

THE FACT AND MEANING OF THE
R E S U R R E C T I O N

A STUDY IN EMPHASES

By

JEAN-FRANCOIS BILL, B.A. (Rhodes).

Thesis submitted in part fulfilment
of the requirements for the Degree of
BACHELOR OF DIVINITY
at Rhodes University, Grahamstown,
South Africa.

CONTENTS.

	page
Preface.....	ii
Summary.....	iii
Prologue.....	vi
INTRODUCTION <u>'The Lord is Risen Indeed'</u>	1
CHAPTER ONE <u>The Resurrection in the Teaching of</u> <u>the New Testament</u>	8
1. The First Preachers.....	8
2. The Gospel Writers.....	11
3. St. Paul.....	16
4. St. John.....	22
5. The 'Author'.....	29
CHAPTER TWO <u>The Resurrection in the Life and Wor-</u> <u>ship of the Primitive Church</u>	32
1. Primitive Worship.....	32
2. The Rite of Christian Baptism.....	38
3. The Eucharist.....	44
CHAPTER THREE <u>The Resurrection in the Teaching of</u> <u>the Fathers</u>	48
1. The Apostolic Fathers.....	48
2. The Apologists.....	55
3. Irenaeus.....	61
4. Athanasius and the Christological Controversy.....	65
5. St. Augustine.....	70
CHAPTER FOUR <u>The Resurrection in the Theology of the</u> <u>Middle Ages and the Reformation</u>	75
1. Anselm of Canterbury.....	76
2. St. Thomas Aquinas.....	79
3. John Calvin.....	84
CHAPTER FIVE <u>Conclusions</u>	89
Epilogue.....	99
Notes.....	100
Bibliography.....	103

PREFACE.

Last year I was privileged to work for a few months in a congregation where I was well and truly initiated into the duties of pastoral responsibility. Even in such a short time I became conscious of the lack of awareness on the part of the Church that our Lord is a Risen and Living Person. Upon reflection it seemed to me that while not denying the Resurrection of Christ, we often fail to recognize its significance in the life and worship of the Church and of her members. We are prone to worship a story-book Christ rather than the exalted and abiding Christ, and to serve the Christ of twenty centuries ago rather than the living and present Christ. It was with these thoughts in mind that I chose, under the guidance of my Professor, Dr. W.D. Maxwell, the Resurrection as the subject of my thesis. It proved to be a most stimulating and invigorating study, widening my vision of Him who has called me to His Service, deepening my devotion to Him, strengthening my faith in Him, and infusing in me a greater will to preach to my fellowmen, His Kingdom and Him as the Risen and Living Lord.

That this has been a fruitful study is due largely to the patient and encouraging help and direction given to me by my tutor, Dr. Maxwell, to whom I take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude and appreciation for all that he has taught me. I should also like to thank Professor J-L.Cattanéo for revising the translations of the French quotations and Mrs. Elaine Milne for her painstaking work in typing the stencils.

Throughout this thesis the Revised Standard Version of the Bible has been used. The books from which I have drawn my information are listed in the bibliography where the title, author, publishers and the date of publication are indicated. Where a book was used for only a passing reference or quotation, that information is given in footnotes.

J-F. B.

October, 1958.
Grahamstown.

SUMMARY.

INTRODUCTION.

The fact of the Risen Christ is the focal point which gives meaning to the Christian faith as a whole. Modern thought, while not denying the Resurrection, tends to confine it to its doctrinal or credal significance. In contrast, the early Christians were conscious of the presence of the Risen Lord and consequently the Resurrection was a fact of living experience. As mere history it loses its moral significance; as mere faith it becomes vague belief in deathlessness, and undermines the reality of the Atonement. The Resurrection is both fact and faith.

CHAPTER ONE.

The First Preachers - The Resurrection, an integral part of the Kerygma, was proclaimed as an act of God, of which the Apostles were witnesses, and which the Jews could not refute.

The Gospel Writers - The Gospels are not legal documents upon whose evidence final judgment on the Resurrection can be pronounced. They must be considered as records of the life of Christ bearing the united testimony that He is Risen. While there are contradictions in the detail of their testimony, they are undivided in the declaration that the women who visited the tomb found it empty and that Christ subsequently revealed Himself to His disciples. Their faith was based on their knowledge of the Risen Christ and substantiated by the fact of the empty tomb. They encountered Jesus not as a disembodied spirit nor as a revived physical body, but as the transformed and glorified Lord - the same yet changed.

St. Paul - Faith and Life in the living Christ is the undercurrent of Pauline thought, which expresses itself principally in three ways: (i) The believer lives in mystical union with his Risen Lord. (ii) Salvation is the result of this union of faith with Christ through whom the believer is forgiven and empowered to overcome evil and live the new life. (iii) Christ's Resurrection is the archetype of the resurrection of the dead. All who are in Christ will be raised from corruption to incorruption, receive a resurrection body and partake fully in Life Eternal.

St. John - St. John sees, behind the historical Resurrection, the reality of Eternal Life which is the gift of Jesus Christ. All who receive this gift by faith and through the Holy Spirit, who points to the Risen Christ, are saved. In the apocalypse Christ is portrayed as the reigning Lamb who is at once the Crucified and the Risen Lord.

The Author - The redeeming work of Christ is expressed in priestly and sacrificial terms. Through His sacrifice on the Cross the believer's sins are expiated, and the believer himself forgiven. Through His victory and exaltation in the Resurrection and Ascension the way to the Holy of Holies is opened and the believer is given access to the Father. This is the work of Christ the High Priest and Advocate.

CHAPTER TWO.

Primitive Worship - The Resurrection gave new meaning and direction to the elements of worship in the primitive Church, which were derived from the synagogue. The institution of the Lord's Day and the phenomenon of speaking with tongues were marks of primitive worship derived directly from the fact and meaning of the Resurrection.

The Rite of Christian Baptism - Christian baptism is a sacrament in which the Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ are dramatically enacted in the life of the initiate, and through which he is incorporated into the Body of Christ - His Church.

In the 3rd and 4th centuries the administration of baptism was marked by certain actions which clearly declared the living and active presence of Christ.

The Eucharist - The Lord's Supper was a meal of fellowship at which all were conscious of the presence of the living Christ. It was an act of thanksgiving for the victorious death of Christ and of participation in the blessings of His atoning work. It was a meal which foreshadowed the final Messianic Meal and expressed the unity of the Body of Christ.

CHAPTER THREE.

The Apostolic Fathers - St. Clement explains the meaning of the Resurrection by the analogy of the phoenix bird. Ignatius insists on the historicity of the events in the life of Christ and expresses faith in the Risen Lord by his bold acceptance of death, knowing that he shares both the suffering and the victory of Christ. Polycarp's life and death are "commentary" on the Resurrection as a fact of living experience.

The Apologists - Justin Martyr relates the Resurrection to the symbolism of the Day of the Sun as the day of Christian worship. But he fails to understand fully the Person and Work of Christ when he gives Him second rank in the Trinity. Yet he shows an awareness of the general belief about the Resurrection and urges for a simple acceptance of the hope of our resurrection. Tertullian explains the Resurrection in terms of the day of judgment. His theory of the departed souls inhabiting the underworld and continuing to suffer between death and the resurrection, undermines the efficacy of Christ's victory over sin and death. He also explains the resurrection of the body in terms close to those of revivification.

Irenaeus - Irenaeus' theology is strongly incarnational but at the same time he keeps close to the Apostolic tradition. Emphasis is laid upon the victory of Christ's death. Our hope of resurrection is founded in His victory. But Irenaeus speaks of the restoration rather than the transformation of the body at the resurrection.

Athanasius - Athanasius upheld the Apostolic teaching on the Person of Christ and was largely responsible for the Church's rejection of Arianism. He emphasizes the victory of Christ's death as a reality because the Incarnation is a reality and shows its importance in the Atonement and as the hope of our resurrection. This is testified by those who face death undaunted and overcome evil. However the implication of restoration rather than transformation at the resurrection is present in Athanasius' thought.

St. Augustine - The influence of St. Augustine's philosophical background prevents him from appreciating fully the historical life of Jesus. God is seen to be remote and His purpose is conceived as redeeming the elect to make up the number of fallen angels in the heavenly city. The resurrection is the last stage in the redemption of the elect whereby they are transformed from corruption to incorruption. He insists that this transformation is not resuscitation but follows the pattern of Christ's Resurrection.

CHAPTER FOUR.

Anselm of Canterbury - Anselm's view of the Atonement that Christ's sacrifice of death is a satisfaction made to the justice of God, denies the place and reality of the Resurrection. He considers that immortality is part of man's original nature, to which he is restored by the Atonement. Once restored he is changed into incorruptibility. This is a further denial of the reality of the Resurrection of Christ as the ground of our own.

St. Thomas Aquinas - St. Thomas expounds the Resurrection from the point of view of eschatology and although he indulges in speculation, remains close to the teaching of the Scriptures.

The souls of the departed dwell in a place prepared by and known only to God, where they await the resurrection of the body. This is an act of God and the body that is raised differs in condition but not in identity from the old body.

John Calvin - Calvin sees the relevance of each aspect of the Atonement in relation to the whole. The Death and Resurrection of Christ are inclusive of each other and totally interdependent. The implications of Christ's victorious death are that the believer receives Eternal Life, is empowered to live this new life, and looks forward to his own resurrection when he shall be changed from corruption to incorruption.

CHAPTER FIVE.

Conclusions - The teaching of the Church on the Resurrection is evaluated in the light of the Apostolic Tradition and from the eschatological, soteriological and existential points of view.

Eschatologically the apostolic teaching emphasized the Resurrection of the whole being as the transformation and glorification of body and spirit. But later thought admitted foreign elements in the interpretation of the Resurrection through adoption of pagan categories or philosophical concepts.

Soteriologically, the Apostolic witness was that Christ - Incarnate, Crucified, Risen and Ascended - is our atonement. Later, the one-sided emphasis on the Incarnation and the idea of God needing to be satisfied, laid exclusive emphasis on one aspect of the Atonement at the expense of other aspects which tended to be isolated from each other rather than viewed as a whole.

Existentially, the Apostles taught that the Resurrection is a fact of living experience. Ascetic and monastic tendencies, while not denying His presence, and the greater emphasis on the eschatological significance of the Resurrection, tended to overshadow the truth that in the Risen Lord the believer is able to overcome the world.

PROLOGUE

Do not be amazed; you seek Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified. He has risen! Mark 16:6.

This Jesus, delivered up according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God, you crucified and killed by the hands of lawless men. But God raised him up, having loosed the pangs of death, because it was not possible for him to be held by it.
Acts 2: 23-24.

For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his son, much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by his life. Romans 5:10.

For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we shall certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his. We know that our old self was crucified with him so that the sinful body might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin. For he who has died is freed from sin. But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him. For we know that Christ being raised from the dead will never die again; death no longer has dominion over him. The death he died he died to sin, once for all, but the life he lives he lives to God. So you also must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus. Romans 6:5-11.

But if there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised; if Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is in vain and your faith is in vain. I Corinthians 15:13-14.

Salvation belongs to our God who sits upon the throne, and to the Lamb! Blessing and glory and wisdom and thanksgiving and honour and power and might be to our God for ever and ever! Amen. Revelation 7:10,12.

INTRODUCTION - 'THE LORD IS RISEN INDEED!'

Delivering the Warrack Lectures to theological students and ministers, at St. Mary's College, St. Andrew's, and New College, Edinburgh, Professor James Stewart, speaking of the Resurrection, said "This is no appendix to the faith. This is the Faith. He is Risen. The Lord is Risen indeed. To preach this is your life-work: and there is no Gospel without it."¹ Such an affirmation is much needed in modern Christianity. Modern Protestantism in particular, awakening to its shortcomings and realising its need for a revival of faith and witness, must, if it is going to meet the challenge of our day, recapture the tremendous truth of the Resurrection. It must live and move in the atmosphere of the Resurrection. It must become as conscious of the risen and living Christ as were the Apostles - the first living stones of the Church. The Church of Jesus Christ is the Church of the Reigning Lord and King of Heaven. "Born"² of the Holy Spirit who awakened the resurrection-faith³ of the Apostles at Pentecost, the Church must continue to live and grow by the empowering of the Holy Spirit who makes contemporaneous and real to succeeding generations, the presence of the Risen Christ.

There can be no doubt that the Apostles lived in this vibrant atmosphere for they were always vitally conscious of their Risen Lord. They did not regard the Resurrection as an epilogue to the life of their Master, nor did they think of it as the re-animation of His body, like that of Lazarus, but the whole trend of the New Testament shows us that for them the Resurrection meant the perpetuation of the encounter between God and man. They saw it as the culmination of victory and triumph for Jesus - true God, true man - over all the powers of evil and death. They saw it as part of God's redemptive act. They saw in their Risen Lord the sure hope of Life Eternal. They saw in Him the Kingdom of God - Incarnate, visible! To deny this would be to deny the perspective in which the New Testament is written. As Professor John A. Mackay puts it, "Christianity is the religion of the Resurrection. A study of the New Testament makes it quite clear that the Gospels were written backwards. ...The story of Jesus from Bethlehem to Golgotha is a tale which gets its meaning from the certainty, 'The Lord is Risen indeed.'"⁴

We shall see in Chapters 1 and 2 just how far the Resurrection of Jesus Christ was central to the life, thought, and faith of the

-
1. "Heralds of God", (The Warrack Lectures) - (Hodder and Stoughton - 1946) - p.88.
 2. See Note 1.
 3. See Note 10.
 4. "Theology Today" - Vol.XIII, No.1., April, 1956, Editorial.

early Christian community. Aware, as we are, that the Resurrection has not always occupied this central position in the history of the Church, and that today the open tomb is often overshadowed by the Cross, giving rise to a false antithesis between the Resurrection and the Crucifixion, we must try to discover the factors which account for the varying degrees of emphasis on the Resurrection. When we say that the Resurrection occupied the central place in the primitive Church we must always remember that we are thinking not of an isolated event apart from the other events in Christ's life, but rather of the fact of the Risen Christ. As we have seen, it was this fact that gave the Gospel its meaning, the Church its direction and purpose, and the Apostles their courageous faith. It is in this sense that we think of the Resurrection as being central to the Christian faith, as the focal point from which all else derives its significance. As St. Paul says, "If Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is in vain, and your faith is in vain."¹

To try and discover the reasons why the Resurrection has not always been the focal point of Christian faith and central to the life of the Church is not an easy task. Nevertheless this thesis is an attempt to find some of these reasons by examining the place of the Resurrection in the life and thought of the primitive Church, the teaching of the Fathers and the theology of the Middle Ages and the Reformation. We shall try not merely to examine the doctrine of the Resurrection in these different periods, but also to evaluate what I have called the resurrection-faith² - a faith which involves the believer in a vital personal relationship with the Risen Lord. The cardinal importance of the Resurrection is clearly seen in the light of so much of our thinking today as compared with the thought and experience of the Apostles. Professor Milligan says that it is common today for us to regard the Resurrection as a fulfilment of prophecies; as an attestation of Jesus' divinity; as a guarantee of His atoning work; or as the pledge of our own resurrection; "without the Risen Lord having any immediate place in our Christian consciousness or any immediate influence on our Christian life."³ There is indeed a prevailing tendency, particularly among fundamentalist thinkers, to place an isolated Cross at the centre of the Christian faith. While belief in the Resurrection is not denied nonetheless it is separated from Christ's sacrifice and death and becomes a seal to guarantee the validity of the Cross. This view fails to see the Resurrection and the Crucifixion as interdependent and mutually inclusive, and both as part of the redemptive work of our Lord.⁴ The isolation of the different aspects of Christ's life

1. I Corinthians 15:14.

2. See Note 10.

3. The Resurrection of our Lord, p.122.

4. See Chapter 5 for further elucidation of the place of the Resurrection in the Atonement.

and work, may be the result of our atomistic way of thinking, which delights in reducing everything to its last possible component, but it has resulted in our failure to see the whole in its true perspective. That certainly is a great danger, for although such a process may afford a useful method of study, we cannot afford to lose sight of the unity and wholeness of Christ's atoning work. More particularly, one result of this method of approach is seen in the fact that the relevance of the Resurrection has largely been reduced to Easter Sunday, the Creed and the after-life. As H.A. Williams says, "there are many Christian people, who while they have never doubted that Christ rose from the dead the third day after His crucifixion, yet regard His resurrection as little more than an isolated fact, stupendous indeed, the supreme miracle, but in no very clear or obvious relation either to their religion as a whole or to their life. In short the resurrection for them is no more than a past event making it possible to think of Jesus as alive in Heaven and not dead in the grave. As thus considered, it is one article of belief among many."¹ Thus, the present, living Christ is eclipsed by the historical Jesus, and instead of being a resurrection-faith that looks up to the ever-abiding Christ who reigns now, ours is all too often a faith which looks back to the historical Jesus. Is it not strange, and perhaps significant, that our theological libraries have few books concerning the Resurrection, and that so many books on the Person, life, and work of our Lord reveal scant reference to His Resurrection though lengthy chapters on His suffering and death.

In contrast to this tendency we find that the Apostles only apprehended fully the significance of Christ's Person, life, and work in the light of the Resurrection. It was as if the Resurrection had given them a panoramic view in which they saw the purpose and wholeness of God's plan. Whereas the Crucifixion had in those few days prior to the Resurrection spelt disaster, despair and despondency, they now saw it as the encounter of Divine love with sin over which that love, revealed as Love Incarnate triumphed victoriously. Far from belittling the death by placing the emphasis upon the resurrection, the Apostles were interpreting Christ's death in its full redeeming value. The Cross was not for them the finale, but the symbol of victory and hope, because their crucified Lord was raised from the dead and overcame sin and death. For the disciples who encountered the Risen Christ before His ascension, and for the multitude of early Christians who knew the presence of the Risen Christ mediated through the gift of the Holy Spirit, there could be no doubt that their faith was sustained by this vital relationship and was not dependent upon the hallowed memories of an historical Jesus. "The Apostles preached the Resurrection of their

1. Jesus and the Resurrection, p. lff.

Lord as the fundamental truth of the Christian faith, not merely as a miracle having no connection with their own Christian life, but in all its depth as part of the whole body of Christian truth which unifies and irradiates all other Christian truths."¹

Yet it would be utterly wrong to regard the historical fact of the Resurrection as of minor importance. On the contrary it is necessary to know the distinction between the realm of history and the realm of dogma because the Resurrection of our Lord belongs to both. His Resurrection is a fact anchored in history as well as a fact of religious experience apprehended by faith. Here history and faith interpenetrate.

As a mere historical fact, viewed objectively, and unrelated to faith, the Resurrection loses its moral significance for the life of man. For "historical events do not bestow their ultimate significance upon us apart from our own personal involvement."² Dr. Karl Barth, anxious to emphasize that the Resurrection is not merely historical, claims that it is "a historical divine fact which as such is only to be grasped in the category of revelation and in none other."³ By that he means that the Resurrection cannot, like other historical facts, be subject to investigation, to be weighed and measured as it were, by the historian. It is an act given by God, which man must receive, and not investigate. While it is true that the significance of the Resurrection cannot be grasped by the detached approach of historical enquiry, it is also true that if the Resurrection is at all an historical fact, such an enquiry, fruitless though it may be, is possible. To say that the Resurrection is out of the reach of historical investigation is to imply that it is not truly historical. In fact this is what Dr. Barth does imply, for he says that the Resurrection is not an historical occurrence, as that would involve it in obscurity and error.⁴ The truth of the matter is not to say that the Resurrection is not historical, but to say that the Resurrection is not merely historical. Indeed a man may refuse to believe in Jesus Christ, as the Son of God and the Saviour of man, and remain untouched even when confronted by the historical fact of Christ's rising from the tomb.

On the other hand, as pure dogma, apprehended subjectively and unrelated to history, the Resurrection becomes a vague generalisation about immortality - deathlessness! Such vague belief in spiritual survival after physical death is arbitrary. Such a conception about the Resurrection is in fact no different from the

-
1. The Resurrection of our Lord - Milligan (p.35).
 2. D.D. Williams, Interpreting Theology. 1918-1952, p.105 (S.C.M. - 1953).
 3. The Resurrection of the Dead, p.145ff.
 4. Cf. H.R. Mackintosh - Types of Modern Theology, p.306. (Nisbet - 1937).

Platonic conception of immortality, which taught that the soul (psyche) by virtue of its spiritual nature is immortal.¹ The human body on the other hand is mortal because it is subject to decay. Death was therefore the releasing of the immortal and spiritual soul from its mortal and material prison-house. Obviously such a conception does not need to stand on an historical foundation. So also, the belief that the Resurrection, whether of Christ, or of believers, is a spiritual fact and not a fact of history, means no more than the eventual escape of the soul from the body. But the implication here is dualism, a characteristic of much Greek thought. It implies that the inherent quality of the spiritual is goodness while the inherent quality of the body is evil. This is clearly contrary to the teaching of the New Testament and to the fact of the Resurrection of the body of Christ. While there are hints of this dualism in the New Testament the teaching is unmistakably that the soul as well as the body are to be sanctified. St. Paul, in his letter to the Corinthians, reminds us of this:

"Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ? Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God? You are not your own; you were bought with a price. So glorify God in your body."²

Our Lord's Resurrection itself teaches us that, He who, "emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men,"³ has sanctified the body by raising it up, and us with Him.⁴ So then, to believe that the Resurrection is a matter of dogma, and not of history is to go no further than a general acceptance of spiritual deathlessness, and leads us into the error of despising the body, with which even God clothed Himself in the Incarnation.

A further error into which the purely spiritual view of the Resurrection brings us, is its indifference to Christ's work of redemption. For if the Resurrection of Christ, is not historical then man is not fully reconciled to God. Salvation includes not only the forgiveness of sins but also at-one-ment of man and God. Having identified Himself with man and taken upon Himself the consequence of man's sin, Christ has also rent the veil of the Holy of Holies, and brought us into the presence of God. On the Cross Christ identified Himself fully with us. In the Resurrection Christ has ushered us into Life Eternal, into the very presence of God. If it is our sinful humanity with which He identified Himself on the Cross, it is redeemed humanity which is raised from the dead. If the Cross is the translation into history of God's eternal forgiving love, the Resurrection is the translation into history of

1. Cf. O. Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?* - pp. 19-21.
2. I Corinthians 6:15 and 19-20.
3. Philippians 2:7.
4. Cf. Ephesians 2:1-10

God's eternal atoning love. Professor Harnack falls into this error when he says that it is 'the Easter faith' and not 'the Easter message' which is important. But the Easter message has as little significance for man, as would the message of the Cross if it were not fact. For if the Cross was not historical, in other words if God had not manifested His forgiving love within the framework of history, then that love would have remained outside the experience of man. And similarly if the Resurrection is not historical, it would cease to be within man's experience. The Resurrection is not either faith or history, it is both faith and history. It is an existential fact to be experienced by encountering the living Christ, and it is an historical fact which stands solidly on Christ's rising from the tomb. In the words of Canon Turner "The Gospel message includes both history and faith, and proclaims 'Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept.'¹ We cannot therefore study the Resurrection merely from the historical point of view, as has so often been done, or merely from the point of view of dogma, as is so seldom done. It is in the very nature of our study to take account of the facts as well as the faith which has preserved the facts.

Maurice Goguel in his refreshing study on the Resurrection "La Foi à la Résurrection de Jésus dans le Christianisme primitif," takes into account both history and faith. The subtitle of his book is a clear indication of the purpose of his study, for he calls it, "Étude d'Histoire et de Psychologie Religieuses".² In his opening chapter he emphasizes the need to consider the relation between the facts of history and the faith of the Apostles.

"L'affirmation de la résurrection de Jésus par les premiers Chrétiens comporte deux éléments: d'abord un énoncé de fait: Jésus est sorti vivant de la tombe; ensuite une affirmation qui dépasse toutes les données expérimentales possibles puisqu'elle porte qu'il vit d'une vie qui n'est plus accessible à la mort et qui est celle du monde futur et céleste. Ces deux affirmations de fait et de foi sont étroitement solidaires l'une de l'autre. Elle sont confondues dans la même formule: "Le Christ est Ressuscité" qui tantôt exprime l'idée d'un retour à la vie terrestre, tantôt celle de la vie céleste, et le plus souvent, les deux idées à la fois."³

On the one hand we have the fact that Jesus was raised from the tomb - this is history. On the other hand we have the proclamation that Jesus has conquered death and lives - that is faith.

It is only in the light of this close interdependence between fact and faith that we can begin to understand the meaning and to appreciate its centrality for the early Christian community. The

-
1. H.E.W. Turner, The Resurrection - Expository Times, Vol. LXVIII No. 12. September, 1957, p.371.
 2. Meaning:- A study of Religious History and Psychology.
 3. "La Foi à la Résurrection dans le Christianisme primitif. M. Goguel. p.7. See Note 11.

bold faith which we encounter throughout the New Testament - a faith which thrived on opposition and was undaunted by persecution - is a faith which not only says "This Jesus God raised up, and of that we are all witnesses,"¹ but also proclaims

"For we know that Christ being raised from the dead will never die again; death no longer has dominion over him. The death he died he died to sin, once for all, but the life he lives, he lives to God."²

-
1. Acts 2:32.
 2. Romans 6:9-10.

CHAPTER ONE - THE RESURRECTION IN THE TEACHING OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT

Section 1 - The First Preachers

We begin our study of the Resurrection in the teaching of the New Testament with the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, for the simple reason that this is where we find the first open and public proclamation of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. It was at Pentecost, with the receiving of the gift of the Holy Spirit, that the Church, as the Body of Christ, was "born",¹ and that for the first time, the Church proclaimed to the world that Christ is Risen. We must not think of the Church in this instance as an organized institution, but rather as the embodiment of a new relationship between God's people and Himself. That relationship was, and remains, a relationship with God through Christ His Living Son, empowered by the Holy Spirit. It is the New Covenant Relationship by which men are engrafted into the Body of Christ, and made members of His Church.

When we realize that the "birth" of the Church at Pentecost meant the giving of the Holy Spirit to confirm this new relationship, we realize also how essential and fundamental the Resurrection of Christ is to the life of the Church. Without the Resurrection there would be no gift of the Holy Spirit.² There would be no covenant relationship, no grafting into the Body of Christ. There would not even be a Book of the Acts of the Apostles! There can be no doubt that the new-born Church stood firmly on the foundation of the Resurrection. The corner stone of the Church is He whom Israel rejected and crucified, but "whom God raised from the dead."³ Speaking of the Church in the Acts of the Apostles, Professor Milligan says, "Belief in the Resurrection of her Lord was no subordinate element in her views ... The Church in fact was reconstructed on the basis of this belief."⁴

On examining the content of the Kerygma in the Book of Acts, we find that the death and resurrection of Christ are not only a prominent, but an integral part. The Kerygma is largely contained in the sermons delivered by Peter to the crowds gathered on the day of Pentecost;⁵ in Peter's address to the people after the healing of a

1. Note 1.

2. See John 16:7ff

3. Acts 4:10-11.

4. The Resurrection of our Lord, p.66ff.

5. Acts 2:14-36; 38-39.

cripple;¹ in Peter's reply to the Sanhedrin after the arrest of the Apostles;² and Peter's speech to Cornelius.³ In all of these, with variation in phraseology and order, the facts that Israel was responsible for the death of Christ, and that God raised Him from the dead, emerge. Taken together the core of the Kerygma on the death and resurrection of Christ may be summed up in these words: "Jesus Christ of Nazareth whom ye crucified,"⁴.... "whom God raised from the dead, whereof we are witnesses."⁵

The term Kerygma, from the root 'Keryssein', means preaching or proclamation. The content of the Kerygma was news proclaimed, not knowledge taught. "The New Testament writers draw a clear distinction between preaching and teaching."⁶ This is very significant because nowhere in these Kerygmatic passages do we find any attempt on the part of the Apostles to explain or to prove the Resurrection. They simply proclaimed the Risen Christ.

First, they proclaimed His Resurrection as an act of God. The Apostles never speak of Christ rising from the tomb as though by His own power. On the contrary the assertion is always, "whom God raised from the dead." But it is only through the power of the Holy Spirit, who is Himself a witness to the Resurrection,⁷ that the Apostles were enabled to see the Resurrection as part of the plan and purpose of God. There is a close relationship between the faith in the Risen Christ and the receiving of the gift of the Holy Spirit. It was at Pentecost that the Apostles realised fully that the Resurrection of Christ meant, not the revivification of His body, but His transfiguration and glorification to a new life - the life of the Kingdom in its fullness. That is why their message was proclaimed with a note of confidence, for they had seen that "behind the apparent tragedy, a divine purpose had been at work."⁸ It was this light shed at Pentecost, that enabled the Apostles to view the whole life of Christ in the perspective of His Resurrection, for "without it all is mystery - a lock without a key, a labyrinth without a clue, a beginning without a corresponding end."⁹ And although theological thought is not developed to any great extent in the Book of Acts, nonetheless the Kerygmatic passages make it quite clear that it was in the light of His Resurrection that the Messiahship of Christ was fully apprehended. As Monsieur Goguel, speaking of the

1. Acts 3:12-26

2. Acts 4:8-12 cf. 5:29-32

3. Acts 10:34-43

4. Acts 4:10

5. Acts 3:15

6. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments, p.7.

