The title of our study indicates the main subjects that must be investigated. Before we can speak of life after death we must know what is meant by life and what is meant by death. We are to speak of these in terms of man who is the subject of life, death and life after death.

Biblical man is seen as being basically a psychosomatic unity. Body and soul do not denote parts of man but man's entire being from different perspectives. This view of human nature profoundly influences the concept of the future life after death in its anthropological dimension. Human life here is an embodied existence and the life after death was described as an embodied existence. Resurrection of the body was the form of expression used by Biblical man of the future life. Life, here or hereafter, requires a body.

Life is not simply duration, but rather means the quality and content of the life that is lived. A basic part of life is that it is lived in fellowship with God and His people. Man breaks this fellowship through sin. Death is not only the divine boundary placed on life but also is the enemy of life and the divine judgment on sin. The life of Jesus is seen as a struggle against and victory over the evil and hostile forces opposed to God and man (esp. a victory over sin and death). Thus the death and resurrection of Jesus is the victory which has won our redemption and "brought life and immortality to light" (2 Tim. 1:10). The believer's life, though still lived in the midst of the evil powers, even now experiences in Christ the new life.
that overcomes death. Fellowship, the community of life with God and those who are His, is restored in Him.

The beginnings of this hope for a life of fellowship with God and Christ is found in the OT when men of faith reached out longingly for unending communion with God (Ps. 73:23ff.). Later developments added to this hope the concept of the resurrection of the body. The body that is to be raised is a body transformed into the likeness of the Body of Christ -- a spiritual body.

The fundamental faith of the NT for a life after death is that it is a life of unending fellowship in and with Christ (resp. God). This is the Christian's life:
(1) we live now in Christ; (2) we will, in some way, be with Him after death; (3) we will be with Him in full fellowship at the Parousia-Resurrection, when our now hidden lives will be revealed (Col. 3:1-4).
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Part I

The Concept of Man as Creature
CHAPTER 1

THE OLD TESTAMENT VIEW

A. Hebrew Psychology

The Hebrews shared with other primitive peoples of their time the same basic view of man. The psychology of the Hebrews was not what we in our day would call "scientific". It was rather that psychology of man which derived its concepts and notions of the nature of man from observations of obvious actions and truths with no attempt at precise analysis. Thus, what we, in reading the Old Testament, are prone to dismiss as fanciful metaphor, was to the Hebrew simple realism. In fact, as H. Wheeler Robinson writes, "the science of the ancient world has often become the poetry of the modern." To primitive man, the obvious difference between a living person and a dead one was the presence or absence of breath. Thus arose the conception of a "breath-soul", which the Hebrews shared with the primitive cultures of their time. The ideas of primitive culture, which were taken up into Israelite

2 Ibid.
psychology, were leavened\(^1\) and modified by the predominantly religious basis of Hebrew thought. H. W. Robinson mentions three such features of Semitic animism to be so leavened:

"The ideas of the breath-soul (and blood-soul), of the psychical function of physical organs, of the ascription of all that is abnormal in conduct and character to the action of invasive spirits."\(^2\) Biblical psychology, then, far from being a scientific view of man and his nature, uses a popular language and a popular approach—one based on observation and coupled to that turn of mind peculiar to so-called primitive thinking in general and Semitic thought in particular.

The Semitic mind is characterised by what A. R. Johnson, following Pedersen, calls "the grasping of a totality."\(^3\) Israelite thought is predominantly synthetic.\(^4\)

Phenomena are perceived for the most part as being in some sort of relation, they have a share, ... in some sort of whole. This recognition of the mental activity of the Israelites as predominantly synthetic, the awareness of totality, is important. It is, perhaps, hardly too much to say that it is the 'open Sesame' which unlocks the secrets of the Hebrew language and reveals the riches of the Israelite mind.\(^5\)

This synthetic method of thinking, this "awareness of totality", governs the Old Testament teaching concerning man.

---

1Ibid., p. 79.
2Ibid., p. 79.
4Johnson, op. cit. Cf. S. A. Cook, Cambridge Ancient History, I (1923), 195ff. (e.g., p. 202, "the Semite was not analytical").
5Johnson, op. cit., pp. 7-8.
Man is not conceived as being made of disparate elements, whether dichotomic or trichotomic. To say man is 'soul' and 'body' is no truer to Hebrew thought than to say man is 'body', 'soul', and 'spirit'. Man "is seen to form a psychical whole."¹ Modern man, following his Greek heritage, speaks of man as having a body but being a soul. The obvious thing to the Hebrew, as well as to other primitive peoples, was that man is a single being. Things are what they seem: thus a bat is a bird or a whale is a fish.² The Hebrew "thought of man as a being with many parts, but they were parts of a whole and never anything more."³ Man is a unity and is viewed as a whole. The whole man may be viewed under the aspects of soul, spirit, flesh and heart, but it is the one man that is considered, though viewed under different aspects.⁴ It is significant that while the Hebrews had many terms for the various parts of the body, they had no term for the whole. Thus, nephesh, ruach, and basar can each stand for the whole of man viewed under different aspects.

Vielmehr wird der lebendige Körper und seine einzelnen Teile so stark als Organe und Träger persönlichen Lebens aufgefasst, dass in jedem Teil die Person in ihrer Ganzheit sich aussern und begriffen werden kann.⁵

The Hebrew had a unitary conception of personality.

¹Ibid., p. 8.
³Ibid.
⁴On this point see Johnson, op. cit., Pedersen, op. cit., the works of H. W. Robinson, and others.
⁵W. Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments, II (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1939), 75.
Another vital characteristic of the Old Testament doctrine of man is its essentially religious basis. Man, in Hebrew thought, was not man alone. That is to say, man does not exist alone, but only in relation to his fellow man and, above all, in relation to God. This characteristic Hebrew approach led them to base everything on the foundation of its relationship with God. Thus the Law was based on divine authority concentrated in a single personal will which makes man a responsible being.\(^1\) In Greek thought the basis of individuality lay in the body (particular) as contrasted with the flesh (general substance). In Israel individuality was based on the indivisible responsibility of each man to God.

The fundamental datum of Israel's view of life is that the individual is summoned to a responsibility which demands to be taken as absolute. The man to whom God's demand comes is recognized as a person, an I, who cannot be represented or replaced by any other.\(^2\)

But the human person, as a responsibly acting I, responding to the call of the divine Thou by action, possesses its unrepeatable unity and independence only in God's act of election, which summons it to a spiritual communion with him.\(^3\)

The Hebrew had little interest in a precise or scientific definition of man. It is the theological truth of man's nature that is paramount. Man cannot be abstracted from his relationship to God and viewed as he is for himself. In the Old Testament man's worth is founded on God's action. Man

---


exists only by God's grace and can only realize his true nature when he hears and obeys God. This strain runs throughout the entire Old Testament and we shall write more of this in the section on "The Creatureliness of Man".¹

B. The Terminology of Hebrew Psychology

We come now to a brief review of some of the more important terms of Hebrew Psychology. No attempt is made to present the material in detail. The reader is referred for further information to the works cited below and in the Bibliography. Our purpose here is to summarize the main concepts and results relating to these terms.

1. Nephesh (Heb. נפש).

A close and precise classification of the uses of Nephesh is exceedingly difficult. Many attempts of this sort have been made.²

E. D. Burton³ makes the following classification which we may find most useful for summarizing the general⁴ uses of this word.

---

¹See also Part II, "The Concepts of Life and Death".
⁴We use "general" advisedly. Brown, Driver and Briggs list no fewer than nine meanings in their Hebrew Lexicon and divide their article into ten main divisions with many more sub-divisions.
1. Soul—"That entity which, residing in a living being makes it alive, and the departure of which is death..." Here see 1 Kings 17:21; Gen. 35:18; Job. 11:20; Ps. 16:10; 30:4; 31:10; Lev. 17:14b; Dt. 12:23; Gen. 9:4, 5; et. al.

2. "Soul, the seat of appetite, emotion, and the like, with no implications of a separate entity, or of the possibility of separate existence."
   a. Seat of appetite, health and vigor. (Dt. 12:20; Num. 11:6; Ps. 78:18; et. al.)
   b. Seat of emotion. (Job. 30:25; Ps. 86:4; Iss. 61:10; et. al.)
   c. Seat of will and moral action. (Dt. 30:2 and with 'heart' frequently.) Cf. also Gen. 49:6; Dt. 4:29; 6:5; Job 6:7; Ps. 74:4; 25:1.
   d. Seat of mentality (rare). (Ezek. 4:13; Dt. 49:15; Ps. 13:3; 35:3.)

3. Life: distinguishes animate from inanimate beings. See Job 2:4; Jer. 51:6; Gen. 9:4; Ex. 4:19; et. al.

4. A living being, a being possessing life.
   a. תי ר י נ; Gen. 1:20, 21, 24, 30; 2:7, 19; 9:10, 12, 15, 16; Lev. 11:60; et. al.
   b. Without תי ר י נ. Here it is applied to man only:1 person (Lev. 17:12); in enumerations

---

1 See Johnson, op. cit., p. 23.
(e.g. Ex. 1:15); as a pronoun (Ps. 11:1; 3:3; 7:3; Gen. 27:4, 19, 25, 31); a dead person (Num. 5:2; Lev. 19:28; 21:1, 11; 22:4; Num. 6:6, 11; 9:6, 7, 10; 19:11, 13; Hag. 2:13).

The original meaning of **Nephesh** is hard to determine. It appears best to hold with Eichrodt,¹ A. R. Johnson² and others that it originally meant 'throat' or 'neck' and then "was aus der Kehle hervorgeht, der 'Atem oder Lebenshauch'."³ Isaiah used it, probably, in this meaning in 5:14 (cf. Hab. 2:5): "Therefore Sheol hath widened its throat (ωτός θορέας), and opened its mouth without limit."⁴ A transition to 'breath' is easy to perceive, though the validity of this sequence is still disputed. At any rate, what is clear is that **Nephesh** has a meaning which is based on physical phenomena. This is quite in keeping with Hebrew, and other primitive, thought forms. In "Israelite thought psychical functions have close physical associations; ..."⁵

The uses of **Nephesh** are so varied that a single word translation of it that holds good in every case is almost, if not in fact, impossible. The usual English translation of 'soul' is not a very happy choice in many respects, for our

¹Eichrodt, Theologie, II, 67.
²Johnson, op. cit., pp. 9f.
³Eichrodt, Theologie, II, 67.
⁴Johnson, op. cit., p. 10 (cf. Jonah 2:5f. for use as 'neck!).
⁵Ibid., p. 9.
modern 'soul' has primarily Greek antecedents and does not admit of any material or physical basis. But an immaterial soul is quite foreign to Hebrew thought. The soul (or Nephesh) is given a physical association and has a material basis. Perhaps the best rendering of Nephesh would be "Person" or better "life". "Das Wort meint zunächst und vor allen Dingen das Leben und zwar in Unterschied von ruach das an einen Körper gebundene Leben."\(^1\) The Nephesh is the vital principle in man or beast which reveals itself in the form of conscious life (see e.g., I Kings 3:11; II Chron. 1:11; Prov. 7:23).\(^2\) Nephesh means "life" (Gen. 37:21; Dt. 19:6, 16; Jer. 40:14, 15; 53:16). As the Israelite made no clear cut distinction between life and death,\(^3\) the Nephesh, in relation to death, may be said to be breathed out or poured out (Jer. 15:9; Job 11:20; Ps. 141:8; Isa. 53:12) and returns when life is restored (I Kings 17:21ff.). Nephesh is used in connection with the appetites. Thus the Nephesh hungers and thirsts (e.g. Prov. 12:10; Num. 11:6; Ps. 107:5, 9 et. al.). It is also used in connection with emotions (Gen. 42:21; Ps. 6:3; 43:5; Judg. 18:25; I Sam. 1:10). The Nephesh can desire something.\(^4\) These uses, and especially its use in relation to desiring, emphasize that unity of purpose which is indicative of the grasping of totality,

---

\(^{1}\)Eichrodt, Theologie, II, 62.

\(^{2}\)Johnson, op. cit., p. 13.

\(^{3}\)See Part II, "The Concepts of Life and Death."

\(^{4}\)For this use of Nephesh with יְנֵפְשָׁה to express desire see Johnson, op. cit., pp. 17f.
characteristic of Hebrew thought. Hophéah is also used as a personal (Job. 30:25; Ps. 33:19; 35:7; Isa. 42:1; 43:4; et. al.) or reflexive pronoun (cf. I Sam. 18:1, 3; Lev. 11:43-4; Dt. 4:9; et. al.). In this use, Hophéah appears to have the purpose of strengthening the statement, of giving it an emotional content. Néphésh also is used to express what we call the "person" or "self". Thus in Gen. 2:7, God breathed into man the breath of life and man became "a living soul" ( נְפֶשׁ), or better, "a living person". This use is also seen in enumerations as when, for example, Abraham is said to have left Haran for Canaan, he took with him the "soul" he had acquired (Gen. 12:5; cf. Gen. 14:21; 36:6; Josh. 10:28, 30, 32, 35, 37, 39; et. al.). Another example is furnished in the legal portions where the offending "soul" is to be cut off from his people (e.g. Lev. 7:20, 31, 27; Num. 15:30f.). With this compare Ezekiel 18:4 ("The soul that sins shall die."). Johnson writes that with the use of Néphésh "to denote a living person it is no far step to its use with reference to a dead one, i.e. a 'corpse'; and indeed this step is actually taken." But in view of the use of Néphésh to denote the whole living person (i.e. body and soul—see e.g. Gen. 2:7), this use of Néphésh is a far step and constitutes a paradox in Old Testament usage. The reference here are Num. 6:6;

---

1Pedersen, op. cit.
2What Johnson calls "a pathetic periphrasis for such a pronoun," op. cit., p. 22.
3Johnson, op. cit., p. 25.

In some cases one speaks of a נֵפֶשׂ that is, the נפֶשׂ of a person who is dead (a "dead body") (see Num. 6:6). In other cases such a definition is not necessary. Thus we see the semantic polarization of נפֶשׂ:

at one extreme it may denote that vital principle in man which animates the human body and reveals itself in the form of conscious life, and at the other extreme it may denote the corpse from which such conscious life has departed.

We may sum up our discussion under נפֶשׂ by again referring to the Hebraic mode of thinking synthetically, that is, what Pedersen calls the grasping of a totality. To speak of man under the term נפֶשׂ does not mean a part of man in isolation from the whole man. It is a means of speaking of the whole man from one particular aspect. In Hebrew thought man does not have a soul but he is a soul. "Such as he is, man, in his total essence, is a soul." נפֶשׂ is not a tertium quid between spirit and body, but denotes the whole man. In no case does a material second self stand behind נפֶשׂ.

Jedenfalls ist nefes als solches Subjekt seelischer

---

1 Ibid., pp. 25f.
4 See Pedersen's discussion on Hebrew thinking as a directing of the whole soul, ibid.
5 Ibid., p. 99.
6 Ibid.
7 Eichrodt, Theologie, II, 68.
Empfindungen etwas wie eine geistige Potenz im Menschen geworden und nähert sich unserem begriff 'Seele'. Und doch bleibt deutlich, dass es dem Hebräer völlig fern liegt, an eine Seele in Sinn eines geistigen Doppelgängers des körperlichen Menschen zu denken, wenn er von nefes redet. Er will vielmehr sagen, dass die betroffenen Triebe und Affekte Ausserungen des persönlichen Lebenstriebes sind, eng zusammenhängend mit dem Leben des Individuums und nur in diesem vorhanden.

Man is a soul and "wer keine Seele ist, ist kein Mensch. Wer ein Mensch ist, ist eine Seele."2 There is no pre-existence of the soul in Israelitic thought.3 The Nephesh does not exist apart from union with a body4 and therefore ceases to exist with the death of man. One can find no dualism of body and soul in the Old Testament, "weil die Seele immer den Leib zur Voraussetzung hat."5 The Nephesh is the animating principle of the body and dependent on the bodily organs for its activity even as these are dependent on it for vitality.6 The Nephesh can stand for the whole person and is, as we have seen, so used. The Nephesh is not "soul" as we usually mean it. In Hebrew thought the soul is both visible and invisible, but it is not immaterial. Furthermore, the Nephesh is dependent on the body—the Nephesh is the animating principle of the body. Man is a unity and "that unity is the body as a complex of parts, drawing their life and activity from a

---

1Ibid., p. 70.
3Such conceptions did enter Judaism in later periods. See, e.g., Wisdom of Solomon, 8:19f.
4Köhler, op. cit., p. 131.
5Ibid.
breath-soul \([\text{Nephesh}]\), which has no existence apart from the body.\(^1\) As Wheeler Robinson has expressed it in a famous sentence: "The Hebrew conceived man as an animated body and not as an incarnate soul."\(^2\) The importance of \text{Nephesh} in describing man lies in its designation of man as created by God and dependent on Him, in its use to describe the whole man under one aspect of his nature and existence, its meaning as the life-principle or principle of animation, and in its relation to and dependence on the body.

2. \text{Rusch}.

The original meaning of the term \(\text{ru'ach}\) was "wind" or "air in motion" and is so used many times in the Old Testament.\(^3\) The word, thus used, varies from a strong wind (e.g. Ezek. 17:10; Jer. 4:11; Job 21:18; Ps. 1:4; Isa. 7:2; \textit{et. al.}), to a gentle breeze (what we would call "a breath of air") (e.g. Jer. 2:24; 14:6; Hos. 8:7). By development it came to be used in the sense of "Spirit", an invisible although not an immaterial spirit. In this meaning it is applied to both God and men, but its special use is as the Spirit \(\text{ru'ach}\) of Yahweh.

The uses of \text{ru'ach} have been classified by many

\(^1\)\textit{Ibid.}, p. 366.
\(^3\)C. A. Briggs, "The Use of \(\text{ru'ach}\) in the Old Testament," \textit{Journal of Biblical Literature}, XIX (1900), 132-45, notes 117 uses in this meaning and Robinson, \textit{The Christian Doctrine of Man}, notes 151. While it is difficult to be precise as to the number of times \text{ru'ach} is used of 'wind', these do at least indicate its frequency.
scholars. Without adhering to the precise number of usages given, we may find Wheeler Robinson's classification a convenient one.

(1) Wind: 131 times.
(2) Supernatural influences acting on man, rarely on inanimate objects: 134 times.
(3) Principle of life (similar to Nephesh): 39 times.
(4) Resultant psychical life: 74 times.

It is not our purpose to discuss the use of ruach in relation to Yahweh, though this is one of its most important uses. We shall confine our discussion for the present to ruach in connection with man. In the earlier strata of the Old Testament ruach is used to denote those who "by physical energy or mental alertness revealed that, as we say, he or she was 'full of life.'" As the wind was observed to fluctuate, so also was man's life seen to fluctuate, i.e. to ebb and flow. The Nephesh was seen to rise and fall between two poles according to its vitality. So also is the case with ruach where it, too, is used to describe this rise or fall of vitality. In this relation it is described in terms of the absence or presence of ruach.

---

3Johnson, op. cit., p. 28.
Thus of Jacob, when told that Joseph was still alive and in Egypt, it was said that "the spirit \([\text{ruach}]\) of their father Jacob revived" (R. S. V., 1

In short, said all the changing circumstances of life man's ordinary physical powers were rightly felt to ebb and flow, just as one's variable moods obviously come and go; and for the Israelite all this might be expressed in terms of the presence or absence of \(\text{Ruach}\). At the same time we must not overlook the fact that in this early period a display of ill feeling might be described, not in terms of one's own \(\text{Ruach}\), but in terms of an\(\text{Ruach}\) (LXX 'evil spirit'), which had its source in Yahweh; and, what is more, any unusual manifestation of physical energy or mental alertness, such as the foresight of an administrator like Joseph, the impulse to action of the so-called 'judges', or the oracular power and extraordinary behaviour of the early prophets (involving, perhaps, a temporary but complete change of character), was normally attributed at this time to the personal influence of the \(\text{Ruach}\) (as the 'Spirit') of Yahweh. 2

Ruach demonstrates a form of polarization according as it described physical or psychical aspects of life. 3 In the former case it is used in the sense of "breath", a synonym for \(\text{Nefesh}\) (e.g. Isa. 42:5). Ruach is used of the 'breath of life' (Gen. 6:17; 7:15; cf. Ps. 105:29; Ezek. 37:1-10) and this breath is a gift of Yahweh. Of the psychical aspects of life, ruach is used of despondency (Josh. 2:11; 5:1; Ps. 143:4; Isa. 57:16; et. al.), an agitated mood (Dan. 2:3) or feelings of

---

1 Gen. 45:27; cf. Judges 15:11; I Sam. 30:12; I Kgs. 10:5; et. al.
2 Johnson, op. cit., p. 30.
3 Ibid., pp. 31ff.
4 On Neshamah used by synecdoche to denote human beings see e.g. Dt. 20:16; Josh. 10:40; XI:11, 14.
distress (Job 15:13).\(^1\) Thus it is possible (in Exilic and especially in Post-exilic times) to use ruach to denote any frame or mood of mind, yes, even to use it to refer to the whole range of man's emotional, intellectual and volitional life.\(^2\) One often speaks of a particular kind of ruach, sometimes from Yahweh, sometimes with no origin designated, rather than speaking in terms of one's own ruach (e.g. Isa. 29:10; Hos. 4:12; 5:12; spirit of wisdom Dt. 34:9; et. al.). These powers are sometimes attributed to the ruach of Yahweh. ( Isa. 11:2). Purposeful action lies in one's own ruach (e.g. Ezek. 11:5; Ps. 77:6; Prov. 1:23; Isa. 26:9). This incentive may come from Yahweh (e.g. Dt. 2:30; I Chron. 5:26). It "is through the activity of the \(^3\) thus ruach can be used of man as the seat of emotions (e.g. Judges 8:3; Job 7:11; Prov. 18:14), the seat of humility and other moral and religious virtues (Ps. 51:12-14 [BBV10-12]; Isa. 57:15; Ps. 34:19; et. al.), the seat of mentality (Job 20:3; Isa. 29:24; Ezek. 11:5b; 20:32; et. al.) and as the seat of volitional action (see above).\(^4\)

Ruach is used in the OT of both God and man.

\(^1\)See Johnson, op. cit., pp. 33f.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 34.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 33.
\(^4\) See Burton, op. cit., p. 58b; Eichrodt, Theologie, II, 66.
Rusach, then, will emphasize the highest sphere of man's existence, for, in that man has rusach he is like God. Rusach is man from the point of view of his highest and best self. Through his rusach man is in touch with the rusach of God. The Rusach is the motive power of the soul.\(^1\) In later books of the OT, rusach becomes a synonym for nephesh. But the primary importance for the understanding of man in the use of the term rusach to describe him, lies in the fact that rusach suggests the life of man in his origin and dependence on God.

Das Leben des Menschen fliesst nicht aus dem Wesen des Geistes, der ihn erfüllt, sondern das Leben fliesst aus dem Gnadenwillen Gottes. Dass er aber lebt, verdankt der Mensch dem Umstand, dass Gottes Geist in ihm ist.\(^2\)

Rusach, then, emphasizes the origin of man in God and his dependence on Him. At death the rusach returns to the God who gave it (Ecol. 12:7). The Psalmist cries out, "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me" (Ps. 51:11), for this would mean death—a separation from God and therefore from life. But by Spirit (ruach) is not meant that part of man which survives death.\(^3\) There is no concept of the immortality of the Soul (nephesh or rusach) or of the spirit (ruach) in the OT.\(^4\) But spirit does also designate that higher aspect of human life in which man

\(^1\) Pedersen, op. cit., p. 105.  
\(^2\) Köhler, op. cit., p. 127.  
\(^3\) See Eichrodt, Theologie, II, 67.  
reaches and fulfills his highest destiny.\(^1\)

It stands for those more exceptional and unusual endowments of human nature which suggest God as their immediate source, the more normal nephesh being taken for granted. It links man to God, as though it were a door continually open to His approach.\(^2\)

One word remains to be said, a word concerning the relation of nephesh and ruach.\(^3\) Man, such as he is, is Nephesh, (Ex. 35:21). Both the heart and spirit act upon the center of the soul and urge it in a certain direction, towards action.\(^4\) "But whereas the heart is at the same time the centre of the soul and the substance gathering round it and determining its strength, the spirit is more particularly the motive power of the soul. It does not mean the centre of the soul, but the strength emanating from it, and, in its turn, reacting upon it."\(^5\)

Spirit is also the strength of the soul (Micah 3:8; Num. 27:18; Dt. 34:9; Isa. 11:2). A further distinction is that nephesh is always bound to a body.\(^6\) The Nephesh may be said to die, but the ruach is never said to die. Ruach is the life-element as principium, the nephesh is the same as working and active in the creature as principiatum.\(^7\)

---

\(^1\)The concept of man as a spiritual being is worked out more fully in the New Testament concept of \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\omega\mu\kappa \tau\alpha\iota\iota\sigma\varsigma\) and \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\omega\mu\kappa \tau\alpha\iota\iota\sigma\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\) as over against \(\psi\upsilon\chi\varsigma\nu\sigma\varsigma\).

\(^2\)Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, p. 82.

\(^3\)On this see particularly Eichrodt, Theologie, II, 68, and Pedersen op. cit., pp. 102ff.

\(^4\)Pedersen, op. cit., p. 104.

\(^5\)Ibid.

\(^6\)Köhler, op. cit., p. 150; Eichrodt, Theologie, II, 68.

\(^7\)Eichrodt, Theologie, II, 68.
supra-individual character. **Nephesh** is "das an einer Körper gebundene, individuelle Leben, so ist räch die überall vorhandene, der einzelnen Individuum selbständig gegenüberstehende Lebenskraft."¹

3. **Basaar.**

is found about 266 times in the Old Testament.² The primary meaning of this term is flesh. It denotes primarily the "soft muscular portions of a body living or once living; . . ."³ In this sense it is used of both man and beasts.⁴ As the Hebrew language had no separate word for the "body" (like the Greek σάρξ), the word *basaar* came to be used by synecdoche for the body (I Kgs. 21:27; Prov. 14:30; Ex. 30:32; Lev. 13:2, 3, 4, 11, 13, 18, 24, 38, 39, 43; Num. 8:7; Ps. 63:2; 16:9; et. al.). A good example is cited by A. R. Johnson:⁵ "And it came to pass, when Ahab heard these words, that he rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his flesh, and fasted" (I Kgs. 21:27, R. S. V.). A further use of the word is by "metonymy for one's kindred, the basis of this usage being doubtless in the fact that it is the body which is primarily thought of as produced and producing by natural generation; . . ."⁶ In this form, *basaar* is generally

¹Ibid., cf. pp. 19f.
³Burton, op. cit., p. 69.
⁴See Job 2:5; Isa. 22:13; Gen. 2:21, 23; 17:11ff; 9:4; Ex. 4:7; et. al.
⁵Johnson, op. cit., p. 44.
⁶Burton, op. cit., pp. 69f.
coupled with דָּבָר (bone). Basar is associated with psychical functions in many cases. An example of this is Psalm 84:2, "My soul longs, yea, faints for the courts of the Lord; my heart and flesh sing for joy to the living God." Note here the parallelism with נפש. In this case as also in others (e.g. Ps. 63:1; Prov. 11:17), נפש andBasar are used in the sense of personal pronouns, in order to strengthen the expression.

The importance of Basar in reference to the nature of man lies in its use to denote man as contrasted with God. Flesh is that which distinguishes man from God. Man is flesh, God is spirit (Isa. 31:3). Flesh, then, marks man off as belonging to a different order of being from that of God (Gen. 6:3; II Chron. 32:8; Job 12:10; Ps. 56:4; 78:39; Isa. 40:6ff; 49:26; Jer. 12:12; et. al.). As such, flesh denotes man's frailty and dependence. Man, as he is flesh, is weak. God, as He is spirit, is strength. Hence man has strength in that God's spirit is in him but he is weak in that he is flesh.

A final point to be considered is the connection of Basar with sin. In Greek thought the body (or flesh) is more than just the lower element of

1E.g., Gen. 29:14; cf. Gen. 37:27.
2Note similar use of לב (heart) in Ps. 84:2.  
3Johnson, op. cit., p. 39.
man's being. It is the hindrance of the soul's development of the full goodness of which it is capable. Flesh, in Greek thought, is essentially evil because it is material—it is "matter". Some have claimed to find similar ideas in the Old Testament. But this is due to a failure to understand Hebraic modes of thought or to a reading back into those few passages of ideas which are not only not there but foreign to Israel's way of thinking. In Israel matter cannot be evil per se. All material things, including flesh, are a part of God's good creation (Gen. 1:31). There could not be an ethical dualism in Israel and indeed such dualism is not found. One passage so used to support the association of flesh (or matter) with evil and sin has been Gen. 6 (esp. vv. 12, 13). But the expression used here is "all flesh" (יִנֶּפֶשׁ), which is a Hebraic mode of expression for all living beings, including animals (cf. Gen. 7:4, 23; 6:17; 9:11; 7:21; et. al.). Job 4:17-19 has also been used to support the idea of the dualism of body (or flesh) and soul (or spirit). The passage reads:

Can mortal man be righteous before God? Can a man be pure before his Maker? Even in his servants he puts no trust, and his angels he charges with error; How much more those who dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, who are crushed before the moth. (RSV).

T. Witton Davies comments on this passage as follows (which may be taken as typical of this approach): "The
reason for man's impurity in God's sight is his material nature, the physical is also the morally frail. The thought of Eliphaz here is not an argument for sinfulness based on man's material nature. Rather, the tenor of his argument is that no innocent man suffers at Yahweh's hand and that therefore Job must have sinned to receive such punishment (cf. vv. 7ff.). Further, the idea expressed in vv. 17ff. is that man cannot presume to stand before Yahweh and challenge His justice and actions (cf. 5:8ff., 17ff.). Similar thoughts are expressed in Job 15:14ff.; 25:5ff. Matter is not essentially evil in Hebrew thought. Therefore we must beware of attributing to poetry and metaphor the preciseness of philosophy or science. Man is never righteous per se, but only as he is in God: i.e., in obedience to God's Word in the covenant relation. E. D. Burton puts it: "Of any corrupting power of either body or flesh to drag down the soul there is no trace in the O.T. The $\text{תֶּלֶב}$ is sometimes spoken of as weak, but never as a power for evil." 

4.-Lebh.

The heart ($בֵּית הָלבַּע$) is the most important of the bodily organs demonstrating psychical uses. The central nervous system was not known to the Hebrews, though they were aware of its presence and operation.  

---

3Johnson, op. cit., p. 77.
So also the central importance of the heart was known, though the idea of the circulation of the blood was not known. The heart takes the place of the brain in Hebrew thought. The Hebrew did not always mean by the term "heart" what we mean by it. Lehb is used as the seat or instrument of intellectual and volitional activity and this is the most predominate use of the term. It does nevertheless appear many times for emotional states (e.g., I Sam. 25:36; Judg. 18:20; I Sam. 1:8; 4:13; Gen. 42:23; et. al.). The heart is primarily the seat of intellect and will. Its use in reference to the mind is demonstrated in passages like Dt. 15:9; 30:14; I Kgs. 3:9; Job 17:11; et. al. In the sense of intellect it is used in passages like Job 8:10; 12:3; Prov. 15:32. In its use in connection with intellectual activities Lehb covers a wide range of uses. In the volitional realm the range of lehb is also wide.

The heart with its latent desire is thus recognized as a governing factor in one's behaviour; so that to do a thing 'from one's heart' is to act spontaneously or on one's own initiative, i.e. 'of oneself'. Hence it is through the instrumentality of the heart that a man decides upon one particular course of action against another; and such choice of direction may be regarded as due either to this spontaneous action within the heart or to the influencing of the heart by external forces, human or divine.

For our purposes, one of the chief uses of lehb

---

1For a detailed discussion of the term see Johnson, op. cit., pp. 77-88; TWNT, III, 609-611.
2See Johnson, op. cit., pp. 77ff.
3Ibid., pp. 81ff.
4Johnson, op. cit., p. 81.
is its employment by synecdoche to stand for the whole man. (e.g., as a pronoun). An example of this is in Prov. (3:1); "My son, do not forget my teaching, but let your heart keep my commandments" (R. S. V). Or as in Isaiah (10:7): "But it is not thus that he planneth, and 'tis not thus that His heart (he himself) doth devise" (cf. Gen. 18:5; Judges 19:5, 8). Because of the importance of the heart as a designation of the inner life, Yahweh is primarily concerned with the heart (I Chron. 29:17; Ps. 17:3; Jer. 12:3; et al.). Because of the deceit or pride of the heart, or the hardness of heart, in order to fulfill Yahweh's standard of behavior, a new heart is needed (Ps. 51:10; cf. v. 17). According to Jeremiah a new heart will be given (Jer. 31:31-34; cf. Dt. 30:6). Because "im Herzen wurzelt die religiös - sittliche Haltung", we should keep our hearts with all diligence (Prov. 4:23).

5. Other terms.

Among the other terms used in Hebrew psychology, the blood (מַעֲשֶׂה) is important. It is used "with a quite general reference to denote the common life which is shared by man with other living creatures" (Gen. 9:4-6; Lev. 17:10-14; Dt. 12:23-25). The importance of blood in the cultic ritual as the proper means of maintaining right

---

1 So translated by Johnson, op. cit., p. 82.
2 Note connection with ruach.
3 TWNT, III, 611.
4 Johnson, op. cit., p. 71.
relationship with Yehweh as the Giver of Life is significant but falls outside the scope of this paper. The taboos on blood are due to this ritual importance and probably grounded in the blood's relation to the soul (nephesh). Violent death is referred to frequently in terms of shedding blood (e.g. Gen. 9:5; 27:22; Num. 35:33; Dt. 19:10; et. al.). The blood of the innocent murdered victim cries out for vengeance (e.g., Gen. 4:10f). This is a good example of the retention by the blood of psychical power after death to cry forth for vengeance so long as it lies exposed to public gaze. Thus, had Joseph's brothers slain him, his blood would have cried out against them unless they had concealed it (Gen. 37:22; 26; 42:22). But the real importance of the blood, for our purpose, lies in its association with the nephesh. Perhaps this association arose when the reek of the blood of a slain man was noticed—i.e., a sort of smell indicative of breath and its expulsion. When we recall the definition of Nephesh as the "breath-soul", the connection is clear. The blood is stated as being the Nephesh or as containing it as the life-principle (Gen. 9:4; Lev. 17:11, 14; Dt. 12:23; cf. Ps. 72:14; Ps. 94:21; Prov. 1:18; Jer. 2:34; Ezek. 22:27; Jonah1:14). "Sehr begreiflich ist, dass das Blut als der bevorzugte Träger der nefes gilt, so dass man geradezu sagen kann: das Blut ist die nefes.
Wer das Blut verliert, verliert eben das Leben.\(^1\)

The remaining terms of Hebrew Psychology are of relative unimportance for our discussion. Many are interesting and to many parts of the body—internal organs like the bowels or kidneys, and external ones like the ear, eye, hand or face—are attributed psychical functions. By synecdoche, these are also used frequently for the person of man as a whole.\(^2\)

G. The Creatureliness of Man.

1. His origin in God.

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." (Gen. 1:1 RSV). Creation begins with God. The world order as known to man has its origin in God. These words of Genesis give Israel's belief in a God who was Lord and therefore also Creator. God created the World. The Hebrew expressed what we mean by "world" or "universe" in the phrase "heaven and earth". "Wenn Gott als Schöpfer von Himmel und Erde bezeichnet wird, so

---

1Eichrodt, Theologie, II, 68.

2E.g. 'face' in II Sam. 17:11 (LXX); Dt. 7:10. Cf. E. Dhorne, L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et en accadien, 1925, 59: "Le grec ἄγων marque les trois degrés: le visage, le masque, la personne. L'hébreu passera directement du visage à la personne, dans les expressions 'mon visage', 'ton visage' ou 'son visage' pour signifier 'moi', toi, lui en personne'" (cited by Johnson, op. cit., 46, n.l.)
bedeutet dies die Weltschöpfung, denn für Welt im Sinne des Alls gab es keinen anschaulicheren Ausdruck.  

Within this original creative act of God, indeed, as part of it, the creation of man takes place. In the first account (Gen. 1:1—2:4a) man is created in the Image of God. This account emphasizes man's origin in God and his likeness to Him. It has its counterpart in Psalm 8. One other point brought out in this account is the idea that man's earthly life as it is now constituted is not a punishment of man but is God's gift to him (Gen. 1:26ff.). Man is declared to be the lord of the rest of creation—only One stands above him—the Lord of all creation, the Creator (Gen. 1:28ff., cf. Ps. 3). The second account, the Yahwist narrative, is less optimistic in its approach. In it man is but dust and made of dust (Gen. 2:7). Here also are set the myths of Sin and Fall, the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. In this story, work and the affairs of earthly life are God's curse, not his gift. This story also emphasizes man's origin in God (2:7).

We do not hold the two stories to be entirely contradictory. There are points of similarity between them. In the first place, both agree that man's origin is in God (1:26f., cf. 2:7). Secondly, in both accounts

---

1 Otto Procksch, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950), p. 455.
the Spirit (ruach) of God is active (1:2; cf. 2:7).
"Das Lebensprinzip der Schöpfung ist der Geist."^1
In 1:2 the Spirit stands over against the dead matter of
creation as the life-principle. But creation itself
takes place through the Word — "and God said . . . and it
was so." The Spirit is the principle of life not its or¬
iginator. In 2:7 God breathes and man is a living person.
The word used is נפש, not ruach, but neshamah is here
probably best to be taken as being a synonym for ruach.
Therefore, we should note that again God is the actor and the
Spirit is the given life-principle. Perhaps the contradic¬
tions in the two accounts are more apparent than real. The two
stories embody myths which emphasize two complementary points in
the Old Testament view of man. The first point concerns
the divine origin of man. The second point is that man is
a creature of two sides. That is to say, that man is at once
of the earth earthly and of heaven heavenly. Man is a
paradox: on the one hand, he is but little lower than the
Elohim (Ps. 8) and has dominion over the rest of creation,
and on the other hand, man is dust, a frail and mortal
creature doomed to perish in like manner as the beasts of
of the field or the grass (Ps. 49:12, 20; et al.). The only
unresolved contradiction between the two accounts is in
their view of the earthly life of man: work is either a
curse or a blessing. These views lie beyond the purpose

---
^1 Procksch, op. cit., p. 459 (see also Eichrodt, Theologie, II, 19ff., 27ff., 65f.).
of our treatise and so we leave them.

This then is the Old Testament view of man. Let us summarize the chief conclusions formed. First, man is God's creature. Man did not just happen nor did he spring up or evolve under his own innate powers. God has created man. Life is a gift of God's grace—life is given to man. Man's origin is in God. Second, man is given the highest place in creation. He is the object of a special act of God in the impartation of the life-principle (Gen. 2:7). He is created in God's image according to the other account\(^1\) (1:26), and is, therefore, like God in some way. Man is, therefore, a spiritual-personal being and is responsible to a spiritual-personal being (God). Man is, thus, the lord of creation. He is between earth and heaven: the lord of the one, the subject of the other. Third, man is dust and therefore mortal and frail.\(^2\) There is no thought in the rest of the Old Testament, and there is none here, that the soul is immortal, while the body being dust is perishable. The nephesh dies with man. The spirit returns to God, but not the nephesh (Eccl. 12:7). The spirit returns because it is the spirit of God, Who gave

---

\(^1\)No attempt is here made to deal with the concept of the Imago Dei. The reader is referred to the Systematic Theologians, the commentators and the Old Testament theologies and special works in his attempt to pierce the maze. Our purposes are served by merely affirming man's being created in God's image.

\(^2\)Cf. Gen. 3:19; Ps. 90:5; Ps. 104:29; Job 34:15; Ps. 146:4; Eccl. 3:20.
it to man, not as man's own possession, but as the principle of life.

Well es die Welt Gottes ist, in der der Mensch lebt, darum ist das Leben des Menschen stets und von Grund aus ungesichert.¹

This then is man in his origin as a creature of God.


2. The Life of Man in Dependence on God.

Man has his origin in God. This is the first thing. But the complement of the concept of God as Creator is the concept of God as Lord. As belief in Creation and a Creator-God flows out of belief in a God who is Lord, so also the belief in the preservation and continuance of life is derived from faith in God as Lord. That God is Lord means He stands over against His creation: God has an independent existence outside creation. He does not need creation. The creative act is a deed of God's grace—it is His will not His nature. Therefore the world is dependent on God for its continuance. "Thou art the LORD, thou alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their

¹Köhler, op. cit., p. 76.
²Ibid., p. 120.
host, the earth . . . and thou preservest all of them" (Neh. 9:6 RSV).\(^1\) God is Lord of all creation and rules it as Lord.\(^2\) All of life is thus dependent on the Lord (Yahweh) for its continuance as He is the one who "gives them their food in due season" (Ps. 104:27ff.). This continuance and preservation of life is often connected with the Spirit—the life-giving Spirit (e.g. Ps. 104:29f.; cf. Job 34:14-15).

Man, as a part of God's creation is, therefore, likewise dependent on God's Spirit for his life. God is the Lord of Life.\(^3\) The references given above apply also to man, for man is bound together with the rest of creation. As life does not begin without God so it cannot persevere apart from Him. To be absent from God is death, and to be "cut of from his people" (Lev. 19:8) is separation from God and therefore death.\(^4\) Because God is creator and the preservation and continuance of man's life as well as its origin depends on God, man is therefore placed in a position of responsibility to God. That man is created and placed in a position of prominence over the rest of creation does not result in pride within Israel but in praise (see Ps. 8; cf. Ps. 19:24; et. al.). The God who is the Lawgiver is also the

---

\(^1\)Cf. Ps. 147:9; Isa. 5:1ff.; Hos. 2:7-10; Ps. 139; Ps. 145:15; et. al.
\(^2\)Ex. 15:8, 11; Jer. 10:13; Ps. 147:8, 15ff.; Num. 16:22; 27:16; Ps. 145:15.
\(^3\)See Part II.
\(^4\)See Part II.
Creator. It is, therefore,

less possible than ever for anybody to escape his responsibility towards God. For now the order of the national life is determined by the same will as reigns throughout the universe and imposes its laws upon it. 1

There is no escape in any direction from this iron ring.

God addresses man as a "Thou" and in this does man's dignity consist. 2 This life of man is connected with the Spirit in many cases. 3

If he should take back his spirit to himself, and gather to himself his breath, all flesh would perish together, and man would return to dust (Job 34:14-15 RSV; cf. Ps. 51:10f.).

Man's life is not a natural right but is a gift. God gives to man life. As the receiver of this Gift man is responsible to the Giver. Man's life is therefore life in responsibility. 4 Obedience means man is given freedom to develop and move within the covenant people of God.

Everything in creation depends on God, who as the Lord is powerful and active in all things. Were God to deprive the world of His care and sustenance, the earth and all creation would return to chaos (Jer. 4:23-26).

Nature is ordered by the power of the Living God, not by a natural Law independent of Him. But this God is not Himself a natural power but is a personal will who as such

1Eichrodt, Man in the Old Testament, p. 28.
2Ibid., pp. 22ff., 28ff.
3See Eichrodt, Theologie, II, pp. 19-21; 27ff; Köhler, op.cit., pp. 68-76.
4As creator, Lord and Preserver, God is also Lord of time and history. As these lie beyond our scope we will not here deal with them.
wills to have communion with man.

Wie Gott selber nicht eine Naturkraft ist, sondern der lebendige Herr, der nur mit dem Menschen durch die Gemeinschaft des Wortes sich verbindet, so sieht sich auch der Mensch der Menge der natürlichen Dinge und Kräfte gegenübergestellt als Anderartiger, dessen Wesen und Bestand nur in Gott seine Bürde hat.  


In accordance with Hebrew thought, man is a part of God's creation. He, like the rest of the world, was called into being by the Word of the Lord. But man is also designated as the lord of creation, i.e., he is to rule over the rest of nature. Man's activities involve him in nature. Does this mean, then, that man fulfills his destiny and purpose best by living in harmony with nature? Is man called to live in harmony with his environment? An affirmative answer has been given to this question by many Christian thinkers as well as by secular philosophy. Ascetic and monastic movements to a certain extent have their roots in the attempt to escape from the order of the world of man's design (what we call civilization) and return to the simpler life—a life at once closer to nature and more in harmony with it. This is not what is meant by the Old Testament view of man and nature. Israel's pagan neighbours worshipped nature gods and attempted to placate the deified forces of nature. Their worship is an attempt to live in harmony with nature.  

\(^1\) Eichrodt, Theologie, II, 58-59.
\(^2\) On this point and on the section as a whole see G. Ernest Wright, The Old Testament Against its Environment, (London: S.C.M. Press 1950) and Eichrodt, Man in the Old Testament.
Lord, in Hebrew thought, stands over against nature. "As a creature man is ranged with all other creatures, but now, as the one whom God's Word meets, he comes to God's side and confronts the rest of creation."¹ This placing of man on the side of God is not due to the initiative of man but solely to God's initiative. This is man's special place in creation and constitutes the boundary between man and the rest of creation—that he is addressed as a "Thou" by God the Lord. Therefore, man cannot be submerged in nature or merged in the laws of the cosmos, so long as he remains true to his destiny. The Creator's greatest gift to man, that of the personal I, necessarily places him, in analogy with God's being, at a distance from nature.²

The emphasis in Israel's faith was not on living in harmony with nature. To do this would be to deify nature or the forces of nature, and would constitute a violation of the First Commandment. Against this form of idolatry the Prophets raised their voices in protest. "The problem of life was seen, not as an integration with the forces of nature, but as an adjustment to the will of the God who had chosen them."³ Israel was called to live in obedience to God's will, not to live in harmony with nature. God was the Lord of nature and the forces of nature. They were not independent forces but were expressions of Yahweh's power.⁴ Israel, then, was called to a life

---
¹Eichrodt, Man in the Old Testament, p. 30.
²Ibid.
³Wright, op. cit., p. 23.
⁴See Wright, op. cit., p. 23.
of responsible existence, a life of obedience, to the God who had brought Israel out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. The God of Israel was not in nature—He transcended nature. The Old Testament is not a record of the power of the forces of nature and man’s efforts to placate them, but is, rather, a record of the mighty acts of God (the "Heilsgeschehen"). Israel is to live in obedience to the will of this God—the God who is the Lord (cf. Dt. 6:4ff., 5:6ff.; Ex. 20:3ff.).

