

Van Horsen: Systematic Theology II

ST502

Class Notes

Christoph Lameter

2. September 1993

1. Introductory Remarks

Roger M. Horsen. Christology and the doctrine of Salvation.

What are we going to do the next couple of weeks? I repeat everything three times.

I am perfectly willing to stop and go over things. I constantly say I am going to slow down but you have to stop me. The sheet I just gave you is an attempt to describe about what theology is all about.

My perception colors all of theology. My theology is motivated by my understanding. I begin all classes with a small devotion.

First Question: What is Systematic Theology?

S.T. is thinking and speaking about God. This is something that all people do. Very few people can avoid speaking about God at least once in their lives. This takes place in bible studies, it takes place wherever you get a couple of people together and they are speaking about God.

A couple of subdisciplines.

1. Historical Theology
2. Philosophical Theology. (Problem of Evil)
3. Biblical Theology

Very early on especially in Christology the church decided that there was a need for systematizing the teaching. This is today called dogmatics.

Barth offers a def of Dogmatics on top of sheet. Barth argues that Dogmatics is centered around the dogmas of the Church. Dogmatics is something that begins in confession and then continues on in reflection.

Systematic Theology has developed in a variety of ways. The older works described is a solutions to a jigsaw puzzle. Put them together in proper fashion.

Dangers:

1. Develop a theologic structure independent from Scripture. You have taken a theologic structure and now we are sticking certain passages in certain places. A selection of proof texts. If you do that too strictly then you end up omitting large passages.

Result in many systematic theologies you have an abstract system having not much to do with life.

systematic theology has to be seen as something that presents doctrine in systematic way but it should not impose its own ideas on scripture.

Nor is systematic theology biblical or historical theology. There is more to it than tracing the history of doctrine. There is the question what do I believe? We have to say this is what I believe. WE have to ask ourselves What role does faith have in the larger societal context.

Lonergan Theology in Culture. Theology is different in different culture. He is saying that theology is attempting to take the affirmations of a particular religion and states that in a way that people can understand it.

For example in cultures without a lamb you need to find some other way of explaining lamb.

The religion remains unchanged. The expression may change with culture that might not be familiar with certain symbol. The truth in its formulations is true but subject to change.

Theologies come and go. When a certain need has been fulfilled they will pass away.

To a certain degree theology is dispensable. Theology is a kind of mediator.

That leads us to the final point: What sort of knowledge does theology have?

"Language is a lie spoken about the truth". The truth is something that can never be fully expressed in human language. If you take human language as literally true then you won't get it. God is beyond our ability to completely express. Theological language is an attempt to describe something that cannot be described. Describe in a way that makes sense to us and that we are able to commit to it.

Theology can be described by three terms:

Knowing - Hoping - Wishing.

They are all characterized by a particular way of looking at the world. Knowing has certainty.

When it comes to feeling about knowing that I express neutrality. That is just a fact I do not get excited about it. It does not change my behaviour.

Wishing includes Possibility. If you wish something because you thought of it then it is possible although not very much likely. A wish is something that is possible and includes the idea of desire. But it can be without basis.

Hoping is characterized by probability. I hope that you all do well in this class. I am able to say that because there is a great probability that you will. Because of that hoping can be described as something that includes expectation. Reason for this expectation is that there is some kind of basis for this. Here for example the history of these classes.

Theology is often described in one of these categories. Some will describe it as a form of knowing.

Theology is objective truth. Like Mathematics. Many people think that theology is in the same line. Theology is a list of propositions and you say yes or no. Naturally saying yes or no might change the way you live.

Others will see theology as wishing. Theological statements are possibly true, but there is no basis on what we can build. There is the desire of something to be true. One has no reason to believe that there is a supreme being. But it makes one feel good and one wants it to be.

I am going to argue that Christian Theology is best described by Hoping. There is the probability. There is the possibility that a theological statement might be inaccurate. How can God become a human being. A lot of different ways of describing this. Some are sufficient but none answers all questions. All

have the possibility that they are not entirely accurate. Few Theologians will say that the doctrine of Trinity is a self-evident truth. Many will say Affirm it and forget it. Theology is not so much a form of knowing but of hoping. One of Webers ideas. A form of hoping that provokes a decision. If it does not provoke a decision then it is useless. Theology is something which provides information and argument. The purpose is to force individual to make a decision about that argument. To make a decision that places you completely on the line. Theology is a form of hoping by which we live. In the End our hope will become a certainty. When we are faced with the ultimate reality. We can no longer escape and say we are wrong formulars are insufficient.

Three things that I want to keep in mind:

1. All doctrine emerges out of Conflict.

In theology there is going to be disagreement and debate. I dont want you to escape class without getting agry at me at least once. If you escape this class without getting provoked then I failed or you intently avoided this.

2. One thing that helps me in my past that is the fact that all of us come from various tradition. I am from the reformed tradition. Long tradition. This is one sure way of having conflicts. We having the same truth from different angles.

Nowadays we have begun to search for things that unite us. That does not mean that we should abandon our tradition. All traditions have element that can serve as corrections for other traditions.

3. The church is described as "semper reformanda" (always reforming). There never was golden age of the church. The church was always the place of a lot of conflict and struggle and hostility. Always be a time of change. Constantly changing and constantly adapting. The church is something it is a historical entity and something that changes and it is open to change. Theology constantly challenges the church.

2. The Person Of Christ

2.1. The Problem of the Method

2.1.1. The Person or the Work

Brunner: We should follow Paul and focus upon the work of Christ and not Johns of describing. Even the titles given to Christ emphasize that by the work you should know. Weber will also emphasize this approach. Weber : Historical Separation of work and person. Weber hates the most abstraction. You can feell him spitting in rage when he talks about abstraction. He gets agry by the idea that anything could be reduced to abstraction especially something theologially. Christ's person and work belongs togehter. If you emph. the work of Christ then Christ as a person is not as important only becuase he did something. On the other hand if you emphasize the person of Christ you have a higlevel discussiona bout being etc.

If you emph the works then you have a works related salvation. If you emph the person of christ then Christ becomes a philosophical principle used to solve some thing. J.c. is not a philosophical principle. Weber expect you to react to Jesus standing before you, provoking you at all time.

When we speaking of christ as a real person that encounters you with us amoung us. When I speak about thte person of christ I have to speak about the works of christ. I will emph. the person most in the first part but nevertheless as we approach the first problem we need to keep in mind that Jesus encounters us as a doer of certain works. What he has done has made agreat difference in our lifes and in the life of th world.

How am I going to proceed in this task. there are various way. If you look at Brunner he will begin by examining the work of Christ. But with the person of Christ he begins to be topical. Sections will develop around topics. Weber takes a more historical approach. Begins with biblical material and turn to examination of creeds and what creeds say.

Berkhof organizes his way around the life of Jesus. follows the course of Jesus life and comments on various events. He combines works and life to a large extent.

Doctrines have to develop from basic affirmations into sophisticated ones nowadays.

Last introductory note: Concern how we approach the fact that when we speak of J.C we are saying two things at once.

When we speak of JC we mean that he is human and divine and that both are essential for the matter. the Church decided on the basis of the revelation of the NT that JC was an individual made up of a divine person and a human person. Any case JC the divine and the human meet in a divine way. This leads us to a methodological statement. We need to keep divine and human all time it seems nearly impossible to thing them together. Think two thoughts simultaneously especially two contrasting.

Problem: Do we begin with JC as a true human or as true God. Modern Terms: From below or from above. Christology from above emphasizes the divine aspect.

2.1.2. Christology from Above

The earliest christologies did not see this problem. They simply presupposed that JC was the eternal son of God and then would speak about what it meant that he became incarnate. JC divinity takes precedence about humanity. The only question was: How did it happen? The church made this decision since the NT made the same affirmation. Phil 2. The trust of NT has been generally from above to below. Problem is that the Christ who confronts us in the gospel is not the second person of the Godhead but rather a living breathing human being. When we read the gospel we are not confronted by an eternal principle but like a human being. Nevertheless JC never claimed that he was more than a human in the Gospels?????

The method was beginning with JC as the eternal son of God and then discussing how he became a human being and what it meant.

2.1.3. Christology from Below

The other is more modern. It is seen as more biblical, because the Gospel reveal JC through his life. That is the way the Gospels proceed. Much of modern theology is to begin from below. Where they end up depends on their presupposition. JC as a great prophet. Presuppositions are going to influence the conclusions. I want to hold both ideas together. Must be described at the same time.

2.1.4. Synthesis

Neither approach can be taken alone. It is obvious that the salvation event has validity because of God's presence in this event. He could not have done it unless God had been present. Our christological thinking is dependant on what God did in that. Jesus is God for us at the same time we recognize that because of what he did while he was here. So our experience of salvation is a strong proof of holding humanity and divinity together. We have to be very careful with abstraction. Some theology try to speak about Jesus prior to the incarnation. there is not much that we can say about it. We need to focus on what we know while he was here.

Incarnation is also God validating history. History is not an imprisoning cycle but a divinely created process. In which we live and are encountered by something beyond. God is part of that history in the incarnation.

The only way to move from below to above is by presupposing the conclusion or the possibility of the conclusion. The only way to begin a christology from below is to share a common understanding with all that believe in him.

2.2. Early Christian Theologies up to Nicea

2.2.1. The Primitive Church

Doctrine shows how the church had to come to grips with some difficult issues. "The only new philosophical development after Plato". Churches thinking about Christ is influenced by cultural and historical context. Earliest days it was enough to say "Jesus is Lord". If you said that then you were a Christian. It was expected that everyone knew what was meant. But this is meaningless unless you have a context about what you are speaking.

From this the church developed the apostles' creed as an outline of Jesus' life. This worked for a time. Was more specific. However it was also nice and simple. There were all sorts of hidden complexity. In itself the creed did not provide tests of validity of interpretation. Council of Nicaea made an increased elaboration about who Jesus is.

The Church had to develop a metaphysical structure to say who Jesus really is. (Ontology = description of being).

This still was not enough. More arguments. In the fifth century Council of Chalcedon. Again a new metaphysical way of describing reality. Basically explaining "Jesus is Lord".

2.2.2. Ebionism and Gnosticism

Son of God? Ebionism and Gnosticism. Have a similar view of the problem but different. Ebionites (Poor) contained a sect that Jesus was born in the same manner as all else, but was elected by God to be something special to be the Son of God. This was made manifest at Jesus' baptism. At baptism the Archangel descended on Jesus like the archangel came on different prophets before him. For this group the emphasis was on Jesus as a human being who was exalted by something that came on him by God. This was a challenge to the early church. They wanted to emphasize divinity to a greater extent. The Gnostics went to far in saying that Jesus was much more than human being.

Fundamental to Gnostics is the "Absolute". for a gnostic system this absolute being is true reality that lies behind everything else. One of the greatest theologians of Gnosticism as Ptolemy. Invisible, preexistent, uncontainable, ungenerated, essential this absolute was a self-absorbed being only thinking of itself. Everything else was secondary. No contact with us. From this absolute being some things came. Pairs Aeons, 30 of them. The Aeons and the absolute are known by pleroma. This could be seen as the supreme god the source of all things. and us down there. There is this Gap between God and ourselves. The link between this Gap is the logos. That which created the world (sort of). But this logos is not something that should feel very friendly. It is hostile to us. The existence of material reality is equal with evil. Matter is evil by the fact of existence. Good is totally above us. Down here material being which is evil. Wisdom (one of the Aeons) became passionate and fell from grace and became evil. The upshot is that if an individual is our saviour that individual cannot have a material body. We can have somebody who looks like us but is not real material. Naturally if you are not material you are not a human being like the rest of us. Various way of describing Jesus. Some said that Christ's human form was like a ghostly sort of form. Appearance without reality. (Docetism). Others Celestial body. Jesus did

develop within Mary's body but did not share Mary's body. Mary's body was just the incubator. In fact as Ptolemy described Jesus passed through Mary as water as through a pipe. For many Gnostics Jesus was not contaminated with Mary's humanity.

That is why the earliest creeds affirm that Jesus was ex Maria. Jesus shared the humanity. Mary was mother in the same way as our mothers were for us. Some gnostics saw JC as a human being who was possessed for a brief time by Christ. Departed at crucifixion.

These were the early two challenges of the Church.

One thing that I did not mention: The reading is not restricted to the title I have given. If there is something you would rather read --- feel free to do it.

Where we wound up before we broke, we have on the one hand the view that JC was a human being specially empowered by nonhuman entity or we have those sayig that JC is not at all human. Then there is the group that wanted to say both. They have to find a way to describe this.

2.2.3. The Nicene Creed

First large scale attempt is the Nicaean Creed (325).

Arius. ARgued that the Father alone is God. One God that God who is spoken of in the OT and NT as father. Not three. Since there is only one God it follows that the son while divine is less so than the father. JC is divine in a sense but not in the same sense as the Father. This was the first thread to faith.

The resulting creed argued strongly against arian position.

1. Begotten of God (of the substance of God). Jesus is God because of who he is.
2. Became a human being. In JC you have someone of the same substance as we are. It did not have to be so explicit at this time.

2.3. From Nicaea to Chalcedon

Two major centers of theology. Alexandria and Antioch. As it is usually the case with competitive thought a deep divisiveness developed. Antioch emphasized the unity of human and divine in one being. Alexandria tried to minimize the humanity of Christ. This was also done by Apollinarius (362-380).

Some sort of philosophical way was needed. Apoll decided that Plato offered the best route to describe this. He used a Platonic trichotomy. He saw human beings made up of three parts. Body, Soul and spirit.

body(material)

soul(vital principle-that what brings life)

spirit(rationality-distinctions to animals)

2.3.1. Alexandria

Apollinarius said that Jesus was both human and divine. Jesus had a human body. JC had a human soul (was alive, needed oxygen and so on). However his spirit was replaced by the logos. Instead of having the same rational essence he had the logos the divine essence in his spirit. This seems to be a fairly good shot at it.

The problem is that this is essential to being a human being. Apollinarius was in essence saying that JC was a human without what was necessary for a human being. JC had a human shell in effect. This was judged as heretical because in the end Jesus is not a human being in the end. Atonement says that in order for what Christ did to apply Christ must be a representative of us. Church required Christ to be truly human.

2.3.2. Antioch

Antioch emphasis was on the distinction between the two natures. Jesus Christ is made up of a human nature and a divine nature truly divine as God is divine. The problem is that eventually you get to the point where it seems that two people are described. One way of getting around is to make a dodge back to Alexandria. Alex Theotokos was becoming very important. It means God-bearer and was applied to Mary. What they were attempting to say is that JC was truly born from a human being and therefore JC was truly human. It precluded adoptionism. JC was God from the very beginning. Alex saw this as a perfect way to describe two natures.

Nestorius in Antioch was not very happy with this and would not use this term. What did he want to say?

"He who is formed in Mary's womb was not himself God. But God assumed him. God entered into some sort of relationship with this individual. This can be described as assume. God assumed Christ." On account of him that assumed, he who was assumed is called God.

Nestorius said that JC in Mary's womb was not himself God, but God entered into a relationship. On this basis this individual can be called God.

Holy Spirit and Jesus can be called God on account of their relationship to God.

No theotokos because Mary did not bear the one and true God.

He used anthropotkos (human bearer). That is true of every mother. So he came up with Christotokos (Christ-bearer). Mary bore Christ.

The End result was some kind of adoptionism. Antiochians would argue that Jesus was elevated to sonship through a process of moral development.

2.3.3. The Formation of the Definition of Chalcedon

Cyril greatest enemy of Nestorius. He taught the hypostatic union. hypostatic (person) personal union. Essentially he said that in this personal union you have a fusion of the divine and the human in one person. The emph is on the fact that these two natures are unified in one person. Cyril got Nestorius exiled. Council of Eph 431 came up with a compromise. On the one hand it asserted the two natures of Christ on the other hand it also applied God bearer to Mary. Distinction but yet union.

Not a long document. Jesus is both perfect God and perfect human complete in every way. JC is the same as God for all time yet born of Mary. Therefore we confess one Christ, One Lord and one Son.

Peace did not last long everyone ignored it. Antiochian continued to refine their definition. Began to be more and more adoptionistic. In Alex increasing hesitation to speak of difference between human and divine.

Eudokos: JC has only one nature (Monophysitism) one essence. That is that JC had one nature the divine nature. The human nature was so assimilated that even his body was divine. Substance had been changed to divine substance.

Even Alex had problems with that.

Pope Leo of Rome "Tome of Leo". He argued that Christ had two natures distinct but united. The church decided to come together again in a council convened at Ephesus in 449. Patriarch of Constantinople sided with Council of Robbers and denied two natures of Leo. 451 Nicaea Bishops got there. Moved to Chalcedon later because of the riots. This definition is an attempt to come up with a mediation for both points. Both sides did have some truth.

2.4. The terms of Chalcedon

2.4.1. Introduction

Chalcedon: Now seen as a milestone in Early Church doctrine. But at that time opposition. Many argued still for one nature, otherwise Christ was separated into two persons (Monophysites). They developed a separate stream of Christianity. Coptics still follows this interpretation.

Most controversy surrounded various aspects that were thought of not being correctly addressed. Mostly around the terms that were used. There were different worlds of thought and languages had different nuances.

2.4.2. Nature

Controversy around Nature.

Generally speaking the term nature was used to refer to the reality of the thing. Not to its looks. There was a reality seen behind the appearance of things. Go beyond appearance and think about its nature. Only go beyond philosophically.

To say that Jesus has a divine nature means that he has everything that was needed for a divine being. Human nature means that Jesus is fully human. JC is not merely human or divine but both. Controversy about understanding of humanity and divinity. Discussion continued about these issues.

2.4.3. Person

The purpose is to describe someone as a self-conscious and self-determined being. In one sense there is no difference between nature and person. There must be a nature to have a person. But a nature must not have a person like a stone. Stone has nature but is not self-conscious and therefore not a person.

The distinction is made so that JC can be one person but has two natures. United but distinct in one individual.

The position described as Personal Union. One individual is a unity. Definition uses four negations to enforce understanding.

Not change between persons in Jesus. Two nature still remain and maintain their integrity. This happened without division.

That was the best that could be done to describe Jesus. Parameters for orthodox thought were staked out with these four negations.

There is a mystery in the center, because this cannot be exactly defined. One cannot say how the incarnation happened.

