

"Healing and the Atonement"

by David Petts, MA, MTh

**Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, May, 1993**



Page Numbering as Bound

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

PREFACE

INTRODUCTION.....	1
-------------------	---

PART ONE:

THE DOCTRINE IN RELATION TO CLASSICAL PENTECOSTALISM	5
---	----------

CHAPTER ONE:

The Doctrine Prior to Classical Pentecostalism	6
---	----------

Rationale for relating the doctrine to Classical Pentecostalism	6
The immediate origins of Pentecostalism	6
The rise of the healing movement	9
The full emergence of the doctrine	12
Major teachings on the subject by some of the earliest proponents	18
Notes	25

CHAPTER TWO:

The Development of the Doctrine within Classical Pentecostalism (with particular reference to the USA and Great Britain).....	31
--	-----------

The doctrine formally adopted by Classical Pentecostal groups	31
The continuation of the doctrine in its original form	33
The doctrine modified and restated	44
Classical Pentecostals whose statement of faith does not include the doctrine	54
Summary	69
Notes	71

CHAPTER THREE:

The Doctrine beyond Classical Pentecostalism	79
---	-----------

The doctrine in the 'faith' movement	79
The doctrine in neo-pentecostalism	85
The doctrine rejected by certain non-pentecostals	92
Summary	95
Notes	96

Contents

PART TWO:

AN EXAMINATION OF NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES

RELATING TO THE DOCTRINE101

CHAPTER FOUR:

He took our infirmities and carried our diseases

(Matthew 8:17)102

The nature of the Gospels - some basic assumptions102

The nature of Matthew's Gospel - an immediate difficulty103

The pericope - a preliminary examination104

The Gospel as a whole - Matthew's major purposes106

Matthew's use of the Old Testament - his understanding of fulfilment107

Matthew's purpose in recording Jesus' miracles - the 'he healed all' passages110

Exegesis of Matthew 8:16-17116

Notes129

CHAPTER FIVE:

By his Stripes you were Healed (1 Peter 2:24)141

Authorship of 1 Peter141

Date and place of writing144

Destination145

The nature of the letter148

The purpose of the letter149

Exegesis of 1 Peter 2:24150

Summary154

Notes155

CHAPTER SIX:

Some Other Passages used in Support of the Doctrine163

Galatians 3:13163

1 Corinthians 11:29-30173

James 5:14-15178

Mark 16:15-18188

Summary191

Notes193

Healing & the Atonement

PART THREE:

NEW TESTAMENT THEMES RELATING TO THE DOCTRINE205

CHAPTER SEVEN:

Healing, Salvation, and the Gospel206

The meaning of σώζω207

The use of σώζω in the New Testament208

The relationship between physical and spiritual aspects
of σωτηρία in the Lukan writings210

Summary on relation between healing and salvation215

Is healing part of the gospel?217

Summary222

Notes223

CHAPTER EIGHT:

Sickness in Relation to Sin, Satan, and Suffering229

Sickness in relation to sin229

Sickness in relation to Satan236

Sickness in relation to suffering239

Summary241

Notes243

CHAPTER NINE:

**Sick Christians and the Art of Medicine
in the New Testament251**

The weakness and thorn in Paul's flesh251

Trophimus, Epaphroditus, and Timothy257

The art of medicine in the New Testament262

Summary269

Notes271

Contents

PART FOUR:

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE DOCTRINE279

CHAPTER TEN:

Difficulties with the Doctrine280

Theological difficulties - the meaning of 'atonement' ,,,280

Theological difficulties - 'claiming promises'298

Pastoral and practical difficulties309

Summary315

Notes317

CHAPTER ELEVEN:

A Proposed Modification to the Doctrine327

Rationale for attempting a modification to the doctrine ..327

A proposed modification to the doctrine331

Healing in the atonement - ultimately332

Healing in the atonement - indirectly345

The Spirit and eschatology in the Pauline corpus
in relation to healing347

Summary and Conclusion355

Notes359

APPENDIX373

BIBLIOGRAPHY375

ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS393

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the thesis is to examine the doctrine that physical healing is provided in the atonement. This is defined as "the view that Christians may claim healing from sickness on the grounds that Christ has already carried that sickness for them just as he has carried their sins".

The theological and literary origins of the doctrine are traced and developments and modifications noted, particular reference being made to the Classical Pentecostal groups among which the doctrine is largely to be found. The New Testament passages used to support the doctrine are identified. These include Matthew 8:17, 1 Peter 2:24, Galatians 3:13, 1 Corinthians 11:29-30, James 5:14-15, and Mark 16:15-18. The conclusion is drawn that none of these passages supports the doctrine as it was originally propounded.

The doctrine is also examined in the light of a possible relationship between healing and salvation, healing and the Gospel, sickness and sin, sickness and Satan, and sickness and suffering. The bearing on the doctrine of New Testament references to sick Christians and to the art of medicine is also considered. The examination of these themes leads to a conclusion that a modified form of the doctrine might well find a basis in the New Testament.

Theological difficulties dealt with include the problem of relating the word "atonement" to sickness and the notion that Bible verses are "promises" to be "claimed". Practical and pastoral difficulties are also considered. In the final chapter a modification to the doctrine is proposed. Healing may be understood to be in the atonement both ultimately and indirectly. This is based on the Pauline teaching that those in Christ are to be clothed with an incorruptible body at the Parousia. Meanwhile healings occur as a work of the Spirit who is given to Christians as an ἀρρῶβών of their inheritance.

PREFACE

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the doctrine that the healing of physical sickness is provided for Christians in the atonement. Since, as I shall show later, this doctrine is embraced largely by Classical Pentecostal groups, I feel it appropriate to declare at the outset my interest in Classical Pentecostalism. I have been a Pentecostal minister since 1962. Since 1978 I have served as Principal of Mattersey Hall, the official Bible College of British Assemblies of God, and for several successive years have been appointed as Chairman of the Assemblies of God Executive Council. I am also a member the Executive Committees of both the Pentecostal European Fellowship and the World Pentecostal Conference.

My interest in the subject of this thesis is thus more than academic. Indeed the denomination with which I hold ministerial credentials (Assemblies of God in Great Britain and Ireland) has embraced the doctrine as one of its 'Fundamental Truths'. Yet, as will become apparent as I develop my thesis, the doctrine, at least in the form in which it was originally propounded, has sometimes been challenged even by leaders from within Classical Pentecostalism itself. The main purpose of this thesis, therefore, is to discover whether or not the doctrine may rightly be held to find a legitimate basis in the New Testament. The conclusion I have drawn will, I trust, offer clarification to those who are seeking it and challenge those who are not.

Sincere thanks are due to my supervisor, Dr. John Muddiman (now of Mansfield College, Oxford) for his thought-provoking comments and warm encouragement over the past four years. I am also extremely grateful to my colleagues at Mattersey Hall (faculty, staff, and students) for their interest and patience - I have not always been as available to them as I might have been! Special thanks are due to Dr. William Kay who has been

Preface

a constant encouragement to me and who has greatly assisted me in the final stages in transferring the text of the thesis from a personal word processor to a computer. This has greatly enhanced the quality of the presentation.

Finally, my heartfelt thanks to my wife, Eileen, who has patiently borne my sometimes lengthy absences and has on occasion foregone the domestic assistance that she might otherwise have expected from her husband.

INTRODUCTION

Much has already been written about 'divine healing' [1]. The subject of this thesis, however, is not merely 'divine healing', but the doctrine that divine healing is provided in the atonement.

In its simplest form [2] this doctrine teaches that Christ bore not only our sins but also our sicknesses when he died on the cross. Passages such as Isaiah 53:4-5, Matthew 8:17, and 1 Peter 2:24 are adduced as evidence for this. As a result, it is taught that Christians may claim their healing on the grounds that they need not have the sickness because Christ has already carried it for them substitutionally. Once this is understood faith will appropriate the healing which has already been accomplished at Calvary. Why should I suffer pain if Christ has already carried my pains and sorrows?

Thus Gloria Copeland, commenting on Matthew 8:17, makes the following statement:

"When Jesus bore away our sins, He also bore away our diseases. The cross pronounced a double cure for the ills of mankind.

The Church of Jesus Christ has been made just as free from sickness as it has been made free from sin. A Christian may continue to sin after he has been born again, but he does not have to. Sin shall no longer lord it over him unless he allows it (Rom. 6:14).

A Christian may continue to be sick after he has been born again but he does not have to. He has been redeemed from sickness. The price has been paid for his healing. Sickness can no longer exert dominion over him unless he allows it.

Introduction

Most believers have only known a part of their redemption. Their faith will operate to the degree of their knowledge of God's Word. They would have begun to live in divine health long ago if they had realised that healing belonged to them.

As you accept the fact that as surely as Jesus bore your sins, He also bore away your disease, weakness, and pain, your days of sickness will be over" [3].

This rather lengthy quotation adequately summarises the teaching of those who hold the doctrine that divine healing is provided in the atonement. Accordingly I offer as a working definition of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement

the view that Christians may claim healing from sickness on the grounds that Christ has already carried that sickness for them just as he has carried their sins [4].

The major purpose of this thesis is to examine this doctrine in the light the relevant New Testament passages. This will be undertaken in PART TWO where the key passages will be considered in detail and exegetical difficulties with the doctrine dealt with as they arise. PART THREE will be devoted to an examination of New Testament themes which relate to the doctrine.

First, however, it will be helpful in PART ONE to trace as far as possible the theological and literary origins of the doctrine [5], to discover how the doctrine has developed and been modified within Pentecostal groups [6] among whom the doctrine is largely, though not exclusively, to be found [7], and thus to identify the various forms in which it is held.

After the relevant New Testament passages and themes have been examined in PARTS TWO & THREE, I shall consider in PART FOUR

what I consider to be the major difficulties with the doctrine. I shall argue that if the doctrine is to be retained it may be best viewed against the background of the Pauline understanding of the relationship between the Spirit and eschatology. This will facilitate the view that healing may be understood to be in the atonement only in an indirect and ultimate sense, a view which will, I trust, prove to be a helpful modification not only from a theological, but also from a practical and pastoral perspective.

Introduction

NOTES

1. 'Divine healing' is a term frequently used by writers to refer to what is believed to be the action of God in healing the sick. As such it is to be distinguished from healing by medical means. See, for example, Horton, H. *'The Gifts of the Spirit'*, London, Assemblies of God, 1954, pp 112-113. Titles listed in the Bibliography containing 'Heal', 'Healing', or 'Health' are included either because they are written directly on the subject of 'divine healing' or because they contain specific reference to it.
2. I shall offer evidence of more sophisticated forms of the doctrine later. See pp 12-24, 33-54.
3. Copeland, G. *'God's Will For You'*, Fort Worth, KCP, 1972, pp. 126-127.
4. More sophisticated forms of the doctrine reject the precise parallel with sin, however. See for example the quote from Gee on p. 44. Cf. note 2.
5. It is not my intention to examine the broader social and historical background. This has already been extensively covered. See, for example:

Harrell, D., *'All Things Are Possible: the Healing and Charismatic Revivals in Modern America'*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1975

and

Chappell, Paul G., *'The Divine Healing Movement In America'*, unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Drew University.
6. For an excellent and brief explanation of 'Pentecostalism' see Livingstone, E.A. (Ed.), *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, Oxford, 1986, p. 391. See also notes 1 and 2 on p. 25 of this thesis.
7. See Appendix, p. 373.

PART ONE

THE DOCTRINE IN RELATION TO CLASSICAL PENTECOSTALISM

In this part of the thesis I propose to examine the doctrine that divine healing is provided in the atonement with particular reference to Classical Pentecostalism [1].

In Chapter One I shall first offer a brief rationale for so doing and shall then seek to trace the origins of the doctrine demonstrating that it in fact came into existence before the formation of those Classical Pentecostal groups by whom it is largely, though not exclusively embraced today. Finally I shall draw attention to the major teachings on the subject of divine healing offered by some of those who first held the doctrine that healing is in the atonement.

In Chapter Two I shall demonstrate that the doctrine was adopted by certain Classical Pentecostal groups and still continues to be held, by some at least, in very much its original form. I shall also show that some Classical Pentecostals have attempted considerably to modify the doctrine and I shall compare their teaching with that of the early teachers of the doctrine.

In Chapter Three I shall offer evidence that the doctrine in both its original and modified forms is also held outside Classical Pentecostalism, partly among the Neo-Pentecostals [2] and partly by certain 'Faith Teachers' [3] some of whom would not be accepted within Classical Pentecostalism. I shall also note the views of some who reject the doctrine.

It is not my intention to attempt an evaluation of the doctrine at this stage. This will be reserved until the relevant New Testament passages and themes are considered in Parts Two and Three after which a concluding assessment of the doctrine will be offered in Part Four.

CHAPTER ONE: THE DOCTRINE PRIOR TO CLASSICAL PENTECOSTALISM

*Rationale for relating the doctrine
to Classical Pentecostalism*

My reason for examining the doctrine that healing is in the atonement in particular relation to Classical Pentecostalism is twofold.

First, because the doctrine is formally stated in the Declarations of Faith of large Classical Pentecostal groups such as the Assemblies of God and the Church of God (Cleveland, USA) [4].

Second, because although the doctrine, as I hope to show shortly, first emerged in the Holiness Movement (in which also the Pentecostal Movement itself appears to have its origins), [5] the Holiness Movement has not retained the doctrine [6]. It is, therefore, all the more significant that at least some of the denominational groups within Classical Pentecostalism have retained it.

The validity of this second aspect is, however, dependent on the assumption that the origins of Pentecostalism lie in the Holiness Movement. Since this has not been acknowledged by all, the matter merits brief discussion before proceeding further.

The immediate origins of Pentecostalism

Historians of the Pentecostal Movement generally trace its immediate origins to the Holiness Movement of the nineteenth century and to that movement's use of the phrase 'the baptism with the Holy Spirit' to refer to a second experience of entire sanctification [7]. Indeed for Conn, the official

historian of the Church of God of Cleveland, Tennessee, Pentecostal doctrine is simply an extension of Holiness teaching:

"Roots of the Pentecostal faith are laid in the holiness revival that appeared during the last half of the nineteenth century. In reality the Pentecostal emphasis is simply an extension of the earlier holiness concepts. Its adherents stoutly maintain that Pentecostal and holiness precepts are inseparable and regard themselves different from other holiness believers only in the further spiritual experience they have received. The history of the Pentecostal faith must necessarily begin with the history of holiness separation" [8].

It is perhaps not surprising that Conn takes this view for it reflects the doctrinal stand of his denomination [9]. However, not all historians of the Pentecostal Movement have acknowledged a connection with the Holiness Movement. Frodsham (an American Assemblies of God author) makes no special reference to the Holiness Movement. He rather draws attention to several nineteenth century cases of speaking in tongues [10]. Similarly, Brumback, who lists seven "positive conditions" in the Church that helped prepare the way for the Pentecostal Movement, makes little reference to the Holiness Movement [11]. Like Frodsham he particularly emphasises the increasing desire for a restoration of the supernatural and, like Gee, the influence of R.A. Torrey's teaching of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit as an enduement with power for service, as the major factors contributing to the rise of the Pentecostal Movement [12].

But if Conn's history appears to be coloured by his denominational affiliation it seems equally likely that Frodsham's and Brumback's failure to acknowledge a connection with the Holiness Movement is a result of theirs [13]. Neither Frodsham nor Brumback deny the connection but the apparent attempt to be dissociated from Holiness doctrine

should not have been allowed to cloud historical objectivity. It may well be possible to argue that the doctrine of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit as an enduement with power for service, distinct from regeneration, is theologically independent from the Holiness doctrine of a crisis experience of entire sanctification, but it would be misleading to suggest that historically there is no connection. Dunn, commenting on the use of the phrase 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit', is almost certainly right when he claims that:

"Towards the close of the nineteenth century, particularly in America, the emphasis in the use of the phrase gradually shifted from the idea of sanctification and holiness..... to that of empowering for service..... At the same time in the United States there was a growing interest in spiritual gifts, and several prominent Holiness leaders taught that these could and should be in operation within the Church. It was directly from this context that Pentecostalism sprang..." [14]

It appears, therefore, that the latter part of the nineteenth century saw the emergence of a sort of proto-Pentecostalism in which certain groups of Christians sought to receive "The Baptism in the Holy Spirit" as an enduement with power for service and at the same time expected to see a restoration to the Church of spiritual gifts such as tongues, prophecy and healing. But it would be wrong to assume that it was here that the doctrine that healing is in the atonement began. Rather the doctrine that healing is in the atonement appears to have preceded the Pentecostal understanding of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit as an enduement with power for service [15].

Before attempting to demonstrate that the doctrine came into existence before the formation of the Pentecostal Movement, however, I shall briefly consider the theological and literary background to the doctrine starting with John Wesley.

The rise of the healing movement

The decision to start with Wesley is based on the understanding that reformers such as Luther [16] and Calvin [17] had both relegated the gift of healing to the apostolic era and that this "dispensational" view had become the assumed position of the Puritans by whom Wesley was deeply influenced.

Wesley's Journal, on the other hand, as advocates of divine healing are quick to point out [18] often mentions events that would today count as miraculous healings. Wesley's attitude, however, was far more detached than that of the intense advocacy of modern faith healers for when challenged on reports of healings in answer to prayer, Wesley replied:

But what does all this prove? Not that I claim any gift above other men, but only that I believe that God now hears and answers prayer even beyond the ordinary course of nature" [19].

Probably more important, however, as far as the origin of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement is concerned was Wesley's view of salvation as the "double cure" (justification and sanctification). Dayton summarises Wesley's major influence on the later Divine Healing Movement thus:

"Wesley's strong sense of the power of God to restore the fallen creation cast a new light on his concern for physical health (evidenced not only in the Primitive Physic but also in his work for health care and dispensaries for the poor) and would eventually help raise more insistent questions about the extent to which healing and restoration of health would be included in the benefits of grace to be expected in this life. If, indeed, we might be fully restored spiritually to the full image of God, to what extent might physical restoration also be expected, since disease is ultimately to be traced to the sin of Adam?

Chapter One

These questions were not directly pursued by Wesley with the intensity with which they would be probed in the 'next century' [20].

But Wesley's doctrines were not the only source from which the healing movement of the nineteenth century sprang. Pietism also produced a doctrine of healing through prayer and faith [21]. John Albert Bengel, in his *Gnomon of the New Testament*, commenting on Mark 16:17, remarks:

Even in our day, faith has in every believer a hidden power of a miraculous character: every effect resulting from our prayers is really miraculous, even though that miraculous character be not apparent..... Signs were in the beginning the props and stays of faith: now they are also the object of faith. At Leonberg, a town in Wirtemberg [A.C. 1644, thirteenth Sunday after Trinity], a girl of twenty years of age was so disabled in her limbs, as hardly to be able to creep along by the help of crutches; but whilst the Dean [Raumeier was his name] was, from the pulpit, dwelling on the miraculous power of Jesus' name, she suddenly was raised up and restored to the use of her limbs" [22].

Similarly, on James 5:14-15 he comments that "the only design of that anointing originally was miraculous healing.....given by God with this intent, that it might always remain in the Church....." [23]. It is interesting that both these statements are produced in abridged form in Wesley's Explanatory Notes on the New Testament [24].

More significant, however, was the work of Johann Christoph Blumhardt, (whom Dayton describes as 'a "latter day" Pietist of the nineteenth century' [25]). Blumhardt argued that sin is the cause of sickness and that therefore "the forgiveness of sins and healing stand in an inner relationship to one another" [26]. According to Dayton,

Healing & the Atonement

"Blumhardt's Kampf in Möttlingen was widely reported and brought him to the attention of many who sought his help. Such demands and his own interest led him in 1852 to Bad Boll, a Württemberg spa, where he established a community for those seeking spiritual and physical help. Meanwhile a similar home was emerging under the ministry of Dorothea Trudel of the Swiss village of Männendorf on Lake Zürich - in spite of local resistance, including prosecutions and fines, to her claims of healing and miracles. Reports of the work of Trudel (and her successor, Samuel Zeller) and Blumhardt began to circulate during the 1850s through the English-speaking world, where developments of another sort had drawn new attention to the 'prayer of faith'" [27].

Dayton proceeds by referring to the work of George Müller in England and to the evangelist Charles G. Finney in America who insisted that in order to 'prevail in prayer' one must 'pray for a definite object', 'pray in faith', and 'expect to obtain the blessing'. These convictions led Finney to the conclusion that Paul had not really prayed 'in faith' in order to be relieved of his 'thorn in the flesh' [28].

It was Charles Cullis, however, an Episcopalian homeopathic physician in Boston who did "more than any other man to bring healing by faith to the attention of the church in the last century" [29]. Cullis, who founded a home for incurable consumptives committed to the faith principles of George Müller, became a major leader of the broader Holiness movement in the wake of the revival of 1857-58 and moved toward the doctrine of faith healing by considering whether the work of faith to which he had been called should extend to the cure of the disease as well as the alleviation of the miseries of the afflicted [30].

"The key text in James 5:14-15 prompted Cullis to enquire among 'earnest Christians' about 'instances of answers to prayer for the healing of the body'. In the midst of this search a book

Chapter One

about Dorothea Trudel fell into his hands. He immediately put out his own expanded version of the book and in 1873 made his own pilgrimage to Männendorf, then announced in his annual report 'the call of the Lord which had come to him to use his faith in praying for the healing of the sick' and included testimonies of those healed under his ministry" [31].

And so a belief in divine healing had arisen within the Holiness Movement. But it is among the followers of Cullis that the doctrine that healing is in the atonement may be clearly seen to have emerged.

The full emergence of the doctrine

W.E. Boardman, a Holiness writer who publicized the work of Cullis, came to the conclusion that healing through faith is "itself part and parcel of the Gospel", of the redemption to be sought in Christ [32]. A footnote, added by Dr. Robert McKilliam, a surgeon who read the manuscript of Boardman's book, is particularly significant. He notes:

"an interesting order of manifestations of Himself by the Lord to His child. First, as the sin-bearing and pardoning Saviour; next in the ever-abiding presence as the Deliverer from present sin and its power, and as the keeper of the heart in perfect peace; and lastly, as the Deliverer from all the consequences of sin, and from all the heritage of sinful flesh - disease, etc. Something like this, I believe, will always be found in the experiences of those who are going in to prove the fulness of God in Christ" [33].

In the search for the origin of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement it is also significant to note that especially important for Boardman was Psalm 103:3, the Hebrew

parallelism of which he understood to bring healing and forgiveness together [34].

Of even greater interest for the purpose of this thesis, however, is the life and work of Carrie Judd Montgomery, where the doctrine that healing is in the atonement can not only be clearly seen but can be seen to have transferred from the Holiness movement into the proto-Pentecostalism of her day.

"Healing and holiness were even more closely connected in work of Episcopalian Carrie Judd Montgomery, who through the influence of Mrs. Edward Mix, a black woman, turned quickly to Dr. Cullis and became part of the network of those advocating faith healing. As Carrie F. Judd she founded Faith Rest Cottage in Buffalo in 1882 and in 1880 authored *The Prayer of Faith*, which saw many private editions. It was also published in this country (sc. USA) by Fleming H. Revell, the dominant publisher associated with the Moody revivals, and in England by the Christian Herald and was translated into at least four European languages. After her marriage to George Montgomery she moved to San Francisco and then to Oakland to found the Home of Peace and finally was swept into Pentecostalism in the wake of the Azusa Street Revival" [35].

The Prayer of Faith written in 1880 just one year before Boardman's *The Lord that Healeth Thee* contains some of the earliest expressions of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement [36]. The columns of her magazine *Triumphs of Faith* also carried

"one of the most systematic developments of the analogy of spiritual and physical healing under the series title *Gospel Parallelisms: Illustrated in the Healing of Body and Soul* by R.L. Stanton, a former President of Miami (Ohio) University and a moderator of the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church.... Stanton argued that 'the atonement of Christ lays a foundation

Chapter One

equally for deliverance from sin and for deliverance from disease; that complete provision has been made for both'. Stanton appealed to the same Hebrew parallelism that lay at the root of Boardman's thought - though this time as found in Isaiah 53:3-5 and quoted in Matthew 8:16-17 - to argue that 'the healing of the sick was one of the blessings which Christ's atonement was designed to provide for' [37].

Other notable contributions on the subject in the 1880s came from Robert Kelso Carter, A.J. Gordon, and A.B. Simpson. Gordon's popular *The Ministry of Healing* first published in 1882 contains the statement that "in the atonement of Christ there seems to be foundation laid for faith in bodily healing" [38] although he carefully avoided the Holiness doctrines of entire sanctification and second blessing but "clearly paralleled sanctification and healing as the twofold work of the Spirit whose benefits may be *at least partially* (my italics) received in this life" [39].

Simpson's major work on the subject, *The Gospel of Healing*, (1885), differs little in its approach from others of the period. Perhaps most significant is his conclusion that if healing is in the atonement of Christ then the use of medical "means" is to be rejected in favour of divine healing:

"If that be God's way of healing, then other methods must be man's ways, and there must be some risk in deliberately repudiating the former for the latter.... for the trusting and obedient child of God there is the more excellent way which his Word has clearly prescribed" [40].

"Having become fully persuaded of the Word of God, the Will of God, and your own personal acceptance with God, NOW COMMIT YOUR BODY TO HIM AND CLAIM HIS PROMISE OF HEALING in the name of Jesus by simple faith..... From that moment doubt should be regarded as absolutely out of the question, and even the very thought of

retreating or resorting to old 'means' inadmissible. Of course such a person will at once abandon all remedies and medical treatment" (my italics) [41].

However it is Carter's book, *The Atonement for Sin and Sickness; or, A Full Salvation for Soul and Body*, (1884), that perhaps more than any other reveals the Holiness roots of the healing doctrine. Carter argued that the Atonement is a basis for 'pardon for all past sins' and the 'cleansing from all inbred sin' before developing his argument for 'bodily healing, as provided for in the Atonement'. For Carter it was 'only in the Wesleyan view of the matter' that the Atonement is believed to be instantaneous in its application to unrighteousness, or inward depravity' [42]. This became the model for healing because 'the Atonement has provided for the body all that it has provided for the soul' [43]. Thus, 'he who finds in Jesus the perfect cleansing of the soul and the keeping power against all sin, can be equally consistent in placing his body beneath the same wonderful salvation' [44].

But the connection with Holiness teaching is seen perhaps even more clearly in the following sweeping generalisation:

"It is a remarkable fact that no-one has been known to seek the healing power without receiving a distinct spiritual baptism; and further, that everyone known to the writer (a very large number), who has been entirely healed in body, is or has become a believer in and professor of entire sanctification of soul" [45].

This understanding of healing as being intimately connected with Holiness (the Atonement being equally the basis for both) also led to the extreme position that continuing sickness must be a sign of continuing sin or lack of faith and that, as A.B. Simpson also taught, medical help was to be avoided as a sign of lack of faith [46].

It is noteworthy, however, that by the end of the century Carter had modified his position. In *'Faith Healing' Reviewed after Twenty Years*, published in 1897 he expressed the wish to postpone some of the effects of the Atonement which previously he had seen as immediate:

"That the Atonement of Christ covers sickness and disease as well as sin is but to say that the effects are necessarily embraced in the root cause. There was and could be no error there. But to claim that ALL the results of the Atonement are NOW open to the present living Christian is a grave mistake..... we may err, and have erred, in endeavoring to appropriate at the present time some of the final fruits of that sacrifice" [47].

Carter's new position was, as we shall see later [48], similar to that adopted by certain Pentecostal writers in the twentieth century, and the reason for the change was also similar - there were very real practical problems associated with the outworking of the former position [49]. Carter's second book is also of note in that it

"also provided an interesting summary of the state of the healing doctrines at the turn of the century with regard to these questions, distinguishing between the 'extreme' position of his earlier book ('Healing in the Atonement') and the more moderate 'special providence' view of the latter book. He reported that Cullis had never been as extreme as many of the followers; he had always given medicine and continued to suffer from a severe heart problem, though his preaching often sounded more like the extreme view. A.B. Simpson was considered to have 'practically' occupied a similar position, something of a crisis having been forced on him and the Christian Alliance by the 'failure of the holiest missionaries to withstand the African fever purely by faith'. Carrie Judd Montgomery 'does not like anyone to attempt much modification of the theory', but her husband had ill health and she continued to wear glasses" [50].

This insight into the 'practical' position of A.B. Simpson and Carrie Judd Montgomery is extremely valuable as it is by no means apparent in their own writings. A.B. Simpson, whose first work, *The Gospel of Healing*, was primarily an anthology of tracts that circulated widely before being collected in 1885, clearly adopted the more extreme position as we have already seen. Further, in a chapter entitled *Principles of Divine Healing* he makes the following statements:

"If sickness be the result of the Fall, it must be included in the atonement of Christ, which reaches 'as far as the curse is found'" [51].

"Our healing becomes a great redemption right, which we simply claim as our purchased inheritance through the blood of His cross" [52].

"Everything that comes through Christ must come as grace. There can be no works mingled with justifying faith. Even so, our healing must be wholly of God, or not of grace at all. If Christ heals He must do it alone. This principle ought to settle the question of using 'means' in connection with faith for healing. The natural and the spiritual, the earthly and the heavenly, the works of man and the grace of God, cannot be mixed, any more than you could expect to harness a tortoise with a locomotive" [53].

Carrie Judd Montgomery also maintained the same position. *The Prayer of Faith* which, according to Dayton [54], was written in 1880, expresses the same view of Atonement and of the use of medical 'means':

"Jesus Himself has said, 'According to your faith be it unto you'. This surely means that just as many of the benefits of His atonement as we choose to accept by faith.... may be ours" [55].

Chapter One

"If we trust fully to His finished work, sickness shall not be able to hold us captive, for Christ 'Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses' (Matt. viii. 17)" [56].

"Holding on to the medicine certainly implies a lack of faith, and by a careful and truthful examination of the motives which lead any one to use it, after prayer has been offered, we shall see that most of them proceed from the sin of unbelief" [57].

But the discussion of the appropriateness of resorting to medical 'means' for those who believe that healing is provided in the atonement, important though it is, is only one example of the implications of the doctrine for those who hold it. The doctrine carried with it other implications, some doctrinal and others practical, which it will now be convenient to consider. In this connection I propose to investigate the work of Carrie Judd Montgomery and of A. B. Simpson, both of whom, as we have already seen, were among the earliest major proponents of the doctrine, and outline the major aspects of their teaching on divine healing. Then, in the next chapter, I shall consider to what extent those teachings have been retained or rejected by twentieth century Pentecostalism.

Major teachings on the subject by some of the earliest proponents of the doctrine

Carrie Judd Montgomery's *The Prayer of Faith* is by no means a systematic treatise on the subject of divine healing. It is rather a collection of letters which testify to the reality of miraculous healing and which are strung together by various exhortations from the author to the reader to believe in God's willingness and power to heal the sick today. Despite this, however, the underlying doctrine is clearly discernible.

Fundamental to the teaching is the author's faith in the Bible as being literally God's Word:

"We are not apt to accept the Bible as literally as we ought. We get into a dangerous habit of considering its exhortations as in a great degree figurative or sacredly poetic, or as relating to past generations and not to our own.....

If we would accept every command contained in the Bible as a direct command to us from our Lord, and obeyed them all as literally as they are intended to be obeyed, we should find inestimable blessings attending such a course" [58].

Accordingly Bible verses are seen as 'promises' which are to be 'claimed' by faith:

"I can encourage you by the Word of God that 'according to your faith' so be it unto you; and besides you have this *promise*, 'The prayer of faith shall save the sick and the Lord shall raise him up'..... God has *promised* to raise up the sick ones.... Now this *promise* is to you as if you were the only person living. Now if you can *claim that promise*, I have not the least doubt that you will be healed" (my italics throughout) [59].

The writer goes on to explain how such a 'promise' (James 5:14 ff.) may be 'claimed':

"I want you to pray for yourself, and pray believing, and then act faith. It makes no difference how you feel, but get right out of bed and begin to walk by faith. Strength will come, disease will depart, and you will be made whole" [60].

This understanding of faith as being belief in the 'promises' of the Bible which must be believed against all contrary evidence is a recurring emphasis throughout the book:

Chapter One

"Faith is belief, and the question is not how much we must believe God's Word, but whether we accept it as true or not; whether we deem it as reliable or not reliable. There is no neutral ground between faith and unbelief" [61].

"Having faith in God is believing His Word without looking at probabilities or possibilities..... without regarding natural circumstances....." [62].

"The great point to remember.... is that God's Word is true and we must believe it despite every apparent contradiction" [63].

"Should increased suffering come to us, after prayer has been offered for our healing, we must believe that it is because of the healing power which is making us whole" [64].

There is a brief concession to the view that true faith must be imparted by the Holy Spirit, but the emphasis swiftly returns to that of human responsibility and determination:

"We all have the germ of faith in the power to believe intellectually, but it requires the quickening of the Holy Spirit to change a mere intellectual belief into that living faith by which the promises are made real to us. We must first use the God-given powers of our mind and determine to believe, praying at the same time for the Spirit to enable us to do so" [65].

Even here, however, we must assume from the overall tenor of the book that the author believed that the Spirit would enable faith once the appropriate prayer for it had been offered, for great emphasis is placed on 'promises' such as Mark 11:24 [66].

One final point to be noted in Mrs. Montgomery's teaching on divine healing is the insistence that sickness is not God's will for his children. In a chapter entitled "God's Blessed

Will for His Children" she concedes that God has a purpose in allowing sickness [67], but

"....would this tender loving Father.... refuse to deliver us from affliction, when His purpose is accomplished, and we are ready to trust fully in Him?

How plainly are we shewn throughout the Bible that it is not the Lord's will to put sickness upon us, if we will only obey His commands and have faith in His promises.....

If we trust fully to His finished work, sickness shall not be able to hold us captive, for Christ 'Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses' (Matt. viii. 17)" [68].

Thus the teaching of Carrie Judd Montgomery on the subject of divine healing may be summarised as follows. The Bible is God's Word and its verses are treated as 'promises' made to Christians. Verses such as James 5:14ff promise that God will heal the sick. This is only to be expected because Christ has already carried our sickness substitutionarily on the cross. All a Christian needs to do to appropriate healing is to 'claim' the promise, and act in faith ignoring all contrary evidence and symptoms. Any resort to medical 'means' must be construed as a lack of faith [69].

A.B. Simpson's *The Gospel of Healing* teaches essentially the same things. However his treatment is more systematic and, as the title suggests, expresses more clearly the thought only briefly alluded to in Mrs. Montgomery's book [70] that healing is a part of the Gospel:

"Faith must ever rest on the Divine Word; and the most important element in the 'prayer of faith' is a full and firm persuasion that the healing of disease by simple faith in God is a part of the Gospel and a doctrine of the Scriptures" [71].

Simpson sees sickness as a result of the Fall [72] and therefore as something "to be embraced in the provisions of Redemption" [73]. It is in this sense that healing is a part of the Gospel. The message of God's healing promise to those who are redeemed is foreshadowed in the Old Testament and made explicit in the New Testament. Since it is a part of our redemption, healing was not intended to cease with the apostolic era but should continue in the Church [74]. It is, therefore, possible to give clear directions to Christians today as to how they may obtain their healing [75].

With reference to the Old Testament Simpson points out that God's promise to heal his people (Exodus 15:26) comes after their passing through the Red Sea which Simpson sees as "distinctly typical of our Redemption" [76] in evidence of which he cites 1 Corinthians 10:11. Further, he sees Psalm 105:37 and Psalm 103:2-3 as evidence that this promise of healing was kept [77]. Thus even in the Old Testament the promise of healing is seen as one of the benefits of salvation.

This, Simpson believed, is made explicit in the New Testament in the life and ministry of Jesus "in whose words and works we may surely gather the full plan of redemption" [78] and in such verses such as Matthew 8:17 and 1 Peter 2:24 both of which quote from Isaiah 53:4-5. With reference to these verses Simpson states:

"That one cruel 'stripe' of His - for the word is singular - summed up in it all the aches and pains of a suffering world; and there is no longer need that we should suffer what He has sufficiently borne. Thus our healing becomes a great redemption right, which we simply claim as our purchased inheritance through the blood of His Cross" [79].

But, Simpson argued, if healing is a part of the Gospel it follows that it should continue in the Church rather than be seen to have ceased with the apostolic era. Jesus had promised that those who believed in him would do greater works than he had done (John 14:12) [80], and this would include the healing of the sick (Mark 16:15-18) [81]. The 'spiritual gifts' (1 Corinthians 12:8-10) include 'gifts of healing' [82] and provision is made for the healing of sick Christians in James 5:14ff [83]. In this passage Simpson also sees further evidence that healing is a part of the Gospel in that the forgiveness of sins is mentioned along with the healing of the body. Indeed for Simpson there is a strong relationship between spiritual and physical health as his understanding of 3 John 2 also indicates:

"John, the last of the Apostles, and the one who best knew the Master's heart, has left this tender prayer by which we may know our Father's gentle care for our health as well as for our souls. And when God breathes such a prayer for us, we need not fear to claim it for ourselves. But, as we do, we must not forget that our health will be even as our soul prospereth" [84].

Yet for Simpson this 'claiming' of divine healing was not only to be based on Christ's work on the cross but also on the power of his resurrection life. The Christian is spiritually united with Christ and from that union may draw spiritual life which will sustain his physical body. Simpson uses verses such as Romans 8:11, 2 Corinthians 4:10-11, and Ephesians 5:30 to support this view [85].

Thus Simpson saw healing as available to all Christians if they would have the faith to claim it. Accordingly he did not hesitate to give practical directions which may be conveniently summarized as follows:

Chapter One

1. Be sure that God's Word teaches Divine Healing [86]
2. Be sure that it is God's will to heal you [87]
3. Be sure you are right with God [88]
4. Claim your healing [89]
5. Act your faith (and renounce medical 'means') [90]
6. Be prepared for trials [91]
7. Use your new strength and health for God [92].

These instructions are clearly very much in keeping with the advice given by Carrie Judd Montgomery and, indeed, Simpson's teaching, though rather more systematic than hers, is evidently in very much the same mould. The work of these two writers having now been carefully examined, the implications of the doctrine that divine healing is provided in the atonement have now been clearly identified. For those who first held it, at least, the doctrine meant that there is a strong correlation between sickness and sin; that it cannot be God's will for Christians to be sick; that Christians do not need to be sick; that if a Christian is sick it is a result of either sin or of a lack of faith; that the use of medicine is not necessary and that to resort to it is an indication of lack of faith. The view also carries with it the implication that divine healing should not be understood to have ceased with the apostolic era.

The practical difficulties that arise from some of these implications are evident. We have already noted that one nineteenth century proponent of the doctrine had revised his opinion after twenty years [93]. But it was the twentieth century Pentecostal Movement that inherited the doctrine and in the next chapter the extent to which that movement has retained, revised or rejected the doctrine will be considered.

NOTES

1. I shall use the term 'Classical Pentecostals' to refer to individuals or groups who are considered to be *specifically* Pentecostal. Such groupings include the Assemblies of God, the Church of God in Christ, the Elim Church, The New Testament Church of God, and many others. The Classical Pentecostals are thus to be distinguished from the Neo-Pentecostals (see note 2). The Classical Pentecostals are also sometimes referred to as 'The Pentecostal Movement'. In this thesis I shall confine the use of this latter term to refer to Classical Pentecostals. I shall use the term 'Pentecostalism' (without the epithet 'Classical' or the prefix 'Neo-') when referring to Classical and Neo-Pentecostals as a whole.
2. The term 'Neo-Pentecostals' is used to refer to individuals or groups within the main Christian denominations whose adherents share in many respects the views of Classical Pentecostals. Unlike the latter, however, they have remained within their own denominations.
3. For an explanation of 'Faith' teaching, see pp 79ff of this thesis.
4. See Appendix on pp. 373-4. Cf. note 7 on p. 4.
5. See below.
6. The Church of the Nazarene, for example, which is one of the largest sections of the Holiness Movement (among whom the doctrine, as I shall show shortly - see pp. 12ff - first emerged) does not adhere to the doctrine. See Ford, J., *'In the Steps of John Wesley'*, Kansas City, Nazarene Publishing House, 1968, pp. 202-204.
7. e.g. Dunn, J.D.G. *'Baptism in the Holy Spirit'*, London, SCM, 1970, pp 1-2. See also Gee, D. *'The Pentecostal Movement'*, London, Elim, 1949, pp 2-8.
8. Conn, C.W. *'Like a Mighty Army'*, Cleveland, Pathway, 1977, p. xxiii.
9. *ibid* p. 400.
10. Frodsham, S.H. *'With Signs Following'*, Springfield Mo., GPH, 1946, pp 9-16.
11. Brumback makes brief reference to the Holiness Movement on p. 5. See Brumback, C. *'Suddenly From Heaven'*, Springfield Mo., GPH, 1961.
12. *ibid* pp 6-10.
13. Both are Assemblies of God historians. Unlike the Church of God, Assemblies of God does not believe in an experience of entire sanctification after regeneration. The Assemblies of God are thus, in Hollenweger's terminology, 'two-stage Pentecostals', in that they believe in regeneration followed by baptism in the Holy Spirit. The Church of God are 'three-stage Pentecostals' because they believe in a sanctification experience between regeneration and baptism in the Holy

Chapter One

Spirit. For further clarification of this distinction, see Hollenweger, W.J., *'The Pentecostals'*, London, SCM, 1972, pp 69-71, 513-522.

14. Dunn, op. cit. p.2. An outstanding example of this is Carrie Judd Montgomery whose teachings we shall examine later in this chapter. Her life alone is at least one very clear evidence that the origins of Pentecostalism lie in the Holiness Movement.
15. For this insight I am particularly indebted to D.W.Dayton, whose recent work on the theological roots of Pentecostalism, unlike other histories of the movement which concentrate largely on glossolalia and the understanding of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit, also offers an analysis of the rise of the healing movement. Dayton rightly points out that the celebration of miracles of divine healing as part of God's salvation and as evidence of the presence of divine power in the church is perhaps even more characteristic of Pentecostalism than the doctrine of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit. He therefore sees the rise of the healing movement as one of the theological roots of Pentecostalism. See Dayton, D.W. *'Theological Roots of Pentecostalism'*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1987, pp. 115-141.
16. In a letter to the Elector of Brandenburg, dated 4th December 1539, quoted by B.B. Warfield, *'Counterfeit Miracles'*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918, reprint, London, Banner of Truth, 1972, p. 306, Luther wrote:

"For Christ did not make anointing with oil a Sacrament, nor do St. James' words apply to the present day. For in those days the sick were often cured through a miracle and the earnest prayer of faith, as we see in James and Mark 6".
17. On James 5:14-15, Calvin comments:

"The Lord is indeed present with his people in every age; and he heals their weaknesses as often as necessary, no less than that of old; still he does not put forth these manifest powers, nor dispense miracles through apostles' hands. For that was a temporary gift and also quickly perished".

John Calvin, *'Institutes of the Christian Religion'*, Library of Christian Classics Edition, ed. John T. McNeill, Philadelphia, Westminster Press, Book 4, ch. 19, sect. 19, p. 1467.
18. Kelsey, M.T. *'Healing and Christianity in Ancient Thought and Modern Times'*, New York, Harper and Row, 1976, p. 235, especially the list of citations in footnote 44.
19. Letter of 16 November 1762 to Dr. Warburton, Bishop of Gloucester, in the Telford edition of Wesley's letters, 4:344.
20. Dayton, op. cit. p. 119.
21. See, for example, Endre Zsindely, *'Krankheit und Heilung im älteren Pietismus'*, (Zurich, Zwingli Verlag, 1962) especially section 3C on *'Gebetsheilung im Pietismus'*.

22. Bengel, J.A. *'Gnomon of the New Testament'*, rev. and ed. Andrew Faussett (Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1857), 1:575-76.
23. *ibid* 5:39-40.
24. Dayton *op. cit.* p 120.
25. *ibid* p 120.
26. William G. Bodamer, Jr., *'The Life and Work of Johann Christoph Blumhardt'* (Ph. D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1966), pp161-171.
27. Dayton, *op. cit.* p.121. See also Dayton's footnotes 21 & 22.
28. Finney, C.G., *'Lectures on Revivals of Religion'*, Leavitt Lord, 1835, critical edition ed. William G. McLoughlin, Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press, 1960, pp 52-58.
29. Carter, R. Kelso *'"Faith Healing" Reviewed'*, Boston and Chicago, Christian Witness, 1897.
30. See Dayton, *op. cit.* p. 123.
31. *ibid* p 124. See also Dayton's footnotes 29 and 30, *op. cit.* p. 139.
32. Boardman, W.E., *'The Lord that Healeth Thee'*, London, Morgan and Scott, 1881, pp 10-11.
33. *ibid* p. 11.
34. Boardman, Mary M. *'Life and Labors of the Rev. W.E. Boardman'*, New York, D. Appleton, 1887, p. 232.
35. Dayton, *op. cit.* pp 125-126.
36. Montgomery, C.J., *'The Prayer of Faith'*, London, Victory Press, 1930 edition, pp 37, 38, 41, 47. I do not have access to the original edition but it seems probable that the statements concerning healing in the atonement contained in the pages referred to above were in fact a part of the original edition. Certainly Mrs. Montgomery held to that doctrine as is clear from Dayton's quotation from her editorial in the magazine *Triumphs of Faith* (January 1881). See Dayton, *op. cit.* p. 126.
37. See Dayton, *op. cit.* pp 126-127. See also Dayton's footnotes 37 & 38
38. Gordon, A.J. *'The Ministry of Healing: Miracles of Cure in All Ages'*, Boston, H. Gannett, 1882, p 16.
39. Dayton, *op. cit.* p 129.
40. Simpson, A.B. *'The Gospel of Healing'*, (New Edition), London, Morgan & Scott, 1915, p 68.
41. *ibid* pp 88-89

Chapter One

42. Carter, R.K., *'The Atonement for Sin and Sickness; or, A Full Salvation for Soul and Body'*, Boston, Willard Tract Repository, 1884, pp 12-13.
43. *ibid* p 17.
44. *ibid* p 38.
45. *ibid* p 38.
46. See Dayton, *op. cit.* p 130.
47. Carter, R.K. *"Faith Healing" Reviewed After Twenty Years'*, Boston and Chicago, Christian Witness, 1897, p. 167.
48. See pp 44ff.
49. See Dayton, *op. cit.* pp 130-131.
50. *ibid* pp 131-132.
51. Simpson, A.B., *'The Gospel of Healing'*, New Edition, London, Morgan and Scott, 1915, p. 31.
52. *ibid* p.32.
53. *ibid* p.37.
54. Dayton, *op. cit.* p. 125.
55. Montgomery, C.J., *op. cit.* p. 38.
56. *ibid* p. 41.
57. *ibid* p. 58.
58. *ibid* p. 12.
59. *ibid* pp 4-5.
60. *ibid* p. 5.
61. *ibid* p. 26.
62. *ibid* p. 27.
63. *ibid* p. 66.
64. *ibid* p. 72. It is noteworthy that although the emphasis here is still on faith for healing a concession is made to the possibility of suffering even after prayer.
65. *ibid* p. 32.

66. *ibid* p. 60. The verse is quoted from the Authorized Version: "What things soever ye desire when ye pray, *believe that ye receive them*, and ye shall have them".
67. *ibid* p. 36.
68. *ibid* pp 40-41. For a concise expression of a similar view, see:
Cooke-Ellis, T., '*Healing in the Atonement*', Tongues of Fire, 1899, 9, 107, p. 5.
69. See p. 20 and footnote 51.
70. Montgomery, C.J., *op. cit.* pp 44-45. That healing is a part of the Gospel is of course implicit in the view that healing is in the atonement. Mrs. Montgomery does not state this explicitly, however, as does Simpson.
71. Simpson, A.B., *op. cit.* p.7.
72. *ibid* pp. 5, 27
73. *ibid* p. 29
74. *ibid* pp. 15-24
75. *ibid* pp. 75-96
76. *ibid* p. 8
77. *ibid* pp. 9-10
78. *ibid* p. 30
79. *ibid* p. 32
80. *ibid* p. 15
81. *ibid* p. 16
82. *ibid* p. 17
83. *ibid* p. 18
84. *ibid* p. 21
85. *ibid* pp. 21-22
86. *ibid* p. 75
87. *ibid* p. 78
88. *ibid* p. 85
89. *ibid* p. 88

Chapter One

90. *ibid* p. 91. See also p.37

91. *ibid* p. 93

92. *ibid* p. 94

93. See p. 16 of this thesis with reference to Robert Kelso Carter.

CHAPTER TWO: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE WITHIN CLASSICAL PENTECOSTALISM, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE USA & BRITAIN

The purpose of this chapter is to show that the doctrine that healing is in the atonement was formally adopted by certain, though not all, Classical Pentecostal groups at their inception, and that it has continued to be held by some Classical Pentecostals in very much the same form as it was originally taught. However I shall also demonstrate that others, both from the groups that formally adopted the doctrine and from those groups that did not, have modified it considerably and shall compare their teaching with that of the early teachers of the doctrine. I shall confine my attention to American and British groups because I consider these groups to be fairly representative of Classical Pentecostalism worldwide [1].

In the Appendix I have listed some of the major Classical Pentecostal groups whose Declarations of Faith affirm belief in the doctrine. I have also listed some of those who do not. With reference to the former I shall demonstrate that the doctrine has been and continues to be held and taught by some in very much the same form as it was originally held and taught by writers such as Carrie Judd Montgomery and A.B. Simpson [2], but that others have sought to modify and restate the doctrine. With reference to the latter I shall show that even though the doctrine has not been formally adopted by those groups it has nevertheless been embraced at times by individuals within those groups. I shall also note any modifications to the doctrine proposed by individuals within those groups.

The doctrine formally adopted by Classical Pentecostal groups

C.W. Conn, 'the first official Church historian' of the Church of God (an American Pentecostal group) [3], states that:

Chapter Two

"Until 1910, the Church had no published declaration of faith or articles of faith - or even a formal outline of its teachings. During the summer of 1910, the August 15 issue of the *Evangel* was dedicated to the doctrines of the Church, in which a committee listed some of the prominent teachings.....

.....These teachings were accepted.....by the Assembly of 1911, and in 1912 were published in the *Minutes*, where, with only slight amendments, they have been published ever since" [4].

Item 13 in the list of these 'teachings' reads:

"Divine healing provided for all in the atonement" [5].

William W. Menzies in his history of the Assemblies of God (USA) relates how the *First General Council of Assemblies of God* took place in April 1914 [6]. However 'no attempt was made to formalize a precise doctrinal statement' [7], and a statement of faith was not voted upon until 1916 'and then only out of very evident necessity' [8]. Menzies does not quote the original statement because:

"....after all these years the Statement of Fundamental Truths has remained virtually unchanged, with but minor rewording for the sake of clarification in recent years" [9].

That Statement, with regard to Divine Healing, reads as follows:

"Divine healing is an integral part of the gospel. Deliverance from sickness is provided for in the atonement, and is the privilege of all believers (Isaiah 53:4-5, Matt. 8:16-17, James 5:14-16)" [10].

Healing & the Atonement

In February 1924 the newly formed 'Assemblies of God of Great Britain and Ireland' followed suit. The Minutes of the inaugural meeting read as follows:

"A preliminary Meeting of leaders and elders of Full Gospel, Pentecostal and Church of God meetings was held at Birmingham on the 1st February, 1924, and it is with joy that we acknowledge the wonderful blessing of God upon our first meeting.

The following Resolutions, Statement of Fundamental Truths, and Minutes were unanimously passed...." [11].

The Statement of Fundamental Truths reads, with regard to Divine Healing, as follows:

"Divine Healing - Deliverance from sickness is provided for in the Atonement. Isaiah 53:4-5, Matt. 8:16-17" [12].

Thus both the Church of God and the Assemblies of God in the USA and the Assemblies of God in Great Britain and Ireland from their commencement adopted the position that healing is in the atonement. It is now my intention to show that the doctrine has been retained not only in the wording of formal doctrinal statements but that it has been and continues to be promulgated, at least by some within the groups in question, in much the same form as it was originally propounded by A. B. Simpson and Carrie Judd Montgomery.

The continuation of the doctrine in its original form

In Chapter 1 of this thesis I noted that for those who first held it the doctrine that healing is in the atonement meant that there is a strong correlation between sickness and sin; that it cannot be God's will for Christians to be sick; that Christians do not need to be sick; that if a Christian is sick it is a result of either sin or of a lack of faith; and that

the use of medicine is not necessary and to resort to it is an indication of a lack of faith [13].

It is not difficult to demonstrate that similar views have continued to be held and taught by Classical Pentecostals in both the United States and Great Britain. It will be sufficient to consider the writings of American authors T.L.Osborn and Hugh Jeter, and of British writers J. Nelson Parr and R.W.Hicklin.

The American Pentecostal evangelist T.L.Osborn has written several books on the subject of divine healing [14] of which *Healing the Sick* appears to be the longest and most thorough exposition of his views. The author acknowledges his indebtedness to the writings of other 'healing evangelists' (notably F.F. Bosworth and E.W. Kenyon) upon whose work he draws heavily [15] and his work is thus in many ways representative of theirs. His chapter entitled *Healing in the Atonement* [16] makes reference to the classic texts (Isaiah 53:4-5, Matthew 8:16-17, 1 Peter 2:24) and makes the usual correlation between sickness and sin. Referring to 1 Peter 2:24 he states:

"By these Scriptures we see healing for the BODY in the same atonement as we see salvation for the SOUL. HEALING IS IN THE ATONEMENT. WE HAVE HEALING IN REDEMPTION. If we are saved we should be healed. If we are healed then we should be saved. Our Lord could not be satisfied with a half salvation" [17].

Accordingly, Christians do not need to be sick:

"When one can realise that healing, just the same as salvation, is his.....he has learned that if Jesus bore OUR infirmities and OUR diseases, WE NO LONGER NEED TO BEAR THEM.....Let me say it again: CHRISTIANS DO NOT NEED TO BE SICK" [18].

Indeed, if a Christian has the right kind of faith God will always heal him:

"FAITH IN GOD'S WORD IS NEVER IGNORED BY THE FATHER. Instead, IT ALWAYS BRINGS HIS COMPLETE ANSWER. This is the faith He longs to see you exercise. It will become a part of you.....God said, 'I AM THE LORD THAT HEALETH THEE'. If three million people could believe it and find PERFECT HEALTH AND STRENGTH under the law, can we not also, who are living under grace, mercy and truth, be a healthy body of Christ?" [19].

Osborn does not state explicitly that if a Christian is not healed it is because of lack of faith but the suggestion is implicit throughout. And although he does not refer to the use of medical means as an evidence of lack of faith, the clear implication is that such means are unnecessary in the light of Christ's redemptive work. In this respect Osborn's teaching reflects substantially the views of the early proponents of the doctrine.

There is, however, an additional element in his presentation which appears to take the doctrine a stage further. The fact that faith is lacking may not be the fault of the individual but of church leaders who have failed to teach the truth that healing is in the atonement. In particular, they have failed to teach God's people rightly to 'discern the Lord's body' at the Lord's Supper. Osborn develops this theme in a chapter entitled *Why Christians are Sick* [20] in which he states that

"Sickness is due to failure to be taught about the BODY of Christ as we have been taught about the blood of Christ" [21].

Christ's blood, he argues, was shed for the forgiveness of sin, but his body was broken for the healing of sickness [22]. Clearly Osborn's exegesis is highly questionable here, and merits further discussion in Part Two of this thesis [23]. It

is sufficient to note here that his understanding of 1 Corinthians 11:27-34 adds a new dimension to the doctrine that healing is in the atonement.

Osborn's presentation of the doctrine appears to be fairly representative of the teachings of other independent healing evangelists of his generation [24], but as Menzies and others have pointed out [25] the 'Salvation-Healing' movement of which they were a part fell into disrepute with Classical Pentecostal denominational groups like Assemblies of God. This, however, was because of questions over fund-raising methods and because of the difficulties experienced in verifying some of the testimonies of healing associated with the mass meetings conducted by the healing evangelists [26]. The Assemblies of God doctrinal view that healing is in the atonement remained unaltered. This is evident from the writings of Hugh Jeter an Assemblies of God missionary and Bible College lecturer.

Jeter's *By His Stripes* subtitled *A Biblical Study on Divine Healing* was written in 1977 and is published by the *Gospel Publishing House* of American Assemblies of God. It is probably their major current publication on the subject [27]. A chapter entitled *Healing in the Atonement* acknowledges that

"Whether or not physical healing was provided for the believer through the atoning death of Christ has been a subject of great controversy for many years" [28].

The author then proceeds to argue for the doctrine by reference to the usual passages [29] and commenting on 1 Peter 2:24 concludes that

"Christ does not have to suffer again to provide forgiveness of sin or healing of the sick. The work has already been done. It is now up to us to accept the finished work of Christ and

appropriate by faith the forgiveness or healing that we need"
[30].

Jeter's work, like that of Osborn, exhibits throughout the same sympathy with the views of A.B. Simpson and Carrie Judd Montgomery, although Jeter does include a chapter on the use of medicine [31], in which he is far less condemning than the early promulgators of the doctrine. Nevertheless his sympathies clearly lie with Simpson whom he quotes as saying that there is no point in giving up 'remedies' if one does not have faith but that people who have real faith in Christ will not want remedies [32]. Moreover it seems likely that his concessions to the medical profession are based on his respect as a Christian for the laws of the United States rather than on a conviction that medical means might at least sometimes be appropriate for a Christian. He acknowledges that 'it should be the sick person himself who decides whether he should give up his medicine or not' and then points out that 'if you tell him to do so you can be accused of practicing medicine without a license' [33]. Further,

"Civil laws may make it necessary at times to call for medical assistance for members of our family. In such cases we are to remember that the Bible tells us to obey the laws. This should not be because of a lack of faith, but to comply with such laws and to set a good example as a Christian. Sometimes we would gladly trust the Lord for ourselves, but our children may not have the same faith and may resent a forcing (as they see it) of our beliefs on them. After raising our own five children on the foreign mission field and seeing God heal them time after time, I am glad to report that all of them have a strong faith in the Lord as their Healer" [34].

Jeter has thus modified in practice the more extreme implications of Simpson's teaching, but the doctrine itself is essentially the same. Indeed he adduces additional Bible

passages to support the doctrine. Like Osborn he interprets Paul's statement that the Corinthians were sick because they did not rightly discern 'the Lord's body' (1 Corinthians 11:29-30) as meaning that they did not rightly understand that Christ's body had been broken on the cross so that they might be healed of their physical infirmities [35]. He also understands Galatians 3:13 to mean that on the cross Christ redeemed us from sickness in that since sickness is one of the curses contained in Deuteronomy 28 it is part of the 'curse of the Law' from which Christians have been redeemed [36]. I shall challenge this exegesis in Part Two of this thesis [37], but for the present it is sufficient to note that the doctrine that healing is in the atonement is still presented in the USA in very much the same form as it was when originally propounded. The practical application of the doctrine, especially with regard to the medical profession, may have been modified, but the doctrine itself is not only intact but its proponents believe that they have found further Biblical evidence to support it.

The doctrine has also continued among Classical Pentecostals in Britain. John Nelson Parr, one of the founder-members of Assemblies of God in Great Britain and Ireland [38], wrote a series of articles in *Redemption Tidings*, the official magazine of British Assemblies of God, which was later published by *Gospel Publishing House* in the USA as a book entitled *Divine Healing* [39]. The author conveniently summarises his understanding of the subject as follows:

"(1) The origin of sickness, disease and death is sin, and the author of sin is Satan.

(2) Sickness may come upon the most godly believers even if they have not sinned.

(3) Sickness may be the result of sin, neglect or abuse of the body, disgraceful disorder (willful or careless) at the Lord's Table, or other forms of evil in a believer.

Healing & the Atonement

(4) There do not appear to be any instructions whatever in the Scriptures for the sick to resort to drugs or to submit to the surgeon's knife.

(5) There is not a single instance in the Scripture of a sick person being healed through drugs or earthly physicians.

(6) His Name (Jehovah-Ropheka) reveals the Lord as our Healer.

(7) The mission of the Lord Jesus and His attitude towards those "oppressed by the Devil" (Acts 10:38) with diseases and other things reveal Him as the Healer.

(8) The Complete Commission of the Lord Jesus to His Church before leaving them, as revealed in the three (sic) Gospels, reveals Him as the Healer.

(9) The Miracles and healings wrought in the early days of the Church, as recorded in the Acts, reveal the Lord as the Healer.

(10) There is not one sentence in the New Testament which indicates that physical healing was a temporary manifestation which would ultimately cease.

(11) Gifts of Healing were set in the Church by the Lord and there is not a single Scripture which supports the assertion that the gifts were to cease before the end of the church dispensation.

(12) If sickness has come upon believers through sin, disobedience, or some other cause, it is unscriptural to seek help from drugs or physicians in order to escape the chastisement or discipline of the Lord.

(13) The explicit instructions contained in the Epistle of James have never been countermanded, and reveal the course we should follow when sickness comes upon us.

(14) The sick are instructed to call for the elders of the church to minister to them in the Name of the Lord" [40].

It is interesting that the author's summary of his own teaching makes no explicit reference to healing in the atonement although Parr clearly believed the doctrine as the following passages reveal:

Chapter Two

"He healed because it was prophesied that He would bear our sicknesses and pains (Isaiah 53:5, Matthew 8:16-17)....

.....We do not of course say that the healing of sickness constitutes so important a part of the mission of the Lord Jesus as the salvation of the soul, but it was and is undoubtedly included in it. Those who have grasped the truth that believers are identified with Christ in death and in resurrection know that upon the Great Burden Bearer have been laid the infirmities of both soul and body" [41].

"The sole ground upon which God healed this man (sc. the cripple in Acts 3) was the redemptive work of One who had died and was raised from the dead; or, in the words of Acts 4:10, 'In the Name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth..... crucified..... raised from the dead, even in Him doth this man stand here before you whole'.
..... all blessings, including Divine Healing, are ours only through the merits of the finished atoning work of the Saviour.

.....If Peter included healing in 'being saved' (Acts 4:9) (*sesostai*, Gk., also note the same word in verse 12 twice), are we not justified in teaching that physical healing is included in the salvation purchased for us by the Prince of Life?" [42].

I find Parr's contribution to the discussion extremely interesting for, although he clearly contends in these passages for the doctrine that healing is in the atonement, his emphasis differs a little from the traditional approach of the American writers whose work we have been considering. First, it seems significant that, as I have already pointed out, Parr makes no explicit reference to the doctrine in his summary of his teaching. Such an omission would be unthinkable in the work of A.B. Simpson or T.L. Osborn for whom the belief that Christ bore our sicknesses on the cross is fundamental to a right understanding of the doctrine of divine healing [43]. Second, in the passages quoted above, Parr makes reference to

the resurrection as well as to the death of Christ with regard to physical healing. This may reflect the influence of other British Classical Pentecostals of his generation, especially the views of L.F.W. Woodford whose contribution I shall consider later [44]. Third, Parr's use of Acts 4:9-12 appears to add a new dimension to the discussion which will require further comment in Part Three of this thesis [45]. Fourth, it is noteworthy that Parr's exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:29-30 differs considerably from that of Osborn and Jeter [46] and is much more in line with a proper understanding of the passage as I shall demonstrate in Part Two [47]. Finally, Parr's attitude to the use of medicine, though similar in practice to that of Simpson and Jeter [48], is based on an entirely different argument which centres around the use in the New Testament of *φάρμακεία* and its cognates [49]. This too will merit discussion in Part Three of this thesis [50].

Despite these differences, however, Parr's teaching is essentially very similar to that of the early proponents of the doctrine. Christ's redemptive work has dealt with sickness as well as sin and obedient Christians do not need to resort to a doctor. Faith in Christ as Healer and obedience to the instructions in James 5:14ff will prove to be a sufficient remedy for Christians who become sick.

A more recent example of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement is to be found in a series of articles by British Assemblies of God evangelist Ron Hicklin [51]. Hicklin adopts a very positive stance with regard to God's willingness to heal the sick. The slogan:

"GOD WISHES TO HEAL THE SICK: ALL OF THEM: ALWAYS"

is repeated at intervals throughout his articles [52], for:

Chapter Two

"God is not arbitrary, willing to heal one day but not the next, willing to heal one but not another. His Word... propounds principles to apply and gives promises to claim which..... guarantee success" [53].

The evidence for God's willingness to heal is that healing is in the atonement. Hicklin compares Matthew 8:16-17 with Isaiah 53:4-5 and argues that Matthew

"saw Christ heal the sick, knew Isaiah had foretold this and realised that, in the same passage, Isaiah spoke of the death of Christ and, connecting the facts, states: CHRIST ATONED FOR OUR BODIES at Calvary as well as for our souls. His body bought healing for ours" [54].

Further, in an article attempting to deal with Paul's 'thorn in the flesh', Hicklin argues that the thorn could not have been a sickness on the grounds that

"since Christ bought healing for Paul, God could not in justice refuse it" [55].

As in the early writers on the subject there is also in Hicklin a strong correlation between sickness and sin. Those intent on health, he says, will learn the unpalatable principle:

"SICKNESS SPRINGS FROM SIN" [56].

Hicklin proceeds to liken a Christian's sins to 'weeds' which need to be 'hoed' from his life before he can receive healing. Such 'weeds' include:

"UNDUE DEPENDENCE ON THE DOCTOR" [57]

"LACK OF DESIRE FOR HEALING - a deep-rooted weed" [58]

"DISOBEDIENCE - a 'great stinging nettle'" [59]

and

"The Worst Weed - DEFECTIVE SPIRITUALITY" [60].

It is noteworthy that 'undue dependence on the doctor' is listed (and is listed first) among the 'sins' which Hicklin sees as preventing healing. In this respect Hicklin is by far the most extreme of the four writers whose work we have considered in this section as the following remarks reveal:

"We are told to judge ourselves to stop God sentencing us to sickness (1 Corinthians 11:31). Go into the witness-box and cross-examine yourself:

A. Do you always send for the minister, as God commands, before you send for the doctor? (James 5:14).

B. Do you rely on God to heal even 'trivial' sicknesses and so give your faith practice?

C. Do you pray seriously only when the doctor can no longer help? If so, God is jealous. The easy availability of medical help under the National Health Scheme is a major enemy to Divine Healing" [61].

The fact that Hicklin was widely criticised for these views [62] is an indication that his understanding of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement, though probably closer to the views of A.B. Simpson and Carrie Judd Montgomery, differed considerably from that of many of his contemporaries. A more moderate approach to the doctrine had already been offered by several British Classical Pentecostals and their more balanced understanding is reflected in the correspondence from Hicklin's critics [63]. In this connection it now seems

appropriate to turn to an examination of the views of those who have sought to modify and restate the doctrine.

The doctrine modified and restated

Attempts to modify the doctrine that healing is in the atonement have arisen from both a pastoral and theological motivation. Donald Gee's *Trophimus I Left Sick*, first published in 1952, is dedicated to:

"that large number of men and women all over the world who have come to the author with their personal problems concerning Divine healing" [64].

Clearly concerned for the many who have been taught that healing is available in the atonement and yet who seem to have been unable to appropriate it, Gee seeks to modify the doctrine in such a way that the doctrine remains intact but yet is not interpreted in such a way as to cause embarrassment and a sense of guilt among those who are not healed.

"A doctrinal basis for the conception of Divine healing as being unquestionably in the will of God for all has been provided by most Pentecostal denominations in their official statements of faith..... That a powerful and important truth is embodied in these statements with their scriptural reference to Isaiah 53:4-5 interpreted on the authority of Matthew 8:16-17, few will deny who love the message of full salvation in Jesus' Name. But that it needs the wisdom that only the Spirit of Truth Himself can give in its application seems equally evident. To assert that healing for our bodies rests upon an identical authority with healing for our souls in the atoning work of Christ our Saviour can involve serious problems of personal faith and confidence for those weak in the faith if, and when, they see manifest cases where Divine healing, though 'claimed', has not been received" [65].

Gee goes on to comment that it is idle to blind ourselves to the fact that such cases exist and argues that the doctrine that healing is in the atonement 'reaches its maximum value when physical sickness is the result of our personal sin' [66]. Those who advocate the doctrine, he says, occasionally neglect the accompanying truth that

"sometimes Divine love and wisdom permit a measure of suffering as a result of sin, in order to teach us to sin no more" [67].

However Gee seems to be saying here nothing essentially different from the early teachers of the doctrine [68] who saw personal sin as one of the causes of sickness and taught that true repentance would always lead to healing. Where he differs from those teachers, however, is in his understanding of the 'precise measure of our present deliverance from all the effects of the Fall' as the following rather lengthy quotation makes clear:

"The doctrine that since sickness is in the human race as a result of the Fall the atoning work of Christ provides full deliverance here and now is attractively logical. The precise measure of our present deliverance from all the effects of the Fall, whether in soul or body, is a matter upon which there must be careful discrimination. Some 'Holiness' doctrines seem to have gone a little astray here, and a parallel fallacy attacks doctrines of Divine healing. Thank God that for the eternal future there is no question of our perfect redemption; and we have it now potentially in Christ.

It is in the personal application to the individual Christian who happens to fall sick that our doctrine of sickness as a result of sin can be most shockingly misapplied and misinterpreted. To hastily attribute personal sickness to personal sin was the precise folly of Job's three friends that drew upon them the anger of the Almighty (Job 42:7). Many cruel things are being

Chapter Two

said on similar lines by hasty and dictatorial exponents of very imperfect doctrines of Divine healing. Usually they are those who have suffered little themselves, or else have had just one experience of Divine healing on just one line, upon which they base all their ideas. It is only in the broadest sense that we can teach that sickness in the human race stems from sin in the race. In the case of many faithful believers in the Lord Jesus Christ it would seem more correct to regard them as innocent victims of our common human frailties *until the atoning work of Christ comes to its glorious consummation in the fulness of the Kingdom of God* (my italics).

Extravagant claims for immunity from physical weakness and pain here and now are corrected by noting such words as those used by Paul in Romans 8:16-25 and 2 Corinthians 5:1-5. Although Christians have the 'first-fruits of the Spirit' they still groan within themselves 'waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body'. Such passages effectively dispel the airy and fanatical claims of some that they are enjoying even now their 'resurrection bodies'. The scriptural truth is that the choicest saints on earth still have times when they 'groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven'. The teaching of these passages is not a claiming of Divine healing from the cause of the groaning or sighing consequent upon infirmities of the flesh, but rather having the comfort of hope that there is a fuller life, and a better body (a 'building' rather than a 'tent') waiting for us in the life to come.

The doctrine that deliverance from sickness by Divine healing is provided for in the Atonement is securely based upon a scriptural foundation, but it needs interpreting in the light of the whole of the Word of God. To apply it indiscriminately and blindly is to plunge multitudes of good people into most grievous problems.Our problems of Divine healing impose upon us the responsibility for a courageous and frank examination of the

applications we make of our doctrines, even though we need not question the basic facts laid down in our statements of faith. Intellectual dishonesty forfeits the guidance of the Spirit of Truth" [69].

I have quoted Gee at some length partly because of the great respect he has commanded as a leader within worldwide Classical Pentecostalism [70] but largely because this part of Gee's writings contains noteworthy emphases which are significant with respect to this section of this thesis and which will become even more significant in Part Four [71].

For example, although Gee's motivation for writing is clearly pastoral, it seems to me that the paragraphs quoted display a theological perceptivity not found in the work of the other Pentecostal writers whose contribution we have thus far considered. This is indicated by his understanding, based on Romans 8, that there are certain aspects of the atonement the outworking of which are yet future and his suggestion that Paul's understanding of the Spirit as 'first-fruits' is a possible key to a balanced understanding of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement. At this point Gee's position comes remarkably close to my own, although, as I shall make clear later, I believe that Gee has not gone far enough [72].

Further, it is interesting that Gee clearly desires to uphold the doctrine that healing is in the atonement and although his understanding brings a radically different emphasis to the doctrine - almost to the point of refuting it - he obviously has no wish to deny it. This is possibly because his ministerial credentials with Assemblies of God would have been in jeopardy had he decided to do so [73] although in the light of his forthright plea for intellectual honesty [74] this seems unlikely. A more probable explanation is that Gee genuinely accepted that Matthew 8:16-17 indicated that healing is in the atonement [75] but that he saw the outworking of the

atonement, at least with regard to the physical body, as yet future.

In this respect Gee's contribution is also significant in that in acknowledging the possibility that the outworking of the atonement with respect to healing might be deferred until the resurrection (when Christians, he believes, will receive 'a better body') he admits that the basis for 'claiming' divine healing immediately has now been removed [76]. In so doing he is adopting a position very similar to the revised view of Robert Kelso Carter whose change of heart we noted in Chapter One of this thesis [77]. However, Gee was by no means the first Classical Pentecostal to adopt such a position, for, as we shall see when we consider Classical Pentecostal groups whose Statements of Faith do not include the doctrine that healing is in the atonement [78], the Elim writer Percy G. Parker expressed a similar view some twenty years before Gee wrote *Trophimus*, although Parker saw healing as in the atonement only 'indirectly' [79].

Finally, it is noteworthy that Gee's understanding made room for the use of medical 'means' of healing although he seemed anxious not to offend those who firmly repudiated such means as the following quotation reveals:

"We seem to have unreasonably refused any place for physical healing to be ministered to us in the will of God except by entirely supernatural and miraculous means. It is necessary to express ourselves with great carefulness on this point, for it touches the devotion and zeal of many choice fellow-believers. Their accepted corollary for their faith in Divine healing seems to have been the firm repudiation of the use of any natural 'means' of healing whatsoever as inconsistent with faith. The help of medicine or surgery, and the assistance of doctors or nurses, has been frowned upon and denounced in the strongest possible terms. Some of these earnest souls have literally died

for their faith because they refused to compromise in the matter. Let us honour their magnificent consistency, even if we feel compelled to question their sound judgment.

For others of us it seems reasonable to trust God for the healing of our bodies in a way that does not necessarily and arbitrarily rule out any thought of Divine providence and love being ministered to us through human intermediaries, and by means of naturally acquired skill in the art of healing" [80].

Gee's attempt at a modification of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement, therefore, carried with it the highly significant corollary that it is admissible for Christians to resort to medical means without feeling that they are in some way lacking in faith. Nevertheless this aspect of his work lacks a theological rationale, a lack which was to be supplied by L.F.W. Woodford four years later.

Woodford's paper, *Divine Healing and the Atonement - A Restatement*, which is perhaps the most sophisticated attempt on the part of a Classical Pentecostal to restate the doctrine that healing is in the atonement, was delivered to the *Victoria Institute* on 13th February 1956. Woodford, who held ministerial credentials with British Assemblies of God, and who, therefore, like Gee, would have found it embarrassing to deny the doctrine [81], seeks to 'define in fresh terms divine healing in relation to the atonement' [82]. He outlines the position of A.B. Simpson and others and proceeds to challenge the view that lack of faith and disobedience are the only two reasons for unhealed sickness [83]. He begins by insisting that in the New Testament atonement always relates to sin:

"When the New Testament sets forth the interpretation of the death of Christ, in the sense of atonement, it is always, without exception, related to the putting away of sin and the resulting effects of that work. From whatever aspect the atonement is

Chapter Two

viewed it is fundamentally related to sin. Thus: it was a work of propitiation - of expiation of *sin* (Hebrews 2:17, 9:26-28, 10:12). It was a work of reconciliation through the *sin*-bearing of Christ (2 Corinthians 5:18-21, Romans 5:10f RV). It was a work of justification through the sufferings for *sins* of the Righteous One (Romans 3:23-26, 4:25, 5:18f, 1 Peter 3:18). It was a work of redemption from *sin* of the Lamb of God, Who bore the *sin* of the world (John 1:29, 1 Peter 1:18f, Titus 2:14)....

.....and everywhere the stress is laid repeatedly upon the fact that His death was fundamentally and essentially concerned with *sin*" [84].

The second aspect of Woodford's argument is that atonement is related not only to Christ's death but also to his resurrection:

"But the work of atonement was not consummated by His death. Apart from His triumphant resurrection His death alone would not have possessed atoning value. His resurrection from the dead is an integral and inseparable part of the evangel (e.g. Romans 10:8f, 1 Corinthians 15:3f). The work of propitiation on the Day of Atonement was not completed until the blood of sacrifice was presented in the holiest by the high priest (Lev. 16), the New Testament truth thus typified being set forth in Hebrews 9:7-28. The efficacy of our Lord's atoning death was assured by the triumph of His resurrection on the third day" [85].

Further,

"The New Testament makes clear that the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus have a wider significance than atonement for sin, a significance touching God's creation at all points.....

.....Sin, at the very root of the disordered creation, has been put for ever away by His atoning sacrifice; the devil has been

deprived of his authority, and cast out, having been brought to nought and his works destroyed; the powers of darkness have been completely overmastered and thrown off by the Lord of life and power; death has been brought to nought, its sting (sin) removed and life and incorruption have been brought to light through the gospel; the Lord Jesus, from His throne, has all authority and power to administer the fruits of His atoning sacrifice and victorious resurrection and ascension, in the salvation of mankind.

We have the definite promise that this disordered creation will be restored, on the basis of our Lord's death and resurrection: delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God (Romans 8:21)" [86].