D. **Summary.**

We now attempt to set forth the main results of the foregoing survey of this aspect of the thought of the Old Testament on man.

1. **The Psychology of Unity.**

We have already pointed out the characteristic Semitic mode of thinking—thinking in a synthetic manner. The Hebrew characteristically sees the whole. Thus man is a unity of personality. To describe man as flesh or dust or nephesh is to describe the whole man, though he is thus described from one facet of his being. Hence to say man is flesh is to describe the whole man on the side of his origin and to characterize him as weak, frail and mortal. The most important terms used in Hebrew psychology are flesh, heart, ruach and nephesh. These each describe the whole man, the one man, from a different perspective. While it is
difficult to be precise in the differentiation of these terms, we can make a certain, though limited approach to designate their chief emphases. Flesh describes man from the point of view of his origin as God's creature and characterizes man as weak, frail and mortal. Heart describes man from the intellectual and volitional point of view (and to some extent the emotional) and characterizes man as a center of thought and purposeful directed action. Ruach emphasizes the origin of man from point of view of his being God's creation in which man is characterized as a spiritual being, subject to invasive influences, and as a being whose life energies are seen to ebb and flow. Nephesh describes man as an animate being and characterizes him from the point of view of life and his emotional activity, and also describes man as a center of action moving in a certain direction. It should be noticed, however, that such a description as the above needs to be qualified, for these terms overlap in many ways. The Hebrew never made a sharp and close distinction between any of these terms (at least in the Old Testament period). These terms are all inter-related. These terms are all expressions of the unity of personality under different

1 For further discussion see Pedersen, op. cit., various works of Robinson, esp., The Christian Doctrine of Man, pp. 26f.; and other references in Bibliography.

2 Compare the uses of ruach, nephesh and heart in the following passages where they appear to be synonyms for each other: (Isa. 26:9; Ps. 77:6; cf. Johah 2:8); (Ex. 35:21; cf. 20:2; Dt. 2:30; Isa. 29:24; cf. Ps. 95:10; Isa. 57:15; et. al.).
aspects. A. R. Johnson, in the use of these terms by
synecdoche to express the whole man, has, we believe,
established this fact.¹

2. The true nature of man.

It is simply not adequate to attempt to describe
the nature of men by psychological terminology, for this
would place man in an isolation as a being-in-himself,
that is, as a being per se. But in Hebrew thought one
could not fully describe man by an investigation of man
alone. Man did not exist in isolation from his fellow
man nor from the rest of creation. Above all, man did
not exist in isolation from God. The true basis of
human nature is in a relation: with God and with his
fellow man (or more precisely with the covenant people).
Thus the real and proper basis of human nature and
personality was a religious one. Man is God's creature-
God had created him. But God had created man for Himself
and endowed him with a high dignity as lord of creation
and as a being in God's own image. This placed man in a
relation with God and life was seen to depend on God. To
obey God's will is life, to disobey is death. All
creation including man depended on God for its preservation
and continuance. Life for man is existence in responsibil-
ity. That God addresses man as a person, a "Thou", placed
man in a relation with God, and therefore in a position of

¹See Johnson, op. cit., and The One and the Many in
the Israelite Conception of God, (Cardiff: Univ. of Wales
Press, 1942).
responsibility. True man lives by God's grace, lives in fellowship with God. This is the true life of man — to live in fellowship with his God.

Thus we see the two facets of Hebrew thought on man: (1) man is a single, whole, being (the unitary view of personality); (2) man is a creature who is summoned to a responsible existence and who is to live in fellowship with the Lord (Yahweh) his God (and hence must live in fellowship with the covenant people of God and his fellow man).
1. Relation to OT.

Apart from a study of the OT view of man, many of the NT statements concerning man would be obscure or liable to serious misunderstanding. The NT presupposes the OT and is based on it. We find in the NT the same terms used with, on the whole, the OT meanings. In spite of the NT being written in Greek, the thought content is predominantly Hebraic. The terms that dominate are, as in the OT: *spirit, soul, flesh,* and *heart.* A new term, *body,* is used, mainly by Paul, and appears mainly to express what in the OT was understood under *basar,* there being no general term in Hebrew to express the concept "body" in the OT (though the concept itself is in the OT).

---

1The question of Aramaic originals for some NT documents is beyond the scope of our purpose. The question is still unresolved but in no way obviates our contention. Aramaic original sources would rather seem to strengthen our contention.
A further fundamental basis of NT teaching on man is found in OT religion. As in the OT so in the New, man is seen not in isolation, but in relation—
to God above all, and also to his fellow man. Man can only be seen, as he is and as he should be, in relation to God. The OT religious basis in the understanding of man is repeated in the New and given a new center of orientation—the person of Jesus.

From this it may be seen, and will be ever clearer as we progress, that the setting forth of the OT concept of man both shortens and lightens our task of presenting the NT concept. We shall in many cases only cite the parallel uses of the NT and the OT terms and rely on and build on the OT background. In the discussion of terms we will mainly deal with new developments or expansions of these terms.

2. From Hebrew to Greek.

Of the literature produced in the period between the Testaments, the LXX appears to have been the most influential, especially in use of language. In the main, the ruach of the OT is rendered by πνεῦμα in the LXX; Nephesh is rendered by ψυχή; basar by σώμα or σῶμα (when basar is used for the whole body); lebh by πνεῦμα. In the other writings of this period these same renderings are followed. In the main, the works of the period between the Testaments follow OT
usage. Any new developments that occur take place primarily in works originally written in Greek.\(^1\) As Burton has put it: "The ordinary classical meanings of all three words \([\text{spirit, soul and flesh}]\) to a large extent obtain."\(^2\) One example of change may be seen in the use of ψυχή to denote "soul", attributing to it a more or less conscious existence of misery or happiness after death.\(^3\)

3. The NT Teaching.

In the NT man is, as in the OT, given a religious orientation. Man is seen in a relation - to God and his fellow man. A new center, around which the ideas of the OT are grouped, manifests itself in the NT. This new center is Jesus Christ. A proper study of the Biblical view of man must take account of this new center. The person of Jesus, as the Incarnate Son and therefore fully man, will underlie our entire presentation of the concept of man in the NT, though it will not itself be developed.\(^4\) In Jesus the NT presents true man - man as God intended him. In Jesus the NT presents the real man - the new man as he can be in

---

\(^1\) For details see Burton, op. cit., pp. 171-172; Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man, et. al.  
\(^2\) Burton, op. cit., p. 168.  
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 147 (and references given there).  
\(^4\) This is mainly due to: (1) the limitation of space and (2) the limitations of the purpose of our study.
Jesus Christ. In Jesus the NT presents the true man— in comparison with Him man is seen as he is now, a sinner.

The chief terms which we shall present are in the main those of Chapter I, but in their Greek form. These are: Psyche, pneuma, kardia, soma and sarks. It will be seen that one new term is added—soma. Soma, body, is added as a result of its use by Paul. This word forms one of the key anthropological terms for Paul and hence its inclusion. The OT (Hebrew) expressed by 'bsar what the NT expresses by soma. The term soma has vital importance in the NT concept of life everlasting and the resurrection. In this connection sarks and soma are to be carefully and separately delimited.

Other terms of importance in NT psychology will not be discussed fully. Such terms as, for example, mind (nous) and conscience (sousa) exercise functions which in the OT were included under "heart". For our purposes they need not be considered here.

In a discussion of NT psychology, the place of Paul assumes proportions of the greatest magnitude. This is because Paul, as the foremost Christian thinker (we may even say theologian!) of the Apostolic Church, has the most

---

1The best treatment of the person of Jesus in relation to the doctrine of man is, to us, that of K. Barth, Kirchliche Dogmatik, III, 2. (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1950).
to say on this subject (as well as on most others of a systematic or theological nature). It is Paul who presents the most elaborate details and Paul who poses most of the problems. However, the main lines of his thought are sufficiently clear\(^1\) for us to present them. It will not suit the purpose and scope of our study to engage in detailed probing of the problems posed by Paul. We shall set forth the main lines and discuss controversial points only where they are relevant. As Paul has given us the most material and has the larger proportion of uses, especially those with significant advances, we shall give a correspondingly large amount of space to him.\(^2\) With exceptions, the rest of the NT exhibits, in the main, OT usage.

B. Terminology

1. Psyche.
   a. General Use.

   In general, the use of psyche in the NT follows that of Nephesh in the OT. This is especially true in the Synoptics. In the Synoptics, however, one

---

\(^2\)Throughout this paper we shall assume to be Pauline all those Epistles bearing his name except the Pastorals and Hebrews. The reasons for excluding others do not appear to us to be sufficiently strong to warrant our concurrence.
significant advance is made—psyche as existing separately from the body or capable of so existing. For this use there is no OT parallel. It is, rather, a product of the development of Judaism after the OT period.¹

In the NT as a whole, the following general classification of meanings may be given.²

1 Life, loss of which is death. Mk. 3:4 (Ψυχὴν σῶμα ἄνθρωπον) (Mt. 2:20; 6:25; Lk. 6:9; et. al.; Jn. 10:11; et. al.; Acts 20:10, 24; 27; 10, 22; Rom. 11:3; 16:4; II Cor. 1:23; et. al. (see also 4) below).

2 Soul as a constituent element of man's nature. Mt. 11:29; Lk. 2:35 (Ἀναστάσεως); Mk. 12:30 (ὁ αἰών); Eph. 6:6; Phil. 1:27; Heb. 4:12; et. al.


4 Human person. Rom. 13:1 (παρὰ ψυχὴν ὑπεράσπισις); 2:9; Acts 2:43; 3:23; 2:41; personal pronoun (Mt. 12:18; Lk. 1:46; 12:19; et. al.); person or life (Mt. 16:25; 10:39; Mk. 8:35, 36, 37; Lk. 17:33; Acts 15:26; et. al.).

5 Soul of man as distinguished from the body and existing separately or capable of so existing.

¹See Burton, op. cit., p. 147.
²Ibid., pp. 183f.
Mt. 10:28 (kill the body, but cannot kill the soul); Acts 2:27; Rev. 6:9; 20:4 (less clearly, I Th. 5:23; Heb. 10:39; Jas. 1:21; 5:20; 1 Pet. 1:9; 4:19; Rev. 18:13).

b. Pauline Usage.

The most striking thing about Paul's use of this term is the rarity in the number of times it is used—only 13 times in all. Six times it means "life" (Phil. 2:30; Rom. 16:4; II Cor. 1:23; I Th. 2:8; Rom. 11:3, from the OT; I Cor. 15:45, from the OT). In two cases it is used as "all souls", an OT use: Rom. 2:9; 13:1. In one case it is a pronoun (II Cor. 12:15). In three cases it expresses a sense of desire ( Eph. 6:6; Phil. 1:27; Col. 3:23). The remaining case, I Th. 5:23, does not imply a trichotomy (spirit, soul and body). It is rather a NT example of OT use (cf. e.g., Dt. 6:5 and see Mt. 22:37; Mk. 12:30). Thus Paul exhibits no advance in the use of ψυχή, his usage being that of the OT Nephesh.

c. Conclusion.

The NT usage of psyche repeats in the main the usage of the OT Nephesh. The most significant advance in development is the apparent possibility of an existence of the ψυχή apart from the body.¹ This has its

¹This usage will come under further investigation in Part IV of this paper.
This has its roots in the developments in Jewish literature of the period between the Testaments.

2. Pneuma.

a. General usage.

Again the OT use of ruach is repeated, with some advances. In the Synoptics the word appears about 78 times: Holy Spirit (34); demons (30); principle of life (3, viz., Mt. 27:50; Lk. 8:55; 23:46); psychical side of life on a higher level than that described by psuche (7, viz., Mt. 5:3; 26:40; Mk. 2:3 (diaynei eIn wud apostumai); 8:12; 14:38; Lk. 1:47, 80).

One striking usage is the extension of pneuma to man as the human spirit, the element of a living man by virtue of which he lives, feels, etc. (e.g. Mt. 27:50; Mk. 14:38 (the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak); 8:12; Rom. 1:9; 2:29; Gal. 6:1, 8, 18; Mt. 5:3; Rom. 8:10; I Cor. 5:3, 4; et. al.).

The most important use of pneuma is in relation to God, as the Holy Spirit. As our study is of man we shall make no detailed analysis of this case. Another usage of interest is the use of Pneuma to denote unembodied or disembodied spirit. Burton lists the following classes.

---

1For detailed classification see Burton, op. cit., pp. 178ff.; Ryder Smith, op. cit., pp. 140-150; et. al.
3See Burton, op. cit., pp. 178ff. (some of these references may be questioned).
4Ibid., pp. 179f.
(1) Spirit of God. e.g. Rom. 8:9 (πνεῦμα θεοῦ)

(2) Spirit of man separated from body after death (Acts 23:9; I Cor. 5:5; Heb. 12:23 (the spirits of just men made perfect); Lk. 24:37. 39; I Pet. 3:19).¹

(3) Angel (Heb. 1:14). (vs. 13 "angels");

(4) Demons (e.g. Mk. 9:25, ὁ θανάτῳ τῆς κατασκέυας άγγελος).

Again as with psyche the use of pneuma is only a development of OT usage. Its most important use is in reference to the Holy Spirit. In this connection, Paul identifies the Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of God (cf. Rom. 8:9 and 8:11; cf. also Phil. 1:19; 4:6 and Rom. 8:14ff.; Eph. 3:16). Indeed in Rom. 8 three uses of Spirit appear to be interwoven. Wheeler Robinson gives the following Pauline uses: Supernatural influences (e.g. Rom. 15:13); higher nature of the Christian man under the influence of the Holy Spirit (e.g. Rom. 1:9); a normal element in human nature (e.g. Rom. 8:16; I Thess. 5:23). In Paul, spirit as applied to man exhibits a contrast with psyche as applied to man. But this contrast is not a contrast between a lower animal nature (psyche) and a higher spiritual principle in man (pneuma). Psyche means the whole man:

¹This point will be considered again in Part IV.
"That specifically human state of being alive which inheres in man as a striving, willing, purposing self."¹

In this respect, pneuma parallels psyche. Both denote the intention, the striving of the self. The contrast is the direction of the intention, of the striving. The "natural man" (psychikos) is directed toward the earthly life alone whereas the "spiritual man" (pneumatikos) is directed toward the divine life, life in accord with God's will.

When Paul speaks of the pneuma of a man he does not mean some higher principle within him or some special intellectual or spiritual faculty of his, but simply his self, and the only question is whether the self is regarded in some particular respect when it is called pneuma.²

Psyche does not mean the "principle of animal life" nor is it that which enlivens the "flesh", if by that is meant a part of man. It is, as is pneuma, a designation of the whole man regarded in a particular aspect. Paul further appears to seek to limit spirit in reference to man to the Christian man indwelt by the Holy Spirit, though in this he is not always consistent. On the one hand, Christian man is man indwelt and living by the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, even natural man appears, in an exceptional Pauline usage, to have a spirit, though whether a definite factor of human personality is meant or whether

²Ibid., 206.
the word is merely a synonym for psyche is not always clear.

c. Conclusion.

In the use of pneuma in the NT, the OT usage again predominates. The application of it to God is in line with the OT. A new feature is an increased use of the phrase and concept "Holy Spirit", and the application of the Spirit to Christ. As with psyche so with pneuma, a new development takes place in the apparent positing of the survival of the spirit of man apart from the body at death. Paul's use of the psychikos and pneumatikos are really rooted in the OT. That is, they are logical developments of OT concepts.1


a. General use.

The use of "heart" (kardia) in the NT is again rooted in OT usage. The following summary lists the chief uses of kardia in the NT.2

(1) Heart as the central organ of the body and the seat of the physical power of life. Lk. 21:34; Acts 14:17; Jms. 5:5 (cf. I Kgs. 21:7). [The use of "heart" in this sense is open to serious question. In any case, its use is rare.]

(2) The central point of man's inner life:

---

1 See Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man.
2 TWNT, III, art. "καρδία" by Behm, 609-616.
where all psychic and spiritual powers and functions have their seat or origin.

s. Feelings, affections desires etc.
Acts. 2:26; Jn. 16:22; Acts 14:17; Jn. 16:6; Rom. 9:2; 10:1; II Cor. 2:4; of God (Acts 13:22); of desire Jms. 3:14; Mt. 5:28; 6:21 (and parallels); Rom. 1:24 ("the lusts of their hearts").

b. Seat of understanding: source of thought and consideration.
Mt. 7:21 (and Parallels); Mt. 12:34 (and parallels); 13:15b; Jn. 12:40; Lk. 1:51; 2:35; 9:47; Acts 6:22; 7:23 (it came into his heart to visit his brethren); Heb. 7:12; et. al.

c. Seat of will: source of resolution.
II Cor. 9:7; I Cor. 4:5; 7:27; Col. 4:8; Eph. 6:22; Acts. 11:23; Lk. 21:14; Jn. 13:2 (had already put it into the heart of Judas to betray him); et. al.

Used as whole inner nature of man in contrast to the exterior: e.g. I Th. 2:17; II Cor. 5:12; Rom. 10:8ff; II Cor. 6:11; Rom. 2:28, 29 (real circumcision is a matter of the heart); Acts 7:51 4:32; Mk. 7:6; Mt. 15:16.

Used as the "I", the person: Col. 2:2; I Jn. 3:14ff; I Pet. 3:4.

d. Above all, the heart is, "die eine zentrale Stelle im Menschen, an die Gott sich Wendet, in der das religiöse Leben wurzelt, die die sittliche
Haltung bestimmt. ¹

Lk. 16:15; 2:15; Mt. 13:19; Rom. 5:5; 2:5; 8:27; 10:9f; II Cor. 1:22; Eph. 3:17; I Th. 2:4; Col. 4:6; Heb. 8:10; 10:16; et. al. (e.g. Rom. 2:5 "hard and impenitent heart").

Heart of natural sinful man: e.g. Mt. 13:15; Mk. 3:5; 6:32; Jn. 12:40; Eph. 4:18; Rom. 1:21, 24; 2:5 (see above, Rom. 2:5).

Heart of the redeemed, as it should be: e.g. Mt. 11:29; 5:6; I Tim. 1:5; Heb. 10:22a; Lk. 6:45; I Th. 3:15; Col. 3:22; Eph. 6:5; I Pet. 3:15 ("in your hearts reverence Christ as Lord").

(3) Heart of the earth. Mt. 12:40 (ἐν τῷ καρδιᾷ τῆς γῆς).

b. Pauline expansion by other terms.

Paul exhibits throughout the OT use of "heart". He does, however, use other terms to describe some functions which in the OT are ascribed to heart. We shall not detail these uses, but merely note them. The chief terms in this connection are νοῦς (and related words) and συνείδησις. ² Nous is not "mind" in the sense of intellect, but the knowing and understanding which belong to man and

¹TWNT, III, 615.
determine what attitude he adopts.¹ "Heart" emphasizes volition; nous, knowing. "Conscience", a knowledge shared with one's self, denotes the relation of a man to himself.² These uses are in the OT ascribed to "heart".

b. Conclusion.

"Heart", thus, assumes its chief importance as the "Hauptorgan des seelisch-geistigen Lebens, damit auch als die Stelle im Menschen, an der Gott sich bezeugt."³ In this respect, the use of "heart" does not depart from OT usage but only represents an intensified form of OT usage of "heart". Paul's use of other terms to describe functions usually attributed to "heart" in the OT is not an innovation but is merely a refinement made possible in the Greek language of the Hebraic meaning of "heart". That is to say, Paul found in Greek special terms by which he could more clearly designate specific functions of the "heart" as it was used in the OT (and LXX). The use of "heart" in the NT is thus entirely Hebraic in content.

4. Sarks

a. General.

Apart from Paul, sarks is used in the NT entirely in the OT sense of basar. Burton cites the following uses.⁴

---

¹See e.g. Rom. 1:29; 28: 12:2; Phil. 4:7; I Cor. 1:10; Rom. 14:5; et. al.
²On συνέφορς see e.g. Rom. 2:15; 13:5; I Cor. 8:7-12; 10:25-30; II Cor. 4:2; et. al.
³TWVT, III, 614.
(1) The flesh-substance. e.g. Lk. 24:39; Jn. 6:51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 63; I Cor. 15:39, 50 (Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom).

(2) Body. Mt. 26:41; Mk. 14:38; Acts 2:26; II Cor. 12:7; et. al. (e.g. Mk. 14:38, "The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak").

(3) By metonymy: basis or result of natural generation. Jn. 3:6; Rom. 4:1; 9:3, 5, 8; 11:14; I Cor. 10:16; Gal. 4:23, 29; Eph 2:11 (e.g. Jn. 3:6, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh").

(4) A corporeally conditioned living being. Mt. 16:17; 19:5, 6; Mk. 10:8 ("the two shall become one flesh"). Lk. 3:6; Jn. 1:14; 17:2; Rom. 1:3; et. al.

(5) The creaturely side, the corporeally conditioned aspect of life, external as distinguished from the internal and real. Jn. 8:15; I Cor. 1:26; 7:26; II Cor. 5:16; 7:5; Gal. 6:12; et. al. (e.g. Jn. 8:15, "You judge according to the flesh").

(6) Product of natural generation. Jn. 3:6b; Rom. 6:19; 7:5, 18, 25; 8:3a; Phil. 3:3, 4 (e.g. Jn. 3:6, "That which is born of flesh"). The relation of sin and the flesh is a Pauline use.
b. Pauline.¹

Paul exhibits each of the above uses. In all this the OT sense of basar is present. But in the connection of flesh and sin Paul advances beyond the OT view. A brief general picture of the word may help to clarify the concept. Sarks does not mean a part of the body, nor does it contrast with the body as if it were thought of as the stuff out of which the body is formed. It is rather "the whole body, or, better the whole person, considered from the point of view of his external, physical existence."² As in the OT, flesh represents mere man, man in contrast with God and hence, man in his weakness and mortality. There are two constant characteristics of man as flesh.³ First, contrasted with God, man is impotent: the weakness of the flesh (Gal. 4:15; Rom. 6:19; II Cor. 1:17; 10:2ff.; Eph. 6:10-12; I Cor. 15:45f.). "The second abiding characteristic of man as υπόστασ, in his distance from God, is his mortality"⁴ (II Cor. 4:11; 4:16, 18; Col. 2:21ff.; I Cor. 15:50; 5:5; Gal. 6:8).


²J. A. T. Robinson, op. cit., 17f.

³Ibid., pp. 20f.

⁴Ibid., p. 20.
Two prepositional phrases are used in connection with sin and flesh: ἐν σαρκί and κατὰ σάρκα. To be "in the flesh" describes the nature of man as determined by the sphere within which he moves.¹ This sphere is the world fallen under the powers of sin and death. Hence, to be "in the flesh" is to be subject to the powers that control it. The Christian still lives "in the flesh" but it is a life in a different sphere than that of the man who lives dominated by the powers opposed to God, by sin and death (Gal. 2:20 and cf. "in the spirit", Rom. 8:9 et. al.).

On the one hand, to be "in the flesh" is man's natural God-given earthly form of existence (Gal. 2:20). On the other hand, it is life limited to the earthly form of existence (Rom. 7:5; 8:8; 8:7; et. al.). The phrase κατὰ σάρκα is also used in a double sense: as the purely natural, God-given ties of family or racial relationship and descent (e.g. Rom. 4:1; 9:3; 1:3); and as describing an attitude of opposition to God and Christ (Rom. 8:5; II Cor. 10:3; 1:17; 5:16; Rom. 8:4). In this latter sense it is the opposite of "according to the Spirit" (Rom. 8:4f.; cf. II Cor. 11:17; Rom. 14:15; et. al.). κατὰ σάρκα, in contrast to ἐν σαρκί which describes the sphere of man's life, describes the manner of man's life and thus characterizes man as living for himself, for the world, rather than living in dependence on God. These two

¹Ibid., 22; so also Bultmann, op. cit., I, 235f.
prepositional phrases, "in the flesh" and "according to the flesh", have no basis in the OT nor in earlier Hellenistic thought. Perhaps Käsemann is correct when he writes that this usage is due to Gnostic influence. He writes: "Fleisch ist nach Paulus so etwas wie ein gnostische Aeon." The contrast of flesh and spirit in Paul is not due to Hellenistic dualism: it is not matter (as inherently evil) in contrast with soul or spirit. The list of carnal sins includes mainly spiritual sins (see Gal. 5:19-21). The contrast is rather between two spheres of living (κατὰ τὸν σώματιν and κατὰ τὸν πνεῦμα): in each case the whole man is involved. "Aber viel häufiger steht σάρξ in Gegensatz zu Gott oder zum πνεῦμα und bezeichnet dann den ganzen Menschen, der als Sünde dem Schöpfer gegenübersteht." In point of fact the sarks is neutral—it is weak, it is susceptible to sin. "Man is, therefore, as σάρξ a sinner." But this does not mean the flesh, as material, is sinful. The flesh, as weak, is the point where sin enters and gains control of man and rules him. Thus, for Paul the term "flesh" describes the whole man from a definite point of view: that of his weakness, mortality and sinfulness, that of the invasion of his nature by the power of sin. We may thus see that in Paul

1So J. A. T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 22, n.2; Bultmann, op. cit., I, 235; Käsemann, op. cit., p. 103.
2So also J. A. T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 22, n.2.
3Käsemann, op. cit., p. 105 (see also 112)
4Käsemel, op. cit., p. 22.
5Ibid.
the contrast of flesh and spirit\(^1\) denotes an involvement of the whole man, considered from different aspects. To "be in the flesh" is to permit one's self to be ordered and directed by the powers of this present aeon (Eph. 2:2f). Thus to describe man as flesh is, for Paul, to describe him as weak, mortal and subject to the powers that control the world. The use by Paul of "flesh" is summarized by J. Robinson thus: "σκοτία as neutral is man living in the world, σκοτία as sinful is man living for the world: ... ."\(^2\)

c. Conclusion.

The term flesh exhibits, in the general picture of NT usage, an OT background. Only in Paul is the term expended to give a definite connection with sin. This is done when Paul, taking the OT position that the flesh is weak, concludes that thereby is the flesh sinful: it is

---

\(^{1}\)Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der Neutestamentliche Theologie, II, (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911), 21, n. 3 lists the terms used in this contrast.

Flesh. | Spirit.
---|---
(1) Τὸ ψυχικὸν | Τὸ πνευματικὸν
(2) ψυχὴ τῶν | πνεῦμα ἰσωτοκοῦν
(3) τὰ ἐπίγεια | τὰ ἐπουράνια
(4) φθορά | ἀφθορία
(5) κτίσις | δόξα
(6) καθενέκα | σύνεσις
(7) ἄνθρωπος ἱμάτιον | ἄνθρωπος εἰς οὐρανός
(8) τὸ θανάσιον | ἀθάνατον
(9) θάνατος | ζωὴ

the point of entry where sin can get its foothold. The flesh is not sinful per se, as matter. The term describes man, the whole man from a definite aspect and stamps him as being determined in a specific manner. It describes man from the point of view of his distance, and indeed his alienation, from God, from the point of view of his weakness, his mortality, and characterizes the life of man seeking to live in his own strength and for himself rather than living in dependence on God.

5. Sôma.

a. General.

The OT had no specific term for "body", and used basar (flesh) to express this concept (a use repeated also in the NT). Sôma is used frequently in the NT (about 135 times), with Paul claiming nearly two-thirds. Sôma expresses the idea of unity (seen especially in its use as "the body of Christ", I Cor. 12:12-26). Apart from Paul, the most important use of sôma is its use in reference to the body of Jesus. In this sense, it is not the Incarnation that is stressed but rather the death of Jesus (e.g. Mt. 26:12; 27:58, 59; Mk. 14:8; 15:43, 45; Lk. 23:52, 53, 55; 24:3; Jn. 19:31, 38, 40; 20:12). Jesus Himself led the way in this stress at the Last Supper (I Cor. 11:24; cf. Mt. 26:26; Mk. 14:22; Lk. 22:19). Other parts of the NT follow in this use of "body" with reference to Jesus' death (e.g. I Pet. 2:24; Jn. 2:19, 21; Heb. 10:10). It is used in the
NT to express what we mean by "body" and is coupled with "soul" to express the whole man (Lk. 12:22f.; Mt. 10:28; cf. I Cor. 7:34; Jms. 2:26; I Th. 5:23).

b. Pauline.

It is, as with other terms, Paul who gives the most detailed and specific information. Paul's concept of and teaching about the body form one of the most vital and distinctive points in his entire thought. Indeed, the importance of this term in Paul (along with ἄνωμος) can hardly be overstated. ἄνωμος repeats all the emphases of ἄνωμος before advancing beyond it.\(^1\) It is the external man, 'the body' (Gal. 6:17; I Cor. 9:27; 13:3). Again, it indicates the external presence of the whole man (II Cor. 10:10; I Cor. 5:3; Col. 2:5). The body is also the source and carrier of sexual power (e.g. Rom. 4:19). The ἄνωμος is, fourthly, the whole person (I Cor. 6:18; 6:19f.; Eph. 5:28f.; Rom. 12:1; Phil. 1:20). Man does not have ἄνωμος, man is ἄνωμος (similarly man is flesh). ἄνωμος can be used as a personal pronoun (e.g. Rom. 6:12f.; II Cor. 4:10-12). Then, like ἄνωμος, ἄνωμος stands for man as a being in the world. "The body is that which joins all people, irrespective of individual differences, in life's bundle together"\(^2\) (II Cor. 5:10; 5:6). This being in the body "not only binds us to the rest of creation; it also, as in

---

\(^1\) See J. A. T. Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 26ff.;

the ease of the ρεφ, binds us to the powers which control the body. In creation under the Fall these are the powers of sin and death"¹ (Rom. 6:6, 12, 16; 7:24; Phil. 3:21; I Cor. 15:43; et. al.). Thus there is the "body of sin (Rom. 6:6; cf. Rom. 8:3), the body "of death" (Rom. 7:24), of "humiliation" (Phil. 3:21). The body, like the flesh, is mortal (Rom. 6:12; 8:11) and has lusts (Rom. 6:12). In all this ωμμ and ρεφ are similar (see Col. 2:11, το σωμα το ρεφ). There are, however points of difference. The body may in all respects be identified with the flesh of sin and death, but the two are not in all respects identical. There is no suggestion, for instance, that ρεφ, in itself connotes weakness and mortality; nor that it carries the imputation of the merely external as opposed to the spiritual, the merely human as opposed to the divine—so that Paul could speak equally of living και ωμμ to indicate man setting himself up in the strength of his own creatureliness.² Thus body and flesh describe different aspects of the human relationship to God. "While ρεφ stands for man, in the solidarity of creation, in his distance from God, ωμμ stands for man, in the solidarity of creation, as made for God."³ In the thought of Paul the "body is for the Lord" (I Cor. 6:13; see 6:12-20). Not only is the body "for the Lord" but "the Lord is for the body" (I Cor. 6:13). No resurrection is promised for the flesh but is proclaimed for the body (I Cor. 15, esp. v. 50 "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom"). ρεφ and ωμμ each stand for the

¹Ibid., p. 30.
²Ibid., p. 31.
³Ibid.; (italics are the author's).
whole man, from different aspects: man as wholly perishable (σῶμα), man as wholly destined for God (σωματίζεομαι). The body will be changed and transformed, but the flesh will perish.

One of the key uses of the term σωματίζεομαι by Paul is his application of it to the Church: the Body of Christ. No other NT author makes this assertion: that the body of the crucified Jesus and the church are connected. Space does not permit a detailed exposition of this concept here. The Christian participates in the resurrection body of Jesus (Rom. 7:4). This concept of the Church as the "Body of Christ" is not social, but organic, not corporate but corporeal. It is not a social group that is meant but rather a person: the language used by Paul in this respect is literal. Its background is partially found in the OT concept of corporate personality: where the group is one though many and the actions of one are actions of all. So also is the Church.

We are members of that body which was nailed to the Cross, laid in the tomb and raised to life on the third day. There is only one organism of the new creation; and we are members of that one organism which is Christ.

Thus does Paul describe the church as the σωματίζεομαι of Christ.

---

1 Ibid., p. 31, n.1.
2 Further information will be found in books listed in the Bibliography and other sources listed in those books.
3 See e.g. Josh. 7.
The question of how literal this is and how far it is to be taken is beyond the scope of our task.

c. Conclusion.

In the NT \( \sigma \omega \mu \) is an important term. It is based on the OT basar and comes in by way of LXX. In the Gospels it is used of the death and burial of Jesus. The term is of chief importance in Paul. He uses it as parallel to \( \sigma \xi \) in many ways but gives it a differing emphasis: \( \sigma \xi \) is man distant from God, \( \sigma \omega \mu \) is man destined for God. The use of \( \sigma \omega \mu \) in the NT is due, beyond the mere formalities of language, to a factor not present in the OT. This new factor is the idea of resurrection. As the flesh is not to be raised (I Cor. 15:50), a term had to be used to express something expressed in the OT by "flesh" and yet not use the term "flesh". This term is \( \sigma \omega \mu \) whose use was already introduced in the LXX for the idea of "body". Thus while the two terms can be synonyms, there is a difference. It is the body that will be raised, not the flesh. A life apart from the body is unthinkable in Hebrew thought.\(^1\) This idea is also present in the NT (whose thought pattern is Hebraic). "Without flesh a human life is conceivable, but not without body."\(^2\) The further use of \( \sigma \omega \mu \) in reference to the church is a

\(^1\)This concept will be studied further in later sections of this paper.

\(^2\)Holtzmann, op. cit., II, 17.
Pauline development. Its importance in the Doctrine of the Church is obvious but it also plays a role in the concept of Eschatology\(^1\) (and also in the Doctrine of the Incarnation).

**C. The Creaturely Existence of Man.**

1. Man as a creature.

The NT repeats and re-emphasizes the OT teaching on man at this point.\(^2\) Two points stand out: man's origin in God and his life in dependence on God.

As in the OT so in the New, God is the Creator. Though Jesus' most often used word in reference to God is "Father", the concept of God as Creator is to be found in His teaching. It was a principle assumed by Him (as also it was assumed in contemporary Jewish faith), though it does not often receive direct assertion. This is seen in his references to the world in terms of "creation" (in the sense of commencement) or foundation. For example: "But from the beginning of creation he made them male and female (Mk. 10:6).\(^3\) Or again: the righteous at the day of judgement are invited "to inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" (\(\text{ἀπὸ κατασκευῆς κόσμου}\) (Mt. 25:34).\(^4\) The concept of creation is also seen in

---

\(^1\)This will be investigated further in Part IV.
\(^2\)See Part I, ch. 1, c.
\(^3\)Cf. also Mk. 13:19.
Jesus' statements on God's care (e.g. Mt. 6:25-34; et. al.). The idea of creation is repeated throughout the NT. Paul speaks of God as the Creator. God has caused light to shine out of darkness (I Cor. 4:6, from Gen. 1:3). Man was created by God (I Cor. 11:8-12; cf. 15:45, 47). The NT use of ἐκτίσις, and derivatives, brings out the concept of creation most clearly. This word is used only of God. The verb is used mainly by Paul (e.g. I Cor. 11:9; Eph. 2:10; 3:9; Col. 1:16; 3:10) but is found in Mark 13:10. ἐκτίσις is the noun form most frequently used. It is used in the sense of: (1) a thing made, creation (Mk. 10:6; 13:19; Rom. 1:20; 8:22; Heb. 9:11; II Pet. 3:4; Rev. 3:14); (2) a thing made, a creature (Mk. 16:15; Rom. 1:25; 3:19; 20, 21, 39; II Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15; Heb. 4:13 et. al.).

Since God is the Creator, it follows that He has created man. Man is a creature and thus owes his origin to God.

The second point regarding man as a creature has to do with man's life in dependence on God. Man is God's creature: his origin in life depends on God. Man is God's creature: His continuance in life depends on God. (Mt. 6:30ff.; 10:28-31; Acts 17:28; I Cor. 10:26). This thought

---

2 Rom. 1:25; cf. Col. 3:10; Eph. 3:9.
3 See Rust, op. cit., pp. 197ff.; TWNT, III, art. "ἐκτίσις" by Foerster, 999-1034.
4 For the relation of Christ and creation see Rust, op. cit., pp. 203-224.
5 E.g. Mk. 10:6; Acts. 17:24f.
is more assumed than explicitly formulated in the NT. In I Cor. 10, where Paul is discussing meat offered to idols, the key point is just that in such offering, the thanks and praise rightly due only to God, who gives bread and life to all, is given to what is not God. Or again in Mt. 6:9-13 (Lk. 11:2-4), the petition dealing with bread\(^1\) teaches our dependence on God. To Jesus, God as the Father, keeps and preserves us. If men, being evil, know how to give good gifts, then God as the Father will certainly provide for us (Mt. 7:11; Lk. 11:13). Jesus "made much of the order and regularity of nature as a proof of the steadfastness and unchanging care of God for His creatures"\(^2\) (Lk. 6:44; Mk. 4:26-28; Mk. 13:29; Mt. 21:29; Mt. 16:2f.). All that is in nature is the direct expression of God's will. To Jesus there are no secondary causes or "laws of nature". God clothes the lilies and feeds the ravens (Lk. 12:22ff.; cf. Lk. 12:4-7; Mt. 5:45). God is "Lord of heaven and earth" (Lk. 10:21). While not as clearly expressed in the rest of the NT as in the Gospels, man's dependence on God for life (an OT concept) is presupposed. This concept is carried out and logically extended to the Christian life. By His Spirit God sustains the Christian life and assists it (Rom. 8:5, 9, 11, 13, 26f.; Gal. 5:25; Eph. 1:11, 12, 13; et al.). At the table of the Lord we are fed and nourished unto

\(^1\)Regardless of the translation of εὐφέρεια.

\(^2\)Rust, op. cit., p. 162.
everlasting life (I Cor. 11:23-32; esp. vv. 29f; 10:16f.; John 6:32-33, 35, 47-51, 53-58, 63). All of life depends on God. In asserting that God is the Creator and that man depends on Him, the NT does not intend any cosmology or theory of origin: it is a statement concerning God and man's relation to God. The NT faith in the Creator and creation places man in a relationship to his Creator.

2. General picture of man in the NT.

The NT presents us with a twofold aspect in its picture of the nature of man. Man is at once a part of the natural order and also of the spiritual order. The picture given to us is, in general, a picture of man as he is and a vision of man as he was meant to be.

a. Man as he is.

At the commencement of his ministry, Jesus sends forth the call to repent (Mk. 1:15; Mt. 4:17). This call was addressed to all men and thus implies that, in the view of Jesus, all men were sinners since all need repentance.¹ A doctrine of the Fall is neither affirmed nor denied by Jesus—it is never mentioned. Against the view that Jesus taught the universal sinfulness of mankind there have been raised several objections.² Mark 2:17 has been held to prove that Jesus believed that some were righteous. That this passage does not sanction this view becomes apparent from

¹So Rust, op. cit., 167; Kämmler, op. cit., 9; Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man, p. 92; et. al.
²For a more complete discussion see Kämmler, op. cit., pp. 9-12.
the context. The passage is Jesus' answer to the criticism that He associated with sinners. Furthermore, if Jesus did thus believe some were righteous, then this passage requires that the Scribes and Pharisees be numbered in that group. But this would be in contradiction to the facts: (1) the repeated conflicts between Jesus and the Pharisees (some are given in this same chapter! cf. Mk. 7:1-15; 10:2-9; 11:27-12:13; 12:13-17; et. al.); (2) Jesus' own words concerning the Pharisees (Mk. 7:6-13; 8:15; 10:35ff.; Mt. 23; 21:28-46; 16:1-4, 6; et. al.). In Mk. 2:17, Jesus means He will direct his message to those who are ready for it, i.e. to those conscious of their guilt and need, not to those who are righteous in their own eyes. Another objection raised to the view that Jesus held all men to be sinners is that Jesus held too high a view of man, as seen in Mk. 8:36; "For what does it profit a man, to gain the whole world and forfeit his soul?" The word used here for "soul" is ψυχή and means "life" rather than "soul" as we understand the word "soul." The idea meant here is not the value of the "soul" as the better part of man but rather the loss of what is valuable in a man's life, viz. the value of the heavenly life. Jesus then held man to be a sinner. This is because Jesus sees man as placed before God. Man is

1 So Kümmel, op. cit., pp. 10f.
2 So Harnack, Das Wesen des Christentums, pp. 43f., cited, Kümmel, ibid., p. 11.
3 Correctly rendered in RSV. See also Chapter one under Nephesh; Chapter two under Psyche.
God's creature and therefore obligated to obey God's will.

"Der Mensch ist für Jesus also ganz gewiss die Krone der Schöpfung, aber Jesus folgert daraus nicht einen besonders hohen Wert des Menschen vor Gott, sondern vielmehr die grosse Verpflichtung des Menschen."¹ Man is to be God's servant (Mt. 7:17-19; 5:16; Lk. 17:7ff.). Man's sin consists in that he does not fulfill his obligation (Mk. 7:9; Mt. 5:17ff., 48; Mt. 6; Lk. 18:9ff.). Jesus refers to man in terms of being "evil"² (Mt. 7:11; Lk. 11:13; cf. Lk. 18:19; Mk. 10:18; Mt. 19:17). This concept of man as a sinner is, in Jesus' eyes, not a static affair but a dynamic one. Man is an acting person, placed over against God, as a being who does not fulfill his obligation.

That Paul held a doctrine of universal sinfulness is beyond doubt (e.g. Rom. 3:23; 6:23).³ But does Paul not also teach that there is within man a dualism, a higher, spiritual element and a lower, sinful element?⁴ That this is not so should be clear as a result of our investigations of the terminology of the NT.⁵ If man is described under sarks or pneuma, or kardia, etc., it is the whole man that is meant and that from a particular aspect (e.g., sarks as man in his weakness, spirit as man in his redemptive status).

¹Kümmel, op. cit., p. 13.
²See further next section.
³See also above under sarks.
⁴So Holtzmann, op. cit., II, 21, 42ff.
⁵See section B of this chapter and extended note A.
Es ergibt sich also aus der Untersuchung dieser Termini für den inneren Menschen, dass Paulus in der Tat kein Gott verwandtes menschliches Innenleben kennt, sondern nur den ganzen Menschen, der σωμα, ψυχ' usw. ist und als ganzer Gott gegenüber steht. ¹

The sinfulness of man is again man as he is now. It is a judgement of man as an active being. The universal sinfulness of man is not the product of theory but is a historical judgement of man's actions. For Paul, and this is where theory enters the picture (or rather theology) only in Christ is there any possibility of goodness. ² Thus the universal sinfulness of man is derived, basically, from two propositions. (1) Observation of man's actual condition and actions. It is a judgement of personal experience in one's own life and the observable results (or lack of results) in the lives of others. Paul found his life as a Pharisee blameless in the sight of man, but woefully inadequate and sinful before God and apart from Christ (Acts 26:4-18; Gal. 1:10-17; 2:11-21). (2) The doctrine of ἐν Χριστῷ δικαιοσύνη, ³ according to which righteousness is found only in Christ and that, therefore, apart from Him man's deeds and efforts must fall short of pleasing God (Rom. 3:23), for only "in Christ" can self-justification be eliminated. The picture of man as sinful is the same for

¹Kämmler, op. cit.
²"Gottes Wohlgefallen", ibid., p. 36.
³Rom. 3:21ff.; 8:1-11; Gal. 5:5; 2:20; II Cor. 5:17.
Jesus as for Paul, except that Paul develops it more fully and adds a doctrine of the fall.

The picture in the rest of the NT presents the same general theme. Man as he is is a sinner. In the Gospel of John, universal sinfulness is affirmed in 7:19; 16:9; I Jn. 1:8, 10. It is implied strongly in other passages like 9:34; 8:24, 34; 3:19 et. al. and also implied in the Johannine concept of \( \pi \nu \varsigma \rho \omicron \mu \omicron \nu \) (or \( \gamma \Delta \) - 5:31; et. al.) (8:23; 15:19; 17:14, 16; 18:36; et. al.). Again, the view of human sinfulness is based on experience—in particular the experience of salvation. Kümmerl summarizes the teaching of the rest of the NT thus: "Voraussetzung aller Heilsverkündigung ist die Tatsache, dass alle Menschen Sünden sind, darum der durch Gott geschenkten Sündenvergebung bedürfen." The relevant passages here are: Acts 2:38; 3:19, 26; 5:31; 13:36; 26:18; Heb. 1:3; 2:17; 5:9; 7:26f.; Jms. 1:14; I Pet. 2:24; II Pet. 1:9; Rev. 1:5. There is thus a unified picture of the nature of man in the NT. Acts 17:26f. and II Pet. 1:4 appear to be exceptions. Acts 17:28 is a quotation from a Stoic poet and it's conception of a relationship of man to God and of human life as being led "within the Deity" is different from the teaching of the

1See Kümmerl, op. cit., pp. 41-56.
2See Kümmerl, op. cit., pp. 47f.
3Ibid., p. 48.
4Ibid., p. 51.
rest of the NT regarding man. II Pet. 1:4 implies a conception of a natural distance of man from God: i.e., that man is by nature estranged from God. This is difficult to reconcile with the teaching of the rest of the NT that it is sin which is the disrupting force and not man's normal and natural condition. II Pet. is closer to a Hellenistic dualism of a material-earthly versus a divine spiritual world. In an extended discussion K"ummel\(^1\) can only conclude that they must be placed on the edge of the NT witness,\(^2\) and with this we are forced to agree.

b. Man as he was meant to be.

Alongside the picture of the universal sinfulness of man is to be seen another side of the picture, viz., the value of man, man as God intended him. This two-sided picture of man is not to be taken as implying a dualism. Man is not a dualism of higher and lower elements.\(^3\) The terms used to describe man do not describe elements or parts of man but describe the whole man under various aspects.\(^4\) What is meant is that there is in man the distinct possibility of good and evil.\(^5\) Jesus describes man as "being evil" it is true, but also adds that he is capable of giving "good gifts" (Mt. 7:11; Lk. 11:13).

