

“INTEGRITY”—A Closer Look: What the New Testament Can Tell Us about Integrity

A follow-up to *What the Hebrew Scriptures Can Tell Us about Integrity*

Kenneth P. Schleimer

Unless otherwise noted, scripture quotations are from the ESV®.

Introduction

The previous study ended by leaving a door open. Having traced the Hebrew words *tummah* and *tom* through a year, a body, a heart, a single act, and a single unaimed arrow, it found one stable core sense: completeness, wholeness, undividedness. This study walks through that door into the New Testament and finds, with some surprise, that the English word “integrity,” the common gloss for those Hebrew words, is almost absent from the New Testament and that no single Greek word or its glosses carry the load that *tummah* or *tom* carry in Hebrew.

The word “integrity” does surface in a few versions (for example, “in your teaching show integrity,” Titus 2:7, where the Greek is *aphthoria*, “incorruptness”), but that is the exception. This near absence is the starting problem. The concept of completeness or wholeness appears to be everywhere, yet the word “integrity” is nearly nowhere to be found.

Part of the difficulty is that the English word has shifted. In current usage, “integrity” usually means honesty or moral uprightness, a person who tells the truth and keeps their word. Its older sense, from the Latin *integer*, “whole” or “untouched” (the sense still heard in “integer” and “intact”), is wholeness: a person, or a thing, that is undivided and all of one piece. It is the older sense that *tummah* and *tom* carry, and it is the sense in which this study uses the word. The aim here is the same as before: not to import a definition of integrity and look for it, but to let a cluster of Greek words sort themselves by what they describe, and then to ask what the cluster discloses.

Two cautions govern the whole study. First, no Greek word “inherits” *tom* the way a translation inherits a source term—meaning, there is no one-to-one Greek word that totally aligns with *tom*. Any Greek word’s relationship is conceptual, not lexical, and treating it otherwise is the mistake James Barr called illegitimate totality transfer: reading everything one word means into every other word that seems related. Second, as in the first study, glosses matter. An English word chosen to render a Greek term is a label, and labels can hide the thing they name.

Brief Lexical Background

The Septuagint (LXX), a translation of the Hebrew scriptures into Greek, offers some possible insights into how the Greek communicates the concept of “integrity.” The translators did not settle on a single Greek word for *tom* and *tummah*; they chose according to context. For example, in Proverbs 10:9 the one who walks in *tom* walks *haplōs* (“simply, singly”). In Psalm 26:1 (LXX 25:1) the phrase “I have walked in my integrity” uses *akakia* (“guilelessness”), and in Genesis 20:5–6 “integrity of heart” becomes a “pure heart” (*katharos*). In Deuteronomy 18:13 the Hebrew *tamim*, the adjective form of *tom*, is *teleios*

in the LXX, which is why Matthew 5:48 is typically read against that verse. It reads, “You therefore must be **perfect**, as your heavenly Father is **perfect**.”

As an initial observation, the concept of integrity in its older sense of wholeness, completeness, or undividedness is present throughout the New Testament, but no single Greek word carries it. It is spread across several Greek word groups, and, as the first study did, these groups are best sorted by what they are applied to. Four emerge.

Four Domains

1. **Literal wholeness:** a body made whole, a work brought to completion. This parallels Domain 1 in the Hebrew study.
2. **Heart and orientation:** singleness against division. This is the closest counterpart to *tom levav* (heart of integrity).
3. **Way and walk:** blameless and straight conduct, set against crookedness and hypocrisy. This is where *tom* and *yashar* meet again.
4. **Bounded by knowledge, judged by God:** innocence relative to what a person knows, and who gets to render the verdict. This parallels Domain 3, Abimelech and the two hundred men.

A fifth section then briefly takes up what is genuinely new in the New Testament: wholeness that is *received* before it is *lived*.

Domain 1: Literal Wholeness

Just as *tom* was applied to a full year or a body at full vigor, several Greek words are used where nothing explicitly moral is in view.