7. Acts 5:32

8. Stewart, A Man in Christ, p.229.

9. Milligan, The Resurrection of our Lord, p.72.

centrality of the Resurrection in the Book of Acts, puts it, "c'est elle (the Resurrection) qui fait de lui le Messie et qui le qualifie pour remplir le rôle rédempteur..."¹ Much of the Kerygma is illustrated by prophetic sources to point to the Messiahship of Christ, fulfilled in His Resurrection by which God has made Him Lord (Kurios).² Thus the Resurrection was proclaimed as an act of God in the fulfilment of His own purpose.

Secondly, the Apostles always claim to be witnesses of the Resurrection.³ The phrase frequently used in these Kerygmatic passages is, "whereof we are all witnesses." The apostolic office was closely and deeply connected with the Resurrection. This connection "lay in the very nature of the apostolic office that the person clothed with it must be a 'witness' of the truth out of which it sprang."⁴ When the Apostles chose someone to take the place of Judas it was stipulated that he should be "a witness to His Resurrection."⁵ This is also borne out by St. Paul's claim to apostleship which depended on his having seen the Risen Christ.⁶ Yet the Apostles never pointed to the evidence of the empty tomb or of Christ's appearings to substantiate their claim, except in Peter's speech to Cornelius. Peter there refers to Christ's appearings to His disciples "who ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead."⁷ But the absence of historical evidence for the Resurrection of Christ in the Kerygma does not mean that the Apostles believed in a spiritual resurrection and not in a bodily resurrection. Theirs was a faith dependent not merely upon Christ's abiding presence, but also upon His bodily Resurrection. They believed in Christ, glorified and changed, transfigured, yet "this same Jesus whom ye crucified", intact in His full person, as the passage quoted above indicates, and as the Gospel records bear out. The significance of the absence of historical evidence lies in the fact that there was as yet no necessity to prove the Resurrection. It was sufficient simply to proclaim it. It would seem that the need of proof and the appeal to the open tomb and the appearings, such as we find in ICorinthians 15, came when the orthodox Church became engaged in controversies with Docetists and Gnostics. Of this we have evidence in the later Pauline epistles. And so Monsieur Goguel says that the plain affirmation which these passages contain was anterior to the controversies which necessitated the Christians to insist on the proof of the Resurrection.⁸ Thus the Apostles

1. La Foi à la Résurrection p.25. Note 2.
2. Cf. Acts 2:17-21; 25-28; 34-36; 3:18-26.
3. Acts 2:32; 3:15; 5:32; 10:40-41.
4. Milligan, The Resurrection of our Lord, p.48.
5. Acts 1:22
6. ICorinthians 15:8-9; Galatians 1:1
7. Acts 10:41
8. See La Foi à la Résurrection p.24.

preached the Resurrection as witnesses to that fact, without having to appeal to substantiating evidence.

Thirdly, the Apostles proclaimed the Risen Christ in the very city and to the very people responsible for His death. One might have expected the Jewish authorities to refute the Resurrection, particularly in view of the precautionary measures which they took at the burial of Jesus. But no refutation is made. On the contrary the empty tomb is an accepted fact by all. But it was the preaching of the Risen and Living Christ, not of the empty tomb, which aroused the anger and hostility of the religious authorities, and eventually caused widespread repercussions throughout the Roman world. For the Christians claimed and proclaimed that their Lord Jesus Christ was still alive. When the Apostles appeared before the Sanhedrin, they were asked, "by what power or by what name"¹ they performed miracles of healing, or else they were charged "not to teach in this name".² It seems quite conclusive that the Jews themselves, who could have strangled Christianity from its beginning by producing the evidence of Christ's dead body, never attempted to disprove the Resurrection. What they did attempt to do was to crush the new-born Church which was disrupting the institutional religion of Judaism and undermining the authority of its leaders. That the apostles began to preach the Resurrection in the face of opposition and hostility speaks all the more clearly for their faith in God's mighty act of raising Jesus from the dead, for their experience of the Risen Christ, and for the truth of their message.

Thus, the Resurrection and glorification of Christ, proclaimed first to those who had crucified Him, as an act of God of which the Apostles were witnesses, was fundamental to the life of the primitive Church. In fact the primitive Church began its life by proclaiming the Risen Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit.

Section 2 - The Gospel Writers -
Mark, Matthew, Luke.

When we come to consider the Resurrection of our Lord in the Gospels of Mark, Matthew and Luke, we are faced with considerable difficulties. Many attempts have been made to resolve these difficulties which are textual as well as theological. But in the process these Gospels have too often been treated as legal documents upon whose evidence the court of reason can pronounce judgment about these various difficulties concerning the Resurrection. Professor Milligan,

1. Acts 4:7
2. Acts 5:28

however, gives us a salutary reminder, when he says, "We do the evangelists injustice when we regard them as witnesses in a court of law, who have been summoned to prove a fact, and who have deliberately taken in hand to do so... men did not need to have every great fact of the Christian faith proved to them by historical narrative before they believed."¹ It is necessary to be reminded that the writing of the Gospels arose out of the need to preserve records of the life and sayings of Jesus. This makes us wary of going to the extreme in weighing up the evidence of one Gospel against another to arrive at the historicity of the events recorded. A healthier approach is to find the central facts to which the Gospels all point, in spite of the differences in apprehension and presentation of those facts.

With particular reference to the Resurrection of our Lord we find three real difficulties. First, we find that Matthew and Luke give a different account of the reaction of the women at the empty tomb than does Mark. According to Matthew and Luke, the women, told to go and tell the disciples that Christ is risen, "departed quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy, and ran to tell his disciples."² Mark however, tells us that the women fled from the tomb, "for trembling and astonishment had come upon them; and they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid."³ At first sight, these two accounts seem completely contradictory, but when we remember that Mark's Gospel is an unfinished work we cannot make a final judgment on the meaning of his incomplete account. We must therefore find the most probable and plausible meaning, which will not do injustice to his account. James Martin suggests that the Markan phrase means no more than that "in their awed and trembling astonishment, they spoke to no one on the homeward way, but kept their tidings for the disciples' ears."⁴

Secondly, there is contradiction in the accounts of the messengers whom the women encountered at the tomb on that first Easter morning. Mark speaks of a young man dressed in a white robe sitting on the right side of the open tomb.⁵ Matthew tells us of an earthquake, and of an angel descending to roll back the stone.⁶ Luke records the women entering the tomb, being puzzled at not finding the body of Jesus, and seeing two men standing by in dazzling apparel.⁷ These differences easily assume the proportions of insurmountable difficulties, and while they may be grave difficulties

1. The Resurrection of our Lord, p.58.
2. Matthew 28:8 cf. Luke 24:9
3. Mark 16:8
4. Did Jesus rise from the Dead? p.41
5. Mark 16:5
6. Matthew 28:2
7. Luke 24:4

from a documentary point of view, they remain mere differences in the light of our knowledge of the development of our Gospels. Appreciating the excitement of the unexpected events of that Easter morning, and the resultant confusion in the minds of the women who related the facts, together with our knowledge that details were inevitably transformed in the formative oral stages of our Gospel tradition, we recognize that what at first sight constitutes a contradiction is in the end a difference of detail.

Thirdly, there is the difficulty encountered in the accounts of Christ's post-resurrection appearances. The difficulty has to do with the locality of these appearances. Although Mark's Gospel does not include any appearances, by implication¹ he is classed with Matthew,² as recording appearances in Galilee. Luke on the other hand records Christ's appearances in and around Jerusalem.³ It is true that we are presented with almost irreconcilable facts here. Yet, while we can imply that Mark, had he completed his Gospel, would have given us an account of appearances in Galilee, we cannot similarly imply that he would not have given any account of appearances in Jerusalem. The fact that Matthew records appearances in Galilee, and that Luke accounts for them in Jerusalem, does not necessarily indicate that they were drawing on contradictory sources. It may indicate that they drew on sources which recorded appearances in both places, "and that for reasons of their own, and on account of the narrow limits of their space, each writer gives prominence only to one or to the other."⁴

It is not within the scope of this thesis to make a precise exegetical study of these passages which present difficulties. We can only briefly mention them, and place them in the perspective of the undeniable faith in the Resurrection of our Lord, which they portray and the authors possessed. And whatever the reasons for differences of detail between the authors may be, one thing is certain; their testimony to the main facts of the Resurrection story -
the visit of the women,
the empty tomb,
the appearances of Christ to His disciples, -
is the same. Christ is Risen. That is their united testimony.

Those critics who see in these textual differences, a stumbling block to faith in the Risen Lord, because they trace a suspicion of legend, forget that perhaps the greatest authenticity of our records of the Resurrection lies in these very differences. As James Martin has put it, the presence of points of difference "strengthens rather

1. Cf. Mark 16:7

2. Matthew 28:7

3. Luke 24:33-36

4. Did Jesus rise from the Dead? p.43

than weakens the narratives' unmistakable ring of authenticity; for one would naturally expect to find some difference in detail between reliable, independent accounts of any event, much more so of one so unusual and disturbing as this."¹

We must now turn to consider the appearances of the Risen Lord, first in relation to the empty tomb, and secondly in relation to the nature of His Resurrection-body.

The Synoptic Gospels are agreed on the fact of the empty tomb, but they do not declare - 'Behold, the tomb is empty!' They declare - 'He is not here, He is Risen!' And having proclaimed that, they recount how the disciples and followers met their Risen Lord. It is this inter-personal encounter which is referred to when we are told that the apostles were witnesses of the Resurrection. The empty tomb alone would not have evoked a faith in Christ as their Risen Lord. Their faith was based on the knowledge² of their Lord in His Resurrection-state, and substantiated by the fact of the empty tomb. But nor would the appearances alone have confounded those early critics in Jerusalem. The Jews never accused the followers of Jesus of basing their faith on visions, hallucinations or illusion, for they themselves could not deny the fact of the empty tomb, by which that faith was given solidity. We must, therefore, recognize the inter-relationship of historical fact and religious faith, which marks not only the Resurrection story, but the Gospels throughout. What we have in the Gospels are not merely facts of history, but facts of history as seen in faith. Thus, it was in the context of religious faith that the historical fact of the Resurrection was recognized.

Modern critics who try to explain away the appearances of our Lord on the ground that they are the product of the visions and hallucinations in the minds of the disciples, have not taken into account this category of faith. They point to certain prevailing pagan ideas that gods rise or return to life; to Jesus' own predictions of His Resurrection before the Crucifixion; and to the anticipation of the disciples themselves that Christ would return to life, as creating a fertile frame of mind for hallucinations. The assumption is that the psychological conditions were ideally suitable for visions of this kind. Whether this assumption is sound or not, we lack the precise data to prove it. But suitable conditions need not produce the visions, and we must therefore distinguish between conditions and event. However, the allegations explicit in this assumption, are refuted by the evidence of our Gospels themselves.

1. Op. cit. p.37
2. Note 3.

The disciples in no way expected Jesus to return to life, as is borne out by the women's intentions when they visited the tomb on the third day. They went with spices and ointments to pay their last respects to their Master, to complete the embalming.¹ Nor did the disciples ever fully comprehend the meaning of Jesus' words when He spoke about His Resurrection. This is clearly indicated in the Gospels, and further substantiated by their reluctance to believe the women's report of the Resurrection.² Nor did the disciples expect the Resurrection. To them the Crucifixion meant the end. They fled and hid themselves for fear that they too should be arrested and condemned.³ It was only when the disciples saw their Risen Lord and recognized Him as He whom they had followed, and He who was crucified, that their eyes of faith were fully opened. This was true even of Thomas who seeing Christ saw Him not only with his eyes, but also with faith, and exclaimed, "My Lord and my God."⁴

Without that faith historical fact had no meaning. That is why we cannot treat our Gospel record as mere history but must treat it as history illuminated by faith.

That brings us on to the second consideration, namely the relation of Christ's appearings to His Resurrection-body. One of the facts which has lent its support to the visionary theories of the appearings of Christ is that He no longer appeared as wholly human, but as supra-human. The fact that Christ appeared to and disappeared from His disciples at will may seem to weigh strongly on the side of those who believe that these appearings were illusory. But we are not to think of Christ's Resurrection-state as being similar to His state before the Crucifixion. Christ, unlike Lazarus, was not raised to His former life. Christ was raised to a new life in a transformed body, "to which the laws of gravity and mortality no longer applied."⁵

We shall never fully understand, in this life at any rate, just what sort of body Jesus Christ had after His Resurrection. But we do know that it was a body both similar to and different from the body that was laid in the tomb. There was both continuity and discontinuity between His earthly body and His Resurrection body. As Westcott puts it, "The Lord rose from the grave: and those who had known Him before, knew that He was the same and yet changed."⁶ There was continuity - Christ was recognized by the women in the garden;⁷ Thomas saw the scars of the Crucifixion in His hands and

1. Cf. Luke 23:55ff. 24:1. Mark 16:1

2. Luke 24:11

3. Mark 14:50

4. John 20:28

5. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, p. 135.

6. Quoted by James Martin, *Did Jesus Rise from the Dead?* p.67, from Westcott's "Gospel of the Resurrection" - p. 158.

7. Matthew 28:9.

side;¹ Jesus Himself said to His startled and frightened disciples, "see my hands and feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have."² Jesus was clearly recognisable by His physical features. Yet, there was discontinuity - Christ was no longer subject to earthly conditions of life as in the days before His Crucifixion. He was able to pass through locked doors;³ He came into the presence of the disciples and left them, not by moving from one point in space to another, but simply by appearing and disappearing;⁴ and He no longer lived with His disciples as before, when He shared a continual existence with them. Christ was no longer bound by the limitations that bind us here.

The disciples saw neither a disembodied spirit nor a merely physical body, but they saw their Lord in His transfigured and glorified body. James Martin describes aptly what is meant by the 'spiritual body', which he eventually calls the 'glorified body', when he says, "the body of Jesus became in the Resurrection, a body that was the perfect, unhindered instrument of His Spirit, no longer subject to limitations which were necessarily there in the days of His flesh."⁵ It seems to me conclusive that Christ was glorified at the Resurrection. The forty days between the Resurrection and the Ascension are not an intermediary stage, but Christ's revelation to His disciples of the new Resurrection life which He had ushered in by virtue of His atoning work in His death and resurrection. That new life He revealed through His glorified Resurrection-body.

We may conclude, therefore, that what the Gospels confront us with in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, are not merely events of history, but also a faith in the Risen Lord. That faith is implicit in the very writing of the Gospels. It is a faith by which the writers whom we have been considering, were able to understand the purpose of the life of Jesus Christ, and worship Him as the Eternal Son of God. When dealing with the Gospels, we shall always find it "difficult to separate the 'actual historical facts' from the meaning of those facts as seen in faith."⁶

Section 3 - St. Paul.

A detailed exposition of Pauline thought is not essential but the main points must be mentioned. Although there are many explicit passages on the Resurrection, the fact of the Risen Christ is implicit throughout the pages of St. Paul's epistles. Faith and life

-
1. John 20:27
 2. Luke 24:39
 3. John 20:26
 4. Luke 24:31 and 36
 5. Did Jesus Rise from the Dead? p.66.
 6. D.D. Williams, - Interpreting Theology, 1918-1952, S.C.M. 1953, p.101.

in the living Christ is the undercurrent of all his thought, and we understand how implicit and basic the Resurrection was to his life and thought only when we view the Apostle's whole life in the light of that dramatic moment on the road to Damascus. It was in that experience that St. Paul, who until then was engaged in persecuting the followers of Jesus, encountered Jesus Christ Himself, Risen and Living. It was an experience as real to St. Paul as were those in which the disciples saw and met their resurrected Lord during the forty days. Many have suggested that this was a vision, or that the brightness of the eastern sun dazzled the Apostle, but St. Paul himself makes it quite clear both in separating this experience from visions which he had, and in his claim to Apostleship, that here he met the Lord Jesus Christ face to face. "Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me".¹ Professor James Stewart says, "it is of the utmost importance that what Paul saw was no vague 'Heavenly Being', no impersonal Messiah: it was Jesus Himself.... We cannot therefore too strongly underline the fact that it was Jesus, and none other, the Jesus who had been crucified, who appeared to Paul in the way."²

We must remember that before his conversion Saul was a devout Jew. He had studied the Law of Moses under the renowned Gamaliel at Jerusalem. As a rabbi he had striven to serve God and to do His will by fulfilling the law. With all devout Jews, he shared the hope of the coming of the Messiah. Saul's whole relationship to God stood on the Old Covenant.

But Saul came into contact with the early Christians, if not before, then most certainly at the time of the stoning of Stephen. He may even have been aware of some of the tenets of this new sect, centred around Jesus of Nazareth and emerging within Judaism. He certainly regarded Christianity as a threat to Judaism and as a blasphemy to God, for we know how vigorously he persecuted the Christians. He regarded Christianity as a threat, because it was rapidly gaining ground; as a blasphemy, because it claimed that this Jesus of Nazareth, although He had been crucified and buried, was the Son of God, the Messiah whom God raised from the dead and who was living. Such, probably, was the frame of mind of St. Paul before his conversion.

But Saul, in his journey to Damascus, was confronted by that same Jesus of Nazareth who appeared unto him as the Risen and Living Lord, as the Eternal Son of God. Saul saw and heard Jesus Christ. It was a spiritual encounter mediated through the senses. In that experience Saul was brought into a new relationship with

1. I Corinthians 15:8, see also v. 9.
2. A Man in Christ, p. 133f.

God. It was the relationship of the New Covenant, made possible by the grace of Jesus Christ. It was a relationship of communion and fellowship with God which the Law of the Old Covenant had so frustratingly denied to Saul. And so Saul, the persecutor of Christ's Church, became Paul, the proclaimer of Christ's Gospel.

In the light of St. Paul's encounter with the living Christ, and of his experience of God's saving grace, let us briefly consider some key thoughts in St. Paul's theology.

First of all, and perhaps most important of all, is St. Paul's strong emphasis on the Christian living in a faith-union with Christ. This mystical relationship is the foundation of St. Paul's own religion as well as of his whole thought. For the Apostle, to be a Christian meant to be "in Christ". This great Pauline concept of being "in Christ" occurs repeatedly in his epistles,¹ emphasising the mystical but existential relationship in which the believer is united to his Saviour. In this relationship the believer participates in the new order of life inaugurated by the Risen Christ. This new life is not a reproduction in the believer of the pattern of Christ's earthly life, but is the beginning of the resurrection life. The life of the Christian is derived both from what Christ was - the Incarnate Lord, and from what Christ is - the Risen and Exalted Lord. It is a life nourished and sustained by Jesus Christ, the abiding and present Lord. St. Paul participated in this new life to the extent that he was able to say, "... I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."² Such a relationship was possible only with the Eternal Son of God, who, having become flesh, glorified man in redeeming him from sin and death, and in becoming Himself the Risen and Living Christ (Messiah). This is expressed in various ways, but most fully in St. Paul's epistle to the Romans, when he says:

"For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we shall certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his. We know that our old self was crucified with him so that the sinful body might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin. But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him. For we know that Christ being raised from the dead will never die again; death no longer has dominion over him. The death he died he died to sin, once for all, but the life he lives he lives to God. So you must also consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus."³

This leads us to the second Pauline emphasis which is that salvation is accomplished through the believer's oneness with Jesus Christ. "For St. Paul.... oneness with Christ is to be

1. Romans 8:1,10; Galatians 2:20; I Corinthians 6:17; 15:18-19; II Corinthians 1:21; Colossians 1:2; etc.
2. Galatians 2:20
3. Romans 6:5-11

redeemed, and to be redeemed is oneness with Christ."¹ The apostle is emphatic that redemption is not a progressive ascension of a soteriological ladder, the rungs of which are forgiveness, justification, adoption and sanctification! Redemption means being united to Christ in a union of which forgiveness and justification, adoption and sanctification are the fruits. The Christian does not strive to become Christ-like, he enters into that mystical oneness with his living and risen Saviour, and manifests the fruits of that relationship in his life.² Professor Milligan sums this up by saying, "such is the true order of Christian experience. To make us one with Himself, one with the Father, is the supreme and final purpose of our Lord's work".³

This view of salvation does not stop short at the Cross, but sees Christ's redemptive work as incomplete without the Resurrection and the Ascension. It is sometimes alleged that St. Paul's view of the Resurrection is spiritual, and that the bodily resurrection of Jesus was of no real consequence in his theology. But such allegations are unfounded. If St. Paul had really believed in a spiritual resurrection only, then why should he have claimed that the Lord appeared also to him?⁴ Would he have claimed that his apostleship, like that of the other apostles, was also founded on his being a witness to the Risen Christ?⁵ And how could he have reminded the Corinthians of the teaching of the Church, which he had delivered to them, namely, that Christ died, was buried, was raised and appeared?⁶

Though he may not always have been explicit on this aspect of the Resurrection, St. Paul certainly implicitly believed in the bodily Resurrection of Christ, "the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep",⁷ for "if there is a physical body, there is also a spiritual body,"⁸ and "if there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised;...our preaching is in vain and your faith is in vain."⁹ There can be little doubt that St. Paul could not have spoken as he did of being "in Christ," of "putting on Christ," of being in union with Christ, had he not himself experienced this close relationship with Jesus Christ, whom he encountered as the Risen Lord.

And so too, when St. Paul speaks of salvation as oneness with Christ, he is not thinking of a Christ whose spirit was raised by

-
1. H.R. Mackintosh, The Person of Jesus Christ - p.334.
 2. Romans 7:4
 3. The Resurrection of our Lord - p. 162 CF. Dominical Prayer, John 17:21-23.
 4. I Corinthians 15:8
 5. I Corinthians 15:9; Galatians 1:1
 6. I Corinthians 15:3-5
 7. I Corinthians 15:20
 8. I Corinthians 15:44
 9. I Corinthians 15:13,14

escaping from its 'prison-house', the body, - a disembodied spirit, but of a Christ whom God the Father raised from the dead¹ and whom God has highly exalted.² Without the Resurrection and exaltation, Christ's death would be meaningless. But in the light of the Resurrection and exaltation, the death upon the Cross is seen as the extremity of God's forgiving love reaching out to man through Christ's utter and complete identification with the consequence of man's sinfulness.³ Because of the Resurrection it is a victorious death in which the devil, sin, and death itself are conquered.⁴ The Ascension, followed by the Pentecostal gift, is Christ's royal entry into His priesthood and Kingship that He may reign, exercising His rule over the evil powers, and that He may be the living and abiding Mediator unto all generations.⁵ In Christ, man is not only forgiven, but he is raised to a new life, the consummation of which is to live, unrestricted, with Christ in His Kingdom.⁶

Pauline soteriology is interpreted in terms of the living and reigning Lord. "Christ was delivered up for our trespasses and was raised up for our justification."⁷ And thus, as Stauffer puts it, the "decisive interpretation of Easter is soteriological."⁸

Finally we must consider the eschatological teaching of St. Paul which we find most fully expounded in his first epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 15. The apostle opens his treatise with an account of Christ's death, burial, resurrection and appearances, which, as most scholars agree, was a summary of the Church's teaching about the person of Christ. Professor James Stewart has pointed out the significance of the fact that the verbs "died", "was buried", and "appeared" are all aorists, while the verb "was raised" (egēgertai) is given in the perfect tense.⁹ This emphasises what has already been said, namely that the Apostle regarded the resurrection (bodily) of our Lord, not only as an historical event, but also as a present reality.

The resurrection of the dead is a reality only because Jesus Christ Himself is Risen. It is made possible because Jesus Christ is "the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep" so that in Him "shall all be made alive."¹⁰ The question that arises and

-
1. Galatians 1:1.
 2. Philippians 2:9; Ephesians 1:20.
 3. Romans 5:6ff; Philippians 2:5-8.
 4. Colossians 2:13-15; I Corinthians 15:25-26, 51ff.
 5. Romans 8:34; Colossians 3:1ff; I Corinthians 15:57.
 6. II Corinthians 3:18; 4:16 - 5:5.
 7. Romans 4:25
 8. New Testament Theology, p.136.
 9. Cf. A Man in Christ, p. 137.
 10. I Corinthians 15:20,22.

which the Apostle himself anticipated,¹ concerns the kind of resurrection-body the dead will receive. Inevitably the further question, whether Christ's resurrection is a pattern of our own, arises. Professor Milligan states that unless our Lord's resurrection is regarded as "the type and model of our own.... the whole argument of the Apostle Paul in I Corinthians 15, and other similar passages of his epistles would be undermined. It would be impossible to accept the doctrine of the second Adam, or to behold in the Risen and Glorified Lord the 'first fruits of them that sleep'."² I can accept Professor Milligan's statement only by making one qualification on the use he makes of the phrase "the type and model of our own". Indeed, the New Testament is clear in teaching that in Christ's resurrection lies our only hope of our resurrection, of Life that is no longer subject to death, of Life Eternal. The resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ is the type and model of our own resurrection but only in so far as the reality of our resurrection is concerned, and not the circumstance. Of course, that is all that really matters, but the words "type" and "model" are, to a certain extent, misleading, for this reason: in the resurrection of our Lord there was continuity and discontinuity between His resurrection-body and His earthly body. The continuity was visible in two ways - spiritually and physically; spiritually because the personality of the Risen Lord was continuous with the personality of Jesus of Nazareth, and physically because the Risen Lord was recognized by the same bodily features borne by Jesus of Nazareth. The discontinuity was manifest in the fact that the Risen Lord was no longer conditioned by the limitations to which He was subject as Jesus of Nazareth, and that the Risen Lord was clothed with a body which was the perfect expression of His Spirit. Similarly, because our hope of and faith in the resurrection of the body is rooted in Christ's own resurrection, we believe that there will also be that continuity, as well as that discontinuity between our earthly bodies and our resurrection-bodies. This, I believe to be the principal truth regarding the resurrection of the dead, and thus far Professor Milligan is correct in saying that Christ's resurrection is the type and model of our own. But when we examine the circumstance of our Lord's resurrection in relation to ours we realize that, without denying the reality that His resurrection is the archetype of all resurrection, there is a sense in which His resurrection is not the type and model of our own. Jesus Christ was buried and was laid in a tomb, but "he whom God raised up saw no corruption".³ But we do see corruption, for our bodies decay. That is why St. Paul, in his imaginative analogy of the seed and the plant, makes it quite clear that our present

1. I Corinthians 15:35

2. The Resurrection of our Lord, p.18.

3. Acts 13:37. (The word 'corruption' used here lays stress on the decay of the body after it is in the grave. Cf. Cruden's Complete Concordance).

body is sown in corruption, weakness, and dishonour, but is raised as a new body, in incorruptibility, in power and in glory. Christ saw no corruption and His body was transfigured and glorified. But we shall see corruption and our bodies shall decay. It is God, who through Christ will raise us up and clothe us with a resurrection body bearing the transfigured but recognizable features of our earthly body, (continuity), at the same time, a body unrestricted by the limitations of our present life and fully the willing instrument of our spirit (discontinuity). Is that not what St. Paul means when he says:

"So it is with the resurrection of the dead. What is sown is perishable, what is raised is imperishable. It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a physical body, there is also a spiritual body.... The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven.... Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the man of heaven."¹

Monsieur Goguel summarises it succinctly; "le corps ressuscité aura d'autres caractères que celui qui a été déposé dans la tombe, il sera pneumatique et céleste et non plus psychique et terrestre".²

We must note that Goguel uses the phrase "le corps ressuscité" emphasising that the resurrection state is not merely spiritual, but that it is a spiritual reality expressed in a corporeal way. And that is precisely what St. Paul means when he speaks of a spiritual body.

We conclude, therefore, that the Resurrection life is basic and central to the thought of the Apostle. St. Paul served and worshipped the Risen and Reigning Lord, who, because He is the Eternal Son of God, revealed the redeeming and victorious love of God to man. St. Paul, by the grace of God, was made a new creature "in Christ", and spent the rest of his life proclaiming "Christ crucified"³ who "being raised from the dead, dieth no more."⁴ In Him alone is Life, with the quality of the Eternal, offered and realized.

Section 4 - St. John.