---

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 51-56.
\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 54f.
\(^3\)K"ummel deals with this question and rejects it completely.
\(^4\)See Part B of this chapter (and chapter one on the OT.).
\(^5\)So Rust, op. cit., p. 167; et. al.
Paul also implied something like this in Rom. 2:14f., where he writes that Gentiles appear\(^1\) capable by nature of fulfilling the demands of the Law.\(^2\) This is not to imply that there is something of value in man that enables him to be good nor that he is worthy of God's care and love. The son is unworthy of the Father's love and respect (Lk. 15). The Father's love (in Jesus' teaching) comes to man in spite of man's unworthiness and sin: \(\text{e.g. Lk. 15}\). Man is seen, in Jesus' eyes, as ideal man: what he was intended to be in God's creative purpose, and what he can be through God's redemptive purpose. In Paul, God's love is seen in that Christ died in spite of man's sin and guilt (Rom. 5:6, 8, 10). The penalty of sin is death (Rom. 6:23) but God instead grants life (II Cor. 5:17; Gal. 2:20; et al.). This thought is echoed in the rest of the NT. Man as he is is a sinner; man as he was meant to be and can be in and through Christ is God's child and is righteous. In the NT it is not transformation of character that is demanded, as if man can cast out what is bad in himself and keep what is good, as if man can eliminate or subdue the lower element and live according to his higher and better nature. Rather, what is demanded is a re-creation (Jn. 3; II Cor. 5:17). Except man repents he shall perish (Lk. 13:3, 5). Jesus came to

\(^1\)The force of \(\text{o}^\text{τωρ}\) indicates this.

\(^2\)Kümmel calls Rom. 2:14f. a judgement of faith not a judgement of experience (op. cit., 35f.).
give His life for sinful man (Mk. 10:45; Mt. 20:28). The Johannine view also presents the same doublesided picture. There must be a new birth, a re-creation of man (Jn. 3:5; et. al.). Man's destiny, to which God summons him now in Christ and for which man was created, is to live in accordance with God's will. This is seen in the Johannine use of ἱσόμος. There is a present ἱσόμος and a coming one (Jn. 12:25; 1 Jn. 4:17), as well as a contrast of this world and an upper world (8:23; 12:31f.; 13:1; et. al.). Man is "in the world" and "of the world". Man's guilt is that he lives for the world (for himself) - he is "of the world". "In diesem Zustand der Selbstbehauptung, des Bestimmteins ἐκ τοῦ ἱσόμος und damit in der Sünde befindet sich der Mensch, wie er ist, nicht aber der Mensch, wie er nach Gottes Willen sein sollte."¹

D. Conclusion.

1. Man is a unity.

In the OT man is a unity, and this thought is repeated in the NT. The use of terms in the NT is based on their Hebrew equivalents. The thought world of NT authors is Hebraic. Other influences (e.g. Greek) are subordinated and adapted to the basic Hebraic thought pattern. When man is designated by psyche, pneuma, sarks, kardia or soma, it is the whole man that is meant. Man is a unity: he is flesh,

¹Kümmel, op. cit., p. 45.
he is spirit, he is body, etc. The NT does not mean that man is spirit (or soul or mind) and has a body. Each of the terms stands for the whole man, considered from a particular aspect (e.g., σάρξ is man in his weakness and distance from God, σῶμα is man destined for God, καρδία is man in his volitional and intellectual aspects, etc.). Each term describes the whole man: man as an acting, purposing and intending self.

2. The nature of man.

The NT has a twofold view of man: the present nature and the future destiny of man. Man as he is is a sinner therefore worthy of death. Man as he was meant to be and can be is God’s obedient creature and child and therefore worthy of life. This destiny of man is not a far off event. Man’s recreation and new life are a present reality in and through Jesus Christ. II Cor. 5:17 expresses this clearly: “If any man be in Christ, he is a new creation.” The Christian man has the gift of the Spirit, and therefore has the possibility of obedience of God’s will within him: he is to walk μετὰ πνεύματος. The new man is a reality in Jesus Christ.

Additional Note A: "Romans 7."

Romans 7 has long been a puzzle. Does Paul here mean to imply a dualism in man? Does he describe the experience of the non-Christian, of man under law (a Jew) or of the Christian man? We do not have the space for a

2 So e.g., Davies, op. cit., pp. 25ff.; Bultmann, op. cit., I, 247.
detailed analysis of these positions\(^1\) (basically, there are only two: non-Christian man and Christian man). The arguments on both sides are weighty but not completely convincing. To our mind, Mitton is correct that Rom. 7 describes the actual experience of non-Christian man under the Law and the potential experience of Christian man.\(^2\)

This view appears to solve the main unresolved difficulties of this passage. (1) The use of the present tense in Rom. 7:14-25. Previously Paul has spoken in the past tense. He now writes in the present tense as if this were taking place now. Of whom, then, is he speaking? of the Jew? of himself (as a Christian or of his pre-Christian experience)? By our view both are true: he speaks of the non-Christian and the Christian. (2) The idea that Rom. 7:14-25 lies entirely in the Christian’s past and therefore such an experience is impossible for him. This contradicts the experience of all Christian living, with its frustrated attempts to obey God’s will, and also contradicts other NT teaching that we are still sinners, though the Spirit now dwells within us (e.g. I Jn. 1; and I Cor. where Paul addresses the church as "saints" in spite of their "unsaintly" behaviour). (3) The position of 7:25b, where after the thanksgiving for deliverance, Paul still speaks of the double service, of the


\(^{2}\) Ibid., Feb., 1954, p. 132.
law of God and the law of sin. The solution of (1) and (2), by the view that Rom. 7 describes the actual condition of non-Christian man and the potential condition into which the Christian man may again fall, is obvious. Rom. 7:25b remains a problem. But this problem also disappears when the Greek text is examined closely. The key words are Κύριος ἔγώ. It is not enough to render it "I myself". The usage gives a double emphasis (either alone suffices for simple emphasis) and the phrase should be rendered "I, left to myself."¹ It means: "entirely on my own." It thus describes the attempt to live in one's own strength, whether Christian or non-Christian. It happens to Christian man when he leaves God and attempts to live on his own. To do this will place him in the position described in Rom. 7 (esp. v. 24). "Let him that thinketh he stand, take heed lest he fall" (I Cor. 10:12). The experience of Rom. 7 is a potentially dreadful one, present at all times for Christian man (note use of present tense 7:14-25). Rom. 7:14-25 is "the description of a man who is trying to live the good life, but doing it on his own strength, relying on his own resources, whether the period in his life be before his conversion to Christ or after it, in a later period of 'backsliding', when through carelessness the absolutely

¹So Thornton, op. cit., 152. J. A. T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 32; Mitton, op. cit.
essential 'injection' of Divine Power has been neglected.\textsuperscript{1} It shows that man apart from God's grace is a sinner: again the whole man is meant.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1} Mitton, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 135.
\textsuperscript{2} See Kümme1, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 34.
Part II

The Concepts of Life and Death
CHAPTER I

THE OLD TESTAMENT

With Part II we come to the concepts of life and death. An understanding of these concepts is vital to our subject of "Life After Death". We must know what death is before we can speak of an "after death". Furthermore, we must understand the nature of life in the Biblical view before we can speak of a "Life After Death". The problem of life and death is one problem not two. The Hebrew understands death in terms of life, for death is the negation of life¹ (as we shall see). Therefore we shall begin with a brief survey of the Old Testament view of life. No attempt will be made to be exhaustive,² but only to present the main lines of the OT teaching in sufficient detail to make clear what is meant by "Life and Death" in the OT.³ The OT view of these concepts is related to the general oriental

¹Against Bultmann, TWNT, II, 851, 6 (art. "צ, צ".).
²The reader is referred to the Bibliography for more detailed works and especially to J. Pedersen, Israel I-II, op. cit.; TWNT, II, 833-877, art. "צ, צ" (esp. pp. 844-853); C. Barth, Die Erretung von Tode (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1947).
³The outline for this chapter is an adapted and revised form of that in C. Barth, op. cit., p. 5f.
view as found in Babylonia, Egypt and elsewhere, though to be sure qualified and transformed by the vital faith of Israel in Yahweh. It is not necessary to go into these parallels in other near Eastern cultures. Information will be found in the works cited in the Bibliography.

A Life in the Old Testament


Life (נֶפֶשׁ) in the OT is not an abstraction, nor is it mere existence. Rather, it designates the physical, organic life. But the OT conception of life is more than a recognition of a physical or natural fact. Life in the OT is a value judgement: life is that which is worth living. Life is in itself the highest good.\(^1\) Life and soul are related concepts; life only manifests itself as soul.\(^2\) In fact, as we have seen, soul (נֶפֶשׁ) must be translated in many places in the OT by "life" (see Part I, ch. 1). Heyyim (life) is closer to the Greek classical ἁγιός in meaning length of life (not the "how" of life); while nephesh corresponds more to the classical Greek ἐνέργεια in meaning the power of life.\(^3\) Again, life in the OT is identical with the happiness and expansion of the soul.\(^4\) Life, then, in the OT,

\(^1\)TWNT, IV, 844, 29. (cf. Pedersen, _op. cit._, I-II, 152f.)
\(^2\)Pedersen, _op. cit._, I-II, 152.
\(^3\)TWNT, II, 851 (cf. 835-36), cf. Ps. 34:12.
\(^4\)Pedersen, _op. cit._, C. Barth, _op. cit._, 27ff.; TWNT, II, 844; Johnson, _Vitality of the Individual, op. cit._, p. 102.
may be defined in many ways: in terms of health, happiness, length of days, peace or material prosperity. Thus it will be seen that the OT view of life is limited to this world and activity in this world: "a man's 'life' consisted in the abundance of the things which he possessed".¹ (cf. Lk. 12:15 and the Book of Job.). Life is defined in the OT in terms which we would describe as "a full life". It is described as a positively qualified existence in terms of power, firmness, security, health, blessing, happiness, fortune and joy.² It is defined in terms of its contents, i.e. all that goes to make a full and complete life.³ There are degrees of life: one may be more or less alive (even as one may be more or less dead). Anything less than life at its fullness is a lessening of the power of life, and therefore, the life that falls short of the attainment of all that properly belongs to life is indeed not to be called life in the real sense of the term. In this sense any weakness in life (calamity, danger, sickness, etc.) can be termed death. "The great soul, which is full of forces, has much life, the weak one only little. The more one possesses of values of life, of strength, the more life one possesses."⁴ This will

¹Johnson, op. cit., p. 97.
²Berth, op. cit., p. 28. (Köhler, Theologie des Alten Testaments, op. cit., p. 137, calls "joy" the central word in the OT).
³Cf. e.g. the wish in Ps. 69:32; 22:26; Ps. 23; Prov. 3:16; et al.
⁴Federsen, op. cit., p. 153.
serve as a general introduction to the term "life". We now pass on to a more specific consideration of the concept.

a. Life is "to have time" (freedom of movement and development).

Life is a power, a force. It is "the disposing of definite possibilities, which serve the free development of the bearer of life, therefore it is the bringing to fulfillment in it of the expectations and anticipations or the promise of it." To do this will require time. If life is health, peace, material prosperity or happiness, then time is again required. One needs "length of days" in which to achieve, and participate in, life. Therefore life means "Zeit haben". An existence without future, without minutes and hours, without days and even years, and with no newly forthcoming day in prospect for it does not, in the OT, deserve the name of "Life". But this matter of time and life must not be an abstract or contentless "Zeit haben". Life is not mere existence. Life is, rather, determined by its contents, by its achievements, qualities and fulfilled goals. In life is inherent the possibility of duration.

To the nature of life belongs: to have time for the realization and fulfillment of the purposes, expectations and promises, which on its side must be presumed as given, where it actually should come to a life. Life means for its bearer—which has to do with the required time—the possibility to be and become what he is.

1 Barth, op. cit., p. 22.
2 "to have time"—the phrase is C. Barth's, op. cit., pp. 22ff.; cf. TWNT, II, 851, 2f.
3 See Pedersen, op. cit., p. 153.
4 TWNT, II, 851, 4f.
5 Barth, op. cit., p. 23.
As long as one has time the possibility of achieving the desired goal of life still exists. Thus in Israel, long life was a prize greatly to be desired. It was essential to the achievement of the purposes and desires of life, to the realization of happiness and prosperity. A long life was considered a blessing from God, and one then died old and satisfied with life (see Gen. 25:8; 35:29; Job 42:17; etc. and cf. Gen. 15:15; Judg. 8:32; etc.). But it should be noted that it was not long life per se that was valued. Rather it was life lived in communion with God. Life is religiously conceived and understood. In Israel, the true goal and purpose of all life is communion with God. The reward of obedience to God is long life (Dt. 5:16; 16:20; 30:19 and cf. Ex. 20:12). This concept is well stated in Ps. 63:3: "Because thy steadfast love is better than life, my lips will praise thee" (RSV). The expression "the king live forever" and related expressions (I Kgs. 1:31; Neh. 2:3; Dan. 2:4; 3:9; Ps. 21:4; 45:6; 61:7; 133:3) are to be seen in this light. Not "eternal" life is meant, but long life, a life of indefinite prolongation until extreme old age and full of joy, happiness, health, prosperity and all else that goes with God's favour to those who obey and serve Him, to those who live in His presence.

It is an essential characteristic of life that there is movement. "Zeit-haben" means to have time for life to develop, for it to move and expand. All living things move. Life is
grounded in the concept of time: the time required to reach and achieve a desired goal. This implies movement and development. But if it is life, the movement must be spontaneous. Thus to the characteristic of life as "Zeit-haben" must be added the characteristic of free movement and development. Life means, then, the power of its bearer to move as a result of his own will. This must be further qualified, for in Hebrew thought not everything that moves itself is living. Life is not mere activity. The dead in Sheol also move in a sense, but this is not called life. Life means, finally, the freedom to move and develop in a particular manner and toward a definite goal. This goal must be the fulfilling of the purpose, hope or promise of the living. And the movement must have the realization of same as the content, must be in the general direction of this goal.1

This movement is not endless: it has a beginning and an end.2 It is a goal that can be realized: communion with God. "Die Bewegung, ohne die es kein Leben gibt, steht im Zeichen des Heils."3

b. Life in Community.

A further characteristic of life grows out of the previously named ones: to have time and the freedom to move to a goal. As the goal in Israel is stated as communion with God or as obedience to His will (to the Word of Yahweh in Law,

---

1 Barth, op. cit., p. 25.
2 See Barth, op. cit.
3 Ibid.
Wisdom and prophecy), so that means in the Old Testament that life cannot be conceived in terms of mere individuality, of isolated individualism. This is seen in the importance of the concept of the covenant in Israel.¹ The individual does not live unto himself but only within the living community. The individual must live in community and share the blessing with others. Yahweh's election concerns Israel, not individuals. His covenant is with the nation, not with individuals per se.² Community, blessing, covenant and life (or soul) are related concepts. Yahweh by His election of Israel has called into being the elect community.³ The individual finds his place as part of this community. The fulfillment of the purposes, promises and hopes of life take place within the community. "Wirklich leben kann der Mensch nur in Gemeinschaft mit seinesgleichen."⁴ Loneliness is a great calamity in Israel.⁵ "The fulfillment of the content of life can not come in solitude."⁶ This life in community is bound up with Israel's relation to God. Yahweh has called Israel into being and made it a living community. The basis of Israel's present and future existence

¹See Pedersen, op. cit., pp. 263-310.
²The covenants made with the Fathers (e.g. Abraham, Jacob, et. al.) were made with individuals but not as individuals, but as representatives of the whole.
³Within this larger community exist smaller ones: family, clan, tribe, etc.
⁵See Pedersen, op. cit., p. 263.
as the living community is communion with God. ¹ Within this community the goal of the individual (which is also communion with God) also may be realized. ² Not only are the neighbour and friends and relations involved in life, ³ but even the enemy, in a negative way, may play a part in the fulfillment of life. The individual receives his meaning within the community in that God's Word summons him to communion, to obedience: the decision in favour of God's call leads to unity with God's will and thereby to life; to withdraw from the claim of God's Word is death. ⁴ Progress toward the goal of life takes place within the community: the same goal is required of all, and movement and development is toward this common goal. Those within the community are partners in the achievement of the common goal, and this is life: together to move toward the desired common goal.

c. The symbols of life.

The OT uses, primarily, two symbols for life. These are "light" and "water". The importance of light for life meets us immediately in Gen. 1. This entire story of the creation is a pictorial expression of the war of life against death, of light against darkness, of order (κόσμος) against

¹ Procksch, op. cit., p. 172.
³ E.g. Gen. 1-2 (the wife); I Sam. 18 (friend); Ps. 55; Ps. 42 (the community); et al.
⁴ Often in Psalms (e.g. Ps. 17); cf. Barth, op. cit., p. 26.
⁵ See Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments, op. cit., III, 149f.
chaos. God calls the light, not the darkness, "good". In Job 3:20, light and life are used in parallelism ("why is light given to him that is in misery, and life to the bitter in soul," RSV). Again, in Ps. 56:13, he who walks before God walks "in the light of life" (cf. Job 18:5f, 18; 38:15; Prov. 13:9). Words used to describe life are also used of light: joy or happiness (Isa. 9:1-3; Amos 5:18-20; Isa. 59:9; Ps. 97:11; Jer. 13:16), fortune (Isa. 9:1; Ps. 112:4; Job 29:2-3; 30:26), hope and promise (Isa. 60:1-3; Ps. 27:1). Also in other passages the use of light is such that it is obviously being used as a synonym for life or for one of the words used in relation to life. Light often appears in this sense in a negative manner, as the opposite of that darkness which "the Day of the Lord" brings (Amos 5:18-20; Micah 8:7ff.). "To see light" is the same as "to live". The life of God is described in terms of light, brightness, glory or splendor (e.g. Isa. 60:1-3; Ps. 97; 18:28; 34:11; and cf. John 1:4; 8:12 et. al.). The world of man is the world of light, whereas the underworld, the realm of death, is the world of darkness.

In the world of man light belongs; it is inseparably united with life. Light is life, but life is, . . . to possess the values of life. Therefore light is identical with blessing and peace, with righteousness and truth (e.g. Prov. 16:15; Ps. 56:13; Job 33:28, 30).

The use of light as a symbol of life can also be seen in such

---

1 See Pedersen, op. cit., pp. 470ff.
2 Pedersen, op. cit., p. 465.
expressions as "to make one's face shine", i.e. to be gracious or friendly (e.g. see Num. 6:24-26; Ps. 13:1, 3; 19:8; cf. Prov. 29:13; et al.). Light is thus endowed with a positive quality of good in the OT. Light, like life, is more or less present; can be weak or strong. It thus forms an excellent symbol for life itself.

Another symbol of life is water. Water plays a double role in the OT; it is both a symbol of death and a symbol of life. That this is so can be readily seen in a comparison of the two creation accounts in Gen. 1 and 2. In Gen. 1, water is the symbol of evil and death - it represents the chaos which must be suppressed and confined before life can arise. In Gen. 2, the second account of the creation represents water as good--no rain had fallen and so the earth is without life (v. 5). After the earth had been watered (v. 6) God made man (v. 7). Here water is clearly associated with life. Why this double function of water? Partly because of the background. Gen. 1 is based on Babylonian creation stories and Babylonia lies in a flood region—the seasonal floods of the Tigris-Euphrates river system. Gen. 2 originated in a Palestinian environment—a dry or semi-arid land where water is welcomed for the life it brings to the land (hence the "rain" of v. 5 and "mist" of v. 6). The double function of water is also an observable function of nature—the fearsome power and destructiveness of

---

1See Barth, op. cit., p. 35.
floods or of a storm on the ocean or a lake contrasts vividly with the gentle coolness of falling rain (especially in a hot climate). Added to this is the fear of the landsmen of the mysterious reach and power of the ocean—an apparently boundless thing of terrible power and containing mysterious and fearsome creatures. The Hebrews were not sea-faring men. Thus we see the double function of water. But it is to be noted that water as a symbol of death and destruction (of chaos) is nearly always stated in the form of "ocean", whereas water as a symbol of life is just "water". Water appears frequently in the Psalms in its negative function (e.g. Ps. 69:1ff.; Ps. 18:4, 16; et. al., cf. Isa. 57:20). Water also is frequently used in the OT as a symbol of life (e.g. Gen. 2:5ff.; Isa. 55:1, 10; 66:11f.).

The particular things that appear to be expressed by this symbol are that life is permitted to grow, prosper, spread and move.

2. The Lord of Life.

In the OT, the source of life is in God: He is the giver of life. (Ps. 36:9). Therefore, life is not a natural or inherent possession of man: it is a gift of God. The origin of life is in God: this is the teaching of the creation stories. Gen. 2:7 describes the creation of man, or the original gift of life to man, as the product of the divine inbreathing. Rusch expresses this concept of man's origin in God and also the related concept of the continuance of life in dependence on God. Life is a gift—it is not,  

---

1Barth, op. cit., p. 35.
like heart, etc., a part of man. God is, therefore, the Lord of life (e.g. Ps. 104:29f.; Job 34:13ff.).

While we cannot in any degree of fulness describe the OT view of the nature of God, it will be necessary to present some facets of its thought in relation to our general purpose. In many ancient Oriental religions, God (or the gods) is identified with creaturely powers of life. But in Israel there is no identification of God with creaturely powers of life. There was a long struggle in Israel by the Yahweh religion against the various agrarian cults. In these cults the Creator and creature, Giver and gift, are intermingled and practically made identical. The Prophets placed the confession of Yahweh as Creator foremost in their struggle against the cults (e.g. see I Kg. 18; Hos. 11:1-4; 14:8; Dt. 4:15-20; Iss. 44:24; 45:3-12). Yahweh is God whether or not there is a creation (e.g. Ps. 90:2; 102:25ff.). Yahweh is the powerful one who dwells in freedom. He alone is God—He is the Lord. For Israel there is no second Lord.

Because "Jahwe als einer, der auch abgesehen von der Kreatur all Voraussetzungen des Lebens besitzt und im eigentlichen und ursprünglichen Sinne lebt, weil er also aus freiem Entschluss die Kreatur, in ihrer Mitte den Menschen und wiederum in deren Mitte das Volk Israel

---

1Ibid., p. 36.
2For further information see Barth, op. cit., pp. 36-44; the various theologies of the OT, special works on the OT, and especially TWNT, III, art. "Θεός:"
3For examples see Barth, op. cit., pp. 37ff. and literature cited there.
4Barth, op. cit., p. 42.
Yahweh is the "living" God (Jer. 10:10; 23:36; Ps. 42:2; 84:2; Josh. 3:10; Dt. 5:22ff.; II Kgs. 19:4; et. al.). It is He who "kills or makes alive" (Dt. 32:39; cf. I Sam. 2:6f.). This concept of Yahweh as the Lord of Life gives to the concept of life in Israel a different character from that found in surrounding peoples. Life can not now be the completely free and self-sufficient movement and development in the direction which man wishes. Rather,

it has as its content the attainment of the goal placed by the Lord of life, the fulfillment of the promise given by him with life. This goal means for Israel: the undeserved and against its will responsible participation in the life of God's called people—; for the individual: to be a member of this people.

The knowledge of this goal and the calling to it are not an indwelling possibility of man but are revealed. They are bound up with the Word—in the Word of Yahweh as proclaimed and represented by prophets, priests and kings. Thus God is the Lord of life and man has life only as a gift. God "has life in himself, while man must receive it (by its acquisition) through nourishment, unless God

---

2So Barth, op. cit., p. 43; cf. Eichrodt, Theologie, op. cit., III, 169.
3Barth, op. cit., p. 43.
4Ibid., p. 44.
5Gen. 3:19; II Sam. 14:14; et. al.
preserves it miraculously (Dt. 8:3). Man is mortal.⁴
Man's life comes only from God and depends on him. True
life must be orientated to God's will: it is to hear and
obey God's Word. "It is only then rightly understood as
God's gift, if it leads to a human response to the call of
God; but even in that it has then also its promise."²

3. The Land of Life.

The ancient Hebrew had a threefold world (or
universe); heaven, earth, and the sea (or waters) of the
netherworld (the underworld). The earth is the basis of
life; the land cultivated and inhabited by man.

For the Israelite 'the land' is the country where
blessing abides. This does not only mean that it is
fertile land. The blessing is not identical with
material fertility, but is the source of it.³

"It is the man's living together with the land that gives
to it its character of land of man."⁴ Parts of the land
are closer to a man than others: family land, the national
land (the Land of Promise). The opposite of the land of
man is the desert land.⁵ It is an evil place (Num. 20:5;
Isa. 5:6; 7:24; Zeph. 2:9; et. al.), the place of the curse
and terror (Lev. 16:10, 21ff.; Isa. 34:4-15; et. al.).

Even in the land of man there are places where the curse

---

¹TWNT, II, 352, 7ff. (on the subject of nourishment
see Barth, op. cit., pp. 26ff.).
²Elchrodt, Theologie, op. cit., III, 149.
³Pedersen, op. cit., p. 454.
⁴Ibid., p. 474.
⁵Ibid., p. 454.
acts (e.g. Jericho, Sodom, etc.). Wherever the desert is, there is the curse. The desert is a constant threat to the land of man and must be kept out by the maintenance of the blessing.1 Within the land of man there are also places where the blessing is concentrated: holy places.2 These are places with a particularly special connection with Yahweh. Yahweh dwells in Heaven and comes down to earth (e.g. Gen. 11:5; 19:24; 21:17; Ps. 2:4; 18:6; Isa. 66:1; et. al.). Where Yahweh appears on earth is a holy place: e.g. Hebron (Gen. 13); Bethel (Gen. 28); etc. It was felt by many that the appearances of God at these places meant He was bound to dwell there permanently (perhaps He had bound Himself). But the Prophets spoke against this concept: God remains free (e.g. Dt. 12). Jeremiah prophesied against the Holy City and the Temple (Jer. 7:26), as did Ezekiel (Ch. 9-11): "Do not trust in these deceptive words: 'This is the temple of the LORD, the temple of the LORD, the temple of the LORD!'" (Jer. 7:4). Micah also spoke thus: "Yet they lean upon the LORD and say, 'Is not the LORD in the midst of us? No evil shall come upon us.' Therefore because of you Zion shall be plowed as a field; Jerusalem shall become a heap of ruins, and the mountain of the house a wooded height" (3:11f.). Yahweh remains the free Lord

1See Pedersen, op. cit., pp. 458f.
2Ibid., p. 475; cf. Barth, op. cit., pp. 44ff.
3Many of these places were holy before Yahweh appeared there: see Barth, op. cit., p. 45.
who decides where and when He shall dwell. It is of His mercy, love and condescension that He comes down to earth. The Temple is the most important of the holy places associated with the presence of Yahweh. The name of Yahweh dwells in the Temple. Zion is the "holy hill" (Ps. 2:6; 3:4; 15:1; 24:3; et. al.). From Yahweh comes help and deliverance (Ps. 7:1; 17:7; 18:2f.; et. al.). By means of the cultic actions and rituals, Yahweh's presence and deliverance are assured—the Temple is the focal point of this cultic life.¹ "In its function as the source of life the Temple forms the background of a great part of the Hebraic Psalm-literature."² It is Yahweh's gracious and free will to dwell here (so Amos 9:1ff.; Mi. 3:11f.; Jer. 7:4, 12ff.; 26:9; Ezek. 8-11).

But it is not only in the holy places that Yahweh is present. He is also in the entire land: the land, that is, that He has promised to His people. He is present here as He is not in other lands (see I Sam. 26:19f.; Am. 7:17;) and therefore by His presence it is holy. This is the land which God has sworn unto Israel's fathers (e.g. Ex. 13:5; 15:17). This land is a gift from Yahweh: it is the land promised unto Israel (Gen. 15:7, 18ff. and cf. Ex. 13:5; 15:17; et. al.). But though Yahweh has given this land to Israel, where they may live and dwell, Israel may never forget that they

¹See Barth, op. cit., p. 49.
²Ibid.
were strangers and sojourners and, in a sense, still are
(Gen. 15:13; Jer. 35:7; Lev. 25:23; Amos 6:2f.; Ps. 105:
7-13; et. al.). Israel's sojourn in the land is conditional
on obedience (So e.g. Deut. 28; esp. 28:63f.). "The
particular proximity and presence of God alone distinguishes
this land from other lands; its distinction stands and falls
therewith, that Yahweh does not remain distant nor covers His
face."

All conceptions of the presence of Yahweh, whether
holy places (Shiloh or Zion) or the Land of Promise, are com-
prehended in the expression "before Yahweh" (or "in Yahweh's
presence", "in the face of Yahweh"). If Yahweh appears and
His face is seen, that means God is not distant but near:
present as the God of help and deliverance. This is also
expressed by the "revelation of the name" (a particular
theme of the Deuteronomist; e.g. Dt. 12:5; 14:23f.; 16:2;
26:2; II Sam. 7:13, 22; et. al.). "Before Yahweh" man is
called and summoned to a responsible existence. In the mean-
ing of "before Yahweh" in its widest sense, God's presence is
conceived to extend to all the earth (e.g. Ps. 139:7ff.; Am.
9:2-4, where Yahweh's presence is not even excluded from
Sheol). The just live and walk "before" or "With Yahweh"

1Ibid., p. 47.
2See Barth, op. cit., p. 47; and esp. Pedersen, op.
cit., pp. 245-259.
3Barth, op. cit., pp. 47f.
4See further Section B of this chapter, on "death",
and the "realm of death".
(Gen. 17:1; 24:40; I Kgs. 3:6; Isa. 38:3; Micah 6:8; et. al.). The presence of Yahweh is not here restricted to any particular place: one is simply to remain, walk or dwell before Yahweh.

Israel's view of life is not restricted to temporal localities nor is it built by means of mythical explanations nor sustained by magical rites or ceremonies. Rather, "the word of God placed him in a decision between life and death; . . . ."¹ The true meaning of life is found in its contents (health, length, etc.), but the contents are determined and validated by the goal of life. This goal is communion with God (within the fellowship of God's chosen community). The Word of God places Israel (and the individual) in a decision between life and death: life is to serve Yahweh and walk before Him but death awaits the one who will not obey God, who does not "seek Yahweh's face". The disobedient one cuts himself off from contact with the Source of Life.

¹TWNT, II, 846 (e.g. Josh. 27:14-15; cf. John 17:3).
B. Death in the Old Testament

In the Old Testament, death is defined in terms of life. This whole section will, we believe, demonstrate the proposition that death is the negation of life. In our modern thought we make a clear distinction between life and death: one is either dead or alive. As long as a spark of "life" remains one is still alive, in the view of modern man. This is not so in the Old Testament. Here one may be more or less dead, even as he may be more or less alive. In fact, death is the weakest form of life: it involves the "complete scattering of one's vital power." The presentation of the concept of death in the Old Testament involves consideration of the spatial and dynamic character of death. In this presentation problems and controversies may arise. Two of the key controversial problems shall be dealt with to some extent: the question of the locale of the realm of death, and the problem of various distresses described as a form of death. In order to be brief we shall again only sketch some of the main points, and only in sufficient detail to attempt to make them clear. It should be noted, however, that the Old Testament is not entirely consistent in its attitudes and statements on death, its power and its realm. Therefore, we shall,

1 So Barth, op.cit., 201; Pedersen, op.cit.; Johnson, Vitality of the Individual, 89.
2 See Pedersen, op.cit., 153; Barth, op.cit.
3 Johnson, op.cit., 89.
in the main, present the general viewpoint.

1. The nature of death.

a. Death as the end of life (loss of freedom of movement and development.)

The most obvious and undisputed characteristic of the nature of death is that of death as the end of life. If life consists in the possibility of movement and development toward the desired goal and the possession of sufficient time in order to achieve its fulfillment, then death is that which brings to an end this possibility. Death is the end of temporal and earthly life. The exception in Old Testament thought to the fact that death means the end of the possibility of reaching the desired goal occurs only in the case of one who has reached his goal—which in the Old Testament required "length of days." Such a one died in "a good old age, an old man and full of years" (Gen. 25:8; cf. 35:29; 49:33; etc.). In such a case death was no evil. But for those dying prematurely the situation is different. For them death is truly the end (e.g. Isa. 38:10; Ps. 102:24f.; Eccl. 7:17): it is the end of the possibility of the fulfillment of life, the end of the progress to the desired goal. But that death is the end of temporal and earthly life does not mean death is extinction. In common with most other ancient peoples, the Hebrews believed in some sort of survival after death. But this survival was not considered as life in the strict and full meaning of the term. Death was

---

1So Barth, op. cit., 54f.; F. Schwa4ly, Das Leben nach dem Tode, (Giessen: J. Richer'sche, 1892), 51.; et.al.
not the end of existence, but the end of the possibility of life's fulfillment.\(^1\) Death means there is no new day forthcoming with its possibility of life's fulfillment. Thus to one in full life, of whom it may not yet be said he is "old and satisfied (or "full") of years (or "life")," death comes as a terror and an evil—death here is no comfort. This is one of the terrors of death in Israel. For, since the fulfillment of life consists in communion with Yahweh within the sphere of the living community chosen by Him, death will mean the end of this communion and exclusion from the living community.\(^2\)

Where the goal of life has been reached death can be no terror. It is then but the conclusion of a full and rich life—the rest from one's labors. Such a person dies in peace. Death is not, then, necessarily evil per se. But where life's goal is not fulfilled, death can be seen only as an evil—the end of the time necessary to move and develop in the direction of the appointed goal.\(^3\) This does not mean the dead do not have any space nor that they cannot move within it. Rather, the dead can move and act—they may reappear on earth and act for evil or good.\(^4\) This is affirmed in many sources (e.g. I Sam. 28, and the operations of the cult of the dead).\(^5\) But true activity takes place

---

\(^{1}\)Barth, op.cit., 55.

\(^{2}\)See further the next paragraph.

\(^{3}\)Which is, as we have said, communion with Yahweh and obedience to His Word.

\(^{4}\)See Barth, op.cit., 55f; Sutcliffe, The Old Testament and the Future Life, (London: Burns Oate and Washbourne Ltd., 1946), 60-69; et.al.

\(^{5}\)For information on cult of dead, see Pedersen, op.cit., III-IV, 484ff.; Eichrodt, op.cit., II, 115-118; Schwally, op.cit., 28-41; et.al.
only in life. "Existence in Sheol, deprived of all the activity that makes up life in this world, was conceived as dull and uninteresting." 1

b. Loss of the living community.

Another characteristic of the nature of death is that death means the loss of the living community. Israel is the community called out and elected by Yahweh as His own peculiar possession, His own people. In death man is excluded from participation in this living community, the community of life. Life in Israel does not consist in isolated existence, but rather in participation in the life, actions and affairs of the community (the so-called corporate conception of personality). This is one of the most important, if not the most important, facets of Israel's thought. This is so because the goal of communion with Yahweh can only be reached within the community of His elect people. True, Yahweh does summon and address the individual by and through His Word, but this event only takes place within the elect community of Israel. 2 Death in the Old Testament is portrayed often in terms of solitude. The dead are solitary, though not necessarily alone. All the dead are gathered together in Sheol, but real fellowship does not take place. But fellowship, as we have seen before (see A, 1, b), is vital to the fulfillment of life. 3 Death is the end of the possibility of this fellowship. In this we come to the

1Sutcliffe, op.cit., 55.
2See Eichrodt, Man in the Old Testament; Theologle; et.al.
3Barth, op.cit., 58.
real terror of death in the eyes of ancient Israel. Participation in the communal life of God's chosen people means participation in all the benefits of that community: joy, happiness, peace, blessing, etc. Participation in the communal life of the elect people means one may enjoy that fellowship with Yahweh which is the true goal of all life. But death means the end of all this: to an Israelite the real terror of death lies in separation from Yahweh (e.g. Isa. 38:18f.).

However, the dead are not absolutely excluded from any relation with the living. This is another side of the thought of Israel on death. For the dead who die having apparently fulfilled the goal of life not only die "old and full of years" but are spoken of as "to lie with his fathers," "to his people (or "to his fathers") is gathered" (e.g. Gen. 25:8; 35:29; 49:29, 33; Judges 2:10; II Kgs. 22:20; et al.). The probable existence of the ancestor cult (the cult of the dead) is also a witness to this connection of living and dead. Thus in some sense the dead still are in a relation with the living: in the family or national life. But this relation, while a true community, is not a living community.

Within the community one participates in the benefits of the community: happiness, blessing, joy, peace, etc. Therefore death may be described in terms which are the opposite of this. If life is strength (or the fulness of vital power),

---

1 On this whole point see Barth, op.cit., 57; and esp. Pedersen, op.cit., I-II, 180ff.; 495ff.; III-IV, 477-486.
2 Barth, op.cit., 58
then death is weakness. Thus the dead are called דַּעַת (the weak ones). The derivation of this word is disputed and we shall not go into it here.¹ This word portrays man as living (or existing) on in the underworld of Sheol, a "mere shadow of his former self."² (See Isa. 14:9f.; 59:10; Job 26:5; Ps. 88:10; Prov. 2:18; 9:18; 21:16; Isa. 26:14, 19). The dead are thus those who have become weak (Isa. 14:9f.), they are "souls bereft of strength."³ Death is then the loss of everything that is meant by "being alive," of liveliness or vitality. To the joy of life corresponds the sadness of death.⁴ This sadness is based on the conception that the dead are excluded from communion with the living God (e.g. Ps. 88 and esp. 88:6; "They are cut off from thy hand").

c. Death and the body.

Unlike much of Western thought on death, which appears to regard death in terms of Platonic Greek thought, as a death of the body and a continued existence of the immortal soul, the Hebrew conceived death as a death of the whole man. We have in Part I, Ch. 1 pointed out the Hebrew conception of the unity of personality. Man is considered as a whole: he is body and soul, and is not the one apart from the other. This thought is basic as regards death and its relation to the body (and the soul). In line with the unitary conception of personality,

¹See works in bibliography, esp. Johnson, Vitality, 90; Eichrodt, Theologie, II, 112.
²Johnson, Vitality, 90.
³See Pedersen, op.cit., 180.
⁴So Barth, op.cit., 67.
death in the Old Testament is regarded as affecting the whole man. Both soul and body die: they die together. "When death occurs, then it is the soul that is deprived of life. Death cannot strike the body or any other part of the soul without striking the entirety of the soul"¹ (e.g. see Num. 31:19, 35:15, 30; Josh. 20:3, 9; Gen. 37:21; Jer. 40:14, 15; et al.). It is the soul which dies (Judg. 16:30; Num. 23:10; 31:19; I Kgs. 3:11; Ezek. 13:19; 18:4; et al.). Thus the soul is said to depart at death or to return when a man revives² (Gen. 35:18 and I Kgs. 17:21; cf. Jer. 15:9). Such "expressions do not imply that death consists in the departure of the soul from the body, so that the soul is untouched, but only goes elsewhere . . . . Both soul and body lose their lives at the same time, because they are a unity."³ This view that both soul and body together is important and is necessary to an understanding of the peculiar form taken in Israel of the rise of the doctrine of a blessed future life. At death the soul is breathed or poured out (Jer. 15:9; Job 11:20 and Ps. 141:8; Isa, 53:12): man is then "like water spilt on the ground and cannot be gathered up again."⁴ (II Sam. 14:14). Body and soul are bound up together. The body is the vehicle of the Nephesh (the principle

¹Pedersen, op.cit., I-II, 179.
²See Johnson; Vitality, 13f.
³Pedersen, op.cit., 180; cf. Barth, op.cit., 63.
⁴Johnson, op.cit., 13.
of life in man). A body without Nephesh would be only dust and one can speak of the soul only in connection with a particular body.1 "Man in death can no longer be a 'living soul', because the power of the 'living breath' in him is withdrawn."2 Thus death means the destruction of the whole man. Even the dead do not continue in a disembodied existence. They retain some form; they have some substance (e.g. see the story of Samuel's reappearance after death in I Sam. 28). Life in Sheol, the realm of the dead, was conceived as a shadowy extension of earthly life.3 It is a life denied of all that which makes earthly life "worth-living." One further point may be mentioned. So long as the body still exists the soul maintains its connection with it: the dead body is still the soul4 (see Num. 6:6; Lev. 21:1, 11; 19:28; etc.). The body is destroyed at death (by burning) only where a soul is to be utterly destroyed (Gen. 38:24; Lev. 20: 14; 21:9; Josh. 7:25; II Kgs. 23:16, 18; Am. 2:1). But whether the soul finally perishes, i.e. becomes extinct, when the body finally decays completely is not stated. From the vital connection of body and soul this would seem likely. But on the other hand, if the Nephesh could have a continued survival as a shadowy counterpart of the living Nephesh, perhaps also the body has its shadowy counterpart which also survives death. In this case it would be a shadow of the whole man that survived death: body and soul continuing in the shadowy existence of Sheol. There seems to be some justification for such a concept.

---

1See Barth, op.cit., 63.
2Ibid.
3So Schwally, op.cit., 63.


d. Symbols of death.

In the discussion of the symbols of life we had occasion to discuss already one of the symbols of death, viz. water (or ocean). We shall not repeat that here but only mention the use (as ocean or deep) of water as a symbol of death. Another of the symbols of death is "darkness." As light is a symbol of life, this use of darkness is not surprising. Pedersen lists three worlds of death: the desert, the realm of death (grave and Sheol: the underworld) and the ocean (or immense deep). Common to all three of these realms is darkness (see Job 10:21f.; 38:17; Ps. 88:13; 49:20; Ps. 23 on realm of death. For ocean see Ps. 88:7 and on desert see Jer. 2:6; Job 12:25). The world of man is a world of light. To this corresponds the world of death as a world of darkness (e.g. Ps. 88:12). "The dead are barred from seeing the light and the sun." In this symbol is comprehended all the evil aspects of the nature of death. The dead can have no part in the joy, fortune, etc. that belong to life; in this is seen the sadness and misery of death.

2. The realm of death.

a. Names.

A detailed description of the names and designations

1 op.cit., 454-473.
2 Ibid., 464.
3 Barth, op.cit., 67.
of the realm of death would occupy far too much space for our purposes. We shall deal with the chief ones and pass over the others. The chief names for the realm of death are Sheol and grave. Of lesser importance are such terms as ocean (or deep), pit (2 words in Hebrew), desert, prison, etc. In fact many of the lesser terms appear to be used as synonyms or descriptions of Sheol. For example—Ps. 30:3 uses Sheol and Pit in parallelism.

Sheol. The etymology of this word is disputed, but apparently it has the meaning of "hollow place" or "deep place." At any rate, Sheol was located deep down under the earth. It is a place to which one "goes down" (e.g. Isa. 38:18; Ezek. 31:14; I Kgs. 2:6; etc.). Sheol is the abode of all the dead: "Yea, I know that thou wilt bring me to death, and to the house appointed for all living" (Job 30:23 (RSV); cf. Isa. 14:19; Ps. 49:19; I Sam. 28:19; Ps. 89:48; Prov. 27:20; 30:15f.; Hab. 2:5; Eccl. 9:10). Everyone goes to Sheol, a land of darkness and misery. Life there is not real life but mere existence. Sheol has gates and bars (Isa. 38:10; Jonah 2:6; Job 38:17; 17:16; Ps. 9:13; 107:18; etc.), and in this respect it is like a prison. All who go there have no hope of return: "he who

1 Details will be found in works cited in Bibliography, esp. Pedersen, op.cit., 454-496; Sutcliffe, op.cit., 36-59; Barth, op.cit., 77-91. By far the most complete discussion of the whole question of life and death is that found in Barth.

2 On Pit: (1) (bor) see e.g. Ps. 30:3; 28:1; 88:6; etc.; (2) (shachath) Ps. 7:15; Ps. 30:9.

3 On this see Sutcliffe, op.cit., 36; Eichrodt, Theologie, op.cit., 112; Theologische Zeitschrift, Vol. 2, 71ff. (by L. Köhler), 233ff. (W. Baumgartner); etc.
goes down to Sheol does not come up" (Job 7:9 (RSV); cf. 16:22; 10:21; II Sam. 12:23). We shall discuss later the passages where it appears one can return from Sheol (e.g. Ps. 116:8 "thou hast delivered my soul from death;" cf. 86:18 30:3; et.al.). But these do, in any case, indicate that thought on this subject of the finality of death was not settled or inflexible. The thought of the Old Testament on the realm of death and its inhabitants is quite varied. The dead can return (e.g. I Sam. 28 and the practice of necromancy), but not to life in its fullest and proper sense. Sheol is a dreary place, a land of darkness (Job 10:21f.; cf. 17:13ff.; 38:17; Ps. 88:6, 12). Sheol is the "land of forgetfulness," its inhabitants are themselves forgetful of everything in their former life and are forgotten by God and man. (Ps. 88:12; 6:5; Eccl. 9:10; cf. Job 3:11-19; Ps. 31:17; 94:17; 115:17). It is a "region of virtual annihilation" (use of יִתְנָה in Job 26:6; Prov. 15:11; 27:20; et.al.).

Grave. The dead are buried in a grave as a general rule. Thus the word "grave" is used as a designation of the underworld. It has a particular aspect in that each person has his own grave, but it also has a general aspect as in the case of the family grave and also in its use as a designation of the gathering place of all the dead. "The dead dwell in the grave." The

1Johnson, Vitality, 93, writes: "there can be no return to former conditions in the 'land of the living'. . . ."
2Johnson, op.cit., 93; Barth, op.cit., 79; et.al.
3Johnson, op.cit., 93.
4Pedersen, op.cit., 460.
words for "pit" are used often with the meaning of Sheol or grave (cf. Ps. 16:10; 28:1; 30:3; 55:23; Job 17:14 et al.). The grave is the particular manifestation of the realm of death. Burial in the family grave ensures a continuing connection with the family and thus in some sense a continuation of life.1 Grave and Sheol are not identical2, but they may not be separated. All the dead "form a common realm, because they are essentially subjected to the same conditions."3 Therefore, everyone who dies goes to Sheol just as he is, if all is normal, buried in the grave (See Num. 16:29ff.; cf. Gen. 37:35 and 47:30). "The dead are at the same time in the grave and in Sheol, not in two different places."4 One lies in the grave and in Sheol (see Ezek. 32:18-32). But Sheol is not the sum of all the graves.

