

B. D. T H E S I S.

D E A T H, I M M O R T A L I T Y & T H E B I B L I C A L
D O C T R I N E O F R E S U R R E C T I O N.

A S T U D Y I N T H E T H E O L O G Y O F R E N E W A L.

L O U I S B A N K.

C O N T E N T S.

Introduction.

- Chapter I. - The Greek Belief in the Immortality
of the Soul.
- Chapter II. - The Nature and Destiny of Man in the
Old Testament.
- Chapter III. - The Resurrection of the Body.
- Chapter IV. - The Body of Christ.
- Bibliography.

----oOo----

All biblical quotations from the American Revised Version,
unless otherwise stated.

----oOo----

I N T R O D U C T I O N .

The fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, from the dead is the central fact of Christian faith and teaching. This centrality is certainly accorded it in the Bible, but has often been forgotten in the thinking, practice and worship of the Christian Church. (The paucity of available contemporary literature on the subject is one fact which may serve to illustrate this.) The subject of the first Christian sermon preached on the Day of Pentecost was on the Resurrection. The Jesus whom they had crucified, God had made both Lord and Christ. (Acts 2. 37.) The Gospels would belie their name if they had left us with an account of the life and tragic death of a man who claimed to know and reveal God in a special way. The news is good news precisely because of the Resurrection of our Lord from the dead. St. Paul's changed life begins with the experience of the Risen Christ on the Damascus road. In the first letter of St. Peter, which is thought to be an instruction to newly baptised converts, there is one of the truest expressions of the nature of the Christian life in the New Testament. 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ! By His great mercy we have been born anew to a living hope through the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, and to an inheritance imperishable, undefiled, and unfading, kept in heaven for you, who by God's power are guarded through faith for a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.' (I Peter 1. 3-4 A.R.V.) In this passage is expressed the renewal of the present life in Christ, for which the name of the Father is praised. The final realization of the fullness of that life is something which is yet to take place. Life in Christ is seen both as a present reality, and as promise of future fulfilment. The aspect which interests us is that all this turns on the fact of the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead. The Resurrection means that Jesus lives, and the Christian knows newness of life in Him. We are not followers of a dead Christ, but of a living Lord. The fundamental doctrine of the epistles of Paul is the en Christo nature of the Christian life. For him to live is Christ, and to die is gain. (Phil. 1. 21.) 'I have been crucified with Christ: it is no longer I

who live, but Christ who lives in me ...' (Gal. 2. 20a.) 'For His sake I have suffered the loss of all things in order that I may gain Christ and be found in Him that I may know Him and the power of His resurrection, and may share His sufferings, becoming like Him in His death, that, if possible, I may attain the resurrection of the dead.' (Phil. 3. 8-10.) Here, as in St. Peter's letter, we have the Christian life as life renewed in Christ, with the expression of this life as parallel to the suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ in this world. The pattern of the Christian's life is the life of Christ. This would lead on naturally to a discussion of the Pauline doctrine of the Body of Christ, but more of that at a later stage. To quote St. Paul once again: 'If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile, and you are still in your sins. (I Cor. 15. 17.) The closest possible relation exists between the resurrection and the renewal of man. There is no renewal without resurrection. Not only that, there is no renewal without the resurrection of Christ. It is of the utmost importance for us to bear this in mind, for theological thinking about the resurrection has often ceased to be Biblical precisely at this point, as we shall attempt to demonstrate, and has been beguiled by philosophy.

To preserve our Christian and Biblical perspective, we have to assert at the very outset that the Christian Church proclaims in its creeds the resurrection of the body.¹ We believe in the resurrection of the body precisely because we believe in the resurrection of the incarnate Christ. The resurrection of Christ was a bodily resurrection. The tomb was empty. There is no place for a body-soul dichotomy such as has so often given to our thinking as theologians a form which is at variance with the plain facts of the Bible. The Church has based its Creed on the experience of the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who bears witness to the living Christ. (St. John 14. 15, 25; 16. 12-15.) A Biblical perspective requires that the incarnation of the Son of God be regarded as the sole, first and authoritative revelation of the Truth

1. "The Resurrection of Christ" - Ramsay. p. 101.

The belief in the resurrection of the Body "has been a stumbling-block both in the ancient and modern world. In the beginning, no doctrine could have been better chosen for exciting ridicule in Athens and disbelief in Corinth. In these latter days, it has been almost an axiom of Liberal theology that the clause needs removing".

about God and man's life and destiny. It is important to state this at the outset, because so much that is written about the belief in an after life seems to have very little place for the fact of the incarnation. This is due to a large extent, to the uncritical acceptance of the Greek ideas of soul and body. Much in other words has been said about the immortality of the soul by Christian apologists in our own time, which finds its inspiration in Plato's "Phaedo" rather than in the Bible. It is unbiblical, and therefore unworthy of a place within a properly Christian theology, and is also the result of the easy assimilation of unchristian concepts by Christian theologians. It is the fruit of interpreting the Bible and the Creeds in terms of philosophical systems, which, however sincere, still stand in need of the Truth as seen in Christ Jesus. For evidence of this we need only turn to the scholastic theology of St. Thomas Aquinas, and in our own day to Fr. Martin D'Arcy's book "Death and Life" to see how, even within as conservative a framework as the Roman communion, there can be, in this respect, a radical departure from the basic Christian truth. Nor are the Thomists always offenders or the only offenders. Protestant theologians of all the communions have shown an inordinate affection for both the findings of science and the speculations of philosophers, which has led to the capitulation of Biblical theology. In reaction, a so-called neo-orthodoxy which, although it claims to be thoroughly Biblical, succeeds only in being thoroughly reactionary. To push God's material creation aside as though it were unworthy of consideration, thoroughly sinful and doomed to dissolution may, on the face of it, fit the facts, but it is not the answer revealed in the incarnate Christ. The incarnation is where God meets man, and the incarnation is where man meets God. The Son of God took human flesh upon Himself to redeem that flesh. The redeemed manhood is taken by the risen and ascended Christ into the Godhead. This is a faith firmly rooted in fact and history, a faith that speaks to man's need as man in his wholeness, and not to man as a redeemable soul clothed in an unredeemable, sinful body. The Bible sees man in his wholeness as the creation of God, and speaks to the whole man as God's creation. The resurrection of the body proclaims the new creation of God in Christ.

'Changed from glory into glory,
Till in heaven we take our place,
And we cast our crowns before Thee,
Lost in wonder, love and praise.'

Another factor to be considered in a Christian statement of the renewal of all men in the risen Christ, is a proper understanding of death. 'Whoever paints a pretty death can paint no resurrection. Whoever has not grasped the horror of death cannot join Paul in the hymn of victory: 'Death is swallowed up in victory! O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?' (I. Cor. 15. 54f.)' ('Immortality of the Soul or the Resurrection of the Body'. Oscar Cullmann. p. 27.) In this important little book, Cullmann contrasts the death of Jesus with the death of Socrates. He describes how Socrates faced death with composure and, indeed, with anticipation as the final liberation of the soul from its prison, the body. Jesus, on the other hand, suffers agony in the Garden of Gethsemane. 'Jesus is so thoroughly human that He shares the natural fear of death.' (op. cit. p. 21.) Jesus, the Son of God, is in the grip of the enemy of God and cries out. As we read the story of our Lord's Passion and Death, we can appreciate the tension which there was in His being. His self-control before Pilate is not self-centred, but God-centred. He always looks to His Father for strength to face the awful trial. 'My soul is very sorrowful even unto death And He said, "Abba, Father, all things are possible to thee; remove this cup from me: yet not what I will, but what thou wilt."' (St. Mark 14. 34, 36.) Here we have a picture of a life and death struggle being waged, with the salvation of man at stake. The death of Jesus is not a mere casting off of the body, but the bitter experience of suffering the wages of sin, of being separated from God. 'Because Jesus underwent death in all its horror, not only in His body, but also in His soul ('My God, why hast thou forsaken me?') and as He is regarded by the first Christians as the Mediator of salvation, He must be the very one who in His death conquers death itself. He cannot obtain this victory by simply living on as an immortal soul, thus fundamentally not dying.' (Cullmann. op. cit. p.25.) Only as we keep this picture of the dying Christ before our eyes, and seek to understand the full meaning of death for Him, can we begin to understand the true meaning of the resurrection and the renewal of our beings in and through

His death and resurrection. The one cannot be seen in isolation from the other, as indeed no one aspect of our Lord's life or teaching may be isolated from the whole. Christ entered the depth of man's condition to raise men to their full status as the sons of God. The existentialist philosophers with their appreciation of the threat of nothingness to being are nearer the Biblical understanding of the condition of man than Greek philosophy and her theological disciples have ever been.

Paul Tillich's understanding of man's condition as one of finitude, estrangement and despair, is a true philosophical statement of man's existence because its inspiration is biblical. But, as we shall see, treatment of 'the Cross of Christ' and 'the Resurrection of Christ' as interdependent symbols based on fact leads to the position where the historical necessity of these events becomes unnecessary, and salvation seems to be played off in a symbolic world, where all that is true about our situation has somehow come adrift from the world as we know it. Thus 'regarding the symbol of the 'Resurrection of Christ' historical research can never give more than a probably answer.' (Sys. Theol. Vol. II. p.179.) If this means (as it seems to) that the fact of the resurrection is no more than probably, the symbol 'Resurrection of Christ' becomes a very doubtful quantity or quality. And indeed he goes on to say 'The faith in the Resurrection of the Christ is neither positively nor negatively dependent on it.' (op. cit. p.179.) i.e. the historical event. This is theology which started firmly in man's situation, but which at this vital point has come adrift from the historical in trying to transcend it. It is no longer Biblical and Incarnational. We agree wholeheartedly the 'Faith is the experience of being grasped by the power of the new Being through which the destructive consequences of estrangement are conquered,' but we would insist on the historical, factual basis for this faith in a much more radical way than Tillich does. This historical perspective is also essential to a proper understanding of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ and the renewal of man. St. Paul commences that great chapter on the resurrection with a statement of the fact of the resurrection '..... that he was buried, that He was raised on the third day in accordance with

the Scriptures, and that He appeared to Cephas and the Twelve. Then He appeared to more than five hundred brethren at one time, most of whom are still alive, though some are fallen asleep. Then He appeared to James, then to all the apostles. Last of all, as to one untimely born, He appeared to me.' (1. Cor. 15. 4-8.) With St. Paul, we will attempt to preserve the historical validity and necessity of the resurrection of our Lord, in accordance with the Bible and Tradition. Any demythologising or modernising often leads to a dangerously subjective approach to the history of our salvation. This has been particularly true of the resurrection. Paul Tillich represents, if anything, a rather more Biblical and conservative approach than say an Ernst Troeltsch, who found no need to believe in the historical or doctrinal truth of these truths at all. (cf. Mackintosh "Types of Modern Theology". p. 200) Karl Barth also strays far from the Biblical paths in some of his statements. In "Types of Modern Theology", Mackintosh says "speaking of Barth's statements on the Resurrection, 'Still more roundly he declares in a controversial passage that the Resurrection is no historical occurrence, because 'if it be brought within the context of history, it must share in its obscurity and error and essential questionableness'". (ibid p.306) This, significantly enough, is attributed to his Hegelianism, which leads him to say 'A is not B' when his real meaning is 'A is not merely B' (ibid. p.307.) This philosophical juggling with the historicity of the resurrection is dangerous and creates more problems than it solves.

The Resurrection of our Lord from the dead can never be less than historical fact, however much its interpretation and meaning may transcend temporal and spatial categories. It is here as in the Birth narratives and the Miracles where God radically reveals Himself in relation to His material creation, that there has been the most baulking by theologians, especially of the Protestant communions. Catholicism, Orthodoxy and conservative biblical scholarship have at these points preserved fundamental insights which Liberal Protestantism did much to undermine. The mystical element which is associated with a high doctrine of the Sacraments has helped in saving Catholic theology from the byways of philosophical preconceptions and scientific restriction. It is significant that the Protestant communions are only now returning to a

deeper understanding of the sacramental nature of the Christian religion. In the worship of the Church, as handed down by tradition, with the Scriptures as the Church's handbook, interpreted by tradition, the sacramental nature of the Christian faith has been kept intact. That this sacramentalism has led to a crass materialism cannot be denied, but it has then ceased to be properly sacramental and become magical. It is this taking of human flesh into the Godhead which is witnessed to in the Bible, proclaimed by the Church and expressed in sacramental worship. All is centred in the Person of Jesus Christ, who took our flesh upon Him to redeem us, and rose from the dead to renew all men in Himself.

To summarize: There are, as we see it, five factors which are to be sought in any discussion of the Resurrection of our Lord which is to be true to the Biblical records, the credal affirmations and sacramental worship of the Church and to the facts of human life.

- I. The centrality of the Resurrection of our Lord for an understanding of the nature and manner of our renewal in Christ.
- II. The death and resurrection of our Lord as interdependent symbols and saving event.
- III. The Resurrection is an historical event whatever else it may be. Any discussion of the Resurrection must accept this fact unequivocally, for it to represent a truly Biblical understanding.
- IV. The Resurrection of Christ is to be set firmly within an incarnational context as set out in the Biblical Revelations, as the basis of our thinking about the meaning of the Resurrection of Christ, and the renewal of man.
- V. Therefore, the Resurrection and the sacramental life of the Church are to be seen in the closest connection the one with the other. The living Christ is active in renewing man in his operation in the Church by Word and Sacrament.
- VI. The Resurrection should be seen as a present reality relevant to the life of the Christian here and now.

CHAPTER I

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BELIEF IN THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL IN GREEK THOUGHT.

It has been said that the Greeks raised all the basic philosophical questions and attempted to answer them. In doing so they bequeathed to Western civilization a heritage which has influenced political, philosophical, ethical and religious thought ever since. This influence has been quite considerable in the formulation of Christian thought because the Christian faith was formulated in a world dominated by Hellenistic thought. The New Testament was written in Greek for a Greek speaking Christian community in Asia Minor and Greece. The majority of these Christians were Gentiles who had been educated in Greek. The Jewish origin of the Gospel came to be reinterpreted in terms of Greek philosophical concepts in theological thinking. This was a later development, but nevertheless a development which profoundly affected the formulation of Christian doctrine. The whole authoritative theology of the Roman Catholic Church is based on the "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas which uses the Aristotelian system as the basis and means of expression. Earlier the Church depended on the Hellenistic philosophy for an expression of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. So too the concepts of substance and essence, so foreign to Biblical thought, yet so fundamental in later Greek thought, were used to explain the nature of the presence of our Lord in the Sacrament of the altar. By the Middle Ages the theology of the Church had been wholly built upon a Greek foundation. 'Medieval theology is derivative from the Greek intellect.'¹

Probably the most commonplace example of the persistence in the popular mind of Greek teaching which has become identified with Christian doctrine is the belief in the immortality of the soul. 'What the Gospel account of the Passion and Crucifixion was for Christians the Paedo was for pagan and free-thinking philosophers. But the

1. History of Western Philosophy. Bertrand Russell.

imperturbability of Socrates in his last hour is bound up with his belief in immortality, and the Phaedo is important in setting forth, not only the death of a martyr, but also many doctrines which were afterward Christian.'¹

Russel goes on to say: "The theology of St. Paul and the Fathers is largely derived from it, directly or indirectly, and can hardly be understood if Plato is ignored."² This is the impression of a non-Christian commentator and, although necessarily lacking in biblical foundation, must be influenced by Christian statements. It has been, however, abundantly shown by Biblical scholars that Paul's ideas are essentially Rabbinic Jewish and not Greek.³ To say that the theology can hardly be understood if Plato is ignored seems to arise from a confusion of medieval theology with biblical and patristic theology. But, nevertheless, it is true that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul has been widely proclaimed as the form of the Christian hope. Fr. D'Arcy, in his book "Death and Life" wrote: 'Speaking of the Socratic expression of the immortality of the soul. "There is here in embryo, at least, a complete theory of the nature of the soul, its relation to the body, and the form of its immortality."'⁴ Here is an orthodox Christian's acknowledgement of the Platonic belief in immortality.

The hope of the survival of man in some form or other is found in all ancient religion. This is true also of the mythology of the Greeks. We find in the Homeric myths an anthropological polytheism in which the gods are frankly human, not so much the objects of worship as of envy. Theirs is the immortality and the power over nature which men crave. These superhuman beings are impotent or unwilling to change the destiny of man. For man, the only life worth while living is the earthly life. The life hereafter is a shadowy existence similar to the Hebrew idea of life in Sheol, where men languish in a bodiless state deprived of all the vigour and enjoyment of life in the flesh, in a dull, dark underground abode. 'The generations of men pass away like the

1. & 2. Russel. op. cit. p. 154.

3. c.f. "Paul and Rabbinic Judaism". Davies.

4. "Death and Life". Martin D'Arcy. p. 61.

leaves of the forest, and there is no life to come, or at best a shadowy one, of which the departed 'soul' is itself unconscious. Only so much is left of it as will explain dreams and visions: the man himself is gone forever.'¹ The resultant ethic is one of enjoying life while it lasted while doing 'naught too much.' Man is seen as mortal in his wholeness without any promise of a better life hereafter, or of a reward for righteousness in some future blessed state - a wholeness without hope.

The philosophy of the Ionians produced a materialistic psychology. They sought the material cause of all things rather than its destiny. Aristotle comments, 'Most of the early philosophers recognise only material principles underlying everything. That of which they believed all things to consist, from which they believed all things to be generated, and into which they believed all things to be resolved when destroyed, they call the element or principle.' They only differed as to the number of these substances and their nature. The primary stuff from which the universe was formed was the only abiding infinite substance which persisted through all the variation and change of the world. The world of change arose from this primary 'element' or 'elements' as a result of condensation and rarefaction as in Anaximenes, mixture as in the view of Empedocles or motion and impact from the Atomists. Heraclitus denied the existence of any abidingness except the shifting element fire. The Eleatics on the other hand would have nothing to do with change, asserting that there was one unchangeable Being, finite, spherical and immovable. Mind or soul is seen scientifically in relation to the formation of the world of sense and usually as the principle of movement, the efficient cause, or all things. This Mind (nous) is often identified with the godhead, but is not seen as personality or in terms of individuality. Man absorbs this reason-stuff and is wise or foolish in proportion to the amount of reason he has absorbed. There is no question of personal immortality here, but there is ascribed to something material or some principle, a permanence in which all things partake. Man as individual man does not have any hope of survival as a person.

1. "Greek Philosophy". Burnet. p.29.

The next period in the development of the thought of the Greeks is described by Windelband as the anthropological period. The shift is from matter to meaning, and it is a very important shift. "The question whether there is anything universally valid, is the problem of the anthropological period of Greek philosophy, or of the Greek Enlightenment." ¹ Morals and knowledge occupy the centre of the stage. A questioning of existing moral standards led to an undermining of permanent value by the Sophists, and an attempt to see the end of man as the attainment of the Good by Socrates in reaction to the relativism of the Sophists. In the search for real knowledge, the path led to the world of ideas which was not subject to the corruption, uncertainty and imperfection of the world of the senses. In the search for truth and permanence a rift forms between the world of sense impressions, the world of the body, and the world of the soul. Man is divided into two: a body, which is tied to the temporal and the corruptible, from which there is no redemption, and the soul (*ψυχή*) which can by the acquisition of wisdom take on an incorruptibility and eternity denied the body. Pure thought and permanent reality came to be identified. Man's ability was dependent on his insight and to know the good was to do the good. Sin and wrong thinking were identified. ² The individual life features prominently in the thought of this period. The value of personality and the permanence of the soul are emphasized. This permanence was part of the make-up of man, not something which required renewal, but which required realization. Out of this grasp of the nature of reality arose the Platonic and Aristotelian systems which are the final impressive achievement of the Greek intellect. It is to these systems we now turn to see what they have to say about the nature of man, and the hope of his survival.

In the *Phaedo*, Plato describes the death of Socrates. Before his execution by drinking poison, a number of friends gathered as was their custom to visit Socrates. The conversation turned to the hope of survival, and Socrates questioned by Cebes and Simmias chiefly sets

1. Windelband. "History of Philosophy". Vol. I. p.68.

2. Vol. I. p. 80 7 p. 191.

out his reasons for believing in the immortality of the soul. The basis of the argument is that the body dies but the soul will continue to live.

Socrates: '... Do we believe that there is such a thing as death?'

Simmias: 'To be sure.'

Socrates: 'Is it not the separation of soul and body? And to be dead is the completion of this; when the soul exists in herself, and is released from the body and the body is released from the soul, what is this but death?'