In considering the place of the Resurrection in the Johannine literature we shall examine the Gospel, the three epistles and the Apocalypse as a whole. It may well be debated whether such a course is justifiable in view of the varied opinions of the authorship of

1. I Corinthians 15:42ff.
2. La Foi à la Résurrection, p.33 - (Note 4).
3. I Corinthians 1:23; 2:2.
4. Romans 6:9.

these books. But as no final judgment on authorship has been attained the view which ascribes the ultimate source of these writings to St. John the disciple, has been adopted. It may well be that one or more of these documents did not flow from the pen of St. John, but it can reasonably be assumed that their contents flowed from his mind.

The Gospel of St. John has a character of its own, unmistakably different from the general character of the Synoptic Gospels. In the Synoptic Gospels the seeds of theology are embedded in historical narrative, whereas in St. John's Gospel, these seeds, nurtured by mature faith and reflection have come to fruition. The Synoptics give us primarily a record of events. St. John gives us an interpretation of those events. St. John, Professor A.M. Hunter tells us, "wrote not so much as an historian intent on setting down the precise sequence of events as a prophet concerned to declare the ultimate truth of that history."¹ We might properly say that St. John witnesses to the historical fact of Christ from the point of view of the 'Eternal'. In the Incarnation, the Life, the Death, the Resurrection and the Ascension of Jesus he sees more than God's personal intervention and activity in the drama of human history; he sees behind this, great and wonderful as it is, to the Eternal creativity and love of God. In the person of Jesus of Nazareth he sees more than the historical figure of the Messiah; he sees the Eternal Logos, the Word. The history of Jesus of Nazareth contains Eternal Truth and it is that Truth which St. John interprets - the Word made Flesh.

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God..... and the Word became Flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; and we have beheld his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father."²

St. John, therefore, is essentially an interpreter to whom Christ appears no longer merely as a figure of history but as the great contemporary. " 'The Jesus of history', it is as if John were saying to us, 'is the Christ of experience. What he is now to my faith, that he was in the days of his flesh'."³

The theological position of St. John remains unaltered in his Epistles. There is, however, a greater emphasis on sin⁴ owing to the antinomianism which prevailed in certain parts of the Church; and a stronger emphasis on the Incarnation in possible re-action to a nascent docetism which claimed that Christ was not made flesh,⁵ but only appeared in the flesh.

1. Introducing New Testament Theology, p.127.
2. John 1:1,14.
3. Hunter, op. cit., p.125.
4. I John 1:7ff; 2:1-2; 3:4ff; III John v.11.
5. I John 2:22; 4:2ff; II John v.7ff.

Although St. John looks beyond the historical Jesus to the Eternal Logos, the contemporary Christ of experience is no other than the Christ who was crucified, who was raised and who is exalted to the right hand of God. St. John, therefore, sees the focal points in the history of Jesus - His death, resurrection and ascension - more in the light of their Eternal significance, than in the light of their historical development. The Resurrection is seen as an eternal reality translated into history rather than as the historical development of a particular situation. Not that the actual history of the Resurrection was of no great importance, for he is most careful to supply historical detail. Yet the significance is not that Jesus of Nazareth should have been raised from the dead, but that God has raised Jesus Christ, the Logos, and thereby declared in the language of history the Eternal Truth of God's sovereignty over sin and death. Monsieur Goguel says of St. John, "Pour lui, la Résurrection était un élément fixé à l'avance du plan rédempteur, mais cela résulte de l'enseignement de l'Écriture beaucoup plus que des instructions que Jésus aurait données à ses disciples.... Ce n'est... qu'après l'événement que, d'après Jean, les disciples se sont rendu compte que Jésus l'avait annoncé. C'est au même qu'ils ont compris l'enseignement de l'Écriture qui s'y rapportait."¹ Goguel here clearly points out that the eternal truth of the Resurrection was part of the plan of God, hinted at both in the teaching of the Old Testament Scriptures and in the teaching of Jesus, but it was only when the disciples witnessed the actual fact of the empty tomb that that truth began to dawn upon them.

What is the eternal truth which the Resurrection of our Lord declares? It is the truth St. John interprets throughout his Gospel, contained in the words "Eternal Life". Professor Hunter rightly suggests that "St. John's key-word is life."² The Logos is creative, and in Him is life.³ But the Logos is become flesh, and his life-giving creativity is redemptive, so that all who believe in Him are restored to a relationship of sonship to God receiving Eternal Life.⁴ This truth is also expressed in the seven "I am's",⁵ to which we may add the indirect "I am" concerning the living water.⁶ These are claims made by Jesus because He is the Logos. In each, reference is to that Life which Jesus as the Christ alone can offer. Let us briefly examine the one more directly relevant

-
1. La Foi à la Résurrection, p.83ff - (Note 5).
 2. Interpreting New Testament Theology, p. 129.
 3. John 1:3-4.
 4. John 1:12-14; 3:16ff.
 5. John 6:48; 8:12; 10:9; 10:11; 11:25; 14:6; 15:1.
 6. John 4:14.

to our present consideration: "I am the Resurrection and the Life."¹ Martha was sure that had Jesus been present He could have prevented the death of Lazarus. When Jesus says that Lazarus will rise again, Martha understands this as referring to the resurrection at the last day, upon which Jesus affirms, "I am the Resurrection and the Life." Here we are face to face with that Eternal Truth, namely that in Jesus the Christ is Life. It is Life with an Eternal quality - God-like life. To all who believe in Jesus as the Christ, death loses its finality. It is overcome through Christ who is the Resurrection. "He who believes in me, though he die, yet shall he live, and whoever lives and believes in me shall never die."² In other words, Life Eternal is a present reality in Christ, and death ceases to be the annihilation of life, but becomes the doorway to a full and complete life in Christ.

St. John's soteriology is marked by the same strong emphasis. Redemption means participation in Eternal Life. But however strong the emphasis, it would be wrong to suppose that the death of Christ plays no significant part in St. John's view of the Atonement. The Christ of St. John is the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world;³ He is the Son of God who must be lifted up to draw all men to Himself;⁴ He is One who faced death knowing it to be part of the redemptive plan of God, as a vicarious sacrifice for men.⁵ Though St. John does not use Pauline words such as "law", "flesh", "devil", he does speak of "darkness"⁶ as the symbol of sin, because it is the hatred of Light which has come into the world. He speaks too of the "world", which, although the object of God's love,⁷ is also the domain of evil where the devil exercises his power;⁸ and of sin as "bondage" unto death - the negation of life.⁹ Yet, St. John and St. Paul, using different language and stressing different aspects, proclaim the same truth, namely, that in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, sin and death are defeated and Life Eternal is offered.¹⁰ For St. John the Atonement is the result of Christ's life-giving ministry which culminates "in the Cross and Resurrection whereby life is made available for all who believe in Him."¹¹

1. John 11:25.

2. John 11:25-26.

3. John 1:29.

4. John 3:14-17 - (Note 6).

5. John 12:27; 17:19.

6. John 1:4; 3:19ff; I John 1:6; 2:7ff.

7. John 3:16.

8. John 1:29; 12:31; 17:15ff; I John 2:15ff Cf. I John 3:7ff. and III John v.11.

9. John 5:24; 8:34 Cf. 8:51; I John 3:10 and 14-15.

10. Compare John 3:16 and I John 4:9 with Romans 5:9 and 6:23.

11. Hunter, Interpreting New Testament Theology, p. 130.

Eternal Life is only given to those who believe - "that whoever believes in Him" - so that faith is man's response to God's self-giving love. By faith St. John means more than the act of believing or trusting. When he speaks of faith, or uses the word "believe", we must understand him to imply and include "knowledge". When Jesus asked His disciples whether they also would forsake Him, St. John reports Peter as answering, "Lord to whom shall we go? You have the words of Eternal Life; and we have believed, and have come to know, that you are the Holy One of God."¹ This is knowledge² on a deep personal level, knowledge which leads to a mystical relationship between God and the believer. "The goal of this knowledge", says Professor Hunter, "is in fact union with God through Christ the mediator."³ Jesus speaks of this union to His disciples when He expresses the mutual indwelling of the Father and the Son,⁴ as the type of a similar mystical relationship between the Son and believers.⁵ Only when the believer is in Christ, is he through Christ brought into fellowship with the Father.⁶

Eternal Life is given to those who believe, but it is given by the Holy Spirit. Although the Holy Spirit is active in the ministry of Jesus, it is only after the Resurrection and Ascension that He comes as the promised Counsellor to the Church.⁷ The Holy Spirit comes that Christ may still be manifest to the believer;⁸ but that manifestation is no longer in terms of the Incarnation or the Resurrection, but in the power and presence of the Holy Spirit Himself. It is, therefore, through the gift of the Holy Spirit extending the incarnate and resurrected Christ to beyond the historical incarnation and resurrection, that the believer is able to see Christ and live in Him.⁹ The words "see" and "live" must surely be interpreted as referring to that mystical relationship between believer and Saviour. Such is Monsieur Goguel's interpretation. "Nous sommes ici en dehors des réalités de l'ordre physique, il s'agit d'un fait de caractère spirituel, d'une participation à la vie divine."¹⁰ And Professor Hunter puts it very aptly when he says, "The Holy Spirit comes as Christ's alter ego, not so much to supply his absence as to complete his presence."¹¹ (The words "alter ego" have

1. John 6:67-69.

2. See Note 3.

3. *op. cit.*, p. 138.

4. John 17:21 Cf. John 10:38.

5. John 15:4ff.

6. John 14:6.

7. John 14:15ff.

8. John 14:21.

9. John 14:18-20.

10. *La Foi à la Résurrection* p. 90 - (Note 7).

11. *Interpreting New Testament Theology* - p. 139.

the unfortunate disadvantage of confusing the identity of the second and third Persons of the Trinity. But we must understand him to mean that the Holy Spirit, Whose ministry it is to point to Christ, comes to make Christ contemporary to each succeeding generation).

There is no doubt that St. John is perpetually conscious of Jesus as the Christ, as the Eternal Son of God who became incarnate, died, was raised, and is now exalted to God's right hand, and whose presence is made real by the Holy Spirit.

We have left the Book of the Apocalypse to the end because it differs so widely in its style and content from the Gospel and the Epistles. It is a record by the Seer of "the revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him to show his servants what must soon take place,"¹ couched in Jewish apocalyptic language as that found in the Book of Daniel. It expresses in earthly and finite terms heavenly and infinite realities. Written at a time when Christians were being persecuted and oppressed by the Roman authorities, it points to those eternal and heavenly realities which lie beyond the passing earthly insecurities. It was written to "brace and fortify people who were not only passing through a time of great distress, but were also facing the probability that their ordeal would only grow in intensity,"² and to inspire in them "the conviction that a God who can be trusted to the uttermost, is in supreme control of all events."³

The fourth and fifth chapters of the Book of Revelation impart to us the wide and far-reaching vision of Him who is in control of all things. God in all His majesty, His power, and His glory, is sitting upon the heavenly throne receiving the worship of His people, and at His right hand is Jesus, His Son, who is described as "the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David," and also as the "Lamb standing as though it had been slain."⁴ This symbolic description of Jesus is of great significance to our present study. "The Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David" suggests strength, conquest and war-like heroism, (as does the symbol of the Lamb) but epitomises the Messiah of men's hopes. "The Lamb, standing as though it had been slain," suggests the perfect pascal lamb, chosen leader of the people, who, though slain and sacrificed, was raised and made triumphant through his death; and this epitomises the Messiah of God's will. This is Adam Burnet's interpretation when he says, "It is very hard to resist the idea of John setting side by side here the Messiah, as longing Israel envisaged Him, and the true Messiah as He was revealed in Christ."⁵

-
1. Revelation 1:1.
 2. A.W. Burnet, The Lord Reigneth, p.57.
 3. op. cit., p.58.
 4. Revelation 5:5-6.
 5. op. cit., p. 64.

The only one who is able to open the scroll with the seven seals and make known its contents - the clue to the history and destiny of man¹ - is Jesus Christ, crucified and risen, in whom alone man finds the goal of his existence. Thus the power of God lies not in strength of conquest but in eternal love. "It is the power of the Lamb's self-sacrifice, the power of the conviction that Christ, living, loving, dying, rising, has brought to the soul of man - that GOD IS LOVE."²

The Seer points us beyond the historical events of the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Christ to their eternal significance and reality, which is that the love of God is at the same time self-denying and victorious, sacrificial and triumphant. The heart of God is continually being hurt while at the same time conquering the sin and evil which hurts it. As Professor John Mackay summarises it, "In the imagery of the apocalyptic Seer, the Risen One never sees to be the Crucified One."³

But the Lamb is also the Lord of Lords and the King of Kings by whom the kings of the world will be defeated when they wage war on Him.⁴ In Him is the hope of all the faithful, for, despite oppression, persecution and even apparent defeat, the ultimate victory is in His hands, since He reigns in the Kingdom of God.⁵ And so, whereas the Gospel tends to see in the Resurrection the return of Christ to His pre-incarnation state, the Apocalypse sees the Resurrection as Christ's exaltation to the heavenly Kingdom of God, where He administers the rule of God at His right hand. The Gospels, containing the narrative of Christ's life, were in circulation in the Churches at the time when the Apocalypse was written, and the Christians were aware of the historical events of His life. The Apocalypse, therefore, takes the historical Resurrection for granted and interprets it, and in doing so places the emphasis on the eternal reality that Christ is the Lamb of God reigning in heaven. It is not that the open tomb and the appearances of the Risen Christ have lost their significance for the Seer, but rather that in the face of persecution and suffering the eschatological aspect of the Resurrection assumes an urgency which transcends the mere historical aspect. The faith of believers is focused on the hope of the final victory of the Risen Lord reigning in heaven, and of a life shared with Him. This hope is indeed grounded in the Resurrection of our Lord, historically manifested, but believers are now reminded of the eternal significance of the Resurrection lying beyond its historical manifestation. In other words, the believers are reminded that they

1. Cf. op. cit., pp. 63ff and 66ff.

2. op. cit., p. 67.

3. "Theology Today", Editorial, Vol XIII, No.1, p.3.

4. Revelation 17:14; 19:11-21.

5. Revelation 21:5; 22:3.

are fighting not a losing, but a winning battle. The strong note of the Apocalypse, therefore, is that the Risen Christ now reigns at God's right hand.

Section 5 - The Author¹
(The Epistle to the Hebrews)

It may be said that the Epistle to the Hebrews expounds Christ's statement: "Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfil them."² In this Epistle the Author demonstrates how Jesus, as the full and final revelation of God not only gathers up in Himself the Mosaic law, the priestly worship and the prophetic proclamation of Jewish religion, but also supersedes them. Under the Old Covenant, these were the channels of communion and communication between God and His people, but now that the New Covenant is established by God through Jesus Christ His Son, there is a new channel of communion and communication between Himself and man - the channel of the personal. J.B. Phillips in his introductory remarks to his translation of the Epistle, says, "the general idea of this letter is to demonstrate that Jesus amply fulfils all the highest conceptions of the Jewish religion, and is infinitely superior to any predecessors.... There is, therefore, for those who belong to Christ far greater privilege in knowing God, but far greater responsibility in serving Him loyally."³

The Author begins by claiming the validity of God's self-revelation in the Person of His Son, Jesus Christ. "In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son." Then he continues by declaring that the Son is Eternal - "whom he appointed the heir of all things;" that He is the agent of creation - "through whom also he created the world;" that He is God Incarnate - "He reflects the glory of God and bears the very stamp of his nature, upholding the universe by his word of power;" that He is Redeemer - "when he had made purification for sins;" and that He is the triumphant

-
1. Professor Hunter calls the writer to the Hebrews 'Auctor' (the writer) or 'The Author' "because, as Origen observed long ago, his real name is known only to God." (Interpreting New Testament Theology, - p. 117).
 2. Matthew 5:17.
 3. Letters to Young Churches, p. 159 (Geoffrey Bles - 1947).

Lord - " he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high."¹ Right at the start he sums up in a few words the essence of the Christian message, and thereby gives his readers a balanced Christology. It is balanced because he does not stress one aspect of the truth concerning Christ at the expense of another. And though the Resurrection itself is not explicitly mentioned, it is implicit and understood in his majestic vision of Christ sitting at the right hand of God. As in the Apocalypse, the emphasis is on the significance underlying the historical fact of the Resurrection. Right from the beginning the Gospel events were read or recited in the Churches. Thus, although the Epistle to the Hebrews was written at about the same time as the first Gospel, that of St. Mark, (c. A.D. 65-70), the early Christians were already well acquainted with the historical events of the life of Christ. The Author, therefore, does not need to remind his readers about the facts of the Resurrection, but supplements the narratives by pointing to the fact which their historical evidence supports, namely, that Jesus Christ is the Risen Exalted Lord.

This fact is implicit throughout the Epistle but more particularly in the concept of the Great High Priest,² which is expressed in the language of Jewish ritual. In this ritual, the unblemished lamb was slain as a sacrifice on the altar. The blood of the animal which symbolized its very life, was offered for the remission of the sins of the people by the priest who officiated on behalf of the people. It was an offering of life through the supreme act of death. The sacrifice of blood was then taken to the mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies where pardon and forgiveness were received by the priest on behalf of the people.³ 'But now,' says the Author, 'Christ Himself has offered the perfect sacrifice.' He has "entered once for all into the Holy Place taking not the blood of goats and calves but His own blood (offering His own life), thus securing an eternal redemption."⁴ What was done repeatedly, imperfectly and partially has now been done once for all, perfectly and completely, not only in history but also in the realm of the Eternal.⁵ Jesus Christ, identifying Himself with man, has borne the penalty of his sin, and, having passed through death which is the final judgment on sin, has presented redeemed humanity to the Father. This is the work of the High Priest which has been done "for all times." Thus what the

1. Hebrews 1:1-3.

2. Hebrews 3:1; 4:15; 5:15; 8:1ff; 9:11.

3. See Hebrews Chapter 9.

4. Hebrews 9:12.

5. Cf. Hebrews 9:24ff.

Jewish religion foreshadowed is now, through Christ, the Great High Priest, not only a fact of history but also eternal fact and reality.¹

The full redemptive work of Christ is seen not merely in His sacrifice on the Cross, but also in His Resurrection and Ascension whereby He has proclaimed an eternal forgiveness, and opened the way to the presence of the Father. Redemption is not merely forgiveness of sin, it is also restoration to the fellowship of God, and this has been made possible by our Lord, crucified, risen and ascended. We may call this the doctrine of "Access", as does Professor Hunter,² but whatever we call it, it does complete our often defective doctrine of the Atonement. For, as Professor Milligan reminds us, the offering of our Lord was not finished until, "as one who had died and risen again, He went perfected through death, into the Holiest of all, and there devoted Himself, and His people in Him, to the perpetual service of the Eternal Father."³

Though the Author's doctrine is couched in priestly and sacrificial terms, somewhat foreign to our present use and understanding, yet he has preserved the glory of the Christian message, that in Christ not only are our sins blotted out and ourselves forgiven, but that in and through Him the veil of the Holy of Holies has been torn down and the way made open for us to enter into the very presence of God our Father. That is the work of our Great High Priest and Advocate, who also perpetually pleads and intercedes for us.

1. Cf. Hebrews 10:1ff.

2. Interpreting New Testament Theology, p.122.

3. The Resurrection of our Lord, p.142.

CHAPTER TWO - THE RESURRECTION IN THE LIFE AND WORSHIP
OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH;

Section 1 - Primitive Worship.

Worship in the primitive Church was the spontaneous and dynamic expression by the Christian community of its devotion and adoration of God, the Father of the Lord¹ Jesus Christ. Although the forms of worship "did not crystallize until the fourth and fifth centuries,"² they were general and fixed long before this and were from the first governed by tradition to a large extent. It was the Holy Spirit who made these forms of worship dynamic and who prompted the spontaneity of Christian worship by pointing to the Risen and Exalted Christ, through whom approach to the Father was made possible, who reigns at the Father's right hand over His God's Kingdom. Thus in considering the place of the Resurrection in the worship of the primitive Church we must look for the marks which characterised the worship of the early Christians and which influenced the development of the liturgies and rites of the Christian Church.

The first Christians continued to worship in the synagogues,³ following the example of Jesus who had worshipped, and expounded the Scriptures, in the synagogue "as his custom was".⁴ During his missionary journeys, St. Paul, whenever he came to a town or city, "made the synagogue the spearhead of his evangelistic campaign."⁵ Worship in the synagogue centred around the reading and exposition of the Scriptures, particularly of the Law and Prophets and this central act was accompanied by prayers and praise. When the Christians were eventually expelled from the synagogues, they naturally took with them their heritage of Jewish worship, which was transformed and given a new focus within the Christian community. Thus "there was a new emphasis and content to accord with the new revelation and to express the new Spirit".⁶ It is in examining this new emphasis and content that we shall find the marks of early Christian worship.

We deal now with those characteristics of primitive worship whose sources are traced back to the synagogue. First we turn to preaching and the use of the Scriptures in the primitive Church. The early Christians did not cease to read and expound the Law and the Prophets, but these were seen in a new light - that of the Risen

-
1. See Note 8
 2. Horton Davies, Christian Worship, p.20.
 3. Acts 2:46; 5:42; Luke 24:3.
 4. Matthew 4:23; 9:35; Mark 1:39; Luke 13:10; 4:15,16,44.
 5. op. cit., p.15.
 6. W.D. Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship, p.3.

Christ, God's Messiah. We need only look at the 'sermons' recorded in the Book of Acts to find a pattern of exposition and preaching in which the Law and the Prophets were seen both as pointing to Jesus Christ, crucified and risen, and as fulfilled in Him. The pattern was briefly this:

Old Testament prophecies are fulfilled.
The Messiah, descended from David, has come.
He is Jesus of Nazareth - who was attested by God
with mighty works and wonders,
was crucified according to the plan of God,
was raised from the dead,
is now exalted to God's right hand, and
has sent the promised Holy Spirit.¹

Thus the Apostles preached Jesus Christ, who came not to destroy the Law and the Prophets but to fulfil them. In Him were revealed not only the mighty acts of God, but God Himself, who in His love made Himself known in person. That is the reason why St. John said in his epistle: "that which we have seen and heard we proclaim also to you."² And so in the Christian community the emphasis gradually shifted from the Law and the Prophets to the memoirs and epistles of the Apostles, until, even before the New Testament canon was formed, the principal place was given to the Gospels, wherein the words and deeds of the Lord Jesus Christ were related and portrayed.

Secondly we turn to the praise used in the worship of the early Christian communities. A clear indication of the type of gathering which took place in the primitive Church is given in St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians. Speaking of the responsibilities of the new life in Christ, he says: "And let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts, to which indeed you were called in the one body. And be thankful. Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, as you teach and admonish one another in all wisdom and as you sing psalms and **hymns** and spiritual songs with thankfulness in your hearts to God."³ If nothing else three things stand out clearly from this passage in relation to the praise used by the early Christians. The first is that, not only did they continue to use the Psalter, as they had been accustomed to do in the synagogue, but they also used distinctively Christian hymns and spiritual songs, of which we find fragments in the New Testament. Most scholars agree that in I Timothy 3:16 we have a fragment of a hymn of praise to Christ. Even

1. Cf. Acts 2.

2. 1 John 1:3.

3. Colossians 3:15-16 Cf. Ephesians 5:19.

earlier than Timothy, we have in the great Kenosis passage of the epistle to the Philippians what is probably a resumé of an early Christian hymn ending in an ascription of glory:

"... that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."¹

We find other fragments of hymns or spiritual songs in the Book of the Apocalypse,² such as

"Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord God Almighty, who was, and is, and is to come;"³

or again,

"Praise our God, all you his servants,
You who fear him small and great."⁴

Thus, apart from the psalms which were given a new, Christian meaning, there grew up a treasury of hymns which were very probably part of the oral tradition which later became fixed in literary composition. The second thing we note from St. Paul's counsel to the Colossians is that the praise of the early Christians was one of joy and thankfulness to God "that now the salvation and the power and the Kingdom of our God and the authority of His Christ have come,"⁵ as one fragment of a hymn has it. The whole atmosphere of the primitive Church was one of joy and gratitude even in the face of the most hostile opposition, as the Apocalypse testifies. The third implication of St. Paul's words is that the worship of the Christian community was always to be directed to and through Christ. He stood at the centre of all their activities; He was the object of their devotion and adoration; He is the Head of the Body to which, says St. Paul, "you were called." The Book of the Apocalypse so rich in imagery, gives us a glimpse into the ways of worship of the primitive Church, and many of the fragmentary hymns recorded there are directed to the Lamb that was slain. But as we have already seen the Lamb that was slain symbolised not only the suffering but also the triumphant Lord and Messiah.

"To him who sits upon the throne and to the Lamb be blessing and honour and glory and might for ever and ever."⁶

It was Jesus Christ, crucified, risen and exalted who gave the praise and adoration of the early Christian community its direction and meaning.

Finally we turn to the third element which the Christians took over from the synagogue worship, namely prayers. In Jewish worship the prayers were of such a nature that the whole congregation was able to take part in them, antiphonally or responsively. This

1. Philippians 2:10-11; Cf. vv 5-11.

2. Cf. Revelation 4:8,11; 5:9,10; 11:15-18; 12:10-12; 14:7; 15:3,4; 19:5-8.

3. Revelation 4:8.

4. Revelation 19:5.

5. Revelation 12:10.

6. Revelation 5:13.

practice seems to have continued in the worship of the early Christian communities, for we are told in the Book of Acts that "they devoted themselves to the Apostles teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers."¹ The irresistible implication here is that the prayers to which they devoted themselves were of such a nature that all could have a part in their recitation. The Didache, which has been called the "Church Manual"² of the primitive Church, gives us many examples of early liturgical prayers. One example is the injunction given for the use of the Lord's Prayer. To this prayer, taught by Jesus, was added the doxology representing "the liturgical echo of the congregation,"³ for as Professor Cullmann points out, "the words 'for thine is the Kingdom' etc. were, as is well known, not spoken by Jesus but are introduced into late MSS ... under the influence of early Christian liturgy."⁴ Other examples are the thanksgiving (eucharist) prayers where we find phrases such as "To you be glory forever,"⁵ or "For yours is the glory and the power for ever,"⁶ appearing at the conclusion of these prayers. In the light of our knowledge of the forms of prayer used in the synagogue and of their influence on the development of Christian worship, it seems very likely that these recurring phrases were the liturgical responses made by the people.⁷ The interesting thing is that these doxologies, whether liturgical responses or not, ascribe praise and glory to God the Father for life and knowledge,⁸ for faith and immortality⁹ revealed through Jesus Christ. This is significant because it indicates how thoroughly the content of Christian worship derived from Jewish worship, was motivated by Jesus as Christ and Lord. Yet another example, which is probably the oldest liturgical prayer, has been preserved in the Aramaic: Maranatha! - Our Lord, come! This is found in St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians (16:22), in the Book of the Apocalypse (22:20), and at the end of the eucharistic liturgy in the Didache (10:6). It was essentially a part of eucharistic prayer whose significance is closely linked to the fact of the Resurrection. Jesus made Himself known as the Risen Christ through the breaking of bread, or at a meal, and so this prayer, used at the eucharistic meal expressed the hope of Christ's re-appearing, even as He had done in the past. This is Professor Cullmann's suggestion, which he sums up when he says, "This ancient prayer thus points at

-
1. Acts 2:42.
 2. Cf. Early Christian Fathers, (Library of Christian Classics Vol. I).
 3. Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p.12.
 4. op. cit., p.13, Footnote I.
 5. Didache 9:2; 10:2,4.
 6. Didache 9:4; 10:5
 7. Cf. the Sursum Corda
 8. Didache 9:3
 9. Didache 10:2

the same time backwards to Christ's appearance on the day of His Resurrection, to His present appearance at the common meal of the community, and forwards to His appearance at the End, which is often represented by the picture of a Messianic meal."¹

But whatever the particular connotation these prayers may have had in the eucharist, the fact remains that our Risen Lord gave the early Christians, and continues to give us, a directive in prayer, knowing that He promises: "whatever ye ask in my name that will I do,"² and that He is the Great High Priest interceding on behalf of His Church. Prayer is, therefore, not the uncertain and vague communication between the believer and his remote God. But, in the Name of Jesus Christ through whom the believer offers his prayers, He Himself is the effective channel of communication and communion with our ever-present and living God. The prayers of the individual as well as those of the Church are gathered up in the intercessions of Jesus Christ, the Priest, who by virtue of His death, resurrection and ascension has made possible man's entrance into the Eternal Holy of Holies - the presence of God.

We have considered three fundamental characteristics of early Christian worship - preaching, praise and prayer, and we have seen how these, taken over from the synagogue, were given a new meaning within the primitive Church. There are two other marks of primitive worship whose sources are specifically Christian and which we must briefly consider in their relation to the Resurrection. These are first, the institution of the Lord's Day, and secondly, the phenomenon of speaking with tongues. The two dominical sacraments will be considered in a separate section.