Sheol is the entirety into which all graves are merged; but no more than the other entireties which fill the Israelitic world of ideas, is it the result of a summing up of all the single parts, so that Sheol should be the sum of the graves.5

"All graves have certain common characteristics constituting the nature of the grave, and that is Sheol."6 Thus Sheol manifests itself in every single grave: "Where there is grave, there is Sheol, and where there is Sheol, there is grave."7 The difference lies in that grave is the visible manifestation of the underworld (Sheol). Grave may be good or bad: it is the dwelling place of the fathers to which one hopes and expects "to be gathered" at death and therefore the family keeps its

---

1See Eichrodt, Theologie, II, 113ff.
2Barth, op.cit., 84; Pedersen, op.cit., 461ff.
3Pedersen, op.cit., 460.
4Ibid., 461 (cf. Barth, op.cit., 84).
5Ibid.
6Ibid.
7Ibid.
graves close by itself; but grave is also the house of realm of death and therefore the enemy of life.

**Ocean.** This will be discussed only briefly.¹ The ocean is associated with chaos (see Gen. 1), and all that is chaos is a form or a manifestation of death. The ocean is called the "deep" (e.g. Ps. 42:7; 77:16; etc.).² The ocean is the immense deep which lies curled under the earth. It is below, even as Sheol is below. But these are so related that no sharp distinction may be made. Sheol is more nearly identical with grave than it is with ocean. In spite of this distinction, it is still the case that he "who is in Sheol is also in the ocean, because they both denote the subterraneous, negative power, the world of death and chaos."³ The Psalmist cries: "Let not the flood sweep over me, or the deep swallow me up, or the pit close its mouth over me" (Ps. 69:15 (RSV); cf. 69:1f.; Ps. 40:2; 88:6f.; etc.). The attempt to separate in accordance with modern spatial conceptions these realms of death has met with little success: the ancients simply did not locate these places geographically. "The lower ocean is not to be seen with the eyes and possesses no geographical spatiality--for it is there where it manifests itself: in the visible sea and its waves."⁴

**Desert.** This is the third realm of death according to

¹For more details see Pedersen, op.cit., 463ff.; Barth, op.cit., 85f.
²For other passages and words descriptive of the ocean as a "deep" see Barth, op.cit., 85.
³Pedersen, op.cit., 463.
⁴Barth, op.cit., 86.
Hebrew thought: the others being in the earth (Sheol, grave) and ocean.\textsuperscript{1} The desert is the opposite of the land of man, the land of the living.\textsuperscript{2} It is an evil place (Num. 20:5; Isa. 5:6; 7:24; Zeph. 2:9; \textit{et al.}), the home of the curse and the terror (Lev. 16:10, 21ff.; Isa. 34:9-15; etc.). Desert is also characterized as that which opposes order: it is therefore chaos (e.g. Ps. 107:40; Job 12:24; 6:18; Dt. 32:10). The desert is a threat to the land of man. Sin means the entrance of the curse, of the desert, into the land of man, the land of blessing.

Thus grave, ocean, and desert are visible manifestations of the realm of death. "Each embodies in its particular manner the nature of death; to each the external and internal, the physical and really existing darkness are common."\textsuperscript{3}

b. The question of locale.

Where is the realm of death located? Various attempts have been made to do this.\textsuperscript{4} Sheol, it is true, is described as lying beneath: one goes down to Sheol (see Gen. 7:11; 8:2; 49:25; Jonah 2:2ff.; Ex. 20:4; Dt. 32:22; Num. 16:29ff.; etc.). It lies in the depths. So also are grave and ocean described as lying beneath or in the depths. Both grave and Sheol lie deep beneath the earth. There is also the lower ocean which also lies beneath. This would seem to settle the matter of locale, but in fact the question is not so simple. For desert is also a realm of death. In fact, the realm of death will be

\textsuperscript{1}For more details see above A, 3 and Pedersen, \textit{op.cit.}, 453ff.; Barth \textit{op.cit.}, 86f.
\textsuperscript{2}See above A, 3.
\textsuperscript{3}Barth, \textit{op.cit.}, 87.
\textsuperscript{4}See e.g. the diagrams reproduced by Barth, \textit{op.cit.}, 82, and A. Bertholet, \textit{Die Israelitischen Vorstellungen vom Zustand nach dem Tode}, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1914), 42.
variously designated as in the grave or in the ocean or as Sheol, or as in the east or in the south or in the desert.\(^1\) The visible ocean and the desert do not lie beneath nor is the individual grave deep in the earth. Further, there is also the upper or heavenly ocean to be considered. Yet amid all this variety there is unity. They each serve to describe the essential thing with regard to death, viz. its distance and diversity from the world of life. Therefore, we cannot give to the realm of death an exact geographical location in terms of our modern notions of spatiality. That this is true is because the ancient Hebrew thought of death more in terms of a power than in terms of a locale. It would be true to locate Sheol as "beneath" or in the "depths of the earth," but it is also true to locate it anywhere that death has asserted its power over man or the land of man. "The realm of death is there above all, where death exercises its lordship."\(^2\) Or as Pedersen has expressed it: "Where there is darkness, there is also the nether world; for the nether world is wherever there is a nether world nature."\(^3\) From this we must take warning against the temptation to speak of the Old Testament conception of the realm of death purely in terms of geography. Death and its realm may not be separated and should be regarded in dynamic rather than static terms. It is not possible to reconcile the various statements on the realm of death and arrive at an exact

---

1 See Barth, *op. cit.*, 88.
2 Ibid.
3 Pedersen, *op. cit.*, 466.
answer to the question of locale.

c. Death and its realm as a power.

Death is in the Old Testament a power. Unlike other ancient peoples, the Hebrew never entirely excluded death and the realm of death from the power of Yahweh. The Hebrew, of course, never attempted to deal with the question in a philosophical manner and thus difficulties are present. But in the main, Yahweh's power extends over death and its realm also (if not in fact, then at least in potential). 1 Yahweh is the God who, in the final analysis, wills life not death for man. His will is directed to the fulfillment of the covenant. Therefore Yahweh's Word places man in a decision. The possibility exists for man to make a choice—he can reject the covenant. But to reject the covenant is to place one's self outside the realm of life and thus to be in the realm of death. Then instead of the blessing, man receives the curse. Man thus falls under the power of death. The sinner, like everyone else, goes to Sheol, but in reality he is there already 2 (Ps. 9:15-17; Prov. 5:1-6; 7:27; etc.). In Sheol there is no praise of God (Isa. 38:18ff; Ps. 6:5; 88:5, 10ff.; 28; 30:9; 115:17; Eccl. 9:10), for the dead are cut off from His hand (Ps. 88:5; Isa. 38:18; Job 7:7f.). "The heavens are the LORD'S heavens, but the earth he has given to the sons of men. The dead do not praise the LORD" (Ps. 115:16f., RSV). This is the real sting of death: exclusion from

---

1 So Barth, op. cit., 67-76.
2 So Pedersen, op. cit., 466.
that earthly life in which the cultic union is maintained.\footnote{TWNT, II, 848f.}
Yahweh is in an exclusive sense the God of the living. Yahweh's relationships are confined to the "land of the living"—death is the sovereign over the realm of death and exercises its power and authority over all who die.\footnote{Ibid.}  "They are cut off from thy hand" (Ps. 88:5). Yet there are also passages affirming God's power over the realm of death. In other ancient cultures (e.g. Babylon) the realm of death is ruled by its own god (or gods) of life.\footnote{See further Sutcliffe, op.cit., 1-19, 51; Barth, op.cit. 67-71.} But in Israel there is only one God—Yahweh, and His power is supreme. Therefore His rule extends to the realm of death. In Amos 9:2, God speaks: "though they dig into Sheol, from there shall my hand take them" (RSV).\footnote{cf. Ps. 139; Prov. 15:11; Job 26:6.} These two positions are not reconciled in the Old Testament (the dead are excluded from any relation with Yahweh, and Yahweh's power over the realm of death), but perhaps it is true to say that Yahweh, while still exercising authority and power over Sheol (the realm of death) has nevertheless excluded the dead from relations with Himself. This would be in accord with the Old Testament emphasis on the covenant relation of Israel with God and its similar emphasis on this life. "According to God's order death follows life; according to God's order death is the end. There is only a present world."\footnote{"diesseits".}
Man, who lives and enjoys his living, encounters death as a power—a force against which he knows he cannot prevail with all the powers of his life. Death is a finality—the end of life. This power seems at times to be opposed to the power of Yahweh (e.g. Isa. 25:8, "he will swallow up death for ever"), but the thought of Yahweh's conquest of death and the possibility of a final banishment of death is a later development. At times death is the instrument of Yahweh: God is He who kills and makes alive (I Sam. 2:6; cf. Dt. 32:39; et.al.). Yet Yahweh is never the God of death; He is the living God.1 Yahweh may punish or even kill, but only in order to lead Israel back to the service and worship of the living God (Hosea 11:1-9).

Death is the enemy of life: the boundary and end of life. Death and the realm of death are described often in terms indicating the power of death (e.g. Isa. 28:15; "because you have said, 'We have made a covenant with death, and with Sheol we have an agreement.'"; cf. Hos. 13:14; Isa. 28:18; Ps. 6:5; 22:16; Job 28:22; 30:23; et.al.). Sheol and death are spoken of as hungering for more inmates for their realm and as menacing all living with an insatiable appetite (Isa. 5:14; Hab. 2:5; Ps. 18:41; 116:3; Prov. 27:20; 30:16). The realm of death is a constant menace to the world of man, the land of life. Often it sends forth its powerful tentacles to grip a portion of man's world: it is a

1See Barth, op.cit., 73, 36-44.
threat menacing all of life. Even as death itself menaces all living beings, so also the realm of death menaces the realm of life. Death exercises its sway over each man who sins and the realm of death breaks into the land of life wherever the curse abides or replaces the blessing. As man and the land of life are bound together, the realm of death and death itself can grip man and his land whenever man sins and departs from the source of blessing (i.e. from fellowship with and obedience to Yahweh).1 "Just as the realm of death manifests itself in the desert or in the ocean, so it can manifest itself also in the individual man, indeed in an entire people or land."2

The Hebrew made little attempt to portray the origin of death, but does, like most other ancient cultures,3 have its legend as to how and why death entered the world in Gen. 3. This is on the boundary of the Old Testament, however, and does not represent any attempt to deal with the origin of evil or of death. It represents merely a mythical explanation of how man came to die. Death is on the one hand the boundary placed by God on man's life4 and on the other hand death is the punishment for sin, and a disrupting force in God's original creation.5

But in all this the Old Testament is not consistent: calamity

---

1 This whole question is discussed in Pedersen, op.cit., 453-496; and esp. Barth, op.cit., 53-67 and 67-76; 89ff.
2 Barth, op.cit., 91.
3 See HERE, Vol. 8, 1-44, art. "Life and Death."
4 So Köhler, op.cit., 134ff.; Eichrodt, Theologie, III, 152f.; et al. See Part III, Ch. 1.
5 Eichrodt, op.cit., 153.
and early or unnatural death are punishments of God on those who sin, but those who obey God are rewarded. But everyone must die, so this system of rewards and punishments must take place in this life. The conflict of the hard facts of life with this prevailing view is the burden of the book of Job and is also seen in the Psalms (e.g. Ps. 17, where also the writer is presented as pious and righteous and yet he suffers). Out of this conflict came the dawning of the hope of an after life of blessedness, a development speeded and accentuated by the national calamities which struck Israel.

Though death is a power and is often conceived as a power which resists the Lordship of Yahweh, and though death is portrayed as having its own realm where it rules supreme (while Yahweh rules in Heaven and over the created earth), this power of death and its realm is not supreme nor above the Lordship of Yahweh. It does not reign independently of Yahweh, who alone is Lord. That this is the case appears from at least two facts: (1) the explicit Old Testament references to Yahweh's power over death and its realm, Sheol; (2) the concept of Yahweh's absolute Lordship. Therefore any power death exercises is by His permission while Yahweh accomplishes His purposes. Death entered the world of man through an act of disobedience

\[1\] See Am. 9:2; Ps. 139; Prov. 15:11; Job 26:6.
\[2\] See e.g. Ex. 20; Gen 1 & 2 (Creator God); Job 26; Ps. 19; 24; 115; 135:5ff., 15ff; and often in the Prophets (see TWNT, III, art. "Ως")
Gen. 3) and rules now until the time when Yahweh’s purpose is accomplished.¹ Death was not God’s original intention for man and will in the end be eliminated (Isa. 25:8 and cf. I Cor. 15:54; Rev. 7:17; 21:4).

Therefore, death and its realm exercise a definite authority and power, but it is done within the appointed bounds and limits set by Yahweh. From man’s standpoint, however, the power of death appears final and absolute. In the Old Testament this is lessened by the concept of the possibility of a special translation before death of certain heroes (Enoch and Elijah) and the power of Yahweh to save and deliver one in mortal sickness or dire peril.²

3. Death and the individual.

a. Various distresses described as a form of death.

As this class is found primarily in the poetical literature, its interpretation and understanding is difficult. It should not prove surprising, therefore, to find many differences of opinion on this subject. The question of locale is decisive in this problem dealing with the description of distresses as a form of death. If the realm of death is to be strictly limited to a geographical location (i.e. Sheol as the realm of death located in the bowels of the earth) then the interpretation of

¹This is admittedly a picture of Old Testament teaching seen from the point of the later works of the Old Testament and from the New Testament perspective.

²On this later point see next section.
statements in the Old Testament of a deliverance from Sheol will take on a different coloring than would be the case if the realm of death is not to be limited to a geographical locale. Statements relating to a deliverance from death will then be described as metaphors, pictures or poetical phantasies. The same is true if death is only that event which terminates earthly life rather than as that force which also makes its power felt in any lessening of the powers of life. In our estimation, the problem of distresses described as a form of death cannot be resolved by simply calling them metaphors and pictures.¹

Generally these descriptions of various distresses as a form of death will be found in the Psalms, particularly in the Lament and Thanksgiving Psalms. The Lament Psalms have their situation in some necessity, in the menace of some dire peril or circumstance (whether the peril be an enemy, sickness or death itself). The Thanksgiving Psalms correspond to the Laments in that they render praise for deliverance from the necessity or circumstance constituting the threat or peril. Sometimes the exact circumstances are capable of definition, but more often are described in general terms. If sickness or oppression by enemies is the circumstance meant and described, a more precise definition (e.g. the precise sickness) is seldom possible. An important factor is that one who is in distress calls upon Yahweh (Ps. 107:7) and often this is done in the particular place of Yahweh's presence, i.e. in the Temple.²

¹See also Pedersen, op.cit.; Barth, op.cit.; Johnson, op.cit.
²See Barth, op.cit., 93.
In order to conserve space we shall take only one example of the distresses that are described as a form of death or as residence in the realm of death. We choose sickness because it plays the dominant role among the distresses which are described as a form of death. Ps. 6 forms a good example of this class (e.g. v. 2 "O LORD, heal me. . . ."). Others in this class include 31:9ff.; 38:3-8 (all dealing with some form of bodily suffering or sickness); 22:14f.; 31:12; (dealing with mental distresses as a form of sickness or the result of sickness). In Hebrew thought the body was not separated from the soul: as if one could be sick in body and whole of mind or the reverse. Rather, if sickness comes it grips the entire person: body and soul together. This is in keeping with the Hebrew conception of man as body and soul in a unified togetherness. Ps. 6:2f. is an example of this: "O LORD, heal me, for my bones are troubled. My soul also is sorely troubled." (RSV)2 Sickness affects not only the external man (Job 2:5, 7; 7:5; 17:7; 18:13; etc.) but also the inner man (Job 16:13; 19:26; 23:16; 30:16, 27).3 Sickness is a radical menace of the whole man: nothing which befalls a man, whether good or bad, can affect the soul without also at the same time affecting the body, and vice versa.4 The identification of the particular

---

1 For detailed consideration of this whole question see Pedersen, op.cit., 153f., 462, etc.; Johnson, Vitality, 88-107; Barth, op.cit., 91-124.
2 Cf. also Ps. 13:2; Job 2:4f., 7f.; 17:1, 7 etc.
3 So Barth, op.cit., 94.
4 See Pedersen, op.cit., 179f., 153, 334.
sickness is difficult, but that it is sickness or injury is easier to determine (e.g. often in Job; cf. Ps. 6, 13 et al.). Sickness is described not only in terms of sores, etc. (see e.g. Job 2:7; 7:5) but also in terms of weakness, misery, and emaciation (e.g. Ps. 35:13; 69:10f.; 31:10; 22:14ff.). External circumstances are also described as affecting the sick: his enemies persecute him (e.g. Ps. 22:16; 13:4; 6:8ff.; etc.). But not only do his enemies persecute the sick person but also one's own relations do the same (Ps. 27:10, "my mother and my father have forsaken me" (RSV)). Or again Ps. 31:11, "I am the scorn of all my adversaries, a horror to my neighbors, an object of dread to my acquaintances; those who see me in the street flee from me" (RSV). We might also mention the treatment of Job by his friends. This attitude is the product of the common belief in the association of sickness, etc. with guilt. Ps. 32:3, "When I declared not my sin, my body wasted away . . . ." (RSV). The basis for this belief is the conception that godliness is rewarded and godlessness punished by Yahweh (and in this life only).

b. Metaphor or reality.

One who has been sick or injured or suffers a bodily weakness of any kind and then recovers is said "to live." Thus, e.g., when Joshua's followers were circumcised they remained where they were in the camp "until they lived" (Josh. 5:8). That is, the circumcision had weakened them and

---

1 cf. also 32:5; 38:3f.; 39:8, 11; 41:4; etc. and see John 9:2.
2 See Johnson, Vitality, 95ff.
3 For this use of the verb יָבָּד in the kal see also Num. 21:8f.; II Kgs. 1:2; 8:8f.; 20:7; Isa. 38:9, 21.
the vitality of their life had ebbed. They were, in a sense, 'dead' until their recovery. Sheol (or death) had laid its hands on them and on recovery they could be said "to have lived." In Judges 15:9 this flow and ebb of life is connected with the presence or absence of ruach: Samson, faint with thirst, drinks of the waters of a spring and "his spirit (ruach) returned, and he lived" (cf. also Gen. 45:27). It may thus be seen that descriptions of recovery from illness or other bodily weakness as a deliverance from death refer to real illnesses or bodily distresses and are not just poetical descriptions, pictures or metaphors. The importance of the question of locale in regard to the realm of death can be seen here. We have stated that the realm of death may manifest itself in the world of man and that death and the realm of death are present wherever there is a nether-world nature. When one is gripped by sickness or afflicted in any way, it is death and its realm which grip him. Thus recovery or deliverance is described in terms like Ps. 116:8, "thou hast delivered my soul from death" (cf. v. 3 and see also Ps. 9:13; 30:3; 86:13). In particular Ps. 30 speaks of healing in the form of a deliverance from Sheol (v. 2-3). All this is in accord with the Israelite view regarding life's ebb and flow. Sickness is a residence in the realm of death and

---

1 For similar uses of מְלוּבָה in respect of other distresses or lessening of the life-powers see Johnson, op.cit., 95-100. 2 For additional uses indicating the same thought of a recovery or deliverance from death see Johnson, op.cit., 96. 3 See Pedersen, op.cit., 99-181 (on soul); Johnson, Vitality, esp. pp. 88-107 and 30.
recovery is a deliverance from the realm of death (or from death itself). The sick man is in the power of death.

This will suffice to show the Israelite view of death in relation to particular distresses. We have confined ourselves to sickness, but among other distresses might be mentioned imprisonment, oppression and persecution by enemies, sin and others. By way of further example, Ps. 143 may be cited as an illustration of assaults by enemies being described in terms of death and deliverance from death:

For the enemy hath persecuted my being; He hath smitten my life to the ground; He hath made me to dwell in dark places like them that have been long dead. (v.3)

For Thy Name's sake, Yahweh, do Thou cause me to live! In Thy righteousness free Thou my being! (v.11)

As Johnson writes, "Moreover, just as death in the strict sense of the term is for the Israelite the weakest form of life, so any weakness in life is a form of death."

The Laments and Thanksgivings in the Psalms exhibit most of these usages. The description of distresses as a residence in the realm of death appear mostly in the Thanksgiving Psalms (e.g. 30:3; 86:13). The Laments prefer to use synonyms for Sheol rather than the terms "death" and "Sheol." Thus

---

1 Barth, op.cit., 100ff.; cf. Pedersen, op.cit., 153.
2 cf. Barth, op.cit., 102ff.
3 Ibid., 104ff.
4 Ibid., 109f.
5 Ibid., 107ff.
6 Translation cited from Johnson, op.cit., 98.
7 Ibid., 94.
8 For "death" see e.g. Ps. 22:15; on Sheol see e.g. Ps. 88:3; Isa. 38:10, 18.
"grave" (or "pit") is used in this way: e.g. Ps. 28:1, "I became like those who go down to the pit" (see also Ps. 88:5-7; 143:7; Isa. 38:18; Jon. 2:6; Ps. 30:4; 103:4). "Pit" and "grave" are in this sense the same thing, "pit" being used in the sense of "grave." Again, ocean is also used (or words relating to it, like "deep" or "deep waters," etc.): Ps. 69:1, "Save me, O God! For the waters have come up to my neck" (also v. 2 "deep waters," v. 15 "flood" and cf. Ps. 144:7; 18:4; 16; Jon.2:4f.). As ocean is a name for the realm of death the meaning of these passages is in accord with our contention that any form of bodily weakness or dire peril or distress is conceived to be a residence in the realm of death. Such passages as these are traditionally explained as metaphors, pictures, etc. (as are the corresponding Thanksgiving Psalms dealing with deliverance from death). But, in line with Pedersen, Johnson and Barth, we hold these statements to describe a real experience of death and are not metaphors or pictures. To be sure, the experience is only a partial and limited one, but it is nevertheless real. Such a one is in the power of death but not irrevocably; he is in Sheol but not completely. He is thus on the brink of the abyss of death, but has not yet fallen; he is at the doors of Sheol but not yet completely within its dreary confines. Thus such a one experiences death but not in

---

1 See Barth, op. cit., 111.
2 Ibid., 112.
3 Ibid., 114ff.
its full bitterness and extent. Pedersen has well expressed this idea:

the man was so ill that he came near the grave; but the very disease was a sojourn in the grave, from which recovery brings him back.¹

His soul is near Sheol. He is still partly in the land of the living, but, nevertheless, so strong is the hold which misery has on him that he is in Sheol. He feels the darkness of the grave, the desolate lack of strength and blessing of the nether world, the gloom of the ocean.²

Thus this experience of death and deliverance is not just pictorial or poetical phantasy, not a metaphor, but a real experience, though a partial one.³

¹Pedersen, op.cit., 467 (on Job 33:22, 28-30).
²Ibid., 469 (on Ps. 88).
³See Barth, op.cit., 114-118.
CHAPTER II

LIFE AND DEATH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

A. Life.

1. The conception of life in the New Testament is in many ways related to the Old Testament conception of life. "Life" is essentially a value statement, not a statement of just being alive in the physical sense of the term.¹ That is to say, life is that which is worth living. Correspondingly, death is that lessened form of life which cuts one off from the values and contents of life. Thus to some extent, in general, the terms life and death in the New Testament are similar in meaning to the same concepts in the Old Testament. But the New Testament portrait of God's mighty act in Jesus Christ—His life, death, and above all His resurrection—affects the New Testament conception in a vitally significant way.²

During the Intertestamental period, the general view of life, in Palestinian Judaism, is strongly related to the

¹Hereafter the term "existence" will be used to convey this sense of "just being alive." The term should not be understood in its contemporary philosophical sense.
²See below in sections 2, 3.
Old Testament and Hebraic conception. The LXX, for example, translates the Hebrew "life" (תְּבֵּן and derivative forms) almost without exception with נֶפֶשׁ, נְפֶשׁ, בָּרָא. Seldom appears except in the Hellenistic parts. Yet there is evident in the LXX a shift from the Old Testament emphasis on present earthly life to the life of the coming age—eternal life. A good example of this can be seen in the rendering of Job 19:25 by the several Greek translations, where the idea of "eternal" is introduced into the Greek text. In Post-exilic Judaism life is, as in the Old Testament, the highest good which is only worthy to be called life when it is related to God and is a life guided by wisdom and proper conduct (see e.g. Ecclesiasticus 4:11 ff.; 34:13ff.; 33:1 ff.; et al.). The basic Old Testament confession that God is "The living God" is affirmed in many places directly and He is called the Lord over life and death (Ecclesiasticus 11:14; 13:14; Wis. Sol. 16:13; et al.) and from Him life comes as a gift (2 Macc. 7:22ff.; Judith 16:44; and in Rabbinic lit.). Death is the fate which awaits all men, to be feared (Ecclesiasticus 41:1) and yet not to be feared (Ecclesiasticus 41:3; cf. 22:11). Death is the punishment for sin (2 Esdras 3:7; 7:20ff., 118ff.; 2 Baruch 23:4;

2 For details see TWNT, op. cit., II, 853ff.
3 Though to be sure, this aspect is still strongly emphasized. (see TWNT, op. cit., II, 854).
4 Other examples will be found in Isa. 26:49; Prov. 9:6 (LXX); Psalms 48:10 (Heb. 49:8, 10).
5 See TWNT, op. cit., II, 857.
6 Particularly in Rabbinic lit.—see Strack-Billerbeck, III, 44; et al.
7 Ibid.
48:42) and came into the world because of Eve (Ecclesiasticus 25:24), Adam (2 Esdras 3:7) or idols (Wis. Sol. 14:27) or envy of the devil (Wis. Sol. 2:23f.; cf. 1:12ff.) or from other sources (e.g. demons—see Jubilees). With an intensified concern for the individual, a development that goes back to the early literary Prophets (and further developed by later Prophets such as Jeremiah and Ezekiel1), we find a belief in life after death becoming increasingly dominant during the Intertestamental Period. Proper life is more and more regarded as eternal life. It should be noted, for our purposes, that this life is not an inherent property of man but a gift of God, a newly created life at the resurrection.2 The Pharisees and Apocalyptic writers accepted this belief in the resurrection life but the traditional Old Testament Sheol doctrine was retained by some others, notably the Sadducees. This is not a concept of life which is different from the Old Testament concept but rather an extension of that concept in terms of duration. The Old Testament idea is modified to the extent that the eschatological life is a life without sin and is a different manner of life.3 The basic Old Testament idea of life as a quality—life lived with God—remains unaltered. In Hellenistic Judaism, on the other hand, the Old Testament conception of life is modified in terms of the Greek understanding of life.4 A concept of

2 On this see TWNT, op.cit., II,158; Paul Volz (Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1934); et.al.
3 Cf. a.g. Volz, op.cit., 368 (citing Tractate Berakoth 17a); TWNT, op.cit., II, 859.
4 For examples and discussion of this see TWNT, op.cit., II, 859ff.
the immortality of the soul is introduced from Greek thought (see e.g. Wisdom 2:23; 8:19ff.; 9:15; 12:1; cf. Test. Reuben 2:4; 4 Macc. 14:6). "The expectation of an eternal life after death is spread in Hellenistic Judaism generally."\(^1\) Requital takes place, not on the Day of Resurrection, but immediately after death\(^2\) (e.g. Wisdom of Sol. 3:1ff.; cf. 3:10, 18; 4 Macc. 14:5; 16:13; 17:18). According to Josephus,\(^3\) the Essenes taught the immortality of the soul and the requital of the good and evil at death. The literature from Qumran does not appear to be conclusive on this point.\(^4\) If van der Ploeg\(^5\) is correct, as we believe he is, the Qumranites held a belief in immortality rather than resurrection. This would then be evidence for accepting that Hellenistic ideas of Immortality were held by groups in Palestine (who claimed adherence to the Old Testament ideas) as well as in acknowledged centers of Hellenistic Judaism such as Alexandria.\(^6\) In any case it is obvious that the concept of life in Hellenistic Judaism has close affinities with the Greek Platonic view.

In general, the New Testament idea of life can designate

---

1TWNT, op. cit., II, 860, 35f.
2Volz, op. cit., 266ff.
3Josephus, Antiquities, Book XVIII.
5van der Ploeg, op. cit.,
two related conceptions. On the one hand, *life* denotes life at its highest and best—life that is indeed worthy to be called *life*. This is frequently described by qualifying terms such as the word *eternal* (e.g. *η ἀιώνιος*, Jn. 17:3) but often *ζωή* used alone has the same meaning (e.g. Jn. 10:10; Rom. 5:18; Mt. 7:14). On the other hand, *ζωή* is used on occasion to denote this present earthly life (e.g. Luke 16:25; Acts 8:33, 17:25; Rom. 8:38; I Cor. 15:19). Life can, thus, both denote the life worth living—a true *life*, portraying the contrast between existence and vitality,¹ and "being alive" (e.g. Luke 16:25; et.al.).

"πνεῦμα" and "ζωή" are the principal words used in the New Testament with the translation "life."² "πνεῦμα" is used primarily to designate the content or mode of *life*—the natural life and the goods of *life* (e.g. Mk. 12:44; Lk. 8:14; 15:30; II Tim. 2:4; I Jn. 2:16; 3:17). This word is used very infrequently, being found only about ten times in the New Testament.³ "ζωή" differs from "πνεῦμα" in that its most frequent usage is to denote the power of *life*: its values, vitality, worth, strength, devotion, completeness and the like. "ζωή" can also be used to denote the content and manner of *life*.

¹This contrast is brought out vividly in Luke 12:15 ("a man's life is not in the abundance of his possessions."). Real *life* is more than having possessions—it is a quality, a content that is related to God (cf. Luke 4:4).

²As in the Old Testament, "soul" (Psalm 1: 1) is often interchanged with "life" and these are then parallel in meaning (e.g. Luke 12:20; cf. 12:15; Mk. 8:35).

³Mark 12:44; Lk. 21:4; (Lk. 8:43 in some MSS); 8:14; 15:12, 30; I Tim. 2:2; 2 Tim. 2:4; I Jn. 2:16; 3:17.
(natural life), but usually with the connotation of life in a fuller sense than simply earthly and temporal existence. For the latter $\Theta\iota\sigma\varsigma$ should be expected with the frequent connotation of livelihood" or "way of living."^1 An overlapping may be due in the New Testament to several factors: (1) unfamiliarity with the Greek terms; (2) an absorbing by $\zeta\omicron\nu$ of the meaning of $\Theta\iota\sigma\varsigma$ (but not the reverse!); (3) an attempt to convey an extra shade of meaning in the use of the terms $\zeta\omicron\nu, \zeta\omicron\nu\iota$ with reference to physical, earthly and temporal life - namely - that all life worthy of the name is to be seen from the perspective of eternity and its dimensions.

We have thus far in an introductory way discussed the general idea of life as it relates to the New Testament. It now remains to explore those facets of the concept that are pertinent to our subject of life after death. There is much to the concept into which we shall not delve, for this would carry us away from our purpose.² We shall, therefore, in succeeding sections make some general observations on the

---

^1The contrast between life in a purely natural sense and life in a higher sense is in the New Testament made by using respectively $\psi\nu\chi\omicron\nu$ and $\pi\sigma\nu\iota\mu$ rather than $\Theta\iota\sigma\varsigma$ and $\zeta\omicron\nu\iota$. Since, in accordance with Old Testament usage, $\psi\nu\chi\omicron\nu$ can be used with the meaning of life, while $\pi\sigma\nu\iota\mu$ can be understood in keeping with the Old Testament antecedents, designates life at its highest and best (life related to God in Christ), the contrast through $\psi\nu\chi\omicron\nu$ and $\pi\sigma\nu\iota\mu$ is not a primarily linguistic contrast but is rather a theological contrast (also thereby ruling out any biological basis for spiritual life).

²For detailed discussion of this term in the New Testament see materials listed in Bibliography. Of special note are TWNT, op.cit., II, art. "$\zeta\omicron\nu, \zeta\omicron\nu\iota"; L. Muirhead, The Terms Life and Death in the Old and New Testaments, (London: Andrew Melrose, 1908); E. V. Schrenck, Die johanneische Anschauung vom 'Leben', (Leipzig: Deichert'ssche, 1893).
New Testament idea of life, life in relation to the Lord of Life and then conclude with the, for our purpose, basic problem of life and the body.


a. The characteristics of life (related to characteristics of life in the Old Testament).

Generally considered, the New Testament idea of life evidences many of the same characteristics as the Old Testament idea of life, though, to be sure, not always with the same identical content and dimension. The main characteristics of life in the Old Testament are: time, freedom of movement and development, and life in community.\(^1\) We shall seek briefly to relate these characteristics in general terms to the New Testament idea of life.

A major characteristic of life (to live) is that it requires time. To live means to have time. The natural life will, it is obvious, require time to grow to maturity of physical development. So also time is required for the development of life in its other natural designations. Time is needed to achieve any of the goals of life: material or spiritual. But whereas in the Old Testament the focus of the realization of goals and of the duration of life (not mere existence) is this present earthly existence, in the New Testament realization of goals and of the duration of life (not mere existence) is

\(^1\)Other characteristics are: nourishment and fullness (health, strength, etc.). For the sake of brevity these will not be dealt with here. See Part II, Chapter 1 and references cited there and cf. TWNT, *op.cit.*, II, 862ff.
widened beyond the present temporal boundary of earthly existence. In general, all goals in the Old Testament are to be realized in this life, while in the New Testament the goals of spiritual existence are reached in a future dimension - the sphere of life eternal. But the essential characteristic remains true for both Old Testament and New Testament - life requires time, however varied may be the concept of time.

A characteristic of life, closely related to that of time, is freedom of movement and development. Life is not pure temporal existence. Life must move and develop freely to the realization of a goal (or goals) to be properly called life. In the New Testament there is not the emphasis on the present goals of earthly life (health, length of years, possessions, children, etc.) as is found in the Old Testament. "A man's life does not consist in the abundance of his possessions" (Luke 12:15; cf. I Tim. 6:6-10; Mk. 10:17-30; Mt. 6:24-34; et.al.). But in the New Testament, as in the Old Testament, the highest and only proper goal of life is fellowship with God (and one's fellow man or "kin-group"). This is the goal that validates life as life, the goal toward the realization of which man is to grow and develop - the abundant life in

---

1 Not purely future, however, for eternal life has present reality also (which will be discussed later).
2 Cf. TWNT, op.cit., II, 862ff. This apparent disparity between the Old Testament and New Testament is not a real disparity. The development in the Intertestamental Period shows how this time element - present life to future life - has come about. (See above section 1). It represents a broadening of the Old Testament conception of life.
communion with God. To live is to live from, with, and to God. God is the Lord of life: its giver and preserver. The Spirit is the God-given power of life (as in the Old Testament). We come thus to another characteristic of life—life in community. If the proper goal of life is to live in fellowship (community) with God, this does not mean it is achieved through an isolated individualism. It is true that the individual is called upon to believe as an individual—he alone can respond to the summons of God to believe and obey. But the individual receives this call through the community of faith and in responding is thereby also included within that same community. Those who have responded in faith to the call of God in Christ form, therefore, the new community. It is a new covenant with individuals that is established, but this is only achieved with this new community—the new Israel (Mk. 14:24; Gal. 5:16; II Cor. 3:14; I Cor. 11:25; et.al.; cf. Jer. 31:31-34). It would rest upon a misunderstanding of the prophets in general and of Jeremiah in particular (who is sometimes called "The Father of individualism") to maintain that

---

1See Part II, ch. 1.
2TWNT, op.cit., II, 863.
3That is, through those who serve as the witness-bearers to the faith. The apostles and others perform this task, but all Christians are to be involved in this.
they advocated individual responsibility in opposition to the older corporate idea. Rather, it would be more accurate to say that they have modified the older corporate emphasis to bring into sharper focus the idea of individual responsibility. The idea of individualism is much older than Jeremiah.¹ It is rather a matter of emphasis - the older period emphasizing the corporate, the later period emphasizing the individual aspect - but in no period is either aspect wanting.² The basic idea of life in community is expressed in Mk. 12:28-34 and related passages. Jesus here places love for God as the first commandment (Deut. 6:5) which places man in a fellowship-relation with God. Life is first of all community with God. This, in turn, implies a community of those who are in this relationship to God. Thus the second commandment follows from the first: "You shall love your neighbor as yourself" (Lev. 19:18). Each man is related to others—he is "bound up in the bundle of life" with others. This is the new community established in Jesus Christ within which alone can genuine faith take place. Paul expresses this community idea in the concept of the Church as the Body of Christ.³ Many elements go together to illuminate this concept of Body. We cannot go into these here in detail.⁴

¹See esp. H.H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel, ch.IV (e.g. p.100, "But in no period of the life of Israel do we find extreme collectivism or extreme individualism, but a combination of both." cf. 100ff.).
²Some authors of the Old Testament do emphasize one side or the other, but this should not be made too much of (cf. Rowley, op.cit., 100).
³E.g. I Cor. 12; Eph. 5; Rom. 12:4f.
⁴The reader should consult for details the very penetrating study on this subject by J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, esp. Ch. 3.
but certain points are of interest for our purposes. Paul's idea of the Church as the Body of Christ appears to have behind it, in part at least, the Old Testament idea of corporate personality.1 There is one community which is conceived not only in corporate terms but also in corporal terms.2 The question might be raised at this point—did Paul obtain the idea of the Body of Christ in the Old Testament or does the Old Testament idea serve to explain the idea which is derived from other sources (or source)? Robinson appears to be quite correct on this as he seeks the source in Paul's own conversion experience.3 Paul persecuted the Christian Church, but the voice of the risen Lord does not say, "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute my followers?" The voice says, "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?" (Acts 26:14f.; 9:4f.; 22:7f.) The resurrection body of Christ was in some sense the community of Christ.4 The community of life is the community of faith—there is life in this community which though it has many members is one body5 (I Cor. 12:12), one flesh (Eph. 5:29ff.)6 The New Testament, then, strongly emphasizes the communal basis of faith. One believes in order to belong—to God (in Christ) and to the new covenant community. Life is life in community.

---

1See Part I, ch. 1 and also A.R. Johnson, The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God.
3Ibid., 58.
4The implications of this for faith in the resurrection of the body will be explored later.
5Cf. Gal. 3:27-29, where the many are one in Christ.
6The Lord's Supper liturgy has implications of this also: "This is my body" (Mk. 14:22; I Cor. 11:24; cf. I Cor. 10:17, "Because there is one loaf, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one loaf." See also the Eucharistic homily in Jn. 6.)
It can thus be seen that in many respects the characteristics of life in the New Testament are similar to the characteristics of life in the Old Testament. They are not, however, identical. In the New Testament one blazing fact alters the understanding of life and gives it a coloring which is not found in the Old Testament: "He is not here; for he has risen, as he said" (Mt. 28:6). Therefore the New Testament speaks of eternal life—the life of the future age, the coming aeon. To this general New Testament idea of life we must now turn.


At first glance, the idea of life in the Synoptic Gospels appears to be that of the Old Testament, with only a few hints as to the development of the term in Paul and John. It is, for example, in the Synoptics that most of the uses of the term in reference to natural life will be found, some of which, directly or indirectly, will refer back to the Old Testament: e.g. Lk. 1:75; 16:25; Mk. 5:23 (where "life" is in the sense of "health"); Lk. 12:22, 23, 25; Mt. 6:20ff.; et al. But it is not simply the natural life that is the primary concern in the Synoptics. In many of these references there is

1It is, of course, true that parts of the Old Testament, and quite extensively in the Intertestamental period, speak of eternal life. But, as will be shown later, the New Testament speech of eternal life is not the same.
2Not solely in the future—see following pages.
3For similar references in the rest of the New Testament see e.g. Jn. 4:50; Acts 8:33; 17:25; Rom. 8:38; I Cor. 3:22; 15:19; Phil. 1:20; et al.
an overtone, explicit or implied, that natural life is not really life—it is only natural life. True life is the life that is life in the Kingdom, spiritual life, future life, eternal life, etc. One is enjoined to enter or acquire this, the genuine and only life, at any cost (e.g. Mt. 7:14; 18:8; 19:17, 29; Lk. 18:30; et al.). In the Synoptics, life is frequently an eschatological term. It refers to the future life, the life after death or the life of the age to come. This designation is Jewish and is a contemporary definition in Judaism. But, unlike the usage in earlier and contemporary Judaic literature, this life of the age to come is not just future. It is also present in a real sense. Bultmann limits the Synoptic view to the future life: "The proper, true \( \omega \), is first of all thought of as the future after death, as the \( \gamma\'). It is in Paul and, above all, in John that the present realization of this future life is taught. In this confining of the Synoptic viewpoint only to a future emphasis

---

1 Whether spiritual or eternal life has any material basis will be the subject of section 4.
2 E.g. Mt. 6:25ff. (and parallels); Lk. 12:15.
3 TWNT, op. cit., II, 865.
4 Ibid., 855ff., 865ff.
5 Ibid., 864ff.
6 Similar statements are frequently made in this article with reference to the Synoptics (see esp. 866, where it is stated the Synoptics speak only of the future life). With this Schrenck agrees, op. cit., 33, 38; cf. G.D. Dalman, The Words of Jesus, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909), 156, 161.
7 TWNT, op. cit., II, 868ff., 870ff.
correct? In nearly every case where \( \text{wv} \) (or a verb form) is used in the Synoptics with the meaning of eternal life it has a future reference. In the Fourth Gospel, eternal life is frequently used not only of the future but as a presently realized possession of the believer (e.g. Jn. 3:36; cf. 3:14, 16; 4:14; 5:24, 39f; I Jn. 3:1f; 5:11, 12, 13).\(^1\) In the Synoptics, Jesus announces the coming of the Kingdom of God—in the Fourth Gospel, He bestows eternal life now. How are these terms related? Are they in any sense synonymous? The answer would seem to be in the affirmative. The Kingdom of God is, according to the Synoptic view, not just the future, coming reign of God, but is in a real sense present now.\(^2\) As Kümmel concludes in his work on the subject: "Jesus could proclaim the paradoxical message, contrary to every Jewish conception, that the future Kingdom of God is already at work in the present."\(^3\) But for the disciples (respectively, believers) the Kingdom is still future—it is present only in Jesus and only to that extent present for the disciples. This is clearly seen in the use of the phrase "to enter into the Kingdom of

---

\(^1\) Eternal life is also for Paul a present reality (Rom. 8:2, 6:10; et al.).

\(^2\) We cannot here enter into the current discussions about the present and future aspects of the Kingdom of God, but in general, take the position that the Kingdom of God is both a present reality and a future hoped-for consummation. For discussion of this problem see W. G. Kümmel, Promise, and Fulfillment (London: SCM Press, 1957).

\(^3\) Kümmel, Promise, 154; cf. 105-140; and other places in Kümmel (e.g. "In Jesus the Kingdom of God came into being and in him it will be consummated," 155).
God"1 (and related expressions such as "inherit the kingdom," etc.). This phrase frequently has a future reference (Mark 10:15, 23, 25; 9:47; Mt. 5:20). The passage in Mark 9:47 is significant for several reasons. First, the context insures a future reference by the use of the contrast "enter the kingdom of God" with "to be thrown into hell." Second, in verses 43 and 45 we find the phrase "enter into the life" as an obvious synonym to "enter the kingdom of God" (vs. 47). It is the second fact that is of interest to us. We have pointed out that in the Fourth Gospel the phrase "eternal life" is used with reference to the believer. The phrase "kingdom of God" is seldom used (Jn. 3:3, 5; cf. 18:36). But the parallel usage of "kingdom of God" and "life" in Mark 9 illustrates a significant fact—namely, that the two phrases are similar in meaning. Thus, when the Fourth Gospel uses "life" or "eternal life," the meaning is similar to the Synoptic conceptual usage of "kingdom of God."2 For example, in Mark 10:30 Jesus says of those who have left all and followed him that they shall receive "life eternal in the age to come." John 12:25 seems to be a rendering of this saying (cf. Mt. 10:39; 16:25; Mk. 8:35f.; Lk. 9:24f.; 17:33): "He who hates his life (ψύχη) in this world will keep it for eternal life." Again, in Jn. 3:5 the

---

1 E.g. Mk. 10:15, 23-25; 9:47; Mt. 5:20; 7:21; 23:13; Lk. 18:24f. Mt. 7:21 appears from the parallels to be his own construction.

2 This fact is widely recognized among scholars, e.g. C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, (London: S.P. C.K., 1955), 174; Schrenck, op.cit.; and others.
phrase "enter the kingdom of God" appears to be paralleled in 3:36 ("shall not see life," i.e. enter the life of the coming age). The Synoptic phrase "inherit eternal life" (Mark 10:17) is paralleled in the Synoptics by the phrase "inherit the kingdom (Mt. 25:34). This idea is not found expressly in the Fourth Gospel, where "inherit" is not used. The idea, however, is paralleled by the Johannine phrase "give . . . eternal life" (Jn. 4:14; 7:37f.; 10:28; et al.; cf. Lk. 12:32). It would appear, then that in view of the parallelism of terms and their similar usage and meaning, that the major difference between the Synoptic view and the Johannine is one of emphasis. What in the Synoptics is announced and promised as a future blessing (the kingdom of God, life of the coming age) is in the Fourth Gospel an already present reality and possession of the believer. In the light of the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus, the New Age has already broken in. The decisive thing has already occurred—the future resurrection of the body is only the conclusion of the events already begun in Christ. If the Kingdom is already present in Christ, then it is in some sense already present for those "in Christ" (Jn. 15; 17:20ff.). The Synoptic emphasis and the Johannine view will thus complement each other. One other Synoptic passage is of significance on this point—"He is not God of the dead, but of the living" (Mk. 12:27;

1 The present reality of "eternal life" is to be completely realized and consummated at the Parousia (e.g. see Schrenck, op.cit., 102ff.; 150ff.; 154-159).
2 TWNT, op.cit., II, 865ff.
3 Kämme, Promise, 105-140.
Mt. 22:32; Lk. 20:38. ¹ Jesus speaks these words in the dispute over the resurrection as his conclusion on the Old Testament and Rabbinic affirmation that God is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Though in the Old Testament the words should probably be understood as meaning that the God who speaks to Moses had dealings with the ancestors of Moses, Jesus understands it to mean that these Patriarchs must in some sense still be living, for "he is not God of the dead, but of the living." But since the dead are not to be raised until the end (the future consummation), it must imply that for others the life of the age to come must also be a possible present reality. This passage is, then, a remarkable foretaste of the Johannine concept that "aeonian life" is the present (though anticipatory) possession of the believer. We conclude, therefore, that the antecedents of the Johannine concept of life are to be found in the Synoptic teaching on the kingdom, life and the coming aeon, and that in both the life of the age to come is in some sense already experienced by the believer.