The noun [holoklēria](#) (from the adjective [holoklēros](#)—“complete in every part,” from *holos*, “whole,” and *klēros*, “portion”) is used in [Acts 3:16](#) of the man healed at the temple gate, who received “perfect health.” This is the only occurrence of this word. [Hygiēs](#) (“sound, healthy”) is the word Jesus used when he asked the man at the pool, “Do you want to be healed?” [[John 5:6](#)], which could as easily be rendered, “Do you want to become whole?” And [sōzō](#) carries both “save” and “make well,” as in [Mark 5:34](#), where the woman is told her faith has “made you well,” the same verb the New Testament uses for salvation. Note [hygiēs](#) also occurs in this verse, “be healed.”

The moral weight of these words, as with *tom* in Leviticus 25 and Job 21, does not live in the word. It comes from context. Notice, however, that the context in the New Testament repeatedly stacks bodily wholeness and spiritual wholeness together. Healing and salvation are not different categories in the vocabulary. This is worth keeping in mind for what follows: just as *tom* ranged from the literal (a full year) to the moral (a whole heart), the New Testament’s “wholeness” is likewise both literal and moral.

[Teleios](#) belongs here too, in its basic sense of a thing brought to its intended end. The writer of Hebrews speaks of the “**mature**” who have trained their faculties [[Hebrews 5:14](#)], and Paul contrasts the “**perfect**” with the partial ([1 Corinthians 13:10](#)). The English gloss “perfect” is the problem the first study anticipated: it suggests flawlessness, where the underlying idea is completeness, a thing that has reached what it was meant to be.

Taken together, these words show that the concept of wholeness and completeness is present in the New Testament and is addressed with several Greek words rather than one: *holoklēria* (a body complete in every part), *hygiēs* (sound, healthy), *sōzō* (made well, saved), and *teleios* (brought to its intended end). Just as *tom* was applied to a year or a body, none of these words is inherently moral. What they share is the idea of a thing that is complete and lacking nothing, and that idea is what the moral uses in the next domains build on.

Domain 2: Heart and Orientation (single/undividedness)

This is the New Testament's richest territory, and the clearest evidence that the concept of "moral wholeness" is present without the word "integrity."

The single eye. In [Matthew 6:22–23](#) and [Luke 11:34](#), the Greek adjective is *haplous*, from the root for "single" or "simple." The ESV glosses it "healthy," the KJV "single," and the NIV "good." All three are labels for one word, and here the gloss matters: "healthy" obscures that Jesus immediately turns to the impossibility of serving two masters ([Matthew 6:24](#)). The whole unit is about **undividedness**. A single eye fills the whole body with light; a divided loyalty cannot be sustained.

Singleness of heart. The noun *haplotēs* (from *haplous* noted above) is used with "heart" in exactly the way *tom* is used with *levav* [[1 Kings 9:4](#)—"integrity of heart"]. [Ephesians 6:5](#) and [Colossians 3:22](#) speak of bondservants obeying "with **sincerity** of heart" (the KJV's "**singleness** of heart" is literal), and [Colossians 3:22](#) adds "fearing the Lord," echoing the same pairing the first study found in Job's description: **wholeness** of heart together with fear of God [[Job 1:8](#)]. in [2 Corinthians 1:12](#), Paul appeals to his own *haplotēs* ("simplicity") and *eilikrineia* ("sincerity").¹ In [2 Corinthians 11:3](#) Paul fears that, as the serpent deceived Eve "by his cunning" (the NASB and KJV have "craftiness," Greek *panourgia*), the Corinthians' thoughts will be led astray from "a sincere and pure devotion to Christ." The Greek is literally "the simplicity [*haplotēs*] and the purity [*hagnotēs*] that is toward Christ." The contrast is the point: a single, uncomplicated devotion set against a many-sided scheme. Paul's fear is not that the Corinthians will stop believing but that their one devotion will be divided.

The divided heart. *Dipsychos*, "two-souled," appears only in James [[1:8](#); [4:8](#)], and it is nearly the exact reverse of *tom levav* (integrity/wholeness of heart). The Hebrew Scriptures have their own picture of the same thing in [Psalm 12:2](#), where flattering lips speak "with a double heart," literally "a heart and a heart," the idiom the first study set against *tom*. What James says of that person deserves a pause: he is "unstable in all his ways." The Greek for "ways" (*hodois*) is the same word the Septuagint uses for *derek*, the "way" that the first study found paired with *tom* throughout Job and Proverbs. A divided **heart** produces a divided **life**, which is the principle the first study drew from [Psalm 78](#). James also writes that endurance should complete its work "that you may be perfect and complete, lacking in nothing" [[1:4](#)], using *teleios* and *holoklēros* together, a doublet that nearly reads as a New Testament definition of *tom*.