The institution of the Lord's Day as the day of worship in contrast to the Jewish Sabbath, the day of rest, is a direct result of the Resurrection. Today the meaning of the Lord's Day is confused with the commandment to keep the seventh day of the week holy; whereas in the primitive Church, it was in deliberate distinction from the worship of the synagogue on the Sabbath that the early Christians gathered together on the day of Christ's resurrection, to re-enact the experience of the Last Supper and to do this 'for the recalling' (in remembrance) of Him. It seems that to begin with, this day was referred to as 'the first day of the week,'³ and only later became known as the 'Lord's Day'.⁴ Both these names have the same implication. The first day of the week was the day on which Jesus was raised

1. Early Christian Worship, p.14.

2. John 14:13.

3. Cf. I Corinthians 16:2; Acts 20:7.

4. Later full use was made of the symbolism of the 'Day of the sun' (Sunday) derived from pagan cult, as it expressed also a symbol of the Resurrection. Cf. Justin Martyr's Apologia I, 67.

from the dead. It was the day on which the great triumph of the love of God was declared by the fact that Jesus could not be held by death but had conquered it.¹ It was in the light shed by the Resurrection that the disciples understood the meaning of the Crucifixion; and in the presence of the Risen Christ that the breaking of the bread and the blessing of the cup became charged with new power. Only then could they grasp the full significance of His words:

"This is my body which is broken for you;"

"This cup is the New Covenant in my blood;"

"Do this in remembrance of me."

The first day of the week was for the early Christians, the ever-recurring Easter festival, the day of the Resurrection, and thus in every sense the Lord's Day, "and to that day belonged their highest act of worship, when they showed forth His death victoriously in the eucharist, while He Himself, their Risen Lord, was present in their midst."²

Another feature of early Christian worship was the freedom it gave to the expression of the influence of the Holy Spirit, particularly in the form of speaking with tongues. This seems to have been widely practised in the beginnings of the primitive Church, but to have disappeared almost entirely by the time of Justin.³ Speaking with tongues was one of the signs of having received the gift of the Holy Spirit as was clearly evident at Pentecost. We have already seen how the giving of the Holy Spirit was directly related to the Resurrection since Christ promised that He would send the Counsellor to be with His disciples after His physical departure from them. The task of the Holy Spirit is essentially to point to the Risen and Exalted Lord and to empower the believer to live in Christ.⁴ Consequently those who were baptized into the Church, - the body of Christ - received the gift of the Holy Spirit and expressed the reality of this gift through speaking with tongues, at the same time expressing the reality of the presence of the Risen Lord experienced through mystical union with Him. The danger of the unrestricted expression of this gift was its inherent individualism, of which St. Paul was well aware. In his first epistle to the Corinthians he contrasts the gift of speaking with tongues with the gift of prophecy, and says, "He who speaks in a tongue edifies himself, but he who prophesies, edifies the Church."⁵ St. Paul did not disparage the

1. See footnote 4 on previous page.

2. W.D. Maxwell, *An Outline of Christian Worship*, p.4.

3. *Apologia* I, 67.

4. Cf. John 14:16ff; also p.26.

5. Cf. I Corinthians 14:4.

gift of speaking in tongues, but he applied the criterion whereby the usefulness of this gift must be measured and all worship directed. The criterion is this, "Let all things be done for edification,"¹ for the building up of the community as the Church. Remembering that the Church was conceived as the Body of Christ because its members were in Christ the Risen Lord, we begin to see that St. Paul's motive in counselling the Corinthians in their forms of worship, was to edify the worshippers and honour the Risen Lord. The gift of tongues was therefore a mark of the believer's union with Christ, through the Holy Spirit, to be used and expressed not for self-elation but for the benefit of those who did not have this gift. He who possessed this gift was but one member of the Body, and his gift was to be used for the building up of the whole Body of Christ.²

Early Christian worship, then, was in all respects given its true content by the Risen and Exalted Christ, who as the focal point of every form of worship, gave preaching, prayer, praise, the expression of spiritual gifts and even the time of meeting for worship, their purpose and meaning.

Section 2 - The Rite of Christian Baptism.

Baptism was a rite amongst the Jews whereby proselytes from paganism were initiated into the Jewish race and faith. The traditional interpretation of this rite has been the symbolism of washing and cleansing which it enacts. But modern scholarship, and notably the work of Jeremias, shows that initiation by baptism as practised within Judaism was regarded as initiation into the covenant and not as merely or even mainly a washing. The rite of baptism was preceded by repentance - a turning back to the Law of Moses - accompanied by a period of probation in which a visible change in the person's way of life had to be manifested. Baptism only came after this 'trial' period and was administered as "a three-fold immersion in running water accompanied by the recitation of the Decalogue and confession of sin."³ This would point to Baptism as a true rite of initiation by which proselytes entered the Mosaic Covenant by dying to their old Gentile life and rising new-born as Israelites. This is substantiated by the linguistic evidence of the terminology used to describe baptism. The Rev. John Heron, in his study of the Theology of Baptism, points out clearly and convincingly that the meaning of the root 'baptō', with which are associated the various

1. I Corinthians 14:26b

2. Cf. Romans 12:4ff.

3. Heron, The Theology of Baptism, Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 8, No.1. March, 1955, p. 39.

references to baptism in the New Testament, is 'to dip', 'to plunge,' 'to dye,' and not 'to cleanse' or 'to wash.' He further points out that the LXX uses the word 'louō' and not 'baptō' or 'baptizō' for Levitical washings and rites of purification. He concludes: "John's baptism would seem to have been an act of prophetic symbolism in which, by an acted parable of drowning, the candidate went down into the water to mark the end of his old life in order that he might emerge a new man. Not cleansing but death and rebirth, was, then, the basic meaning of Baptism."¹

John's work of calling Israel to repentance and baptism was in preparation of the coming of the Messiah and His Kingdom. And by coming to John and being baptised by him, our Lord accepted **him** as His own forerunner, and though He needed no repentance identified Himself with the preparation of the coming of His Kingdom. Quoting Alfred Plummer, Heron says, "By means of this rite the people were consecrated to receive salvation, and He was consecrated to bestow it."² But our Lord's baptism stands out above that of others because of the direct and visible manifestation of the Holy Spirit which accompanied it. It is sometimes said, in view of this manifestation of the Spirit together with the words which accompanied it, that Jesus only became conscious of His divine Sonship at His baptism. This savours of adoptionism, and rests upon a misconception of the central motif of our Lord's baptism.³ The words; "Thou art my beloved Son, with thee I am well pleased"⁴ have their source in Isaiah 42:1 and it is in their relationship with Isaiah's prophecy of the Servant of Yahweh⁵ that we find the significance of Christ's baptism. Jesus, though sinless, identified Himself with the sinful whom He came to redeem in accepting baptism, and in so doing inaugurated His redemptive mission. He became conscious that His task was that of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh, that He was "numbered with the transgressors," and that He must bear "the sins of many."⁶ But He knew too that the mission of the Servant of Yahweh would end in the victory of God.⁷ Thus, "at Jordan Jesus received his calling as Servant of the Lord, accepted his vocation of redemption through suffering, acknowledged his baptism in terms of the cross."⁸ It is precisely when seen in relation to Christ's redemptive mission, which included crucifixion and resurrection, that Baptism derives its full Christian content as a sacrament of the Church. Christian

1. op. cit. p. 38

2. op. cit. p. 41

3. Cf. G.S. Hendry, *The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology*, pp.19ff. (S.C.M. - 1957).

4. Luke 3:22.

5. Cf. Isaiah Chapter 42.

6. Cf. Isaiah 53:12.

7. Cf. Isaiah 53:10-12

8. Clark, *An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments*, p. 18.

baptism became a baptism not only of water but also of the Spirit: for the gift of the Holy Spirit which accompanies baptism, "issues from the crucified and glorified body of Jesus. At this point, and only at this point does Christian baptism become possible."¹

But just how does the Christian rite of baptism derive its meaning from Christ's redemptive task? St. Paul gives a clear and definite answer to this question in his epistle to the Romans:

"Do you not know that all of us who have been baptised into Christ Jesus were baptised into his death? We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life."²

The person baptised is identified through this rite with Christ's death and resurrection, through which man is forgiven, his old self crucified and his sins blotted out, and through which he is raised to a new life, clothed with the righteousness given by God. This is the work of God in Christ done once for all on Calvary and in the garden of the open tomb, but appropriated by each new member of the Body when he is baptised into Christ, reminding us "that salvation history continues in the present time."³ Thus baptism through his immersion into, and his rising out from the water dramatically enacts the death and resurrection of Christ in the life and experience of the believer. For Christian baptism is "baptism into Christ, the incarnate, crucified, risen and ascended Redeemer. In baptism the disciple enters into the whole redemptive action of his Lord."⁴ In this radical manner God's forgiveness and His gift of salvation was effectively actualised in the life of the individual, for baptism in the primitive Church was a symbolic enactment of what through the power of God was operative; it was a work done by God.

Not only was the believer forgiven and raised to the potentiality of a new life, he was also empowered to live that new life by receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit. The Book of Acts always speaks of baptism in the context of the pentecostal experience,⁵ whether or not the gift of the Spirit was simultaneous with or subsequent to baptism. In fact, in response to the preaching of the Apostles the people were told, "Repent and be baptised everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."⁶ But this gift of the Spirit was not simply the corollary of receiving forgiveness of sins, it was integral with the redemptive work of Christ, which, as we have seen, was the foundation of Christian baptism. The

1. op. cit., p. 28.

2. Romans 6:3-4; See also vv. 5-11; Cf. Colossians 2:12.

3. Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament - p.35.

4. Clark, An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments - p. 31.

5. Cf. op. cit., p. 10.

6. Acts 2:38.

outpouring of the Holy Spirit as the Counsellor who brings successive generations to Christ, the source of forgiveness and life, is part of the fulfilment of Christ's redemptive work, and is therefore essential for the efficacy of Christian baptism. The Spirit given through baptism is given by the Risen and Ascended Christ.

There was yet another significance of baptism in the primitive Church, which has faded in some branches of the modern Church, that is its significance as a rite of initiation into the Body of Christ. In the primitive Church this meant becoming a member not of an organization or institution, but of a living organism. St. Paul spoke of the Church as an organism when he called it the Body of Christ.

"For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. For by one Spirit we were all baptised into one body."¹ ... "We, though many, are one body in Christ"² ... "As many of you as were baptised into Christ have put on Christ."³

Through baptism the believer is incorporated into the Body of Christ, the community of all who are "in" Christ, who have "put on" Christ; and it is this community which is the true Church, the true ecclesia, the people of God. As the Body of Christ the Church is, therefore, on earth the visible manifestation of the Risen Christ, and exists on earth as the instrument with which he applies His redemptive work in every age. The Church is also the Spirit-filled community of the redeemed for it is only through the Holy Spirit that the Church can be conscious of being the Body of the Risen Christ. Baptism into Christ, baptism into the Church, or baptism in the Holy Spirit, "these are but different ways of expressing the same one great reality."⁴

Thus, baptism in the primitive Church was an act whereby the believer was set within the body of Christ (initiation into the Church), to be received into the fellowship of Christ's death and resurrection (forgiveness and new life) and to be empowered by the Holy Spirit (baptism of fire). Thus the Church as the Body of Christ is commissioned to go and make disciples of all nations, "baptising them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit"⁵ in the knowledge and certainty that He who has given His Church this mission is the Risen Lord who has promised: "Lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age."⁶

It is very interesting to note, in passing, that, in the Church of the 3rd and 4th Centuries, the administration of baptism was

1. I Corinthians 12:12f.

2. Romans 12:5.

3. Galatians 3:27.

4. Clark, An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments - p.25.

5. Matthew 28:19.

6. Matthew 28:20. Even if not a commission given verbally by Christ (for on textual grounds this is disputable), it sums up vividly the vocation and task of the Church.

linked with certain preliminary acts, such as the renunciation of the Devil, stripping, and confession of faith. These acts served in a very real way to emphasize the Lordship of the living Christ in whose name the disciple was baptised. The catechetical lectures of St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, delivered to the newly baptised, better known as the lectures "On the Mysteries" (348-350 A.D.), show us the tremendous significance of these acts before baptism. The following extract reflects not only the strong symbolism but also the deep reality expressed by these acts, for the fact that something real took place is emphasised in St. Cyril's opening words:

Lecture 1 - To the Newly Baptised

1. "Let us now instruct you with greater exactness, that you may know the effect that was wrought in you on the evening of your baptism.

The Renunciation of Satan

2. First you entered the vestibule of the baptistry, and there facing the West you listened to the command to stretch forth your hand. And you renounced Satan as if he were really present. Now you should know that this is prefigured in ancient history. For when ... Pharaoh was oppressing ... the Hebrews, God sent Moses to lead them out of the bitter bondage of the Egyptians....
3. Turn now from the old to the new, from figure to reality. There we have Moses sent by God into Egypt; here, Christ, dispatched by His Father to the world: there that Moses might lead an oppressed people out of Egypt; here that Christ might free a world oppressed by the burden of sin: there the blood of a lamb turned aside the destroying angel; here the blood of the Lamb without blemish is the refuge from demons....
4. But still, with hand pointed toward him as though he were present, you are taught to say: "I renounce thee, Satan". I intend now to tell you why you stand facing the West; for this is necessary. The West is the region of sensible darkness, and since Satan is darkness and holds sway over darkness, by looking symbolically toward the West you renounce that dark and ominous potentate.

What then did each of you stand up and say? I renounce thee Satan, wicked and cruel tyrant ... For Christ, by sharing with me in flesh and blood, has overthrown thy might, that through flesh and blood He might by death abolish death....

Lecture 2 - On Baptism

... The Stripping for Baptism.

No sooner had you entered than you took off your undergarments. Now this was an image of stripping off the old man with his deeds (cf. Colossians 3:9). Having stripped yourselves, you were naked, imitating Christ in this also, who was stripped naked on the cross, and by His nakedness exposed the principalities and powers and boldly vanquished them on the tree....

The anointing before Baptism.

3. Then when you were stripped, you were anointed with oil that had been exorcized, from the hairs of your head to the soles of your feet, and you were made partakers of the good olive tree, Jesus Christ.... the exorcized oil was a symbol of your participation in Christ's bounty, which puts to flight every trace of hostile influence....

The Profession of Faith.

4. After this, you were led to the holy pool of divine baptism, as Christ was led to the sepulchre which lies before you. And each of you was asked whether he believed in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. And you made that saving confession,....

The Paradox of Baptism.

5. The strange paradox of it all! We did not really die; we were not really buried; we were not really crucified and raised again... Christ was truly crucified and truly buried and truly rose, and all this He has bestowed upon us freely, ... through fellowship with His suffering, He freely bestows salvation.
7. That we might learn, then, that whatever Christ suffered for us and for our salvation - in reality and not in appearance - and that we also are partakers of His sufferings, Paul exclaimed with perfect exactness: "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection" (Romans 6:5)."¹

This stringent preparation for and prelude to baptism was common practice in the Church of those early centuries, as the writings of Hippolytus,² and St. Ambrose of Milan³ also bear out. Evident throughout this elaborate outward ceremonial is the Church's consciousness of and her faith in her risen and living Lord. The renunciation of Satan, the stripping, the confession of faith, the anointing, the immersion, all these were in fact the Church's declaration that Christ the exalted yet present Lord is active still, redeeming all who will to be incorporated into His body. "Thus Westcott could write that, 'so thoroughly was the faith in the Resurrection of Christ inwrought into the minds of the first christians that the very entrance into their society was apprehended under the form of a resurrection.'"⁴

The sacrament of baptism is an opportunity not only for the baptised person but also for the Church to proclaim, dramatically, its faith in Christ as Kurios, the Risen Lord, for "with every baptism a new victory is won."⁵

1. Palmer, Sacraments and Worship - p. 13ff.
"St. Cyril of Jerusalem on the Mysteries, 348-350".
2. Cf. Palmer - op. cit., pp. 6ff.
3. Cf. Palmer - op. cit., pp. 25ff.
4. Maxwell, The Resurrection: Its Significance and Relevance - p.18. (Inaugural Lecture).
5. Cullmann - Baptism in the New Testament - p.32.

Section 3 - The Eucharist.

Baptism, as a Sacrament of initiation into the Body of Christ is administered once and cannot be repeated for the individual, but the Lord's Supper, as a sacrament of communion with our Lord within the Body of Christ, is celebrated frequently, (it should be celebrated at least every Lord's Day)¹ for it is the life-blood of the Christian community. The early Christians, conscious of the Risen and living Lord, celebrated the Lord's Supper frequently,² because it was His command. The fact of the Resurrection, infused His words spoken on the occasion of the Last Supper, with new significance and made the Lord's Supper "not a sad anniversary of a death but a joyous feast of resurrection: ... communion with the risen Christ."³

Much has been written about the origin of the Lord's Supper and there are still conflicting opinions on this subject. But most scholars agree that the Lord's Supper does not derive from the Jewish Passover but that it has its roots in a meal of fellowship in which a Rabbi and his disciples commonly participated on the eve of the Sabbath. Professor Maxwell explains very clearly and succinctly the nature of this meal. "Its purpose," he says, "was to prepare for the Sabbath or a festival and it was religious in character. It consisted of religious discussion followed by a simple meal of common bread and wine mixed with water, the cup being passed from one to another, and prayer offered." He concludes, "It is almost certain that our Lord and His disciples were accustomed to partake of this meal of fellowship on the eve of every Sabbath and festival: the 'last supper,' therefore, was the last of these meals that they shared together."⁴ The great significance about this "Last Supper" was that Jesus turned this simple meal of fellowship into a sacrament of communion between God and man, by making the bread and the wine symbols which conveyed His flesh and blood. The new meaning which He gave to this meal was only grasped after His Resurrection. But the fact remains that the meal which had expressed the bond of fellowship between Jesus and His disciples during His earthly ministry, became, through His death and Resurrection, the expression of fellowship between the exalted Lord and the members of His Body. The meal became a sacrament, when Jesus Himself commanded His disciples, "Do this in remembrance of me."⁵ The English word 'remembrance' is misleading, conveying the meaning of 'memorial,' which is no more than the recapturing of a past event in memory, "a transportation in thought back to the moment of its occurrence.... But

-
1. Cf. Calvin's - Institutes of the Christian Religion Book IV, 17:43-45; also R.S. Wallace, Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament, - p.252.
 2. Cf. Acts 2:42.
 3. W.D. Maxwell, The Resurrection: Its Significance and Relevance p. 20.
 4. An Outline of Christian Worship, p. 5ff.
 5. I Corinthians 11: 24 and 25.

for biblical thought the Greek 'anamnesis' and the Hebrew 'zekher' have the sense of re-calling or re-presenting before God an event in the past so that it becomes living, powerful and operative. ... Henceforth when the disciples 'do this' it will be for the bringing of Christ Crucified out of the past into the present, for the 're-calling' of his sacrifice before God, thus making it here and now operative."¹ And again it must be stressed that it was not until after the Resurrection that Christ's sacrifice on the Cross was seen as victorious and therefore as operative, and consequently only after the Resurrection did the command of Jesus assume its urgency and power.

Thus, in the primitive Church the Lord's Supper was a meal of fellowship at which the early Christians did not look back with nostalgia to a dead Messiah but were conscious of the presence of a living Lord. Professor Cullmann suggests that there is a greater link than is generally considered between Christ's resurrection appearances at meals² and the eucharistic feasts of the primitive Church, which look back to the Easter meals "in which the Messianic Meal promised by Jesus at the Last Supper was already partly anticipated."³ We must however note that these meals at which Jesus appeared were not of the nature of the Last Supper. Too hasty a conclusion about their connection with the Eucharist is unwise but the fact is interesting. Of these meals, only the one which Jesus shared with the two disciples He met on the road to Emmaus, speaks of "breaking of bread," but even then this was palpably not intended to be a fellowship meal similar to the Last Supper. In the other references the meal consisted of fish, and although it was perhaps linked symbolically to the Christ-centred fellowship,⁴ it is unlikely to have been a fellowship meal in the sense of the Last Supper. The New Testament does not record all of Christ's appearances, and it is likely that He did appear to His disciples during one of their fellowship meals. But we can say no more than that His appearances on these other occasions, when He shared a meal with His disciples, confirmed more strongly and powerfully the reality of His Risen presence amongst them. That certainly seems to be the tone of Peter's words to Cornelius: "... but God raised him on the third day and made him manifest, not to all the people but to us who were chosen by God as witnesses, who ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead."⁵ With this strong conviction of His presence amongst them, the Eucharist in the primitive Church which was "the perpetuation in prayer and sacramental fellowship of the experience of the

1. Clark, *An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments*, p. 62.
2. Cf. Luke 24:30,36ff; John 21:9ff; Acts 10:40-41.
3. *Early Christian Worship*, p.15.
4. Note 9.
5. Acts 10:40-41.

Upper Room,"¹ took on a new significance.

The new significance was that Jesus the Risen and exalted Lord, though unseen, was present as Host and gift at the Eucharist. His presence, attested to by the Holy Spirit, whom Jesus had promised saying, - "I will not leave you desolate"² was the cause of great joy and praise. This sacramental meal was chiefly an act of thanksgiving (eucharist) for Christ's victorious work of love and His generous gift of Life - the giving of Himself that all who believe on Him might not perish but have Eternal Life, while He Himself was with them as the Risen and exalted Lord. It was His continuing presence amongst them which enabled the early Christians to rejoice in the victory of His death. That note of exuberance in the primitive Church is a pleasant contrast to our all-too-often grave and austere communion services, in which, because of our one-sided emphasis on His death and sacrifice, we seem to have forgotten the reality of Christ's presence. The early Christians, on the contrary, seeing the significance of Christ's sacrifice and death within the reality of His presence, impulsively worshipped and thanked God for the wonder of His triumphant love. "We give thanks to thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which thou didst make known to us through Jesus thy Son: thine be the glory for ever!"³

It was the bread and the wine in the sacramental meal which pointed to the significance of Christ's sacrifice and death. Jesus had taken these two common daily foods and made them symbols of His body and His blood at the Last Supper, thereby binding every new celebration of that meal to His atoning work. Taking the bread, He gave thanks and broke it, and said,

"This is my body which is (given) for you.
Do this in remembrance of me."

Similarly He took the cup and said,

"This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me."

By His action Christ linked the Last Supper to His sacrifice and death, to His self-dedication in love for sinful man, to His work of redemption. In that sacrificial act of love upon the Cross, Christ's atoning work was only partly fulfilled. The Resurrection followed the Crucifixion, not as a reversal of what had happened, but as God's proclamation of Christ's victory over death and sin, and therefore as part of Christ's atoning work. Then followed the Ascension, as God's act of exalting Christ to sovereignty, that He may reign but also intercede, that all who through the power of the

1. Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship - p.4.
2. John 14:18
3. Didache 9:3

Holy Spirit are brought into the Church of Christ, His Body, may become associated with Christ's completed work of atonement and share the Life which He the Redeemer offers. Thus the Eucharist was both an act of thanksgiving, and a participation in the blessings of the atoning work of Christ offered by Him as the Risen, Exalted but Present Lord. "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me and I in him."¹

Besides this soteriological significance of the Eucharist, there is also emphasis on its eschatological meaning. St. Paul makes this explicit when he writes: "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until He comes."² And when we recollect that at the Last Supper Jesus said to His disciples, "Truly I say to you, I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God,"³ we recognize the significance of the eucharistic ejaculation, Maranatha, summoning Christ not only to be present at the Eucharist but also foreshadowing the final Messianic Meal. Thus Srawley says, "Our Lord by giving them the bread and the cup not only associates the disciples with Him in the blessings of His sacrifice, but also consecrates them for their inheritance in the Messianic Kingdom, of which this is an anticipation in the present."⁴

There is yet another significance of the Eucharist derived from the fact of the Risen Lord. It concerns the unity of the Church as the Body of Christ. St. Paul writes, "The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one loaf, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the same loaf."⁵ Here St. Paul relates the unity of the Body of Christ to the bread, which is His body, we eat at the Eucharist. All who participate in the Eucharist, are members of the Body of Christ, and as His Body, which the bread of the Eucharist symbolises, is one, so the members of His body are knit into a close fellowship of unity. And we are to remember that when St. Paul speaks of the Church as the Body of Christ he is thinking of the Body of the Risen Christ. Thus, "in sharing in the very life of the Risen Lord, the Church becomes in truth the body of Christ, the *sōma Christou*."⁶ This unity of the fellowship of the Body of Christ is perfectly expressed in the beautiful and well-known prayer in the Didache:

-
1. John 6:56
 2. I Corinthians 11:26.
 3. Mark 14:25 Cf Luke 22:18, Matthew 26:29.
 4. The Early History of the Liturgy, p. 5f.
 5. I Corinthians 10:16-17.
 6. Clark, An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments, p.68.

"As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains and was gathered together and became one, so let thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy Kingdom."¹

The Eucharist was the primary act of worship in the primitive Church. It was (and remains) an act of worship which gathers up the fullness of the new life in Christ, and which shows forth with joy and gratitude the Living Christ, who is the suffering and victorious Redeemer, the Crucified and Risen Lord. The elements of the bread and wine not only symbolically relate His atoning life, work and death to the Church, His Body, but also express the **unity** of the Church. And each Eucharist continues to be an Easter Festival, proclaiming again the glorious news:

Christ the Lord is Risen to-day,
Sons of men and angels say;
Raise your joys and triumphs high,
Sing, ye heavens, and earth reply.

Love's redeeming work is done,
Fought the fight, the battle won,
Lo! our Sun's eclipse is o'er;
Lo! he sets in blood no more.

Vain the stone, the watch, the seal;
Christ hath burst the gates of hell;
Death in vain forbids his rise;
Christ hath opened Paradise.

Lives again our glorious King,
Where, O death, is now thy sting?
Once he died our souls to save;²
Where thy victory, O grave?

Hail the Lord of earth and heaven!
Praise to thee by both be given!
Thee we greet triumphant now;²
Hail, the Resurrection thou!

1. Didache 9:4

2. Hymn by John Wesley (1707-1788) vv. 1,2,3,4, and 7.
According to the Handbook to the Church Hymnary (Revised Edition) with supplement, by Moffat and Patrick, p.46, the original line was "dying once, He doth all save."

CHAPTER THREE¹ - THE RESURRECTION IN THE
TEACHING OF THE FATHERS.

Section 1 - The Apostolic Fathers.

In our treatment of the teaching of the Apostolic Fathers on the Resurrection, we shall use as our source relevant extracts from the writings of or commonly ascribed to:

Clement - Bishop of Rome (circ. 95 A.D.)²

Ignatius - Bishop of Antioch (circ. 100-117 A.D.)

Polycarp - Bishop of Smyrna (circ. 115 A.D.)

and the Martyrdom of Polycarp (circ. 157 A.D.)³

To understand fully these writings, it is necessary to examine briefly the history of this period in the life of the Church, which covers the late 1st and the first half of the 2nd Century. It was a period not only of rapid expansion in the Church, particularly amongst the main trading centres of the Roman Empire, but also of an intensification of the catholic consciousness of the Church. The growing Church became more strictly organized under bishops, and their councils of Presbyters who succeeded the Apostles and represented the Apostolic witness of the Church in the various localities. This, together with the Gnostic and Montanistic extremes which were menacing perversions of the Apostolic tradition, led to the establishment of well-knit organization and a monarchical episcopate. It was also the period when the New Testament Canon was being formed; the faith was more carefully prescribed in credal form and the liturgical formulae began to crystallize. At the same time Christians were the victims of outbreaks of persecution by the Roman authorities, because of their unshakable convictions and their obstinate refusal to offer some technical sacrifice to the deified Roman Emperors and accept any Lord other than Christ. As already mentioned, Gnostic and Montanist Christianity were a threat to apostolic and catholic Christianity. Gnosticism was a syncretism between Greek and Oriental thought and aimed at making Christianity a philosophy of 'gnosis' - knowledge of the divine - on the basis of an elaborate intellectual system. It incorporated Greek dualism which made a clean break between spirit and matter, between God and the world and which regarded the body as evil and the soul as good.

-
1. Quotations from the works of the Fathers of the Church will be taken from "The Library of Christian Classics," abbreviated L.C.C.; or "The Early Christian Fathers," edited and translated by Henry Bettenson, abbreviated, H.B.
 2. The dates bracketed refer to the writings, not their authors.
 3. The Didache, dealing principally with liturgical questions has been considered in Chapter two.

The Gnostics who held this view denied the reality of the Incarnation and were known as Docetists. Montanism went to the other extreme in possible reaction to the intellectual tendency of Gnosticism and to the ecclesiastical tendency of the "catholic" church. Montanism was an expression of ecstatic and ascetic religion, for the followers of this brand of Christianity were rigorous in their ethical demands and confident in their expectation of the imminent end of the world. This, very briefly, indicates the trends that prevailed in the Church in the sub-apostolic age.