Having argued, therefore, that in the New Testament atonement always relates to sin and is related to the resurrection as well as to the death of Christ, and that Christ's death and resurrection have a wider significance than atonement for sin, but touch creation at all points, Woodford then enquires 'in what way sickness and disease have been fully met and covered by the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus' [87]. The following quotations adequately illustrate his findings:

"Sickness and disease are clearly universal manifestations present in our existing disordered creation, affecting the animal and vegetable kingdoms as well as mankind. They were not present in the original creation pronounced very good (Genesis 1:31); they will not be present in the future New Creation, to be pronounced perfect: 'I make all things new' (Revelation 21:5). They are manifestations originating with sin and are part of that bondage of corruption which awaits the deliverance of God. The atonement of the Lord Jesus dealt with the sin behind this corruption, thus providing the basis for the deliverance from, and elimination of, its manifestations in His due time and purpose" [88].

Chapter Two

"Sickness and disease, as non-moral and non-spiritual manifestations on the plane of the physical and natural, did not require atonement as a basis for any forgiveness or reconciliation; they required - of themselves - removal by authoritative intervention. The Scriptures declare, as noted above, that the Lord did not atone for the devil and his works, or for death; *He conquered them all*. Similarly, He did not atone for sickness and disease; He *conquered* them as elements present in a world of corruption" [89].

"*Sin* has thus been expiated by the atoning sacrifice of the Lord Jesus; *sickness and disease* have been conquered by the victorious resurrection and ascension of the Lord Jesus, who lives in the power of an endless life and who, having all authority within His hands, as the Lord of life releases that life to meet the need of man (Hebrews 4:15, 7:16, 25)" [90].

"By the atoning death of the Lord Jesus and His triumphant resurrection all the disorder of creation caused by sin has been dealt with - including sickness and disease - and overmastered by the power and authority of His risen life. Their removal from God's creation are all within the supreme administrative authority of the Living Christ, in the all-embracing purpose of God. The first-fruits of this victory, in delivering and healing power over sickness and disease, are being shared by the living Church, and the basis of this ministry from the Throne of God is *His grace and compassion*" [91].

"Deliverance from sickness, disease, and demon power is most frequently granted by God through a mediated ministry possessing delegated authority from His throne. This renders it therefore *an entirely different matter from that of the forgiveness of sins* (my italics), for a mediated ministry is subject to the sovereign will and grace of God for its operation. Such gifts are 'grace-gifts' (*charismata*) set in the Church and dispensed in His will as He pleases (1 Corinthians 12:4-11, 12:28, Hebrews 2:4) - thus,

Healing & the Atonement

the operation of gifts of healings, the laying on of hands, and the prayer of faith (which is subject to the laws of prayer common to every other exercise of prayer) (Mark 16:18, James 5:13-18)* [92].

Woodford's position may, therefore, be briefly summarised as follows. Healing is not in the atonement inasmuch as atonement deals with *sin*. Sickness does not need to be atoned for in that it is a non-moral manifestation of the corruption of the world. It needs to be authoritatively removed. Christ's death and resurrection, in dealing with sin (which Woodford sees as the root cause of sickness in the universe) provided not only atonement for sin but victory over sickness. As a result of that victory the ascended Christ delegates healing authority to his church through charismatic gifts such as the gifts of healing (1 Corinthians 12:9) which are distributed subject to his sovereign will. Such gifts are a part of the first-fruits of that victory and are a token now of the future perfect New Creation.

Woodford's position, although rather more sophisticated than that of Gee, differs essentially very little from it except that Woodford deals with the passages which are held to teach that healing is in the atonement (Matthew 8:16-17, 1 Peter 2:24) and submits that rather than supporting the healing in the atonement view they are in harmony with the main line of thought advanced in his paper [93]. Woodford's understanding of these passages is in fact very close to the view which I express in Part Two of this thesis [94]. Woodford also, unlike Gee, offers a theological rationale for the view, which he shares with Gee [95], that 'supernatural divine healing' may be reconciled with 'healing through the given resources of nature' [96]. This I shall examine in Part Three [97].

Finally, before turning to the views of those within Classical Pentecostal groups whose Statements of Faith do not include

the doctrine, it seems appropriate to refer to the recent work of Dr. Robert Baldwin, a medical doctor and a minister of British Assemblies of God whose views appear to reflect in some respects the more moderate approach of Gee and Woodford and yet who clearly still holds quite literally to the old healing in the atonement view:

"Jesus sees the forgiveness of our sins and the healing of our bodies on the same level. One is no different from the other as far as our Saviour is concerned.....

.....When He cried out on the cross, 'It is finished', it did not just mean as far as sin was concerned, but included all our sickness as well, as Peter indicates when he quotes this verse in his epistle (1 Peter 2:24)" [98].

Despite this, however, Baldwin concedes elsewhere that healing may take place by medical means [99] and that in some cases may be deferred until the resurrection of the dead [100]. But the synthesis of the old healing in the atonement view with these more recent accommodations is, in my opinion, unconvincing. A theological reappraisal of the original doctrine (such as that of Woodford) is essential if views such as the acceptance of medical means and the postponement of the outworking of divine healing until the resurrection are to carry credibility.

*Classical Pentecostals whose 'Statement of Faith'
does not include the doctrine*

As a sample of Classical Pentecostal groups who have not formally embraced the healing in the atonement view I have selected the Elim Pentecostal Church whose Statement of Faith with regard to divine healing is listed in the Appendix. Even within that group, however, modified versions of the healing in the atonement doctrine have been accepted by some. For

example, 'Principal' George Jeffreys, described as 'Founder and Leader of the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance' [101], was a firm believer in the doctrine:

"The atoning and redeeming work of Christ on the cross is the sovereign remedy for all the evil results of the first Adam's disobedience. The future benefits of the last Adam's death on the cross include the destruction of the last enemy, which is death, the deliverance of the animal kingdom from the bondage of corruption, the removal of the curse that rests upon the earth, and the superseding of mortality by immortality. The present benefits of His atoning and redeeming work include deliverance from sin and healing for the mortal body" [102].

It is noteworthy that Jeffreys, while acknowledging here that some benefits of Christ's death are for the future, nevertheless firmly places healing for the body in the category of present benefits. The following chart which clearly reflects the Pre-millennial eschatology prevalent in Classical Pentecostalism [103] is Jeffreys' own summary [104].

Original Condition and Results of First Adam's Disobedience as described in the Word of God.		Present and Ultimate Benefits of Last Adam's Obedience definitely promised in the Word of God.	
Original Condition	Present Condition confirmed by experience	Present Benefits confirmed by experience	Future Benefits
No sin No death	Sin Death	Deliverance from sin -----	Death destroyed
No bondage in animal kingdom	Bondage in the animal kingdom	-----	Animals delivered
No curse on the earth	Curse resting on the earth	-----	Curse removed
No mortality	Mortality	-----	Immortality
No bodily sickness	Bodily sickness	Bodily healing	

From this it might be assumed that Jeffreys' position is very similar to that of A.B. Simpson and the other early proponents of the doctrine. The inclusion of healing for the mortal body in the same category as deliverance from sin as a 'present benefit' of the atonement would certainly seem to indicate this. However, a closer examination of Jeffreys' work reveals certain major differences of emphasis from that of Simpson [105] and that he is, in fact, much closer to the position of Gee and Woodford [106].

First, although Jeffreys states that healing is in the atonement, it is interesting that he does not quote Matthew 8:16-17 or 1 Peter 2:24 in this connection [107]. Rather, his view of healing in the atonement is based on the understanding that

"The Saviour of fallen humanity is the Lord Jesus Christ..... who came into the world to..... save mankind by His atoning death on the cross, and to make it possible for the suffering creation to be delivered" [108].

Jeffreys adduces Romans 8:20-21 as evidence that the creation is suffering because of Adam's sin [109] and reaches the conclusion that

"Sin, sickness, death, mortality, the curse upon the earth and the bondage of corruption from which the animal creation suffers came into the world as a result of the first Adam's disobedience" [110]

although he acknowledges that

"there is no definite scripture to shew that sickness and disease came into this world as a result of the first Adam's disobedience" [111].

On the assumption, then, that sickness entered the world because of Adam's sin, Jeffreys proceeds to argue that

"the atoning and redeeming work of Christ on the cross is the sovereign remedy for *all* (my italics) the evil effects of the first Adam's disobedience" [112]

but that

"while we can claim deliverance from part of these effects in the present, we have to wait until some future time before the full benefits of the atoning and redeeming work of Christ on the cross can be realised" [113].

As his chart reveals, Jeffreys believed that 'bodily healing' is a 'present benefit' which is 'definitely promised in the Word of God' [114]. His evidence for this is that 'Scripture abounds in testimonies of those who enjoyed the immediate benefits of bodily healing' and that 'our Lord distinctly included bodily healing as an immediate benefit among the miraculous signs that were to follow them that believe' [115]. In this connection Jeffreys cites Mark 16:15,18 and James 5:14-15. But at best this evidence supports the view that healing is a present benefit, not that it is a present benefit of the atonement. Further, Jeffreys at no point fully clarifies the apparent anomaly implicit in his teaching that healing is a present benefit available because of the atonement and yet may be a benefit for which we have to wait. He clearly does not want to say that we must wait for it and yet he concedes, as I shall show shortly, that in this life saints suffer, no-one is immune from sickness, that healing is an 'earnest' of the Christian's future inheritance, and that sickness can be in the will of God.

In a section headed *Deliverance from mortality when Christ comes* Jeffreys states

"Saints and sinners alike grow old, the eye becomes dim, the back bent, and the effects of mortality, *which does not necessarily mean sickness and disease* (my italics), are marked upon all, even those who take a stand for the truth of Divine healing. Nevertheless, how consoling it is to know that the bodies of believers are the present dwelling place of God. They were included in the great purchase price, not that of corruptible silver and gold, but the precious blood of Christ. Thus the benefits of His atoning and redeeming work will be seen in the complete redemption of the mortal body" [116].

Jeffreys then quotes Romans 8:23, 1 Corinthians 15:51-55 and Philippians 3:20-21 as evidence. From this it would appear that Jeffreys believed that Christians must expect to experience the usual symptoms of old age and must wait for the Parousia for a new incorruptible body. But what is he saying with regard to sickness? His next section, which follows immediately after the passage quoted above, is entitled *Bodily healing from sickness and disease a present-day experience*. This would seem to indicate, as also does his chart which forms a part of that section [117], that Christians do not need to wait for Christ's coming for the healing of their sicknesses. However the use of the word 'necessarily' in the italicised clause in the above quotation possibly indicates that Jeffreys believed that in some cases healing of sickness might be delayed until the Parousia, yet at no point does he explicitly say so.

The anomaly in Jeffreys position is further evident in that, although he sees bodily healing as a present benefit of the atonement, he nevertheless recognises that Christians are not immune from sickness:

"The fact that no member of the human family, whether saint or sinner, is immune from sickness, disease and decay, proves that all suffer from the limitations of fallen human nature" [118].

Indeed sickness may even be in the will of God for some Christians:

"There is no authority in Scripture for the view that every saint who is suffering from sickness and disease is out of line with the will of God. The most devoted saints, such as Paul, Timothy and Epaphroditus, suffered in body, but were certainly not out of God's will. The reason why God sometimes allows His saints to suffer is that they may be schooled and disciplined in the things pertaining to the kingdom of God" [119].

This theme is developed later with reference to Paul's thorn in the flesh:

"Although bodily healing is one of the present benefits of the atoning work of Christ on the cross, the Scripture definitely shows that all who truly seek bodily healing do not find it. It is possible for a person to be suffering from some physical infirmity, and yet be in the will of God (2 Corinthians 12:9-10)" [120].

Accordingly, although unhealed sickness may be attributable to lack of faith or personal sin [121], these are by no means the only causes since, for Jeffreys, although healing is in the atonement and to be placed in the same category as deliverance from sin, sickness may be in the will of God for some Christians. There is clearly a certain inconsistency in this position, but it is by no means clear that Jeffreys was aware of it. If he was, he appears to have made no attempt to resolve it. His view of healing in the atonement is thus radically different from that of A.B. Simpson and Carrie Judd Montgomery and this is reflected in his attitude to medical means:

"When we come to consider the human creation, we find that God in His love and mercy has provided the means of healing for all.

Chapter Two

mankind, *saints and sinners alike* (my italics), by the operation of a natural law which is inherent in the human organism. Physicians and nurses through much study have become acquainted with this natural law of healing; consequently they can intelligently assist nature to heal and it is the duty and privilege of every Christian to pray for them in their work" [122].

"It is a huge mistake on the part of many devout believers in the truth of Divine Healing to ignore natural healing. Some earnest saints have regarded the work of physicians and nurses who minister in the natural realm as being distinctly evil or carnal. A few have gone so far as to disregard the essential laws of hygiene, to ignore natural curative means, and even refuse the absolute necessities of the body, in case they should manifest unbelief and dishonour God. Such indiscretion has hindered many from taking a stand for the truth, and often resulted in the work of God being brought into disrepute. It is most necessary that the truth of bodily healing should be viewed from the right perspective, and that its presentation be sane, sound, and balanced" [123].

It now seems appropriate to summarise Jeffreys' position, inasmuch as it has been possible to discern it thus far, before drawing attention to one final aspect of his doctrine which may shed some light on his understanding of the relationship between the present and future outworking of the atonement with regard to physical healing.

In short, Jeffreys believed that healing is in the atonement although he based his argument on the understanding that sickness has its origin in the Fall (and that Christ's atoning death has dealt with the Fall) rather than on proof-texts such as Matthew 8:17 and 1 Peter 2:24. Some benefits derived from the atonement are available already. Other benefits will not come into effect until Christ returns. 'Present benefits' are

Healing & the Atonement

deliverance from sin and healing for the body. All other benefits are future. However, although healing is a present benefit, some may have to wait for it for sickness may be the will of God for them as it was for Paul. Medical healing should not be refused by those who believe in supernatural divine healing.

A possible solution to the apparent tension in Jeffreys' teaching that healing is a 'present' benefit for which some may nevertheless have to wait until the Parousia might be found in his understanding that divine healing is the 'earnest' of the Christian's inheritance (cf. Ephesians 1:14). Jeffreys appears to understand Romans 8:11 to refer to divine healing [124] and argues from 1 Corinthians 6:19-20 that the Christian's body has been purchased and that, therefore, the 'purchased possession' in Ephesians 1:14 'certainly means the mortal body'. The writer, he says, refers to the mortal body as

"having received an earnest of the inheritance, in view of the full redemption that was to come. The earnest of the inheritance is undoubtedly the quickening of the mortal body by the Spirit" [125].

That by this Jeffreys is referring to divine healing is apparent in that he goes on to criticise those who relegate 'this quickening of the body to the second coming of Christ' [126]. His position with regard to this is developed a few pages later when he says:

"The glory of the King's advent shall be seen by the once blind eye, and the sound of the trumpet shall break in upon the ear that used to be deaf. The weak shall be made strong and every sick one shall be healed..... Until He comes we shall continue to praise Him for the earnest of that glorious inheritance and wait

patiently and prayerfully for the full redemption of the purchased possession, which includes the mortal body" [127].

However in these two passages Jeffreys appears to be saying two rather different things. In the first he seems to be saying that the possession of the 'earnest' means that we can have healing now and in the second he infers that some at least must wait for healing until the second advent. His precise position is, therefore, by no means clear [128] and, in my opinion, the tension remains.

The reason for Jeffreys' failure to resolve this tension is probably twofold. First, although it was clear to Jeffreys both from observation and from his understanding of the New Testament that not all Christians are healed of their physical infirmities, he wanted firmly to retain bodily healing as a 'present benefit' of the atonement because of his strong opposition to the views of those 'lower critics' who wanted to postpone all such manifestations of healing to the millennium [129]. And, second, it must be remembered that Jeffreys was an evangelist who was himself greatly used in healing the sick [130]. He probably felt that too much emphasis on the possibility of healing being delayed until the Parousia would have damaged faith on the part of the sick in his gatherings for healing in the present. Despite these observations, however, I feel that Jeffreys' chart would have better represented his own teaching (as well as perhaps the overall ethos of the New Testament), if he had included 'bodily healing' as a 'future benefit' *as well as* a 'present benefit'.

Percy G. Parker, another Elim author, writing at about the same time as Jeffreys [131], devotes a chapter specifically to the question of healing and the atonement [132]. In answer to the question *In what way is healing in the atonement?* he considers three possible replies:

- (1) Healing is not in the atonement at all
- (2) Healing is directly in the atonement
- (3) Healing is indirectly in the atonement.

Concerning the first, he says

"This certainly cannot be correct. Every blessing that a believer gets is in the Atonement. We should be under perpetual curses if it were not for the Atonement. But the Cross of Christ has brought us into the place of perpetual blessings..... The Cross has brought us into the place of provision" [133].

Thus the proposition that healing is not in the atonement is rejected. However Parker also rejects the proposition that healing is directly in the atonement. By this he means the teaching which says that

"Christ's death was for a double purpose. He bore the penalty of sin. He bore the penalty of sickness. He was made sin for our sins. He was made sick for our sicknesses" [134].

This teaching, he says, is based largely on Isaiah 53:4 and Matthew 8:16-17. Parker rejects this on the grounds that

"the fulfilment of Isaiah 53:4 is declared in Matthew 8:16-17 to be *in what Christ did in His life - not in His death*. He was healing men and women of all kinds of diseases. He was lifting them off them and bearing them right away" [135].

Although it was 'in view of' his death on the Cross that Jesus could remove sickness in his life, Parker insists that

"to say that He removed sickness in virtue of His Cross is a different thing to saying that he removed sickness by being made sick on the Cross, or bearing stripes for physical sickness" [136].

Instead Parker opts for the third possibility, that healing is *indirectly* in the atonement. To support this he quotes 'Dr. Torrey' [137] at length:

"The question arises, When do we get what Jesus Christ secures for us by His atoning sacrifice? We get the *first* fruits of the atoning work of Christ, the *first* fruits of salvation in the life that now is, but we get the *full* fruits only when Jesus Christ comes again. The atoning death of Jesus Christ secured for us not only physical healing, but the resurrection and perfecting and glorifying of our bodies. No, we do not get the full measure of what Jesus secured for us by His atoning death on the Cross in the present life, but at His coming again.

But while we do not get the full benefits for the body secured for us by the atoning death of Christ in the life that now is, but when Jesus comes, nevertheless, just as one gets the first fruits of his spiritual salvation in the life that now is, so we get the first fruits of our physical salvation in the life that now is.

We do get in many, many, many cases, physical healing through the atoning death of Jesus Christ, even in the life that now is" [138].

Parker interprets Torrey as meaning that in the atonement there are first, intermediate, and final fruits (although from the passage quoted the idea of intermediate fruits is to me by no means obvious).

"The first fruits is that of forgiveness of sin, one of the intermediate fruits is health sufficient to carry out God's primary will for us down here, and the final fruit includes the entire perfecting of body, soul and spirit" [139].

Parker identifies himself with this view which he then clarifies further by saying:

"The sinner.... has broken the law of God. He is under condemnation. By His death Christ met that penalty. He ransomed him altogether from the power of Satan and sin. Christ's death was the ransom price. Now, having saved by His death, the Lord Jesus heals by His life. It is the life of Christ which brings health. It was the death of Christ which brought atonement. The poured-out blood saves the sinner from guilt. The poured-in resurrection life saves the saint from disease. Forgiveness through the Atonement is God's gift to the sinner. Health through the resurrected life of Christ is God's gift to the saint" [140].

However, from this it should not be understood that Parker believed that 'poured-in resurrection life' saves every saint from every disease for he later argues strongly that Paul's thorn in the flesh was a disease [141]. His view is rather that God 'overrules' sicknesses for his own glory 'either by removing the sickness or giving grace to overcome the limitations of it' [142].

Accordingly Parker's version of healing in the atonement places him alongside Jeffreys in his understanding of Paul's thorn in the flesh and the possibility of Christians being sick within the will of God, alongside Gee and Woodford in seeing 'firstfruits' as having at least some connection with healing, and alongside Woodford in particular in regard to his emphasis on healing through Christ's life rather than through his death. But concerning the use of 'means' Parker is surprisingly closer than might have been expected to the position of A.B. Simpson and Carrie Judd Montgomery, for although he acknowledges that

"as long as 1 Timothy 5:23 is in the Bible no-one can rule out the use of simple homely remedies" [143].

he also offers the following advice:

"Seek directly to God. Do not look this way and that way to earthly physicians. Don't try and think of remedies. But if God by special illumination reveals one then use it. There is a great deal of difference between waiting for God's special illumination, and eagerly trying remedy after remedy and physician after physician. *Personally I would not consider a remedy for a moment* (my italics) - unless it was supernaturally revealed to me that I should use it.

We certainly cannot absolutely rule out remedies. But such should only be used under God's direct revelation" [144].

However, although there is probably an unnecessarily perceived tension between looking to God for one's healing and the use of medicine, and despite the interesting assumption that supernatural revelation is readily available, Parker by no means suggests that to resort to medical means is an indication of a lack of faith. His attitude seems to be rather that it is a matter of personal conviction and faith as to whether one uses medical means or not, on the principle that 'according to their faith it will be unto them' [145].

Alexander Tee is a final and more recent example of an Elim writer who has embraced the doctrine that healing is in the atonement. In an article written in 1976 he refers to Isaiah 53:4-5 and Matthew 8:16-17 and states:

"In the light of Matthew 8:17 these blessed and most sacred words from Isaiah refer directly to divine healing. It may be argued that Jesus had not yet died when He healed these people and that therefore Isaiah 53:5 does not refer to Christ's atonement, but

many Old Testament saints entered into the benefits of Christ's atonementbefore Christ went to Calvary" [146].

However, Tee does not develop the doctrine that healing is in the atonement. The passage quoted above is merely part of a list of Bible verses which Tee uses to show that 'divine healing is taught in the Scriptures' [147]. Nevertheless it does indicate his allegiance to the doctrine. Later, when summarising his understanding of the various passages he has listed, concerning healing and the atonement he briefly states

"There is a sacred connection between the atoning work of Christ on the cross and divine healing" [148].

Disappointingly, he does not tell us what that 'sacred connection' is. However he does see a connection between sickness and personal sin:

"It is foolish to expect a holy God to send His healing virtue into our bodies if we want to cling to sin and do what is wrong. Sin stops the flow of God's healing power. Sin destroyed the fellowship between Adam and God in the Garden of Eden. When contact is broken in an electrical circuit no power can get through. Sin produces comparable results and the power of God is cut off" [149].

And in similar vein, with reference to 1 Corinthians 11:29-30, he states:

"Here again we see that we cannot be doing or allowing wrong things and expect either health or healing. We cannot treat the things of God lightly without paying the price" [150].

It is clear, however, that Tee does not attribute all sickness to personal sin for he believes that 'in the matter of divine healing we must always remember that God is sovereign and that he can do exactly as He wants' [151]. Neither is the

reception of divine healing merely a matter of 'claiming a promise by faith', for

"I would be a fool to think that I can pressurise God or manipulate Him into doing anything. If this is not the case, why did Paul need to pray so much about his thorn in the flesh? Could he not simply have claimed one of God's promises by faith (so-called), smote (sic) the thorn, and commanded it to leave his body in the name of Jesus?" [152].

In saying this, however, Tee does appear to be contradicting an earlier statement, where, commenting on Romans 10:17, he says:

"The Word of God has much to teach us about divine healing. God's Word is not given to mock us, His promises 'are yea, and in Him Amen' to them that believe (2 Corinthians 1:20). *We can fully expect these promises to be substantiated (my italics)*" [153].

It seems to me that this contradiction exhibits a tension (similar to that noted previously in Jeffreys [154]) between the desire on the one hand to encourage faith for healing and the concern on the other hand to avoid saying that sickness is either a result of personal sin or of lack of faith. In this connection Tee is also careful to stress that the use of medical science is an appropriate means of healing:

"The earth and everything in it were created by God and can be used for our well-being. Clever men have discovered that, when certain things found in mother earth are used correctly, they can restore our bodies to health and strength. Medical science has saved many lives, but God provided the means used in the medicines. Other clever men who have studied the human body use surgery. They know what to do, and that after their operation, nature will do its work. God put healing propensities into our

bodies. Doctors, surgeons and nurses who do the right things with our bodies know that these God-given qualities will play their part. Surely it is not wrong to pray that God will guide the surgeon's hand. God has helped many a nurse and surgeon. Here is God working with nature and with men. Indeed, there is a case in the Bible where a prescription was given to a dying man. It was used as prescribed and the dying man lived (2 Kings 20:7 and Isaiah 38:21)" [155].

Thus Tee, in common with Jeffreys and Parker (both Elim writers of an earlier generation) holds a view of divine healing that puts healing indirectly in the atonement. Tee's position, though undeveloped and considerably less clear than the views of Jeffreys and Parker, nevertheless shares with theirs the commendable attempt to present the doctrine in such a way that it will create faith for healing without appearing to condemn those who are not healed.

Summary

It will now be convenient briefly to summarise this chapter in which I have sought to survey the development of the doctrine within Classical Pentecostal groups before offering evidence in the next chapter that the doctrine also exists outside those groups.

In this chapter I have demonstrated that the doctrine has continued very much in its original form, particularly within groups such as the Assemblies of God who have incorporated the doctrine in their Statements of Faith. In the USA writers like Osborn and Jeter have not only continued to teach the doctrine but have used additional arguments to substantiate it [156]. These writers have, however, been more careful not to condemn the use of medical 'means' than were A.B. Simpson and Carrie Judd Montgomery, but this is perhaps due to the current legal situation in some American states rather than to any

real difference doctrinally. British writers Hicklin and Parr, however, have perpetuated the opposition to the use of medicine although Parr's reasons for doing so were different as was his underlying rationale for the doctrine [157].

There have, however, been attempts to modify or restate the doctrine both from within and outside the groups that formally embraced it. British Assemblies of God writers such as Gee, Woodford and, more recently, Baldwin have all made a plea for a more balanced approach to the use of medicine, as have British Elim writers Jeffreys and Tee and, to a lesser extent, Parker. All these British writers accept in some measure the doctrine that healing is in the atonement, although Woodford's position is closer to a rejection of it (rather than a restatement of it, as his paper purports to be). All these writers concede that healing may be delayed until the Second Advent, Parker, Gee and Woodford seeing healing as in some way a 'firstfruits' (and Jeffreys as an 'earnest') of the new incorruptible body the Christian is believed to receive at the resurrection. Perhaps most significantly, however, Parker and Woodford reject the exegesis of Matthew 8:17 upon which the original theory of healing in the atonement is based. For them, and also for Jeffreys - although Jeffreys does not specifically reject the original exegesis of Matthew 8:17; he simply ignores it - healing in the atonement is best understood in terms of Christ's redemptive work on the cross counteracting the effects of Adam's Fall to which, they believe, the origin of sickness may be attributed.

NOTES

1. My belief that this is so is based on over thirty years' personal experience of the Pentecostal Movement in over 20 different countries. Further considerations are that most of the literature of the Pentecostal Movement is in English and emanates from the USA and Britain, and that the doctrine and practice of many of the Pentecostal groups in other countries have been profoundly influenced by either British or American missionaries.
2. Compare pp 18-24 of this thesis, especially the penultimate paragraph on p. 24.
3. Conn, C.W., *'Like A Mighty Army'*, Cleveland, Pathway, 1977, p. viii.
4. *ibid* pp 117-120.
5. *ibid* p. 118.
6. Menzies, W.W., *'Anointed to Serve'*, Springfield, GPH, 1971, pp 97 ff.
7. *ibid* p. 104.
8. *ibid* p. 101. The 'evident necessity' was the dispute over whether baptism should be administered in the name of the Trinity or 'in the Name of Jesus' (*ibid* pp 106 ff.).
9. *ibid* p. 119. Menzies' footnote indicates that no doctrinal amendments have been made to the original Statement: 'In 1961 a committee which had been assigned the task of suggesting revisions in the Statement of Fundamental Truths presented several minor changes, which were in no sense doctrinal changes, but intended to clarify and strengthen existing statements'.
10. *ibid* p. 389.
11. Opening paragraphs of the *'Minutes of the General Presbytery of the Assemblies of God of Gt. Britain and Ireland'*, located in the archives of British Assemblies of God at Mattersey Hall, Nottinghamshire.
12. *op. cit.* p.2.
13. See p. 24 which summarises the teachings of A.B.Simpson and Carrie Judd Montgomery.
14. See Bibliography
15. Osborn, T.L., *'Healing the Sick'*, Tulsa, T.L.Osborn Evangelistic Association, 1961, p. 6 and *passim*.
16. *ibid* pp 35-37.
17. *ibid* p. 35.

Chapter Two

18. *ibid* p. 35.
19. *ibid* p. 37. Osborn's reference to 'three million people' presumably reflects his understanding of the number of people in the Exodus. He does not clarify this, however. His understanding that they 'found perfect health and strength' may be based on Psalm 105:37 (cf. Osborn, *'Healing en Masse'*, Tulsa, Osborn, 1963, p 94).
20. *ibid* pp 147-156.
21. *ibid* p. 147.
22. *ibid* pp. 147-156
23. See pp. 173ff of this thesis.
24. Cf. Roberts, O., *'Oral Roberts' Best Sermons and Stories'*, Tulsa, Oral Roberts, 1956, p. 103.
25. Menzies, W.W., *op. cit.* pp 330-335. Cf. Brumback, C., *'Suddenly from Heaven'*, Springfield, GPH, 1961, p. 334.
26. Menzies, W.W., *op. cit.* p. 334.
27. Other, much briefer statements, include books by Lilian B. Yeomans and Bill Popejoy. See Bibliography.
28. Jeter, H., *'By His Stripes'*, Springfield, GPH, 1977, p. 31.
29. Isaiah 53:4-5, Matthew 8:16-17, 1 Peter 2:24.
30. Jeter, H., *op. cit.* p. 35.
31. *ibid* pp 131-139
32. *ibid* p. 138
33. *ibid* p. 137.
34. *ibid* p. 138. Bill Popejoy, another American Assemblies of God writer offers a considerably more balanced view: "On the basis of God's Word, until healing comes the sick man *ought* to be under a doctor's care!" (Popejoy, Bill; *'The Case for Divine Healing'*, Springfield, GPH, 1976, p. 55.) See also my discussion on references to doctors and medicine in Part Three of this thesis, pp 262 ff.
35. *ibid* pp 35-36.
36. *ibid* p. 31.
37. See pp 163-173 of this thesis.
38. See *Minutes* referred to in note 11.

39. Parr, J.N., *'Divine Healing'*, Springfield, GPH, 1955.
40. *ibid* pp. 38-39.
41. *ibid* p. 20
42. *ibid* pp. 25-26.
43. See pp. 21-23 and 34-36 of this thesis.
44. See pp. 49ff
45. viz. that the use of $\sigma\lambda\omega$ to refer to healing implies that physical healing is included in salvation. See pp. 206ff of this thesis.
46. See pp. 35, 38. Cf. Parr, *op. cit.* pp. 12-13.
47. See pp.
48. Like Simpson and Jeter, Parr sees no Biblical warrant for the use of medicine. He shares with Jeter, however, the view that Christians should consult a doctor if required to do so by the law of the land. See Parr, *op. cit.* pp. 60-61. Cf. Jeter, as quoted on p. 37 of this thesis.
49. Parr, *op. cit.* pp. 46-50, but cf. pp 61-62.
50. See pp. 262 ff.
51. *Redemption Tidings*, (Volume 58, No.1 - issue January 7th, 1982 - to Volume 58, No.13 - issue April 1st, 1982). Views very similar to those of Hicklin are also expressed by British Assemblies of God Evangelist, Gordon Cove in two undated works both of which were published by the author, viz. *'God's Covenant of Divine Healing, or, An Amazing Contract'* and *'Why Some are Healed by Christ and Some are Not'*.
52. *ibid*, Vol.58, No.3, p. 5., No.4, p. 6, No.5, p. 7, No.6, p. 7.
53. *ibid*, Vol.58, No.2, p. 5.
54. *ibid*, Vol.58, No.5, p. 7.
55. *ibid*, Vol.58, No.6, p. 7. This is an interesting example of how the doctrine that healing is in the atonement may affect the exegesis of what otherwise might appear to be a totally unrelated passage. I shall devote further attention to this in Part Three of this thesis. See pp. 251-256.
56. *ibid*, Vol.58, No.7, p. 11.
57. *ibid*, Vol.58, No.7, p. 11.
58. *ibid*, Vol.58, No.8, p. 6.
59. *ibid*, Vol.58, No.8, p. 6.

Chapter Two

60. *ibid*, Vol.58, No.9, p. 5.
61. *ibid*, Vol.58, No.7, p. 11.
62. *ibid*, Vol.58, No.24, p. 6.
63. It is with great sadness that I record that Hicklin, who was personally well-known to me, died of inoperable cancer in December 1988.
64. Gee, D., *'Trophimus I Left Sick'*, London, Elim, 1952, p. 5.
65. *ibid*, pp. 21-22.
66. *ibid*, p. 22.
67. *ibid*, p. 22.
68. See, for example, Simpson, *op. cit.* p. 85. However Gee possibly means that even if repentance is complete suffering may continue for a while in order to create in us the greater determination not to sin again.
69. Gee, *op. cit.* pp. 23-25.
70. Donald Gee was a member of the Executive Council of British Assemblies of God for 40 years, of its Overseas Missions Council for 39 years, was Principal of its Bible College for 14 years, and was a world-travelled Bible teacher. The author of numerous books, still widely available, published by Gospel Publishing House, Springfield, Missouri, he was also Editor of *Pentecost*, the official magazine of the World Pentecostal Conference. See Carter, J., *'Donald Gee - Pentecostal Statesman'*, Nottingham, Assemblies of God, 1975, pp. 111 and *passim*.
71. See pp. 309ff.
72. Gee does not refute what I consider to be the faulty exegesis of Matthew 8:16-17 and of 1 Peter 2:24 offered by the more ardent advocates of the doctrine. I shall argue that these passages do not teach that healing is in the atonement. See pp 100-154, esp., 125-128, 150-154.
73. From its inception to the present day Assemblies of God has insisted that its ministers believe the 'Fundamental Truths'. Ceasing to do so results in loss of ministerial credentials. See *'Minutes of the General Presbytery of the Assemblies of God of Great Britain and Ireland, Preliminary Meeting, held at Birmingham, February 1st, 1924'*, p. 4. Compare p. 17 of the 1988-89 Year Book of Assemblies of God.
74. Gee, *op. cit.* p. 25.
75. See Gee, *op. cit.* as quoted on p 44 of this thesis.
76. See Gee, *op. cit.* as quoted on p 46 of this thesis.
77. See p. 16 of this thesis. Compare Carter, R.K., *'Faith Healing Reviewed After Twenty Years'*, Boston, Christian Witness, 1897, pp 153-161.

78. See pp 54ff.
79. Parker, P.G., *'Divine Healing'*, London, Victory, 1931; pp31-32.
(It is noteworthy, however, that Parker does not cite R.K. Carter but R.A. Torrey whom he quotes at length, unfortunately without revealing his source). I refer further to Parker's view on pp 62-66 of this thesis.
80. Gee, op. cit. pp 27-28
81. Compare note 73.
82. Woodford, L.F.W., *'Divine Healing and the Atonement - a Restatement'*, London, Victoria Institute, 1956, p. 48.
83. ibid pp 49-50
84. ibid p 50
85. ibid p 51
86. ibid pp 51-52
87. ibid p 52
88. ibid p 52
89. ibid p 53
90. ibid p 53
91. ibid p 55
92. ibid p 55
93. ibid pp 57ff
94. See pp 100-154, esp. 125-128, 150-154. Cf. my quote from Woodford on p. 127 of this thesis.
95. See pp 48-49
96. Woodford, op. cit. pp 55-56
97. See pp. 262-268 of this thesis.
98. Baldwin, R., *'Healing and Wholeness'*, Milton Keynes, Word UK, 1988, p. 127.
99. ibid pp 168-169
100. ibid p 177
101. So described on the title page of his book:
Jeffreys, G., *'Healing Rays'*, London, Elim, 1935.

Chapter Two

102. Jeffreys, op. cit. p. 34
103. See Hollenweger, W.J., *'The Pentecostals'*, London, SCM, 1972, pp 513-521.
104. Jeffreys, op. cit. p. 33
105. Compare Simpson's position as outlined on pp 21-24 of this thesis.
106. See pp 44-53 of this thesis. Since Jeffreys wrote (1932) some 20 years before Gee (1952) and Woodford (1956), it seems reasonable to assume that their work may well have been conditioned by his thinking. However, as I shall point out later (see pp 64ff), their source may well have been the even earlier work of R.A. Torrey.
107. Jeffreys does in fact quote these verses but nowhere as evidence that healing is in the atonement. Matthew 8:16-17 is included in a lengthy list of examples of Jesus healing the sick - see Jeffreys, op. cit. p. 89 - and 1 Peter 2:24 is listed, significantly, among verses quoted as evidence that deliverance from *sin* is a benefit of the atonement (see Jeffreys, op. cit. p. 25).
108. Jeffreys, op. cit. p. 12.
109. *ibid* p 16.
110. *ibid* p 37
111. *ibid* p 19
112. *ibid* p 37
113. *ibid* p 37
114. *ibid* p 33
115. *ibid* pp 32-33
116. *ibid* pp 30-31
117. See p 55 of this thesis
118. Jeffreys, op. cit. p. 18
119. *ibid* p 141
120. *ibid* p 157
121. *ibid* pp 165ff
122. *ibid* p 4
123. *ibid* p 6

124. *ibid* p 51. This claim is sometimes made by the advocates of divine healing on the grounds that the term *mortal* means 'subject to death and can therefore only refer to those who are alive (cf. Jeffreys, *op. cit.* p 62).
125. *ibid* p 52
126. *ibid* p 52
127. *ibid* p 63
128. In Part Four I shall argue that a right understanding of ἁρρᾰβῶν may well provide the key to a better understanding of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement. However it is the Spirit who is the ἁρρᾰβῶν, not divine healing; but the Spirit does distribute gifts of healing (1 Corinthians 12:10) as He will. Jeffreys fails to stress this as also he fails to mention that the ἁρρᾰβῶν is by definition *less* than the promised κληρονομία. Compare pp 347ff. of this thesis.
129. *ibid* pp 7-10. Cf. p 52.
130. The 'Publishers' Note' which serves as a preface to Jeffreys' book makes the following comment with regard to his ministry:
- "The many astonishing testimonies of those who have been miraculously healed in great gatherings have received world-wide publicity through the medium of the secular press. The vacant spinal carriages and bath chairs, the discarded crutches, the cast-off steel and other kinds of body jackets, the cripples who now walk, the cancer and tumour cases that have been miraculously healed, all eloquently testify to the supernatural character of his ministry. The author of this book writes with unequivocal authority".
131. Jeffreys' *Healing Rays* was first published in 1932, Parker's *Divine Healing* in 1931 (cf. Note 132).
132. Parker, P.G., '*Divine Healing*', London, Victory, 1931, Chapter 5.
133. *ibid* p 30
134. *ibid* p 30
135. *ibid* pp 30-31. Later (pp 33-35) Parker also rightly rejects the view which we have already noted in Jeter (cf. p 38 of this thesis) that Galatians 3:13 also teaches that healing is in the atonement. See also my own challenge to this view on pp 163ff.
136. *ibid* p 31. Parker does not clarify what he means by saying that Christ's ability to heal during his life was 'in virtue of' or 'in view of' his cross.

Chapter Two

137. Sadly Parker does not reveal his source. However he is almost certainly referring to R.A. Torrey whose views helped shape the thinking of the early Pentecostals. Cf. p 7 of this thesis.
138. *ibid* pp 31-32
139. *ibid* p 32. I shall discuss Paul's use of ἀνάγκη later.
140. *ibid* p 33
141. *ibid* pp 67-72. Parker argues that Paul's thorn was probably chronic eye trouble.
142. *ibid* pp 44-45
143. *ibid* p 40
144. *ibid* pp 39-40
145. *ibid* p 40
146. Brewster, P.S. (Ed.), *'Pentecostal Doctrine'*, Cheltenham, Editor, 1976, p 200.
147. *ibid* p 199
148. *ibid* p 201
149. *ibid* pp 203-204
150. *ibid* p 204
151. *ibid* p 198
152. *ibid* pp 202-203
153. *ibid* p 199
154. cf. p 62 of this thesis
155. *ibid* p 198. It is interesting that P.G. Parker rejected Hezekiah's healing with a poultice of figs as medicinal. See Parker, *op. cit.* p 38
156. ie the arguments from Galatians 3:14 and 1 Corinthians 11:29-30 (cf. p 38)
157. Parr's argument is based on the meaning of σώζω in Acts 4:9 rather than on the usual 'proof-texts'. See p 40. Cf. my discussion of σώζω on pp 207-220 of this thesis.

CHAPTER THREE: THE DOCTRINE BEYOND CLASSICAL PENTECOSTALISM

Having demonstrated in the last chapter that the doctrine that healing is in the atonement has continued within Classical Pentecostalism in both its original form and in various modified forms, it is my intention in this chapter to show that the doctrine also exists today outside Classical Pentecostalism and to identify any areas of differing emphasis in the presentation of the doctrine. This, together with the evidence already offered in the first two chapters, will provide an overview of the doctrine in its various forms which will to a large extent define the limits of the passages to be exegeted in Part Two and of the themes to be discussed in Part Three.

I shall consider first some of the teachings of the 'Faith Movement' [1] and second the contribution of certain neo-pentecostal [2] authors. I have selected these two groups partly because both have their origins in Classical Pentecostalism - to which this section (ie Part One) of this thesis is particularly related - and partly because the doctrine that healing is in the atonement is to be found in both groups [3]. Finally I shall note the views of some who reject the doctrine.

The doctrine in the 'Faith Movement'

D.R. McConnell, whose recent work has robustly challenged the teachings of the 'Faith Movement' [4], sets that movement within the context of the American charismatic renewal:

"The history of the church in America has seen numerous revivals of its faith and practice. American church historians identify at least three major 'great awakenings', stretching from 1726 to 1914. On a far lesser scale, the twentieth century has witnessed three more such revivals: (1) the Pentecostal revival of 1906; (2) the Healing revival of 1948; and (3) the Charismatic renewal.

Chapter 3

of 1963. we shall deal with one part of the Charismatic renewal: the Faith Movement" [5].

The 'spiritual predecessors' of the Charismatic renewal, says McConnell, are the Classical Pentecostals, but although the two movements share many common beliefs and practices the Classical Pentecostals are historically prior to the charismatics by more than fifty years and have developed their own distinct theologies and denominations. The charismatic renewal is a relatively recent phenomenon and has developed many unique beliefs and practices which many Classical Pentecostals do not accept [6].

Among such beliefs are the distinctive teachings of the Faith Movement, which appeals strongly to the Bible as a basis for 'promises' which are seen as 'faith formulas'. 'Promises' relating to health and wealth are to be appropriated by 'faith' so that Christians who learn how to exercise the appropriate 'faith formula' may expect health, wealth and prosperity. The following critical analysis by McConnell provides an excellent summary of the Faith Movement's overall position:

"In the jargon of biblical theology, the Faith interpretation of the kingdom of God could be labeled as a 'hyper-realized' eschatology. The Faith eschatology is 'hyper-realized' because of its extreme promises to the believer of a life which is absolutely invulnerable to any type of evil. It claims that 'the powers of the age to come' have *completely* come in this life and that these powers can be used *at will* by the believer with enough faith and knowledge to operate them. There is no process of realization of God's kingdom; the kingdom can be completely realized in the lives of those who exercise Faith principles. We see evidence of this hyper-realized eschatology in the Faith doctrines of healing, authority, and prosperity. The hyper-realized nature of Faith eschatology emphasizes the 'now' of the kingdom of God to the exclusion of the 'not yet'" [7].

The man thought to be the primary author of 'Faith' theology is Kenneth E. Hagin, whom Charisma magazine has referred to as *the father of the Faith Movement* [8]. Other 'Faith' teachers, including Kenneth Copeland the 'heir apparent', readily admit that they first learned the 'Faith' teaching from Kenneth Hagin [9]. Hagin claims that the first 'revelation' of 'Faith' theology was given to him in 1937 when God healed him of a congenital heart defect. Since that time he claims to have had numerous personal visitations from Jesus Christ [10], he regards himself as a prophet [11] and has threatened divine judgment, even death, to those who do not accept him as such [12]. It is not surprising that he gives his opponents short shrift, referring to them as 'stupid' [13] and 'hoodwinked by the devil' [14].

In recent years there have been numerous rebuttals of Hagin's teachings in particular and of the Faith Movement in general [15] and it is not the purpose of this thesis to add to them. What is relevant, however, is that the doctrine that healing is in the atonement is firmly held by 'Faith' teachers [16] and that, rather than having modified it, they hold it in a form even more extreme than that in which it was originally propounded. All the old ingredients are there - the strong correlation between sickness and sin [17], the insistence that it cannot be God's will for a Christian to be sick [18], the implication that to resort to medical means indicates a lack of faith [19] - but, added to these, are three new ingredients which are not found in the original version of the doctrine.

First, the Faith Movement teaches its adherents to deny the symptoms of disease. This is based on a pedantically literal interpretation of 1 Peter 2 :24 - 'by whose stripes you were healed'. It is argued that since the verb is in the past tense the redemptive work of healing has already been accomplished on the cross. Once this 'promise' has been 'claimed' in faith the Christian should refuse to believe that he is sick. How can he be if by Christ's stripes we 'were'

healed? Therefore, all symptoms of disease are lies of the Devil and should be refused or denied. It is better to believe God's Word [20]. I shall challenge this exegesis of 1 Peter 2:24 in Part Two [21] and the notion of claiming promises in Part Four [22].

The second aspect of 'Faith' teaching that takes the doctrine to a further extreme is closely related to the first. Having determined to believe a 'promise' in the Bible rather than the evidence of his senses the Christian should 'confess' what 'God' says - by which is meant what the Bible says - rather than what his senses say. In this way a person can 'confess' revelation-knowledge (what he has learned in the Bible) and, it is believed, completely change his physical circumstances. This principle of 'positive confession', as McConnell points out, is not limited to the realm of healing:

"One of the more extreme practices occurring in the modern Faith movement is writing 'faith checks'. Even though your bankbook may tell you that you have insufficient funds in your account (sense knowledge), the Bible tells you that 'God shall supply all your needs according to his riches in glory' (Philippians 4:19 - revelation knowledge). So the believer goes ahead and writes a 'hot' check, trusting that God will miraculously cover it in time. This practice has been greatly discouraged by the more prominent Faith teachers, but is one of the many bizarre ways that their followers apply their dualistic distinction between revelation knowledge and sense knowledge" [23].

Applied to the realm of healing this principle implies that if people think and talk about having cancer, then cancer is what they will have, but if they think and talk as though they were healed, they will be healed, for 'sooner or later we become what we confess' [24]. In accordance with this principle T.L. Osborn states:

Healing & the Atonement

"How often Christians will pray and obey the healing Scriptures exactly, and then, when some symptom appears, throw the entire Word of God overboard, and begin to make CONFESSION of their sickness, thus annulling their prayer and its effects! God's blessings are hindered when we let our lips contradict His Word.

If a disease threatens your body, DON'T CONFESS IT! CONFESS the Word: 'With His stripes I AM HEALED!' Say what God says! CONFESS HIS WORD!

Disease gains the ascendancy when you agree with the testimony of your senses. Your five senses have NO PLACE in the realm of faith..... Do not accept anything sent by the devil. Even though your five senses may testify that it has come to you, REFUSE TO CONFESS IT. Look immediately to Calvary. Remember, you were FREED" [25].

According to this view 'positive confession' is the most powerful weapon in the Christian's armoury. By 'confessing' the 'promises' of the Bible he can obtain healing, prosperity, freedom from suffering, and longevity [26] whereas 'negative confession' brings calamity [27]. I shall discuss both the the notion of claiming promises (which underlies 'positive confession') and the pastoral difficulties that arise from it in Part Four [28].

The third aspect in which the Faith Movement's version of the doctrine differs from that of the early proponents and of the Classical Pentecostals is the teaching, apparently based on a misunderstanding of the Hebrew use of the plural in Isaiah 53:9, that Christ died two 'deaths' - not only a physical death on the cross but also a spiritual death in hell. His physical death on the cross is seen as abrogating the old 'Abrahamic' covenant [29], but only by Christ's (supposed) 'spiritual' death can man obtain freedom from sin, sickness and poverty. This is because sin, sickness and poverty are all seen as spiritual in origin. Christ's physical death

could not atone for a problem that was spiritual. Hence the need for his 'spiritual' death - in hell. But born of the Spirit, he was raised 'the first-begotten from the dead'. Sin, sickness, poverty, and Satan were thus defeated by his 'spiritual' death and the blessings of forgiveness, health and prosperity were available to mankind [30].

From this it is clear that 'Faith' teachers hold the view, in common with several of the Classical Pentecostal writers referred to in the last chapter, that healing is directly in the atonement. Their understanding of the atonement as having been accomplished through Christ's supposed spiritual death in hell, rather than on the cross, however, is manifestly different, for the Pentecostal understanding of atonement (apart from the inclusion of healing within it) is recognised as very much in line with that of other conservative evangelical groups [31]. It seems to me that, while the 'Faith' teaching seriously affects the understanding of atonement in general, it says nothing of significance with regard to the subject of healing in the atonement in particular. Accordingly, having noted the deviation, it is not my intention to seek to refute it in this thesis [32].

The position of the Faith Movement with regard to the doctrine that healing is in the atonement may, therefore, now be summarised. With the exception of their understanding that atonement was accomplished when Christ died 'spiritually' in hell, 'Faith' teachers hold very much to the doctrine as propounded by A.B. Simpson with its emphasis on a strong correlation between sickness and sin, its insistence that it cannot be God's will for a Christian to be sick, and its strong suggestion that to avail oneself of medical means is to reveal a lack of faith. In addition there is a strong teaching that once healing has been 'claimed' Christians should deny all symptoms of sickness. Rather they should 'confess what God says' by believing and declaring the appropriate 'promises' in the Bible. Thus, unlike the

Classical Pentecostals, some of whom at least have sought to modify the doctrine, the 'Faith' teachers have, if anything produced a more extreme version of it, and, in the process, have adopted an entirely different position with regard to when and where atonement took place.

The doctrine in Neo-Pentecostalism

Apart from the 'Faith' teachers, the more extreme views of some of whom we have just briefly considered, neo-pentecostals elsewhere who write on the subject of healing appear either to affirm the doctrine in more or less its original form, or to modify it in much the same way as some of the Classical Pentecostals have sought to modify it, or to ignore it completely.

But before evidence is offered for this variety of positions within Neo-Pentecostalism it must first be observed that within Neo-Pentecostalism, unlike Classical Pentecostalism, there is a distinct absence of official doctrinal statements. This is because neo-pentecostals have either remained within their denominations and sought to maintain their 'charismatic' emphasis and experience there (and thus their only doctrinal statement would be that of their denomination, which by definition would not contain distinctively pentecostal or charismatic doctrinal elements), or, having come out of their denominations, they have been wary of forming new ones and have been reluctant to produce statements of faith. Evidence can only be adduced, therefore, from the written opinions of individual authors within the charismatic renewal, and the fact that a Baptist writer within the renewal may express an opinion on healing and the atonement will by no means indicate that that opinion is held by all charismatic Baptists.

I shall, therefore, consider the individual opinions of a selection of neo-pentecostal writers and demonstrate that some

affirm and some modify the doctrine. The views of those who ignore the doctrine [33] I shall not consider, on the grounds that their views, though relevant to the subject of divine healing in general, are not relevant to the specific subject of this thesis.

That the doctrine is affirmed within Neo-Pentecostalism is evident from the following quotation from the work of Ian Andrews:

"For example, if I were going to meditate on 'by his wounds you have been healed' (1 Peter 2, verse 24) I would first take the words 'by his' and dwell on them for five or ten minutes..... Then I would move on to the word 'stripes' and would picture Jesus strapped against the whipping post being scourged for my healing, Jesus bleeding on the Cross so that I could be free from pain..... Then I would spend about ten more minutes meditating on 'have been', because this is the difference between being sick and being healed: it has already been accomplished! Jesus did everything necessary for my health nearly 2000 years ago. By the time I get to the word 'healed', I'm generally strong enough in faith to believe it" [34].

Tony Dale also affirms the doctrine:

"Our healing as believers flows from the atoning work of Christ. Matthew makes this clear by quoting a passage from Isaiah 53 in the context of Jesus healing all those who came to him. Whereas the Old Testament Hebrew words for griefs, sicknesses, sorrows, and pains are interchangeable, in Matthew 8 it is the more precise Greek wording that we have. Here it plainly says of Jesus that he did his healings in order 'to fulfil what was spoken through the prophet Isaiah: He took up our infirmities and carried our diseases'" [35].

Dale goes on to argue that Christ's salvation includes our physical needs and concludes:

"The wonder of the redemption bought for us at Calvary is that Christ offers us himself. Not only does Scripture teach that he is our 'righteousness, sanctification, and redemption', but also that he is 'our life'. In a wonderful way beyond anything that we can adequately understand or explain, when Jesus died on the cross, he not only carried the full weight of our sin, but also of our suffering, pain and sickness" [36].

In fact Dale's article reflects very much the teachings of A.B. Simpson to whom he refers in very positive terms [37]. However, as might be expected in the contribution of a medical doctor [38], there is no suggestion that to resort to medical means is indicative of a lack of faith [39]. Moreover, commenting on Romans 8 he acknowledges that 'creation is still subject to both futility and decay' and adds that 'our bodies are not excluded' [40]. Nevertheless he sees verse 21 as indicating that Christians as the 'children of God' are *already* enjoying 'glorious freedom' in the physical realm and 'as the firstfruits of redemption are also experiencing the powers of the age to come in a way that is not yet available to the rest of creation' [41]. Dale's view that the 'low level of faith and expectation in the church' means that the kingdom is perhaps not fully *anticipated* in the present age seems to suggest that he sees lack of faith in general terms as the reason why the church does not see more miracles of healing. He does concede, however, that the kingdom is 'not yet fully *realised*' [42]. But in making this concession Dale only shows that he recognises that there is a problem with his view and that the problem is eschatological. In my opinion, he by no means solves the problem. Thus Dale's position cannot be seen as a modification of Simpson's position, but perhaps may be understood as a more moderate expression of it.

Other neo-pentecostal writers, however, do express a modified view of healing in the atonement and, perhaps unsurprisingly, their conclusions are not unlike those of the Classical

Pentecostals who made the same attempt. Rex Gardner, for example, commenting on Matthew 8:16-17, remarks that

"it seems that the passage really insists that what Christ did for our sins he did for our sicknesses" [43].

In quoting Graham Kendrick's song [44], however, he reflects, probably unwittingly, Woodford's insistence that Christ conquered sickness rather than atoned for it [45], although in claiming that Kendrick's parallelism leads us to the correct interpretation of the verse he has clearly overlooked the context in which Matthew sets the quotation.

Gardner is also close to Woodford in that he sees the outworking of Christ's victory over sickness as ultimately future. Meanwhile the Spirit is given as 'pledge':

"Satan and his agents, sin, sickness, death, have been conquered by Christ, but until the end of this age they remain still present and active. The problem is that, while realising that we have to wait for the other liberations of glory, we really want our resurrection bodies now and are dissatisfied that we have not got them. Paul felt the same".

Then, following a quote from 2 Corinthians 5:4-5, which refers to the Spirit as the ἀρροβών of the life to come, he continues:

"But a pledge is a promise of something for which we still have to wait. This is true even when the Holy Spirit does heal us, for..... when he does, he heals us into dying bodies" [46].

Thus Gardner's position is extremely close to Woodford's [47]. Sickness was conquered by Christ's death and resurrection. The final outworking of that victory is reserved until Christ's second advent. Meanwhile Christians have been given

the Spirit as a 'pledge' of their future inheritance which will include a new body after the resurrection.

John Goldingay adopts a very similar position:

"Matthew 8:17 is not about the death of Christ, but the actual idea that the atonement included dealing with illness does not seem to me incoherent, though to speak of Christ atoning for our sicknesses may be too shorthand a way to put it. My personal sickness may not result from my personal sin (cf. Job and John 9). Nevertheless the presence of illness in general in the world results from evil in the world, which itself results from the presence of sin in the world. Insofar as all illness results from the presence of evil in the world, all healing, like all forgiveness, is a fruit of his death, which produces this gracious fruit before his time as well as after it. It is in keeping with this that bodily resurrection (his and ours) is, among other things, a sign that his work of atonement has been effective: the spiritual work 'naturally' has a physical outward expression. In Christ God has won the victory over evil. But resurrection belongs to the End. That victory is not yet completely effective in this age. And because the illness (and the death) of believers issue as much from the general presence of evil in the world as from our personal sin, it is also quite 'natural' that believers still experience illness and death" [48].

David Pytches takes a somewhat stronger line:

"The particular verse that highlights the belief that there is healing in the atonement is Matthew 8:17, which is of course based on Isaiah 53:4....."

In Isaiah 53:4ff the Hebrew words *choli* and *makob* are translated 'griefs' and 'sorrows'. Matthew's interpretation of these as 'infirmities' and 'diseases' is simply respect for the actual meaning of the original words....

Chapter 3

We may not dismiss lightly the question of whether Christ was bearing our *sicknesses* and *sorrows* along with all the other effects and judgments of *sin* on the cross.....

There would appear to be enough clear evidence in the Bible for believing that there is healing in the atonement. We worship Jesus Christ not only because he paid the price on Calvary for our sins, but also because he carried our sicknesses and our sorrows. We can be physically and spiritually whole" [49].

Nevertheless Pytches acknowledges that medical means may sometimes be appropriate for

"God is the source of all healing, but he uses various means to heal" [50].

Further,

"Where someone is not healed it could be worthwhile checking on such areas as unforgiveness, deeper emotional hurts, unbelief or faithlessness, but in the final analysis it must always be recognised that our sovereign God may have some inscrutable reasons which he is not willing to disclose....

It is very important that no-one is left feeling accused by us that he must have some hidden sin or condemned that he did not have enough faith" [51].

And,

"We are still part of a fallen and groaning creation. Healings are a sign that the kingdom has come, but the limited number only goes to show that the kingdom of God has not yet fully come....

We will see signs of the victory God has already won in Christ. We will see eyes and ears opened, but we will not see every eye nor every ear opened. To expect to do so is to miss the tension

between the 'now' and the 'not yet' of God's kingdom and to attempt to by-pass the mystery between God's creative and his permissive will" [52].

It is thus clear that Pytches' position is very close to the views of Woodford, Gee, Gardner and others whose work we have already considered.

A final example of a modified view of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement is to be found in the following extract taken from a leaflet produced by St. Nicholas' Church, Nottingham, to be used in discussion with other Anglican churches:

"We believe

1. That the healing ministry is the ministry of Jesus, one of the fruits of his death on the cross (Isaiah 53) and something which we, his followers, are commissioned to do.

2. That God desires wholeness for his people. This wholeness includes forgiveness of sin and the healing of the body and the emotions (past and present)".

However the leaflet goes on to say:

"3. That alongside a theology of healing must stand a theology of pain; that some suffering is redemptive in the sense that it is an entering into the pain of the world and as such is an identification with the ongoing sufferings of Christ (see Col. 1).....

4. That healing is a free gift from God, an expression of his love, not a merited bonus.

5. That healing is a mystery; we cannot understand the way it happens nor why some people are healed while others are not...."

[53].

Sadly the leaflet does not develop further the ideas expressed in these items. It is clear, from items 1 and 2, however,

that some form of healing in the atonement theory is intended, and from items 3 and 5 that the compilers would not have embraced the doctrine as originally propounded.

In summary, the views of the writers we have surveyed in this chapter are closely parallel to those expressed by Classical Pentecostals. Although some still hold the doctrine in approximately its original form, others have sought to modify it by the recognition of a tension between the 'already' and 'not yet' aspects of the kingdom of God. In so doing they have followed perhaps unwittingly a pattern already established by the Classical Pentecostals a generation earlier. Sufficient attention has now been drawn to the doctrine, however, to have provoked a response from certain 'non-pentecostals' [54], a response which it is now appropriate to consider.

The doctrine rejected by certain 'non-pentecostals'

Although the doctrine that healing is in the atonement is now at least one hundred years old [55] and although it has formed a part of the statements of faith of various Classical Pentecostal groups since as early as 1911 [56], it has probably received wider attention in recent years through the regular television broadcasts of the 'Faith' teachers [57]. Perhaps because of the extreme version of the doctrine promulgated by these teachers [58] the doctrine has now attracted comment from non-pentecostal writers. I shall consider briefly the contributions of Peter May and of J.R.W. Stott whose work adequately summarises the difficulties felt by opponents of the doctrine.

In an article entitled *Focusing on the eternal* [59] May argues that health is *shalom*. *Shalom* characterized the experience of life before the Fall and will be the experience of the redeemed in heaven. Christians experience it now in part through the gift of new life in Christ, but in the present

world restoration to God's image is spiritual, not physical, for death is inevitable. Thus healing can only be partial and signs and wonders are not normative for the Christian. Concerning the specific matter of healing and the atonement he writes

"It is often suggested that Christ's death on the cross was to bring us physical health quite as much as forgiveness. Matthew 8:17 is called upon to support this idea. Quoting the prophet Isaiah (53:4) the text reads, 'He took up our infirmities and carried our diseases'. The passage is directly linked in people's minds with the atonement, for Isaiah goes on to speak of the suffering servant being crushed for our iniquities (Is. 53:5). However, Matthew says that the verse he has quoted has already been fulfilled, not in Christ's death but in his life as he healed all the sick people who were brought to him. The passage points to the significance of Christ's healing miracles as signs that he is the promised Messiah.

The memorial meal as instituted by Christ and passed on by Paul bears no reference to healing in the atonement..... neither does Paul mention healing when he lists those things which were of 'first importance' (1 Cor. 15:3).....

It is true that 1 Peter 2:24 quotes Isaiah 53:5 in a statement about the atonement: '.... by his wounds you have been healed'. The context is plainly about the moral and spiritual implications of Christ's death achieving our forgiveness that we might 'live for righteousness', and it would be clutching at straws to read physical health into this" [60].

In similar vein, referring to the teaching that 'Christ bore our sicknesses in the very same way that he bore our sins', Stott writes

"There are three difficulties in the way of accepting this interpretation, however. First, *nasa'* in itself does not

mean to 'bear the punishment of'. We are obliged to translate it thus only when sin is its object. That Christ 'bore' our sicknesses may (in fact does) mean something quite different.

Secondly, the concept does not make sense. 'Bearing the penalty of sin' is readily intelligible, since sin's penalty is death and Christ died our death in our place. But what is the penalty of sickness? It has none. Sickness may itself *be* a penalty for sin, but it is not itself a misdemeanour which attracts a penalty. So to speak of Christ 'atoning for' our sicknesses is to mix categories; it is not an intelligible notion.

Thirdly, Matthew applies Isaiah 53:4 not to the atoning death but to the healing ministry of Jesus. It was in order to fulfil what was spoken through Isaiah, he writes, that Jesus 'healed all the sick'. So we have no liberty to reapply the text to the cross. It is true that Peter quotes the following verse 'by his wounds we are healed', but the contexts in both Isaiah and Peter make it clear that the 'healing' they have in mind is salvation from sin.

We should not, therefore, affirm that Christ died for our sicknesses as well as for our sins, that 'there is healing in the atonement', or that health is just as readily available to everybody as forgiveness.....

.....that God can and sometimes does heal miraculously (without means, instantaneously and permanently) we should joyfully and confidently affirm. But to expect the sick to be healed and the dead to be raised as regularly as we expect sinners to be forgiven, is to stress the 'already' at the expense of the 'not yet', for it is to anticipate the resurrection. Not till then will our bodies be entirely rid of disease and death" [61].

Little comment seems necessary with regard to May's and Stott's positions at this stage. I shall be taking up the

issues they raise in Part Two of this thesis. It is, however, interesting to note that in order to refute the doctrine Stott in particular uses almost precisely the same arguments as Woodford [62] who wanted at least in some measure to retain it.

Summary

The findings of this chapter may now be briefly summarised. 'Faith' teachers like Hagin and Copeland hold the doctrine in very much the same form as A.B. Simpson. However there are the added elements of the denial of symptoms, 'positive confession', and the belief that Christ died spiritually in hell.

Of the neo-pentecostals whose writings we have considered only Andrews and Dale have accepted the doctrine in its original form, although Dale as a doctor makes certain important qualifications. Gardner, Goldingay, Huggett and Pytches have sought to modify the doctrine by recognising the tension between the present and future aspects of the kingdom of God, but none has added anything essentially different from the earlier contribution by Woodford.

Certain non-pentecostals have recently rejected the doctrine, among whom are May and Stott.

In the last three chapters I have surveyed the doctrine that healing is in the atonement both within and beyond Classical Pentecostalism. This will provide a basis for deciding which New Testament passages and themes need to be examined and evaluated in the remainder of the thesis.

NOTES:

1. For clarification of the term 'Faith Movement' see pp 79-80 below.

D.R. McConnell sees the Faith Movement as a part of Neo-Pentecostalism (cf. note 2) - McConnell, *'The Faith Movement: New Revelation or Charismatic Cultism?'*, a paper delivered to the European Pentecostal Theological Association in Erzhausen, West Germany, on Friday 31st March, 1989, p 1. However, I shall deal with the Faith Movement separately from Neo-Pentecostalism because of certain very distinct emphases within the Faith Movement. See pp 81-84.

2. The term 'neo-pentecostal' is used to refer to individuals or groups within the main Christian denominations whose adherents share in many respects the views of Classical Pentecostals. Some have remained within their own denominational groupings. Others have formed new independent groups. Some neo-pentecostals prefer the term 'charismatic' (based mainly on the emphasis they place (in common with Classical Pentecostals) on the spiritual gifts - *χαρίσματα* - of 1 Corinthians 12, which include, of course, healing. Neo-Pentecostalism is therefore sometimes referred to as the 'charismatic movement' or 'charismatic renewal'.
3. I am not, of course, suggesting that the doctrine is to be found nowhere else. However, I have found no evidence of its existence today outside of Classical Pentecostalism except in the Faith Movement and in what may broadly be called Neo-Pentecostalism. This latter category, however, defies precise definition (but see note 2 above) and it is almost impossible to say of any given writer that he would consider himself to be a part of 'Neo-Pentecostalism'. Cf. note 48.
4. D.R. McConnell, *'A Different Gospel: A Historical and Biblical Analysis of the Modern Faith Movement'*, Peabody, Mass., Hendrickson, 1988, passim.
5. D.R. McConnell, *'The Faith Movement: New Revelation or Charismatic Cultism?'*. Cf. note 1 above.
6. *ibid* p 2.
7. *ibid* pp 19-20.
8. *ibid* p 3.
9. *ibid* p 3. McConnell mentions Hobart Freeman, Fred Price, Robert Tilton, Charles Capps and Norvel Hayes as 'lesser lights' in the Faith Movement.

It is also highly significant that although McConnell recognises Hagin as the widely acknowledged father of the Faith Movement he goes on to demonstrate that Hagin has severely plagiarised E.W. Kenyon (1867-1948) most of whose writings predate Kenyon's by at least 30 years *ibid* pp 24-28. Cf. McConnell's *'A Different Gospel'*, pp 6-12, 67-71.

10. Many of these 'visitations' are recounted in Hagin's *'I Believe in Visions'*, Old Tappan, New Jersey, Fleming H. Revell, 1972.

Healing & the Atonement

11. Hagin, K.E., *'The Ministry of a Prophet'*, Tulsa, Faith Library, 1984, p 19.
12. *'I Believe in Visions'*, pp 114-115.
13. Hagin, K.E., *'A Better Covenant'*, Tulsa, Faith Library, 1980, p 5.
14. *ibid* p 4.
15. In addition to McConnell's work already referred to in note 4, see also:

Blue, K., *'Authority to Heal'*, Eastbourne, Monarch, 1989, pp 38-48.
Brandon, A., *'Health and Wealth'*, Eastbourne, Kingsway, 1987.
Fee, G.D., *'The Disease of the Health and Wealth Gospels'*, Costa Mesa, The Word for Today, 1979.
American Assemblies of God have also published a 'position paper' which rejects the teachings of the Faith Movement.
16. See, for example, the quote from Gloria Copeland on pp 1-2 of this thesis. Cf.:

Hagin, K.E., *'Prevailing Prayer to Peace'*, Tulsa, Faith Library, 1981, 90-91, and

Hagin, K.E., *'How to Keep Your Healing'*, Tulsa, Rhema, 1983, pp 1-2.
17. "You need to fight the temptation to be sick just as you would fight the temptation to lie and steal. Satan will tempt you with sickness, but you don't have to give in" - Copeland, K., *'Our Covenant with God'*, Fort Worth, KCP, 1976, p 28.
18. See Copeland, G., *'God's Will for You'*, Fort Worth, KCP, 1972 pp 85-134.
19. "Either you have faith and discard medicine or you discard faith and continue with medicine" - Brandon, *op. cit.* p. 50 describing the position of 'Faith' teacher, Stephen Hall. For a chilling account of the tragically fatal effects of such teaching, see:

Parker, L., *'We Let our Son Die'*, Irvine, Cal., Harvest House, 1980.
20. See, for example, Hagin, K.E., *'Real Faith'*, pp 119-120.
It is noteworthy, however, that this aspect of the doctrine did not originate with Hagin. McConnell has demonstrated that it can be traced to E.W. Kenyon (cf. note 9). T.L. Osborn (though not a part of the Faith movement) also influenced by Kenyon (cf. p 34 of this thesis), taught along similar lines - see Osborn, T.L., *'Healing the Sick'*, Tulsa, TLO, 1961, pp 96-111.
21. See pp 141ff.
22. See pp 298ff.
23. McConnell, *The Faith Movement*, pp 7-8.
24. Kenyon, E.W., *'Two Kinds of Faith'*, Seattle, Kenyon, 1942, pp 65-66.

Chapter 3

25. Osborn, T.L., *'Healing the Sick'*, Tulsa, Osborn, 1961, p 102.
(Cf. his *'Receive Miracle Healing'*, Tulsa, Harrison House, 1984,
pp 191-211, which indicate no real change of position).

It is difficult to know how to classify Osborn. In the 1960s he was certainly identified with the Classical Pentecostals (cf. pp 34-36 of this thesis). In 1972, however, his popularity among that group was certainly declining. See, for example, Dr. Valentine Cunningham's article, *'Eratosthenes Butterscotch'* in Redemption Tidings, 20th July 1972, pp 7-8, in which Cunningham castigates Osborn for his change of emphasis from a simple healing message to a message of prosperity and success. Although Osborn may not usually be considered a part of the modern 'Faith' movement, in this aspect of his teaching he is certainly identified with it. The doctrinal similarities are probably attributable to the great dependence on the work of E.W. Kenyon of both Osborn and Hagin (cf. note 9 and p 34).

26. Hagin, K.E., *'How to Turn Your Faith Loose'*, Tulsa, Faith Library, 1985, p 28.
27. *ibid* p 25. cf. Capps, C., *'Why Tragedy Happens to Christians'*, Tulsa, Harrison House, 1980, pp 28, 41.
28. See pp 298ff and pp 309ff.
29. Copeland, K., *'Our Covenant with God'*, Fort Worth, 1976, p. 28.
30. Brandon, *op. cit.* 121-128, deals with this subject at some length.
Cf. McConnell *'The Faith Movement'* pp 10-11.
31. See, for example, Julian Ward's article *'Pentecostalist Theology'* in the New Dictionary of Theology, Leicester, IVP, p 504.
32. For a refutation of the 'spiritual death' teaching, see Brandon, *op. cit.*, pp 121-128.
33. Father Francis MacNutt and John Wimber, for example, both well-known writers on divine healing, make no reference to the doctrine. See:
- MacNutt, F., *'Healing'*, New York, Ave Maria, 1974, *passim*
Wimber, J., *'Power Healing'*, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1986, *passim*.
34. Andrews, I., *'Building a People of Power'*, Milton Keynes, Word, 1988, pp 135-136.
35. Taken from Dale's article *'Seeing God at Work in the Physical'*, in Goldingay, J., (Ed), *'Signs, Wonders and Healing'*, Leicester, IVP, 1989, p 68.

Dale is described as a medical doctor who 'pioneered the Tower Hamlets Christian Fellowship before becoming involved full-time with Caring Professions Concern, which he heads' - *ibid* p 185.

36. *ibid* pp 73-74.

37. *ibid* p 51.

38. See note 34.

39. Dale does warn, however, that 'modern scientific medicine has effectively become a religion of its own' and that the doctor's "'divine' ability to give a prognosis has become a type of negative prophecy that usually inspires despair and fear in those who receive it" - *ibid* p 52.

40. *ibid* p 48.

41. *ibid* pp 48-49.

42. *ibid* p 52.

43. Gardner, R., *'Healing Miracles'*, London, Dartman, Longman & Todd, 1986, p 160.

44. "Over sin he has conquered
Over death victorious
Over sickness he has triumphed"

Gardner, *op. cit.* p 160.

44. See p 52.

46. *ibid* p 164.

47. I have already stated that I think it unlikely that Gardner was aware of Woodford's contribution (see p 87). However Gardner does acknowledge Dunn as a source of his thinking. See Gardner, *op. cit.* p 163 where he quotes from

Dunn, J.D.G., *'Jesus and the Spirit'*, London, SCM, 1975, p 89.

48. Goldingay, *op. cit.* pp 183-184. It is questionable whether Goldingay should be classified within Neo-Pentecostalism. However his remark, 'I have come to experience and appreciate more fully aspects of charismatic renewal' (*op. cit.* p 14) perhaps justifies the inclusion of his contribution within this section of the thesis. He does go on to say, however, 'I have not been 'baptized in the Spirit', nor do I speak in tongues' (*loc. cit.*). His position illustrates the difficulties experienced in seeking to classify contributors within Neo-Pentecostalism. Cf. note 3.

49. Pytches, D., *'Come Holy Spirit'*, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1985, pp27-28.

50. *ibid* p 165.

51. *ibid* p 166.

52. *ibid* pp 30-31.

53. David Huggett, Vicar of St. Nicholas' Church, Nottingham, in an article entitled *'A ministry to be encouraged'* in Goldingay, *op. cit.* pp 152-153.

Chapter 3

54. I shall use the term 'non-pentecostals' to describe those Christians who are certainly not Classical Pentecostals and who would probably prefer not to be regarded as neo-pentecostals. However, note my caution on the difficulties of precise categorization - note 3, p 96.
55. cf. p 12ff.
56. cf. p 32.
57. Copeland and Hagin have been broadcasting widely on television in the USA for many years. The advent of transmission by satellite has of course increased the spread of their doctrines.
58. cf. pp 79-85.
59. Goldingay, op. cit. pp 27-45.
60. ibid pp 38-39.
61. Stott, J.R.W., *'The Cross of Christ'*, Leicester, IVP, 1986, pp 244-246.
62. cf. p 49ff. However, Woodford's statement is fuller than Stott's.

PART TWO

AN EXAMINATION OF NT PASSAGES RELATING TO THE DOCTRINE

In the first part of this thesis I examined the theological and literary origins of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement and demonstrated how the doctrine has developed both within and beyond Classical Pentecostalism [1]. This examination has revealed several New Testament passages which are adduced as evidence in support of the doctrine and it is my intention in Part Two to give careful consideration to those passages which I consider to be the most important [2]. (Part Three will be dedicated to a discussion of various NT *themes* which are sometimes used to support the doctrine).

In Chapters Four and Five I shall consider the two New Testament passages upon which the doctrine is directly based [3] and in Chapter Six I shall examine various other passages the interpretation of which has been affected by the doctrine [4]. It is my intention to discover, as far as is possible, the author's intention in each of these passages and in so doing to show that none of these passages when correctly interpreted supports the doctrine as it was originally taught.

In considering each passage I shall, of course, give due attention to the historical context of the NT book in which the passage is found before investigating the literary context of the passage itself. The number of passages to be examined is such, however, that discussion of the historical context will of necessity be relatively brief at times [5]. This thesis is not intended to be an Introduction to the New Testament. I shall, nevertheless, refer to matters of Introduction as much as seems necessary to a correct exegesis of the passage in question.

CHAPTER FOUR: HE TOOK OUR INFIRMITIES & CARRIED OUR DISEASES -
MATTHEW 8:17

The Nature of the Gospels - Some Basic Assumptions

A detailed discussion of what is often referred to as *the Synoptic Problem* is neither possible nor necessary within the scope of this thesis. I shall make three basic assumptions concerning the nature of the Gospels all of which are 'the shared convictions of the vast majority of NT scholars' [6].

First, I shall assume that the Gospel writers had available to them the sayings of and narratives about Jesus which had been preserved in the tradition of the church in oral and possibly in written form and that the Gospel writer's own contribution was that of selection, adaptation and arrangement of pericopes.

Second, I shall assume that each writer adapted the materials not simply to record the life and teachings of Jesus, but also to present Jesus to his readers from his own distinctive point of view.

Finally, I shall assume that the Synoptic Gospels were not written independently of each other, but that Mark was written first and that Matthew and Luke used Mark as well as other common materials (often referred to as Q) in writing their own Gospels.

Although these assumptions are by no means unchallengeable [7] they do form a simple working hypothesis upon which to proceed and they do reflect my own understanding of the nature of the Gospels. Accordingly my exegesis of the pericope found in Matthew 8:16-17 will be based on these assumptions. But, as will become apparent later [8], it is questionable if one's understanding as to whether the passage supports the doctrine

that healing is in the atonement will be seriously affected by these assumptions [9].