2.5. Medieval Christology

Problems remain because of this lack of ability to define the issue. Things became steady until the medieval age when issues came up again. Large part of Christianity rejected Chalcedon finally. The Eastern church had the most trouble because the way it was interpreted went against their emphasis.

They felt that the four negations could be interpreted differently from what they practised and felt. F.e. without confusion could be used to argue for separate existence of divine Jesus from the human Jesus.

Without change could be understood as attacking the basic notion (eastern) of salvation. The goal of salvation was deification. It means that believers were involved in a process of transformation. As time went on they would become more and more like Jesus Christ. They felt that incarnation was perfect example of this. In course of his life the divine nature transformed the human nature. This is an example to all of us.

There were those concerned about who was the subject of the crucifixion. could God suffer? Can Jesus suffer? That seem to be antithetical to our understanding of deity. Something needs to be said about if Christ suffered on the cross.

Doctrine of two nature hold a possibility to attack icons. Those painting images of Christ were either drawing his deity or not. If Christ as divine then you are guilty of making a graven image. If you say you are drawing a picture of a human. Then you are separating the two natures of Christ. Neither case the person creating an icon could be a heretic. This sort of attitude could be damaging to their customs. Eastern Church finally decided that this had more flaws than they want to live. They came up with other ways of describing the incarnation.

The Latin west Chalcedon dominated and turned to a discussion of the atonement. There were two questions that were argued from Chalcedon. One of the most important surrounded the issue of person with two natures. The solution accepted was that the human nature was enclosed by the divine nature. Human nature has no basis on its own but exists in relation to the divine nature.

Two terms. Attempts to have a bracketed were truth resides.

Anhypostasis Christs human nature does not posses life of itself. Does not exist independantly.

Enhypostasis Christs human nature existance dependent on union with divine nature.

What they tried to say that JC as a human cannot exist by himself but in relation to Jesus as a divine being.

This puts an end to adoptionism. It allows Jesus to exist as a divine nature.

It lead medieval theology into a very speculative period but unproductive. logos asarkos = Naked word. Meaning word without substance. CHrist prior to incarnation. Often in mediaval writings meditations on this. There is not much to be said with certainty in this field. Here theology becomes philosophy of being. Impersonal force behind reality.

A discussion of impersonality of Jesus. JC always existed as a united being. In time this term became to be understood as impassibility. The human Christ of the gospels is more and more seen as someone playing a role. More and more seen as divine that just appears like on as ourselves.

=> Increased emphasis on perpetual virginity of Mary. Mary virginity was not affected by pregnancy. Church affirmed by miraculous intervention that this was the case even after delivery. During medieval time position similar to gnostic position. Christ passed through Mary but did not affect her at all.

Medieval Church was not able to find a solution if the divine nature participated in death. It had always be a nagging problem in the christian mind. How could that be explained in light of the fact tha JC died and was dead for 3 days before resurrection. If this was a true union then it would seem hat Christs divinity did not take part. By definition divine is immortal. It was assumed that the divine nature was somehow removed. "It was located in the soul?" Jesus was in the tomb solely as a human being. At

resurrection the soul was reunited with the body and we have Jesus again. God lying dead in a tomb is very difficult to explain.

Lombard: There was no part of Christ that was outside of Godforsakeness, but Christ as a being was not completely overtaken. Two terms: *Christus totus* completely involved

Christus totum essence nature the whole was not overtaken.

The last problem in the medieval period had to do with communion of the properties (Attributes). What is meant is that it is understood that anytime you have a nature there are things that are appropriate to that nature. Like divine characteristics or human nature. If it is true that within JC you have two natures in one person then how do they relate to each other. Chalcedon seems to offer two nature in an uneasy piece. How do we understand this union.

Idea developed that the properties of one nature would be communicated to the other. As union endures each partner takes upon something from the other one. It is natural to say that this happened in Jesus.

If it is said no way then you attack the union in Christ.

If yes accept then you do not have two natures anymore.

The east said that there was a merger of natures even in our life how much more in Jesus. The west was a little more cautious. You speak about properties in reference to the person. There can be no statement to the communion of properties. Jesus was born but eternal. We should not speak of properties of one nature. We should stop here and not go any further.

Communion of property will be very important later for the understanding of the sacraments and the Lord's Supper.

2.6. Reformation and Post-Reformation Christologies

Lutheranism the debate over christology focuses on the presence of Christ in the eucharist. Lutherans seemed always to be orthodox in affirmation of Jesus one in two natures. But the discussion remained about the working together of the two natures and how we experience Christ in the Eucharist.

Luther wound up holding to consubstantiation. RC held to transubstantiation. Both speak in terms of substance, both say there is such a thing as substance. You have bread and wine, because they exist they have a substance. TSUB says that substances transform in Eucharist. Now you have body and blood. Accidents remain the same but substance changes. It looks like bread and wine but is literally blood and wine of Christ. Luther first rejected it completely then accepted it and again rejected. Finally came up with CSUB the wine is both wine and blood.

Reason of connection with Christology because Luther pointed to Christ as someone who is both human and divine. Someone who looks human but within the humanity you have divinity. So it is the case in the Eucharist. Both human and divine. Wine and blood. He was able to say that JC is present both spiritual and communal in the eucharist.

Luther is going one step beyond communion of properties.

Some other thinking Brenz: Defended Lutheran idea Used Ubiquity. Christ is spiritually and physically present everywhere the Eucharist is celebrated. Even though it is a physical body it can be present simultaneously everywhere in the world.

Chemnitz: *ubi volu* presentia. Christ wills to be everywhere. Christ wills to be present everywhere that the eucharist is being performed. Christ while being physical is of a different kind of physical being than

most. Usually physical beings are just in one place. This was different. Attributes must relate to each other in a certain way.

Communion of Properties can be described as *communio idomatum*. Community of attributes. This is the reformed position.

Many Lutherans would say that this is not strong enough. What really happened in the person of Christ was *communicatio idomatum*. Attributes must in some fashion be communicated. Aquinas said before that this cannot be done on separate natures but just on Jesus.

This results in an incarnation like two boards glued together (*communio idomatum*). Not truly united. In *communicatio idomatum* the human nature receives attributes from the divine nature and is transformed Lutherans (like earlier Orthodox Church). Many Orthodox were attracted to the Lutheran Churches.

Reformed said: we understand why you would want to do this, but you are confusing the natures. This is inappropriate.

Calvin: He agreed with trad creed and felt that the church had adequately explained the two natures. The implications that came out were mistaken. He denounced ubiquity as monstrous against scripture. Since JC is ascended to heaven that is where JC body is and not all over the earth. He did accept the idea behind the communication of the attributes. He understood the Lutheran dissatisfaction. But he did not want any sort of interpenetration of divinity and humanity. He was much more interested in the atonement anyway. At the end of the Reformation there is agreement that the early documents had adequately expressed the christological issue. There were some side issues, but Chalcedon described the truth of the matter. Chalcedon seems almost the last time that people have agreed in the church on anything.

2.7. The Search for the Historical Jesus

Books: Charles Anderson "The Historical Jesus" "Critical Quests of Jesus" both are essentially chronological accounts what took place in centuries when this was important. Fairly readable. Wonderful anecdotes.

I. Howard Marshall "I Believe in the Historical Jesus" History but also an attempt to actually come to grips with what it means to argue for historicity. This is practice. Not merely reportant.

2.7.1. Introductory Methodological Questions

Introduction reference: From above and below. But also now from behind. Move through history of NT and see how Jesus thought about himself. Observe how Jesus arrives in the redemptive history of Israel. This is said to be the approach followed by Luke and by Paul. Begin by saying What did Israel expect what did God say and how were these expectations met?

Paul begins his argument as speaking of one that was promised by the prophets. JC did not appear out of nowhere there was a context. This particular view is often combined with Christology from below. Examining Christ as a person of History in the context of the promises to Israel. Hope is that you end up with an understanding of Jesus as a divine being. This is not necessarily the case.

Most people who were on this quest for the historical Jesus decided that he was not divine.

Why? There is a great religion all over the earth. We have this document of a history. Let's write a coherent account. Gospels have same events. Seems simple until you do it. When you do this you begin with presupposition. People began to write a biography of Jesus from their presupposition. Berkhoff said that the Quest was doomed to fail because people were convinced of the conclusion from the

beginning that Jesus was a western gentleman and that is what he turned out to be. If there was anything against that in the Gospels then there was a problem that had to be argued away.

A look at the Gospel show that Jesus was not a western european adjusted male. He did things that were rather unusual. No one walks on water or transforms water. I cant do those things but Jesus could say it without thinking about it. There must be something wrong with the document.

Sources of Jesus life are somewhat unreliable. Sources were read with suspicion like no other documents. A nervousness found in no other branches. One of the things of the Gospels is to make people decided. The people decided that the Gospel account were unreliable. They were afraid that it might be true. That might be certain death in certain university situations. They certainly would not come out with anything that would rock the boat.

They would be reactionaries.

So what is the point of thinking about this part of history? It was very important part of the history of theology. It is difficult to understand contemporary theology without understanding this issue.

The first question that people had to address was: Did Jesus exist? Most said: Probably. Yes someone lived at the particular time in Palestine and did something.

What do we know about that person in that time?

Answer: The Gospels. That leads to the question: Are Gospels biographies? Here is the basic question how you answer it will determine the result of the study.

Many people have a simple answer. They confidently. Gospel is inspired by God. Scripture is truthful and therefore Gospels are account of things that truly took place.

Depends on the view of scripture. Pretty simple. If you can affirm that scripture inspired by God then Scripture is truth.

Others cannot take this approach. Two groups that do not accept.

1. REjectors of any notion of divine things. The story of Jesus have to stand and fall according to historical reserach like any other. This is a problem since it is difficult to prove the historical reliability of the sources. The gospel are the only evidence but there is no other evidence available. Sources outside are not very convincing. Many find them not at all convincing and may be later editions. For those who hope for external evidence the situation is not very good.

2. OTthers who accept the idea that the only information can be found int he Gospel. The inspiration shows that documents are reliability but do not define how reliability should be understood. Truth in a parable is fiction. That same goes for events in Jesus' life. F.e. the description of Jesus before Caiaphas are different. Difference in wording. One or both do not giving word to word accouitn. Meaning was more important than the actual words. The actual words did not matter much but the significance of the event. Whatever purpose the Gospels might have it is not the exact narration of Jesus life.

How do we then find the historical outline of his life? Combine the passages given in the Gospel.

What do we mean when we say something is a historical fact. How much evidence do we need? Is probable enough? There is also the problem of bias in historical reporting. There was a time when it was felt that history was an objective matter. Everything was reported as it happened. At this time the event occured the way it was reported or it did not. If not the person cannot be trusted. It has become evident that historians carry bias into histories.

I went to Burbank yesterday and a woman was standing in front of those shop where they do surveys. We had a little conversations and she said something that is hilarious. Something that lightens up my life for weeks. It was great.

There is a certain point that I notice that she might totally insignificant to here. She would not know anything. My Bias would show up in that. All reporting had a certain amount of bias.

There is a maturing in the understanding of history now. But then it was false or true.

You have the trouble of perspectives and of biases. Different stories that need to be put together to find out what actually happened.

These difficulties were insurmountable for the people of that times. Therefore they had to come up with some description without historical certainty.

Where at a place where I have set up that nothing good can come out of it. But there are somethings that come out that will be important later. Final problems that we have to deal with.

You come up with a statement of the historical Jesus. How do you relate this to the Christ of Faith? Faith says that Jesus continues to live. The living Christ of Faith that is active in the ones who follow him. The final problem is to relate this to the Christ of Faith to the one who is seen as life changing.

If you study Christ it is the purpose to have your life transformed. First we need to find out who Jesus Christ really is.

2.7.2. History of the Quest of the Historical Jesus

2.7.2.1. Early Lives

2.7.2.1.1. The English Deists

Of course Deists are separated from Theists by believing in God less than personal, removed from day to day live not connecting with us.

They first began to apply a critical method to the Gospel.

Toland "Christianity not mysterious" Everything is perfectly natural. God intervenes through natural causes. God follows the laws of nature.

Peter Annet. These attempts to write a history of Jesus are characterized by a denial of miracles. God would not violate his own natural laws. God does not directly intervene. Miracles do not take place. Jesus was seen as a natural human being like us but was a great prophet and had a fuller understanding of God's will and was seen as someone who gave a better understanding to the universal natural understanding.

God wanted to teach in every culture about himself. You can learn by viewing the world of nature. God wanted to reveal more and gave prophets like Jesus.

When they look at the Gospels and find a disharmony they would judge them as untrustworthy. They did prefer John (less miracles, more ethical and philosophy).

The critical study is generally seen as beginning with

2.7.2.1.2. Reimarus (1694-1768)

He formed the first critical study of Jesus. He published his research posthumous since he felt that this was the wrong time. He concluded that Jesus was a rabble rouser who wanted to throw the Romans out and

was arrested and executed and disciples were left on a limb. What did they do? Stole his body and started a whole new movement. Inventing yourself a job. Unemployed disciples who invented themselves a job.

A lot of people did not buy it, but the technique was interesting. The issue is not the result but the method that he used set the stage for after people. He had a preference for the synoptics over John. He also paved the way by seeking to deal with JESUS in light of his environment. Jesus did not operate in a vacuum. JESUS came in a certain historical setting. Jesus in harmony with Jewish culture and worldview. He strongly emphasized that Jewish thinking has two aspects. Political Messiah and spiritual Messiah.

2.7.2.1.3. Rationalists

They are known as rationalists because they said to test all things by rationalism alone. No emotion or prejudice. Simply reason. School varied. Three groups with a certain progression. Not a hardened and fast distinction.

2.7.2.1.3.1. Early period

Johann Hess (1741-1828) There was little attempt to deny miracles. They said something happened but explained it naturalistically. Hess would say that miracles were not valued for their own sake. A miracle was there to validate the ethical teaching surrounding it. Hess wants to be aware of the danger of overemphasizing miracles but if you deny then you are underemphasizing the important. You do not want to be like the Jews overemphasizing the sign nor like moderns who eliminate miracles and therefore important events from the Gospels.

There are some miracles who are expendable. other are too important like the virgin birth since it assures the sinlessness of Christ. Also the bodily resurrection is to be maintained else we are not resurrected. This would deny the faith. The temptation of Jesus shows that Jesus understood what Human life was about.

Then the account of the resurrection of Lazarus since this is another example of our hope.

Miracle of Water into Wine is a nice story but does not change Christian theology. No point in worrying about it.

Hess was seen as too conservative for the next group.

2.7.2.1.3.2. Middle period

Complete rejection of miracles. All miracle stories had to be explained as natural events or lies. Heinrich Paulus (1761-1865). Most did not want to say that the Gospel-writers were lying. They felt that they described something that happened. In reality there is a perfectly natural explanation. Two important points that others followed. Something extraordinary can neither overthrow or test a spiritual truth. The message stands on its own apart from fireworks. Everything that happens in nature emanates from the omnipotence of God. When it gets right down then there is nothing like miracles since all come from the hands of God. Why does a flower grow? When it gets down to it it is because God causes it to grow. You could call that a miracle. Miracles is an unnecessary category, but something that normally happens. The problem is to discover the secondary causes of Jesus miracles. In case of healing: Maybe Jesus worked on the nervous system or he used some medicines only known by him. Or he prescribed diets and treatment. The tedious long descriptions were omitted in the Gospel.

Nature miracles: Jesus walking on the water. It is an optical illusion. People that saw this believed it but there was a lot of glare that day. It was a dark and stormy night.

Resurrections were the result of cases of coma.

The only miracle that cannot be explained naturally is the virgin birth. (Of course it can, but he did not want it to be). That was thought as essential to understanding Jesus as sinless. This had to be maintained in all times.

2.7.2.1.3.3. Last Period

There was a moderation. The attempt to say that miracles perhaps speak of something that cannot be explained totally rationally. Schleiermacher. They have less confidence in their ability to explain miracles. He agrees that miracles are not necessary for the modern world only back in the primitive days. We are grown up now we don't need that stuff. All things are miraculous. We have not recognized that everything is a miracle. Miracles might have been necessary to provoke faith. Now we do not need that. We can judge Jesus teaching on the basis of what he taught.

If you would ask Schleiermacher What is a miracle? He would say it refers to the spiritual condition of the observer. Miracle is the religion's name for event. Miracles speak not of the event but of the perception of the event. If you wish to dispute about single event that is pretty astounding. Neither event is more miraculous than the other. See the miracles of nature around you.

Jesus teaching depends not upon miracles because he did not perform them, his teaching is dependent upon the type of things he said. Evaluate by the things he said not by what he did.

2.7.2.1.4. Strauss (1808-1874).

Strauss offered a different way of viewing things. He tried to develop an understanding along the lines of Hegelian dialectic. Mode of argumentation that comes down to the truth.

1. Thesis (It is the case that....) It is the case that the events of the Jesus life can be explained using supernatural explanation.

2. Antithesis (or..)

there can be a natural explanation.

You put these together and end up with a synthesis.

3. Synthesis (Combination)

Is the mythological. The notion of mythos entering in a discussion of the Gospel. The term Myth is problematic since it referred to fiction. Strauss redefines myth as redefining a higher truth, using language to express something that cannot be expressed naturally.

The stories of the suffering and death of Jesus bring over some truth and principles. The stories were there for a particular purpose. So Strauss said that the Gospels were constructed in order to point us to a higher reality. Low understanding is to see them as historical. What he thought of as historical is the development of the messianic thought of Jesus. Jesus originally saw himself as the forerunner of the Messiah. At the end he had developed doctrines of his second coming based on his understanding of being the messiah.

The Gospels are entirely untrustworthy and are not historical documents.

2.7.2.2. Harnack.

Jesus did not have contact with Qumran or Zealots. No Rabbinic education. Nothing in Jesus teaching is a radical break with the past. Nothing really new in Jesus teaching. Nor evidence of contact with Greek thinkers. Harnack sees Jesus against the background of first century Judaism. Different emphasis.

Analyzing Jesus live. Focuses on miracle stories. Four generalizations about miracles.

1. The Gospels are from a time when the miraculous was a every day appearance. A lot of strange things occurred during this time not only be beneficent but also malevolent magicians. They were somewhat controversial because of the person.

The fact that someone performs miracles is no proof that that person is divine.