Unmixed. *Akeraios* means literally "unmixed, unadulterated" ([Thayer's](#) lexicon has "unmixed, pure, as wine, metals"), and [LSJ](#) adds "untouched," as of land or pasture, which echoes the Latin *integer* ("untouched"). It appears three times, and the ESV glosses it "innocent" each time: [Matthew 10:16](#),

¹ The Greek word behind "sincerity" is traditionally explained as "tested in the light," though that derivation is uncertain. Some manuscripts read *hagiotēs*, "holiness," in place of *haplotēs*, which is worth noting for anyone building weight on that verse.

[Romans 16:19](#), and [Philippians 2:15](#). The gloss is an acceptable label but a thin one, since what is being described is a heart with nothing foreign mixed in. That makes the word a near neighbor of *tom*: a mixed loyalty is a divided one, and “unmixed” is one way Greek can say “undivided.” The gloss “blameless” is [amemptos](#)—addressed under Domain 3.

Two of the three occurrences set the word beside shrewdness. In [Matthew 10:16](#) Jesus sends his disciples out to “be wise as serpents and innocent as doves,” and in [Romans 16:19](#) Paul wants his readers “wise as to what is good and innocent as to what is evil.” The pairing guards against a misreading: being unmixed is not naiveté. The shrewdness is aimed at the good and at the danger, while the heart stays unmixed with evil.

Hypocrisy as the antithesis. Acting a part is the exact opposite of what *tom* and *haplotēs* describe. A hypocrite is a person who is one thing outside and another inside. Jesus applies the charge most sharply to the scribes and Pharisees, and the noun [hypokritēs](#), “actor, hypocrite,” is the word he most often uses of them. In [Matthew 23:28](#) the split is explicit: “outwardly you appear righteous to others, but within you are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness.” In [Matthew 15:7–8](#), quoting Isaiah, he describes a heart “far from me” behind honoring lips. The verb [hypokrinomai](#) occurs only once in the New Testament, in [Luke 20:20](#), of spies who “pretended to be sincere.” Their next words praise Jesus as one who “truly” teaches “the way of God,” a compliment much like the one in [Matthew 22:16](#) (discussed under Domain 3). This is why the positive forms [anypokritos](#) (“without hypocrisy,” [Romans 12:9](#) “sincere”; [2 Corinthians 6:6](#) “sincere”) belong in this domain. The Hebrew study observed that *tom* is not strictly inward and *yashar* (“straight,” the partner word the first study paired with *tom*) not strictly outward, and that each can include both. The same holds here: hypocrisy is not merely an outward flaw. It is a split between the inward and the outward.

[Matthew 5:48](#). Few verses suffer more from its gloss than this one: “You therefore must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.” Read against Deuteronomy 18:13 and in its own context (the preceding verses are about loving enemies and being impartial, like a Father who sends rain on the just and unjust), the verse is less about flawlessness than about wholehearted love without a hidden exception. The parallel in Luke 6:36 renders the same idea as “be merciful.” Nothing about the passage requires reading [teleios](#) as sinless. It reads naturally as undivided in love, as God is.

Taken together, these words show that the New Testament describes wholeness, and the lack of it, with a variety of Greek words rather than a single term. On the positive side are the single eye (*haplous*), singleness of heart (*haplotēs*), the unmixed heart (*akeraios*), sincerity (*eilikrineia*, *anypokritos*), and completeness (*teleios*). On the negative side are the divided heart (*dipsychos*) and the actor (*hypokritēs*). Each word looks at the same condition from a different angle: a person who is one thing all the way through, or who is not. As in the first study, the core idea is constant across the cluster, and what differs is what each word is attached to. Each of these words can provide fruitful ground for further detailed study.

Domain 3: Way and Walk (blameless, upright/straight)

The first study found that *tom* regularly pairs with *derek* (“way”) and *halak* (“walk”), and the Greek has the same structure. [Peripateō](#) (“to walk about,” hence to live) is Paul’s and John’s standard verb for conduct ([Ephesians 4:1](#); [Colossians 1:10](#); [1 John 1:6–7](#); [2:6](#)), and [hodos](#) (“way”) is used for the whole direction of a life, to the point that the early church was called “the Way” ([Acts 9:2](#)). The question, then,

is what kind of walk is meant, and the New Testament's answer is most often given with the word "blameless."