The Nature of Matthew's Gospel - an immediate difficulty

Graham Stanton has pointed out that 'between 1945 and 1965 there was a measure of scholarly agreement on many of the central issues in Matthean scholarship' [10]. Since 1965, however, the discussion has become more intense and today the issues are far from settled. Matthew is a 'new storm centre in contemporary scholarship' [11]. Issues such as authorship, readership, the theological principles upon which Matthew edited the material available to him, remain largely unresolved. In a recent article [12] Dick France has provided an excellent summary of the discussion to date and it would be inappropriate to attempt to reproduce it here. However, the unresolved nature of some of the issues, particularly with regard to redaction criticism, leaves us with an immediate difficulty in that the normal process which leads to an exegetical decision (that is, that the exegesis of individual passages is made in the light of what one holds to be the overall structure of the writer's thought) becomes almost impossible. Stanton recognises this difficulty when he states

"The exegete is caught in a hermeneutical circle: since it is so difficult to grasp the overall structure of the evangelist's thought, we cannot always be certain that we have understood his intentions in particular passages" [13].

Despite this difficulty, however, a decision has to be made as to the point at which it will be most helpful to break into the 'circle'. With regard to the passage under discussion in this chapter it seems to me that the most helpful methodology will be to look briefly at the pericope *first* in order to determine which introductory areas are likely to be relevant to the ultimate exegesis of the passage. Those areas can then

be examined before returning to a detailed exegesis of the pericope. In this way introductory areas which are relevant to a study of the Gospel as a whole but which may well be irrelevant to the passage in particular need not be discussed.

The Pericope - a Preliminary Examination

The following brief analysis of the pericope found in Matthew 8:16-17 is based on Kurt Aland's *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* [14]. It is significant that the pericope (which Aland entitles *Heilungen am Abend*) is found in all three Synoptic Gospels and in each case follows the writer's account of the healing of Peter's mother-in-law [15]. It is probable, therefore, that the same event is intended by each evangelist. A comparison of Matthew with Mark quickly reveals the following:

Matthew omits

ὅτε ἔδυ ὁ ἥλιος
and πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας
from Mark 1:32,

καὶ ἦν ὅλη ἡ πόλις ἐπισυνηγμένη πρὸς τὴν θύραν
from Mark 1:33,

and ποικίλαις νόσοις
and οὐκ ἤφιεν λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια, ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτὸν
from Mark 1:34.

Matthew adds

λόγῳ after ἐξέβαλεν (τὰ πνεύματα)
(cf. Matt. 8:16, Mark 1:34)

and ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου
λέγοντος, αὐτός τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβεν καὶ
τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν (Matthew 8:17).

Matthew also makes the following adaptations:

	ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτόν	in Mark 1:32
becomes	προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ	in Matthew 8:16.
	τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους	in Mark 1:32
becomes	δαιμονιζομένους πολλοὺς	in Matthew 8:16.
	δαιμόνια πολλὰ	in Mark 1:34
becomes	τὰ πνεύματα	in Matthew 8:16.
	ἐθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς	in Mark 1:34
becomes	πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ἐθεράπευσεν	in Matthew 8:16.

From this brief analysis of the differences in the pericope between Matthew and Mark what is clearly most significant with regard to the doctrine that healing is in the atonement is Matthew's use of Isaiah 53:4 (to which no reference is made in either Mark's or Luke's account) in connection with Jesus' healing the sick. Further, the fact that in Mark *all* the sick are brought to Jesus and *many* are healed, whereas in Matthew the bringing of the sick (as distinct from the demon-possessed) is not mentioned but *all* the sick are healed may also be significant.

The introductory issues that need to be carefully considered before attempting to come to a proper understanding of the passage, therefore, must include Matthew's use of the Old Testament and his understanding of its 'fulfilment' in the life and ministry of Jesus. His purpose in stressing in several places [16] that Jesus healed *all* must also be considered along with an investigation into his purpose in recording the healing miracles of Jesus. These issues, which, as I shall argue shortly, are closely related to Matthew's didactic, apologetic, and Christological purposes [17], are

clearly relevant to a correct understanding of not only the passage in particular but also the Gospel as a whole. I shall, therefore, first indicate briefly what I believe to be Matthew's major purposes in the Gospel as a whole and then consider the more specific issues referred to above. It is not my intention to enter into detailed discussion with regard to the authorship of Matthew's Gospel. I shall refer to the writer as 'Matthew' assuming that the writer was a Jewish Christian writing primarily within a Jewish context [18]. I shall also assume, with most modern scholars, that Matthew's Gospel was written between 80 and 100 AD [19].

The Gospel as a Whole - Matthew's Major Purposes

Graham Stanton has provided an excellent summary of the study of Matthew in recent decades [20] in which he draws attention to Günther Bornkamm's claim in 1948 that Matthew's reinterpretation of the Marcan account of the stilling of the storm offered 'proof of definite theological intentions', and to Otto Michel's 1950 study of the closing verses of Matthew as 'one of the first modern studies to concentrate on the distinctive theological emphases of the evangelist' [21].

Since that time lively and interesting discussion has ensued with regard to a variety of aspects of the Gospel [22], and although contributors have expressed widely differing opinions as to precisely what Matthew's theological intentions are, there appears to be fairly general agreement that Matthew, like the other Synoptic writers, is by no means a mere collector and hander-on of the tradition, but is also an interpreter of it [23].

The difficulty in reaching agreement with regard to Matthew's precise theological intentions springs partly, of course, from more basic disagreements that underly the discussion [24], but despite these disagreements it seems to me that certain

distinctive characteristics found in Matthew indicate fairly clearly the writer's overall theological intentions. R.T. France, for example, draws attention to Matthew's portrayal of Jesus as the fulfilment of Old Testament hopes, to his application of OT texts to the life and ministry of Jesus, his attitude to OT law and to the tradition of Jewish scribal teaching, his accounts of Jesus' confrontation with the official representatives of the Jewish nation and religion, and his understanding of the Christian church vis-à-vis Judaism. These distinctive characteristics, all of which are, it seems to me, clearly discernible in Matthew, all strongly suggest that Matthew's overall purpose cannot be unrelated to the needs of the Jewish Christians of his day. Indeed, as France goes on to argue,

"These are the issues which must have been uppermost in the minds of those Jews who had recognised Jesus as the Messiah, and who now needed both to work out their own self-understanding in relation to their Jewish roots and to learn to present and defend the gospel among non-Christian Jews" [25].

If France is right, as I believe he is, Matthew's purposes are didactic, apologetic and Christological [26] and it is in the light of these purposes that we must now examine Matthew's use of the Old Testament and his understanding of 'fulfilment'. I shall then consider Matthew's use of the stories of Jesus' miracles before attempting a detailed exegesis of the passage under discussion.

Matthew's Use of the Old Testament - his Understanding of Fulfilment

A pronounced feature of Matthew's Gospel is the frequent appearance of quotations from or allusions to the Old Testament. Of particular interest and significance to the

subject of this thesis, however, is his use of 'formula quotations' in which we find either

ἵνα (or ὅπως) πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου (or τῶν προφητῶν)

or τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου.

There are ten such 'formula quotations' [27] which stand out from other quotations from the Old Testament, not only by virtue of the inclusion of this formula, but also because they all appear to function as 'asides' of the evangelist and not as part of his narrative, for if the quotation and its formula were omitted the narrative would not be interrupted. They may thus be seen as comments added by Matthew to existing stories. They also differ from other Old Testament quotations in Matthew in that the text in the 'formula quotations' is less close to the LXX than that in the other quotations [28].

These 'formula quotations', all of which (with the exception of Zechariah 9:9 which is also cited in John 12:15) are quoted only in Matthew, could be, if we could determine their purpose with any certainty [29], not only of general significance with regard to our understanding of Matthew's intention in writing his gospel, but also of particular significance with regard to Matthew 8:17 which is itself a 'formula quotation'. Sadly, however, as Graham Stanton has pointed out:

"Almost the only point on which there is general agreement is that there are important differences between the fulfilment formula quotations and the other citations of the OT found in Matthew.....

....Even after a good deal of very detailed work it is clear that the origin of many of the evangelist's OT citations is an unresolved issue. There seems to be reasonable certainty at only one point: the introductory fulfilment formulae which precede

many of the OT citations are a distinctive and important Matthean refrain" [30].

But if the matter remains as yet unresolved a decision must nevertheless be made, albeit cautiously, with regard to the purpose of Matthew's 'formula quotations', for a working hypothesis is needed upon which to base our exegesis of Matthew 8:17.

In this respect it seems to me clear that the key to understanding the 'formula quotations' lies in the fact that they are *fulfilment* formula quotations. A right understanding of Matthew's use of 'formula quotations' must be dependent on the significance of his use of πληρόω (since πληρόω is part of the formula). But if Matthew's use of πληρόω is to be correctly understood it must be seen in the light of a wider concept of fulfilment, for Matthew's presentation of Christ as in some way the fulfilment of the Old Testament is by no means limited to a series of quotations used as 'proof-texts'. T.L. Donaldson has argued that Matthew

"combined christological terms, OT citations, and other typological and narrative elements to form a comprehensive picture of Jesus as the fulfilment of OT hopes and ideals" [31].

and sees fulfilment as the key to understanding not only the 'formula quotations' but the gospel as a whole. This view is also endorsed by H. Frankemölle who claims that the verb πληρόω indicates 'Matthew's fundamental theological idea' [32].

If this understanding is correct then it indicates that Graham Stanton was right to question the sharp division that had been made between the 'formula quotations' and the other citations of the Old Testament found in Matthew [33] for, as R.T. France also suggests:

"It is not the merely formal quotations with their *plerōs*-formula which draw out this emphasis, but the subtle interweaving of scriptural themes in both narrative and teaching, more often by allusive reference than by direct quotation" [34].

Furthermore,

"No one OT theme dominates Matthew's concept of fulfilment; what is impressive is the sheer exuberance of his wide-ranging search for suitable predictive themes and typological models" [35].

According to this view, which I share, the formula quotations must be understood in the light of Matthew's overall emphasis on fulfilment [36] the purpose of which was, if France is right, to enable Jewish Christians to defend and present the Gospel to non-Christian Jews. The presentation of Jesus as being in a variety of ways the fulfilment of Old Testament hopes and ideals would clearly be of significance to such people and the 'formula quotations' should probably be seen as just one aspect of such a presentation. Accordingly, when turning to the exegesis of Matthew 8:17, I shall assume that Matthew's purpose in citing Isaiah 53:4 was in harmony with his overall presentation of Jesus as the fulfilment of Old Testament hopes. But first attention must be given to Matthew's purpose in recording the miracles of Jesus and his unique emphasis that Jesus healed all.

*Matthew's Purpose in recording Jesus' Miracles -
the 'he healed all' passages*

I argued earlier that Matthew's purposes were didactic, apologetic and Christological [37] and that his overall intention was to present Jesus, particularly to the Jews, as the fulfilment of Old Testament hopes [38]. If this latter point is correct it means that his central purpose was clearly Christological, and that Jesus was the primary focus of the

didactic and apologetic elements in Matthew's redaction. This understanding not only takes satisfactory account of the 'formula quotation' passages but also is in harmony with Matthew's use of the miracle stories in the Gospel tradition.

In connection with the latter David Hill comments:

"The use made by Matthew of the healing miracle stories in Mark's Gospel is also instructive. The stylistic traits (as the Form Critics, especially Bultmann, list them) are found much less frequently in Matthew. The amount of introductory and concluding descriptive material is strikingly compressed: secondary people and secondary actions are omitted: the conversation between Jesus and the person seeking healing tends to become the focus of meaning, and so gives prominence to the role of faith: formal expressions and catch-word connections within the story appear to a greater extent than in Mark" [39].

Hill goes on to agree with H.D. Held that 'the miracles are not important for their own sakes, but by reason of the message they contain' [40] and argues that the miracle stories are re-narrated by Matthew for the instruction of the Church, in the nature of faith and discipleship and on the person of Christ and suggests that the evangelist's primary purpose was catechetical [41]. As examples of miracle stories that teach faith he cites Matthew 8:13, 9:22, and 15:28. Stories with a Christological emphasis include 8:16-17, 8:28-34, 9:2-7, and Matthew 8:23-27 and 14:22-23 are seen as lessons in discipleship.

I am happy to agree with Hill that the miracle stories he cites do in fact teach the lessons he derives from them and that it was Matthew's intention to teach those lessons. It is questionable, however, whether these were the only lessons he intended to convey. That a lesson on discipleship can be derived, for example, from the story of the stilling of the

storm on the lake [42] few would deny. But the story clearly also contains lessons on faith and on the person of Christ. Any attempt, therefore, to place each story in a particular category of lesson to be learned is probably an oversimplification and it may well be that we are to look for more than one lesson in each miracle story.

Furthermore, the statement that the miracles are not important for their own sakes should not be accepted without qualification. It seems to me that this view makes a somewhat artificial distinction between the miracle itself and the lesson the miracle is intended to teach. Surely it is at least possible that a part of the Christological lesson that Matthew intends to teach when he records the miracle stories is that the miracle not only says something about who Jesus *is* but also about what he can *do* for his disciples [43]? Understood this way the miracle becomes a part of the message and cannot be totally separated from it. The fact that Matthew more than once directly links Christ's proclamation of 'the gospel of the kingdom' with the healing of the sick [44] may possibly be an indication that he intends us to understand that healing is in some sense a part of the message. In making this observation it is not my intention to deny that a major purpose of the miracle stories may well be to teach lessons on faith, or discipleship or the person of Christ, but rather to stress that the miracle itself may also be rightly understood to be a part of the message if I am right in thinking that for Matthew the healing of the sick was an integral part of the proclamation of 'the gospel of the kingdom'.

Indeed I would suggest that if we are rightly to understand Matthew's intention in his use of the miracle stories we must view them in the light of his emphasis upon the kingdom. Early in the Gospel [45] Jesus is introduced as a king and this emphasis is repeated in the parables of the wedding feast

[46] and of the sheep and the goats [47], in the account of his triumphal entry into Jerusalem [48] and in the record of his trial before Pilate [49]. This in itself reveals a somewhat stronger emphasis on kingship than is found in Mark or Luke [50] but the importance of the theme for Matthew is further accentuated by the following quotation from France:

"While Matthew's Gospel, like the other Synoptics, speaks much of the kingdom of God (or 'heaven'), he also includes a few references by Jesus to himself ('the Son of man') as having his own kingship (13:41; 16:28; 19:28; 25:31, 34). In 25:31ff. his kingship is described in terms used in the Old Testament for that of God himself. And the Gospel reaches its climax in the declaration of Jesus' universal sovereignty (28:18).

The kingship of Jesus is thus an important theme for Matthew. Jesus 'fulfils' the institution of kingship in the Old Testament: he is the 'son of David', the 'greater than Solomon'...." [51].

Matthew's free use of the title 'Son of David' [52] and its implied link with his understanding of Jesus as 'king of the Jews' [53] is of special interest here because attention to the contexts in which it occurs indicates a particular connection with Jesus' healing ministry [54]. Although various different explanations have been offered for this [55] there seems to me to be an inescapable link between the idea of Jesus the king, descended from King David, who as son of David heals the sick, and the clear connection in Matthew between the proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom and Jesus' healing ministry [56].

Closely connected with Matthew's emphasis that Jesus is king is the stress he places on Jesus' authority. This is explicit in his teaching (7:28-29), in his right to forgive sins (9:6, 8), and in his miracle-working power over unclean spirits and over sickness which he delegates to the twelve disciples

(10:1) so that as they go out to preach that the kingdom of heaven is at hand (10:7) they too may 'heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out demons' (10:8). His authority extends as far as the temple itself (21:12-27) and the Gospel closes with the statement that universal authority is given to Christ in whose name disciples are to be made of all nations (28:18-19).

But Christ's kingly authority is seen frequently in the Gospel, not merely in those places where it is explicitly stated. The miracles recorded in Chapters 8 and 9, for example, serve as an excellent illustration of this. The one who taught with authority (7:28-29) also exercises authority over leprosy, paralysis, fever, demons and diseases, the forces of nature, blindness, dumbness and death itself. He even has authority to forgive sins for which his authority to heal is cited as evidence (9:6). This authority to heal 'every kind of disease and every kind of sickness' is placed alongside the proclaiming 'the gospel of the kingdom' (9:35) and must surely be viewed as an integral part of that gospel.

In the light of this it is difficult to see how the message the miracles teach can be divorced from the miracles themselves. The good news of the kingdom is the message that the king has come and the fact that sicknesses and sins and evil spirits are subject to him is part and parcel of the good news. Matthew's use of the miracle stories, therefore, must be seen, in part at least, as intended to illustrate the authority of Jesus, the son of David, the king of the Jews.

With this in mind it is not difficult to suggest a possible means of interpreting Matthew's repeated emphasis that 'Jesus healed all' [57] and the several occasions where he states that multitudes came to Jesus for healing [58]. Statements to the effect that he healed all; or that he healed every kind of sickness, or that as many as touched him were healed may all

be understood to be saying essentially the same thing. Jesus' kingly authority is such that there is no sickness that he cannot heal, no problem that he cannot solve. In short, his authority is absolute. Anything short of this - the suggestion, for example, that there were some whom Jesus did not heal - would detract from Matthew's picture of Christ as the king to whom all authority is given [59]. Further, such a suggestion might be interpreted as a lack of willingness or even of compassion on Christ's part. Yet Matthew indicates no such lack (8:1-4, 14:14, 20:34). His insistence that Jesus healed all is, therefore, in harmony with his overall emphasis that Christ is king, that with his coming the kingdom of heaven has come, that the gospel of the kingdom includes good news for the sick and suffering, and that Christ's authority and compassion are such that he is willing to heal all who come to him.

But Matthew uses the miracle stories not only to portray Jesus as king but to teach the need for faith as an appropriate response to his authority. Indeed it appears that faith is the recognition of his authority. This is explicit in the account of the healing of the centurion's servant (8:9-10) and in the healing of the two blind men (9:27-29) and seems to be implied elsewhere where faith is mentioned (8:25, 9:1, 9:22, 14:31, 15:28, 17:20). In the light of this it does not seem unreasonable to suggest that part of the purpose of Matthew's miracle stories, which accentuate so frequently Jesus' kingly authority, along with his repeated emphasis that Jesus healed all, is to encourage faith on the part of his readers. His Gospel concludes with the command that disciples be made of all nations on the basis of Christ's universal authority and with the promise of Christ's presence with his disciples to the end of the age. If I am right in thinking that Matthew uses the miracle stories to show that faith is the appropriate response to the authority of Jesus, then the statement of Christ's universal authority with which the Gospel concludes

may well suggest that the Gospel as a whole was written with a view to promoting faith on the part of Matthew's readers. Such a view would be by no means out of harmony with the apologetic, didactic and Christological purposes referred to earlier [60].

In accordance with the position I have advanced thus far I shall, therefore, assume that a major purpose of the miracle stories in Matthew's Gospel and of his statements that Jesus healed all, is to illustrate the kingly authority of Jesus. This is designed not only to teach about faith and discipleship but also actively to promote faith both among those who were already and those who were about to become disciples. It is with this in mind that the exegesis of Matthew 8:16-17 must now be attempted.

Exegesis of Matthew 8:16-17

As H.J. Held has pointed out [61] these verses are the climax of a carefully composed section in which three specific healing miracles lead up to a general summary which concludes with a quotation from Isaiah which Matthew relates to Jesus' healing ministry in general. It is not my intention to investigate each of these specific healings in detail but, by way of introduction, to concentrate attention on the healing of Peter's mother-in-law (14-15) which in all three Synoptics immediately precedes the pericope which is before us [62].

I have already argued that a major purpose of the miracle stories in Matthew is to illustrate the kingly authority of Jesus. If Gundry's understanding is correct the pericope dealing with the healing of Peter's mother-in-law is a superb illustration of this. He points out that where Mark (1:28) writes 'they' (understood in context as Jesus and his disciples) Matthew (8:14) writes of Jesus alone and identifies him by name. Similarly,

characteristically simplifying Mark [66]. Despite this caution, however, Gundry's comments are an excellent example of the contribution that redaction criticism can make to our understanding of the author's intentions and, if correct, strongly confirm my view that a major purpose in Matthew's use of the miracle stories is to emphasise the kingly authority of Jesus, an emphasis which, as I pointed out earlier, with reference to the other miracles recorded in Chapters 8 and 9 [67], may well have been designed to promote faith in the hearts of Matthew's readers.

Having now considered both the wider context of the Gospel as a whole and the more immediate context of Chapters 8 and 9, it is now time to examine in some detail the verses which are the subject of this investigation, verses 16 and 17 of Chapter 8, which read as follows:

Ὅρας δὲ γενομένης προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δαιμονιζομένους πολλούς· καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὰ πνεύματα λόγῳ καὶ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ἐθεράπευσεν,

ὥπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος·

αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβεν
καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν. [68]

Earlier I summarised the differences between Matthew's account and that of Mark [69]. For convenience of analysis these alterations may be divided into the following categories:

1) Contextual and Stylistic Alterations

- a) The omission of ὅτε ἔδυ ὁ ἥλιος
- b) The omission of καὶ ἦν ὅλη ἡ πόλις ἐπισυνηγμένη πρὸς τὴν θύραν
- c) The substitution of προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ for ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν

"Where Mark makes Simon's mother-in-law the subject of lying in bed with a fever, Matthew makes Jesus the subject of seeing her prostrate with a fever. In these ways the evangelist concentrates attention on Jesus and gives him the initiative in the exercise of his authority" [63].

Furthermore,

"Despite Matthew's liking for Mark's *προσέλθω*, Jesus' approaching her also disappears. In Matthew, others approach Jesus; he does not need to approach them. There are only two exceptions, 17:7 and 28:18, where Jesus has to approach his disciples because his transfiguration and resurrection have incapacitated them" [64].

Concerning verse 15 Gundry, still comparing Matthew with Mark, comments:

"In Mark.... Jesus seizes Peter's mother-in-law by her hand and raises her up. The fever leaves. In Matthew Jesus merely touches her and the fever leaves. Then she gets up. Mark locates the cure in the visible raising of the woman by Jesus, Matthew in Jesus' initial touching of her, i.e., before the cure becomes noticeable. Just as in the preceding story a mere word suffices to heal the centurion's servant (vv 8, 13), so here just a touch effects the cure of Peter's mother-in-law. Raising her as a means of healing (so Mark) becomes her getting up as a sign of her healing. And her waiting on, i.e., serving food to, 'them' (so Mark and Luke, referring to Jesus and his disciples) becomes a waiting on 'him' (a reference to Jesus). Thus the authoritative figure of Jesus dominates the story from beginning to end" [65].

A simple reading of Matthew 8:14-15, however, might suggest that Gundry has read into a relatively simple statement rather more than Matthew himself intended. It may just be that he is

2) Alterations with regard to Exorcism

- a) The omission of οὐκ ἤφιεν λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτόν
- b) The addition of λόγῳ after ἐξέβαλεν
- c) The adaptation of τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους to δαιμονιζομένους πολλοὺς and of δαιμόνια πολλὰ to τὰ πνεύματα

3) Alterations with regard to Healing

- a) The omission of πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας (after προσφέρω)
- b) The omission of ποικίλαις νόσοις
- c) The adaptation of ἐθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς to πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ἐθεράπευσεν
- d) The addition of the reference to Isaiah 53:4.

It seems to me that the alterations in group 1 are of relatively little significance to the purpose of this thesis and may therefore be dealt with quite briefly. Unlike Mark, Matthew has no reference to the Sabbath within the context of his narrative. Thus Mark's emphasis that evening had come (he uses ὅτε ἔδυ ὁ ἥλιος as well as ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης) is unnecessary in Matthew [70]. Matthew's omission of the statement that the whole city was gathered at the door is probably simply an example of his characteristic simplification and abbreviation of Mark [71], and the use of προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ is a favourite of Matthew [72]. All these alterations may, therefore, be accounted for on contextual or stylistic grounds and probably have no bearing on Matthew's view of healing.

The alterations in group 2, with regard to exorcism, are far more significant, however, for they are probably made with a view once again to stressing the authority of Jesus and so promoting faith in the hearts of Matthew's readers. This is

particularly clear with regard to the addition of λόγῳ after ἐξέβαλεν. The demons are expelled with a mere word, just as earlier in the chapter the centurion's servant was healed by just a word from Jesus (cf. vv 8, 13) [73].

Further, in Mark the demonized are brought to Jesus and many demons are cast out, whereas in Matthew the use of πολὺς is transferred from the demons to the demonized. In this way many demonized are brought and the demons cast out and any inference that there might have been some demons that were not expelled is eliminated. This is, of course, completely in line not only with Matthew's frequent emphasis that Jesus healed all but also with his specific statement to that effect in the same verse. The insistence that all were healed (whether demonized or sick) would clearly not only accentuate the authority of Jesus but also inspire faith for such healing.

The omission of οὐκ ἤφιεν λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτὸν could be yet another example of Matthew's simplification and abbreviation of Mark. However Mark's inclusion of these two clauses may well refer back to the exorcism in the synagogue (1:24-25) and Matthew's omission of this entire incident may also account for the omission of these clauses here. Further, as Gundry comments, Matthew is far more concerned with the fulfilment of prophecy (cf. v.17) than with the Messianic secret [74].

Thus the alterations with regard to exorcism in these verses continue the trend already noted in the previous pericope. Matthew's redaction emphasises once again the kingly authority of Jesus in whom Matthew's readers are inspired to have faith. Jesus' authority marks him out as the one who fulfils Old Testament hopes and the way has been paved quite naturally for the OT quote which is to follow.

But the alterations with regard to exorcism are not only of interest because of the stress that is placed upon the authority of Jesus. They are also of relevance to the subject of this thesis in that the distinction between exorcism and healing in the Synoptics is somewhat blurred [75] and it is surely reasonable to argue, therefore, that there must be, to say the least, an extremely close connection between whatever Matthew says about exorcism and what he says about healing. If so, the conclusions drawn in the previous paragraph with regard to Matthew's redaction vis-à-vis exorcism will have immediate bearing upon our understanding of his redaction vis-à-vis healing. In short, Matthew's alterations with regard to exorcism are relevant not only because they form a part of the immediate context of these verses but also because of the overall connection between exorcism and healing in the Synoptics.

With this in mind Matthew's alterations with regard to healing *per se* must now be examined. His omission of ποικίλαις νόσοις (cf. Mark 1:34) is probably in anticipation of his use of the quote from Isaiah (including τὰς νόσους) in the next verse. More significant, however, is his use of πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας which, though omitted after προσφέρω is used later as the object of ἐθεράπευσεν. Thus in Matthew the bringing of the sick is not mentioned [76] but 'all the sick' (as distinct from 'many sick') are healed. I have already drawn attention to the fact that this is a repeated emphasis in Matthew [77] and have suggested that such statements are to be understood as emphasising Jesus' kingly authority, his compassion and willingness to heal, and are designed to promote faith [78].

In harmony with this it is now appropriate to point out that just as Matthew's redaction with regard to exorcism eliminates any possible suggestion that there were some demons which were not cast out [79], so too his redaction with regard to healing,

precludes any suggestion that there were those who were not healed [80]. Such a suggestion would be completely out of harmony with Matthew's portrait of Jesus as the Son of David who fulfils and embodies Old Testament ideals of kingship and authority [81]. It might also inhibit faith for healing.

Further, if this understanding, along with the view that Matthew's central emphasis is that of fulfilment [82], is correct then the statement that Jesus healed all who were sick would seem to be a natural introduction to the quotation from Isaiah which follows immediately. Viewed this way the whole of verse 16 may be seen as Matthew's redaction of the pericope material in order to prepare the way for the fulfilment quotation in verse 17.

Matthew's use of Isaiah 53:4 here in the context of Jesus' healing ministry is, of course, of particular relevance to the subject of this thesis because it has been used as a basis or a 'proof-text' for the doctrine that healing is in the atonement. It is, however, of more general interest for a variety of other reasons. It is, as I have already pointed out [83], one of the controversial 'formula quotations' about which there has been so little agreement. It is also unique to Matthew, not only in the context of this pericope, but also in the New Testament as a whole - no other NT writer quotes this verse from Isaiah. Furthermore, no other NT writer quotes any verse from Isaiah 53 and applies it to physical healing [84], although the chapter is, of course, referred to in other contexts [85]. Finally the citation is of interest because Matthew's version is much closer to the Masoretic Text than to the LXX [86]. The interpretation of this verse, therefore, must be at least partly determined by one's understanding of the significance of the 'formula quotations' in general, by its uniqueness both in terms of the verse cited and in terms of Matthew's application of the citation in a context of physical healing, and by the significance that may

be attributed to Matthew's preference for a translation of the Masoretic Text rather than the LXX.

I have already noted the unresolved nature of the discussion with regard to the 'formula quotations' in general [87]. It is not possible, therefore, to adduce conclusive evidence from it with regard to this quotation in particular. However, if I am right in thinking that the 'formula quotations' should probably be seen as just one aspect of Matthew's overall presentation of Jesus as being in a variety of ways the fulfilment of Old Testament hopes and ideals [88], then the quotation here may be interpreted accordingly. Jesus' kingly authority, already emphasised in the healing of a leper by a touch, in the cure of the centurion's paralysed servant by a word spoken at a distance, in the healing of Peter's mother-in-law by simply touching her hand, in the expulsion of spirits with a mere word and in his healing *all* who were sick, is now, in a summary of all this, further accentuated by a quote from the Old Testament which portrays him as the one who 'himself took our infirmities and carried our diseases'. Jesus is thus not merely *a* man of authority, but *the* man of authority, the one of whom the prophets spoke. The quotation is, therefore, not only the culmination and climax of a series of miracle-stories recorded by Matthew, but is that which makes explicit what is, for Matthew, implicit in those stories, that Jesus is the fulfilment of Old Testament hopes and ideals.

That the verse is unique in that this is the only occasion on which Isaiah 53:4 is directly quoted in the New Testament is probably of little particular significance [89]. The majority of Old Testament quotations found in the New Testament occur only once [90] and, with the exception of the quote from Zechariah 9:9 (cf. Matthew 21:4-5; John 12:15), all the 'formula quotations' are unique to Matthew.

What may be more significant, however, is the uniqueness of Matthew's use of Isaiah 53 to refer to physical healing. This is clearly connected with his choice of the Masoretic Text rather than the LXX for the latter 'spiritualizes' the sicknesses referred to whereas the former may be interpreted more literally. France comments:

"The healing miracles.... are a fulfilment of Isaiah 53:4, here quoted by Matthew in what appears to be his own literal rendering of the Hebrew which speaks of 'sicknesses' and 'pains' (see RSV mg. at Is. 53:4) whereas the LXX (and the Aramaic Targum) spiritualized the meaning into 'sins'" [91].

That Matthew saw Isaiah 53:4 as in some sense 'fulfilled' in the healing ministry of Jesus is evident from his use of the verse here. But in the light of the use of Isaiah 53 elsewhere in the New Testament [92] where the Servant's role of redemptive suffering is applied to Jesus, it is pertinent to ask whether Matthew was aware of this understanding of Isaiah 53 and if so whether he identified with it or not. It must then be asked how the conclusions reached with regard to these questions affect our understanding of Matthew's intention in using the passage in the context of physical healing, particularly vis-à-vis the doctrine that healing is 'in the atonement'.

With regard to the first question France comments:

"Matthew was well aware of the Servant's role in Isaiah 53 as one of redemptive suffering and this was the dominant use of the passage in Christian circles" [93].

B. Gerhardsson sees Isaiah's Servant-figure as the basis of a motif running right through Matthew's Gospel and culminating in Jesus' giving himself as a ransom for many [94] and although not all would agree with this view it seems virtually

Jeremiah
✓
Hock

certain that by the time of Matthew Isaiah 53 was interpreted messianically and applied to Jesus [95]. For the purpose of argument I shall assume that Matthew was at least aware of the understanding that Jesus in some way fulfilled the Servant's role of redemptive suffering described in Isaiah 53.

But even when this assumption is made it is difficult to say with any certainty that Matthew identified with this understanding. Matthew's use of Isaiah 53 is limited to this one occasion and although Gundry may be right in seeing 27:57 as an example of Matthew's applying Isaiah 53 to Jesus' passion, the evidence is far from conclusive [96]. Indeed there are occasions in his passion narrative when, if Matthew saw Jesus as fulfilling the role of the *Suffering* Servant, one might have expected a 'formula quotation' [97], but none is to be found. Further, where Matthew uses the 'Servant' passages elsewhere as a source for a 'formula quotation' the application is not to the *Suffering* of the Servant nor is it applied to Jesus' redemptive work [98]. In the absence, therefore, of any direct quotation of the 'Servant' passages in the context of Jesus' redemptive work in Matthew's Gospel, and in the light of Matthew's use of those passages in a non-redemptive context, attempts to see a reference to Christ's atoning work in Matthew 8:17 must be viewed with some scepticism.

But this brings us to the heart of the matter as far as the subject of this thesis is concerned. Was it Matthew's intention to teach that physical healing is in some way in the atonement? The evidence thus far has certainly pointed towards a negative answer to this question. To this must be added the following further considerations.

First, the citation from Isaiah is made in the context of Jesus' healing those who were *physically* sick. There is no suggestion in the context that Matthew is using Isaiah 53:4 in

connection with Christ's redemptive work. His divergence from the LXX (which 'spiritualizes' the meaning) is confirmation of this. As Gundry points out:

"The Septuagintal translator renders the Hebrew very loosely in order to gain a reference to sins (cf. the Targum). Matthew translates independently in order to make the quotation apply to physical maladies cured by Jesus" [99].

Hooker also confirms this view:

"The author applies the words to the healing of the sick by Jesus: they are understood, not in any figurative way of mental grief, but of the actual physical ailments of those cured. This passage is of the greatest significance: far from proving that Jesus was one who suffered because of the sins of others, directly bearing their guilt, it will, unless other passages are to be found to be used with this meaning, point to exactly the opposite conclusion" [100].

Hooker's purpose here is, in fact, different from mine. But the logic still holds good. The fact that in Matthew we find no clear evidence that the evangelist saw Jesus in his passion as fulfilling the role of the *Suffering* Servant but that he cites Isaiah 53:4 in connection with Jesus' healing ministry in Galilee points us in an entirely opposite direction from the view that healing is 'in the atonement' [101].

Second, the events recorded in Matthew 8 take place long before Jesus' passion. The fact that Matthew cites Isaiah 53:4 in the context of Jesus' healing ministry, long before his passion narrative, suggests that (whatever Matthew may have believed about other verses in the 'Servant' passages with regard to Jesus' redemptive work) that verse at least he understood as having been fulfilled in Jesus' ministry in Galilee rather than in Jesus' death upon the cross. It is of

course possible that Matthew understood the verse also to be fulfilled in Jesus' passion, but there is no New Testament evidence for this, and the burden of proof rests upon those who wish to make the connection if the connection is to be made. And there is certainly no hint of a *double entendre* here [102] and the suggestion that Matthew is not only recording and interpreting events in Galilee but also pointing us forward to the passion is almost certainly a case of the wish being father to the thought. In this connection I find L.F.W. Woodford's argument extremely compelling when he says:

'Matthew's method of quotation from the Old Testament Scriptures is of importance. On no less than eleven occasions (RV) he uses the phrase, 'That it might be fulfilled', and on every occasion he draws upon the Scriptures quoted in order to relate their fulfilment to the actual events there and then recorded (my italics), as e.g. the Virgin birth (1:22), the time spent in Egypt (2:15) and so on. In this passage (8:17) Matthew was not referring to our Lord's coming passion when he drew upon this quotation, but he was referring to the actual events he was then describing' [103].

Finally, Matthew's choice of verbs is also significant here for, as Gundry points out:

'There is no implication that Jesus vicariously became sick. Rather, he removed sicknesses. Because it might be taken to imply that Jesus became sick, Matthew replaces the Septuagintal φέρει, 'carries', with ἔλαβεν, 'took'..... ἐβάστασεν also indicates removal rather than carrying' [104].

This clearly means that Matthew's choice of verbs indicates that he intends us to understand that, in the context of his healing ministry in Galilee, Jesus did not become vicariously sick for those whom he then healed. It seems to me improbable, however, that anyone would have been likely to

interpret Matthew's statement in this way, and, if this is so, and if the assumption is correct that Matthew was aware of the understanding that Jesus in some way fulfilled the Servant's role of redemptive suffering in Isaiah 53, the possibility may then arise that the evangelist chose his verbs to accentuate his view that Isaiah 53:4 was fulfilled in the life of Jesus, not during his passion, but in his ministry to the sick in Galilee. Whether or not this is so, Matthew's avoidance of φέρω and his use of λαμβάνω and βαστάζω are in my view in keeping with Woodford's assertion that:

"There is no thought of substitutionary sacrifice for sickness in the mind of Matthew in this Scripture. His quotation was related to the life-ministry of the Messiah, not to His sacrificial death" [105].

I, therefore, reject the view that Matthew 8:17 teaches that healing is 'in the atonement'. There are no direct references to the 'Servant' passages in Matthew's passion narrative and his quotes from those passages are used in a non-redemptive setting. The quote from Isaiah 53:4 is set in the context of the healing of physical sickness and Matthew avoids, both by his divergence from the LXX and in his choice of verbs, any suggestion that Jesus vicariously took sicknesses upon himself. Indeed, for Matthew, Isaiah 53:4 was fulfilled not in Jesus' passion but in his healing ministry in Galilee. As I have argued in this chapter, the purpose of the citation is adequately explained in terms of Matthew's overall emphasis on Jesus as the fulfilment of Old Testament hopes and ideals, the one who, by his kingly authority manifested in the healing of all who are sick, shows himself to be him of whom the prophet spoke when he said, 'He himself took our infirmities and carried our diseases'.

NOTES

1. Cf. p. 25, note 1.

2. See notes 3 and 4 below

3. Matthew 8:16-17 and 1 Peter 2:18-25 respectively.

For evidence that the doctrine is based primarily on these two passages see pp 12-24, especially pp 14, 18, 21, 22.

4. These passages are:

Galatians 3:13 (cf. p 38)

1 Corinthians 11:29-30 (cf. pp 35-36, 38, 67)

James 5:14-15 (cf. pp 19, 21, 32, 41)

Mark 16:15-18 (cf. p 57)

5. See, for example, my comments on p 103 with regard to the peculiar difficulties with regard to Matthew's Gospel.

6. Fee, G.D., *'New Testament Exegesis'*, Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1983, p. 36.

7. See, for example, Farmer's challenge to the priority of Mark:

Farmer, W.R., *'The Synoptic Problem'*, Dillsboro, Western North Carolina Press, 1976.

cf. Stoldt, H.H, *'History and Criticism of the Marcan Hypothesis'*, E.T., Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1980.

8. See pp 116-130.

9. In other words, even if, for example, we reject Marcan priority, it is still difficult to see how Matthew can be understood to teach that healing is in the atonement. Cf. pp 123ff where the argument depends on the uniqueness of Matthew's citation from Isaiah, not on his dependence on Mark.

10. Stanton, G.N., *'The Interpretation of Matthew'*, London, SPCK, 1983, p 1.

11. *ibid*, p.1

12. France, R.T., *'Matthew's Gospel in Recent Study'*, in *Themelios*, Vol.14, No. 2, Jan./Feb. 1989, pp. 41-46.

13. Stanton, *op. cit.* p 9

14. Aland, K., *'Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum'*, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1982, (12th edition), pp 117-118, pericope nr 88 *Heilungen am Abend*.

15. The pericope is found in Matthew 8:16-17, Mark 1:32-34, Luke 4:40-41.

16. Matthew 4:24, 8:16, 12:15. Compare also 9:35, 14:14, 36, 15:30, 19:2.

17. See pp 106-107.

18. Matthew's main theological interests seem to indicate Jewish authorship. See, for example, France, R.T., *'Matthew'*, Tyndale NT Commentary, Leicester, IVP, 1985, p 17.

However, Clark's view that only a Gentile Christian could have written such a book is noteworthy. See:

Clark, K.W., *'The Gentile Bias in Matthew'*, Journal of Biblical Literature, 66, 1947, pp 165-172. Cf. Strecker, G., *'Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit'*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962, pp 15-35.

France, however, challenges this view by arguing that the paradoxical attitudes of the Gospel may well be accounted for if the writer were a Jewish Christian, proud of his Jewish heritage, who found the majority of his own people rejecting the Messiah. See France, R.T., *'Matthew's Gospel in Recent Study'*, Themelios, Vol. 14, No. 2, 1989, p.42.

Davies and Allison also reject Clark's view and argue for Jewish authorship on the grounds that 'the external evidence makes our evangelist a Jew writing for Jews' and that 'much of Matthew's special material - including redactional material - contains a distinctively Jewish flavour and a close examination of our author's use of the OT strongly implies that he could read the OT in Hebrew'.

See:

Davies, W.D., & Allison, D.C., *'The Gospel According to Saint Matthew'*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1988, Vol. 1, pp 7-58, esp. pp 33, 58.

Gundry's view that the author was the apostle Matthew (Gundry, R.H., *'Matthew: a Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art'*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1982, pp 599-622) should not, in my opinion, be discounted, but is by no means necessary to a correct understanding of the author's intention and purpose in writing.

Beare, however, rejects the possibility of the Gospel being 'the work of any immediate disciple of Jesus' because the 'dependence of the book upon documentary sources is so great'. See:

Beare, F.W., *'The Gospel According to Matthew - A Commentary'*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1981, p. 7.

19. 'Most modern scholars have concluded that Matthew's Gospel was written within the last twenty years of the first century' (France, R.T., *'Matthew'*, Tyndale NT Commentary, Leicester, IVP, 1985, p 28). Gundry, however, offers a date before AD 63. See Gundry, R.H., loc. cit.

20. Stanton, op. cit. pp 1-18. See also:
Stanton, G.N., *'The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945-1980'*, in H. Temporini & W. Haase (eds), *'Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. II Principat'*, Vol. 25. part 3, Berlin, De Gruyter, 1985, pp 1889-1951.

21. Stanton, op. cit., pp 3-4.

22. *ibid* pp 4-18.
23. See, for example, Hill, D., *'The Gospel of Matthew'*, London, Oliphants, 1972, p. 61.
24. The controversy as to whether Matthew was a Jew (or a Jewish community), or a Gentile is an obvious example of this. Cf. note 18. Matthew's attitude to Law (written and oral), Eschatology, and Church Organisation are also major topics of debate.
25. France, R.T., *op.cit.*, p. 17.
26. This understanding is also in line with that of Hill who sees Matthew's primary purpose as catechetical, particularly with regard to faith, discipleship, and the person of Christ - Hill, *op. cit.* pp 60-63.
27. The references are: 1:22-23, 2:15, 2:17-18, 2:23, 4:14-16, 8:17, 12:17-21, 21:4-5, 27:9-10. To these 2:5-6 is usually added although here the citation from Micah is introduced by
οὕτως γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου.
28. Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 14. For detailed analysis of this topic see: Davies & Allison, *op. cit.*, pp 50-52.
29. Matthew's precise intention is, however, by no means certain.

For discussion of a rich variety of views of this matter, see:
Stanton, *op. cit.*, pp 14-15.
France, *op. cit.*, pp 22-26, 38-40.

Major studies on the subject include:
Stendahl, K., *'The School of St. Matthew'*, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1968.
Gundry, R.H., *'The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel'*, Leiden, Brill, 1967
Rothfuchs, W., *'Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums'*, Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1969
Soares Prabhu, G.M., *'The Formula-Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew'*, Rome, Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
30. Stanton, *op. cit.*, pp 14-15.
31. Donaldson, T.L., *'Jesus on the Mountain: a Study in Matthean Theology'*, Sheffield, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 1985, pp 204-205.

Cf. Moo, D.J., in Carson, D.A., & Woodbridge, J.D., *'Hermeneutics, Authority & Canon'*, Leicester, IVP, 1986, pp 191-192, where a similar argument is advanced.

For the suggestion that πληρώω is used in the NT to indicate the broad redemptive historical-relationship of the new climactic revelation of God in Christ to the preparatory, incomplete revelation to and through Israel, see:

Chapter Four

Moule, C.F.D., *'Fulfilment Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse'*, New Testament Studies 14, (1967-68), pp 293-320.

32. Frankemölle, H., *'Jahwe-Bund und Kirche Christi'*, Münster, Aschendorff, 1984, pp 382-394.

33. Stanton, op. cit. pp 14-15.

34. France, R.T., *'Matthew's Gospel in Recent Study'*, in Themelios, Vol. 14, No. 2, Jan./Feb. 1989, p. 43. In a footnote France acknowledges that Gundry drew attention to the allusive references over against Stendahl's concentration on direct quotations. Cf. Gundry, R.H., *'The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel'*, Leiden, Brill, 1967, pp 2-5.

35. France, loc.cit.

36. France also sees Matthew's use of the Old Testament as 'often creative rather than literal' and concerning the 'formula quotations' he states:

"They display a quite sophisticated and very Jewish hermeneutical approach for which the 'surface meaning' is only a starting point, allowing a rich variety of 'midrashic' inferences and connections with related passages of the OT" - *ibid* p 42.

37. cf. p. 107.

38. See pp 107-110.

39. Hill, D., *'The Gospel of Matthew'*, London, Oliphants, 1972, p. 62.

40. Hill, loc. cit. The quote from Held is from Bornkamm, G., Barth, G., and Held, H.J., *'Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew'*, Philadelphia, Westminster, 1963, p. 210.
Cf. Burger's view that Matthew's governing concerns in chapters 8-9 are kerygmatic and ecclesiological - Burger, C., *'Jesu Taten nach Matthäus 8 und 9'*, ZeitTheolKirch 70 (3,'73), pp 272-287.

41. Hill, op. cit. p. 63. Hill's emphasis on the catechetical may well be valid, but such a focus is probably too narrow. I have already argued that Matthew's purpose was, in part at least, didactic. A catechetical purpose could well embrace the didactic and the apologetic, as well as the Christological, but Christians would have required instruction in these areas well beyond catechesis.

42. Matthew 8:23-27

43. This view is confirmed in some measure by Held who maintains that miracle stories which do not admit of any devotional interpretation 'are intended to show the Church by means of the picture of the earthly Jesus who her Lord is and what provision she may expect from him (my

italics). The interpretation of the miracle-stories by Matthew is thus borne by the conviction: What Jesus once did on earth he does still'. Held, H.J., in Bornkamm, Barth, & Held, *'Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew'*, Philadelphia, Westminster, 1963, p.299.

Cf. Richardson, A., *'The Miracle Stories of the Gospels'*, London, SCM, 1966, pp 135-138.

Cf. Connolly, D., *'Ad miracula sanationum apud Matthaeum'*, *Verbum* 45, (5-6, '67), pp 306-325. Connolly stresses that in Matthew the miracles are not 'signs' of the Kingdom of God but an integral part of it.

44. Matthew 4:23-24, 9:35 (cf. 10:7-8, 12:28).

45. Matthew 2:2

46. Matthew 22:1-14

47. Matthew 25:31-46

48. Matthew 21:5

49. Matthew 27:11, 29, 37

50. Mark refers to Jesus as king only in the passion narrative (15:2 ff.) . Luke refers to Jesus as king in the passion narrative (23:3 ff.) and in his account of the triumphal entry (19:38).

51. France, R.T., *'Matthew'*, Tyndale NT Commentary, Leicester, IVP, 1985, p. 45.

52. Matthew uses the title nine times of which only 20:30-31 is shared with the other Synoptics. Compare also his emphasis on David in 1:1, in the genealogy that follows, and in 1:20

53. Matthew 2:2, 27:11, 29, 37.

54. Matthew 9:27, 12:23, 15:22, 20:30-31, 21:15 cf. v.14.

55. For a summary of the discussion, see France, R.T., *'Matthew's Gospel in Recent Study'*, in *Themelios*, Vol. 14., No. 2, Jan./Feb. 1989, p.44

Cf.

Kingsbury, J.D., *'Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom'*, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1975, pp 40-127.

Burger, C., *'Jesus als Davidsohn'*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979, pp 158-215.

Hahn, F., *'The Titles of Jesus, in Christology'*, New York, 1969,

56. See especially 4:22-23, 9:35. Compare also 12:23-28 where healing is a sign that the kingdom has come, 10:7-8 where healing the sick is a part of the proclamation of the kingdom in the ministry of the apostles, and

Chapter Four

11:2-5 where Jesus' healing miracles are not only cited as evidence that Jesus is the 'Coming One' but are also closely linked with the preaching of the gospel.

57. This emphasis is found in 4:23-24, 8:16, 9:35, 12:15, 14:36.

58. 14:14, 15:30, 19:2, 21:14.

59. Even in 13:58 where Matthew states that Jesus did not do many miracles because of their unbelief there is no suggestion of a lack of authority on Christ's part. Where Mark 6:5-6 reads:

καὶ οὐκ ἔδύνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν.... διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν

Matthew 13:58 reads:

καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ δυνάμεις πολλὰς διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν.

Matthew appears to reject the thought that Jesus *could* do no miracle and substitutes the statement that he *did* not. (Matthew also modifies the Marcan account by changing 'no miracle' to 'not many miracles').

Matthew's redaction here clearly supports my view that his emphasis is to uphold the authority of Christ and that the 'he healed all' passages may well be understood in this light.

60. See p. 107.

61. Bornkamm, Barth, & Held, *op. cit.*, pp. 253-255. Cf. note 40.
Cf. Drewes, B.F., 'The Composition of Matthew 8-9', *SFA JournTheol* 12, (2, '71) pp. 92-101.

62. France's observation that each of the three people healed (a leper, a Gentile, and a woman) is in some sense an 'excluded person' is, however, noteworthy. He points out that:

"The three healings reveal Jesus' compassion in meeting the needs of despised and rejected people, and above all his authority in curing instantly three serious diseases of varied character."

Nevertheless his caution with regard to Hill's suggestion (Hill, *op. cit.* p. 160) that in touching a woman's hand Jesus infringed the law should also be noted.

France, R.T., 'Matthew', Tyndale NT Commentary, Leicester, IVP, 1985, p. 158. Cf. pp. 156-157.

63. Gundry, R.H., 'Matthew, A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art', Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1982, p. 148.

64. *ibid* p. 148. However Gundry's point with regard to the incapacity of the disciples is not immediately obvious in 28:18 although the use of *προσκυρεω* in the previous verse may well imply this.

65. *ibid* pp 148-149.

66. Compare Hill's comment on p 111 of this thesis.
67. See pp 114-116.
68. Nestle-Aland, *'Novum Testamentum Graece'* Ed. 26.
69. pp 104-105.
70. Cf. Gundry, op. cit., p. 149.
71. Cf. Hill, op. cit., p. 160.
72. E.g. 2:11, 4:24, 8:16, 9:2, 9:32, 12:22, 14:35, 17:16, 18:24, 19:13, 22:19.
73. Hull sees the dismissal of the demons 'with a word' as part of Matthew's 'anti-magical stance'. See Hull, J.M., *'Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition'*, London, SCM, 1974, p. 129.
- Cf. Böcher, O., *'Christus Exorcista'*, BWANTA 96, Stuttgart, 1972.
Kee, H.C., *'Medicine, Miracle and Magic in New Testament Times'*, Cambridge, CUP, 1986.
74. Gundry, op. cit., p. 149. Gundry also notes that Mark's δαιμονία πολλά which is placed in the emphatic first position (Mark 1:34) in Matthew becomes τὰ πνεύματα and is moved to an unobtrusive middle position. In this attention is drawn away from the demons and the emphasis is upon Jesus. (πνεύματα may replace δαιμονία because Matthew possibly wants to avoid δαιμονία so soon after δαιμονιζομένους).
75. Demons and spirits were regarded as agents of illness. See, for example, Matthew 12:22, Mark 9:25, Luke 13:11,16. Hill (op. cit. p. 160) points out that 'spirit' is frequently used with this meaning in the intertestamental literature. Hull has also drawn attention to this connection (Hull, J.M., *'Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition'*, London, SCM, 1974, pp 78ff, cf. p. 135).
- France, however, claims that sickness and demon-possession are differentiated here (Matthew 8:16) and even more clearly in Mark's parallel (Mark 1:32-34) and elsewhere in the Gospels (cf. Matthew 4:24). (France, R.T., *'Matthew'*, Tyndale NT Commentary, Leicester, IVP, 1985, p. 158).
- Nevertheless, the fact that in the very passages where they are so differentiated they are also placed in such close proximity, together with the clear evidence that demons were regarded as agents of illness (see above), indicates that it is appropriate to emphasise the closeness of their connection in these verses. The omission of τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας after προσφέρω could also be significant in this connection. Cf. note 75:4.
76. Matthew's omission of the bringing of the sick may be because:
- 1) He has already described three healings in some detail and any mention of the bringing of the sick might now seem superfluous

Chapter Four

- 2) The bringing of the sick might be considered to be implied in the simple statement that Jesus healed them
- 3) Matthew wishes to use τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας as the object of ἰθεράπευσεν and so omits the phrase (along with προσφέρειν) here
- 4) Matthew, *pace* France (cf. note 75), does not clearly differentiate between sickness and demon-possession. On this view the bringing of δαιμονιζομένους πολλοὺς might be taken at least in some sense to include τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας.

Although all these views have some merit I strongly favour 3. Cf. p. 105

77. Cf. note 56

78. See pp 114-115.

79. See p. 121.

80. Such an interpretation is, of course, possible (though not necessary) when reading Mark's account, where 'many' might be interpreted as 'not all'. (However, 'many' may be contrasted with 'few' as easily as with 'all').

81. See pp 113-114.

82. See pp 109-110.

83. See pp 107ff.

84. I shall demonstrate later that 1 Peter 2:24 (quoting Isaiah 53:5) does not refer to physical healing. See pp 150-154.

Luke 4:18 may be an example of Luke's using a quote from Isaiah to refer to Jesus' healing ministry although the blind referred to may be those who are spiritually blind. And the reference is, of course, to Isaiah 61 not Isaiah 53. Matthew 8:17 is thus unique in specifically applying a verse from Isaiah 53 to physical healing.

85. For example:

Verse 1 is quoted in John 12:38 and Romans 10:16.

Verse 5 is quoted in 1 Peter 2:24.

Verses 7-8 are quoted in Acts 8:32-33.

Verse 9 is quoted in 1 Peter 2:22.

Verse 12 is quoted in Luke 22:37.

Cf. Hooker, M.D., *'Jesus and the Servant'*, London, SPCK, 1959, *passim*.
Jeremias, J., *'Zum Problem der Deutung von Jes. 53 im palästinischen Spätjudentum'* in *'Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne'*, Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel, Neuchâtel, 1950, pp. 113-119.

86. Archer and Chirichigno translate as follows:

"He Himself has borne our griefs/illnesses, and as for our sufferings, He has loaded Himself with them" (Masoretic Text).

"This man bears our sins and suffers anguish for our sake" (LXX).

They comment:

"Matthew 8:17 furnishes a rendering completely distinct from the LXX. Matthew probably translated ... directly from the Hebrew text".

Archer, G.L., & Chirichigno, G.C., *'Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament: A Complete Survey'*, Chicago, Moody Press, 1983, p 121.

However, although Matthew's rendering is *literally* closer to the MT, it is quite possible that the LXX has better captured the Hebrew writer's original intention.

87. See pp. 108-109.

88. See pp. 109-110.

89. Except, of course, that if first-century Christians had any understanding that physical healing was provided for in the atonement one might have expected the verse to have been quoted elsewhere, especially in view of the frequency with which Isaiah 53 is quoted in the New Testament (cf. the six references in Note 85).

Hooker has challenged the view that the Servant passages were of doctrinal significance in the early church and although she acknowledges that 'the meaning of the death of Christ is interpreted in terms of Isa. 53 in the later books of the New Testament' she claims that 'there is no evidence even here that the concept ever occupied any prominent position in their thought'. See Hooker, M.D., *'Jesus and the Servant'*, London, SPCK, 1959, p 152 and *passim*.

If Hooker is right then my view that early Christians had no understanding that Isaiah 53 teaches that physical healing is in the atonement is confirmed. If, however, the early Christians attributed a greater significance to Isaiah 53 than Hooker allows (cf. note 93 re the position of France and Gundry), then my point holds good that one might have expected verse 4 to have been quoted elsewhere in the New Testament.

90. Archer & Chirichigno, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

91. France, R.T., *'Matthew'*, Tyndale NT Commentary, Leicester, IVP, 1985, p. 158. It is possible, however, that LXX did not 'spiritualise' the Masoretic Text but correctly rendered its intention.

92. E.g. Acts 8:32-33, 1 Peter 2:22, 24.

93. France, R.T., *'Matthew'*, Tyndale NT Commentary, Leicester, IVP, 1985, p. 158. Gundry, *op. cit.*, p. 158 adopts a similar view. Elsewhere France goes farther and argues that Jesus himself was the origin of this use (France, R.T., *'Jesus and the Old Testament'*, London, Tyndale

Press, 1971, pp 110-132). For an alternative view compare Hooker, op. cit., passim. Cf. note 89.

94. Gerhardsson, B. in Banks, R.J., ed., *'Reconciliation and Hope'*, Exeter, Paternoster, 1974, pp. 25-35.

95. Hill, op.cit., p. 161. Cf. Hooker's comment (op. cit., pp 91-92) with regard to the reference to Isaiah 53:12 in Mark 15:27:

"The gloss... which is found in some manuscripts of Mark shows that at an early time the fact that Jesus was crucified between two evil-doers was regarded as a fulfilment of the words of Isaiah 53:12".

96. Gundry, op. cit., p 150, cf. p. 380 where Gundry sees a reference to Isaiah 53:9 in Matthew's use of 'a rich man' in preference to Mark's 'a prominent councilman'.

97. We do not know if Matthew was familiar with Isaiah 50 but a formula quotation from verse 6 might well have been expected with reference to 26:67. Similarly a quote from 53:12 might have been expected in 27:38 (cf. Mark 15:27 where the citation is found in some manuscripts, though this may well be a gloss - see note 93 above).

98. Cf. Matthew 12:17-21, Isaiah 42:1-3.

99. Gundry, op. cit., p. 150.

100. Hooker, op. cit., p. 83.

101. Those who see Matthew 8:17 as teaching that healing is 'in the atonement' appear to assume that the whole of Isaiah 53 is about Christ's redemptive work. The context in Matthew 8 however makes it clear that, for Matthew anyway, at least a part of that chapter (v4) relates not to Christ's passion, but to his ministry in Galilee.

David Lim is in my view unconvincing when he argues that 'the Matthew 8:17 quote of Isaiah 53:4 must refer to Christ's redemptive work' on the grounds that we cannot 'isolate Matthew 8:16-17 from its Early Church context'. However, although he wrongly adduces this passage as evidence that healing is in the atonement, he later rightly sets the doctrine in the eschatological setting of Romans 8:23. His understanding of the doctrine thus differs considerably from that of the original proponents.

See Lim, D., *'Spiritual Gifts - a fresh look'*, Springfield, GPH, 1991, pp. 279-286. Cf. 332ff and 12-24 of this thesis.

102. Gundry comes close to suggesting this when he says that the healings 'anticipate the passion in that they begin to roll back the effects of the sins for which Jesus came to die' and acknowledges with reference to Isaiah 53:4 that 'along with forgiveness of sins physical well-being was thought to characterize the messianic age', but he rightly stops short of the statement that Matthew intended here an indirect reference to the cross. (cf. Gundry, op. cit., p. 150).

D.A. Carson makes a similar point when he argues that Matthew holds that *Jesus' healing ministry is itself a function of his substitutionary death* by which he lays the foundation for destroying sickness. However, although Carson concludes that 'this text and others clearly teach that there is healing in the Atonement' he modifies his conclusion considerably by adding 'but similarly there is the promise of a resurrection body in the Atonement, even if believers do not inherit it until the Parousia. From the perspective of the NT writers, the Cross is the basis for all the benefits that accrue to believers; but this does not mean that all such benefits can be secured at the present time on demand, any more than we have the right and power to demand our resurrection bodies'.

See Carson, D.A., on Matthew in 'The Expositor's Bible Commentary, Vol. 8', (Ed. Gaebelin, F.E.) Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1984, pp. 205-207.

Cf. my comments in note 101.

103. Woodford, L.F.W., *'Divine Healing and the Atonement - a Restatement'*, London, Victoria Institute, 1956, p.58. For further discussion of Woodford's significant contribution to the debate see pp 49-53 of this thesis.

104. Gundry, op. cit., p. 150.

Cf. Hill, op. cit., p. 161, Hooker, op. cit., p. 83,

Beare, F.W., *'The Gospel According to Matthew'*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1981, p. 211.

105. Woodford, op. cit., p. 59. With regard to the meaning of βασιάζω Büchsel comments:

"The basic meaning is uncertain. In the NT it means a. 'to lift up' (Jn. 10:31), b. 'to bear away' (Jn. 20:15), 'to pilfer' (Jn. 12:6; cf. Jos. Ant., 1,316: Laban to Jacob: ἑρὰ τε πατριὰ βασιάζας οἶχην)".

Büchsel: βασιάζω article in TWNT, Eerdmans, 1978, Vol. 1, p. 596.

Woodford, loc. cit., insists that in the NT the verb is *never* used in a substitutionary sense and stresses as significant Matthew's avoidance of φέρω (which is used in LXX in Isaiah 53:4) which he says *is* used in a substitutionary sense in 1 Peter 2:24 and Hebrews 9:28. However, even if βασιάζω could be shown to carry a substitutionary connotation elsewhere, the immediate context of Matthew 8:17 makes any such interpretation implausible here.

Further, although in the expression στίγματα βασιάζω (Galatians 6:17) Büchsel, loc. cit., rightly points out that βασιάζω means the same as ἔχω, 'to have on oneself', any attempt to read such an understanding into the verb in Matthew 8:17 should be vehemently resisted. The context demands no such understanding. Further, the advocates of the 'healing in the atonement' doctrine do not teach that Jesus carried sickness on himself until the occasion of his passion.

Chapter Four

CHAPTER FIVE: BY HIS STRIPES YOU WERE HEALED

1 PETER 2:24

The doctrine that healing is in the atonement is directly based on Matthew 8:17 and 1 Peter 2:24 [1]. In Chapter Four I rejected the view that Matthew 8:17 teaches that healing is in the atonement. In this chapter it is my intention to show that 1 Peter 2:24, when correctly exegeted, cannot reasonably be understood to teach the doctrine either. Once again the attempt to discover the author's intention in the passage in question [2] will involve a brief discussion of the historical context of the letter before the literary context of the passage itself is investigated. Accordingly, by way of introduction, I shall consider the authorship, the date and place of writing, and the destination of the epistle before offering an assessment of its nature and purpose.

Authorship

Although the New Testament letter known as 1 Peter opens with the words

Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

Petrine authorship has been challenged by commentators such as Beare [3] and Best [4]. Beare argues that 'Peter' is a pseudonym on the grounds that

"There are strong reasons for dating the Epistle in the reign of Trajan, and that in any case it must be later than the persecution under Nero, in which the apostle met his death" [5].

He further argues that the epistle shows a clear dependence on the epistles of Paul with whom, he maintains, Peter never had any close relations, yet makes little use of the language of Jesus with whom Peter had been intimately associated [6].

Furthermore, the writer of the epistle is readily familiar with the language of the Septuagint, yet Peter, Beare insists, would have had no occasion to use the Greek Scriptures at all until late in life [7].

Most decisive for Beare, however, is the argument that

"The Epistle is quite obviously the work of a man of letters, skilled in all the devices of rhetoric, and able to draw upon an extensive and even learned vocabulary" [8].

This, Beare maintains, is out of harmony with the description of Peter in Acts 4:13 where Beare understands ἀγράμματος to mean 'illiterate'. The case against the attribution to Peter he therefore considers overwhelming.

Best's approach is rather similar although, in addition to 'a number of minor additional arguments' [9] he reasons that

"If Peter was writing to areas which had been evangelised by Paul then in view of his previous clash with Paul (Gal. 2:11-14), his known warm-hearted though impulsive nature and his humility expressed at 5:1 in calling himself 'fellow-elder', we might have expected that he would have made some reference to his brother apostle's previous work" [10].

However, although Best agrees with Beare that the epistle was pseudonymous, he concludes that 'the understanding of the epistle is not greatly affected by such a decision about authorship' [11].

In the light of this comment, with which I am in agreement, particularly with regard to the exegesis of 1 Peter 2:24, it is not my intention to survey at length the arguments in favour of Petrine authorship. I shall, rather, list the

commentators who support Petrine authorship and then briefly summarise some of the arguments. Such commentators include Hort, Bigg, Selwyn, Stibbs/Walls, Cranfield, Blum, and Grudem [12]. Kelly [13] is noncommittal. A lengthy defence of Petrine authorship is also to be found in Guthrie [14].

The arguments of those who defend Petrine authorship may be summarised as follows. 1 Peter 1:1 (which directly claims authorship by Peter), 5:1, and 5:13 are cited as evidence from within the epistle itself [15]. It is also claimed that Eusebius (who makes mention of Polycarp and Papias) and Irenaeus offer external evidence [16]. Objections based on the probable date of the epistle are countered by pointing out that such objections assume that 1 Peter reflects official persecution by the government whereas the persecution envisaged may have been privately instigated rather than official [17]. The claim that there is surprisingly little use of the language of Jesus is seen as largely a matter of personal impression [18] and the high quality of the Greek and the author's familiarity with the Septuagint are explained by some on the grounds that Silvanus (5:12) may well have played the part of a responsible secretary [19]. The role of Silvanus is also seen as a possible explanation of the epistle's theological affinities with the Pauline writings [20].

This brief summary of some of the arguments advanced by those who oppose and by those who defend the Petrine authorship of 1 Peter is perhaps sufficient to show that Cranfield is right when he says:

"While there is a considerable body of critical opinion which regards the Epistle as pseudonymous, an equally reputable body of critical opinion supports the Petrine authorship" [21].

Cranfield goes on to express the view that 'the balance of probability remains on the side of traditional authorship' [22], and for the purpose of this thesis I shall assume that this is so [23].

Date and Place of Writing

From the foregoing it is clear that a decision with regard to the date of the epistle is inevitably linked with the issue of authorship. Beare, for example, denies Petrine authorship because he believes *inter alia* that the epistle must have been written later than the persecution under Nero and was probably written in the reign of Trajan [24]. In reaching this conclusion he draws attention to the correspondence between ὡς Χριστιανὸς (1 Peter 4:16) and Pliny the Younger's statement that many had been accused before him *tamquam Christiani* [25]. Those who support Petrine authorship, however, contend that the persecutions referred to in 1 Peter are not official persecution by the government but spasmodic trials which were 'a matter of incidents rather than of policy' [26].

The issues of authorship and date are thus inseparably linked and the decision to assume Petrine authorship [27] will largely determine a decision with regard to date. Indeed scholars who argue for Petrine authorship invariably conclude that the epistle was written in AD 63 or 64. In the words of Cranfield:

"On the assumption that the traditional attribution of the Epistle to Peter is correct, the date must have been shortly before the Neronian persecution (in which most probably the apostle lost his life), i.e. in AD 63 or early in 64, and the place of writing Rome" [28].

Accordingly I shall assume that the epistle was written during those years.

But the quotation from Cranfield also suggests that the question of the place of writing is also linked to the issue of authorship and date. The assumption that the letter was written by the apostle Peter in or around AD 63 leads the scholars who make it to the conclusion that it was probably written from Rome and that 'Babylon' (5:13) stands for Rome as it does in the Apocalypse [29]. Indeed, even scholars who prefer a later date and deny Petrine authorship now acknowledge that Rome is the likely origin of the letter [30]. I shall, therefore, assume not only that the letter was written by Peter in or around AD 63, but also that it was written from Rome [31].

Destination

The destination of the letter is stated in the opening verse. It is written to 'the exiles of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia'. It is, therefore, a circular letter but differs from the other General Epistles of the New Testament in that it specifies the areas in which the recipients are found.

The major areas of discussion with regard to this have centred around whether the areas addressed were political or geographical units (i.e. the Roman provinces of those names or the older countries from which those provinces had been formed), the reason for the order of names, and the religious background of the readers (in particular whether they were predominantly Jews or Gentiles). I shall briefly summarise the discussion with regard to each of these areas and then, because of its relevance to the exegesis of 1 Peter 2:24, draw attention to the social and economic status of the readers of the epistle.

Beare [32], Best [33] and Kelly [34] all prefer to accept the names as indicating the Roman provinces whereas Guthrie [35]

and Stibbs/Walls [36] adopt the alternative position. Since this is unlikely to have any direct bearing on the exegesis of 1 Peter 2:24, I shall not develop this aspect of the discussion in this thesis.

Concerning the reason for the order of names there have been two major expressions of opinion. Hort suggested that the names describe the travel route to be followed by the bearer of the letter [37]. This view, though refined in some detail by Colin Hemer [38], has been fairly widely accepted [39] and is, in my opinion, to be preferred to that of Beare who, on the supposition that Pontus and Bithynia were suffering fiercer persecution than the other areas, suggests - 'though without too much confidence' - that these names are put at the beginning and the end of the list in order to give them prominence [40]. Best is probably right, however, when he says that 'probably we shall never know the answer concerning the question of the order of the names' [41].

More relevant to the subject of this thesis, however, and to the exegesis of 1 Peter 2:24 with its quote from Isaiah 53:5, is the issue of the readers' religious background. The phrase 'exiles of the Dispersion' (1:1) raises the question as to whether the recipients of 1 Peter are converts from Judaism. Further the writer's frequent use of OT quotations and his assumption that his readers understand Jewish ideas and traditions might also be adduced as evidence in support of such a view. According to Kelly, however, it is reasonably certain that the majority of the addressees have a pagan background:

"This is the clear implication of the statements that they have been rescued from a futile way of life inherited from their fathers (1:18), that having formerly been 'no people' they have now become 'God's people' (2:10), and that previously they had been idolaters indulging in typically Gentile excesses (4:3: cf.

1:14; 2:9; 3:5f.). The description of them as the Dispersion is a simple instance of the Church's habit of transferring to itself, as the new Israel, the language appropriate to the experience of the old" [42].

This view, which sees the recipients of 1 Peter as mixed communities which were predominantly but not exclusively Gentile in background, is held by Beare [43], Best [44], Cranfield [45], Grudem [46], and Guthrie [47]. It also reflects my own understanding. Selwyn acknowledges that the churches addressed were 'mixed' but suggests that in most first century churches Jews were probably in the majority [48].

With regard to the social and economic status of the readers there appears to be general agreement that the membership of these churches, like most in the primitive period, was socially mixed [49]. The following quotation from Best adequately summarises the position:

"Socially there were great extremes of riches and poverty. In the rural areas almost feudal conditions prevailed in which the large estates were worked by vast gangs of slaves. In the cities there was a measure of industrialisation with individual small businesses. Large numbers of slaves were employed in these and in the households of the wealthier citizens; these slaves were often well educated or skilled in a trade. On the whole in this period Christianity was found largely in the cities, an urban phenomenon. From the letter we learn a little about the composition of the churches. Slaves are addressed in 2:18-25, but there is no direct ethical instruction to masters; we dare not assume that there were no masters in the congregations since 2:13-17 is directed to free men who may possibly have had civic duties; moreover what is said about wives in 3:1-6 suggests that some at any rate were wealthy. The churches must therefore have contained a cross-representation of society as a whole..." [50].

These facts will be seen to be of significance when we turn to the exegesis of 1 Peter 2:24, which in its original context is addressed to slaves [51]. But first the nature and purpose of the letter must be briefly considered.

The Nature of the Letter

Space forbids detailed discussion of the variety of views with regard to the nature of the letter. Preisker's liturgical hypothesis (that 1 Peter originated as a liturgy read at a baptismal service with the baptism itself occurring between 1:21 and 1:22) [52] and the variation offered by Cross (that the baptismal service occurred at a Good Friday-Easter celebration) [53] are summarised and briefly discussed by Cranfield who, making reference to Moule's 'penetrating criticism' of the hypothesis, is sceptical about many of their arguments [54]. Rather, 'in view of the allusions to baptism' in the letter, he suggests that a baptismal sermon may have been incorporated into it along with fresh material written with the current situation of the particular churches in mind. Walls, however, while agreeing that there is no reason why Peter should not have preached a sermon and later sent it as a letter also notes that 'the one place in the Epistle which contains an explicit reference to baptism is a parenthesis' [55].

Guthrie also rejects the liturgical hypothesis and argues:

"The many instances of 'now' in the Epistle need not be regarded as evidence of a liturgy in process (as Preisker assumes) but rather the realization on the part of the Christians of the importance of the present in their eschatological outlook" [56].

Grudem agrees with this analysis and goes on to point out that although Peter's language frequently refers to the new life which Christians have this does not in itself imply a

reference to baptism. Further, within the contexts in which they occur not one of these references would be inappropriate if applied to *all* Christians. He concludes that the thesis that 1 Peter was originally a liturgy or perhaps a sermon at a baptism remains unconvincing [57].

In the light of the overall discussion I shall assume for the purpose of this thesis that 1 Peter is a genuine letter [58] which, because of the wide circle of readers to which it is addressed, contains no personal greetings to individuals. Whether or not it contains a baptismal sermon remains an open question the answer to which, fortunately, is by no means crucial to the subject of this thesis.

The Purpose of the Letter

The purpose of the letter is, however, more important. At the conclusion (5:12) the writer summarises what his purpose has been:

ἔγραψα παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ
θεοῦ εἰς ἣν στήτε.

According to this the purpose of the letter appears to be that the readers might 'stand in the true grace of God' [59]. In the light of 5:10 the 'grace' referred to here may well be that conferred on the readers enabling them to remain faithful in the midst of suffering while they await God's eternal glory in Christ. If this is so, the closing verses of the epistle appear to be in harmony with its overall theme. Whatever the precise circumstances of the epistle's writing and the suffering referred to in it may be [60], the dominant theme throughout is clearly that of suffering in this life sustained by the assurance of glory in the next and the knowledge that, though rejected by men, Christians are chosen by God and precious to him (2:4-10). The motif that glory follows suffering is not only found in the opening chapter (vv 6-8) with regard to the experience of the Christian but is seen a

few verses later (vv 10-11) as exemplified in the experience of Christ as it had been predicted by the prophets:

τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ πάντα δόξας.

It continues throughout the epistle [61]. The dominant purpose of the letter, therefore, is to exhort Christians who are suffering *now* to stand firm in the faith knowing that glory is to follow [62]. It is with this very firmly in mind that we must now turn to the exegesis of 1 Peter 2:24.

Exegesis of 1 Peter 2:24

1 Peter 2:24 is part of a passage which encourages Christians to be submissive to those who are in authority (2:13-3:6). This passage falls naturally into three sections which deal in turn with:

submission to rulers (2:13-17)

submission to masters (2:18-25), and

submission to husbands (3:1-6).

I shall briefly consider the first section which in some measure serves as an introduction to the second. The second section will be dealt with in more detail as it forms the immediate context of verse 24. However, I shall not discuss the third section as it is not critical to a correct understanding of the verse.

In the first section Christians are to submit themselves to every authority instituted among men (v.13). Respect is to be shown to the king as the supreme authority and to governors, who are sent by him to administer justice, so that by their good behaviour Christians may put to silence those who accuse them (vv. 13-17). They are free, but freedom must not be used as an excuse for wrong-doing, for despite their freedom Christians are God's slaves as the contrast between ὡς ἐλεύθεροι and ὡς θεοῦ δοῦλοι makes clear (v. 16). Submission to rulers is thus set firmly in the context of ultimate

submission to God for if the king is to be honoured it is God who is to be feared (v. 17) [63]. Indeed it is 'for the Lord's sake' that a Christian submits to authority, no matter what form that authority may take (v.13).

The implication of all this seems to be that it is this awareness that his submission to human authority is an expression of his submission to divine authority that enables the Christian meekly to accept the decisions of those who have authority over him. This is of special relevance to slaves [64] who are specifically addressed in verses 18-25 where they are instructed to submit to their masters even if they are harsh [65]. The possibility of suffering unjustly is very real (vv. 19-20) and if this occurs Christian slaves are to remember that they are called by Christ's own example to endure it (vv. 20-21) [66].

It is highly significant here, (particularly in view of the interpretation placed upon verse 24 by the proponents of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement), that there is no suggestion in these verses that Christians do not need to suffer because Christ has already suffered for them. Quite the opposite is indicated. The Christian who suffers for doing good must endure it patiently knowing that this is God's will for him, for Christ himself has set an example for him to follow (vv. 20-21) [67].

Verses 22-25, which depend heavily on Isaiah 53 [68], set forth the sufferings of Christ as the supreme example of the innocent suffering unjustly and may be correctly understood as an elaboration of the principle stated in verse 21 that Christ's sufferings are an example for the Christian to follow. Seen this way the statement of Christ's innocence (v.22), his refusal to retaliate or complain (v.23), and his committing of himself to God (v.23) are all clearly intended as an example and an encouragement to the Christian slave who

is suffering unjust punishment. Furthermore, such an interpretation of these verses is completely in harmony with the teaching concerning suffering elsewhere in the epistle [69].