The philosopher, therefore, is to mortify the body and its lusts, and seek the growth of the soul. In this sense the philosopher is dying all the time, is, in fact, preparing for death. The body, furthermore, is a hindrance in the philosopher's search for truth. '.... the philosopher dishonours the body; his soul runs away from his body and desires to be alone and by herself.' The absolute is attained by the mind alone in its grasp of the essence of things. All that is wrong with the world and men can be traced to the body and its lusts. 'For the body is a source of endless trouble to us by reason of the mere requirement of food; and is liable also to diseases which overtake and impede us in the search after true being; it fills us full of loves, and lusts, and fears, and fancies of all kinds, and endless foolery, and, in fact, as men say, takes away from us the power of thinking at all. Whence come wars, and fightings, and factions? Whence from the body and the lusts of the body? Death then surely is a release for one who realises the obstacle the body is to life. The true philosopher should, in fact, look forward to death for that reason. 'And will he who is a true lover of wisdom Will he not depart with joy? Surely he will, O my friend; if he be a true philosopher.'

Granted that the soul is the really worthwhile part of man's being, argues Cebes, but what guarantee is there that it does not perish with the death of the body or be 'dispersed like smoke.' The immortality of the soul has yet to be established. Socrates proceeds to advance the arguments for his belief in the immortality of the soul. The first is that opposites are generated by opposites. The greater must have been smaller before it was greater, and the weaker must have been stronger before it could be described as weaker. So all things are generated

out of their opposites. The opposite of life is death, and therefore life is generated out of death.

This argument is based on the idea in Greek philosophy that all things are a mixture of opposites which can be traced back to Heraclitus, who believed that everything was continually changing into its opposite. That the greater is to be seen in relation to the smaller must be conceded, but that the greater is necessarily generated by the smaller must be questioned. Greatness and smallness are relative terms. A thing is great because there are other smaller existents with which it is compared. An idea is great because it embraces more than a lesser insight does. All these are states of being within which they are realised.¹ Life does not come from death, but from life. It is generated by life and not by death. The weak man will not necessarily become stronger. He may remain weak. It is in this that Socrates fails to see the finality and threat of death to life. As the soul for Socrates is that part of man which through the mind apprehends true reality and is thereby lifted above corruption, there is no question of its being generated from its opposite, because its nature is to persist and not to perish.

The second argument suggested by Cebes and taken up by Socrates is that all knowledge is recollection. This means that the soul which remembers must have had some previous existence. The basis of this belief arises out of the fact that the truths of reason are recognised by all and are universally valid - e.g. the propositions of mathematics. Burnet explains the Socratic doctrine of recollection as follows:-

'The question really is, how can we come to have a standard which enables us to pronounce the things of sense to be imperfect. We certainly do not start with such a standard in our possession; it is only our experience of sensible things that gives rise to our apprehension of it. On the other hand, our apprehension of the standard when it does arise cannot be produced by the sensible things, since it is something which goes beyond any or all of them. Now when we apprehend a thing and this apprehension gives rise at the same time to the thought of another thing which the first thing is either like or unlike, we call that being

1. We know cold by being aware that there is an opposite state which we call hot. We speak of hot and cold bodies - not of hot and cold as abstracts, apart from the bodies which are hot or cold.

'reminded' or put in mind of the one thing by the other. (73c Meno)¹. The example which Socrates uses in the Phaedo is that of equality. It is a standard which we apply in comparison, and is not to be identified with the sensible objects which are being compared. '..... we must have known equality previously to the time when we saw the material equals, and reflected that all these apparent equals strive to attain absolute equality, but fall short of it?' There are two points to be noticed here: firstly, that the world of the senses is imperfect, and, secondly, that the reminiscence (ἀνάμνησις) is a manifestation of the perfect world of absolutes which characterises the soul. The store of knowledge which the soul had in its previous state was somehow lost at birth and therefore all knowledge is recollection. This idea is, of course, consistent with the Socratic teaching about forms existing in the real world of which the particulars on earth are imperfect copies. The earthly copies remind one of the real forms, which the soul knew before it became incarnate. If this ability to recognise in the world of the senses imperfect particulars of original forms is the nature of the imperishable soul, it will mean that what continues to exist will be form without content, apprehension without anything to apprehend. This surely is more of a philosophical Saeol than a philosopher's heaven! It is precisely that diversity which we find in creation which fills us with so much wonder and gives to life a fullness, a 'body'. This tendency of Greek philosophy to reject the sensible as the source of corruptibility and evil is in direct conflict with the Biblical teaching that the Creation is the work of a loving Father.

The next argument brought forward by Socrates is that the single and uncompounded is indissoluble. 'Now the compound or composite may be supposed to be naturally capable, as of being compounded, so also of being dissolved; but that which is uncompounded, and that only, must be if anything is, indissoluble.' The soul is simple and unchangeable, whereas the body is compound and changeable. The soul which is seduced by the body is in danger of being contaminated by the earthy and never attaining complete freedom. This, according to Socrates, explains the

1. Burnet. op. cit. pp. 157, 158.

existence of 'ghostly apparitions of souls which have not departed pure, but which are cloyed with sight and therefore visible.' An ethical note is struck here in that the body as the origin of evil is considered as directly responsible for dragging the soul of some down. Some souls will pass into animals after death because of their contemnation, their sins of the flesh; gluttony, wantonness and drunkenness Thus it is not simply the soul's inherent simplicity which assures it of immortality, but a disciplined cultivation of knowledge and virtue. This is the way chosen by the philosopher and the hope which is reserved only for the lover of wisdom; 'No one who has not studied philosophy and who is not entirely pure at the time of his departure is allowed to enter the company of the gods, but the lover of wisdom only.' Life is of eternal worth, and must be cherished as such by those who have the wisdom to realise it. All the experiences of the senses, pleasure as well as pain, rivet the soul to the body.

The noble view of the value of the soul expressed in this argument gives it a certain cogency for those who value human life. It calls for discipline and abstinence, as does the Christian view of man, but unlike the Biblical view of man, it does so by rejecting the material creation as evil, and is to be renounced for that reason. The callous way in which Socrates treated his wife and child in according them only a short time with him, and sending them off so that he could get on with the real business of argument, shows what this amounts to in practice. It means that we withdraw to such an extent from all that is truly meaningful in life, that we empty life of all true meaning. It is exactly because we form attachments in the flesh, learn to love the beauty of this physical world in which we live, that leaving it is such a negation of all we feel that we were meant to be and have in some small measure become. The physical must be related positively to the spiritual in any exposition of the after-life. The Christian answer is one of re-creation and not the negation of creation. Socrates has not plumbed the depth of the fall of man. He seeks to offer hope where there is really no hope. Aristotle was more consistent in his reasoning and consequently there is no real doctrine of the immortality of the soul, as individual soul, in his philosophy.

These three arguments form the basic case for the belief in the immortality of the soul as set out by Socrates. Cebes and Simmias are, however, not entirely satisfied. Simmias mentions the Pythagorean doctrine, that the soul is an attunement, a harmony, of the body. If this is granted, the soul should perish before the body, just as the harmony produced by the strings of the lyre, when struck in a certain way, are more transitory than the lyre itself. Cebes, for his part, could not fully accept that the soul would persist whole after death. He thought that it is possible for the soul to perish after having grown tired of successive births. Socrates deals first with the belief that the soul is a harmony of the body. He reminds them of the proof of the pre-existence of the soul, which was based on the conception of knowledge as recollection. This they had accepted. If the soul exists before that in which it takes up its abode, it cannot be like a harmony which is produced after the instrument is made. Furthermore, good souls on this view would be in harmony with the body, whereas evil souls would be a discord. As Socrates was not prepared to grant that one soul could be less a soul than another - i.e. that there could be degrees in the nature of the soul - this conclusion made the doctrine that the soul is a harmony of the body doubly unacceptable. In answer to Cebes he reminds them of the doctrine of forms or ideas, which constitute the real world of the soul. Fire and snow may perish, but heat and cold cannot. These forms are eternal, and can never be changed into their opposites. The soul 'will never receive the opposite of what she brings.' i.e. death. This is a contradiction to the first argument in support of the immortality of the soul, but is more truly in agreement with the proper Socratic position which holds that the soul is immortal and is therefore above generation or destruction.

Socrates then relinquishes philosophic reasoning, and relapses into a fanciful picture of the soul's passage to the 'world below'. The soul is judged according to its works, and led by a guide to its appointed place. There is another earth in the heavens which Socrates then describes to his spellbound hearers. There dwell perfected beings with the gods in strangely physical surroundings. One is rather ^{to} ^{senses,} find that Socrates did not entirely mean what he said about

and that there are places which may thrill the senses even in a philosopher's heaven! Having sketched the picture of his destiny, he takes the poison, the only calm and composed one among his tearful friends and admirers. And so died the 'wisest and justest and best' of the Greeks.

In the fully Platonic doctrine of the soul, the soul is brought into closer relationship with the body, i.e. in the Platonic system in its later development which distinguished it from its Socratic beginnings. The soul here forms the link with the world of ideas. It belongs both to the world of Becoming, insofar as it directs its desires towards the objects of the senses and to the world of ideas or the eternal world of Being. Plato conceives a tripartite soul consisting of Reason (νοῦς) will (θύμος) and sensuous desire (ἐπιθυμία). In the Timaeus, the soul is described as formed out of these parts and immortality is retained for the rational part only.

In Aristotle, the soul became identified to a large extent with what we would call the life of the organism. The soul (νοῦς) was that which gave the matter, of which the body is composed, purpose, form and life. He used the concept entelechy (ἐντελέχεια) as the unifying and purposive moulding of matter by form. It may be described as the directedness of the being. The soul, although thought of as a different something which is joined to the body, is related more closely to the body than in Platonic thought. 'It indubitably follows that the soul is inseparable from the body.' But at the same time the hope of personal immortality becomes more remote. It is very doubtful whether Aristotle believed in personal immortality at all. For Aristotle, there are three grades of the soul: the vegetative, the animal and the rational. The higher in the scale the organism is, the more of these grades are present, and not just the highest grade - e.g. man is not just rational soul, but the rational has worked over the vegetative and animal aspects of man's being. So impulse in man becomes will, and perception becomes knowledge because of the effect of the rational soul on the animal soul. The highest activity of man, reason, is divided

into active and passive reason ... Passive reason is that process by which sense impressions are formed, and this may vary from individual to individual. The capacity of the mind to use these sense impressions in the formulation of concepts is the active reason. Active reason is viewed as a form which comes from without, added to the soul of man. It is this active reason which is the same for all men. It is this which makes mathematics and logical argument possible. As Russell puts it: 'One man likes oysters and another likes pineapples; and distinguishes between them. But when they think about the multiplication table there is no difference between them.'¹ The forming mind was the only imperishable aspect of man's being in the thought of Aristotle. Windelband comments: 'Personal immortality is put in question just as in the Platonic Timaeus, where it was claimed for the rational part of the soul, i.e. that which is everywhere alike and impersonal.'²

The Greek philosophical hope was a hope of the survival of the soul of man conceived as the mind (*νοῦς*) of man. The real world is the world of pure thought which is the one unchanging thing in a world of change and decay. Thought is the specific function of rational man, and therefore constitutes the hope of those who realise their full rationality in philosophy. Throughout there is the idea of imperfection which is associated with the material world. All that is wrong with man is to be attributed to his association with matter, i.e. his having a body. Sin is wrong thinking, thinking which is directed towards the physical world. To become an inheritor of the real world one has to purify oneself of the contamination of the flesh through the discipline of philosophy. Heaven is strictly for philosophers. Philosophy is the pathway to the gods and the bridge from mortality to immortality.

There are sound theological reasons for the Christian to reject any belief in the immortality of the soul, as Greek philosophy conceived it. When Christians speak of survival, they ought to mean what the

1. Russell. op.cit. p.194

2. Windelband. op. cit. Vol. 1. p.151.

Bible says and the Church has taught, and not what the Greeks thought, however sincerely. God's truth is known only in Jesus Christ.

1. The Greek belief in the immortality of the soul means that man's utter dependence upon God is undermined. The soul of man becomes an independent entity which can of itself realise its intrinsic immortality. The unfolding of eternity is an activity of man as man, in Plato as a vision of the world of ideas, and in Aristotle as a beholding (*θεωρία*) in the divine self-consciousness. The Good is the ultimate for Plato, it is true, but only the Good as thought to which even the Deity must give ear. Man extricates himself from his own predicament. This is the basis of all man-centred thinking. It is based on the idea that there is some worth apart from God, and it is often religious thinking as it was in the case of Socrates, but it is nevertheless sinful thinking because it places man at the centre of the picture. The condescension with which the philosopher is to deal with the lesser mortal, leaves the road right open to philosophies such as those of Nazism, Communism and Pharisaism. This is in direct conflict with the teaching of Christianity that our only hope is in God, that whether we die or live we are the Lord's.¹ Our only hope is in God's mercy and His love, as shown in Jesus Christ. 'Our ultimate hope is anchored far more deeply than in the shifting sands of human wisdom; it is anchored in the Rock of Ages.'²

11. The Greek belief in the immortality of the soul is in direct conflict with the Judeo-Christian belief that God made the world and saw that it was good. It has an entirely negative attitude towards matter. (Aristotle was less negative, relating the two as matter and form, but nevertheless he saw hope only for the rational soul.) God and creation are driven apart. The Gnostics were the heirs of this attitude, not the Catholic Church. It is, however, still rather prevalent in Christian theology, leading to a depreciation of sacramental theology. Any belief in the survival and renewal of man must be related positively to what God made and saw that it was good.

1. c.f. Rom. XIV. 8.

2. Miegger. "Visible and Invisible", p.13. Emil Brunner comments 'Our eternal life is rooted in the "thou" of God who addresses us, not in the "I" which we speak to ourselves.' ("Eternal Hope". p. 107.)

111. Related to this is the separation of body and soul, rather than seeing them as one whole realised as an organic unity in one being. The tension which may arise from my being a body and being more than a body is the result of my sin and is not due to the imperfection of my flesh. (The Pauline concept of the flesh ($\sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota\varsigma$) is much more profound, and is not to be thought of as physical flesh only.¹) Sin manifests itself in matter just as righteousness and love do, because creation is one whole. At the very basis of matter there is the phenomenal power of the atom. The whole universe is co-ordinated energy, and man is the crown of creation. He is not set over against it but within it. Matter considered in isolation as matter has just that meaninglessness which Sartre sees in l'en soi or which Heidegger describes as man's facticity. The sciences, and especially psychology, have shown the intimate relation which exists between the emotional and physical structures of man. Rather than express concern at these facts, the theologian should welcome them as an affirmation of what Biblical theology has been saying all along. In an age in which the psychological causes of so much physical as well as mental sickness are recognised, there should be a return in theology to seeing man in his wholeness. Let us banish the word soul from our theological vocabularies!² The Bible hardly ever uses it, and it has no place in the statements of faith, the Creeds of the Church.

IV. This dualism leads to a superficiality in the face of death. Brunner comments: 'The effect of this Platonic dualism is not merely to make death innocuous but also to rob evil of its sting.' ("Eternal Hope." p.101.) The imperturbability of Socrates before his execution is grounded in an illusion about the nature of man, and, therefore, of death. There is no threat to being, no deep sorrow at the breaking of bonds of love and friendship, but a sort of self-satisfaction that the time has come to leave these pitiable creatures in their pitiable state. A superficial view of life, however it may be flattered by being called philosophy, results in a superficial view of death. Socrates

1. cf. Chapter IV.

2. The Bible uses $\psi\upsilon\lambda\eta$ for soul or life. This is variously translated in the New English Bible as soul and true being.

shows a certain self-assurance in the face of death which at times is almost revolting. There is no note of the condemnation of God issuing in the death of man. 'In the sweat of your face you shall eat bread till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; you are dust and to dust you shall return.'¹ That is God's condemnation of man's sin. It is this negation of that which God had created to dwell with Him in all eternity which is both the glory and the tragedy of man. The Greeks are blind both to the fulness of the glory and to the depth of the tragedy. For them, the Cross of Christ was to be foolishness, but the foolishness of God is wiser than the wisdom of men.²

V. All this adds up to the fact that the belief in the immortality of the soul as expressed in Greek philosophy is a belief in the ability of man to realise himself somehow, and a negation of the need of man for renewal. Death is seen as the point at which the soul, in itself immortal, leaves the body. Its destiny depends on its behaviour during its earthly life - i.e. whether it learnt the lesson of purification which philosophy alone could teach it, or not. In the Greek view, man is already what he is to be, a being whose essential nature is immortal. This essential nature it turns out is only the form of reason, the logical part of man, a mere skeleton of man's wholeness, but for the philosopher, the only part worth keeping, and the only part which for philosophical reasons seems to have any chance of immortality. The soul may grow weak and lose its rationality through its association with the flesh, and thereby live on in animals. But all this is the fault, the ignorance of that particular soul. On the other hand, the philosopher has the wisdom to know what he is made of, and to seek to realise it by dying to the flesh. The dimension of the eternal is placed within the nature of man in such a way that he is eternal in relation to his own inmost nature. This may have been created by God, as Christians who accept this view of the immortality of the soul hold, but they claim it is only eternal in its relatedness to God, and not to itself as the Greeks held. They did not see the very existence of man threatened by sin which severs man from the Source and Sustainer of all

1. Gen. 3. 19.

2. I Corinthians 1. 22-25.

life.¹ The modern existentialist philosophies see man's predicament and his despair when he is turned upon himself to realise his being much more clearly than the Greeks ever did. The Messiah for the Greek Philosopher was within his own being, and not Someone who had to come from without to save him, renew and reorientate him. And this belief in the dignity of man, while admirable and Biblical in its proper context, must be balanced by the stark realism of man's sin and degradation - i.e. there is no truth in the one statement without the other. The two must be held together in dialectical tension. Whenever there has been a so-called Enlightenment, the light has been the light of man's worth, and not of God's grace - i.e. within the spirit of the Greek enlightenment: Giovanni Meigge comments pertinently:

'In that critical reduction of Christian dogma which was carried out by the thought of the Enlightenment, the idea of the immortality of the soul survives as one of the two essential principles of Natural Religion. Everything that has to do with the doctrine of redemption - original sin, the atoning death of Christ, salvation by faith - all this is forgotten or denied; but the dogma of the intrinsic immortality of the soul, that bulwark of man's consciousness of his own dignity, is retained'² Death has no sting and the grave no victory for Socrates because his death is simply and literally a passing on. The element of the tragic in life and in death is disregarded. The need for forgiveness and restoration in the experience of eternal life is accorded no place. There is, in fact, no real place for Jesus Christ, Saviour of all men, in this structure.

Those are some of the more important theological objections which Christians who are concerned to preserve a Biblical theology must bring against the belief in the immortality of the soul, which finds its inspiration in Greek philosophy. To readjust our perspective, we need to turn first to the Biblical view of the nature of man, his purpose and destiny and his place within the created order. Thereafter we shall

1. cf. Matt. 10. 28. For the use of the word soul () in the New Testament see Chapter III.

2. Meigge. op. cit. p.158.

consider some Christian expressions of the nature and destiny of man, to see whether they agree basically with the Biblical idea or the Greek philosophical idea. The nature of our renewal in Christ through sacrifice, death and resurrection are to be contrasted with the realisation of life through life, death and immortality.

APPENDIX:

It is significant to note that the philosophies current at the time of our Lord's life on earth had, for the most part, rejected concern about the life hereafter, and concentrated on a way to live this life. There was still the emphasis on wisdom, but essentially wisdom to get the best out of this life, to be able to choose the pleasure which led to the highest good, a practical as against a purely abstract wisdom. The main aim of these philosophies was the attainment of tranquillity (ἀταραξία). The Sceptics sought this tranquillity in complete suspension of judgment (ἐποχή): the Cynics in a renunciation of all external things including conventions and a realisation of self along self-chosen lines; the Hedonists or Cyrenaics in the pursuit of pleasure as the supreme aim of existence; the Epicureans in rejecting the fear of death and of the gods and the attainment of tranquillity through the conquest of fear. Their whole concern was with this life, and for the most part with the body. Epicurus said: 'Death is nothing to us; for that which is dissolved is without sensation; and that which lacks sensation is nothing to us.' Lucretius (100 - c55 B.C.), that ardent disciple of Epicurus, gives us an idea of how the body and soul (ψυχή) were seen as one in Bk. III (94-329) and that both the body and the mind will perish. This teaching was very influential amongst the intellectuals of the time of our Lord, and especially the aristocracy of Rome. Values were crumbling, and there was a certain despair, an apathy much as there is in our age. The answers given were much the same as we find in such manifestations as "Beatniks", "ducktails", and the general degeneration of morals and art. Much of it was a sincere search for new values and a positive, meaningful affirmation of life, just as much of it is to-day. Most of them saw true happiness as a pursuit of lasting values, but as values which were

values here and now, and not just values in the world to come. It led, therefore, to an interest in science as we find in Lucretius, which interpreted death as it saw death, and not as it thought death should be. Its realism and pessimism arises out of its emphasis on the physical. There was no 'real' world in the form of a world of ideas apart from the world in which man finds himself, and in that world he is to live for better or for worse. The answers of the various schools may differ, but their basic attitude remains the same.