2. Miracles tended to be attributed to famous people immediately after their death. Miracles stories are not unusual but not part of some later invention. They developed very soon after Christ death.
3. Everything that occurs in space of time is subject to the laws of motions. If you understand a miracle as an interruption as the laws of motion then they cannot happen.
4. While the laws of nature cannot be violated we do not understand the laws of nature. There might be a natural explanation for the miracles.

Harnack proceeds to analyse the miracles. Five classes.

1. Nature miracles exaggeration of natural events.
2. Nature miracles projection of sayings into the external word. After parable a miracle story is woven around the saying as a way to reinforce what he has said.
3. There are some miracle stories which arise out of the need to fulfill some OT sayings and prophecies (transfiguration). Connection to OT established.
4. Some healings attributed to special spirituality of Jesus. Not supernatural but something natural that we do not understand how it works,
5. Some stories we just do not know.

Central miracle is the resurrection. Harnack spends more time on resurrection. Resurrection: two kinds of evidence.

First physical evidence. Empty tomb and post resurrection appearances of Jesus. These pieces of evidence cannot resolve all doubts since there is not an orderly coherent account. No historical account that connects with his understanding of historical account.

Second the easter account and the faith of the ones experiencing it more reliably argued that something happened or bring this faith about. Harnack does not know what exactly happened.

The significance of Jesus has nothing to do with what he did. Significance were his words his message to Israel and the rest of the world. Three part message:

1. The kingdom of God and its coming.
2. Jesus proclaimed constantly exalted God and exalted the infinite value of the Soul.
3. Jesus proclaimed the higher righteousness and the commandment of love.

2.7.2.3. History of Religions

God was bringing history ahead. Popular liberal thought of the time. Liberals found little material to base a biography on. They tended to reject all ideas of a physical resurrection. The Gospel had little historical

value. Jesus a great ethical teacher and spiritual force. He showed us new way to live. Hope that the whole world would live like this to establish the kingdom of God.

About of the same time the liberals were doing their work a new school - the history of religions - arose. Toward the end of the 19th century people began to study the religions as an academic study and began to be interested in how religions began. They studied christianity among other. They asked some question to the liberal theologians.

1. Why should something like faith be based on such uncertainty as the historical knowledge of Jesus.
2. What right to you have to treat Christianity as an isolated religion in the history of religion. Is there not a hellenistic background to the Church as well as judaistic? What are the origins. This question guided them.

As they studied the NT they found elements that were considered unique but were not. A lot of things that came from the larger greek society. One of the leaders was Bousset. Most of the evidence for the Gospels was nonhistorical. Most evidence is found in metaphysics. Salvation occurs within an individual. The only need for Jesus is a cult symbol around which believers can gather. Religions need some sort of founder a central focus. Some icon to typify the values of the religion.

However he felt that there was an individual named Jesus and that he taught certain things and that the Gospels were evidence of that . Miracles expression of his teaching. Resurrection followed the development of the Church. The Church developed a faith and then developed an idea of a resurrection on the basis of prior faith.

Christianity turns out to be as just one more religion that can be studied as most others. This puts the effort to write a biography of Jesus in a difficult spot.

2.7.2.4. Albert Schweitzer

Reaction by Albert Schweitzer. He shared the opinion of most in his time. He felt that the attempt for a historical Jesus was going wrong. There was no assurance that anyone could separate the historical evidence from the tradition. No one can separate fact from tradition. That is not too much a problem since this is not necessary. It was probably inevitable of the people before him to come the result of Jesus being a perfectly well adjusted 19th century European.

Schweitzer argued that Jesus was convinced that the end of the world would be at hand. Jesus felt that in the very near future he would be revealed as the messiah. He failed and his contemporaries put him to death. His history is one of failure. The significance of Jesus lies in his teaching and spirit. Emphasize on reverence for all forms of life and in that way show God's love for the world. Schweitzer managed to destroy the liberal lies. He showed the impossibility of their task given the way of approach.

2.7.2.5. Form Criticism (Rudolf Bultmann)

Then the development of various ways of biblical criticism. Especially form criticism. Bultmann.

Form criticism began in the world of OT writers and they were seen as editors bringing together traditional material. OT critics separated literature of OT to find out more about the origin. After a while the NT writers took this approach too, Especially looking at the Gospels. They discovered that the order of events was not always the same. Various Gospels would order things in a different way. Were they reliable? Only one could be true.

The answer that they developed the framework was created by the Gospel writers to place in sayings of Jesus. There were stories being told both within and without the community. Gospel writers collected these sayings and developed a narrative framework and placed the sayings where they fit best. It is arranged according to the plans of the Gospel writer.

Form criticism does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that the Gospels are nonhistorical. Bultmann would go beyond this. His basic part in his piece "The Study of the Synoptic Gospel". Two characteristic of contemporary research. First History of Religion made it clear that there were two distinct groups of Christians. Palestinian Christians (Jesus as the Messiah and return expected soon) and Hellenists (wound up to be majority, emphasize on Jesus as present exalted Lord). Bultmann says what you find in the NT is evidence of controversy of these groups. Gospels were used as arguments in this debate. Things were manufactured for their point of view in the Gospels. Bultmann feels that there is a great uncertainty about the origins of early Christianity and historical Jesus. Bultmann was also heavily influenced by form criticism. Bultmann attempted to find out how the Gospels were constructed. Compares Mark, Matthew and Luke to find out similarities and separate them from the devices of the editors. Bultmann came to the conclusion that the traditional material were small detached units. These units existed as sayings of Jesus and as of narratives of what happened in Jesus. Gospel writers had to present a coherent account.

Mark and Luke proceeded in different ways. Matthew leaves the narratives as Mark had it but adds from Q. Luke invented entirely new scene in which he could place the saying.

Bultmann there was no reliability in the historical framework. That leaves us with two problems:

1. We have traditional material. What certainty do we have that the traditional material was not reworked? Narrative could have been changed as they were retold again and again. Even traditional elements might not be accurate reflection of what Jesus says. Generally what he is looking for is for certain types of style in the primary sources that identify them as primary.

He feels that if you study carefully you can discern the material.

How then can you know what is left is historical? In the end you do not know if it is reliable. No independent evidence. The Gospels are maybe historical. He analyses the literary form in the Gospels with the greatest interest in the miracle stories. The miracle stories are not important for the Hellenists not for the Judaistic culture. Nature miracles share a number of sources. OT description. Some out of the Church's celebration of the Eucharist (from other source). Feeding of the 5000 for example. The church expressed the understanding of one of the rituals. He does not know what to do with miracle stories. Certain style. First the patient and bystanders scornful of the one ill. Simple act of healing by Jesus follow. Third part the fact that the bystanders exhibit signs of awe or wonders. The Gospel writer had a stylistic device for healing stories. Therefore it is virtually impossible to see them as historical since they have been heavily reworked.

The sayings of Jesus. B. feels that most sayings are nonhistorical. Some can be judged as historical because it fits in the historical context. HE divides into five types:

1. Wisdom words. Some from Jesus. Some things used in Jesus time. The majority was supplied by Christian community and was placed in the mouth of Jesus.
2. Prophetic and Apocalyptic sayings. Some attributed to Jesus. Many from early prophets in early church. That found its way into the Gospel. some were spiced up by the community. Some Jewish sayings.

3. The Law. This is certainly Jesus saying. Any saying antilegalistic come directly from Jesus. Other sources would not come out with these sayings.
4. I-Sayings. Jesus in the first person. Virtually none of these was spoken by Jesus but is the work of the hellenistic community since this has to do with exaltation.
5. Kingdom of God is like... Comes from the Church.

Summary of Bultmann: Quest for historical Jesus is impossible. Fortunately it is not necessary that you do so.

In Jesus you see the love of God revealed. That is the importance. We know that miracles are impossible. REsurrection inconceivable. Most is myth. What we can know is that in the individual the love of God is revealed.

2.7.2.6. The New Quest

Some people felt that Bultmann did not do it correctly. Responses from all sides.

James Robinson. He began the New Quest of the Historical Jesus. The old quest turned out to have been impossible. It is impossible because any historical information that survives is part of the kerygma. Church was not interested in keeping history for history's sake. They were interested in preaching. That has survived. Everything that survived has survived as interpreted material. A particular piece of tradition can only be attributed if it cannot be explained by the Church or Jews of Jesus days. This old quest was illegitimate because Jesus is not important for the Christian faith. You need to know what he intended to do. Gospels show that he did not accomplish what he was attempting to do. Robinson: Jesus was trying to bring a new age. That is the importance. Jesus was trying to establish a new world. The new quest has nothing to do with history.

Jeremias. He feels that oddly enough the basis of the Christian faith lies in what Jesus did. Was laughed at. What he would like us to do is trying to discover the historical kernel of the Gospels. There is a great deal of history in this. C.H. Dodd agrees with some that a great deal of material comes from the Church. But a great deal of the proclamation was history! You can come up with a fairly good picture of who Jesus was and what he did.

For many the existence of the Historical Jesus is beyond question. This has not affected a large number of people. The big question had to do with the significance of this person. What does Jesus mean to me now. A great deal of modern literature emphasizes what Jesus means to me now? How Jesus Christ is related to faith that people proclaim. Shift from early days: How is Jesus composed? Question moved to: What does Jesus mean to me? What is the importance of him?

2.8. A Couple of Introductory Issues

Have always been issues in the churches thinking about Jesus. They became more important in the 20th centuries.

2.8.1. The notion of Kenosis. The emptying.

Phil 2:7 Christ emptied himself. Kenotic theories try to explain that. Problem has gone all the way back to the earliest time of the church. Early Church felt that Jesus had a history.

I. Christ was divine before incarnation.

II. Christ was both divine and human during incarnation

III. After exaltation completely human and divine.

Kenosis is the middle state (II). Modern theories conclude somewhat differently. M. Creed. Arguing that in the incarnation the second person laid aside the divine attributes during incarnation and lived on the world in the natural world. Divine attributes were not brought with him in incarnation.

There are several objections to this approach. This explains several problems. Like Christ's being sad, uncertain or tired. A divine person would not be like that.

But this substitutes a theophany instead of an incarnation. Once he was God and then temporarily became a human being. When he was human he no longer was divine since he left that behind.

(In stage II his divinity was veiled. And he was incomplete since he had not passed through life. We need to receive this process of life to be completely human. He did too.)

VanHorse: He emptied himself of his glory. Being brought down from an exalted state. He set aside his glory. Glory is not necessary for divinity.

2.8.2. The Sinlessness of Christ:

Chalcedon affirmed sinlessness although Christ was like us. In one case he was different since he did not sin. This has been held since it appears in a variety of places in Scripture. There are some that see contradictory things.

Overthrow the tables in the temple. Jesus behaving disrespectfully to his mother at Kana. There are some more substantial questions. I distilled them down to four questions.

How do we understand Jesus without sin?

I. Why should Jesus have received the baptism of John (John 1:4) if he was sinless. Baptism required repentance. Why did I accept baptism?

Limit myself to the particular question of Jesus being baptized. It appears that the answer is two fold.

1. Jesus accepts John's baptism he identifies himself with us that need repentance and conversion. He begins the preparation of a community of his followers. It does not mean that he required baptism. Jesus was baptized because he wanted to identify with those to whom he was sent. Becomes simpler if you argue that baptism does not provide forgiveness of sin. This is not so difficult in Protestant tradition. Baptism is typifying a life of total dependence on God. Evidence of life acceptance of obedience.

2. Jesus is seen as receiving the Spirit and the approval of God. Not remission of sin (and in all cases of baptism) baptism seals the identification of Jesus with us and the empowering of the Spirit that Jesus receives.

2.8.3. The Sinless identifies with the Sinful?

II. How can anybody who is sinless identify with us that are sinful? Particularly difficult if Jesus could not have sinned like the Church has argued.

Encounter with Satan. How can anyone who cannot sin be tempted?

1. There is nowhere in scripture saying that Jesus was incapable of sinning. Church has held that while he had the capability of sinning he did not seem to have the tendency to turn that into reality.
2. There are no difference between the temptations of Jesus and our temptations. The difference is in his inner response. Jesus was tempted without the possibility of failing. Why? first it is saying that he was God and therefore he could not sin. However that leads to a problem understanding his humanity. How does he identify with us.

His moral strength is found in his obedience. Why and How was he able to maintain his obedience? Many have tried and failed. Once again a) Jesus was God b) Maybe that is the case but it instructs us in a certain way.

2.8.4. The Sinless learns obedience

III. How can someone without sin learn obedience? If you are not fully obedient are not sinning?

this was something that he possessed by nature but this is something that we have by grace. This is something that shows him to be the being that we are going to become.

How could he learn obedience? There are times when they do not pass all the lessons. Sometimes they do things wrong. You have to show how to be obedient. Jesus was never obedient. We can never learn obedience without disobedience. That does not mean that disobedience is necessary to the learning of obedience.

Disobedience is part of a defective human. The way this flows into previous. If we set ourselves up as the standard of what a human being is then it is a problem. If we see Jesus as the ideal and see ourselves as ones who have not reached the ideal then we can see Jesus as ideal and wholly human.

Barth: There is only one real human Jesus Christ. all others need to be moved into that position. Everyone else is inferior to the true humanity found in Christ.

2.8.5. The Son in Sinful Flesh?

IV. John 1:14; Rom 8 Son was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh. Does this mean something? How do we understand that.

Here I am going to repeat myself because Barth has approached question and has noted that while Christ's humanity is like our sinful humanity it is only like not the same. Barth holds that Christ is completely human but we are not.

Traditional approach is to have an anthropology and then move into christology. Barth reverses that because you cannot know anthropology without knowing the perfect human Jesus Christ.

Christ is not the surprise but the rule. We are defectively human.

Humanity is only perfect in relationship to the one who created him.

2.9. Barth

Barth felt that Christ was important to faith and theology. I am trying to distill his theology down.

Colin Brown "Karl Barth and the Christian Message" I am not happy in some of the polemic in which he engages here.

G. Bromiley "Introduction to Theology of Karl Barth" One of the translator of the Dogmatics. He stays away from the polemic.

O. Weber a contemporary of Barth and kept a clear eye on it. What he did give an outline of what Barth was doing in these Volumes. He tries to clear things up.

We want to focus the things that Barth is saying about Christology. Barth says all theology is christologic. JC should never be considered apart from his work. It cannot be done. He also feels unlike traditional setup there is a couple of ways theology has been organized. Protestant theology around the apostologic creed. Then JC as the second person and then the Church. Barth says Christology is not just one topic but the starting point of theology. We can know nothing of God unless we know JC. That does not mean that theology should be no more than a christology. Everything that is said in theology has to be related to christology.

F.e. he could not talk about a doctrine of creation without talking JC. JC appears hundreds of times on a page. That makes it difficult to say here is Barth's christology.

Barth begins by talking about the external bases of christology. Trad theology tends to begin with the story of JC and the Gospel. With the incarnation. Barth begins his Christology in eternity prior to everything. JC and Gospel originate with the eternal decree of God.

Barth was convinced that God did establish all things prior to creation even JC and the Gospels. JC as mediator stands at the beginning of God's works. Salvation is primarily of Christ. The whole world was created for Christ. By means of the election of Christ, Christ can be received two ways. JC is both the electing God and the elected human being.

Electing God = divine subject in reference to JC. Wants to emphasize that the word in taking human flesh is and remains the eternal God. JC remains divine but is also a subject. One who acts. JC is someone who is divine and acting.

As a human being continues to be called a divine subject. There is no loss of divine majesty. God's majesty was in JC just as prior but there is a veiling in the flesh. he rejects most forms of Kenosis Theory. God does not cease to be God when he is merciful. You cannot take anything away that is appropriate to divinity from JC.

Final affirmation that the equation God became a human being is irreversible. a human being cannot become God. That is the only way to be understood and expressed. Barth unlike many contemporaries is

beginning from above. Before the foundations of the earth JC son of God was set apart to become a human being. Nevertheless he always gives equal importance to the fact the JC was a human being to relate to us.

Barth does not begin with an anthropology. Instead he derives his anthropology from the person of Jesus.

Barth finds the most complete description of Christ in Christ's work. First thing that he sees in JC is that JC is the revelation of God. For Barth in JC and only in JC that the one true God makes himself known to us. Without JC no knowledge of God.

The event of God's self-disclosure is identical with JC. Christ's humanity is not directly a revelation of God. Nevertheless apart from JC God is hidden. As revealer Christ points beyond himself. This does not mean that God is open to all. You could look at JC you probably would not see God revealed. The only way one can look at see is only through the Holy Spirit.

Secondly Barth sees JC as the Reconciler. In the incarnation JC makes our humiliation his own without ceasing to be God. So in JC God reveals himself to us in a variety of ways. Various titles have been applied to him. Son of David, Son of Mary... all these point to the fact that God is revealing himself in JC. We see it also in Christ's Lordship. JC has always been Lord and his Lordship is independent. The nature of Christ's deity is not found in the exalted state of his preexistence, nor on earth, but most in Christ's humanity and suffering under the wrath of God. No signs and wonders or pre-existent but as a human being as suffering.

The center for interpretation for the deity of Christ is the suffering and death. That is how we will know who JC really is. The true nature of God is manifest in Christ.

Barth tends to see incarnation in terms of self-humiliation of God. God willingly lowers himself from his transcendence into his earthly human state.

Barth consistently says that this cannot be understood in way of the Kenotic Theory. God did not give up anything, rather God is someone who is not downkept, Deity is not his only possible. God is free. Instead within God there is the possibility of being a human. Jesus concealed his majesty but he brought it undiminished. He brought it all with him. but some things are not appropriate to be manifest at all times. This was not appropriate as a human.

this can be seen as some kind of paradox. God-Servant. Barth says that some people have seen this as a stumbling block. It places a rock between Christ being himself and a redeemer. They divide their understanding of God as person and work. You cannot divide the two. Barth wants to hold together Redeemer and Creator.

The possibility of self-humiliation rests not in Kenosis but in divine nature. God's love in which he is divinely free. Love is free from our expectations and his expectations as well. This obedience this love which led Christ to ultimate act of obedience on the cross. Barth will say that it is obedience is a basic aspect of Christ's deity. JC can be described as perfectly obedient. Christ as divine can be spoken of as obedient.

Barth. JC had no part in his awakening from death. It is a completely divine activity. JC was there completely unconscious and God awakens him. In some way God was uniquely aligned with God.

A free act of divine love. A free gift. Nor resurrection and awakening are equivalent. JC is the passive object of divine action. Truly raised from the dead.