The blameless group. Three words dominate.

- [*Amemptos*](#) ("blameless, without fault," from a derivative of [*memphomai*](#), to blame, find fault) describes Zechariah and Elizabeth, "walking in all the commandments and statutes of the Lord **blameless**" ([Luke 1:6](#)), Paul's own record under the law ([Philippians 3:6](#)), and exhortation to believers to so walk ([Philippians 2:15](#)).²
- [*Amōmos*](#) ("without blemish") carries the sacrificial overtones of [*tamim*](#) (adj. form of *tom*): believers are to be presented so ([Ephesians 1:4](#); [Colossians 1:22](#); [Jude 24](#)—glossed as "blameless"), and Christ is the lamb without blemish ([1 Peter 1:19](#); [Hebrews 9:14](#)).
- [*Anenklētos*](#) ("not called to account," from [*enkaleō*](#), "to bring a charge") is the most legal of the three, and it is the word in [1 Corinthians 1:8](#) ("guiltless"). Its negation of the verb in [Romans 8:33](#) ("Who shall bring any charge against God's elect?") is not accidental.

The first study observed, regarding Job, that "blameless" has a forensic sense that can sever the visible link to integrity, and that *tam* (adj.) describes who Job is more than whether a court would acquit him. The New Testament words are mixed on this point, and it is worth being precise. [*Anenklētos*](#) leans forensic. [*Amemptos*](#) in [1 Thessalonians 3:13](#) does not: Paul prays that the Lord will "establish your hearts **blameless** in holiness," and the object is the *heart*, the same organ that *tom levav* describes. Even within the "blameless" family, then, there is a range from verdict to character.

Whole and straight again. [Philippians 2:15](#) is a remarkable convergence. Paul wants his readers to be "blameless ([*amemptos*](#)) and innocent ([*akeraios*](#)), children of God without blemish ([*amōmos*](#)) in the midst of a crooked ([*skolios*](#)) and twisted ([*diastrephō*](#)) generation." The phrase "crooked and twisted" is borrowed from [Deuteronomy 32:5](#), a passage whose preceding verse says of God, "his work is perfect" ([*tamim*](#)). So, in Philippians, three words for wholeness are set against two words for crookedness, and the background is a text about God's own *tom*. In the Septuagint, *yashar* ("straight") is frequently rendered *euthys* or *orthos*. In Psalm 25:21 (LXX 24:21) the pair "integrity and uprightness" becomes *akakoi kai eutheis*, and in Psalm 32:11 (LXX 31:11) "upright in heart" is *eutheis tē kardia*. Its opposite, the "crooked," is *skolios*. This is the whole-and-straight pairing, complete and in Greek dress. The pairing "blameless and innocent" also has a Hebrew counterpart in [Psalm 19:13](#), where the psalmist hopes to be "blameless, and innocent of great transgression." The "blameless" there comes from the *tamam* root, the same family as *tom*. Just as a reminder, this is a parallel, not a source: no Greek word inherits *tom* from the Hebrew, but both languages reach for the same combination of wholeness and innocence.

The New Testament also uses the straightness language literally. In [Galatians 2:14](#), Paul says Peter's conduct was "not in step with the truth of the gospel," using [*orthopodeō*](#), which is built from "straight" and "foot," a straight walk. The episode (2:11–13) is Peter's division in action: he ate with the Gentiles, then withdrew "fearing the circumcision party." [Acts 13:10](#) accuses Elymas of making crooked "the straight paths of the Lord" ([*euthys*](#)). [Hebrews 12:13](#) urges, "Make straight paths for your feet" ([*orthos*](#)).

² It does not teach sinless perfection on earth but the absence of grounds for accusation before God or men. The concept is deeply rooted in the Old Testament ideal of integrity.

The plumb-and-complete image from the first study carries over directly. Paul before Damascus ([Philippians 3:6](#); [Romans 10:2](#)) was whole but not straight: zealous and undivided, aimed at the wrong standard. Peter at Antioch was straight in doctrine but, in that moment, divided in practice. The New Testament's concern is for both.