CHAPTER I.BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- | | |
|---|---|
| A History of Philosophy. Vol. I. | Wilhelm Windelband. |
| History of Western Philosophy. | Bertrand Russell. |
| Phaedo. | Plato |
| Metaphysics. (Everyman edition) | Aristotle. |
| The Nature of the Universe. | Lucretius. (tr. R. E. Latham.
Penguin.) |
| Greek Philosophy. Thales to Plato | John Burnet. |
| The Expository Times: | Articles by Revd. Wm. Barclay, D.D.
in Vol. LXXI. Nos. 7-10, 12.
Vol. LXXII. Nos. 1, 3-6. |
| Visible and Invisible. | Giovanni Meigge.
(tr. Stephen Neill) |
| The Immortality of the Soul or the
Resurrection of the Dead? | Oscar Cullmann. |
| Eternal Hope. | Emil Brunner. |

C H A P T E R I I .

THE NATURE AND THE DESTINY OF MAN IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. The Hope of Restoration - the Nation.

The understanding of man in the Old Testament is an understanding which is all the time being drawn forth by man's relationship to his Creator, and through man's active participation in the plan of God for him and for the cosmos. It is, in fact, a religious view of man which looks to God for understanding and light. This distinguishes it from a purely scientific or philosophical view of the nature of man. The scientific approach is not to man in his fulness, but to man as body, (anatomy, medicine, &c.), or man in community (social sciences), or man and his attitudes, complexes, intelligence and all that has to do with his mental and emotional make-up (psychology). It observes, tabulates, generalises, seeks to understand and through understanding to remedy that which is diseased in man or society. It may find itself associated with a religious attitude of life or it may not. Its results are not dependent on the spiritual state of the observer, but on his ability to observe without prejudice and with accuracy. Philosophy claims to see life in its wholeness, to see life sub specie aeternitatis. It only deals with God as it thinks that concept is meaningful in man's situation. A Christian philosophy would approach man from a theistic point of view, and an atheistic philosophy may say with Sartre or Nietzsche that 'God is dead'. Both would be philosophies, and both would be judged by their understanding of life and their relevance to man's situation in the world. The point is that a belief in God is not essential for a philosophical or scientific understanding of life, whereas it is the very heart of a religious understanding of life. "In the realm of religion, most of all in that of Israel's religion, the stress falls on GOD not on man". (H. W. Robinson. 'The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament.' p.78.)

The Hebrews were a religious people, whose religion constituted their identity as a people, and completely governed their attitude to life. Their God Yahweh who had taken them up out of the land of Egypt

and set them in a land which He gave them for their own possession, came to be seen not only as the war god of a group of tribes, but as the God of all the earth. He had created man in His own image (Gen. I. 26,27.) as the crown of His creation set within creation, as the master under God of all His work, reaping the fruit of all that God had set within it to nourish him. (Gen. I. 29,30.) In the narrative of the creation written by the Priestly writer, we have a magnificent picture of the unity of all creation, and the majesty of the Creator. 'This interdependence which unites together the works of creation, shows that all things belong together and that nothing is useless and nothing incomplete' ¹ Alongside this picture of God in His Otherness is the story of God creating man (ADAM) as a potter forms his vessel from the dust of the earth, breathing into his nostrils the breath of life (Nephesh) and man becomes a nephesh chayyah, a living being. God walks with man in a garden which He planted and prepared for man. He attends to man's need by providing him with a 'helper fit for him', from the substance of the man himself, one who is 'bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh'. (Gen. II. 20-23.) Man is of the very stuff of the earth animated by the breath of God, placed within creation to take his unique place within it as God's husbandman, entrusted freely with all that God has made. The restriction placed upon man is that he should not try to usurp God's place and position, that he should not be like God, knowing good and evil. (Gen. III. 5.) Man in his innocence is man completely at peace with himself and God, having all his needs fulfilled through the love and providence of God. Man, in his fallen state, is man in whom desires are awakened which are contrary to his creatureliness, which make him discontented, at variance with God's purpose for him, and in a state of estrangement from that which is nearest to him. All this comes out in the mythical story of the Fall of man in Genesis III. The relationship which existed between God and man is broken, with the result that man is ashamed of God and hides from His presence. He is also ashamed of woman, and woman of him, so that they hide their nakedness from each other. (Gen. III. 7.) God walks in the garden in the cool of

1. Jacob. 'Theology of the Old Testament'. p. 147.

the day and seeks Man and Woman only to find that they have hidden because of their nakedness, the nakedness of self-conscious creatureliness. God knows what has brought about this tragic change in man, who has thrown away his inheritance through his disobedience, and He announces to man and woman the consequences of their sin. Woman shall bring forth children in pain, in a world in which man is divorced from God, while man shall strive with nature to sustain himself and those of his family. But, most tragic of all, man, in seeking to transcend his creatureliness, has negated his being. The nephesh chayyah will return to the 'aphar min-ha'adamah from which it was formed. (Gen. III. 19.) Man and his mate are driven from the place which God appointed for them, and are banished from it for ever.

GOD, MAN AND CREATION: THREE BASIC POLARITIES.

In that tragically beautiful myth of creation we have poignantly depicted both the glory and the shame of man's nature. Man, created to enjoy a unique relationship to the Creator of all things as the one who has under God dominion over all creation, seeks to realise his destiny apart from God, and, in disobedience to the commandments of God, only to find that along that path lies shame, despair, suffering and finally death. All these things are part of man's being as a sinner isolated from God. Man has lost his created right to possess the earth and enjoy the fruits thereof. His sin has separated him from God, from his fellow man and from his help, woman. Perversion and corruption of his being set in, to such an extent that God desires to destroy the earth. (Gen. VI. 5 - 7.) Thus destruction as well as creation is seen as an act of God, for that which is wicked and unworthy cannot be tolerated in the presence of God. In the first six chapters of Genesis the whole narrative of creation has become inverted. What God had made and seen that it was good, had become entangled in the web of corruption and death sparked off by the sin of man, changed from a world created by God for His glory to a world under the wrath and condemnation of God.

The mythology brings out the polarity in man's nature which is characteristic of his creatureliness. The polarity is relation on the one hand to nature and his fellow man, and on the other to his Maker, the God who is Creator, but not of Creation, and this polarity is essential

to the Biblical view of man and his nature. It is to be distinguished from all pantheism which seeks to identify God and Creation, ^{from} all thought which seeks to make of man a god and thereby deny his creatureliness as we have seen only leads to a philosophical pantheism in which the human reason rejects creation as corrupt or illusionary, and from all atheistic materialism or humanism which regards creation apart from the Creator. It is also important that this polarity be preserved in theology so that a course is steered between idolatory under the guise of sacramentalism on the one hand and a puritannical negation of the body on the other. It is this polarity which is the basis of the objective-subjective aspect of our being. Our relationship to God is the basic 'I-Thou' relationship in which I am in gracious communication with God and all that He shows Himself to be. The relationship of God to Creation is the basic 'I-It' relationship which is full of all the creativity and love which He has revealed, and in which man participates as God's representative. Both these relationships are broken by the sin of man.

1. The First Polarity: God and Creation.

God in his love, His chesed, does not leave man in his predicament, but seeks him out and tries to bring man back to Himself. He saves Noah and his family from the destruction of His wrath as 'Noah was a righteous man, blameless in his generation; Noah walked with God.' (Gen. VI. 9b), and 'Noah found favour in the eyes of the Lord.' (VI. 8.) With him God made a Covenant which He was to make with successive generations of those whom He chose. The nature of the Covenant was a gracious renewal of the relationship which man had with God before the Fall. The condition of man before the Fall must not be construed as being immortal, as H. Wheeler Robinson pointed out: 'In regard to the consequences of the act of disobedience we are not entitled to infer from it that man's mortality is here traced directly to his sin; on the other hand we read in iii.22f that man is removed from Eden in order that he may not eat of the tree of life and live forever, the inference being that, without it, he is naturally mortal. This is the view elsewhere found in the Old Testament; we are not justified, therefore, in saying more than that man is left to his natural mortality because of his sin, whilst the woman's travail and the man's toil are its direct punishments.' 1.

1. The Christian Doctrine of Man. p.60.

The condemnation of man through sin, then, is a tragic dimension added to his mortality on this view. We agree sin does bring about, essentially, separation from God, pictured as the banishment from the Garden of Eden, in the toil and the travail, but also in the death of the sinner.

The narrative includes in God's condemnation of man and woman 'dust thou art and to dust thou shalt return', which is the final condemnation. If we accept Wheeler Robinson's view, it would be an anti-climax, a simple reminder of man's mortality. We suggest that here we have the beginnings of the recognition, in later Jewish thought, of the close relationship between death and sin. As we shall see, the Hebrew thought of death as a basic part of man's creatureliness, and no so much as a result of his sin. Nevertheless, a long life was the gift of Yahweh to those who obeyed his commandments; and on the other side, sinfulness was always punished by death or the threat of death. The restoration of man was not seen as a promise of immortality, which would be foreign to the Jewish thought of the Old Testament, but as the conciliation of man and God and the restoration of man's productive relation to nature; a state of affairs which had been disrupted by the Fall. 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth. The fear of you and the dread of you shall be on every beast of the earth, and upon every bird of the air, upon everything that creeps upon the ground and all the fish of the sea: into your hand they are delivered. Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you; and as I gave you the green plants I give you everything.' (Gen. IX. 1-3.) When we compare this with God's blessing of man in the P-Creation narrative the renewal theme comes out clearly: 'And God blessed them, and said to them, 'Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds

/... of the air

of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth.'

(Gen. 1.26f.) The steadfast love (chesed) of God was active in trying to restore man to the image of His glory, to give him back that place in creation which was his right.¹

2. The Second Polarity : God and Man.

But again God's overtures to man are spurned. An abortive attempt made to construct a tower to reach up to the heavens fails because of the confusion of languages, symbolic of the strife evident in all man-centred attempts to build an abiding city on earth.² The theme clearly is that any co-ordinated effort on the part of mankind to establish an abiding place for itself is doomed to failure. (We are sadly reminded of the attempts and failures of the old League of Nations and the present United Nations.) Man's sin makes all such efforts useless, and destructive of what they seek to achieve. The only way man can meet his fellow man in love and fellowship, in peace and true co-operation is through the saving act of God. The chapter following the one describing the débacle of Babel begins: 'Now the Lord said to Abram, 'Go from your country and your kindred and your father's house to the land that I will show you. And I will make you a great nation and I will bless you, and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing and by you all the nations of the earth will bless themselves.' " (Gen. XII. 1-3.) The initiative lies with God and not with man; the Covenant and the Law are God's Covenant and Law on which depend the very existence of the people of God. God alone can restore mankind torn apart by sin and selfishness. What is true of mankind as a whole is true also of each individual in his relation to his fellow. In Israel the individual was not considered as a unit but always as part of the whole.

3. The Third Polarity: The Wrath of God & the Love of God.

In all the early religious history of man as described in the Old Testament there seems to be a tension between the Wrath of God and the Love of God. The Lord sees the wickedness of man and wishes to destroy

1. Compare also Gen. IX, 8-17.

2. Genesis, XI. 1-9.

him, but yet in His mercy He always takes someone out of the mass through whom He seeks to bring about salvation. This association of destruction and salvation, of death and life, is⁹ the theme which recurs in the history of salvation in the Bible, culminating in the death and Resurrection of Our Lord, and it is basic to the understanding of God's purpose of renewal. In salvation God both destroys and renews; His Wrath and His Love are both at work. This is a polarity which is vital to the understanding of the destiny of man, a polarity which runs right through the Bible. Man experiences the wrath of God, the destruction of his being in death, as sinner. As restored he experiences the love of God in renewal of his being through death i.e. resurrection. This last stage is only attained in Christ Jesus.

From the foregoing discussion of God, Man and Creation as set out in the opening chapters of the Bible and as understood in the experience of the Christian Church there are these three basic polarities in the nature and condition of man which characterize the Biblical understanding of man. This understanding of the nature of man must be distinguished from a dualistic understanding such as finds its inspiration in Greek philosophy or Persian religion with its dualistic view of Good and Evil. These basic polarities are expressed in the immanence and transcendence of God, the earthly and spiritual nature of man, the glory and the shame of creation and in fact in every aspect of theological thought.

Man is a 'being between'. He is not God and he is not matter. He is the dust of the earth enlivened by the breath of God. We can perhaps best express the nature of man by saying that man is matter brought into vital reciprocal relationship with God. That would hardly be man in a nutshell, but it would state man's position in relation to God and the material creation which is a crucial perspective in theological thought.

What effect has sin on the nature of man's being? It disrupts man's relationship with nature and his fellow man and brings him under the Wrath of God. In the first place, through sin man's being is directed away from God to Creation. This causes a false autonomy in which man is brought under the dominion of the material and the fleshly, the elemental spirits of the world.¹ In the second place sin disrupts the polarity of

1. Colossians II, 20.

man's being by the creation of a false community. The false community is the man-centred community: the community in which God is accorded no place. All atheistic political theories which glorify race or descent or colour are the direct result of the effect of sin on man's relation with man. Thirdly, sin brings man under the Wrath of God, under the threat of non-being. This sense of nothingness, of non-being, has been much emphasized in recent years in existentialist thought, notably by Sartre and Heidegger. The effect of sin, then, is seen in man's (i) autonomy (ii) community life, and (iii) the threat to his being. (For this totality of sin existentialist thought has used the terms 'inauthentic existence' and 'estrangement' both being based on truly Biblical insights whether acknowledged or not).

The reintegration of God and man, and man and man, involves the establishment of a true autonomy and a true community positively related the one to the other. True autonomy is only experienced within the true community, the people of God, which brings the two into the closest possible relationship. God establishes His Covenant and His Law with the people so that they may observe them and so be blest in the land which the Lord their God will give them.¹ Thus God makes a Covenant with Abraham, Isaac and with Jacob. Through this moral relationship of free association the people whom God delivered from the land of Egypt will be renewed. To obey the Law and Covenant is to be accepted as God's people: to fail to obey the Law and the Covenant is to come under the Wrath of God, i.e. to lose one's being, one's autonomy and the community to which one belongs. These three forms of salvation are seen in the O.T. God makes His Covenant with individuals, with Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and through them with the people. He gives Moses the Ten Commandments which is to be the Law of the people of God. To disobey the Law of God is to be condemned to death. The Covenant and the Law constitute the community and the identity (autonomy) of the Israel of God. The first form of the hope then, is a nationalistic hope. Later, the personalization of the hope brought with it the beginnings of a belief in the resurrection of the body as we shall see.

1. Genesis. IX. 1-17; XV; XXII. 15f.

The picture presented to us in the Old Testament then, is one in which God, in his merciful purpose of love, seeks out a small insignificant people to reveal to them the truth of His nature and the purpose of salvation. This restoration consists in giving His people a place where they may dwell in peace and prosperity. There they would be safe from all their enemies while they observed the covenant and laws and statutes which God had commanded them, and in their descendants all the nations of the earth would be blessed. In all this there is the clear message that God's purpose of salvation is concerned (i) with the restoration of men on earth; (ii) that this involves a new relationship on the part of man to god, established by God and upheld by God in spite of Man's disobedience; (iii) that this renewal of man will involve a renewal of nature by God, that the earth will bring forth her fruits in due season, thus the curse of God upon nature would be removed; (iv) that the relationship between man and man would be restored; (v) that the enemies of God would be vanquished so that they become powerless to disturb the people of God.

The restoration of man, then, was his renewal as a member of the people of God, not as an individual, for the individual was never the primary unit in Semitic society. 'The unit for morality and religion is not so much the individual as the group to which he belongs, whether this be for particular purposes, the family, the local community, or the nation.'¹ This has been described as the idea of 'corporate personality' and, as such, it places the individual not as the centre of life but as part of a greater unit. This could and did lead to, what to the modern mind is unfair condemnation of members of the family for the sins of the father. Examples of this are the slaying of seven of Saul's sons as blood-revenge for the slaughter of the Gibeonites by Saul² and the case of Achan, who took spoil of Jericho which had been devoted to God. He and his whole family were stoned and burnt.³ But it does emphasize the solidarity of man in sin and in God's purpose of salvation. The individual is never entirely responsible for his actions, as he is not responsible for the family into

1. H. W. Robinson. 'Religious Ideas of the O.T.' p.87.

2. II Sam. XXI. 1 ff.

3. Joshua VII. 22-26.

which he is born, or the environment in which he grows up, or the intelligence or lack thereof which he has. A deeper realization of the uniqueness of the individual comes out in the Deuteronomic Law, in the eighth century prophets and in the post-exilic period. A new approach appears in the injunction, 'the fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin.' (Deut. XXIIV. 16.) Jeremiah sees the restoration of Israel as a restoration to the land which has been devastated because of the sin of the people. In the restored land, '.... they shall no longer say: 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge.' But every man shall die for his own sin: each man who eats sour grapes, his teeth shall be set on edge.' (Jeremiah XXXI. 29,30.) The destruction of Israel had been the result of the sin of the people and of their forefathers. In the new Israel, however, the covenant of God would be written in the hearts of men. / This laid the emphasis on individual responsibility in a new way. Ezekiel acknowledges individual responsibility. 'The soul that sins shall die. The son shall not suffer for the iniquity of the father, nor the father suffer for the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon himself, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon himself.' (Ezekiel XVIII. 20.) But in Ezekiel there is the expression of the belief in individual retribution and reward which simply is not true of life and was to be questioned in Job. The individual became the moral and religious unit, but still very much as a member of the people of God to whom God had given his covenant and who were his chosen people entrusted with His Truth.

The survival of man is also seen in this corporate aspect at first as the survival of the people of God and in no sense as the survival of the individual.¹ There was a belief in the underworld, which was the popular and not the official belief.² This will come up for discussion later, but it may be said at this stage that the continued life in Sheol was not a positive contribution to any doctrine of the renewal of man, but simply a form of survival. The renewal of the people was their establishment in the

1. C.f. Israel. Lods. Vol. I, p.474.

2. C.f. Gesterley & Robinson. "Hebrew Religion, p.80.

land flowing with milk and honey promised by God. For this they would fight and die knowing that God was on their side and their children and their children's children would inherit the land and the blessing of God. This hope also appears in another form, viz. the survival of the family name in the children. The man blessed by God will have many children. 'Your wife will be like a fruitful vine within your house: your children will be like olive shoots around your table. Lo, thus shall a man be blessed who fears the Lord.' (Ps. CXXVIII. 3,4.) The joy of a man's life is to see his children and children's children in prosperity. Such a one may die in peace, happy that his life has been blessed in his children. 'The Israelite went on living in his children to a degree which really made their life his own.' The only real life was the life on earth, obeying God's will and thereby living in peace with oneself and one's neighbour. Death terminated life for the individual. The desire for personal survival was very much a subconscious desire and in practice revealed much of the shadowiness which is commonly associated with the sub-conscious.

God's creation, then, is one whole of which man is the crown and special manifestation of God's creativity and love. The tragedy of man's existence consists in his persistent denial of his creatureliness and his desire to be like God. The re-integration of man as man with his fellow man and with creation (the figure of the Promised Land) is wrought by God in establishing a Covenant with his people which binds them to him in a special way (sacrifice, circumcision and Law) and through it God seeks the renewal of man. This renewal consists of two movements, both initiated by God, (i) redemption, as pre-figured essentially in the Exodus from Egypt and remembered in the memorial and sacrificial feast of the Passover. (Exod. XII., Deut. XVI.) and (ii) restoration, the settlement in the Promised Land. However, the Lord took away the Land from a people that went after other gods and did not keep His commandments. (the lament and condemnation of the eighth century prophets ¹⁵ directed against the transgression of Israel and Judah.) They are over-run and destroyed by their enemies and exiled in a foreign land. In exile their religion became more individualized

as we find in Ezekiel, the great prophet of the exile. The hope was, a new Jerusalem with a new temple. (Ezekiel XL - XLVIII). After the Return in 538 B.C. disillusionment set in - the Temple was not the glorious structure Ezekiel had seen in a vision but a poor effort compared with the first Temple. It took years to complete, being finished in 516 B.C. The exclusive cult of Judaism, for such it had now become, was chiefly concerned with individual holiness - the beginnings of Pharisaism. There are also the beginnings of Apocalyptic in Zechariah, and the intense nationalism which was to keep Palestine in political ferment even to this day. The most significant development for the purposes of this study was the emergence of the Messiah-figure who was to restore Israel. The whole redeeming and restoring act of God was now concentrated in one figure who was to link up with the glories of the past as a descendant of the great king David, (Jeremiah XXXIII, 14-16, Is. XI, 1ff.) and who would establish the kingdom in righteousness and judgment in the future. This restoration was not to be for the Jews only, but for the whole earth, "for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of God as the waters cover the sea". (Is. XI, 9, 10.) In Him the hope of Israel was to be fulfilled in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, but not in the way the Jews expected.