Primary emphasis here is to continue the idea that Christ is someone completely dependent on God. While Christ is divine he does not operate independently.

Also in resurrection Christ's humanity. On the cross Christ being an exalted human being (concealed seems suffering and dying). In resurrection we have a revelation of the reconciliation. Somewhat of the end result of the reconciliation is the resurrection.

Resurrection confirms the Lordship of the crucified. Reveals Jesus as the Lord and King on the Cross. Confirmed in the Ascension which is the glory of the Cross.

2.10. Paul Tillich

If you would draw a spectrum of theological thinking Tillich would be at the other end. Somewhat the same basic thought.

Tillich begins with commenting on philosophy and theology. Both are concerned with Being. Absolute reality. Difference is their approach. Phil looks at the general structure of being. How things are composed. Theol looks at being as how it is lived by individuals. Day to day life within this general structure.

Tillich: Theol looks at new being. Overcoming of alienation. Being is not only a phil concept but it is God who is the ground of being. Famous title for God: Ground of Being.

Alienation from a Ground of Being and from ourselves and from others is in human life's experience. That puts us in a place where we need to find a solution. A large part of Tillich's thinking is how we can avoid that.

Follows Bultmann and Schweitzer. Jesus is the Christ and thereby the bearer of this New Being. JC is the one person who overcame the alienation that characterizes our being. Jesus is merely a name of many, Christ is a title and refers to the individual who overcame the alienation caused by sin. Title existed prior to Jesus and it was a title that Jesus claimed for his own. The way how Jesus overcame alienation is by refusing to fight it.

Tillich sees that most human beings struggle against humiliation. Jesus accepted it and overcame it.

Jesus as a human being and overcame estrangement and therefore is able to mediate that to others.

Tillich's Christology is primarily adoptionistic. Christ overcome by this New Being. Tillich says that it is adoptionistic. It is fine.

1. Adoptionistic Christology has the same Biblical basis as incarnational.

2. You can never be an adherent of the incarnational without being adoptionistic. It gets down to what aspect you want to emphasize. The ideal of incarnation is an unnecessary complication.

the importance of Christ: By accepting Christ we are able to overcome the alienation.

Christ was overcome by this New Being at his baptism sometime (if there was a baptism).

His Systematic Theology is a small volume. He is able to polish it off rather quickly.

2.11.B. Baillie

"God was in Christ". One of the most important Works on Christology after the second World War. The subtitle is "An Essay on Atonement". He tends to hit most of the major problems and offers some attempts to solve these problems.

Begins by noting that Christ's humanity was not always taken seriously in history like today. Always trouble with dealing the human aspects of Christ's life like struggle or temptation. In many older theology more a simulation than a reality.

Jesus had a variety of limitations common to all humans. We have no evidence that Jesus' knowledge was more than other human beings. It was limited to what was available in that time. We should expect to find thinking appropriate for that time.

The miracles are human miracles. Jesus does not point to them as something extraordinary but sees them as items of love from God. It was something that any human being empowered could accomplish. Miracles are the result of human faith in God which brings the power which is to come when he reveals his kingdom completely into the human condition of life. Foretaste of the world to come.

The human condition of Jesus human and moral life. Lived a life of faith and victory. Through his faith he was victorious over temptation. The life of a human and that he accomplished what he accomplished like any other human being would be able to.

Contemp Christologies are more aware of Christ's humanity. Different emphasis and a problem were certain forms of theology wind up devaluing the humanity. See Form Criticism. Undercuts all knowledge of historical Jesus. That is disastrous for a theology. He has to be a human but we need to know about him for Christian life to flourish.

The uniqueness of Christianity is that it is a historical religion. Quest for Jesus was an unproductive path. He wants to start a new path of religion. We have to affirm the historical Jesus but we cannot stop there. The incarnation is not to be seen as a difficulty but is the only way that a Christian theology can be valuable. Christology only possible when Christ became a human being. Center point of all theology.

2.11.1. Paradox

Baillie. All of theology is at root a meditation on Paradox. Paradox is a guiding principle in Christology. There is a sense in which the mystery of Christ must always remain a mystery.

Theology always smoothes things out. That means that theology misses the depth that can be found on meditations on its basic principle. Paradox can be found because God cannot be comprehended by God. God is too big for our minds and our modes of explanation. The fact that God is beyond comprehension does not mean that we cannot know anything about God. For Baillie the best knowledge is through a personal relationship. It's a good thing that we cannot know God through a relationship. We cannot come to a knowledge of him by studying him. We cannot dissect him. That does lead Baillie to a problem: How can we do Theology? All you could say is : My experience is

Very difficult to do a theology. Theology is bound by its nature to objectify God. A being other than ourselves uses human words and categories. Our theologies are not exactly the case what our explanations explain. Our theologies are like a map. To a certain degree the map is wrong because the world is not flat. But it is necessary you need a map to go from one place to another. You have to remember that this is not actually true.

You can solve this by drawing two maps from the same area. To a certain extent they will contradict each other but they are needed to correct each other.

The idea of paradox in our understanding of God works in similar fashion. The divine reality is not contradictory. But when we are trying to objectify there is a certain degree of falsification because our tools do not allow to draw an accurate picture. We can resolve this contradiction through objective .

Actual reality has to be lived in actual relationship to God. All theological thoughts eventually runs into the problem of paradox.

Christians see God as active in the world, but the world is governed by cause and effect. The element that makes it highly paradoxical is that not all things that happen in the world are in line with the will of God. The supreme example of the paradox is the crucifixion of God. When all things happen by Gods direct action then why this?

Despite all this Christians confess that these evil things are under control of God that is good and benevolent. Some way they work out for good. That is an excellent example how paradox is inherent in all theological thinking. You have to accept.

the central paradox is the paradox of Grace. That is the one that you are not able to resolve. Every good thing in a person every good deed performed is not done by that person but by God. He goes on to say that while all things are ascribed to God this does not annul human responsibility. See Sermon of the Mount. Purposely impossible to fulfill in order to drive us away from ourselves to God. Once you have understood that this ethic is something that is impossible to fulfill you are drawn to God and then this good behaviour comes that gives all glory to God. You need to allow God to do good through you.

If I do wrong then I am condemned for that. If I do right then my conscience should say not the grace of God. We have no reason for boasting. This he feels points the way to a better understanding of the mystery of incarnation.

Baillie argues that NT shows that Jesus did not claim anything for himself. He ascribed all goodness to God. This is seen by the fact that Jesus looked to God for power to heal. When people were healed Christ did not say: Tell all your friends, give money, but give glory to God. Christ did not seem conscious of having anything on his own. He perfectly exhibited all that he did to the one that sent. The whole problem of the incarnation: Was Jesus divine because he lived a perfect life? Or did he live a perfect life because he was divine?

Baillie sees the affirmation of Christ's sinlessness of the most important affirmation. This is the key to Christ's divinity.

While Jesus' decisions were human in the last analyses human thought is wholly dependant on divine grace.

He lived as he lived because he was divine. No one could have lived a perfect life indeed if you were able to do so you would be God incarnate. A human being cannot archive this kind of life.

Then what value is Christ's life then for us as an example? Because Christ experienced God's grace so fully he allows us to experience God's grace in a similar way. Our life depends on Christ's life.

Christ exhibited by his life perfect divinity, his instructiveness is that we can live this life as God gives us the grace. Christ mediates this grace to us.

2.12. Wolfhard Pannenberg

Still alive. "Jesus - God + Man" 1970s. A couple of guides to Pannenberg. Don Olive "Wolfhard Pannenberg". Frank Tupper "The Theology of Wolfhard Pannenberg".

Christology primary focus of Pannenberg.

Begin with: whether a christology should begin from above or below. Divinity or humanity? Response: First reject a christology from above for 3 reasons:

1. You are beginning from the end. Sole purpose of theology is to tell why Christ is divine. Here Theology is done backward.
2. The result will be a devaluation of Jesus as a real historical person. Yank him out of his historical and cultural context.
3. Has to be rejected because a believer has to think in the historical context. We cannot view the Christ event from God's perspective. From above would be a theology from God's perspective.

Christology has to begin from below. He will give reasons why Jesus is divine. The central element in christology is the resurrection. Without resurrection no christology, no messiah.

Important: Appearance of the risen Christ and the empty tomb.

2.12.1. Pannenberg's Method

He feels that his method determines his conclusion. Spent time looking at method. Two methodological questions.

1. The historian has to maintain an open mind about the possibility of an event occurring. Resurrection might not be valid in a scientific way, but this is not something that should influence the historian. Science is limited. You cannot make that statement. A historian accepts an event until other evidence is found.

The judgment if an event has happened is a judgment of a historian and not of the natural science.

Pannenberg affirms that if an event cannot be shown not to have occurred and is the best explanation for the circumstances it has to be accepted as historical.

In historical inquiry the event should always be presupposed until contrary evidence appears. He changes the burden of proof.

Very few events can be proven by complete historical certainty.

Turns then to the evidence for the reality of the resurrection.

First post-resurrection experiences. Found throughout the NT. Evidence that it was widely held. Most important 1 Cor 15:1-11. This is the earliest account in NT. Paul speaks from personal experience. Two sorts of evidence. His own experience and he is also saying that there are many others who experienced the same thing. Exhaustive investigation results that the resurrection has actually occurred and the resurrected Christ appeared to them.

Some have argued that these experiences could be explained as imagination. Pannenberg says that this is not a valid move since people have tried to prove it for centuries but never succeeded. The term best used here would be Vision Experiences. That does not mean that they were just subjective events. That would not explain the Easter faith. Vision explains the experience of the event. They did not encounter Christ like we encounter each other but encountered them in a different way. They knew that it was something out of the ordinary. They were real visionary events.

Final analyses: The most satisfying explanation is not only of visions but also of appearances of the resurrected Christ.

2.12.2. Empty tomb

Very early tradition. Seems to have existed in isolation from the appearance stories. Evidence for making this statement is that the earliest Gospel (Mark) does only present the empty tomb tradition. The appearance tradition developed somewhat later.

Empty tomb points to an actual event. Even the Jews agreed that the tomb was empty. The situation in Jerusalem demanded that the tomb was empty. Everyone could go there and see.

Of course the empty tomb does not argue for the resurrection. The disciples could have stolen the body.

The body yet is appearing as the living Christ.

So the resurrection is a real historical event.

He is not just a historian but a theologian. What is the significance of this event. He places his discussion within the general resurrection of the dead. We understand it in the context of the final resurrection of the dead. It speaks to what is going to happen in the future. Both tied to past and future. Its significance lies in what God is bringing in the future.

This opens up the whole process of history. How should we live our life.

The event has been established. So who was Jesus? Makes his affirmation very clear. This individual in this situation with this mission and faith. This person Jesus is not just a human being but from the perspective of the resurrection is one with God and is himself God. With the resurrection the Christology from below confronts the incarnation.

The Eschaton is being incarnate in Jesus. The End revealed in Christ.

Now he takes the question of unity with God. Jesus' revelatory unity with God. Through Jesus God is revealed. This is not merely an appearance of God. This presupposes a similarity in the essence. You cannot reveal something that is not part of yourself. There has to be a unity of what he reveals and revelation. He must be united with God otherwise no revelation.

This revelation is of a different nature than the revelation before.

Three steps of coming to evidence that Christ was divine:

1. Revelation that God is one that has power over everything. You see the God that has power even over the dead in the Gospel.
2. Self-revelation precludes the possibility of many revelations. If there were many then no revelation could qualify as God's absolute self-disclosure.
3. Self-Revelation requires that the revealer and the content be equivalent. You cannot reveal that is not part of yourself.

Therefore you have to acknowledge that God's revelation in Christ we see that Christ is essential to God's revelation.

On the basis of revelatory unity Christ is in unity with God.

Still leaves open the extent of the unity. Jesus essential unity with God. How is Jesus Christ as nature united with God.

First problem concerns the problem of adoptionism. Two choices Christ is either completely identified with God or partial because God exalted him. The problem of adoptionism is focused in Son of God term of the NT. Son of God = Jesus is not God.

This is a problematic title can be read difficult. The resurrection is the key to solve this problem. Look at Romans 1 specially Verse 3ff and you will see a two stage theology. Pre-easter Jesus as son of David. After resurrection he is now installed as Son of God. That does not mean that he received divinity at the resurrection rather it was applied retroactively to his life. Jesus claims of authority have to be seen as confirmed by resurrection.

Reason that he makes this move is to affirm the centrality of the resurrection. If we deny the resurrection we deny Christ. No Christian without acceptance of the resurrection.

2.12.3. Virgin Birth

Pannenberg has problems with this since there is no historical reason for it. How do you prove that? You have to find that this is the best explanation for circumstances. You cannot prove it here you have to take opinion. The best explanation for Jesus birth is a natural explanation. No independent evidence.

He concludes that the virgin birth is a legend developed by the church in order to affirm that Jesus was the son of God from the very beginning.

This is not to be placed on the same level as the resurrection but it can be tolerated since it precludes adoptionism. Virgin Birth a useful defense for the two natures.

2.12.4. Incarnation and Preexistence

Preexistence expression that describes Jesus unity with God developed in early Christian community in light of Resurrection. The commissioning of Christ developed into preexistence.

The problem he finds that there is a tendency to distinguish the eternal Son of God and Jesus of Nazareth. Task of Christology is to bring those together and show a unity. Chalcedon wound up bringing more problem than solved. This definition makes him one being with two natures. Monophysite position. One nature one person. A single whole. The only alternative to avoid separation to discard the approach with the incarnation and focus on personal unity with God. sufficient to confess that God was in Jesus.

2.13. Process Theology

Derived from a philosophy developed by Alfred North Whitehead "Process and Reality". Appendix about God.

Whitehead offered a new kind of philosophy. Tries to put together a philosophy metaphysics.

First set aside the old way of viewing things about substance. That is not the way of Einstein and Heisenberg. We should think about the world as a interconnected web of processes. Reality is not based on Matter but on events. Actual entity.

How does this work. You have to use your imagination. If there was a rock here it would just sit there as a rock. Anything that happens to this rock happens because an external force is exerted on it. If we feel it we know that it is a substantial amount. Scientifically we know that this is mostly space. Atoms

are bound together by sharing electrons. Process thought that this is a good beginning. think of it as empty space. Important is that this rock is a society of events. ONE after the other. Everything is made up of the sequence of events.

.....

Each actual entities. Each comes into being and goes out of it instantaneously before you knew it was here. Everything that exists beyond is made up by a society of these entities.

Entity before coming into existence:

Past actual world. All experiences prior to this one. Context. Like our parents live for us. And for our parents....

That does not leave much room for change. Obviously change is going on. Each entity is receiving the initial aim coming from God. Each entity has free will. You can choose to accept God's initial aim.

All sorts of choices that we could make as entities. Our past worlds have a lot more going. There is more options. Ultimate free will in this situation. Every aspect of your being is able to make a choice.

Nothing comes from nothing. Yet there is something. So there must be God. All things are not good, because God's plan is often ignored. Each small entity can choose to obey the will of God or not.

God is the guiding power in the Universe. God does not initiate things does not cause but it entirely persuades to persuade things to do his will. The entities decide.

There is no good thing or bad thing. It becomes good or bad against or for God. Every entity free, but they would be better off following God's initial aim. Initial aim comes to us on an unconscious level.

God lures all things, calls for obedience. That is the way this being acts.

2.13.1. Process Theology and Christology.

Griffin "Process Theology" Basic intro with Processes of Christ.

John Cobb "Christ in a pluralistic Age" One of the most complete texts having to do with a process view of Christ.

Much of thoughts about Jesus and incarnation from Whitehead. Whitehead was brought up by Anglican. It was part of him. So Jesus was an important part of his thinking.

Jesus was a supreme figure in history, typified a relationship to God in a greater fashion than anyone else.

The motivating force within creation is love. Whitehead felt that this was the basis of Jesus's message. This message of Jesus which led Christians to affirm God's immanence in the World. Judaism had stressed transcendence. Not involved physically. With Jesus God was physically involved. Development of Christian theology as attempt to understand immanence. The foremost example is the doctrine of the Trinity. This was an attempt to understand one to be immanent in the other. Christian theology was extension of Platonism. This sort of improvement Whitehead wants to continue. This being made up of other beings. That is what all reality is. Christian Theology gives him the tools to develop a natural theology.

Process Theology sees God as creative love. Dipolar. One side the primordial nature totally transcendent and detached. It is the residence of eternal object. These are like platonic forms, prototype of all things that exist.

The other side is the consequent nature which interacts with others.

Logos = incarnate initial aim. This is Christ and Christ in the broadest sense is present in all things. There are two qualifications. They will not allow any absolute line between animate and inanimate objects. But they have less of logos. Higher organism where the work of the logos is more apparent. Here the role of the decisions of the creatures becomes more important. The logos within us is only effective as long as we decided that it is effective. Christ can only work in it when we allow it. We have to make a decision for or against the initial aim. The more you willing to open us the more Christ will be present in you. The purpose of the logos is to develop, creative transformation. The will of God for all.

The logos can be understood from two sides. Primordial nature and incarnate in each individual being (logos Christ).

What is the relationship of Christ to Jesus? Jesus had Christ attached to his name, Jesus had a particular relationship that allowed him to be called Christ. Christ is particular present in Christian experience. Meaning that C. experience is a different way of understanding reality. an entirely different from other.

The important thing about Jesus is that the event of Jesus is a revelatory event. Some information is displayed that we could not get any other way. This open ourselves to divine impulses and divinely transformed. Jesus was totally open to being transformed and what God wanted to do.

How is God related to him? PT feels that there are two characteristic in the words of Jesus that gives a clue.

1. The sayings of Jesus reflects an undistorted insight into life.
2. Jesus spoke and acted as if he had some particular insight into reality.

He was uniquely related to God. They offersomewhat of a Process view of a unity.

Human beings are centered around the eye. The I. Experience are organized in terms of things inherited from the past. Within our experience there is the divine presence. And we also continue to receive the initial aim throughout the existence. This points us what would be best at each moment. For a human being there is a tension, we are what we are and we know what we could be. WE can often discern the divine person as a judge. In Jesus saying we come into contact with an individual who does not have this tension. For us Christ is incarnate within us. For Jesus there is no distinction. Jesus self and the logos are one and the same. The logos constitutes that self around which a being is organized. The initial aim was the self of Jesus. In that sense Jesus is the incarnate Christ.