Clement - Bishop of Rome.

The so-called First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians was occasioned by faction in the Church at Corinth,¹ in circumstances very similar to those which prompted St. Paul's first Epistle to the same Church. It provides, therefore, a most interesting comparison to examine side by side what these two writers say on the Resurrection to the same congregation. On the one hand we have St. Paul's great treatment of the Resurrection in which he declares: "But if there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised; and if Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is in vain and your faith is vain,"² and on the other we have Clement's analogy of nature in which he says:

"Let us observe, beloved, how the Ruler is continually displaying the resurrection that will be, of which he made the firstfruits when he raised the Lord Jesus Christ from the dead. Let us look, beloved, at the resurrection which happens regularly. Day and night show us a resurrection; the night goes to sleep, the day rises: the day departs, night comes on. Let us take the crops. How does the sowing happen, and in what way? 'The sower went out' and cast each of his seeds into the ground. These fall dry and bare on to the ground and decay. Then from the decay the mightiness of the Ruler's providence raises them up, and many grow from the one and bear fruit. (25) Let us look at the marvellous sign which takes place in the East, in the district of Arabia. There is a bird called the phoenix. It is the only one of its kind, and it lives for five hundred years. And when it reaches the time of its dissolution, the time for it to die, it makes for itself a coffin of incense and myrrh and other spices, which when the time is up it enters and dies. But with the decay of its flesh a worm is produced, which is nourished from the moisture of the dead creature and grows wings. Then when it has grown into a fine specimen, it takes up the coffin in which are the bones of its progenitor and flies with them from Arabia to Egypt, to the city called Heliopolis. And in the day-time, in view of all, it flies to the altar of the Sun and lays them on it, and then sets off back again."³

At first sight these two views seem, theologically, not fully to coincide. St. Paul makes it quite clear that the hope of resurrection

-
1. Cf. The Early Christian Fathers, Edited and Translated by H. Bettenson, p.3.
 2. St. Paul's I Corinthians 15:13-14
 3. St. Clement's I Corinthians 24-25 (H.B.)

is entirely dependent upon the act of God who raised Jesus Christ from the dead. His analogy of the seed and plant serves only to illustrate the "how" of the Resurrection and not to furnish any grounds for the "why" of the Resurrection. The only ground for the resurrection of the dead is Christ's own Resurrection. St. Clement, however, while following the Pauline doctrine of Christ as the firstfruits, seems to imply more from the analogies of nature, - the rising and setting of the sun, the sowing and growing of crops, and the extraordinary phenomenon of the phoenix bird which dies and produces a winged worm that takes the remains of the bird to the altar of the Sun in the city of Heliopolis, - and to suggest that these are more than analogies and rather grounds for the hope of our resurrection. "Do we then think it a great marvel if the Creator of the universe is to effect the resurrection of those who served him in holiness with the confidence of a good faith, seeing that he shows us the magnificence of his promise even by a bird?"¹ It is as though Clement were asking, 'If God can do such marvellous acts of "resurrection" in nature, will he not resurrect those who believe in him?' It would appear at least that he has extended the grounds for belief in the resurrection of believers, because the Pauline doctrine of resurrection, grounded both in reality and mode upon God's act on that first Easter, is in reality in a completely different category from the examples of "resurrection" found in nature. These examples may help us to understand the fact of the resurrection but they cannot constitute the grounds for our hope and faith in the resurrection. Such examples belong to the category of nature. They constitute the pattern for the growth, (seed and plant), continuance (rising and setting sun) and reproduction (phoenix bird), of certain natural phenomena. But the resurrection in Christ is a unique phenomenon which belongs to the realm of the "new creation".

Yet we must not judge Clement too severely. It is probable that he intended his analogy of nature to be merely an analogy, an illustration, a pointer to the fact of the Resurrection in Christ, who is the firstfruits of them that sleep.² Possibly such analogies were found to be helpful to convey the reality of the resurrection to pagan minds. For in the end, there can be little doubt that Clement was certain that in Christ was God's revelation of Eternal Life which is no longer subject to death. "This is the way, beloved, in which we found our salvation, Jesus Christ, the high priest of our offerings.... Through him we see as in a mirror the spotless and excellent face of God:.... through him the Ruler willed that we should taste the immortal knowledge...."³ Thus, although we may

1. op. cit. 26:1 (H.B.)
2. Cf. op. cit. Chapter 24:1
3. op. cit Chapter 36 (H.B.)



find St. Clement's analogy of nature unconvincing as an explanation of the Resurrection, we must view it in the light of his whole thought.

Ignatius - Bishop of Antioch.

The prevailing Docetic heresy, with which Ignatius came into contact particularly during his interval at Smyrna¹ while on his way to martyrdom in Rome, prompted him to express emphatically, in his many letters, the reality of Christ's birth, life, death, and resurrection. "Be deaf then, to any talk that ignores Jesus Christ of David's lineage of Mary; who was really born, ate, and drank; was really persecuted under Pontius Pilate; was really crucified and died; ... He was really raised from the dead...."² Ignatius was in no doubt about the fact that the Person Jesus was the Christ, in whose life and work, death and Resurrection, God's work of redemption and His conquest over sin and death were realized.³ His inassailable conviction in the reality of Christ's Resurrection is expressed in his letter to the Smyrnaeans, where it is clear that Ignatius believes in the bodily Resurrection of Jesus Christ. "For myself, I am convinced and believe that even after the resurrection he was in the flesh."⁴ This is not only God's declaration that death has been defeated, but also the ground of the hope of resurrection for every Christian. Just as Peter and the disciples, convinced that Jesus was risen in the flesh, and "for this reason... despised death itself, and proved its victors,"⁵ so Ignatius, awaiting his own death, can exclaim, "come fire, cross, battling with wild beasts, wrenching of bones, mangling of limbs, crushing of my whole body, cruel tortures of the devil - only let me go to Jesus Christ!"⁶

And so we must note that Ignatius' insistence on the historicity of the events in the life of Christ is not only a refutation of docetic tendencies, but also an expression of his own unshakable faith in Christ through whom death has lost its sting. This strong faith is further expressed in his longing for his martyrdom - a longing which rings with a note of anticipated triumph:

"I plead with you do not do me an unseasonable kindness. Let me be fodder for wild beasts - that is how I can get to God. ... if I suffer, I shall be emancipated by Jesus Christ; and united to him I shall rise to freedom. ... That is whom I am looking for - the One who died for us. That is whom I want - the One who rose for us."⁷

Such jubilant courage and fearlessness could only belong to one who, ever conscious of the Risen Lord, knew that "his Father raised him,

-
1. Cf. Early Christian Fathers (L.C.C.) p.112.
 2. Ignatius to the Trallians, 9. See also Ephesians 7 and 9; Smyrnaeans 1-3 (L.C.C.)
 3. Cf. Ephesians 19.20 and Smyrnaeans 1 and 2.
 4. Smyrnaeans 3:1 (L.C.C.)
 5. Smyrnaeans 3:2 (L.C.C.)
 6. Romans 5:3 (L.C.C.)
 7. Romans 4:1,3 and 6:1 (L.C.C.)

just as His Father will raise us, who believe on Him, through Christ Jesus, apart from whom we have no genuine life."¹

That Ignatius was conscious of the Risen Lord is clearly expressed in his comments on the Eucharist which he sees as an act of worship in which Jesus Christ is active in His presence. Ignatius emphasises the symbolism of the eucharistic bread as the broken body of Christ when he says that it is "the medicine of immortality, the antidote which wards off death but yields continuous life in union with Jesus Christ."² But each time the community gathers together for the Eucharist (and Ignatius advises frequent gatherings) "Satan's powers are overthrown and his destructiveness is undone by the unanimity of your faith."³ Thus the Eucharist is linked to the Resurrection of Christ not only because, by his participation in it, the believer is associated with Christ's atoning work and receives anew God's gift of Eternal Life, but also because in the celebration of the Eucharist, the community of believers constitute in a special way the Body of the Risen Christ who has vanquished Satan. Ignatius is careful, in other words, to preserve both the individual and the communal significance of this act of worship, which not only bestows the blessing of union with the Risen Lord on the believers, but is also a uniting with Him in the conquest of death and the proclamation by them in community that the Lord is Risen!

One last point we must note is that although Ignatius sometimes lays stress on the death of Christ, as if it had some peculiar value of its own⁴ nevertheless he does view the Cross in the light of the Resurrection. Speaking of Christ's suffering and death upon the Cross, the fruit of which we are part, he adds, "... by his resurrection, he raised a standard to rally his saints and faithful forever ... in one body of his Church."⁵ Through the Resurrection the Cross can and does symbolize the standard, or rallying point, of all who belong to Christ and are members of His body.

Ignatius reflects in his writings not merely his awareness of the Risen Lord, but also his consciousness that because the Lord is Risen, he as a member of His Body, is a sharer of His sufferings and His victory. The boldness, the joy, and the peace of mind with which Ignatius faces his death are in themselves living hymns of praise to the Lord Risen and Triumphant.

-
1. Trallians 9:2 (L.C.C.)
 2. Ephesians 20:2 (L.C.C.)
 3. Ephesians 13:1 (L.C.C.)
 4. McGiffert, History of Christian Thought Vol.I, p.39.
 5. Smyrnaeans 1:2 (L.C.C.)

Polycarp - Bishop of Smyrna.

Polycarp as a leader of the Church was held in high regard not only for his faithful witness to the apostolic tradition and his prophetic teaching,¹ but also for his saintly and blameless life and his noble martyrdom.² In his letter to the Philippians, which is largely an ethical treatise and exhortation,³ Polycarp quotes extensively from the New Testament reiterating the Church's faith in the Lord Jesus Christ "who endured for our sins even to face death, 'whom God raised up, having loosed the pangs of Hades.'"⁴ He always speaks of the Resurrection as God's act,⁵ and in so doing not only upholds the teaching of the Apostles but also affirms his own faith in the Risen Lord. This is expressed in his conviction that all who do the will and keep the commandments of Jesus Christ will be raised by the Father who raised Jesus from the dead.⁶ To deny the Resurrection has grave consequences because whoever perverts sayings of the Lord to suit his own lusts and says there is neither resurrection nor judgment - such a one is the first-born of Satan.⁷

But perhaps Polycarp's strongest witness to the Risen Lord was his calm and courageous acceptance of death at the stake. The account of his martyrdom tells us that the martyrs of Christ gave "themselves over to the grace of Christ ... despised the tortures of this world, purchasing for themselves in the space of one hour the life eternal,"⁸ and that Polycarp himself "was not perturbed" but "was inspired with courage and joy, and his face was full of grace."⁹ The quiet but strong confidence of the Christian martyrs, and of Polycarp in particular, was founded upon the knowledge that in Jesus Christ, death was no longer the enemy but the gate-way to the heavenly city of God. This living faith echoed from the stake to which Polycarp was tied to be burned, as a last hymn of thanksgiving and adoration to God, with whom the saintly bishop was to enter into perfect union. To Polycarp martyrdom was a privilege, if an ordeal, because he could enter fully into the fellowship of Christ's suffering, death, and glorious Resurrection.

"Lord God Almighty, Father of thy beloved and blessed Servant Jesus Christ, through whom we have received full knowledge of thee, ... I bless thee, because thou has deemed me worthy of this day and hour, to take my part in the number of the martyrs, in the cup of thy Christ, for 'resurrection to eternal life' of soul and body in the immortality of the Holy Spirit; among whom may I be received in thy presence this day as a rich and acceptable sacrifice. ... For this and for everything I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee,

1. Martyrdom 16:2 (L.C.C.)
2. Martyrdom 13:2; 17:1 (L.C.C.)
3. Cf. Philippians 3:1 (L.C.C.)
4. Philippians 1:2 (L.C.C.)
5. Philippians 1:2; 2:1; 9:2 (L.C.C.)
6. Philippians 2:2 (L.C.C.)
7. Philippians 7:1 (L.C.C.)
8. Martyrdom 2:3 (L.C.C.)
9. Martyrdom 5:1 and 12:1 (L.C.C.)

through the eternal and heavenly High Priest, Jesus Christ, thy beloved Servant, through whom be glory to thee with him and the holy Spirit both now and unto the ages to come."¹

And so, though he does not give us an exposition or a theological treatise on the meaning of the Resurrection, Polycarp's own life and experience is itself a commentary on it, vibrant with joy and zeal, pointing us to the fact of Christ, suffering yet triumphant and living Lord.

Section 2 - The Apologists.

We turn now to consider two of the most important Apologists of the 2nd and early 3rd centuries - Justin Martyr (martyred circ. 165 A.D.) and Tertullian (floruit circ. 200 A.D.).

Justin Martyr was a philosopher whose chief concern was to defend Christianity against pagan calumny, and "for whom Christianity is rational truth and a noble way of life."² He was one of the first to commend the Christian faith to others of the same philosophical and cultural background, and to attempt a reconciliation of Christian and Hellenic thought in terms of the philosophical climate of the day. Tertullian, on the other hand, although a lawyer before his conversion, became an enthusiastic supporter of Montanism which he found "congenial to his fiery spirit and his austere morality."³ The Montanists not only claimed to give free expression to the Spirit but also claimed that the Spirit gave new revelation to interpret the Scriptures. And so Tertullian, far from attempting to interweave Christian thought with Hellenic ideas, was uncompromising, resisting to the uttermost the contamination of Christian faith by pagan thought. In his defence of the faith expounded in his "Apology" Tertullian stands on the same ground as Irenaeus who insisted that the teaching of the Church "is based on Scripture interpreted by the Church according to the tradition delivered by the Apostles to the churches and preserved by the succession of bishops."⁴

Justin Martyr.

The only direct mention of Christ's Resurrection which Justin Martyr makes is his explanation of Christian Worship,

-
1. Martyrdom 14:1-3 (L.C.C.)
 2. The Early Christian Fathers, Edited & Translated by H. Bettenson p. 13.
 3. op. cit. p. 19.
 4. op. cit. p. 19 (I am indebted to Henry Bettenson for the thoughts in this introductory paragraph.)

where he points out that the reason why Christians gather together for worship on the first day of the week, known as the day of the sun, is two-fold. It links Christian worship with God's creativity on the first day, "on which God transforming darkness and matter made the universe"; and with the "day Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead, ... for they crucified him on the day before Saturday, and on the day after Saturday, he appeared to his apostles and disciples and taught them these things which I have passed on to you for your consideration."¹ It is also interesting to note that apart from explaining the significance of Sunday in relation to the Resurrection, he also claims to be a witness of the Apostolic tradition, which itself derived its authority from the fact that the Apostles were witnesses of the Resurrection.

In view of this claim, we must point out the deviation he makes from the Apostolic tradition when he speaks of the person of Jesus Christ in relation to the Trinity. Justin gives Christ, as well as the Holy Spirit, inferior "ranks" in the Trinity when he says that Christians honour Jesus Christ "having learned that he is the Son of the true God Himself, and holding him to be in the second place and the prophetic Spirit in the third rank."² Justin, though recognising Christ as the Logos, the Word, the unique Son of God,³ gives Him a secondary place in a loose-knit trinity, whereas the Apostolic tradition, in spite of not having a fully developed doctrine of the Trinity, nonetheless gave Christ His rightful place as God the Son in the mystery of the unity of the triune Godhead - Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Mindful that we would be doing Justin an injustice by drawing hard and fast conclusions about his theology from his Apologia, since it is not a theological treatise, nevertheless it does reflect an incomplete doctrine of the person and place of Jesus Christ. We are led to infer from his own words - that heathen gods and demons "were not only condemned among the Greeks by reason, through Socrates, but among the barbarians by Reason himself, who took form and became man and was called Jesus Christ"⁴ - that in Justin's mind, Jesus Christ was more the embodiment of the philosophical concept of the Logos than the Word made Flesh, God become man. This is quite clearly the influence of Hellenic thought and as an attempt at syncretism between Hellenic thought and Christian doctrine, it is a deviation from the Apostolic tradition, which held that Jesus Christ was God who became man,⁵ and that having completed His work of reconciliation and redemption through His Ministry, Suffering,

1. Apologia I, 67 (L.C.C.)
2. op. cit., I, 13 (L.C.C.)
3. op. cit., I, 5 and 23; II, 13 (L.C.C.)
4. op. cit., I, 5 (L.C.C.)
5. Cf. Philippians 2:6-7, John 1:1 and 14. etc.

Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, returned to the Father, for He and the Father are One. The danger of Justin's suggestion of priority within the Trinity is that unless Christ is given His rightful place within the Godhead, His work of redemption loses its significance, which is derived from the fact that "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself."¹ The essence of the Atonement is that it is God's work undertaken on His own initiative. God sent His only begotten Son into the world because God loves the world. To fail to recognize in the Incarnation, Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, the work of Divine love and care is to deny their eternal and universal import, and to deny the efficacy and validity of God's great triumph over the power of the devil, sin and death. If Christ is not God then we are not redeemed from sin, nor are we heirs of Life Eternal, for these are the gifts of God alone. But Christ is God Incarnate, a God of love who became involved in the lot of sinful and rebellious man, took upon Himself the consequences of his sinfulness and rebellion, and conquered the power of evil releasing man from the clutches of the devil and raising him to Life Eternal. This is what God did in Jesus Christ. This was not the work of a second-ranking, supra-human, sub-divine being. It is the work of God Himself.

Yet, lest we misinterpret Justin's intentions, we must recognize his awareness that in the Eucharist we have a pledge of the salvation of God through the elements empowered as symbols of the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ which represent His life-offering ministry.

"We do not receive these gifts," says Justin, "as ordinary food or ordinary drink. But as Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh through the Word of God, and took flesh and blood for our salvation; in the same way the food over which thanksgiving has been offered ... is we are taught, the flesh and blood of Jesus who was made flesh."²

Justin's interest here is predominantly incarnational, nevertheless, he does reveal his awareness of the general belief of the Church that Jesus Christ is received through the sacramental meal for our salvation. And of course, implicit in the Church's belief is the fact that Jesus is Risen and Living.

Moreover, in the face of prevailing unbelief about the resurrection, Justin appeals for a simple trusting faith in the sovereignty and might of God. He points out the "miraculous" element in the birth and growth of the human being "from a single drop of human seed" which we accept because we witness its occurrence continually. Using that as our analogy he urges us to accept the resurrection of the dead as simply and as trustingly. "But as you at first would not have believed that

1. II Corinthians 5:19.

2. Apologia I, 66. (H.B.)

from a little drop such beings (as men) could develop, yet, you see it happening, so consider that it is possible for human bodies, dissolved and scattered in the earth like seeds, to rise again in due time by God's decree and be clothed with incorruption."¹ The argument is that if we accept the wonder of birth as an act of God's power, so also we must accept the miracle of our resurrection as an act of God, for this is something which God has shown us through Jesus Christ.² Because this is an appeal to the unbelieving, Justin would not have been nearly so convincing had he pointed to Christ as "the firstfruits of them that sleep," as he is by showing that our resurrection is as much a work of God as His act of creation. This is, we must remember Apologetics and not Dogmatics. The validity of Justin's argument lies in that he quite unmistakably declares the hope of our resurrection as an act of God.

Tertullian.

Tertullian expounds the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead in relation to the Day of Judgment. "Our hope of the resurrection cannot be fulfilled, as I think, before the coming of Christ,"³ says Tertullian. He regards the coming of the Lord's Kingdom (in the eschatological sense) as the yearning of every Christian because that day will mean the conclusion of this age, and the beginning of the millennial Kingdom.⁴ So strong is Tertullian's yearning for the Lord's Kingdom that he is impatient with those who "pray for some extension in this present age."⁵ Yet, in contrast to this sense of expectation, there is also evident a sense of dread and fear about the "terrible sufferings" and the "stupendous shock" which impend over the world at the last day. For this reason he admits that Christians "favour the long-continued existence of Rome."⁶ Thus he states the paradox that "faith keeps watch for that day... and daily fears that for which she daily hopes."⁷

The general resurrection awaits the return of Jesus Christ while in the interim the faithful depart to the underworld. Tertullian is aware of the opposition to this view, and quotes those who disagree with him as arguing that since Christ went

-
1. Apologia I, 19 (L.C.C.)
 2. op. cit., I, 19 (the conclusion) (L.C.C.)
 3. De Resurrectione Carnis, 22 (H.B.)
 4. Cf. De Oratione, 5 and Apologeticus, 1.
 5. De Oratione, 5 (H.B.)
 6. Cf. Apologeticus, 32 (H.B.)
 7. De Anima, 33 (H.B.)

to the underworld (he descended into hell) "that he might make the prophets and patriarchs partakers of himself,"¹ there is no need for the faithful to go there as well. To this he replies that there can be no resurrection "when as yet the command of God has not been heard by means of the archangel's trumpet, when those whom the Lord's coming shall find on earth have not yet been 'caught up into the air to meet him,' together with 'the dead in Christ who shall first arise.'"¹ As long as the earth remains, heaven's doors are closed, only to be opened when the earth passes away. The souls of the dead must await the fulfilment of their hope in the underworld where "every small sin has to be expiated ... in the interval before the resurrection."² We have here the basis of the Roman doctrine of purgatory which derives from an attempt to resolve the factor of time - when are the dead resurrected? After death? Or at the last day? Owing to the insufficient scriptural lead for a clear solution, the discussion of this question is inevitably tainted with a greater or lesser degree of speculation, and this is so with Tertullian.

He is in no doubt as to the fact of the resurrection of the body. He sees in the natural processes of growth and decay a universal principle of renewal which "restores to us things far richer and finer than those which it brought to an end."³ On the basis of this principle, Tertullian concludes that "nothing perishes but with a view to restoration. Thus the whole order of things, this order of revolution, bears testimony to the resurrection of the dead..."³ But it is not the soul alone that is raised from death, from its state of lifelessness in the underworld. The body (which he calls the flesh) also is "raised," for Tertullian sees the soul and the body as a unity, in spite of the fact that the soul has its own corporeality. It is Tertullian's notion that the soul possesses qualities of corporeality, "such attributes as shape and definition, and the three dimensions of length, breadth and height, by which scientists measure bodies..."⁴ He explains that in the act of creation the corporeality of the soul was moulded and fashioned in its various features by the Divine breathing. This he calls the inner man, which though distinct from the outer, is nonetheless identical with its replica. At the day of judgment this inner man, this corporeal soul, will be raised with the flesh, the outer man, for he considers that God's judgment must be pronounced over the whole being in its entirety. He tells us that the body (flesh) is not destroyed at death, but withdrawn, having been "in safe-keeping with

1. De Anima, 55 (H.B.)
2. De Anima, 58 (H.B.)
3. De Resurrectione Carnis, 12 (H.B.)
4. De Anima, 9 (H.B.)

God through the most faithful 'mediator between God and man, Jesus Christ,' who will restore man to God, the spirit to the flesh and the flesh to the spirit."¹

Here we have the two-fold clue to Tertullian's idea of the resurrection. First, he considers the resurrection of the whole being as caused by the necessity of God to judge not only the inner man, but the whole man.² He supports this by insisting that "whatever goes on in the heart is the activity of the soul in the flesh, with the flesh, and through the flesh."³ Thus soul and body must form a unity before receiving the judgment of God, and this unity is restored at the day of judgment. Secondly, when he speaks of the resurrection of the soul as well as the flesh, Tertullian really means the re-union of the body and the soul. This is clearly the implication of his notion that at death the body is not destroyed but withdrawn, and is further substantiated by his explicit statement that "the whole man appears (on the day of judgment) as a result of the concretion of the two natures..."⁴ This certainly does not mean resurrection which is the transformation from corruption to incorruption of the whole person, but rather revivification of the original nature by uniting again the soul and the flesh.

The conclusion seems inevitable that although Tertullian acknowledges his faith in the exalted and triumphant Lord,⁵ yet he fails to see in Him both the ground and the mode of our own resurrection. In his attempt to explain our resurrection, which is a mystery, in terms of finite categories, he is confronted by innumerable difficulties. Certainly not the least of these is his explanation that the soul suffers in the underworld for the expiation of sin.⁶ The unavoidable implication is that Christ's work of redemption is not final and complete, that His own victory over sin and death proclaimed by His Resurrection has lost its validity, and that death has not really lost its sting for him who dies in Christ, since he continues to suffer for his sin after death. Tertullian is thus driven by the logical conclusions of his speculation to hold a view of the Resurrection foreign to that of the Apostolic teaching, and he undermines the true significance of both the soteriological and eschatological aspects of the Resurrection of our Lord, to

-
1. De Resurrectione Carnis, 63 (H.B.)
 2. Cf. op. cit., 14
 3. op. cit., 15 (H.B.)
 4. op. cit., 14 (H.B.)
 5. Cf. De Spectaculis, 30.
 6. Cf. De Resurrectione, 17.

whom he was nevertheless devoted.

Section 3 - Irenaeus.

Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, in his great work Adversus Haereses, is concerned not only to refute the fantasies of Gnostic Christianity, but also to expound Christian teaching. He affirms the Apostolic tradition by opposing the many and various trends of heresy with the revelation given in the Scriptures, interpreted by the one true Church, bound by one true faith. "Irenaeus may justly be called the first biblical theologian; for him the Bible ... is a continuous record of God's self-disclosure and his dealings with man, reaching its culmination in the person and work of Christ."¹ Irenaeus, unlike the Apologists who have a philosophical approach to the Christian faith, gives us a clear and simple exposition of the main doctrines of Christianity in a manner that has made him stand out among his contemporaries, and which prompted Bishop Aulén to call him "the Schleiermacher of the second century."² The last book of his work is devoted to the Resurrection and the consummation of history and we must now examine this together with his treatment of the Atonement. For, as Bishop Aulén shows us in his chapter on Irenaeus,³ every aspect of the work of Christ is given its due recognition and regarded as part of the whole of God's plan of redemption in the thought of this inspiring leader of the early Church.

Let us begin with a brief survey of his doctrine of the Atonement, noting particularly his emphasis on the triumph of Christ over the devil, sin, and death. It is very easy to interpret Irenaeus' theory of the Atonement in terms of the Incarnation, to see the grounds of our redemption in the union of God and man in Christ, and to conclude that Christ's passion is of secondary importance. "The Lord redeemed us by his blood and gave his life for our life, his flesh for our flesh, and poured out the spirit of the Father to unite us and reconcile God and man, bringing God down to man through the Spirit, and raising man to God through his incarnation, and by his coming truly and surely conferring on us immortality by means of our fellowship with God."⁴ As Bishop Aulén points out, there is

-
1. The Early Christian Fathers, (Edited and Translated by H. Bettenson), p.17.
 2. Christus Victor, p.33.
 3. Christus Victor, Chapter 2.
 4. Adversus Haereses V, 1:2 (H.B.)

no opposition, as so often suspected, between the Incarnation and the Atonement in the thought of Irenaeus and to interpret his thought in the light of such an opposition is to impose a meaning foreign to his intention. The Incarnation indeed, of fundamental importance in Irenaeus' theology, "is the necessary preliminary to the atoning work, because only God is able to overcome the powers which hold man in bondage, and man is helpless. The work of man's deliverance is accomplished by God Himself, in Christ."¹ God became man in the person of Jesus Christ, that as God-man, He might overcome and destroy the power of the devil, the adversary who holds man captive in the bonds of sin and death, and be the mediator who reconciles man to God, making man a partaker of Life Eternal. It is quite clear that Irenaeus places the Incarnation in just relation to the work of Christ, which is the redemption of humanity through identification with man, and victory over the adversary of man. In his own words: "For he who was to destroy sin and redeem man from guilt had to enter into the very condition of man, who had been dragged into slavery and was held by death, in order that death might be slain by man, and should go forth from the bondage of death."²

This emphasis on the victory of Christ is central to Irenaeus' thought in the doctrine of the 'Recapitulation' of man, the restoring and perfecting of God's creation, and shows how fully he appreciated the unity of Christ's redemptive work. He does not stress the Incarnation at the expense of the Atonement, nor the Crucifixion at the expense of the Resurrection, but sees each - Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension - as an aspect of the whole atoning work of Jesus Christ, in whom God reconciled the world to Himself.

"The only-begotten Word, who is always present with the human race, united and mingled with his handiwork, according to the Father's pleasure, and incarnate, is himself Jesus Christ our Lord, who suffered for us, and rose again for us, and is to come again in the glory of the Father to raise up all flesh to manifest salvation, and to apply the rule of just judgment to all who were made by him."³

The goal and purpose of the work of God's love is that "through a victorious man we may rise up to life"⁴ to "recover in Christ Jesus what in Adam we had lost, namely, that state of being in the image and likeness of God."⁵

-
1. Aulén, *Christus Victor*, p. 36.
 2. *Adversus Haereses* III, 18:7 (H.B.)
 3. *op. cit.*, III, 16:6 (H.B.)
 4. *op. cit.*, V, 21:1. (H.B.)
 5. *op. cit.*, III, 18:1 (H.B.)