II. The Hope of Resurrection.

God's plan for man was much wider than the exclusiveness of the post-exilic Judaism could comprehend. The survival of a small nation in a small country was not the purpose of God for Israel, because it was not the remedy for the fall of man. As the Fall is expressed mythologically in terms of individual man, (the term 'adam' is clearly used as both individual man and man in general) so the renewal of man had to be expressed in similar terms. We turn, therefore, to the nature and destiny of man as a person.

Man in the Old Testament, is basar animated by nephesh. For the Hebrew the person was a unity created by God and not as in Greek thought, a body and a soul. Nephesh is the breath of the life, and the best translation, says Wheeler Robinson, is simply Life.¹ (op. cit. p.80.)

1. W. Robinson, op. cit. p.80.

John A. T. Robinson lists four differences between the Hebrew and the Greek idea of man's nature.¹ The Greeks, he says, made four distinctions which are reflected in their concept of man: (i) between form and matter, (ii) between one and many, (iii) between body and soul, and (iv) body as bounded, i.e. in individuality. The Hebrews made none of these distinctions. As man was one creature, there was no philosophical escape from his creatureliness. Death is taken right out of the realm of appearance and unreality with which it is surrounded in Greek thought, and placed within the real world, its implications threatening, like a deep dark abyss. If man is seen in his unity, as mortal creature, then when he is dead he is dead. ~~The~~ ~~on~~ the nephesh of God is taken away, (not to exist apart from the flesh in some other existence, for that is inconceivable) 'the first affirmation of the Old Testament about man, and the one which underlies all the rest, is that he is a creature, and, as such, shares in the feebleness and limitations of all creatures; his existence is ephemeral, and ends inexorably in death.'² In the Psalms are found the most poignant expressions of the transitoriness of man's life, of which one example will suffice. 'Put not your trust in princes, in a son of man, in whom there is no help. When his breath departs he returns to his earth; on that very day his plans perish.' (Ps. ~~CXVI~~^{XL}. 3,4.)³ There is no talk of persistence of personality or the incorruptibility thereof, as is so popular in books on the life hereafter, because the Hebrews did not place much stress on the person, apart from his relationship to God and the people. In death the life conceived as the breath (nephesh and later also ruah) or the blood (damim) left the body, was dispersed, and the body perished. The clearest expression of the implications of this view of life is found in the Book Ecclesiastes.

But this is not the only view of death taken by Hebrews and described in the Old Testament. There was throughout the ancient world a belief in an underworld, to which departed 'spirits' (rephaim) went. As the Hebrews thought of the human being as a unity, a nephesh chayyah, the nature of the life in the grave was a very poor shadow of the life on earth, and not any-

1. J. A. T. Robinson, "The Body", p. 13-15.

2. Edmond Jacob. "Theology of the Old Testament", p. 151.

3. Cf. also Ps. xxx. 9: cxvi. 3, 4.

thing to which one could look forward with any great expectancy. There was no note of fulfilment about the life hereafter, no entering into the Presence of God in glory. God was the God of the living, and not of the dead, in a very literal sense. In the earliest writings Sheol is inhabited only by the rephaim; Yahweh is not present in Sheol at all. (Is. 38. 18, Ps. 88. 11-13, Ps. 6. 5.) There is a desolation and darkness about the Pit (712) which makes it almost a place of punishment. Any contact with the dwellers in the underworld was expressly forbidden to the worshippers of Yahweh. (Deut. 18. 10, 11. Lev. 20. 6, 27. II Kings. 23, 24, I Sam. 28, 9.) Nevertheless, this practice of necromancy persisted, as we know from the story of Saul's consultation of the witch of Endor. (I Sam. 28.) The rephaim were supposed to be acquainted with the affairs of men and have some supernatural power associated with their 'unearthly' state. The only attraction life in Sheol had was a freedom from all striving, suffering and exploitation, such as was experienced in the life on earth. It was a haven ^{for} the desperate and disillusioned. In the Book of Job (Job 11. 13f) we read: 'There the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest.

There the prisoners are at ease together: and they hear not the voice of the taskmaster.

The small and the great are there, and the slave is free from his master.'

The blessed life for the true worshipper of Yahweh was a long life and peace on earth. He who saw his children's children grow up before him, saw in them and their descendant's a hope of immortality and blessing. This is, of course, linked with the concept of 'corporate personality' which led to a view of corporate immortality, immortality of the nation as the people of Yahweh. 'Yahweh was the God of Israel and only secondarily the God of the individual Israelite.'¹

The experience of suffering led to a more profound questioning of the human spirit which could not be satisfied with the idea of a hope of survival and blessedness in the future of the nation as was proclaimed in the official religion, or of a mere shadow of the existence on earth, such as was offered in the popular belief in the shadowy life of Sheol.

1. Oesterley & Robinson, *ibid*, p.87.

Human experience was too complex, human personality too mysterious, and human life too short to find fulfilment in a life of four score years and ten on earth. When the nationalistic and exclusive hope of Israel was shattered after the Exile, there emerged a deeper questioning and a profound longing for a vindication of those who served God. The suffering Job, tormented by his own soul searching, and the superficial answers of his friends, asks the question to which the Old Testament does not really have an answer. 'If a man die, shall he live again?' (Job. 14. 14.) This is no mere selfish desire for survival, as the verses following show, but a profound, although tortured, faith in God's answer to his predicament.

"All the days of my service I would wait, till my release should come.

Thou wouldest call and I would answer thee; thou wouldest long for the work of thy hands.

My transgression would be sealed up in a bag, and thou wouldest cover over mine iniquity." (Job. XIV. 14b, 15, 17.)

This hope for vindication ~~of~~^{of} the righteous is even more poignantly expressed in the oft quoted passage, Job. 19. 24-27.

'I know that my Vindicator lives, and at last he will stand upon the earth:

and after my skin has been destroyed, then without (or from) my flesh I shall see God,

There is one thing that this obscure passage certainly does mean, and that is, that God will supply the answer to Job though he should perish. It does point to a vindication from above which will be known to him who questions and satisfies his being. The form and reality of the answer was to be more glorious than Job imagined. The theophany in chapters 38-41 is an overwhelming statement that God's ways are hidden from man, but nevertheless is too much of a 'deus ex machina' type of answer. The narrator concludes with the traditional answer of material prosperity and long life. "And Job died an old man and full of days." (Job. 42. 17.)

The break-down in the doctrine of blessing and retribution of Yahweh being accomplished in this life during the post-exilic period, is the inspiration of a re-valuation and reformation of the belief which led

to a deeper realization of sin, and a search for the nature of God's answer. Thus in the Psalms there appears a deeply personal longing for some manifestation of God's redemption to the believer. It is true that the belief which was held by the sect of the Sadducees in our Lord's time persisted unchanged during this period, but it is a manifestation of the hard-core conservatism through which the Spirit of God does not break in all His glory and truth. We have quoted those psalms as examples of the one stream in Judaism. The other which led up to fulfilment in Christ finds expression in such Psalms as Ps. 71, 73, and 139. In Psalm 73, 12, the psalmist cries out against the prosperity of the wicked. 'Behold these are the wicked: always at ease they increase in riches. All in vain have I kept my heart clean and washed my hands in innocency.' The problems of the prosperity and apparent victory of the wicked on earth, are a corollary to the problem of the suffering of the innocent, and together they form the chief criticism of the belief that God would vindicate the righteous in this life. It led to a deeper realization of the nature of man and the purposes of God. We find intimations of some fuller, truer word of God as the fulfilment of man, but no clear doctrine of an after life. In spite of the persecutions which the righteous man suffers at the hand of the wicked, in spite of the apparent indifference of God to the sufferings of those who keep His Law and observe His commandments, God will triumph, and they will experience His triumph in glory.

'Thou who hast made me see many sore troubles wilt revive me again,
from the depths of the earth thou wilt bring me up again.'

.....

My lips will shout for joy, when I sing praises to thee;

My soul also which thou hast rescued.' (Ps. LXXI. 20, 23.)

The firm faith that God who had formed man, would re-form, rescue, restore man in spite of the strength and apparent victory of the forces of those who reject Him, and the full vindication of the righteous in the presence of God, is the prevailing note of triumph of these psalms. It does involve a personal hope, combined with its fulfilment under different conditions than those which pertain on the earth. The nationalistic view of God's purpose has proved insufficient, and the belief in a shadowy survival after death has not satisfied the hungry soul. Only the vision of God and the blessedness of His eternal presence are the hope of those who suffer.

The participation of the righteous (hasidim) in the suffering of this sinful world gives a new meaning to suffering. It is no longer simply the experience of God's wrath reserved for the godless, but a part of ^{the} purification of those chosen by God. The righteous will suffer at the hand of the wicked in remaining faithful to God's will. The figure of the Servant of God in Deutero-Isaiah is the figure of one who will be rejected and despised, but who through this suffering will redeem.

'Thus says the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel and His Holy One,

To one deeply despised, abhorred by the nations, the servant of rulers.'

Suffering and death will be the lot of the Servant of God, but his sufferings will redeem. Thus Is. LII. 13 - LIII. 12, speaks of one who bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors through suffering.

'Yet it was the will of God to bruise; He has put him to grief'. The link is forged between suffering and redemption, suffering and renewal, which transcends the old conceptions. It does not make suffering something to be sought after as a means to redemption, but does affirm that suffering and death take on a new meaning in God's redemptive purpose, a meaning which would only be fully revealed in the suffering and death of Jesus Christ the Son of God. The final stage in the belief in the renewal of man is reached in the suffering servant.

There are other later developments which need brief mention; they do not constitute the main development of the ~~hope~~ as it was fulfilled in Jesus Christ. In the apocalyptic vision of Daniel there is explicit mention of the resurrection of the dead in the Old Testament. 'And many of those who sleep in the dust shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.' (Dan. XII. 2.) Here is a definite statement that there will be some kind of separation of the righteous and the wicked after death. But it is not a general resurrection for only 'many' shall awake, presumably those who have been either particularly good or particularly bad. The other passage in the Old Testament which contains a specific reference to the resurrection is in Is. XXVI. 19, which, in the translation of Oesterley and Robinson, reads as follows: 'Thy dead men shall arise; the inhabitants of the dust shall awake, and shout for joy; for the dew of lights is thy dew, and the earth shall bring forth rephaim.' Wheeler Robinson's comment on this passage emphasises the

restricted view of the author: 'It should be carefully noticed that this resurrection life is to be realized in Palestine, with the earthly Jerusalem as its centre; there is no reference to a future life in some other world, nor is it believed that any but faithful Israelites will be raised.'

III. The Personalization of The Hope.

These expressions seen, as they should be, as arising out of a firm faith that the God who had chosen Israel to be His people, and had set them in a land according to His Covenant and Promise, would, in fact, establish them for ever. As restoration of the whole Israel became a spiritual necessity, the hope of the Resurrection grew. The form of the hope was always nationalistic and materialistic; the establishment of God's people as a separate entity in the Promised Land. The individual man was part of the nation, and found satisfaction in the thought that God would bless the nation. His duty was to obey the Law and Covenant as one member of a people with whom God had Covenanted. His reward would be a sharing in the prosperity of the nation, a long life in the land which the Lord his God had given to his fathers as their inheritance forever, and the blessed assurance that his children would enjoy the same blessing through the mercy of God. Personal immortality was not a dominant factor in Old Testament thought because the person, as such, did not constitute a basic unit in Hebrew religion. God's Covenant was with His people, not with persons as separate units. Gradually, as the hope of the people being a great nation, as in the days of David the great king, grew more and more remote, and especially during and after the Exile, the religion became more pietistic, with an emphasis on individual responsibility. This is partly attributable to the deeply personal experience of the living God of the eighth century prophets. They found that, more often than not, the will of God and the will of the bulk of the people of God were not one and the same thing, and that there was a situation in which the wrath of God and not his special favour rested on the people whom He had chosen as much as it rested on the irreligious Gentiles. In fact, D.-Isaiah declared that God had chosen Cyrus of Persia as His anointed. A revision of the nation as the basic unit was coming about, and a consequent revision of the place of the person and ~~person~~ in the purpose of God.

The concept of the Faithful Remnant ($\text{אִתְּךָ֑ יִשְׁרָאֵ֖ל}$)¹ came to replace the idea

¹ cf. Adam C. Welch: *Post-exilic Judaism*. p. 60ff.

of the whole people as the people of God. Only those who remained faithful to the Law and all its demands would receive God's blessing. The form of the hope remained a blessedness on earth for those who did the will of God, but the emphasis was shifting to a personal understanding of that hope. It was inevitable that this emphasis should bring about deep questionings about the destiny of righteous men who had not experienced the blessings of peace and prosperity during their own life time. One who had been zealous in doing the will of God should, in some way, partake of the blessings which he so ardently believed was the reward of all those who diligently sought God's face and suffered for His sake. We have seen how the whole problem of the suffering of the righteous man was raised in the Book of Job. There the question of the final vindication of the righteous man finds its most agonized expression. The form of the answer is really that Job should bow before the Almighty Wisdom and Power of God and not be too concerned with his own misery. It is a revelation that faith in God means believing 'though He slay me'; that God is just and will reward the righteous. It is a spiritual pointer, rather than a satisfactory clear answer. The answer given is a reversion to the belief that such a man will, in fact, be rewarded on earth, that he will live to experience his vindication in the eyes of his friends, and prosperity amongst his children. This personalization of the hope of Israel raised the question of the immortality of the righteous, rather than answered it. Thus we find that in the Apocalyptic Book of Daniel, from the intensity of apocalyptic vision, a statement of the resurrection of the just and unjust almost bursts forth. A cry for justice which must be meted out, and if not here then the dust must bring forth those to whom it is due. In Isaiah LXVI. 19, the resurrection is restricted to Israelites and to a return to the land of Palestine. Again, it is a cry for the vindication which seemed to be denied those who faithfully suffered and died for their faith. These passages are the more striking for their transcendence of Old Testament thought about the destiny of man. They are, nevertheless, very restricted in intention, as has been shown. The popular belief in the existence of Sheol as a dwelling for the rephaim was not the official religious belief, but a poor compensation for the lack thereof, which, in practice, led to necromancy and a corruption of the worship of Yahweh because of its

association with the Gentile worship. Cesterley and Robinson point out the similarities in the belief in the after life found in the Babylonian myths and the Hebrew religion.

Personalization:

"It was characteristic of Israelite thought to pass from the collective to the individual, however, and to present the group by a single figure and then to treat this as a real individual. The concept of the Messiah began in the promise of the lasting glory of the Davidic House (2 Sam. VII, 16.) and in the expectation that after the northern exile the restoration of the Davidic line would bring about the restoration of the national fortunes. (Hos. III. 5.) The concept of the Son of Man began as a personifying of the Saints, as we have seen, and later the personification became a person; the same thing probably happened with the concept of the Suffering Servant. What was at first a collective figure, representing the community, became the figure of an individual who in himself embodied its mission." (Rowley. The Relevance of Apocalyptic, p.33)

The personalization of the hope of Israel took its final form in the Messianic hope of Israel. The Messiah became the one whom God would appoint to restore His people in their land in prosperity. (It is not within the scope of this thesis to go into the Messianic hope in any detail, but certain aspects of that hope are relevant.) The form of the hope is best expressed in the words of the prophet Jeremiah:

'Behold the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In his days Judah will be saved, and Israel will dwell securely. And this is the name by which he shall be called: The Lord is our Righteousness.'

(Jeremiah 23. 5, 6.) The characteristics of this hope are clear. It is a return to the days of the great king David and his righteous rule. It is reserved for the Jews in their land. It holds hope for the individual believer, only insofar as he may live to see Messiah come, God breaking into history through His anointed to deliver and restore those whom He had chosen in the land which He had given to them. God wills to restore His people in spite of their sin. The kingdom of the Messiah will be a new creation by God with the Messiah as His anointed representative.

'.... his person and work will form part of a new creation, inaugurated like the first, with a great light and a great battle. Yahweh, who is always the principal actor will launch against the power of chaos.'

(Jacob. p.336.) This is a development of tremendous importance, as it is a hope, not of restoration, but of resurrection. It is a major development in the religious understanding of the Jews. The hope is no longer so much for a kingdom like that of David, but for new heavens and a new earth. (In Ezekiel the resurrection is given in the vivid vision of the valleys of dry bones. (Ezekiel 37), in Isaiah it retains its links with the past through the 'shoot from the stump of Jesse.' (Is. II. 1.))

There is a further understanding of the one who would act as the representative of God in the deliverance of Israel which needs emphasis, and that is the figure of the Servant of Yahweh (עַבְדַּי יְהוָה) in the Servant Songs in Isaiah. The religious Israelite's concern with the problem of suffering was, as we have seen, associated with the increased emphasis on personal responsibility. The fact of the sufferings of the righteous and belief that the answer to suffering was in the hands of Yahweh, find expression in Job and also in the Psalms. Suffering came to be accepted as in some mysterious way part of God's purpose of redemption. The Servant of Yahweh partakes of suffering, and through suffering redeems people. That there seems to be some doubt as to whether the Servant is a person or the people Israel, is not at all surprising, for he is, in a sense, both. The hope of the people finds fulfilment in him, and he is identified with the sufferings of the people. He is both himself and the people. I am deeply indebted to Edmond Jacob's discussion on the Messianic Kingdom for much that I have written about the Messiah and Servant of Yahweh, and could do no better than quote him at some length on this point:

'Founded upon election and destined to a mission, the people of Israel underwent a long series of trials, due to the most part to their unfaithfulness, from which they had always been delivered anew by a not less uninterrupted series of liberating interventions of God. All these themes are used again in the Servant Songs: the servant is the elect, the wretched, the missionary, the glorified one; he summarizes in his person the whole history of his people, but where Israel failed the servant will succeed: "Behold my servant will succeed" He will succeed

by his sufferings and by his death, which have a substitutionary value, for by substituting himself for his people, the servant makes their salvation possible; that is why, in the last song, the figure of the servant can only be understood in an individual sense.' (ibid. p.338.)

IV. The Actualization of the Hope:

In the Old Testament, God is always the agent in creation. He creates the world out of chaos through the operation of His Spirit and His Word. He establishes a Covenant with His people and gives them a Law, thus making them a peculiar people who have the Lord for their God. There is no question of the realization of hope apart from God, for He alone constitutes their hope. But the nation became feeble, the people disobedient to the Covenant, and the land was taken away from them. The original hope of Israel had crumbled and lay in ruins, like the Holy City Jerusalem. The wrath of God had been visited on His people. But the wrath of God was not the final word of God spoken to His people, for God kept His promise for all generations. The hope of men failed, but the faithfulness of God stood firm. The Word of God came to the prophets commanding them to proclaim to the people that their hope was not lost, as God would re-create what had been destroyed. Out of the stump that remained a sprout would come - new hope would grow like a young shoot, fresh and full of vitality. (Is. VI. 10-13, XL. 1.) A darkness had descended upon the people, the darkness of destruction and chaos, but the light of God would shine through the darkness.

'For behold darkness will cover the earth, and gross darkness the peoples, but the Lord will arise upon thee, and His glory shall be seen upon thee'. (Is. LX. 1,2.)

The purpose of God was to create new heavens and a new earth. (Is. LXV. 17ff.) XI. 1ff.) There would be a new covenant, (Jer. XXXI. 31-33.) a law which will be written in the hearts of the individuals constituting the new people.

The spirit (רוח) and the word (דבר) of God would re-create the people of God, and re-create the earth.

(i) The spirit of God: The power of God in all its mystery and unpredictability was connected with the wind, as the primary meaning of the word *rush* indicates. It is always the property of God, never of the

people, and is operative in history. Thus the breath of God creates man, and the wind of God separates the Red Sea so that the people can pass over to safety. The spirit of God rests upon the leaders of the people, upon Moses, Joshua and the Judges of Israel. The early prophets, the nebi'im, fall into ecstatic trances as the spirit rests upon them. In the early history of the people, the spirit seems to rest on the leaders only at certain times when God breaks through to reveal Himself. The spirit is never the possession of man, who is flesh and not spirit. Thus Isaiah criticizes the defensive alliance with Egypt because the Egyptians and their horses are only basar (flesh) and not ruah. (Is. XXXI. 3 Cp. Jer. 17. 5, Ps. 103, 14.) God alone has the spirit, and only He is immortal. The impartation of the spirit to man lifts him up to God, and fills him with new life. There is no communication with God apart from the mediation of the spirit, for the spirit is the very nature of God. All in all, this means that the hope of man waits upon the outpouring of the Spirit of God. This outpouring was promised (Joel. II. 28ff) and would be fulfilled. (Acts II. 15-21.)