Sam process but Jesus had Christ to a larger extend in himself.

The Work of Christ is enhanced within us as we accept Jesus as divine revelation.

This has taken root in Methodism since it emphasises changes. It allows great success in counseling.

The logos comes from, it that way in which the objects in the primordial nature are expressed in reality.

God is not coercive, God is persuasive. God's power is entirely moral. God is always changing. God could change the plan because God is limited in power and in knowledge. He does not know how this will end. God would have to adjust his plan when a large nuclear war would occur. History is totally open ended.

There is no need for an atonement since there is no existence after death. It is better to be on God's side than not, though.

God's primordial nature is not personal, but the logos nature can be personal. There is not much spoken of that.

2.14. Liberation Christology

Liberation Theology would point to PT and would say that Theology is worthless. PT is a game people like to play. Theol should change society. We do not need this metaphysics.

There are a lot of Liberation theologies, since they have to grow out of the situation. I will try to develop a mainstream version.

LTheol is not much interested in the natures of Christ. A needless abstraction. The true work is to look at the work of Christ. Last major christology serves as a transition to the work of Christ. LTheol are very uncomfortable speaking about the person apart from the work. Definitely modern. Similar stuff has appeared several times in history. Not until the empires in Europe disintegrated in the last century.

John Sobrino "Christology at the Crossroad". Attempt to develop a christology from a liberation theology standpoint. He begins with criticizing traditional christology. He especially criticizes Chalcedon. This deludes the humanity of Jesus and replaced an abstraction in the place of a person. The emphasis was on a metaphysical ideology.

There are some affirmations from these definitions that we should continue to confirm. The ultimate reason for existence is revealed in Christ. Secondly it is important that in Christ God and humanity were united without separation.

Finally it is important that it affirmed that Jesus is the eternal Son of God.

Maybe we can affirm it without delving into the speculative aspect.

Christologies have to develop in a historical context and speak to the situation. He tries to develop a christology for the 20th century. LT emphasize the historical situation. They examine Christ through the incidences in Jesus' life. Four divisions are important.

1. Jesus' early life. Birth and Baptism.
2. His ministry
3. His death
4. His resurrection.

When we go through his life we will find his importance for us today. Major themes:

1. Early life. LT says that there is very little known. It is significant that Jesus refused to enter history in terms of power but he identified with the poor. He was able to enter history in a very big way but he came in a way of identifying with the poor. Jesus' baptism and temptation signify the beginning of his

ministry. Some see Jesus when he is baptized to place himself in the role of a human being. Identifies himself with us. In the temptation Jesus is tempted to reveal his power or to remain with the poor.

Others see J. Baptism where he identifies with the oppressed. They see this as a sign of the coming kingdom. Jesus refusal to follow the tempter shows that Jesus did not want to be absorbed into the ruling class but sticks with the poor.

Refusal to accept power.

For LTheologian it is Jesus public ministry is of utmost importance. The situation nowadays is similar to Jesus situation. The teachings of Jesus are particularly relevant to the third world.

Liberation sees Jesus as coming to literally free those who have been oppressed. The key can be found in the Sermon on the Mount. That sermon that Jesus gave gives us Jesus's view of how Society should be organized. This is seen as the ethics of a classless society. LT operates in society where class-structure is prevalent. In Sermon of the Mount the idea that Society should be without classes and that Christians should transcend those.

This is seen as developing a new kind of lifestyle that the people of God should adopt as their own. Peacemaking, justice.....

Jesus sets up a contrast between the lifestyle that the people of God should adopt and the lifestyle that human society expects one to adopt.

Human society - a class ridden society - teaches "Do not kill".

In order to maintain a society you need teach not to kill. Jesus taught not to get angry and that barriers should break down.

"Do not commit adultery". Very good advice. Keeps things orderly. Jesus says that a man should not lust after a woman. This is division. Jesus goes beyond orderliness and goes into real life.

Society teaches to love the neighbor and hate the enemies. But Jesus' say that one must love ones enemies because they are all parts of the same family. This is something that a society based on privilege would not accept. Once you lose the enemies you lose class distinctions.

The Lord's prayer synthesises the New Society that God wants to establish in one tidy little document.

Matt 6:19- are seen as the new 10 commandments for a new society. How the people of God should organize their life.

They feel that there are certain times when violence is justified. But there is a fundamental disagreement about the use of violence as a means of promoting change. Violence is justified in selfdefense and in some society the oppressed have to rise in selfdefense.

Moltmann develops idea of the liberation of the oppressor since he is locked into false securities.

We have to move on to the next element which is Jesus death. Meditations on the meaning of Jesus death are of great significance. This embodies the originality of Christianity. The Death of Jesus is the

revelation of God taking upon himself the oppression of the world. That is the purpose of Christ's death. Christ challenges the idolatrous use of Power in human society.

Christ refuses to compromise with the power of oppression and dies. That was because of his political stand refusing to accept the oppression of people.

The resurrection of Christ. For many theologians the resurrection is seen as the counterpart of the crucifixion. In the crucifixion he takes all oppression on himself. In the resurrection he shows his victory over oppression. The primary understanding of liberation theology is Jesus as a liberator as bringing freedom to all of humanity. Not a long time of discussion Jesus' unity with God or two nature. They get to the heart of the message. What does Jesus mean for us. The freedom of Jesus brings liberation from oppression. Christ's liberation is personalized. So for example Jesus brings liberation to believers in a particular way.

First Jesus frees us from the false security. The basic problem of humans is to find security in the things that they can do. All people have this problem. Find in Christ the only true security. In order to depend on Christ we have to give up material securities.

Believers are freed so that we can see the world from eyes other than our own. You see the world differently through Christ's eyes.

Jesus frees us from struggle with and for struggle on behalf of others. We need to struggle with and for those who need our help after being freed by Jesus. Jesus does more, Jesus frees all of humanity from all that oppresses them. From disease, hunger and so on. African Theologian Dwane has done a lot of work in Christology. Jesus as the pattern of human dignity and freedom. In the end Jesus is seen as a teacher and as that individual that gives the world victory through his death and resurrection.

2.15. Conclusion of first chunk

It is important to keep the notion of person and work of Christ together. Provisional conclusion, the final cannot come till next Wednesday. A few concluding comments on the person of Christ.

The first thing to keep in mind as we move to another part of the subject is the importance of history to Christianity.

The basic affirmation that the church has always made is the Lord Jesus Christ. It does not imply ignoring the historical element although it speaks in terms of belief which might be different from knowing. It does not speak of complete certainty on the person of Christ what happened where and what was said. We allow ourselves to live with a certain amount of indecision. Express a conviction beyond historical scrutiny.

The origin of Faith lies beyond history but it is not a substitute for historical debate. Bultmann says that history is not important. If you have a faith with a historical background you have a subjective faith. Without historical background you have no objective faith, Choose what you like.

Faith is not entirely an appeal to history. There is an element that says it feels right. It fills up an emotional aspect in your life. Both an appeal to history and to faith.

Faith emptied of historical data is without substance. But faith only on the absolute certainty of historical data is also shaky.

Two things about the role of History in Christianity:

1. The NT Sources have a great deal of reliable information about Christ. Many theologies have a lot of trouble with that.

2. We can know the historical Jesus. We can come up with a great deal about Jesus' life.

then we are faced. How do we connect this with the Christ of Faith.

One more contemporary theology J. Wainwright "Doxology". Wainwright offers a few points that are particularly helpful.

Wainwright does not offer a full-blown christology but gives you some ideas. Much of his presentation about Christology arises out of the myth of God incarnate. You need to know about the articles of Wines and Hick. Wainwright's emphasis is how theology develops out of Worship.

His argument that Christology is something like all other parts of theology that arose from worship. Early Christians came together as a worshipping community and theology developed from that. What did the early Church do in communal worship?

JC was the center of worship. In worship believers are baptized in the name of Christ. Believers partake and assemble in the name of Christ, Christian worship in the beginning emphasizes the centrality of Christ in their thinking. It is the Christian experience of worship that led the Christians to attribute the title Lord to Christ. Throughout early Christian worship the emphasis is that Christ is Lord who they invoke worship and so on.

The Church comes to a place where they are willing to call Christ God. This is a rather exciting event. This is not something that people from a Jewish background would do very easily. In the earliest days Jesus was called Lord, it took some longer to be called God. Palestinian background. Yahweh is God.

At the time the NT period ends there is no problem in addressing Christ as God. From the earliest time of Christianity JC has been acknowledged as Lord and God. This is at the center and must always be at the center of Christian worship.

The second element: Prayer tends to be addressed to the Father through the son. There is also a reason why we need to think it through again. Wainwright's study into worship of the early church, leaves the conclusion that as soon as they discovered that Jesus was God they prayed directly to Jesus Christ. Others prayed through Christ to God. Arianism required an emphasis on the deity of Christ. Always the idea the appropriate way of addressing is in the role of the mediator.

That note on prayer leads to the conflict with Wines and Hick. Conflicts between sermon preaching and lectures. Hick argues that there must be a difference between preaching and lectures. Worship is a sort of poetry you can speak in poetic ways. Lectures need to be more accurate.

That has a grain of truth. Language in a sermon needs to be a little different from lecture. But it does not mean that it should be entirely different.

One thing surveyed: How is the relationship between what was said in worship and outside? Hick: Worship is artistic endeavour. Scholarship is not artistic. Wainwright agrees to some extent in the choosing of words that would convey a sense of awe and beauty. That does not mean to choose Trinitarian words for worship and unitarian for other. Both worship and lectures have the same intention of speaking the word of God. Language needs to be consistent.

Wyles: There is an element of idolatry in theology between the reality and its image its Christ. Christians are guilty of worshipping the image and not Christ.

Wainwright: It is directed through Christ to God not an image. Christ is not a conduit like a pipe. Water is not flowing through. Instead Christ actively mediated our worship. Phil 2. At the name of Jesus every knee should bow....

As we confess Christ's lordship we do so to enhance God's glory.

there is a kind of hierarchy in the Godhead. There seems to be a functional subordinatism. The Son takes the role of Servant to the father. Son as God who is self-given.

God as Father is often seen as self-giving.

Wainwright turns to Christ as a mediator. Begins by saying that this role is a major theme in NT. Christ taught that it was through himself that we could achieve access to God.

Confronted with Arianism the Church had to develop a strong emphasis on the deity of God. Worship language changes to emphasize more what separates us from God. Christ seen as that conduit by which our worship goes to God. Emph. in NT is that Christ also mediates God's grace to us. Works in both directions.

Because of this Christ is someone in whom we can see a pattern for our worship.

Wainwright terms his discussion in terms of the seven sacraments. He sees in all these sacraments patterns described by Christ and have developed further by the Church.

Baptism as a ritual of death and resurrection. Seen as symbolizing literal change and that the individual is a new individual. We cannot do that on our own. Yet humanity has to accomplish. Baptism is a change that God's makes for us but it is life that we need to live. God does not do it all.

For Wainwright Christ is the firstborn of a new humanity. He is the pattern-setter. He is the PATTERN-setter because he is a human being, he must be a human being to set this pattern, he must be the same as those who are supposed to follow this pattern, so that we can follow him in obedience.

He is the pattern-SETTER. He is the gift of God and start transforming Christian being. He is that person who sets that pattern and allows us to be transformed.

These two ideas are seen in all rituals and rites of the church. Christ is present in these acts. The presence of Christ in worship is emphasized as the imminence of God within its people.

Wainwright offers a good place and ideas that we can use as we move from one aspect of speaking about Christ to another because he focuses on the place where it comes together namely in worship. Thinking and acting on the basis of these thoughts.

Two particular problems of Wainwright. That will come up in greater importance next week.

1. Notion of orthodox subordination. Emph. Father self-giving and son subordination. This can result in a blurring of distinction within the Godhead (Atonement blurs actor).
2. A problem concerned the problem of whether the mediator must be divine for various reasons. The argument is going to be that a true mediator must be truly God in order to mediate for us before God. At the same time it is argued that this mediator must be truly human to mediate it to humanity. How do we relate humanity and divinity. Wainwright tries to develop this role as we worship.

WW there is a great deal of significance in praying to God through Christ. Mediation is central. The way in which Christians worship says a lot about Christians thinking.

Consistency in Christian terms. Changing understanding of terms between different Christians. WE need to be consistent in our thinking about Christ.

The thing I would like to leave you with is this Idea of Jesus as a pattern-setter. Within this idea you have to take into account that Christ does something for us and that we have to do something for him.

Having received something from Christ, what is our response? This is to be kept in mind as we work from one element to the other.

Wainwright. Correct spelling.

3. The Work of Christ

Challenge is to hold these ideas together.

Person of Christ. Early doctrine failed because Church felt that it did not explain the atonement.

Background issues: The Notion of Mediator:

3.1. The Threefold office of Christ

- I. A Prophet
- II. A Priest
- III. A King

3.1.1. The Role of the Mediator

In all three instances Christ is understood as a mediator.

Two questions which focus in on this:

3.1.1.1. What qualifications are necessary for a mediator?

Three Qualifications:

- I. Mediator must be a human. This affirmation was held as important element of Christology. Heb 2:14-16. He must share our sufferings and our temptations.
- II. Mediator must be sinless because it is standard understanding of OT and NT that a victim/offering must be without blemish. Also so the mediator has not to deal with his own sin.
- III. Mediator must be a divine person. Only a divine person is capable of doing away with sin. The lower christologies from Antioch were seen as not efficient since they did not deal with Christ's humanity.

If any christology fails in one of these then there is the question if it needs adjustment.

3.1.1.2. Is Jesus Christ the only Mediator?

For most of the Church through most of history the answer was unqualified: Yes. Only Christ possesses appropriate qualifications. Medieval Priest moved in a mediating role. But on the basis of Christ's work.

3.1.2. The Concept of Office itself

The history of the idea of office is relatively recent as theological principles go. Protestant emphasises office because it wanted to speak in terms of what Christ did in historical aspects and historical impact.

Protestant theologians made points:

- In JC you have someone who is not only form and fulfillment but that in his person JC represented the fulfillment of the entire salvation history before him.
- In Christ you have the entire history of salvation summed up in one person. Radical difference of role than in OT times.

They attempted to set the work of Christ fully under the Lordship of Christ. JC acted on behalf of the other. Christ the anointed He was commissioned. His role within the history of salvation is one of who has been sent. What he did was not arbitrary but carry out the work that is set before him.

Protestant Theology can reintroduce that Christ is the obedient one. In Medieval Theology obedience seems not to be important to speak of since he is so highly elevated. Also points to the fact that his mission could only end in success.

Theories that the crucifixion is not necessary failed shortly.

Emphasizing the threefold nature of the office it was attempted to avoid seeing Christ in a too one-sided fashion.

Some groups emphasized the Prophetic office of Christ. The greatest of all prophets. Christ gives us some profound teachings which we may apply to ourselves. Prophet who guides us in quest of self-actualization.

Emphasize on Priest. Result a certain passivity. The church has no task to perform. Christ did it.

Undue focus on the Kingship of Christ. Developed into communities legalistic and focused on political change. Christ as the ruler of human society. Often leads to overemphasis and error.

3.2. The Prophetic office

Is a two-edged sword. Christ took upon himself the role of a prophet and proclaimed the word of the Lord. He set himself up as one who was proclaiming the good news. HE announced himself as such. Many people of his time accepted his idea. When he entered Jerusalem the crowds cried for him as a prophet. However Christ is much more than just one of the prophets. Brunner notes: For the prophets only the word given matter. Personalities do not matter much. The word of God was important not the person.

Authority was one derived from God. Jesus speaks with absolute authority. He does not say: Thus says the Lord, but I say unto you. Here is someone who is the word.

The church cannot be satisfied with saying that Christ merely a great prophet. In Jesus Christ the word and the person are one.

3.3. The Priestly Office (Atonement)

3.3.1. Early Church.

Several terms grew up in the church. Several theories concerning the atonement.

3.3.1.1. Irenaeus (130-200).

Recapitulation. The guiding principle in examining Christ behaviour has to do with the imitation of Christ. Christians pattern their life along Christ's. Essential element of plan of salvation. When Christ

became incarnate and was born and lived like any other human being. He passed through every stage of human growth. As Christ went through every state he was redeeming every stage. He is summing up the continuity of human life. The word was made flesh in order that sin should not longer be in us. The Lord took our form to join the battle and overcome sin. Sin might be destroyed by someone who shared the same flesh as Adam had. Christ brought salvation also by the obedience of his passion.

In his life many things are set right that were wrong in the life of Adam and Eve. Restoration. What was lost by the first Adam was restored by the second Adam. Long list of events. Life of Mary. Mary is seen as someone who obeys God whereas Eve disobeys God. Both were virgins??? Before the fall Adam and Eve were pure and afterwards they became impure through sexual intercourse. He finds many parallels in the life of Christ what had taken place before. Christ always made the right choice.

That leads us to the second idea:

3.3.1.2. Consummation.

Because Christ is gone through these acts of restoration, Christ brings about the consummation of humanity for God's purpose. Christ brings humanity back to what God had intended for humanity. Christ as the example of what we shall become. Represents perfection before the fall. However is not only an example but the prototype after which humans were created. What we are to do then is to live like Christ. As we live like Christ we shall become more like Christ. We are now engaged in a life long venture. Christ has restored those things that were lost. Salvation is determined on our willingness to live the life Christ wants us to live.

3.3.1.3. Clement

Developed the eastern notion of salvation.

By imitating Christ the believer will assimilate into Christ. Emphasis of the deification of the believer. That is the way of salvation. That were strong themes in the early years.

3.3.1.4. Tertullian

Another one was that of satisfaction. Prominent by Tertullian. The term itself began as a Roman legal term referring to the amends that someone makes to someone else for failing to obey a contract. Other with a form of punishment. If you did something wrong you were expected to offer satisfaction in form of some punishment. The idea is if you fail you have to pay. This appeared to Tertullian to describe the penance that is required for post baptismal sin.

3.3.1.5. Role of Baptism

Very early the Church decided that in baptism the believer was freed from all sin. If you were without sin at baptism then what happened afterwards? What do you do with someone who has sinned after baptism? They have to pay some sort of satisfaction. Someone who repented of sin made satisfaction to God. Those who lapsed were seen as paying satisfaction to the devil. Life of the person had lots of obligations.