In Paul also can be seen this double aspect of life: it is present and it is yet to be revealed. The basic idea of life in Paul is not different from that of the rest of the New Testament. He uses the term to refer to physical and temporal life (Rom. 7:2, 3; 8:38; I Cor. 3:22; 15:19; II Cor. 4:11; Phil. 1:20). Here ἀιόνιον refers to existence in this world in the ordinary sense of living. But, as is true of the Old

Testament and the other parts of the New Testament, genuine life—the life deserving of the term—is for Paul the life lived from, with and for God (respectively, Jesus Christ). Such a passage as Rom. 6:11 expresses this vividly: "you must consider yourselves dead to sin but alive (living—\\textit{\\textgamma\\textnu\\tau\\omega\\nu}) to God in Jesus Christ" (cf. 8:10; 1:17; 6:2,4, 22, 23; 5:10, 17; 8:13; 14:8; et al.). This is the life of the age to come—aonian life. This life is not a natural possession of man but is a gift of God (respectively, Christ).\textsuperscript{1} The Gentiles, those outside Christ, have alienated themselves from the life of God (Eph. 4:18), who is the source of all life. Eternal life is a present possession of the believer.\textsuperscript{2} This is brought out, not just in the use of \textit{\\textgamma\\textnu\\tau\\omega\\nu}, but also in the use of other phrases and terms. For example, the believer is justified out of faith (Rom. 3:24ff.; 4:24f; 5:1, 17f., 19, 21; et al.). This justification is the product of God's love demonstrated in the death of Christ (Rom. 5:6, 8) and as a consequence of this justification we have now peace with God (Rom. 5:1). It confers life: "one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men" (Rom. 5:18). This righteousness is a gift and may thus only be accepted by faith\textsuperscript{3} (Rom. 3:22, 24f.; 5:17, 21; et al.). Thus the Christian already has

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}Rom. 6:23; 2:7; 5:10, 17f., 21; 6:22; Col. 3:3; II Cor. 5:15; Gal. 2:19f.
\item \textsuperscript{2}TWNT, \textit{op.cit.}, II, 868; Schrenck, \textit{op.cit.}, 43ff.; H.A.A. Kennedy, \textit{St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things}, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1904), 154ff.; et al.
\item \textsuperscript{3}See Kennedy, \textit{op.cit.}, 138.
\end{itemize}
aeonian life. In baptism he has already been raised from death to life -- the believer is to "walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6:3-4). The Christian is now "alive to God in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 6:11), free from the law (Rom. 8:2; 7:4ff.). To further express this presentness of life, Paul writes frequently of the Spirit which now indwells the believers (Rom. 8:11). The believer is "in the Spirit" and indeed whoever does not have the Spirit does not belong to Christ (Rom. 8:9, 11, etc.). Those who are led by the Spirit are children of God (Rom. 8:14-17). Spirit and life frequently, in Paul, correspond to or are related to each other (II Cor. 3:6; I Cor. 15:45: Rom. 8:2, 6, 10-13; Gal. 5:25; 6:8). The Christian is to walk in "newness of life" (Rom. 6:4) and this new life is from the Spirit (Rom. 7:6; cf. 8:4ff.; Gal. 5:25; et al.). "The Spirit, therefore, is the Divine factor, working in the believing soul and sustaining the life of faith." The believers' present life -- the gift of God through the death and resurrection of Christ which the Christian has by the Spirit of God (Christ) in him -- is contrasted with natural life. Herein Paul differs from the Johannine view of life in which there is only one life -- aeonian life. I Cor. 15:45 brings out this contrast vividly:

1 For detailed discussion of the presentness of life see TWNT, op. cit., II, 868-871.
2 For details on Pauline doctrine of spirit see TWNT, op. cit., VI, art., "πνεύμα", II, 413-436.
"The first man Adam became a living being (ψυχὴν ἰὼν); the last Adam became a life-giving spirit (πνεῦμα ἤνωσος)."

We cannot here into the details of Paul's doctrine of the two Adams,¹ but will briefly summarize some of the salient features of it. The Pauline doctrine of the two Adams is primarily given in Rom. 5:12-21 and 1 Cor. 15:20-22, 42-49.

It is developed extensively through the use of paired phrases or expressions: Adam and Christ, old and new, first and second (last), death and life, natural (ψυχὴ) and spiritual (πνεῦμα), obedience and disobedience, sin and grace, etc.

To this would correspond the Pauline doctrine of the two ages—indeed the Adam theology is a part of the two age theology: the Old Age and the old Adam to which belongs sin, death and the powers of destruction; the new (or coming) age and the New (or second) Adam to which belongs righteousness, life and the resurrection. There is thus an old humanity and a new humanity. The mark of the one is natural (ψυχὴ) and fleshly life (σαρκὴ) whose end is death (θανάτος, ἀπώλεία).

The mark of the other is spiritual (πνεῦμα) life whose end is resurrected life. For Paul, then, there can be two possible lives: natural life bound to this world (aeon) and therefore subject to the powers of this age (sin, law, death, flesh, destruction, etc.); spiritual life bound to the coming world (aeon) and therefore enlivened by the power of

¹For details see W. Grundmann, "Die Übermacht der Gnade: eine Studie zur Theologie des Paulus," Novum Testamentum, Vol. II, 1957, 50-54; Bultmann, Theology, I, 300ff.; Kennedy, op.cit., 310ff.; W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, (London: SPCK, 1948), 36-57 (and the literature cited there); and others (e.g. TWNT, op.cit., I, "Δ'I", 341-343).
that age (grace, freedom under the law of Christ, resurrection life, body of redemption (the spiritual body, the body of Christ, etc.), communion (fellowship, community) with God in Christ (and therefore with each other in the body of Christ), etc.).

Life is, for Paul, life in community. It is the "deliverance out of the bondage to sin, the transfer into community with Christ and God." This life is life by the Spirit—by the constant reference of life to the Spirit, Paul brings out that man does not live from himself (e.g. Rom. 14:7; Gal. 5:25; Rom. 8:13ff., 9-11; etc.). The living community is the Body of Christ. Paul can even say that the life he now has is not his own but that Christ lives in him (Gal. 2:19ff.; Rom. 8:10), that the life of Christ is in us (II Cor. 4:10ff.).

He can also say that we live in Christ (Rom. 6:11), will live with him (II Cor. 13:4) and that our life is in Christ (Rom. 8:2; cf. 6:5ff.; II Cor. 4:10; 5:17; Gal. 2:20; Col. 3:3).

It must not, however, be thought that Paul teaches that the new life is only present. There is, on the contrary, a future aspect to the new life. The Christian has life now but it is in anticipation of the fullness of life yet to come.

In Romans 8, for example, Paul can put both ideas together:

1The list of contrasts is not exhaustive but is meant to suggest some of the pairs Paul uses to develop and express his thought. For details see the various theologies of the New Testament, commentaries and other works (e.g. relevant articles in TWNT; Robinson, The Body.).

2Schrenck, op.cit., 43.

3See Robinson, The Body, ch. 3. The phrase "Body of Christ" must be discussed later in this paper when dealing with the New Testament concept of the resurrection.

4TWNT, op.cit., II, 868.

5Ibid.
"all who are led by the Spirit of God are sons of God" (v. 14, cf. v. 16) and "if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body you will live" (vs. 13). What the believer now has is the "first fruits of the Spirit"—he thus awaits the redemption of the body (Rom. 8:23) which is still in the future. Paul teaches by this that the future life in the coming age is not something new—a second life—but is the consummation of the new life now given to the believer in Christ. We are now to walk in newness of life because we died with Christ (in baptism) but we shall be united with Christ in a resurrection like his (Rom. 6:4f.) and shall thus live with him (6:8). The Christian lives from the hope of the coming glory (Rom. 5:2; 8:17, 18, 30; et al.), but this hope is not a vain hope—it is grounded in the already occurred mighty act of salvation in Jesus Christ and the Christian's present experience of the newness of life received by faith. It is, therefore, in the future resurrection that the presently experienced aeonian life will be finally and completely and fully realized. For this reason Paul exhorts his readers to "seek the things that are above" (Col. 3:1), for they have died and their lives are hid with Christ in God (Col. 3:3), and "when Christ who is our life appears, then you also will appear with him in glory" (Col. 3:4). The present earthly existence will perish—only

---

1 άνεμος κυρίου

the life of the new age remains: see e.g. I Cor. 15:50, "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God nor does the perishable (corruptible, φθορα) inherit the imperishable (incorruptible)." In Rom. 14:17 Paul expresses this clearly: "For the kingdom of God does not mean food and drink but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." Yet this new life is not bodiless existence but rather is still somatic life. Of this somatic life we will speak later. In the present life the believer is still bound up to "the body of this death" (Rom. 7:24), still subject to sin to some extent (8:9f): he is risen now only with Christ (Col. 3:1), but will at the consummation be raised and redeemed (Rom. 8:11, 19, 22ff.; cf. I Thess, 4; I Cor. 15).

The double aspect of the new life which we have seen in Paul is also seen in the Johannine literature. We shall now attempt to summarize this briefly. Basic to the Johannine view of life is the belief that God is the origin of all life——

1 In these two passages (I Cor. 15:50; Rom. 14:17), Paul expresses in the former passage the future destiny in the kingdom of God and in the latter the present experience of the kingdom. This is similar to the distinction Jesus made on the futurity and presentness of the kingdom (see e.g. Kummel, Promise and Fulfillment).

2 TWNT, op.cit., II, 870.

3 For details on the Johannine view of life see especially the following: TWNT, op.cit., II, 870-874; Schrenck, op.cit.; Feine, Theologie des Neuen Testaments, (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1910), 699ff.; and the various commentaries, theologies of the New Testament and special books on John.
both in our sense of physical life as well as of spiritual life\(^1\) (I Jn. 5:20; Jn. 6:57; \textit{et al.}). Jesus is also described as the life (Jn. 14:6; 1:4; 11:25). When John uses the term life he means by this the life which God has, which the Son has in himself and which the believer shall receive (see, in addition to the references already given above, Jn. 6:35, 47ff., 53ff., 63; 7:37ff.; 8:12, 51; 10:10, 28; I Jn. 1:2; 5:12; \textit{etc}).

"Dieses ewigen, göttlichen Lebens werden die menschen teilhaftig, wenn sie sich im Glauben an den Sohn anschliessen. Der Glaube wird als Vermittlung dieses Lebens an die Menschen gedacht."\(^2\)

Aeonian life is a present, not a future, possession of the believer (Jn. 3:36; 6:47, 54; 5:25; 3:18; I Jn. 5:1ff.; \textit{et al.}). But this present possession is to be fully realized in the future—at the consummation\(^3\) (cf. Jn. 5:24 with 5:25-29 and see also 11:23, 23; 14:1-3, 19). In John as in Paul we hear of the victory of Jesus Christ over death: "I am the resurrection and the life; he who believes in me, though he die, yet shall he live, and whoever lives and believes in me shall never die" (Jn. 11:25). Here we can see the presentness of life combined

\(^1\)In John there is only one \textit{life}, not a physical life and a spiritual life, a natural life and supernatural life. See Schrenck, \textit{op.cit.}, 78, etc.

\(^2\)Feine, \textit{op.cit.}, 700; cf. Schrenck, \textit{op.cit.}, 62; TWNT, \textit{op.cit.}, II, 87ff.

\(^3\)See Schrenck, \textit{op.cit.}, 62-78, 154-159; Feine, \textit{op.cit.}, 700; TWNT, \textit{op.cit.; et al.}
with the future aspect. The same can be seen in Jn. 5:24-29, where vs. 24 speaks of the present while vs. 28 speaks of the future.1 That only one life is meant is strikingly brought out in vs. 25, "the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live." Those who do not hear are dead already—in the Son is life, the only possible and true life while apart from Him is only death (note vs. 28: resurrection of life and resurrection of judgment). The Spirit does not figure as prominently in John as in Paul in connection with the idea of life. Here the Spirit is more the Divine assistance to those who carry out the work of being witnesses. But there is in this a hint of the Pauline concept of the Spirit as the power of life. Through receiving the Spirit the believer can, as Jesus does, mediate life to others2 (Jn. 16:7-15; 15:26f.; 14:25f.; 20:22f.). One receives life through faith3 (Jn. 1:12; 3:15-18, 36; et al.). As elsewhere in the New Testament, so also in John life is described as community with God (respectively, the Son).4 "Es ist Gottesgemeinschaft in umfassendem Sinne, Lebens- und Wesensgemeinschaft mit Gott, ein Sein mit Gott in religiöser und ethischer Vollkommenheit."5 "Faith effects life if it, ... effects that condition where one in an unhindered manner feels the joy of the vision of God, i.e. knows God."6 This community is succinctly summed up in I Jn. 1:3, "so that you may have

1See Schrenck, op.cit., 66ff.
2Ibid., 99ff.
3Ibid., 117-130 (also TWNT, op.cit., II, 872f.; and others).
4See above IV, A, 2, a.
5Feine, op.cit., 200; cf. Schrenck, op.cit., 134-141.
6Schrenck, op.cit., 136-137.
fellowship (\textit{Koinw\'\v{n}a}, \textit{Gemeinschaft} in Luther's translation) with us; and our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ." Thus the believer is to "have fellowship with God," a parallel expression to "have life" (I Jn. 5:13), "to have the Son" (I Jn. 5:12). Those who have received the gift of life and of community from the Son receive an imperishable gift (e.g. Jn. 10:28; 3:16; et al.). "Life according to John is the happy condition, in which man—taken away from the misery and damnation of sin is put into community with God through Christ and has gained the power of indissoluble existence (Daseins)."2

This idea of life in community sums up not only the Johannine view of life but that of the whole New Testament. God has destined man to life through his Son—life in community, i.e. life in the Kingdom of God (Synoptics), in the Body of Christ (Paul), in the fellowship with God, Christ and each other (John). With this we may conclude this section of our discussion.

---

2Schrenck, \textit{op.cit.}, 160.
3. The Lord of Life.

That God is Lord of life is a concept which we have already dwelt upon from the Old Testament point of view.\(^1\) The same viewpoint is represented in the New Testament; viz., God is the Lord of life. However, in the New Testament the Christ-event is once more the determiner of a major shift of emphasis. It is in Jesus Christ that life is to be found, as we have pointed out in earlier sections. Those who have abandoned all for Jesus' sake shall inherit eternal life (Mt. 19:29; Mk. 1:30; Lk. 18:30).\(^2\) By inference the healings and events of raising from the dead are indirect claims to be the Lord who kills and makes alive (e.g. Deut. 32:39; I Sam. 2:6f.; Ps. 103:2ff.; 104; 36:13; 116:8; et al.). Thus, Jairus says, "Come and lay your hands on her, so that she may be made well and live" (Mk. 5:23 and parallels). In the Fourth Gospel the relation of Jesus to life is clearly set forth in definitive terms. In the Prologue the \(\text{\Life}\) is life and the source of life (1:4). In the Gospel proper Jesus proclaims Himself the life (14:6), the living water (7:37ff.; 6:35), the bread of life (6:35; etc.) and the bestower of life (5:21, 25, 39-40; 6:40, 47-51; 10:28; 11:25f.; 17:2; et al.). He is acknowledged as the source of life by the Disciples (6:68),

---

\(^1\)See Part II, ch. 1, A, 2.

\(^2\)As the one who announces the Kingdom and in whom the Kingdom is present, Jesus is again the giver of life—life in the Kingdom of God (e.g. see T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, Cambridge Univ. Press., 1951 (2nd ed.), Ch. VII and VIII; Wm. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1952, 152-156).
by the Scriptures (5:34f.), indirectly by the High Priest (11:50ff.), by the Evangelist (20:31) and by God in the resurrection. In Paul, Jesus is again the giver and source of life (e.g. Rom. 5). The gift of God is life in Jesus Christ (Rom. 6:23; et al.). Life comes as a gift to man through faith in Christ. Paul speaks of life through the Spirit—God gives life through the Spirit (Rom. 8:11). If the Spirit is in the believer he has life. But Paul also writes in the same passage that "if Christ is in you, . . ., your spirits are alive because of righteousness" (8:10). How then does he connect the Spirit and life and Christ and life? One answer is suggested by II Cor. 3:17, "Now the Lord is the Spirit." On the basis of this passage it might well be asserted that the terms "Lord"¹ and "Spirit" are simply identical and that one should so understand it.² To thus understand the passage would not be correct, not only in view of the context of II Cor. 3:17, but particularly in view of Paul's usage of the term "Spirit" elsewhere.³ In Rom. 8:9-11 Paul uses the terms Spirit, Christ, Spirit of God and Spirit of Christ and uses them almost interchangeably. The believer is "in the Spirit" when

¹The use of the term "Lord" with reference to Christ is well substantiated in New Testament writings. He is thus on the basis of the resurrection (cf. Rom. 1:4; Acts 10:36; Jn. 20:28; I Cor. 12:3 and see TWNT, III, art. "Kupios," 1087ff.).

²This passage has also been used as a basis for the Trinity, but we cannot here go into this aspect.

³It is not our purpose here to delve into Paul's concept of the Spirit. We have touched upon its anthropological significance earlier (see Part I, ch. II, B, 2, b) and some aspects of it have been given previously in this chapter. For details see esp. TWNT, Vol. VI, 413-436 (art. "Πνευμακ").
"the Spirit of God" dwells in him but if he does not have the "Spirit of Christ," he does not belong the Christ (v. 9). In verse 10 Paul speaks of the believer's spirit being alive if Christ is in him. Life is given the believer if the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in him--life is given the believer's mortal body through "his Spirit" (God's or Christ's?) which dwells in him (vs. 11). In view of this passage and others, the passage, as the context shows, in II Cor. 3:17 must mean a functional identity rather than an identity of being. The Spirit so effectively gives to man the benefits of the resurrected Lord that it is just as if Christ were Himself present bestowing these self-same benefits.

Edward Schweizer has expressed this well when he writes:

I nsofern Christus in seiner Bedeutung für die Gemeinde, in seinem kraftvollen Handeln an ihr gesehen wird, kann er mit dem identifiziert werden; insoweit er auch Herr über seine Kraft ist, kann er von ihr unterschieden werden, wie man das Ich immer auch unterscheiden kann von der Kraft, die von ihm ausgeht.

Thus what the Spirit gives comes from the risen Christ. It has been accomplished through Him. It comes from Jesus through the Spirit to the believer. The Spirit is as the Spirit of the Lord, the channel of life to those who walk not according

---

1See the various commentaries on II Cor.
2TWNT, op. cit., VI, 416, 25ff.
3The Spirit gives, according to II Cor. 3, life (vs. 6), freedom (vs. 17), glorification (vs. 18).
4Cf. Rom. 6:23 where it is said that God gives life and see further 8:9-11. cf. also Col. 3:4 where Christ is said to be the believer's life (see also Rom. 8:2; 2 Cor. 13:4; Rom. 6:11).
to the flesh, but according to the Spirit (Rom. 8:4).

Thus life is established in Jesus Christ. The decisive thing has happened—the future life is established on the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. He is the first fruits of those who sleep (I Cor. 15:20) and the believer in Christ has now the first fruits of the Spirit (Rom. 8:23). The power of death has been taken away and the new age has dawned! This life the believer has through faith (Rom. 6:8ff.; 1:17; cf. Rom. 10:9; Jn. 3:15ff.; et al.). "Jesus Christ is, therefore, He who has brought ἀνάπτυξιν and ἀνάξιος to light (II Tim. 1:10); He is the ἀνάφημα τῆς ἀνάπτυξι (Acts 3:15); through His life, death has been conquered, we have been delivered (Rom. 5:10). To receive Christ by faith is to receive life. Paul expresses this in various ways, some of which we have already referred to. He can write that our life is hidden with Christ in God (Col. 3:3) or that we have been buried with Christ and risen again with Him to newness of life (Rom. 6:4ff.). The believer is now dead and alive—dead with Christ and risen (alive) with Him, dead to sin but alive to God, dead but alive with Christ in God, dead through trespasses and sins but now is made alive. In Him is life and it can even be said of

1TWNT, op.cit., II, 866.
2Cf. Acts 13:46—only the believer is worthy of eternal life.
3TWNT, op.cit., II, 866.
4The above is based on Rom. 6:4ff.; Col. 3:3; Eph. 2:1, 5.
5See esp. Rom. 8:2ff.; II Tim. 2:1; I Jn. 5:11; Jn. 20:31; Jn. 15 (engrafted into the true vine); 11:25; et al.
Him that He is the true God and eternal life (I Jn. 5:20).\(^1\)

A brief word on the sustaining of life is in order, although this has been touched upon at various points in earlier sections of this chapter. Life in the New Testament is not a power which man can dispose of—it is a gift of God (resp., Christ). This is true not only of eternal life but even of the natural life. This is brought out in the Synoptic accounts of the ministry of Jesus. By word and deed He asserts God's interest in and concern for all of the phases of man's life. His ministry consisted of preaching, teaching and healing (Mt. 4:23)—that is to say, it was concerned with all of man's needs: emotional and volitional, intellectual, spiritual and physical. At the Temptation, Jesus rejects a purely physical approach to man ("Man does not live by bread alone," Mt. 4:4; Lk. 4:4), again affirming His and therefore God's concern for all of man's needs. This is brought out in the teaching when, for example, He asserts the Father's concern for the physical needs of man (Mt. 7:25-32; cf. Lk. 11:1ff.; Mt. 7:9ff.). But the vital thing in Jesus' mind is that to truly know life man must be concerned first of all with God and his relation to Him (the point of the Parable of the Rich Fool, Lk. 12:15-21). In His teaching on God's concern for man's physical needs, the vital factor is brought out in

\(^{1}\)TWNT, op.cit., II, 866.
the statement "Seek first his kingdom and his righteousness and all these things shall be yours as well" (Mt. 6:33; Lk. 12:31). Jesus thus recognizes man's natural concern for physical well-being. Nevertheless, in so far as man makes this his overriding concern, in so far as he regards this life as a natural power which he can dispose of and to whose needs he must cater—in so far does man depart from true life and fall into the life whose end and present content is sin and death. It is when man does this that he loses the proper perspective on the real content of life. The emphasis of Jesus is on the life of the Age to Come—life in the Kingdom of God. The rest of the New Testament emphasizes this side of Jesus' teaching even more emphatically. The Fourth Gospel, as a result, makes life a major theme and means by life the life of the New age—eternal life. It is no departure from the Synoptic presentation to do this—rather it is to make emphatic a major side of the Synoptic presentation. Jesus is giver and sustainer of life. The sustenance of life and its relation to Jesus is quite clearly brought out in such passages as the interview with the Samaritan woman (Jn. 4, esp. vv. 10, 13f.), the Eucharistic homily in John 6, the proclamation of being the Light of the world (e.g. 8:12), the affirmation of being the Door of the Sheep in John 10 (note vs. 9, where the sheep who enter by Jesus "go in and out and find pasture," i.e. nourishment), and the True Vine passage in John 15 (the branches must abide in Jesus, the True Vine, to bear fruit, the product of nourishment). In Paul this is also brought out very strongly.
Two examples will suffice. The first example is the Pauline contrast between natural (\(\psi\nu\chi\iota\kappa\omega\)) life and spiritual life (\(\pi\nu\varepsilon\mu\mu\mu\tau\iota\kappa\iota\omega\)). The second example involves the contrast between "walking" according to the flesh and "walking" according to the Spirit (\(\kappa\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\sigma\iota\rho\iota\kappa\alpha, \kappa\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\sigma\nu\sigma\mu\alpha\)). While these two paired expressions\(^2\) are not identical in meaning, their importance for our purposes will enable us to treat them together. They both involve a contrast between the false and the true, the apparent and the genuine, the lower and the higher (usually conceived in ethical concepts) life. The natural life (\(\psi\nu\chi\iota\kappa\omega\)) is the life that is purely natural—that is, the life directed to the present concerns of life. The natural also refers to the life suitable to the material, bodily, life (cf. I Cor. 15:44ff.). The spiritual life in this latter sense is the life adapted to the higher future spiritual life (I Cor. 15:44ff.) — the resurrection life in the spiritual body. In the former sense, spiritual denotes the life in which the Spirit of God (respectively, Spirit of Christ, Holy Spirit) is present (Rom. 8:4ff.; I Cor. 2:14ff.). The paired contrast between \(\omega\chi\iota\kappa\iota\kappa\iota\) and \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\mu\mu\mu\tau\iota\kappa\iota\kappa\iota\) is a more severe contrast than that between \(\psi\nu\chi\iota\kappa\iota\iota\) and \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\mu\mu\mu\tau\iota\kappa\iota\kappa\iota\). In some respects flesh and Spirit denote, not ethical contrasts, but simply the contrast between two spheres of life. Thus to be "in the flesh" means

---

\(^1\)See below and also Part I, Ch. 2, B, 2, 4.
\(^2\)See above Part I, ch. 2, B, 2, 4.
simply to live the life of a man with all that this implies (cf. Gal. 2:20; Phil. 1:22; et al.)—there is here no implication that bodily life is evil as such. The ethical contrast is, as it were, lurking in the background of the use of "flesh" and "spirit" and is drawn out in the phrase κατὰ φύσις when used in contrast to κατὰ πνεῦμα. For to "walk according to the flesh" (cf. "walk according to the Spirit") means to live the life determined by this world—it is to have one's mind set (Rom. 8:5) upon an existence apart from God, or denotes the attempt to serve God through human endeavors. It denotes the way of life determined by this world and its dictates and the way of life which seeks God through self-justification (cf. e.g. Gal. 3:2-3). To walk (i.e. live, cf. Rom. 8:5 and Gal. 5:25) according to the Spirit is to live in the sphere of the unseen and eternal—the life lived from and to God (resp. Christ). It emphasizes that the Christian's life is lived "in Christ" and that life in this sense is lived by the power of Him who is the Giver and sustainer of life (resp. Christ, the Spirit and God). That all the gifts of the redemptive life came to the Christian as a gift is, therefore, brought out

2 Even Jesus had a body and lived a corporeal life!
3 κατὰ φύσις can also be used without an ethical contrast; see e.g. Rom. 4:1; 9:3; 1:3.
4 On this whole subject see the commentaries on Romans, Galatians and I Cor. and esp. Neill Hamilton, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul, (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, Ltd., 1957) and TWNT, op.cit., VI, art. "πνεῦμα."
by the use of the term "spiritual."\(^1\) \(\sigma \delta \varepsilon \) and \(\pi \nu \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \) denote, further, the contrast between Law and Gospel, works and faith, merit and grace (cf. e.g. Gal. 2:21, 3:2ff.; Rom. 3:27ff.; 4:1ff., 23f.; et al.). Life is the gift of God in Jesus Christ (Rom. 6:23; I Cor. 1:30). Thus one who has received this gift and now lives by the Spirit (Rom. 8:1-17) is to walk by the Spirit (Gal. 5:25)—that is, to live a life in which the Spirit motivates and controls the life (see Gal. 5:22ff.).

4. Life and the Body.

a. The Corporeal Aspect of Life.

As we have seen earlier\(^2\), the nature of man in the Old Testament is conceived as being a bodily existence. Man is a unity of being—a psycho-physical organism. That is to say, man is a unity of body and soul and is not essentially one or the other. In fact the two terms just used—body and soul\(^3\) do not describe parts of man but rather describe aspects of his nature, his being. The corporeal is a requisite of human life. Life is life in a body. "Unlike the Greeks, the Jews did not think of a man as being made up of a body and a soul; a man was a living body."\(^4\) This concept of life as a corporeal existence is found in both the Old Testament\(^5\) and

\(^1\)See TWNT, op.cit., VI, art. "\(\pi \nu \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \)," 425-428, 435f.; Hamilton, op.cit., 29ff.
\(^2\)Part I, Ch. 1 and ch. 2.
\(^3\)As well as the other psychological terms: flesh, heart, spirit, etc.
the New Testament.¹

The necessity of corporeal existence (or as Bultmann titles it "somatic existence")² is partially grounded in anthropology. Hebrew anthropology, followed in the New Testament, requires a body in order for there to be life. We are body. The vital ego of a human being is a self-awareness that is given only in the indissoluble unity of the corporeal and spiritual. What we experience in life comes through the organ of corporality. This does not mean spiritual and corporeal are identical but only that they may not be separated. We do not experience the spiritual as pure spirit but rather in a psycho-physical manner.³ The idea of man as body and soul means we should not think of the one without the other. The corporeal is an essential aspect of our being.

The characterization of man as some, implies, then, that man is a being who has a relationship to himself, and that this relationship can be either an appropriate or a perverted one: . . . ⁴

Thus the possibility exists for man to be in a relationship with God—for or against Him. If man were no longer some—if he no longer had a relationship to himself—he would no longer be man.⁵ Our personal life is only real as corporeal

¹E.g. Bultmann, Theology, op.cit., I, 192 ("The only human existence there is—even in the sphere of Spirit—is somatic existence; . . . .").
²Ibid.
³See Ibid., 195f.
⁴Ibid., 197.
⁵Ibid., 198.
A further basis of the necessity of the body for life is what might be called the Christological basis. This has a twofold application. The first application is in the Synoptic accounts of the ministry. There is in the Bible no deprecation of physical life. Rather, corporeal existence is affirmed, though not unduly emphasized. God acts with man through His Word—a Word which came through the Prophets and servants of God in the Old Testament (e.g. Moses) and a Word whose content, according to the Fourth Gospel, is the man Jesus Christ.

The summation of the ministry of Jesus in Mt. 4:23 involves again a recognition of corporeal existence: Jesus went about Galilee preaching, teaching, and healing. Thus Jesus in His public ministry is not concerned solely with "spiritual" needs but also physical needs. The second application of the affirmation of corporeal existence is in the resurrection of Jesus. However difficult the event of the resurrection was for the witnesses to explain, this much is clear: it was not just an "inner experience" of the disciples but the manifestation of Jesus as living in a genuine corporeality.

---

1See also P. Althaus, Die Letzten Dinge, (Götterslohn: Carl Bertelsmann Verlag, 6th ed., 1956), 122ff.
2Reference here could be made to examples in Mt. 4:4 (Deut. 8:3), "Man does not live by bread alone" and Luke 12:22-31.
3The Doctrine of the Incarnation of Christ is a strong affirmation of corporeal existence. The Council of Chalcedon affirmed in 451 the idea of two natures (divine and human) in one person. The concepts of the resurrection and ascension of Jesus affirm the continued corporeality of Jesus. See further D. M. Baillie, God Was In Christ, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), 151ff.
4Althaus, op. cit., 127.
Gospel affirms this in the presentation of Jesus' teaching on the resurrection and in the Eucharistic homily (chapter 6) which uses the figure of eating the flesh as a means of life—certainly a strong affirmation of the corporeal life. Many of Jesus' sayings, as well as the figures used in the Fourth Gospel, are drawn from corporeal existence (e.g. Parables of Sower, Mustard Seed, Marriage Feast, et al.). Bodily existence is, thus, no evil but is, rather, essential to any life properly called human. For this reason Paul, when speaking of the future life, speaks of a body—a spiritual body.

A few preliminary remarks on the relation of the present body to the future body in terms of corporeality would seem to be proper at this point. Both the present life and the future life are conceived in terms of corporeality. The distinctive difference will not then be expressed in the idea that this life is embodied life while the future life is disembodied life. To each is embodiment appropriate. The difference is, rather, expressed by means of the terms "flesh" and "spirit" or, alternatively "natural" and "spiritual." The contrast that is established is not, then, a dualism of body and soul. "The body is essentially not inferior to and not better than

1 e.g. 5:25ff.; 11:25.
2 See Althaus, op.cit., 127.
3 e.g. Bread of Life (6:35), True Vine (15:11).
4 So Bultmann, Theology, op.cit., I, 192 (cf. p. 198).
5 See also Part IV.
6 See Althaus, op.cit., 96-115 on "immortality."
7 There are, of course, other terms expressing this difference such as, e.g., "corruption" and "incorruption," "dishonor" and "glory"—see I Cor. 15.
the soul. Both are, without Christ, sold under evil, both will be redeemed and sanctified through Christ.¹ "Body of flesh" describes the body (i.e. man) ruled by "flesh"—by the sinful power at enmity with God.² It is the life lived apart from God—life lived and determined by the God-alienated and opposed power. "Body of Spirit" (spiritual body) is that life which is determined by and lived from the power of God.³ The present body is flesh—part of and subject to this worldly existence. The resurrection is of the body, not of the flesh (e.g. I Cor. 15:35-57, esp. vs. 50, "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." cf. Rom. 8:9ff).

Thus Paul did not dualistically distinguish between man's self (his "soul") and his bodily somā as if the latter were an inappropriate shell, a prison, to the former; nor does his hope expect a release of the self from its bodily prison but expects instead the "bodily" resurrection—or rather the transformation of the somā from under the power of flesh into a spiritual somā, i.e., a Spirit-ruled somā.⁴

The deliverance from the "body of death" (Rom. 7:24) means, therefore, release from the "flesh" while the "redemption of our bodies" (Rom. 8:23) refers to the forthcoming resurrection with its freedom from being ruled by the flesh.⁵ Life, present or future, is conceived in Biblical thought as being in some sense corporeal—a body is necessary for it to be real and

¹Althaus, op. cit., 128.
²See earlier in this chapter and also Part I, ch. 2 on "flesh" and ἱλήσις and on the whole question of flesh and body see Robinson, The Body, op. cit., esp. pp. 31ff.
³See Althaus, op.cit., 128.
⁴Bultmann, op.cit., I, 201.
⁵So Bultmann, Ibid.
genuine human life. Holtzmann sums this up quite succinctly in a statement quoted earlier: "Without flesh a human life is conceivable, but not without body."¹

b. Can the soul exist apart from the body?

The question as to whether the soul can exist apart from the body has its primary application in the problem of the intermediate state. A further application would, of course, be in the area of immortality as the only and real future of man—a future life conceived of in terms of a disembodied state. Granted the conclusion established in our preceding section that genuine life which is human is, in Biblical terms, only a life which involves corporeal existence, this latter application does not directly concern us. We are thus left with the former area as our concern—namely, can the soul exist apart from the body in an intermediate state prior to the resurrection? Our immediate problem in this section is to raise the question and to see if the possibility of the existence of the soul apart from the body is a "live option" in the New Testament. The actual question of the intermediate state we will return to in Part IV of this paper.

In Platonic—Greek thought a definite doctrine of the immortality of the soul is taught. The basis of this doctrine is the dualistic conception of man in which the body (material part of man's nature) dies but the soul (the immaterial part of

¹Holtzmann, op.cit., II, 17.
man's nature) lives on. Death is here a separation of the soul from the body.\(^1\) Death frees the soul from the embodiment which weighs it down and hinders its full development.\(^2\) This "nakedness" of the soul is higher and purer condition of existence. The soul is by nature immortal—death places the soul into its true and destined condition of being disembodied and "naked."\(^3\)

Biblical religion knows nothing of a natural immortality of the soul and, as we have affirmed, requires corporeality as a condition of genuine human life. The dualistic basis for belief in immortality is thus not found in the New Testament, and accordingly the thought of the natural immortality of the soul must be rejected. If the soul is by nature immortal then death will not be taken seriously,\(^4\) and death cannot be a real death of man but only a freeing of the kernel from the husk, a desirable liberation of the real personal ego from the "tent" or vehicle of its transitoriness. But death, as we shall see, must be taken much more seriously—it is the enemy (e.g. I Cor. 15:26, 54ff.). An even more important reason for rejecting the natural immortality of the soul is that it makes the

\(^1\)e.g. Death is "the separation of soul and body . . . when the soul exists in herself, and is released from the body and the body is released from the soul, what is this but death?" (Plato, Phaedo).

\(^2\)e.g. Plato speaks of the souls which cannot escape the attraction of embodiment at death and which wonder about "until, through the craving after the corporeal which never leaves them, they are imprisoned finally in another body." (Plato, Phaedo).

\(^3\)See the remarks by Althaus on this subject, op.cit., 91ff.

\(^4\)See further section B of this chapter.
encounter with God in Christ no longer vital. Man can withdraw from this encounter, for the ground of his hope and of his confidence in the future life is no longer in God and what He has done for us in Christ, but is rather now sought within himself. Self-confidence replaces trust in God. It is a quality of his own nature that now establishes the hope of man in the face of death, the boundary of his temporal existence. Christian faith, faith in Christ, becomes now, if even it is accepted, only a buttress for the hope of continued life. It can only inform the content of that hope—it is no longer the ground of hope. Christian eschatology now describes what blessings lie in store for one who is by nature immortal and the death of Christ is a victory only in that it shows us that after all dying is not so bad for it brings the welcome release from a world where the spirit is chained by lesser cares and woes and grants freedom to achieve the full life without being dragged down again by corporeality. For all practical purposes, then, the death and resurrection of Jesus become examples and parables and the resurrection in particular is of value primarily because it provides an evidence that immortality, established on other grounds, is a true and valid hope. It confirms but it no longer promises the future—resurrection life is not really the hoped-for future life! The picture of death in the Bible is quite different, however.¹ Death is a real dying and real experience of man in which he encounters the threat

¹See Part II, ch. 1, p and further B of this chapter.
of non-being. Christ encounters death as the enemy—an enemy whom He defeats. The ground of hope is just this victory over death won for us in the death and resurrection of Christ and the encounter with God is then the only basis for future hope. It is not survival that is here offered but life. The resurrected life man is to expect—a resurrected life made possible by Jesus and therefore a life similar to His (see e.g. Rom. 6:5ff.; Col. 2:12; 3:1-4; I Jn. 3:2; II Cor. 5:14; et al.).

Does this mean, then, that when man dies, he dies completely? That both body and soul die? That the ego, the self, the person, is with death simply extinguished? That for man between death and resurrection there is nothing? To these questions we must return later in Part IV, but for now we must simply posit the question as to whether in the New Testament there is not after all some evidence that at least hints or raises the possibility that man does survive after death and that life continues after death to some extent at least. How this will affect the conception of the future life in general and of the intermediate state in particular will be our concern in Part IV of this paper. For the present it is merely the possibility of life existing, without a body, that concerns us. The basic passage in Paul's writings on

---

1Whether believer or unbeliever.
2Many of the remarks, suggestions, and conclusions made here will concern us in Part IV. Here they should be regarded as preliminary, tentative and possible.
This subject is II Cor. 5:1-8. The precise interpretation of this passage will concern us later. The important thing now is that in this passage Paul posits the possibility of disembodied life after earthly existence has been terminated by death! Paul speaks of this condition as a being "found naked" (vs. 3) or a being "unclothed" (vs. 4). The person, the ego, the self, can exist apart from the body, though this existence is one of "nakedness." For Paul, then, at least one interpretation of death is that it is a separation of the self (soul?) from the body, but this is not a prospect to which he looks forward as desirable. Rather, he shrinks from it in terror. The only thing that mitigates this prospect is that it is a being with God: "we are of good courage, and we would rather be away from the body and at home with the Lord" (vs. 8). The possibility exists for Paul that there is a survival, an existence, apart from the body after death. However, this one passage would not be firm basis on which to make such a conclusion were it not for the fact that it is not the only one which hints at such a possibility. Col. 3:3f. hints in the same direction: "Your life is hid with Christ in God... then you also will appear with him in glory." Again in I Cor. 5:5 the same possibility is posited: "You are to deliver this man to Satan for the destruction of the flesh,

1Paul does not use the word "soul" in this passage!
2Althaus, op.cit., 92.
that his spirit may be saved in the day of Lord Jesus." A possible interpretation of this passage involves a dying by means of which the spirit may be saved,1 providing again a hint as to the existence of the self apart from the body. Phil. 1:21-24 again presents the same possible interpretation. Here Paul declares that "to die is gain" and that he desires this departure to be with Christ but nevertheless he will remain in the flesh in order to continue his earthly work. In II Cor. 12:2-3 Paul speaks of a man in Christ caught up into Paradise and adds the, for our purpose, significant expression, "whether in the body or out of the body I do not know." Existence apart from the body is thus, for Paul, a possibility. Confirmation of this view appears to be found in the Gospels. An example is the statement to the criminal crucified with Christ, "today you will be with me in Paradise." The today means, perhaps, that Jesus expects to survive death and that He will do this before the resurrection.2 If this be the correct interpretation, a disembodied existence is implied if not definitely affirmed. The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus is another passage (Luke 16:19-31) that appears to infer a possible existence apart from the body after death.

---

1 The above statement is the conclusion of Prof. R. M. Grant of the University of Chicago, made in a private conversation on the subject with the present writer. See also Leitzmann, An die Korinther, I-II, HNT, (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1949), 4th ed., rev. W. G. Kümmel, p. 23.

2 Another rendering would be "today I say to you, you will be with me in Paradise," thus removing the temporal import that affects our investigation.
Matthew 10:28 is another passage that applies to our question: "do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul; rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in Gehenna." The soul can apparently survive bodily death and lives on after death. Revelation 6:9ff. is also a passage pointing in the direction of the survival of the self after death and prior to the resurrection. We can conclude, therefore, that the New Testament does posit the existence of the self after death in a disembodied state as a definite possibility.1 The basis of the New Testament doctrine appears to be not Greek dualistic thought but rather the Old Testament and Jewish concept which always affirmed that death was not extinction and man did survive, a weaker and shadowlike replica of his former self, but nevertheless a survival.2 Our point is established, namely, that the New Testament recognizes a possible existence of the self, ego, person or soul (?) after death between death and the resurrection.

1 Other passages in this connection are Eph. 4:8-10; I Peter 3:19f.; I Cor. 15:29; Jn. 11:26.
2 That there may still be some influence from Greek thought, esp. in Paul (see II Cor. 5:1-8) is still an open question. We affirm here only that Hebrew thought is the primary influence.
B. Death.


a. Similarity to the Old Testament view.

The New Testament idea of death resembles in some ways the idea of death found in the Old Testament. Death is again to be understood in terms of life. If to life belongs vitality, then to death belongs impotence. Death is the negation of life. A major characteristic of life in the Old Testament is that to live means to have time. Death means that the time of life is over—death is the end of life. Death has this same significance in the New Testament—it is the end of earthly and temporal existence (life).¹ Death is thus the boundary placed by God on man's life. Human life is distinguished from God's life in that man must die.² Death is the end of life—the decisive end of this one life, beyond which we do not know what lies. With death, then, will come the cessation of the possibility of movement and development toward the achievement of the goal (goals) of life. Life has, therefore, a decisive quality. Now, in this life, is the time for action—now must one realize the goal of life. To this end, Jesus sternly admonishes his hearers:

"what will it profit a man, if he gains the whole world and forfeits

²See TWNT, III (art. "ζωή ἥτο; "), p.13.
his life?" (Mt. 16:26). Not only must one act now to achieve the goals of life, but he must be very careful to choose the right goals! Thus does Jesus warn of life: "better for you to enter life maimed than with two hands to go to the Gehenna, to the unquenchable fire" (Mk. 9:43; cf. vs. 45, 47-48). Life now has a decisive quality, then, which affects the future (both Mt. 16:26; Mk. 9:43 refer beyond this life to life in the eschatological sense). There is no middle ground—one must decide: "he who is not with me is against me, and he who does not gather with me scatters" (Mt. 12:30). That death, which is the end, awaits man gives to life its decisive quality. One cannot say, "If I had only known—please warn my brothers," for the answer is, "They have their chance to hear and decide—let them do it." Or as it is written in the Fourth Gospel—"if anyone keeps my word, he will never see death" (Jn. 8:51; cf. 3:14-21, 36; 5:24, 39ff.; et al.). Or as Paul writes, "Behold now is an acceptable (favorable) time, behold now a day of salvation" (II Cor. 6:2; cf. also Rom. 13:12 and other imperatives to live and act: e.g. II Cor. 5:10; I Cor. 7:1; Gal. 6:7; Rom. 12:1f., 6ff.; et al.).

Death means, further, the loss of the living community—separation from God and the community of life. This is the real terror of death—not just that all is over, but that all might be lost. The invitations to life and the warnings of hell have

---

1 cf. Mk. 9:40 ("he that is not against us is for us").
alike this in view—to be with God or apart from God as the positive and negative valuations of genuine life. Death is "the state of exclusion from the life which is life indeed."¹ This is the real import of the references given above on the decisive quality of life.² The believer is invited to receive life and this life is fellowship with God and His people.³ The blessing pronounced includes fellowship⁴ (II Cor. 13:14). The people of God, the church, the New Israel is distinguished by three marks: proclamation (κήρύξεως), service (σερνομία) and fellowship (κοινωνία).⁵ From this possibility the dead are excluded, according to the Old Testament view. For them service and fellowship is over—death is the end, it is final.⁶ For this reason the "good news" is the proclamation of the defeat of death and the triumph of life in Christ. The believer may thus be said not to die (Jn. 11:25; 8:51), or may be said even in death to be with God in Christ (Phil. 1:23; Col. 3:3) or to have died with Christ (Col. 3:3; Gal. 2:20; Rom. 6:3ff.) or to have (eternal) life now (Rom. 6:11; Jn. 3:36; 5:24; 6:47).