But if Christ's innocence, his non-retaliation, and his committing himself to God are intended as an encouragement to the Christian who is suffering unjust punishment, how much more is the reminder of the results of Christ's passion? The sense of purposelessness encountered by those enduring unjustly inflicted suffering is softened for the Christian by the realisation that Christ's sufferings were by no means without purpose. Verses 24-25 serve as a reminder of this. Christ's sufferings were redemptive. The innocent slave who is unjustly beaten by his master is reminded that Christ too was unjustly punished, but not without purpose for Christ bore our sins that we might die to sin and live to righteousness (v.24) and as a result the wandering sheep has returned to the shepherd (v.25). Perhaps, by implication, the slave might understand that his suffering too is not without a purpose, hidden and unstated though that purpose might be [70].

In the light of all this it seems to me that Peter's use of οὗ τῷ μώλωπι ἰάθητε will only be correctly understood when it is seen within the context of a discussion which presents to slaves who were sometimes unjustly treated the example of Christ whose passion provides the pattern for all who suffer unjustly. Such an understanding will also provide, with particular reference to the subject of this thesis, a clear indication as to whether the healing referred to in the phrase is intended to be interpreted as physical or spiritual.

The relevance of the phrase τῷ μώλωπι ἰάθητε in a passage addressed to slaves who were sometimes unjustly flogged is immediately obvious. The word μώλωψ means a bruise, scar, or weal left by a lash and describes a physical condition with

which the slaves were all too familiar [71]. To slaves who were unjustly beaten Peter points out that Christ too was beaten, and because of the wound inflicted upon him they have been 'healed'. The use of the second person (ιάθητε) in place of the first (LXX ιάθημεν) [72] is perhaps significant in that the first person *is* used in the first part of the verse (τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἵνα ... ζήσωμεν). The switch to the second person thus highlights the fact that it is particularly the slaves who are addressed here for it is for them that the use of μῶλωψ is especially significant [73].

But in what sense had the slaves been 'healed'? Peter obviously intends them to understand here the forgiveness of their sins, for not only does he refer in the immediately previous clauses to Christ's bearing of our sins that we might die to sin and live to righteousness, but he uses the conjunction γὰρ in verse 25 thus identifying their 'healing' in verse 24 as what took place when ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι they returned ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα (v. 25). The fact that no such conjunction is found in Isaiah 53:6 may indicate that Peter is especially stressing this connection and certainly suggests that the 'healing' referred to is spiritual [74].

Furthermore, to seek to understand the 'healing' as physical seems to be totally inappropriate. There is no reference to the healing of disease anywhere in the epistle, let alone in the immediate context, and the only other possibility might be to suggest that physical healing was available for the slaves' wounds because Christ had already been wounded for them. But such a suggestion totally ignores the major purpose of the passage, that slaves who are suffering unjustly should uncomplainingly follow Christ's example and patiently *endure* it (vv. 20-21).

One other possibility remains, however. Cranfield suggests that 'healing' included a 'sense of comfort in their

sufferings' [75], but, although the awareness that Christ too has suffered unjustly would undoubtedly have provided some comfort to a suffering slave, this is clearly not Peter's primary intention as we have seen from an examination of the context.

Accordingly I reject the view that 1 Peter 2:24 teaches that physical healing is 'in the atonement'. The 'healing' referred to clearly means a spiritual wholeness which results from Christ's bearing our sins on the cross and our return, as sheep who had gone astray, to the shepherd and guardian of our souls. This view is endorsed by all the major commentaries [76] and indeed it is difficult to see how, when the verse is seen in its proper context, it could possibly be understood in any other way. The passage is, in fact, an encouragement to Christians to endure suffering, not a means of escape from it.

Summary

The two verses upon which the doctrine that healing is in the atonement is directly based have now been examined in the light of their historical and literary contexts. In the last chapter we saw that although Matthew takes Isaiah 53:4 and applies it to physical healing he does not do so in the context of Christ's passion. In this chapter we have seen that Peter takes Isaiah 53:5 and applies it, in the context of Christ's redemptive work on the cross, to healing from the wounds of sin, but no thought of physical healing is in mind. In short, in Matthew 8:17 there is physical healing, but no atonement. In 1 Peter 2:24 there is atonement, but no physical healing. We are thus driven to the inescapable conclusion that neither verse supports the doctrine.

NOTES

1. See pp 12-14 of this thesis, especially pp 14, 18, 21, 22.

2. Cf. my comments on p 101.

3. Beare, F.W., *'The First Epistle of Peter'*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1961, pp 24-31. Beare claims to offer for the first time to the English reader a commentary based on the thesis that 1 Peter is a pseudonymous work of the post-Apostolic age, but acknowledges his indebtedness to German writers such as Knopf, and Windisch - *ibid*, Preface, p. ix.

Cf. Knopf, R., *'Die Briefe Petri und Judä'*, Göttingen, Meyer, 1912.
Windisch, H., *'Die Katholischen Briefe'*, (Handbuch zum NT), 3rd edn. by H. Preisker, Tübingen, 1951.

4. Best, E., *'1 Peter'*, London, Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1971, pp 49-63.

5. Beare, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

6. Beare, *loc. cit.*

7. *ibid*, p. 26.

8. *ibid*, pp 27-28

9. Best, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

10. *ibid*, p. 50.

11. *ibid*, p. 63.

12. Hort, F.J.A., *'The First Epistle of Saint Peter 1:1-2:17'*, London, Macmillan, 1898.

Bigg, C., *'A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of Saint Peter and Saint Jude'*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1910.

Selwyn, E.G., *'The First Epistle of St. Peter'*, London, Macmillan, 1949, pp. 7-38.

Stibbs, A.M. & Walls, A.F., *'The First Epistle General of Peter'*, London, Tyndale, 1959, pp. 15-68.

Cranfield, C.E.B., *'1 & 2 Peter and Jude'*, London, SCM, 1960, pp 13-17.

Blum, E.A., '1 Peter' in *'The Expositor's Bible Commentary'*, Vol.12, edited by Gaebelein, F.E., Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1981.

Grudem, W.A., *'The First Epistle of Peter'*, Leicester, IVP, 1988, pp 21-33.

13. Kelly, J.N.D., *'A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude'*, London, Black, 1969, pp 32-33.

Chapter Five

14. Guthrie, D., *'New Testament Introduction'*, Leicester, IVP, 1970, pp. 773-790. Cf. Robinson, J.A.T., *'Redating the New Testament'*, London, SCM, 1976, pp. 140-169.
15. See Grudem, op. cit., p.21. Cf. Selwyn, op. cit. p. 31, Stibbs & Walls, op. cit. p. 15.
16. Selwyn, op. cit., pp. 36-37, Stibbs & Walls, op. cit., pp. 15-18. Cf. Grudem, op. cit., pp. 22-23.
17. Cranfield, op. cit. pp. 14-15, Grudem, op. cit. pp. 31-32, Stibbs and Walls, op. cit. p. 57, Selwyn, op. cit., p. 54, Guthrie, op. cit. pp. 781-785. Cf. note 26.
18. Cranfield, for example, argues that 'others are struck by the number of touches that suggest to them an eye-witness and of reminiscences of sayings of our Lord' (Cranfield, op. cit. p. 15). See also R.H. Gundry *Verba Christi in 1 Peter*, *NTS* 13, 1966-67, 336-350, who argues that the underlying allusions to the 'words of Christ' are specifically connected with narrative contexts in the Gospels where Peter is an active participant.
19. *ibid*, p. 14.
20. Stibbs and Walls, op. cit., pp. 39-45.
21. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 16.
22. Cranfield, *loc. cit.*
23. Note, however, Best's comment as quoted on p. 142. Cf. note 11.
24. See the quote on p. 141 of this thesis. Cf. note 5.
25. Beare, op. cit., p. 14. The well-known reference to Pliny's letter to the Emperor is found in *Epist.* X:96.
26. Selwyn, op. cit., p. 55. According to Selwyn (p.54):

"The general ordeal (*persecutions*) lay in the complete lack of security which exposed Christians at any moment, and in any part of the empire, to slander, defamation of character, boycott, mob-violence and even death: they were, or at any time or place might be, hated of all men for Christ's sake: society was inhospitable and the world unjust".

Cf. Stibbs & Walls, op. cit. pp. 49-58, Guthrie, op. cit. pp.793-796, Grudem, op. cit. pp. 31-32.

27. See p. 143.

28. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 17.
 Cf. Selwyn, op. cit. pp. 56-63 argues for 63-64 AD (see esp. p. 62).
 Stibbs & Walls, op. cit. pp. 66-67 argues for 63-64 AD.
 Guthrie, op. cit. pp. 795-796 argues for 'the period up to AD 64'.
 Grudem, op. cit. pp. 35-37 argues for a date between AD 62 and 64.
 Robinson, op. cit., p. 169, argues for April 65.

29. E.g. Revelation 14:8, 17:5 etc.
 Cranfield, op. cit., p. 19.
 Selwyn, op. cit., p. 61.
 Stibbs & Walls, op. cit., pp. 64 -66.
 Guthrie, op. cit., pp. 801-803.
 Grudem, op. cit., pp. 33-35.

30. Best, op. cit., pp. 64-65

 Beare, op. cit., p. 31, expresses the view that Rome is mentioned as the place of writing only because Peter is put forward as the writer. He modifies this view, however, on pp. 202-203, having been convinced by Cross's work of the connection of 1 Peter with Hippolytus and thus with the Roman liturgy (Cf. Cross, F.L., '*1 Peter, A Paschal Liturgy*', Oxford, Mowbray, 1954, passim) and by Lohse's conclusions with regard to points of contact between 1 Clement and 1 Peter (Cf. Lohse, E., *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 45, 1954, pp. 83-85). He also rejects Boismard's suggestion that the epistle may have been written from Antioch (Cf. Boismard, M.-E., 'Une Liturgie Baptismale dans la *Prima Petri*. I. Son influence sur Tit., 1 Jo. et Col.', in *Revue Biblique* 63, No.2 (April 1956), pp. 182-208).

- Kelly, op. cit., p. 34, who in noncommittal over authorship and date, (cf. note 13) also prefers a Roman origin for the letter: 'The tradition connecting it with Rome still seems much more solidly based than any rival hypothesis'.

31. Peter's martyrdom in Rome is fairly well attested. Cullmann offers a clear discussion of the matter. See:

 Cullmann, O., '*Peter, Disciple, Apostle, and Martyr*', London, 1962, pp. 89-152.

32. Beare, op. cit., pp. 19-22 (though Beare does not discuss the alternative possibility).

33. Best, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

34. Kelly, op. cit., p. 2.

35. Guthrie, op. cit., pp. 792-793. (Guthrie points out that Pontus and Bithynia, which formed one administrative Roman province, are not only mentioned separately, but one comes first and the other last).

36. Stibbs and Walls, op. cit., p. 63.

37. Hort, op. cit., pp. 183-184.

38. Hemer, C., 'The Address of 1 Peter', in *'Expository Times'*, 89, (1978), pp. 239-243.

39. Other writers who adopt this position are:

Guthrie, op. cit., p. 793.

Grudem, op. cit., pp. 37-38.

Stibbs & Walls, op. cit., p. 64.

Clowney, E.P., *'The Message of 1 Peter'*, Leicester, IVP, 1988, pp. 16-17.

40. Beare, op. cit., pp. 22-24.

41. Best, op. cit., p. 16.

42. Kelly, op. cit., p.4.

43. Beare, op. cit., p. 48.

44. Best, op. cit., pp. 69-70.

Best also asks if the epistle provides evidence of the length of time its readers had been Christians and concludes that the evidence could imply a period of existence lasting anything from two or three years to a couple of generations (Best, op. cit. p. 19). The latter, however, is only possible if the epistle is dated considerably later than 63 AD.

45. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 28.

46. Grudem, op. cit., p. 38.

47. Guthrie, op. cit., pp. 794-795.

48. Selwyn, op. cit., pp. 42-44.

49. Selwyn, op. cit., pp. 47-52

Best, op. cit., pp. 16-17

Kelly, op. cit. p. 5

Cranfield, op. cit., p. 29

Guthrie, op. cit., p. 794.

50. Best, op. cit., p. 17. Cf. Elliott's understanding of the sociological background to 1 Peter:

Elliott, J.H., *'Home for the Homeless'*, London, 1982, passim.

51. See pp. 150ff.

52. The original statement is found in:

Windisch, H., *'Die Katholischen Briefe'*, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 15, revised by H. Preisker, Tübingen, Mohr, 1951, pp. 156-162.

53. Cross, op. cit., pp. 28-35 (cf. note 30).

54. Cranfield, op. cit., pp. 11-13.

Cf. Moule, C.F.D., 'The Nature and Purpose of 1 Peter', *NTS* (3), 1956-57, pp. 4-7.

Beare, op. cit., pp. 196-202, however, welcomes the hypothesis.

55. Stibbs and Walls, op. cit., pp. 60-61 (referring to 1 Peter 3:21).

56. Guthrie, op. cit., p. 798.

57. Grudem, op. cit., pp. 41.

58. Best, op. cit., p. 13, so argues. The possibility that 2:21-25, for example, was a liturgical text, possibly a hymn, should certainly not be discounted (cf. Kelly, op. cit. p. 120). This possibility, however, does not in my opinion seriously affect the exegesis of the passage.

59. Cf. Best, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

Beare, op. cit., p. 6

60. I have already briefly referred to the discussion with regard to the nature of the persecutions mentioned in 1 Peter (cf. p. 144). For a variety of views see:

Best, op. cit., pp. 36-42

Beare, op. cit., pp. 9-14

Guthrie, op. cit., pp. 781-784

Kelly, op. cit., pp. 5-11

Selwyn, op. cit., pp. 52-56

Stibbs and Walls, op. cit., pp. 49-58

However it seems clear that a wide range of 'sufferings' is in mind, from simply being 'strangers' in this world (1:1, 17; cf. 2:10-11) to a slave being treated unfairly by his master (2:18-25), to the 'painful trial of suffering' referred to in 4:12ff.

61. References to suffering in 1 Peter are found in the following verses. An asterisk denotes those verses where 'glory' is contextually connected:

1:6*, 11*

2:19, 20, 21, 23

3:9, 17

4:1, 12*, 13*, 14*, 15*, 16*, 19

5:1*, 9*, 10*.

Moreover even those 'suffering' passages which do not specifically relate present suffering to future 'glory' nevertheless indicate that some blessing or reward is to be expected [e.g. those who repay evil with blessing will inherit a blessing (3:9) and Christ's unjust suffering has resulted in his session at God's right hand with angels, authorities and powers in submission to him (4:18-22)].

62. Cf. Best, op. cit., p. 14

Grudem, op. cit., p. 39

Cranfield, op. cit., p. 18

Beare, op. cit., p. 6

Kelly, op. cit., p. 1

Stibbs and Walls, op. cit., p. 36

Guthrie, op. cit., pp. 791-792.

63. Beare comments on ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ:

"Not fear of the masters to whom they are subject, but fear of God. Throughout the epistle, it is always the fear of God that is enjoined (1:17, 2:17, cf. 3:2, 15); any other fear is not to be entertained. 'All fear', then, will mean, 'the fear of God which governs all your conduct'; it is the spirit of reverence towards Him that induces respect and faithfulness to duty in the sphere of human relationships" (Beare, op. cit., p. 121). Cf. Romans 13:1-7.

64. Those addressed are οἰκέται. The word denotes household-slaves, many of whom might be well educated and hold responsible positions in the household. They were, however, owned by their δεσπότης and did not work for a wage. Cf. Best, op. cit., p. 117.

Beare points out that, although most masters were relatively humane, beatings were common and were 'the normal punishment for the ordinary faults of the slave' (Beare, op. cit., p. 121).

65. σκολιός (harsh) literally means 'bent' or 'crooked' and so figuratively, as here, 'perverse' or 'awkward to deal with' (cf. Kelly, op. cit., p. 116).

66. ὑπογραμμόν - 'example'- literally refers to the model of handwriting to be copied by a schoolboy (cf. Beare, op. cit., p. 122) and then figuratively a model of conduct for imitation. Slaves who suffer unjustly are thus encouraged to follow step by step the example of Christ as delineated in the verses which follow. Such patient endurance of suffering wrongfully inflicted is *excellence* (Beare, op. cit. p. 120, so translates χάρις in vv 19-20) in the sight of God (cf. Best, op. cit., p. 118).

67. Cf. 1 Peter 4:12-19 where the same teaching is repeated with reference to Christians in general, not only to slaves. The Christian who suffers is seen as participating in the sufferings of Christ (4:13) and is suffering according to God's will (4:19).

68. Verse 22 borrows heavily from Isaiah 53:9 although Isaiah's ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν (LXX) becomes ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν.

Verse 23 may be seen as a paraphrase of Isaiah 53:7. The first two phrases certainly reflect its thought (cf. Beare's comment - op. cit. p. 123).

Verse 24 ἀμαρτίας ἀνήνεγκεν reflects αὐτός ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν (Isaiah 53:12 LXX) - cf. Isaiah 53:11 'he will bear their iniquities'.

The final part of verse 24 is almost a direct quote from Isaiah 53:5 for τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἰάθημεν becomes οὐ τῷ μώλωπι ἰάθητε.

Verse 25 is a clear reference to Isaiah 53:6.

69. Cf. 3:8-18, 4:12-19.

70. There is, in my view, no suggestion here that the slaves' suffering might be redemptive in the sense that Christ's suffering is clearly portrayed as redemptive in these verses. The suggestion might well be, however, that by following Christ's example in enduring unjust suffering meekly the slaves might, by their Christ-like attitude, win others to Christ.

71. Stibbs & Walls, op. cit., p. 121. Cf. Best, op. cit. p. 123, Cranfield, op. cit., p. 86, Kelly, op. cit., p. 124. Beare, however, while agreeing that the word well describes the common condition of slaves, claims that its strict meaning is a 'cut which bleeds' (Beare, op. cit. p. 124).

Bishop Wordsworth, as quoted by Beare, op. cit. p. 122, also sees a similar significance in the use of the word ξύλον in this verse:

"The μώλωψ is the wound produced by the *chastisement of slaves*, and the ξύλον is the instrument of the *death of slaves*. Mark the humility of Him, who being Lord of all, stooped to be the servant of all, and to suffer scourging and the cross *as a slave*; and was especially exemplary to that class which St. Peter is here addressing".

72. Peter replaces αὐτοῦ with οὐ and ἰάθημεν with ἰάθητε. In Peter the personal pronoun (LXX ἡμεῖς) is also omitted. See Archer and Chirichigno, loc. cit. Cf. note 68.

73. Beare comments (op. cit. p. 123) that by the change from the first to the second person 'he brings the thought sharply back to its particular application to the slaves'.

74. Cf. Kelly, op. cit. p. 124, who interprets 'healed' as 'restored to health from the wounds which their sins had inflicted'. Cf. p. 125 where Kelly rightly sees verse 25b as a 'clear allusion to the readers' conversion' (cf. Best, op. cit., p. 123, Grudem, op. cit. p. 132). Forgiveness of sins also seems to be the clear sense of the 'healing' referred to in Isaiah 53:5 where the Servant is pierced for *transgressions* and crushed for *iniquities*. Woodford, op. cit., p. 60, also takes this view.

75. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 86.

76. Cf. note 69. See also:

Bigg, C., *'The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude'*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1978 edn., p. 149 where attention is drawn to 1 Peter 3:18 in connection with 2:24.

Selwyn, op. cit., p. 181.

CHAPTER SIX: SOME OTHER PASSAGES USED
IN SUPPORT OF THE DOCTRINE

In Chapters Four and Five I have examined the two New Testament passages upon which the doctrine that healing is in the atonement is directly based [1] and have concluded that, when properly exegeted, neither passage supports the doctrine. In this chapter I shall consider certain other passages the interpretation of which has been affected by the doctrine and which are used by advocates of the doctrine to support it [2]. In considering these passages it will be neither possible nor necessary to provide either a full discussion of introductory matters [3] or a detailed exegesis of the passage in question [4]. My purpose here is not to discuss the wide variety of scholarly opinions expressed with regard to a particular theme or passage. It is, rather, simply to show that the verse in question provides little or no support for the doctrine that healing is in the atonement.

Galatians 3:13 - Redeemed from the Curse of the Law

In this section I shall consider the significance of Paul's statement in Galatians 3:13 that 'Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us'. Jeter uses this verse to support the doctrine that healing is in the atonement as follows:

"Sin and sickness came as a result of the Fall. We know that the substitutionary death of Christ - the atonement - provided a means whereby God could forgive the sinner and yet be just. What about sickness? Was it included in the atonement? We believe that God provided a double remedy for the double curse. In Galatians 3:13 we read..... He redeemed us from the curse of the Law.

The Law pronounced severe penalties or curses on those who refused to comply with the divine precepts. In Deuteronomy 28

there is a long list of diseases that would come upon those who refused to keep the law of God. In this case, at least, we see that sickness is a part of the curse. This agrees with the Biblical account of the fall of man and its consequences. How and where was the curse removed? By Christ's atoning death on the tree?" [5].

Jeter clearly understands the verse to mean that on the cross Christ redeemed us from sickness in that, since sickness is one of the curses contained in Deuteronomy 28, it is part of the 'curse of the Law' from which Christians have been redeemed. Dr. Lilian Yeomans adopts a similar position. Commenting on the curse from which Christ has redeemed us in Galatians 3:13 she states:

"From Deuteronomy 28, it is evident that disease, all disease, is included in the curse of the broken law" [6].

In seeking to show that this understanding is incorrect I shall assume that the letter was written by the apostle Paul [7] to the Galatians of the southern region [8] in or around the year 49 AD [9] in the confidence that those who would challenge these assumptions will nevertheless find no reason to challenge my conclusion that Galatians 3:13 offers no real support to the doctrine that healing is in the atonement. In this connection it will now be convenient briefly to consider Paul's purpose in writing the letter.

The overall purpose of Galatians is clear enough. The letter was written to answer the Judaizers who were troubling the Gentile churches of Galatia by teaching the benefit of circumcision [10]. Paul's reply was that such a 'gospel' was no gospel at all, and 'insofar as it involved a reversion to legal bondage it undercut the message of justification by faith' [11].

Bruce argues that for the message of the Judaizers to be adjudged 'no gospel' there must have existed a primitive Christian message as a standard by which to judge it. This message, he suggests, as it is presupposed in the letter to the Galatians might be summarised as follows:

"Jesus our Lord, the Son of God, was sent into the world by his Father when the due time came. He was born into the family of Abraham and lived under the Jewish law. He was crucified by his enemies, but in his death he gave himself for his people's sins. God raised him from the dead to be the Saviour of all who believe in him; he has sent his Spirit into their hearts, enabling them to call God 'Father' as Jesus did, to exhibit his love in their lives and to look forward confidently to the realisation of their hope" [12].

Whether this was the message preached by Paul's predecessors need not concern us here. It is clear from Galatians that this was certainly Paul's own understanding and I shall base my discussion of Galatians 3:13 on the assumption that Paul's purpose in writing Galatians was to defend his gospel (as summarised above) against the teaching of the Judaizers [13].

Lightfoot observes that a rough analysis of the letter separates it into three sections of two chapters each [14]. Chapters One and Two he designates as 'personal, chiefly in the form of a narrative'. Chapters Three and Four he describes as 'doctrinal, mostly argumentative' and Chapters Five and Six as 'hortatory' or 'practical'. Betz in a footnote acknowledges that these are 'proper terms' [15] and Cole's analysis is virtually identical [16] as is that of Guthrie [17]. I shall, for convenience, follow this broad analysis of the epistle in my approach to Galatians 3:13 and will concentrate the discussion on the doctrinal section in which the verse is to be found. Before doing so, however, it

will be helpful to summarise briefly the two opening chapters by way of introduction.

The subject of the epistle is introduced early in the first chapter where Paul expresses his amazement that the Galatians have so quickly moved away from the things which he has taught them to 'another gospel' (vv 6-7). The gospel which Paul had preached to them he had not received from man but by direct revelation from Jesus Christ (vv 11-12). His insistence that he had had little contact with the apostles at Jerusalem (vv 16-19) is offered as evidence of this.

When Paul had gone up to Jerusalem fourteen years later (2:1) with Titus and Barnabas, Titus as a Gentile had not been compelled to be circumcised (2:3). There had been some inconsistency on the part of Peter, however, when he came to Antioch and Paul had found it necessary to withstand him with regard to his inconsistent attitude to the Gentile Christians (2:11-14).

Verses 15-21, which are possibly intended to be understood as a summary of the points Paul had made to Peter, form nevertheless the introduction to the 'doctrinal' and 'argumentative' section in Chapters Three and Four. These verses are not out of harmony with Bruce's view that Paul's argument in Galatians presupposes a primitive Christian message [18], for Paul commences his argument with the statement that Jewish Christians *know* that justification is not by the works of the law but by faith in Christ (2:15-16). Certainly the argument which follows is Paul's defence of a doctrine which had not only been taught to the Galatians when he had first preached to them (1:6-10) but which, Paul claimed, had already been in some measure argued through with and approved by the church leaders at Jerusalem.

Detailed discussion of Chapters Three and Four is neither necessary nor possible within the scope of this thesis. It will be sufficient to note where the verse to be discussed occurs in relation to the overall argument of this 'doctrinal' section and then to examine it with reference to its immediate context. For its location in relation to the overall argument it will be convenient to list the headings offered by Betz:

- 3:1-5 A. The first argument: an argument of indisputable evidence
- 3:6-14 B. The second argument: an argument from Scripture
- 3:15-18 C. The third argument: an argument from common human practice
- 3:19-25 D. A digression of the (Jewish) Torah
- 3:26-4:11 E. The fourth argument: an argument from Christian tradition
- 4:12-20 F. The fifth argument: an argument from friendship
- 4:21-31 G. The sixth argument: an allegorical argument from Scripture [19].

Following this abbreviated analysis it is clear that the verse to be discussed falls towards the end of Paul's second argument appropriately entitled by Betz 'an argument from Scripture' [20]. This argument may be divided into two distinct but related sections. Verses 6-9 seek to show from the example of Abraham that justification is by faith. Verses 10-13 seek to show by reference to the Law that justification cannot come from the Law. These two sections are brought together in conclusion in verse 14. I shall deal briefly with the first section by way of introduction to a more detailed discussion of the second.

In verse 6 Paul uses Genesis 15:6 as evidence from the OT that Abraham's faith was accounted to him for righteousness:

ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.

From this he challenges the Galatians to recognise (Γινώσκετε) that the true children of Abraham are those who are 'of faith' (v.7). It seems likely that the use of ἐκ πίστεως here is a deliberate contrast with ἐξ ἔργων νόμου (v.10) and ἐκ περιτομῆς (2:12). The true sons of Abraham are not those who keep the works of the Law, neither are they those who have been circumcised. They are those who believe as Abraham believed.

In verses 8-9 Paul argues, with a remarkable use of personification, that the Scripture 'foresaw' that God would justify the Gentiles by faith and proleptically 'preached the gospel' to Abraham. The promise that in Abraham all the Gentiles would be blessed is thus seen as fulfilled in those who believe as Abraham believed and who are as a result blessed along with him. The difficulties with Paul's methodology here are obvious, but his overall intention is plain. God has always justified by faith. Abraham believed and as a result was both justified (v.6) and blessed (v.9). His true children are those who believe as he believed and who as a result are, like him, accounted righteous and are blessed.

The suggestion, implicit in verse 8, that it has always been God's intention to justify by faith, is made explicit in the following section for Paul not only continues to argue that the Old Testament taught justification by faith (v.11) but also insists that the Law itself indicated that justification could not come by obedience to it. It is to this section that we must now turn in order to gain a correct understanding of verse 13.

Verse 10 comes as an abrupt contrast to verse 9. Those who are of faith are blessed (v. 9) but those who are of the works of the Law are under a curse (v.10). Quoting Deuteronomy 27:26 Paul points out that the Law itself pronounced a curse on all who did not continue to obey it in its entirety. The

underlying assumption which remains undeveloped here but which is fully stated in Romans is that of man's inability to keep the Law. Thus those who put themselves under the Law come under its curse because of their inability to keep it. For those who want to be circumcised the implication is clear. To be circumcised is to put yourself under the Law. But the Law pronounces a curse on all who do not keep it in its entirety. Paul reserves until later (5:2-4) his full warning of the danger of seeking to be justified by Law, but the implication here is already very strong.

By contrast, however, he argues that the Old Testament itself (Habakkuk 2:4) teaches justification by faith (v 11):

ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

Set in this context it is not clear whether Paul intends his readers to understand that the one who is righteous by faith shall live or that the righteous shall live by faith. The former certainly fits the overall argument for justification by faith better, but the latter provides a more logical basis for verse 12 where the contrast is between living by faith and living by the Law. Since the Greek can carry both meanings, and since the two are not mutually exclusive, it seems best to attempt to retain the force of both in one's exegesis. Paul's intention seems to be that the man who is righteous by faith will live, and will live by faith.

The argument thus far, then, may be summarised as follows. Abraham and those who, like him, are ἐκ πίστεως, are accounted righteous and blessed. Those who are ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, however, have, by their inability to keep the Law, put themselves under the curse which the Law itself pronounces on all those who do not keep it in its entirety. With this in mind we are now in a position to consider verse 13:

Χριστὸς ἡμῶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα, ὅτι γέγραπται, ἐπικάτατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμνόμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου.

Betz refers to this verse as Paul's 'fifth and most important Scripture proof' and adds that 'it is also the most difficult one for us to understand' [21]. Not all the difficulties need concern us here, however, since our purpose is to consider this verse with particular reference to the doctrine that healing is in the atonement. Since those who use this verse to support that doctrine argue that sickness is part of the curse from which Christ by his death has redeemed us, the crucial issue that must now be addressed is the meaning of the phrase

ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου.

It seems to me that the question turns largely around what kind of Genitive we understand τοῦ νόμου to be. If it is a Subjective Genitive then the curse is the curse which the Law pronounces. If it is a Defining or Epexegetic Genitive then the curse is the Law itself [22]. Since it is not possible morphologically to determine which Genitive Paul intended the issue must be decided by contextual considerations along with our understanding of Paul's overall theological emphasis. Unfortunately an examination of the context leads in my opinion to at best tentative conclusions. Bruce, for example, opts for the former view:

"The 'curse of the law' is the curse pronounced on the law-breaker in Dt. 27:26 quoted in v.10" [23].

Betz, on the other hand, comes closer to the epexegetic view when he says:

"In the context of the letter he (sc. Paul) certainly assumes that the Law *becomes* (my italics) a curse for those who seek justification before God 'by works of the Law', because by doing so they deprive themselves of the blessing of Abraham given to 'men of faith' (3:9). The question is, however, whether Paul does not go further, calling the Law itself a curse. 3:19-25 indeed comes close to saying that" [24].

It seems to me that although both views are clearly permissible, Betz's understanding is preferable in the light of the overall emphasis of Galatians. If this is so then the position of those who hold that this verse teaches that healing is in the atonement must clearly be rejected, for their position depends upon the understanding that 'the curse of the law' means the curse pronounced by the law, not the law itself [25].

But what if Bruce's understanding is correct? Does this in some way validate the interpretation of the proponents of the healing in the atonement doctrine? The answer must surely be that while Betz's view precludes the possibility of the healing in the atonement interpretation, Bruce's position at best makes room for it. It by no means confirms it. Indeed, I hope to show that even if Bruce is right in treating the Genitive as Subjective, there are several compelling reasons why the verse may not reasonably be understood to support the doctrine that healing is in the atonement.

First, it is noteworthy that physical healing is not under discussion in the passage. Paul's theme is that of how a man can be in right standing with God. Can he be justified by the Law or is he justified by faith? The Law curses everyone who does not keep it in its entirety (v.10) and therefore justifies no-one for (Paul implies) no-one has succeeded in keeping it. Thus the only way to be justified is by faith and not by Law (vv. 11-12). In this context verse 13 must surely

be understood to be teaching that, by his death on the cross, Christ has made our justification possible. It is in this sense that he has 'redeemed us from the curse of the Law'. Thus redemption from the curse of the Law must be seen as something much wider than deliverance from sickness. It relates to the whole question of a man being in right relationship with God.

Moreover, there is no evidence whatsoever that Paul had physical healing in mind in his quotes from Deuteronomy. The quote from Deuteronomy 27:26 is used in verse 10 to show that, because no-one can keep it, the Law turns out to be a curse rather than a blessing, in contradistinction to faith which brings a man into blessing (cf. vv.8-9). The blessings and curses of Deuteronomy 28 are neither referred to nor alluded to here. Sickness and health, poverty and prosperity, military victory and defeat are not in Paul's mind [26]. The contrast between being blessed and being cursed is here in the context the contrast between being in right relationship with God or not, between being blessed because of faith and being condemned by a Law one cannot keep. In the light of this Paul's intention in quoting from Deuteronomy 21:23 in verse 13 must surely have been to indicate that Christ by his death on the cross has set us free from the Law that condemned us and thus made possible our right standing with God [27].

Further, the suggestion that Paul had in mind in this verse the doctrine that healing is in the atonement in my view presupposes that such a doctrine already existed in the early church. The doctrine is certainly not clearly taught in this passage and is, therefore, at best alluded to. But to be alluded to it must have already existed, and yet our examination so far has led to a very negative conclusion in this respect [28].

Finally, the purpose of the redemption referred to in verse 13 is explicitly stated in verse 14:

ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ γένηται ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Πνεύματος λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως.

Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the Law so that the blessing of Abraham might come to the Gentiles and that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. The 'blessing of Abraham' (here clearly an Objective Genitive) is the blessing Abraham received, justification by faith. This blessing is now made available to the Gentiles (who are outside the Law) because of Christ's death on the cross. The blessing is not divine healing, but right standing with God. The blessing does, however, include the 'promise of the Spirit'. I shall argue later that if healing is to be understood to be in the atonement at all it should be understood to be so indirectly, in that the gift of the Spirit is a result of the atonement, and healing is a gift of the Spirit [29].

1 Corinthians 11:29-30 - Discerning the Body

I pointed out in Chapter Two that T.L. Osborn, a zealous advocate of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement has argued from Paul's teaching on the Eucharist in 1 Corinthians 11 that as Christ's blood was shed for the forgiveness of sin, so his body was broken for the healing of sickness [30]. This view regards both the failure to 'discern the body' (1 Cor. 11:29) and the sickness consequent upon it (v.30) as resulting from a lack of understanding that Christ's body was broken for the healing of sickness:

"When Jesus said: 'This bread which is broken for you represents My body', He expected us to understand that it was on His body

that the cruel stripes by which we were healed were laid.
Discerning His body properly (my italics) will bring deliverance
 from our diseases as discerning His shed blood will remove from
 us our sins" [31].

My purpose in this section is to question this interpretation and to show why it is, to say the least, improbable that Paul intended the phrase $\mu\eta\ \delta\iota\alpha\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\nu\ \tau\acute{o}\ \sigma\acute{o}\mu\alpha$ to be understood in this way [32].

First, Osborn's view makes too great a distinction between the body and blood of Christ at the Lord's Supper, between eating and drinking. Sickness, he says, is due to failure to be taught about the body of Christ as we have been taught about the blood of Christ [33]. Christ's blood was shed for the forgiveness of sin, his body was broken for the healing of sickness. It is because we do not understand this that we are sick. By this Osborn implies that if the Corinthians had understood that the body of Christ was broken for their sicknesses (as his blood was shed for their sins) they would not have been sick. But the judgment Paul refers to (which in verse 30 results for some in sickness and even death) is a result of eating *and drinking*. He who eats *or drinks* in an unworthy manner (v.27) is guilty. That is why he must examine himself before he eats *and drinks* (v.28), and if he does not discern the body rightly (v.29) he eats *and drinks* judgment to himself. Thus for Paul the Corinthians were sick as much for the manner in which they were drinking as for the manner in which they were eating. This, it seems to me, invalidates Osborn's view that it is failure to discern rightly the Lord's *body* (as distinct from his blood) that results in sickness.

Second, Osborn's position assumes that Paul is speaking of the communion bread representing the broken body of Christ when he refers to the body in verse 29. However, it is by no means

clear that this is the right interpretation. Barrett suggests three possibilities:

"(a) he (*sc.* the one who does not discern the body) fails to distinguish the eucharistic from the common food; (b) he fails to distinguish the Lord's body in the bread which he eats; (c) he fails to perceive and give due weight to the church, assembled at the Supper as the body of Christ" [34].

In fact Barrett opts for (b) 'in view of the parallelism between verses 27 and 29' [35] but acknowledges that none of his explanations is entirely satisfactory. He rightly rejects (a), *pace* Goudge, Weiss, Parry and Hering [36], because it introduces a distinction that does not appear in the context [37], but in my view dismisses (c) too lightly on the grounds that it 'would require a genitive with *body*, and strains the meaning of the verb (*διακρίνειν*)' [38].

The case for (c) has recently been ably argued by Fee [39] who suggests that Paul is deliberately recalling his interpretation of the bread in 10:17. He denies any parallelism between verses 27 and 29 arguing that the differences are more striking, especially the use of *σῶμα* without a qualifying genitive (which Fee sees as purposeful) and the absence of the heretofore parallel mention of the cup. With regard to the use of the verb *διακρίνειν* he comments:

"The answer to this seems to lie in the wordplays on the theme of 'judgment' that dominate the paragraph. No other forms of this verb would be appropriate for expressing the need properly to take cognizance of the whole church that is seated as one body at this meal..... The Lord's Supper is not just any meal; it is *the* meal, in which at a common table with one loaf and a common cup they proclaimed that through the death of Christ they were one body, the body of Christ.... Here they must 'discern/recognize as distinct' the one body of Christ, of which they are all parts and

in which they all are gifts to one another. To fail to discern the body in this way, by abusing those of lesser sociological status, is to incur God's judgment" [40].

It seems to me likely, however, that Paul's intention is neither exclusively (b) nor (c). If Fee is right, as I believe he is, in seeing a connection between verse 29 and 10:16-17, then the body of Christ is *both* 'the bread which we break' (10:16) *and* the church (10:17). It seems to me reasonable, therefore, to understand 'the body' in 11:29 as referring to both. By their disgraceful behaviour (described in vv 17-22) the Corinthians were failing to discern the significance of Christ's death, symbolized by the emblems of the Eucharist. The communion bread is at very least a reminder that Christ's body was broken on the cross, and the message of the cross had been Paul's answer to the divisions in the Corinthian church in the opening chapter of the epistle (1:10-24). Thus to behave at the Lord's Supper in a way that created and perpetuated division was to fail to 'discern the body' in both these senses. If Christ died for the church then the Corinthians' behaviour revealed a serious lack of understanding concerning both the cross and the church. They were, at one and the same time, failing to discern the purpose of Christ's body broken on the cross and the sanctity of the church, the body for whom he died. There is, therefore, in my view a *double entendre* in the phrase *μη διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα* and I find it difficult to side completely with Fee in discounting all possibility of a reference to the communion bread [41].

But how does all this affect Osborn's interpretation which depends for its validity on τὸ σῶμα referring to the body of Christ broken on the cross which is represented by the communion bread? Clearly if Fee is right then there is no room whatsoever for Osborn's interpretation. If, on the other hand, there is, as I have argued, at least a partial reference to the communion bread, then Osborn's view must be more

carefully examined in the light of the immediate context of the verse.

Such an examination leads us to the third, and by far the most serious difficulty with Osborn's view which suggests that the Corinthians were sick because they had failed to understand a *doctrine* (viz. that physical healing is in the atonement). The context makes it perfectly clear, however, that it was the Corinthians' *behaviour* that was at fault. The sickness mentioned in verse 30 is a result of the 'judgment' (v.29) which a Christian 'eats and drinks to himself' if he does not discern the body. This judgment is seen in verse 32 as a discipline from the Lord. The way to avoid it (vv. 33-34) is to 'wait for one another' and, if anyone is hungry, to eat at home. This is with the express purpose that 'you may not come together for judgment'. These two last verses which are thus clearly linked with verse 29 also bring us back to the theme with which the passage was introduced in verses 17-22. Verse 21 describes the shameful behaviour of the Corinthians at the Lord's Supper:

ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον δείπνον προλαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν,
καὶ ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ ὃς δὲ μεθύει.

It is in this context that eating and drinking unworthily (v.27) must surely be understood and similarly the man who eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the body (v.29). Whatever the meaning of 'not discerning the body' may be, therefore, it seems clear that the judgment which for the Corinthians resulted from it was that many were weak and sick. This judgment could be avoided (v.34) by remedying the disgraceful behaviour at the Lord's Supper described in verse 21. It is to that behaviour that the phrase 'not discerning the body' must clearly be related, and Osborn's suggestion that the Corinthians were sick because they did not understand that healing was in the atonement is totally unconvincing.

Finally, it is questionable whether Osborn's interpretation is supported by the overall evidence of the New Testament. It is clear that the doctrine that healing is in the atonement is by no means explicit in 1 Corinthians 11:29-30. Indeed, if I have understood the passage rightly, the doctrine is not even implicit. And even if one allowed that it might be implicit in this passage this would surely demand some evidence that it is explicit elsewhere. It must be demonstrated at the very least that the doctrine was understood and believed by some Christians at the time of Paul's writing to the Corinthians. To be really convincing it must be shown that the doctrine was known to and believed by Paul. Of course advocates of the doctrine believe that verses such as Matthew 8:17, 1 Peter 2:24, and Galatians 3:13 furnish such evidence, but I have already argued that these verses, when correctly exegeted, do not support the doctrine [42]. If I am right about this then there is no evidence that a doctrine of healing in the atonement either existed or was on the point of emerging when Paul wrote 1 Corinthians 11:29 and any interpretation which sees the doctrine as implicit in this verse must surely be rejected.

James 5:14-15 - The Prayer of Faith

James 5:14-15 has been associated with the doctrine that healing is in the atonement since the doctrine emerged towards the end of the nineteenth century. The title of Carrie Judd Montgomery's book *The Prayer of Faith* which was written in 1880 and contains some of the earliest expressions of the doctrine is taken from this passage which is quoted in full on the title page [43]. The passage is also emphasised by A.B. Simpson [44] and although neither of these writers makes the connection explicit, the connection in thought is clear since both the James 5 passage and the doctrine that healing is in the atonement are seen as offering physical healing to

Christians who are sick. T.L. Osborn, however, makes the connection explicit:

"Faith is merely believing that God will do what He has said in His Word that He will do. God has never asked anyone to believe Him for anything that he has not promised to do.

God has said, 'I am the Lord that healeth thee'. The prophet Isaiah said, 'He (Jesus) was wounded for OUR transgressions.... and with His stripes WE ARE healed'..... Peter said, 'His own self bare our sins.... by whose stripes YE WERE HEALED' James said, 'Is ANY sick among you.... the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up'.

Faith is merely believing that God will do all these and other things that He has said in His Word that he would do" [45].

Thus the verses that are understood to teach that healing is in the atonement are placed alongside the statement in James 5:15 and seen as promises that God will heal. Indeed for Osborn, the prayer of faith *can* only be prayed if one is persuaded that it is always God's will to heal, for:

"How could one pray 'the prayer of faith' while entertaining the thought that 'Maybe it is God's will to take this sister home (sc. to heaven) by means of this disease'?" [46]

And this persuasion is, of course, for Osborn firmly rooted in the doctrine that healing is in the atonement [47]. This view, however, presupposes (1) that the doctrine that healing is in the atonement has a firm basis in the New Testament and (2) that the passage in James 5 offers physical healing to all Christians if only the elders have enough faith when they pray. With regard to (1) I have already demonstrated that the key verses used to support the doctrine do not in fact support it [48], and with regard to (2) I hope to show that the

passage can bear a wider interpretation. Further, I shall suggest that far from supporting the doctrine the passage actually, by implication at least, calls it into question.

James 5:14-15 reads as follows:

ἀσθενεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν, προσκαλεσάσθω τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ προσευξάσθωσαν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀλείψαντες αὐτὸν ἐλαίῳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου,

καὶ ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως σώσει τὸν κείμενον καὶ ἐγερεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος, καὶ ἂν ἁμαρτίας ἢ πεποιηκὼς, ἀρεθήσεται αὐτῷ.

As with the other passages considered in this chapter I shall make little reference to introductory matters [49], especially because of the 'notoriously scanty material' afforded by the epistle 'for answering the traditional questions of an introduction' [50]. An examination of the verses themselves in the context in which they are set in the epistle will, however, be sufficient to reveal that, although they offer a high expectation of healing to those who are physically sick, no indication is given that such an expectation is directly connected to the atonement, or that the healing provided is necessarily immediate. In this connection I shall argue that the verses are set in a passage which carries heavy eschatological overtones and with this in mind I shall make brief reference to certain aspects of the epistle commencing at 4:13.

The general sense of James 4:13-16 is extremely clear. Because of the brevity of life we cannot be certain of tomorrow. Therefore in all our plans we should recognise that their fulfilment is entirely dependent on the Lord's will. Verse 15 indicates that even the question of whether we shall be alive tomorrow is subject to the will of the Lord. It seems to me that this aspect of James' teaching must not be

disregarded when we seek to understand the statement in 5:15 that the prayer of faith will save the sick and the Lord will raise him up.

The first six verses of chapter 5 are a condemnation of those who misuse wealth. They have afflicted their employees (vv 4-5) and killed the righteous (v 6) and as a result miseries are coming upon them (v 1). This, together with the reference to 'the last days' (v 3), suggests that the day of judgment is in mind.

This appears to be confirmed by the mention of the coming of the Lord (vv 7 and 8), the Judge who is standing at the door (v 9). But in this section (vv 7-12) the coming of the Lord is an encouragement to brethren (v 7) rather than a threat to the wicked. The verses appear to be addressed to those who are suffering (v 10) and exhort brethren to be patient (vv 7, 8, 10) until the Lord comes (vv 7, 8). It is interesting that Job is cited as an example of suffering and patience (vv 10-11) as this may give some indication of James' intention in the use of the word *κακοπαθία* (suffering) which reappears in verse 13. The conjunction *οὖν* (v 7) certainly appears to link this passage with the condemnation of the rich who have abused their employees (vv 1-6) and thus the suffering referred to in verse 10 must bear some reference to those so afflicted. However the *κακοπαθεῖ τις* in verse 13 suggests that the discussion has widened to all forms of suffering and the reference to Job probably indicates that sickness should be understood to be *included* in James' use of *κακοπαθία* rather than distinguished from it [51]. If this understanding is correct then the promise of healing for the sick in verse 15 must be tempered by the teaching on patience until the coming of the Lord in verses 7-12 [52].

Verse 13 encourages any who are suffering (*κακοπαθεῖν*) to pray and any who are cheerful to sing praises. Verse 14 encourages

anyone who is sick (ἀσθενεῖν) to call for the elders of the church that they might pray over him anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. But if I am right in saying that sickness (ἀσθένεια) is included in James' understanding of suffering (κακοπαθία), some explanation must be offered as to why separate instructions are given to those who are sick.

In this respect I suggest that several factors indicate that James has in mind here someone who is seriously ill. First, he is to *call for* the elders rather than go to them. This may well indicate that the sickness has rendered him incapable of going. Second, they are to pray *over* him (ἐκ' αὐτὸν) [53] and 'the Lord will *raise him up*' (ἐγείρειν). This could well suggest that the sick person is lying down [54]. Finally, the fact that he needs the elders to come and pray for him points to the possibility that he is too ill to pray for himself. I conclude, therefore, that the sick person James has in mind is seriously ill and that the exhortation to call for the elders for anointing and prayer should not be taken to apply to minor ailments [55]. Thus, although sickness would be included within James' understanding of κακοπαθία some sickness is so serious that it renders the patient incapable of praying for himself, or at least of praying in faith [56], and that is why he must call for the elders.

Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the only responsibility placed upon the sick person in verses 14-15 is that he should call for the elders of the church. It is the elders' responsibility to pray the prayer of faith and anoint the sick one with oil in the name of the Lord. There is no suggestion here that the sick person prays for himself [57] and there is no indication whatsoever that he should be claiming his healing by faith because it is 'in the atonement'. It is the elders who are to pray and who must exercise faith as they do so.

But the elders are not only to pray and to pray in faith. They are to anoint the sick with oil. Most commentators acknowledge that although oil was frequently used for medicinal purposes the context in James 5 demands that the oil be understood to be of religious significance [58]. Blackman, however, talks of 'the medicinal power of the oil not being regarded as sufficient in itself' [59] and Laws insists that it would be wrong to distinguish between the 'medical' and 'religious' elements of James' picture [60]. Clearly both these views leave room for an element of the medical in James' teaching and although it is certainly not my intention to argue that the use of oil in this passage is intended to be understood medicinally, it does seem to me that, in the light of the evidence for the use of oil for medical purposes [61], James would hardly have recommended the use of oil in connection with healing if he had believed as the early proponents of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement believed [62] that all medical means should be abandoned on the grounds that they indicate a lack of faith!

Indeed, if healing is immediately available to all believers simply for the asking because of Christ's death on the cross, then it is difficult to see any possible relevance to James' teaching concerning anointing with oil. In this connection it is noteworthy that T.L. Osborn, in a chapter entitled *Healing in the Atonement*, states quite clearly that when a Christian understands that healing is in the atonement then he does not need to be anointed with oil:

"When one can realize that healing, just the same as salvation, is his, he need not 'call for elders'..... He has realized the truth of Matt. 8:17: 'Himself TOOK OUR infirmities....'" [63].

Yet earlier he states that James 5:14-15 'is an unmistakably clear promise of healing for the sick' [64]. Osborn has clearly failed to recognize the inbuilt contradiction in his

thinking here, for if the healing in the atonement doctrine renders the promise of James 5 unnecessary then the existence of such a promise presents a challenge to that doctrine.

Thus the passage does not indicate that because of the atonement healing is available to all believers simply for the asking but rather that healing is available through the ministry of the elders. We are clearly intended to understand that if the elders anoint the sick with oil in the name of the Lord and pray over him in faith the sick will be healed. But what if no immediate healing results? Presumably it is a simple matter to anoint someone with oil and in so doing to invoke the name of the Lord. Any elder should be capable of that. Are we then to assume that if no immediate healing takes place the elders have failed to pray in faith? This certainly appears to be a distinct possibility especially in the light of James' insistence earlier in the epistle that prayer must be in faith and that he who doubts will receive nothing from the Lord [65]. Perhaps James assumed that those who were elders in the church should be able to pray in faith, but his overall teaching certainly indicates that lack of faith could inhibit the answer to prayer. But if healing is in the atonement and thus to be claimed by the sick person himself it is difficult to see how the lack of faith of the elders could affect the healing.

But does the passage suggest that lack of faith on the part of the elders is the only possible explanation if the sick person is not immediately healed? I have already indicated that the statement that the prayer of faith shall save the sick (5:15) must be tempered by James' teaching that we only live if the Lord wills (4:15) and by his understanding that the coming of the Lord was very near [66]. These two factors, together with the use of ἐγείρειν (5:15) in connection with the promise of healing, suggest to me that, although James' primary intention was undoubtedly to indicate that an immediate miracle of

healing might be expected, we may discern within his statement a secondary intention which, based on the earlier analogy with Job (James 5:8-11), suggests that if immediate healing is not the will of the Lord then the sick must be patient until the Lord's coming at which time they will undoubtedly be 'raised up'.

Admittedly, to understand the passage as containing such a twofold message is to attribute to James the same kind of 'inaugurated eschatology' as that which, as I shall argue later [67], is found elsewhere in the New Testament, especially in Paul's teaching on the Spirit; but such an understanding is by no means unreasonable, for although the prospect of judgment or deliverance at the Parousia is an important motivating factor in James [68], the present eschatological dimension is not neglected [69]. Indeed, as Moo has argued:

".... the days when God's promises are to be fulfilled have begun, but a climax to that period is still expected. It is in the eschatological tension of that 'already..... not yet' that James' ethics are to be understood" [70].

If this understanding is correct then the prayer of faith is not a prayer that insists that healing must be immediate but a prayer that commits the sick one to God knowing that his will is best [71] and that he can be trusted to 'raise up' the sick whether it be immediately by a miracle of healing or ultimately at the Parousia [72].

Before drawing this section to a conclusion, however, the reference to the forgiveness of sins (5:15) must be considered along with the instruction to 'confess your sins to one another and pray for one another that you may be healed' (5:16). More specifically it must be asked whether the association of the forgiveness of sins with the healing of

sickness in this passage offers some indication that healing is in the atonement.

The fact that James mentions that if the sick man has committed sins he will be forgiven clearly indicates that James understood sickness to be sometimes though not always the result of sin. Indeed, in the light of the long-standing belief in the connection between sickness and sin [73] it is natural that James, having stated that the sick would be raised up, should go on to deal with the possibility that the sickness was caused by sin. This he does by simply stating that 'if he has committed sins, he will be forgiven' (5:15). He then adds, 'Therefore confess your sins to one another and pray for one another that you may be healed' (5:16). This suggests to me that, despite Laws' contention that here 'the sequence is not a strictly logical one' [74], the forgiveness of the sick man's sins (if he has any) is based not simply on the anointing with oil but on his confession of those sins. Understood this way the sequence of James' thought seems to be as follows:

If somebody is sick (v.14) they should call for the elders of the church for anointing with oil and the prayer of faith will produce the desired healing (v. 15a). But what if the sickness is caused by sin? In that case the sin will be forgiven (v. 15b) but, says James (reminding his readers that forgiveness comes as a result of confession [75]), when praying for healing, sins should be confessed (v. 16).

Of course v. 16 has a wider application than vv. 14-15 and leads into a more general passage with regard to prayer (vv. 16-18), but its connection with vv. 14-15 should not for that reason be missed. The forgiveness of the sick man's sins (if he has committed any) (v. 15) is, in my view, directly linked with the thought of confession of sin and prayer for healing in v. 16 [76].

But does the association of the forgiveness of sins with the healing of sickness in this passage in any way suggest that healing is in the atonement? By no means. For even if we assume that the forgiveness of sins is based upon the atonement [77] and that forgiveness of sin is a prerequisite for healing, that does not in any way imply that Christ bore our sicknesses on the cross as the proponents of the doctrine believe [78]. At best it may be argued that the healing of sickness is *indirectly* in the atonement in the sense that forgiveness is available because of Christ's death and that healing becomes available as a result of that forgiveness and consequent reconciliation with God [79]. But that is a very far cry from the teaching that we can claim healing from our sicknesses on the grounds that 'by his stripes we are healed'. Indeed if that is what James had intended his readers to understand one wonders why he did not instruct them to do just that! As I have already pointed out [80], there appears to be an inbuilt inconsistency in the view that sees James 5:14-15 as a clear promise of healing and yet insists that healing is in the atonement, for if healing is in the atonement, why do I need to be anointed with oil?

In short, although the passage indicates that the sick may expect to be healed as a result of the anointing with oil and prayer offered in faith by the elders, there is no suggestion that the healing is a direct result of the atonement. And even the apparently clear promise of a miracle of healing as a result of such a prayer must be tempered by James' earlier teaching that prayer must be offered without doubting (1:6-8), that no-one can count on tomorrow but recognise that the length of life is as the Lord will (4:13-17), and that Christians must, like Job, be patient in suffering (5:10-11) for the coming of the Lord is at hand (5:8). Thus an eschatological fulfilment of the promise of healing should by no means be discounted.

Mark 16:18 - They will lay hands on the sick

The statement in Mark 16:17 that certain signs would accompany those who believe the gospel is followed by a list of miraculous phenomena which ends in verse 18 with the words:

ἐπὶ ἀρρώστους χεῖρας ἐπιθήρουν καὶ καλῶς ἔξουσιν [81].

Although this contains no direct reference to the atonement it is relevant to the subject of this thesis in that the statement is seen by advocates of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement as supporting their view. T.L. Osborn, for example, in a chapter entitled "Synopsis", argues as follows:

"As has been clearly shown in preceding chapters of this book, our salvation, our deliverance, and our redemption from all the works of Satan, have been accomplished by Christ at Calvary....

Christ, the Captain of our salvation, has fought our battle for us and has liberated us from the power and dominion of the enemy. Now you can say 'I am saved through His blood, and I am healed through His stripes', because redemption is yours forever....

Hear our Captain say: 'Behold I give unto you power.... over all the power of the enemy' (Luke 10:19)..... 'Ye shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover' (Mark 16:18)" [82].

The connection in thought here is clear. Because of Christ's victorious death upon the cross Satan's power (including that of inflicting sickness) has been defeated. As a result those who believe are seen as having authority to heal the sick by the imposition of hands in the name of Jesus. Mark 16:18 is thus seen as a 'promise' [83] of healing which has as its basis Christ's atoning death upon the cross.

In support of this view two things might be added. First, the 'promise' occurs after the crucifixion and therefore might be seen as resulting from it. Second, the 'promise' is made in conjunction with the command to go into all the world and preach the gospel (Mark 16:16) and therefore might be understood to be a part of the gospel message (the gospel itself being understood to be based upon the atonement).

In my view, however, neither of these points holds good. In the first place both points presuppose that the healing in the atonement view is upheld elsewhere in the New Testament. Yet if my argument hitherto has been valid, the verses usually adduced as evidence for the doctrine do not in fact support it and therefore any suggestion that Mark 16:18 is in some way based on the doctrine must surely be discounted. Further, as I hope to show briefly in the remainder of this section, there are not only certain logical difficulties in understanding the passage in this way but an examination of the passage in its context will reveal that any such interpretation is entirely inappropriate.

The first logical difficulty relates to the view that since the promise occurs after the crucifixion it might be seen as resulting from it. But such a conclusion is based on the fallacious assumption that that which is *post hoc* is necessarily *propter hoc*. Clearly the fact that one event follows chronologically after another does not establish a causal relationship between them, and unless the writer expresses some causal link between the two events it would be mistaken to assume that a connection is intended. In the case in question it seems to me from the context of the passage far more significant that the promise is made immediately before the ascension (Mark 16:19) than that it happens to have been made after the crucifixion. But I shall say more of this when I consider the context in greater detail.

A further logical difficulty for the view that the passage is in some way based on the doctrine that healing is in the atonement arises when we consider the purpose of the laying on of hands. For if the gospel really does contain the message that Christ died for our sicknesses as he did for our sins, then the imposition of hands would appear to be redundant. Why not just claim the healing for which Christ has died [84]? But perhaps the sick person envisaged here is an unbeliever and unaware of the benefits of the atonement. Perhaps the laying on of hands is intended for him. This interpretation would possibly suit the evangelistic context of the passage, but it would certainly not support the view that the promise of verse 18 is related to the atonement. It would establish precisely the opposite [85]!

There are thus in my view insuperable logical difficulties with the position that links the 'promise' with the doctrine that healing is in the atonement. Furthermore, a closer examination of the passage reveals that such a position is difficult to justify on contextual grounds. In verse 14 the risen Christ appears to 'the eleven' and commands them to go into all the world and preach the gospel (v.15). Those who believe and are baptized will be saved and those who do not believe will be condemned (v.16). Certain signs (v.17) will accompany those who believe. In Christ's name they will cast out demons, speak in new tongues, pick up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it will not hurt them; they will lay hands on the sick and they will recover (vv17-18). Jesus then ascends into heaven (v.19) and the disciples go out and preach everywhere, the Lord working with them confirming the message with accompanying 'signs' (v.20).

Seen in its context, therefore, the 'promise' that believers will lay hands on the sick and that the sick will recover is one of several miraculous signs. These signs were granted to confirm the message as the disciples went out to preach the

gospel. The nature of the 'promise' concerning healing must be understood in the light of the other signs that are also promised. The signs listed are clearly examples of the kind of miracles the ascended Christ would perform through his disciples in order to confirm the truth of the gospel message they preached. The 'promise' of healing does not mean that every sick person ever prayed for with the laying on of hands of a believer will make a full recovery any more than the 'promise' concerning serpents means that every believer will at some time in his Christian experience pick up a snake! Indeed to argue from this passage that healing is in the atonement is tantamount to saying that snake-handling is in the atonement!

But the atonement is not mentioned in the passage and healing, along with the other signs, is coupled with the preaching of the gospel, not because healing (or any of the other signs for that matter) is in the atonement, but as a sign that confirms the truth of the gospel message. The context of the 'promise' concerning healing is not the crucifixion, but the ascension. The risen Christ just before he ascends promises his disciples that although he is leaving them he will continue to work with them in miracle-working power. A similar promise just prior to the ascension is made in the Lucan writings [86] but there the promise is the gift of the Spirit. And, as I shall argue later [87], healing is more appropriately linked with the work of the Spirit than with the atonement.

Summary

In Chapters Four and Five I examined the two major passages adduced as evidence that healing is in the atonement. In Chapter Four I demonstrated that although Matthew 8:17 undoubtedly refers to physical healing its context is by no means related to the atonement. In Chapter Five I concluded that although 1 Peter 2:24 certainly refers to atonement, the

subject of physical healing is not under discussion in the passage. In my view, therefore, neither verse supports the doctrine.

In Chapter Six I have considered four other passages which are sometimes used to support the doctrine and in each case have argued that when understood in its correct context and rightly exegeted none of these verses either supports or requires the understanding that healing is in the atonement.

Accordingly I reject the view that healing is directly in the atonement and that Christ carried our sicknesses on the cross just as he carried our sins [88]. I find no New Testament evidence whatsoever for such a position. However, as I have already indicated briefly [89], and as I shall again argue later [90], healing may be understood to be indirectly in the atonement in that the gift of the Spirit is a result of the atonement and healing is a gift of the Spirit [91].

My examination of New Testament passages relating to the doctrine is, therefore, now complete. In Part Three I shall consider a variety of New Testament themes which relate to the doctrine before attempting an assessment of the doctrine in Part Four.

NOTES

1. Matthew 8:16-17 (cf. pp. 101-140)
1 Peter 2:24 (cf. pp. 141-162)
2. Galatians 3:13 (cf. p. 38)
1 Corinthians 11:29-30 (cf. pp. 35-36, 38, 67)
James 5:14-15 (cf. pp. 19, 21, 32, 41)
Mark 16:15-18 (cf. p. 57)
3. For example, the majority of scholars accept the Pauline authorship of Galatians (See note 7) and disagreement over the destination of the letter - whether to the North or South (cf. note 8) - has little, if any, bearing, on whether Galatians 3:13 supports the view that healing is in the atonement.
4. For example, Galatians 3:13 clearly raises the much debated issue of Paul's relationship to the Law which cannot possibly be discussed at length in this thesis. Major contributions on this subject include:

Dunn, J.D.G., *'Jesus, Paul, and the Law'*, London, SPCK, 1990, pp225ff.
Hübner, H., *'Law in Paul's Thought'*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1984
Sanders, E.P., *'Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People'*, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1983

Räsänen, H., *'Paul and the Law'*, Tübingen, Möhr, 1983
Barclay, J.M.G., *'Obeying the Truth'*, Cambridge Ph.D Thesis, 1985

Barclay *'Paul and the Law'*, *Themelios* 1986, 12,1, pp. 5-15 also offers a convenient summary of the recent discussion.

5. Jeter, op. cit., p. 31. Cf. p. 38 of this thesis.
6. Yeomans, L.B., *'Healing from Heaven'*, Springfield, GPH, 1973, pp. 73-74.
7. Writers who accept or assume Pauline authorship include:

Lightfoot, J.B., *'St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians'*, London, Macmillan, 1876, pp. 57-62
Ridderbos, H.N., *'The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia'*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1953, passim
Cole, A., *'Galatians'*, London, Tyndale, 1965, passim
Stott, J.R.W., *'The Message of Galatians'*, Leicester, IVP, 1968, passim
Bligh, J., *'Galatians - a Discussion of St. Paul's Epistle'*, London, St. Paul Publications, 1970, passim
Guthrie, D., *'Galatians'*, London, Marshall, 1973, passim
Betz, H.D., *'Galatians - a Commentary on Paul's Letter'*, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1979, passim
Bruce, F.F., *'The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians'*, Exeter, Paternoster, 1982, passim
Räsänen, H., *'Paul and the Law'*, Tübingen, Mohr, 1983, passim
Sanders, E.P., *'Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People'*, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1983, passim

Chapter Six

Barrett, C.K., *'Freedom and Obligation'*, London, SPCK, 1985, passim
Fung, R.Y., *'The Epistle to the Galatians'*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1988,
passim
Hansen, G.W., *'Abraham in Galatians'*, Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1989, passim

8. The controversy concerning the geographical location of the churches to whom Paul wrote has been long and indecisive. Scholars favouring the 'northern' theory include Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 20, Betz, op. cit., pp. 3-5, Moffatt, J., *'Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament'*, New York, 1911, pp. 90-94, Kümmel, W.G., *'Introduction to the New Testament'*, E.T., Nashville, 1975, pp. 296-298, Marxsen, W., *'Introduction to the New Testament'*, E.T., Philadelphia, 1968, p. 46, Harrison, E.F., *'Introduction to the New Testament'*, Grand Rapids, 1971, pp. 272-274, Grant, R.M., *'Historical Introduction to the New Testament'*, New York & Evanston, 1963, p. 185.

The 'southern' theory was popularized by Sir William Ramsey in his *Historical Commentary on Galatians*, 1899 and in his earlier *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 1884, pp. 74ff.

Others who favour this view include Ridderbos, op. cit. p. 31, Cole, op. cit. p. 20, Stott, op. cit., p. 11, Bligh, op. cit., pp. 3-7, Guthrie, *'Galatians'*, pp. 17-27, Bruce, op. cit. pp. 8-18, (cf. his *'Galatian Problems 2. North or South Galatians'*, *BJRL* 52 (1969-70), pp. 10-18), Fung, op. cit., pp. 1-3, Robinson, op. cit., p. 55.

9. The decision with regard to the date of the letter is largely determined by one's decision with regard to its destination. Thus Lightfoot prefers a later date and argues for 57-58 AD (op. cit. pp. 36-56). Those who prefer the 'southern' theory normally date the letter just prior to the 'apostolic conference' at Jerusalem (Acts 15) in or around 49 AD. See Ridderbos, op. cit. pp. 31ff, Cole, op. cit., pp. 20ff, Guthrie, op. cit. pp. 27ff. However, as Guthrie (op. cit. p. 37) points out:

"Uncertainty concerning the dating has little effect on the interpretation of the epistle".

10. Galatians 1:7, 2:11-14, 5:11-12, 6:11-15.

11. Bruce, op. cit. p. 32. Cf. Cole, op. cit., p. 23, Betz, op. cit., p. 7. For an excellent summary of the discussion with regard to the identity of the Galatian agitators see Fung, op. cit., pp. 3-9. Cf., also:

Watson, F., *'Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: a Sociological Approach'*, Cambridge, CUP, 1986

Barclay, op. cit., passim.

12. Bruce, op. cit., p. 35.

13. Cf. Betz, op. cit. p. 7, who states:

"The opponents of Paul must have come into contact with the Galatian churches after Paul founded them. The gospel which the

Healing & the Atonement

opponents proclaimed was, in Paul's view, 'another gospel'. In some way this gospel was associated with observance of the Jewish Torah and with the ritual of circumcision. The opponents had, in Paul's words, 'confused' the churches".

It is, of course, possible that the Judaizers accepted Paul's theoretical statement of the Gospel and merely disagreed about its practical consequences.

14. Lightfoot, op. cit. p. 65.

15. See Betz, op. cit., p. 14, note 97, where Lightfoot's analysis is acknowledged 'if we analyze the letter according to Greco-Roman rhetoric'. Betz's impressive argument (loc. cit.) that Galatians can be analyzed in this way need not detain us here. It is noteworthy, however, that Barrett, *Galatians*, p. 417 feels that Betz has made too much of the apologetic genre of the letter. Cf. Fung, op. cit. pp 28-32.

16. Cole, op. cit., p. 27.

17. Guthrie, D., *New Testament Introduction*, London, Tyndale, 1965, pp. 468-470.

18. See p. 164 and Note 12.

19. Betz, op. cit., pp. 19-21.

20. The passage contains no less than six quotations from the OT.

21. Betz, op. cit., p. 148.

Despite the difficulties I venture to suggest that the quote from Deuteronomy 21:23 should be understood in conjunction with the quote from Deuteronomy 27:26 in verse 10. Taken together the Law is seen as pronouncing a curse on all who do not keep it in its entirety and on everyone who is hanged on a tree. This means that the Law pronounces both a blessing and a curse on Christ, a blessing because of his obedience to it and a curse because he was hanged on a tree. The only solution Paul finds to this dilemma is to understand that in some way Christ was bearing the curse for us. Understood this way the verse is clearly parallel to 2 Corinthians 5:21.

22. For clarification of the definition and use of Genitives see: Moule, C.F.D., *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*, Cambridge, CUP, 1971, pp. 37-43.

23. Bruce, op. cit., pp. 163-164.

24. Betz, op. cit. p. 149.

Dunn, however, understands 'the curse of the Law' quite differently. The curse is neither the Law itself nor simply the condemnation that falls on those who fall short of its requirements. It has rather to do with the

attitude which confines the covenant promise to Jews as Jews. It falls on those who live in such a way as to exclude the Gentile as Gentile from the promise. The curse which was removed by Christ's death was thus the curse of a wrong understanding of the Law.

See Dunn, J.D.G., *'Jesus, Paul and the Law'*, London, SPCK, 1990, pp. 225-229.

Clearly if this understanding is correct then there is no room for the view that sees Galatians 3:14 as a basis for the doctrine that healing is in the atonement.

For a rejection of Dunn's position, see:

Cranfield, C.E.B., 'The Works of the Law' in the Epistle to the Romans, *JSNT* 1991, 43, pp. 89-101. Cranfield argues that in both Galatians and Romans the expression denotes the doing of the works that the Law requires.

25. Cf. Jeter's understanding referred to on p. 163 of this thesis. See also note 5.

26. It may be argued that Deuteronomy 27 lists those who are subject to God's curse (see especially vv. 15-26) and that the curses listed in the following chapter (including a variety of sicknesses) are a description of what it means to be cursed by God. However, although this may have been the intention of the writer of Deuteronomy, there is no evidence that Paul understood the curse in this way. Indeed Paul's use of OT verses in Galatians (as indeed elsewhere) often appears to have little regard for the original context of those verses (eg. his use of Habakkuk 2:4 in Romans 1:17 and Galatians 3:11).

27. In this connection it is not surprising that none of the commentaries I have consulted connect the curse referred to here with the sickness curses of Deuteronomy 28. See, for example:

Luther, M., *'A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians'*, London, Saunders, 1833 ed., p. 217.

Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 139.

Ridderbos, op. cit., pp. 125-128.

Cole, op. cit., pp. 99-100.

Stott, *'The Message of Galatians'*, Leicester, IVP, 1968, pp. 80-83.

Bligh, op. cit., pp. 264-272.

Guthrie, *Galatians*, pp. 98-99.

Betz, op. cit., pp. 148-153.

Bruce, op. cit., pp. 163-167.

Fung, op. cit., pp. 147-151.

28. See Chapters 4 and 5 of this thesis. It seems to me that the proponents of the doctrine, having concluded from Matthew 8:17 and 1 Peter 2:24 that healing is in the atonement, have read the doctrine into Galatians 3:13. However, since we have already concluded that neither verse supports the doctrine (cf. p. 154), any understanding that the doctrine somehow underlies Galatians 3:13 must accordingly be rejected.

Healing & the Atonement

29. See Part Four, pp. 345ff. Cf. pp. 331-345 where I argue that healing may also be understood to be 'in the atonement' ultimately rather than immediately.

30. See pp. 35-36 of this thesis and footnotes 20, 21 and 22 on p. 72.

31. Osborn, T.L., *'Healing the Sick'*, Tulsa, T.L. Osborn Evangelistic Association, 1961, p. 155.

Jeter, op. cit., pp. 35-36, expresses a similar view.

Dr. Raymond Carlson, General Superintendent of American Assemblies of God, appears to adopt the same position. Preaching in my hearing at the Communion Service at the World Pentecostal Conference in Oslo, Norway, on Sunday 13th September 1992 he encouraged the congregation to believe for healing from physical sickness as they took the communion bread.

32. I shall assume with Barrett 'both the authenticity and the integrity of 1 Corinthians', Barrett, C.K., *'A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians'*, London, Black, 1983, p.11.

33. See p. 35 of this thesis and note 21.

34. Barrett, op. cit., p. 274.

35. *ibid* p. 275. It is perhaps noteworthy here that Barrett does not understand Paul to think of Christ's body and blood as 'physically or substantially present, for he does not identify the wine with the Lord's blood' (p. 273). In this respect I share Barrett's view.

36. Goudge, H.L., *'The First Epistle to the Corinthians'*, London, Methuen, 1926, p. 102.

Weiss, J., *'Der erste Korintherbrief'*, Göttingen, 1910, p. 291.

Parry, R. St. John, *'The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians'*, Cambridge, 1926, p. 171.

Héring, J., *'The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians'*, ET, London, Epworth, 1962, p. 120.

Cf. Margerie, B. de, *'Réception indigne et infructueuse de l'Eucharistie d'après Saint Paul: 1 Corinthiens 11:27-29'*, *Esp.Vie* 87 (40,'77) 513-519.

Margerie argues that unworthy reception of the Eucharist consists in failure to appreciate the nature and grandeur of the bread. Divorce and remarriage are seen as incompatible with worthy reception. This view must also be rejected on the grounds that the issue of divorce and remarriage does not appear in the context.

cf. also Theissen, G., *'The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity'*, ET, Edinburgh, Clark, 1982, pp.164-165.

37. Cf. Fee, G.D., *'The First Epistle to the Corinthians'*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1987, p. 563.

Chapter Six

38. Barrett, op. cit. p. 275.

39. Fee, op. cit., pp. 558-564.

Cf. Minear, P.S., '*Paul's teaching on the Eucharist in 1 Corinthians*', *Worship* 44, (2'70), 83-92. Minear argues that 1 Corinthians 10:1-26 compares the Exodus event with the Eucharist. God punished the Israelites whose behaviour contradicted the sacrament of the manna. 1 Corinthians 11:17-34 is seen as reinforcing this interpretation.

40. *ibid* p 564. For a similar view, see Orr, W.F., & Walther, J.A., '*1 Corinthians*', New York, Doubleday, 1976, pp. 273-274. See also:

Conzelmann, H., '*1 Corinthians*', ET, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1975, p. 202:

'The man who offends against the elements offends against the Lord himself. If we are to understand this we must bear in mind that the idea of the church as the body of the Lord has a part to play'.

And again, in a footnote:

'We offend against the Lord because we offend against his body, the community'.

41. Cf. Prout, E., '*One loaf..... one body*', *RestQuart* 25, (2,'82) 78-81. Prout argues that 'body' in 1 Corinthians 10:16-17, and in 11:29, implies that recognising the body of Christ through the bread we break entails recognising the purpose of his death - to call people into unity under Christ. This view is clearly close to Fee's but recognises in 11:29 the *double entendre* for which I have argued.

42. Cf. pp. 18-24, 31ff.

43. Cf. pp. 13ff of this thesis.

44. Simpson, op. cit., pp. 18-20. Cf. pp. 11-15 which indicate his understanding that healing is in the atonement.

45. Osborn, T.L., '*Healing the Sick*', Tulsa, Osborn, 1961, p. 75.

46. *ibid*, p. 27.

47. cf. pp 34-36 of this thesis.

48. See chapters 4 and 5 and my conclusion on p. 154.

49. See my opening comments on p 163.

50. Laws, S., '*A Commentary on the Epistle of James*', London, Black, 1980, p.2. Despite the scanty material afforded by the epistle, however, it is noteworthy with reference to the subject of this thesis that there are few Christian differentia in James and no reference to the cross.

69. Christians are 'heirs of the kingdom' (2:5) and 'a kind of firstfruits of his (sc. God's) creatures' (1:18).
70. Moo, op. cit., p. 44. Cf. Mussner, F., *'Der Jacobusbrief'*, Herder, 1981, pp. 207-210.
71. Cf. Moo, op. cit. p. 186.
72. Cf. Cothenet, E., *'La Maladie et la Mort du Chrétien dans la Liturgie. La Guérison comme signe du royaume et l'onction des malades (Jc 5, 13-16)'*, *EspVie* 1974, 84, 41, pp. 561-570.

Cothenet argues that the rite envisaged by James is a rite of healing, presented in the light of the miracles worked by Jesus and ought to be interpreted in the perspective of the Pauline texts on the identification of the Christian with Christ dead and risen. Thus the sacrament has a twofold polarity. Ordained for healing in the full sense of the term it can reveal the meaning of health as a gift of God; at the approach of death it takes on the form of an appeal for eschatological healing.

73. For the long-standing connection between sin and sickness see Laws, op. cit. p. 229, Mitton, op. cit. pp. 201-202, Adamson, op. cit. p. 198.
74. Laws, op. cit. p. 232. For more detailed discussion of the relationship between verses 15 and 16, see:

Adamson, op.cit. pp. 198-199
 Blackman, op. cit. p. 155
 Dibelius, op. cit. pp. 241-242, 255.
 Mitton, op. cit. pp. 202-203
 Moo, op. cit. p. 182
 Tasker, op. cit. p. 134

Of these only Adamson and Blackman see a direct link between the verses. However, I find Adamson compelling when he writes:

"We cannot believe that after vv. 14 and 15 a stylist like James would here have invited misunderstanding by using 'heal' in any but its medical sense. The well-documented association of sickness, sin, and confession in Jewish thought and ministrations seems to us to confirm (against e.g., Dibelius; see Mitton, pp. 202ff.) the unity of the whole passage in question including the connective *own* found at the beginning of v. 16 so there is no break between vv. 15 and 16. Confession and prayer were already implicit in Jewish thought of the sickbed and the elaborate passage from 'The prayer of a righteous man.....' to the end of v. 18 is climactic not merely of the first ten or eleven words of v. 16 but to the whole passage, certainly from the beginning of v. 14".