The hostile witness. In [Matthew 22:16](#) the Pharisees' disciples say to Jesus, "Teacher, we know that you are true and teach the way of God truthfully, and you do not care about anyone's opinion." They say it to trap him, but the statement is remarkable. Like Job's wife and Eliphaz, who recognized Job's *tummah* from what they could observe, these hostile observers testify to a man who is the same person whatever the pressure or audience. (Some versions render *alēthēs* here as "a man of integrity.") Jesus himself is the New Testament's fullest portrait of the undivided person: "I seek not my own will but the will of him who sent me" ([John 5:30](#)), "I always do the things that are pleasing to him" ([John 8:29](#)), and "not my will, but yours, be done" ([Luke 22:42](#)).

Taken together, these words show that the New Testament speaks of a whole life as a walk, and that it describes the walk with two kinds of words. One kind says the walk is whole: *amemptos*, *amōmos*, and *anenklētos* ("blameless," "guiltless," "above reproach"), ranging from character to verdict. The other says it is straight: *euthys*, *orthos*, and *orthopodeō*, set against *skolios* and *diestrammenēs* ("crooked and twisted"). As in the first study, neither is enough alone. Paul before Damascus was whole but not straight, and Peter at Antioch was straight in doctrine but divided in practice. Jesus, whom even his opponents could describe as unswayed by anyone's opinion, is the pattern of both.

Domain 4: Bounded by Knowledge, Judged by God

The first study's Domain 3 (Abimelech and the two hundred men) produced a principle we called integrity "bounded by knowledge." The idea is simple: a person's integrity of heart reaches only as far as what the person knows. Abimelech took Sarah believing she was Abraham's sister, and God confirmed that he had acted "in the integrity of your heart," because he was undivided about a wrong he did not know he was committing. His integrity was real, but it was limited by what he knew. The first study also noted that this integrity secured Abimelech's innocence but not his household's safety. The New Testament has direct counterparts.

Ignorance and its limits. [Luke 12:47–48](#) distinguishes degrees of accountability according to what the servant knew: the one who knew receives a severe beating, the one who did not know a light one. Ignorance reduces guilt, but it does not erase consequences. In [Acts 17:30](#), God "overlooked" the times of ignorance but now commands repentance. Paul says of his own persecuting past, "I acted ignorantly in unbelief" ([1 Timothy 1:13](#)), and in the same breath calls himself the foremost of sinners. [Acts 3:17](#) is the closest parallel to the Abimelech record in [Genesis 20](#): Peter says, "you acted in ignorance," yet he calls them to repent. This is exactly the distinction the first study drew in Abimelech's case.

Self-assessment and the verdict. The Hebrew study noted that Proverbs distrusts self-assessment, and that Job asked God himself to weigh his integrity ([Job 31:6](#)). [1 Corinthians 4:4](#) is the New Testament's version: "I am not aware of anything against myself, but I am not thereby acquitted. It is the Lord who judges me." A clear conscience is real evidence, but it is bounded by what the person knows. The verdict belongs to God, who "will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purposes

of the heart” ([1 Corinthians 4:5](#)). Paul’s own words show which way the verdict runs: he is aware of nothing against himself, “but I am not thereby acquitted [*dikaioō*].”³

What Changes: Wholeness Received

Up to this point the New Testament has largely extended the Hebrew picture. Here it does something new, and the first study’s own footnote anticipates it: the concept of vindication “takes on a very different scope, primarily eschatological.”

In the Hebrew texts, the ground of vindication is typically the person’s *tom*. “You have upheld me because of my integrity” ([Psalm 41:12](#)); “Vindicate me, O LORD, for I have walked in my integrity” ([Psalm 26:1](#)). David, we noted, is not claiming sinlessness, but integrity is nonetheless the basis of his appeal.

The New Testament inverts the order. Wholeness is first *given*, then *lived out*.

- Believers “have been filled in him” ([Colossians 2:10](#)), using the verb *plēroō*, “made full, complete.”
- By a single offering he has perfected for all time those who are being sanctified” ([Hebrews 10:14](#)). The verb *teleioō* (“has perfected”) is in the perfect tense, which names a completed work whose results continue, while “are being sanctified” (*hagiazó*) is in the present tense, which names a process still under way. One verse holds both: a standing already complete and a life still being made holy.
- Paul says both “Not that I have already obtained this or am already perfect” ([Philippians 3:12](#)) and, three verses later, “Let those of us who are mature think this way” ([3:15](#)). The same word family, *teleioō* and *teleios*, is used for what he has not yet reached and for what he already is.
- The final presentation is God’s work: “may your whole spirit and soul and body be kept blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. He who calls you is faithful; he will surely do it” ([1 Thessalonians 5:23–24](#); see also [Philippians 1:6](#); [Jude 24](#)).