¹Morris, op.cit., p. 13. 
²see also section 2 on death and sin and also 1c on the power of death. 
³e.g. I Jn. 1:3 and see section A above. 
⁴κοινωνία. 
⁵see e.g. respectively Rom. 10:8ff.; 12:7; Acts 2:42 (see also e.g. Richardson, Theology, esp. pp. 376ff.; L. S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ; E. Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship (Naperville: Alec. R. Allenson, Inc., 1960). 
⁶The question of κηρύξεως to the dead will be dealt with in Part IV.
One who is separated from God is dead already (Eph. 2:1ff; cf. I Cor. 15:17).¹

It can be seen from the above that the New Testament and the Old Testament are similar in many ways in the conception of death. As we shall see there are still more similarities (e.g. death is a power). There are, however, also differences. These are, as in the idea of life, seen primarily in the understanding of death in the light of Jesus' death and resurrection. Even more than in the Old Testament does the New Testament see death as a hostile power and in the New Testament as in the Old Testament death is not natural or normal. It can be said only of those who die in Christ that they die in peace.² Of these aspects of death we shall speak in succeeding sections.

b. General view of death.

Before going on to consider other aspects of the concept of death, let us now set forth some general remarks on the idea of death in the New Testament.³

There are several words used in the New Testament with the significance of "death," "to die," "dying," "to put to death," "to kill," "perish" and the like. The chief of

¹See further section 2: "Death and Sin."
²e.g. II Cor. 5:8; Rom. 14:8; Phil. 1:23; cf. Lk. 2:29.
³Death as it affects the Christian will be treated more extensively in Part IV, Ch. 2. Especially there will "sleep" (νεκρασθεί) as a designation of death be considered.
these are: θανάτοι (θανάτω, θανάτοι), ἀποθάνῃσθαι, ἀποκτεῖναι, ἀπόλλυμι (καταλῦμι). These are the chief words in the New Testament to express the idea of death—death in the sense of the termination of earthly life, or the idea of eternal death, separation from God, the state of being dead (or in the power of death), ruined or perishing. Many of the uses of these terms are with reference to the death of Christ and its significance for man, the world and history. For the New Testament this is the decisive factor: the eternal God, who alone has immortality (I Tim. 6:16), has become incarnate in the man Jesus and has "tasted death" for every man (Heb. 2:9) and has, in His dying, won the victory over death (Acts 2:24; Rom. 6:5ff.; 3:24ff.; et al.). Just as the concept of life has been intensively altered as a consequence of the Christ event, so has the concept of death been altered by the same event. While death is still the enemy whose power yet grips the sinner, that power has been broken and annulled by Him who has died and "brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel" (II Tim. 1:10). Death, the "last enemy," will be destroyed (I Cor. 15:26), even as now its power is broken (death no longer "reigns" over the man in Christ—Rom. 5:12-21; 6:9, 22).

1 For meanings and uses see Arndt and Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon, (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1957)—a translation, with additions, of the 4th ed. of W. Bauer's Wörterbuch.
2 Of men, plants or animals. See HERE, op.cit., VIII, pp. 16ff.
3 The relevant ideas of the death of Christ will concern us in Part IV.
We may now set forth some general theological statements, very briefly, on the nature of death. These are not New Testament statements, but rather are theological statements. They build on New Testament uses as their foundation and for that reason sample New Testament references are given. First, death is the divinely placed boundary on human, creaturely existence. This is the demarcation between man and God: man is finite and must die, God is infinite and immortal. "Zwischen Gottes Leben und unserem Leben steht das Sterben...Der Tod ist Grenze, an der uns der Herr des Lebens erscheint, der Schöpfer, der allein Unsterblichkeit hat (I Tim. 6, 16), der seine Geschöpfe unter das Gesetz des Werdens und Vergehens gestellt hat."1 Secondly, death is the great questioner of our existence. We do not know what lies beyond.2 What man fears is not that death is the end but that it is not. But if not, what does lie on the other side—this uncertainty is one of the terrors of death. If death were the final end, then man could seek it as the solution to all problems and the escape from the Judgment of God.3 Death questions the validity, not just of our existence, but of our life—its conduct, manner, goals and orientation. Third, death is a power—the power hostile to and opposed to life and God. It is the negation of life

1Althaus, op.cit., p. 84.
2Morris, op.cit., pp. 3f.
3So Althaus, op.cit., p. 109.
and rules the life of fleshly and natural man (Rom. 5-7).\(^1\) Fourth, death is the "wages of sin" (Rom. 6:23).\(^2\) Sin and death go together--"the sting of death is sin" (I Cor. 15:56). Through sin death entered the world and now reigns supreme (Rom. 5:12; cf. Gen. 3:19). Because all have sinned, all now die (Rom. 3:23; Jn. 8:21). "To set the mind on the flesh is death" (Rom. 8:6). The key word of this verse is the word "is." It is death.\(^3\) From the "body of this death," this human solidarity in sin, we must seek deliverance (Rom. 7:24).

Sin, flesh and death are indissolubly connected.\(^4\) Fifth, death is a transition. Death is not only a state—the state of being dead, it is also a transition. It is this in two ways: (1) a transition to eternal life, to communion with the Lord\(^5\) (e.g. Phil. 1:23); (2) in the sense of dying as the transition between life and death, being and non-being.\(^6\) In this latter sense, death\(^7\) is the transition between this side and the other side,\(^8\) the state of no longer living. Dying is the experienced boundary of our existence, and is, therefore,

---

\(^1\)Death as a power will be considered in more detail in the next sub-section.
\(^2\)See further below, #2.
\(^3\)cf. Morris, op.cit., p. 17, "It is not merely that such an attitude inevitably brings death about or deserves death, it is death."
\(^4\)TWNT, III, pp.15f. (see also Robinson, The Body, pp.34-37).
\(^5\)This will be discussed further in Part IV, esp. ch.2.
\(^6\)But not existence and non-existence.
\(^7\)or more properly, "dying."
\(^8\)What the Germans call "diesseits" and "jenseits."
an intermediate phase between life and the state of being dead. Death, being dead, is thus not just the event of dying—it is also the state of being dead. Leon Morris expresses this view well when he writes: death is not only an event, "it is a state, ... the sphere in which evil has its sway, and sinners are, and must be, within this sphere with all that that means, until they are redeemed from it."¹ Man is afraid not only that death may not be the final end, he is also afraid that death may mean the end—the absolute and final end. Death is also the menace of our existence by "nothing," non-being and non-existing. In the New Testament it is affirmed that man must die and that this death is a terrible and real dying, a horror from which man shrinks, a death which may well be final and ultimate. But that death means the cessation of all existence is a doubtful New Testament teaching.² Death is not natural—on the contrary it is unnatural, a hostile power which has enslaved man.³ Death is then an event of transition; it is a state of being (equal to a "non-being being"). How can death be both—a transition (event) and a state? From the above it would appear to be summarized in the following: dying separates from life and death is this final separation from life. The difference then is found in the two words: dying and death—the one dynamic and event, the other static and a state.

¹Morris, op.cit., p.20.
²On this see Kennedy, op.cit., pp.119ff., esp. 123f.
³So TWNT, op.cit., III, p.14; Althaus, op.cit.; Morris, op.cit.; et al.
Both can be further understood in the God-relation. To be separated from God is to be separated from life—this, as we have affirmed before, is death. Death can then be wherever this separation exists. What we call "being dead," after physical death, only confirms what for the sinner, was already a reality.1 "Death is regarded as separation from God."2 Dying is the transition to death—separation as the final and conclusive state. Sixth, death is a daily dying.3 This is specifically Christian, not a general, statement. Paul expresses this idea well when he writes: "always carrying in the body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our bodies. For while we live we are always being given up to death for Jesus sake, so that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh" (II Cor. 4:10f.; cf. I Cor. 15:31, where he speaks of dying every day). The Christian has died with Christ and his life is a continued dying of the old man and a consequent continued renewal of the new man in Christ (cf. II Cor. 4:16; 3:18; Eph. 4:22ff.; Phil. 3:8ff.; Rom. 8:23ff.; 12:1ff.).4

---

1See further sections 2 and 3 of this chapter and also Part IV, ch. 2.
2Kennedy, op. cit., p.117.
3This aspect of death will be dealt with more extensively in Part IV, ch. 2.
4It should also be noted that suffering and dying are connected in some passages with the future glorification at the resurrection (e.g. Phil. 3:7-11). When present life is in view it is a continued renewal, when future life is in view it is a glorification in resurrection.
These general statements on death may be further summarized and categorized under the following groupings.\(^1\) The first category is the view of death which distinguishes man from God and thus portrays the creatureliness and finitude of man. Under this category will appear the first statement, viz. that death is the divinely appointed boundary of our creaturely life. Man is finite and mortal—a creature. God is infinite and immortal—the Creator. The second statement, viz. that death is the great questioner of the validity of our existence also belongs to this category. The question of finite existence is whether death is the end or not and thus whether life has meaning and purpose—is life valid or can it be valid and worthwhile in the face of death?\(^2\) The second category views death in itself and as it relates to man prior to and outside Christ. It is similar to the first category and really represents only a further refinement of it. To this category belongs the third statement, viz. that death is the power that is hostile to and opposed to God. This death—power rules over man and is sovereign in the world of human existence. Against this power man fights and struggles but his alien ruler in the end triumphs—man is weak, frail

---

\(^1\) Some overlapping will here be evident, as all statements are not mutually exclusive, but are rather, supplementary and complementary.

\(^2\) Cf. the statement by Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der Neuen Testament Theologie*, II, p. 53, that the fearfulness of death before Christ is that death is the final end. "The temporal death is the final, the eternal death."
and mortal and in the end must die. To this category also belongs the fourth statement, viz. that death is "the wages of sin" (Rom. 6:23). Man is ruled not only by death but also by sin and in fact is ruled by death because he is ruled by sin (see e.g. Rom. 5:12-21), and as a sinner man not only dies but he must deservedly die. Sin is an alien power, like death, which now rules the life of man in the flesh. As sinner man has cut himself off from the source of true life—God. The second statement also belongs here, for man's life is not just questioned by death as a finite existence, but the quality and validity of his life is also questioned. The fifth statement, that death is a transition is also under this category. The part that fits in here is that of death as a transition between being and non-being (not existence and non-existence). Man dies and is dead—dying is the experienced boundary of our life. For man outside Christ it is a terror—he knows not what lies on the other side. He knows only that he does not wish to leave this side. The third category concerns death as it affects the believer—the man in Christ. This presents the view of death in the light of the Christ event—the life, and above all, death and resurrection of Jesus. To this category belongs the fifth statement that death is transition from this life to a being with Christ (resp. God). The sixth statement also belongs here—that

---

1To be discussed more fully in Part IV.
death is a daily dying with Christ of the old man and constant renewal of the new man in Christ by the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{1} In another respect, death is once and for all behind the Christian, for he has died with Christ (e.g. Rom.6:1ff.).

c. Death as a Power.

Death in the Old Testament, as we have written earlier,\textsuperscript{2} is a power, an intruder in the world of man, a force which grips man and weakens the capacity for life. In the New Testament, death is also portrayed as a power—a cosmic power\textsuperscript{3} opposed to and at enmity with God. It is Paul who most strongly brings out this aspect of death as a power. In Rom. 5:12-21 he brings out the idea that death now rules over the life of man. Death is here portrayed as a monarch and is connected closely to sin.\textsuperscript{4} Because man "is enslaved to sin he cannot avoid death, and so may fitly be said to be under the rule or sovereignty of death."\textsuperscript{5} In this sense death is frequently personified\textsuperscript{6} as it is here in Rom. 5. In Rom. 8:38f. death is listed with those things which shall not be able to separate us from God's love in Jesus Christ. According to Colossians

\textsuperscript{1}We have died with Christ (Col. 3:3), we die daily (I Cor. 15:31; II Cor. 4:10f.) and will yet see death finally removed and so will never die (I Cor. 15:24-28; Jn. 11:25).
\textsuperscript{2}See Part II, ch. 1. B, 2, c.
\textsuperscript{3}Bultmann, TWNT, III, p.15, states that sin, death and life appear as cosmic powers.
\textsuperscript{4}See also section 2 on "Death and Sin."
\textsuperscript{5}Morris, \textit{op.cit.}, p.6.
\textsuperscript{6}Holtzmann, \textit{op.cit.}, II, p.52; HDB, \textit{op.cit.}, III, p.117; Morris, \textit{op.cit.}, p.5.
the principalities and powers have been defeated by the death of Christ (Col. 2:15). Christ is superior to all powers and spirits since by Him they were created (Col. 1:15ff.) and in their demonic form He has defeated them (Col. 2:15). Among these powers is death: God "has delivered us from the dominion of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved son" (Col. 1:13). Darkness is a symbol of death in the Biblical language, and is a defeated ruler—death is a power whose spell is now broken for the Christian. Death is a power, but not one whose rule was originally appointed over man—it is an intruder in God's universe—"it entered upon its reign over man from outside." It is a power "now at work in the sons of disobedience" (Eph. 2:2). Death is the enemy—the last enemy to be destroyed by Christ at the end of the age (I Cor. 15:26) and is now as a consequence of the Christ event an enemy, a power, which has lost its sting and for which there can be no victory over the believer (I Cor. 15:54ff.). In the Letter to the Hebrews death as a power also is affirmed. Here the power of death is linked to the devil who exercises

1See Part II, ch. I, A, 1c and B, 1d.
2See further #2 below and esp. Part IV, ch. 1 & 2.
3Robinson, The Body, p.35.
4Ibid.
6Paul's ruler or prince of this age (e.g. Eph. 6:10-17; cf. II Thess. 2:1-11; II Cor. 4:4).
the power of death (Heb. 2:14ff.). In the Fourth Gospel the same idea appears, especially under the symbol of darkness. For example, the λόγος shines in the darkness and the darkness (death, evil) has tried but for all its efforts cannot overcome the light (Jn. 1:5; cf. II Cor. 4:3-6, esp. vs. 6). Again, as in Paul, the power of death (resp. sin—Jn. 8:34) is a defeated power. The believer has eternal life and therefore, as a consequence of sharing in the life of the Son (who has won the victory and grants eternal life) will not die the death (Jn. 6:47; 8:12, 24, 31-36, 51; 10:28; 11:25-26; et al.). The idea that death is a power is not so directly presented in the Gospels, but is nevertheless found there also. The main idea in view in the Synoptics is the power of the devil. Thus is Jesus the "strong man" who binds the ruler of the house (Mt. 12:29). The healing miracles are demonstrations of the power of Jesus and the Kingdom of God rules supreme (Mt. 12:28; Lk. 11:20). Among the demonstrations of this power is the power to raise the dead (Mk. 5:35-43 and parallels; Lk. 7:11-17). When we recall the Old Testament teaching that sickness, persecution, etc. were forms of death—

1 But see Heb. 9:27 where it is said "that it is appointed for men to die once."
2 Darkness in the Fourth Gospel is also connected with evil and ignorance. This may, in fact, be the primary meaning (cf. 3:19 and the translation difficulty of 1:5, which may also be rendered, "the darkness has not comprehended it"). Our point is that death as a power is also found in John, not that death as a power is a dominant motif in John.
3 See Part IV, Ch. 1, A.
the power of death gripping a man—the healings of the sick, raisings of the dead and casting out of demons are onslaughts on the powers of sin, death, and evil.¹ Luke gives a statement that remarkably confirms this when upon healing a woman of a sickness, Jesus replies to those who accuse Him of violating the Sabbath, "ought not this woman, a daughter of Abraham whom Satan bound for eighteen years, to be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?" (Lk. 13:16). In His final encounter with death, Jesus does not regard it as a friend, but as the enemy whom He must encounter in the final way. He describes this encounter in language which vividly brings out the terrifying aspects of death. His death is a ransom (Mk. 10:45), a price paid to free man from sin and death. It is a baptism (Mk. 10:38; Lk. 12:50), a cup² from which He recoils—He does not wish to drink (Mk. 10:38; 14:36). On the Cross, when death has Him fully in its grasp, Jesus cries out, "My God, My God, why have you forsaken me?" (Mk. 15:34) and utters a final cry as He dies (Mk. 15:37).³

d. The Origin of Death.

There is no definitive treatment of the origin of death in the New Testament in philosophical or logical language.

¹See references given above.
²Note also the place of the cup in the Lord's Supper ritual (e.g. Mk. 14:22-25; I Cor. 11:23-34).
³We shall consider this aspect of Jesus' death further in Part IV, Ch. 1.
What is said on the subject is said in figurative, typological or mythological language. Into all of the ramifications and problems of this subject we cannot and need not enter here. A few general remarks on the subject are, however, pertinent and relevant at this point.¹

Not much is said on the subject in the New Testament. It is in Paul's writings that one finds the fullest description and answers to this question. However it should be noted that nowhere in the Bible is the question of the origin of death (resp. sin, evil) per se ever answered.² The concern is only, in figurative language, to account for the entrance of sin and death into the world of human experience. The question of the origin of death is closely connected with the question of the origin of sin, as Bultmann has pointed out.³ Paul in Rom.⁵ affirms the proposition, found also in Judaism,⁴ that sin and thus death originate with Adam. Adam's Fall is the origin of sin and death in world—death is the punishment of sin.⁵ "Der Tod aber herrscht über den Menschen auf Grund des Todesurteils, das Gott über jeden Sünden seit Adams Tagen, ja damals bereits

¹For details see the various Systematic Theologies, Theologies of the New Testament, the relevant Articles in TWNT (e.g. "ἀναπτάνω", Vol. I, pp. 267-320, esp. 282ff., 312f.; "Ἀδημοσίως", I, pp. 141-143; "Θάνατος", III, 15) and various specialized sources (e.g. W. D. Dickson, op. cit.; et al.). For Paul, in addition to the above, see also E. Lohmeyer, "Probleme paulinischer Theologie: III Sünde, Fleisch und Tod," ZNW, Vol. 29, 1930, pp. 1-59 (esp. 43-53).
⁴See TWNT, I, pp. 282ff., 141-143; Bultmann, Theology, I, pp. 251ff. See also works on the Intertestamental Period.
⁵See below #2.
über die ganze Menschheit gesprochen hat Rom. 5:16; 5:18f. "

Thus death cannot be regarded as the natural and necessary end of life but is a hostile power. Adam, in terms of the Hebraic concept of corporate personality, represents humanity—Adamic humanity as under the powers of sin, death and the Law (Rom. 5:7). Sin and death came into the world through one man and thus now rule over the lives of all men since Adam (Rom. 5:12-21). Paul presents a view that involves two humanities: the one through the first Adam is the humanity ruled by sin, death and the Law, the other the new humanity created through the new Adam (the second Adam) ruled now by righteousness, life and grace (Rom. 5:12-21; I Cor. 15:20-28). There are thus two humanities with two representative heads, Adam and Christ. If one interprets this from the point of view of what Paul writes regarding the obedience of Christ and its effects, one may conclude therefore that the effects of Christ's deed of righteousness (Rom. 5:18) do not automatically extend to all men. There is an act of decision whereby men may be included within the new humanity: they may receive the free gift of righteousness (Rom. 5:17). Rom. 5:18 states that one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men and that one

3In addition to the above, seeon Christ and Adam as representatives of the new and old humanities especially W. Grundmann, "Die Übermacht der Gnade: eine Studie zur Theologie des Paulus," Novum Testamentum, II (1957), pp. 50-72; K. Barth, Christus und Adam nach Röm. 5, (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1952).
man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men. Is this verse to be understood from the point of view of the following verse where the word "many" is used instead of the word "all" or is the reverse the case? The latter could make Paul a universalist. Is he? The former would not conflict with the idea that men can reject the Gospel and perish (e.g. Rom. 8:13; I Cor. 1:18ff.; et al.). Paul also in Rom. 5 insists that men are sinners, not just through Adam, but because "all men sinned" (vs. 12; cf. 3:23). The problem (viz. Adam's fall involves all men in death, all men are guilty and responsible on their own account) is a difficult one, but several things suggest themselves in solution. First, the logical answer to the situation posited by Paul is that he does not conceive of a dual standard: all are involved in Adam's sentence of death, all are worthy of death because of their own actions. That is to say, Paul does not mean by this that just possibly some have not sinned and thus are not worthy of death but nevertheless die because they are involved in Adam's sentence of death. Rather, it is because we are all in Adam that we all do in fact sin. To hold otherwise would involve Paul in a grave contradiction, for he has firmly asserted here as elsewhere that men (all, not just some) are worthy of death because all have sinned (e.g. Rom. 3:23; and here in this passage—"all men sinned"). Bultmann is misleading when he

1Theology, I, p.251.
writes: "Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that in Rom. 5:12ff. the sin of humanity after Adam is attributed to Adam's sin and that it therefore appears as the consequence of a curse for which mankind is not itself responsible." Adam's sin only accounts for death's entrance, but "death spread to all men because all men sinned." (Rom. 5:12, emphasis added). We sin because we are in Adam, i.e. in fallen humanity. Second, Paul means here in Rom. 5 and I Cor. 15 that death is universal and all men die—they are a part of Adamic humanity. As a consequence of Adam's Fall all men are ruled by sin and death. It would seem that what Paul is saying here is that each man when he enters this world finds that evil, sin and death are already there, a part of the fate that awaits him, a part of the experience that will involve him. On the other hand, Paul will not thereby remove from man his responsibility. For just as he sees man involved in a humanity of death, Paul at the same time points out that each man has involved himself in this fate, not as a natural necessity, but as a consequence of his own actions. As in Adam, then, sin and death entered the world and so all die, so also because each man has sinned, he must as a consequence die. Paul acknowledged himself as worthy of death, in spite of his best efforts, and confessed himself a sinner deserving of the sentence of death (Rom. 7). Paul also sees deliverance as God's gift to those who were helpless (Rom. 5:6; cf. Rom. 7:24f.). These two ideas, then, are held in tension: that death is a consequence of Adam's sin and
therefore a universal fact of experience and that death is the consequence of each man's sin and therefore again a universal fact of experience. Bultmann feels the part of verse 12 of Rom. 5 which affirms that all have sinned is obscure in relation to the context, and that death as a consequence of Adam's sin is not compatible with death as the consequence of the individual's sin. It would not seem thus when seen in the light of the double tension referred to above. Adam represents the corporate solidarity of humanity, but each man in that humanity is also a sinner and thus must die. Bultmann also suggests that as not all are made alive in Christ in fact but only in potential, the same may hold for Adam. He writes:

Not all men since Christ, it is clear, receive life, as all since Adam become the victims of death, but only those who have faith ("those who receive," v. 17). Through Christ, that is, there was brought about no more than the possibility of life, which, however, in men of faith becomes certain reality. That suggests, then, that one should assume by analogy that through

1cf. No man can by works justify himself in the sight of God (Rom. 3:20; Gal. 2:16; 3:11; see also Ps. 143:2, "no man living is righteous before thee") and Rom. 3:23 where Paul states that all have sinned (cf. 3:9 and Chapters 1-3 of Romans where Paul at length argues the universality of sin. Sin is seen as a power gripping man (e.g. 3:9) and yet every man sins (e.g. 3:23; 5:12).

2Theology, I, p.252.
4So Dodd, Romans, pp.79ff.
Adam there was brought about for Adamitic mankind the possibility of sin and death—a possibility that does not become reality until individuals became guilty by their own responsible action.¹

He does not present this as being assuredly the intent of Paul and concludes that this aspect must remain an open question. With this we must also agree. A statement of Bultmann's in the same work is a fitting conclusion to this section as summing up the teaching on the origin of death and sin: "the universal fallenness of Adamitic mankind to sin and death is beyond all question to Paul."²

2. Death and Sin

In the Old Testament death and sin³ are connected, not so much by direct statement (though this is also found⁴) as by the implications of sin. Death, in the Old Testament, is regarded as unnatural—a power hostile to life and that which terminates or lessens the blessedness of life.⁵ Sin is fundamentally a breach—that which cuts a man off from Yahweh.⁶ Since Yahweh is the source and ground of all life, to be separated from Him is death. "Its first consequence is just that it breaks

---

¹Bultmann, Theology, p. 252.
²Ibid., p. 253.
⁴e.g. Gen. 2:16f.; 3:19; Num. 16 (Korah's rebellion, punished by death); Deut. 28 (curses for disobedience); Josh. 7 (sin of Achan): Ps. 37:9; Ezek. 18:4.
⁵See also Part II, ch. 1, B on the Old Testament concept of death.
that fellowship with God which is the foundation of man's well-being. To be thus cut off from God is death. Though the sinner must, as do all men, go to Sheol at death, in reality he is there already, (see e.g. Ps. 9:15-17; Prov. 5:106; 7:27). The concept of death as a power brings out this aspect of death and sin. Death is both the boundary placed on man's life by God and a punishment for sin, a disrupting power in God's creation. Man is a sinner and thus under the sentence and power of death. "Sin separates from God... this is also true of death. Unrelieved death was felt to be a judgment, a doom. Sin and death were inextricably interwoven." With this power of sin and death God will finally deal once and for all (e.g. Isa. 25:8; 26:19). Even now for the sinner the possibility of the restoration of lost fellowship may take place (e.g. II Sam. 12:13; Ps. 51, esp. vs. 17).

In the New Testament, the Old Testament idea of sin, especially in relation to death, is even more strongly emphasized. A major basis for this teaching on sin and death is the affirmation that sin is universal. We have dealt with this subject earlier and need not repeat that now. Paul, among New Testament

1Rowley, op.cit., p.89.
2Pedersen, op.cit., p.466.
3See Part II, Ch. 1, B, 2c and 3.
4See Eichrodt, Theologie, III, pp.152f.
5TWNT, I, pp.286f.; 293.
7See further Part III, ch. 1.
9See Part I, Ch. 2, C, 2 and D, 4 (also additional note A on Rom. 7).
writers, affirms this idea more strongly than any other author, though the idea is found outside Paul. Sin is a power which has gripped man and has now its sway over the human race. Paul grounds this universality, as we have seen, on two ideas: (1) Adam's sin has occasioned the entrance of sin (and death) into the world; (2) sin is universal fact of experience (see e.g. Rom. 3:23; 5:12-21). In the face of Jesus Christ man feels himself a sinner and acknowledges himself as worthy of death.1

In the presence of Him, the second Adam, we recognize ourselves as the Adam who was created by God and has fallen away from God. We recognize our personal guilt as sinners, as existing in solidarity with the sin of mankind. The light of Christ illuminates the unity of human history as a history of fallen creation. My sin is no private affair but something universal which I have in common with mankind as a whole. I recognize the true nature of myself only when I see myself not merely in my private experiences but as integrated into the history of mankind. I am always both myself and humanity as a whole.2

In our opinion, Dr. Brunner has adequately summed up the New Testament view of man, particularly the view of Paul, as he is apart from Christ. He has presented the universality of man's sinful existence as it is based on the twin anthropological grounds (viz. man as a part of the corporate solidarity of

---

1See Ibid., Ch. 2, C, 2.
Adamic humanity, and man as the individual who sins) and on the Christological ground that man only really knows his sin as he is confronted by God in Jesus Christ. The universality of sin is a general New Testament teaching. It is clearly brought out by Paul, is found in the Fourth Gospel (e.g. Jn. 8:12, 21, 24, 34; I Jn. 1:8ff.), and, not so clearly, in the Synoptic Gospels.

Death and sin are closely related. Again, it is Paul who brings this out most clearly. Rom. 6:23 expresses this concept very well: "the wages of sin is death." Both sin and death are universal—they belong together. One who sins becomes a slave to sin (Rom. 6:16-23; Mt. 6:24; 6:12; Lk. 7:41-48; 17:26-30; Jn. 8:34) and so passes under the dominion of death.

Death is the punishment of sin. The anomaly of man's existence is that he strives for life—an egocentric striving—but man only accomplishes death. Man apart from Christ is under the dominion of death and sin, for sin is also a power which rules over the life of man (e.g. Rom. 6:12, 16-23; 5:12; Jn. 8:24,

---

1 cf. Rom. 7:24 where Paul speaks of "the body of this death" (and also Rom. 5:12-21 and I Cor. 15:20ff. on the Adamic humanity). See Robinson, The Body, pp. 29ff. on the body as a term of corporate solidarity.
2 TWNT, I, pp. 313, 316.
3 Ibid., p. 306 (note 138). See also on each of these Part I, ch. 2, c, 2 and D, 4.
4 so Weinel, op.cit., p. 224; Stewart, op.cit., p. 265.
Man is a sinner, ruled by a hostile power—thus is he lost. "Man does not just sin; he can do nothing else."¹ Death is thus the judgment pronounced by God on man's sin.² The entrance of sin into the life of man has so altered his condition that he is said to be ruled by alien powers: he is under the sovereignty of sin and death, he is in the power of the Evil One (the power of Satan). From this condition man must seek release—he seeks to escape the bondage to sin and death. Sin leads inevitably to death—the death which is the judgment on sin. Sin thus leads to death with an inner necessity³ because it characterizes man's aberrant search for life. This is what Jesus means by the call to repent—to change one's life from this false pursuit to the true pursuit, to move from bondage to death to the service of life in the Kingdom of God (e.g. Lk. 13:5; Mt. 7:24-27; Mk. 1:15; Lk. 12:4ff.; cf. Jn. 15:1-11; 14:6; 8:12; et al.).

Paul expresses this same idea in Rom. 8:13, "if you live according to the flesh you will die, but if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body you will live" (cf. Gal. 6:8; II Cor. 7:10; Rom. 8:5ff.). The deliverance man seeks

¹Weinel, op.cit., p.224.
is to be found only in Christ—to search elsewhere is to remain under the sovereignty of death. "Eine Religion, die dem Menschen wirklich helfen kann, muss ihm auch von all diesen furchtbaren Mächten befreien, die über ihm walten." The life of man, therefore, leads inevitably to death. Death is not only the divine penalty for sin (e.g. Rom. 6:16, 23) it also describes the life which leads to or results in death (e.g. Rom. 7:5; II Cor. 7:10; Gal. 6:8; Rom. 8:13). Further, for one outside Christ, for the natural (ψυχός) or fleshly (σαρκός) man one cannot only say that he will die, one can also say that he is dead. "To live in sin is a living death, for one is actually a slave of death, obeying its commands."

We must now take up the question: how is the death that is "the wages of sin" related to bodily death (i.e. biological death, the physical death as we understand it)? The New Testament does not appear to have a purely natural view of death in a biological sense. This is particularly true of Paul where death is used mostly in a metaphysical sense—it is the enemy,
an intruder in the universe, a power, something unnatural and horrific. Romans 7:2f; 8:38; 14:7f. appear to be exceptions. But Rom. 8:38 may not, in the light of the Biblical teaching on death, be an exception, for death is mentioned as being unable to separate us from the love of God in Christ (8:39). Now death, as we have seen, has as one of its characteristics that it separates a man from God. Rom. 8:38 sounds a paean of the victory of Christ over the principalities and powers (Eph. 6:12), which can no longer separate us from God in Christ. Romans 14:7f. can also be understood as an affirmation that because Jesus is Christus Victor we are His in death as well as in life: "Whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord's." Death is, then, very rarely to be understood in a purely natural sense—in all dying there is the theological overtone that death is the punishment, the enemy, the negation (not the cessation) of life. While the statement that the New Testament knows nothing of a natural death or natural dying in our sense of these terms may be too strong, it would be true

---

2 So Minear, op. cit.
3 So TWNT, III, p. 14; Lohmeyer (on Paul), "Probleme paulinischer Theologie...", op. cit., p. 37; cf. Morris, op. cit., p. 3; Minear, op. cit., p. 150 (on Paul).
to say that death as a natural phenomenon only rarely comes into view and that even then it has the overtones of the metaphysical and theological significance behind it in many cases, and further that most of these examples of death in a natural sense are in the Synoptics. On the other hand if to say the New Testament knows nothing of a natural dying may be too strong a statement, the statement of Strawson also appears to be too generalized when he writes: "Death is a fact to be faced without too much special concern; . . . . death is not 'spiritualized': there is no implication in the term except plain, inevitable physical death." Strawson also writes that "Death in the gospels is the physical end of life; it is not, as in Paul particularly, also being dead toward God." These statements on death do not appear consistent with his presentation of death as the enemy, especially in his treatment of Jesus in His death encountering the enemy which is death. Can purely physical death be meant, a natural and normal end of life, if it is also the enemy? It rather appears that

---

1e.g. Rom. 7:2f.; Lk. 2:26, 29; Mt. 10:21; 15:4; Mk. 7:10; Lk. 22:33; 13:33 are possible places where death is viewed as natural. Yet several of these may be questioned. Rom. 7:2f. should not be pressed for it is used only as an illustration of what death with Christ means (see 7:4ff.). Mt. 10:21; 15:4; Mk. 7:10; Lk. 13:33; carry the connotation that the death in view is a punishment or unnatural death.

2Even here death is often punishment: e.g. Mt. 15:4; Mk. 7:10; Lk. 24:20.

3Strawson, op. cit., p.79 (cf. p.101).

4Ibid., p.106.

5see e.g. Ibid., pp.91-101, 106.
Jesus does regard death as the enemy, and in light of the general Biblical concept of death,¹ that the healing miracles represent the onslaught of the forces of the Kingdom, the power of God, against the stronghold of the enemy.² In the events of the raising of the dead Jesus attacks the heart of the power of the enemy and in His own dying Jesus enters the house of the strong man to bind him for all time (Mk. 3:27; Mt. 12:29; Lk. 11:21; cf. Mk. 3:23f.; Mt. 12:28; Lk. 11:20; 10:18f.; 7:1-10, 11-17, 22; Mk. 9:14-29; 5:35-43). Physical death is more than just a natural event, the end of life. In and through physical death Jesus sees death as the enemy of life and a hostile power to be overcome. When Paul speaks of death as the wages of sin he means that death which is the power opposed to God and which separates man from God—a separation which is already a reality for man as sinner and with dying becomes final. Physical death is the symbol of that which death is in its metaphysical sense³—the death which I as sinner must receive because I as sinner have cut myself off from the source of life and ground of being. As Brunner expresses it: being a sinner and having to die "are necessarily linked because separation from God implies separation from life, manifested

¹esp. the Old Testament idea of death.
²See further Part IV, ch. 1, A.
³See Lohmeyer, "Probleme paulinischer Theologie: . . .," op.cit., p.38; Morris, op.cit., p.17.
ultimately in physical dying."¹ Bodily death is then the visible manifestation of the theological significance of death: separation from life in the ultimate sense. Physical death is an "acted parable" and yet is more than that, for in and through physical death as separation from life acts that death which is separation from the life.


In general, death as it affects the nature of man can be said to affect the whole of man's being. As in the Old Testament, when man dies, it is the whole man who dies. "Man dies, not simply as a body, but in the totality of his being, as a unity with physical and spiritual aspects."² Since man is in his totality a sinner and since death is the wages of sin, it follows that the man who is under the sovereignty of sin and death is the whole man. Thus it is not a part of man which dies, it is the whole man. I am a sinner, not just a part of me and I must die, not just my body. In the same way it is I who am alive in Christ—the whole man is a sharer in the victory just as the whole man must participate in the consequences of sin.³ The original destiny of man is

¹Brunner, op.cit., p.103.
²Morris, op.cit., p.10.
³cf. e.g. Feine, Theologie des Neuen Testaments, p.699: "'Leben' ist ihm Leben in absoluten, vollkommenen Sinne, wie der Tod (ο. θανάτος) der gegenteilige Zustand ist" (on John).
life—death is an intruder.1 "Between the original destiny and its fulfillment steps death as judgment, which affects the whole man."2 Death touches the whole man, not just a part of him—it is my death that is meant.3 Yet death does not mean extinction—we cannot seek it as the last attempt to escape God. "It is appointed for men to die once, and after this is judgment" (Heb. 9:27; cf. Rom. 14:10ff.; II Cor. 5:10; Mt. 16:27; I Jn. 2:28; et al.). That death is not extinction does not mean death is not real death. It is part of the terror of death that it is final, inescapable and total, but not that it is total annihilation into non-existence and nothingness.4

Paul's use of "destruction" (στοιχεῖον) in such places as II Thess. 2:3; Rom.9:22; Phil. 1:28 (cf. I Cor. 1:18; II Cor. 2:15; 4:3; et al.), cannot be taken as references to annihilation as if they are statements on the existence of the person. They are, rather, statements dealing with the quality of life. The opposite of the terms ἐς τοιώδεσι and ἄπλονίασμα in Paul's writings are the terms σωτήρια and σωτήρια (e.g. I Cor. 1:18; II Cor. 2:15; 4:3; II Thess. 2:10). It is life that is

---

1See above # 1 & 2.
3See Ibid., p.83.
4Although passages such as Rev. 20:11-15 raise the question as to whether annihilation may not be the ultimate fate of the lost (the "second death"), it cannot be regarded as being an assured New Testament teaching. See e.g. Kennedy, op.cit., pp.119ff. on ἐς τοιώδεσι in Paul.
in view, not existence. The saved have life, the lost suffer ruin (exclusion from the life which is worth living). Death indicates that one is cut off from God and thus the real meaning of sin is most overwhelmingly felt. If death does not touch the whole of man, death is not real death nor is it taken seriously. The belief that the soul persists beyond death forever is not a Biblical teaching but rests on Greek-Platonic thought, especially where it asserts the future bliss of the soul. Here again, however, is raised the question as to whether the Bible knows of the possibility of a disembodied existence. We have already dealt with this question. We must here deal with those passages which appear to indicate that death does not affect the whole man. We shall consider Mt. 10:28; Luke 12:4f; Mk. 8:35f. and I Cor. 5:5 as relevant in this context.

Matt. 10:28 ("And do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul (ψυχὴς); rather fear him who can kill both soul and body in Gehenna") appears, when isolated from...

1So Kennedy, op.cit., p.125.
5See above Part II, ch. 2, A, 4.
6Rev. 20:11-15; II Cor. 12:2; 5: 1-10; Rev. 6:9 are in a different context (second death) or relate to the Christian man and are special cases not related to the general concept of death.
context to teach the soul does not die with the body. In context, however, the passage teaches only that those (in this case, men) who kill the disciple can only kill them and that the martyr is then out of their power and has his relationship with God unaltered. The passage refers to being faithful unto death and relates to the idea of martyrdom. Physical dangers are not to be feared—only He who has the ultimate power is to be feared. Only God can separate a man eternally from Himself—the true significance of death. It is not that the body is mortal and the soul immortal—rather it is that only God has the power to destroy life in the ultimate sense. Luke 12:4f. represents a parallel passage. There are textual variances in the Lukan version (both Mt. 10:28 and Luke 12:4f. are from Q) which may be accounted for either by supposing that one or the other has editorialized the passage or that the saying comes from varying textual recensions of Q. In any case, the meaning and purpose of the Lukan version is the same as that found in Matthew.

Mark 8:35f. is in a similar vein to Mt. 10:28 and Luke 12:4f. Yet there is here again no indication that death per se can only be bodily death. The word "life" in the text

---

is \( \psi\nu\chi\nu \)' and should probably be taken as meaning life in the sense of "man himself."¹ Two senses of life appear to be meant in vs. 35: in the first clause ("whoever would save his life") refers to temporal and earthly life, while the second clause ("will lose it") brings in the idea of life as spiritual good in the eschatological sense—that life which a man has in Christ. This means, then, that the disciple has, even if death should result from his faithfulness to Jesus, preserved his true self, has gained life which is life.²

It is martyrdom that is in view here.³

We have not found in any of the passages thus far considered any indication that death in the New Testament does not affect the whole man, no indication that death is not viewed with all seriousness. In the passages thus far considered we can see, rather, that death must be regarded with all seriousness and that it is only such because of what it is in itself and what it signifies in terms of the God-man relation. Man does not have in his own power the full power of death—he can only end life on the present temporal level of existence. God alone can inflict (or annul) the full death penalty—separation from Himself.⁴ This is true even when death is regarded as the

---

¹So Klostermann, Das Markusevangelium, HNT, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1950), p. 84; Schniewind, Markus, NTD, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958), pp. 85f. Note also Lk. 9:25 ('loses or forfeits himself').

²So Taylor, Mark, p. 382.

³So Schniewind, op. cit., p. 85; Klostermann, op. cit., p. 84; et al.

⁴This is the death (e.g. see Rev. 20:14, "the second death").
power opposed to and hostile to God for death is not only the 'wages of sin,' it is also the divine sentence on man who is a sinner. Thus only he can preserve his life who has fully given it up to God—then and only then does he preserve it.

We have yet one passage to consider. This is the very difficult passage in I Cor. 5:5: "You are to deliver this man to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord." From the context of the usage of these two terms (flesh and spirit) it would not appear to be a correct interpretation to derive from this a special teaching on death that affirms that in death only the body dies while the soul (esp. spirit) lives on immortally. This is not in keeping with either the concept of death in Paul nor with the uses of the terms flesh and spirit in Paul. The spirit here referred to cannot be the Holy Spirit, for the Holy Spirit does not need to be redeemed. It must be referred to man. The passage seems to be best understood if we interpret the terms flesh and spirit as referring to man himself, with each

---

1Prof. R. M. Grant of the Univ. of Chicago in a private conversation with the present writer opined that this passage was example of primitive magic, a ritual in which the death of the sinner would kill the flesh and save the spirit. It was to him an example of Hellenistic influence in the New Testament in reference to the concept of man: it indicates the flesh dies while the spirit lives on after death. cf. Lietzmann, An die Korinther I/II, (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1949), p.23.

2So most commentataries and see also Bultmann, Theology, I, p.208.
term bringing out its own connotation with reference to man.  

Flesh means, then, "he himself" as sinner, and spirit means "he himself" as indwelt by the Spirit of Christ (cf. I Cor. 3:16). The sentence pronounced on the man is remedial not condemnatory (see also I Cor. 3:15). Paul expects this action to result in the man's salvation. "The deliverance unto Satan aims at the destruction of the sinner's sinful nature."2 Thus he himself can be saved, though he must endure the trial and suffering.3 It is the person who will be saved.4 The deliverance may involve death, though this is not clearly indicated, especially when one recalls the Biblical teaching that such things as calamity, sickness and demon possession can also be a binding by Satan5 (e.g. Luke 13:16). In any case it would seem best to assume that the underlying doctrine of death that may be indicated here would be in keeping with the Apostle's other teachings on the subject. One passage is not a secure ground upon which to base an established doctrine.6

---

3 Ibid., cf. Wendland, op.cit., p.39; Lietzmann, op.cit., p.23.  
4 Wendland, op.cit., p.39.  
6 It is thus apparent that we cannot agree with the opinion expressed by Prof. Grant referred to above. It would, on the other hand, seem probable that the passage represents a parallel to the ritual for exorcism (e.g. Lk. 10:17; Acts 3:6, 16; 4:10; 16:18; 19:11-17). See Bultmann, Theology, I, p.127 (cf. also p.48).
To conclude, death in the New Testament is taken quite seriously. It affects the whole man—when man dies, it is man, not a part of man that dies. Only when death is thus taken in all its seriousness does the New Testament teaching on death in general and the significance and meaning of the death of Jesus become intelligible. Only thus can we understand the note of victory sounded throughout the New Testament. Jesus in His public ministry demonstrates His power and authority over the forces of sin, death and evil. In His death is the final victory won! Only thus can Paul cry: "Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 7:25; cf. 8:1ff., 31-39; I Cor. 15:22-28, 54-57; Lk. 10:17-20; 11:20; et al.).

It is a real death that is involved—whether of man or Jesus—and it is a real victory that is also involved—of man through Jesus. In each case it is man that is involved—the whole of a man’s being. This does not, as we have said before, mean death is extinction. The dead survive—man survives—but again it is the whole man that is meant: i.e. the self, the person, the ego, the totality that is man.

---

1 See further Part IV, ch. 1.
2 See above Ch. 2, A esp. #4.
Part III

The Emergence and Development of the Concept of Life After Death
CHAPTER I

THE EMERGENCE OF THE CONCEPT OF LIFE AFTER DEATH

A. Introduction

In this chapter our particular concern is not to investigate the entire problem of the development and emergence of the concept of belief in a blessed future state in the Old Testament. Our concern is chiefly with the form which this belief took, especially in the late Old Testament period. Further, the form of the belief in a life after death in relation to the nature of man is of particular relevance. We shall develop the subject with these ideas in view.

We have seen earlier that death in the Old Testament does not mean extinction or annihilation and that the dead do survive. This survival is a form of life but yet cannot be called a proper life. The dead survive—they do not cease to exist. Death is the weakest form of life. The dead are the

---

1 For this see standard works on the subject and Bibliography.
2 For the earlier period and also for the traditional doctrine of survival in Sheol see Part II, Ch. 1, esp. B.
3 Part II, ch. 1, B.
4 See e.g. Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual, pp. 89ff.
Shades, the Repha'im. Life after death is a minimum of life.¹ The shadowy existence of Sheol is a survival, but not in the desirable sense of the term "survival." Yet there is a desirable form of survival, though not of the individual personal being. A man lived on in his descendants and in the nation.² As mentioned earlier when dealing with the concept of death in the Old Testament, it is the person that survives in Sheol—a shadowlike replica living a shadowlike existence in the land of shadows.³ The dead live in a sense, but it is not a real life.⁴ Death is a real death but it is not the extinction of the person.⁵ The real nature of death that makes it a terror is that it cuts a man off from God. The dead are weak (e.g. Isa. 14:9f.; 59:10; Job 26:5; Ps. 88:10; et al.) and dwell in a land of darkness (Job 10:21f.) and

¹See e.g. F. Schwally, *Das Leben nach dem Tode*, pp.8, 93ff.; Johnson, *op.cit.*, p.94.
⁵See below B.
forgetfulness (Ps. 88:12), a land of gloom (Job 10:21f.). A. R. Johnson well expresses this aspect of death when he states: "at death a man's vital power is found to be broken up in disorder, its unity shattered; and the result is that as an individual he drags on a relatively weak existence which is as opposed to life in its fulness as darkness is to light."  

The dead do survive, but the question now is: In what form do they survive?

B. Survival and the Nature of Man.

As we have affirmed earlier, death in the Old Testament is the death of man—the whole man. But, as we also affirmed, death does not mean the cessation of all existence. The dead survive in Sheol. Is it, the body that dies while the soul survives in Sheol? The opinions of scholars are divided on this point. Some maintain that the soul survives in Sheol, others that the soul dies.  