(ii) The Word: As the word of God went out and formed the earth, so it would go out to re-form the earth. For the Jew, words which were spoken were active, and not mere sounds. So God's word would not return empty, but accomplish His purpose. The word of God always establishes new life. Thus the word of the Lord creates new life in the prophet on whom it rests. These are the things which are accomplished by the spirit, so what is the particular meaning of the word of God? It is probably best described as the form of the spirit, the intelligible, spiritual operation of God, the blueprint of His purpose which is proclaimed to those who listen. But it is more than that, it is an embodiment of that purpose. In the words of Jacob: '..... the word of God in the Old Testament directs and inspires a single history, which begins with the Word of God pronounced at the creation, and which is completed by the word made flesh. (Jn. I. 14.)' (ibid. P.129.)

V. Conclusion:

The Biblical picture presented to us in the Old Testament is of man in vital relationship with God. Man is creature, and, as creature, he has a dual relationship which we have described as a polarity. This

dual relationship or polarity can be seen under three aspects. Firstly, man as related to creation on the other hand, and God, the Creator, on the other. Secondly, man as related to his fellow man and to God, and, thirdly, man as related to the Love or the Wrath of God. Sin disrupts the polar relationship by directing man's being away from God towards the other pole. In the first case, a reliance upon and concern with material things creates a false sense of security and autonomy. In the second case, a false humanism leads to a corrupt community concept, such as nationalism or Communism. And lastly, sin places man under the wrath of God, in a negative relationship to God and to Life. This view of man excludes all dualism. There is no question of man's nature being partly corrupt and partly immortal, as in the Greek separation of soul and body. Through sin the whole man is wrongly directed, and comes under condemnation. Man is seen not as he is in himself, but as he is in the light of God's revelation, for man cannot be regarded in isolation from God.

Within this context is set the drama of the salvation of man. This is seen in the first place as the realization of the nationalistic hope of the people of God. The Hebrew shared with the ancient peoples the concept of the solidarity of the tribe or nation, the concept of 'corporate personality', as it was called by H. Wheeler Robinson. God's work of restoration was seen as the establishment of the people with whom He has covenanted. They would be given a land flowing with milk and honey, where they would prosper and experience all the blessings of the chosen people for ever. The people, however, did not keep the covenant and the statutes and the commandments that God had commanded them, and they were punished, the righteous with the unrighteous. It was then that the righteous (hasidim) began to question the rightness of their suffering, and grope for a deeper meaning to man's destiny and to God's purposes. There is a growth in the concept of personality, and a consequent emphasis on resurrection. Martin-Achard, in his book "From Death to Life", distinguishes three groups of texts in the Old Testament, which in one way and another describe Yahweh's power over death.

(i) Those texts that are an expression of Yahweh's power over death, without any indication of man's sharing in this after death. Here he lists Deut. XXXII. 39; I Sam II. 6.; I Kings XVII. 17-24.;

II Kings IV. 31-7,; Psalms XXX, LXXXVI, LXXXVIII, and CIII. 3-5.; Gen. V. 21-4, and II Kings II. 1-15. These passages express only an occasional and sporadic power over death. '.... these are exceptional actions, and, moreover, their effect is only transitory; the law demands that the sons of Adam do not ultimately escape Sheol.'¹

(ii) A second group of passages assert the restoration of the Chosen people, and the possibility of the departed returning to life. We have discussed the most important texts in this group in the foregoing discussion. They are: Hosea VI. 1-3, XIII. 14.; Ezekiel XXVII. 1-14; Isaiah LIII. 10b ff., XXV. 8, XXVI. 19.; and Daniel XII. 2ff. All, except Hosea XIII, which is a statement of condemnation rather than of restoration, assert the restoration to life of those who suffer for Yahweh. The hope of resurrection is very restricted when it is stated being only for the Hasidim, the righteous remnant.

(iii) A third selection of texts tells of the permanence of the bonds which unite the righteous to Yahweh. The belief is clearly expressed that these bonds cannot be broken by death. Here the piety of the psalms features prominently, as one would expect. There are expressions of this expectation in Psalms XVI. 9-11, XLIX. 15., LXXIII. 23-2, and Job XIX. 25-7. The hope of resurrection, then, emerges with the growth in the understanding of individual responsibility within the covenant community. Martin-Achard comments on this development as follows: 'In short, after the Exile, but especially from the time of Alexander the Great's conquests, a process of disincorporation becomes apparent, which affects not only the Chosen People, but the whole religion subject to the Greeks. Israel tends to be no longer an ethnic group but a religious community At this period, man discovers his individuality in a very special way, he dissociates himself psychologically from the group, he seeks to distinguish himself from it. He means no longer to resign himself to the common lot, but to take his personal destiny upon himself; the God whom he seeks is the personal God, the God with whom he will have real personal relationship. Concomitant with this emergence of individualism, the problem of death

1. 'From Death to Life.' Martin-Achard. p. 184.

assumes an increasing importance, and tends to become the great anxiety of the being.'¹

Associated with the growing consciousness of God's purpose of salvation, as restoration of the nation in the earlier stages, and, later, as renewal and vindication of the righteousness of God, there arose the Messianic figure and the Servant of Yahweh, as seen in Deutero-Isaiah. These figures represent the embodiment of the hope of Israel in different ways. The Messiah is seen mainly as a political figure who would inaugurate the Kingdom of God. The suffering Servant expresses the suffering of the hasidim, the righteous remnant, and their intense belief that God would not desert them, but that he would vindicate them. The expectation of Israel, then, becomes a Person from God who would reveal God's will, establish His Kingdom, vindicate His righteousness, and finally overcome death. Those who had suffered for righteousness sake would share in the new life, the resurrection.

The renewal of the people of God would be accomplished by God through the operation of His Word and His Spirit. It is a new creation from above. (cf. John III. 3.)

It needs to be noted, finally, that the destiny of man is described both in terms of the Immortality of the Soul, and in terms of the Resurrection of the Body, in the Old Testament. The Hebrew expression of the Immortality of the Soul in the belief (popular but not official) in the continued existence of man in a disembodied, weak state in the gloomy interior of the earth, expresses very well what Dr. Ramsay has called 'the incompleteness and the dullness'² of the immortality of the soul. It is the belief of those who believe, that God created the world and man, and saw that it was good. It is the belief of those that believe, that death and sin belong together and reduce man to a shadow of his true created glory. So, although there is this background belief in the immortality of the soul in the Old Testament, it really serves only to show the weakness and unattractiveness of such a belief in the future life, and cannot be called the Biblical answer to man's questionings about

1. op. cit. pp. 210, 211.

2. The Resurrection of Christ, p.103.

life and death. The Resurrection of the Body is the true Biblical expectation, for the body represents, for the Hebrew, the whole man created by God, standing in need of God's redemption. The Resurrection of the Body and the Renewal of man are the same thing!

CHAPTER II.BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Israel.	Lods.
The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism.	Lods.
Religious Ideas of the Old Testament)	
The History of Israel)	H. Wheeler Robinson.
The Christian Doctrine of Man.)	
Hebrew Religion.	Oesterley & Robinson.
Man in the Old Testament.	Walther Eichrodt.
The Theology of the Old Testament.	Jacob.
The Body.	J. A. T. Robinson.
The Relevance of Apocalyptic	Rowley.
From Death to Life.	Martin Achard.
Eschatology.	Charles.
Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek.	Boman.

C H A P T E R III.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

The Old Testament is promise, the New Testament is fulfilment.^{1.}

We cannot discard the Old Testament for that would make the New Testament unintelligible; the Word of God would fall on uninstructed and unprepared hearts and minds. All the themes of the Old Testament meet, and have their fulfilment in Christ. Thus, as we move from the Old Testament to the New Testament, we move from expectation to fulfilment. In Christ, God has spoken His final Word of salvation and judgment to man. 'When, in former times, God spoke to our forefathers, He spoke in fragmentary and varied fashion through the prophets. But in this the final age, He has spoken to us in the Son whom He has made heir to the whole universe, and through whom He created all orders of existence; the Son who is the effulgence of God's splendour and the stamp of God's very being, and sustains the universe by His word of power.' (Heb. 1. 1-3.) The hope of the restoration of the Kingdom is fulfilled in Christ, for He comes to usher in the Kingdom of God. (Matt. IV. 17, X.7, Mk. 1. 15, Matt. XII. 28, Lk. XI. 20, etc..) The signs of the coming of the Messiah are present for 'the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached unto them.' (Matt. XI. 5, cp. Lk. IV. 18, 19, and Is. LXI. 1-2.) Jesus, the Christ, comes to fulfil the law and the prophets. (Matt. V. 17., Lk. 24. 27.) His body is the new Temple (John II. 19-21.) His blood the New Covenant (Matt. 26. 28, Mk. 14. 24.) But the fulfilment is not simply like adding the finishing touches to the building, it is a complete renovation of the building. The Old Testament promise and expectation are filled with new meaning. What had been done by God in the history of the people would not be negated, nor would one iota or dot of the Law pass away, for Christ had come to fulfil the Law and the prophets, and not to abolish them. (Matt. V. 17.) Nevertheless, the fulfilment meant a radical transformation, a renewal. Thus

1. cf. Floyd v. Filson 'Jesus Christ the Risen Lord'. p. 88 ff.

there is a new law, a new covenant, a new Temple, a new people, a new and better sacrifice, for 'the old has passed away; behold the new has come.' (II Corinthians V. 17b.) There is, then, throughout the life of our Lord a continual tension between Himself and the established Judaism; He did not fit easily into the structure of legalism and Pharisaism which passed as the true worship of God, and they crucified Him for His revolutionary teaching, teaching which had its roots in the very Scriptures which they claimed to revere. Still, it was in the synagogues and in the Temple that He taught. He identified Himself with the people of God, born a Jew, His mission was to His people, and He seldom went beyond the boundaries of Palestine. Both these themes of identification and renewal are expressed most fully in the events of the passion, Crucifixion and Resurrection of our Lord. The New Testament rings with the message of new life through the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, as the Gospel of the renewal of man. There have been attempts in the past by New Testament scholars to give the New Testament a Hellenistic 'twist'. These attempts have always proved without any real basis. It has been argued¹ with a certain amount of cogency, that the New Testament was born in a Hellenistic world, and was written in Greek for Gentile Christians who were unfamiliar with the thought forms of Judaism. There had been the syncretistic system of the Alexandrian Jew, Philo, who had tried to combine Hellenism and Judaism into one system. St. Paul is sometimes accused of being a Christian Philo, of perverting the pure, simple teaching of Jesus to accommodate a mysticism borrowed from Hellenism. We have to give a brief answer to these questions before we can proceed with our study.

Floyd V. Filson, in his little book "The New Testament against its Environment" in the S.C.M. series, 'Studies in Biblical Theology' deals very fairly and adequately, in our opinion, with the whole question. The question that should be asked, he maintains, is not 'Whether the New Testament written in Greek, reflects Gentile life and thought', but, 'Is the New Testament the product of a secondary phase of Christian development which has not merely obscured, but even warped, the true original message?

1. Deissmann and Reitzensteir.

Did the essential New Testament content takes its rise in the Gentile world, or did it come to the Gentile world as a gift and a challenge, in indictment and an answer to a need? ¹ He sets out the answer in five propositions:

- (i) The adaptation to the New Testament to the Gentile world can only be asserted within strictly defined limits. The almost universal practice of polytheism in the Hellenistic world sets the first an important limit to a correspondence in theological outlook. Christianity was 'militantly hostile' to a polytheistic world.
- (ii) 'There is no thoroughly Greek or Hellenistic book in the New Testament.' The books which have been thought to reflect Hellenistic thought, James, Hebrews, II Peter, and the Gospel according to St. John, are all shown to be fundamentally Jewish. They have tried to meet the Greek, not to accommodate his teaching.
- (iii) The Hellenistic world has no parallel for the combination of the sovereign transcendence and the gracious redemption of God. The Epicureans made the gods so transcendent that they were unconcerned with the human scene. The Stoics emphasized the indwelling of the Logos, which undermined the transcendence of God and consequently the need for grace. The popular Olympian gods were superior beings, living in a world of their own, which was very much like our world with all its sins magnified ten times.
- (iv) There was no thought in the Hellenistic world to compare with the Biblical understanding of God as both Creator and Redeemer. 'All dualism between matter and spirit is decisively excluded in this view, and this marks a real difference between most Greek thought and the New Testament.' This is precisely one of the important points we wish to emphasize.
- (v) The Christology of the New Testament is too early and too widely prevalent to find its origin in Hellenistic thought. Here Filson is countering the argument of Bousset in 'Kyrios Christos' that the designation of Christ as Lord was Hellenistic in origin. Dodd's opinion is that 'Seldom has a theory been so widely accepted on such flimsy grounds.' ²

'The way of the Greeks and the Jews is old. But you are a third race.' (quoted from Stauffer: New Testament Theology, p.45, where he quotes from the apocryphal Gospel of Peter.) This certainly is true

1. "The New Testament against its Environment", p. 23.ff.

2. Apostolic Preaching, p. 15.

of the Christian Church. Its roots were Jewish, Old Testament, but its teaching is that of He who is Lord of the Jew as well as the Gentile. We look for the meaning of words in the New Testament in its roots in the Old Testament, not in the philosophical systems of Hellenism, but we see the Christian teaching standing in Judgment of Judaism as well as Hellenism.

Two Eschatologies:

The New Testament then is fulfilment; ~~the~~ fulfilment of the Jewish expectation. In addition, we accept the essential eschatological structure of the New Testament witness to the Person of Jesus Christ, and the formation of the Christian Church. A. M. Ramsay distinguishes between two different beliefs about the Gospel.¹ 'According to the one belief Jesus Christ is interpreted within the series of evolution and history in such a way that the transcendental and redemptive aspects of the Gospel receive less than their proper place: the resurrection is an example to us that if we are good we may, like Jesus, survive death. According to the other belief the Resurrection is a divine intervention, transcendent and creative, whereby a new creation is inaugurated in the life of mankind and the world.'¹ The former belief, as he points out, finds its inspiration, not in the Biblical message, but in the concept of the immortality of the soul: the latter is orthodox, biblical and evangelical, i.e. in accordance with the teaching message and preaching of the Catholic Church. The Gospel, as the word of God and the Spirit of God in Christ, incarnate, renewing man, is eschatological through and through. We need only to be reminded of the title which our Lord used of Himself most frequently in the Synoptic Gospels, to see that He had an eschatological understanding of His own ministry and mission. Whatever the origin of the title Son of Man, one thing is certain, it refers to an eschatological figure, one who would come to bring the reign of God. The titles which were used of our Lord also witness to the understanding by the early Church that, in Christ, God has come to establish His Kingdom: Messiah, (Christ), Son of God, Lord (Kurios) All these have their origin in the Old Testament revelation of the purpose of God.²

1. The Resurrection of Christ. p. 55.

2. cf. E. Stauffer. New Testament Theology. pp. 112-116. He too sees the Jewish roots of Kurios, as against Bousset and Baltmann.

It should be noted that the other significant titles used of our Lord refer to His Passion and Death. Such are, 'Servant of God' (Matt. XII. 18, Acts III. 13, 26., IV. 27, 30.) 'Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world' (John I. 29, 36., Rev. V. 6ff.) 'Mediator of a new covenant' (Heb. XII. 24) and 'High Priest' (Heb. V.5, IX. 11ff, XIII. 11. etc.) All these titles are thoroughly Judaistic, and can only be understood in the light of the Old Testament revelation. The final act of God in saving His people is an act of renewal, a new creation. (II Corinth. V.17.) The Soteriological and eschatological emphasis of the Gospel message, as the New Testament witness reflects, are inseparable. In other words, what God has done in Christ is the final saving event. How this final saving event is worked out in the history of mankind and in the life of the individual, is the history of the Church, which marches under the banner of the Cross of Christ until the consummation of all things.

The New Testament begins with the proclamation of the coming of the Kingdom of God.¹ John the Baptist, the forerunner of the One who was to come, proclaims that one will come who will baptize with the Holy Spirit. (Mk. I. 8., Lk. III. 16.) His preaching was, 'Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand' (Matthew III. 2.) - he called men to prepare themselves, and by repentance and baptism to await the advent of God's kingly rule. God was going to break into history, to appear in this world to establish His rule in the hearts of men. Jesus of Nazareth appears along the banks of the river Jordan to be acclaimed by John as 'the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world.' (John 1.29.) The baptism of Jesus in the river Jordan reveals Him as the Son of God on whom the Spirit of God rests in all its fulness. (Mk. 1. 9-11, Matt. III. 13-17., Lk. III. 21, 22.) Associated with the revelation of the Spirit are the Birth narratives in Matthew and Luke, where the spiritual nature of Jesus, as born of Mary, imply a new creation.² The nature of the spiritual birth is a witness that, in Christ, God is present among men, He has come to tabernacle with them. His rule and

~~1. Colossians I. 13.~~

1. *Basileia* like its Aramaic equivalent mal'kuth means 'reign sovereignty - kingship rather than kingdom.' Richardson: 'An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament'. p. 24 ff. cf. Dalman: The Words of Jesus. p. 94.

2. *vide footnote 1a on the following page.*

kingship comes in the person of Jesus Christ. All this is clearly presented by the Synoptic Gospels. In the Gospel according to St. John there is the complementary emphasis that, in Christ, the Logos of God has come among men. (John I. 14.) He who was in the beginning with God, creating the world, has come again to enter His creation, to shine with all the divine glory in the world, and to give to all who recognize the light, and believe, the power to be the sons of God. (John I. 6-13). The Gospels proclaim the good news that God has entered history in Jesus Christ 'in whom all the fulness of God was pleased to dwell'.¹ As in the Old Testament God is described as working in history through His Word and Spirit in the renewal of the People of God, so He has come in the fullness of His Word and Spirit in Jesus Christ to renew man.

What happens in Christ is not the act of a God who, having tried all other solutions in seeking to redeem man, tries this last decisive way, but is that final act of God in redeeming man according to His pre-determined purpose. God's love for man has not changed, nor has His redemptive purpose, for He is the same to-day, yesterday and for ever. In Christ, the end of the ages has come, God has come to fulfil His purpose, Christ shall reign until 'the telos when He delivers the Kingdom to God the Father, after destroying every rule and every authority and every power. For He must reign until He has put all His enemies under His feet. The last to be destroyed is death.' (1 Corinthians XV. 24-26.) And this reign of Christ begins with the Incarnation. His life on earth is the final history of the conquest of disease, sin and death. The Incarnation, life, crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, our Lord, therefore, in no way changes the attitude of God to man, as has been suggested in the Substitutionary and Penal doctrines of the atonement, where the justice and wrath of God are satisfied by the death of Christ on the Cross. We cannot restrict the redemptive act of God to any one aspect of our Lord's life. The Gospels do, indeed, give prominence to the Passion, Death and Resurrection precisely because they express the whole redemptive act, to which every aspect of our Lord's earthly life

1 *Colossians* I. 19.

1a. Richardson: *ibid.* p. 175. comments on the Virgin Birth as follows: 'The Birth of Christ is an eschatological event inhering in the New Age, and is itself a manifestation of the expected outgoing activity of the Spirit in the latter days.'

bears witness. This is the structure of the Gospel of John, where sign and discourse all witness to God breaking into history in all His glory. In the Synoptics, the action is set within the framework that God is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. In answer to the disciples of John, who have come to question Jesus whether it is He who is to come, or do they wait for another, Jesus answers, 'Go and tell John what you hear and see: the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have the good news preached to them. And blessed is he who takes no offence at me.' (Mat. XI. 4-6, cf. Is. XXXV. 5-6.) The Jews recognised the presence of power in Jesus, but attributed it to Beelzebub, the prince of devils. Jesus answered them that a house divided against itself could not stand, and a kingdom divided against itself would fall. 'But if it is by the finger ("Spirit of God" - Matthew) that I cast out demons, then the Kingdom of God has come upon you.' (Lk. XI. 20., Matt. XII. 28.) The Transfiguration is a momentary revelation of the true nature of Jesus, Son of God, appearing with Moses and Elijah, through whom He had spoken to the people of God in years past. (Matt. XVII. 1-8, and parallels.) It is especially in John that we find the close relationship which exists between the Father and the Son. Jesus in the Word of God coming forth from God as light shines in darkness. The intimate union of Jesus with His heavenly father is everywhere attested in the Gospel. Thus, when Jesus claims to be the Light of the world, and the Pharisees accuse him of witnessing to Himself, i.e. having no corroborating witness as required by the Law. (Deut. 19. 15.), Jesus replies, 'I bear witness to myself and the Father who sent me bears witness to me.' (John VIII. 18.) And again, 'I speak of what I have seen with my father ...'. (VIII. 32.) And so quotations could be multiplied.