If you please God you offend Satan. However Satan demanded satisfaction. Sinning was paying this satisfaction. Your choice was what was the best investment.

3.3.1.6. Satisfaction

In the 4th century you have people who equate satisfaction with sacrifice. And to speak of this in the context of the death of Christ. Christ's death in an act of reparation to God for the sins of humanity. That which offers the only satisfaction that God will accept. The other term was that of ransom. This is a biblical term but its theological meaning moves more to blending of cultural and biblical ideas. To

whom is the ransom paid? Christ gives his life as a ransom to many. The answer was that this ransom was paid to Satan to set the sinners free. All of us are captives of Satan. God wants to liberate us but this is only possible through paying a ransom to Satan. Origin. Ransom to Satan for all of creation. Satan was true ruler of all of creation until Christ offered his soul.

3.3.1.7. Christ the Victor

Finally: The theory that gained the greatest prominence focused on the notion of resurrection. Resurrection as that event through which Christ triumphed over his final enemy. A great change in emphasis. The earlier theories based in history before the resurrection, focused on crucifixion. Resurrection is testifying to Christ's work but not adding anything. The conviction is expressed that in his resurrection Christ triumphs in his battle against Satan. Salvation is seen something that comes directly from the fact that in this battle Christ overcame Satan.

The fact that this notion of Christ as victor was predominant does not mean that this question was resolved. It was part of the debate even in medieval times.

3.3.2. Anselm

Presents us in *Cur deus Homo* with an epochmaking theory of the atonement of the middle ages. This swept the field. It is now impossible to think about the atonement without looking at Anselm. He cannot be ignored.

Text in dialogue between Anselm and Boso. Boso is not one of the quickest individual. He is not seen as Anselm's equal, but is necessary to make things clear. Before looking at what he is trying to do we have to look at two principles of his thinking.

3.3.2.1. Honor.

Specifically God's honor. According to Anselm sin is something very specific. Consists of breaking commandments doing wrong things. Sin is an attack on God's honor. A direct attack on God. By sinning Humanity has encroached on God's honor. It is a personal attack on God. God cannot ignore sin. By sinning we have performed injustice in our relationship with God. Therefore God cannot ignore sin and has to do something in the face of human sin. One thing would be to forgive sin. There is a very restrictive notion of forgiveness.

God cannot simply forgive sin, because the effects of sin extend far beyond relationship it goes to the effect of saying that God is wrong. God must be vindicated. The only way to vindication is through some sort of satisfaction. Some sort of payment to God. He is thinking to a very popular item of payment "wergild" to a wronged party.

3.3.2.2. His Method.

Evident in the preface. He attempts to prove two things. First the reasonableness of the atonement. This is not irrational and makes perfect sense. Something that can be described according to reason. Second this act of atonement could only have been accomplished in one way and in no other fashion. It was necessary.

He begins in the first part of answering the objections of the infidels who claim that Christianity is contrary to reason. He will answer from reason alone. Second part argues that human nature was ordained for one purpose. Because of this the purpose cannot be fulfilled unless God becomes a human being.

3.3.2.3. Atonement necessary

Anselm is trying that the atonement is the only course that God can follow. Book one begins with the question: Why is the incarnation necessary for our salvation? Why not through a creature or act of his will?

Answer is going to determine the rest of the discussion. Anselm proves that there was just one way. Before he does this he answers some objections. The objections go directly to Anselm's view of God.

Christians dishonor God by saying that he was born and lived on the earth? Not dishonoring and offers a doctrine of recapitulation. Death by disobedience, live by obedience. This is the way that God needs to operate to deal with the effects of sin.

Redemption could not have come from a creature unless we needed to be thankful and servants to this being. The incarnation is not only fitting and proper but necessary so that we become servants of God and not of a creature.

3.3.2.4. Christ's free choice

God did not compel Christ to die, he freely chose the course to his death. Scripture is contrary but we are only concerned with reason. Christ was not obedient to God saying: You must die, but to YOU must be holy. He was consistent in maintaining his holiness. He died because he offended people by maintaining his personal holiness.

3.3.2.5. Sin not left unpunished

Boso: Why the blood of an innocent demanded by God?

Anselm explains why Christ's death was necessary. He is convinced that sin is robbing God of the honor. Everyone ought God to pay him back. We all have a debt. There is several reasons why sin is not left unpunished. Three reasons.

- I. If sin would be left unpunished, then sin would be left undischarged (There would be some sort of loose end in God's kingdom, something out of sync). God has to do something about Sin.
- II. No difference between guilty and not guilty. Classic justification for any sort of legal system. No particular reason why anyone should be good or bad. That is definitely an unseemingly state of affairs.
- III. Sin would be subject to no law. The negative would not be subject. If injustice were cancelled by compassion alone, then injustice would be more free than justice. How do we know that something is just? It is regulated by law. If you forgive without punishment then sin would be free. It would be lawless. Forgiveness is anarchy.

In summary it is necessary something to be done against sin.

3.3.2.6. Why give thanks?

Boso: God did what he did for his sake rather than ours. He is in a fix of honor. He is not particularly concerned in others. What thanks do we owe him? How can we attribute salvation to his grace when he does it by necessity?

The prize is greater than anything in the universe. Only God can make this satisfaction that is necessary.

A human being must pay the price since humans caused it. That is why God needed to be incarnate.

If the heavenly kingdom to be made of human beings, then this kingdom cannot be come about without satisfaction then incarnation is necessary.

3.3.2.7. Death not part of human nature

God only accepts death as satisfaction because death is not part of a human nature but added later to humans. If death would be part of human beings then there would be no choice involved. The most difficult thing a human being could do is to suffer death voluntarily. That person who wants to make atonement is one who can die if he so chooses. Christ did not have to die since he was sinless and divine. He could have lived forever and he knew it. Choice was to live forever or perform an act that would restore my honor.

Anselm arguments on necessity and honor.

3.3.2.8. Problems

Debt can only make satisfaction or accept the penalty. Even eternal suffering cannot pay the debt. Only God can pay a price greater than all of the universe. He must be human because humans incurred the debt. God sends his son to live a life of perfect obedience.

One thing Christ does not owe God is his death. He owed a life of obedience.

Supererogation: More than required.

The problem within the divine life is that God said Live a life of perfect obedience and my honor will be taken care of. Christ does it so well that he is executed. He is obedient although he knows that it will lead to his death.

God the father has to do one of two things: Reward him, or be in his debt. Now God is in another fix. God cannot be in any one's debt so he will give a reward. The son is God, so what can he give he does not need anything. So the son says let's give it to the human beings. Salvation comes to us because it was due to Christ, he passed it on to us since he did not need it.

This makes our salvation as an unintended consequence of Christ's death. Not because God loved. Death of Christ is something optional and salvation was unintended.

This became dominant theory of atonement in medieval church despite of this since it answers so many questions and is so coherent. We cannot archive our salvation it has to be archived by others. No one has been able to destroy it. A pillar of Christian thinking.

3.3.3. Abelard

Rumored castrated for affair with Eloise. Wrote commentary criticizing the ransom theory of atonement (see Romans 3), listing a bunch of (rhetorical) questions. Is God in cahoots w/Satan? Is God not all powerful? In what way does Christ's death make us more righteous than before? Abelard also didn't like Anselm's formulation, saying God is under no necessity to punish (or do anything else God doesn't want to do). So what's the obstacle that keeps us from redemption? Not God's justice (see above). Lack of love w/in ourselves. God's grace kindles w/in us responding love, freeing us from slavery to sin, bringing true liberty as sons of God. Bottom line: We need to be transformed.

3.3.4. Aquinas

God could have provided atonement any way God wanted, but God did what God did for God's good reasons. 1) Merit - Christ's death earned merit with God by offering something of equal or greater value than the pain or offence against God. The issue is compensation (and more - supererogation). 2) Satisfaction - what Christ did was to pay the debt. 3) Sacrifice - the offering of due honor to God that God may be appeased.

3.3.5. John Duns Scotus

Acceptation theory of the atonement. It is only the will of God which determines what should be and what must be. Place no limits on God. The merit achieved in Jesus' death was finite, yet God chose to accept it as sufficient to cover all humanity's sin. Atonement is not a mechanical affair.

3.3.6. Martin Luther

Merit. For Luther and tradition atonement receives its necessity from that all are condemned. Anselm. Reason has nothing to do with God's needs but our needs. Condemnation is seen as God's strange. His strange work is resolved in his proper work: reconciliation. That is what is God most concerned about. Reconcile what is estranged from him.

The two natures in his small Catechism. Then why incarnate? Anselm. Necessary to be human to be our representative. Christ must be true God so that in the fulfillment of law will be sufficient for all people.

Christ as priest is doing three things:

- I. Fulfill the law. Act of obedience in my stead.
- II. Sacrificed himself. Passive obedience. In his sacrifice Christ is allowing himself to be overcome and to be put to death.
- III. As someone who continues to intercede for us. Pleading our case before God.

In the incarnation the divine nature communicates the divine nature to the human nature. But in the human he did not use all of these things. The question is why did he enter this state where he would not use his attributes? To redeem lost creatures that need it.

Medieval focus on death, but Luther emphasizes that we deserve punishment as well as death. Christ suffered that punishment for us. Luther argues for vicarious atonement. Jesus was a substitute for humanity in his death paid the price of us and suffered the punishment that we deserve.

This comes about as our connection to Christ not by the works we are accomplish.

Christ is the head of humanity. Who is part of this humanity? Christ has redeemed me and all lost and condemned humanity. Christ died for all. Not universalis, Christ's redeemed work covers all of humanity, but those that do not participate will not have a share in it.

Christ continues to work for us in his state of exaltation. Christ as someone who now while still completely human uses his divine features. Very strong of following the early church that following his death Christ went to hell and in his resurrection signals release for all those oppressed.

Resurrection proves 4 things:

- i. Christ is the son of God.
- ii. His doctrine is true.
- iii. It proves that God the Father accepted the sacrifice of Christ for the reconciliation of the world.
- iv. It is proof that all believers shall rise into eternal life.

The resurrection does not add anything but it is the revealing of the act of atonement.

3.3.7. John Calvin

Agrees largely with Luther. Some nuances of his own. Again I follow the catechism. Organizational structure point out a basic disagreement on the role of the law in God's dealing with the world. Luther: Law and Gospel are separate manifestations. Separate fashion. Luther begins with ten commandments. Then show how the Gospel fulfills these.

Calvin disagrees and begins with the apostles creed and then comes to the ten commandments. Luther: the difference between Law and Gospel:

- I. The Law teaches us what we are to do and not do. The Gospel teaches what God has done and still does for our salvation.
- II. The Law shows our sin and the wrath of God. The Gospels shows our saviour and the grace of God.
- III. The Law is something that has to be preached to all people especially to impertinent sinners. The Gospel is to be preached to sinners who are troubled because of their sins. Law is a preparation for the Gospel.

Very strong sense of relationship between Law and Gospel. Calvin sees the Law as a rule for life. It describes the life that humans shall live. The chief effect on non-believers to show the sins but for the believers a rule of life. Luther wanted to abolish the laws, Calvin through they just were the wrong ones.

Calvin begins by seeing Christ as a sinless human being. L taught that the virgin birth teaches Christ's true human being. C. teaches that this shows a sinless human being. No human failing.

Since there was no father the sin could not have been passed to him. Calvin's emphasis is on the complete sinlessness of Christ. If Jesus is innocent then it is evident that Jesus did not suffer for his crimes but for our sin.

Christ must be innocent to receive our punishment. He subjected himself to the curse of that kind of execution. He willingly accepts our condemnation.

What kind of benefit do we get from this?

Our sins are forgiven. In this sacrifice the wrath of God is appeased and we are in a state of Grace, Even the memory of sin is eradicated. Redemption:

- I. Sacrifice. The only possible. God no longer angry.
- II. Purification. We are purged of every trace of sin. When God looks to us he sees Christ.
- III. Eradication. Even the memory of our sin is purged so that we can stand before guiltless. God will not say that the sins are forgiven but will say: Well done.

This benefit is only revealed in the resurrection. In the resurrection Christ shows himself as the conquerer of sin and death. Calvin goes a little bit beyond Luther, there is also a way in which we get benefits from the resurrection:

- I. Righteousness. That is the Method by which righteousness applied to us. That righteousness he won during his suffering is now applied.
- II. Pledge of immortality. Because Christ rose from the dead we can be sure that we will as well.
- III. Raised to a newness of life. Resurrection results in a renewal, we now become alive.

Calvin sees in Christ's ascension a threefold benefits:

- I. Opens a way for us into the presence of God.
- II. Christ continues to intercede for us. Appears as an advocate on our behalf.
- III. Christ provides with the power to live a spiritual life. Right to empower those who call on his name.

For Calvin redemption is seen in terms of sacrifice. There is no access to God without the shedding of blood. Christ is both our Priest and our victim. Therefore it is through Christ that we are assured access to Christ.

3.3.8. Socinus

1578 *On Jesus Christ the Saviour*. He questioned the received theory of the atonement as well as the atonement of the reformers. Christ did not appease the wrath of God but made known the way of eternal salvation that results from imitating Christ. Reach back to Irenaeus. We need to live the sort of life that Christ lives. Unlike Irenaeus Christ was a human being although extraordinary.

Basic document of modern unitarianism. For most Reformers the notion of atonement was much more conservative.

3.3.9. Heidelberg Catechism

Is intended to be a personal confession. Publish in Jan 1563. Set forth as teaching of German Calvinists. Arrangement between Roman Catholicism and Luther but the Calvinists were left out.

Centrality of discussion and redemption. Redemption is the beginning of any other discussion having to do with faith.

First question: What is your only comfort in life and death? Tat I belong body and soul to Christ who paid for the sins.

Its presentation of the way of accomplishing atonement is quite similar to Anselm. The reformers were gathering around a common view of the atonement.

Escape punishment through payment by ourselves or by another. The only possible mediator is that individual who is capable of making such a payment. It cannot be one of us because our debt increases every day. The only mediator is a truly righteous and more powerful than us.

Christ descended into hell? Luther: He literally went into Hell. Calvin: Spiritual affirmation. Speaking through the agony that his soul underwent as he was tormented and executed. Dead people do not go to hell and proclaim the Gospel.

Heidelberg: Why is it added to apostles creed? This is added so that in my severest tribulation I can be sure that Christ has already endured it.

Very little change in the understanding until the 19th century.

3.3.10. Schleiermacher

Active only 100 years after Westminster Confession but operates in different thought world.

Acknowledges that traditional Christianity was correct that in Jesus is divine need and human healing. Jesus must be described as God with us. Jesus is truly God, with us. Christ is for us a manifestation. He is with us a true manifestation.

We must feel adoration since he is God but also comradeship because he is one of us. We no longer think like the early church. A person is a nature. The two natures doctrine cannot be held because we cannot experience it.

Anything that cannot be experienced is not important. Trinity alike we do not experience. We experience God. Christology for a modern world cannot follow the same path as those that came before. They are to be expressed in experiential rather than ontological statement. We must confess those.

However his conclusions are certainly not the conclusion of the reformers. They sound similar but are understood in a dissimilar fashion. Confession made up of three elements.

- i. The Redeemer is sinless. In order for someone to be a mediator that individual must not require mediation. Jesus does not sin.
- ii. Confession must include divinity of the redeemer. The divinity of the redeemer is to be thought of as the constant potency of his God consciousness. Jesus had a particular consciousness of divinity which was a veritable existence of God in him. Jesus is to be understood as one in whom God dwell. Deity can only be understood in terms of Gods fellowship with God.
- iii. Redemption. The redeemer assumes believers in the power of his God consciousness. In that way we are redeemed. By knowing and experiencing Christ we are experiencing God. We are knowing and experiencing God because of Christs experiences God. Christ redeemes us by being the way in which we come to God. Not by sacrifice but by imitating Christ. In JC salvation by imitating Christ.

As we imitate Christ we will become better people. 19th century liberalism. Schleiermachers view continued to be very important in many people in the west. you can follow the trad view of Anselm emph that Christ paid our debt. Or Christ presents us with an example how we shall live.

3.3.11. Barth

Barth tried to resolve this two tendencies. He does have a very strong affirmation of the meaning of the atonements.

The atonement is best understood in the context of Jc as Judge. Barth will play nice little wordgames here.

JC as judge is both the judge, who judges us, and the judged who is judged in our place. As judge JC manifests the divine judgment, the being of the divine subject that judges (He is God).

Christ manifests this judgment by being as the Son of God the divine judgment in person. We encounter that individual in judgment above us. That is a terrifying thought, but it is liberating, that removes us from our position of judge. That is one major root of sin. We judge our neighbour. Here a human being takes Gods place by seeing himself as right and all others wrong.

As saviour Jesus is one who is judged. He allows himself to be judged for us. This judge stands before the bench and is himself condemned. Christs stands in our place and takes that condemnation on himself. Salvation in Christ is total salvation and points to total corruption. That gives Barth the opportunity to display his view of the atonement and how it should be carried out.

- I. sin is not a neutral object. sin is something that exists in active rebellious subjects in humans as sinner. Cannot be divided from the actor. Sin can only be identified in a sinner.
- II. Therefore sin is one's own responsibility. We cannot avoid the consequences of our sin. Sin is sin and it is your sin and your responsibility you cannot pass it on to anyone else.
- III. The only way to do away with sin is to do away with the sinner.
- IV. There is the possibility of some form of substitution.

3.3.11.1. Substitutionary Atonement of Barth

Any atonement must be substitutionary atonement. The judge must be put to death so that sin is removed. Central movement in the death of Christ. The passion of God.

- i. This passion of God can be viewed as action in the death of Christ. Death is active, by the person of Christ. As the judge allows himself to be judged the actions of God are accomplished.
- ii. Barth sees in the passion and death of Christ the spatio-temporal character of Christ. In the passion of Christ there is a unique occurrence which cannot be repeated.
- iii. Crucifixion as literally the passion of God. Through his suffering and his passion Jesus gives his deity the strongest expression. The highest revelation of God is found in the crucifixion. Christ as God suffers in his passion. God as father also suffers in the crucifixion in the offering of his son.

Barth accused here of Patripassionism.

Barth's intention is not to speak of divine ontology but of divine emotionalism. Barth's God actually feels things. Because he has feelings he feels pain when his son is put to death. Like any other father would feel pain when his son is tormented and executed. You have the complete Godhead participating in his thing. God has to suffer to bring this about.