Briefly summing up then, the teaching of Irenaeus is clear that the work of Atonement is the work of God Himself. In Christ Incarnate God has entered the condition of man; through Death and Resurrection He has overcome the power of the devil; and through the Ascension has finally restored man to full fellowship with Himself.

The hope of our resurrection, as Irenaeus rightly stresses, is founded upon the Atonement. It is precisely because of his sound view of the Atonement, which Bishop Aulén upholds and calls the 'classical' or 'dramatic' view, that Irenaeus can proclaim that because our Lord "followed the normal course of death that he might be the 'firstborn from the dead,' and stayed till the third day in 'the lower parts of the earth,' and then rose in his physical body to show the marks of the nails to his disciples, and thus ascended to the Father; ... therefore it is clear that the souls of his disciples, for whom the Lord performed this, will depart into an unseen region, set apart for them by God, and will dwell there until the resurrection which they await. Then will they receive their bodies and arise entire, that is in bodily form as the Lord arose, and thus will come into the presence of God."¹ While Irenaeus is grappling with the problem of the time of our resurrection and resolves it by saying that the dead in Christ will dwell in God's own appointed place until they are raised, he also leaves us in no doubt that our being raised is solely and entirely God's act already performed in and through Jesus Christ. He also upholds the Apostolic tradition by stating emphatically that what God raises is the whole being, not merely spirit, but body as well. In Adam all die because the flesh succumbed to the power of the devil, but in Christ the flesh is restored to life receiving the power to live in the Holy Spirit. It is the flesh, the body, given spiritual life by the empowering of the Holy Spirit, that will be raised.² Irenaeus is careful to explain that when we speak of the flesh we speak of God's creation and this is not to be confused with the lusts of the flesh which have made His creation corruptible. Thus God will raise the flesh, but He will destroy the corruption in the flesh, even as He has done in Christ.³ He is saying in words of his own that as co-heirs with Jesus Christ we shall inherit a physical resurrection since our Lord, 'the firstborn of them that sleep,' rose in His physical body. "The flesh which at the beginning

1. op. cit., V, 31:2 (H.B.)

2. Cf. op. cit. V, 12:3

3. Cf. op. cit. V, 3:2

was the subject of God's act will be found capable of receiving and assimilating God's power."¹ It is not always clear whether Irenaeus, in speaking of the resurrection, means the resurrection of the old body or, as in St. Paul, of a new body. At times he means the one and at other times he means the other. When he compares our resurrection to that of our Lord, he implies that as Christ died and was raised and glorified in His earthly body, so also will His disciples.

"What is restored to life is not something other than that which dies; ... what then was it which perished? Clearly, it was the substance of flesh which lost the breath of life.... The Lord came to restore this flesh to life..."²

But then he goes on to say that the Lord restores us not to a sensual life but a spiritual in which we put away the lusts of the flesh and receive the Holy Spirit. "For God fails in power if he does not give life to mortality and bring corruptibility to incorruption."³ There is no doubt that here he is thinking not of the restoration of the old body but of the resurrection of the new body. He further clarifies his meaning by urging us who believe in the wonder of God's creation to believe also in His act of re-creation, since to bring a man into being out of nothing is a far harder and more incredible task than to restore this creature after it has "re-dissolved into the earth." Difficult as it may be to know precisely what Irenaeus really means, one thing is certain: although he prefers to speak of the restoration rather than the transformation of the body, he does emphasize both the continuity and the discontinuity in the resurrection-body, and in doing so he upholds Pauline thought. It may well be that the reason why he speaks of restoration rather than transformation is his emphasis upon the Incarnation, in which, because of the union of the Divine and human natures, the body of flesh is sanctified and deified. The process of transformation is seen to derive from the Incarnation so that the emphasis placed upon the Resurrection, is one of restoration - the completion of the process, rather than transformation - the beginning of the process. If that is indeed the underlying basis of Irenaeus' thought, then we more readily recognize the danger of his incarnational theology.

Concerning the life hereafter, he tells us that the righteous shall be raised from the dead to reign with Christ in the millennial Kingdom. It is in this Kingdom that the restoration of the whole creation shall be fulfilled, in which food will grow in abundance, the vine grow prosperously and

1. op. cit., V, 3:2 (conclusion) (H.B.)
2. op. cit., V, 12:3 (H.B.)
3. op. cit., V, 3:2 (H.B.)

the animals enjoy the fruits of the earth and live peaceably and in harmony. Referring to Christ's words: "I will no more drink the fruit of the vine until I drink it new in my Father's Kingdom"¹ Irenaeus tells us that two things are indicated in this promise, firstly "the inheritance of the earth in which the new fruit of the vine will be drunk" and secondly, "the physical resurrection of his disciples."² The vine was always a symbol of prosperity and peace in Hebrew thought and, linked with the Kingdom as well as with Christ's messianic task (sacrament and John 15) symbolises the prosperity and peace of the fully consummated and redeemed creation over which Christ and the righteous shall reign. The act of drinking the fruit of the vine, recalls the meals of fellowship which Jesus shared with His disciples, in the inaugurated Kingdom, and looks forward to the consummated Kingdom when the righteous raised in the body will share the blessing of the Kingdom with the Risen Lord. That is the great hope of all who believe in Jesus Christ - a hope vouchsafed to us by God's work of reconciliation through Christ.

Irenaeus is refreshing because at a time when Christian thought tended to become clouded by philosophical considerations and speculation, he was able to see and interpret the Christian faith as it was given by God's disclosure of Himself in Jesus Christ and thereby to preserve the Apostolic witness to the person of Jesus Christ - Lord Incarnate, Crucified, Risen, and Exalted.

Section 4 - Athanasius and the Christological Controversy

The name of Athanasius is inseparable from the great Christological controversy waged in the Church during the latter part of the 3rd century and continued till the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D. Athanasius (296-373) was the leading defender of the Christian faith against the threat of Arianism by preserving the truth "that if Christ is God, then he must be God in the same sense as God the Father is God; divinity is one 'substance,'"³ which was expressed by the formula of the

1. Matthew 26:29.

2. Adversus Haereses V, 33:1 (H.B.)

3. The Early Christian Fathers, Edited and Translated by H. Bettenson, p.36.

'homoousion.' To understand Athanasius' theology we must briefly survey the phases of this controversy.

This debate on the Person of Jesus Christ was initiated by Arius, a popular and able presbyter of a parish in Alexandria, who contended that God is indivisible in person and substance, and therefore cannot share His nature with another being. Christ is not Eternal but was created ex nihilo, yet He was made supra-human, that is, a creation of a higher order than mankind. In other words Arius refuted the idea that Christ is one with the Father in person and substance, and thus, while making Him less than God, also made Him greater than man. This was a denial not only of the Incarnation, God becoming man, but also of the incarnational interpretation of redemption which held that man is saved by the union in Christ, of God and man. According to Arius the "Incarnation" did not achieve this union and consequently man is not deified. Christ was not in the full sense the Saviour of man for He merely, by His complete obedience to God revealed God's will and pronounced the Divine judgment, that men may repent and obey. It was because of Christ's devotion and obedience to the Divine will that He was given glory and lordship and consequently that He is worshipped, even called God, as long as it is understood that He is not one with God. Arius was condemned and deposed in 321 for upholding and teaching this combination of the doctrine of one God together with the worship of one who was less than God.

In 325 A.D. Constantine as Emperor called the first Ecumenical Council of the Churches to meet at Nicaea, where the term 'homoousion,' expressing the oneness in substance of the Father and the Son, was adopted. This term was accepted by all excepting the extreme Arians. But it was not long before even the Arians who had accepted the Nicene formula, began to intrigue and eventually to demand the return of Arius. Athanasius who had attended the Council and had since become Bishop of Alexandria, opposed the demand but was himself deposed and exiled. On the death of Constantine, Athanasius was reinstated in his see but Eusebius, leader of the Arians at the Council at Nicaea prevailed on Constantius, the Emperor of the East, to place another bishop at Alexandria. This time Athanasius went into exile in Rome where Constans, the Emperor of the West, welcomed him and eventually persuaded his brother Constantius to restore Athanasius in the interest of imperial unity. However after the murder of Constans, Constantius became sole emperor and was coerced to condemn Athanasius at a Council in Milan. Athanasius, once again in exile, spent seven years chiefly among the desert monks, who distributed his writings among his flock. During this period he wrote his "Orations against the Arians" in support of the Nicene

formula. On the death of Constantius, Athanasius was again restored as Bishop of Alexandria but spent several more periods in exile until after a clamour in Egypt he was brought back to enjoy the last seven years of his life in peace and honour. It was not only his stand against Arianism but also the political intrigues of certain bishops and the caprices of emperors, which chiefly contributed to the vicissitudes of Athanasius' career. In spite of his varied circumstances he defended the 'homoousion' formula with such rigour and perseverance that its final triumph at the Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D. was due in large measure to Athanasius.¹

He upheld the Apostolic tradition that the Father and the Son are One, sharing an identity of substance (ousion) though not of person (hypostases). Jesus Christ is truly Divine and eternal, not the created demi-god of Arius. Consequently the Incarnation was fundamental in the thought of Athanasius because in Christ the Divine becomes human, God becomes man in the person of Jesus Christ. The Incarnation is given a soteriological interpretation since the union of the Divine nature with the human means that God becomes man that man may be God-like. "He assumed a created body, that having renewed it as its creator, he might deify it in himself, and thus bring us all into the Kingdom of heaven through our likeness to him."² Salvation is founded primarily on the Incarnation. Here we see the influence of Irenaeus which becomes more marked as we examine the writings, particularly 'De Incarnatione,' of Athanasius. To begin with his theology may seem one-sidedly incarnational, but bearing in mind that the exigencies of the Christological debate in which Athanasius was involved demanded a strong and unequivocal affirmation of the Incarnation, we recognize that, as in Irenaeus, it was the cornerstone of his theology underlying a full and comprehensive view of the Atonement which includes not only the Incarnation but also the Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of Jesus Christ. Unless the reality of the Incarnation - that God and none other became Flesh - is affirmed, the atoning life and redemptive work of Jesus Christ, which include His Death and Resurrection, lose their significance, as they did in Arian theology.

That the Incarnation underlies the reality and efficacy of Christ's Death and Resurrection is borne out by Athanasius' clear and strong emphasis upon the victory of Christ's death in the third section of his De Incarnatione which we must now

1. See Henry Bettenson - pp. 33-37.

2. Contra Arianos 2:70 (H.B.) Cf. De Incarnatione, 54.

consider. He begins by affirming that Christ "known to be God and the Son of God" has appeared in bodily (human) form because "it was in the power of none other to turn the corruptible to incorruption, ... that none other could create anew the likeness of God's image for men, ... that none other could render the mortal immortal..."¹ To turn the corruptible to incorruption, the mortal to immortality, and to renew God's image in man, it is necessary for Jesus Christ as Saviour to partake of death. This necessity arises from the debt that is owed by all. "For there was need of death, and death must needs be suffered on behalf of all, that the debt owing from all might be paid."² This debt is cancelled by Jesus Christ because as the Eternal Word who shares our human nature and dwells in our mortal and corruptible body, He yields "His temple to death in the stead of all, in order firstly to make men quit and free of their old trespass, and further to show Himself more powerful even than death, displaying His own body incorruptible as first-fruits of the resurrection of all."³ Thus while He shared our corruptible nature, He Himself saw no corruption because being God Himself, He defeated sin and death in the victory of the Resurrection. Athanasius goes to the extent of showing how, although cruel and humiliating, the death on the Cross was the most fitting because thereby He

"did not devise a death for his own body, so as not to appear to be fearing some other death; but he accepted on the cross and endured a death inflicted by others, and above all by his enemies, which they thought dreadful and ignominious and not to be faced; so that, this also being destroyed, both he himself might be believed to be the life and the power of death he brought utterly to nought.... for the death which they thought to inflict as a disgrace, was actually a monument of victory against death itself."⁴

The emphasis on the victory of Christ's death is made repeatedly, and the course of the argument is clear, that the death was necessary to make possible the manifestation that in Christ is Life which is beyond the reach of corruption and death. Athanasius argues that the length of Christ's death bears this contention, since the interval of three days between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection is long enough to prove His real death, and not too long to have elicited the suggestion that He had exchanged His body for another.⁵ This may sound unusually original but the purpose of Athanasius is to show that the body which He offered as a sacrifice in death is that which has been raised victoriously from corruption to incorruption.

1. De Incarnatione, 19,20 (L.C.C.)
2. op. cit., 20 (L.C.C.)
3. op. cit., 20 (L.C.C.)
4. op. cit., 24 (L.C.C.)
5. Cf. op. cit., 26.

Another unusual argument which Athanasius uses to underline the victory of Christ's Resurrection is that His death on the Cross "which took place in the air" is efficacious in casting down the devil. This notion, curious and foreign to our understanding, is possibly derived from the belief that the devil and his power operates in the atmosphere and that through Christ's being 'lifted up' to His death on the Cross, the victory of His death has cleared the air and "prepared the way for us up into heaven."¹

The victory over death continues to be manifested by the disciples and followers of Christ who no longer fear death but "despise this life and practise to die."² Every time a Christian is martyred, or a man "weak by nature" leaps forward to death "for Christ's sake electing to rush upon death in preference to life upon earth"³ Christ's victory over death is proclaimed. His disciples are enabled to face death undaunted both because of the victory which He Himself won in the Resurrection and because He is alive and continues to be active.⁴ The activity of the Living Christ is further evidenced by the adulterer who has ceased to commit adultery, the murderer who no longer murders, the profane who has become religious, the overthrow of the unbeliever's false gods and idols.

"For where Christ is named, and his faith, there all idolatry is deposed and all imposture of evil spirits is exposed, and any spirit is unable to endure even the name, nay, even on barely hearing it, flies and disappears. But this work is not that of one dead, but of one that lives - and especially of God."⁵

Then, as if to make quite certain of all the evidence that points to the fact that Jesus Christ is the Risen Lord who has conquered death, Athanasius concludes with yet another argument. It is intended for those who would deny the reality of Christ's Resurrection on the grounds that He is invisible. The argument is that even a blind man, though he cannot see the sun, can feel the warmth that the sun gives out and therefore knows that there is a sun above the earth. Thus, though Christ is not seen, men witness and experience the power of His Resurrection and can know that He is the Risen Christ. "For it is plain that if Christ be dead, he could not be expelling demons and spoiling idols, for a dead man the spirits would not have obeyed."⁶

1. Cf. op. cit., 25.
2. op. cit., 28 (L.C.C.)
3. op. cit., 29 (L.C.C.)
4. Cf. op. cit., 31.
5. op. cit., 30 (L.C.C.)
6. op. cit., 32 (L.C.C.)

The contribution of Athanasius, then, was chiefly, but not only, to uphold the truth that God the Father and God the Son are one in substance, thereby winning the day against Arianism. It was also to emphasize that the victorious atoning work could only be accomplished by a Saviour who was the Word made Flesh - God in Christ. Thus there could be no more fitting conclusion to Athanasius' work on this aspect than his own invigorating and inspiring words:

"As, then, demons confess him, and his works bear him witness day by day, it must be evident - and let none brazen it out against the truth - both that the Saviour raised his own body and that he is the true Son of God, being from him, as from his Father, his own Word, and wisdom, and Power, who in ages later took a body for the salvation of all, and taught the world concerning the Father, and brought death to nought, and bestowed incorruption upon all by the promise of the resurrection, having raised his own body as a firstfruits of this, and having displayed it by the sign of the Cross,¹ as a monument of victory over death and its corruption."

We must note however that Athanasius speaks of Christ raising His own body, whereas the Apostles always spoke of God raising Christ from the dead. This may be an indication that he considered the Resurrection to be an act of revival rather than an act of transformation and glorification performed by God. It is difficult to know just what he meant, for he does show his awareness of the fact that the Resurrection bestows incorruption upon corruption. We can only surmise that, as with Irenaeus, his emphasis upon the Incarnation led him into the danger of regarding the process of transformation from corruption to incorruption as beginning with the Incarnation and culminating in the Resurrection, and thus of making the Resurrection secondary to the Incarnation. If that be his trend of thought, then in spite of his stressing the victory of Christ's death, he has at this point deviated from the Apostolic teaching.

Section 5 - St. Augustine (354-430).

St. Augustine was a scholarly philosopher and religious genius whose influence on the life and theology of the Church was not confined to his own day but continued through the ages and is still felt in our own times. His life and thought reveal a process of mental and spiritual struggle and growth mirrored best in "The Confessions." His early training was philosophical and this gave him a firm foundation in Platonic

1. op. cit., 32 (L.C.C.)

modes of thought upon which was based his early conception of God - pure Spirit, infinite Mind, ultimate Reality, dynamic Source of power. This God is known through the mind for knowledge is the purpose of living, and as the Truth which the mind seeks to know is eternal, so knowledge means immortality.¹ That, in a word, formed the basis of his thought, modified and superseded in large measure after his conversion, but its imprint was never altogether lost.

Alongside this philosophical conception of God he held, before his conversion, a sub-christian, (or 'pre-christian' as Albert C. Outler calls it²) view of Jesus Christ interpreted by the Platonic conception of the Logos, which while accepting a mediating principle between the abstract God and the concrete world, "between essence and existence, between eternity and history," could never be conceived "as Lord incarnate of existence and history."³ Thus he says:

"I saw in our Lord Christ only a man of eminent wisdom to whom no other man could be compared ... But concerning the mystery contained in "the Word was made flesh," I could not even form a notion... I acknowledged a perfect man to be in Christ ... not only because he was a form of the Truth, but also because of the great excellence and perfection of his human nature, due to his participation in wisdom."⁴

Thus before his conversion Augustine's Christ was man - a perfect man, but not God. It is obvious that the Life, Death, and Resurrection of such a Christ have neither soteriological nor eternal significance. But alongside St. Augustine's pre-conversion philosophy, we must place his post-conversion theology. While his theology did not develop all at once, and as Outler points out, "his thought is clearly and constantly theocentric; it is not always clearly and decisively Christocentric", nevertheless, he perceived the deficiency of the Platonic conception and affirmed that Jesus Christ is truly God and truly man. This we see most clearly in his De Fide et Symbolo, where he says that Jesus Christ is the Word through whom the Father is made known, that He is the only-begotten, not created, Son of the Father, and that He became incarnate among men.

"The Word abides unchangeable. ... He is called the Word ... because through him the Father who dwells in utmost secrecy becomes known to worthy minds... God the Father had the will and the power to make himself most truly known to those who were destined to know him, and to make himself known he begat one who is like himself, and who is called the Power and Wisdom of God because God operated through him... Wherefore the only-begotten Son of God was not made by the Father ... nor was he born of time for the

1. Cf. Soliloquies II, i and ii.
2. A Companion to the Study of Augustine, Edited by R.W. Battenhouse, p. 344.
3. op. cit., p. 345.
4. Confessions VII, 19:25 (L.C.C.)

eternally wise God has his Wisdom with him eternally...¹
The Wisdom who was begotten of God deigned to be created¹
among men ... which is Christ incarnate, through whom
there was to be given us an example of living, i.e. a
certain way by which we might reach God."²

It is quite conclusive that St. Augustine had grown more mature in his Christological thought but as Outler points out, his doctrine of the Incarnation was derived from his doctrine of the Trinity unlike "primitive and patristic Christianity, in which the doctrine of the Trinity is a derivation from the Christian confession of Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour."³ The result was that St. Augustine's theology of the historical Christ and His work was not wholly adequate.

His doctrine of the work of Christ was based not on the love of God as revealed in the historic life of Jesus of Nazareth but on two premises. The first is that God wills to restore part of mankind in the heavenly city to offset the deficiency caused by the fallen angels.

"While some of the angels deserted God in impious pride and were cast into the lowest darkness from the brightness of their heavenly home, the remaining number of the angels persevered in eternal bliss and holiness with God.... From the other part of the rational creation - that is, mankind - although it had perished as a whole through sins and punishments, both original and personal, God had determined that a portion of it would be restored and would fill up the loss which that diabolical disaster had caused in the angelic society. For this is the promise to the saints at the resurrection, that they shall be equal to the angels of God."⁴

The second premise is that, because fallen man is unable to save himself⁵ God must take the initiative and act through a mediator who is both God and man.

"This then is the grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord - that we are reconciled to God through the Mediator and receive the Holy Spirit so that we may be changed from enemies into sons.... That one sin ... was itself so great that by it, in one man, the whole human race was originally and, so to say, radically condemned. It cannot be pardoned and washed away except through 'the one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus'... Once sin ... had widely separated the human race from God, it was necessary for a mediator, who alone was born, lived, and was put to death without sin, to reconcile us to God, and provide even for our bodies a resurrection to life eternal... that even the resurrection of the body - itself promised to the redeemed - might be

-
1. St. Augustine in the preceding paragraph mentions that the latin word 'to create' is sometimes used as a synonym for 'to beget.'
 2. De Fide et Symbolo, ii; 3 - iv:6 (L.C.C.)
 3. A Companion to the study of Augustine, p.348.
 4. Enchiridion IX:28,29 (L.C.C.)
 5. Cf. City of God XIII, 3:10; The Trinity, XIII:17; Enchiridion IX:30.

previewed in the resurrection of the Redeemer himself; that the devil might be vanquished..."¹

Thus while St. Augustine apprehends the significance of the Life, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus Christ as mediating redemption and restoration, the underlying motive is not so much the out-reaching concern of God who sends His Son because He loves the world, as the necessity on the part of God to do justice by making up the complement of the heavenly company. Here we have evidence of the lingering philosophical conception of a remote and abstract God, the imprint of which still marks his interpretation of the Christian doctrine St. Augustine had since come to accept. In evaluating his view of Christ's redemptive task, we cannot help but be mindful that it was not in seeing the love of God operating in the Birth, Life, Death, and Resurrection of Christ that Augustine came to know the Father, but rather that his philosophical quest for God followed by his conversion to Christianity enabled him to see the Logos as the Incarnate Son of God whose life and work aimed at the restoration of mankind.

As already noted, the complete restoration of the elect to the heavenly city is through the resurrection. St. Augustine expounds the reality of the resurrection in one chapter of the Enchiridion and shows himself closer to the Apostolic tradition than certain patristic authors such as Tertullian, Athanasius, and even Irenaeus. Tertullian's idea of the union of a corporeal soul to the body of flesh and the ante-Nicene emphasis on the deification of the flesh through the Incarnation² as keys to the interpretation of the Resurrection are absent. In fact St. Augustine begins his exposition by making it clear that he is speaking of the resurrection and not of the revivification of the body.

"Now with respect to the resurrection of the body - and by this I do not mean the cases of resuscitation after which people died again, but a resurrection to eternal life after the fashion of Christ's own body..."³

To make it quite clear that the body with which we shall be raised is not the revivification of our present body, he uses the illustration of people who are born with physical defects, and in particular to the case of a double-limbed man who was born in the Orient,⁴ and stresses that "at the resurrection they will be restored to the normal human physiognomy, so that every soul will have ... as its own, all that is required to

1. Enchiridion X:33; XIV:48; XXVIII:108 (L.C.C.)
2. Cf. Irenaeus and Athanasius pp. 61ff and 65ff.
3. Enchiridion XXIII:84 (L.C.C.)
4. Cf. Enchiridion XXIII:87

complete a whole human body."¹ He points out that our bodies perish and are "dissolved into dust or ashes, or dispersed into vapours and the winds, or converted into the substance of other bodies, or served as food for beasts"² but that as far as God is concerned they have not perished because He will re-create our bodies with the same substance that we may become men. He clearly implies that we do not become disembodied spirits, at the same time making it clear that our bodies are re-created and not resuscitated. He further substantiates this by reiterating the Pauline concept of the body which sown in corruption is raised in incorruption.³ Emphasising the difference between "the lusts of the flesh" which is the corruption that will not inherit the Kingdom of God and the "body" or "flesh" which will be raised a spiritual body, he says, "as far as the substance of the resurrection body is concerned, it will then still be 'flesh'. This is why the body of Christ is called 'flesh' even after the resurrection.... For there will then be such a concord between flesh and spirit - the spirit quickening the servant flesh without any need of sustenance therefrom - that there will be no further conflict within ourselves."⁴ There can be no doubt that here St. Augustine is echoing Pauline eschatology, and together with St. Paul affirms convincingly that our resurrection is of the same nature as Christ's Resurrection, that even as Christ's body was raised and glorified to become the obedient servant of the Spirit, so we shall be raised in a new body which will be the perfect expression of our soul.

Thus, although at times complex and inadequate yet chiefly constructive and evangelical, St. Augustine's theology and thought "must be judged as one of the most remarkable of all Christ's triumphs in transforming the mind of genius."⁵ He remains an eminent teacher of the Church both of his own time and of our own.

-
1. op. cit., XXIII:87 (L.C.C.)
 2. op. cit., XXIII:88 (L.C.C.)
 3. op. cit., XXIII:91; Cf. I Corinthians 15:44.
 4. op. cit., XXIII:91.
 5. A Companion to the Study of Augustine, p.365.

CHAPTER FOUR - THE RESURRECTION IN THE THEOLOGY OF THE
MIDDLE AGES AND THE REFORMATION

Medieval Theology

The theology of the Middle Ages was formulated by the penetrating minds of some of the ablest scholars and most eminent thinkers in the history of the Christian Church. The Middle Ages was a period when questions about the nature of God and His universe were reflected upon in the light of Christian Revelation and of the two main streams of Greek philosophy, viz., the Platonic and Aristotelian. At the core of the Platonic metaphysic lay the Doctrine of Ideas, which taught that "the ideal is the real, the underlying substance: that the universal was real in a sense in which the particular was not."¹ St. Augustine was largely responsible for the co-ordination of Platonic philosophy with Christian theology, and we find the influence of Augustinian-Platonic thought in St. Anselm's ontological argument for the existence of God. "Since perfection is an attribute of being, the idea of 'that than which there can be no greater,' God, must exist, in substance and reality, and not as a bare intellectual concept..."² One contribution of Aristotelian thought was the principle of logic, and later, with the discovery and translation of Aristotle's other works, another contribution was his view of philosophy as the unifying apex of the study of the whole of nature. The influence of the Aristotelian principle of logic - Do universal ideas have an objective existence or do they exist only in the mind of the philosopher? - is seen in Abelard, who, for teaching that the persons of the Trinity are not part of the divine essence but attributes of the Godhead in terms of power, wisdom, and goodness, and that the existence of the Trinity is accessible to reason, was condemned a heretic. It is in the theology of St. Thomas Aquinas that we find the fully matured influence of the Aristotelian concept of knowledge - the sciences of observation (astronomy, botany, zoology, etc.) and the sciences of speculation (history, ethics, education) form an ascending order of knowledge unified by philosophy. St. Thomas taught that theology and philosophy must be distinguished as two different sciences because of the different approach to their subject-matter. "Philosophy examines the natural order by the light of reason: theology the supernatural order as revealed in the Word of God."³ And yet, there is no opposition and contradiction because the truth of divine revelation and the truth

1. M. Deanesley, A History of the Medieval Church 590-1500. (Methuen & Co. Ltd. - 1925), p.167.

2. op. cit., p.170.

3. op. cit., p. 175.

pursued by philosophy is ultimately one. St. Thomas saw the task of reason as showing that the supra-rational is not anti-rational.¹

It has been necessary to attempt to depict briefly, even though inadequately, the trend of theological thinking in the Middle Ages, to provide a background to the more specific thought on the Resurrection. We now go on to consider the writings of the great theologian of the eleventh century, Anselm of Canterbury, and thereafter St. Thomas Aquinas of the thirteenth century, whose brilliant scholarly, and intensely devotional mind is recognized by theologians and philosophers alike.

Section 1 - Anselm of Canterbury

In his great work Cur Deus Homo, Anselm expounds the soteriological meaning of the Incarnation. He sets himself the task of answering the question which forms the title of his treatise - Why did God become man? The premise of his argument is that satisfaction for man's sinfulness must be made to God. His outlook is penitential and it therefore seems appropriate to him to use juridical terms in his argument, which in brief outline runs thus: Man is sinful and therefore incapable of making satisfaction to God. Even if man were able to offer God a life of perfect obedience, he would only be giving God His due, and would not compensate for the injury done to God by the sinfulness of man. If man cannot make the necessary satisfaction then God must do it. Yet, since man is guilty and the responsibility is his, God must become man, so that the satisfaction which God demands may be made by the perfect man, the God-man, but nonetheless man. As Dr. Aulén remarks in his exposition of Anselmian soteriology, "The satisfaction must be made by man; and this is precisely what is done in Christ's atoning work."² The atoning work lies not in Christ's perfect life of obedience, for this is what man owes God in the first place, but in Christ's voluntary act of sacrifice, the free giving of Himself to death, for this is the greatest gift man can make to God.