The Synoptic Gospels, therefore, declare that Jesus is the Messiah who has come to establish the Kingdom of God according to the scriptures. All the signs of the Messianic Kingdom are performed by Jesus, as He Himself implied in His answer to the disciples of John the Baptist. But the coming of Christ is not only the coming of God in power, but also in grace, ---- it is a consummation, the consummation of God's redeeming love. 'And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us.' (John I. 14.) Christ is not only fully identified with God, but

is also fully identified with man. God has entered history as man! This is the New Man, Jesus Christ, in whom death is to be conquered, 'As in Adam all die, in Christ shall all be made alive.' (1 Cor. XV.22.) This manhood Christ will bear to the Cross, to die the death of all men. In this manhood he will suffer temptation, sorrow, anger, disappointment, in fact, all that to which flesh is heir, and this manhood He will offer to God in perfect obedience, so that all men may be obedient to the will of God. All is a manifestation of God's glory as we have seen above, a manifestation of God's glory in the whole life of a man, so that even the Passion and death upon the Cross is the glorifying of the Son of Man. (John III. 36; XII. 16; XIII. 31. etc.) Although the Cross is the power of God for our salvation, this power is made available only after the Resurrection and the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. Before that time, the disciples see but do not understand, they are witnesses of a new life which has, as yet, not become theirs. How the apostles understood the nature of the saving act of God in Christ is proclaimed in the kerygma, or proclamation of the Gospel.

Professor C. H. Dodd, in the little classic 'The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments', has shown what the form of the primitive kerygma was as it can be seen in the preaching of Paul in the Epistles, and in the first sermons in the Acts of the Apostles. 'The main burden of the kerygma is that the unprecedented has happened: God has visited and redeemed His people.'¹ The message of the Church is an eschatological message. 'Let all the house of Israel, therefore, know assuredly that God had made Him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified.' (Acts. II. 36.) Dodd identifies six aspects of the primitive preaching in the Acts of the Apostles.

- (i) The age of fulfilment has dawned.
- (ii) This has taken place through the ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus.
- (iii) Jesus is the Messianic head of the new Israel through His resurrection from the dead.
- (iv) The Holy Spirit in the Church is the sign of the present power and glory of Christ.

1. Dodd. The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. p.33.

- (v) The Messianic age will shortly reach its consummation in the return of Christ.
- (vi) The hearers are urged to repent and believe the message and to receive the forgiveness of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit. ¹.

All these witness to a deep sense of the living presence of Christ with the Church to whom he imparts His life. The life of Christ is given through the operation of the Holy Spirit who descends on all who believe in Christ and are baptized into ~~the~~ (~~the~~) His name. (Acts. II. 38; X.44-48) This new life is expressed in fellowship, in which a new community of common concern and sharing comes into being, and in worship, especially in sacramental union, 'the breaking of bread and of prayers.' (Acts. II. 43-46; XX. 7 ff.)

The same eschatological emphasis is found in the preaching of St. Paul as it may be gleaned from the Epistles. 'The Pauline kerygma ... is the proclamation of the facts of the death and the resurrection of Christ in an eschatological setting, which gives significance to the facts.' ². Christ is risen and present, and through His saving work men are saved. '..... designated Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by His resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom we have received grace and apostleship to bring about obedience to the faith, for the sake of His name among all nations, including yourselves, who are called to belong to Jesus Christ.' (Rom. 1. 4-6.)

Now, whereas this note of what has been termed "realized eschatology" since the research and findings of Prof. C. H. Dodd is there throughout the New Testament, there is also a clear expectation that the work of Christ would reach its consummation in the future. Albert Schweitzer in 'The Quest for the Historical Jesus' has shown that the imminence of the Kingdom of God is the decisive note in the teaching of Jesus. Thereby He brought biblical scholarship back from the byways

1. Dodd. The Apostolic Preaching and its developments. pp. 21-23.

2. Dodd. *ibid.* p. 13.

of evolutionism to the core of the nature of the Gospel message. Jesus taught His disciples to pray, 'The Kingdom Come. They will be done on earth as it is in heaven.' This note of imminence is sounded by Jesus at the very outset of His public ministry: 'Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.' (Matt. 4. 17. Mk. 1. 14.) He commissions His disciples to go out to the lost sheep of the house of Israel and preach that the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. (Matt. X. 1. ff. Lk. IX. 2.) So the dominant note in the parables of Jesus is the Kingdom of God. The Reign of God is like seed sown in a field, which germinates and grows up with the weeds until the day of the harvest. (Matt. 13. 24-30 and II's.) like a grain of mustard seed which will grow into a large shrub, which will provide a home for all the birds of the air: (Matt. XIII. 31, 32: Mk. IV. 30.) Like the leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of bread until the whole was leavened. (Matt. 13. 33. Lk. 13. 20-21.) The Reign of God would grow from small, almost unnoticed, beginnings like the mustard seed and the leaven hidden in the meal, into something great. What Schweitzer missed was precisely the note of the presence of the Kingdom of God in Jesus, to which Dodd has drawn attention. The reign of God would be fulfilled in the future, but it was already present in Christ.

How are these two eschatologies to be related? It is no use trying to understand the message of Jesus in terms exclusively of the one or the other, because the New Testament cannot be forced into a prepared mould of 'realized' or 'futuristic' eschatology. Nor do we really get very far by setting them side by side and stating that here we have a tension. The New Testament teaching is not there to create tensions, but integrated, new beings with an integrated, new understanding of life! This is a dialectic relationship, and like all Biblical dialectic it points to a profound spiritual truth.

One Soteriology.

One of the most interesting aspects of the reaction to our Lord's teaching, as recorded in the Gospels, is the almost complete lack of understanding of what our Lord was trying to say. The Scribes and Pharisees were actively antagonistic. They accused our Lord of performing His miracles through the medium of Beelzebub, the prince of devils. (Lk. XI. 20

and II's.) They called Him a Samaritan and a madman. (John VIII. 48.) They would crucify Him for His teaching and the claims He made for Himself. The disciples seemed to be particularly slow to understand the meaning of what was happening. They were often rebuked by Jesus for failing to understand His teaching or some miraculous act. Let us consider a few examples:

(i) After our Lord had told the parable of the Sower. (Mk. IV. 3-8; Matt. XIII. 3-8; Lk. VIII. 5-8.) all the Synoptics record that the disciples asked Jesus of the parables. Luke mentions that they asked specifically about that parable. Mark records the rebuke of our Lord: 'Do you not understand this parable? How then will you understand all the parables?' (Iv. 13.) Jesus then carefully explains the parable to them. Although it is given to them to know the secret of the Kingdom of God, it seems that the parables in themselves did not open the minds of the disciples to the hidden reality. It should be noted, too that it is very significant that most of the teaching about the Kingdom of God is in parabolic form, beginning, 'The Kingdom of God is like' As Manson says re. parabolic teaching: '... the perception of the real issues must be the work of the individual himself; and the decision must be his own spontaneous act.'¹ The disciples seemed unable to make this spontaneous act in response to the parable of the Sower, and we may accept that the pattern set there was often repeated.²

(ii) The Confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi is also recorded in all the Synoptics, although Luke does not specify the locality. (Mk. VIII 27f. and II's.) Jesus asks His disciples to tell Him whom they think He is. Peter acknowledges Jesus as the Christ. Jesus implicitly accepts the confession, but commands the disciples to tell no one. Again, there is the note of secrecy. 'And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected and be killed, and after three days rise again.' (Mk. 8. 31. Matt. 16. 21, Lk. 9. 22.) Peter cannot accept this teaching about the Christ, and rebukes Jesus, only to be severely rebuked himself: 'Get behind me Satan: For you are not on the side of God but of man.' Peter was

1. T. W. Manson. *op.cit.* p.202.

2. Cf. Mk. VII. 17; Matthew 13. 36.

misunderstanding the nature of Christ's mission, and misunderstanding it in a dangerous way. The devil is the father of lies. (John VIII. 44.) Only he who is inspired by the devil could take offence at what Jesus was saying, but that was precisely what the chief disciple was doing. It was he who was to deny vehemently that he ever knew Jesus, because he could not accept such a Christ, that was not the Messiah he thought he had been following.

The Confession at Caesarea Philippi brings out the lack of understanding on the part of the disciples, which was most tragically shown in their desertion of Jesus at the Trial.

(iii) Both Matthew and Mark record that Jesus rebuked His disciples for not understanding the significance of the miracles of the feeding of the five thousand, and the feeding of the four thousand. The disciples had run out of bread when our Lord reminded them of the two miracles, and rebuked them: 'do you not yet perceive nor understand? Are your hearts hardened? Having eyes do you not see, and having ears do you not hear? And do you not remember?' (Mk. VIII. 17, 18.) They were accused of being as blind as those who were 'without', from whom the mystery of the Kingdom was hidden.

(iv) John tells how many disciples left our Lord after the discourse following the sign of the feeding of the five thousand. (John VI. 60f.) The teaching^{was} about participation in the life of Christ through partaking His flesh and His blood. (We accept the view of the scholars who, with Cullmann, say of this miracle '.... it must at all events be supposed that the evangelist saw, as he was writing down the story, a reference in this miracle to the Eucharist, that he had the Eucharist in mind without actually saying so.'¹) This the hearers found a 'hard saying', many took offence at it, so that 'many of His disciples drew back, and no longer went about with Him.' (John VI. 66.) Jesus asks the Twelve whether they too would go away. Peter, who usually acts as spokesman answers, 'Lord to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life'. There is no indication that they have understood the teaching. They are prepared to follow in spite of their failure to understand, because they know deep down in their inmost beings that He is the Holy One of God. (VI. 69.) There is a distinct note of 'in spite of' in Peter's

1. Early Christian Worship. p. 94.

answer.

(v) Events in the Garden of Gethsemane show clearly the failure of the disciples to appreciate what was happening. The Synoptics bring out the disappointment of our Lord when He found His disciples fast asleep, utterly oblivious of His deep suffering.

(vi) The Trial and Crucifixion left the disciples even more bewildered. The fact that, after Peter's Confession, Jesus began to teach them of His sufferings and His rejection and condemnation by the Scribes and Pharisees seems to have made little or no impression on them. But 'they all left Him and fled.' (Mk. XIV. 50; Matt. XXVI. 56.) Peter followed afar off, only to deny that he ever knew Jesus. Judas had capitulated to those who were in league with the powers of evil, and sought to kill him. Only John followed in a daze, loyal to the Lord whom he had learned to love more selflessly than any of the other disciples.

(vii) Even in the post-Resurrection appearances, there is still the dullness of apprehension on the part of the disciples.¹ The empty tomb only filled the women with alarm, (Mk. XVI. 8.) although the angel had given them a clear message that Jesus had risen. Ramsay attributes this to awe instilled by the 'overwhelming reality of the Resurrection.'² We feel certain, however, that, in addition to the awe, there was an uncertainty, for the event was still 'external', literally outside their understanding. We find the same mixture of belief and unbelief in the minds of Peter and John when they rush to the tomb to see whether what the women had said could be true. It is surely wrong, here, to attribute to John 'the leap of faith',³ because the text reads: 'he saw and believed; for as yet they did not know the Scripture, that He must rise from the dead.' (John XX. 8, 9.) Luke tells the story of the appearance of Jesus to Cleopas and the other disciple, on the road to Emmaus. (Lk. XXIV. 13ff.) This story is particularly instructive as it shows that the disciples had not understood the objective witness of the

1. Paul Tillich's doctrine of 'restitution' assumes that the post-Resurrection appearances were actually 'an ecstatic experience' (presumably identical in the case of all the disciples,) by which 'the concrete picture of Jesus of Nazareth became indissolubly united with the reality of the New Being.' *opcit* Vol. II. p.181.

2. A. M. Ramsay. 'The Resurrection of Christ.' p. 77.

3. Cf. G. D. Yarnold. 'Risen Indeed'. p.22.

Scriptures to what Stauffer calls the 'Christ-event'¹. nor could they recognize the risen Christ. It is, furthermore, most significant that they recognized Him when He broke the bread! '... they told what had happened on the road, and how He was known to them in the breaking of the bread.' (Lk. 24. 35.) Here we see a sacramental reference of the utmost importance, as we shall attempt to explain in the following chapter.

John gives us a number of post-resurrection appearances² not recorded in the Synoptics. It is evident from these accounts that the fact that Jesus had risen from the dead becomes accepted as a fact, indeed a glorious fact, but is not "assimilated" fact. They had to wait for the outpouring of the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost before they saw what that fact became in the lives of men. As yet, the Spirit of truth had not come into their lives to renew their lives, so that they could proclaim the word of God with power in word and deed.

The conclusion is quite inescapable that all the disciples hoped for and believed, died with Jesus on the cross. With Him died their Messianic expectation of political freedom, and the establishment of the visible rule of Christ on earth. With Him died that part of themselves that had followed where He led them, that had wondered at His teaching and gloried in His presence. The Cross of Christ was not only the tragic and unjust death of a righteous man, but seemed to leave His work incomplete, unfinished. One is very conscious of this sense of utter incomprehension from the story of the discussion on the road to Emmaus. (Lk. XXIV. 13 ff.) This meaninglessness which surrounded the event of the cross and death of Christ is a clear and decisive indication that the teaching of Jesus could not be separated from His person. Where He was, there was meaning in His Being and Words and deeds. Not until the risen Lord had appeared to the disciples were they drawn out of their dejection, and bound together in some sort of unity. Thomas remained isolated before he saw Jesus, the risen Lord, and exclaimed, 'My Lord and my God!' (John XX. 28.) : isolated in his doubt and the deep meaninglessness of death, which in Christ was most acute. The disciples were really sharing in the death

1. E. Stauffer. op.cit.

2. John XX. 19-23, 24-29: XXI. 1-23.

of Christ in their experience, in a way which they were only later to understand.

The Person of Jesus was the embodiment of all He said.¹ Even the teaching which is most often universalized and taken in isolation from the Person of Christ will not permit such a dislocation. We are thinking of the ethical teaching of Jesus contained in the Sermon on the Mount. (Matt. V - VII. Luke. XII.) Throughout the instruction there is the note of personal authority which binds the teaching to the person of Christ. 'You have heard that it was said but I say to you ...' (Matt. V. 21, 22, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 39, etc., Lk. VI. 27.) The power over evil spirits belonged uniquely to Him, and was delegated to those He appointed (Matt. X. 1 ff.) His teaching always had as^a setting the coming of the Kingdom of God in His presence among men. The Gospels witness that He is related to men even before the Resurrection primarily through His presence among them, which makes Him utterly different from any mere teacher of spiritual truths. And it is kerygmatic structure which is characteristic of the Gospels.² They witness to a living Lord, not to a dead teacher. All this makes the quest for the historical Jesus no other more than an academic exercise.

The Resurrection of Jesus, the Christ, consequently has a central place in the New Testament. Without the Resurrection there is no New Testament, no gospel, no new creation. It is the sine qua non of all truly Christian doctrine, the event which throws light both on what Christ has done on the Cross and is doing in the life of the Church. The Resurrection of Jesus Christ is only secondarily a symbol of survival, primarily it is the symbol of renewal, and, as such, it is the soteriological symbol which incorporates in its meaning all other soteriological symbols. The earliest recorded sermons of the Church all proclaimed a risen Lord through whom alone salvation had come to man. (Acts II. 32f. III. 15f. IV. 10.f., XIII. 32f., XVII. 31f.) In the epistles of Paul and the Gospel of St. John, the keynote is the presence of the risen Christ who saves and renews, who grants light and life to those who believe in Him.

1. Cf. Tillich : Systematic Theology Vol. II. p.140ff. also
F. I. Forsyth : The Person and Place of Jesus Christ, p. 101ff.

2. Dodd. op. cit. pp. 46-52.

The Catholic and Pastoral epistles speak of an experienced salvation through the living Christ. (e.g. I Peter I. 3., II. 4., I John. 1. 3., II. 1f., II Tim. 1. 16.) So too the epistle to the Hebrews has as its central theme the High Priesthood of the Risen and Exalted Lord, whose life is offered for our life for ever in heaven. (Heb. II. 17, 18., V. 17f., VI. 13f., etc.)

How did the Church which gave us the New Testament witness to Jesus Christ, Lord and Saviour, see the resurrection of Jesus Christ? It is important that an attempt should be made to take up a position with regard to unbiblical interpretations of the resurrection. There have been those who have found the empty tomb, and with it the objective historicity of the event the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead unacceptable.

Let us consider the most important of these theories. 1. Two of these theories would make the event something purely subjective. The first, associated chiefly with Strauss and Renan and more recently with Bultmann,¹ held that the resurrection was really a psychological change in the disciples, which resulted in visions of Jesus as still living. If what we have found in this brief study about the disciples' attitude to the crucifixion is a true reflection of the biblical witness, it certainly on these grounds alone would make the theory untenable. The second theory in this category holds that the subjective apprehension of the disciples was the result of a 'telegram from heaven' which told them that Christ had risen. In other words, the resurrection stories in the Gospels are fabrications which try to make of a trans-historical event appear historical. 'To what purpose?', one may ask. Surely the New Testament emphasis is precisely that the risen Jesus is amongst His people, witnessing to His victory over death and sin. Such a theory fails to appreciate the meaning of the empty tomb as objective-historical event. It is a relapse into conceptions about the immortality of the soul. Thus one exponent of this theory believed that, 'the Resurrection of Jesus from the tomb involved intolerable difficulties concerning the nature of the future life, and he interpreted the Resurrection to mean that the spirit of Jesus survived, and was able to convey to the disciples

1. Cf. Kerygma and Myth. p. 42.

the certainty of His presence with them.'^{1.} This is just another case of an attempt to tell the Bible what it ought to be telling us!

ii. Another theory, whose chief exponent has been Kirsopp Lake, maintains that the Resurrection is a purely spiritual happening.^{2.} He is prepared to admit that Jesus appeared to His disciples in Galilee, but seeks to discount the evidence of the empty tomb in Jerusalem. (The Jews apparently also tried to discount the evidence of the empty tomb, but were unable to produce the body.) Lake thinks that the message of the angel, 'He is not here: behold the place where they laid Him' indicates that the women had come to the wrong tomb, and He was pointing out the right tomb. This is, of course, a desperate measure which cannot stand up to scrutiny in the light of the evident emphasis on the empty tomb in the Gospels. Why are Peter and John not told of the other tomb? Can we accept that the empty tomb is a biblical white lie? Again, one fears, it is scholarship, honest in intention, but prejudiced in approach.^{3.}

iii. One of the most well constructed theories of the Resurrection, which tries to do justice to both the subjective and objective understandings of the event, is the 'restitution' theory of Paul Tillich.^{4.} To attempt to understand what Tillich is saying, one has to come to terms with his terminology. He describes the Cross and the Resurrection of Christ as the two central symbols 'in which the universal meaning of Jesus as the Christ is expressed.' (ibid. p. 176.) He sees the theologian's task in relation to these central symbols as one of 'deliteralisation' and not of 'demythologisation', as Bultmann does. To silence the language of symbol and myth would be to 'silence the experience of the holy.' Both symbol and myth are expressions of religious realities which in a Christian witness would express the New Being in Jesus as the Christ, and they are to be criticised 'on the basis of their power to express what they are supposed to express'. (ibid. p.176.)

1. Ramsay. op.cit. p.50., where he states the view of Dr. Streeter in 'Foundations.'

2. Ramsay. ibid. p.52.

3. For a fuller discussion of these theories see 'The Resurrection of Christ'. A.M.Ramsay. pp. 48-53.

4. Systematic Theology. Vol. II. pp. 176 - 182.

How does Tillich relate the religious language of symbol and myth to the historical and incarnational witness of the Christian confession?

The two central symbols of the Christian in the New Testament are symbols based on fact, says Tillich. But there is a difference. "One could say that in the minds of the disciples and the writers of the New Testament the Cross is both an event and a symbol, and that the Resurrection is both a symbol and an event." (ibid. p. 177.) There is a clear distinction here of the greatest importance of Tillich's theory of restitution.

The understanding of the Cross is governed by the event, the Crucifixion of Jesus, whereas the event, the Resurrection of Jesus, becomes a projection of an experience, which seeks to express it's reality in the literalization of that experience. This difference in the relation of symbol and event, in the case of the two symbols, makes the Cross a 'Highly probable fact; the other a mysterious experience of a few.' (ibid. p. 177.) How does Tillich preserve the objective side of the

Resurrection on which he recognizes the New Testament lays 'tremendous significance.'? In what way are we to understand the Resurrection as historical event on which the New Testament also lays tremendous significance? Tillich has no adequate answer to these questions.

All he can say of the Resurrection as a factual event, is that it 'is a necessary implication of the symbol Resurrection ...' (ibid. 179.)