75. Blackman, op. cit. p. 155, draws attention to 1 John 1:9 in this connection.
76. See note 73.
77. Such an assumption is, of course, basically Pauline (cf. Romans 5:1-11). It is, however, by no means impossible that James held such a doctrine

and the absence of any reference to it in his epistle could perhaps be explained on the grounds that the letter is ethical rather than theological in nature. Nevertheless there is no clear doctrine of atonement in James although Manns has argued that the idea of confessing sins to one another in James 5:16 is rooted in the Jewish ceremony of selihôt, associated with the Day of Atonement. See:

Manns, F., "'Confessez vos péchés les uns aux autres', Essai d'interprétation de Jacques 5,16", RevSciRel 1984, 58, 4, pp. 233-241.

Further, as Cadoux points out, the phrase 'to cover sins' (5:20) is a ritual term: the sin that bars from God is covered by sacrifice so that God no longer sees it, and so receives the man (Cadoux, op. cit. p. 96).

78. See, for example, the quote from Copeland on pp 1-2 of this thesis.

79. Later I shall argue that healing may be understood to be *indirectly* in the atonement. See pp. 345ff of this thesis.

80. pp. 183-184.

81. Although the verses found in Mark 16:9-20 are notoriously controversial, it is not my intention to discuss their authenticity here. They have long been an accepted part of the canon of the New Testament in the tradition of the church and they are certainly accepted as authentic by those who argue that healing is in the atonement. I shall therefore not discuss the authenticity of the verses in question but shall simply seek to demonstrate that they do not support the view that healing is in the atonement.

For discussion of the authenticity of the passage see:

Anderson, H., *'The Gospel of Mark'*, London, Oliphants, 1976, p. 358

Farmer, W.R., *'The Last Twelve Verses of Mark'*, Cambridge, CUP, 1974, passim

Hengel, M., *'Studies in the Gospel of Mark'*, London, SCM, 1985 pp.167-169

Menzies, A., *'The Earliest Gospel'*, London, Macmillan, 1901, pp. 290-292

Rawlinson, A.E.G., *'St. Mark'*, London, Methuen, 1953, pp 246-248

Schweizer, E., *'The Good News according to Mark'*, London, SPCK, 1971, pp 373-378

Taylor, V., *'The Gospel according to St. Mark'*, London, Macmillan, 1966, p.610

Trocme, E., *'The Formation of the Gospel according to Mark'*, London, SPCK, 1963, ET P. Gaughan, p. 64. Trocme comments:

"It is clear that verses 16:9-20 of the 'received' text are a later addition since most of the witnesses to the text earlier than the fifth century make no mention of them, but they are nevertheless old, since Irenaeus quotes one of these verses and attributes it definitely to Mark 'at the end of his Gospel' (Adv. Haer. III 10.6). It is thus as early as the second century that Mark was found incomplete and it was sought to replace the 'missing' passage".

E. Linnemann, however, has argued that at least part of the longer ending - viz. vv. 15-20 - is authentic. See:

Healing & the Atonement

Linnemann, E., 'Der (wiedergefundene) Markusschluss', ZeitTheolKirch, 1969, 66, 3, pp. 255-287.

Her work has been robustly challenged, however, by both Aland and Trompf. See:

Aland, K., 'Der Wiedergefundene Markusschluss? Eine methodologische Bemerkung zur textkritischen Arbeit', ZeitTheolKirch, 67, 1970, 1, pp. 3-13.

Trompf, G.W., 'The Markusschluss in Recent Research', AusBibRev 1973, 21 pp. 15-26.

82. Osborn, T. L., 'Healing the sick', Tulsa, Osborn, 1961, pp. 132-134.

83. For the understanding that verses of the Bible may be seen as 'promises' see Part Four of this thesis, pp. 298-309. Cf. also pp 18-21.

84. Cf. my comments with regard to anointing with oil on pp 182-184 where I advance a similar argument.

85. Those who teach that healing is in the atonement apply the doctrine to *Christians* (cf. the quote from Gloria Copeland on pp 1-2 of this thesis). It is argued that if Christians only realised that Christ died for their sicknesses as he died for their sins then Christians need not be sick. But if Mark 16:18 offers healing to the unbeliever (on the grounds that believers do not need the laying on of hands because they can simply claim healing because it is provided in the atonement) then the passage may not with consistency be used to support the view that healing is in the atonement.

86. See Luke 24:44-53, Acts 1:1-8.

87. See 347ff. Cf. p. 173.

88. Cf. the quote from Gloria Copeland and my working definition of the doctrine on pp. 1-2 of this thesis.

89. See p. 173.

90. See Part Four pp. 345ff.

91. Cf. Galatians 3:13-14, 1 Corinthians 12:9.

Chapter Six

PART THREE

AN EXAMINATION OF NT THEMES RELATING TO THE DOCTRINE

In the first part of this thesis I examined the theological and literary origins of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement and showed how the doctrine has developed both within and beyond Classical Pentecostalism. That examination revealed several New Testament passages which are adduced as evidence to support the doctrine and in Part Two I gave consideration to what I consider to be the most important of these. In each case I have sought to show that the passage in question does not support the doctrine as originally propounded.

But the survey of the theological and literary origins of the doctrine conducted in Part One not only reveals *passages* that are used in support of the doctrine. It also brings to light certain *themes* which are either used to support the doctrine or are in some way closely related to it. I shall devote Part Three of this thesis to an examination of what I consider to be the most important of these themes. These include the relationship between healing, salvation and the gospel (Chapter 7), sickness in relation to sin, to Satan, and to suffering in general (Chapter 8), and sick Christians and the art of medicine in the New Testament (Chapter 9).

CHAPTER SEVEN: HEALING, SALVATION AND THE GOSPEL

In this chapter I intend to examine the relation between physical healing, salvation, and the gospel. I shall first consider the claim that the use of $\sigma\acute{o}\zeta\omega$ in the New Testament to mean both 'save' and 'heal' indicates that healing is a part of salvation. I shall then discuss the relationship between healing and the gospel.

The fact that $\sigma\acute{o}\zeta\omega$ (which in the NT is usually translated 'save' [1]) is sometimes used to mean 'heal' [2] has been used by some advocates of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement to argue that healing is included in salvation and is therefore 'in the atonement' since salvation is seen to result from the atonement. John Nelson Parr, for example, comments:

"If Peter included healing in 'being saved' (Acts 4:9) (*sesostal*, Gk., also note the same word in verse 12 twice), are we not justified in teaching that physical healing is included in the salvation purchased for us by the Prince of Life?" [3].

Parr's point seems to be that since $\sigma\acute{o}\zeta\omega$ is used in verse 9 to refer to physical healing and then in verse 12 to refer to 'salvation' (in what is presumably intended to be a wider spiritual sense), it is reasonable to conclude that physical healing has been 'purchased for us' and is therefore in the atonement.

But this conclusion is illegitimate since it involves an elementary error in semantics. It is not my intention, however, to engage in detailed exegesis of Acts 4 in order to justify my rejection of Parr's conclusion. I shall rather address the more general point of the meaning of $\sigma\acute{o}\zeta\omega$ and its linguistic implications with regard to physical healing in

relation to salvation. In so doing the reason for my rejection of Parr's conclusion will become apparent. I shall consider the meaning of σώζω, its use in the New Testament with reference to the healing passages in Luke, and the relationship between physical and spiritual aspects of σωτηρία in the New Testament. In so doing I hope to establish in what sense, if any, physical healing may be rightly understood to be a part of salvation in general.

The meaning of σώζω

According to Foerster the Greek verb σώζω has its origin in the verb σάω which in the present tense came to be replaced by σωίζω which in turn became σώζω. The verb itself is related to the adjective σάος (safe) and means 'to make safe' and hence 'to deliver from a direct threat' and 'to bring safe and sound out of a difficult situation' [4]. Under the heading σώζω and σωτηρία in the Greek World Foerster lists four major areas of meaning for σώζω and its cognates: *saving*, *keeping*, *benefiting*, and *preserving the inner being* [5].

Saving includes dynamic acts in which gods or men snatch others from peril especially in the context of war or of a sea-voyage, 'deliverance' from judicial condemnation, and, of especial interest to the subject of this thesis, being 'saved' from an illness [6]. *Keeping* includes the idea of the king keeping a subject alive by granting pardon, men being kept from perishing, and even the spark of a fire being kept from going out. The verb is also used in the sense of lost money being 'got back', and of wine or goods being 'kept'.

In all the above examples there is in some measure the element of keeping from a threat, but σώζω and σωτηρία can have a purely positive content. The word group is thus used in the sense of *benefiting*. Prayer is offered to Zeus for the σωτηρία of the nation, for peace, wealth, the growth of crops

and cattle. With regard to healing σώζομαι can mean not only to be cured but to be in good health and the formula of self execration τὴν ἐμὴν σωτηρίαν [7] means 'by my health'.

But σώζω may also be used of *preserving the inner being* of men or things. So Plato thought that it was the task of the ἄρχων to σώζειν the state by maintaining it as a constitutionally ordered state [8] and "in philosophical and religious trains of thought σώζω and σωτηρία often refer to the inner 'health' of man" [9].

This brief analysis demonstrates that, long before the New Testament documents came to be written, σώζω was being used in a wide variety of ways. It is noteworthy, however, that in all the examples mentioned above the root meaning of being made or kept safe is clearly discernible. It is not surprising, therefore, that, when the use of σώζω in the New Testament is examined, although the range of meanings is more restricted, each meaning carries with it the underlying suggestion of being made or kept safe.

The use of σώζω in the New Testament

As we examine the New Testament we find that writers use σώζω and its cognates to mean being made or kept safe whenever such terminology is appropriate. The verb is used, for example, in relation to acute danger to physical life. In Matthew's account of the stilling of the storm the disciples plead with Jesus to 'save' them (Matthew 8:25) and Peter walking on the water makes a similar request (Matthew 14:30). In the accounts of the mocking of Jesus on the cross (Matthew 27:40-42, Mark 15:30-31, Luke 23:39) he is challenged to 'save' himself. The verb and the noun denote the saving of the shipwrecked crew and passengers in the account of Paul's shipwreck in Acts 27:20, 31, 34, and Hebrews 11:7 refers to Noah preparing the ark εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ.

The verb is also used with reference to deliverance from disease. In the account of the healing of the woman with the issue of blood (Matthew 9:21-22, Mark 5:28, 34, Luke 8:48), in the story of the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mark 5:23, Luke 8:50), in the healing of blind Bartimaeus (Mark 10:52, Luke 18:42), in Luke's account of the deliverance of Legion from demon-possession (Luke 8:36) and in his story of the healing of the ten lepers (Luke 17:19) $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ is used to mean 'heal'. A similar use is found in Acts 4:9 and 14:9 as well as in James 5:15. It is thus clear that $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ is used in the New Testament to mean to deliver from both danger and disease.

But $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ and $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ in the New Testament mean far more than this. As Marshall points out, "'Salvation' is the most widely used term in Christian theology to express the provision of God for our human plight" [10]. The danger from which man needs to be saved is more than physical and by far the major emphasis of $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ in the New Testament is that of deliverance from sin. As Walters points out:

"The movement in Scripture is from the more physical aspects towards moral and spiritual deliverance. Thus the earlier parts of the Old Testament lay stress on ways of escape for God's individual servants from the hands of their enemies, the emancipation of his people from bondage and their establishment in a land of plenty; the later parts lay greater emphasis upon the moral and religious conditions and qualities of blessedness and extend its amenities beyond the nation's confines. The New Testament indicates clearly man's thralldom to sin, its danger and potency, and the deliverance from it to be found exclusively in Christ. The Bible gives an unfolding account of how God provides the basis for salvation, presents it, and is Himself man's salvation" [11].

However, although I am in broad agreement with Walters' distinction between 'the more physical aspects' of the use of

σωτηρία from its use to refer to 'spiritual deliverance', this analysis may well be criticised as predominantly Pauline. Liefeld, for example, has argued that a more 'holistic' concept is to be found in the Lukan writings [12].

Because of this, because of limitations of space, and because Parr's claim that healing is a part of salvation is based on Luke's use of σώζω in Acts 4, I shall confine my attention to Luke's use of the σώζω word-group. Clearly there is a *linguistic* connection between the ideas of spiritual and physical deliverance (in that they are linked by the use of σώζω), but is there also in Luke a *conceptual* connection? Do the Lukan passages where σώζω is used to mean 'heal' suggest that the writer intended by his use of σώζω to link physical healing with the more 'spiritual' aspects of σωτηρία, deliverance from sin [13]?

*The Relationship between Physical and Spiritual Aspects
of σωτηρία in the Lukan Writings*

Of the fifteen references in the New Testament where σώζω is used of physical healing seven are to be found in the Lukan writings [14]. On examining each of these passages it seems to me that in no case is σώζω used with the *clear* intention of anything more than physical healing although in some cases a 'spiritual' motive might be read into the passage. Space forbids a detailed examination of each passage but the account of the healing of the leper (Luke 17:11-19) will serve well as an example. A full exegesis of the passage will not be necessary. I shall consider only the significance of the use of σώζω with particular reference to its possible bearing on any relation there may be between physical healing and salvation.

In Luke 17:11-19 ten lepers meet Jesus and ask him to have mercy on them (v.13). Jesus tells them to go and show

themselves to the priests and as they go they are cleansed - ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτοὺς ἐκαθαρίσθησαν (v.14). One of them, a Samaritan, when he sees that he is healed - ἰδὼν ὅτι ἰάθη (v.15) - returns to give thanks (v.16). Jesus marvels at the ingratitude of the nine (v.17) and at the thankfulness of a foreigner (v.18). He sends him on his way with the words ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε (v.19).

Thus three different verbs are used to describe the leper's healing - καθαρίζω (v.14, 17), ἰάομαι (v.15), and σώζω (v.19). The context suggests that each of these verbs is used with very much the same meaning for in verse 15 ἰάομαι replaces καθαρίζω (v.14) [15] and in verse 19 σώζω appears to have the same force as καθαρίζω in verse 17. Further, the fact that Jesus told the lepers to show themselves to the priests (v.14), the normal procedure when a leper *had been* cured (Leviticus 14:2ff), may well suggest that he was testing their faith by asking them to act as though the cure had already taken place [16]. If this is the case, then their faith was rewarded in that as they departed they were cleansed. This understanding also harmonises with Jesus' statement to the Samaritan in verse 19, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε, and suggests that the primary significance of the use of σώζω here is that of physical healing, a view endorsed by the majority of English translations [17].

But is there a *double entendre* in the use of σώζω here? Does the leper receive salvation as well as healing? Betz, for example, argues that the passage is an attempt to show that a healing miracle is not the same thing as salvation itself. The miracle is not properly experienced unless it leads to a change of inner orientation. Thus the miracle opens up the way for a faith in Jesus which is independent of the occurrence of miracles [18]. On this view, therefore, the healing is not the same as salvation, nor even a part of it, but rather a stepping-stone to it. The suggestion is that the

Samaritan received salvation as well as healing, the nine receiving only healing. The use of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ with reference to the Samaritan in verse 19, then, could thus be understood to incorporate both his healing and his salvation.

For Marshall too $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ in verse 19 refers to salvation as well as healing. 'His faith has been the means of his cure - and of his salvation' [19]. The whole point of the second part of the story lies in the man's relationship to Jesus, not in the fact that he gave thanks. The faith of the nine, by contrast, was incomplete because it did not issue in gratitude. Thus Marshall, like Betz, distinguishes between salvation and healing in this passage but sees the Samaritan as receiving both, his faith being made complete by his gratitude for his healing and resulting in his salvation.

Schweizer, however, sees verse 19 as evidence that healing is a part of salvation rather than something to be distinguished from it. Pointing out that 'healing' and 'salvation' are the same word in Greek he argues from this passage that the healing of disease is itself 'part of the process of salvation'. Even the amazing faith of the nine, who are confident of healing upon the mere word of Jesus, is not salvation until they arrive at a knowledge of God's merciful action, a knowledge which here expresses itself in thankfulness [20].

Betz, Marshall and Schweizer, therefore, all understand $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ to mean more than physical healing in this passage, and view the leper's healing as either a stepping-stone to or a part of the process of salvation. Yet Betz argues that the passage distinguishes healing from salvation whereas Schweizer claims that healing is a part of it. Rather than attempting to resolve the difficulties between these two views, however, I shall endeavour to challenge the common premise upon which the

arguments of all three scholars are based, viz. that σώζω in verse 19 refers to salvation as well as healing.

First, it seems to me by no means certain that the use of ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε in this passage differs in any substantial way from its use in the other healing passages in the synoptic gospels. Luke uses it in the account of the healing of the woman with the internal haemorrhage (Luke 8:48) as also do Matthew and Mark (Matthew 9:22, Mark 5:34) [21] and in the healing of the blind man (Luke 18:42, cf. Mark 10:52). In none of these accounts is there any obvious indication that anything more than physical healing is intended. That Luke uses it also in connection with deliverance from demons (Luke 8:36) and with the forgiveness of sins (Luke 7:50) may simply indicate that faith brings deliverance in a variety of different areas and there is, it seems to me, no more reason to conclude that its use to refer to forgiveness in Luke 7:50 should influence our understanding of Luke 17:19 and so lead us to assume that the leper was 'saved' as well as 'healed' than to believe that the leper was delivered from demon possession on the basis of its use in Luke 8:36. By far the simplest explanation is that σώζω may, as we have already noted, appropriately be used to refer to deliverance from sickness or danger or demons or sin and that its use with regard to any or all of these need not imply anything more than a linguistic connection between them.

Second, if Luke 17:19 refers to salvation as well as healing, it is difficult to see at what point in the story the leper exercised faith for this salvation. The argument that his faith was made complete when he returned to give thanks is not justified by the text, neither is the suggestion that his faith for healing was a stepping stone to salvation, for these views seem to imply that salvation takes place because the leper gives thanks. But it was *faith* that delivered him and the giving of thanks need not in itself indicate faith. The

obvious point in the passage where the leper exercises faith is when, like the nine, he departs at the mere word of Jesus and as a result is healed. I conclude, therefore, that the most natural way to interpret ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε in Luke 17:19 is to understand Jesus as saying that the leper has been cured of his leprosy because of his faith.

The view that σώζω is intended in Luke 17:19 to be interpreted spiritually is, therefore, in my view at best unproven and must remain an open question. In the light of this it is difficult to adduce this passage as clear evidence that healing is a part of salvation. This is not to deny, however, that Luke might have intended his readers to apply this story spiritually *to themselves* and that the passage may be interpreted as teaching that Jesus came in order that men might be cleansed from their sin. Indeed I think it likely that this was Luke's intention as is suggested by his use of ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε in Luke 7:50 [22]. But such an admission by no means implies that physical healing is a *part* of our 'spiritual' salvation. It acknowledges simply that it is *illustrative* of it.

If the principles which I have enunciated in the previous paragraphs are right, and if they are rightly understood, when the other healing stories which include the use of σώζω are examined it will be clear that they may all be interpreted in a similar way. With the possible exception of the deliverance of Legion, whose case is complicated because he is said to be 'healed' [23] of demon-possession, on each occasion the context clearly indicates that σώζω is used to refer to physical recovery. Thus the only 'spiritual' interpretation that may, in my view, validly be gleaned from the passages in question is where the physical healing may be understood as an illustration of the spiritual deliverance which is the forgiveness of sins [24].

Further, the attempt to read into passages such as the one we have examined the view that healing is a part of salvation on the grounds that σώζω frequently has a spiritual connotation elsewhere in the New Testament involves highly questionable exegesis and makes the mistake of reading the full breadth of a word's connotation into one specific use of that word. For example, an S.O.S. signal from a ship in distress is a plea for *physical* deliverance even though 'save our souls' in a religious context might rightly be interpreted as a request for *spiritual* help. To confuse the two might well lead to disastrous consequences [25].

With all this in mind the passage in Acts 4 quoted by Parr [26] is now easily understood. The fact that σώζω is used in verse 9 to mean 'heal' and in verse 12 to mean 'save' does not in itself imply that physical healing is a part of salvation. The miracle of healing on this one man is better seen as illustrative of that 'spiritual healing', deliverance from sin and its consequences, which in verse 12 is offered to all men in Jesus' name through the proclamation of the gospel. Peter uses the miracle as a stepping-stone to and the basis for the preaching of salvation from sin [27], but the healing itself need not be seen as a part of that salvation. The use of σώζω to mean both 'heal' and 'save' is simply explained by the fact that σώζω may legitimately be used to mean both 'heal' and 'save'. Its use in verse 9 (in the context of physical healing) is almost certainly deliberate and probably anticipates its use in verse 12 (in the context of deliverance from sin). But the fact that they are used in such close proximity, the one being intentionally used as an illustration of the other, by no means indicates their identity.

Summary on Relation between Healing and Salvation

In summary, then, the σώζω, σωτηρία group of words is used in the New Testament to refer to deliverance from acute danger to

physical life, from disease and from demons. It is far more frequently used, however, in connection with deliverance from sin and from future eschatological wrath. With regard to the subject of this thesis I have argued that although the use of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ links deliverance from sickness with deliverance from sin *linguistically* this need not in itself imply a *theological* connection. The New Testament writers did not, it seems to me, develop a systematic theology of $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ subdivided into categories of physical and spiritual deliverance, for example. Rather, they used $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ wherever it might appropriately be used to mean 'make safe' or 'deliver'. Thus to argue from the use of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ for anything more than a linguistic connection between those uses may possibly indicate a misunderstanding of the nature of language.

Nevertheless it seems likely that writers sometimes took advantage of cases of physical deliverance (e.g. the healing of blind Bartimaeus) to illustrate the principles of spiritual deliverance (how those who are spiritually 'blind' might, through faith in Jesus, 'see'). But to say this is not to confuse the illustration itself with the truth it illustrates. Healing may illustrate salvation without being part of it. Thus Parr's claim, based on the use of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ in Acts 4:9-12, that 'physical healing is included in the salvation purchased for us' [28] is shown to be invalid.

I therefore reject Parr's assumption that, *because of the use of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$* , deliverance from sickness is provided for Christians in just the same way as deliverance from sin. This is not to say, however, that physical healing may not in some sense rightly been seen as part of God's overall salvific work. Indeed, as I shall argue later, final physical deliverance is certainly, in Paul's understanding at least, part of the ultimate salvation for which Christians await the eschaton [29]. Moreover, in the Gospel records the possibility of physical healing *now* certainly appears to be part of the good

news of the kingdom of God [30]. But the connection between healing and the gospel is something which must now be briefly examined.

Is Healing Part of the Gospel?

Perhaps the clearest evidence that the early proponents of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement saw healing as part of the gospel is the title of A.B. Simpson's book, *The Gospel of Healing* [31]. His belief that 'the healing of disease by simple faith in God is a part of the Gospel' [32] is, as I have already pointed out [33], largely based on his view that healing is in the atonement and in his understanding of verses such as Matthew 8:17 and 1 Peter 2:24. However, I have already argued that these verses when correctly exegeted may not legitimately be adduced as evidence that healing is in the atonement [34]. It seems to me, therefore, that the basis of Simpson's understanding that healing is a part of the gospel is thereby removed, but the possibility that it might *on other grounds* be seen as part of the gospel must now be briefly considered.

If the view that healing is a part of the gospel on the grounds that it is thought to be in the atonement is to be rejected it may still be possible to maintain the position that healing is in some sense a part of the gospel on the grounds that in the Gospel records the possibility of physical healing appears to be part of the good news of the kingdom of God. In examining this possibility I shall consider the use of εὐαγγέλιον and its cognates (εὐαγγελίζω-ομαι, εὐαγγελιστής) in connection with healing in Matthew, Luke, and Paul. (John nowhere makes use of the word-group and Mark makes no obvious connection between healing and εὐαγγέλιον except in 16:15ff, a passage I have already considered [35]).

Matthew uses the εὐαγγέλιον word-group five times in his Gospel [36]. On three of these occasions there is a clear link between healing and the gospel. In Matthew 4:23 Jesus goes about all Galilee

διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν...

In 9:35 this wording is repeated verbatim. The reference in 11:5 records Jesus' message to John the Baptist:

τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται.

At this stage it is sufficient to note that in neither of these passages is healing identified with the gospel, nor is it stated to be a part of it. It is, however, seen to be very closely linked with it and, as I pointed out in an earlier chapter [37], in Matthew the good news of the kingdom is the message that the King has come and the fact that sicknesses and sins and evil spirits are subject to him is part and parcel of the good news. Thus the healing miracles are evidence of Jesus' messiahship. This is precisely the point of Jesus' message to John the Baptist (see above) and in this context healing may, in my view, legitimately be understood to be a part of the gospel (good news) that Jesus is the Christ.

In this connection it is noteworthy that in the passages where Luke connects healing with the gospel a similar emphasis may be discerned. The passage in Luke 7 (especially v. 22) is parallel to that in Matthew 11 to which I have just referred (indeed with the exception of the omission of καὶ from before χωλοί, νεκροί and πτωχοί the wording is identical). The phrase πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται is reminiscent of Isaiah 61:1-2, τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν of Isaiah 35:5. Jesus' healing miracles

are thus used as evidence of his messiahship in answer to John's question $\Sigma\delta\epsilon\iota\ \acute{o}\ \epsilon\pi\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$; (vv. 19-20) by indicating that they are a fulfilment of OT scripture.

The account in Luke 4:16ff may be understood similarly. In verse 18 Luke quotes extensively from Isaiah 61:1-2 to show that Jesus is the anointed one. The gospel and healing are again in close proximity because the 'good news' is, quite simply, that Jesus is the Christ (anointed one, messiah) and as such he has authority in the Spirit's power to proclaim release to captives and recovery of sight to the blind.

In Luke 9:1-6 Jesus gives authority to the Twelve over demons and diseases and sends them out to preach the kingdom of God and to heal. In verse 6 they preach the gospel and heal everywhere. Again the connection between healing and the gospel is linked with Christ's authority (v.1). The kingdom of God has come in the person of Christ and this is the good news they are to preach. One evidence of the truth of their message is that the sick are healed (v.1, v.6) [38].

Thus far I have argued from Matthew and Luke that healing may be understood to be a part of the gospel not because it is 'in the atonement', but because the gospel is a message about Christ's kingly authority and as such includes acts of healing. But does this hold up in the light of Paul's understanding of the gospel? It is clear from Paul's summary of the gospel message in 1 Corinthians 15:1-4 that Christ's death, burial and resurrection are at the heart of the gospel and that the purpose of his death was 'for our sins'. It is significant that Paul does not state here that Christ also died for our sicknesses and this passage suggests neither that healing is in the atonement nor that it is a part of the gospel. But is there any suggestion in Paul that healing may at least be closely connected with the gospel?

In Romans 15:16-20 Paul refers to his ministry to the Gentiles in the service of the gospel (v.16). Through Paul's ministry Christ has won obedience from the Gentiles by word and deed (v. 18). This has been accomplished (v. 19) by the power of signs and wonders, by the power of the Holy Spirit

ὥστε με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ
πεπληρωμέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Thus Paul claims to have 'fulfilled the gospel of Christ' in a context of signs and wonders performed by the Spirit's power. It is possible that by fulfilling the gospel Paul means that he has preached it in all the provinces between Jerusalem and Illyricum [39]. But the phrase 'from Jerusalem as far round as Illyricum' is *part of* the ὥστε clause. He does not say, 'I have preached all the way from Jerusalem to Illyricum and as a consequence have fulfilled the gospel of Christ'. Rather he says, 'Christ has used me to bring the Gentiles to faith by signs and wonders performed by the Spirit's power and as a consequence I have fulfilled the gospel of Christ from Jerusalem all the way to Illyricum'. Thus the fulfilling of the gospel of Christ relates in my view more naturally to the proclamation of the gospel with signs and wonders performed by the Spirit than to the geographical limits within which Paul had preached [40]. If this analysis is correct then there is here a clear connection between signs and wonders performed by the Spirit - and these would undoubtedly include healing - and the proclamation of the gospel. This does not mean that the signs and wonders and miracles of healing are a part of the gospel message, but they are an important accompaniment to Paul's proclamation of it. They are a demonstration of Christ's authority and that authority is part of the good news. In that sense, as in Matthew and Luke, they are part of the gospel without being directly linked to the atonement.

This of course is perfectly reasonable when we understand that the gospel comprises a variety of diverse elements. For example, F.F. Bruce, following C.H. Dodd, suggests the following:

"1. the prophecies have been fulfilled and the new age inaugurated by the coming of Christ; 2. he was born into the family of David; 3. he died according to the Scriptures to deliver his people from this evil age; 4. he was buried, and raised again the third day, according to the Scriptures; 5. he is exalted at God's right hand as Son of God, Lord of living and dead; 6. he will come again to judge the world and consummate his saving work" [41].

It seems to me that this is a reasonably accurate summary of the basic elements of the gospel message, although I would have expected at the end of 5 a reference to the gift of the Spirit to the church as a result of Christ's exaltation (cf. Acts 2:33, 38-40). In the light of this my understanding of the relationship between healing and the gospel may now be easily summarised. Healing is directly connected with elements 1, 5, and ultimately 6 of the gospel. During the earthly ministry of Jesus it was part of the good news that the new age had been inaugurated by his coming. Since his death and resurrection, signs and wonders (which include miracles of healing) are granted by the Spirit as evidence of Christ's exaltation [42]. And healing will be a part of the consummation of his saving work in the age to come. Thus healing may rightly be understood to be a part of the gospel and as such is *indirectly* linked with the atonement. There is no suggestion at all, however, that Christ died for our sicknesses in just the same way as he died for our sins [43].

Summary

In this chapter I first considered the relation between healing and salvation. I concluded that the use of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ to mean both 'heal' and 'save' affords no clear evidence that the writers of the New Testament saw physical acts of deliverance like healing as in any sense a part of that deliverance from sin which is so frequently referred to as 'salvation'. It is likely, however, that cases of healing (physical deliverance) were sometimes used as parables of salvation (spiritual deliverance) the significance of which would have been readily appreciated because of the breadth of connotation of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$.

I therefore reject any suggestion that healing is a part of salvation in the sense that healing, like the forgiveness of sins, is understood by some to be 'in the atonement'. But I do not reject the view that healing is in some sense a part of God's overall salvific work and it may rightly be understood to be part of the Christian's ultimate salvation. In short, healing may or may not be correctly viewed as part of salvation depending on which aspect of salvation one is talking about.

And I have drawn a very similar conclusion with regard to the relation between healing and the gospel. Healing may rightly be understood to be a part of those aspects of the gospel message which proclaim the inauguration of a new age with the coming of Christ and his exaltation as Lord at God's right hand. But to say this is not to link healing directly with the atonement.

NOTES

1. The Authorized Version translates σώζω as 'save' 88 times out of 106 occurrences in the New Testament.

2. σώζω is used of being healed or 'made whole' in:

Matthew 9:21-22

Mark 5:23, 28, 34

10:52

Luke 8:36, 48, 50

17:19

18:42

John 11:12

Acts 4:9

14:9.

James 5:15

3. Parr, J.N., *'Divine Healing'*, Springfield, GPH, 1955, p.26.

Cf. pp.40-41 of this thesis.

4. Foerster, σώζω article in TWNT, p. 965.

5. *ibid*, pp.966-968.

6. E.g. πολλοὺς τε σώσαντος ἐγ μεγάλων ἀρρωστιῶν (Ditt. Syll. II, 620, 13f)
ἐσώθη (*ibid* 1173, 9 in a collection of stories of healings by
Aesculapius)

φάρμακον σῶζον (Plut. *Adulat.*, II, 55c).

Foerster, *loc. cit.*, also comments that the many coins with *Salus Augusti* refer to the Emperor's health.

7. Epictetus, *Diss.* III, 23, 11.

8. Plato, *Leg.*, XII, 962a-b.

9. Foerster, *loc. cit.*, p.968.

10. Marshall, I.H., *'Salvation'* article in *New Dictionary of Theology*, (eds. S. B. Ferguson & D. F. Wright), Leicester, IVP, 1988, p. 610.

11. Walters, G., *Salvation* article in *The New Bible Dictionary*, (Ed. J.D.Douglas), London, IVP, 1967, p. 1126.

12. Paul especially uses the σώζω word-group to refer to the relation between God and man. As Foerster comments,

'When Paul is referring to other dangers from which he asks God for deliverance, and receives this from him, he uses ῥύομαι'
(Foerster, *op. cit.* p. 992).

In Luke, however, σώζω carries a much stronger holistic emphasis.
Liefeld comments that

Chapter Seven

'for Luke salvation is not limited to the spiritual realm. His works frequently employ salvation terminology in a secular sense, specifically with reference to healing. There is thus a strong holistic emphasis in Luke' (Liefeld, W.L., *Salvation* article in 'The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia', ed. G.W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1988, Vol. 4., p.292).

cf. p. 206 of this thesis.

I shall later consider the view that salvation may be rightly understood holistically and as such ultimately includes physical healing.
See p. 329ff .

13. It is not my intention to consider the passages where $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ is used to refer to deliverance from physical danger (to which I have already referred on p. 205). However, those who see healing as a part of salvation on the grounds that $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ is used to mean 'heal' must, to be consistent, include deliverance from physical danger on the same grounds. Such a position is of course clearly untenable in the light of NT teaching with regard to Christians who suffer persecution (e.g. 1 Peter, *passim*, Romans 8:35-39, 2 Corinthians 11:23-33).

14. See note 2. Cf. pp. 205-206.

15. Cf. Marshall, I.H., *'The Gospel of Luke'*, Exeter, Paternoster, 1978, who comments (p. 651) that ' $\iota\delta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ demonstrates the meaning of $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ ' here. However he is inconsistent in not making a similar link between $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ and $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ in verses 19 and 17.

16. Cf. Marshall, *op. cit.*, p 651

Manson, W., *'The Gospel of Luke'*, London, Hodder, 1948, p. 196.

Schweizer, however, rejects the view that the lepers' faith is *tested* here although he acknowledges that their action demonstrates their faith.
See:

Schweizer, E., *'The Good News According to Luke'* ET D.E. Green, London, SPCK, 1984, pp. 267-268.

17. E.g.: AV, RSV, Moffatt, Weymouth, Phillips, NAS, NIV, Good News Bible, all use verbs which indicate primarily physical healing. Even the Amplified Bible, which by the use of parenthesis attempts to bring out the variety of shades of meaning in the Greek text, simply translates:

"Your faith [that is, your trust and confidence that spring from your belief in God] has *restored you to health* (my italics)".

18. Betz, H.-D., *'The Cleansing of the Ten Lepers (Luke 17:11-19)'*. *IBL*, 1971, 90, pp. 314-328.

Cf. Marshall, *op. cit.*, pp. 649 and 652.

A similar point is made by Christopher Marshall when discussing the faith of the haemorrhaging woman (Mark 5:24-34) whom he understands to have been healed physically in verse 29 but to have found salvation in verse 34. In a footnote he comments:

"A comparable use of *ἰάσθαι* and *σώζειν* in Lk 17:11-19 provides an interesting parallel. All ten lepers are cleansed; but only one, seeing that he was healed (*ἰάθη*, v15), returns to encounter Jesus again and only then is the term salvation used (*ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε*, v19)"

(Marshall, C.D., *'Faith as a Theme in Mark's Narrative'*, Cambridge, CUP, 1989, p. 109).

19. Marshall, H., op. cit., p. 652.

20. Schweizer, op. cit., pp. 268-269.

21. With reference to Mark 5:34 C.D. Marshall argues that the woman receives more than healing on the basis of 'the eschatological and soteriological import of *σώζειν* elsewhere in the gospel' and the use of *θυγάτηρ* and *ἔκαγε εἰς εἰρήνην* (C.D. Marshall, op. cit. pp. 107-109. Cf. note 18). This, however, ignores in my view the plain sense of *σώζειν* in 5:23 and 6:56 and reads more into the passage than Mark intended. R.A. Cole is more likely to be correct when he states:

"She was already healed, but confession brought the word of assurance from the Master, and a fuller understanding of her own experience. This brought a realisation of the means by which she had entered into this experience (*Thy faith...*), an assurance of God's peace, and a sense of security for the future: confession thus brought to her, not conversion, but assurance. This woman is a good 'type' of healing of the soul" (Cole, R.A., *'Mark'*, London, Tyndale, 1973, p.102).

Taken this way the woman's healing is seen as an illustration of salvation for the benefit of Mark's readers without the implication that she herself received anything more than physical healing. Cf. my comments on p. 214 below.

22. The idea that physical healings may have been illustrative of spiritual blessings may be attested to by Luke's use of *ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε* in Luke 7:50. This logion accounts for no less than six out of the nine references to *σώζω* meaning 'heal' quoted in note 5. Five of the six (Matthew 9:22, Mark 5:34, 10:52, Luke 8:48, 17:19, 18:42) clearly refer to physical healings (the woman with the internal haemorrhage, Bartimaeus, and the leper who returned to give thanks). In Luke 7:50, however, the logion is used with regard to the forgiveness of sins, no miracle of healing having taken place in the context. Commenting on this Foerster remarks that

"The choice of the word (sc. *σώζω*) leaves room for the view that the healing power of Jesus and the saving power of faith go beyond physical life" (Foerster, op. cit. p.990).

Chapter Seven

This not only supports Walters' claim that there is a movement in Scripture from the more physical aspects of σωτηρία towards moral and spiritual deliverance (cf. quote on p. 207) but also lends weight to my view that physical deliverances like healings were seen as illustrative of spiritual deliverance (ie the forgiveness of sins). However, it does not in my opinion support the position that sees physical deliverance as a part of salvation.

23. σώζω is used in Luke 8:36:

ἀπήγγειλεν δὲ αὐτοῖς οἱ ἰδόντες πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς.

RSV translates σώζω as 'heal' here, but perhaps 'deliver' would be more appropriate. Although there may have been physical aspects to his deliverance the suggestion is that his problem was spiritual. However, if σώζω is used here to refer to a 'spiritual' deliverance the case should not be confused with that spiritual deliverance which elsewhere in the NT is synonymous with the forgiveness of sins. At all events the verse cannot legitimately be cited to support the view that physical healing is a part of 'salvation' in the spiritual sense of the word.

24. See note 21.

25. See Carson, D.A., *'Exegetical Fallacies'*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1984, p. 62. Cf. Barr's criticism of Kittel's Theological Dictionary:

Barr, J., *'The Semantics of Biblical Language'*, Oxford, OUP, 1961, pp.206-262.

26. See p. 204 of this thesis.

27. A similar pattern is seen in Acts 2 where the miracle of tongues is used as a stepping-stone to the preaching of the gospel. In my view healing is no more a part of salvation than speaking in tongues.

28. See p. 204 of this thesis. Cf. note 6.

29. See pp. 331ff.

The matter is somewhat simplified when it is remembered that salvation is seen as past and present and future in the New Testament. Christians are those who have been saved (Ephesians 2:5, 8), are being saved (Acts 2:47, 1 Corinthians 1:18, 2 Corinthians 2:15), and who are yet to be saved (Acts 2:21, Romans 13:11, 1 Corinthians 5:5, Hebrews 9:28, 1 Peter 1:15). It is clearly possible to understand healing to be a part of our future salvation without its being always experienced as part of our present salvation.

30. Cf. pp. 111-116 of this thesis.

31. For a summary of Simpson's views see pp 21ff of this thesis.

32. Simpson, op. cit., p. 7.

33. See p. 22 of this thesis.
34. See chapters 4 and 5, especially my summary on p. 154.
35. See pp. 188-191. Mark does occasionally connect κηρύσσω with casting out demons, however. See 1:39, 3:14, 6:12. Note the reference to healing in 6:13.
36. Matthew 4:23, 9:35, 11:5, 24:14, 26:13.
37. See pp. 110-116, esp. p. 114.
38. Luke adopts a similar approach in Acts 8. Philip, described by Luke as an εὐαγγελίστης (Acts 21:8), goes to Samaria and preaches 'Christ' (Acts 8:5). In verse 35 he tells the eunuch the good news of Jesus (εὐαγγελίσσατο αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰησοῦν). Thus for Luke the good news is that Jesus is the Christ, and this is evidenced by his power to heal (vv. 6-7)
39. So Bruce, F.F., *'Romans'*, London, Tyndale, 1963, p. 261.
Cf.:
- Barrett, C.K., *'The Epistle to the Romans'*, London, Black, 1991, p. 253.
Barth, K. *'A Shorter Commentary on Romans'*, London, SCM, 1959, p. 178.
Best, E., *'The Letter of Paul to the Romans'*, Cambridge, CUP, 1967, pp. 167-168.
Black, M., *'Romans'*, London, Oliphants, 1973, p. 176.
Dodd, C.H., *'The Epistle to the Romans'*, London, Hodder, 1954, pp 227-228,
Dunn, J.D.G., *'Romans 9-16'*, Dallas, Word, 1988, p. 863,
Käsemann, E., *'Commentary on Romans'*, London, SCM, 1980, p. 394.
40. Friedrich states that Romans 15:19 'does not mean that Paul has concluded his missionary work, but that the Gospel is fulfilled when it has taken full effect. In the preaching of Paul Christ has shown Himself effective in word and sign and miracle (v.18). Hence the Gospel has been brought to fulfilment from Jerusalem to Illyricum and Christ is named in the communities (v.20)' (Friedrich, G., εὐαγγέλιον article, TDNT, Vol. 2, p. 732).
41. Bruce, F.F., *Gospel* article in *New Dictionary of Theology*, Leicester, IVP, 1988, pp. 278-279. This summary of the gospel is almost identical to the *Kerygma* offered by C.H. Dodd:
- Dodd, C.H., *'The Apostolic Preaching and its Development'*, London, Hodder, 1936, p. 21.
42. 1 Corinthians 1:22 might be interpreted as indicating that Paul viewed with distaste any suggestions that miraculous signs should confirm the gospel message, yet even to the Corinthians whose zeal for such phenomena needed serious correction Paul did not hesitate to write that his message had come in demonstration of the Spirit and power (1 Cor.2:4) and that miracles and healings were gifts granted by the same Spirit (1 Cor. 12:9-10).

Chapter Seven

43. cf. my working definition of healing in the atonement, p.2 of this thesis.

CHAPTER EIGHT: SICKNESS IN RELATION TO SIN, TO SATAN
AND TO SUFFERING

The doctrine that healing is in the atonement clearly implies that there is a relationship between sickness and sin. In the first part of this chapter I shall consider the evidence afforded in the New Testament for the view that sickness is caused by personal sin and for the view that sickness in the world is a result of Adam's sin [1]. If either of these views is to be accepted, what are the effects for the doctrine that healing is in the atonement?

But an alternative explanation for the cause of sickness is also frequently expressed in the New Testament. Sickness is often seen as having been caused by the activity of Satan or of evils spirits. In the second part of this chapter I shall briefly consider whether this might provide some basis for the understanding that healing is in some sense in the atonement.

And closely connected with the question of the cause of sickness is the question of the cause of suffering in general. But the doctrine that healing is in the atonement suggests that sickness is to be distinguished from other forms of suffering in that, if healing is in the atonement then presumably Christians ought not to be sick [2], whereas suffering, in the form of persecution for example, is to be expected by Christians [3]. I shall discuss this matter in the third part of the chapter.

Sickness in Relation to Sin

The doctrine that healing is in the atonement indicates a connection between sickness and sin in that Christ is seen as having carried sickness on the cross just as he carried sin [4]. Although I have hitherto repeatedly rejected this doctrine it seems to me that if it could be shown that New

Testament writers understood personal sin to be the direct cause of personal sickness then there might be here a valid basis for belief in the doctrine. If Christ's death has dealt with a man's sin it might also be understood to have dealt with his sickness [5]. But do New Testament writers suggest that sickness is always caused by personal sin? Or is sickness in the world seen as resulting from Adam's sin [6]? Or is another explanation offered?

The view that personal sickness is caused by personal sin rests largely on the assumption that God sometimes punishes sinners by inflicting them with sickness. In the Old Testament Israel is promised health if she will obey God's commandments (Exodus 15:26) and threatened with disease if she disobeys (Deuteronomy 28:58-60). Cases are recorded where individuals were smitten with leprosy because of their sin (e.g. Miriam in Numbers 12:10, Gehazi in 2 Kings 5:25-27, Uzziah in 2 Chronicles 26:16-21). The Book of Job on the other hand clearly rejects the view that personal sin is necessarily the cause of personal sickness.

And the New Testament appears to reflect a similar ambiguity, for although there are cases where sickness is attributed to personal sin there are also passages which make it clear that the link is by no means inevitable. Jesus' forgiveness of the paralytic (Luke 5:17ff) before restoring him to health may suggest a link in thought between his sickness and his sin [7] as may the exhortation to the man at the Pool of Bethesda:

μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε, ἵνα μὴ χειρὸν σοί τι γένηται (John 5:14) [8].

More explicitly, in Acts Herod is smitten with worms and dies because of his pride (12:21-23) and Elymas is stricken with blindness for resisting the Gospel (13:11). The Corinthians are told that some of them are sick as a result of their

behaviour at the Eucharist (1 Cor. 11:30) [9], and James 5:15 implies that sickness may be connected with sin [10].

Other New Testament passages, however, reveal that the link between sickness and personal sin was by no means thought to be inevitable. The passage in John 9:1ff concerning the healing of the man blind from birth indicates that although sickness was seen to be a result of personal or parental sin (v 2) Jesus denied this assumption in the following verse. Further, the passage in James 5:14ff which implies that sickness may be connected with sin also affords clear evidence that it need not be, for forgiveness is promised to the sick 'If he has committed sins' (v 15).

In short, there is evidence in the New Testament, as there is in the Old, of a view which held that sickness was, at least sometimes, caused by personal sin. There is also clear evidence of a view that sickness was not always so caused. This need not, of course, indicate disharmony between New Testament writers [11], for the two views are not mutually exclusive. Indeed, as I have already indicated, James understood that sickness might be caused by sin but that it need not be, and a comparison of John 5:14 with John 9:1ff suggests a similar position as does a comparison of 1 Corinthians 11:30 with, for example, Galatians 4:13 [12]. Admittedly in Luke's writings there is no clear evidence that sickness may not be caused by sin, but neither do the particular statements about Herod and Elymas (Acts 12:21-23, 13:11) imply that all sickness is so caused. It is certainly possible that Luke held a view similar to that expressed in John, in James, and in the Pauline corpus - that sickness is sometimes, though not always, caused by personal sin.

But of what significance is this for the doctrine that healing is in the atonement? I have already suggested that if personal sin is the cause of a sickness then healing for that

sickness might be seen to be provided for in the atonement [13]. This line of reasoning, however, offers insufficient evidence to establish the doctrine for it merely underlines the fact that it is the forgiveness of sins that is made available through the atonement, the healing of the sickness resulting from the forgiveness of the sin. Thus healing could, at best, be considered to be in the atonement in a secondary sense and this is not what the advocates of the doctrine claim for it for Christ is seen as having carried our sicknesses *just as* he carried our sins [14]. Further, if healing is in the atonement only in the sense that it is provided on the basis that the personal sins that caused it have been atoned for, then clearly those cases where sickness is not caused by personal sin would not be covered by the atonement. In short, such a version of healing in the atonement would be far removed from the understanding of those writers who have promoted the doctrine whose work we have already examined.

If, on the other hand, personal sin is not the cause of a sickness is there any sense in which healing for that sickness might be said to be in the atonement? If, as I have already argued, the suggestion that healing is in the atonement only for those sicknesses that are caused by personal sin is to be rejected and along with it the view that Jesus carried our sicknesses on the cross [15], is there any meaningful sense in which healing might be said to be in the atonement? One possible way forward is to consider the view that sickness in the world is a result of Adam's sin.

The argument for the doctrine that healing is in the atonement which is based on the view that sickness is a result of Adam's sin may briefly be summarised as follows:

Sickness in the world is a result of Adam's sin.

Christ's death on the cross dealt with Adam's sin.

Therefore Christ's death has dealt with the cause of sickness.

Accordingly Christians may expect healing today.

But the final outworking of Christ's victory at Calvary will not be consummated until the Parousia.

Therefore some Christians may not be healed until Christ returns.

Healings experienced today must be seen as 'firstfruits' of the age to come [16].

Although I am in broad agreement with this view it seems clear to me that it is the Spirit, not healing, that is the 'firstfruits' of the age to come [17] and as I have already suggested and will argue again later [18], it is the gift of the Spirit rather than healing that is 'in the atonement'. However, since healing is a gift of the Spirit (1 Corinthians 12:9), healing may be said to be, indirectly at least, in the atonement.

A further difficulty with this view, however, is that it presupposes that sickness in the world is a result of Adam's sin and it is, to say the least, questionable whether the New Testament supports this presupposition which must now be examined in more detail.

George Jeffreys, who acknowledges that

"there is no definite scripture to shew that sickness and disease came into the world as a result of the first Adam's disobedience"

[19]

nevertheless adduces Romans 8:20-21 as evidence that the creation is suffering because of Adam's sin [20] and reaches the conclusion that

Chapter Eight

"Sin, sickness, death, mortality, the curse upon the earth and the bondage of corruption from which the animal creation suffers came into the world as a result of the first Adam's disobedience" [21].

It therefore seems appropriate to examine the passage in question to see whether Jeffreys' conclusion is legitimate. Does Romans 8 indicate that sickness in the world is a result of Adam's sin? To answer this question it is clear that two preliminary questions must be addressed. First, does Paul have in mind in Romans 8 the sin of Adam? And second, does the suffering referred to in this passage include sickness? If the answer to both these questions is affirmative then Jeffreys' conclusion that sickness came into the world because of Adam's sin is valid.

We need spend little time with regard to the first of these questions. There is wide agreement among commentators that Romans 8:20 refers to the Fall [22]. As Cranfield comments:

"The aorist ὑπετάγη refers to a particular event. The use of the passive veils a reference to God. There is little doubt that Paul had in mind the judgment related in Gen. 3.17-19, which includes (v.17) the words 'cursed is the ground for thy sake'" [23].

Thus Paul may be understood to be saying that τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ (v.18) are a result of the curse placed upon creation in Genesis 3:17-19 as a result of Adam's sin. But are we at liberty to understand that sickness is a part of that suffering? I shall discuss in the final part of this chapter whether a valid distinction may be drawn between sickness and other forms of suffering in the New Testament and any conclusion reached at this stage must therefore be provisional. It seems to me, however, that there is no reason to exclude sickness from Paul's use of παθήματα in Romans 8.

His overall emphasis in the passage is that Christians suffer now but in the age to come will share in Christ's glory (vv 17-18). The reason for this suffering is that we live in a world that is under God's curse and we, like the rest of creation, are longing for that future Day when the creation will be set free from its bondage to decay (v 21) and when our bodies will be redeemed (v 23). The scope of Paul's thought in this passage is so vast and the terms of reference so general that it seems inconceivable that one particular form of suffering should be excluded from his thinking. His imagination spans the entire creation and stretches the length of this present age from the Fall whence all suffering results [24] to the Parousia when all suffering will be done away. Meanwhile Christians have the Spirit as the ἀρχή of the age to come (v 23) and live in the knowledge that nothing can separate them from the love of God in Christ (v 29) who loved them enough to die for them (vv 31 and 35). If sickness is not specifically mentioned - though note ἀσθένεια in verse 26 - it is surely covered by the phrase οὔτε τις κτίσις ἔτερά in the final verse of the chapter.

I see no reason, therefore, to exclude sickness from the scope of Paul's thinking in this all-embracing passage. If I am right in drawing this conclusion then Paul did understand sickness to have come from Adam's sin and there may be here a way rightly to understand that healing is, indirectly at least, in the atonement. But this is by no means the healing in the atonement view of the proponents of the doctrine who believe that healing can be claimed immediately because of Christ's work on the cross [25]. This view makes room for healing to be delayed until the Parousia without denying the possibility of healing now through the work of the Spirit.

Chapter Eight

Sickness and Satan

Even if the view that sickness in the world results from Adam's sin is correct, however, it must be borne in mind that this is by no means the only emphasis in the New Testament. Sickness is sometimes understood, particularly by the Synoptists, as the result of the activity of Satan [26] or of evil spirits [27] rather than as the result of sin and although the two views are not mutually exclusive there is in these passages no clear indication that personal sin had opened the door to satanic attack. To take the case in Luke 13 as an example, there is no suggestion that the woman's condition had been caused by her sin; rather, as a 'daughter of Abraham' she had a right to be set free from her long-standing affliction without a moment's delay - without even waiting for the Sabbath day to pass (v.16). Sickness is seen as a bondage from Satan from which Jesus had come to set people free (cf. Acts 10:38).

But how does this understanding affect the doctrine that healing is in the atonement? First, it is clear that the view of healing in the atonement which I have suggested to be acceptable, namely that Christ's death dealt with Adam's sin which may have been understood by Paul at least to be the root cause of sickness in the world, is not undermined by the understanding that sickness is the work of Satan. The latter position need not be seen as an alternative view. It may reasonably be seen as complementary [28]. Second, if sickness is understood to be the work of Satan and his forces, then Christ's death may reasonably be understood to have dealt with sickness if it can be shown to have dealt with Satan [29]. This second possibility must now be briefly explored.

Several verses in the New Testament indicate that by his death Christ is understood to have triumphed over Satan and his forces. Hebrews 2:14 states that Christ partook of human

nature ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὸν διάβολον. Here the devil, as the one 'who had the power of death', is said to be rendered powerless by the death of Christ.

In Revelation 12:9-11 those whom Satan accuses are portrayed as having conquered him διὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀρνίου καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν. The mention of 'the blood of the lamb' is almost certainly a reference to Christ's victory over Satan on the cross into which victory Christians enter by refuting Satan's accusations against them as they testify to the redemptive power of Christ's passion.

Perhaps the most graphic description of Christ's death as a victory over the forces of Satan, however, is Colossians 2:15 where Christ is seen as having disarmed the principalities and powers ranged against the Christian ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ, θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ. The principalities and powers which are seen as the Christian's enemy (cf. Ephesians 6:12) are here said to have been disarmed, made a public example of and triumphed over by Christ's death on the cross in the manner of a Roman triumph [30].

The three passages to which I have just referred, seem to indicate, therefore, that Christ's death was understood by at least some New Testament writers as a triumphant victory over Satan and his forces. But may they legitimately be interpreted as meaning that Christ conquered sickness on the cross? The context of each verse certainly does not suggest this. In Hebrews 2:14 sickness is neither mentioned nor alluded to, but the devil's power over *death* [31]. In Revelation 12:9-11 it is Satan's *accusations*, not the Christians' sicknesses, that are overcome 'by the blood of the lamb' [32]. And in Colossians 2:15 Christ's victory over the principalities and powers is set in the immediate context of

legalistic regulations which are dealt with by the cross (v.14, cf. v.16), and in the wider context of a letter written to a church grappling with a heresy which probably combined the free-thinking Judaism of the Dispersion with the speculative ideas of Greek mystery-religion [33]. Deliverance from sickness is nowhere part of the discussion.

Nevertheless there is no reason to suppose that the writers in question understood Christ's victory over Satan to have been limited to the specific areas they were addressing. If, as seems likely, their understanding was that Christ's victory was total, then these verses may well indicate a wider understanding of that victory. If that be the case then the view that Christ's death dealt with sickness in that by it he conquered Satan who is understood to be the author of sickness is at least credible.

Such a position, however, although it links victory over sickness with Christ's death, is not to be identified with the view that healing is in the atonement. (L.F.W. Woodford [34], for example, adopted a position very close to this and yet he rightly rejected the concept of 'atonement' in relation to sickness [35]). The New Testament does indicate that Satan and his forces are sometimes the cause of sickness. It also indicates that by his death and resurrection Christ won a great victory over Satan and his forces. But it draws no explicit conclusion from this with regard to Christians and sickness.

The theory that Christ's death dealt with sickness in that it dealt with Satan is, therefore, at best at unproven. Nevertheless, since it is likely that the view that sickness was attributable to Satan was held fairly widely, it does not seem improbable that the understanding that Jesus conquered Satan and his forces on the cross carried with it, for some at least, the idea that sickness was also in some way conquered.

However, even if such a theory is to be adopted, two points need to be borne clearly in mind. First, the theory does not in itself lend support to the doctrine that healing is in the atonement, for Woodford at least appears to have held the theory and yet rejected the doctrine. And second, if the theory is correct then Christ's death would deal with those sicknesses caused by Satan. It would not necessarily deal with any sickness that was not.

Sickness and Suffering

The doctrine that healing is in the atonement suggests that sickness is to be distinguished from other suffering in that, if the doctrine is correct, then Christians ought not to be sick, whereas other forms of suffering - persecution for example - are to be expected by Christians [36]. In the remainder of this chapter I shall consider whether such a distinction is made in the New Testament and in this connection it will be convenient briefly to consider the semantic field of the verb *πάσχειν*. In the New Testament, according to P.H. Davids,

".... the vocabulary of suffering is limited to external persecution by persons or demons or to the eschatological judgment of God; in the NT documents it does not include human illness" [37].

However, the distinction here between sickness and other forms of suffering is clearly too rigid. The nature of language is such that vocabulary can rarely be defined as precisely as Davids' analysis demands and Michaelis has shown that from Homer on the *πάσχω* word-group was used to refer generally to an experience of something which has to be suffered [38]. Such suffering included corporal and capital punishment, misfortune, the blows of fate, the disfavour of men or gods, and sickness. Indeed *πάσχω* embraces the multiplicity of

experiences which can overtake a man' [39]. The fact that it is used in the New Testament largely to refer to the sufferings of Christ and to the persecution of Christians by no means precludes the possibility of its referring on occasion to sickness as it clearly does in Matthew 17:15 [40].

Further, to classify the πάσχειν word-group so as to exclude sickness but to include persecution may conveniently allow us to say that it can be God's will for Christians to suffer persecution although it is not his will for them to be sick; but if this argument is followed to its logical conclusion then sicknesses caused by demons or by snake-bite must presumably be categorized along with persecution and considered to be part of God's will for Christians - for πάσχειν is used in both these connections [41] - whereas other forms of sickness are not his will! But this absurd conclusion is only reached by an over-rigid classification of the use of πάσχειν.

Moreover it seems to me that the exclusion of sickness from the semantic field of πάσχειν ignores at least two important passages with which I have already dealt in this thesis. First, if my exegesis of James 5:13-18 is correct [42] the use of κακοπαθέω (v 13) links the κακοπαθία of Job (vv 10-11) whose suffering included sickness with the verb ἀσθενέω (v 14). Second, the distinction between sickness and other forms of suffering excludes sickness from the scope of τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ (Romans 8:18) and, as I have already argued [43], the range of Paul's thought in this passage is so vast, spanning the entire creation and stretching the length of this present age from the Fall to the Parousia, that no form of suffering can be excluded from his thinking.

Finally, such an analysis gives insufficient weight to Paul's 'thorn in the flesh' and to his ἀσθένεια τῆς σαρκὸς in Galatians 4:13-15 which even Davids acknowledges was probably

a sickness [44]. But these are subjects which I shall take up in the next chapter [45].

In conclusion, as far as the subject of this thesis is concerned, it is evident that although the doctrine that healing is in the atonement requires the kind of distinction that Davids has made between sickness and other forms of suffering, nevertheless even if such a distinction is valid it by no means proves that doctrine. Moreover, if the distinction is, as I have suggested, invalid, then the possibility that suffering may be God's will for his people holds serious implications for the doctrine that healing is in the atonement.

Summary

In this chapter I have considered sickness in relation to sin, to Satan and to suffering. With regard to the relation between sickness and sin I concluded from Romans 8 that if Adam's sin may rightly be understood to be the root cause of sickness in the world then Christ's death may be viewed as dealing with sickness in that it dealt with the root cause. Such a view of healing in the atonement, however, differs widely from the position of those who first promoted the doctrine.

With regard to the relation between sickness and Satan I found that although Satan is sometimes seen in the New Testament as the author of sickness and although Christ's death is seen in several passages as having rendered Satan and his forces powerless, in none of the passages in question was sickness a part of the immediate context. Certain passages, however, indicate such a comprehensive victory that it is difficult to see that Satan's power over sickness might not have been understood to have been broken by Christ's triumphant death and resurrection.

Finally, with regard to the relation between sickness and suffering, I have concluded that even if it could be finally shown that sickness must be excluded from the New Testament use of the *πάσχω* word group - an assumption which I have challenged - this would not in itself offer evidence that healing is in the atonement, for although the doctrine requires the distinction, the distinction does not require the doctrine.

In short, the doctrine that healing is in the atonement as taught by its early proponents is not supported by the evidence we have considered. There is room, however, for the possibility that healing may be said to be in the atonement if Christ's death is seen as the antidote to Adam's sin and if Adam's sin is seen to be the cause of sickness. Christ's death may also be understood as a victory over Satan who is also seen as a source of sickness. Both these views associate Christ's death with the conquest of sickness without embracing the fallacious view that Christ carried our sicknesses just as he carried our sins.

Healing & the Atonement

NOTES

1. I shall use the terms 'personal sin' and 'personal sickness' when considering the possibility that a person's sickness may be caused by their own sin. I shall use the term 'sickness in the world' to refer to sickness in general which is seen by some to be a result of Adam's sin (cf. note 6 below) rather than a result of personal sin.
2. See the quote from Gloria Copeland on p. 1 of this thesis.
3. e.g. Matthew 5:10, 1 Peter 1:6, 2:20ff., 3:17, 4:14, 16, 19.
4. See my working definition on p. 2 of this thesis.
5. However, this is not the basis on which healing is generally understood to be in the atonement. Advocates of the doctrine support it by references to verses such as Matthew 8:17 and 1 Peter 2:24 which they interpret to mean that Christ dealt with sickness on the cross. (For my rejection of this view see chapters 4 and 5 of this thesis). Thus Christ's sickness-bearing is linked with his sin-bearing because both took place on the cross, not because sin is seen as the cause of sickness. Osborn, for example, in a chapter entitled "Why Christians are Sick" nowhere suggests that sin might be the cause. Rather his emphasis is that if Christians only understood that Christ had substitutionarily borne their sicknesses on the cross as he had borne their sins they would be healed (Osborn, T.L., *'Healing the Sick'*, Tulsa, Osborn, 1961, pp. 147-156).
6. For the view that sickness in the world is a result of Adam's disobedience, see the quotation from George Jeffreys on p. 55 of this thesis. Cf. p. 233.
7. The context, however, does not demand such an interpretation. The passage is, in my view, better understood as illustrating the priority of forgiveness than as indicating that sickness may be caused by sin.
8. However, note Brown's comment that elsewhere Jesus does not accept the thesis that because a man was sick it was a sign that he had committed sins. See:

Brown, R. E., *'The Gospel According to John (1-xii)'*, New York, Doubleday, 1966, p. 208.

Brown does accuse the man of 'persistent naïvety' (ibid p.209), (e.g. his failure to ask Jesus' his name, and his reporting him to the Jews), but rejects (rightly in my view) the suggestion of Theodore of Mopsuestia (*In Jo.* [Syriac] CSCO 116:73) that the latter action was tantamount to treachery. (The sin to which Jesus refers in verse 14 can hardly be that of informing on Jesus to the Jewish authorities, for prior to this verse the man did not know Jesus' name. It was after the command to stop sinning that he informed the Jews that it was Jesus who had cured him - v.15).

9. Cf. my discussion of this passage, pp 173-178 of this thesis.
10. Cf. my discussion of this passage, pp 178-188 of this thesis.
See also my comment on p. 240.
11. Harmony of doctrine among NT writers must not, of course, be presupposed.
12. See my comments in Chapter 9 with regard to this passage. Cf. in the same chapter my comments with regard to Trophimus, Epaphroditus and Timothy. Taken along with 2 Corinthians 12:7 these passages make clear that Paul did not understand all sickness to result from personal sin.
13. See p. 229.
14. See p. 2 of this thesis.
15. See my discussion of Matthew 8:17 and 1 Peter 2:24 in Chapters 4 and 5.
16. I have already outlined several different versions of this view. See my discussion of the contributions made by:

Gee, pp. 44-49 (esp. p. 46)
Woodford, pp. 49-53 (esp. p. 52)
Jeffreys, pp. 54-62 (esp. the chart on p. 55)
Parker, pp. 62-65.
17. Romans 8:23. My interpretation is based on the understanding that the genitive τοῦ πνεύματος here is possessive denoting the Holy Spirit himself. However, note Cranfield's preference for the appositive indicating not the Spirit himself but his present work in the believer. Cranfield acknowledges, nevertheless, that both views 'yield substantially the same sense' (Cranfield, C.E.B., *The Epistle to the Romans*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1977, Vol. 1, p. 418).
18. See my comments on Galatians 3:14 on p. 173.
See also pp. 345ff.
19. Jeffreys, G., *Healing Rays*, London, Elim, 1932, p 19.
20. *ibid*, p. 16.
21. *ibid*, p. 37.
22. E.g. Best, *op. cit.*, pp. 97-98
Black, *op. cit.*, pp. 121-122
Bruce, F.F., *Romans*, London, Tyndale, 1963, p. 169
Cranfield, C.E.B., *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 413
Davidson, F. and Thompson, G.T., *Romans* article in *The New Bible Commentary*, London, IVF, 1961, p. 954.
Dillistone, F.W., *The Christian Understanding of Atonement*, London, SCM, 1984, pp. 40-41
Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 134
Dunn, J.D.G., *Romans 1-8*, Dallas, Word, 1988, p. 469.
Käsemann, *op. cit.* p. 233

Healing & the Atonement

Sanday W. and Headlam A.C., *'The Epistle to the Romans'*, Edinburgh,
T & T Clark, 1977, Vol. 1, p. 208.

Williams, N.P., *'The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin'*, London,
Longmans, Green & Co., 1929, 157-159.

However, cf. Barth, op. cit., p. 100, who sees v. 20 as a reference to
the cross:

"Jesus Christ in his death..... has pronounced and executed this
verdict".

See also:

Christoffersson, O., *'På jakt efter den rätter bakgrunden till Rom
8:18ff'* (Stalking the Real Background to Rom 8:18ff), *SvenskExegArs* 50,
'85, pp. 135-143. Christoffersson argues that although most exegetes
(rightly) assume a Jewish apocalyptic background and bring Adam's fall
into the picture, a more likely background to Paul's text is the Noah
tradition (Genesis 6-9) particularly as it is presented in 1 Enoch 6-12.
Cf. N.P. Williams, op. cit., pp 20-35.

23. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 413.

24. However, see Christofferson's view in note 22 above.

25. See, for example, pp 1-2, 18-24, 33-34 of this thesis.

26. e.g. Luke 13:16, Acts 10:38. Cf. note 27 below.

27. Although a distinction is made between demonization and sickness (Matthew
4:24) sickness is sometimes attributed to the work of spirits - e.g.
Matt. 12:22, blindness and dumbness; Mark 9:17, dumbness; Mark 9:25,
deafness and dumbness; Luke 13:11, curvature of the spine. This last
case is noteworthy in that the condition is attributed to both a 'spirit
of infirmity' (v.11) and to 'Satan' (v.16). Presumably the spirit is
seen as an agent of Satan. Cf. also Luke 7:21 where Luke uses *θεραπεύω*
in connection with evil spirits.

On the relationship between exorcisms and healings Theissen comments:

"Only a few exegetes regard exorcisms as an independent theme. It is
held to be difficult to separate them from healings, since here too
demons are regarded as the cause of disease. Nevertheless a distinction
is necessary".

Theissen, G., *'Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition'*, ET
Francis McDonagh, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1983, p. 85.

See also:

Böcher, O., *'Dämonenfurcht und Dämonenabwehr, Ein Beitrag zur
Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe'*, *BWANT* 10, Stuttgart und Berlin,
1970, whose work Theissen (loc. cit.) criticises on the grounds that:

Chapter Eight

"Böcher interprets as demonic almost anything which has any analogy with something which can obviously be regarded as demonic. The result is that exorcisms and healings can no longer be distinguished".

28. If Adam's sin is seen as a surrender to Satan (Genesis 3:1-19) - assuming the serpent to refer to Satan (cf. Revelation 12:9) - the understanding that sickness comes from Adam's sin may well be harmonised with the view that sickness is caused by Satan.
29. Gustav Aulén draws attention to the 'dramatic' view of the atonement which sees Christ's death as a cosmic drama in which God in Christ does battle with the powers of evil and gains victory over them. He claims that this was 'the ruling idea of the Atonement for the first thousand years of Christian history'.

Aulén, G., *'Christus Victor'*, London, SPCK, 1931, pp. 22-23.

cf. Leivestad, R., *'Christ the Conqueror'*, London, SPCK, 1954, pp. 102-104

For an alternative view see:

Carr, W., *'Angels and Principalities'*, Cambridge, CUP, 1981, pp. 47-85, 93-111, 122, 174-177. Cf. note 30.

30. Carr, however, (ibid pp. 52-66) rejects this interpretation of Colossians 2:15 arguing that τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας are not demons but angels. He paraphrases (p. 65) the passage as follows:

'He obliterated our autographed self-condemnation
(together with all our damning decisions on it)
He has removed it once and for all;
He nailed it to the cross.
He laid aside his battledress (his flesh);
He publicly paraded his army of the heavenly host;
He, there on the cross, led them in his triumphal procession'.

His exegesis depends, however, on the rejection of Ephesians 6:12 (which depicts the 'principalities and powers' as enemies of the Christian) as a later interpolation (ibid pp. 104-110).

31. Commenting on this passage Bruce cites the Wisdom of Solomon 1:13, 2:23-24 and observes:

'These quotations do not amount to a statement that the devil "had the power of death", but they come very near to it. Jesus broke the devil's grip on His people when in death He became the death of death'

(Bruce, F.F., *'The Epistle to the Hebrews'*, London, Marshall, 1971; p.50)

Cf. Montefiore, H.W., *'A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews'*, London, Black, 1964, p. 65 where the same passages in the Wisdom of Solomon are cited.

Healing & the Atonement

Attridge points out that

"The imagery evokes the depiction of the Messiah's victory over demonic forces widespread in Jewish apocalyptic tradition and in early Christianity. This general tradition frequently becomes specified as a victory over death in Christian sources"

(Attridge, H.W., *'The Epistle to the Hebrews'*, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1989, p. 92).

Neil, however, appears to connect Christ's victory over Satan manifested in his healing ministry with Christ's victory over Satan on the cross when he comments:

"Jesus..... had come as God's Messiah to do battle with Satan and he regarded his healing of men's bodies and minds as signs that the power of God was stronger than that of the Devil....."

The conviction of the Church was that in principle Satan had been defeated. Evil still flourished in the world and would fight for the mastery until the final victory of Christ, when he would reign supreme..... But victory was assured since Christ had by his resurrection wrested the power of death from Satan's hands. The death of the body, epitomizing all the pain and suffering of mankind..... was the thralldom from which Christ had delivered men".

(Neil, W., *'The Epistle to the Hebrews'*, London, SCM, 1955, p. 42).

However, at no point does Neil identify Christ's victory on the cross as a victory over sickness. His comments do, nevertheless, provide a possible basis for believing that at least some early Christians may have understood Christ's death as a victory over all Satan's power, including that of sickness. If this be the case, however, the final outworking of that victory must be seen as awaiting the Parousia as Neil's comments suggest.

32. See Beasley-Murray, G.R., *'The Book of Revelation'*, London, Oliphants, 1974, pp. 203-204.

Cf. Kiddle, M., *'The Revelation of St. John'*, London, Hodder, 1947, pp. 230-234

Caird, G.B., *'The Revelation of St. John the Divine'*, London, Black, 1966, pp. 152-156

Sweet, J., *'Revelation'*, London, SCM, 1979, pp. 201-202.

33. The difficulties in identifying the heresy at Colossae are notorious. For a sample and methodological critique of major views see:

Francis, F.O. and Meeks, W.A., (Eds), *'Conflict at Colossae'*, Missoula, University of Montana, -1975, passim

Chapter Eight

where the contributions of Lightfoot, Dibelius, Bornkamm, and Lyonnet are reprinted.

See also:

Martin, R.P., *'Colossians and Philemon'*, London, Oliphants, 1974, pp. 8-22, 80-88. Martin argues that the heresy at Colossae appears to have resulted from the free-thinking Judaism of the dispersion and the speculative ideas of Greek mystery religion. This fusion produced a syncretism which was a deadly danger to the incipient church. Paul's answer, he argues, is to present the Lordship of Christ (1:18, 2:10) and to neutralize the power of the στοιχεῖα (2:8, 20) as immortal lords of creation existing in their own right who as astrological tyrants laid claim to control men's lives as the playthings of fate. 2:15 is thus understood as a statement of Christ's victory over the στοιχεῖα.

Cf. Caird, G.B., *'Principalities and Powers'*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1956, pp. 86, 92.

However, cf. Carr's view - see note 30. For a rebuttal of Carr's view see:

Tan, J.H., *'Principalities and Powers in Pauline Literature'*, Aberdeen, MTh Thesis, 1990

Cf. Stott, J.R.W., *'The Cross of Christ'*, Leicester, IVP, 1986, pp. 227-239

Twelftree, G., *'Christ Triumphant - Exorcism then and now'*, London, Hodder, 1985, pp. 91, 133, 149, 176, 192, 210. Twelftree sees Paul as having 'widened the demonic beyond the scope of certain types of illness to include even the evil of men's design' (ibid p. 133).

34. See my extensive quotes from Woodford's paper on pp. 49-53 of this thesis.
35. See p. 52 and note 89 on p. 75. Woodford also stressed the resurrection rather than the cross as the scene for Christ's victory (cf. p. 52 of this thesis) although he did see the cross and resurrection as inseparably linked (cf. p. 50). For Woodford the death and resurrection of Christ had a wider significance than atonement for sin, a significance 'touching God's creation at all points' (ibid, p. 51.) He saw disease and sickness as 'elements in a world of corruption' which, by his death and resurrection, Christ has conquered (ibid p 53). Thus although sickness is not dealt with by the atonement (for the atonement deals with sin) it is nevertheless 'conquered' by Christ's death and resurrection. But although he acknowledged that Satan and his forces are also similarly conquered he nowhere made explicit the connection between Satan and sickness. It is, therefore, not entirely clear whether he understood Christ's death to have dealt with sickness on the grounds that it dealt with Satan. However the fact that, in a paper on *Healing and the Atonement*, he stressed so strongly Christ's victory over both Satan and sickness may well suggest that he saw some connection. But it is possible

Healing & the Atonement

that Woodford refused to be explicit on this matter because he saw that the New Testament is by no means explicit.

It is perhaps noteworthy that Woodford's argument *distinguishes* between Christ's victory from the atonement whereas Aulén (cf. note 29) understands that victory to be the atonement. In Chapter 10 I shall argue that 'atonement' has acquired a wider connotation than its narrow definition of *at-one-ment*. Victory over the powers of evil may, therefore, be understood as at best an aspect of the atonement.

36. Cf. Notes 1 and 2.

37. Davids, P.H., *'The First Epistle of Peter'*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1990, p. 37.

Davids argues further (pp 30-44) that Christians are encouraged to endure persecution, but never to endure illness. James 5:13-18 indicates that Christians who suffer are to pray (for strength, endurance, and the coming of Christ) whereas those who are sick are to call for the elders whose prayer of faith will lead to healing. Davids acknowledges that even the New Testament Christians did not see 100% success in praying for the sick but nevertheless argues that illness is to be met with prayer and the expectation of healing whereas persecution is to be met with endurance.

Davids accounts for the shift in the Church's thinking which he understands to have taken place over the centuries by drawing attention to the reduction in the level of persecution on the one hand and the lessening of healing-gifts on the other. Thus suffering for the faith came to be identified with illness and illness was seen to be the will of God since he did not see fit to heal. This was accompanied by an increase in the influence of Platonism which saw the suffering of the body as a means of purifying the body from the evils of the flesh. With the consequent lack of expectation of miracles of healing in the Church the healing passages in the New Testament came to be interpreted in terms of the soul. The need today is to recapture the biblical tension.

38. Michaelis, W., *πρόσω* article in TWNT pp 904-905.

39. *ibid*, loc. cit., cf. pp 926-927.

40. Davids excludes it on the grounds that the illness is attributed to a demon. But such an exclusion is surely unwarranted in the light of the widely held view that many sicknesses were caused by demons. This is highlighted by the fact that the epileptic sufferer out of whom the demon was cast in the case in question was perceived to need *healing* as the use of *θεραπεύω* in the following verse suggests. Cf. notes 26 & 27.

41. With regard to illness caused by demons see note 27 above.
With regard to illness caused by snake-bite see Acts 28:5.

42. See my discussion of this passage, pp 178-187 of this thesis, esp. p 181.

43. Cf. p 234.

Chapter Eight

44. Davids, *op. cit.*, p.39, footnote 59,

45. See Chapter Nine.

CHAPTER NINE: SICK CHRISTIANS AND THE ART OF MEDICINE
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The doctrine that healing is in the atonement suggests, and indeed several of the proponents of the doctrine have taught, that Christians who become sick should not continue to be so and should not need to resort to medical remedies for their healing [1]. The New Testament, however, despite the many miraculous healings that are recorded, also appears to make reference to Christians who were sick and who do not seem to have found immediate supernatural healing. These include, notably, the apostle Paul himself [2], and others such as Trophimus [3], Epaphroditus [4], and Timothy [5]. In this chapter I shall consider these cases and conclude with a discussion of a closely related theme, the New Testament church's attitude to the practice of medicine.