The human aspect of Christ's work of redemption is emphasized while there is no hint of the love of God seeking after His lost and wayward children. Anselm's answer is that the Incarnation is a necessity arising out of man's guilt and not the generosity arising out of the love of the Father. Defective and inadequate as we may hold this view of the Atonement to be, it is not our task here to give a critical appreciation of it.

1. For further detail cf. op. cit., pp. 166-178.
2. Christus Victor, p.103.

Rather we must note the contrast between this line of thought and that of the Apostolic tradition. Anselm sees the death of Christ in isolation, as a human work of satisfaction meeting God's demand. The Apostles and Fathers teach that God became Flesh that He might redeem, bearing the sins of many in Christ's perfect obedience unto death, but triumphing over sin and death through Christ's glorious exaltation. The Apostolic teaching never isolates any aspect of Christ's life or work from the whole, but always teaches that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself."¹

It is in noting this contrast that we see the waning of the significance of Christ's Resurrection. The Resurrection is no longer part of God's redemptive work, nor is the Cross seen as the victorious suffering of Him, who for our sake was made sin though He knew no sin,² and who is now the Risen, Living Christ. And though Anselm does say that the resurrection of the dead is the fulfilment of the restoration of man to what he was originally intended to be, the basis of his argument is not that in Jesus Christ death has been overcome so that all who are in Him, participating in His victory, are raised and glorified, (not restored) but that immortality is part of the rational nature of man. God made man not only a rational creature but also a just creature so that by his rationality man might be able to discern "good from evil, and the greater good from the lesser good."³ The purpose of this power of discernment is that man should hate and shun evil and love and choose the good, above all the supreme good, not for another's sake but for its own sake. This he can only do if he is just, "therefore, so that it should not be rational to no purpose, it (he) was created rational and just at the same time for this purpose."⁴ But, continues Anselm, if the purpose of man is to choose and love the supreme good it is not conceivable that man should never attain to it and possess it. If so, God's purpose in making man a rational and just creature, would be in vain. "Man, therefore, who is of a rational nature, was made just in order that he might be blessed in the enjoyment of God."⁵ Having established this fact, Anselm now proceeds to deduce from that, man's immortality. As it is contrary to God's wisdom and justice to require the death of a man without sin,⁶ since the purpose of man is to enjoy God, therefore, if man had not sinned, he would never have died.⁷ Consequently, if man is restored, he must be restored

1. II Corinthians 5:19.

2. Cf. II Corinthians 5:21; Hebrews 4:15; 7:25; I Peter 2:22; I John 3:5 etc.

3. Cur Deus Homo? Book II, Chapter 1. (L.C.C.)

4. op. cit.

5. op. cit.

6. Cf. op. cit. I, 9.

7. Cf. op. cit. II, 2.

to the original condition in which he would have been, had he not sinned. "From this we can clearly prove the resurrection of the dead at some future time. ... If he had not sinned, man was to have been transformed into incorruptibility with the very body that he possessed. When he is restored, then he must be restored with his own body in which he lives in this life."¹

It is a strange and curious thing that Anselm who speaks of the body being transformed into incorruptibility should base his hope of the resurrection, not in Christ who, having died, was raised from the dead - i.e. transformed and glorified, but in the rational nature of man whom he considers as being, and by strict logic attempts to prove him to be, inherently immortal. Yet, even though Anselm speaks of the body being transformed into incorruptibility, as though to avoid the suggestion of re-vivification, he is thinking of man who has not sinned and therefore, of the unreal. In fact, since he maintains that the sinless man would not in God's justice be required to die, he cannot mean by his phrase "transformed into incorruptibility" a resurrection at all. Resurrection implies death. Our Lord Jesus Christ was crucified and buried - He died! But He was raised from the dead, the same Jesus yet different. His corruptible body was transformed into incorruption, He was glorified by an act of God. It is difficult therefore to know what Anselm means when he says that we are to be restored with the very bodies in which we live this life. But it seems to me to be the implication of his argument and of his whole view of the **Atonement**, that when satisfaction has been made to God for man's sin, man is restored to his original condition, and only when restored is he "transformed" into incorruptibility. For sin, according to Anselm, is an external factor which can be removed by Christ's atoning work, and not, as according to the Gospel, the seed of death and corruption which can only be overcome and destroyed through Christ's victorious death. Thus Anselm's view of the resurrection is inadequate because he fails to recognize the death of Christ as a victorious death and consequently to see our resurrection as grounded in the Resurrection of Christ, whereby we who are sown in corruption, are raised in incorruption, and who die as mortals, are raised in immortality. It may be that he has allowed reason to usurp the place of faith - that he has tried to discover the truth through the channel of the rational rather than to receive the truth through faith. Certainly, there is no doubt that his exposition is prompted by philosophical rather than exegetical considerations. When Dr. Aulén says of Anselm's doctrine of the Incarnation that it is "no longer with him a fully living idea, as it was to the Fathers. It is a fixed dogma, which he takes for granted

1. op. cit. II, 3.

as beyond dispute; but his deductions only with difficulty succeed in relating it with his doctrine of the Atonement,"¹ one feels that the same judgment might equally apply to his doctrine of the Resurrection.

Section 2 - St. Thomas Aquinas

St. Thomas devotes one book of his Summa Theologica (Vol. XX) to a treatise on the eschatological aspect of the doctrine of the Resurrection. Penetratingly he analyses every possible difficulty that arises from the hope of our resurrection, and by a process of almost impeccable logic resolves these difficulties in the light of philosophy, of the teaching of the Fathers, but above all, of the revelation contained in the Scriptures. There can be no doubt that he accepts without question the authority of the Scriptures and finds in them the basis of most of his arguments. However, the deductions he makes by way of strict and coherent argument do not always conform to the general teaching of the Scriptures. This is particularly noticeable in the sections on the state and conditions of the after-life, where rather than accept the mysterious, he pursues the path of speculation.

The first section of his treatise concerns the state and abode of the departed souls. The idea behind St. Thomas' concept of life after death is that of an interim period between our present life and our future resurrection-life. After death the soul is freed from the body and dwells in a corporeal place. This in itself is contradictory and St. Thomas finds it a little difficult to explain exactly what he means. He admits that we cannot really know the nature of this abode. "Incorporeal things ... are in place after a manner befitting spiritual substances, a manner that cannot be fully manifest to us."² But souls, he tells us, have no bodies, even though they inhabit a corporeal place, to which they are assigned according to their degree of nobility, i.e. as they more nearly approach the first Substance (God) or not. Souls have merit or demerit as bodies have gravity or levity, and this determines where they are to be conveyed, for according to their reward or punishment, souls set free from the body at death, either plunge to hell or soar to heaven.³ These souls retain the intellective powers (not the sensitive or vegetative powers) by which he means only those powers which he conceives the soul to exercise independently of the body - e.g. the will. And so the souls of the

1. Christus Victor, p. 103ff.

2. Question LXIX, Article 1. (The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas, Edited by the Dominican Fathers).

3. Q. LXIX, A. 2.

departed dwell in this strange and indefinable place graded as it were according to a "scale" of spiritual substance - those approaching the highest substance are in heaven and those least resembling this prime substance are in hell. This is a notion most curious and strange to our way of thinking but it is related to the medieval belief in the hierarchy of saints through which the believer on earth can approach God. But the point to note here is that after death the soul is separated from the body and waits for the resurrection.

St. Thomas disclaims any knowledge of the time when the general resurrection will take place since this is unknown by natural reason and undisclosed by revelation.¹ He does suggest that it will be sudden and may happen at night since our Lord rose from the dead before sunrise, and His return is compared to the coming of a thief. But St. Thomas is aware of the small importance of such speculation. He feels, however, that the resurrection of the dead will be delayed until the end of the world. For "Christ's resurrection is an exemplar of ours, and through our faith therein, there arises in us the hope of our own resurrection. ... consequently Christ's resurrection had to precede the resurrection of others who have all to rise again at the consummation of the world."²

Aware that the Scriptures testify to the resurrection of saints before Christ's own Resurrection, he explains that these were "for the sake of bearing witness to Christ's resurrection,"³ but adds that we must take these statements as made in anticipation, "for none rose again with a true resurrection before Christ, since He is the firstfruits of them that sleep (I Corinthians XV:20), although some were resuscitated before Christ's resurrection, as in the case of Lazarus."⁴ It is important to notice this clear and explicit distinction which St. Thomas makes between resurrection and resuscitation. He is close to Tertullian (and not unrelated to St. Paul's early teaching) in his view of the soul's sojourn in an "interim" habitation between death and the end of the world, but unlike Tertullian, who hints at the raising of a corporeal soul, he is unequivocal about the resurrection of the body.

This he makes quite clear when he says that "in Christ has our resurrection begun, and His resurrection is the cause of ours. ... Now Christ's resurrection is said to be the cause

1. Question LXXVII, Article 2.
2. Question LXXVII, Article 1.
3. op. cit.
4. op. cit.

of ours, in that it works our resurrection, not immediately, but by means of its principle, namely the Divine which will work our resurrection in likeness to the resurrection of Christ."¹ Just as we cannot be delivered from spiritual death except by the gift of God's grace, so also we cannot be delivered from bodily death except by the resurrection wrought by the Divine power and will, and this is done through Jesus Christ who is the Mediator between God and men. Our resurrection is a resurrection of the body. St. Thomas rejects both the dualistic concept of spirit as essentially good and the body as essentially evil, and the theory that the body is merely the instrument of the soul.² He sees body and soul as forming the unity that constitutes human nature so that if resurrection is to be real it must be the resurrection of the whole human nature. He confirms this by pointing out that members of the body should conform to the Head - Jesus Christ, so that as Christ lives eternally in body and soul (Cf. Romans 6:8) so all men who are His members will live in body and soul.³ Yet, he tells us that all men not merely those who are in Christ will be raised because the soul alone, i.e. the soul separated from the body, cannot achieve the final perfection of the human species. Thus the good and the wicked alike will participate in the resurrection because all are conformed by nature to Christ, though only the good are conformed to Him by grace.

"The resurrection of all men will bear some resemblance to Christ's resurrection, as regards that which pertains to the life of nature, in respect of which all were conformed to Christ. Hence all will rise again to immortal life; but in the saints who were conformed to Christ by grace, there will be conformity as to things pertaining to glory."⁴

Although all men shall be raised, St. Thomas makes it clear that the resurrection is not a natural or inherent property of man. Sin and death have deprived man of Life and the resurrection is not simply a reversal of that condition by a natural process. St. Thomas defines what he means by natural:

"Properly speaking natural is that which is according to nature, and a thing is according to nature if it has that nature and whatever results from nature (Phys. ii. I). Consequently, speaking simply, movement cannot be described as natural unless its principle be natural."⁵

He argues therefore that since there is no principle of resurrection in nature, the resurrection is miraculous. It is in

1. Question LXXVI, Article 1. Cf. Romans 8:11.
2. Question LXXV, Article 1.
3. op. cit.
4. Question LXXVI, Article 1
5. Question LXXV, Article 3.

other words, the work of God.

To confirm the fact that our resurrection is from death St. Thomas reiterates the Pauline phrase - "as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive"¹ - and shows that this is in accordance with Divine justice (condemnation of sin), with the Scriptures, and with nature (what is corrupted is not renewed except by means of corruption). But then he attempts to explain the inexplicable by trying to show how our decayed bodies that have turned to ashes and dust will be re-formed into our resurrection bodies.² The body that rises differs not in identity but in condition as the example of the seed and plant illustrates. The identity must be complete in that the self-same body must be united to the self-same soul "for otherwise there would be no resurrection properly speaking, if the same man were not reformed."³ He argues that all the members of the body must be restored including hair and nails, which are the ornaments of the human body, and the entrails which "will be filled not with vile superfluties but with goodly humours."⁴ And yet he continues by saying that it is not necessary in the resurrection life for man to attain to primary perfection. By this he means the perfection of the animal life and its function - e.g. the nutritive system. The resurrection body will attain to the ultimate perfection in which the essence of human nature will be involved. The fact that Christ did eat and drink after His Resurrection, is an exception to the rule, the purpose of which was revelatory. There seems to be a contradiction in his argument for on the one hand he insists that the body must be raised in its totality if the resurrection is to be valid, but on the other hand he admits that only the essence of human nature necessary for the ultimate perfection of man will be raised. Neither proposition can be said to be true or false since these notions belong to the realm of speculation and it would have been sufficient for St. Thomas to have said simply that our resurrection partakes of the same nature as Christ's resurrection body i.e. they will bear the identity of our present bodies and yet be transformed and glorified.

One last point we must note and that concerns the impassibility of our resurrection bodies. Sown in corruption and mortality, but raised in incorruption and immortality, our bodies will be beyond suffering. Nonetheless they shall bear the scars of wounds received in the suffering for justice and faith in our present life not as defects but as signs even as

1. I Corinthians 15:22. Cf. Question LXXVIII, Article 1.
2. Question LXXVIII, Article 3.
3. Question LXXIX, Article 2.
4. Question LXXX, Article 1 Cf. Article 2.

Christ bore the signs of His death in His resurrection body.¹

St. Thomas continues his argument dealing with many more questions and aspects of our resurrection life, but we have no need to consider them as we have examined the core of his thought on this doctrine. There is no doubt that he upholds and expounds the Apostolic teaching on this aspect of the Christian faith. Yet we cannot escape the suspicion that his outlook is detached, rather than existential. In Medieval times the belief prevailed that the channel of access to God was more effective through the saints to Mary, through Mary to Christ, and through Christ to the Father. "Prayers"² were offered to the saints who intercede for men, and the effect of this may well have been to make Jesus Christ more remote, so that His living presence was no longer the vital reality that it was in the Apostolic Age. Yet, although we may be tempted to regard St. Thomas' exposition of the resurrection as lacking the vibrant faith which we meet in St. Paul's exposition in I Corinthians 15, we must not forget that St. Thomas was writing not a pastoral epistle but a theological treatise. If he does not convey to us, in this treatise, his intense devotion, we find it elsewhere, for example in his sermon on "The Body of the Lord."

"Let none, then, approach this awful Table without reverent devotion and fervent love, without true penitence, or without recalling his redemption. For it is the Lamb without spot, without taint or smirch of sin, that is eaten in the unleavened bread. Approach not before the cleansing waters have poured over thy soul; approach not without firm faith, burning charity, the vinegar of suffering, and the proving of trial. So approach, child of faith, the supper of the Lord, the table of plenitude and holiness, that at the last thou mayest attain to the wedding feast of the Lamb: there we shall be incbricated with the plenty of the house of God; then we shall see the King of Glory and the Lord of Hosts in His beauty, and shall taste bread in the Kingdom of our Father; and our host shall be our Lord Jesus Christ, whose power and empire are without end for ever. Amen."³

Here we are made aware of St. Thomas' deep faith. In his Summa Theologica we are made aware of his acute mind and keen intellect. We would do him injustice were we to pass judgment on the basis of only one aspect of his life and thought.

However, from the purely theological point of view, we must note that he refers to the faith⁴ in the intellectual and

1. Cf. Question LXXXII, Article 1.

2. See Note 12.

3. Thomas Aquinas - Selected Writings Edited by M.C. D'Arcy (Everyman's Library No. 953 - J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd - 1939).

4. Cf. Question LXXIX, Article 2.

credal sense. His outlook is almost empirical, as for example, in his argument that Christ is the cause of our resurrection. Using the language of logic, he sees Christ's Resurrection as the cause of which the resurrection of the dead is the effect, and while it is true that Christ is the ground of our resurrection, it is also true that it is more than the cause. It is also the expression by God of His infinite love which seeks and forgives man, overcomes the evil in him, and restores him to the fellowship of a Father. Thus, apart from the speculation in which he sometimes indulges, where he should accept in reverence the mystery of God's act, St. Thomas does emphasize the main aspects of the Resurrection in accordance with the Apostolic teaching.

Section 3 - John Calvin (1509-1564).

We now turn to consider John Calvin's teaching on the Resurrection as representing the theology of the Reformation. His treatise on the Resurrection of Christ and of our own resurrection is based upon the relevant articles of the Apostles' Creed and expounded soteriologically in the light of New Testament teaching.

He asserts that "the whole sum of our salvation, and every single part of it, are comprehended in Christ"¹ to emphasize that Christ's Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension are not isolated or unrelated factors, but form a unity in His redemptive work. In this manner, Calvin is able to show the relevance of every aspect of the Atonement in its relation to the whole. While his thought is Anselmian in many respects because of his view of Christ's death as a satisfaction made to the justice of God and for the appeasement of His wrath,² nevertheless he is not altogether guilty of subscribing wholly to that theory of the Atonement. He stresses equally firmly the fact that the love of God the Father is not the result of the satisfaction made by Christ but the motive of His sending Christ to be our Saviour.³ Thus he avoids the danger into which the satisfaction theory always leads, namely that God's attitude to man is reckoned to be changed from hatred to love as a result of Christ's death, and therefore that God Himself is not responsible for our atonement. Although Calvin does avert that danger, we cannot overlook the fact that he persists in using the terminology

1. Institutes of the Christian Religion, Book II, Chapter 16:19 (Translated by Henry Beveridge).

2. Cf. Institutes II, 16:1-3

3. Cf. Institutes II, 16:4

of the satisfaction theory which can have no real place in our understanding of God's great work of love. The initiative is God's who seeks not reparation for the violation of His justice but the loving response of His creation made in His own image to have fellowship with Him.

Our salvation is achieved through Christ's complete identification with man so that as our representative, who has taken upon Himself not only our sin but also the consequences of our sinfulness, He pays the price of our deliverance.

"Our acquittal is in this - that the guilt which made us liable to punishment was transferred to the head of the Son of God (Isaiah liii:12). We must specially remember this substitution in order that we may be not all our lives in trepidation and anxiety, as if the just vengeance, which the Son of God transferred to himself, were still impending over us."¹

Here we have a hint of the substitution theory which is also untenable as an explanation of the work of atonement, because it eclipses the truth that, although Christ has on our behalf accepted the consequence of our sin and overcome death, the result of sin, we must nonetheless participate in Christ's death and crucify our old self in order that our new self may be raised to newness of life, through His Resurrection.²

Calvin stresses the importance of the life of obedience which Christ lived unto God, as part of His atoning work. For although the full atonement consists of Christ's death and resurrection, His life obedient to the will of God is not excluded. His obedience becomes the perfect sacrifice through His willing surrender to death. In this voluntary act of self-denial and self-oblation, the expiation of our sins is made. But Calvin goes on to explain that Christ's death is more than the expiation of sin, or the payment of the penalty of sin, but that it is the acceptance to the uttermost of the torture and agony of death, which he sees to be the significance of our Lord's descent into hell. He rejects both the notion that this clause in the Creed is just another way of emphasising the burial of Jesus, and the "fable", as he calls it, that this signifies Christ's visit to the underworld.³ Christ is so completely identified with sinful man that He experiences death which means complete separation from God and which is the ultimate consequence of sin. Christ feared the Cross not because He desired to be exempted from it but because, although sinless, He had to accept, in the place of the sinner, the experience of forsakenness. It is in this sense that Calvin

1. Institutes II, 16:5.

2. Cf. Romans 6:5-11.

3. Cf. Institutes II, 16:8,9. But Cf. I Peter.

interprets the cry of Jesus on the Cross: "My God, my God why hast thou forsaken me?" Not that God the Father forsook His Son, but that the Son, so identified with man, endured the terrible torture that man in his sin had brought upon himself - the agony of being cast off from the very source of life.¹ But, says Calvin, "by engaging with the power of the devil, the fear of death, and the pains of hell, he gained the victory, and achieved a triumph, so that we now fear not in death those things which our Prince has destroyed."²

The death of Christ shows us not only how great was the cost for Him to be our Saviour, but also how great was His victory which proclaimed Him the Saviour.

"Our salvation may be thus divided between the death and the resurrection of Christ: by the former, sin was abolished and death annihilated; by the latter, righteousness was restored and life revived, the power and efficacy of the former (death) being still bestowed upon us by means of the latter (resurrection)."³

The Resurrection is, in the thought of Calvin, an integral part of the Atonement, because the death and Resurrection form a unity, the one always implying the other. The two are mutually inclusive and cannot be considered in isolation from one another.

"Let us remember, therefore," he says, "that when death only is mentioned, everything peculiar to the resurrection is at the same time included, and that there is a like synecdoche in the term resurrection, as often as it is used apart from death, everything peculiar to death being included."⁴

Calvin points out several implications of the Resurrection of Christ for the believer. The first is that the faith of the believer is aroused only by the Resurrection. While through His death Christ has given satisfaction to God's justice, paid the penalty of sin and removed the curse that hung over the sinner, it is only by the Resurrection that we are given the hope of Eternal Life and Righteousness. Without the Resurrection, the death would have meant nothing but that Christ had not conquered but been defeated by its power.⁵ The second implication is that the believer is not only urged to follow the example of a Risen Saviour in living the new life, but that he is empowered and renewed by the Risen Saviour to live in righteousness. In other words the Resurrection is not a detached fact for the believer, but a fact of living experience whereby he participates in the Resurrection of Christ and receives the power to live the new life the Saviour has inaugurated and offers. Here we see Calvin's own interpretation of the resurrection-faith,

1. Cf. Institutes II, 16:10-11.

2. Institutes II, 16:11 (conclusion).

3. Institutes II, 16:15.

4. Institutes II, 16:13.

5. Cf. II Corinthians 13:4; Philippians 3:10; I Peter 1:3,21; I Corinthians 15:17.

which he himself shares, and which was so vital to the Apostles, because it constituted their relationship not with a dead Saviour of the past, but with the living and ever-present Saviour. A third implication, or benefit as Calvin calls it, is the hope of our own resurrection, of which Christ's is the earnest or guarantee. He observes that the phrase "risen from the dead" conveys to us "the reality both of his death and resurrection, as if it had been said, that he died the same death as other men naturally die, and received immortality in the same mortal flesh which he had assumed."¹ This is a clear indication of his belief that Christ was not resuscitated but raised and glorified in His own body, which, having passed through death and endured its agony, is transformed from corruption to incorruption. Speaking of our own resurrection he conveys the same view. At the last day when Christ returns those still alive as well as the dead will be raised. But those who are alive, although they will not die a natural death, will be transformed in such a manner that their transformation may be called a death, since their mortal life will perish and they will be given their new nature.² There is no doubt that Calvin is here thinking of the transformation similar to that which took place in Christ's own Resurrection, whereby His mortal body was changed into an immortal one, at the same time retaining His identity. In other words our resurrection will be like Christ's - there will be continuity as well as discontinuity between our present body and our resurrection body. Yet another benefit of Christ's Resurrection is that, having ascended up into heaven i.e. "he withdrew his bodily presence from our sight, not that he might cease to be with his followers, who are still pilgrims on the earth, but that he might rule both heaven and earth more immediately by his power;"³ He has sent His Spirit that we may live no longer subject to corruption but as already participating in Life Eternal. The blessing of Christ's Resurrection, in other words, is effective not just in the life to come but in this life. The Resurrection concerns the believer not merely eschatologically but also immediately. Christ "thus occupies his exalted seat, that thence, transferring his virtue unto us, he may quicken us to spiritual life, sanctify us by his Spirit and adorn his church with various graces... until he arrives to complete the last act by judging the quick and the dead."⁴

Evident throughout Calvin's systematic exposition is not only his power of intellect but also a deep personal faith. His teaching on the Resurrection not only echoes that of the Apostles but also mirrors his own faith in the Risen Lord. We

1. Institutes II, 16:13.
2. Cf. Institutes II, 16:17.
3. Institutes II 16:14.
4. Institutes II 16:16.

can appreciate Calvin's contribution only in the light of his own day, when, in the Catholic Church, faith had, to a large extent, ceased to be a personal relationship between the believer and God, mediated through Jesus Christ, but had become a formal and nominal relationship to the ecclesiastical institution. The Mass, for example, was no longer the sacramental meal at which the believer communed with his living Lord, but had become a form of insurance for securing salvation, and entrance into heaven. Calvin, however, accepting the authority of the Scriptures over against that of the Church of his day, devoted himself to proclaim the Truth as contained in the Scriptures and to revive personal faith - faith not in a Lord enshrined in the elaborate paraphernalia of ecclesiasticism, but in an ever-present and ever-living Lord.

CHAPTER FIVE - CONCLUSIONS.

We must now endeavour to evaluate the teaching of the Church on the Resurrection, if possible to discover the factors which caused the varying emphases in different periods of the life of the Church. Because this has been a theological study, our conclusions are of necessity limited to this field, and can barely take into account the conclusions that might have been drawn from a similar study in the fields of worship and the devotional life of the Church. The Church has always believed in the Resurrection of our Lord but there were times when the significance of the Resurrection was only partially apprehended - times when the fully personal significance (physical and spiritual) was substituted by the solely spiritual significance; times when the soteriological aspect was confused and even forgotten; and times when the existential were eclipsed by the eschatological implications. It is from these different points of view that we must now consider the whole question in retrospect, and particularly in the light of the Apostolic teaching.

Firstly then we turn to the question of the resurrection itself. Did the Church teach a spiritual, a physical, or a fully personal resurrection? There can be no doubt that the primitive Church, in spite of contending tendencies, upheld the belief in the resurrection of the whole being - physical and spiritual and, therefore, fully personal. On the one side, under the influence of Gnostic christianity which held the dualistic concept of matter and spirit, the tendency was to deny a physical resurrection in favour of a purely spiritual resurrection. Such teaching was more easily accepted by those Gentiles whose background was dualistic. On the other side, under the influence of the many pagan religions whose gods were essentially anthropomorphic, the tendency was to deify the flesh and to think of the resurrection in crudely literal and materialistic terms.¹ But the orthodox teaching of the Church steered a clear path between these two extremes by upholding the unity of body and spirit as constituting the whole of personality. The resurrection is neither the mere continuation of the spiritual character of man in the life here-after, nor the resuscitation of the earthly body but the transformation and glorification of God's creation which not only retains the identity of its physical nature but is given a new mode of life whereby the 'physical' becomes the unhindered expression of the spiritual within their essential unity. This, as we have seen, was the teaching of the Apostles who were witnesses of the Resurrection and knew their Risen Lord as the same Jesus, yet

1. Cf. E. Frost, Christian Healing, p. 125.

changed. Furthermore, this whole concept was basic to the whole Gospel. In the Incarnation God took the form of man, i.e. of His own creation, and achieved a complete salvation (not merely a spiritual salvation) through Jesus Christ, revealing the eternal value of the material in God's economy. The distinction made in the primitive Church was not between the flesh and the spirit, but between the lusts of the flesh and the body (sarx and sōma). The body is part of the human personality and nature which is redeemed and perfected in Christ. It is lusts of the flesh, the seat of evil in human nature, that part of human nature which gives play to sinfulness - describe it as we may - that God in His redemptive work destroys. It is the wholeness of human nature that He redeems. We find support for this central teaching of the primitive Church in the attitude of the Christian martyrs. They were not afraid to face either death or the destruction of the body because they were confident that in and through Christ, death itself had lost its power and that the hope of life in the new creation was a reality. The present mortal and corruptible body decays and perishes but by God's act it is raised a new body in the likeness of Christ's. Thus, inspite of the two extreme tendencies which prevailed, the primitive Church clearly emphasised the resurrection of the whole being - the unity of body and spirit.

Later, however, particularly because of the spread of the Gospel and the growth of the Church in the Gentile world, foreign elements crept into the interpretation of the orthodox doctrine of the resurrection. The need arose not only to defend the Christian faith but also to interpret it to the non-Christian world. It was into this interpretation, which was not always in strict Scriptural terms but often in terms of the concepts of the non-Christian world, that these foreign elements crept in. St. Clement, for example, attempted to interpret the doctrine of the resurrection in terms of the legend of the phoenix bird,¹ which, although probably congenial to the pagan mind, tended to detract from the underlying fact of the Resurrection, whether of Christ or of believers, namely, that it is an act of God - an act of re-creation. It must be understood that in using the term 'creation' to describe the resurrection, we mean not creation *ex nihilo* but the redemptively creative act of God whereby the old man is crucified (in Adam) and the new man is raised (in Christ). St. Clement, in his interpretation of the Resurrection, undermines this basic truth about the resurrection. Another strange element is introduced by Tertullian. As a Montanist he had strong ascetic tendencies, the influence

1. Cf. p. 50 above.

of which is felt in his interpretation of the Resurrection. The key to Tertullian's thought at this point is his notion of the corporeality of the soul. The souls of the departed are corporal¹ and as such inhabit the underworld awaiting the resurrection. At the resurrection this corporal soul is united to the body of flesh which, he tells us, was not destroyed but withdrawn at death. In other words, the resurrection is not the transformation of the whole personality, body and soul, but the restoration of the original human nature by the union of the purified and perfected soul to the old body of flesh. In spite of Tertullian's distinction between the lusts of the flesh and the body of flesh, the implication of his interpretation appears to be very close to revivification, in which the soul having passed through death and continued its process of perfection in the underworld (purgatory) is "reassembled" to the body of flesh at the resurrection. Tertullian, therefore, although defending the faith, is also interpreting it and he does so not in terms of the Apostolic tradition, but in terms of the extreme group within the Church to which he belonged, and which had departed from Apostolic tradition by its exclusive emphasis on certain aspects of the faith. Thus either through the adoption of pagan categories, as in St. Clement, or of the categories of exclusive and heretically-inclined groups within the Church, as in Tertullian the Montanist, the interpretation of the resurrection received elements foreign to that of the Apostolic teaching.