The symbol Resurrection, he says, was well-known as a mythological symbol in the mystery cults, (Of these the disciples certainly could only have a very scanty knowledge, if any at all, as Jews.) also in the belief in the Resurrection of the dead, which was accepted in the Judaism of our Lord's time. This Jewish belief in the Resurrection was always associated with the final establishment of God's Kingdom, and Jesus, like the martyrs, would be expected to rise at the Last Day. The Symbol could hardly have become the event the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead, on the basis of this belief on the part of the disciples. He maintains further that 'the disciples' assertion that the symbol had become an event, was dependent in part upon their belief that Jesus, who, as Christ, became the Messiah.' (ibid. 178.) We have seen in our preliminary study that, although the disciples believed that Jesus was the Messiah, especially after Caesarea Philippi, they completely misunderstood the significance of His Messianic Mission, which resulted in their desertion

of Jesus at the Crucifixion. Tillich seems to us to expect a complete change in the minds of each of the disciples within two days after the Crucifixion. (That is, if he is prepared to accept the chronology of the 'factual event' as given in the New Testament.) This, we contend, is not borne out by the New Testament witness. One should expect the appearances of our Lord, as recorded in the New Testament, to have been more readily acknowledged by the disciples. But, on the contrary, Mary Magdalene mistakes Jesus for a gardener in her grief; the women are frightened when they see the empty tomb, the disciples on the way to Emmaus are slow to understand the Scriptures, and do not, in fact, recognize the risen Christ until He reveals Himself in the breaking of bread! Thomas refuses to believe until he can place his finger in the marks of the nails, and his hand in His side. It was, in fact, not until Pentecost that Resurrection became an experience of the New Being in Christ for the disciples, and changed them from people gathered together for fear of the Jews to those who rejoiced to proclaim the risen Lord.

We are forced to conclude that Tillich does not do justice to the biblical witness to the historicity of the Resurrection. But he also fails to come to grips with the relation between the New Being in Christ and the Incarnation. If, as Tillich says, in Jesus as the Christ the destructive consequences of estrangement are conquered, the Resurrection means that our humanity is renewed by Christ. This is the vital New Testament witness to the centrality of the Cross and the Resurrection. Tillich's doctrine of Restitution, however, makes the Resurrection a psychological necessity, which issues in 'the certainty that he who is the bringer of the new eon cannot finally have succumbed to the powers of the old eon ..' (ibid. p.178.) In another place he says, "Faith provides the certainty that the death of Jesus of Nazareth was not able to separate the New Being from the picture of its bearer". (ibid. p.182.) A memory of what Jesus was, made it impossible that He should cease to be! But as J. W. Smith points out, 'The New Testament faith in the Risen Christ is surely a new experience in which the meaning of Jesus' death is a central element.'¹ Tillich does not find it possible to link the death of an individual man and his re-appearance as a spirit, with the experience of the disciples of the New Being in Christ. (cf. ibid. pp.180-1)

1. The Resurrection of Christ: Myth or History. An article in 'The Expository Times.' Vol. LXXII. No. 12.

This is because they are not so linked in the New Testament before the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. The salvation history does not end with the Resurrection of Jesus, the Christ from the dead, it is the history of the Church, His Body, in which, through the working of the witness of the Holy Spirit, the New Being in Christ renews those who believe in the Crucified, Risen and Ascended Lord. What Tillich claims for the effect upon the disciples of the Resurrection of Jesus, as the Christ, is more than the New Testament does, before the gift of the Holy Spirit. It is this latter event which unites the disciples with the New Being, and is 'rooted in the personal unity between Jesus and God.' (cf. *ibid.* P.182.)

Tillich attempts to give full expression to the soteriological significance of the Resurrection of Jesus, as the Christ, and its interdependence upon the Cross. It is the manner in which he relates the two symbols which we find unacceptable, on the basis of the clear witness of Scripture. For the symbol, the Cross of Christ, the factual and historical reality of the event is recognized and accepted. 'Certainly, the Cross of Jesus is seen as an event that happened in time and space.' (*ibid.* p. 177.) Because this man Jesus is no ordinary man, the meaning of His death is more than 'all men die.' The event, the Cross of Jesus, transcends the historical, by becoming symbol and myth. 'It is the myth of the bearer of the new eon who suffers the death of a convict and slave, under the powers of that old eon which He is to conquer. This Cross, whatever the historical circumstances may have been, is a symbol based on fact.' (*ibid.* p. 177.)

Surely the Cross came to be the symbol it is for the Christian Church precisely because the historical circumstances were what the New Testament says they were. Apart from the darkness which descended upon the city during the crucifixion, there is very little in the narrative which makes it suspect from the point of view of scientific history. One cannot, therefore, appreciate what need there is to detract from the strict historicity of the event, as such. Unless we had the narratives of the Passion and the Crucifixion of Jesus recorded and preserved by the Church, the symbol of the Cross may have remained the subjective experience of the disciples. One cannot heighten the subjective by playing down the

objective in a properly Christian context. A simple reading of the story of the Passion and Crucifixion often has much more effect than a profound exegesis of the meaning of the event. It is also services like Stations of the Cross which often revive faith and deepen understanding. We cannot allow our search for meaning to become divorced from the event which conveys meaning. This is what Tillich is inclined to do. The tendency comes out much more clearly in his discussion on the nature and significance of the symbol Resurrection. Although he acknowledges that the Resurrection, like the Cross, is 'symbol based on fact', it is clear from the discussion that follows, that he means 'fact based on symbol'. (ibid. 177-178.) As we have seen above, (p.) Tillich regards the symbol, Resurrection, as the universal, 'a familiar mythological symbol', and the Resurrection of Jesus the particular instance for Christian faith. To 'deliteralize' the Resurrection in this way is really to empty it of all meaning, other than the symbol Resurrection already has in its association with mythology. The Resurrection of Jesus is not primarily mythology, but primarily history. To say with Tillich of the historical objectivity that 'Theologically speaking, it is a rationalization of the event, interpreting it with physical categories that identify resurrection with the presence or absence of a physical body', (ibid. p. 179.) is really a failure to understand that here is a New Humanity in Christ, with a new possibility for man, which He has made through His death and Resurrection. To speak of the New Being in Christ as Tillich does, often sounds too much like Platonic idealism to make good Christian sense, and, as we have seen above, is, in fact, too much like Platonic idealism to make sound biblical sense.

There is one further objection which must be brought against Tillich's theory of restitution. Not only does the history of redemption seem to be taking place in the 'real' world of symbol and myth, but it appears to be restricted to the mind. According to the Restitution theory, 'the Resurrection is the restitution of Jesus as the Christ, a restitution which is rooted in the personal unity between Jesus and God, and in the impact of this unity on the minds of the disciples.' (ibid. p.182) The restitution consists in a remembrance of the nature of Him who died on the Cross, and a belief that He could not be overcome by the powers of death. Nothing more! The life of Jesus as the Christ is a revelation

of the New Being in him, and, as such, would constitute no more than the supreme example of a life which transcends the restrictions of this world. There is no recognition of the New Humanity in Christ which is the crucial significance of the Resurrection. Furthermore, for Tillich, the Resurrection, as restitution, is rooted in the mental activity of the disciple under the Divine influence. All the disciples, it would seem, experienced almost simultaneously the same spiritual certainty that Christ is risen, which 'is rooted in the personal unity between Jesus and God.' If this were so, the New Testament is, to say the least, very misleading about the nature of the disciples' response to the empty tomb. What are we to say about Thomas? What are we to say about the fact that Jesus ate fish with the disciples after His Resurrection? (John XXI. 9f.) Why the Biblical insistence on an objective presence of flesh and bones? Luke records our Lord's answer to the frightened disciples when they thought they saw a spirit as, 'Why are you troubled, and why do questionings arise in your hearts? See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have.' And He took a piece of broiled fish and ate it before them. (Lk. XXIV. 33-43.) What the New Humanity was like was not left to the inspired intuition of the disciples, it was revealed to them in the presence of Jesus Himself! It is to this revelation that the Christian Church is called to bear witness, and which that same Church has preserved in its records in the New Testament, which are the basis of all its teaching and doctrine. It is only on the occurrence of such an historical event that the response of the disciples could be based.

All the theories we have discussed fail to express the Christian verities, because they are not grounded in the historical biblical witness, but bring to the Bible preconceived ideas about the nature of the Resurrection. They are all subjective theories of the Resurrection, which do not accord to the historical the place it must have in Christian theology. Not one of the theories is prepared to give a positive meaning to the Resurrection of the Body. '..... the fact remains that the only authoritative account which we can ever possess is the one which is embodied in the New Testament as it stands. It is to this, and to no

other that the Christian must go; and from this and from no other that the preacher must expound the "good news" to his congregation. if he is to understand the spiritual message of the Resurrection, he must allow himself to enter into the thought-forms of the New Testament itself. If he is to see the Risen Christ at all, he must see Him first through the eyes of those who saw Him over nineteen centuries ago." ¹. We subscribe to this view. It is to the meaning of this Biblical doctrine that we next turn our attention.

The Resurrection of Christ and the Resurrection of the Body.

The Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, is to be seen and understood as an historical event, in accordance with the Biblical revelation. It means primarily that, in the year 32 or 33 A.D., the disciples of Jesus of Nazareth found the tomb in which He had been buried empty, and subsequently saw Him alive. The fact that the earliest written witness, I Cor. XV., mentions that 'He appeared to more than five hundred brethren at once' is quite adequate proof of the objectivity of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. On the basis of the event, the Resurrection of Jesus, the disciples could have reported that they had known a man, Jesus of Nazareth, who had lived a life of perfect communion with God, and who possessed exceptional spiritual insight and power; that He had been wrongfully condemned and crucified by the Jews, and that they had seen Him risen from the dead. And that appears to be all that the disciples were prepared to say in the period before Pentecost. There was, indeed, the joy at having the Lord with them again; even though He wasn't with them all the time, but, in spite of it, they drifted back to their fishing in Galilee. (John XXI. 2ff.) Then He left them altogether, (Luke XXIV 50 ff., Acts I. 9 ff.), as He had predicted. (John XVI. 5.) But He had also told them that it was to their advantage that He should go away, (John XVI. 7.) because, if He did not go away, the Counsellor, the Spirit of Truth, (John XV. 26) who would lead them into all truth and would convict the world of sin, of righteousness and judgment would not come. (John XVI. 8-11.) They were told to wait at Jerusalem for this gift. (Acts 1. 4.)

1. Yarnold, "Risen Indeed", p. 3.

The Ascension of Jesus the Christ into heaven, and the gift of the Holy Spirit are linked both in the Gospel according to St. John, and in the account of the actual events in the Book of the Acts. The Ascension is the symbol of the universality of the rule of Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is like the Resurrection, an event which is grounded in the historical, but which transcends the historical plane in its cosmic soteriological significance. About the historical aspect of the event, we say that there was an event after the Resurrection, when the disciples saw the Lord for the last time on earth. This is to start with one's roots firmly in the historical Biblical tradition. Like the Resurrection, the Ascension is an historical event, and whatever meaning it has come to have for the Church has been based on an appreciation of the theological significance of that event in the life of the Church.

How did the disciples come to proclaim that the crucified Jesus was both Lord and Christ? The answer given by the New Testament is that they had experienced certain events associated with the person of Jesus Christ in time and space, i.e. historical events which left an indelible impression upon them. If that was all, the New Being would be represented in the man Christ Jesus, and only in Him. The gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost reveals to them that these events have meaning for them, that they are renewed in the renewal of Christ through His death and resurrection. They preach repentance, faith and baptism into the name of Jesus Christ. (Acts. II. 38, 41.) They live together in a close-knit fellowship, sharing all their possessions, expressing their belonging together in the sharing of meals, and especially in the common fellowship with their Lord in the 'breaking of bread and prayers.' (Acts II. 42 ff.) The presence of the Lord with them is shown in their changed lives, and the new powers over sin and evil which have been bestowed upon them. The new creation in Christ has become the new creation, the Church, among men. Here, through the gift of the Holy Spirit, what was done in Christ is happening in the lives of those who believe in Him. This renewal of man through the Holy Spirit, and the establishing of the Church of God we shall call the Resurrection of the Body. It represents the final work of Christ accomplished in the lives of men, but not as yet complete. What happened in the human life of Christ has happened for the salvation

of all men, and is happening in the lives of all who believe in Him and are baptized into His name. Unlike their Lord, however, they are still in the flesh. Their being in the flesh, and in the world, causes the tension between what they are, and what they are meant to be. The conquest of sin is accomplished, but the conquest of sin is not complete. The work of Christ is going on in the lives of those who are joined to Him through faith and baptism through the power of the Holy Spirit. That is why St. Paul can say, 'It is my happiness to suffer for you. This is my way of helping to complete, in my poor human flesh, the full tale of Christ's afflictions still to be endured, for the sake of His Body, which is the Church.' (Col. 1. 24.)

The soteriological reference of the Resurrection of the Body combines the two eschatologies which we have seen in the New Testament witness. It is both a present reality and a future hope. As Christians are partakers of what Christ has done through His Death and Resurrection, so they are aware that what He has done is final and complete. But as they are partakers of what Christ is doing in the Church and in their lives, so they look forward to the final consummation of all things. That is why the Church could witness to the finality of salvation in Christ, and also to the future consummation of all things as complementary truths which are a direct result of their relationship to Christ. The Resurrection of the Body is both a present experience, and a future hope in the New Testament witness to the nature of the Christian life. The life and witness of the Church is in fact an expression of the New Being in Christ, both corporate and personal, both present and future, both historical and trans-historical; corporate because the Resurrection of the Body is based on the revelation of the New Israel of Old Testament expectation, personal because of the relationship of each member of the New Israel to Jesus Christ through faith and Baptism: Present in those who are reborn in Christ who have died to the life of sin and death, and risen with Jesus Christ into a new life of righteousness and holiness future as the hope of the fulfilment of what has been done in Christ in the flesh and in the world in which the Church finds itself: historical as having taken place in time: trans-historical as the eternal reality of the New Being, the renewal of man in Christ Jesus who lives now.

Summary:

1. The New Testament witness to Christ is to be seen as the fulfilment of the Old Testament witness to the nature of God, and the hope of the Jewish people. Attempts to make the New Testament, and especially the writings of St. Paul, appear basically Hellenistic, have been discarded by modern Biblical scholarship. But the New Testament as fulfilment is also the renewal of the Old Testament witness.
2. Against this background of fulfilment, is to be seen the proclamation of the coming of the Kingdom of God, which characterized the preaching of Jesus. The Kingdom would be the renewal of man, as we saw in chapter II. Jesus preached that in His person the time was fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God had come. The same message was the burden of the early preaching of the Church, in which the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead was a central feature. He who died and rose again had come to give new life to all men.
3. But the Kingdom of God is also seen as finding its fulfilment in the future, both in the preaching of Jesus, and the witness of the Church. How are these elements to be reconciled and related? The answer lies in the primarily soteriological nature of Christ's presence, which is seen supremely in His death and resurrection from the dead. We have to emphasize, therefore, the soteriological meaning of the Resurrection, and not restrict the soteriological act to the Cross. All theories of the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead, which do not recognize the objective-historical nature of that redemptive event, restrict the saving work of Christ to the Cross, and interpret the Resurrection in purely subjective personal terms, and are therefore not a true reflection of the biblical witness.
4. The Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is the final soteriological, as well as eschatological, reference in theology. Without a full recognition of the biblical emphasis on history and incarnation, the full soteriological significance of the Resurrection is lost, and it becomes merely a hope of survival.
5. In this connection, we saw the Resurrection of Jesus and the Resurrection of the Body as related, but not identical realities. The

Resurrection of Jesus is an event in redemption history, the Resurrection of the Body is the full story of redemption. Just as the Cross points forward to the Resurrection, so Ascension and Pentecost make the Resurrection a present reality for all who believe, by bringing the Resurrection of Christ into the lives of all the faithful. The Resurrection of Jesus from the dead refers to the Resurrection of one man, the Resurrection of the Body refers to the resurrection of all men in Christ. There is, however, no such thing as the Resurrection of the Body without the event, the Resurrection of Christ. The two cannot be separated, but they are not the same reality.

6. The renewal of man is a reality in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. On the Cross, He took upon Himself the consequences of sin, and suffered death for our sakes. In rising from the dead, He, in His Being, conquers sin and death. This new life becomes available to all men in union with Christ through the gift of the Holy Spirit. This is the new humanity in Christ, present in the Church which is His Body.

CHAPTER IV.

THE BODY OF CHRIST.

In the last chapter we saw that the Resurrection of the Body has soteriological as well as eschatological significance. In a Christian theology all eschatology is soteriological. The Resurrection of the Body represented for us the full biblical expression of the renewal of man in Christ through the working of the Holy Spirit. As such, it has both a present and future reference; as accomplished now in Christ yet to be fulfilled through Him who fills all in all. (cf. Eph. I. 22-3).

In this chapter we wish to discuss the essentially corporate nature of Man's renewal in Christ, as it is expressed in the New Testament. We wish to relate the Resurrection of the Body in its eschatological and soteriological reference to the expression of that reality in the world. Our concern will be with the Church as the dead and risen Body of Christ. The emphasis of the Resurrection Body is on the solidarity of all in Christ, sharing the salvation from sin and death. The individual is only seen in relation to the whole, and there is absolutely no place for the saving of souls in the sense of removing individuals from a state of sin and placing them in an isolated state of salvation. The salvation of one is bound up with the salvation of all. The New Testament doctrine of the Body is the key to this 'corporate solidarity'¹ of redemption.

The New Testament Doctrine of the Body:

In our discussion of the Old Testament doctrine of the nature of man, we found that any biblical doctrine must take a positive attitude towards creation as the act of God. It must relate the visible created order to the purpose of God, and not place it completely outside that purpose as did the Greeks, and as many Christians are inclined to do in their thinking. The sin of man has brought a destructive factor into creation which is expressed by death. Man is being unto death, and not

1. Cf. "The Christian Doctrine of Man" - Wheeler Robinson Chapter I.
"The Body" - J. A. T. Robinson. "Paul & Rabbinic Judaism" - W. D. Davies.

being unto God, but as being at all he is related to God.

In the New Testament witness the Old Testament thought forms are preserved and found to be filled with new meaning through the experience of the Spirit of God. Thus in St. Paul we find two terms which are used of the nature of man as man, i.e. sarx and soma. Both these terms express the solidarity of mankind but under different aspects. There is, however, a very important difference. Sarx, which means, literally, the flesh, refers to the aspect of man in his separation from God. Sarx remains the weak, the mortal flesh, which, although not evil in itself, is the realm in which evil easily manifests itself. The flesh itself is neutral. It has become the instrument of sin, and as such must die. The sins of the flesh are not distinguished from so-called spiritual sins, they, in fact, take their origin from man as sinner in his totality, and man in his totality, both seen as person, and the whole of humanity is bound in the flesh to sin. 'Flesh and blood can never possess the kingdom of God, and the perishable cannot possess immortality.' (I Cor. XV. 50, N.E.B.) It is this sarx which Christ came to redeem by taking^{it} upon Himself, and bearing it upon the Cross for our redemption. We may either die in the flesh, in our separation from God, or to the flesh in Christ.

The body as soma is seen as man 'in the solidarity of creation as made for God.'¹ The sarx denotes man in his otherness, in distinction to God exactly as did the Hebrew word basar man as man and not God. (cf. Is. XXXI. 3.) Soma denotes man in his potentiality as a child of God. In I Cor. VI. 13-20 the distinction between the body as sarx and the body as soma comes out clearly. The body as a physical organism will perish. Here the stomach (κοιλία) refers to the whole man as flesh. But the body (σῶμα) 'is not meant for ~~immortality~~^{immortality}, but for the Lord and the Lord for the body.' (v.13b.) The Christian's body has become part of Christ's Body, it is to be considered as part of Him who gives to man a new spiritual body. Therefore the body can be the temple of God, a thing the flesh could never be. But it should not be concluded that sarx denotes man as a purely physical organism which, because it is physical, is corrupt. For Paul sarx has become the physical expression of man's bondage to sin and death. Thus in Galatians V. 19f. Paul lists "spiritual" sins as well as 'fleshly' sins as sins of the flesh (σάρξ).

1. J. A. T. Robinson. "The Body". p. 31.

Sarx is man in positive rebellion against God, man united in Adam's sin and partaking of Adam's condemnation, being cast out from God's presence. Sarx refers, then, to a state of man, man considered under the categories of sin and death. This state finds expression in our visible bodies as corruptibility. It is irredeemable as it is man in his facticity¹ as sinner. Man as intended for God is soma. Under the conditions of sin the soma is being unto death and becomes identified with sarx. Man as soma is man as spiritual being aware of responsibility and the necessity of decision. Man under this aspect is redeemable, not, however, by self realization, for man as man cannot realize himself in any other way than the way that leads to bondage and death, 'While Paul promises no resurrection of the flesh, he proclaims it for the body; whereas man as sarx cannot inherit the Kingdom of God (I. Cor. 15. 50.) man as soma can.'²

The term soma is a general term referring to mankind as a whole. It is essentially a corporate concept, and, as such, does not stress individualization. Redemption and corruption as possibilities of the body are corporate concepts. (cf. Rom. XII. 1f., I Cor. XII. 3f., Eph. IV. 11ff. etc.) The redemption of man is within the Body of Christ as the new creation of God.