The Weakness and Thorn in Paul's Flesh

In Galatians 4:13 Paul writes:

οἶδατε δὲ ὅτι δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν τὸ πρότερον

and in 2 Corinthians 12:7 he speaks of a σκόλω τῇ σαρκί which had been given him ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι.

For the purpose of my present discussion I shall refer to the ἀσθένεια referred to in Galatians 4:13 as Paul's 'weakness' and to the σκόλω in 2 Corinthians 12:7 as his 'thorn'. The discussion will centre around whether the thorn may be identified with the weakness, and whether either the thorn or the weakness may be understood to have been a sickness.

According to Plummer 'it is commonly assumed' that Paul's weakness may be identified with his thorn [6]. Certainly Luther appears to have identified them understanding both the weakness and the thorn as Paul's persecutions [7]. However, the majority of modern commentators are more cautious acknowledging that although such an identification is natural we are too ill-informed to be certain [8]. In the light of this uncertainty I shall not prolong the discussion further but will deal with the passages separately making no assumption about the identification of Paul's weakness and his thorn [9].

With regard to Galatians 4:13 the majority of commentators are agreed that Paul's weakness was a sickness although there is little agreement as to what that sickness was [10]. Ridderbos, however, appears to follow Luther in understanding Paul's weakness to have resulted from the persecutions described in Acts 14:19ff arguing that it refers

"not to a particular disease or ailment, but to an exhausted and weakened condition owing to the molestation that he had undergone" [11].

But even if Paul's persecutions are seen as the cause of his weakness that does not preclude the possibility that the weakness was a sickness. This possibility is acknowledged by Longenecker when he states that

"modified by τῆς σαρκὸς ('of the flesh')..... it (sc. ἀσθένεια) certainly refers to a physical weakness - ie a 'sickness' or 'illness'"

and then adds that

Healing & the Atonement

"Perhaps that illness was a result of one or more of the afflictions mentioned in 2 Corinthians 11:23-25: frequent imprisonments, severe floggings....." [12].

But whatever the cause of Paul's weakness might have been its effects were undeniably physical as the use of σάρξ in this context clearly indicates [13]. Paul's ἀσθένεια τῆς σαρκὸς was a physical weakness or sickness which may or may not have been caused by his persecutions. And whatever it was, his purpose in referring to it was to appeal to the Galatians' loyalty to him reminding them that although his physical condition had been such a trial to them when he had first preached the Gospel to them they had nevertheless received him as God's messenger (v.14). Clearly either interpretation would fit this context and it would be unwise to be dogmatic as to the precise nature of that weakness or sickness. In short, we cannot be sure that it was a sickness rather than a weakness (or vice versa).

But does this matter? For the rigid adherent to the doctrine that healing is in the atonement it clearly does. This is demonstrated by T.L. Osborn's reaction to the suggestion that Paul's weakness might have been a sickness, for, for Osborn:

"Paul's alleged sickness (?) would contradict so much of Bible truth" [14].

This statement is followed by a series of rhetorical questions all prefaced by the clause 'If Paul was sick.....' clearly revealing that for Osborn, if Paul had been sick, he could not have enjoyed the 'fulness of the blessing of the Gospel' (Romans 15:29), the people of Ephesus could not have received faith for 'special miracles' (Acts 19:11-12), the cripple at Lystra would not have had faith to be healed (Acts 14:8), and Paul could not have made the Gentiles obedient by signs and wonders by the power of the Spirit (Romans 15:18-19) [15].

Thus, for Osborn, his entire structure of belief in divine healing is undermined if it can be shown that Paul was sick. This illustrates what a shaky foundation the doctrine is built on, for although we cannot say with certainty that Paul was sick, Galatians 4:13 gives an extremely strong indication that he may have been. It also shows how doctrinal bias can cloud objectivity and predetermine the exegesis of a particular text, for without a doctrine which asserts that Christians can always claim immediate healing for their sicknesses, probably the most natural way to read the verse in question is to understand that Paul was sick [16].

Finally, it is worth pointing out that those who promote the doctrine that healing is in the atonement adopt an extremely literalist approach to Scripture. 'Promises' such as Matthew 8:17 and 1 Peter 2:24 are to be 'claimed' by faith [17]. Given that this is so the claim that ἀσθένεια in Galatians 4:13 refers to a weakness and not a sickness fails to resolve the difficulty for the advocates of the doctrine, for in Matthew 8:17 Christ is said to have borne our ἀσθένειας! If this verse is to be claimed as the advocates of the doctrine say that it should be claimed [18] we may well ask why Paul did not claim deliverance from his ἀσθένεια. We can only assume that he was ignorant of the doctrine! But we must now turn to the subject of his thorn.

In 2 Corinthians 12:7 Paul writes:

διὸ ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι, ἐδόθη μοι σκόλον τῇ σαρκί, ἄγγελος σατανᾶ, ἵνα με κολαφίζῃ, ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι.

This statement is set in the context of Paul's defense of his apostolate against the claims of those he calls ψευδαπόστολοι (11:13). If these men are διάκονοι Χριστοῦ (11:23), he Paul is more so because of the abundant labours and frequent persecutions which he recounts (11:23-33). In the opening

verses of Chapter 12. Paul reluctantly (v.5) speaks of the 'visions and revelations' (v.1) he has received and informs his readers that it is because of these that he has been given a σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί to keep him from being excessively exalted (v.7). But how is this 'thorn' to be understood?

As I have already pointed out, the suggestion that Paul may have been sick causes considerable difficulty for advocates of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement [19]. The view which sees Paul's thorn as a sickness given by God is, therefore, strongly resisted [20] the proponents of the doctrine aligning themselves with the position of those who understand the thorn to refer to Paul's opponents. As Martin has pointed out [21] this position is endorsed by four facts. First, the phrase ἄγγελος Σατανᾶ could well refer to a person since 'it appears that Paul does not use ἄγγελος except to refer to a person'. Second, the 'thorn' may well be rightly understood to be personal on the grounds that chapters 10-13 describe Paul's fight against his adversaries. Third, the use of κολαφίζειν may be taken to refer to beating about the head, and finally, in the LXX we find σκόλοψ associated with opponents of Israel (Numbers 33:55, Ezekiel 23:24).

Further, it is by no means certain that τῇ σαρκί should be read as a locative dative. Tasker [22] and Plummer [23] understand it as a *dativus incommodi* or dative of disadvantage and interpret σάρξ as referring to Paul's lower nature ("Why omit ἐν if 'in the flesh' is intended? [24]"). The thorn is thus *for* the flesh rather than *in* it and as such could mean the 'painful experiences which pierce this (sc. lower) nature from without' [25] rather than a sickness.

Despite this evidence, however, the view that Paul's thorn was a sickness should not be entirely discounted. Satan is associated with illness in biblical tradition (Job 2:5, Luke 13:16) and it does not seem inappropriate for a sickness to be

described as a messenger of Satan. Not all the difficulties Paul faces in chapters 10-13 need have been inflicted by personal agency [26] and therefore the thorn need not be understood to be a person. Indeed, it is questionable whether Paul would have asked the Lord to take it away (12:8) if the thorn referred to human opposition [27]. The dative τῇ σαρκί could be locative and, as Hughes has pointed out, if Paul had intended σάρξ to refer to the lower nature here we might have expected him to have contrasted it with some reference to the Spirit [28].

But all this is extremely inconclusive and as Martin comments:

"The exact meaning of the thorn remains elusive. No one has ever yet given an interpretation that is generally accepted" [29].

Yet this uncertainty does not mean that nothing may be learned from the passage [30]. Paul's thorn clearly represents suffering in some shape or form and whatever its precise nature there are lessons to be learned that may well be of value to Christians in circumstances far different from Paul's and yet undergoing a form of suffering for which the lessons of Paul's thorn may seem entirely appropriate [31]. Thus even if Paul's thorn was not a sickness - and in my view, on balance, it probably was not - the principles taught in the passage may certainly be applied in cases where a Christian's sickness has not been healed in response to persistent and believing prayer.

But such a position is unthinkable for those who hold that healing from sickness may always be immediately claimed because it is in the atonement. Here, as with the passage in Galatians 4:13, it is vital for the proponents of the doctrine that Paul be shown not to have been sick. Yet once again [32] the problem for the literalist lies in the use of ἀσθένεια for

if Christ has really carried our ἀσθένεια (Matthew 8:17) how can Paul say that he glories in them (2 Corinthians 12:9)?

In summary, therefore, neither Paul's weakness nor his thorn can be adduced as *conclusive* evidence that Paul was sick. But the proponents of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement can take little comfort from this, for the fact that both Galatians 4 and 2 Corinthians 12 refer so explicitly to Paul's ἀσθένεια(ς) must shed serious doubt on the interpretation they place on Matthew 8:17 where Jesus is said to have carried our ἀσθένεια.

But even if Paul himself may not have been sick, there is clear evidence that some of his companions were and this evidence must now be considered.

Trophimus, Epaphroditus, and Timothy

The evidence for the sickness of Trophimus, Epaphroditus and Timothy is very easily provided. 2 Timothy 4:20 states that Paul left Trophimus ill at Miletus. Philippians 2:27 reveals that Epaphroditus had been extremely ill, indeed he had nearly died, but 'the Lord had mercy on him'. 1 Timothy 5:23 refers to Timothy's 'frequent illnesses' and recommends the taking of a little wine as a remedy. However, as I have already shown [33], the doctrine that healing is in the atonement means for some of its proponents at least that Christians need not be sick, and the evidence of the passages to which I have just referred might, therefore, be expected to occasion them some difficulty.

The majority of writers who hold the doctrine, however, appear either to ignore the problem of these verses [34], or to deal with them trivially. In the case of Epaphroditus we are simply reminded that the passage records his healing, as well as his sickness and in the case of Trophimus we are told that

he *may* have been healed eventually, that not all healings are instantaneous and that he himself may have been to blame for his illness or lack of faith [35]. As far as Timothy is concerned both Jeter and Yeomans make use of the passage to remind the reader that the instruction to take a little wine is no excuse for drinking to excess but completely fail to address the problem posed by Timothy's 'frequent illnesses' [36]. Of the writers who uphold the doctrine only Donald Gee has offered any serious attempt to discuss the problems posed by these cases of Paul's sick colleagues and his writing seems to be more an attempt to modify the doctrine than to defend it [37].

In this section, therefore, I shall attempt to show why these three cases pose, in my view, serious problems for the doctrine that healing is in the atonement, problems which to the best of my knowledge remain unanswered by the advocates of the doctrine.

Turning first to the case of Epaphroditus, the passage makes it abundantly clear that he was sick:

καὶ γὰρ ἠσθένησεν παραπλήσιον θανάτῳ (Philippians 2:27)

Indeed, as Silva points out [38], Paul stresses the seriousness of Epaphroditus' condition three times, by the use of καὶ γὰρ, by the phrase παραπλήσιον θανάτῳ, and, in verse 30, by μέχρι θανάτου ἤγγισεν - he was indeed sick, he was close to death, he came near to death.

But that he was sick is not disputed by the advocates of the doctrine. They simply - or perhaps we might say, simplistically - point out that Epaphroditus was healed. Yet this 'explanation' ignores two major facts. First, it ignores the significance of the clause

ἀλλὰ ὁ θεὸς ἡλέησεν αὐτόν (v.27).

Far from implying that Epaphroditus 'claimed' his healing in the manner advocated by the proponents of the doctrine this clause clearly indicates that the source of his healing was God's gracious mercy. Nothing else is said about what caused the healing. There is no suggestion that Paul could command his friend's recovery. There is no mention of faith or prayer or the laying on of hands or the anointing with oil. Rather, as Collange comments,

"ce qui importe à l'apôtre n'est pas la guérison en elle-même mais son sens. Il y distingue un acte souverain et miséricordieux de Dieu lui-même" [39].

And Hawthorne, having quoted Collange, adds:

"In other words, Paul views Epaphroditus' recovery as the direct merciful intervention of God which not only spared a devoted servant for the work of the gospel, but which also spared himself, Paul, the pain of bereavement added to the pain of suffering with a much loved friend during his illness. God thus delivered Paul from 'wave upon wave of grief' (λύπην ἐπὶ λύπην)" [40].

Second, in offering the simple explanation that Epaphroditus was healed the proponents of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement appear to ignore the plain implication of the passage that Epaphroditus was not healed immediately. This in itself must pose a major problem for a doctrine which insists that Christians need not be sick and that if they are healing should be claimed immediately by faith. But this leads us on to the case of Trophimus.

2 Timothy 4:20 simply states

Τρόφιμον δὲ ἀπέλιπον ἐν Μιλήτῳ ἀσθενοῦντα [41].

But if healing is readily available and may be claimed by faith in the 'promise' that Christ has already carried our sicknesses, then why didn't Trophimus claim it? It is surely unthinkable that, if the doctrine had existed at the time and if Paul had been aware of it, one of his companions should be ignorant of it. But perhaps Trophimus himself was to blame for his illness or simply lacked faith for healing [42]. Yet such an assumption is completely gratuitous. As Gee has pointed out:

"Those who want, somehow or other, to fit in this verse about the illness of Trophimus with their own doctrines of Divine healing are tempted to assert that he MUST have failed somewhere. But that is the worst possible way of interpreting the Scriptures. There is nothing whatever in the statement, or in its context, to suggest anything spiritually or morally wrong about Trophimus" [43].

And the alternative explanation, that Trophimus may have been healed later (with the corollary that not all healings are instantaneous) [44] really fares no better. First because there is no statement that Trophimus was healed later, and second, because the defense that not all healings are instantaneous really will not do. If we adopt a 'long-term' view of healing in the atonement [45] we may consistently adopt this explanation, but for those who insist that sickness has been carried by Christ and that, therefore, healing may be claimed by faith immediately [46] there clearly can be no recourse to it.

Finally, before turning from the case of Trophimus, it is important to draw attention to one further implication of the statement that Paul left Trophimus at Miletus sick. Miracles

of healing are not at the command of those who perform them.
As Vine comments

"This (sc. Paul's leaving Trophimus sick) may seem somewhat strange, considering the Apostle possessed the gift of healing (see Acts 19:11,12; 28:8). While such supernatural gifts were bestowed to confirm the work of the gospel, there were limitations as to its exercise. The Apostles' use of the gift was not directed by their own wishes. They were acting simply as the Lord's servants and their power was controlled by their Master, and not by their personal affections or desires. The healing was accomplished by faith, but faith-healing was not practised as an art" [47].

Thus the simple brief statement that Paul left Trophimus sick at Miletus implies that healing could be demanded neither by Trophimus nor by Paul. Indeed, according to Paul, healing like other spiritual gifts is at the discretion of the Spirit [48].

And Paul's inability to use his healing gifts at his own discretion is further attested by his recommendation that Timothy take a little wine for the sake of his stomach and his frequent illnesses:

Μηκέτι ὑδροπότηι, ἀλλὰ οἶνον ὀλίγον χρῶ διὰ τὸν στόμαχον καὶ τὰς πυκνάς σου ἀσθενείας (1 Timothy 5:23).

This verse, like those concerning Epaphroditus and Trophimus, in my view poses unsurmountable difficulties for those who argue that healing can be claimed on the basis that it has been provided in the atonement. I have already drawn attention to the view that Trophimus may have been in some way to blame for his own sickness and agreed with Gee that such an explanation must be rejected for want of evidence [49]. And any attempt to argue in similar fashion with regard to

Timothy's frequent illnesses must be rejected on the same grounds. Indeed if the illness were Timothy's fault we might have expected Paul to say so and to encourage him to rectify the matter accordingly. Instead he offers a medicinal solution.

Further, if Paul had understood healing to be in the atonement, why did he not encourage Timothy to claim his healing as would the advocates of the doctrine today? Again, his offer of a natural remedy seems to preclude the possibility of his having any understanding of such a doctrine. Indeed, when we bear in mind the view of the early proponents of the doctrine which opposed the use of medicine on the grounds that medical means are unnecessary if healing is in the atonement [50], this verse reduces the doctrine to absurdity. But this leads us into our next section, the New Testament attitude to the art of medicine.

The Art of Medicine in the New Testament

I have already drawn attention to the fact that several of the proponents of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement have taught that Christians should not need to resort to medical remedies for their healing [51]. Indeed, if Christians can claim immediate healing on the grounds that Christ has already carried their sicknesses for them, then the use of medicine is clearly unnecessary. If, on the other hand, it can be shown that New Testament writers adopt a positive attitude towards the medical profession and on occasion advocate or endorse the use of medical remedies for Christians who are sick, then this in itself must call into question the doctrine that healing is provided in the atonement. In attempting to assess the attitude of New Testament writers to the use of medicine I shall consider first those passages where the medical profession might be

understood to be spoken of negatively and, second, those passages where it is referred to positively.

Mark 5:25-26 is perhaps the most negative reference with regard to the medical profession to be found in the New Testament:

καὶ γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος δώδεκα ἔτη καὶ πολλὰ παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν καὶ δοπανήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ὠφεληθεῖσα ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα....

This aspect of the story, which is entirely omitted by Matthew (cf. Matthew 9:18-26), is considerably softened by Luke:

Καὶ γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα, ἥτις ἰατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ἀπ' οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι... (Luke 8:43) [52].

Luke simply states that although the woman had spent everything she had on doctors none of them had been able to heal her. Mark however emphasises that she had *suffered* at the hands of the doctors and instead of getting better had actually become worse!

Lane points out that what she might have experienced may be estimated from the Talmud which has preserved a record of the medicines and treatments applied to an illness of this nature [53]. One remedy consisted of drinking a goblet of wine containing a powder compounded from rubber, alum and garden crocuses. Another treatment consisted of a dose of Persian onions cooked in wine administered with the summons, 'Arise out of your flow of blood!' Other physicians prescribed sudden shock, or the carrying of the ash of an ostrich's egg in a certain cloth [54].

But was it Mark's intention to be critical of the medical profession? This is certainly one way of understanding his statement [55], but it is by no means the only way. A second possibility would be to understand Mark as criticising the particular doctors who treated the woman but as not condemning the medical profession as a whole. Thirdly, and in my view preferably, we may understand that Mark's intention was to stress the extremity of the woman's condition and thus to emphasize the greatness of the miracle that Jesus performed on her. To state that doctors have failed completely in a particular case is not necessarily to condemn the medical profession as a whole.

In support of this view Schweizer comments:

"It is affirmed explicitly that human skill had been exhausted. This is a regular feature in miracle stories, which usually indicates the severity of the illness..... and does not say anything about the Christian's attitude toward physicians" [56].

Further, Mark's inclusion of Jesus' saying that the healthy do not need a doctor but those who are sick (Mark 2:17) strongly suggests that his attitude to the medical profession in general was by no means hostile, for although the saying is used to illustrate a spiritual truth and to defend Jesus' eating with sinners and tax-collectors (v.16), the parallel would have been offensive had he disapproved of the medical profession [57].

But is the medical profession condemned elsewhere in the New Testament? According to John Nelson Parr [58] the use of *φάρμακεία* and its cognates in Galatians 5:20 and in Revelation 9:21, 18:23, 21:8, 22:15 certainly indicates such condemnation. Parr argues [59] that *φάρμακεία* properly means 'The administration or application or use of a medicine, a remedy, a purgative, a charm, or poison'. He dismisses the

possibility that in the New Testament the word may carry the connotation of sorcery because he believes that φαρμακεία 'primarily means the use of drugs' and is 'clearly distinguished' from the occult because the New Testament uses other words to refer to sorcery [60]. Thus in the passages referred to it is not sorcery (since for Parr φαρμακεία in the New Testament does not mean sorcery) that is condemned, but the practice of medicine! Such a conclusion clearly reveals a serious lack of understanding of the nature of language [61] and makes no allowance for variation in the use of a word according to context. A similar error today might be to assume that the word 'drug' always refers to narcotics and never to a medicine on the fallacious assumption that the writer would use the word 'medicine' if he meant medicine!

Furthermore it is noteworthy that, despite the scathing implications of Parr's understanding of the meaning of φαρμακεία in the passages referred to above, he later modifies his position with the following comment:

"It is perhaps necessary to make it clear that we do not condemn physicians because we do not find the Saviour ever condemned them; and while He never recommended or advised anyone to go to them, He did not forbid anyone to go, neither did He upbraid anyone for having been to them. We need to avoid going to a fanatical and unscriptural extreme" [62]!

This comment, it seems to me, clearly invalidates his former argument and leads naturally to a consideration of those passages in the New Testament which display a positive attitude to medicine or the medical profession.

I have already drawn attention to Jesus' saying that the healthy do not need a doctor but those who are sick (Matthew 9:12, Mark 2:17, Luke 5:31) [63] and have argued that such a statement by no means suggests hostility to the medical

profession. Indeed, it may reasonably be understood to indicate approval. At the very least it is an acknowledgement of a need.

The reference, found only in Luke, to the proverb 'Physician, heal yourself' (Luke 4:23) is used by Harnack as evidence of Luke's special interest in the medical profession [64]. His suggestion that Luke was better acquainted with the proverb than was Jesus need not concern us here. For our present purpose it is sufficient to note that the use of the proverb indicates no hostility to the physician's skill. Indeed, coupled with the understanding that Luke was himself a physician (Colossians 4:14) [65] the use of the expression almost certainly indicates approval.

Even more interesting for the purpose of this thesis, however, is Harnack's twofold suggestion that Luke may well have been Paul's physician and that his medical skill complemented Paul's charismatic gifts in healing the sick in Malta. Harnack argues on the basis of Acts 27:1-3 that Paul was an invalid when he started his voyage to Rome - hence the need to be put ashore after only one day's journey to be cared for by his friends [66] - and that Luke accompanied him as his personal physician. Indeed, this was part of the purpose of his presence with Paul in Rome (Colossians 4:14).

With reference to Acts 28:8-10 Harnack states:

"In this narrative, which is also noteworthy for the precise medical definition *καρπετοῖς καὶ δυσεντερίῳ*, we are struck by the concluding words: 'we were honoured with many honours'. It follows that the numerous sick folk were healed not only by St. Paul, but also by his companion the writer of the narrative. If St. Paul had been the sole agent upon this occasion, the author would not have written simply *ἐθεραπεύοντο*, but would have added *ὕπὸ Παυλοῦ*" [67].

But both parts of Harnack's suggestion must surely be treated with some caution. Although I see no great difficulty with the view that Luke may have on occasion given medical assistance to Paul, Harnack clearly claims too much in using Acts 27:3 as a basis for his assumption that Luke served as Paul's personal physician both on board ship and during his imprisonment in Rome. For even if we accept on the basis of the use of ἐπιμέλεια in Acts 27:3 that the purpose of Paul's going ashore at Sidon was to receive medical attention - and I have already noted that the connotation of ἐπιμέλεια is by no means restricted to the medical [68] - the clear implication is that he received this from 'his friends' and not merely from Luke. And the phrase ὁ ἰατρὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός (Col. 4:14) is hardly compelling evidence that Luke served as physician to Paul himself. The suggestion that Luke served as Paul's physician is, therefore, in my view only a possibility, at best a probability.

And the view that Luke's medical skills complemented Paul's charismatic gifts in healing the sick in Malta (Acts 28:8-10) I find even less compelling. First, there is no clear statement that Luke used his medical ability in this situation. Second, it is by no means impossible that Luke himself was also charismatically gifted in the realm of healing. (He does not restrict the possession of such gifts to the apostles - cf. Acts 6:8, 8:5-7). Third, the bestowing of honours on both Paul and Luke by no means implies that both were used in healing the sick. Luke may well have been honoured along with Paul simply by virtue of being his companion (cf. the reaction at Lystra to both Paul and Barnabas after Paul has healed the cripple - Acts 14: 8-12). And finally, by far the most natural way to interpret the passage is to understand the sick of the island coming to Paul for the laying on of hands (v.9) as a result of the healing of Publius (v.8). This is surely the force of τοῦτου δὲ γενομένου καί (v.9). Despite this evidence, however, it is,

of course, not impossible that Luke used his medical skills in Malta, but the passage in my view, *pace* Harnack, by no means demands, nor even suggests, such an interpretation.

Nevertheless, even if Harnack's twofold suggestion is to be rejected for want of compelling evidence, the very use of the phrase *ὁ ἰατρὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός* (Col. 4:14) clearly displays in itself at least a positive attitude towards his medical ability. Furthermore, the phrase must surely indicate the distinct possibility that Luke was still practising medicine, for why else should he be referred to as a physician rather than as just a 'brother'? Even if, as Martin suggests, Paul commented on Luke's medical ability because it was so unusual [69], the view that the New Testament condemns the practice of medicine [70] must surely be rejected.

Finally, it is noteworthy that on at least three occasions the New Testament actually advocates the use of medicinal means. One clear example, to which I have already referred, is Paul's recommendation to Timothy to take wine for the sake of his stomach [71]. A further example is the instruction given to the church at Laodicea to purchase eyesalve that they might see [72] and although the use here is clearly metaphorical it seems hardly likely that such a metaphor would have been employed if the use of medicinal means were disapproved of.

Yet another example is the use of oil and wine in the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:29-37). In v. 33 the Samaritan takes pity on the wounded man and in v. 34 dresses his wounds, pouring on oil and wine. He then takes him to an inn where he takes care of him. The force of the verb *ἐπιμελέομαι* is of little consequence here [73]. It is clear from the context that the purpose of the oil and the wine was medicinal and Harnack cites Hippocrates to show that 'physicians of antiquity used oil and wine not only internally, but also for external application' [74]. And Jesus commands his followers

Healing & the Atonement

to 'Go and do likewise' (v. 37). Such an exhortation would surely have been inappropriate if his intention had been that his followers should not use medical means in healing the sick.

Summary

Working on the premise that the doctrine that healing is in the atonement implies that Christians who become sick should not continue to be so and should not need to resort to medical remedies for their healing [75], it seems reasonable to assume that, if the doctrine is valid, the Christians of the New Testament would always find immediate deliverance from sickness and that medical means would not be advocated. But, as I have sought to show in this chapter, the New Testament provides evidence not only that several prominent Christians were sick over a prolonged period of time, including even the Apostle Paul himself, but also that medical remedies were recommended and the art of medicine approved of. This evidence must surely cast serious doubt on the doctrine at least in the form in which it was originally propounded.

Chapter Nine

NOTES

1. See pp. 14-18, 21, 24. Cf. pp. 38-44, 81-84.

2. Galatians 4:13ff. Cf. 2 Corinthians 12:7

3. 2 Timothy 4:20

4. Philippians 2:25-30

5. 1 Timothy 5:23

6. Plummer, A., *'II Corinthians'*, Edinburgh, Clark, 1978, p. 349.

Plummer himself, however, commented that although there is much to commend this view 'nothing approaching proof is possible' (loc.cit.)

However, cf. Betz, H.D., *'Galatians'*, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1979, pp. 224-225. Betz assumes their identity - a sickness caused by a demon residing in Paul's body.

7. Luther, M., *'A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians'*, London, Clarke, 1953 (first published 1535), pp. 400-401.

8. See, for example:

Barrett, C.K., *'A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians'*, London, Black, 1973, p.

Bruce, F.F., *'Commentary on Galatians'*, Exeter, Paternoster, 1982, p.208

Burton, E. de W., *The Epistle to the Galatians*, Edinburgh, Clark, 1977, p. 239

Fung, R.Y., *'The Epistle to the Galatians'*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1988, p. 197

Hughes, P.E., *'The Second Epistle to the Corinthians'*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1977, p. 444

Longenecker, R.N., *'Galatians'*, Dallas, Word, 1990, p.191

Martin, R.P., *'2 Corinthians'*, Waco, Word, 1986, pp. 411ff

Ridderbos, H.N., *'The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia'*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1976, p. 167

Tasker, R.V.G., *'2 Corinthians'*, London, Tyndale, 1969, p. 175.

9. It is noteworthy, however, that Cole appears to identify them. He sees Paul's weakness as 'some constitutional malady to which Paul was constantly subject' and comments that 'it does seem that Paul was constantly plagued by ill-health'. Of Paul's thorn he says, '2 Corinthians 12:7 seems to describe Paul's constant malady as *skolops te sarki*, 'a stake thrust into my body' which suggests intense pain' (Cole, R. A., *'Galatians'*, London, Tyndale, 1971, pp. 121-122).

10. In support of the view that Paul's weakness was a sickness, see:

Betz, op. cit., p. 224

Bruce, op. cit., p. 208

Chapter Nine

Burton, op. cit. p. 238ff

Cole, op. cit. p. 121ff

Fung, op. cit. p. 196ff

Hendrikson, W., 'Galatians', London, Banner of Truth, 1969, p. 170

Lightfoot, J.B., 'St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians', London,

Macmillan, 1876, p. 174

Longenecker, op. cit. p. 190ff.

Theories as to nature of the sickness include:

MALARIA (supposed to have been contracted in the low-lying territory of Pamphylia whence Paul made his way up to Pisidian Antioch to recuperate - hence δι' ἀσθένειαν, 'because of an infirmity'). See:

Ramsay, W.R., 'St. Paul the Traveller & the Roman Citizen', London,

Hodder, 1920, (14th Edn), pp. 94-97

Schweizer, E., σάπξ article in TDNT VII, p. 125 n. 216

EPILEPSY (based on the use of οὐδὲ ἐξεπύσσατε in v.14 because of the practice of spitting to exorcize a demon believed to be the cause of epilepsy). See:

Wrede, W., 'Paul', ET E. Lummis, London, Green, 1907, pp. 22-23

Klausner, J., 'From Jesus to Paul', ET W.F. Stinespring, New York,

Macmillan, 1943, pp. 325-330

OPHTHALMIA (based on a literal understanding of v.15, cf. also Gal.6:11).

See:

Brown, J.T., 'St. Paul's Thorn in the Flesh', in *Horae Subseclivae*,

Ed. J. Brown, Edinburgh, 1858.

However, as Bruce has rightly commented:

"The fact that such diverse ailments..... have been suggested.... indicates that there can be no certain diagnosis"

Bruce, op. cit. p. 209.

11. Ridderbos, op. cit. pp.166-167

12. Longenecker, op. cit. pp. 190-191

13. The context does not allow for σάπξ to be understood in its ethical sense here.

14. Osborn, T.L., 'Healing the Sick', Tulsa, Osborn, 1961, p. 175.

For Osborn, when Paul speaks of his weakness 'he is expressing his nothingness in his own strength, depending wholly on the power and Spirit of God' (ibid p. 174). Although this may fit the context elsewhere, however, (e.g. 1 Corinthians 2:1-4), it does not, in my view fit the context in Galatians 4:13.

15. ibid p. 176

Chapter Nine

Binder, H., '*Die angebliche Krankheit des Paulus*', TheolZeit, 1976, 32, 1, pp. 1-13. Only a healthy person could have achieved what Paul did. The thorn is a metaphor to describe the opposition he encountered.

Hisey, A., '*A paragnostic view of Paul the Apostle*', Unitarian Universalist Christian, [Boston MA], 1978, 33, 3-4, pp. 12-19. Paul's experience on the Damascus Road was probably a subarachnoid haemorrhage of which the consequent neurological disturbances of vision and speech constituted his 'thorn'.

Price, R.M., '*Punished in Paradise (An Exegetical Theory on II Corinthians 12:1-10)*', JournStudNT 1980, 7, pp. 33-40. The thorn, a demon or malevolent angel, was inflicted in direct connection with Paul's visionary journey to paradise.

Barré, M.L., '*Qumran and the 'weakness' of Paul*', CathBibQuart, 1980, 42, 2, pp. 216-227. As in the case of IQH 9:25-27, the context is one of persecution by adversaries. Thus the thorn must allude to Paul's adversaries.

Loubser, J.A., '*Paulus se doring in die vlees, 2 Kor 12:7*', NedGerefTeolTyd, 1981, 22, 4, pp. 259-268. The phrase 'thorn in the flesh' was an ironic word-play referring to the irritation caused by the false apostles in Corinth.

Louw, J.P. and Stander, H.F., '*Paulus se doring in die vlees, 2 Kor 12:7*', NedGerefTeolTyd, 1981, 22, 4, pp. 269-272. The phrase is an idiomatic expression meaning 'that which causes hardship'. The expression can only refer to Paul's suffering in the service of the Gospel.

McCant, J.W., '*Paul's Thorn of Rejected Apostleship*', NTS 1988, 34, 4, pp. 550-572. Paul's thorn was not a physical malady. It referred to the Corinthian church's rejection of his apostleship.

30. Indeed Hughes goes so far as to suggest that our uncertainty about the thorn is providential as it leaves open a wider field of application to our personal needs - Hughes, op. cit., p. 442. See also

Barnett, P., '*The Message of 2 Corinthians*', Leicester, IVP, 1988, p. 177

31. Martin (op. cit. p. 416), for example, points out that although the thorn was inherently evil it served a good purpose as a gift from God. This divine concealment in a human trial places the experience on a theological plane where the need for a theodicy is urgent. Paul's suffering is viewed within the context of divine grace which not only allows the affliction but sustains the sufferer.

32. Cf. my comments on p. 254.

33. See, for example, my quotation from Copeland on pp. 1-2 of this thesis. Cf. Osborn, op. cit. pp. 147ff.

Healing & the Atonement

16. See p. 252 and note 10.

17. See, for example, my comments with regard to Carrie Judd Montgomery and A.B. Simpson on pp.18-24, esp. p. 19. See also pp.34-37.

18. E.g. Osborn, op. cit., p. 48.
Cf. Montgomery, C.J., op. cit. pp. 41 and 47.

See my discussion of Mathew 8:17 and the reasons for rejecting this claim in Chapter 4 of this thesis, esp. pp. 116ff.

19. See pp. 252-254 and notes 14 & 15. Cf. Simpson op. cit. pp. 62-62.

20. See note 19. Cf. Jeter op. cit., pp. 100-102. Cf. also Hicklin's comment quoted on p.42 of this thesis.

For the understanding that ἐδόθη μοι is to be interpreted as a *passivum divinum*, see Martin, op. cit. p. 412. Cf. Plummer, op. cit. p. 348. This is clearly the correct interpretation despite Copeland's insistence that 'God does not use Satan's messengers' (Copeland op. cit. p.88). Copeland's understanding of this whole passage illustrates once again how doctrinal bias clouds objectivity (cf. my comments on pp. 253-254 of this thesis), for Paul is understood by Copeland to have been delivered from the thorn (an evil spirit who inspired people to persecute Paul) when he realised that he, not God, must exercise authority over it! (ibid pp 89ff)

21. Martin, op. cit. pp.413-414.

22. Tasker, op. cit. p. 174.

23. Plummer, op. cit. p. 348.

24. Plummer, loc. cit.

25. Tasker, op. cit. p. 174.

26. See, for example, 2 Corinthians 11:23-28 (esp. v. 27)

27. So Martin, op. cit. p. 415.

28. Hughes, op. cit. p. 448.

29. Martin, op. cit. p. 413. For historical surveys of the discussion, see:
Allo, E.B., *'Saint Paul: seconde épître aux Corinthiens'*, Paris, Gabalda, 1956, pp. 313-321

Furnish, V.P., *'2 Corinthians'*, New York, Doubleday, 1985, pp. 548-549.

Hughes, op. cit. pp. 443-446

Martin, op. cit. pp. 412-417

Plummer, op. cit., pp. 348-351.

Recent articles demonstrate that the problem of Paul's thorn is by no means resolved. The view that the thorn was a sickness, however, is largely rejected. See:

34. This is probably because most books on Divine Healing are not theological text-books but inspirational writings encouraging faith for healing. It is probable, therefore, that 'difficult' passages are not referred to lest they inhibit faith. The major exception is Donald Gee whose challenging booklet 'Trophimus I left sick' still awaits a serious answer. Cf. pp. 44-49 of this thesis.
35. Simpson op. cit. pp. 63-64
Jeter, op. cit. pp. 105-106
36. ibid pp. 102-103
Yeomans, L.B., '*Healing from Heaven*', Springfield, GPH, 1972, p. 62.
Yeomans does address the issue raised by the medicinal aspect of the wine (p.63 ff.), a matter I shall deal with later in this chapter.
See pp. 261-262. Cf. note 50.
37. Gee, D., '*Trophimus I left Sick*', London, Elim, 1952, passim.
38. Silva, M., '*Philippians*', Chicago, Moody, 1988, pp. 160-161.
Cf. Vincent, M.R., '*The Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon*', Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1976, p. 76
Martin, R.P., '*Philippians*', London, Tyndale, 1972, p. 131
Beare, F.W., '*The Epistle to the Philippians*', Peabody, Hendrickson, 1987, pp. 88-89
Bruce, F.F., '*Philippians*', Peabody, Hendrickson, 1989, pp. 96-99
Hawthorne, G.F., '*Philippians*', Waco, Word, 1983, pp. 118-119
Lightfoot, J.B., '*Philippians*', London, Macmillan, 1883, pp. 123-125
39. Collange, J.-F., '*L'épître de Saint Paul aux Philippiens*', Neuchatel, Delachaux et Niestlé, 1973, p. 107.
40. Hawthorne, op. cit. p. 118
41. The use of the Present Participle may suggest that Trophimus' sickness was of a continuing nature.
42. Simpson and Jeter both suggest this. See note 35.
43. Gee, op. cit., p. 12.
44. Again Simpson and Jeter both suggest this. See notes 35 and 42.
45. See, for example, the position outlined on p. 232 of this thesis which I suggested was an acceptable way of understanding healing in relation to the atonement. See also Chapter Eleven in Part Four of this thesis.
46. See, for example, my quotation from Copeland on pp. 1-2 of this thesis. Cf. Osborn, op. cit. pp. 147ff.
47. Vine, W.E., '*The Epistles to Timothy*', London, Pickering, 1925, p.98.
Cf.:
Brown, E.F., '*The Pastoral Epistles*', London, Methuen, 1917, p. 90.
Simpson, E.K., '*The Pastoral Epistles*', London, Tyndale, 1954, p. 162.
and Gee, op. cit., p. 9, who express similar views.

Chapter Nine

For further comment on Trophimus see also

Kelly, J.N.D., *'The Pastoral Epistles'*, Peabody, Hendrickson, 1987, pp. 221-222

Fee, G.D., *'1 and 2 Timothy, Titus'*, Peabody, Hendrickson, 1988, p. 301.

Guthrie, D., *'The Pastoral Epistles'*, London, Tyndale, 1973, pp. 178-179.

Lock, W., *'The Pastoral Epistles'*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1978, p. 120.

48. 1 Corinthians 12:8-11. NB. This passage in itself calls into question the teaching that healing can be 'claimed'. If, however, the Spirit himself may be understood to come as a result of the atonement, then the healings which he gives may be said to result indirectly from the atonement. Cf. my comments on p. 173 and Chapter 11 in Part Four of this thesis.

49. See pp. 259-260.

50. See the views of Montgomery and Simpson on pp. 14-24 of this thesis. Cf. Hicklin's similar view, p.43.

In stark contrast, Bill Popejoy commenting on 1 Timothy 5:23 remarks:

"A lot of people wish that verse were not in the Bible, but it is. I have no interest at all in discussing the age of the wine, but I would have you note the intent of it. Timothy had a bad stomach and he was sickly. And Paul prescribed some medicine - call it any other name you want, it was medicine!"

Popejoy, B., *'The Case for Divine Healing'*, Springfield, GPH, 1976, p. 54.

Despite the evident sanity of these remarks, however, Popejoy fails to address the clear theological problem posed by this verse for the doctrine that healing is in the atonement, a doctrine which he himself embraces - Popejoy, op. cit., pp. 20, 59.

51. See p. 251. Cf. note 1.

52. Luke is described in Colossians 4:14 as ὁ ἰατρός ὁ ἀγαπητός. (For further discussion, see pp. 265-267 below). This may well be the cause of the softened the account here.

53. Lane, W.L., *'The Gospel of Mark'*, London, Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1974, p. 192.

54. See Preuss, J., *'Biblisch-talmudische Medizin'*, Berlin, 1911, pp. 439ff. Cf. Strack, H.L. & Billerbeck, P., *'Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch'*, 1922, p. 520

55. See Kee, H.C., *'Medicine, Miracle and Magic in New Testament Times'*, Cambridge, CUP, 1986, p. 65.

Healing & the Atonement

According to Kee 'In the New Testament there are only seven occurrences of the word *hiatros*, and in only one of these is there a positive estimate of a physician'. Cf. note 65.

56. Schweizer, E., *'The Good News according to Mark'*, ET D.H. Madvig, London, SPCK, 1971, p.117. Cf. *ibid* p. 20.

Cf. Alexander, J.A., *'The Gospel according to Mark'*, London, Banner of Truth, 1960, p. 127.

Anderson, H., *'The Gospel of Mark'*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1976, p. 152.

57. A similar argument may be applied to Matthew and Luke's attitudes to the medical profession (not to mention Jesus'!) - cf. Matthew 9:12, Luke 5:31.

58. Cf. p. 41 of this thesis.

59. Parr, J.N., *'Divine Healing'*, Springfield, GPH, 1955, pp 46-50.

60. Parr refers to Acts 8:11, 16:16, and 19:19 where, he rightly points out, *φαρμακεία* is not used, but *μαγεία*, *μαντεύομαι*, and *περίεργος* are used respectively.

61. Cf. the similar criticisms I levelled against Parr earlier with regard to his understanding of *σώζω*. See pp 214-215 of this thesis.

62. Parr, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

63. See p. 264. Cf. note 56.

64. Harnack, A., *'Luke the Physician'*, London, Williams and Norgate, 1907, p. 17.

65. For the view that the third gospel and Acts were composed by a physician, see:

Hobart, W.K., *'The Medical Language of St. Luke'*, Dublin, DUP, 1882, *passim*. Hobart's work is subtitled: *'A Proof from Internal Evidence that the Gospel attributed to St. Luke and the Acts of the Apostles were written by the same person and that the writer was a medical man'*.

See also Harnack, *op. cit.*, pp. 175-198.

However, note Cadbury's rejection of this position:

Cadbury, H.J., *'The Book of Acts in History'*, Harper, 1955.

Cadbury points out that although there are remarkable parallels between Luke's vocabulary and that of such writers as Hippocrates, Galen and Dioscorides, most of the examples cited could be paralleled in other educated Greek writers of that time.

NB also Kee's comment that:

Chapter Nine

"the author of Acts does not look to physicians for cures, but to God who acts directly on behalf of needy, seeking persons" (op. cit p 65).

For a convenient summary of more recent discussion see:

Guthrie, D., '*New Testament Introduction*', 4th Edition, Leicester, Apollos, 1990, pp 116ff.

66. Harnack, op. cit., p. 148. See also p. 181 where Harnack cites Hobart (op. cit. pp. 29, 269ff) as evidence that ἐπιμέλεια is a technical term used for the medical care of the sick. It is clear, however, that ἐπιμέλεια and its cognates are by no means restricted to medical care (cf. 1 Timothy 3:4-5 where ἐπιμελέομαι is used of the care an ἐπίσκοπος must have for the church).

Further, it is noteworthy that Hobart (op. cit., p. 269) is far less dogmatic on this point than is Harnack:

"ἐπιμέλεια, peculiar to St. Luke was very much employed in medical language to express the care and attention bestowed on the sick and invalids, and *perhaps* (my italics) such is its meaning here".

67. ibid pp 15-16.

68. See note 65.

69. Martin, R.P., '*Colossians and Philemon*', London, Oliphants, 1874, p. 135.

70. Cf. Parr's view, p. 264 of this thesis.

71. 1 Timothy 5:23. See my discussion on p. 261.

72. Revelation 3:18.

73. See my comment, *pace* Harnack and Hobart, in note 65.

74. Harnack, op. cit., p. 190. Cf. Hobart, op. cit., pp. 28ff.

Cf. Hippocrates, *Morb. Mul.*, 656: ἦν δὲ αἱ μήτραι ἐξισχωσι, περινίψας αὐτάς ὕδατι χλιερῷ καὶ ἐλειψας ἐλαιῷ καὶ οἰνῷ.

I have already discussed the view that the anointing with oil in James 5:14ff may be a reference to the use of medicine. See p. 183.

75. See p. 251. Cf. note 1.

PART FOUR
AN ASSESSMENT OF THE DOCTRINE

In PART ONE of this thesis I traced the theological and literary origins of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement and sought to show how it has developed and been modified within Pentecostal groups among whom the doctrine is largely to be found.

In PARTS TWO & THREE I examined the doctrine in the light of some of the relevant passages and themes found in the New Testament. Here I found no legitimate support for the doctrine in the form in which it was originally propounded. I suggested, however, that in a modified form the doctrine might find a basis in the New Testament. This will be discussed at greater length in the final chapter of this thesis.

In PART FOUR I shall attempt an assessment of the doctrine discussing in Chapter 10 some of the difficulties with the doctrine before offering in Chapter 11 what I trust will prove to be a helpful modification to it not only from a theological perspective but also from a practical and pastoral point of view.

Chapter Ten

CHAPTER TEN: DIFFICULTIES WITH THE DOCTRINE

I have argued thus far that the doctrine that healing is in the atonement as originally propounded finds no legitimate support in the New Testament when the texts used to support it are correctly exegeted [1]. In this chapter I shall explore some of the considerable theological difficulties presented by the doctrine before highlighting some of the problems it produces both practically and pastorally.

Theological difficulties fall into two main categories the first of which centres around the very use of the word 'atonement' in connection with healing. The second springs from the understanding, common among the proponents of the doctrine, that verses of the Bible may be 'claimed' as 'promises' [2]. Pastoral and practical problems occur largely because the doctrine offers no adequate theology for those who are not healed and leaves such people in doubt as to the forgiveness of their sins [3]. Serious difficulties also arise when the doctrine is taken to imply that a Christian should not avail himself of medical assistance. The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to show that the doctrine as originally propounded is theologically unsound and presents intolerable problems not only for the unhealed but for those who are responsible for their pastoral care.

Theological Difficulties - the Meaning of 'Atonement'

The purpose of this section is to ask if the doctrine that healing is in the atonement makes sense theologically. The chief difficulty here is deciding whether the question should be based on

(1) the definition of the word 'atonement' found in an English Dictionary (the early proponents of the doctrine having expressed their teaching in the *English* language) [4], or

Healing & the Atonement

(2) the use of the word in Romans 5:11 in the Authorised Version of the Bible (the version invariably quoted by those proponents) [5] with reference to the meaning of the Greek noun καταλλαγή (there translated 'atonement') [6], or

(3) the wider range of concepts which both in the New Testament and in later theological discussion have been closely linked with atonement [7].

The difficulty arises from the fact that, as I shall show later, the narrow denotation of the word precludes by definition the thought that the atonement deals with sickness, whereas its wider connotation might at least in one of its aspects leave room for some understanding that healing is in the atonement. In this section, therefore, I shall attempt briefly to deal with both the narrower and wider understanding of the word 'atonement' and to show that in the narrower sense of the word the concept of sickness being 'atoned for' is, to say the least inappropriate, and that in the wider sense if the atonement may be understood to provide physical healing at all, it does not provide it in the way expressed by the early proponents of the doctrine. Finally I shall consider whether a way forward might be found for the doctrine in terms of metaphor.

The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary [8] indicates that the word 'atonement' finds its origin in the phrase 'at one'. The following uses are listed:

1. The condition of being at one with others; concord, agreement.
2. The action of setting at one or being set at one after discord; reconciliation, appeasement.
3. Reconciliation or restoration of friendly relations between God and sinners.
4. Propitiation by reparation of wrong or injury; amends, expiation; propitiation of God by expiation of sin.

Chapter Ten

The general sense of the word is therefore that of persons being at one with each other usually after a state of estrangement. This is certainly the sense in which it is used in Romans 5:11 (AV). Verse 8 indicates that while we were still sinners Christ died for us. We shall be saved from God's wrath (v9) because although we were enemies we have been reconciled to God through the death of his Son (v10) and it is through him that we have received 'atonement' (v11 AV) or reconciliation. Indeed the Authorised Version elsewhere consistently translates καταλλάγή and καταλλάσσω as 'reconciliation' and 'reconcile' respectively [9].

In short, the word 'atonement' is found only once in the Authorised Version, which was the version used by the early proponents of the doctrine, and there (Romans 5:11) it denotes 'reconciliation'. This is the underlying theological meaning of the word 'atonement'. Man because of his sin is at enmity with God but because of Christ's death has been reconciled to God. It was thus because of man's sin that atonement or reconciliation was necessary. No atonement was needed for sickness. Sickness is not, as Stott has rightly pointed out [10] a misdemeanour which attracts a penalty. To speak of Christ atoning for sickness is to mix categories. Atonement by definition deals with sin.

Compelling though this rejection of the doctrine may be, however, it is dependent on a very restricted understanding of 'atonement'. It is surely at least possible that other New Testament concepts, closely related to atonement and traditionally understood to be aspects of the atonement, might provide a basis for an understanding that physical healing is in some way made available to Christians because of the atonement. If this is so a broader understanding of atonement than that offered by its narrow denotation must clearly be considered.

Healing & the Atonement

That 'atonement' has in theological discussion acquired a wider connotation than the limited definition offered by the English Dictionary is evident from both the historical discussion of the doctrine and from more recent theological contributions. Indeed the New Testament itself reveals a variety of aspects from which the idea of atonement may be understood [11].

Space forbids a detailed examination of each of these aspects and such an examination is by no means necessary. It seems to me that the aspects of propitiation and justification, for example, are so clearly linked with sin that the criticism I have already levelled against the doctrine that physical healing is in the atonement [12] must hold good against these particular aspects. But what of concepts like redemption, victory over the powers of evil, and even substitution [13]? Do these aspects of the atonement offer grounds for belief in the doctrine?

I have already argued in an earlier chapter [14] that the understanding of Christ's death as a victory over Satan and the powers of evil may provide some basis for an understanding that healing is in the atonement and little needs to be added here. Gustav Aulén in his book *Christus Victor* [15] sees the atonement as a cosmic drama in which God in Christ does battle with the powers of evil and gains the victory over them. This aspect of the atonement, he claims, was 'the ruling idea of the Atonement for the first thousand years of Christian history' [16].

"Christ - Christus Victor - fights against and triumphs over the evil powers of the world, the 'tyrants' under which mankind is in

bondage and suffering, and in Him God reconciles the world to Himself". [17]

I draw attention to this here simply as evidence that 'atonement' has, in the history of theological discussion, a

Chapter Ten

wider connotation than is indicated by its narrow definition in relation to sin, and to suggest, in answer to the question as to whether the idea of healing being provided in the atonement makes sense theologically, that there might possibly be a way forward here subject to the cautions I have already expressed in Chapter 8.

I shall now consider the concept of redemption as an aspect of the atonement before briefly turning to the subject of substitution. There are two Greek word-groups which are translated by the word 'redemption' and its cognates. These are the ἀγοράζω and λυτρόω word-groups. ἀγοράζω which means 'to buy' (from ἀγορά, 'market') occurs in the New Testament 25 times in a commercial sense. On six other occasions, however, it refers to Christians having been 'bought' or 'redeemed' by Christ [18]. The compound form ἐξαγοράζω occurs 4 times, twice in the sense of 'redeeming the time' (Ephesians 5:16, Colossians 4:5), and twice in the sense of Christians being 'redeemed' from the law (Galatians 3:13, 4:5).

According to Büchsel, who cites contemporary uses of the verbs, the thought underlying both ἀγοράζω and ἐξαγοράζω in the verses relating to the redemption of Christians is that of sacral manumission whereby

"the god buys the slave to freedom from his owner. For the legal establishment of the liberation a purchase by the god is pretended. The owner actually receives the purchase price from a man, even if only mediately. The god does the slave no real favour but simply mediates the freedom which he has mostly won for himself...." [19].

Clearly the parallel must not be pressed too closely [20] but two factors are significant here. The slave is (1) liberated from his former owner but is (2) now the possession of the god. Both these factors are clearly discernible in Paul's use of ἀγοράζω and ἐξαγοράζω. To have been bought by Christ means

that we are not our own (1 Corinthians 6:20, 7:23) yet we are free from that which previously enslaved us (Galatians 3:13, 4:5). With reference to these verses from Galatians Büchsel comments:

"The idea is the same as in the case of ἀγοράζειν, except that now the purchase does not transfer to the possession of God or Christ, but to freedom. Standing under the Law and its curse is thought of as slavery (4:1, 3:7). To this extent the idea corresponds to the contemporary practice of sacral manumission" [21].

It is to this emphasis upon freedom or liberation that it will shortly be appropriate to turn our attention with regard to the question of physical healing, but first it will be convenient to consider the closely connected concept of a ransom conveyed by the λυτρόω word-group.

The λυτρόω word-group (including λύτρον, ἀντιλύτρον, λυτρόω, λύτρωσις, λυτρωτής, and ἀπολύτρωσις) is closely connected with the concept of a ransom [22]. Büchsel comments that

"λύτρον is formed from λύω with the ending -τρον. In the oldest stratum nouns formed thus denote a means, ἄρο-τρον, 'plough', φέρ-τρον, 'bier'. In post-Homeric constructs the means usually has the sense of payment for something, θρέπ-τρα, 'reward for instruction', μήνυ-τρον, 'for information', διδάκ-τρον, 'for teaching', and similarly λύτρον, 'money paid as a ransom'.....

....λύτρον is esp. the money paid to ransom prisoners of war, but it is then used for slaves or for release from a bond" [23].

There is thus a close affinity between λύτρον and its cognates [24] and the ἀγοράζω word-group in that both connote the payment of a price in order to obtain freedom, liberation, or release. Is it possible to understand from this that the price paid has purchased freedom from sickness for those who

Chapter Ten

are 'redeemed' [25]? For surely sickness is a form of bondage.

Sickness is certainly seen as a bondage in Luke 13:11-16. The woman (v11) is described as 'having a spirit of sickness' (πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενείας) and as having been 'bound by Satan' (ἣν ἔδησεν ὁ Σατανᾶς) (v16) for eighteen years. Jesus tells her (v12) 'You are freed from your sickness' (ἀπολέλυσαι τῆς ἀσθενείας σου) and in verse 16 she is described as having been 'released from a bond' (λυθῆναι ἀπὸ ... δεσμοῦ).

At first sight it is perhaps tempting to see a possible solution here. Sickness is described as a bondage here and redemption is a setting free from bondage. It is also an aspect of the atonement. Is it, therefore, not possible to understand healing to be a part of redemption and as such to be provided by the atonement?

Before reaching a hasty conclusion, however, three facts must be borne in mind. First, it is noteworthy that δέω is nowhere else in the New Testament used with reference to sickness and δεσμός is used but once [26]. It would, therefore, perhaps be unwise to build a theology of healing in the atonement based on such slight evidence. Second, it is highly significant that at no point in the text is the woman's healing described as 'redemption'. The verb describing her release from sickness in verse 12 is ἀπολύω (not λυτρόω) and although this is used 68 times in the New Testament it is never used to mean 'redeem' or 'ransom'. Further, that it here carries the simple sense of 'release' is indicated by the use of λύω in verse 16. And third, the sickness in this case is specifically stated to have come from Satan (v16) and it is from his bondage that Jesus looses her. Since it is relatively rarely that Luke attributes sickness to the work of Satan or of evil spirits [27] no conclusion may legitimately be drawn from this passage with regard to sickness in general [28].

There seems thus far, therefore, no valid reason for the view that healing from sickness forms a part of our redemption. Yet examination of the use of the noun ἀπολύτρωσις in the New Testament reveals a possible solution in that redemption is seen as having a physical dimension at least in Romans 8:23 [29]. Here Paul refers to 'the redemption of our body' (τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν) as something for which we are eagerly waiting. That a physical redemption is here referred to there can be no doubt [30]. I have already argued [31] that 'the sufferings of this present time' (τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ) embrace the full scope of human suffering, including sickness. There is, therefore, in my view in this passage at least an indication that in Paul's understanding the Christian's ultimate redemption would bring freedom from all forms of suffering including sickness. But this is a matter which I shall discuss further in the final chapter of this thesis. It is sufficient to note meanwhile that the redemption of the body of which Paul speaks is a future redemption [32] and that although this passage may be understood to support a modified version of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement [33] it does not support the doctrine as propounded in its original form [34].

But we must now turn to the concept of substitution. At first sight it might appear that like justification and propitiation substitution is so closely connected to sin that to use it to refer to sickness must again involve a mixing of categories. It is necessary to consider it, however, because of the emphasis placed upon it by the proponents of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement as is evident from the following quotation from A.B. Simpson with reference to 1 Peter 2:24:

"That one cruel 'stripe' of His - for the word is singular - summed up in it all the aches and pains of a suffering world; and there is no longer need that we should suffer what He has sufficiently borne" (my italics). Thus our healing becomes a

Chapter Ten

great redemption right, which we simply claim as our purchased inheritance through the blood of His cross" [35].

In Chapter Five I rejected this understanding of 1 Peter 2:24 on the grounds that this is not the plain meaning of the verse in its context. But that in itself need not imply that the concept of sickness-bearing is theologically meaningless. Even if, as I have argued, proponents of the doctrine misapply verses like Matthew 8:17 and 1 Peter 2:24 in their attempt to show that Christ carried our sicknesses substitutionally that does not mean that there can be no sense in which Christ bore our sicknesses on the cross. Yet if such a concept is to be validated it must in my view (1) find some attestation in the New Testament and (2) be capable of being demonstrated as meaningful and intelligible.

With regard to (1) I have in Part Two of this thesis examined the major verses which are adduced as evidence that healing is in the atonement and have concluded that none of them, when correctly exegeted, support the doctrine. On these grounds alone, therefore, I consider the notion of Christ's bearing our sicknesses substitutionarily to be invalid. Furthermore, with regard to (2), I regard the concept as incapable of meaning or intelligibility.

In this connection it is noteworthy that proponents of the doctrine when talking about Christ bearing our sicknesses invariably draw a parallel with his bearing of our sins. The quote from Gloria Copeland on the first two pages of this thesis provides an excellent example of this. But the concept of Christ bearing sins, difficult though it may be, is at least intelligible in terms of his taking the punishment for them [36]. But what is the meaning of his carrying our sicknesses? It cannot be that of taking the punishment for them, for that is, as Stott has pointed out, a meaningless mixing of categories [37]. Neither surely can it mean - at the risk of sounding trivial - that he was sick in my place,

Healing & the Atonement

so that I no longer need to be sick. I can tell the measles and the mumps to go away because Jesus already had them for me on the cross! Yet what else could the substitutionary bearing of sickness mean? Is there a serious alternative to this clearly over-literal analysis?

Perhaps a solution may be found by using an adaptation of the notion of recapitulation. Space forbids here a detailed elaboration of Irenaeus' doctrine of recapitulation [38] but his understanding that Christ

"recapitulated in Himself the long line of men, giving us salvation compendiously, so that what we had lost in Adam, viz. that we should be after the image and similitude of God, this we should receive in Jesus Christ" [39]

may provide a way forward especially when it is borne in mind that for Irenaeus this recapitulation is concerned not only with man but with the whole creation. Commenting on this Dillistone remarks

"Through the Incarnation God was recapitulating in himself the original creation, primarily of man, but also of nature itself. Never at any time had He ceased to operate within the world of nature - the processes represented by sunshine, growth, harvest, fruitfulness are all signs of His beneficence. But with the coming of the Word in person into the world, these processes were all, as it were, gathered up into a concentrated activity and directed to their true end. He took the loaves and sanctified them to a divine use. Similarly the water at the wedding feast. In fact He summed up all things in Himself, and taking to Himself the pre-eminence drew 'all things to Himself at the proper time'" [40].

The doctrine of recapitulation is thus all-embracing and within it there might perhaps be scope for a view that the suffering of Jesus on the cross was a recapitulation of all.

Chapter Ten

the suffering ever endured since the Fall. In saying this I am not, of course, suggesting that Irenaeus himself held such a view, but that the notion that Christ bore sicknesses on the cross might at least be made intelligible as an extension of the idea of recapitulation.

There are, however, two major difficulties with such a position. First, if such a view were correct, Christ's death would recapitulate *all* forms of suffering, not just sickness. This would mean that, if healing from sickness can be 'claimed' [41] on the grounds that Christ has carried our sickness substitutionally, then deliverance from all forms of suffering could likewise be claimed. But this clearly expects too much, for the New Testament nowhere suggests that Christians are immune from, for example, persecution as the First Epistle of Peter makes very clear [42].

Second, Irenaeus' understanding of recapitulation must not be divorced from the eschatological perspective:

"What Christ did in His incarnate life is continued in the life of the Church which is His Body and the whole process will come to its completion when the bodies of the dead are resurrected and a new heaven and a new earth come into being 'in which the new man shall remain, always holding fresh converse with God'" [43].

Any attempt to restate the recapitulation theory in terms of Christ carrying suffering in himself must clearly take this into account. I have already drawn attention to the over-realised eschatology of certain proponents of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement [44] and I shall return to this theme in the final chapter of this thesis [45]. It is sufficient for the present to note that, if an extension of the notion of recapitulation is the only serious option for the view that Christ in some way carried our sicknesses on the cross, then the only intelligible understanding of the doctrine will place final and full deliverance from sickness,

Healing & the Atonement

along with deliverance from all other forms of suffering, in its right eschatological setting. This, for Paul at least, was something for which Christians are still waiting - the redemption of the body [46].

Thus far in this chapter, in the attempt to answer the question whether healing in the atonement makes sense theologically, I have considered not only the narrow definition of atonement (the restoration of friendly relations between God and sinners) but also the broader connotation covering the aspects of victory over the powers of evil, redemption, and substitution. I have concluded that, although the narrow definition precludes the possibility of atonement covering sickness, there is perhaps a way forward in terms of the broader connotation of atonement. But in each case, whether considering the aspect of victory, or of redemption, or of substitution, if healing of sickness is to be understood in the context of atonement, it must be understood in its right eschatological setting concerning which I shall have more to say in the final chapter of this thesis.

Finally, before leaving the question of the theological intelligibility of the doctrine, I shall consider whether the doctrine might be reasonably understood in terms of metaphor. Colin Gunton in his recent study on the atonement [47] argues that metaphor is of more than secondary value for the expression of truth. Using Aristotle's classic definition of metaphor as 'the application of an alien name by transference' (*Poetics* 1457b.7-8) as a working definition he concentrates on the notion that metaphor involves the transfer of a word from one context to another. Arguing from the fact that recent work gives much attention to the place of metaphor in scientific discovery he concludes that metaphors are not 'improper'. Indeed

"They are so pervasive a part of our experience that they are, if not *the*, clue to what language is and does" [48].

Chapter Ten

If we understand metaphor aright we are liberated from the narrow view that the only words capable of being true are those which in some way directly 'fit' the world as a mirror image 'fits' a face. The truth of a claim about the world does not depend upon whether it is expressed in literal or metaphorical terms, but upon whether language of whatever kind *expresses human interaction with reality successfully (truthfully) or not*. The key to the relation between language and world is its indirectness. The world can be known only indirectly, and therefore metaphor, being indirect is the most appropriate form that language can take.

But how does this relate to theological language which is necessarily different from and more difficult than the language of science because God, however he be conceived, is related to the human mind in a different way from the things we call the natural universe? In contemporary theology, Gunton argues, the stress falls not, as it does in the case of scientific language, on the creation of new language in conversation with the world, but on the projection by analogy of familiar terms on to the (supposedly) unfamiliar. But although theological language is not concerned to accommodate language to causal features of the world after the manner of natural science, nevertheless insofar as the first Christians can be said metaphorically to have found themselves - after what had happened with Jesus - newly accommodated to the causal structures of reality - set in a different place before God and in the world - the language they used of the atonement can be used in a similar way. The metaphors of atonement are ways of expressing what had happened. They enabled the Christian community to speak of God as he is found in concrete personal relationship with human beings and their world. Language that is usually used of legal, commercial and military relationships was used to identify a divine action towards the world in which God was actively present remaking broken relationships.

Healing & the Atonement

Thus for Gunton (whose thinking I have in the last few paragraphs expressed almost entirely in his own words [49]) the metaphorical use of language is the heart of the way in which we come to speak of our world which we approach indirectly in the hope that by forcing changes in our language it will enable us to come to a measure of understanding of its structures. This, he believes, is even more characteristic of theological language [50].

But how, if at all, does this affect the matter of healing and the atonement? First it seems to me that an analogy might be drawn between the early Pentecostals' experience of healing and the first Christians' experience of salvation. If Gunton is right in his understanding that the first Christians found themselves after what had happened with Jesus newly set in a different place before God and in the world and used legal, commercial and military terms (justification, redemption, victory etc.) as metaphors to express what had happened to them spiritually, then it might be argued that the early proponents of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement were using atonement terminology to express their newly found experience of physical healing. In short, if the first Christians could use commercial terminology like 'redemption' as a metaphor to express their spiritual experience, could not the first Pentecostals use terminology like 'atonement' (even though it is usually employed to describe the spiritual relationship between man and God) as a metaphor to express their experience of physical healing?

Such a metaphor would have been by no means inappropriate, for just as they had experienced forgiveness of sins through faith in Christ, now they were experiencing physical healing through faith in Christ. Further, if the first Christians - and indeed Jesus himself (Mark 2:17) - could use metaphors of physical healing to describe the forgiveness of sins (e.g. 1 Peter 2:24) could not the early proponents of the doctrine use the language of atonement to relate to the healing of the

Chapter Ten

body? In so doing, it might be argued following Gunton's analysis of metaphor, they were forcing language into new meaning in their discovery of new truth. *By his stripes you were healed* may well have been misapplied, but it expressed for the early proponents of the doctrine a truth which they had come to experience - that the Christ who had died on the cross for their sins was also the healer of their sicknesses. As such it was to them at least undoubtedly meaningful.

However, if the concept of metaphor is to be advanced as a means of making a doctrine theologically intelligible the criteria for judging such metaphors must first be established. In this connection I wish to propose four such criteria.

First, it seems to me that any metaphor used must be readily intelligible to the reader. The use of redemption as a metaphor of Christ's death, for example, was readily understood by the first Christians familiar as they were with the practice of slavery. They did not have to perform mental gymnastics to understand the metaphor.

Second, if we are to argue that a phrase or passage is to be understood as metaphor then we must establish that the writer himself understood that he was speaking metaphorically. For example, if my exegesis of 1 Peter 2:24 is correct [51] it is clear that the writer was aware that in saying 'by his stripes you were healed' he was speaking figuratively. The validity of a metaphor may thus be tested by asking whether the user understood that he was speaking metaphorically. If he did not, we would simply say that he was mistaken.

Third, if we are to follow Gunton's understanding of the use of metaphor as outlined above, the metaphor used will be in keeping not only with the user's experience, but also with the common experience of Christians. According to Gunton the first Christians used metaphors to express something which had happened to them and there was a common understanding that

such metaphors fitted their common experience [52]. There was widespread agreement among them that the metaphors they used in connection with atonement *expressed their interaction with reality truthfully* [53].

Finally, for a metaphor to be theologically valid it must, from a Christian perspective, find some support in the New Testament. That is not to say that it must be the same kind of metaphor as is used in the New Testament, but that if the metaphor expresses an aspect of teaching that is not supported by the New Testament then it must be open to question. It seems to me that these four criteria are minimal if a metaphor is to be theologically acceptable. They must now be applied to the notion that healing in the atonement might be understood as a metaphor.

In connection with the first of my proposed criteria it is by no means clear that atonement is readily intelligible as a metaphor for healing. The kind of metaphors Gunton talks about (redemption, justification, victory, etc.) are only intelligible when one understands first the literal significance of the terminology used and then is able to relate that significance either directly or indirectly to one's experience. For example, the early Christians' understanding of Christ's death as bringing them redemption presupposes their familiarity with, or at the very least their awareness of, the literal meaning of redemption in terms of slaves being bought out of slavery. This awareness, along with a personal experience as a result of which they perceived themselves to be liberated from slavery to sin, made the metaphor of redemption readily intelligible. Further, the metaphor is intelligible to the modern reader too, provided that (1) he is aware of the literal significance of redemption (ie what redemption meant in terms of slaves being set free) and (2) can relate that significance directly to his own experience or indirectly to that of another.

Chapter Ten

But can the notion that 'atonement' may be seen as a metaphor for healing be deemed intelligible by these criteria? Once we have understood the literal significance of atonement as that of reconciliation can we relate that significance to our experience of physical healing (whether direct or indirect)? At first sight there seems little obvious connection between the restoration of friendly relationships (reconciliation, atonement) and the physical healing of our bodies. Nevertheless, a little imaginative thinking may well provide a possible model whereby the notion is rendered intelligible. Clearly if I have a bad relationship with my doctor because I have ignored his advice on several occasions, I am not likely to avail myself of the cure he offers next time I am sick. Indeed, he may be unwilling to offer any such cure. If, however, friendly relations can be restored between us, the likelihood of his giving and my receiving the necessary remedial treatment is much greater. Healing will result from reconciliation.

This illustration hardly requires explanation! For the Christian, who sees himself as one who had ignored God's instructions but who has now been reconciled through the death of Christ, it is not difficult to believe that God, who in Christ revealed himself repeatedly as one who healed the sick who came to him, is both willing and able to heal him of his physical infirmities. In this sense healing may clearly result from the atonement.

Before proceeding further, however, it is important to note that if this model provides a basis for a metaphorical understanding that healing is in the atonement, this by no means supports the doctrine of those who have taught that Christ carried our sicknesses substitutionally on the cross [54]. Further, the suggestion that by the use of this model the doctrine might be understood in terms of metaphor is mine, not that of the original proponents. If my second criterion is valid then certainly *their* doctrine may not be understood

Healing & the Atonement

in terms of metaphor for they certainly did not understand themselves to be speaking metaphorically. Quite the opposite. They took that which was originally intended to be understood figuratively and applied it literally, thus collapsing the metaphorical tension.

Moreover, the notion must also be rejected in the light of my third criterion, for it does not 'express human interaction with reality truthfully'. The belief that healing is in the atonement did not bring - indeed it has never brought - healing for everyone. Indeed, as I shall demonstrate in the last section of this chapter, even some of those who believed in it most fervently did not receive the healing they expected.. The fact that the doctrine needed to be modified so quickly is abundant evidence of this [55].

And with reference to my fourth criterion, it is clear that if my main line of argument in this thesis is correct, the doctrine finds no real support in the New Testament when the appropriate verses are correctly exegeted. The attempt to find refuge for the doctrine as originally propounded by seeking to understand it in terms of metaphor is thus, in my view, plainly futile. The concept of metaphor might, however, provide a basis for a modified form of the doctrine by the use of the illustration I offered above. But this would support a view that saw healing as coming indirectly rather than directly from the atonement, a view with which, as I shall indicate later [56], I find no difficulty.

This concludes the section with regard to the theological difficulties which centre around the meaning of 'atonement'. The only ways forward that I have found for the doctrine lie in the understanding of 'atonement' in its wider connotation which includes aspects such as redemption and victory over the powers of evil. But even here the doctrine is only valid when set in the right eschatological tension - the 'already - not yet' of the kingdom of God.

Chapter Ten

Theological Difficulties - 'Claiming Promises'

In Part One of this thesis I traced the theological and literary origins and development of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement. From the early days of Carrie Judd Montgomery and A.B. Simpson to the modern teachers of the 'Faith Movement' the doctrine has been founded on the assumption that certain verses of the Bible may be 'claimed' as 'promises' [57]. In this section I shall challenge the understanding that Bible verses may be indiscriminately viewed as promises and in order to do so I shall briefly examine the use in the New Testament of ἐπαγγελία and its cognates. I shall also question the notion that God's promises need to be claimed.

For Carrie Judd Montgomery the understanding that Bible verses may be taken as promises was closely linked to her faith in the Bible as being literally God's Word:

"We are not apt to accept the Bible as literally as we ought. We get into a dangerous habit of considering its exhortations as in a great degree figurative or sacredly poetic, or as relating to past generations and not to our own.....

If we would accept every command contained in the Bible as a direct command to us from our Lord, and obeyed them all as literally as they were intended to be obeyed, we should find inestimable blessings attending such a course.

....With the promise in James so plain before us it is strange and sad that we should languish so long on beds of suffering making no effort to claim this promised healing..." [58].

Healing & the Atonement

Mrs. Montgomery's position appears to be that the exhortations, commands, and promises found in the Bible may, indeed should, all be applied literally to ourselves today. My purpose in drawing attention to this is not so much to expose the obvious hermeneutical weaknesses in Mrs. Montgomery's overall approach [59] as to illustrate the fundamentalist origins of the understanding that Bible verses may be claimed as promises. Yet for such an approach to be consistent with its own fundamentalist presuppositions it must surely be possible to show that the Bible itself indicates that its verses are to be understood in this way. And although there is indeed evidence in the New Testament that certain Old Testament verses were understood as 'promises' it is by no means clear that the understanding of the New Testament writers was akin to that of the proponents of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement as, I trust, the following examination of the ἐπαγγελία word-group in the New Testament will demonstrate.

The majority of references to ἐπαγγελία and its cognates in the New Testament are to be found in Luke/Acts, in the Pauline corpus, and in Hebrews [60]. In Luke/Acts, as far as the citation of Old Testament passages is concerned there appears at first sight to be a plurality of 'promises'. When Luke uses ἐπαγγελία he usually cites, or at least appears to have in mind, a statement attributed to God in the Old Testament. In Acts 7 the promise referred to in vv 5 and 17 is clearly Genesis 15:13-14 for this is cited in vv 6-7 [61]. Similarly, in Acts 13:23, 32-33, God is said to have promised to 'the fathers' that Christ would rise from the dead and in vv 33-35 Psalm 2:7, Isaiah 55:3, and Psalm 16:10 are cited as evidence of this. The references to the Holy Spirit as τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς (Luke 24:49, Acts 1:4) are accompanied by no immediate citation from the Old Testament, but that Joel 2:28ff is in mind is made clear in Acts 2:17ff.

Chapter Ten

There are thus in Luke/Acts several citations from the Old Testament which might well be understood to have been regarded as 'promises'. Closer examination of Luke's use of ἐπαγγελία, however, suggests that such a view is an over-simplification. Indeed, it may well be significant that Luke never refers to an OT citation specifically as a promise and never uses ἐπαγγελία in the plural form. This is perhaps because he understands there to be in effect only one promise, or, to borrow Pauline terminology, that all God's promises find their fulfilment in Christ (2 Corinthians 1:20). There is a strong suggestion in Acts 13:32-33 that for Luke the ἐπαγγελία is the εὐαγγέλιον:

Καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίαν γενομένην ὅτι ταύτην ὁ θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκεν τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῖν ἀναστήσας Ἰησοῦν....

With the exception of Acts 23:21 where the Jews in their attempt to kill Paul await the promise of the chiliarch, ἐπαγγελία is used in Luke/Acts to refer to:

- (1) God's promise to Abraham and his seed (Acts 7:5-7, 17),
- (2) Christ and his resurrection (Acts 13:23, 32-33, 26:6), and
- (3) the gift of the Spirit (Luke 24:49, Acts 1:4, 2:33, 39).

This analysis indicates that for Luke ἐπαγγελία is essentially a messianic term. The promise made to the fathers (Acts 26:6-7) was a promise to which the twelve tribes, serving God day and night, hoped to come. It was a promise which found its fulfilment in the resurrection of Jesus (Acts 13:32-33, 26:8). And the resurrection of Jesus was the key to the fulfilment of God's promise with regard to the Spirit (Acts 1:3-5). Thus for Luke ἐπαγγελία points primarily to the resurrection of Christ and the resultant gift of the Spirit to the Church. As Schniewind and Friedrich point out, ἐπαγγελία is

Healing & the Atonement

"a specific term for the word of divine revelation in salvation history. It is a word which expresses not merely the promise but also the fulfilment of what is promised" [62].

In short, if Luke understands certain verses of the Old Testament to be God's promises he nowhere indicates that they are to be appropriated by Christians at will and 'claimed' for themselves. Rather they are the declaration of the divine intention that God will bring about his purposes in history through the coming of the Messiah, by his death and resurrection, and through the consequent gift of the Spirit. This for Luke is the ἐπαγγελία. It is also his εὐαγγέλιον.

A similar understanding is readily discernible in the Pauline corpus. Although several Old Testament passages are clearly understood to be 'promises' [63], the use of ἐπαγγελία centres around the same theme as in Luke/Acts, the promise to Abraham and his seed [64], Christ himself [65], and the gift of the Spirit [66]. The promises are Messianic for it is Christ himself who is the fulfilment of those promises (Romans 15:8, 2 Cor. 1:20).

"The content of the promises, of the promised benefit, whether it be κληρονομία (R.4:13; Gl.3:18,29), or ζωή (Gl. 3:21; R.4:17), or δικαιοσύνη (Gl. 3:21), or πνεῦμα (Gl.3:14; Eph.1:13), or υἱοθεσία (Gl.4:22ff. and R.9:8) is always Messianic salvation. Hence it is possible to speak both of ἐπαγγέλαι in the plural and also of ἐπαγγελία. The promises have been fulfilled in Christ (R.15:8). He is the Yea of the promises of God, the fulfilment of salvation in person. By the fact that he has come to earth God has owned his promises; for they are all fulfilled in him (2 C.1:20)" [67].