The depth of sin is not so much our inability to make up but our unwillingness to solve the problem. Only in JC is that possible.

3.3.12. Florovsky

A nod to the eastern church. Most people here have no connection with the eastern church. F. is definitely someone who represents the orthodox church. Russian orthodox. 1919 left Soviet Union. After second WW came to US taught at Saint Wladimir. 1955 to Harvard, 1964 Princeton. He wrote many many things.

He has a detailed discussion on the various aspects of redemption. This volume has to do with creation and redemption. Redemption is the restoration of original creation. His greatest piece of material for developing his material begins with the epistle to the Hebrews. The major element will be the notion of sacrifice. He points to the cross as that place where sacrifice was accomplished. Usually sacrifice is described as offering. Here sacrifice is also seen as a dedication to God. The cross is also the glorification of humanity. Here God experiences death and humiliation. At the same time the ultimate element of glorification of Jesus and God.

The cross itself is a miracle. Christ's death on the cross receives its effectiveness because it is the death of the incarnate one. Humanity is glorified on the basis of this.

The essence of atonement in the east focused on the resurrection. God died for us. That is probably a very important emphasis. Neglected often in the west.

3.3.13. Concluding comments

There are a variety of ways to approach this topic. Focus on atonement but hopefully will tie up loose ends.

The Cross is the central event of human history. What is the meaning of this event for us today? I am going to take the Aquinas way. There is not one single word that would address the issue. All systems have emphasized one idea or the other. None offered a systematic account of the whole. I am not going to do any better. The atonement is best way understood like the NT understood it in a variety of ways. Do not try to make it one big picture. Take a variety of pictures. They will be complementary.

3.3.13.1. Atonement requires obedience.

the life of Jesus can be summarized Phil 2:8. He was obedient to death, death on the cross. Put to death because he was obedient. He fulfilled the meaning of the law not every interpretation.

Brunner notes that the meaning of the law is quite simply love agape=self giving love. In his place as the obedient one christ gives himself completely to the mission that was given to him by God. The first element that is required is that JC gave himself out of an act of obedience to GOD.

3.3.13.2. Atonement is a sacrifice.

The fact that JC is the one true high priest turns attention to sacrifice. I am in opposition to Calvin saying that sacrifice is not so much an ultimate sacrifice in the OT sense. Not that God requires large quantities of blood to appease his blood. Nor is the blood of christ different from any other human. But sin is a reality that can only be removed by a real event. That is found in the notion of sacrifice.

God is saying: This is what sin is all about. Can only be conquered by real event. In order to grab attention this has to be a dramatic event like a sacrifice. Atonement includes this notion of sacrifice that is the only way of God teaching the reality of Sin.

3.3.13.3. Atonement includes suffering.

Cannot be done easily without pain. Essential part of atonement includes suffering. Isa 53. One of the basic propostitions is that through sin we hav become liable for punishment. The wages of sin are death. But in our place the servant willingly suffers death. He does not die in a clean fashion but dies horribly. Protestantism sanitizes the crucifixion. Barth's point takes on special meaning. As human beings we are in a state of complete disobedience deserves punishment. The servant of God accepts this punishment instead of us. God then overrules it out of love for his own creation.

3.3.13.4. Atonement cancels a debt.

This debt can be understood like in Matthew 18. Importance of forgiving sins. However the atonement takes this matter of paying the debt out of our hand. Instead Christ ransoms us. While we need to forgive we neednt worry that God will not accept us.

3.3.13.5. Atonement brings forgiveness.

There is a fundamental connection between Gods free offer of forgiveness and Jesus death.

God desires to give proof of his righteousness so that we would understad the seriousness of sins and the act of God to forgive.

3.3.13.6. Summary

Summary of what these 5 points are leadng to:

Atonement is essentially reconciliation. The end result of atonement is the notion of reconciliation. Has been cricitize din some circles. some have said that it is wage. Anything is wage that you do not define.

I used this because in one term it describes all that has been accomplish in Christ's work. Two problems. The term reconc. is not used very often in NT. Only Matt 5 else only Pauline. This term does not seem to be very significant. The term Trinity is not used at all in NT, yet it is a important term.

3.3.13.7. Reconciliation

The term reconciliation is not been accorded a great deal of influence in the history of the Church. What Jesus accomplished has been explained in other terms. Reconciliation became central with Reformers.

Despite this I will advocate the use of this term. Three reasons:

- ◆ Reconciliation is a appropriate term since it presupposes a relationship. In order for parties to be reconciled there must be a previous relationship. So this notion speaks to the fact that the relation between God and human existed prior to reconciliation. That leads to

- ◆ Reconciliation presupposes estrangement. You needn't be reconciled if you had not had any falling out with them. This speaks to the fact that there is a break to the relationship preceding the relation. Enmity between human and GOD because of Sin. Calvin: God cannot love the unrighteousness that we have become. This does not mean that the relationship has been completely destroyed. Even if we do not want to have anything to do with it.
- ◆ In this act of reconciliation God takes initiative. God is the reconciler. He did not break the relationship. Because of this recon cannot be understood in a fashion but only in a relationship. Reconciliation cannot be delivered by sacrament but only effected as an individual accepts the invitation of God. When one accepts this invitation one enters into a new relationship with God. To sum up the whole view of Christ as God is to return us to the relationship with God.

3.4. Kingly Office

The core of Jesus message was the kingdom was at hand. This topic is discussed under eschatology. What does it mean to say that Jesus is King? Certainly Jesus preached the coming kingdom. Yet Jesus is more than a Prophet. He inaugurated this kingdom and presented it to others. In JC you have the kingdom present. In Jesus the sovereign authority of God is present like never before. Kingdom established in unusual fashion. Jesus did not accept Satan's offer nor did he smite down Satan and take the kingdom without him. The way he won and exercised his power is by becoming powerless. He exhibited powerlessness. On the cross Christ disarmed the principalities and power. As he is most powerless Christ received power.

Of whom is he king? One thing that the church affirmed is that as King Christ is lord of all. All of Creation is Christ's subject. Yet it is evident that not all confess Christ's name. The Lordship of Christ is both a reality and a potentiality.

Political leaders can enforce external obedience. However they cannot enforce inner obedience. That comes only from confidence in love. That is something that we receive and offer back to whom we call Lord. JC is the recipient of an inner obedience. We will always as Christ enables us be obedient to us. The Lordship over all the earth will not exist until he puts all enemies under his feet.

4. The Holy Spirit

Weber not leaving discussion of Christology but we are looking at the issues from a different angle.

4.1. Jesus and the Spirit

The best way to understand Christ is to survey his relationship to the spirit. Olaf Hansen thinks that we should see Jesus as a spirit filled human. Some elements that argue for it:

Twofold relationship between Jesus and the Spirit. Receives Spirit at Baptism. Sends spirit at the end. Spirit provides the link between Jesus and God and God and believer.

JC was a human totally possessed by the Holy Spirit.

Support from synoptics. Jesus talks about an attack on the spirit as an attack on himself. Also Mk 1:8. Baptism with the spirit.

This leads to the idea that Jesus is completely linked with the spirit. G.W.H. Lampe Jesus by the spirit is the agent of God's redemptive agency. The divine element is the spirit that possessed Jesus.

Some who think that this is the way out of the problem. Others too many new problems.

John seems to add. John 1 Jesus alone seems to be divine without the spirit. The Father is present in him by his word and spirit.

4.2. Overview of Biblical depictions

4.2.1. Old Testament

Lloyd Neve *The spirit of God in the OT*. He more or less looks at every mention of the spirit in the OT. Spirit is identified by Hebrew term as blowing as some kind of active principle not passive. Gen 1 spirit involved in primordial ordering of the elements. In other the spirit is seen as that what brings life. Gen 2 Breath of life breathed into Adam. Loss of breath means death.

This points out that in some way God is seen as active in this world and that life itself is dependant on God's activity.

I have divided the history of Israel into 4 periods. The spirits acts in differnt ways indifferent times.

4.2.1.1. Period of early Prophets.

Spirit active in the life of certain individuals seen as uniquely possessed by God. Gideon. This possession is seen as temporary. Samson went back to normal after period of possession acting like a beserker.

Spirit is there to do certain tasks with the individual.

4.2.1.2. Period of establishment of the nation of Israel.

Spirit still is selective. Idea here is that when the spirit inhabits someone it changes his behaviour. Originally Kings and prophets were seen as being anointed with the spirit. After the reign of Solomon the endowment of the Kings with the spirit was no longer evident. The cloak of the spirit falls on the shoulders of the prophets.

4.2.1.3. Exile and Restoration.

Spirit is seen as someone who could be described in more inclusive terms. Spirit promised to all. Spirit will not be selective anymore. This continues on to be the major promise that Israel holds before itself.

4.2.1.4. Intertestamental period.

Israels feelings are less than conclusive. There were two parties. Somewould identify the spirit with the spirit of phrophecy in the world of old. Now scripture. Primary role of Spirit was the scripture. In the future the spirit will come again, but now it is absent and role is fulfilled by scripture and rabbinical tradition.

Other party would say: The spirit was active in the past and continues in the presents and point to groups like the Essenes or the Zealots. At the same time the groups would agree that history comes to a time when the spirit comes on the entire nation.

4.2.2. New Testament

Begins with the annoucement of the impending birth of John the Baptist who will be filled with the spirit from conception. The purpose was to set John apart as the herald of the new age. Prepare Israel for a great change in its history. In his ministry John acts like an OT prophet.

There is the baptism of Jesus and the coming of the spirit in all four Gospels. J.Dunn "On Exorcism" in NIDNTT. Jesus explains his ability to exorcise demons (Mk 12). Jesus expects his listeners to understand that he gets the power from the spirit and that the kingdom of God is therefore at hand.

Dunn we see that the eschatological rule is already operative. Kingdom of God operating within the world. Jesus claims unique empowering of the Spirit. there were other exorcists. His acts of exorcism do have a special significance. Jesus appears to see his ability of exorcism not as his innate power but as from the spirit.

When Jesus speaks of his inspiration he speaks as if he was a prophet endowed by the spirit. He is claiming the person who brings upon the later time in history. The spirit is seen as the energizing part of Jesus, while Jesus is the focus of the Spirit's activity.

Early church has many prophets bringing the word of the Lord. The spirit sends the missionary and makes the decision where the Gospel would be preached next. In the early days of the church the spirit is active within the individual and in the church guiding the believers. In Paul the spirit definitely plays a major role. The spirit is the mark of a believer being in Christ. The believer's body is the dwelling place of God. All believers to a certain extent.

He understands the spirit in an eschatological sense. The spirit is also a guarantee that Christ will complete what was begun. Responsible not only for initial change but also empowering the believer in sanctification. Through the spirit the believer experiences Christ. Christ is someone who can be known only experientially and the spirit gives us the opportunity.

The spirit makes the relationship with God possible.

4.2.2.1. John's Theology of the Spirit

Spirit anointed him at his baptism and is handed over by Jesus at the crucifixion. Christ gave up the spirit. John sometimes emphasizes the unity of Christ and the spirit. 1 John refers to paraclete a term given to the Jesus but in other places also refers to the spirit. Primary lesson appears to be that the spirit continues the message of Christ in the church. There is this strong relationship between Christ and the spirit even after the resurrection and ascension.

4.2.3. Philosophical bickering

Church received this understanding of the spirit and sooner or later would have to do something. History of Church can be divided into two periods.

4.2.3.1. Period of benign neglect.

Speaks only of theologies view of the spirit. Does not describe the experience. Up to 300 the church was aware of the activity of the spirit. Spirit was present in every aspect of the church, but the Church did not stop to think about it. One of the main reasons that there was a greater need to defend the person of Christ. No need to address any question about the Spirit. Arians and the Gnostics were the problem. If there would not have been Montanism there would even be less.

Montanism began as a renewal movement. People felt that the Church grew more and more lax in its discipline. They were seen as losing spiritual empowerment. Montanism says that we need to reassess our understanding and implement stringent discipline like in the early church. That was dangerous to the established church. The first response was just "It ain't so". Then after then they discovered that no one prophesied for 150 years. Then they said that the age of the spirit was in the past to give us the word of the Lord. No need of the spirit to continue to be active (Same as in the intertestamental period).

Tertullian was a very important convert to Montanism. He was an important theologian at the time. He taught the spirit's divinity in a clear fashion. Argues that the spirit is closely joined with the Father in substance. Is one with Father and Son. The HS is God. No one had ever said that. In the end Montanism was declared a heresy and Montanism died out. A couple of things became evident at the end of this period. Abundant references to the Spirit but not as much as about the Son. More devotional type discussion. Most of these references spoke about the spirit's work rather than about his nature.

The spirit was seen as the inspirer of scripture and the sanctifier of the believer. Rarely is the spirit called God. Definition is left open.

4.2.3.2. Preoccupation with the person.

Speaks solely of theologic aspects of the spirit.

A time when the church had to think intellectually about the spirit. Montanism challenge the church about the understanding of the spirit. Following there is a preoccupation with the person. The disputes of the 4th century changed the role of the spirit as Arianism changed the role of the Son.

General frame on how the church changed it.

At the end of 4th century church rarely would speak of the spirit as divine later very confident that the spirit was define. This evolution is evident in the nicene creed. Original creed was the creed in use in several churches ended with "We believe in one holy spirit". Pretty vague. Was first shortened more "And the holy Spirit". Just tacked on. The creed was later reconfiment at constantinaople in 381. The affirmation had been expandedn "And the Spirit the Lord and lifegiver and proceeds from the Father". The question that arises is the eternal procession of the Spirit. John 15:26. This was one of the passages looked at what exactly says what is the case.

4.2.3.3. Filioque

The Constantinopelian Creed defined the procession from the father. In the West the Creed appeared with procession from the Father and the Son.

Most elements of the Western Church approved this changed in 487. The East said Augustine did it! They felt that Augustine was the greatest enemy to the church since Arius. For the Eastern Church theological progress is not something to be esteemed but to be avoided. It is inappropriate to add something to it.

The question is wheter it is produced by the Father or also by the Son. Filioque-Clause. Variety of reason why the eastern church refused this. One was where the authority is to accept doctrine. Eastern Church only the council can do it! Western church well someone has to have authority, Pope!

The basic issue apart from power play is the view of the trinity. The eastern church tended to emphasize the difference of persons within the trinity. The father as being the source or origin of the son and the spirit. The West tended to see the trinity not as a triangle but more in terms of a hierachy. Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son. West thought the Son as being over the Spirit. East roughly equality of Son and Spirit.

This resultet in one more thing. Any discussion of the spirit was within the larger concept of the Trinity. Attention moves away to dealing with the works of the spirit. How the spirit brings the benefits of christ to me.

5. Salvation as the Work of the Spirit

Move to the various aspects of the doctrine of salvation. Different way of looking at the spirit and what the spirit does:

5.1. Order of Salvation

We will proceed by the order of salvation. What must I do to be saved? This was a center that lead to the reformation. The debate took place on a variety of level. There was general agreement at the time of the reformation that the atonement is sufficient for our salvation. Controversy around how to receive it and what to do with it? The way that this question has been approached is by means of "ordo salutis" (order of salvation) attempt to discern a sequence of events as that individual comes under the power of Christ. Weber: Such an order cannot be understood as a temporal sequence. Every time we tried to do

that the NT tipped us up. NT has a couple of orders of salvation 1 Cor 6:11. Vs. Ro 8:29+30. The order is one of perception. We are temporal creatures and therefore we have to think in terms of time.

I am going to fiddle around with it a bit because I think that is what the NT implies.

The purpose for this order of salvation is the archievin of a unity with Christ. Telos (Gk.) which we translate as end but as end of a process, a goal. A goal toward something moves. Salvation is propelling us to something else. This union with God can be understood in three forms.

- I. Federal Union. Speaks to the notion of the substitutionary nature of the atonement (Lutheran sense). Christ died for our sins and in our place.
- II. Spiritual Union. Believers are indwelled by the spirit. Vinebranch equivalent with Jesus (John 15).
- III. Mystical Union

Mystical union is seen to be something mysterious. It has to do with knowledge available only through faith not by reason. Mystical union is not something where I could stand before you and describe what is going to happen. I cannot give you anything like a direct experience of union. Because of the nature of this you cannot describe it fully to others (Ineffable).

You are speaking about experiencing God directly.

Individual experience is needed.

5.2. Union with Christ

Union of Christ is based in a time when God made certain decisions. Election. Union with Christ experienced in the choice that we experience when we are called. This call results in us being regenerated. Results in a change in ourselves. This change is sanctified in Christ Jesus. Our union is based in the past and based in the presence where Christ sanctifies us and continues in the future past the boundary of our earthly lives.

Finally I am going to argue that union with Christ is something that cannot be dissolved. Once someone has been united with Christ this union will be maintained. Perseverance of the Saints. At this point I have to anticipate and mention the idea of persistence and the problem that this idea has of apostasy. If scripture taught once saved forever saved. But there are instances where it speaks about apostasy. Generally the notion of apostasy has to do something with somebody repudiates the witness of the spirit. There are varying degrees of separation from God. Distinction between backsliding and apostasy. Apostates never come back to Christianity. 1 John 5:16 Apostasy is blaspheming the work of the spirit. Describing the power to heal as power of Satan. Apostates belong to a particular class of people, they made at one time a commitment to the church. Heb 6:4 once been enlightened. Tasted the goodness of the word of God and then deny it. -> Profaned the word of God. There is no repentance for that one (Heb 6:4;10:29).

5.2.1. Apostasy?

Scripture speaks that once God has chosen a course of action he continues those action. John 10 My sheep hear my voice, no one shall snatch them away. Those who have been called by God will never forsake them. People often talk about the perseverance of the faithful. People remain firm because God is with them. Paul to Phil 1:6. The work that God has begun will be completed by God. However the passages from Hebrews remains a sticking point. This has never been completely resolved.

One attempt to solve this was the emphasize on Calvin Matt 22:14. Calvin says: God calls all of us: Return to me, but most don't because only a few are chosen. Perseverance is found within the second group. Perseverance is a sign of election. In the doctrine of election there is always the question how do

you know? You remain firm. If you fall away then you are not part of the elect. If you worry about it then you are concerned that you remain firm. A place of realized eschatology. Each of us will taste beforehand.

5.3. The idea of the Call

Vocation. That we can speak about this in terms of salvation and ministry. Here I am focusing on God initiating the relationship.