Soma denotes three important facts about man which are essential to a biblical understanding of the renewal of man in the Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

(a) It stresses the nature of creation as related to God in a positive manner, which distinguishes it from the Hellenistic outlook. It is in fact man in his polarity in relation to God and creation, as we saw in chapter II.

(b) It expresses the whole man in his being. There is no question of its being the soul of man as distinct from the body.

(c) It unites mankind in a solidarity which permits personal differences, but not individualization. We can never speak of the resurrection of the body in a purely individual sense. 'The body' never stands for or stresses self-sufficiency, self-determination, or isolation of each

1. By facticity we mean man as determined, in this case by sin.

2. Robinson. op. cit. p. 31.

man from his neighbour. It is used, rather, to symbolize the corporate solidarity of every person in the natural, historical and cosmic order, whether this is redeemed or unredeemed.'¹

The Body of Death:

The body of death is the solidarity in which man, as sinner, finds himself. In Adam all die. (I Cor. XV. 22.) 'It was through one man that sin entered the world, and through sin death, and thus death pervaded the whole human race, inasmuch as all men have sinned.' (Rom. V. 12.) Death and sin are seen in this passage as in all Paul has to say about it in the closest possible relation to sin. 'The wages of sin is death...' (Rom. VI. 23a.) The whole man is bound under sin, and so under death. The revelation of the will of God, instead of freeing man from the bondage, becomes an instrument of sin in that it deceives men into thinking that they can be righteous without renewal; without being delivered from the bondage of corruption. Paul says, 'For sin finding opportunity in the commandment, deceived me, and by it killed me.' (Rom. 7. 2.) It is, however, not the Law itself which brings death, but sin through the Law. 'Did that which is good, then, bring death to me? By no means: It was sin working death in me through what is good.....'

Death is not simply what happens to the physical organism at the end of life, but the experience of living in defiance of God's will and purpose. This is the condition of all men. Paul speaks of death as a present experience in the life of the sinner. Speaking of the former condition of those who were Gentiles, and were now saints, he says, 'Time was when you were dead in your sins and wickedness.....' (Eph. II. 1f.)¹ This is the frightening reality of death, as man in his wilful separation from God experiencing the wrath of God, and it is this which separates the death of man from the death of the animal. Man is a responsible being, the animal is not. Man can see his being as being unto death, and death as life bound in sin from which there is no human means of escape as all men die. This threat of non-being is part and parcel of our daily experience as sinners. The fact that all die is no consolation, because it means that those who are nearest and dearest to me live, like myself, under the condemnation of death. Stoicism in the face of death can only

1. We accept that Ephesians represents Paul's thought.

be the result of the deadening of one's awareness of life, and, as such, can never be Christian. It is only by being confronted with the reality of death that we can see the reality of sin. The experience of sickness, suffering in the flesh, and all the mental anguish of disrupted relationships is an experience of death, and all are death manifesting itself in the flesh, for they all are means whereby the final expression of death, as the death of the body (soma) eventually is realized.¹

God has identified Himself with man's condition in Christ, not as sinner, but as Man under the conditions of the solidarity of sin, in the body of death. In the body of death, but as He who has power over the forces which hold man in bondage to death, and as such the victor over death. This we saw in the discussion of the nature of Christ in Chapter III. In Him the life of God is manifested in human flesh, and in Him the redemption of God is mediated through the death of the Cross. Death acquires a new significance as a path to God, and not a path to perdition. Emil Brunner, in his book 'Eternal Hope' has a chapter entitled 'Death as the Transition to Eternal Life', in which he discusses the nature of Christ's death. In His death we see the meaning of our death and the conquest of our death, the one with the other as belonging to the same truth about God. 'Only in Him can we measure what our condition is. By that event once only, once for all, the cataract of our self-deception is pierced and we are given a clear-eyed awareness of ourselves.'²

Death is revealed as not merely biological fact, as the Greeks would have us believe in the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, but existential reality; man in his separation from God. Bound with us in the body of this death, Christ experiences death in all its existential reality, as Oscar Cullmann has stressed. 'Jesus knows that in itself, because death is the enemy of God, to die means to be utterly forsaken. Therefore he cries to God: in^{the} face of this enemy of God he does not want to be alone. He wants to remain as closely tied to God as He was throughout His earthly life. For whoever is in the hands of death is no longer in the hands of God, but in the hands of God's enemy.'³ Thus Christ conquers death not by 'living on as an immortal soul, thus fundamentally not dying;

1. 'Physical expiration is the outward confirmation of being in fact already dead.' - Robinson. op. cit. p.36.

2. E. Brunner. op. cit. p. 109

3. 'Immortality of the Soul or the Resurrection of the Dead?' pp. 22-23.

but 'by betaking Himself to the sphere of death, the destroyer of life, to the sphere of 'nothingness', of abandonment by God.' ¹.

The Cross in itself is not the Gospel of Man's redemption. In itself it presents man with the greatest tragedy of all time, as the final revelation of sin and death. With St. Paul, we do indeed preach Christ crucified, but as Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. (I Cor. 1. 23, 24.) The Gospel is the Gospel of the Risen Lord, and, as such, the proclamation of the hope and salvation of man. 'This realization of the significance of the death of Christ is only possible because Jesus Christ is proclaimed to us as the Risen Lord.' ². The Resurrection is the key to the meaning of Christ's death, without which the Cross would remain the proclamation of man's condemnation, the final act of man's rejection. Through the Resurrection it stands revealed as the final act of man's redemption. The body of death is done away in Christ, and with it the power of sin. Man is not freed from dying, but from death. Only in dying with Christ can death be conquered.

The Body of Christ.

'The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is the doctrine of the redemption and replacement with one solidarity by another - the body of the old mortality by the Body of Christ.'³. This is the redemption theme which runs through the epistles of Paul, and is the basis of his doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ. The solidarity of man under the dominion of sin and death is replaced by the new solidarity in the body of the Resurrection of Christ from the dead. The self-identification of Christ with man in the body of death is not the assimilation of the Godhead by man, but the taking of manhood upon himself by the Son of God. 'Bearing the human likeness, revealed in human shape (σχήματι) He humbled Himself. and, in obedience, accepted even death - death on the cross.' (Phil. II. 8. N.E.B.) He who thus humbled Himself was none other than the Divine Logos, the Creator of all things. 'He is the image of the invisible God; His is the primacy over all created things. In Him everything in heaven and on earth was created,

¹ ^{Callmann} ibid. p. 25.

² E. Brunner. op. cit. p.110.

³ J.A.T. Robinson. 'In the End. God ...' p.39.

..... the whole universe has been created through Him and for Him'.
 (Col. I. 15-16.) The death and resurrection of the Divine Logos is
 a new creation into which the whole creation is drawn. (II Cor. V. 17.)
 The new solidarity has overcome the old solidarity, but not supplanted
 it. 'As in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive.'
 (I Cor. XV. 22.) The new creation is a new creation in Christ, which
 is not merely the formation of a new 'stuff', but of a new being. The
 new body in Christ, therefore, refers not only to the new spiritual
 condition of the person, but to the conduct of the person who is in
 Christ. Thus it is initiated in baptism and realized through faith.
 Faith and baptism are always so linked in the New Testament. (cf. Acts. II.
 38. VIII. 36f., XVI. 15.) 'What Christ has done in His flesh-body has
 been through baptism, and must be in conduct, reproduced in the life of
 the Christian.'¹

This sacramental emphasis is integral to Paul's teaching on the
 Body of Christ as the 'vehicle' of man's salvation in Christ. 'Have
 you forgotten that when we were baptized into union with Christ Jesus,
 we were baptized into His death? By baptism we were buried with Him,
 and lay dead, in order that, as Christ was raised from the dead in the
 splendour of the Father, so also we may set our feet upon the new path
 of life. For if we are incorporate with Him in a death like His, we
 shall also be one with Him in a resurrection like His.' (Rom. VI. 3-6.
 N.E.B.) Brunner does not accord baptism its proper place in his
 discussion of the new life in Christ. (cf. Chapters 12 & 15 of *Eternal
 Hope*.) He presents us with an almost purely subjective interpretation
 of the incorporation of the individual into the new life in Christ.
 '.... faith is already the beginning of a new and risen life, because
 faith in the death of Jesus as marking the judgment on my life implies
 an actual dying, even though not a dying in the biological sense. To
 believe means objectively to die to believe means objectively to
 rise again as the new man - Christ in me.'² The objective aspect of
 the new life is not belief in Paul, but baptism. Brunner would be more
 correct if he had said, 'To believe is subjectively to die,' for that

1. Robinson. "The Body", p. 43.

2. Brunner. *op. cit.* p.110.

is what he meant. Faith and baptism belong together, because together they express the biblical teaching regarding our being in Christ. The nature of faith is response. The objective reality to which my faith is the response is the re-creation of my being in Christ, which is expressed in baptism. If I believe, I seek to be baptized, if I am baptized I should realize my new being in faith. It is only towards the end of his discussion that he rather belatedly adjusts his perspective. 'What we experience chiefly as coming to faith or a coming to Christ, is, in reality, a movement of the Church towards me, in virtue of the word of the preacher, of baptism, of my incorporation into the body of Christ. It is not I who go, but Christ who comes'¹. This is, in fact, where we begin, within the Body of Christ the Church, not as individuals. We cannot begin to speak about the new being in Christ without thereby speaking of the Church in its fullness as the new solidarity of man in Christ, and only secondarily of individual in the new context.

Just as baptism expresses and effects the new creation of man through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, so the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord is the sacrament which expresses the nature of our life in Christ. It is the outward symbol of the new solidarity. The Institution of the Lord's Supper is where our Lord links His disciples sacramentally with Him in His death and resurrection. 'This is my Body given for you This is my blood shed for you,' means no less at the Last Supper than it does at any celebration of the Eucharist. The disciples are drawn into the solidarity which is to link them in all eternity with God: they partake of the eternal being of Christ which is yet to be manifested fully in His Resurrection Body, and fully given through the gift of the Holy Spirit. The teaching of the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel brings out the sacramental nature of our union with Jesus Christ in almost materialistic terms. 'Truly, truly, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh (of the Son of man and drink His blood you have no life in you; he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me and I in him.' (John VI. 53-56.) The fact that these words are 'spirit and life', does by no means make them purely

1. *ibid.* p.151.

subjective as some would have us believe. On the contrary, they are sacramental, expressing the nature of our new life in Christ as being united in the closest possible manner with His glorified body. The same emphasis is seen in Paul in his exhortation on the Eucharist, in the tenth and eleventh chapters of I Corinthians. The participation in the body and blood of Christ is through participation of the bread and the cup. 'Because there is one loaf we, who are many, are one body, for we all partake of the same loaf.' (I Corinthians X. 15-17.) Paul goes on to link the Eucharist in the closest manner with the risen life in Christ. 'Whoever, therefore, eats the bread and drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of profaning the body and blood of the Lord. That is why many of you are weak and ill and some have died.' That some had died was, for Paul, a clear indication that the risen life of Christ could not have been in them. The Eucharist is clearly the sacramental reality of our being, as being in Christ and our participation in the risen Life of Christ. The sacraments are central in the Church's worship because they are vital to the Church's life.

In the sacraments, then, we are brought into the closest possible union with Christ. The sacraments express the corporate nature of the Church as the Body of Christ. Baptism is never an individual thing, but the incorporation of someone into the new life in Christ. The new life in Christ is not my possession, but my inheritance as a member of the Body of Christ with all the other members of Christ's Body. Baptism as a sacrament has so often been relegated to the back of the Church, and pushed to one side in a place where only a few can gather round. It is hoped that baptism will be reinstated theologically, as well as in the architecture of the Church. Similarly, the Eucharist is essentially the central act of Christian worship, for it effects most fully our corporate redemption in Christ.

The Resurrection life is a present reality experienced in the life of the Church, the Body of Christ. But, and this is a very important 'but': the individual is not extracted from the situation of sin and death, but redeemed within it, because the Church is in the world as Christ was in the Incarnation. 'There is no redemption for the individual out of this mass, but only in it and with it. The

Christian Gospel is not of the saving of individuals out of nature and history (these things themselves considered merely as a vale of soul-making), but the redeeming of all the myriad relationships of existence into a new heaven and a new earth, the City of God, the Body of Christ (vide Rom. VIII. 19-23., Phil. III. 21, etc.)¹. The Church, in other words, continues the work of Christ in the world. The Church does not point men back to a Saviour who lived thousands of years ago, but proclaims that that Saviour lives, and has become contemporaneous with us in his Body the Church. Thus, the form of the Resurrection life of the Church is the form of a Cross. Not, however, the Cross with a dead or dying Christ, but a Cross with a living Lord. The experience of the new solidarity in Christ in the world is an experience of dying. 'But the strange and characteristic fact is that this new life assumes the form of a dying.'² Thus continually Paul rejoices in his sufferings, and exhorts other Christians to do the same. (II Cor. IV. 7-12., Phil. 1. 29; II. 5-11; III. 8; Col. 1. 24; vide Pet. 1.6f.) Paul expresses the nature of his experience of the new life in Christ as a becoming like Christ in His death. (Phil III. 10.) The resurrection life is not life for oneself, but life for others, for it is the life of Christ. It is not to be had as a possession, but is life as expressed as life for others, in Christ.

What, then, of the death of the body? How is the obvious observable death of Christians to be reconciled with having eternal life as members of the Church?

What is overcome by Christ is not the death of the flesh (σάρξ) but the death of the body (σώμα). 'Though our outer nature (ἐξω ἀνθρώπου) is wasting away, our inner nature (ἐσω ἀνθρώπου) is being renewed every day.' (II Cor. IV. 16.) This does not mean that we have to say, with Oscar Cullmann, that, 'There is a sense in which a kind of approximation to the Greek teaching does actually take place, to the extent that the inner man, who has already been transformed by the Spirit (Romans 6. 3ff.), and consequently made alive, continues to live with Christ in his transformed state,'³. The inner man (ἐσω ἀνθρώπου) who continues to live is the resurrected being in

1. Robinson: 'In the End, God....' p.89.

2. E. Brunner. op. cit. p.111.

3. Cullmann. op. cit. p. 56.

Christ; resurrected in baptism. The death of the body is the final severance of the link with the old order, it is the final casting off of the old man. 'Each individual, when and as he comes into Christ, begins to put on the new man. The resurrection of the body begins, not at death, but at baptism (cf. I Cor. XV. 29.) What happens at death does not concern the new body but the old.'¹ This does not, however, mean that the individual is immediately clothed with the Resurrection Body. The Resurrection Body, as we have seen, does not refer to the nature of the individual's state after death, but to the corporate reality, the Body of Christ, in which all Christians participate. There is no salvation of the individual apart from the Body. When St. Paul desires to depart and be with Christ, he is not saying anything about the nature of the life hereafter other than it is being with Christ in a closer union. In Cullmann's words, 'So then, a man who lacks the fleshly body is yet nearer Christ than before....'² The dead are nearer to Christ, but they are not as yet perfected in Him. The final fulfilment must wait for the Parousia.³

The Parousia:

Many commentators have pointed out how the expectation of the Parousia plays a prominent part in the Pauline epistles. In the earliest epistles its prominence is more marked than the later epistles, where the delay in our Lord's coming caused a change in emphasis. Paul clearly expected the Lord to come during his life time. The death of some of the Christians before the Parousia troubled the Thessalonians, and it is to set their minds at rest that he replies that, those who are alive will 'in no wise precede those who have fallen asleep.' (I Thess. 4. 13ff.) (It needs to be noted that 'sleep' does not refer to a state of unconsciousness, a state of separation from God such as Sheol. The designation of those who are dead as those who sleep, points to a consciousness other than that experienced in the world.⁴) The Christians who remained, would be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, to join those who had risen first (v. 18.) and had been brought by God

1. Robinson. "In the End, God...." p.98.

2. Cullmann. *ibid.* p.54.

3. *vide* Cullmann, *ibid.* p. 49., where he criticises Karl Barth's view stated in "Die Kirkliche Dogmatik".

4. On this point *vide* Cullmann *ibid.* pp. 49-57.

from the dead, through Jesus. (v.14.) We see here an apparent contradiction in verses 14 and 16. In verse 14, Paul says, that at the Parousia, the dead will be present with Jesus, while in verse 16, it is stated that the dead in Christ will rise first. Both, of course, are true. As we have seen from the foregoing, resurrection as the new life in the Body of Christ is a present and eternal reality, which cannot be destroyed by death. Those who are asleep are, therefore, with Christ, for nothing can separate the Christian from Christ, not even death, and especially not death. (cf. Rom. VIII. 35ff.) But until the coming of Christ the dead are in an interim state (cf. Callmann. *ibid.* p.53.) waiting with the living for the consummation of all things.

This state of being asleep in Christ, of being 'with' Him, (Phil. 1. 23.) is described by Paul in another passage, i.e. II Cor. V. 1ff. The prospect of death in no way pleases Paul. He has no desire to be 'unclothed', to be found 'naked', but rather to be clothed with the 'heavenly dwelling.' There are two points to be noticed here. Firstly, that Paul clearly does not expect to be clothed immediately after death with the resurrection body, but that he would experience the nakedness of being stripped of the body. The second is that the 'heavenly dwelling' (*οικουμένη*), the 'house not made with hands eternal in the heavens' refers to the Body of Christ, not to an individual body.¹ The dead are joined to the living in the body of the Resurrection, which is experienced through the Spirit, who is the guarantee (*ἀρραβών*) of eternal life.

It is this belief in the Communion of the Saints which has so often been shifted into the background in Protestant thinking. P.T. Forsyth boldly advocated prayer for the dead. 'I venture to say, then, that the instinct and custom of praying for our dearest dead should be encouraged and sanctified as a new bond for practical life between the seen and the unseen, where we have bonds all too few.'² When one is reminded of the reaction which is evoked in certain circles at the mention of prayer for the dead, one realizes how Christian faith and practice has been impoverished. It is significant that in the

1. vide Robinson. "The Body". p. 76ff.

2. "This Life and the Next". p.36

Eucharist our worship is with angels and archangels and all the company of heaven. It is worship within the Body of Christ where prayer is properly made for the whole state of Christ's Church. In this connection it should be mentioned that those who are with Christ are also praying for those in the flesh. There is absolutely nothing in a properly biblical doctrine of the Body of Christ to lead us to believe anything less than that those who have departed this life are interceding for us.

The Parousia, then, will be the final victory of God's love when all will be fulfilled in the Body of Christ. (Eph. 1. 23.) Thus, the eschatological note is a very important one in Christian worship. "We proclaim the Lord's death until He comes." (I Cor. XI. 26.) As heirs (Rom. VIII. 17f.) we wait for our inheritance; as adopted sons; 'The whole creation has been groaning in travail together until now; and not only the creation, but we ourselves, who have the first fruits (^{ἀπαρχῆς}) of the Spirit, groan inwardly as we wait for adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies.' (Rom. VIII. 22-23.)

CHAPTERS III & IV.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- | | |
|---|---|
| The Teaching of Jesus | T. W. Manson. |
| The Apostolic Preaching & Its Development. | C. H. Dodd. |
| A Theological Word Book of the Bible. | Ed. Richardson. |
| New Testament Studies. | C. H. Dodd. |
| The Resurrection of Christ. | A. M. Ramsay. |
| Primitive Christianity. | R. Bultmann. |
| Jesus Christ, The Risen Lord. | Floyd V. Filson. |
| Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection
of the Body. | O. Callmann. |
| The Body. | J. A. T. Robinson. |
| In the End, God ... | J. A. T. Robinson. |
| The New Testament against its Environment. | Floyd V. Filson. |
| Corinthians - I. C. C. Commentary. | |
| Corinthians, Colossians & Ephesians. - Interpreter's Bible. | |
| Paul & Rabbinic Judaism. | W. P. Davies. |
| The Gospel of the Hereafter. | J. Paterson Smyth. |
| This Life and the Next. | P. T. Forsyth. |
| Eternal Hope. | Brunner. |
| Is Death the End? * | Carrol E. Simcox. |
| The Christian Doctrine of Man. | Wheeler Robinson. |
| The Resurrection of Christ: Myth or History? | J. W. D. Smith.
Article in "Expository Times"
Vol. LXXII. No. 12. |
| Systematic Theology. Vol. II | Paul Tillich. |
| An Introduction to the Theology of the
New Testament. | Richardson. |
| New Testament Theology. | E. Stauffer. |
| Jesus and His Church. | Newton Flew. |
| Death in God's Design. | B. A. Martin.
Article in "Theology",
Vol. LXIV. No. 495. |