Thus in the Pauline corpus, as in Luke's writings, the ἐπαγγελία is virtually indistinguishable from the εὐαγγέλιον. Promises are not something to be 'claimed' by Christians for in Christ they are already fulfilled. There is a sense, however, in which their final fulfilment is still awaited for

Chapter Ten

if Christ is himself the fulfilment of all God's promises that fulfilment is nevertheless for the Christian realised in the gift of the Spirit which is the ἁρρᾶβὼν and σφραγίς of an inheritance which is yet future (2 Corinthians 1:20-22, Ephesians 1:13-14). Christ is the fulfilment of all God's promises and the Spirit is God's pledge to the Christian that their ultimate fulfilment is guaranteed at the eschaton. The already/not yet tension of the Kingdom of God is thus clearly manifest with regard to God's promises, and that in my view must include the 'promises' of healing. But that is a theme which I shall develop at greater length in the final chapter of this thesis [68].

So far in this section I have underlined the clear emphasis in both Luke and Paul that ἐπαγγελία is primarily a term for the word of divine revelation in salvation history. This is not to deny that specific Old Testament sayings attributed to God are themselves on occasion referred to as promises [69]. It is rather to emphasise that such sayings, even when referred to as promises, are essentially messianic in intention. They are not the kind of 'promise' that a Christian 'claims' for himself, for they are already fulfilled in Christ and the gift of the Spirit is the Christian's guarantee that they will ultimately be fulfilled at Christ's coming. But can a similar emphasis be discerned in Hebrews where the use of ἐπαγγελία also features strongly?

In Hebrews promises were received by Abraham (6:13ff), Isaac and Jacob (11:9), Sara (11:11), the Judges, Kings and Prophets (11:32-33) and the Jewish people (4:1ff). Specific promises included the land of Canaan (11:9), rest (4:1), a posterity (6:14, 11:11-12), and an eternal inheritance (9:15). But all God's promises converge on the Messianic salvation which is yet future. Abraham lived in the land promised to him yet he lived as a stranger there awaiting the final fulfilment of the

city of God which he saw contained in the promise given to him (11:8ff). The fathers died in faith, not having received the promises but seeing them from afar they sought a heavenly country (11:13-16).

There is thus in Hebrews a strong eschatological emphasis with regard to God's promises, yet even here there is a sense in which the fulfilment is already accomplished in Christ. The new covenant which is established on 'better promises' (8:6) is brought about by the death of Christ (9:15). This covenant gives to those who are called the promised eternal inheritance (9:15) which the patient believer will receive at the Parousia which is soon to take place (10:35-37). Meanwhile as one who has received the Spirit he has already tasted the powers of the age to come (6:4-5).

The emphasis in Hebrews is, therefore, by no means dissimilar from that in Luke and Paul. Old Testament verses are cited and referred to as promises [70], but these are essentially Messianic, are already fulfilled in Christ and yet will not reach their ultimate fulfilment until the Parousia. Christians are in the tension between what is already and what is not yet, but in that interim they have the Spirit.

And the few references to 'promise' among other New Testament writers, though offering a far less complete picture, tend largely to confirm what we have said already. In James ἐπαγγέλλομαι points Christians forward to the crown of life (1:12) and to the kingdom (2:5) which God has promised to those who love him. In 2 Peter ἐπαγγελία and ἐπάγγελμα are strongly connected with the Parousia (3:4, 9, 13) [71], and in 1 John 2:25 ἐπαγγελία and ἐπαγγέλλομαι are used to refer to eternal life. Space forbids detailed exegesis of any of these verses, but they certainly appear to harmonise with the understanding which we have discerned in Luke/Acts, Paul and Hebrews. God's promises centre on the salvation which is offered to man in Christ. These promises are primarily

Chapter Ten

fulfilled already by the coming of Christ but find their ultimate completion at the Parousia. In the interim God has provided the eschatological gift of the Spirit as both a guarantee and a foretaste of the age to come.

This brief study of ἐπαγγελία and its cognates, therefore, clearly indicates that the New Testament offers no warrant for the practice of Christians taking Bible verses and 'claiming' them as 'promises'. This, of course, is not to suggest that God's promises mean nothing to the Christian today. But clearly Bible verses must not be indiscriminately wrested from their context and claimed as 'promises' as if the verse in question were the *ipsissima verba* of God to the reader. (This is obviously what is happening when a Christian who is physically sick 'claims' 1 Peter 2:24 and insists that he is not really sick on the grounds that he has already been healed by Jesus' stripes [72]!) Rather, the realisation that all God's promises find their fulfilment in Christ enriches the Christian's understanding of the salvation of which those promises speak. The promises, like salvation [73], are both fulfilled and yet to be fulfilled. In Christ the Christian has already received the fulfilment of all God's promises although the final outworking of many of those promises is still future. For that fulfilment the Christian awaits the eschaton. Meanwhile he has the promised gift of the Spirit which is not only a foretaste of the age to come but also its guarantee.

But there is a further difficulty with the notion that God intends us to claim his promises. This lies in the very nature of who God is and centres around the question as to whether it is appropriate to talk of 'claiming' a promise which has been made by God. This, of course, is not to assert that the phrase 'to claim a promise' is always without meaning. Indeed it is not difficult to envisage circumstances in which such a phrase might well be used meaningfully [74]. It is rather to challenge the appropriateness of such

terminology with reference to God's promises. Accordingly I offer four main reasons why I believe it is inappropriate for Christians to talk of claiming God's promises.

First, the idea that we should claim God's promises is not biblical. That is to say, not only is the understanding that Bible verses are to be indiscriminately understood as promises to Christians unbiblical [75], but the notion that the promises that are contained in the Bible are to be 'claimed' is equally unbiblical [76]. Of the seventy references in the New Testament to ἐπαγγελία and its cognates not one is used in conjunction with the verb 'to claim' [77].

Luke uses λαμβάνω in connection with ἐπαγγελία and on each occasion this refers to the gift of the Spirit. Christ is said to have received from the Father the promise of the Spirit (Acts 2:33) and the congregation at Pentecost are told to repent and be baptized and they will receive the gift of the Spirit 'for the promise is to you....' (Acts 2:38-39). The promise of the Spirit was something for which the disciples had been told to wait (περιμένω, Acts 1:4), and which, as from Pentecost was to be received (λαμβάνω, Acts 2:38) by those who repented and believed [78].

Paul also uses λαμβάνω in connection with 'the promise of the Spirit' (Galatians 3:14). Here the promise is received 'by faith' (cf. v 2) and is seen as a result of Christ's redemptive work on the cross (vv 13-14). It is perhaps here, if anywhere in the New Testament, that we come closest to the idea of a promise being claimed for it might well be argued that there is precious little difference between receiving a promise by faith and claiming it. But even if this be allowed it is noteworthy that Paul does not in fact use the terminology of claiming - this might have savoured too much of receiving by works, a notion he is here concerned to denounce - and that it is the Spirit, not healing, to which he is referring [79].

Chapter Ten

Paul also uses ἔχω with regard to ἐπαγγελία. In 2 Corinthians 7:1 Christians are said to 'have' certain promises and as a result are encouraged to be holy. The promises referred to are cited in the previous chapter (vv 16-18):

'I will live with them and walk among them, and I will be their God and they will be my people' (v16, cf. Leviticus 26:12)

and

'I will be a Father to you and you will be my sons and daughters', says the Lord Almighty' (v18, cf. 2 Samuel 7:14).

There is clearly no sense here in which these promises are intended to be 'claimed'. For Paul these promises, like all God's promises, are fulfilled in Christ (2 Corinthians 1:20), and it is because he understands Christians now to 'have' them that he can exhort his readers to be holy. Because of Christ God does live with you, he says, you are his people, he is your Father and you are his sons and daughters, so live accordingly, be holy. Thus the promises referred to here are not to be claimed for we already 'have' them. There is nothing further that could possibly be done to bring them to pass, for they are fulfilled in Christ. Rather, accepting that this is so, Christians must live as what they are, God's chosen people [80].

The writer to the Hebrews uses a wider range of verbs in connection with ἐπαγγελία. He uses λαμβάνω (9:15, 11:13) and ἔχω (7:6) but he also uses κομίζω (10:36, 11:39) and ἀναδέχομαι (11:17) both of which appear to be interchangeable with λαμβάνω (cf. 11:13 and 39). In none of these passages is there any suggestion that promises are to be 'claimed'. Indeed in 10:36 the need for perseverance (ὑπομονή) is stressed in order to receive the promise.

And perseverance is surely not far removed from patience (μακροθυμία) which is connected to both the remaining verbs used in Hebrews in relation to ἐπαγγελία. Promises are said to have been 'obtained' (ἐπιτυγχάνω) with patience (6:15, cf. 11:33) and by patience will be 'inherited' (κληρονομέω) (6:12, cf. 6:17, 11:9). Thus far from endorsing the notion that promises are to be actively claimed, the writer to the Hebrews insists that they are to be steadfastly and patiently awaited.

This brief summary of the use of verbs employed in the New Testament in connection with ἐπαγγελία, therefore, by no means indicates that New Testament writers understood that promises were intended to be claimed. Rather, as we have already noted [81], God's promises were seen as essentially Messianic, as already fulfilled in Christ, and yet as not yet reaching their ultimate fulfilment until the Parousia, which ultimate fulfilment Christians patiently and perseveringly await knowing that the present gift of the Spirit is God's ἀρρῶβὼν that all will be fulfilled at the eschaton.

Thus my first reason for rejecting the notion that God's promises need to be claimed is that the concept is not biblical. The second relates to the faithfulness of God. The writer to the Hebrews particularly stresses that God's promises are reliable. Christians are to hold unswervingly to the hope they profess, for he who promised is faithful (πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος) (10:23, cf. 11:11). The Christian's hope is firm and secure (6:19) an anchor for the soul because God's purpose is unchanging (6:17). Other New Testament verses also stress God's faithfulness and the reliability of his promises [82], and in the light of this it seems to me quite unfitting that a Christian be encouraged to 'claim' what God has promised. The appropriate response to a promise from one who is totally reliable is surely a simple and implicit trust that he will do what he has said, not an insistence on one's rights on the grounds that he has said it! Such an

Chapter Ten

insistence takes no account of the patience to which we have already referred.

Third, if my analysis thus far has been correct, God's promises are not only reliable but they are also soteriological. That is to say, inasmuch as they are primarily Messianic finding their fulfilment in Christ, they also find their fulfilment in the salvation that Christ has procured for us. That salvation has brought the Christian through the at-one-ment [83] into right relationship with God whereby he understands that God is his Father.

Now it is precisely here that I find difficulty with the idea of 'claiming' God's promises. If a personal illustration may be permitted, I have enjoyed throughout my life thus far a very warm and close relationship with my earthly father. I have known from him nothing but love, even if in my younger days that love was sometimes tempered with discipline. I count myself privileged to be his son and because he is the kind of father he is I not only love him but I trust him and respect him. Such is my relationship with him that I know that, if he has promised me something which it is in his power to perform, he will certainly do it. To claim such a promise - by saying, 'Father, I insist that you give me what you have promised me. Give it to me now. I demand it as my right. You have promised' - would be to doubt his love, impugn his integrity and question his faithfulness. But because I trust him and respect him I would not dream of so doing. Accordingly, it seems to me, that the Christian who needs to 'claim' God's promises has not yet fully understood how much his Father loves him.

And finally, if the notion that God's promises need to be claimed is to be rejected on the grounds that they are soteriological, it must also be rejected on the grounds that they are eschatological for if the promises find their fulfilment in Christ and in the salvation he has brought they

Healing & the Atonement

find their fulfilment in an eschatological salvation [84]. In other words God's promises must be understood in the light of the tension between the already and the not yet, to which tension I have already referred [85].

I conclude, therefore, that the practice, prevalent among the proponents of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement, of 'claiming' Bible verses as 'promises' from God finds no warrant in the New Testament. Thus the doctrine as originally expressed faces insurmountable theological difficulties both with regard to the meaning of 'atonement' [86], and with regard to the notion of 'claiming promises'. And the pastoral and practical problems it produces are equally serious.

Pastoral and Practical Difficulties

The doctrine that healing is in the atonement as originally expressed is so dogmatic with regard to the provision of healing for Christians who are physically sick that it leaves little or no room for those who remain unhealed. Because it offers no 'theology for the unhealed' [87] Christians who do not find healing through the doctrine [88] face doubts about the reality of their faith and the forgiveness of their sins. Indeed a sense of guilt about not being healed is by no means uncommon. In addition to these psychological problems produced by the doctrine, problems which clearly create difficulties for those attempting to help such Christians pastorally, very serious practical difficulties also arise when the doctrine leads to the rejection of medical means. In this final section of this chapter, therefore, I shall briefly demonstrate why the doctrine makes no room for the unhealed and illustrate by way of example the pastoral and practical difficulties the doctrine has caused. In the final chapter of this thesis I shall argue that a modified form of the doctrine would eliminate these difficulties.

Chapter Ten

The doctrine as originally expressed makes no room for the unhealed precisely because it is so positive and dogmatic not merely about God's willingness to heal the sick, but about what Christ is thought already to have done upon the cross. A Christian has no need to be sick because Christ has carried his sickness substitutionally on the cross [89]. A.B. Simpson's understanding of 1 Peter 2:24 is sufficient illustration of this:

"That one cruel stripe of His - for the word is singular - summed up in it all the aches and pains of a suffering world; and *there is no longer need that we should suffer what He has sufficiently borne* (my italics). Thus our healing becomes a great redemption right, which we simply claim as our purchased inheritance through the blood of His cross" [90].

Gloria Copeland's more recent statement is to the same effect;

"A Christian may continue to be sick.... *but he does not have to*" [91].

Such an approach clearly leaves no room for those who are sick. If they believe the doctrine they have been taught they perceive themselves to be, and understand that others perceive them to be, sick, but unnecessarily sick! The difficulty of living with the sickness is thus compounded by the frustration of not understanding why one is sick when one ought not to be and, according to the doctrine, need not be. It is to these psychological difficulties that we must now turn our attention.

The psychological and resultant pastoral problems which arise in this connection fall into three main areas. The first is doubt about one's faith. According to the doctrine, healing is readily available to the Christian and must simply be appropriated by faith [92]. If healing does not come the sick

Healing & the Atonement

Christian is thus led to the inescapable conclusion that his faith is in some way deficient. He consequently faces not only the problem of his physical sickness but also the spiritual battle of wondering why he does not have enough faith. This in turn may lead to a questioning as to whether his sins have been forgiven and, coupled with it, a very real sense of guilt.

This sense that one's faith is deficient is clearly an extremely serious issue, particularly among those who heavily stress the doctrine of justification by faith [93]. For if my faith is deficient with regard to healing (which according to the doctrine that healing is in the atonement it clearly might be if I am not healed) then how do I know that my faith for salvation, the forgiveness of my sins, is not also deficient? And this is no mere academic point. After 30 years' ministry in Assemblies of God and after innumerable conversations with Assemblies of God pastors during that period, I have discovered that this issue is undoubtedly the major area of pastoral concern with regard to the doctrine.

Nor is this concern of recent origin. As long as 40 years ago Donald Gee wrote:

"To assert that healing for our bodies rests upon an identical authority with healing for our souls in the atoning work of Christ our Saviour can involve serious problems of personal faith and confidence ... where Divine Healing, though 'claimed', has not been received" [94]

and

"Part of the unfortunate manner in which faith in Divine Healing sometimes has been sincerely promulgated ... is this continual suggestion that failure to get healed is rooted in some deep spiritual failure in the one who is sick. This attitude has added mental suffering to physical suffering, and in extreme

Chapter Ten

cases turned belief in Divine Healing into a scourge rather than a privilege, and a burden rather than a relief" [95].

The 'mental suffering' to which Gee refers here springs, as I have already suggested, partly from a sense of failure that one has not had enough faith to be healed and partly from a very real doubt as to whether one's sins have really been forgiven. But it is further intensified by a sense of guilt felt by the sufferer. Perhaps two recent examples from my own pastoral experience will provide sufficient illustration.

A friend who had been experiencing nightmares which resulted from sexual abuse during childhood was prayed for that she might be 'healed'. When the nightmares returned she confessed to me that she felt guilty about this. Clearly, she felt, there was some spiritual failure on her part or the nightmares would not have returned. Those ministering to her had heightened her expectation of healing, presumably with a view to increasing her faith, but when the anticipated healing did not happen her faith was in fact weakened and this resulted in an acute sense of guilt.

A similar sense of guilt had been borne for some years by a woman suffering from spondylitis. She told me of this after a sermon I had preached on the theme of 'The Sufferings of this Present Time' based on Romans 8:18 [96]. Taught that it was God's will that she be healed she had felt guilty that she was rarely free from pain. She now felt able to bear her pain more gladly for she was free from the guilt that had condemned her for not being healed.

Thus the doctrine that healing is in the atonement may, for those who are not healed, lead to a very real concern that their faith might be deficient. This in turn may produce both a sense of guilt and doubt concerning the forgiveness of their sins. The ultimate outcome of this may be a rejection of the Christian faith altogether both on the part of the unhealed

and on the part of those, such as relatives, who are closely connected with them [97].

But these are by no means the only difficulties caused by the doctrine. There are also very real practical difficulties. These include (1) the rejection of the use of all medical means [98], (2) the denial of all symptoms of disease [99], and (3) the harsh treatment and even ostracism of those who are terminally ill [100]. I shall deal with each of this points briefly in turn.

Although the early proponents of the doctrine encouraged the rejection of the use of medicine [101] in recent years its advocates have been more careful. As I have already pointed out [102] this is possibly because of the legal implications (particularly in the United States) rather than because of a change in convictions. And as Bruce Barron has aptly commented, though the main proponents of the doctrine never advocate abandonment of medical care, those who hear that healing is available to all who will claim it by faith might easily infer that [103]. Indeed, whatever the overt position of the teachers of the doctrine might be, there have been tragic cases among their followers because of the rejection of medical care.

Perhaps the best-known example of this is the case of the eleven-year-old diabetic Wesley Parker whose parents, trusting in the doctrine that healing is in the atonement, threw away his insulin. Refusing to return to a doctor, they watched Wesley die in agony. Even then, in their attempt to exercise faith, they planned a 'resurrection service' instead of a funeral. After the service they were arrested, found guilty of child abuse and imprisoned [104].

And allied to the rejection of medical care is, of course, the denial of symptoms which can be an equally risky business. McConnell points out that in diseases such as cancer, where

Chapter Ten

early detection is directly proportional to cure rates, the denial of symptoms can have tragic consequences. He records how physicians in Tulsa have described to him the frustration of attempting to treat serious illnesses that could have been prevented had they been diagnosed sooner. One cancer specialist commented that on a weekly basis he encountered believers who were denying the symptoms of cancer [105].

McConnell also records how a woman described to him the results of following the teaching to deny the reality of a sore throat. Although her sore throat persisted and worsened to a point that she grew seriously ill, she still did not seek medical attention. When she finally did see her doctor her sore throat turned out to be advanced rheumatic fever. Her health and mental clarity have been permanently affected [106].

Finally, according to McConnell, there have been consistent bad reports with regard to the treatment of the terminally ill on the part of some who hold the doctrine:

"Because of the belief that listening to a 'negative confession' can infect one's faith, not many in the Faith movement are willing even to be around, much less listen to those who are seriously ill in their own churches. Basically, the Faith churches have little or no concept of pastoral care for the chronically and terminally ill believer. Such a believer is shunned, isolated and ostracized as though he was an unbeliever - which by definition is precisely what he is, or else he would not be ill in the first place.... Perhaps the most inhumane fact revealed about the Faith movement is this: when its members die, they die alone" [107].

Clearly this criticism is not levelled against all who hold the doctrine that healing is in the atonement, but against the Faith movement specifically. Nevertheless the danger is clear. A doctrine which so dogmatically asserts the

Healing & the Atonement

availability of healing will inevitably cause problems for those who are not healed and may, indeed if McConnell is right sometimes does, affect the attitude of others towards them.

Summary

The doctrine that healing is in the atonement, therefore, produces a variety of practical and pastoral problems. Those who remain unhealed often experience doubts about their faith and about the forgiveness of their sins. This is frequently coupled with a sense of guilt and in some cases may lead to the rejection of Christianity altogether. The denial of symptoms and the rejection of medical care have resulted in tragically impaired health and, in some cases even death. The doctrine has also been the cause of harsh treatment of those who are terminally ill.

These problems, along with the serious theological difficulties discussed in the first two sections of this chapter, may offer sufficient grounds for the total rejection of the doctrine, at least in its original form. In the next and final chapter of this thesis, however, I hope to offer a modified form of the doctrine which not only overcomes the theological difficulties we have discussed but which, I believe, would if accepted also largely eliminate the pastoral and practical problems to which I have referred.

Chapter Ten

Healing & the Atonement

NOTES

1. See Parts Two and Three of this thesis, *passim*.
2. Cf. pp. 18-25 of this thesis.
3. If Christ died for our sicknesses *just as* he died for our sins (cf. pp. 1-2 of this thesis) then the unhealed Christian may well ask whether, since his sickness has not been healed, his sins have been forgiven, since both sickness and sin are seen to have been carried on the cross. Cf. pp. 309-315 in this chapter.
4. For an account of the origins of the doctrine see Chapter One of this thesis. The doctrine had its origins in the USA in the late nineteenth century. It was thus expressed in the English language.
5. See note 4. Bible quotations in the writings of the early proponents of the doctrine were in the Authorised Version.
6. Translated 'atonement' in the Authorised Version of Romans 5:11 καταλλάγη is elsewhere (both in the AV and in more recent versions) frequently translated 'reconciliation'. Earlier it was used by Tyndale to translate καταλλάγη in 2 Corinthians 5:18.
7. Concepts such as justification, redemption, substitution, propitiation, and victory over the powers of evil are linked with atonement both in the New Testament and in subsequent theological discussion. New Testament references include:

justification - Romans 5:1, 9

redemption - Matthew 20:28, Mark 10:45, Romans 3:24, Ephesians 1:7,
Colossians 1:14, 1 Timothy 2:6, 1 Peter 1:18

substitution - 2 Corinthians 5:21, Hebrews 9:28, 1 Peter 2:24, 3:18

propitiation - Romans 3:25, 1 John 2:2.

victory over the powers of evil - Colossians 2:13-15

Examples of these concepts being linked with atonement in recent theological discussion include:

Dillistone, F.W., *'The Christian Understanding of Atonement'*, London, SCM, 1984, (2nd Edn.), pp 29-114, 161-262

Gunton, C.E., *'The Actuality of Atonement'*, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1988, pp 53-142

8. 1987 edition

9. See Romans 5:10, 11:15, 1 Corinthians 7:11, 2 Corinthians 5:18, 19, 20. Cf. Büchsel's article on καταλλάσσω, καταλλάγη in TWNT, Eerdmans, 1978, Vol.1 pp 254-258.

10. Cf. my lengthy quotation from Stott on pp 93-94 of this thesis.

Chapter Ten

11. Cf. note 7. I have referred to justification, redemption, etc. as *concepts* and as *aspects*. Each is a concept in its own right yet each, if my understanding is correct, is an aspect of the central theme of atonement. John Stott has argued that:

"the salvation of Christ is illustrated by the vivid imagery of terms like 'propitiation', 'redemption'" etc. (Stott, op. cit. p.167)

and refers to such terms as 'images' of the atonement (ibid p. 168). Thus propitiation is an image from the temple court, redemption an image from the market place, justification an image from the law court etc. The theme of atonement is, therefore, central. Justification, redemption etc. are 'images' of that atonement. Although I have chosen the term 'aspects' rather than 'images' I agree with Stott that the atonement is central to them all.

Gunton, on the other hand, talks in terms of 'metaphors' and argues powerfully for the appropriateness of such metaphors in theology (Gunton, op. cit. pp. 27-52). Similarly Dillistone uses the terms 'analogies' and 'parables' which he sees as 'extended metaphors' (Dillistone, op. cit. p.vi). I shall return to the theme of metaphor later. See pp 291-297.

12. See p 282

13. It might be thought that substitution, like propitiation and justification, is so closely connected with sin that the same objection holds good. However, since the proponents of the doctrine hold that Christ carried our sicknesses just as he carried our sins and that his bearing of sickness was substitutionary (cf. pp 1-2 of this thesis), the concept of Christ bearing sickness instead of us must clearly be examined. See pp 297-291.

14. Chapter 8, esp. pp 235-239.

15. Aulén, G., *'Christus Victor'*, London, SPCK, 1931.
cf. Leivestad, R., *'Christ the Conqueror'*, London, SPCK, 1954

16. Aulén, op. cit. pp 22-23.

17. ibid p. 4. For discussion of some of the weaknesses is Aulén's position, see:

Gunton, op. cit. pp 54-59. Gunton's criticism (p.57) that Aulén has overlooked the fact that in the New Testament Christ's victory is seen to continue in the life of the Christian is most apposite here. For if the victory won on the cross over the principalities and powers may be understood (albeit indirectly) as a victory over sickness, then clearly the Christian might be expected to live in victory over sickness as he should live in victory over sin. However, note my cautions with regard to applying the victory motif to sickness on pp 235-239 of this thesis.

See also:

Healing & the Atonement

Dillistone, op. cit. p. 103

Stott, J.R.W., *'The Cross of Christ'*, Leicester, IVP, 1986, pp. 228-230

18. 1 Corinthians 6:20, 7:23

2 Peter 2:1

Revelation 5:9, 14:3,4.

19. ἀγοράζω, ἐξαγοράζω article in TWNT, Eerdmans, 1978, Vol.1, p. 124.

20. In Christian thought the 'god' has indeed done the 'slave' a great favour and the purchase is no pretence!

21. *ibid*, p 126.

22. However, many of the uses of λύτρον and its cognates in the New Testament no longer carry the force of ransom. This is especially true of ἀπολύτρωσις when used with regard to future redemption (e.g. Romans 8:23) - see λύτρον article in TWNT (Vol. 4), Eerdmans, 1978, pp 354-355.

23. *ibid*, p. 340.

24. NT uses of the λυτρόω word-group are as follows:

λύτρον - Matt. 20:28, Mark 10:45

ἀντιλύτρον - 1 Timothy 2:6

λυτρόω - Luke 24:21, Titus 2:14, 1 Peter 1:18

λύτρωσις - Luke 1:68, 2:38, Hebrews 9:12

λυτρωτής - Acts 7:35

ἀπολύτρωσις - Luke 21:28, Romans 3:24, 8:23, 1 Corinthians 1:30, Ephesians 1:7, 14, 4:30, Colossians 1:14, Hebrews 9:15, 11:35

25. Gloria Copeland certainly assumes so. Cf. pp 1-2 of this thesis.

26. δεσμός is used in Mark 7:35 with regard to a speech impediment. Here, however, the thought may be simply that of being 'tongue-tied'. There is no clear indication that Mark understood sickness in general as a bond.

27. See, for example, 4:38-39, 5:12-13, 15, 17-26, 6:6-10, 7:1-10, 8:43-48, 14:1-5, 17:12-19 where no mention is made of evil spirits in connection with sickness.

Indeed in several passages a contrast is made between healing and exorcism. See 4:40-41, 6:18, 8:2, 9:1-2. In other cases a sickness is specifically attributed to a spirit. See 11:14, 13:11.

This evidence indicates that Luke understood some sicknesses to be caused by evil spirits, but by no means all. Indeed he connects the two relatively rarely.

28. And even the thought that redemption (and therefore the atonement) brings release from sicknesses caused by Satan flounders on the ancient difficulty of understanding that the price paid for our redemption was paid to the devil. This theory is attributed first to Origen. See: Grensted, L.W., *'A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement'*, Manchester, MJP, 1920, pp 37-38.

Chapter Ten

For a rejection of Origen's view see:

Büchsel, TWNT Vol.4, Eerdmans, 1978, pp 343-344

Gunton, C.E., *'The Actuality of Atonement'*, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1988, pp. 64, 88.

29. In Hebrews 11:35 ἀπολύτρωσις is also used of physical deliverance, but here it does not refer to the theological concept of redemption.

There may well have been a physical connotation in the minds of the disciples on the road to Emmaus when they expressed their hope that Jesus might have been the one to redeem (λυτροῦσθαι) Israel. But their aspirations were probably political and in the context it is clear that they were lacking in understanding.

30. "The ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος in R.8:23 is not redemption from the body, but the redemption of the body. Comparison with v.21 proves this beyond cavil. As creatures attain to the freedom of the glory of the children of God when they are freed from bondage to corruption, so we shall attain to the υἱοθεσία, i.e. institution to sonship and its glory, when our body, which is dead because of sin (v.10), is freed from this curse of death and puts on incorruption and immortality (1C.15:53f.). For Paul to be without the body is not redemption. It is a state from which he shrinks (2C.5:2-4). He hopes for a new body (1C.15:35-57)" (Büchsel, TWNT Vol.4, Eerdmans, 1978, p.352).

31. See pp 234-235, 240.

32. In the Pauline corpus redemption is frequently seen as future. See: Romans 8:23, Ephesians 1:14, 4:30. (cf. also Luke 21:28).

It is also seen as something which Christians already have (Romans 3:24, 1 Corinthians 1:30, Ephesians 1:7, Colossians 1:14, Hebrews 9:15) but in these verses redemption is either explicitly (Col.1:14, Eph. 1:7) or implicitly (Rom. 3:24, 1 Cor. 1:30) equated with the forgiveness of sins.

33. See, for example, the outline of a modified version on pp 232-233 of this thesis.

34. See pp 12-24

35. Simpson, op. cit. p. 32. Cf. p 22 of this thesis and note 79 on p. 29.

36. For the intelligibility of sin-bearing as the taking of punishment for sin, see:

Calvin, *Institutes*, II.xvi.5

Packer, J.I., *'What did the Cross Achieve? The Logic of Penal*

Substitution', Tyndale Bulletin, 1974, 25, pp 3-45.

Stott, op. cit. pp 141 ff.

37. For Stott, to speak of Christ 'atoning for' our sicknesses is to 'mix categories'. See my lengthy quotation from Stott on p.94 of this thesis.

Healing & the Atonement

38. For a concise summary see Dillistone, op. cit. pp. 50ff, 93ff.
See also in Irenaeus *Adversus Haereses* such passages as III.18.1, V.6.1, V.21.1.
39. *Adversus Haereses*, III.18.1.
40. Dillistone, op. cit., p. 53.
41. For evidence that proponents of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement hold such a view, see pp. 18-24 of this thesis. See also p.80. I shall return to the subject of 'claiming promises' in the next section of this chapter.
42. For discussion of 1 Peter see pp 141ff.
43. Dillistone, op. cit., p. 53.
44. See p. 80 of this thesis, esp. the quote from McConnell.
45. See pp 347ff
46. Romans 8:23. Cf. pp 234-235, 286-287. See also notes 29-31 of this chapter.
47. Gunton, op. cit. pp 27-52
48. *ibid* p. 32
49. *ibid* pp 33-46
50. A similar approach is adopted by Dillistone who discusses atonement in terms of analogies and parables. He seeks to express the atonement not merely with the traditional biblical metaphors but also by the use of modern illustrations. "The search for analogies and parables (which can be viewed as extended metaphors) continues. No single pattern of language is adequate to encompass the total meaning of the Cross"
Dillistone op. cit. p. vi.
51. See Chapter 5 of this thesis.
52. As evidence of this consider the metaphor of redemption which is used by a great variety of NT writers.
53. Cf. p. 292.
54. Cf. pp. 2, 34-37.
55. See, for example, pp. 16, 44-53 of this thesis.

My argument here may be countered by the suggestion that the doctrine is not invalidated by the fact that on occasion it does not appear to work in practice, any more than the doctrine that Christians should live sinless lives because of Christ's redemptive work (cf. Romans 6:1-14).

Chapter Ten

is invalidated by the fact that Christians go on sinning¹ after their conversion. If Gunton's understanding is right, however, (cf. my summary Gunton's position on pp. 291-293), the military, legal and commercial metaphors used by the first Christians to describe their understanding that they had been reconciled to God *did* express their interaction with reality truthfully, whereas, in my view, the use of atonement terminology to express the healing experiences of the early Pentecostals clearly did not. (Cf. also pp. 309-315).

56. See pp. 345ff in the final chapter of this thesis.

57. See pp. 18-24, 35, 42, 68, 80-81 of this thesis.

58. Montgomery, C.J., op. cit., pp. 12, 14. Cf. note 76.

59. Verses are quoted as 'proof-texts' often without reference to the literary, historical or sociological context. I have already demonstrated that the key verses used to support the doctrine that healing is in the atonement, when exegeted with proper reference to their context, do not in fact support it. See Chapters Four and Five of this thesis. The quoting of such verses out of context is a major failing of proponents of the doctrine. See, for example, pp 79ff of this thesis.

60. Other references are James 1:12, 2:5, 2 Peter 3:4, 9, and 1 John 1:5, 2:25.

61. Other 'promises' were also possibly in mind. See, for example, Genesis 12:7, 13:15, 15:18, 17:8.

62. Schniewind, J. & Friedrich, G., ἐπαγγελία article in TDNT, ed. G. Kittel, ET G.W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1977, Vol. 2, p. 582.

63. To use Romans as an example:

Genesis 15:6 is cited in Romans 4:17 in the context of promise (vv 13, 14, 16, 20). Genesis 18:10 is cited as a promise in Romans 9:9. In Romans 15:8 Paul speaks of promises made to the fathers and in vv 9-12 cites Psalm 18:49, Deut. 32:43, Psalm 117:1, and Isaiah 11:10.

64. Romans 4:13, 14, 16, 20, 21
9:4, 8-9
Galatians 3:14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 29
4:23, 28
Ephesians 2:12

65. Romans 15:8
2 Corinthians 1:20

66. 2 Corinthians 1:20-22
Galatians 3:14
Ephesians 1:13

67. Schniewind and Friedrich, loc. cit., pp. 583-4.

Healing & the Atonement

68. See pp. 347ff. For comment on the use of ἐπαγγελία in 2 Cor. 1:20 see also note 58 on p. 359 of this thesis.
69. Romans 15:8 and 2 Corinthians 6:16-7:1 are clear examples of this. Cf. p. 306 of this thesis.
70. Cf., for example, 3:7-11 & 4:1.
71. ἐπαγγελμα is also used in 2 Peter 1:4 to refer to the precious promises by which Christians become partakers of the divine nature (θείας φύσεως). This is manifested progressively as Christians add to their faith one virtue after another (vv 5-10) but culminates in an abundant entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (v.11).
72. Cf. pp 36-37, 81-82, 141-161.
73. Salvation in the New Testament is spoken of in Past, Present, and Future terms. Christians are those who have been saved (Eph. 2:5, 8, Tit. 3:5), those who are being saved (Acts 2:47, 1 Cor. 1:18, 2 Cor. 2:15), and those who are yet to be saved (Acts 2:21, Rom. 13:11, 1 Cor. 5:5, Heb. 9:28, 1 Pet. 1:15).
74. A promise might reasonably be said to be 'claimed' when we insist that a person does for us what they have said they will do. This is certainly the sense in which Mrs. Montgomery talks about claiming God's promises (cf. note 58). Such terminology is appropriate with regard to promises made by our fellow-men who sadly do not always keep their promises.
75. See pp 299-304.
76. T.L. Osborn teaches that claiming a promise is like cashing a cheque:

"The promises you read in the Bible are God speaking to you personally. They are just as much yours as a check which is made out to your name. You can cash that check at the bank because it is yours, and you can claim those promises in prayer because they are just as much yours".

Osborn, T.L., *'Healing from Christ'*, Tulsa, Osborn, 1961, p. 11.

Osborn continues by quoting a variety of verses including 1 Peter 2:24 and concludes:

"Do you believe God's promises are for YOU? If so, claim them in sincere prayer, and God will fulfill them. Do not doubt. Believe His Word. It is as though He were speaking personally to YOU" (ibid p. 13).

However Osborn fails to warn that such 'promises' need to be rightly understood in their context. Further, if the analogy of the cheque is to be taken to its logical conclusion, a cheque made out to someone else cannot (unless endorsed) be cashed by me. It is clearly unreasonable to suggest that Christians may 'claim' any promise made by God in the Bible without considering first to whom that promise was originally made.

Chapter Ten

77. Indeed it is questionable whether the verb 'claim' is to be found in the New Testament. It is certainly to be found nowhere in the Authorised Version - the version used and quoted by the proponents of the doctrine. If a claim is 'an assertion of a right' (SOED) then the notion of claiming is absent from the New Testament probably because it did not belong to the world-view of the first Christians. It rather belongs to the post-Enlightenment thinking of modern democracy.

78. Paul also uses λαμβάνω in connection with the promise of the Spirit (Galatians 3:14) which is said to be received by faith. But neither Luke nor Paul uses the terminology of claiming. For discussion of the significance of receiving the Spirit, see:

Dunn, J.D.G., *'Baptism in the Holy Spirit'*, London, SCM, 1970, passim

Ervin, H.M., *'Conversion-Initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit'*, Peabody MA, Hendrickson, 1984, passim

Lull, D.J., *'The Spirit in Galatia'*, Chico CA, SBL, 1980, pp. 72-74.

Pawson, J.D., *'The Normal Christian Birth'*, London, Hodder, 1989, passim.

Cf. also my own unpublished M.Th. Dissertation:

'The Baptism in the Holy Spirit in Relation to Christian Initiation', Nottingham University, 1987.

79. For my rejection of the claim that healing is referred to in this passage see pp 163-173 of this thesis.

80. The writer to the Hebrews also uses ἔχω in connection with ἐπαγγελία (Hebrews 7:6). Here Abraham is referred to as 'the one who had the promises' an expression which in its context clearly means 'the one to whom the promises had been made'.

81. pp 299-304.

82. See, for example, 1 Corinthians 1:9, 10:13, 1 Thes. 5:24, 2 Thes. 3:3, 2 Peter 3:9, 1 John 1:9, Rev. 1:5, 3:14, 19:11, 21:5, 22:6.

83. Cf. pp 281-282.

84. Cf. Note 73.

85. See pp. 302-304. See also pp. 347ff.

86. See pp. 280-297.

87. 'A Theology for the Unhealed' was the title of a confidential paper given by Keith Munday (General Secretary of Assemblies of God in Great Britain and Ireland) to a joint meeting of members of the Assemblies of God and Elim Executive Councils on 18th November 1986 at Cobham, Surrey. The paper (perhaps surprisingly) does not comment on the doctrine that healing is in the atonement, but illustrates the fact that the leaders of two major Pentecostal groups, both of which believe firmly in Divine Healing (See Appendix, pp.373-4), felt the need to face the problem of those who are not healed.

Healing & the Atonement

88. As an example of how proponents of the doctrine have taught that healing might be received, see 19-20 of this thesis.
89. See quotes from proponents of the doctrine on pp 1-2, 14-15, 18, 19-23, 34-35, 38-39, 41-43, 83.
90. Simpson, op. cit., p. 32.
91. See p. 1 of this thesis.
92. See, for example, pp 19-20 of this thesis.
93. The doctrine that healing is in the atonement is held largely by groups who emphasise that justification is by faith. British Assemblies of God, for example, not only believe 'that deliverance from sickness, by Divine Healing, is provided for in the Atonement', but 'in salvation through faith in Christ who died for our sins' and that 'this experience is also known as the New Birth, and is an instantaneous and complete operation of the Holy Spirit upon initial faith in the Lord Jesus Christ' (Assemblies of God Year Book, 1991, p. 10).
94. Gee, D., *'Trophimus I Left Sick'*, London, Elim, 1952, pp. 21-22.
95. *ibid* p. 12.
96. Cf. pp.348-350 of this thesis.
97. For an example of this see Barron, op. cit. p. 130.
98. For examples of this and for modifications to this position see in this thesis pp. 14-18, 24, 37, 39, 43, 48-49, 262ff.
99. Cf. pp 81-82.
100. See McConnell, op. cit. p. 166.
101. See pp. 14-18 of this thesis.
102. See p. 37.
103. Barron, op. cit. p. 129.
104. The full story of Wesley's tragic death is told by his father in:

Parker, L., *'We Let Our Son Die'*, Eugene Ore., Harvest House, 1980.
105. McConnell, op. cit. pp. 165 and 169.
106. *ibid* p. 169.
107. *ibid* p. 166.

Chapter Ten

CHAPTER ELEVEN: A PROPOSED MODIFICATION
TO THE DOCTRINE

In Part One of this thesis I examined the doctrine that healing is in the atonement in relation to Classical Pentecostalism [1] and in so doing identified several New Testament passages which are adduced as evidence in support of the doctrine. In Part Two I considered these passages [2] and concluded that none of them when correctly exegeted supports the doctrine. Part Three was devoted to a discussion of New Testament themes relating to the doctrine and here again I found no legitimate support for the doctrine as originally propounded. Finally, in Part Four, I have indicated what I consider to be major difficulties for the doctrine both from a theological perspective and from a practical and pastoral point of view.

The weight of evidence against the doctrine, therefore, might well suggest that it should be abandoned entirely. Before reaching such a conclusion, however, the possibility of a modified form of the doctrine must be considered. This possibility has indeed already begun to emerge [3] and must in this the final chapter of this thesis be clarified and examined more closely. It will be appropriate first, however, to indicate why the retention of the doctrine, albeit in a modified form, is thought to be desirable.

Rationale for attempting a modification to the doctrine

If the doctrine that healing is in the atonement is, in its original form at least, unacceptable, then it must clearly be either abandoned or modified. In my view the latter is the more helpful approach for, despite the arguments which I have in this thesis brought to bear against the doctrine, and despite the problems which I have shown it to produce, it is evident that it has (1) been a source of benefit to some who

Chapter Eleven

have embraced it, that it has (2) in some measure kept the attention of the Pentecostals focused on healing, and that it has (3) to some extent provoked serious thought as to the holistic nature of salvation. I shall deal with each of these points briefly in turn.

First, it seems to me quite clear that the doctrine has been of benefit to some who have embraced it in that it has drawn their attention to God's willingness to heal. For implicit in the understanding that healing is in the atonement is the understanding that healing is *provided* in the atonement [4]. The quotation from Gloria Copeland on the first page of this thesis is clear evidence that those who hold that healing is in the atonement believe that it is God's will to heal, as is Hicklin's repeated slogan GOD WISHES TO HEAL THE SICK: ALL OF THEM: ALWAYS [5]. This emphasis on God's willingness to heal has undoubtedly resulted in many testimonies of healing [6] and the value of this is by no means to be minimised. On the other hand an over-emphasis on God's willingness to heal can result in the kind of tragedy to which I referred in the previous chapter [7]. Any modification to the doctrine, therefore, should, if possible, emphasise God's willingness to heal in such a way that it encourages faith [8] for healing without leading to either a fanatical rejection of medical care on the part of some or a sense of unforgiveness, failure and guilt on the part of others who may not be healed.

Second, it seems to me that the presence of a very positive statement with regard to divine healing (such as is provided by the doctrine that healing is in the atonement) in the Declaration of Faith of most Pentecostal groups [9] has ensured a continued interest in healing among those groups [10]. A weaker statement might well have led to a declining enthusiasm and to a relatively low expectation of healing. If a modified form of the doctrine is to be embraced, therefore, it must in my view be sufficiently strong as to continue to

Healing & the Atonement

promote an active expectation of healing on the part of those who are sick and of those who pray for the sick.

Third, the doctrine has been valuable in that it has stimulated serious thought with regard to the holistic nature of salvation. Dayton has pointed out that divine healing has been understood by Pentecostals as part of the 'full gospel' since the beginnings of the movement's existence [11]. Salvation is thus understood to be 'holistic' in that it touches the whole man. God is interested in our body as well as our soul. This is clearly expressed in a paper given by Vernon Purdy of Fuller Theological Seminary to the Society for Pentecostal Studies in which he states:

"The major concern of this paper is to show the inner logic of the classical Pentecostal doctrine that Christ's passion provides the basis for a salvific experience of God's grace not just in the inner person (soul, spirit, etc.) but also for the outer person (physical). . . . The presupposition that underlies the Pentecostal hope for divine healing for the body as well as the soul is the assumption that God created not just souls but whole persons as well as souls. 'The Whole Gospel for the whole person' is a Pentecostal theme. . . . Biblical anthropology portrays human persons in wholistic (sic) terms" [12].

Purdy believes that a holistic conception of anthropology and soteriology is a dire necessity for the church today and that the classical Pentecostal doctrine of divine healing is a step in the direction of a broader view of man and of Christ's holistic work of salvation. He argues that

"throughout the biblical story . . . the community of faith, whether it was Israel or the church, felt the implication of God's Lordship in all areas of life, spiritually, physically, and socially. . . . Pentecostal theology helps us recover the physical dimensions of Christ's Lordship" [13].

Chapter Eleven

Space forbids detailed analysis of Purdy's important contribution. Of primary significance for our present discussion is his insistence that 'the body-soul dualism of Plato and the revision of that dualism by Aristotle are responsible for the separation of the body and soul in Christian theology' [14], that 'body (σῶμα), soul (ψυχή), spirit (πνεῦμα), etc. are only terms used to point to different aspects or facets of human existence' for 'they never have an independent existence of their own [15], and that 'human persons are not a disjointed composite of dissimilar parts but a whole with various aspects' [16].

It is easy to see how the doctrine that healing is in the atonement fits into such an understanding and at first sight one is tempted to agree with Purdy's defense of the doctrine in these terms. However, three factors are immediately noteworthy here. First, Purdy's brief attempt to defend the view that sees Matthew 8:17 as teaching that healing is in the atonement is, in my view, extremely unconvincing for he attempts no exegesis of the passage [17]. Second, he rightly strongly emphasises the eschatological perspective with regard to the redemption of the body [18] and his view therefore fits the modified version of the doctrine which I am about to propose [19] far better than the original version. Third, the very recognition that the redemption of the body must be viewed eschatologically must surely in some measure challenge Purdy's holistic anthropological assumptions [20].

Yet despite these criticisms Purdy's paper does illustrate how the doctrine that healing is in the atonement may lead to serious consideration of how biblical anthropology and soteriology may be viewed holistically. If this in any measure contributes to the understanding that man's physical and material needs - as distinct from his spiritual needs - are of legitimate concern for the Christian then to that extent at least the doctrine may prove to have been of value. For these reasons it seems to me better to propose a

modification to the doctrine rather than to reject it outright. It is to that modification that we must now turn our attention.

A Proposed Modification to the Doctrine

I have already given some indication of the modification I propose [21]. I shall now briefly summarise and clarify this before seeking to justify my proposition in greater detail. I have suggested that there is no legitimate reason to exclude sickness from the scope of Paul's thinking in the phrase τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ (Romans 8:18) [22] and that, therefore, Paul may well have understood sickness to have resulted from Adam's sin. If this be so, and if Christ's death on the cross dealt with Adam's sin, then Christ's death has dealt with the cause of sickness. The final outworking of Christ's victory at Calvary, however, will not be consummated until the Parousia. Meanwhile Christians 'groan' along with the rest of creation (Romans 8:22-23) awaiting the redemption of the body. This redemption of the body, to which it seems clear that Paul also refers in 1 Corinthians 15:50-57, will take place ἐν ἁτόμῳ, ἐν ῥιπῇ ὀφθαλμοῦ (v:52) and will confer upon the Christian a new body which is both immortal and imperishable (ἀθανασία, ἄφθαρτος). This ultimate victory over death itself is a direct result of Christ's own victory over death (v:57) [23]. This is the ultimate 'healing' and is undoubtedly in Paul's thinking a result of the atonement.

But if we left the matter there there would be no hope of healing now. Christians would be left suffering and groaning and waiting until the Parousia. For Paul, however, the difficulty is solved in some measure at least by the gift of the Spirit (Romans 8:23) which is given to Christians as the ἀπαρχή (firstfruits) of the eschaton. Elsewhere he refers to the Spirit as the ἄρροβόν (pledge) [24] and the σφραγίς (seal) [25] of the coming κληρονομία (inheritance), and it is through the Spirit that gifts of healing are given (1 Corinthians

Chapter Eleven

12:9). Moreover, the Christian's reception of the Spirit is itself a result of the atonement (Galatians 3:13-14).

Healing may thus be understood to be 'in the atonement' in two senses. First, it may be understood to be ultimately in the atonement in that the Christian's ultimate victory over death and his reception of an immortal and imperishable body is undoubtedly for Paul a result of Christ's victory on the cross. And second, it may be understood to be indirectly in the atonement in that the gift of the Spirit is a result of the atonement and healing is a work of the Spirit. Thus the blessings of the age to come are in some measure available to the Christian now through the work of the Spirit. But these concepts must now be examined in greater detail.

Healing in the Atonement - ultimately

The argument that physical healing may be rightly understood to be ultimately in the atonement rests on two assumptions, (1) that when Christians' bodies are 'changed' at the Parousia (1 Corinthians 15:51) their sicknesses will be healed, and (2) that that healing will be in some sense a result of Christ's death on the cross. These two assumptions must now be examined in the light of 1 Corinthians 15:35-57. Space forbids a detailed exegesis of this passage but I shall first briefly set the passage in the context of the chapter as a whole and then seek to show that it supports both of the above assumptions.

The fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians appears to have been written in response to the suggestion on the part of some that 'there is no resurrection of the dead' (v 12) [26]. Paul's response falls into three main sections:

- 1) The reality of Christ's resurrection (vv 1-11)
- 2) The illogicality of his opponents' position (vv 12-34)

3) The nature of the resurrection body and the Parousia.

(vv 35-57).

The first section in which Paul seeks to establish the reality of Christ's resurrection need not concern us here except to say that it is upon this that his argument throughout the rest of the chapter is predicated.

The second section, in which Paul seeks to demonstrate the illogicality of his opponents' position, falls into three sub-sections. In vv 12-19 he argues that if the dead are not raised then it follows that Christ was not raised, his preaching and their faith are therefore futile and they are still in their sins. In vv 20-28 he insists that since Christ has been raised believers too will be raised from the dead. The noteworthy contrast between Adam and Christ in these verses is, as I shall show shortly, significant with regard to our present discussion. Death came through a man (Adam) and resurrection comes through a man (Christ). In Adam all die, but in Christ all will be made alive. Christ's resurrection is thus the ἀπαρχή of a full harvest of 'those who belong to him'. This will take place 'when he comes'. Finally, in vv. 29-34, Paul argues that his present activities and those of the Corinthians are absurd if there is no resurrection from the dead.

It is the third section of the chapter, however, that is of the greatest significance with regard to the question of healing at the Parousia and its relation to the atonement. This section (in which Paul answers the question posed in verse 35, 'How are the dead raised?') also falls naturally into three sub-sections:

a) Illustrations from nature about different kinds of 'body' (vv. 35-41)

b) The contrast between the 'natural' and the 'spiritual' body (vv. 42-49)

Chapter Eleven

(This sub-section also contains a significant reference to Adam to which I shall refer shortly - see vv. 45ff. Cf. vv. 21-22).

c) A description of the Parousia - the change from the 'natural' to the 'spiritual' body (vv. 50-57).

It is in this third section of the chapter that a clear indication is given of Paul's understanding of the events that would take place at the Parousia and from which I shall argue that the two assumptions I have made may be justified. We must first consider the assumption that when Christians' bodies are 'changed' (v.51) at the Parousia their sicknesses will be healed. In support of this assumption the following factors must be considered.

First, it is noteworthy that Paul is concerned in this passage not only with the resurrection of the dead but also with the transformation of those who are still alive at the Parousia [27]. Their bodies are to be 'changed' too. In v. 50 he states that (1) flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God and that (2) the corruptible does not inherit incorruption. Jeremias understands the two clauses to refer to the living and the dead respectively:

"The two lines of verse 50 are contrasting men of flesh and blood on the one hand and corpses in decomposition on the other. In other words, the first line refers to those who are alive at the parousia, the second line to those who died before the parousia. The parallelism is thus not synonymous but synthetic and the meaning of verse 50 is: neither the living nor the dead can take part in the Kingdom of God - as they are" [28].

Fee, however, rejects Jeremias' interpretation of the second clause and qualifies his understanding of the first:

"The two lines are most likely to be understood as synonymous parallelism, so that the second makes the same point as the

Healing & the Atonement

first. Together they declare most decisively that the body in its present physical expression cannot inherit the heavenly existence of vv. 47-49. Of the two terms that describe present physical existence, the second, 'the perishable', was used in v. 42 and will be repeated in vv. 52-54. Contrary to Jeremias, it does not refer to what is already dead, but to that which in its present form is subject to decay, which in itself rules out its possibility for eternal longevity.

This is probably also how we are to understand the more ambiguous 'flesh and blood'. On the one hand this could refer to the *composition* of the present body; a body so composed cannot enter the Eschaton. Very likely a dimension of this understanding must be included. On the other hand, Jeremias popularized the view that it means 'the living' in contrast to 'the dead'; the living cannot enter the kingdom as they are. Although this seems to move in the right direction, both of these are probably too narrowly conceived. Most likely it refers simply to the body in its present form, composed of flesh and blood, to be sure, but subject to weakness, decay, and death, and as such ill-suited for the life of the future" [29].

It seems to me that Fee's understanding fits better the overall sense of the passage. What is most significant, however, is that both Jeremias and Fee agree that the living as well as the dead need to be transformed in order to take part in the Kingdom of God. Thus both the living and the dead are in some way to be 'changed' at the Parousia.

But this leads us to the second factor to be considered in support of the assumption that Christians are to be made physically whole at the Parousia. If the living and the dead are to be 'changed' what kind of change is to take place? This is clarified in verses 52-53 where Paul speaks of the necessity for the corruptible to be clothed with incorruption, the presence of the conjunction γάρ (v.53) suggesting that again both the living and the dead are indicated. Thus the

living as well as the dead are to be 'changed' for they have 'corruptible' bodies which must 'be clothed with incorruption' (v.53).

But by referring not only to the corruption which takes place in our body after death but also to the corruptible nature of our present body Paul clearly brings the healing of sickness within the scope of the physical transformation which he envisages for he surely has in mind every conceivable aspect of our human physical weakness and frailty including sickness. It is interesting that in verse 43 he has already used ἀσθένεια in connection with the 'natural' body, but this should not in itself be taken to refer specifically to sickness, for it is here more naturally translated as 'weakness' in the light of the contrast with 'power' (ἐν δυνάμει). It is, nevertheless, surely natural to understand it as carrying in some measure the thought of sickness if only as a part of the 'weakness' of our overall human condition [30].

Further, it seems to me self-evident that if a body were to become incorruptible it would by definition be no longer subject to sickness. Moreover, if it had been sick before, upon becoming incorruptible it would immediately cease to be sick. In short the clear implication of Paul's teaching is that the change which is to take place at the Parousia will by the very totality of its nature involve the healing of sickness.

But there is at least one further factor that indicates that the healing of sickness may be understood to be implicit in this passage. This is with regard to the references to Adam. If I am right in understanding with most commentators that Romans 8:18ff refers to the Fall [31] and that there is no need to exclude sickness from the scope of Paul's use of τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ, then a connection in Paul's thinking between Adam's sin and the origin of sickness has already been

established. The references to Adam in 1 Corinthians 15 (vv.21-22 and vv.45-49) must now be considered in order to determine whether or not they confirm this view.

With regard to vv.21-22 it seems evident that this is a clear reference to the Fall. Paul argues that as death came through a man (sc. Adam) so through a man (sc. Christ) came resurrection from the dead, for 'as in Adam all die, so in Christ all will be made alive'. Paul's understanding of the resurrection of those 'in Christ' (which later in vv. 50-57 he makes clear will take place at the Parousia) is thus closely linked with his understanding of the Fall [32]. Death comes through Adam because of the Fall. Life comes through Christ whose resurrection Paul sees as the ἀπαρχή of the resurrection of those who are in Christ. The resurrection of which he speaks is thus the ultimate antidote to the sufferings ushered in by the Fall, and if, as I have suggested, Paul understood sickness to have resulted from the Fall, then the Parousia must surely be the end of it.

And vv.45-49, although taking us back beyond the Fall to the creation of man himself, are also closely connected with it. In verses 42-44 Paul describes the body in which we live our present life as being 'sown' (ie buried) ἐν φθορᾷ... ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ ... ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ. This body he calls σῶμα ψυχικόν. In contrast it is raised ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ ... ἐν δόξῃ ... ἐν δυνάμει. This body he calls σῶμα πνευματικόν. Our present bodies are thus 'natural' (ψυχικός) and are buried in corruption, dishonour, and weakness. They are to be raised as 'spiritual' (πνευματικός) bodies in incorruption, glory and power. And the term ψυχικός is certainly linked with Adam. In verse 44 Paul states that 'there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body'. In support of this he cites in verse 45 the LXX of Genesis 2:7. The use of the term εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν to refer to Adam clearly links Adam with the term ψυχικός and thus with the associated corruption, dishonour, and weakness [33].

Chapter Eleven

The evidence that the Fall is not far from Paul's thinking in these verses is twofold. First, it seems likely that at the time of writing 1 Corinthians Paul already held the view that Adam's transgression was the cause of physical death. This he later made explicit in Romans 5:12-21, but 1 Corinthians 15:20-22 is sufficient evidence not only that he held this view - albeit perhaps in a simpler form - but that it was very much in mind as he wrote chapter 15. Second, it is likely that the Fall is in mind, not only in the chapter as a whole, but also in verses 42 to 49 specifically, because the sub-section is commenced with a reference to the resurrection of the dead and continues with the theme of burial (cf. σπείρεται vv 42-44). Indeed resurrection from the dead is the theme of the entire chapter. This, together with Paul's overall emphasis that physical death is a result of Adam's sin, along with the explicit references to Adam himself at the heart of the sub-section, suggests forcibly that Paul's understanding of the Fall is prominent here. In short, the corruptibility, dishonour and weakness of the human body referred to in these verses is directly related to the fact of physical death, and that for Paul was a result of the Fall [34].

Yet as we have already noted these verses take us back beyond the Fall to the creation of man himself and we must ask whether the corruption, dishonour and weakness of which Paul speaks result not from the Fall but simply from man's being created out of dust as the citation from Genesis 2:7 seems to suggest. Verse 47 indicates that Adam was ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός and this appears to be linked with ψυχικός (vv.46-47). It is clear that at present (v.49) we bear the earthly (χοϊκός) likeness of Adam, that our natural (ψυχικός) body is thus made of dust (χοϊκός) and will be buried in corruption (φθορά), dishonour (ἀτιμία), and weakness (ἀσθένεια), and that by contrast the 'spiritual' (πνευματικός) body which Christians will receive at the Parousia will be incorruptible and immortal (vv. 53-54). Does, therefore, our human frailty

spring from the Fall or rather from our nature as beings created from dust?

The major thrust of any attempt to answer this question must surely lie in Paul's purpose in writing these verses and in this connection three considerations are significant. First, Paul is not attempting to show in this passage why we have weak and corruptible bodies. His primary concern is to show the plausibility of believing in the resurrection of the body in the light of the sceptical question posed in verse 35: 'How are the dead raised and with what kind of body will they come?' His answer to this question is that 'when you sow you do not plant the body that will be, but just a seed' (v.37). So, he says, it is with the resurrection of the dead (v.42). Following this analogy he seeks to show the contrast between the body that is 'sown' (ie buried) and the body that is to be raised (vv.42-49). Paul's hope of resurrection is based entirely in Christ for, as he has stated earlier (vv.21-22), 'in Adam all die' but 'in Christ all shall be made alive'.

The reference to Adam as *χοϊκός*, therefore, must be understood as part of the dramatic contrast between Adam and Christ. Paul is not producing a systematic theology aimed at explaining the reasons for human frailty. He is marshalling arguments for the credibility of resurrection. That credibility is based on the stark contrast between Adam and Christ, between the hopelessness of being in Adam and the real hope of being in Christ. The essence of that contrast is that Adam is natural (*ψυχικός*) and earthly (*χοϊκός*) whereas Christ is spiritual (*πνευματικός*) and heavenly (*ἐπουράνιος*). Of course the resurrection of the natural, earthly body is inconceivable. But he argues that at the Parousia those who are in Christ will be raised with 'spiritual' (sc. 'supernatural' [35]) bodies and will bear the image of Christ, the last Adam, the life-giving spirit (*εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν*, v.45), the man from heaven. The reference to Adam as 'made of dust', therefore, should probably be read not so much as a

Chapter Eleven

reason for human frailty as part of the build-up of Paul's presentation of the dramatic contrast between Adam and Christ in order to show the plausibility of resurrection.

Second, there is evidence to suggest that Paul's purpose in stressing the earthly nature of Adam and of our natural bodies was to correct what he believed to be doctrinal error on the part of the Corinthians [36]. Some have suggested that the Corinthians were asserting some kind of Philonic [37] or Gnostic [38] understanding of the priority of the spiritual to the physical, and although Fee, for example, rejects this view he nevertheless commends Wedderburn's understanding that the passage is

"a polemic against an unrealistic spiritualizing of this present life, a blending of heaven and earth that does away with the *earthiness* (my italics) of the latter" [39].

Fee himself argues that the Corinthians assumed that they had already entered 'into the totality of pneumatic existence while they were still in their *psychikos* body' and that Paul is here insisting that since the *psychikos* comes first and has a body the Corinthians must 'reckon with the physical side of their present life in the Spirit' [40]. Although neither Wedderburn's nor Fee's view is likely to be established with certainty it seems probable that the passage is rightly understood to stress the importance of the physical. This, coupled with the importance of the contrast Paul is making between Adam and Christ to which I have referred above, may well account for Paul's use of *χοϊκός* in this passage, a use which need not, therefore, be taken to indicate that Paul understood the 'earthiness' of our bodies to be the cause of human suffering. Rather, as I have already suggested, the evidence is far greater that he understood all suffering to result from the Fall [41].

Finally, in attempting to answer the question as to whether Paul understood human frailty and suffering to result from the Fall or from our nature as beings created out of dust, it is noteworthy that the two alternatives are not mutually exclusive. It may well be that Paul held a view which, although not precisely elaborated in the New Testament, incorporated both aspects. The verses we have been considering indicate that for Paul that which Adam was, even before the Fall, was ψυχικός and χοϊκός, and was therefore vastly inferior to Christ who is by contrast πνευματικός and ἐπουράνιος. It was at the Fall, however, that Adam, the natural man, made from dust, became mortal (θνητός) as a result of which the creation over which he had been given dominion now suffers the bondage of corruption (Romans 8:21) [42]. The reference to the creation of Adam from dust, therefore, by no means contradicts the clear implication of the passage as a whole that Paul understood that the transformation to take place at the Parousia would be the ultimate solution to the sufferings inaugurated by the Fall from which I have argued Paul understood all suffering to result. It simply indicates that that transformation will involve something greater still, bestowing on those in Christ a spiritual (πνευματικός) and heavenly (ἐπουράνιος) likeness which the natural (ψυχικός) and earthly (χοϊκός) Adam never knew.

I conclude, therefore, that Paul probably believed that the Fall was the origin of sickness and that the Parousia would be its ultimate antidote. My arguments in reaching this conclusion may be briefly summarised as follows:

- 1) Romans 8:18ff indicates that Paul saw the Fall as the origin of suffering in the universe. The breadth of scope in the passage eliminates entirely the view that sickness should be excluded from Paul's thinking here. Thus for Paul the Fall is the origin of sickness.

Chapter Eleven

2) 1 Corinthians 15:51ff indicates that the transformation which Paul envisaged would take place in Christians' bodies at the Parousia would occur not only for the dead but also for the living. That transformation which involved, *inter alia*, the corruptible being clothed with incorruption, would by its very nature mean healing for any Christian who might be still physically sick at the time of the Parousia.

3) Since, as I have argued, Paul's understanding of the Fall underlies his teaching about resurrection and the Parousia in 1 Corinthians 15, and since the resurrection which occurs at the Parousia is the antithesis of the death which results from the Fall, then it follows that sickness too, which Paul also understood to result from the Fall, will be dealt with at the Parousia, the lesser being subsumed by the greater.

These considerations, it seems to me, indicate a strong probability that Paul believed that sickness finds its origin in the Fall and its end at the Parousia. Although this is nowhere specifically stated in his writings such a view is at the very least by no means inconsistent with his teaching in Romans 8 and 1 Corinthians 15 and, in my view, is strongly implied by it. If this be so, then the ultimate physical healing for all Christians will take place at the Parousia. But may this be said to be as a result of the atonement?

I stated earlier that the argument that physical healing may be rightly understood to be ultimately in the atonement rests on two assumptions, (1) that when Christians' bodies are 'changed' at the Parousia their sicknesses will be healed, and (2) that that healing will be in some sense a result of Christ's death on the cross. Having dealt with the first of these two assumptions I now turn, with considerably greater brevity, to the second.

If, as I have already argued, the change that Paul describes as taking place to Christians' bodies at the Parousia involves

Healing & the Atonement

by its very nature the healing of those bodies, then that healing may be said to result from the atonement if the resurrection to take place at the Parousia can be shown to result from the atonement. And of this there can surely be little doubt. 1 Corinthians 15 opens with a declaration of the gospel Paul had preached to the Corinthians (v.1). That gospel, which Paul had both received and passed on to them (v.3) was that

"Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures.... he was buried..... he was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures" (vv.3-4).

The Corinthians are said to have 'received' this gospel and 'taken their stand' on it (v.1). They are 'saved' if, having 'believed' it (v.2) they 'hold firmly' to it. Thus their salvation depends on their acceptance of, belief in and holding firmly to the message of Christ's atoning death [43] and bodily resurrection. But central to the theme of the chapter is the emphasis that Christ's resurrection was the ἀπαρχή of the resurrection of believers (v.23). For Paul 'salvation' meant ultimately entering the kingdom of God (v.50) with a resurrection body adapted to life in that kingdom. And that salvation was made possible only because 'Christ died for our sins'. There is thus here a clear connection in thought between the atonement (Christ's death for our sins) and salvation (which ultimately involves the resurrection of the body, incorruptible and, therefore, sickness-free).

Indeed, the understanding that (1) Christ's death is the basis of our salvation, and that (2) the Christian's bodily resurrection (or transformation) at the Parousia is an integral part of that salvation is so fundamental to Paul's understanding of salvation that it seems to me self-evident that for Paul at least the Christian's ultimate 'healing' would be as a result of the atonement.

Chapter Eleven

But if further evidence is necessary that in 1 Corinthians 15 the atonement underlies Paul's thinking with regard to the Christian's resurrection two other passages in the chapter seem strongly to indicate this. First, because Paul's teaching in Romans 5 clearly links the Fall (vv.12ff.) with the atonement (vv.1-11) it seems to me that 1 Corinthians 15:21-22 which, as I have already suggested, is a clear reference to the Fall, once again links Paul's teaching on resurrection with the atonement. And second, and more important, the reference to sin and the law and to the Christian's 'victory through our Lord Jesus Christ' in verses 55-57 offers compelling evidence that the atonement is at the heart of Paul's understanding of the Christian's hope of resurrection. As Barrett, commenting on this passage, so fittingly remarks:

"The earlier verses look into the apocalyptic future, and rejoice in the ultimate defeat of death. Verse 56 soberly considers its present sting and power, and verse 57 exults not in unfounded optimism but in the victory already won, not only over death but over sin..... The victory of Jesus Christ was a victory over sin in that he died to sin a death which men are summoned to share (Rom. vi. 10f.), so that *the sting of death* is now in Christ drawn; and it was a victory over death, in that Christ himself was raised from the dead, and raised as the firstfruits - the pledge that all who are in him will also be raised (xv.20,23). The victory is not fully won, for mankind as a whole until the End (xv.26), but it is so certain that Paul can speak of it in the present tense: *who gives us the victory* (cf. Rom. viii.37)" [44].

Thus both the opening and the closing verses of the chapter point to the cross as the basis for the Christian's hope of bodily resurrection. It seems to me meaningful, therefore, to speak of physical healing as being ultimately in the atonement.

Healing & the Atonement

But it is now time to draw to a conclusion this section in which my findings confirm the view expressed earlier [45] that final physical deliverance is in Paul's understanding at least part of the ultimate salvation for which Christians await the eschaton. We must now direct our attention to another possibility - that healing may be understood to be *indirectly* in the atonement because of the work of the Spirit.

Healing in the Atonement - indirectly

It is evident from 1 Corinthians 12:9 (cf. v. 30) that Paul understood healing to be a work of the Spirit. The χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων are one of the nine charismatic gifts listed in verses 8-10 of which Paul writes in verse 11:

πάντα δὲ τὰυτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ
ἐκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται.

This verse indicates not only that all the gifts to which Paul has just referred are given by the one and same Spirit, but also that they are given 'as the Spirit will'. Further, verse 30 makes it clear that not all possess gifts of healing, thus re-emphasising that healings are granted at the Spirit's discretion. This emphasis, together with the very fact that χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων were needed at all, seems to discount any thought that Christians may 'claim' healing by faith [46].

Of paramount importance here, however, is Paul's understanding that healing is a work of the Spirit, for this means that it may be viewed as resulting at least indirectly from the atonement since for Paul the atonement is the basis upon which the Spirit is given. As I have already suggested this when discussing Galatians 3:13-14 [47], and to that discussion little needs to be added. As Dunn has rightly pointed out

*the Christology and pneumatology of the letter presuppose a richer and fuller theology, as fundamental, but in the letter

Chapter Eleven

itself Paul develops only those aspects of immediate importance to the situation of the readers" [48].

Thus in its context Galatians 3:14 stresses the extending of God's blessings to the Gentiles, but the verse clearly indicates an underlying theology that sees the reception of the Spirit as at least a part of God's purpose brought about by Christ's redemptive work on the cross. Dunn is surely right again when he says that

"the gift of the Spirit to Gentiles was both recognized among the first Christians, and acknowledged as the sure indication of God's acceptance/justifying act" [49].

This statement (which is undoubtedly confirmed by the record in Acts - see especially 10:44-48, 11:15-18, 15:7-9), in emphasising that the gift of the Spirit to the Gentiles was a demonstration on God's part that he had accepted and justified them, clearly implies that the reception of the Spirit presupposes a man's acceptance with God. It thus serves most adequately to underline the point that I am making, that the Spirit is given on the basis of reconciliation or atonement [50]. And since the gifts of healing are a manifestation of the work of the Spirit, when a sick Christian is healed by the use of those gifts, his healing may be said to have resulted, indirectly at least, from the atonement.

But this now leads us to the heart of the matter. If healing may be said to be in the atonement *ultimately* (ie from the eschatological perspective) [51], and *indirectly* (through the work of the Spirit), then is there a connection between the Spirit and eschatology which will lead us to a right understanding of divine healing? In the next section I shall argue that such a connection is clearly discernible in the Pauline corpus. I shall consider the use of the distinct yet inter-related terms ἀπαρχή, ἀρρόβων, and σφραγίζω, and seek to show that these terms, when used in connection with the

Spirit, indicate that the work of the Spirit now may be viewed as a foretaste of the age to come. As the argument is developed the application to healing will, I trust, become increasingly clear.

*The Spirit and Eschatology in the Pauline Corpus
in Relation to Healing*

In the Pauline corpus the terms ἀπαρχή, ἀρρῶβών, and σφραγίζω are used with reference to the Spirit on the following occasions:

ἀπαρχή	Romans 8:23.
ἀρρῶβών	2 Cor. 1:22, 5:5, Ephesians 1:14.
σφραγίζω	2 Cor. 1:22, Ephesians 1:13, 4:30

I shall consider briefly the general significance of each of these terms before seeking to determine their significance in the passages in question.

The noun ἀπαρχή is used in its original sense in the LXX to refer to the first sheaf of the harvest or first lamb from the flock which is offered to God (Deut. 18:4, 26:2, 10, Num. 18:8-12, Neh. 10:37ff). In the New Testament it is used figuratively by Paul of Israel (Romans 11:16), of the household of Stephanas (1 Corinthians 16:15) who are the 'first-fruits of Achaia', of Christ with regard to resurrection (1 Corinthians 15:20, 23), and of the Spirit (Romans 8:23). Each of these figurative uses appears to reflect the sense, apparent in the original literal idea of the first sheaf of the harvest, that there is something more to follow. This will be of particular importance when we come to consider the use of the term with reference to the Spirit.

Chapter Eleven

According to Behm [52] ῥῥῶβών is a commercial term signifying a pledge or deposit which gives a legal claim. It always implies an act which engages something bigger. Barrett defines it as

"the first instalment of a total sum due, itself part of the sum and the pledge that the whole amount will in due course be paid" [53].

With reference to its use in the New Testament, the Spirit is the ῥῥῶβών (guarantee) of the Christian's full future possession of salvation. As such it is close in meaning to that of ἀπαρχή as used in Romans 8:23.

But ἀπαρχή and ῥῥῶβών are also connected with σφραγίζω. The connection with ῥῥῶβών is suggested by the references tabulated above. The link with ἀπαρχή will become clearer when the context of its use in Romans 8 is examined and compared with the use of σφραγίς (the noun cognate with σφραγίζω) as a seal used to protect a letter against premature disclosure [54]. Meanwhile it is sufficient to note that the most important aspect of σφραγίζω as far as the work of the Spirit is concerned is probably that of the use of a seal as a mark of ownership [55].

Having now provided this brief overview of the use of these three terms I shall now consider those passages in the Pauline corpus where they are used to refer to the Spirit, commencing with Romans 8:23:

οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες, ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν.

To understand the significance of the phrase τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος with regard to our present discussion the immediate context must be briefly considered. In this connection it is

Chapter Eleven

(v.16), who helps us in our weakness (v.26) and who intercedes for Christians according to the will of God (vv.26-27). Indeed it is in the midst of this eschatological tension between groaning inwardly now and the future redemption of our bodies for which we eagerly wait that we are said to have (v.23) τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος - we have the Spirit as the 'first-fruits' [59]. There is, as we have already noted, implicit in the idea of first-fruits the thought that there is something more to follow. Just as in 1 Corinthians 15:20ff Christ's resurrection is for Paul the guarantee that all those in Christ will rise - ἀρχή in that passage coming very close in meaning to ἀρρᾶβὼν - so here in Romans 8:23 the Spirit is given to Christians as the guarantee of the ultimate redemption of the body at the Parousia. And what is true of the Spirit must be at least indirectly true of the gifts the Spirit bestows upon us. If the Spirit himself is for the Christian the ἀρχή of physical redemption then perhaps the gifts of healing (1 Corinthians 12:9) granted by the Spirit in the interim may have been understood by Paul as evidence from the Spirit of the ultimate redemption of the body.

Thus while the Christian awaits, in the midst of present suffering, his final 'adoption as a son', 'the redemption of the body' (Romans 8:23), he has already as a token of that adoption and redemption, the Spirit as 'first-fruits'. Applied to physical healing this suggests that, although the ultimate deliverance must await the Parousia, the Spirit is given meanwhile as a token and guarantee that that deliverance will surely come, and as evidence he gives 'gifts of healing' (1 Corinthians 12:9) to whom he will.

With this understanding in mind it will now be helpful to consider Paul's use of ἀρρᾶβὼν and σφραγίζω in 2 Corinthians 1:22:

ὁ καὶ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς τὸν ἀρρᾶβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν.

noteworthy, first, that the passage (vv.17-39) is concerned very much with the theme of the Christian's present sufferings (παθήματα) and weakness (ἀσθένεια). Verse 18 refers to 'our present sufferings' which Paul understands to be a sharing in the sufferings of Christ (v.17). Indeed these sufferings are shared by the entire creation which at the Fall [56] was 'subjected to frustration' (v.20) and is consequently 'in bondage to decay' (v.21) and groans as if it were 'in the pains of childbirth' (v.22). Christians, along with creation, 'groan inwardly' (v.23) eagerly awaiting 'the redemption of the body'. Towards the end of the chapter, in a passage where Paul graphically highlights the Christian's victory over all opposition through the love of Christ, some of these sufferings are briefly listed (vv.35-36).

Second, there is a very evident eschatological tension throughout the passage. The Christian's present sufferings are contrasted with future glory. We share in Christ's sufferings that we might share in his glory (v.17). Our present sufferings are not worth comparing with the glory that will be revealed in us (v.18). Indeed the creation itself earnestly awaits this 'revelation of the sons of God' (v.19) [57] and, like an expectant mother, longs to be delivered (v.22). Christians, too, are earnestly awaiting their 'adoption as sons, the redemption of the body' (v.23) [58]. This wonderful emancipation is described in verse 21 as 'the glorious freedom of the children of God'. Thus although the passage is concerned with the theme of suffering it is by no means dominated by it. If there is suffering for the Christian now - and there certainly is, for we live in a suffering universe - there is, equally as certainly, a glorious future.

But the eschatological tension is not only seen in the contrast between present suffering and future glory. It is also in this passage evident in the work of the Spirit. It is the Spirit who bears witness that we are God's children,

Healing & the Atonement

With regard to the immediate context it is noteworthy, first, that, after the customary greeting (vv.1-2), the epistle opens with a statement about Christian suffering and its purpose (vv. 3-11). Space forbids a detailed exegesis of this section, but it is undoubtedly significant that, as in Romans 8:23 Paul's reference to the Spirit as the ἀπαρχή of the coming redemption of the body is set in the context of Christian suffering, so too here in 2 Corinthians 1:22 his use of ἀρρῶβῶν and σφραγίζω with reference to the Spirit is set in a similar context [60].