First appears in OT as Israel is the chosen people. Quite often it takes the context of judgment. Because Israel is been called they have a special responsibility to God.

God continues to look for his people although they were faithless in the relationship with him. JB preached both warning and summons to repentance. The coming of Jesus continues this call but there is a greater emphasis on invitation. Notion of calling in both old and New Testament based on God as initiator and humans as responding.

Different types of calls:

5.3.1. General Call (universal call)

Seen as essential equiv to the proclamation of the Gospel. God speaking to people as the Gospel is proclaimed. Any place that the Gospel is proclaimed God is speaking to the people. This call is important event to those who have no chance of salvation because this is a ground for the judgment.

5.3.2. Special Call

Speaks to the idea that within those that respond God has spoken directly. In order for an individual to respond to the Gospel, God must speak directly to the individual. Speaks to God working within an individual. Internal. This is considered as always successful.

Spoken of as effectual. This call affects salvation and brings it about. The reason that the reformed branch emphasizes this is because of the view of humanity. Scots confession argues that only through the work of the spirit human beings can answer.

Human beings are so dead and perverse that they cannot respond to the Gospel unless the spirit is there.

There is a problem of responsibility here. Here is the paradox of Grace. If you respond that is grace, if you did not then you are a sinner. If you are saved it is not because you did it, if not it is your fault.

The important thing is that it is God who initiated the relationship. It point to that we do not go to seeking God.

5.4. Regeneration

If we are called then there is the need for some kind of response. God is calling for you to respond.

Speaking about a radical change in someone. A rebirth. Definitely speaks of a radical change.

- I. As the case in physical birth a new being comes into existence. Baptisms in the old days really pictured this. You are baptized to signify you infancy. Then you were fed milk and honey to signify this. The idea of new names given at baptism.
- II. Focused on fact that we are recipients of God's grace. We did not get ourselves born. It would be odd if we got ourselves reborn. You need to be taken out of where you are and placed in a different environment.

III. Birth introduces the principle of live. When you are born you become alive. For the most part the beginning of your life is when you are born. Reborn introduces within us a new life. John 3:3. We become entirely new beings in this process.

There are a couple of points that I need to raise here:

- i. The question of infant regeneration. Can Infants be regenerated?
- ii. Rebirth does not need to be tied to a specific event at a specific time. Paul had a dramatic experience. Others did not have this experience. No reason to deny the possibility of infant regeneration. We read that JB will be filled by the spirit from the womb on.
- iii. Connection between regeneration and baptism? People have argued strongly for a particular position. Baptism=rebirth. This does appear to have some support. John 3:5. Acts 22:16. Once again this is not the place to delve into. Regeneration has always been linked to the notion of baptism. They are in some way connected. Baptism speaks to the reality of rebirth. To the fact that it is a real change.

5.5. Conversion (Faith)

Both associated with rebirth but also speaks to the Future. Important part is this idea of faith. Theological discussion of faith tends to focus on the objective things in faith and the relationship to conversion.

Calvin speaks of faith as the parent of repentance. Faith is what brings about true repentance.

Puritans: Repentance precedes faith.

William Ames: Repentance as something that precedes faith and a cause of faith. Faith is also found in the unregenerate. Insofar as repentance can turn someone away from Christ faith is required. In order to have true repentance faith is required. Like RC notion of repentance.

Repentance in NT metanoia. Radical change of mind and position. Going in to opposite position. Sin become something that cannot be explained away. We feel sorrow for the things that we have done. RC has developed a thinking about the sorrow. Two kinds of sorrows.

Attrition: Sorrow that someone feels for sin because of the consequences. Fear of punishment.

Contrition: Sorrow that we feel because we have offended God. Love of God.

Attrition can just come as a human response. Contrition requires the divine element. We cannot do this unless we know that God first loved us. Repentance can be seen as more than just one act. Something that involves sorrow and continues through the rest of our lives. Another distinction is that between remorse and repentance. Repentance is a hopeful sorrow, hope that sin will be forgiven. Remorse is a sorrow that is hopeless. They feel that there will be no forgiveness.

Can remorse be transferred into repentance? Difficult to generalize and answer.

Repentance seems to require faith.

5.5.1. What is the nature of faith?

Faith is used in two senses in theology.

- ♣ Inner attitude towards Christ or God. Sign that we trust God. Refer to the content of Christian teaching. A system of doctrine.
- ♣ Both elements appear in the NT. Certainly in the NT there is a strong sense that faith includes the idea of trust.

The notion of faith as the content of doctrine appears in 1 Tim 3:9. Jude 3 encouraged the reader to content for the faith.

Distinction between the act of believing and the content of faith.

When you do that you run into the problem of the subjective and the objective.

Example logical conception of getting as faith as something objective in is Aquinas. Faith is an act of the intellect.

- I. Faith begins with the act of believing in a God.
- II. Believe in God. Move to the acceptance that there is one particular divine person that is God.
- III. Believing God. Once you have made this commitment to a particular divine being you exercise trust.

When you get to the Reformation you have a stronger emphasis on faith as an dedication. Calvin also trying to hold together subjective and objective: A firm a certain knowledge of God's benevolence... Faith is a knowledge of what God has done to us. This knowledge is founded on the promise in Christ. Because we have received the promise give in Christ. Both revealed in our minds and sealed in our hearts.

Heidelberg Catechism described faith as a sure knowledge and a firm confidence that the holy spirit works in my heart. There is both the content of faith and this inner attitude.

The pietist afterwards emphasize faith as a subjective event. Others guard the doctrine. There is no simple solution so this still continues.

One attempt was Luther. Faith is assenting to the promise of God in which he offers forgiveness and justification. Right doctrine tells you what Christ has done to you. More than believe it live it!

5.5.2. Assurance

That leads to the last problem in conversion that is the idea of assurance.

Question refers to How can we be certain that our faith is a saving faith? The answer depends on the tradition that one is a part of. For tradition with holiness this is very important because you might loose it. For most of protestantism this question is of less consequence because our assurance is not based on ourselves but on Christ. Otherwise we would be in the situation as the middle ages where people constantly did things to be assured of salvation.

Some have complete assurance of their salvation, other must constantly plead. For some people life will be a constant struggle. Even those who have a complete sense of assurance do so because this is based on God. Grounds of Assurance:

- I. Because of the universal and unconditional promise of God.
- II. Our assurance is based on the infinite and sure love of God. He will not set us aside.
- III. On the infinite merit of the work of Christ.

Focus upon the promises given to us by Christ (Charles Hodge).

Faith seems to be as Weber will say made up of two things:

- God's faithfulness
- Human trust.

Both are necessary in order for someone to exercise faith.

In the end faith is a knowledgeable trust. Faith is an attitude that should express confidence.

5.6. Justification

5.6.1. Introduction

What is going on in the objective relationship between God and us. Issue of Justification. Change of status.

Like many other terms justification is not an explicit theological term. It was a legal term. One is justified when one is declared as not guilty.

The guiding presupposition is that all have been judged guilty and therefore all of us need to make some sort of satisfaction to God who is the judge. Doctrine of atonement about how this satisfaction can be made. But how does this relate to me?

5.6.2. Luther

Instead of beginning with the ancient church and move through I am going to begin with Luther. Because with Luther justification became the essence of the understanding of salvation.

The thing that started it was his 95 thesis. He does not mention justification by faith at all but criticizes all other possibilities. As the argument went on Luther came to the point that the justification is available solely by faith. This has to be maintained for four reasons:

- I. Chief doctrine of Christian religion. Cornerstone of Christian life and faith. To lose this doctrine is to lose the church.
- II. We must affirm this statement because it distinguishes Christianity from false religions. False religions teach salvation by works. All religions apart from Christianity teach this. Salvation is based solely on God declaring us as righteous. Justification by faith.
- III. Comfort to penitent sinners. While we yet sin our sins are forgiven. We can never totally be victorious. God is always forgiving.
- IV. Chief doctrine because it gives all glory to God. It is God alone who accomplishes our salvation.

Justification has to do with the imputation. Forensic theory of justification. "Imputation of righteousness" righteousness is not given to us. But our faith in Christ is seen as righteousness. We do not become righteous in ourselves but God sees us as righteous in Jesus Christ. Believing in God is what God sees as righteousness. We still can be sinners but nevertheless God sees us as righteous.

5.6.3. Calvin

Calvin agrees with Luther to an extent. Systematizes it in an almost legal fashion. Essentially three ways of expressing justification.

- Justified before God
- Justified by faith.
- Justified by works.

These are the three possibilities. How do these three possibilities work out. You are justified when God looks at you and says you are righteous and then accepts you on the basis of this righteousness.

To be justified by works occurs when the life of a person is so pure that when you come before the throne of God and you can justify the divine God.

By faith one accepts the righteousness of God and is clothed in that and by that is accepted by God. Calvin sets this up that the first two cannot occur.

Justification is the acceptance of God as if we were righteous. Justification itself consists in forgiveness of sins and the imputation of righteousness. Does not depend on our efforts but on God's acceptance of us. So we can be both a sinner and righteous at the same time.

5.6.4. Osiander

(Lutheran theologian). He was opposed to the notion of imputation of righteousness. Instead he argued for the impartation of righteousness. His doctrine of justification is controlled by his image of God. Within each human there is the image of God which is the dwelling place of God (Theory of God-shaped whole). The son of God would have entered the world even if there was no sin because we are unfinished to turn us into complete human being. Justification involves truly being righteous not only saying to be so. The righteousness of God dwells in Christ. When we dwell in us his righteousness is imparted into us so that we become righteous.

Problem with sin after conversion. It was just an attempt.

5.6.5. Response: The Council of Trent

In response to the Reformers the Church called an ecumenical council 1545-1563 in Trent. It more or less was an attempt to look at the whole system of theology. The reformation has raised questions about everything. Not to get back with the protestant but to get their own act together again. Because the notion of justification was so important and it was the first thing.

1547 Three parts follows Trends view.

5.6.5.1. Our inability to save ourselves.

Agrees with reformers. Spoke of the gracious nature of the first justification and spoke of baptism. The decree begins that justification is by grace alone.

We are completely unclean and we can only become children of God by adoption.

Necessary things to prepare an adults for conversion is Prevenient Grace. Grace that comes before conversion = Gods call to us. God's call is seen as a sense of grace.

Quickening Grace is seen as the grace that gives life. A helping grace. In the course of an adults conversion quickening grace allows the human to respond.

Necessity of baptism. It is completing the conversion. Now you are justified.

A state of justification includes renewal of our inner selves.

5.6.5.2. Justification

We are now to be renewed day by day as the decree says: Mortifying the flesh. Faith with good works. Now you embark on a lifelong process of justification. Faith cooperating with Good works. You are increasing your justification.

Similar to protestant holiness understandings.

5.6.5.3. Possibility of losing justification.

It is possible to lose it again. Simply speaking those who sin forfeit justification. For most people this is the way life is going to look. Step on the first justification. Then you fall of and go back again. Hope you die in a state of grace.

Again justified when they exert themselves through penance to regain the grace that is lost.

Council of Trent teaches two types of justification. First by baptism and the second progressive justification by faith with good works.

5.6.6. Three main things about justification:

- I. The Bible does not think of the atonement in a quantitative fashion. No deposits were deposited in the treasury of merit. Withdrawals to cover sins? Picture was taken to be the real understanding. If you think in that way it tends to separate from the person who did it. You are attempting to access the bank account instead of being interested in Jesus. Medieval Priest is center of focus since he accesses this bank account.
- II. Righteousness is not something that exists apart from Christ. Righteousness comes from participation in Christ. The righteousness that we have is not our own righteousness. Justification could be seen as a continuing application of Christ's righteousness.
- III. Justification is something that cannot be abstracted from faith. Justification flows from faith. We receive righteousness through our faith in Christ. Those are the three main aspects.

Does James teach justification by faith? Contrary to Reformers that taught justification by faith. Luther says that only apostolic writings should be in the scripture. James was not apostolic since no apostle would speak like that. But James is apostolic acknowledged by the Christ.

So how do you reconcile that?

The church found a way to reconcile that. It tended to draw inspiration from two extrabiblical sources. 1 Makk 2:52; Philo. 1 Makk speaking to Abraham's offering of Isaac. That was considered righteousness. Philo this offering was motivated by faith and gained righteousness. Works that are motivated by faith help you to become more righteous. The result comes out full blown in Trent where you have an affirmation that you have to do certain things. That is why the Reformation tended to move away from that. The church swings back and forth on this.

5.7. Sanctification

A decisive thing within Church. It deals with human thought and behaviour. There is the desire to justify ourselves and condemn the others. Sancta holiness. Seems to speak of sinlessness.

Weber: When you use sanctification with Good works it can become very egotistic. Guard your works. Seek perfection. He argues that the opposite is true. Sanctification is not to be about me but about freeing myself from the effort and concern about me. It should be a liberating notion.

5.7.1. Biblical background

qadas = Hebrew. Sacred holiness. Apart from ourselves. Higher. Because God is holy he can establish things that are holy. For example the day of atonement. Certain things are holy. Things around the ark of the covenant. You can be killed when coming into contact with such holiness. However by relation to these things people can be made holy. Holiness is given by God. However there is also an ethical component. The ark did not necessarily make them holy. By their way of life the people and the individuals have to show that they belong to the God of Israel. The holiness of the people is grounded in that God is Holy.

The NT has the same sort of idea. hagios. Major shift is that instead of referring to God as the source of holiness it shifts to Christ. There is however a couple of ways in which you can view this process of holiness. At times similar to justification. There is also an emphasis on ethical perfection. You must

have an ethical life (Even in Romans). Sanctification seen as a gift from God. God empowers you to live an ethical life (Rom 6:2).

5.7.2. Roman Catholic Position

The RC position is the standard for the greatest part of Christianity. RC does not use sanctification. Not as referring to a special thing. They think of sanctified as being justified. Two sides of the same coin. That is their idea of sanctification. Justification is something that is the result of a disposition of doing something. Justification is not only remission of sins but also the renewal of the person. Sanctification of the larger concept of Justification. That worked for most of the history of the church.

5.7.3. Reformation

The Reformation began with a radical different idea of sanctification. Sanctification the believers spontaneous response to a previous address to what God has done for us. Luther speaks about sanctification in two senses.

- ◆ Wider sense. HS making me holy. Sanctification is imparted to us. The Spirit gives us holiness.
- ◆ Narrower sense. The Spirit has empowered me and I now can overcome sin do good works. Possible because the spirit made us holy. Good works is everything that God does. It does not make you holy but your response to you having been made holy.

Calvin does have much on sanctification. Emphasized the personal holiness but did not have a sense of sanctification because his little confidence in what human beings deeds.

Catechism: He begins that all our works prior to our justification are best described as vicious. Nothing but displeasure. Reason they are your acts and you think that makes you great. Not the acts in themselves but what you do.

Once we are saved God is pleased by acts because he chooses to accept them as favourable things. God's will determines if something is appropriate. Difference between good work and evil work is whether God accepts it or not. That explains Cain and Abel. God choose not to accept one offering. Cain choose to get upset about it. Even those works ordered by God and done are tainted by our sinfulness. Every claim to be good is boasting.

God has promised reward for those who do what is acceptable. God expects us to do what is proper and will reward us. We pursue true holiness but this is not an end in itself but leads to union with Christ. Calvin in his book of the golden Christian life. Holiness is not a merit but a gift of Christ that allows us to cling to him and follow through.

Concludes: No works or mean that would look highly respectable to God. God will decide if they are acceptable.

Calvin feels that the true freedom comes by leaving the strain of gaining acceptance from God. God sees what you do as acceptable.

Not long after the reformation the whole thing arose again: What is my motivation? Relation between sanctification and the believer becomes problematic again.

5.7.4. Entire sanctification, perfection (Wesley).

Westminster confession: Sanctification takes place throughout the whole person but remains unfinished in this life. WC saw irreconcilable war between flesh and spirit. Sanctification is entire in the sense that the entire person is sanctified but not complete. Only after resurrection sinless through union with Christ.

Pushed by John Wesley. JW doctrine of sanctification is composed of two parts. Pulled from variety of sources.

- A. We are sanctified like we are justified by faith alone. Faith is the only condition of sanctification just as for justification. Without faith no one is sanctified. Only through faith and nothing else comes sanctification
- B. Sanctification should be understood in a gradual process. Can result in the end in becoming perfect. Should an individual be expected to be saved from any sin before death? Psalm 30:8. Yes. Ez 2:26+29. No promise could be more plain. 2 Cor 5:1. Cleanse ourselves perfecting holiness.

JW feels that there is a strong scriptural support that Christians can be free from sin. John 3:8. the work of the devil therefore Christ has destroyed sin. It is no longer a problem for Christian.

In NT prayers and demands for that. If we pray that then it must be possible. If we pray to be delivered from evil then we are. God would not command something that we cannot do.

A Christian is insofar perfect as to not commit sin. Not on your own effort. This started the holiness tradition. Methodism had a sense for the need of holiness there was a sense that theoretically a Christian could be perfect but never seen one. The holiness movement tried to live perfect of sin. You focus on what you are doing. You have to focus on your own group.

A split in Protestantism. RC was correct in saying that you have to work out your own salvation. Many responses. Weber offers one. Instead of firing dogmas, both sides have never stopped to think that sanctification appear in plural terms. It means that sanctification is carried out in and upon a community. We should focus on the people of God. God is making a holy people. That would allow for a sense of right living without individualism.

Secondly our holiness is grounded in the fact that Jesus is the only holy one. Just as we are justified so we are sanctified in Christ. Stop focusing on yourself. That is the error of humanity. Focus on Christ. In both cases we can reject the temptation of thinking how we act and focus on Christ.

The purpose of sanctification is to be in Christ and appear to be a process since it is part of living rather than being. It seems to be part of conversion. We have to keep turning. Repentance keeps to be important. The more we are sanctified the more we are converted. This work it is something accomplished in Christ and applied by the Spirit. Christ has set the basic for our sanctification and we received this as the holy Spirit.

Sanctification is seen as a counterpart to original sin. We are sin. Original sin is something we start out with. I did not sin when Adam sin yet I did and this sin is my responsibility. We share guilt for something that we were not a part of. that places us in a position of being judged guilty for an act we did not commit. Sanctification is something that we receive, yet we are responsible for the lives we live.

5.7.5. Conclusio

To be part of Christ people does not make you not responsible but increases the responsibility.