G. A. Barton, Vitality, p. 94. See also Part II, Ch. 1, B for further on the state of the dead and the concept of Sheol. See also C. Barth, op. cit., pp. 36ff., 53f., 67; Pedersen, op. cit., pp. 179ff., 453f.; and other works cited in Bibliography (e.g. Charles, op. cit., pp. 33ff.; Schwally, op. cit., et al.).  


3Part II, ch. 1, B.


for example, writes, "The soul went with the body into the under world of Sheol."¹ On the opposite side, H. Wheeler Robinson writes of the dead: "It is not his soul that survives at all; . . . ."² In fact, Robinson almost indicates that with death man ceases to exist at all: "The Testament conception of man, therefore, regards him as coming into existence and as continuing to exist, by the grace of God, and as ceasing to be in any real sense at death; . . . ."³ Pedersen vacillates in his references on the subject. On the one hand he speaks of the soul dying ("When death occurs, then it is the soul that is deprived of life"⁴), yet on the other hand he speaks of the "soul of the dead."⁵ Thus various authors oppose each other and even the same authors are not always consistent within themselves. Yet this difficulty might well be expected. The Old Testament itself does not maintain a rigid internal consistency on this subject. H. H. Rowley has well expressed this when he writes: "All the variety of view of the afterlife contained in the Old Testament does not reveal the

²Rel. Ideas, p. 92 (cf. Schwally, op. cit., p. 7; Pedersen, op. cit., p. 179.).
³Inspiration and Revelation, p. 70 (later Robinson clarifies this by affirming the survival of man after death in Sheol: ibid., pp. 94 ff.).
⁴Pedersen, op. cit., p. 179.
⁵Ibid., pp. 180 f.
vacillating and uncertain mind of God, but the imperfect apprehension by men of the truth which is hidden in God's heart.1 In a series of writings produced over the length of time as is found in the Old Testament, this lack of rigid consistency is to be expected.

Nevertheless, we do feel that there is in the Old Testament an overall pattern of thought which is consistent on this subject, though differences in details will be present. In the problem under consideration there are several points where the Old Testament is, in the main, consistent. One of these is the conception that death involves the soul2 (Job 11:20; 31:39; Gen. 35:18; Judges 16:30; Num. 23:10; I Kgs. 19:4; Jonah 4:8; Ezek. 18:4; 22:25, 27; et al.). Another fact which strongly tells against those affirming the continued existence of the soul after death3 is that the dead are never called "souls."4 Yet, on the other hand, it should be recognized that while the denizens of Sheol are never called "souls," the term "soul" can be used to refer to the dead—but only in the sense of corpse5 (e.g. Lev. 19:28; 21:1, 11; 22:4; Num. 5:2; 6:6, 11; 9:6, 7, 10; 19:11, 13; Hag. 2:13).6 This

1 The Faith of Israel, p. 154.
2 See earlier Part II, ch. 1, B (esp. 1c).
4 See Robinson, op.cit., pp.180f.; et al.
5 On this e.g. Johnson, op.cit., pp.25f.
6 With the exception of Haggai all references are from the Priestly circle of the Pentateuch (P or H).
does not seem to be justification for calling the dead in Sheol "souls" as Pedersen and others do. The dead are the "weak ones," they are "shades," they are not souls.

What then survives in Sheol? This is a difficult question to answer with any definite certainty. However, we can present what, in the light of evidence and theory, seems a justifiable hypothesis. When death strikes, it is man who dies—the "I" of man dies, the person or self dies and is dead. But it is also true to the Old Testament to say that it is the person or self of man which is in Sheol (the place and state of the dead). As Schwally puts it: "the death of the soul is not to be taken in the absolute sense... (life) is not entirely lost, but is reduced to a minimum." Thus man, the self, survives death. Thus Jacob, on hearing of the supposed death of Joseph, says, "I shall go down to Sheol to my son, mourning" (Gen. 37:35 RSV). He believes that even after death he will remain himself. The shades in Sheol are still persons (e.g. Isa. 14:4-20; Job 14:21-22; Ps. 139:8; Am. 9:2; which attribute a modicum of personal existence to the residents of Sheol). The Shades have no life in the

2See above Part II, ch. 1, B, I, c.
3I. e. in the sense of extinction or annihilation.
4op.cit., pp.7-8.
6So Nikolainen, op.cit., p.111; et al.
real sense of the term, but they do exist and to that extent may be said to be living. Life in Sheol is a shadowlike semblance of the former earthly existence⁠¹ (e.g. Isa. 14²). The practice of necromancy attests not only a belief in the survival of the dead³ but also that the dead have a conscious existence of sorts. If, accordingly, the dead are not souls but shades and these shades live a pale reflection of earthly existence⁴, it would be a natural conclusion to assume that the shade which survives is a shadowlike replica of the soul (the person),⁵ as if this were what survives the death of man. But if the concept of man is taken seriously as a psycho-physical unity⁶, it would be more logical to assume that the shade is the shadowlike replica of the whole man. To the Hebrew, man was not body with a soul (person or ego or self)—he was body-soul, conceived in such a way that these terms designate not parts of a man but the whole man (self) from varied points of view.

¹So Burney, Israel's Hope of Immortality. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), pp.8ff.; Bertholet, op.cit.; Rowley, "Future Life...", op.cit., p.120; et al.
²There are other passages which appear to minimize even a modicum of conscious existence by stressing that the dead do not know about life on earth, are forgetful and forgotten, are asleep, etc.—see Part II, ch. 1, B. (e.g. Job 14:21 but see vs. 22 also; 3:13, 17; Ps. 115:17; 88:10ff.). But even here the contrast is between earthly life and Sheol-existence, not between conscious life and the total lack of it.
⁴See Johnson, op.cit., p.94.
⁵See Part II, ch. 1, B and references given there—e.g. Pedersen, op.cit., pp.180ff.
⁶See Part I, ch. 1.
It would be man who survived death and thus the dead are "shadows of the former self." The dead have some physical substance just as they have some conscious existence. The shade (shadow) is lacking in substance, not in reality. Thus Samuel is recognizable when called up from the dead by the witch of Endor (I Sam. 28). The dead have, then, a body somewhat like the body which was theirs in life.

We may thus tentatively conclude that the dead in Sheol are shadowy extensions of the whole man. In this case, the general view of the nature of man and the general view of the nature of life coincide. Just as death is the weakest form of life and thus the dead do exist (even live to an extent), so also that which survives is a weakened form of the whole man—the Shade is a person, is a man, but in a weakened and insubstantial form. The dead are replicas of the whole man living a replica of former life. Evidence and theory seem thus to reinforce each other.

C. The Development of Hope Regarding an After Life.

1. The forms of immortality.

It is frequently said that the immortality of the

---

1So Johnson, op.cit., p.90.
2The author came to this conclusion as a result of his own investigation. He was pleased to find the same conclusions reached by some of the authors he has consulted and thus to have his own tentative conclusion confirmed. See e.g. Rowley, The Faith of Israel, p.156; Robinson, Inspiration, p.96.
3Tentative because the evidence is not overwhelming, though the author believes it points strongly in this direction.
4As given in Part I, ch. 1.
5As given in Part II, ch. 1.
soul is not found in the Old Testament and that such thought, where it is found, is due to Greek influence. There is truth to this type of statement, but it does not, in our estimation, do full justice to the Old Testament ideas. The basic truth in the idea is found in the phrase "immortality of the soul." The soul is not immortal and the soul of man does not achieve a blissful existence after death. But there is an immortality found in the Old Testament. One aspect of immortality is found in the concept of survival in Sheol. It is not blissful survival, however. Another aspect is found in the belief that one lives on in his descendants and in the continued existence of the community. There is yet another aspect of immortality found in the Old Testament, which we must now develop due to its relevance to our subject. This aspect of immortality does not so much emphasize individual immortality as it does the immortality of the God--man relation. The basis of immortality is a theological one. The expressions of this hope and its development are found mostly in the poetic literature of the Old Testament. It is, therefore, the expression of imagination and the projection of hope rather than being a stated dogma.

2Hence the importance of the "name"—see Pedersen, Israel, I-II, pp.245-259, 474ff.
3E.g. See Burney, op.cit., p. 18f.; Rowley, Faith of Israel, p.154; et al.
4The anthropological basis will be treated in the following section.
The basis of this hope of a blissful immortality is the theological conception of the presence of God, not the belief in the inherently abiding existence of the soul (as in Greek thought). Because it is not a fully developed concept and because its development is relatively late in the Old Testament it is probably best to speak of this not as a "teaching" or concept but rather to speak of it as a hope, a trend.

2. The theological basis of immortality.

Let us now seek to develop the basis of this hope, after which we will then consider some passages where this hope is expressed. The focus of hope in earlier ages was on a man's continued existence in his posterity. The individual lived on through the continued survival of the group. His experiences were a part of the corporate experience of the group and he thus, in a sense, could be said to live on in the group, in his descendants who formed an extension of his personality. The individual lives on in the consciousness of the group, in its experience, for he is a unity with them—a corporate personality. In a similar way the thought of an immortality with God may be developed. The focus of the hope in this case will be on being "with God" or in His presence. It is not the idea of personal, individualistic survival per se that is in view. Rather, it is a being with God that is important. The individual, we may say, lives on in the


2e.g. Ps. 73:23 ("I am continually with thee;" cf. vs. 24ff.; 49:15; 16:10f.).
consciousness of God, just as he is believed to live on the
consciousness of the family group after death. He lives on
with Yahweh: fellowship with Him is not broken by death, only
the subjective experience of it. As Yahweh is the living God,
so he may be said to live on in Yahweh. "In Yahweh" is the
key phrase, for as Yahweh is the Lord, he, so to speak, sur-
vives, for the fellowship he has had with Yahweh and the
community is now forever and irrevocably a part of Yahweh's
relation with the individual and the community. It must not
be thought however that this is an assured result of Old
Testament teaching. At best it is only tenuously suggested
and remains only a hope, something hinted rather than dog-
matically affirmed.

a. Let us

Let us now examine the several passages where these
hints appear to be suggested. The various interpretations of
them are not agreed and so caution must be the watchword re-
garding them. But if the interpretation of these passages is
so disputed, we must argue that ours is at least a possible
and valid one, though not, perhaps, the definitive and ultimate
one.

Ps. 17 is the first such passage to be considered.

Verse 15 is the key passage:

As for me, I shall behold thy face in righteousness;
When I awake, I shall be satisfied with beholding
thy form.

What does the Psalmist mean when he writes "when I awake?"
Nikolainen believes it refers to resurrection—an awakening from the sleep of death to behold God. The verb "awaken" is used in Isa. 26:19 and Dan. 12:2 in the sense of "to resurrect" and must mean the same here as a technical term for "to resurrect." A daily awakening would not be satisfying, he maintains, and would be expressed differently. At the other extreme are those commentators who see no reference to a life after death at all. There are still others who do not find in the Psalm a teaching on resurrection but who yet feel that the Psalm does present the hope of life beyond death with God. That the Psalm teaches resurrection is not very likely—a mere verbal correspondence does not mean the same teaching (see e.g. Prov. 6:22; Ps. 3:5—which also use "to awake"). If so then Ps. 35:23 must refer to a God who is dead, from which the Psalmist hopes He will be resurrected ("bestir

1 op.cit., p. 123.

2 But he does not clarify what this different means of expression would be, giving only a footnote referring to two other authors (R. Kittel, Die Psalmen and Nötscher, Auferstehungsglauben).


thyself, and awake for my right, for my cause, my God and my Lord"!
Yet the Psalmist (Ps. 17) could mean to suggest an abiding communion with God which even death cannot annul, without thereby meaning a resurrection from the dead. Several authorities think this is the case. One of these writes that the Psalmist relies on "an experience which is enduring because it depends on God himself and so is beyond even the power of death to destroy." To the present author there is still another possible interpretation of this Psalm which involves a more symbolic understanding of the idea of awakening. In verse 3 the Psalmist speaks of God visiting him "by night" to try and test him. The rest of the Psalm speaks of this; of his confrontation by hostile enemies seeking his hurt and of his plea of vindication. We have seen earlier that death is symbolized by darkness and that any lessening of the forces of life is itself a form of death—it is to be gripped by the power of death. Thus the night (Vs. 3) may well refer to the persecution and oppression of enemies, while the awakening (vs. 15) is the awakening after the time of oppression, after

1 Oesterley, op.cit., p.266; Gunn, op.cit., p.177 interpret it in the sense of the awakening from death and seeing the face of God, but do not definitely affirm resurrection. See also sources referred to in the preceding footnote.
2 Gunn, op.cit., p.177.
3 Part II, ch. 1, B.
vindication, with his communion with God still unbroken. It would thus be possible to interpret the awakening in a different way than that of a daily awakening after a night's sleep or of referring the passage to a thought on the resurrection. In this case the Psalm does not say much on a future life directly. It is, however, to be affirmed that in the Psalm is the seed of the doctrine of the future life, for the author knows a communion with God so intense that even the power of death which he has experienced cannot break it. It is not a big step from this to the belief that even the ultimate power of death cannot break communion with Yahweh. Perhaps this hope, this reaching of the imagination, was in fact present in the Psalmist's mind. Though we cannot be sure, it seems a further possible interpretation based on the intenseness of the experienced fellowship with God.

Our next passage is found in Psalm 49:15 ("But God will ransom my soul from the power of Sheol, for he will receive me"). Once again opinions on this passage are divided. Some find a teaching or an expression of hope on a life after death. Others find no teaching of an individual

---

1 On this see the similar remarks of Kirkpatrick, The Psalms, Cambridge Bible, (Cambridge: The University Press, 1892), p. 84.

life after death nor any hope for it expressed in this Psalm.¹
Most commentators find in this Psalm either a direct expression
of hope for a blessed future life or at least the germ of it.²
To confine the hope of the Psalmist to this life only by
stating, as do C. Barth³ and others, that he hopes only for
a deliverance from death in this life is to make his hope a
hollow one. If the unrighteous was to relinquish his good
fortune only at death (vv. 6-14, 16ff.) while the righteous
will receive some fortune before death, the contrast between
wicked and good is still an unfair one for both lose their
fortune at death.⁴ The good fortune of the wicked is still
more than that of the righteous, for the wicked does not
suffer until death while the righteous must bear ill fortune
now with some good fortune before death. The hope of the
Psalmist becomes, thus, a hollow mockery. Even the context
of Vs. 15 suggests that the Psalmist here expresses a hope
that communion with God transcends and conquers death: for
the wicked only Sheol is the prospect, but for the righteous

¹e.g. Schwally, op.cit., pp.125ff.; Sutcliffe, op.cit.
p.102 (although he appears to waver and recognize the Psalmist
may have discerned it half-way); C. Barth, op.cit., pp.159ff.;
Kirkpatrick, op.cit., p.274.
²for the former see note #2 above. On the latter see
e.g. Sutcliffe, op.cit., p.102; Kirkpatrick, op.cit., p.274.
³op.cit., pp.159ff.
⁴note vs. 10 where it is said that even the wise die!
the hope is to be with God\(^1\) (vv. 14–15).\(^2\) The Psalmist bases his hope not on any human power but rather on Him who has power over life and death.\(^3\) The Psalmist entertains the hope that God will really deliver him from death and that the present living communion will continue hereafter.\(^4\) It is a hope of faith, not a statement of dogma, that sees a real victory over the power of death and is thus a real solution, though only a hope, to the riddle of life. "Die Gotteszugehörigkeit ist das Motiv für den Triumph über den Tod; die Gottesgemeinschaft wird ungestört verbleiben."\(^5\)

In Ps. 16 we find another passage which raises the question of a similar hope: "for thou wilt not abandon my soul to Sheol; nor let thy godly one see the Pit. Thou dost show me the path of life; in thy presence there is fulness of joy, at thy right hand are pleasures for evermore" (vv. 10–11). As before, interpretations of this Psalm differ with some finding a hope of immortality, more or less strongly affirmed.\(^6\)

---

1. The phrase "he will receive me" seems to recall the case of Enoch (Gen. 5:24), as Burney, op.cit., p.43, points out.
4. Ibid.
while others find little or no hope of a blessed future life expressed. 1 Several believe the "I" of the Psalm refers to the community not to the individual. 2 C. Barth sees this Psalm as being of the same type as Ps. 30 (esp. v. 3) where the Psalmist expresses his thanksgiving at being delivered from distress, misfortune or sickness. Yet there is no suggestion, as in Ps. 30, that the author of Ps. 16 is in any distress, need, peril, sickness, etc. 3 It is, thus, not fully in the category of Thanksgivings Psalms. The Psalmist presents a view of the abiding comfort of the presence of God and of the durability of the fellowship with Him that is almost overpowering. The soaring of imagination and hope in this Psalm is that both in this life and beyond the enjoyment of the presence of God endures. 4 "The life in community with God can also not be broken by death." 5 Weiser 6 sees also in this Psalm an expression of a fellowship with God, a conception of life out of and under God, which is so deeply felt that death cannot break it. He sees the Psalmist's hope as one


2 e.g. Schwally, op. cit.; Charles, op. cit.

3 So also Rowley, Faith of Israel, p. 174.

4 See Rowley, p. 174.


6 op. cit., pp. 110f.
based on a higher conception of life springing out of communion with God. "In this life out of God lies the victorious power which overcomes death." The Psalmist, in his leap of faith, in his joyous realization of the strength of fellowship with God, is assured of a full enjoyment of the presence of God even beyond death, though he does not yet venture into the form in which this communion will be enjoyed—he has not come to a hope or belief in resurrection. The 'that' of the overcoming of death through God is the firm ground of clear certainty, with which the poet faces death, the 'how' remains still to him a veiled divine mystery.

The last passage to be considered is found in Psalm 73:23f. ("nevertheless I am continually with thee; thou dost hold my right hand. Thou dost guide me with thy counsel, and afterward thou wilt receive me to glory."). As before, the interpretations differ, with some finding a hope for a blessed life after death expressed more or less explicitly, while others find little or no expression of hope in a future life. The

---

1Ibid., p.111.
2Nor of an immortality of the soul.
3Weiser, op.cit., p.111.
Psalmist here expresses a confident assurance of the presence of God. He has been upright but is disturbed by the apparent good fortune of the ungodly (vv. 12ff). If now the Psalmist means no more than the idea that the wicked will at some time, sooner or later, receive due recompense and that the Psalmist's own vindication is to receive some honor in life (vv. 17ff., 24), the contrast is a disparate one (as in Psalm 16). Further, his manner of referring to the boon is a strange one. If, as seems to be correct, the Psalmist already enjoys the fellowship of God, and if God is to receive him, it seems natural to understand this as referring to a future fellowship (vs. 24). If it is all in this life, nothing is added to the thought expressed in vs. 23, but if he is referring to a future life, the addition is appropriate and not superfluous. As Weiser has expressed it, the Psalmist's confidence is in the "that" of the future presence with God, the "how" remains a divine mystery. Verse 24, then, expresses the hope for the perfection of communion with God after death—the eternal presence of God is the overcoming of death and thus the Psalmist's hope is expressed in the sense of the indestructibility of this relationship with God. The Psalm offers no insight as to the manner of this survival. P. Volz writes of this Psalm (and also of Ps. 49:15 and 16:10) that it expresses the faith "that the pious will be

1So Rowley, Faith of Israel, op. cit., pp. 172f.
2So also Rowley, op. cit., p. 173.
3Weiser, op. cit., p. 337.
4Ibid.
taken up after death in blessed community with God, not in the form of resurrection, but as an immediate entrance into the blessedness of the divine sphere.¹ His concern is with the experienced intenseness of his communion with God, a communion so deeply felt that his hopes soar beyond the confines of this earth to the vision of the immortal shores. It is a leap of faith, a flight of imagination and in this experience of communion with God and in its implications for the life of man do we see, as the Psalmist appears to have seen, the basis for the hope of immortality.

b. Summary

Certain conclusions may now be drawn as a result of the preceding investigation. From theory and from evidence it would seem reasonable to conclude that in the Old Testament poetic literature a glimpse is given of the vistas of immortality. But, as we have attempted to show, it is no more than a glimpse, a leap of faith, a flight of imaginative hope, not a settled and established doctrine. That scholars are so divided in their interpretation is itself evidence that in the Psalms there is little basis for the establishment of a clear and fixed dogma. However, we can say that at the very least the basis of a hope is reached as the Psalmists reach out toward the veiled mystery beyond death on the basis of the intensely high level of their

¹op. cit., p. 117.
experience with God, and that at the most their thought reaches out to the awareness of the realization of the hope itself.\(^1\) The basis of this hope is not a conviction about the nature of man—that some part of man is so durable as to be superior to the power of death. Rather, the basis of the hope of immortality lies in the doctrine of God and the experience of community with Him which is achieved by the pious. We find ourselves in agreement with H. H. Rowley when he writes, "In all these three passages\(^2\) from the Psalter, therefore, I find an incipient faith that God, who is the source of man's well-being here, will continue to be the source of the well-being of his own in the hereafter."\(^3\) The basis for hope in a life after death is a theological concept of the presence of God. We may now turn to the question of resurrection faith as it is found in the very late portions of the Old Testament literature.

D. Resurrection Hope in the Old Testament,

1. Relation to poetic hope of immortality.

In the preceding section we presented the first stirrings of hope for a future life which was of a happier state than the traditional Sheol doctrine. These first stirrings of

\(^1\)Kirkpatrick who finds no teaching of the afterlife in any of the passages we have considered, nevertheless concedes that the basis for a hope of life after death is to be found in some of them. See Psalms, op. cit., pp. LXXVII, 78, 84, 274, 431.

\(^2\)i.e. Ps. 49:15; 73:23f.; 16:10.

\(^3\)op. cit., p. 175.
hope were concerned more with the idea of the enjoyment of the presence of God in a manner transcending death than they were with the form in which this enjoyment of communion would take place. For this reason we have given it the description "the theological conception of the presence of God." The emphasis is on "I am with Thee" (Ps. 73:23)—i.e. the continued bliss of fellowship with God is the major focus of attention, not how this bliss would be achieved. As attention later came to focus on the question as to how this fellowship would be realized, faith reached out to a conception of the resurrection.\footnote{This is, to be sure, not the only factor contributing to the rise of belief in the resurrection. See further section E. below.}

In terms of the phrase by which we have described the first glimmerings of hope ("I am with Thee"), the question that comes to the fore is the question "How am I with God?" In what form can one enjoy the presence of God? It should be noted that the belief in an abiding communion with God has not receded into the background. Rather, in effect, a second stage has been reached in which faith affirms both the idea of continued fellowship with God and a statement as to how this fellowship is to be realized. But this development too was not the conscious and logical development of reason. It was an act of faith, a step made in the light of the encounter with the God who is Lord of life and death. The step when made was made
in the context of basic Hebraic thought about God and man—the product of a variety of influences.\(^1\) While the earlier hope is the product of the experienced fellowship with God in which the man of faith is content just to raise the astounding hope of the continuance of that fellowship beyond death and is satisfied with this, the later resurrection faith has added a conception that introduces the "how" of that continuance in terms of the "I" who is to be with God.

2. The anthropological basis of immortality (resurrection).

We have in an earlier part presented the Old Testament conception of the nature of man.\(^2\) Man is conceived of as a single whole being, not a being composed of single and separable parts. This is known as the "unitary conception of personality." When the Hebrew turned to thoughts of a future life after death and in that context thought of the "I" who was to enjoy this future life, he quite naturally turned to the conception of a resurrection. The logical antecedents of the conception of the nature of man required the future life to be conceived in terms of a resurrection.\(^3\) A disembodied existence was foreign to Old Testament thought. Even the dead are conceived to have some sort of physical or material substance----a body.\(^4\) As

---

\(^1\)See E Below.
\(^2\)Part I, Ch. 1, esp. A and D, 1.
\(^3\)The conception of immortality found in Hellenistic Judaism concerns us in the next chapter. The question of foreign influence will be touched on in section E of this chapter.
\(^4\)See section B above.
H. W. Robinson has put it: "This form of belief is seen to have been inevitable, once we have grasped the Hebrew idea of personality; a resurrection of the body was the only form of triumph over death which Hebrew psychology could conceive for those actually dead."¹ Burrows agrees with this, stating that "when the idea of a blessed future existence finally appears in the religion of the Old Testament, it takes the form of the resurrection of the body (s. 69), not of the escape of the immortal soul from its fleshly prison."² Similarly Volz remarks that, "The resurrection doctrine rests on the anthropological presupposition, that the body is necessary to the full existence of man... if the departed soul partakes of salvation, it thus needs again a body; full blessedness without a body is unthinkable."³ Paul also shrinks from the possibility of disembodied existence, preferring rather to be "clothed" (II Cor. 5:1ff.).

The resurrection is a resurrection of the whole man, not just a part of man which survives to live in the beyond. If death is the scattering of one's vital power,⁴ then

³op.cit., p. 118.
⁴so Johnson, op.cit., p. 89.
resurrection involves the return of vital power and thus man lives. Resurrection is the return of the whole man to life.¹ The anthropological conception of the blessed future life in the presence of God leads with an inner logical necessity to the idea of resurrection. For a different conclusion to be reached, a different anthropological basis must be used.² We must now turn to the actual evidence on resurrection faith in the Old Testament, since it appears to be a valid conclusion that if such a faith in a future life is reached, it will be in the form of a belief in the resurrection. We must now ask: is such a belief in fact reached and if so when?


The relevant passages in this area are not numerous, with five of them being the key passages on the subject:
Hos. 6:1f.; Ezek. 37; Job 19:25ff.; Isa. 24-27 (esp. 26:19); Dan. 12:2.³

It is difficult to see a belief in the resurrection as we usually think of it in the passage in Hosea 6:1f. The phrase that probably induces a Christian to see a resurrection alluded

¹See also Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 134; Eichrodt, Theologie, III, p. 160.
²This is the case in Hellenistic Judaism which conceives of the blessed future life in terms of an immortality of the soul. See Chapter 2 of this Part.
³Other passages have been claimed as teaching a resurrection faith by some (Ps. 16, 17, 49, 73—see above #3; 139; I Sam. 2:6; Hos. 13:14; Deut. 32:39). The majority of scholarly opinion does not support the view that any of these teach a resurrection. See the various commentaries, Rowley, The Faith of Israel, pp. 163-170; et al. (but see Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 112-139).
to here is the section of verse 2 that reads "on the third day he will raise us up, that we may live before him." The parallel is striking but should probably be regarded as accidental. Many commentators have drawn attention to allusions to the fertility cult in this section of Hosea, and it seems likely that this is so. In view of the context, the language of the passage seems more adequately understood as referring to national restoration—a return to the worship and service of Yahweh by the apostate Israelites and Judeans after their punishment by Yahweh. It does not refer to a resurrection, whether of nature or of the individual.

The Vision of the Dry Bones in Ezekiel 37 is generally agreed not to refer to the resurrection of individual men to a state of bliss, but rather refers to the revival of the nation after the Exile. Ezekiel describes the hope of this restoration in the form of a vision, a parable of the life of the nation in terms of life and death. The prophet speaks of "the recovery of the nation from the death of the exile and its resurrection to national life in its own land." The

---

2So many interpreters: e.g. Rowley, op.cit.
4Rowley, op.cit., p. 164.
clue is given in vs. 11: "Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel." Rowley believes it possible that this vision may have aided in the growth of the later idea of individual resurrection,¹ but this was not what the prophet had in mind.

With the next passage, Job 19:25ff., we come to a much disputed and difficult section: "For I know that my Redeemer lives, and at last he will stand upon the earth (25); and after my skin has been thus destroyed, then without my flesh I shall see God (26), whom I shall see on my side, and my eyes shall behold, and not another" (27) (RSV). The interpretation of this section could be given with greater confidence if the exact Hebrew text could be ascertained for verse 26, but this is not the case.² As a consequence, there is no agreement on the interpretation of the passage, some seeing a reference, more or less strongly affirmed, to a future life,³ while others find here little or no expression.

¹Ibid. (but see Nikolainen, op.cit., who states that belief in individual resurrection does not spring from the belief in national restoration portrayed in terms of a resurrection.).
of hope for a future life after death. Of those who find in this passage on afterlife, some believe it is a hope for resurrection, while most see the passage as only teaching either a vision of God after death in a disembodied form or that it just affirms Job's being vindicated in a future life without affirming a resurrection faith on Job's part. Charles observes only that in Job 19 there is a preparation for the future doctrine of moral retribution after death and that there is here to be seen only the steps progressing, but not reaching, to the belief in life beyond the grave. Weiser sees a strong affirmation of faith in a future life in the passage but states that the author has only the assurance of his faith in God, not the certainty of absolute knowledge or dogma. Job's conviction, writes Weiser, centers on the "that" of future vindication, not on the "how" of the vindication. Others see it as being only a temporary return to life for the purpose of vindication. That the vindication takes place before Job's

2 e.g. Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 125ff.
3 e.g. Holscher, op.cit., pp. 45f.; Burney, op.cit., pp. 52ff.
4 e.g. Weiser, op.cit., pp. 148f.; Gray, op.cit., p. 172; Rowley, op.cit., p. 165; Peake, op.cit., p. 192.
5 op.cit., pp. 68ff.
6 op.cit.
7 e.g. Burney, op.cit., p. 54; Rowley, op.cit., p. 165; Peake, op.cit., p. 172.
death is the opinion of still others.\textsuperscript{1} To Schwally\textsuperscript{2} the time of vindication is a question which cannot be decided. The only certain thing is that Job does expect vindication. Several authors argue that the verbs translated "see" in vs. 27 can be taken as having a present-perfect force describing a present experience rather than being the future tense.\textsuperscript{3} From this the conclusion is drawn that Job expects vindication in the future after he is dead but neither Job nor his friends will be alive to see it. The certainty of this vindication is the basis of Job's assurance but neither resurrection nor immortality is expected by Job.\textsuperscript{4}

It would appear, with all the variety of conflicting interpretations of Job 19:25ff., to be unwise to state any interpretation in definitive and confident form.\textsuperscript{5} Some light may be shed by considering certain other related passages. Job 14:14ff. seems to raise a hope of a similar nature, but the Hebrew here expects a negative answer: \textsuperscript{6} "If a man die, shall he live again?" No, he will not live again after death.

\textsuperscript{1} e.g. Waterman, \textit{op.cit.}; Jastrow, \textit{op.cit.}
\textsuperscript{2} \textit{op.cit.}, p. 111.
\textsuperscript{3} e.g. Ch. Bruston, "Pour l'exegese de Job 19, 25-29," ZAW, Vol. 26 (1906), pp. 143-146; Waterman, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 379.
\textsuperscript{4} So e.g. Waterman, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 380.
\textsuperscript{5} For the history of the interpretation of this passage up to 1905 see the article of J. Speer, "Zur Exegese von Hiob 19:25-27," ZAW, Vol. 25 (1905), pp. 47-140.
\textsuperscript{6} So Prof. C. Howard Wallace of the Theological Seminary of the University of Dubuque in a private conversation.
The view of Sheol in Job is the traditional one. Yet even here there seems to be a hope for something greater, something more in life: But if a man could live again, "all the days of my service I would wait, till my release should come. Thou wouldst call, and I would answer thee" (14:14-15). Job appears to be stating a desire that such a future life were possible, but soon again he sinks into despair and posits no hope for a future life after death (14:16-22). Again in 16:19 Job expresses his hope for vindication in the future: "O earth, cover not my blood, and let my cry find no resting place. Even now, behold, my witness is in heaven, and he that vouches for me is on high" (16:18-19). But here there does not appear to be a hope for a future life for Job also states "when a few years have come I shall go the way whence I shall not return. My spirit is broken, my days are extinct, the grave is ready for me" (16:22-17:1). Yet in all of this it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Job's hope is searching for something eminently more satisfying, and that in that search by a tremendous surge of imaginative hope he approaches the portals where he has glimpsed, however inadequately, the vistas of eternal life. This glimpse is the most clearly seen, though still vague and uncertain, in the passage 19:25ff. As Rowley

1See references earlier in Part II, Ch. 1, B.
writes:1

There is no hint here of more than a momentary consciousness of his vindication by the God in whom he trusted, in spite of all his complaint against him. He seems to me to be reaching out after something more satisfying than the common view, but not yet to have grasped it securely. For our purposes it is pertinent to note that the type of language used by Job describes this "momentary consciousness" in terms that indicate a resurrection concept:2 "I shall see God, whom I shall see on my side and my eyes shall behold and not another" (19:26-27). This temporary vindication would thus seem to involve the whole man and thus to suggest a temporary resurrection.3 The seeds of resurrection hope are thus seen in an individual form as early as 400 B.C.4

Isa. 24-27 contains another passage that appears to present a belief in resurrection faith. There are textual problems in this section into which we cannot enter here.5

---

2Not fully and clearly articulated, but nevertheless it appears to be indicated by the passage.
3So also Rowley, Faith of Israel, p. 170.
4The dating of Job is not easy, ranging from the Exile to about 200 B.C. as the possibilities. 400 B.C. is fairly conservative. See commentaries and introductions to the Old Testament (e.g. N. Gottwald, A Light to the Nations, (New York: Harper & Bros., 1959), p. 475.)
The key passage for our purposes is 26:19, "Thy dead shall live, their bodies shall rise. O dwellers in the dust, awake and sing for joy! For thy dew is a dew of light, and on the land of the shades thou wilt let it fall." The passage is generally agreed to be Post-Exilic, probably from the 4th - 3rd centuries B.C. While many commentators find in this passage a clear reference to a future resurrection life, there are those who do not see in this passage anything more than a reference to national restoration in the same terms as Ezekiel 37 and who do not find any reference to the idea of individual resurrection.

Schwally is somewhat non-committal on the passage, referring it to the restoration of Israel after the Exile and yet holding that a resurrection is meant by the passage. Rowley writes of this verse:

In their context, however, they may with more probability be understood to be a promise that the nation will not again find itself in its present low estate. Ezekiel

---

1Heb. "my body." Translation based on Syriac and Targum.  
2See commentaries and introductions to the Old Testament for discussion of dating (e.g. R. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, (London: A. & C. Black, 1941), pp. 441ff. dates it in the 3rd cent. B.C.; Charles, op. cit., p. 126 and Rowley, Faith of Israel, p. 166; date it in the 3rd century.).  
5op. cit., pp. 115f. (see also Rowley, op. cit., pp. 166f.)  
6a corporate resurrection?  
7Faith of Israel, pp. 166-167.
could think of the exile as the death of the nation, and this author could similarly treat the national misfortunes. Nevertheless, from the sense of the passage in context it is difficult to escape the feeling that the author speaks of something more satisfying than the preservation of the nation from further misfortune. The repeated phrase "in that day" (or a close equivalent) seems to bring the concept of the Day of Yahweh to mind, and thus to look forward to the full realization of the purpose of God for His people. From this purpose the dead martyrs are not to be excluded: the faithful dead will live again to rejoice in the presence of Yahweh. It thus seems to us that this passage is one which speaks of the resurrection of individuals and would thus appear to be the earliest to speak thus. This does not necessarily mean that resurrection faith is a generally accepted doctrine in the Judaism of the time for there is no other definitely supportable evidence which can assuredly be dated in this period to support Isa. 26:19. It is, thus, only the faith of this author—but it is his faith and probably that of at least some others. It should also be noted that the passage does not speak of a general resurrection but only of a resurrection of the righteous.

---

1 e.g. 25:9; 26:1; 27:1, 2, 6, 12, 13.
2 cf. also e.g. Volz, op. cit., pp. 231, 238; Snaith, The Jews from Cyrus to Herod, p. 120.
3 So also Burney, op. cit., p. 85.
4 Who adhered to it sufficiently to preserve the passage now included in the Old Testament canon.
The last passage to concern us is Dan. 12:2. About
this passage there is almost no dispute: it affirms the
resurrection. "Many of those who sleep in the dust of the
earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame
and everlasting contempt" (Dan. 12:2, RSV). Even the date of
this passage is generally agreed upon: c. 168-165 B.C. Several things in the passage are noteworthy. The author seems
to presume the general Old Testament view of Sheol as the gathering
place of all the dead. From there many, not all, are to be
resurrected, some to reward, others to punishment. There is
no general resurrection thought here, neither of the righteous
nor of the wicked and not of both together. It is only the
outstandingly good and bad who are raised to receive the due
reward for their deeds, as both the language of vs. 2 and the
context infer. Rowley holds that there is no ground for
supposing the verse represents the general view of the author's
day. Rather, he feels the idea of the resurrection was the
author's own conception. The evidence on this is scanty and
it would appear difficult to argue for or against Rowley on
this point. One thing is certain, however, and that is that
the teaching of Daniel must have strongly influenced others
very soon, for the belief in the resurrection becomes more

1So Rowley, Faith of Israel, p. 167.
2Some conservative scholars prefer a much earlier date
(c. 540 B.C.), but the evidence they give does not appear to us
to be convincing. See the various commentaries; Gottwald, op.
cit., pp. 527ff.; Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, (London:
3Faith of Israel, p. 168.
and more widespread in Palestinian Judaism and was an article of faith for the Pharisees. If the author was alone in his faith, and it is by no means certain that he was, he was not alone for very long!  

E. Summary.

1. Major factors leading to the rise of the new hope.

It is not our purpose to develop the explanation of these factors in detail, but only to briefly elucidate them with a view to showing the diversity of influence which resulted in a diversity of development in the late Old Testament period and the Intertestamental period. There was, thus, very little doctrinal rigidity in the eschatological belief of the period, with the traditional Sheol doctrine, resurrection faith and immortality all having their adherents by the end of the second century B.C. We may now turn to the enumeration of the major factors that appear to have contributed, more or less strongly, to the rise of hope in a blessed future life among the Jewish people. First, the breakdown of the older forms of belief in immortality would be necessary before men of faith would look elsewhere for a satisfactory hope. The political upheavals just prior to and after the Exile left the hope of national

---

1 See following chapter on the Intertestamental period.
2 For details consult standard works in field of eschatology, esp. those in the field of Old Testament and the Intertestamental period (see Bibliography).
3 These are not listed in order of importance since there is no real consensus of opinion on the degree of importance, if any, exercised by some of these factors.
and family survival in a considerable state of stress. These stresses were deeply felt and contributed a necessary presupposition to the rise of individual hope in a future life supplementary to the older group hope for the future.¹

Fulfillment of individual piety in national and family continuance and permanence was seriously weakened, thus assisting the move toward individual continuance beyond death.²

A second factor was the influence of foreign beliefs and concepts. The extent of this influence is still debated, some giving more weight, others less weight to it. The Chief areas from which are derived foreign influence on belief in a future life are: the Egyptian cult of Osiris, Persian Zoroastrianism and Greek thought. The influence attributed to these areas varies. Rowley³ argues convincingly against the case favoring the introduction of resurrection faith from Egyptian influence. The main basis for his argument is that in view of the relation between the Osiris cult and the Babylonian Tammuz and Canaanite fertility cults the rise of resurrection faith in Israel should have occurred much earlier than it did if the influence had been felt favorably. The strictures of Yahweh religion against the fertility cults would have a negative impact on their influence.⁴ For Persian influence a much

---

¹So e.g. Volz, op.cit., p. 230.
²Ibid.
³Ibid., Faith of Israel, pp. 161-163.
⁴Ibid., pp. 162, 163. See also Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 1-21.
stronger case can be made for there are resemblances between Zoroastrian resurrection faith and Israel's resurrection faith. Yet there are significant differences, as, for example, the fact that the resurrection in Zoroastrianism is a universal one, while the earliest Jewish statements affirm only a selective resurrection\(^1\) (Isa. 26:19; Dan.12:2). Many scholars deny that Jewish resurrection faith is derived from Persian thought.\(^2\) While Persian influence on Judaism is undoubtedly present,\(^3\) its influence does not appear to be as great as is often supposed.\(^4\) Bertholet, for example, recognizes the influence of Persian thought on the development of Jewish doctrine, but nevertheless maintains that the Jewish belief in resurrection


\(^{4}\) An example of exaggeration of Persian influence can be seen in e.g. L. Browne, *This Believing World*, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1961), pp. 251, 21f. He allows very little originality to Judaism and Christianity in this area, deriving most concepts from foreign sources, especially Zoroastrianism and Mithraism.
is not to be traced to Persian sources.¹ W. F. Albright writes that the value of Iranian religious influences "for our understanding of Judaism and early Christianity has been greatly overestimated."² Albright writes also that "There is no clear trace of Iranian influence of Judaism before the second century B.C., though the beginnings of this influence may well go back a century or two earlier."³ He further remarks that Persian conceptions "exerted no effect except where the ground was already fully prepared for them."⁴ Greek influence is usually held to be apparent, in respect of beliefs on the future life, in the acceptance of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul by Hellenistic Judaism. There is truth in this, but it should be recognized that this is not the limit of Greek influence on Jewish ideas.⁵ Many other traces of Greek influence can be seen in Jewish eschatology.⁶ However, this influence was only felt where the ground had already been prepared for it. Thus, for example, belief in the immortality

²From the Stone Age to Christianity, p. 358.
³Ibid., p. 364.
⁴Ibid., p. 364.
⁵T. F. Glasson, Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology, (London: S.P.C.K., 1961) has convincingly argued for recognition of a wider influence of Greek thought on Jewish eschatology. Of particular note is his argument for seeing Greek influence even in the area of resurrection faith (esp. pp. 26-32). However, Glasson recognizes that it is questionable if the Greek conception could be called resurrection (p. 29)—it is closer to a concept of reincarnation.
⁶See e.g. Glasson, op.cit.; Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 62-95.
particular difficulties for the individual so long as the
group was the object of attention. But with the increase
of emphasis on the individual aspects of religious life,
the problem becomes more acute. The dogma of Ezekiel (e.g.
18:19-32) that individual retribution is exact and occurs in
this life broke down on the shores of individual experience.
Although widely accepted, it was also met by the protest of
those who affirmed innocence and maintained that the
suffering on both national and individual levels was far
disproportionate to that which was deserved (see e.g. Ps. 13,
17, 22, 26, et al. which present both individual and corporate
protests). Job raises his protest and cries for vindication,
while Ecclesiastes retreats into despair. Norman Snaith has
well summarized this conception:

When sad experience had taught the individual Israelite
that in this life there can be no guarantee of either re¬
wards for the righteous or punishment for the wicked, then
he began to look for another world in which these matters
of justice would receive proper attention.

The idea of a Last Judgment thus has a major role in thought
on the future life. We have already referred to Isa. 26:19
and Dan. 12:2 which present the early belief in resurrection
and which do so in terms of the idea of retribution. The just,
usually those who have shared only in the misery and lowly estate

1Although the question was increasingly asked: why do
thy people suffer, O Lord (e.g. Ps. 14:7; et al.).
2See remarks of Rowley on this subject in Faith of Israel,
pp. 99-123 (esp. 104ff., 109ff.).
3The Jews from Cyrus to Herod, pp. 123-124.
4Ibid., p. 123.
of Israel, are raised to reward and participation in Israel's glory, while the wicked, usually those not adequately punished in this life, are raised to receive the due recompense.1

A fourth factor is the theological motivation, particularly the influence of developed concepts of God.2 The stress on the sovereignty of God over all of life found in the prophets, especially from the eighth century on, made its impact on eschatology.3 When the power of God is believed to extend even over the realm of the dead4 (Ps. 139:8; Am. 9:2; Hos. 13:14; et al.), it is not a big step to the belief that death cannot annul fellowship with Him.5 The life of man is not guaranteed by any power of the soul or nature, but by the power of Yahweh.6 The more loftily developed conception of God did not lead immediately to a developed view of a blessed future life, but it did contribute to that development. Charles remarks on this:7 "eschatological beliefs are universally the last of all beliefs to be influenced by the loftier conceptions of God." Yahweh is lord of life and death8 and thus, finally,

1Ibid., pp. 123-127 (esp. 126).
2See earlier in this chapter, C.
4See also discussion of power of Yahweh in restoring those menaced by the power of sickness, etc., in Part II, ch. 1, B. Cf. also Burney, op.cit., pp. 22ff.; Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 117ff.
5See also this chapter, section C.
6Cf. e.g. Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 101-108, 113ff.
8See Part II, Ch. 1.
the dead are also in his power. "God is naturally a God of the living and of life; but precisely as the 'perfecting' (vollkommenen) God he must also be a God of the dead; in the later time he is this really." The doctrine of God is a necessary presupposition to development of resurrection hope, and fellowship with such a God cannot ultimately be broken by death.

The "anthropological motivation" (as we prefer to call it) is the fifth factor in the rise of hope for a future life.\(^2\) The form of the enjoyment of the future life is the major element that is seen here. As we have seen, this development is later than the development of hope for the future which derived from the religious experience with God. The earlier roots of faith in a blessed life after death are theological—the emphasis on unbroken communion with God. The anthropological motivation is concerned with How this fellowship is to be enjoyed.\(^3\) The worth of the individual life before God coupled with the basic anthropological viewpoint of the Old Testament

---

\(^1\)Schwally, op.cit., p. 82.
\(^2\)See earlier in this chapter, section D.
\(^3\)Fellowship with God is the primary concern, not a longing for more life derived from selfish concerns. Robinson, *Inspiration*, p. 104 has surely overstated the case when he affirms that a newly felt confidence in individual worth means man finds an inherent worth in himself that demands an immortality. Rather, it is a newly found worth in relation to God that contributes to belief in the future life.
leads to the development of the belief in the resurrection. For man to live there must be a body, for life apart from a body is not normative to Old Testament religion.\(^1\) This hope is not derived from a self-centered approach to life\(^2\) but from a deeply perceived and experienced relationship with God which then from an anthropological basis affirms a resurrection. The "person" who is now to be with God in bliss forever must be the person which is known as man—a psycho-physical organism. The resurrection faith was first concerned with the righteous and their vindication (Isa. 26:19). But as anthropocentrism increased in Israel, it no longer sufficed to simply exclude the wicked from the resurrection and let them remain dead in the old sense (in Sheol). It became frequently necessary to affirm the resurrection of the wicked also in order that they might receive further punishment (Dan. 12:2; 4 Ezra; cf. Luke 16:19ff.).\(^3\) That the righteous are rewarded by being raised to share in the blessing of the New Age with Yahweh is not always satisfactory. The wicked must also be raised to punishment—exclusion from the New Age is not sufficient. This is the poorer side of the development of belief in the

---

\(^1\)See section D. of this chapter and cf. also Robinson, *Inspiration*, p. 101; *Religious Ideas*, 97; Snaith, *The Jews from Cyrus to Herod*, pp. 122f.; et al.