Irenaeus and Athanasius, as well as St. Augustine upheld the teaching of the Apostles on the resurrection of the body. Although Irenaeus and Athanasius were strongly incarnational in their theology, and St. Augustine's thought was a syncretism between philosophy and theology, yet not one of them leaves us in any doubt that the resurrection involves a transformation from the corruptible to the incorruptible.

It was in the Middle Ages, with the coming of Anselm that the emphasis upon a fully personal resurrection again faded. Anselm spoke of the transformation into incorruptibility but understood and explained this in terms of his own doctrine of sin and death.² As an external factor - a penalty for sinfulness which is removed by the Atonement of Christ - death loses its significance in the theology of Anselm and consequently the resurrection also becomes unimportant. The glory of our Lord's Resurrection is that He has conquered the last enemy and destroyed the power of death by His own acceptance

1. Cf. pp. 58ff above.

2. Cf. pp. 76ff above.

of death. It is as if He engaged war with death and involved Himself in this "battle" by accepting it, but, because He is Life and Light, death and darkness could have no hold on Him. Our own resurrection is therefore no 'short-cut' around death, but in the same way as our Lord's, through death. And the glory of our hope is that we know and believe that death cannot hold us nor defeat us, but that in accepting it we participate in Christ's victory and appropriate it for ourselves, confidently laying down our corruptible bodies in the sure knowledge that God will raise them up incorruptible. This is the New Testament emphasis which Anselm misses and omits.

The reason for this is that juridical terms were introduced in the interpretation of the Atonement. Known as the Latin theory, the main thesis was that Christ's perfect obedience even unto death is the sacrifice that satisfies God's justice by paying the penalty of sin and death on our behalf. In this theory the Resurrection becomes secondary since the penalty is paid and the satisfaction is made on the Cross. Thus because of the loss of its significance in the Atonement, the Resurrection was no longer seen as the victory of Life over death, of the incorruptible over the corruptible, as the triumph in which the whole man in Christ is lifted up from sin and death, transformed and glorified to inherit fully Life Eternal, and the Righteousness of God.

St. Thomas Aquinas also allowed his philosophical thought to colour his theology, but he nevertheless retained the Apostolic emphasis in this, that the resurrection means the transformation and glorification of the whole person. This was again the unmistakable teaching of John Calvin three centuries later.

We may say however, that the attempts to syncretise certain philosophical concepts with the faith, or to explain the inexplicable by philosophical speculation confused and distorted the truth received in revelation. Certainly the truth of the resurrection and the Apostolic emphasis upon each aspect of that truth was confused and partially lost in Anselmian theology.

Secondly we turn to consider the place of the Resurrection in the Atonement, or, in other words, the soteriological significance of the Resurrection. The Apostolic teaching is clear that the Resurrection of Christ is no appendage to the Gospel but that it is the Gospel. The glorious message which was proclaimed throughout the Roman Empire and which continues to be proclaimed throughout the world, is that our Risen Lord, through His victorious death has broken the power of sin and death and inaugurated the Kingdom of God as the reign of Righteousness here on earth. Through Him, our sins are not only forgiven but we are made righteous and empowered to live no longer as slaves

of the devil but as sons of God. The gift of eternal life is offered to all who would receive it that they may be reconciled to God the Father through God the Son. This is the work of Jesus Christ Crucified and Risen! But more than that, our Lord has ascended and sits on the right hand of God, reigning with the Father until His return when His Kingdom will be consummated and all His saints shall reign with Him in glory, enjoying God for ever. As High-Priest and Advocate He intercedes for us and gives us access to the Father, because in Him our humanity has been raised and glorified within the mystery of the Holy of Holies. His atoning work is not confined to its historical manifestation although performed once for all, but by the ministry of the Holy Spirit it is appropriated to successive generations. It is in this sense that He is the Mediator between man and God and that all who believe in Him and live in the union of faith with Him are reconciled to the Father, becoming co-heirs with Christ. Christ is our atonement, not the Incarnation nor the Cross, nor the Resurrection, but Christ Who is Incarnate, Crucified, Risen, Exalted Lord, our Great High Priest and Redeemer. " His presence in the world as Risen Lord, and before God as representative man, His eternal mediation: this is the Atonement! It is because He is with us now, because we are united with Him now through the Holy Spirit, that we know salvation; it is because He is the expiation now for our sins that we may approach the throne of God;"¹ it is because of the living and present Christ that we are now the sons of God. Such is the teaching of the New Testament and such is the Christ to whom the Apostles were witnesses.

But such was not always the clear emphasis of the teaching of the Church through the ages. During the great Christological controversies in which the relationship of the Father and the Son was debated, the Apostolic emphasis was not always clear. We have a hint of this debate in Justin Martyr's notion that Christ ranks second in the Trinity because He is not co-substantial with God the Father. The influence of the Hellenic concept of the Logos is evident here and Justin, while acknowledging that the Logos became flesh in Jesus Christ, could not go on to say with St. John, that "the Word was with God, and the Word was God."² The great danger of Justin's reluctance to accept the unity in essence, though not in Person of the Father and the Son, was that the Resurrection of Christ could no longer be God's victory over sin and death. It may be the victory of a second-ranking deity, but it cannot be the victory of God Himself unless we acknowledge the mystery of the unity of Father and Son. Thus the place of the Resurrection

1. T.A. Hay, The Atonement, A Brief Discussion. (B.D. Thesis)
2. John 1:1.

in the Atonement was partly lost through an inadequate appreciation of the doctrines of the Person and Work of Christ, and of the Trinity.

Justin was not involved in the Christological controversy, but the same danger we see in his theology emerged in this controversy because the problem was the same. Broadly speaking, there were, on the one hand, the Arians who made Christ sub-divine though supra-human - an "in-between" being, a demi-god. On the other hand, there were the orthodox theologians, of whom Athanasius was one, who believed that Jesus Christ is one with the Father in nature (substance or essence) though not in Person. It was largely due to the persistent work of Athanasius that the orthodox view triumphed at the Council of Constantinople by adopting the homousion formula. While Athanasius' contribution cannot be underestimated, his emphasis was predominantly on the Incarnation, as the nature of the debate demanded, but his interpretation of the Atonement bore the same emphasis. The primary fact for Athanasius is that God became man, the Word became Flesh, and upon this rests all else. So the Atonement derives its primary significance from this fact, that man is made god-like through God becoming man-like; or in other words, human nature is deified by its union with the Divine nature in the Incarnation. The Death and Resurrection of Christ are significant only because He is God made man. While this is perfectly true, Athanasius was unable to see that the Death and Resurrection are not secondary to the Incarnation, but are part of the whole atoning work of Christ which includes the Incarnation and the Ascension as well. Nonetheless, he did apprehend that the Death and Resurrection reveal Christ's victory over sin and death and that because of His victory the mortal and corruptible, participating in this victory, are raised in immortality and incorruption. In spite of his strong emphasis on the Incarnation, Athanasius did not lose the Apostolic emphasis on the Resurrection even if he did not stress it.

Tertullian's theology clearly undermines the efficacy of Christ's atoning Death and victorious Resurrection. His view that the souls of the departed inhabit the underworld where they continue to suffer for the expiation of sin is wholly foreign to the Apostolic witness, but more gravely denies the power of Christ's own Death and Resurrection. The believer who in union with Christ shares in the blessing of His victory over sin and death is assured that, at his own death, the power of sin is completely broken and the power of righteousness is completely triumphant. But if the believer, in awaiting the resurrection of the body, must continue to suffer for sin after death, then death itself which is the ultimate consequence of

sin, still has a hold on the believer. The crux of the matter is whether death means simply the decaying of the body and the emancipation of the soul, or the threat of total non-being. Knowing Christ's own fear of the Cross and His prayer that the cup may pass from Him, we perceive that death means the cutting off of the whole being from God. It is indeed because death is so radical that the Resurrection is so glorious. God "made him to be sin who knew no sin so that in Him we might become the righteousness of God."¹ Thus, in complete identification with man, Jesus surrendered Himself to death that He might conquer it, for death could not hold Him. All who are in Christ need not fear death, not because death in itself is not radical and terrible, but because Christ has taken away the sting of death.² This is precisely what Tertullian fails to understand or to convey, and in doing so he fails to recognize the place of the Resurrection in Christ's redemptive work.

St. Augustine, on the other hand, was emphatic upon the reality of the Resurrection as a transformation of the whole person, but less emphatic in recognizing the place of the Resurrection in the Atonement. The legacy of his philosophical training was the concept that God is remote and abstract and this influence persisted even after his conversion. Consequently, his interpretation of the Atonement was prompted largely by the necessity to make up the number of fallen angels in the heavenly society, and the necessity of God to take the initiative in making up this number by redeeming the elect. He showed less awareness of God's love manifesting itself in the life and work of Christ than he did of the ultimate fulfilment of what he conceived to be the goal and purpose of God for the elect. Consequently the Resurrection, acknowledged as victory over sin and death, was seen in the light of this purpose rather than in the light of the purpose of God's love, which is to destroy evil and break the power of the devil that all men might now and eternally live as sons reconciled to God through Jesus Christ. Thus both Tertullian and St. Augustine, by allowing speculation and philosophical concepts foreign to the Apostolic witness to mould their interpretation of the Atonement, lost to a lesser or greater degree the Apostolic emphasis upon the redemptive significance of the Resurrection.

In Medieval theology we find that Anselmian thought lost almost entirely the soteriological import of the Resurrection. Anselm's theory of the Atonement was conceived, as we saw, in strict legal terms and founded upon the view that satisfaction must be made to God's justice. Christ's atoning work consists

1. II Corinthians 5:21.
2. Cf. I Corinthians 15:56.

in offering a perfect sacrifice which will remedy the injustice which man's sinfulness has done to God. This is seen to be accomplished in Christ's death upon the Cross which is the culmination of a life of obedience and the willing surrender of Himself. That is the perfect sacrifice which satisfies the demands of God's justice. It is clear that the Resurrection, or the Ascension for that matter, has no place in this theory of Christ's work of salvation, and therein lies the inadequacy of the Anselmian or Latin theory of the Atonement. The loss of the significance of the Resurrection was due to the prevailing concept that God is both remote and judicial and that only the perfect sacrifice offered to satisfy His demands can redeem man from the condemnation in which he stands.

In Calvin's theology, the influence of Anselm is unmistakable, but it remains only an influence and does not become an emphasis. Calvin, though he adopts Anselm's thought and interprets the Atonement in terms of the Latin Theory, does not allow it to override the other aspects of Christ's redemptive work. He clearly upholds the Apostolic teaching concerning the soteriological significance of the Resurrection, for he sees it as God's great victory over the Devil in which sin and death are conquered and human nature redeemed and given Life and Righteousness.

Finally we turn to consider the existential aspect of the Resurrection, by which we mean its significance in the earthly life of the believer. It is clearly the teaching of the Apostles that the Resurrection has existential as well as eschatological or soteriological importance, i.e. present as well as future and saving significance. As St. Paul said:

"For we know that Christ being raised from the dead will never die again ... the death he died he died to sin, once for all, but the life he lives he lives to God. So you must also consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus;"¹

or,

"If then you have been raised with Christ seek the things that are above, where Christ is seated at the right hand of God."²

The whole tenor of the lives and teaching of the Apostles, the Fathers, and the Martyrs, is that the believer is united to Christ his Saviour and through that union of faith participates in the blessings of Christ's Death and Resurrection. The believer receives the power of the Holy Spirit who enables him to live in Christ and to appropriate Christ's victory over sin and death in his own life, putting to death what is earthly and corrupt,

1. Romans 6:9-11.
2. Colossians 3:1.

and putting on what is Christ-like and righteous.¹ The believer, incorporated into the Church which is the Body of Christ, is initiated by the Sacrament of Baptism which is the dramatic enactment of Christ's Death and Resurrection in the life of the initiate; and is sustained by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in which, in communion with his Risen and Living Saviour, he shares the blessings of His Death and Resurrection.

While the Resurrection of our Lord always gave content and meaning to the devotional life of the Church, it is generally true to say that this was not always apparent in the ethical life of the Church. The further we go from the New Testament the less pronounced, generally speaking, does that emphasis become. We find that in the ascetic tendencies of certain groups within the Church, such as the Gnostics and Montanists, and later in the monastic life, particularly in the Middle Ages, the tendency was to escape from the temptations and evils of this life rather than to confront and overcome them in the power of the Risen Lord. While not denying the value of the monastic movement in the life of the Church its danger was to ignore the fact that God calls His Church and His disciples to live, work, and witness in the world while not becoming part of the world, and consequently to deny the power of the Resurrection made real in the life of the Church and of her members by the ministry of the Holy Spirit.

Another reason for the waning of the emphasis upon the existential significance of the Resurrection was the greater emphasis placed upon its eschatological aspect. This is particularly apparent in the theology of St. Augustine and of the Middle Ages. Their concern was predominantly eschatological so that the ethical aspect of the Resurrection received little attention. It was only with John Calvin that a return to the New Testament emphasis is made. He is aware that the believer not only finds hope in the Resurrection of Christ but is empowered and renewed by the Risen Saviour to live as a redeemed man in righteousness. His emphasis is clearly that the resurrection is not only a fact of the life hereafter, nor merely a fact of salvation, but also a fact of living experience. It is truly existential, because the believer lives in Christ and Christ in him. Our conclusion must be that the ascetic and monastic tendencies in the Church as well as the greater emphasis upon the life hereafter, contributed to the diminishing significance of the Resurrection as a fact of experience, which John Calvin attempted to recapture.

1. Cf. Colossians 3:5-11.

The Resurrection of our Lord stands at the centre of our faith. It is the one fact which gives meaning to the whole. Without the Risen and Living Christ the Church could never have survived the opposition and persecution, the suppression and division which has marked her history. But the Truth is that Christ is Risen, and Reigns as the Head of His Church - the Body of the Living Christ. In Him as Exalted yet Present Lord, the Church finds power and strength to do His work, seeks to redeem mankind by confronting men with the Living Redeemer, and looks forward to the consummation of His Kingdom.

In the Name of Jesus
Every knee shall bow,
Every tongue confess Him
King of Glory now; ...

Humbled for a season,
To receive a name
From the lips of sinners,
Unto whom He came,
Faithfully He bore it
Spotless to the last;
Brought it back victorious,
When from death He passed.

...He is God the Saviour,
He is Christ the Lord,
Ever to be worshipped,
Trusted and adored.¹

1. Part of a Hymn to the Praise of the Lord Jesus Christ
by Caroline Maria Noel (1817-1877)

EPILOGUE.

Christ is indeed the Living Lord and it is He

Incarnate,
Crucified,
Risen,
Exalted,
Reigning,

whom the Church must ever proclaim for the salvation of the whole world. The fundamental need of the world today is to be confronted with Jesus Christ, for all the problems and evils both personal and social - problems of marriage relationships and race relations; of neighbourly love and international peace; of family life and sound government; as well as the evils of intolerance and prejudice, of hatred and injustice, of greed and pride, of war and murder; all these can only be fully resolved if men commit themselves to Jesus Christ. In Him evil is conquered, and problems, even though they do not vanish, become opportunities. It is only in that committal that men will find meaning in worship, a new vision of their mission in life, and a sense of pilgrimage. To worship the Risen Lord is to live in reverent obedience to His will and in utter and complete devotion to Him, so that all we are and all we do will reflect the glory and majesty of God Almighty.

Worship means infinitely more than regular church attendance. For the Christian to live is to worship, and to worship is to live! In worshipping, the Christian becomes conscious of his responsibility to love and serve his fellowman. It is in serving his fellowman that he serves God and becomes a co-builder of God's Kingdom on earth. Everything that he undertakes must be for the upbuilding of the Kingdom that God's will may be done on earth as it is in heaven. Difficult as the task may be, he labours joyfully in the knowledge that the Risen Lord has overcome the world and inaugurated His reign here on earth. But the Christian knows also that his life on earth is short and transitory because greater things await him. While he does not neglect his earthly mission but undertakes his task as unto the Lord, yet he is aware that he cannot take root on earth. He is on pilgrimage to the heavenly city, the place which Jesus Christ has gone to prepare for him. And so, confident of the promises of Christ, which he already foretastes through the power of the Holy Spirit, the Christian worships and works in the certain hope of the fulfilment of these promises, awaiting with eagerness the glorious return of his Lord.

Maranatha!

NOTES.

1. We speak of the "birth" of the Church meaning the Church as the Body of Christ. It is true that the Church as the 'ecclesia' (the people of God) was present even in the days of the Old Testament. But in and through Christ the 'ecclesia' was brought into a new relationship with God. The first Christians became aware of this relationship at Pentecost, when through the new ministry of the Holy Spirit as Counsellor, they were able to see in Jesus Christ the embodiment of that relationship. To be in Christ meant also to be a member of His Body, His Church, His 'ecclesia.' It was in this sense that the Church was not only empowered but reborn and made new by the gift of the Holy Spirit.

2. Translation:

It is this (the Resurrection) which makes Him the Messiah and which qualifies Him for the part of the Redeemer.

3. The term 'knowledge' is here used in its existential connotation. It does not refer merely to intellectual knowledge but rather to the knowledge that is interpersonal. Its meaning is better understood by the French word 'connaître' as opposed to the word 'savoir'; or by the Afrikaans word 'ken' as opposed to 'weet'.

4. Translation:

The resurrected body will have other characteristics than that which was laid in the grave, it will be spiritual and heavenly and no longer psychic and earthly.

5. Translation:

For Him, the Resurrection was a predetermined element in the redemptive plan, but that follows from the teaching of Scripture much more than from directions that Jesus might have given to His disciples. It is only after the event that, according to John, the disciples realized that Jesus had declared it. It was at the same time that they understood the Scriptural teaching which related to it.

6. The meaning of this concept of exaltation expressed by the word 'hupsoō' - to lift up, which St. John records here in 3:14, can only be fully understood in conjunction with its significance expressed by the same word in 8:28 and 12:32. Here (3:14), the comparison that is made between the serpent which was lifted up on a pole (Cf. Numbers 21:9) in the wilderness, and Jesus who must be lifted up for the salvation of the world, emphasizes the exaltation upon the Cross. But in the other references the emphasis is upon the exaltation of the Resurrection. In 8:28 Jesus makes it clear that only after His exaltation will men really understand and know who He is and in whose authority He speaks. In 12:32 Jesus says, "and I, when I am lifted up from the earth will draw all men to myself." Both these point emphatically to the exaltation of the Resurrection. Surely, therefore, we must understand the significance of this word 'hupsoō', not by interpreting it in terms either of the Cross or of the Resurrection, but in terms of both. The truth of the matter is that the exaltation of Christ includes both His death and His victory over death - it is an exaltation attained through the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. It is only the exalted Christ who is both the crucified and the risen Lord who can save the world.

7. Translation:

We are, here, outside the realities of the physical world, we are dealing with a fact of a spiritual nature, ... with a participation in the Divine life.

8. The title 'Kurios' - Lord is a post-Resurrection one. Dr. Vincent Taylor has shown that the New Testament evidence indicates this title to have been seldom used of Jesus during His life-time. When it was used, it was either drawn from the terminology of the Caesarean community, or conveyed the respectful attitude of pupils to their master, as expressed in the Hebrew equivalent - 'Rabbi'. But the specifically Christian content of the title 'Kurios' is derived from the Resurrection and Exaltation of Jesus Christ. It was used extensively after the Resurrection, particularly in the worship of the Church, and conveyed the fact that He is the historical Jesus and the Risen Christ, the Redeemer and the Exalted One. Thus, the very use of that title signifies and affirms the Resurrection and Exaltation of Jesus Christ. To say that Jesus is Lord is to say that Jesus is Risen and Exalted! (Cf. Vincent Taylor, The Names of Jesus, Macmillan & Co. Ltd. - 1953).

9. The Greek word for fish is "ichthus", which was one of the earliest Christian symbols to denote faith in Christ. The symbol summed up the basic creed of the Christian.

i stands for Iēsous
ch stands for Christos
th stands for Theou
u stands for huios
s stands for sōtēr

Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour!

10. I am using the term 'Resurrection-faith' to emphasize the fact that the faith of the Apostles was faith in the Risen Christ, not only grounded and rooted in His Resurrection but also sustained by His continuing and abiding presence. This term serves, in my mind, to distinguish the early Christian faith from the more general use of the term 'faith' today, which does not always convey an idea of relationship with a living Person.

11. Translation:

The affirmation of the Resurrection of Jesus by the first Christians comprises two elements: firstly a statement of fact: Jesus emerged living from the tomb; and then an affirmation which transcends all possible experimental data since it conveys that He lives a life which is no longer open to death and which belongs to the future and heavenly world. These two affirmations of fact and faith are closely dependent upon each other. They merge in the same formula: "Christ is Risen", which sometimes expresses the idea of a return to earthly life, sometimes that of a heavenly life, and most often, both ideas at once.

12. The distinction between prayers (requests) to the saints, and prayers to God was always made in Medieval times. The word 'latreia' was used for prayers offered to God but never for those offered to the saints.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

INTRODUCTION.

- BARTH, K. The Resurrection of the Dead, Chapter 3, (Hodder & Stoughton - 1933).
Credo, Chapter 16, (Translated by J.S. McNab), (Hodder & Stoughton - 1936).
Dogmatics in Outline, Chapter 18, (S.C.M. - 1949)
- GOGUEL, M. La Foi à la Résurrection dans le Christianisme Primitif - Etude d' Histoire et de Psychologie Religieuses, Première Partie, (Librairie Ernest Leroux - 1933).
- HOWAT, J. Concerning the Faith in Christ, Chapter 9, (The Church of Scotland Publications Department - 1949).
- MACKAY, J.A. Christ is Risen - For What? Editorial in "Theology Today", Vol.XIII, No.1, April, 1956.
- MILLIGAN, W. The Resurrection of our Lord, (Macmillan & Co., - 1913).
- TURNER, H.E.W. The Resurrection, Article in the "Expository Times", Vol.LXVIII, No.12, September, 1957.
- WILLIAMS, H.A. Jesus and the Resurrection, (Longmans, Green & Co., - 1951).

CHAPTER ONE.

- BURNET, A.W. The Lord Reigneth, Chapter 3, (Hodder & Stoughton - 1946).
- DODD, C.H. The Apostolic Preaching and its Development, Chapter 1, (Hodder & Stoughton - 1936).
- GOGUEL, M. La Foi à la Résurrection dans le Christianisme Primitif - Etude d' Histoire et de Psychologie Religieuses, Première Partie. (Librairie Ernest Leroux - 1933).
- HUNTER, A.M. Introducing New Testament Theology, (S.C.M - 1957).¹
- MACKAY, J. Christ is Risen - For What? Editorial in "Theology Today", Vol.XIII, No.1, April, 1956.
- MARTIN, J. Did Jesus Rise from the Dead? (Lutterworth Press - 1957).
- MILLIGAN, W. The Resurrection of our Lord, (Macmillan & Co., 1913).

1. Where Professor A.M. Hunter's book is referred to as "Interpreting New Testament Theology", in the footnotes, please read as "Introducing....".

- STAUFFER, E. New Testament Theology, Chapters 32 and 52, (S.C.M. - 1955).
- STEWART, J. A Man in Christ, (Hodder & Stoughton - 1935).
- CHAPTER TWO.
- CLARK, N. An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments, (S.C.M. - 1956).
- CULLMANN, O. Baptism in the New Testament, Chapters 1 and 2, (S.C.M. - 1950).
- Early Christian Worship, Section I, (S.C.M. - 1953).
- DAVIES, H. Christian Worship, Chapters 1 and 2, (The Religious Education Press - 1946).
- HERON, J. The Theology of Baptism, Article in the "Scottish Journal of Theology", Vol. VIII, No.1, March, 1955.
- MAXWELL, W.D. The Resurrection: Its Significance and Relevance. Inaugural Lecture. (Rhodes University - 1958).
- An Outline of Christian Worship, Chapter 1, (O.U.P. - 1936).
- PALMER, P.F. Sacraments and Worship, Parts I and II, (Longmans, Green & Co., - 1955).
- SWRAWLEY, J.H. The Early History of the Eiturgy, Chpaters 1 and 2 (Cambridge University Press - 1949).
- TELFER, W. (Editor) Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa, General Introduction pp. 19-54, (Vol. IV, The Library of Christian Classics), (S.C.M - 1955).
- CHAPTER THREE.
- AULEN, G. Christus Victor, (Translated by A.G. Hebert,) (S.P.C.K. - 1931).
- BATTENHOUSE, R.W. A Companion to the Study of Augustine, Chapter 13. (O.U.P. - 1955)
- BETTENSON, H. (Editor & Translator). The Early Christian Fathers, (O.U.P. - 1956)
- BURLEIGH, J.H.S. (Selector & Translator) Augustine: Earlier Writings, Soliloquia and De Fide et Symbolo. (Vol. 6, The Library of Christian Classics), (S.C.M. - 1953).
- HARDY, E.R. (Editor) Christology of the Later Fathers, Athanasius, pp. 41-110, (Vol. III, The Library of Christian Classics), (S.C.M - 1954).
- MCGIFFERT, A.C. History of Christian Thought, Vol. I, Early and Eastern, Vol. II, The West - Tertullian to Erasmus. (Charles Scribner's Sons - 1953).
- OUTLER, A.C. (Editor & Translator). Augustine: Confessions and Enchiridion, (Vol. VII, The Library of Christian Classics), (S.C.M. - 1955).

RICHARDSON, C.C. Early Christian Fathers, (Vol, I The Library of Christian Classics), (S.C.M. - 1953).
(Editor & Translator)

CHAPTER FOUR.

AQUINAS, St. Summa Theologica, (Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province), (Burns Oates & Washbourne - 1921).
THOMAS.

AULEN, G. Christus Victor, (Translated by A.G. Hebert), (S.P.C.K. - 1931).

CALVIN, J. Institutes of the Christian Religion, Book II Chapter XVI, (Translated by H. Beveridge), (James Clarke & Co., - 1953).

FAIRWEATHER, E.R. A Scholastic Miscellany: Anselm to Ockham, (Editor & Translator) Anselm of Canterbury - Cur Deus Homo (Vol.X, The Library of Christian Classics), (S.C.M. - 1956).

MCGIFFERT, A.C. History of Christian Thought Vol I, The West - Tertullian to Erasmus. (Charles Scribner's Sons - 1953).

CHAPTER FIVE

FROST, E. Christian Healing, Chapter VI, (A.R. Mowbray & Co., - 1940).

HAY, T.A. The Atonement: A Brief Discussion, (B.D. Thesis submitted to Rhodes University - 1957).

MICKLEM, N. The Doctrine of our Redemption, (Eyre & Spottiswoode - 1948).

GENERAL

BRUNNER, E. Scandals of Christianity, Chapter V (The Robertson Lectures) (S.C.M. - 1951).

CULLMANN, O. Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead? (Epworth Press - 1958).

LATOURETTE, K.S. The Unquenchable Light, (The William Belden Noble Lectures). (Eyre & Spottiswoode - 1948)

LEWIS, C.S. Miracles, (Geoffrey Bles- 1948)

MORISON, F. Who Moved the Stone? (Faber & Faber - 1930).

ORR, J. The Resurrection of Jesus, Chapters 1 & 2, (Hodder & Stoughton - 1908).

SHAW, J.M. The Resurrection of Christ, (T & T Clark -1920)

WEATHERHEAD, L.D. The Resurrection and the Life, (Epworth Press - 1948).

WESTCOTT, B.F. The Revelation of the Risen Lord, (Macmillan & Co., - 1898).

WHALE, J.S. The Resurrection of the Body and the Life Everlasting, Article in "Scottish Journal of Theology", Vol. II, No.2, June, 1949.