1 Corinthians 1:8 in this light. Paul says Christ “will sustain you to the end, guiltless (*aneklētos*) in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ,” and verse 9 supplies the ground: “God is faithful.” Compare [Psalm 41:12](#), where God “upholds” the psalmist “because of my integrity.” In both, God is the one who upholds. The difference is the stated basis. In the Psalm it is the person’s *tom*. In Paul, it is God’s faithfulness, and the people being addressed are the divided, quarreling Corinthians, hardly a picture of undivided integrity. The New Testament does not abandon the idea that the whole life matters ([Colossians 1:22–23](#) still says “if indeed you continue in the faith”), but it relocates the foundation. Standing before God no longer rests on the believer’s own wholeness. Wholeness is first the gift in Christ, and the believer’s lived undividedness is its fruit and its evidence.

³ 1 Corinthians 4:4 does not use *aneklētos* (the word “acquit” is *dikaioō*). However, we see the same courtroom image as *aneklētos* in [1 Corinthians 1:8](#). *Aneklētos* means that no charge can be brought (Thayer’s has “that cannot be called to account”), and the context supplies the basis. In 1 Corinthians 1:8 the context is forensic: God’s verdict on the day of Christ, grounded in his faithfulness ([1:9](#)) and not in the believer’s record. In the qualifications for deacons and elders it refers to behavior, a life against which a community can bring no charge ([1 Timothy 3:10](#); [Titus 1:6–7](#)). The word itself does not specify legal standing or behavior; the context does.

This also reframes how to read [2 Corinthians 1:12](#), where Paul boasts in his conscience about his simplicity and godly sincerity, and immediately adds, “not by earthly wisdom but by the grace of God.” He is claiming undividedness, but as received. And [Philippians 3:6–9](#) makes the same turn: Paul had been [amemptos](#) under the law, yet counts that blamelessness as loss compared with “a righteousness from God.” He had a form of wholeness without the right object, and he now has the right object.

Conclusion

The first study concluded that *tummah* and *tom* describe “the absence of division: a thing, or a person, that is entirely what it is, all the way through.” The New Testament cluster says the same thing in different words and adds one thing.

What it carries over: the concept is expressed through *haplous*, *haplotēs*, *akeraios*, *holoklēros*, *teleios*, and the blameless group, with *dipsychos* and *hypokrisis* as the antitheses. Heart and conduct are tied together, in the same way *tom levav* and *derek tamim* were. The pairing of whole and straight remains, in the contrast between blameless and crooked (Philippians 2:15). The integrity of heart is still bounded by knowledge, and the final verdict is still God’s (1 Corinthians 4:4).

What it adds: wholeness is received in Christ before it is practiced, and the confidence of standing before God at his coming rests on God’s faithfulness rather than on the believer’s own record. The forensic and the characterological are therefore both present, and they belong in a particular order. Standing is the ground, and undividedness is the fruit.

This has a practical consequence for communication. Because English “integrity” can sound like a self-achieved moral trait, it risks sending the hearer in the wrong direction, toward self-improvement. The biblical idea is better stated as *being made whole and living from that wholeness*. A speaker or writer might use “integrity” as the point of contact, since people recognize it, and then lead with the language of wholeness and undividedness. The pictures that people grasp immediately are already in the text: the single eye, the two masters, the double-minded man unstable in all his ways, the plumb and complete building.

The diagnostic question the first study ended on still stands: not “are you good enough,” but “are you divided.” The New Testament’s answer is that the divided can be made whole, and that the One who makes them whole will see it through.

That answer raises two questions this study has not settled: what, exactly, is received, and what is different about the person who has received it? The New Testament says that wholeness is given in Christ and then lived out, but it assumes a story that begins long before the New Testament and continues past the resurrection. Following that story, from the beginning of Genesis to Pentecost and beyond, is the subject of Part 3.