Second, it is significant that the work of the Spirit is here closely connected with Paul's understanding that Christ is the fulfilment of all God's promises (v.20). Verses 18-22 are found at the heart of a section (1:12-2:4) in which Paul is explaining the reasons for the change in his travel plans. His insistence (v. 17) that he, as God's messenger, is not double-minded and does not behave inconsistently (that he does not say 'Yes' and 'No' in the same breath) leads him in verse 18 to stress the faithfulness and consistency of God himself. The message he had preached to them was not self-contradictory, for the message was none other than 'the Son of God, Jesus Christ' himself (v.19) and he was not 'Yes' and 'No' but is the affirmative response to every promise that God has made (v.20). All God's promises find their fulfilment in him [61] and the 'Amen' spoken by Christians in public worship [62] is the church's affirmation of this.

The theme of God's faithfulness continues in vv.21-22 as Paul uses four participles - βεβαιῶν, χρίσας, σφραγισάμενος, δοῦς (τὸν ἀρρῶβῶνα) - to illustrate God's guarantee of the Christian's ultimate salvation [63]. In verse 21 God is said to 'guarantee' (βεβαιῶν) [64] us and to have 'made us share his anointing' (χρίσας) [65]. With respect to the latter Martin comments:

Chapter Eleven

"The verb (χρίειν) conjures up OT associations of God's servants (judges, kings, prophets) who were set apart and commissioned for their office by the pouring out of oil over their heads. If that is the background here, the anointing will refer to the bestowal of charismatic gifts intended to equip men and women for God's work by the coming of the Spirit (cf. Isa 61:1-3, cited in Luke 4:18, 19; Acts 4:27; 10:38)" [66].

If this understanding of χρίσας is correct then all four participles may possibly be linked with the work of the Spirit, for 1 Corinthians 1:6-7 associates βεβαιούν with charismatic gifts, and 2 Corinthians 1:22 (cf. Ephesians 1:13-14) links ἀρρῶβόν and σφραγίζω with the Spirit [67]. Taken this way verses 21 and 22 may be paraphrased as follows:

"Now it is God who guarantees our salvation - both ours and yours - and he does so by giving us his Spirit who anoints us for service (with accompanying charismatic gifts) and whose presence in our lives not only marks us out as belonging to God and kept by God (for the Spirit is God's seal of ownership upon us), but also is a deposit and foretaste of our ultimate salvation" [68].

Now this brings us to the heart of the matter as far as the subject of this thesis is concerned. In a passage which opens with the theme of Christians suffering (vv. 3-11) and in which he confesses that he has despaired of life itself (v.8) but has come to trust in God who raises the dead (v.10), Paul encourages his readers by reassuring them of God's faithfulness (v. 18) to his promises which have been fulfilled in Christ (v.20) but of which the ultimate guarantee of fulfilment as far as their personal salvation is concerned is the gift of the Spirit whose presence in their lives is an ἀρρῶβόν guaranteeing what is to come.

Thus the application of this passage to the subject of physical healing is extremely close to that of the passage in Romans 8 which we considered earlier. Both passages recognise

the reality of Christian suffering, and are in my view sufficiently broad in their intention as to include sickness as part of that suffering. Both passages connect Christian suffering in some way with the sufferings of Christ (Romans 8:17, 2 Corinthians 1:5) and both point us forward to the Parousia [69] as the ultimate solution. Finally, both passages see the work of the Spirit in the life of the Christian as both a foretaste and a guarantee (for both ἀπαρχή and ἀρροβών connote this twofold emphasis) of the life to come. And although it is the Spirit, not healing, that is the ἀπαρχή, it is the Spirit who grants gifts of healing.

Space forbids detailed examination of the other passages in the Pauline corpus which use ἀρροβών and σφραγίζω in connection with the Spirit, but both 2 Corinthians 5:1-5 and Ephesians 1:13-14 (cf. 4:30) confirm the approach we have adopted. Terms such as ἐπίγειος, ἐπενδύσασθαι, καταποθῆναι, and τὸ θνητὸν in 2 Corinthians 5:1-5 are heavily reminiscent of the concluding section of 1 Corinthians 15 as is the contrast between an earthly tent and an eternal house in heaven (2 Cor. 5:1) which, although the illustration is not used there, is certainly in harmony with Paul's emphasis regarding different kinds of 'body' in 1 Corinthians 15:35ff. Further the use of στενάζομεν (vv. 2, 4) suggests a possible link in thought with Romans 8 (vv. 22, 23, 26). These striking associations, along with the clear contrast in the passage itself between our present earthly body and our future heavenly dwelling, indicate decisively that 2 Corinthians 5:1-5 refers to the resurrection of the body. The use of ἀρροβών in verse 5 thus confirms the link with the Spirit as both a foretaste and guarantee of resurrection. Finally, the passages in Ephesians carry the same emphasis. The Spirit (1:13-14) is both the seal and the guarantee of the Christian's future inheritance as he awaits 'redemption' (cf. 4:30), a redemption which in Romans 8:23 is said to be 'of the body' [70].

Chapter Eleven

I conclude, therefore, that the terms ἀπαρχή, ἀρρόβων, and σπργίζω when used to describe the work of the Spirit are used consistently in the Pauline corpus. They are used in the context of the eschatological tension which recognises that in receiving the gift of the Spirit the Christian has already tasted something of the power and glory of the coming age and yet that he has not yet received his full inheritance. For that he must await his adoption as a son, the redemption of his body, the glory that shall be revealed, the manifestation of the sons of God. At that Day, for which the whole creation waits, the dead shall be raised incorruptible and those who are alive and remain shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye at the last trumpet. But until that Day for which he has been sealed, preserved and marked out by the Spirit, he has the Spirit as an ἀπαρχή, an ἀρρόβων, a first instalment.

Of course for Paul the gift of the Spirit meant far more than the healing of sickness, but that was certainly a part of the Spirit's work. And if he understood the Spirit to be in some sense a foretaste, a first instalment, of a future life to be lived in an immortal incorruptible body it surely does not stretch imagination too far to suggest that he may well have understood the healings performed by the Spirit's power to have been at least an expression of that foretaste. And if, as I have argued [71], Paul understood the atonement to be the basis upon which the Spirit was given, then healing may be said to be 'in the atonement' not only ultimately (in that all sickness will be healed at the Parousia) but also indirectly in that the Spirit who heals comes as a result of the atonement [72].

It seems to me that this understanding of healing in relation to the atonement is much to be preferred, not only because it is more in harmony with what I believe to be the correct exegesis of the relevant passages, but also because it is pastorally and practically more helpful than the doctrine as

Healing & the Atonement

taught by its original proponents. In this modified form the doctrine may still encourage the sick Christian to an active faith for healing, without bringing with it the sense of failure, guilt and condemnation that accompanies the old doctrine if the Christian is not healed. And it certainly need not discourage the seeking of medical help. In short, it retains a positive emphasis in encouraging expectation for healing through the Spirit's work in bestowing charismatic gifts while discarding those extremes which lead to the rejection of medical aid on the one hand and a sense of condemnation in the unhealed on the other. But it is now time to bring this thesis to a conclusion.

Summary and Conclusion

The major purpose of this thesis has been to consider the doctrine that healing is in the atonement - viz.

the view that Christians may claim healing from sickness on the grounds that Christ has already carried that sickness for them, just as he has carried their sins -

in the light of the relevant New Testament passages. In order to establish what those passages are, I have in PART ONE examined the theological and literary origins of the doctrine and have shown how the doctrine has developed and been modified both within and beyond Classical Pentecostalism.

This examination has revealed that the major New Testament passages used to support the doctrine are undoubtedly Matthew 8:17 and 1 Peter 2:24. It has also shown that the interpretation of certain other passages has been seriously affected by the doctrine. Of these the most significant are Galatians 3:13, 1 Corinthians 11:29-30, James 5:14-15, and Mark 16:15-18. PART TWO was devoted to a detailed examination of Matthew 8:17 and 1 Peter 2:24 and to a rather briefer consideration of the other passages to which I have just

Chapter Eleven

referred. In each case my findings have shown that the passage in question does not in fact support the doctrine.

With regard to the two major passages it is particularly noteworthy that although Matthew takes Isaiah 53:4 and applies it to physical healing he does not do so in the context of Christ's passion. Conversely, 1 Peter takes Isaiah 53:5 and applies it, in the context of Christ's redemptive work on the cross, to healing from the wounds of sin, but with no thought of physical healing in mind. Thus in Matthew 8:17 there is physical healing but no atonement; in 1 Peter 2:24 there is atonement but no physical healing. I was thus driven to the inescapable conclusion that neither of the major verses used in defense of the doctrine does in fact support it.

But the examination of the theological and literary origins of the doctrine undertaken in Part One revealed more than a set of proof-texts used to support the doctrine. It also showed a set of closely related themes which led in PART THREE to discussion of (1) the relation between healing, salvation and the gospel, (2) the relation between sickness, sin and Satan, and (3) sick Christians and the art of medicine in the New Testament.

With regard to (1) I concluded that the use of *σώζω* to mean both 'heal' and 'save' affords no clear evidence that the writers of the New Testament saw physical healing as a part of that deliverance from sin which is so frequently referred to as 'salvation'. I did not reject the view, however, that healing is in some sense a part of God's overall salvific work and may be rightly understood to be a part of the Christian's *ultimate* salvation. And I drew a similar conclusion with regard to the relation between the gospel and healing. This, however, is not to link healing *directly* to the atonement.

With regard to (2) I found that the doctrine that healing is in the atonement as taught by its early proponents is not

Healing & the Atonement

supported by the evidence. I acknowledged, however, that healing may be said to be in the atonement if Christ's death is seen as the antidote to Adam's sin and if Adam's sin is seen to be the cause of sickness. I also recognised that Christ's death may be understood as a victory over Satan who is also seen as a source of sickness. Both these possibilities associate Christ's death with the conquest of sickness without embracing the fallacious view that Christ carried our sicknesses just as he carried our sins.

With regard to (3) I argued that, since the doctrine that healing is in the atonement implies that Christians who become sick should not continue to be so and should not need to resort to medical remedies for their healing, the fact that in the New Testament prominent Christians were sick over a prolonged period of time and the fact that medical remedies were approved of and recommended undoubtedly casts serious doubt on the doctrine at least in the form in which it was originally propounded.

In PART FOUR I have considered further difficulties with the doctrine, both theologically and from a practical and pastoral point of view. These I found to be so serious that I concluded that the doctrine as originally propounded must undoubtedly be rejected. In keeping with my earlier findings, however, I have felt able to offer a modified form of the doctrine which not only overcomes the theological difficulties I have raised but which also, if accepted, would I believe largely eliminate the pastoral and practical difficulties to which I have drawn attention.

The modified form of the doctrine which I have proposed sees physical healing as ultimately and indirectly 'in the atonement'. It is ultimately in the atonement because of the incorruptible body with which those in Christ are to be clothed at the Parousia. It is indirectly in the atonement through the work of the Spirit who is given on the basis of

Chapter Eleven

Christ's atoning work and who in turn bestows gifts of healing. The Pauline use of the terms ἀπαρχή, ἀρρόβων, and σφραγίζω in connection with the Spirit strongly supports this view which I commend, especially to my fellow Pentecostals, with whose emphasis on the gift of the Spirit my thesis is very much in harmony. If such a modified view of the doctrine be accepted, however, it must be recognised that it is by no means that of the original proponents of the doctrine. It is, nevertheless, in my view, a logical development to Pentecostal thinking on this subject some of the major strands of which I outlined in the first part of this thesis.

Healing & the Atonement

NOTES

1. For an explanation of the term *Classical Pentecostalism*, see p. 4 note 6 and notes 1 and 2 on p. 25 of this thesis.

2. Matt. 8:17 (cf. pp. 102-140)
1 Peter 2:24 (cf. pp. 141-162)
Galatians 3:13 (cf. pp. 163-173)
1 Cor. 11:29-30 (cf. pp. 173-178)
James 5:14-15 (cf. pp. 178-188)
Mark 16:15-18 (cf. pp. 188-191).

3. See especially pp. 232-233.
See also pp. 45-47, 77, 173, 185, 191-192, 216, 224, 226, 244, 275, 276, 287.

4. Note the repeated use of the phrase 'healing is provided' in the Declarations of Faith of some major Pentecostal groups. See Appendix.

5. Cf. p. 41 of this thesis.

6. Many of the books written by advocates of the doctrine provide testimonies of healings. These are far too numerous to list here. By way of example, however, see:

Bosworth, F.F., *'Christ the Healer'*, Miami, Bosworth, 1948, pp. 221-249.
Jeffreys, G., *'Healing Rays'*, London, Elim, 1935, pp. 174-209.
Osborn, T.L., *'Receive Miracle Healing'*, Tulsa, Harrison House, 1984, pp. 67-68, 92-93, 130, 156, 174, 235-237.

7. See pp. 313-314.

8. The importance of faith in connection with healing is repeatedly stressed in the New Testament. See:

Matthew 8:10, 9:2, 22, 29, 15:28

Mark 2:5, 5:34, 10:52

Luke 5:20, 7:9, 50, 8:48, 17:19, 18:42

Acts 3:16, 6:8, 14:9

James 5:15.

If the doctrine that healing is in the atonement has 'worked' in that people have been healed as a result of believing it, it is, in my view, not because the doctrine is correct, but because it stresses God's willingness to heal, and so produces faith for healing in those who hold it. I shall suggest later that a modified form of the doctrine would be equally successful in producing faith for healing.

9. See Appendix.

Chapter Eleven

10. Dr. William Menzies has suggested that the continued manifestation of glossolalia during the twentieth century is largely due to the Pentecostals' *doctrinal* insistence that tongues is to be expected as an accompaniment to the Baptism in the Holy Spirit. Earlier manifestations in church history were not sustained because there was no doctrinal statement on the matter. If Menzies is right, then clearly a similar argument might be used with regard to divine healing. See:

Menzies, W.W., *'Anointed to Serve'*, Springfield, GPH, 1971, pp. 39-40.

11. Dayton, D.W., *'Theological Roots of Pentecostalism'*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1987, pp. 19-20.

The term 'full gospel' probably has its origin in the Authorised Version translation of Romans 15:19 'I have fully preached the gospel of Christ'. For a brief discussion of the significance of this verse see pp. 220-221 of this thesis.

12. Purdy, V., *'Biblical Anthropology and the Pentecostal Doctrine of Divine Healing'*, a paper given to the Society for Pentecostal Studies meeting at Asbury Theological Seminary, November 12, 1988, p. 190.

In common with Purdy I have used the term 'holistic' to refer to God's interest in 'the whole man', body as well as soul. When the term 'holistic' is used with a different emphasis, however, the doctrine that healing is in the atonement may validly be criticised for it may be said to detract from a holistic understanding of the gospel in that it emphasises very much the needs of the individual as distinct from society as a whole. This is particularly evident in the teachings of 'The Faith Movement' (cf. pp. 79-85 of this thesis).

13. *ibid* p. 192

14. *ibid* p. 199

15. *ibid* p. 200. This statement, however, is by no means unchallengeable. Purdy does not clarify, for example, how he understands 2 Cor. 5:6-8. For the view that Paul envisaged the possibility of the soul's disembodied existence between death and the Parousia, see, for example:

Osei-Bonsu, J., *'Does 2 Cor. 5:1-10 Teach the Reception of the Resurrection Body at the Moment of Death?'* *JSNT*, 1986, 28, 81-101.

Cf.

Yates, J., *'Immediate or Intermediate? The State of the Believer upon Death'*, *Churchman* 1987, 101, 4, pp. 310-322.

16. *ibid* p. 205

17. *ibid* pp. 224-225. Purdy cites, *inter alia*, Carson who states that

'his (sc. Matthew's) own rendering of the Hebrew indicates his profound grasp of the theological connection between Jesus' healing ministry and the cross'.

Healing & the Atonement

Carson, D.A., *Matthew--Expositor's Bible Commentary*, (Ed. Gaebelein, F.E.) Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1984, p. 206.

For my exegesis of Matthew 8:17 and a rejection of this view see pp. 102-140 of this thesis. See especially my quote from Woodford on p. 127.

18. Purdy, op. cit., pp 207-209.

19. See pp. 331ff. Cf. the references in note 3 above.

20. The difficulty with Purdy's view, it seems to me, is that he wants to defend the doctrine that healing is in the atonement *without modification*. As I shall make clear shortly, it is my opinion that the only possible way forward for the doctrine is to understand the redemption of the body (cf. Romans 8:23) to be something for which the Christian awaits the eschaton. But the unmodified doctrine insists that Christians may demand healing NOW because of the atonement. Purdy nowhere in his paper attempts to deal with this difficulty. Indeed it is by no means clear that he sees it. (Cf. also note 15.)

21. See the references in note 3.

22. pp. 234-235.

23. Note the connection between victory over death and victory over sin and the law in these verses. Comparing this with Paul's understanding in Romans 6 and 7 it seems clear that the victory referred to here is that accomplished by Christ's death and resurrection. However, note Muddiman's understanding - cf. note 32 below.

24. 2 Corinthians 1:22, 5:5. Cf. Ephesians 1:14.

25. 2 Corinthians 1:22, Ephesians 1:13, 4:30.

26. Cf. the repeated phrase 'if the dead are not raised' (vv. 16, 29, 32).

27. Paul's personal expectation that he would be alive at the Parousia need not detain us here. Fee's comment is noteworthy, however:

"It is hardly possible that this clause could have been expressed in either the second or third person. Thus it says very little about Paul's expectations with regard to the Parousia; what it says is that he is currently among the living" (Fee, G.D., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1987, p. 800). Fee acknowledges, however, that in 1 Thes. 4:13-18 it is difficult to avoid the plain sense of the language, that he expected to be among the living at the Parousia' (loc. cit.).

28. See Jeremias, J., *New Testament Studies*, ii, p.152; who is followed by Barrett C.K., *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, (2nd Edn), London, Black, 1971, p. 379.

29. Fee, op. cit., pp. 798-799. Cf. Conzelmann, H., *1 Corinthians*, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1975, pp.289-290

Chapter Eleven

- Goudge, H.I., *'The First Epistle to the Corinthians'*, London, Methuen, 1926, p. 159.
- Héring, J., *'The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians'*, London, Epworth, 1962, pp.179-180
- Orr, W.F., & Walther, J.A., *'1 Corinthians'*, New York, Doubleday, 1976, pp. 349-350
- Robertson, A., & Plummer, A., *'1 Corinthians'*, Edinburgh, Clark, 1911, pp. 375-376

With reference to the difficulty of identifying ἡ φθόρα with the already dead see also:

- Gillman, J., *'Transformation in 1 Corinthians 15:50-53'*, EphTheolLoy, 1982 58, 4, pp. 320-322.
- Morisette, R., *'La chair et le sang ne peuvent hériter du Règne de Dieu'* (1 Cor., XV, 50), Science et Esprit, 1974, 26, pp. 46-48.

30. Put very simply, if my understanding of this passage is correct, a Christian who may have died of a sickness or who was still alive and yet sick at the time of the Parousia would certainly not, in Paul's understanding, have remained sick thereafter!

Cf. my discussion of sick Christians in the New Testament on pp. 251-261 of this thesis. See also my comments on James 5:14ff on pp. 178-188.

It is also noteworthy that in rabbinic theology there is a notion that resurrection brings healing. See:

- Montefiore, C.G., & Loewe, H., *'A Rabbinic Anthology'*, London, Macmillan, 1938, p. 599

31. See p. 234 and notes 22 and 23 on pp. 244-5.

32. For support for the understanding that 1 Corinthians 15:21-22 refers to the Fall see:

- Barrett, op. cit., pp. 351-353
- Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 268
- Fee, op. cit., p. 751
- Goudge, op. cit., p. 147
- Héring, op. cit., p. 164
- Robertson & Plummer, op. cit., p. 352f.

That Paul means that 'in Christ *all who are in Christ* will be made alive is, in my view, the only interpretation that fits the context. For further discussion see:

Fee, op. cit., p. 750. Cf.

- Crockett, W.V., *'The Ultimate Restoration of All Mankind: 1 Corinthians 15:22'* in *Studia Biblica*, 1978, III. *Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors*, (ed. E.A. Livingstone), Sheffield, 1980, pp. 83-87.

For a rejection of the view that 1 Corinthians 15 refers to the Fall see:

Healing & the Atonement

Muddiman, J., 'Adam, the Type of the One to Come', *Theology*, March '84, pp. 104-106. Muddiman argues, *pace* Barrett and other commentaries, that the emphasis in 1 Corinthians 15 differs from that in Romans. In Romans death is undoubtedly seen as the punishment for sin (6:23), but in 1 Corinthians 15 sin is the sting in the tail of death - without post-mortem retribution for sin death would hold no terror for man.

33. See Fee, *op. cit.*, p. 788, who states:

"The two words that describe Adam and Christ respectively are the cognate nouns for the adjectives *psychikos* and *pneumatikos* in v.44. This clear linguistic connection implies that the *original bearers* of the two kinds of bodies mentioned in v. 44 are Adam and Christ".

Cf. Dunn, J.D.G., '1 Corinthians 15:45 - last Adam, life-giving Spirit' in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament, Studies in Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, (ed. B. Lindars and S. Smalley), Cambridge, 1973, p. 130.

34. I have already referred to the wide agreement among commentators that Romans 8:20 refers to the Fall (see p. 234, cf. note 22 on pp.244-245). If this is correct then Paul's use of *φθορά* in both Romans 8:21 and 1 Corinthians 15:42 appears to link the passage we are considering to the Fall. However, note Hering's comment (*op. cit.*, p. 179):

"The earthly character is not... an effect of the Fall. It is inherent in the creation. Moreover the Fall is not in question here; but the doctrine of the Epistle to the Romans makes it clear that Adam was corruptible, is likely to corrupt himself, body and soul by a fall".

Yet Barrett's cross-reference with Romans 8:21 clearly links verse 42 with the Fall (Barrett, *op. cit.* p. 372):

"Corruption is an evil power by which the world is dominated in the old age (Rom. viii. 21). It affects not only human life but the whole of creation. Its dominion will be ended in the age to come, at the beginning of which the resurrection takes place. Thus Paul's point is not simply that we shall have a new body, no longer subject to change and decay, but that the new body will be appropriate to the new age in which God, having reasserted his sovereignty, is *all in all* (xv. 28)".

In similar vein, Dunn comments, with regard to Romans 8:21, that:

"there is a slavery to corruption, the complete inability to escape from the physical deterioration and dissolution which characterizes the created order (and on which sin has capitalized). And believers are still part of that created order; like creation as a whole, they have not yet been liberated from that slavery..... As man fallen into futility required a world given over to corruption and decay as his appropriate setting, so man liberated from both sin and the flesh will require an incorruptible setting for his resurrected embodiment (cf. 1 Cor. 15:42-50)" (Dunn, J.D.G., 'Romans 1-8', Dallas, Word, 1988, p. 488).

35. So Fee, *op. cit.*, p. 786. Cf.

Chapter Eleven

Héring, J., *'The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians'*, ET, London, 1962, p. 176

Martin, R.P., *'The Spirit and the Congregation: Studies in 1 Corinthians 12-15'*, Grand Rapids, 1984, p. 137.

36. Fee, for example, argues that the emphatic 'not... but' (v.46) suggests that Paul is making this assertion against the Corinthians themselves (Fee, op. cit., p.791).

37. See, for example:

Allo, P.E.-B., *'Saint Paul Première Épître aux Corinthiens'*, Études Bibliques, Paris, 1934, pp. 427-428

Barrett, op. cit., pp. 374-375

Héring, J., op. cit., p. 178

Pearson, B.A., *'The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians, A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism'*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 1973, 12, pp. 17-23.

For a rejection of this view see:

Scroggs, R., *'The Last Adam, A Study in Pauline Anthropology'*, Philadelphia, 1966, pp.115-122.

38. See, for example:

Brandenburger, E., *'Adam und Christus'*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 7, Neukirchen, 1962, passim.

Jewett, R., *'Paul's Anthropological Terms, A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings'*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 10, Leiden, 1971, pp.352-356.

Schmithals, W., *'Gnosticism in Corinth, An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians'*, ET, Nashville, 1971, pp. 169-170.

For a critique of this view see:

Kim, S., *'The Origin of Paul's Gospel'*, Tübingen, 1981, pp. 162-193.

39. Wedderburn, A.J.M., *'Philo's Heavenly Man'*, Novum Testamentum, 1973, 15, 4, p. 302

40. Fee, op. cit., p. 791. According to Fee the Corinthians held the view that:

"by the reception of the Spirit, and especially the gift of tongues, they had already entered the true 'spirituality' that is to be (4:8); already they had begun a form of angelic existence (13:1; cf. 4:9, 7:1-7) in which the body was unnecessary and unwanted, and would finally be destroyed. Thus... the idea that the body would be raised would have been anathema" (Fee, op. cit. p. 715)

Fee's understanding is that Paul is denying that the Corinthians 'are completed pneumatics now' (Fee, op. cit. p. 790) insisting that they must await resurrection before their 'spirituality' is complete, since as with

Healing & the Atonement

Christ it must include a somatic expression. If Fee is right, then there is here another expression of the eschatological connection between the spiritual gifts of 1 Corinthians 12 (including the gifts of healing) and the redemption of the body at the Parousia. Cf. pp.345ff of this thesis.

41. Cf. note 31. But note also Christoffersson's view. Cf. note 22, p.245.

42. See Goudge, op. cit., p. 158. Cf. also note 34.

43. Commenting on this verse Fee states:

"This is the language of atonement. In saying 'Christ died for our sins' the creed presupposes alienation between God and humans because of human rebellion and sinfulness, for which the just penalty is death" (Fee, op. cit. p. 724).

44. Barrett, op. cit. p. 384. Cf. Fee, op. cit., p. 797, who comments:

"The one who will swallow up death at his Parousia (vv.54-55) has already through his death and resurrection prevailed victoriously in our behalf over sin and the law (vv.56-57)".

However, note Muddiman's objections - cf. note 32.

45. See pp. 216, 286-287. Cf. Gee's view, quoted on pp. 46-47 of this thesis.

46. Cf., for example, the views of the early proponents of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement. See pp. 18-24 of this thesis.

It might be argued, of course, by those who hold the doctrine, that since Christians can claim their own healing for themselves the gifts of healing are intended to be used for the healing of non-Christians in an evangelistic context. The weakness of this position is, however, threefold. First, it presupposes that healing may be 'claimed' - a thesis which I have already rejected (cf. pp. 298-309). Second, it restricts too narrowly Paul's intention in the context in 1 Corinthians 12. Third, the emphasis that charismatic gifts are given for the common good (*πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον*, v.7), along with Paul's teaching that the different members of the body need each other (v.21ff), suggests that these gifts are given for the benefit of the church. It would thus be wrong to limit Paul's understanding of the use of the healing gifts to non-Christians.

47. See pp. 163-173, esp. pp. 172-173.

48. Dunn, J.D.G., *'Jesus, Paul and the Law'*, London, SPCK, 1990, p. 249.

49. *ibid*, p. 248. Here Dunn also cites Betz as saying that "This reception of the 'Spirit' is the primary datum of the Christian churches in Galatia" (Betz, H.D., *'Spirit, Freedom and Law; Paul's Message to the Galatian Churches'*, *Svensk exegetisk årsbok*, 1974, 39, p.145).

However, to agree that the reception of the Spirit is the primary datum of the early Christian churches is not necessarily to identify with

Chapter Eleven

Dunn's conclusion that the reception of the Spirit is what makes a man a Christian. See

Dunn, J.D.G., *'Baptism in the Holy Spirit'*, London, SCM, 1970, passim.

Cf. Ervin, H.M., *'Conversion-Initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit'*, Peabody, Hendrickson, 1984, passim, for a critique of Dunn.

50. See also Bruce, who comments:

"Abraham by faith received justification and the promise of blessing; now that Christ has accomplished his redemptive work, Abraham's children (cf. v.7) likewise by faith receive justification and the promised blessing - the gift of the Spirit" (Bruce, F.F., *'The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians'*, Exeter, Paternoster, 1982, p. 168).

Hansen, likewise, remarks that

"it is only through identification with Christ in his death on the cross that... participation in the promised blessings can be acquired. In the light of the Galatians' own experience of receiving the Spirit by faith in Christ crucified Paul defines the content of the promise as the Spirit" (Hansen, G.W., *'Abraham in Galatians'*, Sheffield, JSNT, 1989, pp. 126-127).

Cf. Betz, H.D., *'Galatians'*, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1979, pp. 152-3
Lull, D.J., *'The Spirit in Galatia'*, Chico CA, SBL, 1980, pp. 153ff, 193-195.

51. See pp. 332-344 of this thesis.

52. Behm, J., ἀρρᾶβών article in TDNT, ed. G. Kittel, ET G.W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1977, Vol.1, p. 475.

53. Barrett, C.K., *'A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians'*, London, Black, 1982, p. 80. Cf.:

Hughes, P.E., *'Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians'*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1977, who comments with respect to ἀρρᾶβών:

"The present gift of the Spirit is only a *small fraction* of the future endowment" (p. 42).

Cf. Kerr, A.J., *'APPABON'*, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1988, 39, 1, pp. 92-97. Kerr argues that 'a first installment' is most likely to convey the sense to a modern reader.

54. In this connection Fitzner comments:

"The seal was also meant to protect a document against inappropriate or premature disclosure. It prevented people from reading a work. Is. 29:11: All these words will be like the words of a sealed book, and if it is said to him, You are a man who can read, read this, he will say, I cannot read it: 'it is sealed'. In the story of the pages in 1 Εσδρ.

Healing & the Atonement

3:8 we read that each inscribes his own saying and seals it and lays it under the king's pillow. The seal does not merely close; it is also a safeguard against violation"

(Fitzner, G., σφραγίς/σφραγίζω article in TDNT, ed. G. Kittel, ET G.W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1978, Vol. 7, p. 945).

Cf. p. 349 and note 57.

55. As far as the use of the term in the Pauline corpus is concerned, Fitzner comments (op. cit. p. 950) that 'one may thus conclude that the idea of marking as a possession determines the use of the term'.

Fitzner also (loc. cit.) lists a variety of other uses of σφραγίς. A seal may be:

that which gives validity to a document
that which imparts power and protection (from a god)
that which denotes authority (from a king)
and, in Philo, a copy of an original.

Although it is possible that some or all of these uses may be of some significance with regard to the Pauline use of σφραγίς to refer to the Spirit in relation to the Christian, a discussion of this is clearly beyond the scope of this thesis.

56. For evidence that this verse refers to the Fall see p. 234 and notes 22 and 23 on pp. 244-245 of this thesis.

57. It seems to me that the use of ἀποκάλυψις here may possibly hint at a connection in thought with the use of σφραγίς as that which prevents premature disclosure (cf. note 54). Although neither σφραγίς nor σφραγίζω is used in this passage the term is closely linked with ἀρρόβων (cf. note 58) in connection with the work of the Spirit, and Paul's use of ἀπαρχή in verse 23 is virtually equivalent to ἀρρόβων (see further my discussion on p. 349, cf. Behm op. cit., p. 475). If this understanding is correct then the work of the Spirit may be understood, paradoxically, both to mark out the Christian as belonging to God and yet to keep his sonship hidden until the day of redemption, when the sons of God shall be 'revealed'.

58. 'The redemption of the body' referred to here is surely nothing less than the transformation which is to take place at the Parousia when the mortal is clothed with immortality, the corruptible with incorruption (1 Corinthians 15:50ff). As Delling comments with reference to ἀπαρχή in Romans 8:23:

"The gift of the *pneuma* is . . . only the beginning which will ultimately be followed by *υιοθεσία*, by the gift of the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*" (Delling, G., ἀπαρχή article in TDNT, ed. G. Kittel, ET G.W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1977, Vol. 1, p. 486).

Cf. Büchsel's comments, quoted in note 30 on p. 320 of this thesis.

Cf. my discussion of 1 Corinthians 15 on pp. 332-344 of this thesis.

Chapter Eleven

The theme of future redemption is also found in Ephesians 1:13-14 where the Spirit is seen as a seal and a deposit which guarantees (ἀρρόβων) redemption. Cf. Ephesians 4:30. The theme of redemption thus links the three terms we are considering for ἀπαρχή, ἀρρόβων and σφραγίζω are all used in the context of a redemption which is seen as yet future and which in Romans 8:23 is specifically linked to the body. The three terms are also linked by their use with regard to the Spirit (see table on p. 347). Cf. also note 57.

59. Hamilton sees the genitive as partitive - the first instalment of the whole Spirit. See

Hamilton, N.Q., *'The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul'*, 1957, p. 32.

However, as Barrett has pointed out, (op. cit. p. 80), 'Paul does not think of the Spirit as given in parts' and Hamilton's view misses the connection with the future both in 2 Cor. 1:22 and in 5:5. Cf. note 69.

The genitive is, therefore, epexegetic. The Spirit is the ἀρρόβων. Cf. Dunn, J.D.G., *'Romans 1-8'*, Dallas, Word, 1988, p. 473, (cf. p. 490), who agrees that the genitive is epexegetic.

60. The context of suffering is, of course, highly relevant to the subject of this thesis. Although sickness is not mentioned in this passage it is noteworthy that in v. 4 Paul uses the phrase ἐν πάσῃ θλίψει which Barrett translates 'in any kind of affliction' (Barrett, op. cit., p. 61). Barrett (ibid, p. 64) further argues (with reference to vv. 8-9) that:

"As good a suggestion as any is that Paul had been seriously ill; Clavier (*Studia Paulina*, p. 77) draws attention to hints in the narrative that suggest a peril arising within rather than without. Allo reaches a similar conclusion. It is not clear why Strachan should think of physical violence, perhaps lynching. The nature of Paul's supposed illness has elicited many conjectures; see xii.7 None of these is more than a conjecture, but it is certain that Paul's life was in serious danger...."

With reference to the phrase ἐν ἑαυτοῖς τὸ ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου (v.9) he remarks:

"The meaning will be that though the sentence was not immediately carried out it remained in force, so that Paul knows that henceforth his only hope lies in resurrection. This is most natural if the threat was illness" (ibid, p. 64).

Against this, however, must be set the general uncertainty with regard to Paul's thorn in the flesh. See my discussion of this debate on pp. 251-257. However I have already rejected the view that the πάσχω word-group is not used in the New Testament to refer to sickness (see pp. 239-241, cf. pp. 234, 181), and if, as I have argued (pp. 234-5), sickness should not be excluded from our understanding of τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ in Romans 8:18, then I see no valid reason to exclude it from our understanding of παθήματα here in 2 Corinthians 1:3-11 (see esp. vv.5-7), for whatever the nature of Paul's personal sufferings may have been, the principles he is teaching with regard to suffering appear to be

Healing & the Atonement

sufficiently general that they may validly be applied to all kinds of suffering, including sickness.

For further discussion of the nature of the suffering referred to in this passage, see:

Héring, J., *'The Second Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians'*,
London, Epworth, 1967, p.2

Plummer, A., *'The Second Epistle to the Corinthians'*, Edinburgh, Clark,
1978, pp. 23-27.

Tasker, R.V.G., *'The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians'*,
London, Tyndale, 1969, pp. 40-44.

Strachan, R.H., *'The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians'*
London, Hodder, 1935, pp. 51-53.

61. I have frequently heard those who hold that Bible verses are promises to be claimed use this verse (2 Corinthians 1:20) to teach that Christians may claim any promise in the Bible on the grounds that in Christ they are all available to us. Some have even added that all we have to do is to say 'Amen' in faith and the promise will be fulfilled for us (in contrast to which see note 62).

Thus far I have found no written evidence for this doctrine, but from personal experience I would say that it is widely, indeed almost universally, held by Classical Pentecostals. It certainly found a warm reception when preached at a public meeting at the Assemblies of God General Conference held in Prestatyn in April 1992.

The meaning of this verse, however, is not that any Christian may 'claim' any promise in the Bible because he is in Christ - cf. my argument that proponents of the doctrine that healing is in the atonement have misunderstood the nature of God's promises (see pp.298-309) - but that whatever promises God has made they all find their fulfilment in Christ. See, for example:

Barrett, op. cit., p. 77

Héring, op. cit., p. 11

Hughes, op. cit., pp. 36-37

Martin, R.P., *'2 Corinthians'*, Waco, Word Books, 1986, p. 27

Plummer, A., *'The Second Epistle to the Corinthians'*, Edinburgh, Clark,
1978, pp.37-38

Strachan, R.H., *'The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians'*, London,
Hodder, 1935, p. 57

Tasker, R.V.G., *'The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians'*,
Leicester, IVP, 1978, pp. 47-48

Wilson, G.B., *'2 Corinthians'*, Edinburgh, Banner of Truth, 1973, p. 24.

See also the quote from Schniewind and Friedrich on p. 301 of this thesis.

62. The view that the 'Amen' here refers to that spoken by Christians in public worship finds wide acceptance. See:

Barrett, op. cit., pp. 77-78

Hughes, op. cit., p. 37

Martin, op. cit., p. 27

Chapter Eleven

Plummer, op. cit., p. 38.

Strachan, op. cit., pp. 58-59

Tasker, op. cit., p. 48.

63. For discussion that these terms refer to the sacraments (esp. Baptism) consult the commentaries. For the purpose of this thesis I shall assume with Barrett (op. cit. p. 81) that the passage 'refers more probably to the whole complex of their entry into the Christian life - conversion, faith, baptism, the reception of the Spirit'. Cf. Dunn, J.D.G., *'Baptism in the Holy Spirit'*, London, SCM, 1970, pp. 131-134.
64. According to Martin (op. cit., p. 27), 'βεβαίωσις is ... a legal and commercial term to designate properly guaranteed security'. He sees (as does Barrett, op. cit. p. 79) ἐβεβαιώθη (1 Corinthians 1:6) as a good parallel with its statement that Paul's testimony about Christ is confirmed (ἐβεβαιώθη) in his people who are then (1 Corinthians 1:8) said to be confirmed to the end time (βεβαιώσει ὑμᾶς ἕως τέλους).
65. So Barrett (op. cit. p. 79) seeking to preserve the word-play of Χρίστος...χρίσας.
66. Martin, op. cit. p. 28.
67. For a brief overview of the meaning of ἀρρῶβών and σφραγίζω see pp.347-348 above. For more detailed analysis see the references to TDNT mentioned in notes 52, 54, 55, 57 and 58.
68. If this interpretation is open to challenge - e.g. by those who interpret the verses sacramentally (cf. note 63) - the association of ἀρρῶβών and σφραγίζω with the work of the Spirit can hardly be denied.
69. The reference to the Parousia is less obvious in 2 Corinthians 1 than in Romans 8. However, Paul's reliance on God who raises the dead (v.9) may indicate that Paul was looking to the resurrection of the body as the ultimate solution to his physical suffering (so Barrett, op. cit. p. 64). Further, the use of ἀρρῶβών in itself points us future, for it is a guarantee of what is to come. In 5:1-5 Paul is to make it clear that the Spirit is the ἀρρῶβών of the resurrection body (which according to 1 Corinthians 15:50ff Christians will receive at the Parousia).
70. As evidence of the connection in thought between 2 Corinthians 5:1-5 and 1 Corinthians 15:42-57, Romans 8:17ff, see:
- Barrett, C.K., *'A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans'*, London, Black, 1991, pp. 154-157
- Dunn, J.D.G., *'Romans 1-8'*, Dallas, Word, 1988, pp. 489-91.
- Héring, J., *'The Second Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians'*, London, Epworth, 1967, p. 37.
- Gillman, J., *'A Thematic Comparison: 1 Cor 15:50-57 and 2 Cor 5:1-6, Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1988, 107, 3, pp. 439-454.
- Osei-Bonsu, J., *'Does 2 Cor. 5:1-10 Teach the Reception of the Resurrection Body at the Moment of Death?' JSNT*, 1986, 28, 81-101.

Healing & the Atonement

Perriman, A.C., 'Paul and the Parousia: 1 Corinthians 15:50-57 and 2 Corinthians 5:1-5', NT Studies, 1989, 35, 4, pp. 512-521.

71. See pp. 345-346.

72. I have based my modification to the doctrine that healing is in the atonement on what appears to be the Pauline understanding of the relation between the Spirit and eschatology. Although this theme is less explicit outside the Pauline corpus it is by no means out of harmony with the emphasis of other New Testament writers. Cf. my comments on James on p. 185 and notes 69 and 70 on p. 201.

Chapter Eleven

APPENDIX

Extracts from the Declarations of Faith of various Pentecostal groups with regard to healing

Statements that stress that healing is in the atonement are emphasised in bold type. This brief selection indicates that the view that healing is in the atonement is by no means universal, even within Assemblies of God. However, since the Assemblies of God (USA) and the Church of God (Cleveland USA) are among the largest of the world-wide Pentecostal groups, and since both those groups adhere firmly to the doctrine, the influence of the doctrine continues to be considerable [1]. For further details of the Declarations of Faith of these and other Pentecostal groups, see Hollenweger, op. cit., pp.513-522.

Assemblies of God (USA): ***Deliverance from sickness is provided for in the atonement, and is the privilege of all believers.***

Assemblee di Dio (Italy): *Noi crediamo alla guarigione divina secondo le 'Sacre Scritture': per la preghiera, per la somministrazione dell'Unzione dell'olio; per l'imposizione delle mani [2].*

Assembléias de Deus (Brazil): *Nós cremos que no plano da redenção ha uma bênção para os crentes em suas enfermidades físicas um privilégio de receber a cura divina pela fé; sendo a cura divina um privilégio para os que crêem, é claro que não pode ser uma lei, nem um motivo para combater ou desprezar a ciência e a medicina [3].*

Assemblies of God (Great Britain): ***We believe that deliverance from sickness by Divine Healing is provided for in the Atonement [4].***

Elim Pentecostal Churches (Great Britain): ***We believe that our Lord Jesus Christ is the Healer of the body, and that all who will walk in obedience to His will can claim Divine healing for their bodies [5].***

Assemblées de Dieu (France): ***La Guérison Divine, soit la délivrance de la maladie acquise par le Sacrifice de Jésus au Calvaire [6].***

Church of God (Cleveland, USA): ***Divine Healing is provided for all in the atonement.***

NOTES:

1. This influence is well-illustrated by the statement made by Dr. Raymond Carlson, General Superintendent of American Assemblies of God, while

Appendix

preaching at the World Pentecostal Conference in Oslo on Sunday September 13th, 1992. Cf. note 31 on p. 197 of this thesis.

2. The Italian statement thus makes no reference to the atonement with regard to healing, simply to prayer, anointing with oil and the laying on of hands.
3. The Brazilian statement speaks of the believer's privilege of receiving divine healing by faith, but makes no mention of the atonement. The statement also emphasises that faith in healing is no reason to suppress medical science.
4. The British Assemblies of God statement reflects very much that of the American Assemblies of God. Cf. my comments on pp. 32-33 of this thesis.
5. The Elim statement makes no reference to the atonement, but note the emphasis on the right to 'claim' healing. Cf. pp. 298ff. of this thesis.
6. The French statement reflects the idea of healing in the atonement in saying that deliverance from sickness was acquired by Christ at Calvary. This is not surprising since the existence of French Assemblies of God is largely due to the missionary activity of Douglas Scott of British Assemblies of God (a fact frequently publicly attested to even today by many French Assemblies of God pastors).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamson, J., The Epistle of James, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1976)
- Adolph, P.E., Health Shall Spring Forth, (Chicago, Moody, 1956)
- Aland, K. (Ed), Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, (Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1982)
- Alexander, J.A., The Gospel according to Mark, (London, Banner of Truth, 1960)
- Allen, D., Bird, L., & Herrmann, R. (Eds), Whole-Person Medicine, (Downers Grove, IVP, 1980)
- Allo, E.B., Saint Paul: première épître aux Corinthiens, (Paris, Études Bibliques, 1934)
- Allo, E.B., Saint Paul: seconde épître aux Corinthiens, (Paris, Gabalda, 1956)
- Anderson, H., The Gospel of Mark, (London, Oliphants, 1976)
- Andrews, I., Building A People Of Power, (Milton Keynes, Word, 1988)
- Archer, G.L. & Chirichigno, G.C., Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament, (Chicago, Moody, 1983)
- Attridge, H.W., The Epistle to the Hebrews, (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1989)
- Aulén, G., Christus Victor, (London, SPCK, 1931)
- Baldwin, R., Healing and Wholeness, (Milton Keynes, Word, 1988)
- Banks, R.J. (ed.), Reconciliation and Hope, (Exeter, Paternoster, 1974)
- Barnett, P., The Message of 2 Corinthians, (Leicester, IVP, 1988)
- Barr, J., The Semantics of Biblical Language, (Oxford, OUP, 1961)
- Barratt, W. & Williams, A., Christ's Compassion for the Sick, (Manchester, Authors, 1964)

Bibliography

- Barrett, C.K., A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, (London, Black, 1991)
- Barrett, C.K., A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, (London, Black, 1983)
- Barrett, C.K., A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, (London, Black, 1973)
- Barrett, C.K., Freedom and Obligation, (London, SPCK, 1985)
- Barron, B., The Health and Wealth Gospel, (Downers Grove, IVP, 1988)
- Barth, K., A Shorter Commentary on Romans, (London, SCM, 1959)
- Beare, F.W., The Epistle to the Philippians, (Peabody, Hendrickson, 1987)
- Beare, F.W., The First Epistle of Peter, (Oxford, Blackwell, 1961)
- Beare, F.W., The Gospel according to Matthew: a Commentary, (Oxford, Blackwell, 1981)
- Beasley-Murray, G.R., The Book of Revelation, (London, Oliphants, 1974)
- Bengel, J.A., Gnomon of the New Testament (revised & edited by Andrew Faussett), (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1857)
- Best, E., 1 Peter, (London, Marshalls, 1971)
- Best, E., The Letter of Paul to the Romans, (Cambridge, CUP, 1967)
- Betz, H.D., Galatians - a Commentary on Paul's Letter, (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1979)
- Bigg, C., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of Saint Peter and Saint Jude, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1910)
- Black, M., Romans, (London, Oliphants, 1973)
- Blackman, A.C., The Epistle of James, (London, SCM, 1957)
- Bligh, J., Galatians - a Discussion of St. Paul's Epistle, (London, St. Paul, 1970)
- Bloch-Hoell, N., The Pentecostal Movement, (London, Allen & Unwin, 1964)
- Blue, K., Authority to Heal, (Eastbourne, Monarch, 1989)

Healing & the Atonement

- Blumhofer, E.W., The Assemblies of God, (Springfield, GPH, 1985)
- Boardman, M.M., Life and Labors of Rev. W.E. Boardman, (New York, D. Appleton, 1887)
- Boardman, W.E., The Lord That Healeth Thee, (London, Morgan & Scott, 1881)
- Bornkamm, G., Barth, G. & Held, H.J., Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, (Philadelphia, Westminster, 1963)
- Bosworth, F.F., Christ the Healer, (Miami, F.N.Bosworth, 1948)
- Brandon, A., Health and Wealth, (Eastbourne, Kingsway, 1987)
- Brewster, P.S. (ed.), Pentecostal Doctrine, (Cheltenham, Brewster, 1976)
- Bromiley, G.W. (ed.), The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1988)
- Brown, C., Miracles and the Critical Mind, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1984)
- Brown, E.F., The Pastoral Epistles, (London, Methuen, 1917)
- Brown, R.E., The Gospel according to John (i-xii), (New York, Doubleday, 1966)
- Bruce, F.F., Hebrews, (London, Marshall, 1971)
- Bruce, F.F., Philippians, (Peabody, Hendrickson, 1989)
- Bruce, F.F., Romans, (London, Tyndale, 1963)
- Bruce, F.F., The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, (Exeter, Paternoster, 1982)
- Brumback, C., Suddenly From Heaven, (Springfield, GPH, 1961)
- Burger, C., Jesu als Davidsohn, (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979)
- Burton, E. de W., The Epistle to the Galatians, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1977)
- Burton, W.F.P., Signs Following, (London, AOG, 1949)
- Cadbury, H.J., The Book of Acts in History, (London, Adam, 1955)

Bibliography

- Cadoux, A.T., The Thought of St. James, (London, Clarke 1944)
- Caird, G.B., Principalities and Powers, (Oxford, Clarendon, 1956)
- Caird, G.B., The Revelation of St. John the Divine, (London Black, 1966)
- Calvin, J., Institutes of the Christian Religion, (Library of Christian Classics Edition, ed. John T. McNeill, Philadelphia, Westminster Press)
- Capps, C., Why Tragedy Happens to Christians, (Tulsa, Harrison, House, 1980)
- Carr, W., Angels and Principalities, (Cambridge, CUP, 1981)
- Carson, D.A., Exegetical Fallacies, (Grand Rapids, Baker, 1984)
- Carson, D.A., Showing the Spirit, (Grand Rapids, Baker, 1987)
- Carson, D.A. & Woodbridge, J.D., Hermeneutics, Authority & Canon, (Leicester, IVP, 1986)
- Carter, H., Questions and Answers on the Gifts of the Spirit, (Slough, Ambassador, 1946)
- Carter, J., Donald Gee - Pentecostal Statesman, (Nottingham, AOG, 1975)
- Carter, R.K., The Atonement for Sin and Sickness; or, A Full Salvation for Soul and Body, (Boston, Willard Tract Repository, 1884)
- Carter, R.K., 'Faith Healing' Reviewed After Twenty Years, (Boston & Chicago, Christian Witness, 1897)
- Cho, Y., Successful Living, (Seoul, Youngsan, 1976)
- Clowney, E.P., The Message of 1 Peter, (Leicester, IVP, 1988)
- Cobb, E.H., Christ Healing, (London, Marshall Morgan, 1933)
- Cole, A., Galatians, (London, Tyndale, 1965)
- Cole, R.A., Mark, (London, Tyndale, 1974)
- Collange, J.-F., L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Philippiens, (Neuchatel, Delachaux et Niestlé, 1973)
- Conn, C.W., Like A Mighty Army, (Cleveland, Pathway, 1977)
- Conzelmann, H., 1 Corinthians, (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1975)

Healing & the Atonement

- Copeland, G., God's Will for You, (Fort Worth, KCP, 1972)
- Copeland, K., Our Covenant with God, (Fort Worth, KCP, 1976)
- Cove, G., God's Covenant of Divine Healing, (Brierley Hill, Author, undated)
- Cove, G., How to Make Your Healing Permanent, (Brierley Hill, Author, 1956)
- Cove, G., Why Some Are Healed by Christ and Some Are Not, (Brierley Hill, Author, undated)
- Cranfield, C.E.B., 1 and 2 Peter and Jude, (London, SCM, 1960)
- Cranfield, C.E.B., The Epistle to the Romans, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1977)
- Cranfield, C.E.B., Matthew, (Edinburgh, T.& T. Clark, 1988)
- Cross, F.L., 1 Peter - a Paschal Liturgy, (Oxford, Mowbray, 1954)
- Cullmann, O., Peter, Disciple, Apostle, and Martyr, (London, SCM, 1962)
- Darragh, R.E., In Defence of His Word, (London, Elim, 1932)
- Davids, P.H., The First Epistle of Peter, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1990)
- Davies, W.D & Allison, D.C., The Gospel According to Saint Matthew, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1988)
- Dayton, D.W., Theological Roots of Pentecostalism, (Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1987)
- Dearing, T., Supernatural Healing, (New Jersey, Logos, 1979)
- Dibelius, M., James (revised by Heinrich Greeven), (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1976)
- Dillistone, F.W., The Christian Understanding of Atonement, (London, SCM, 1984)
- Dodd, C.H., The Apostolic Preaching and its Development, (London, Hodder, 1936)
- Dodd, C.H., The Epistle to the Romans, (London, Hodder, 1954)
- Douglas, J.D. (ed.), The New Bible Dictionary, (London, IVP, 1967)
- Duncan, D., Health and Healing: A Ministry to Wholeness, (Edinburgh, St. Andrew Press, 1988)

Bibliography

- Dunn, J.D.G., Baptism in the Holy Spirit, (London, SCM, 1970)
- Dunn, J.D.G., Jesus and the Spirit, (London, SCM, 1975)
- Dunn, J.D.G., Jesus, Paul, and the Law, (London, SPCK, 1990)
- Dunn, J.D.G., Romans 1-8, (Dallas, Word, 1988)
- Dunn, J.D.G., Romans 9-16, (Dallas, Word, 1988)
- Edmunds, V. & Scorer, C.G., Some Thoughts on Faith Healing, (London, Tyndale, 1966)
- Elliott, J.H., A Home for the Homeless, (London, SCM, 1982)
- Ervin, H., Conversion-Initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit, (Peabody, Hendrickson, 1984)
- Farmer, W.R., The Last Twelve Verses of Mark, (Cambridge, CUP, 1974)
- Farmer, W.R., The Synoptic Problem, (Dilshoro, Western North Carolina Press, 1976)
- Fee, G.D., 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, (Peabody, Hendrickson, 1988)
- Fee, G.D., New Testament Exegesis, (Philadelphia, Westminster, 1983)
- Fee, G.D., The Disease of the Health and Wealth Gospels, (Costa Mesa, Word for Today, 1979)
- Fee, G.D., The First Epistle to the Corinthians, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1987)
- Feider, P.A., Healing and Suffering, (London, DLT, 1988)
- Ferguson, S. & Wright, D.F. (eds), New Dictionary of Theology, (Leicester, IVP, 1988)
- Finney, C.G., Lectures on Revivals of Religion, (Leavitt Lord, 1835, critical edition ed. William G. McLoughlin, Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press, 1960)
- Foot, D.R.P., Divine Healing in the Scriptures, (Worthing, Walter, 1967)
- Ford, J., In the Steps of John Wesley - the Church of the Nazarene in Britain, (Kansas City, Nazarene, 1968)
- France, R.T., Jesus and the Old Testament, (London, Tyndale, 1971)

- France, R.T., Matthew, (Leicester, IVP, 1985)
- Francis, F.O., & Meeks, W.A., (eds.), Conflict at Colosse,
(Missoula, University of Montana, 1975)
- Frankemölle, H., Jahwe-Bund und Kirche Christi, (Münster,
Aschendorff, 1984)
- Frodsham, S.H., With Signs Following, (Springfield, GPH, 1946)
- Frost, E., Christian Healing, (London, Mowbray, 1940)
- Frost, H.W., Miraculous Healing, (London, Marshall Morgan,
1951)
- Fung, R.Y., The Epistle to the Galatians, (Grand Rapids,
Eerdmans, 1988)
- Furnish, V.P., 2 Corinthians, (New York, Doubleday, 1985)
- Gaebelein, F.E. (ed.), The Expositor's Bible Commentary,
(Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1981)
- Gardner, R., Healing Miracles, (London, DLT, 1986)
- Gee, D., Concerning Spiritual Gifts, (Springfield, GPH, 1972)
- Gee, D., The Pentecostal Movement, (London, Elim, 1949)
- Gee, D., Trophimus I Left Sick, (London, Elim, 1952)
- Gerhardsson, B., & Banks R.J., (eds) Reconciliation and Hope,
(Exeter, Paternoster, 1974)
- Gerner, K., Divine Healing, (London, Peniel, 1977)
- Goldingay, J. (Ed), Signs, Wonders and Healing,
(Leicester, IVP, 1989)
- Gordon, A.J., The Ministry of Healing, (London, Hodder &
Stoughton, 1882)
- Goudge, H.L., The First Epistle to the Corinthians, (London,
Methuen, 1926)
- Grant, R.M., Historical Introduction to the New Testament,
(London, Collins, 1971)
- Grensted, L.W., A Short History of the Doctrine of the
Atonement, (Manchester, MUP, 1920)
- Grudem, W.A., The First Epistle of Peter, (Leicester, IVP,
1988)

Bibliography

- Gundry, R.H., Matthew: a Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1982)
- Gundry, R.H., The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel, (Leiden, Brill, 1967)
- Gunstone, J., The Lord is Our Healer, (London, Hodder, 1986)
- Gunton, C.E., The Actuality of Atonement, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1988)
- Guthrie, D., Galatians, (London, Marshall, 1973)
- Guthrie, D., New Testament Introduction, (Leicester, IVP, 1970)
- Guthrie, D., The Pastoral Epistles, (London, Tyndale, 1973)
- Hagin, K.E., A Better Covenant, (Tulsa, Faith Library, 1980)
- Hagin, K.E., How to Keep Your Healing, (Tulsa, Rhema, 1983)
- Hagin, K.E., How to Turn Your Faith Loose, (Tulsa, Faith Library, 1985)
- Hagin, K.E., I Believe in Visions, (Old Tappan, Revell, 1972)
- Hagin, K.E., Prevailing Prayer to Peace, (Tulsa, Faith Library, 1981)
- Hagin, K.E., The Believer's Authority, (Tulsa, Rhema, 1985)
- Hagin, K.E., The Ministry of a Prophet, (Tulsa, Faith Library, 1984)
- Hahn, F., The Titles of Jesus in Christology, (London, Lutterworth, 1969)
- Hansen, G.W., Abraham in Galatians, (Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1989)
- Harnack, A., Luke the Physician, (London, Williams and Norgate, 1907)
- Harrell, D., All Things are Possible; the Healing and Charismatic Revivals in Modern America, (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1975)
- Harrison, E.F., Introduction to the New Testament, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1971)
- Hawthorne, G.F., Philippians, (Waco, Word, 1983)
- Hendrickson, W., Galatians, (London, Banner of Truth, 1969)

- Hengel, M., Studies in the Gospel of Mark, (London, SCM, 1985)
- Héring, J., The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, (London, Epworth, 1962)
- Héring, J., The Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, (London, Epworth, 1967)
- Hickson, J.M., Heal the Sick, (London, Methuen, 1925)
- Hill, D., The Gospel of Matthew, (London, Oliphants, 1972)
- Hobart, W.K., The Medical Language of Saint Luke, (Dublin, DUP, 1882)
- Hodges, H.A., The Pattern of Atonement, (London, SCM, 1955)
- Hodgson, L., The Doctrine of the Atonement, (London, Nisbet, 1951)
- Hollenweger, W., The Pentecostals, (London, SCM, 1972)
- Hooker, M.D., Jesus and the Servant, (London, SPCK, 1959)
- Hopkins, H.E., The Mystery of Suffering, (London, IVF, 1959)
- Hort, F.J.A., The First Epistle of Saint Peter 1:1-2:17, (London, Macmillan, 1898)
- Horton, H., The Gifts of the Spirit, (London, AOG, 1954)
- Horton, S.M., What the Bible says about the Holy Spirit, (Springfield, GPH, 1976)
- Hübner, H., Law in Paul's Thought, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1984)
- Hughes, P.E., The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1977)
- Hull, J.M., Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition, (London, SCM, 1974)
- Hummel, C.E., Healing, (Downers Grove, IVP, 1982)
- Jeffreys, E., Stephen Jeffreys - The Beloved Evangelist, (London, Elim, 1946)
- Jeffreys, G., Healing Rays, (London, Elim, 1935)
- Jeffreys, G., The Miraculous Foursquare Gospel, (London, Elim, 1930)
- Jeter, H., By His Stripes, (Springfield, GPH, 1977)

Bibliography

- Jewett, R., Paul's Anthropological Terms - a study of their use in conflict settings, (Leiden, Brill, 1971)
- Käsemann, E., Commentary on Romans, (London, SCM, 1980)
- Kee, H.C., Medicine, Miracle and Magic in New Testament Times, (Cambridge, CUP, 1986)
- Kelly, J.N.D., A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude, (London, Black, 1969)
- Kelly, J.N.D., The Pastoral Epistles, (Peabody, Hendrickson, 1987)
- Kelsey, M.T., Healing and Christianity in Ancient Thought and Modern Times, (New York, Harper & Row, 1976)
- Kenyon, E.W., Two Kinds of Faith, (Seattle, Kenyon, 1942)
- Kiddle, M., The Revelation of St. John, (London, Hodder, 1947)
- Kim, S., The Origin of St. Paul's Gospel, (Tübingen, Mohr, 1981)
- Kingsbury, J.D., Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom, (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1975)
- Kirby, G.W. (Ed), The Question of Healing, (London, Victory, 1967)
- Klausner, J., From Jesus to Paul (ET W.F. Stinespring), (New York, Macmillan, 1943)
- Knopf, R., Die Briefe Petri und Judä, (Göttingen, Meyer, 1912)
- Kümmel, W.G., Introduction to the New Testament, (London, SCM, 1975)
- Lane, W.L., The Gospel of Mark, (London, Marshall, 1974)
- Lawrence, R., Christian Healing Rediscovered, (London, Coverdale, 1976)
- Laws, S., A Commentary on the Epistle of James, (London, Black, 1980)
- Leivestad, R., Christ the Conqueror, (London, SPCK, 1954)
- Lewis, C.S., The Problem of Pain, (London, Collins, 1957)
- Lightfoot, J.B., Philippians, (London, Macmillan, 1883)
- Lightfoot, J.B., St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, (London, Macmillan, 1876)

Healing & the Atonement

- Lim, D., Spiritual Gifts - a fresh look, (Springfield, GPH, 1991)
- Lindars B. & Smalley S. (eds.), Christ and Spirit in the New Testament, (Cambridge, 1973)
- Lindsay, G., Bible Days Are Here Again, (Shewport, Author, 1949)
- Livingstone, E.A., The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, (Oxford, OUP, 1986)
- Lloyd-Jones, D.M., Healing and Medicine, (Eastbourne, Kingsway, 1987)
- Lock, W., The Pastoral Epistles, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1978)
- Longenecker, R.N., Galatians, (Dallas, Word, 1990)
- Lull, D.J., The Spirit in Galatia, (Chico CA, SBL, 1980)
- Luther, M., A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, (London, Saunders, 1833)
- MacLachlan, L., How to Pray for Healing, (London, James Clarke, 1955)
- MacNutt, F., Healing, (New York, Ave Maria, 1974)
- MacNutt, F., The Power to Heal, (New York, Bantam, 1979)
- Manson, W., The Gospel of Luke, (London, Hodder, 1948)
- Marshall, C.D., Faith as a Theme in Mark's Narrative, (Cambridge, CUP, 1989)
- Marshall, I.H., New Testament Interpretation, (Exeter, Paternoster, 1977)
- Marshall, I.H., The Gospel of Luke, (Exeter, Paternoster, 1978)
- Marshall, T., Foundations for a Healing Ministry, (Chichester, Sovereign World, 1988)
- Martin, R.P., 2 Corinthians, (Waco, Word, 1986)
- Martin, R.P., Colossians and Philemon, (London, Oliphants, 1974)
- Martin, R.P., Philippians, (London, Tyndale, 1972)
- Martin, R.P., The Spirit and the Congregation, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1984)

Bibliography

- Marxsen, W., Introduction to the New Testament, (Oxford, Blackwell, 1968)
- McConnell, D.R., A Different Gospel - a Historical and Biblical Analysis of the Modern Faith Movement, (Peabody, Hendrickson, 1988)
- Menzies, A., The Earliest Gospel, (London, Macmillan, 1901)
- Menzies, W.W., Anointed to Serve, (Springfield, GPH, 1971)
- Missen, A.F., The Sound of a Going, (Nottingham, AOG, 1973)
- Mitton, C.L., The Epistle of James, (London, Marshalls, 1976)
- Moffatt, J., Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, (Edinburgh, Clark, 1918)
- Montefiore, C.G., & Loewe, H., A Rabbinic Anthology, (London, Macmillan, 1938)
- Montefiore, H.W., A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, (London, Black, 1964)
- Montgomery, C.J., The Prayer of Faith, (London, Victory, 1930)
- Moo, D.J., James, (Leicester, IVP, 1985)
- Morris, L., The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross, (London, Tyndale, 1960)
- Morris, L., The Cross in the New Testament, (Exeter, Paternoster, 1967)
- Motyer, A., The Message of James, (Leicester, IVP, 1985)
- Moule, C.F.D., An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek, (Cambridge, CUP, 1971)
- Moule, C.F.D. (Ed), Miracles, (London, Mowbray, 1963)
- Murray, A., Divine Healing, (London, Victory, 1934)
- Neil, W., The Epistle to the Hebrews, (London, SCM, 1955)
- Orr, W.F. & Walther, J.A., 1 Corinthians, (New York, Doubleday, 1976)
- Osborn, T.L., Faith's Testimony, (Tulsa, Author, 1962)
- Osborn, T.L., Frontier Evangelism, (Tulsa, Author, 1962)
- Osborn, T.L., Healing en Masse, (Tulsa, Author, 1963)
- Osborn, T.L., Healing from Christ, (Tulsa, Author, 1961)

Healing & the Atonement

- Osborn, T.L., Healing the Sick, (Tulsa, Author, 1961)
- Osborn, T.L., Impact, (Tulsa, Author, 1963)
- Osborn, T.L., Receive Miracle Healing, (Tulsa, Harrison House, 1984)
- Osborn, T.L., The Purpose of Pentecost, (Tulsa, Author, 1963)
- Osborn, T.L., Three Keys to the Book of Acts, (Tulsa, Author, 1963)
- Parker, C.L., Covet Earnestly, (London, AOG, 1961)
- Parker, L., We Let Our Son Die, (Irvine CA, Harvest House, 1980)
- Parker, P.G., Divine Healing, (London, Victory, 1931)
- Parr, J.N., Divine Healing, (Springfield, GPH, 1955)
- Parry, R: St. John, The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, (Cambridge, CUP, 1926)
- Pawson, J.D., The Normal Christian Birth, (London, Hodder, 1989)
- Pfeifer, S., Healing At Any Price?, (Milton Keynes, Word, 1988)
- Plummer, A., II Corinthians, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1978)
- Popejoy, B., The Case for Divine Healing, (Springfield, GPH, 1976)
- Preisker, H. (ed.), Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, (Tübingen, Mohr, 1951)
- Prickett, S., Words and The Word, (Cambridge, CUP, 1986)
- Pytches, D., Come, Holy Spirit, (London, Hodder, 1985)
- Räisänen, H., Paul and the Law, (Tübingen, Möhr, 1983)
- Ramsey, W.R., St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, (London, Hodder, 1920)
- Reike, B., The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude, (New York, Doubleday, 1964)
- Richards, W.T.H., Divine Healing, (Slough, Advance, 1968)
- Richardson, A., The Miracle-Stories of the Gospels, (London, SCM, 1966)

Bibliography

- Ricoeur, P., Essays on Biblical Interpretation, (London, SPCK, 1981)
- Ridderbos, H.N., The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1976)
- Riggs, R.M., The Spirit-Filled Pastor's Guide, (Springfield, GPH, 1948)
- Riggs, R.M., The Spirit Himself, (Springfield, GPH, 1949)
- Roberts, O., Attack Your Lack, (Tulsa, Author, 1985)
- Roberts, O., Best Sermons and Stories, (Tulsa, Author, 1956)
- Roberts, O., Deliverance from Fear and from Sickness, (Tulsa, Author, 1954)
- Robertson, A. & Plummer, A., 1 Corinthians, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1911)
- Robinson, J.A.T., Redating the New Testament, (London, SCM, 1976)
- Rothfuchs, W., Der Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums, (Stuttgart, Kolhammer, 1969)
- Sanday, W & Headlam, A.C., The Epistle to the Romans, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1977)
- Sanders, E.P., Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People, (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1983)
- Sandhurst, B.G., Miracles Still Happen, (London, Burns & Oates, 1957)
- Schweizer, E., The Good News according to Mark (ET D H. Madrig), (London, SPCK, 1971)
- Schweizer, E., The Good News according to Luke (ET D. E. Green), (London SPCK, 1984)
- Schmithals, W., Gnosticism in Corinth, (Nashville, Abingdon, 1971)
- Scroggs, R., The Last Adam, a Study in Pauline Anthropology, (Oxford, Blackwell, 1966)
- Selwyn, E.G., The First Epistle of Peter, (London, Macmillan, 1949)
- Silva, M., Philippians, (Chicago, Moody, 1988)
- Simpson, A.B., The Gospel of Healing, (London, Morgan & Scott, 1915)

- Simpson, E. K., The Pastoral Epistles, (London, Tyndale, 1954)
- Soares Prabhu, G.M., The Formula-Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew, (Rome, Bib. Inst. Press, 1976)
- Stacey, D., Interpreting the Bible, (London, Sheldon, 1976)
- Stanton, G.N., The Interpretation of Matthew, (London, SPCK, 1983)
- Stendahl, K., The School of St Matthew & its Use of the Old Testament, (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1968)
- Stibbs, A.M and Walls, A.F., The First Epistle General of Peter, (London, Tyndale, 1959)
- Stoldt, H.H., History and Criticism of the Marcan Hypothesis, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1980)
- Stott, J.R.W., The Message of Galatians, (Leicester, IVP, 1968)
- Stott, J.R.W., The Message of 2 Timothy, (Leicester, IVP, 1973)
- Stott, J.R.W., The Cross of Christ, (Leicester, IVP, 1986)
- Strachan, R.H., The Second Epistle of Paul o the Corinthians, (London, Hodder, 1935)
- Strecker, G., Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit, (Göttingen, Vandenoek & Ruprecht, 1962)
- Sweet, J., Revelation, (London SCM, 1979)
- Tasker, R.V.G., 2 Corinthians, (London, Tyndale, 1969)
- Tasker, R.V.G., James, (London, Tyndale, 1973)
- Taylor, V., The Gospel according to St. Mark, (London, Macmillan, 1966)
- Theissen, G., Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1983)
- Theissen, G., The First Followers of Jesus, (London, SCM, 1978)
- Theissen, G., The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1982)
- Thistleton, A.C., The Two Horizons, (Exeter, Paternoster, 1980)

Bibliography

- Thompson, J.M., Miracles in the New Testament, (London, Edward Arnold, 1912)
- Torrey, R.A., Divine Healing - Does God Work Miracles Today? (New York, Revell, 1924)
- Torrey, R.A., What the Bible Teaches, (London, Oliphants, 1957)
- Trocme, E., The Formation of the Gospel according to Mark, (London, SPCK, 1963)
- Turner, W.H., Christ the Great Physician, (Pentecostal Holiness Church, 1941)
- Twelftree, G., Christ Triumphant - Exorcism Then and Now, (London, Hodder, 1985)
- Valdez, A.C., Divine Health, (Springfield AOG, undated)
- Vincent, M. R., The Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon, (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1976)
- Vine, W. E., The Epistles to Timothy, (London, Pickering, 1925)
- Watson, F., Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles, a Sociological Approach, (Cambridge, CUP, 1986)
- Weiss, J., Der erste Korintherbrief, (Göttingen, Vanderhoek und Ruprecht, 1910)
- Whittaker, C., Rich In Faith, (Basingstoke, Marshall Pickering 1988)
- Wigglesworth, S., Ever Increasing Faith, (Springfield, GPH, 1924)
- Wigglesworth, S., Faith that Prevails, (Springfield, GPH, 1938)
- Williams, N. P., The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin, (London, Longmans Green, 1929)
- Williams, R. R., The Letters of John and James, (Cambridge, CUP, 1965)
- Wilson, G. B., 2 Corinthians, (Edinburgh, Banner of Truth, 1973)
- Wimber, J., Kingdom Suffering, (London, Hodder, 1989)
- Wimber, J. & Springer, K., Power Healing, (London, Hodder, 1986)

Healing & the Atonement

- Wood, J. D., The Interpretation of the Bible, (London, Duckworth, 1958)
- Woodard, C., A Doctor Heals By Faith, (London, Max Parrish, 1953)
- Woodford, L.F.W., Divine Healing and the Atonement - a Restatement, (Croydon, Victoria Instit. 1956)
- Wrede, W., Paul (ET E. Lummis), (London, Green, 1907)
- Wright, G., In Quest of Healing, (Springfield, GPH, 1984)
- Wyman, F.L., Divine Healing, (London, Bannisdale, 1951)
- Yeomans, L.B., Balm of Gilead, (Springfield, GPH, 1936/73)
- Yeomans, L.B., Healing from Heaven, (Springfield, GPH, 1926/73)
- Yeomans, L.B., Health and Healing, (Springfield, GPH, 1938)
- Yeomans, L.B. The Great Physician, (Springfield, GPH, 1933)

Bibliography

THESES AND ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

- Aland, K., Der Wiedergefundene Markusschluss? Eine methodologische Bemerkung zur textkritischen Arbeit, ZeitTheolKirch, 1970, 67, 1, 3-13
- Barclay, J.M.G., Paul and the Law, Themelios, 1986, 12, 1, 5-15
- Barré, M.L., Qumran and the 'weakness' of Paul, CathBibQuart, 1980, 42, 2, 216-227
- Betz, H.-D., The Cleansing of the Ten Lepers (Luke 17:11-19), Journal of Biblical Literature, 1971, 90, 314-328
- Binder, H., Die angebliche Krankheit des Paulus, TheolZeit, 1976, 32, 1, 1-13
- Bodamer, W.G., The Life and Work of Johann Christoph Blumhardt, Ph. D. thesis, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1966
- Boismard, M.E., Une Liturgie Baptismale dans la prima Petri 1, son Influence sur Tit., 1 Jo. et Col., Revue Biblique, 1956, 63, 2, 182-208
- Bruce, F.F., Galatian Problems 2. North or South Galatians, BJRL 1969-'70, 52, 10-18
- Burger, C., Jesu Taten nach Matthäus 8 und 9, ZeitTheolKirch, 1973, 70, 3, 272-287
- Christofferson, O., På jakt efter den rätter bakgrunden till Rom 8:18ff, SvenskExegArs, 1985, 50, 135-143
- Clark, K.W., The Gentile Bias in Matthew, Journal of Biblical Literature, 1947, 66, 165-172
- Connolly, D., Ad miracula sanationum apud Matthaeum, VerbDom, 1967, 45, 5-6, 306-325
- Cooke-Ellis, T., Healing in the Atonement, Tongues of Fire, 1899, 9, 107, 5
- Cunningham, V., Eratosthenes Butterscotch, Redemption Tidings, 20th July 1972, 7-8
- Donaldson, T.L., Jesus on the Mountain: a Study in Matthean Theology, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1985, 204-205
- Drewes, B.F., The Composition of Matthew 8-9, SEA JournTheol, 1971, 12, 2, 92-101

Bibliography

- Fraeyman, M., De sacramentele zending van de Kerk tegenover de sieken, (The Church's Sacramental Mission to the Sick), CollBrugGand, 1958, 4, 1
- France, R.T., Matthew's Gospel in Recent Study, Themelios, 1989, 14, 2, 41-46
- Gillman, J., A Thematic Comparison, 1 Cor. 15:50-57 and 2 Cor. 5:1-6, JBL, 1988, 107, 3, 439-454
- Gillman, J., Transformation in 1 Corinthians 15:50-53, EphTheolLov, 1982, 58,4, 320-322
- Gundry, R.H., Verba Christi in 1 Peter, NTS 1966-'67, 13, 336-350
- Hemer, C., The Address of 1 Peter, Expository Times, 1978, 89, 239-243
- Hisey, A., A paragnostical view of Paul the Apostle, Unitarian Universalist Christian, 1978, 33, 3-4, 12-19
- Kerr, A.J., APPABON, JTS, 1988, 39, 1, 92-97
- Linnemann, E., Der (wiedergefundene) Markusschluss, ZeitTheolKirch, 1969, 66, 3, 255-287
- Loubser, J.A., Paulus se doring in die vlees, NedGerefTeolTyd, 1981, 22, 4, 259-268
- Louw, J.P., Paulus se doring in die vlees, NedGerefTeolTyd, 1981, 22, 4, 269-272
- Manns, F., Confessez vos péchés les uns aux autres, RevSciRel, 1984, 58, 4, 233-241
- Marjerie, B. de, Réception indigne et infructueuse de l'Eucharistie d'après St. Paul: 1 Corinthiens 11:27-29, Esp. Vie, 1977, 87, 40, 513-519
- McCant, J.W., Paul's Thorn of Rejected Apostleship, NTStud, 1988, 34,4, 550-572
- Minear, P.S., Paul's teaching on the Eucharist in 1 Corinthians, Worship, 1970, 44, 2, 83-92
- Morisette, R., La chair et le sang ne peuvent hériter du règne de Dieu, Science et Esprit, 1974, 26, 46-48
- Moule, C.F.D., Fulfillment Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse, New Testament Studies, 1967-68, 14, 293-320
- Moule, C.F.D., The Nature and Purpose of 1 Peter, New Testament Studies, 1956, 57, 3, 4-7

Healing & the Atonement

Muddiman, J., Adam, the Type of the One to Come, Theology, 1984, 87, 716, 101-110

Osei-Bonsu, J., Does 2 Cor.5:1-10 teach the reception of the resurrection body at the moment of death? JSNT, 1986, 28, 81-101

Packer, J.I., What did the cross achieve? The logic of penal substitution, Tyndale Bulletin, 1974, 25, 3-45

Pearson, B.A., The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians, SBL, 1973, 12

Perriman, A.C., Paul and the Parousia, NT Studies, 1989, 35, 4, 512-521

Price, R.M., Punished in Paradise, JournStudNT, 1980, 7, 33-40

Prout, E., One loaf....one Body, RestorQuart, 1982, 25, 2, 78-81

Shogren, G.S., Will God Heal Us? - a Re-examination of James 5:14-16a, Evangelical Quarterly, 1989, 61, 2, 99-108

Trompf, G.W., The Markusschluss in recent research, AusBibRev 1973, 21, 15-26

Wedderburn, A.J.M., Philo's Heavenly Man, Novum Testamentum, 1973, 15, 4

Wilkinson, J., Healing in the Epistle of James, Scottish Journal of Theology, 1971, 24, 3, 326-345

Yates, J., Immediate or Intermediate? The State of the Believer upon Death, Churchman, 1987, 101, 4, 310-322