\(^2\)See also Charles, *Religious Development*, p. 114; ("the self-centredness, nay the selfishness, that marked the Greek doctrine of immortality is conspicuous by its absence in Israel").

\(^3\)See also e.g. Charles, *Religious Development*, p. 123; Volz, op.cit., et al. See also Part III, ch. 2. For some authors the punishment of the wicked must be carried out in the presence of the righteous (Charles, op.cit.).
future life. Yet, the dominant note heard is that of the wondrous gift of life with God which even some of the less spiritual and more morbid concerns for revenge could never obscure. It was the abiding communion with God that was important. "This conviction of a personal relation to God independent of time and change, and not any particular theory as to the character of life after death, is the lasting contribution of the Old Testament to the doctrine of a Future Life."  

2. The basic hope of the Old Testament.

The basic hope of the Old Testament religion, as it was developed towards the close of the Old Testament period, was hope in the presence of God. The thought is not that man by his constitutive nature cannot die nor that life is too good to be finally annulled by death. Rather, the belief is that the life which is worthy to be called life is life with God, fellowship with Him. God offers life that is life--now and hereafter. It is life that is offered, not survival. Because the One who offers life endures, so also will the life He offers endure. God "offers life because He offers Himself,

---

and that life shall abide because the abiding God is its source.\footnote{Ibid.}

It is the theological presence that is the vital aspect of Old Testament religion, not its anthropological conception. That is to say, the focus of attention is on being with God ("I am with Thee," Ps. 73:23). \textit{That} one is with God is the important thing, not \textit{how} one is with God. There can be seen in the Old Testament, however, a trend toward anthropocentrism, an increasing concern with the one who survives.\footnote{In the form of belief in the resurrection.} But even here the trend does not obscure the primary concern of life in fellowship with God. In the New Testament, as we shall see, the theological conception also predominates.\footnote{See also e.g. Rowley, \textit{The Faith of Israel}, pp. 175f.} The anthropological concern centers in the concept of the presence of God and relates that belief to the means by which one can enjoy God's presence in the full realization of personal life.
CHAPTER II

THE NATURE OF MAN AND THE AFTER LIFE

IN THE INTERTESTAMENTAL PERIOD

A. Resurrection and Immortality

1. Anthropological presuppositions.

In an earlier section we presented the anthropological basis of resurrection faith.¹ The Hebrew concept of man as a unity of personality—a psycho-physical organism—required that once a concept of a future life is reached, that concept must be conceived in terms of resurrection if it is to be man who is the beneficiary of that future life.² For there to be man, there must be a body. If man lives beyond death, the anthropological concept of the Old Testament religion leads to the idea of resurrection. To hold a different form of belief in a life after death, viz. the immortality of the soul,

¹See esp. Part III, Ch. 1, B; D, 2; E, 1 and also Part I, Ch. 1.
a different anthropological basis must be reached. In Hellenistic Judaism belief in the immortality of the soul is in fact reached and the anthropological basis of this belief is not that of the Old Testament. Rather, the belief in immortality is based on Greek thought, especially Platonic, that man is a being composed of parts and the part that is immortal is the soul.\(^1\) The body is mortal, the soul is immortal.\(^2\) The soul exists before its residence in a particular body, endures its incarceration in the body and survives after the body dies. It is the body that dies, not the soul.\(^3\)

Hellenistic Judaism understood all this in terms of individual personal survival. The soul was the real person, the individual ego. Thus the soul and its fate in life and after death is the proper focus of attention. Volz sums up this viewpoint on immortality when he writes:

die Seele oder Besser der Geist ist das Ausschlaggebende am Menschen, er ist unsterblich, präexistiert, er kann für sich existieren, ja die Verbindung mit einem Körper ist für ihn etwas Unnatürliches, der Geist ist in der Körper nur Zeitweilig gebannt wie in einen Kerker; mit dem Tod beginnt das wahre Leben für ihn. Der Geist ist etwas Göttliches, der Körper gehört zur vergänglichen nichtswertigen Materie. Wohl hat der Geist auch nach dieser Anschauung eine stoffliche Hülle, aber sie ist eben nur Hüll.\(^4\)

\(^1\)See earlier Part I, Ch. 1 and esp. Part II, Ch. 2, A, 4, b. 
\(^3\)For expressions of this in Hellenistic Judaism see sub-section 2 below.
\(^4\)Volz, op.cit., p. 118.
2. The general development of doctrine.

a. Resurrection faith.

We have seen earlier that belief in the resurrection is a relatively late development, coming after the return from Exile. The earliest passage affirming hope of the resurrection is Isa. 26:19 which is dated from the Third Century to the Second Century B.C., i.e. about 250-200 B.C. Dan. 12:2 also teaches resurrection and is dated about 165 B.C. There are no other references to the belief in resurrection earlier than these. In Isa. 26:19 the resurrection is of the faithful witnesses, the just. Daniel 12:2 adds to this concept of the resurrection of the just the idea of the resurrection of the unpunished wicked. Resurrection is now of the just and the unjust, the very good and the very bad. However, the focus of attention in Daniel is on the just. To this time, then, there is no general resurrection—not all rise. The primary object of resurrection is that the martyrs and the pious rise to share in the benefits of the golden age.

1Part III, ch. 1, D.

2Charles, Rel. Develop, pp. 223ff. dates Enoch 6-36 before Daniel. Rowley has shown that this is probably not the case and most authorities now see a date after Daniel for all of I Enoch. See Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, pp. 54, 77-84. For approximate dates of relevant literature of this period see Additional Note B at the end of this chapter.

Under the influence of the doctrine of retribution, the resurrection of the exceedingly wicked is added in Daniel. From the time of Daniel forward (c. 165 B.C.) the belief in the resurrection becomes an increasingly prominent part of Palestinian Judaism. Resurrection faith did not, however, completely eliminate the older Sheol doctrine. The traditional Old Testament picture of the fate of the dead as surviving (but not in a happy or blessed state, nor in one of punishment) in Sheol continued to be held by many and was an article of faith for the Sadducees.

The Intertestamental literature discloses, from the time of Daniel, three main teachings on the nature of the resurrection: one, only the just rise; two, resurrection of the just and of the unpunished wicked; three, general resurrection.

(1). Resurrection of the just.

This is the usual belief in resurrection during this period. The belief in the resurrection of the just only is found in Enoch 83–90 (e.g. 90:33). This belief is

---

1 See Part II, Ch. 1, B.
2 See further E., 1 of this chapter.
3 So Boussset-Gressmann, op. cit., p. 272; Nikolainen, op. cit., p. 159.
4 Dated about 160–150 B.C. See Additional Note B.
also found in II Macc. 1 (e.g. 6:26; 7:9, 14, 36; 12:43f.; 14:46)\(^2\), Testament of the 12\(^3\) (e.g. Simeon 6; Levi 18; Judah 25; Zeb. 10; Dan. 5)\(^4\), Ps. of Sol. 5 3:10ff.\(^6\), Enoch 91-104\(^7\) (e.g. 91:10; 92:3-5; 102:6-11),\(^8\) Life of Adam\(^9\) (βios 'Αμα)\(^10\) 13 and 28 (?). It should be noted that nearly all of these documents are fairly early in the period during which belief in the resurrection was developed (an exception is the Life of Adam and as noted there is some dispute on this document. In my estimation, Volz is probably correct and the passage will be listed again among those teaching the general

\(^1\)Dated about 75-1 B.C. See Note B.  
\(^2\)So Bousset-Gressmann, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 273; Nikolainen, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 157; \textit{et al.}.  
\(^3\)Dated about 110 B.C. See Note B.  
\(^5\)Dated c. 50 B.C. See Note B.  
\(^6\)So also Volz, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 238; Charles, \textit{Eschatology}, p. 239; Nikolainen, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 159; Moore, \textit{op. cit.}, II, p. 308; Rowley, \textit{Relevance of Apocalyptic}, p. 73. According to Bousset-Gressmann, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 271, the Ps. of Sol. are ambiguous on the subject of resurrection.  
\(^7\)Dated about 150-90 B.C. See Note B. This section is very complex.  
\(^8\)So also Nikolainen, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 239; Charles, \textit{Eschatology}, p. 239; Moore, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 306; Snaith, \textit{The Jews from Cyrus to Herod}, p. 126; \textit{et al.}.  
\(^9\)Dated about 50-100 A.D. See Note B.  
\(^10\)So Bousset-Gressmann, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 272. But see Volz, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 49, 243, where the teaching of the book is held to be that of general resurrection.  
\(^11\)Test of the 12 is another exception if the evidence of the Qumran findings correctly demonstrate the lateness of this work. See further Additional note B and references cited there.
resurrection.), being mostly dated between 160-50 B.C. Apparently the basic underlying motivation for the belief in the resurrection of the just is that the blessings of the Golden Age should not be withheld from the departed pious while simply being excluded¹ from the new life is deemed punishment enough for the wicked.²

(2) Resurrection of the just and the unpunished wicked.

Some authors in this period teach that not only do the righteous rise but also those wicked who have not as yet been punished. The impact of the doctrine of retribution can be seen here even more strongly, for it is believed that not only are the just given their due at last but also the dead wicked are not at last to escape. They will not receive their due. Dan. 12:2 is the classic passage on this view. Of the few other authors advocating resurrection of both the just and the wicked, Enoch 6-363 is the most important. Ch. 22 is the

¹It should, however, be noted that some writings do not see a simple deprivation from life and a consequent remaining forever dead as being sufficient. A place of torment is created for the wicked (e.g. Enoch 102:7f.; 103:5ff.). II Macc. does not know of any further punishment after death of the wicked. They are simply excluded from the resurrected life (e.g. 7:14).
³Dated about 150-100 B.C.
decisive section. Here Sheol is divided into 4 sections: two for the righteous and two for the wicked. One class of each, righteous and wicked, has died a natural death. One class of the righteous consists of the martyrs, while one class of the wicked consists of those wicked who died without being punished. Verse 13 is the key verse, for it speaks of one class of the wicked who shall not be raised. This implies that others will rise. From verses 10-11 it would appear that the wicked who have not been punished on earth will be raised for punishment. However, from verse 13 (and by referring to the context, esp. vs. 3) a distinction between "spirits" and those who rise could be meant. If the former interpretation is correct, the righteous (either unrewarded or all righteous: it is not explicitly stated which of the righteous is to rise, but probably all the righteous will rise

---

Charles in the first ed. of his work Eschatology speaks of 4 divisions. In his book Rel. Development, pp. 121f. he speaks of 3 divisions. The latter view is his attempt to reconcile vs. 2 and 9 of this section of Enoch which speak of 4 and 3 divisions respectively, by emending v. 2 to read "3." His reasons for this are given in his edition of the set, The Apocrypha and Pseudoepigrapha, (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1913), II, p. 202. Glasson, Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology, p. 15, believes the emendation should be reversed so that verse 9 reads "four" instead of "three." With this we agree. The passage makes far better sense in this way and vs. 9, 10, 12, and 13 denote the respective divisions of Sheol. In any case the teaching remains that only some of the wicked rise.
in view of the promises of life in the new age given elsewhere—see e.g. 25:4-6; 10:7, 16, 20-22; 11:1-2) are raised to the New Age and the unpunished wicked are raised for punishment. If the latter interpretation be correct, the unpunished wicked are not raised at all but at the judgment cast directly into Hell. Enoch 27:2f. helps here for it presents the picture of the torment of the wicked who are punished and judged at the last times in the presence of the righteous. It should be noticed that the wicked are visible to the righteous, thus suggesting the wicked possess some material substance, some form of body and thus indicating that 22:10-11 refers, indirectly and vaguely to be sure, to a resurrection of the unpunished wicked. We may thus conclude that this section of Enoch probably teaches a resurrection of all the righteous and some of the wicked (the unpunished). Volz interprets Enoch 22

1 Charles does not think the wicked are raised at all but that only their "spirits" are punished. Glasson does not agree—see Greek Influence, pp. 15ff. We agree with Glasson but in the presence of the vague descriptions as Enoch 22:10-11, 13 and 27:2f. must also point out that there can be no definitive conclusion on the subject. Our conclusion is one that in the light of the texts seems most logical. The author of this section of Enoch is more concerned to affirm the certainty of the punishment of the wicked than to describe the form (body or spirit) possessed by those who are punished.

as referring to the general resurrection.\(^1\) This is very
doubtful in view of the clear reference in Enoch 22:13 to those
who will not be raised.

In the Testament of 12, Benj. 10:6ff. speaks of a
resurrection. Snaith\(^2\) seems to interpret it as a resurrection
of some rather than all. If so this passage would fit under
our present classification. Volz\(^3\) places this passage with
those that teach a general resurrection. The temptation to
refer this to a limited resurrection probably rests upon the
phrase in verse 8, "some unto glory and some unto shame"
which shows a clear affinity with Dan. 12:2f. The difference,
however, is clear: Daniel speaks of "many" rising, some to
glory, others to shame, whereas Test. of Benj. 10:8 speaks of
"all" rising, etc. Volz and others are correct in placing this
passage with those that speak of a general resurrection.

One other passage may also be placed in the category
of partial resurrection of righteous and wicked. This is, if
Moore is correct, Enoch 51:1ff. and 61:4f. Moore writes,\(^4\)
"the restoration is to life on earth, and notwithstanding the
universal expressions of 51, 1, a resurrection of Gentiles is

\(^1\) p. 241.
\(^2\) The Jews from Cyrus to Herod, pp. 125f.
\(^3\) op.cit., pp. 242f.; also Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 163;
Moore, op.cit., p. 307; et al.
\(^4\) op.cit., p. 304.
not thought of." Others refer the passage to a teaching of general resurrection. Moore does not expound nor defend his position: he simply states it. The same is true of Bousset-Gressmann. Nikolainen explains Enoch 51:1ff. but ignores the problem raised by 61:4ff.; 62:13ff.; 45:1-6. Charles states that the "testimony of the Similitudes on this head is doubtful." He cites Enoch 61:5 as appearing to teach a resurrection of the righteous only while Enoch 51:1f. clearly states both just and unjust will rise. Volz writes that while Enoch 51:1 appears to affirm a general resurrection, it cannot be affirmed as certain that this is so. It would seem that no definite interpretation of this section of Enoch can be given. However, the author appears to be implying a general resurrection in 51:1f. and in a few other places which speak of the judgment awaiting sinners (e.g. 45:2, 6). It would seem best then, with reservations, to include Enoch 37-71 among the authors who teach a general resurrection. It will thus be seen that the evidence for a resurrection of the just (all or some) and of the unpunished wicked only is very tenuous. Only Dan. 12:2

1 e.g. Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 160; Bousset-Gressmann, op.cit., p. 271.
2 Eschatology, pp. 239f.
3 op.cit., p. 241.
4 It should be noted that the evidence from Qumran indicates a late date for this section of Enoch. It is quite possible that this section is either a Christian work or more likely a late Jewish work edited by Christian hands. See Additional Note B and the references cited there.
and Enoch 6-36 fall definitely in this category.

(3) General resurrection.

The view that all will rise, both good and evil, is generally late in the Intertestamental period. Comparatively speaking, it is not as prevalent a view as the belief in the resurrection of the righteous only. The basis of the belief in the general resurrection is to be found in the doctrine of the Last Judgment and belief in retribution. The intensification of these beliefs along with troubled times in the history of Israel led to the development not only of the belief that the unpunished dead must receive their proper punishment and that the departed pious must be restored to life for their proper reward, but also to the belief that all men and nations stand under the judgment of God. Accordingly, all must rise to receive their due reward or punishment. Among the works teaching a general resurrection are the already

---


2See earlier, ch. 1 of this Part, esp. E, 1.

3See further works cited in preceding notes and also Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 160-169; Snaith, The Jews from Cyrus to Herod, pp. 123ff. (esp. p. 126: "There are innumerable passages to be found in the writings of the first century B.C. which deal with the idea of a resurrection in connection with the day of judgment, and with the concern for individual retribution. In the first century A.D. the references are multiplied.").
mentioned Life of Adam\(^1\) (βίος Ἁδών) 13, 28, 41; Enoch 37-71 and Test. of Benj. 10:6ff.\(^2\) The idea of the general resurrection is also taught in II Esdras\(^3\) (4th Ezra), e.g. in 7:32-35; 14:35; 4:35ff.; 7:32 is especially instructive: "and the earth will give up those who are asleep in it and the dust those who are silent in it, and the chambers\(^5\) will give up the souls that have been committed to them" (Goodspeed's translation). The rest of the passage speaks of the judgment. II Baruch\(^6\) (Apoc. of Baruch) also presents a concept of general resurrection, e.g. 42:7; 50:2; 51:1ff.; 52:3 (a good example of this is 50:2, "for the earth will give back then the dead, which it now receives, in order to preserve them, making no change in their appearance;"\(^7\) cf. also 42:7 where to the dust will come the cry, "Give back that which is not thine, and let all rise, which thou hast preserved for its time."\(^8\)) Finally, we may mention the Sibylline Oracles, Book IV, 180ff. One part of

\(^1\)Also called the Apocalypse of Moses.

\(^2\)It should be further noted that all of these are late, dating at least in first century A.D. if not later.

\(^3\)Dated in the late first century A.D. See Note B.


\(^5\)This phrase evidently recalls Enoch 22.

\(^6\)Dated after 4th Ezra in late first century A.D.

\(^7\)Translated from edition of Kautzsch, op.cit., p. 430 (ed. by Hyssel.)

\(^8\)Ibid., p. 426.

this is worth citing: "Then will God himself form anew the bones and dust of men and the mortals erect, as they were before" (180-181). All of these references are late (from the first century A.D.). The concept of the general resurrection is thus the last stage in our tracing of the development of this doctrine.

b. Immortality of the soul.

The stronghold of belief in the immortality of the soul among the Jews is in Hellenistic Judaism. The Judaism of the Diaspora was more strongly influenced by Greek thought and culture than was the faith of Palestinian Jews. The faith of the Diaspora was still that of the Old Testament and of the later Judaism, but with a more pronounced Hellenistic flavor. It is in this area that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was taught. The book, The Wisdom of Solomon offers many examples of this belief. The author of this work

1 Translated from the edition of Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 205 (ed. by Blass.)
2 As will be shown later, belief in immortality is also found in Palestinian Judaism.
4 See also Part II, Ch. 2, A, 1. For the anthropological basis see subsection 1 of this section. The compromise between resurrection and immortality as it appears in the concept of the Intermediate State will be treated in section B of this chapter. The Biblical basis of immortality in the Old Testament was dealt with in Ch. 1 of this Part.
5 Dated between 100 B.C.—40 A.D. See Additional Note B.
cannot conceive of resurrection because of his belief in the "evil nature of matter." Wisdom 9:15 is a good example of this: "For a perishable body weighs down the soul, and its earthly tent burdens the thoughtful mind" (Goodspeed's translation). The concept of the pre-existence of the soul is also found in this book (e.g. 7:3; 8:19-20). The fates of the just and wicked are not the same: "righteousness is immortal" (1:15) but wickedness will be punished (3:10ff.; cf. 4:7, 16, 18ff.). Man was created for immortality (2:23f.) and "and souls of the upright are in the hand of God" (3:1), where they are at peace (3:1ff.). The hope of the upright "is full of immortality" (3:4) but those who belong to the devil suffer death (2:23f.). At death the soul is released from its prison (16:14; cf. 15:8) and the upright man lives forever and his reward is with God (5:15ff.).

IV Maccabees also contains the doctrine of immortality. This work is based on II Maccabees but departs from it doctrinally in several particulars. The major difference between II and IV Maccabees which concerns us is the teaching of

---

1 Charles, Eschatology, p. 255 (cf. also Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 155ff.; Volz, op.cit., p. 266; et al.).
2 LXX, φθαρτά.
3 See also Rohde, Psyche, pp. 49, 60, 117, 465ff.
4 An interesting additional fact about the book is its retention of the Old Testament prophetic concept of judgment: e.g. 3:5, 7, 9-10, 13, 18; 4:6, 18-20, 6:5; 16:13ff.
5 Dated about 30-70 A.D. See Note B.
IV Maccabees that the soul is immortal while the concept of the resurrection of righteous Jews is found in II Maccabees. IV Maccabees speaks of the soul, especially the soul of the godly, as being immortal (14:5f.; 16:13). The pious martyrs receive from God "pure and immortal souls," joining the "choir of the fathers" (18:23). The pious are honored by God, abiding in heaven (17:5), after achieving "the prize of victory in long lasting life" (17:12). The wicked have no hope of salvation from God (11:7) and are punished in this life and after death (18:5, 22; cf. also 9:9; 10:11, 15, 21; 12:12). The souls of the pious and wicked dead receive at death their appointed reward or punishment. It is worthy of note, however, that immortality is not in this work, apparently, an inherent quality of man—it is the result of God's work and is His gift (e.g. see 7:14; 17:17-21; 18:23).

Immortality is also found in I Enoch. A clear example may be found in chapter 103:4, 7:3 "And the spirits of you who have died in righteousness shall live and rejoice, and their spirits shall not perish, nor their memorial from before the face of the Great One ... Know ye, that their souls (i.e.

---

2 The wicked thus also have immortal souls (cf. 13:15).
3 It should be noted that this portion of I Enoch is in a very complex section and probably contains several works. See e.g. the analysis of Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times, p. 77 and see Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 155, 158; et al. The resurrection may take place after an intermediate state described above. Charles, Eschatology, p. 200 and Pfeiffer, History, p. 79 believe so. (But see Volz, op.cit., pp. 19f.).
the wicked) will be made to descend into Sheol, and they shall be wretched in their great tribulation" (Charles translation).

Jubilees\(^1\) is another work that teaches the concept of immortality.\(^2\) Ch. 23:31 speaks of the bones of the pious resting in the earth while their spirits have much joy. The phrase in 23:30, "they will rise up and see great peace," probably does not refer to resurrection, but rather to the idea of the righteous "rising up" (an "uprising" or revolt) to drive out their enemies,\(^3\) as the succeeding phrases in this verse indicate. Nearly all authorities are agreed that this book does not contain a teaching on resurrection but rather prefers a concept of immortality.\(^4\) Thus we find in a work usually attributed to Pharasaic circles\(^5\) a concept of

---

\(^1\) Dated about 135 B.C. see Note B.

\(^2\) II Enoch could also be mentioned but there is a good bit of dispute on the date of this work. See Rowley, Relevance of Apocalyptic, pp. 95ff. II Enoch has both a concept of immortality and a concept of resurrection (so Charles, Eschatology, pp. 261-266). See II Enoch 23:5; 49:2; 58:5; 22:8-10. That the resurrection is taught in this book is doubtful. The only place that Charles can cite as teaching it is 22:8-10, but the passage only speaks of the righteous as clothed in the garments of God's glory—which could in the light of other passages mean an immortal glory, not a bodily one. See also 10:1ff.; ch. 8; Ch. 9; 42:3, 5; 61:3; 65:10 in addition to the above. Bouset-Gressmann, op.cit., p. 273 and Volz, op.cit., p. 262 do not find a teaching of resurrection in this work.

\(^3\) See Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 155; Volz, op.cit., pp. 29, 263; Bouset-Gressmann, op.cit., p. 271.

\(^4\) So Volz, op.cit., p. 263; Bouset-Gressmann, op.cit., p. 271; Charles, Eschatology, p. 248; Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 155; Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times, p. 69; Rowley, Relevance, p. 61; Moore, op.cit., p. 308n.; et al. (e.g. See the editions in Kautzsch, op.cit., II and Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, vol. II).

immortality which demonstrates again the doctrinal fluidity in the area of eschatology during this period. Even in Palestine, the center of resurrection faith, immortality was not without its advocates.\(^1\) It should also be noted that Jubilees does not emphasize the form of the after-life to any extent. The above cited passage is the only clear reference to individual future life.\(^2\)

Another Palestinian work which advocates immortality rather than resurrection is the Assumption of Moses.\(^3\) The future abode of the righteous is in heaven (10:3-10). From there the righteous can see their enemies being punished in Gehenna (10:10). The words of Rowley\(^4\) are worth quoting in this connection as a good summary of the teaching of the book on this subject:

> There is therefore no resurrection, either of the righteous or of the wicked, but there is bliss in Heaven for the righteous, and torment in Gehenna for the Gentiles. The satisfaction with which the author contemplates that torment is one of the least pleasing features of his anticipations.

The idea of the immortality of the soul appears also

---

\(^1\)The Essenes also held to a belief in immortality. See earlier Part II, ch. 2, A, 1 and see also Volz, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 268f.; Bousset-Gressmann, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 273, 295; Pfeiffer, \textit{History}, pp. 56f.; et al.

\(^2\)The book has other eschatological features but they are mainly concerned with the nation. See references referred to in Note 4, p. 267.

\(^3\)Dated about 30 A.D. See Note B.

in Philo¹ and Josephus.² Space does not permit detailed treatment of their views.³ Philo's concept of the nature of man is strongly influenced by Platonism.⁴ Man is a union of body and soul but the body is a menace to the soul (e.g. legum allegoria, I, 107). Death frees the soul from the body (e.g. de Abrahamo, 258; legum allegoria, I, 105). Everyone enters his final abode at death:⁵ the wicked are punished forever (de Cherubim, 1; de praemia et poenis, 70ff.), the pious receive life and immortality (de plantatione 37; de posteritate Caiini, 39; de Josepho, 264). It should be noted that for Philo life has its source in God (de Iuga, 198; de specialibus legibus, I, 345). God gives man immortality (de aeternitae mundi, 46). Josephus apparently held that at death the good souls went to heaven, but the evil to the darkest underworld (see Wars, Book 8).⁶ He appears to have connected this with a view that the souls of the righteous received "pure bodies" (Wars, Book 3; cf. Antiquities, XVIII, 1, 3, 14). Josephus, then, apparently

¹ Died about 50 A.D.
² Lived about 37-100 A.D.
⁴ So Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 170.
did not subscribe exclusively to a belief in immortality but attempted to combine the two ideas of immortality and resurrection.¹

B. Intermediate State.

1. Belief in the resurrection of the dead is a presupposition of the concept of an intermediate state of the dead.² Once the doctrine (or belief) in resurrection is accepted, the question arises: what is the fate of the departed after their death and before they are raised? The doctrine of retribution also had its part to play in the solution to this question. The earlier references have nothing to say about the interim state of the dead—they are simply raised on the day of the great victory (see Isa. 26:19; Dan. 12:2f.). To this question of the fate of the dead in the interim between death and full reward several answers were given. The first answer is that of silence: the view of early proponents of resurrection faith who had not as yet faced the problem (e.g. Isa. 26:19; Dan. 12:2f.) as well as those who held the traditional Old Testament view and for whom accordingly there was no problem.³

¹ Though not a deliberate combining. See Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 177f., 200.
³ On the adherents of the traditional Old Testament View see D, 1 of this chapter.
2. A second answer is that given by those who held a belief in immortality of the soul (resp. spirit). The stronghold of this belief is Hellenistic Judaism where the belief that the righteous achieved blessedness immediately after death was most vital. Retribution takes place immediately after death, with the fate of the righteous in blessedness being given the greatest emphasis. The author of the Wisdom of Solomon expresses it thus: "The souls of the upright are in the hand of God, and no torment can reach them. In the eyes of foolish people they seemed to die, . . ., but they are at peace" (3:1-3, Goodspeed's translation). In IV Maccabees similar thoughts are found. Ch. 7:19 speaks of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as living unto God for they "died not." Of the righteous it is thus said that "men dying for God live unto God, as live Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and all the patriarchs" (16:25; cf. 13:17; 17:5). The wicked are punished now in this life and also after their death (11:7; 18:5, 22). The belief in the reward of the righteous immediately after death is found also in Philo. Among Palestinian sources may be mentioned Jubilees 23:31, and Assumption of Moses (10:3-10).

1 Although not confined to Hellenistic Judaism, as was shown in the preceding section.
4 See earlier A, 2, b and references cited there.
5 Though this view does not play an important role in the book.
3. The third answer given to the problem posits the existence of an intermediate state where the righteous receive a preliminary reward and the wicked are punished prior to their final punishment on the Day of Judgment at the close of the Age. The final peace of the righteous and the final punishment of the wicked take place at the end of the Age. Enoch 22, which we have already discussed, speaks of the intermediate condition of the departed. It should be noted that the righteous are partially rewarded after death (note the "spring of water" in 22:2, 9 and cf. Lk. 16:24) while the spirits of the wicked are "set apart in this great pain, till the great day of judgment." 22:13 further relates that the dead wicked who have been punished in this life remain forever in Sheol.

IV Ezra (II Esdras) also speaks of the intermediate state. The spirits of the wicked are punished at death: "such spirits shall not enter dwellings but wander about thenceforth in torment, always grieving and sad, in seven ways" (7:80). The succeeding verses describe the travail of the spirits of the wicked (7:81-87). Their punishment after the judgment will be even worse (7:84; cf. 7:36-44). The righteous also

1As will be seen, there are variations in the views of some authors of the literature of the period.
are given their preliminary reward after death, "when they shall be separated from this fragile jar" (7:88-99). Until their final reward at the last day they rest in "their chambers" (7:95; cf. 7:32, 75, 121).

2 Baruch (Apoc. of Baruch) also described though not as clearly as IV Ezra the preliminary reward of the righteous and punishment of the wicked (23:5; 48:16; 52:2). The wicked "recline in anguish and rest in torment" but this is not as severe a punishment as they shall receive, for on the day of judgment they "know that their torment has come and their perdition has arrived" (30:5). The righteous are spoken of as being preserved in "chambers" or "treasuries" where they are at rest until the day of resurrection, (30:2).3

Second Maccabees does not appear to know anything about a preliminary reward of the righteous as such, but does take the first step in this direction with its teaching that some of the dead otherwise excluded may be included among the resurrected through the intercession of those now living (12:43-45). For the rest, the dead are in Sheol and at the resurrection the righteous leave Sheol while the wicked remain there forever (6:23ff.; 7:9, 11, 14, 19, 23, 29, 36ff.).

1So also Volz, op.cit., p. 260.
2The similarity to Enoch 22 and IV Ezra should be noted.
3See also 50:1ff. which speaks of the resurrection of both just and unjust.
The Psalms of Solomon\(^1\) are not too clear on the intermediate state. The godless are punished immediately after death in Hell, but it is not clear whether the righteous are rewarded in a preliminary way before their final reward at the resurrection or whether they must await the resurrection for their reward\(^2\)—probably the former, though it cannot be definitely affirmed that such is the case.

The Similitudes of Enoch do not present a clear picture on this subject. According to 39:4ff. (cf. 48:1f.; 61:12; 70:1ff.; 40:5) the righteous dwell in the presence of God after death. But 51:1ff. speaks of the resurrection of the dead from the earth, Sheol and Hell to receive judgment.\(^3\)

The solution of Volz\(^4\) to this problem seems best: the spirits of the just\(^5\) enter a blessed condition in heaven which is preliminary and they receive at the resurrection their full reward and bliss.

We may now summarize briefly the various teachings on the intermediate state. Some authors envision a full preliminary reward for the righteous and punishment for the wicked (all or some of the wicked). This is the teaching of Enoch 22, IV Ezra (II Esdras) and 2 Baruch. Some state the godless immediately go to their final abode of punishment while

---


\(^3\)See earlier Section A, 2, a.

\(^4\)op.cit., pp. 260f.

\(^5\)God is frequently described as the "Lord of Spirits" in this section of Enoch (e.g. 39:2, 7; 43:4; 46:3; et al.)
the godly receive their reward at the resurrection (Ps. of Solomon). 2 Maccabees implies that some who are not immediately on their death included among those to be raised may, through the intercession of the living, be included finally. Enoch 37-71 speaks of the bliss of the righteous spirits after death with God and of their final and complete blessedness at the resurrection when the godless are also to receive their punishment (the wicked are not, apparently, to be punished until the day of judgment—45:2; 50:2, 4; 51:1ff.; but see 53:2ff.). The concept of human nature presupposed in these writings has in some respects departed from the Old Testament view of man. Even while these authors hold to a concept of resurrection, preserving the Old Testament view of man as a psycho-physical organism, a being to whom a body is necessary if he is to really be man, the view of human nature has been altered to allow for a fully conscious and human life without a body. The soul (resp.) spirit) can survive death without a body and be the recipient in a fully or nearly fully, conscious way of the action of God upon it either for good or ill. The remark of Volz on Enoch 22 is valid also for the other authors considered in this section: "Subject des Zwischenzustandes sind die leiblosen Geister, es wird ihnen allem nach volles Bewusstsein für ihren religiösen bzw. unreligen Zustand beigelegt." 2 The conception of man as having a soul capable of conscious existence and experience apart from the body while yet retaining the view

1Although some preliminary reward for the righteous possibly is indicated in Ps. of Solomon.
2Volz, op.cit., p. 258. See also Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 166, 167, 168f.
that fullness of life can occur only in the body, necessitating the faith in the resurrection, is a combination of the views of immortality of the soul (based on a Greek anthropology) and resurrection of the body (based on a Hebraic anthropology). It could well be that the compromise was not deliberate and artificial but rather was the product of outside foreign influence combined with the inner theological necessity of solving the dilemma posed by the question: "What happens to the dead (esp. the righteous) before the resurrection and judgment, and where are they now?"¹

4. The changing description of Sheol.

It will have been evident from the preceding discussion that the concept of the realm of the dead in this period is not the same as is found in the Old Testament.² A brief word needs to be said about this.³ For some authors Sheol is still the general abode of the dead (e.g. Tabit, Ecclesiastically, and most of the Apocrypha) as it is in the Old Testament. For others it is this general abode from which the righteous are raised at the last day (e.g. Isa. 26:19; Dan. 12:2f.; II Maccabees, et al.). As was noted above, others

²Though, to be sure, many of the writers of this period retained the Old Testament picture of the realm of the dead; See further D, 1.
divide Sheol into several places, one or more for the righteous, one or more for the wicked (e.g. Enoch 22; 2 Baruch; IV Ezra). The places received various names, though perhaps the most famous, from the New Testament standpoint, are Paradise and Abraham’s bosom (cf. Lk. 23:43; 16:22f.) as names for the place of blessedness, and Hell (Gehenna) as the place of the departed wicked when they received their punishment (e.g. Luke 12:5; Mt. 10:28). Other names for the place of punishment are: Hades (e.g. Ps. of Solomon 14:9; 15:10; 2 Enoch 40:12; Test. of 12, Levi 4; cf. Lk. 16:23), Abaddon (e.g. Enoch 51:1; cf. Rev. 9:11), Sheol (e.g. 2nd Esdras 4:7), "place of judgment" or "condemnation" (Jubilees 7:29; 22:22) and Tartarus (e.g. Sibylline Oracles, IV, 185; cf. 2 Peter 2:4). There are also many names for the place of blessedness. Among these are Palestine and Jerusalem (e.g. Jubilees 1:28; 4:26; Ps. of Sol. 11:17f.), the new Jerusalem (e.g. Enoch 90:28ff.; 2 Esdras 7:26), the earth (e.g. Enoch 10:16ff.), Garden (e.g. Apoc. of Abraham 12:21; Enoch 60:23; 2 Enoch 8:6; 42:3) and the upper world or heaven (e.g. Enoch 103:4; 104:2; 51:4; 52:1).

---

1e.g. Enoch 61:12. See Charles, Eschatology, pp. 234f., 262–64.


3e.g. Enoch 27:2.


5of Eden.
Thus it can be seen that the descriptions of places of blessedness and damnation are many and varied in this period. For our purposes it is necessary to emphasize several points. One is that the punishment of the wicked and the reward of the righteous can occur after death and before the resurrection. Second, the full and final reward (or punishment) is not received until after the "day of resurrection" (or judgment). Third, Sheol is now often divided and there are several places to which the departed may go at death rather than a single general abode for the dead. Yet the idea of a general abode is still retained by many authors, but it is partitioned into several divisions, some (or one) for the righteous, some (or one) for the wicked. For others, the righteous do not go (at all) to the underworld at death but rather are gathered in heaven, the underworld being reserved for the wicked. A fourth point is the concept of a place of punishment (usually Hades, Gehenna in the sense of Hell) reserved for the wicked, human and superhuman. This development is the product of the intensified desire for an exact retribution which will not allow the wicked to escape the dire consequences of their evil.

---

1 The contrast is thus "heaven and hell," as it also appears in much contemporary Christian usage. The idea in Judaism is, however, late—probably not before the first century A.D.

2 This is part of the background for the idea of Hell in the New Testament, esp. the Synoptic Gospels and the Revelation of John.
C. The Nature of the Resurrection Body.

The question as to the nature of the resurrection body in this period is not easy to answer. Few writers deal with the problem as such and one must draw conclusions regarding their views from indirect statements, as a rule. The early statements on resurrection affirm it with no details being given on the nature of the resurrection body (Isa. 26:19; Dan. 12:2f.). These appear to presuppose the body will be a material one and probably the same body that had previously been buried. When we turn to other pieces of literature, similar conceptions are found, especially in the earlier ones. There is, however, a materialistic tendency to be noted in many of these writings. It can hardly be denied that the view of 2 Maccabees is very materialistic. In 2 Macc. 7:11, the third son before he dies speaks, as he stretches forth his hands, "I got these from heaven, and for the sake of its laws I disregard them, and from it I hope to receive them back again" (cf. 7:22f.). The view of the nature of the resurrection body is apparently that it is identical with the present physical body, with its lost or disfigured members restored.1 II Esdras portrays the resurrection as a reuniting of the soul with the body: "the earth will give up those who are asleep in it and the dust those who are silent in it, and

---

1So also Volz, op. cit., p. 254.
the chambers will give up the souls that have been committed to them" (7:32). The references to earth and dust probably refer to the bodies that will be reunited to the souls that have been preserved in storehouses, especially the souls of the just (cf. 7:80, 95). II Baruch presents a similar idea of the reuniting of the body and soul at the resurrection (30:1ff.; cf. 21:23f.). Enoch 51:1 appears to have the same view: the souls are kept in dwelling places, while the body is in the earth and resurrection is a reuniting of the soul and body. Enoch 51:2 and 28 do not clearly indicate the nature of the resurrection but, from the figure of eating the tree of life, appears to suppose the identity of the present and future bodies. The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs is mixed: t. Judah 25 seems to suppose the identity of the present and future bodies (so also perhaps t. Zeb. 10), but the other sections are indecisive (see t. Simeon 6, t. Levi 18; t. Dan. 5). t. BenJ. 10 also appears to assume the identity of present and future bodies. A passage in the Apoc. of Baruch is especially interesting and instructive. The author asks, "In what shape (form) will those live who live in thy day?" (49:2). The answer is given, "For the earth will then assuredly restore the dead, which it

---

So also Volz, op.cit., p. 251.
So also Volz, op.cit., p. 251. See also Enoch 61:5 which seems to present the idea that the mutilated bodies of the righteous dead will be restored.
now receives, in order to preserve them, making no change in their form, but, as it has received, so will it restore them, and as I delivered them unto it, so also will it raise them" (50:2, Charles' translation, underlining mine). This exact restoration is needed to preserve identity and establish it with certainty—it is a means of recognition (50:3f.). If this were all that the book had to say on the subject, there would be little that could be called "new," though perhaps more exactly stated. But this is not all. Ch. 51 presents the further information that once the identity of the dead is established, the bodies of the righteous will be transformed: "as for the glory of those who have now been justified in my law, . . . , then their splendour will be glorified in changes, and the form of their face will be turned into the light of their beauty" (51:3; cf. rest of ch. 51). The wicked are also changed. As Volz writes, "after the judgment the blessed and cursed assume the character and fate correspondingly of glorious or hideous form, and the form of the blessed will be glorious as the angels." The concept of a transformation of the resurrection body is also found in the Similitudes of Enoch (37-71). Ch. 62:15f. speaks of the righteous, after their resurrection, as follows: "And they shall have been clothed with garments of glory, and they shall be garments of life from the Lord of Spirits: and your garments shall

1 Cf. I Cor. 15:35ff.
not grow old, nor your glory pass away before the Lord of Spirits" (62:15-16, cf. 51:4). In the light of passages such as 61:5, 51:1ff. a resurrection of the body is taught, but this body is to be transformed and glorified. It thus appears to be similar to the teaching of the Apoc. of Baruch.1

In summary, we should note the tendency to materialism prevalent in the literature of this period when referring to the nature of the resurrection body.2 There is, however, a tendency in some of the later authors to spiritualize this materialistic tendency (notably Enoch 37-71 and the Apoc. of Baruch3) by describing the resurrection body as a transformed, glorious one.4 But even here a body (apparently having some degree of materiality) is affirmed. The motives for this preservation of materiality5 are: one, the anthropological concept of the Old Testament; two, the necessity of the body to preserve identity.6

1In the light of the difficulty surrounding the dating of this section of Enoch, it is hard to say which, Baruch or Enoch 37-71, came first. Provisionally, we will accept the view that Enoch is earlier. See Glasson, Greek Influence, p. 41; Rowley, Relevance of Apocalyptic, pp. 56ff. and Note B at the end of this chapter.

2See e.g. also Volz, op.cit., pp. 249-255.

3Both probably in the first century A.D.

4The parallels in e.g. Mark 12:25 ("like the angels"); I Cor. 15:35ff. (esp. 15:42ff., 51) should be noted. See further Part IV.

5The material nature of the resurrection was strongly affirmed by the Rabbinic authors also. See Volz, op.cit., p. 250; Moore, op.cit., pp. 380ff.; Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 178-197 (esp. 191-197).

D. Summary

1. The diversity of belief in the Period.

We have already seen evidence of this diversity in the opposed views of resurrection of the body and immortality of the soul. We have also noted variances within the circle of adherents of the resurrection faith; resurrection of righteous only, resurrection of righteous and some of wicked, resurrection of all. We have seen too the varied conceptions as to when retribution takes place: at death, partially at death and fully on Day of Judgment and resurrection, only on Day of Judgment and resurrection. This diversity is also seen in the conception of the intermediate state (if any) and again in the views on the nature of the resurrection body.

In addition, however, to the diversity present among those who believed in some form of a blessed after life, we must also briefly note a further divergence in that many did not accept any of the above views of a happy or cursed future state but rather adhered to the older, traditional view of the Old Testament: the dead simply went to Sheol, there to remain with neither reward nor punishment beyond this life.¹ This the view held by most of the apocryphal authors. The Old Testament belief that premature death is a tragedy is

found in Ecclesiasticus 41:1, while the idea that the death of one who is old is no evil is given in the following verse (41:2). All are alike in death, which is the boundary placed on life by God:

_Do not fear the sentence of death; remember those who went before you and those who came after. This is the sentence of the Lord upon all flesh and blood, and how can you refuse what is the will of the Most High? Whether it was ten or a hundred or a thousand years, there is no reproach about life in Hades_ (Ecclus. 41:3-4; cf. 14:16-19; 38:16-23; 17:22-28).

No prospect for a future blessed life is offered in the books of Judith (e.g. 7:27), Tobit (e.g. 4:10), Baruch (e.g. 2:17) or 1 Maccabees (e.g. 2:49-70). The third and fifth books of the Sibyllene Oracles also hold to the traditional view.1 The Sadducees remained true to this Old Testament viewpoint throughout their existence.2

Thus the diversity in this period ranged from the traditionalist Old Testament Sheol doctrine to the varying beliefs regarding the resurrection and the immortality of the soul. There is little unity of thought in the details on the subject of life after death in the Jewish eschatology of this period. Yet, though the period is one in which thought on the subject is in a state of considerable flux and development, the lines are a bit more firmly drawn towards the end of the period (first century A.D.). The traditional Old Testament Sheol doctrine loses ground and resurrection faith,

---

1So Volz, _op.cit._, p. 233.
2See Moore, _op.cit._, pp. 316ff.; Volz, _op.cit._, p. 234; Bousset-Gresamann, _op.cit._, p. 193.
under the impetus of Pharasaic teaching, becomes increasingly dominant. In Hellenistic Judaism, the belief in the immortality of the soul was, for some, still a live option. This diversity of viewpoints forms a part of the background from which we must approach the teaching of the New Testament.

2. Major development of the period.

a. Resurrection of the body.

Among the developments during this period, among the most important from the New Testament standpoint, is the development of belief in a blessed life after death, particularly in the form of faith in the resurrection of the body. As we have seen the views of the various authors differ. For some only the just (either or both martyrs and all the just) will rise, for others the just and the unpunished wicked rise, for still others the resurrection concerns all men. Again, by way of further example, there are different ways of regarding the nature of the body that is raised: the identical body possessed in the present life, the identical body but soon transformed and changed, a completely new and transformed body. There are varying anthropological conceptions which are presupposed in these varying views. For example, the conception of man which underlies the view that the same physical body is raised as was buried appears to be the traditional Old Testament psychology which regards man as a psycho-physical organism.

---

1 See e.g. Bousset-Gressmann, *op.cit.*, pp. 273f.
Thus the man who will live at the resurrection is conceived as being the same man who now lives and will die.\(^1\) The belief that the body of the resurrection is a transformed body still presupposes the Old Testament psychology but has also modified it to some extent, though the essentiality of the body for human life is still affirmed. The belief in a transformed and glorified body rests more on theological than anthropological considerations.\(^2\)

b. The intermediate state.

The development of belief in the beginnings of blissful existence immediately after death with full bliss taking place at the resurrection is another important facet of the thought of this period. Again there is little unity in the details of the descriptions of the interim state of the dead. The dead are spoken of as resting, as being preserved in chambers, as sleeping, as being in paradise, Sheol or heaven and so on with greater, lesser or no preliminary enjoyment of the fruits of righteousness.\(^3\) The anthropological basis of the belief that man, as soul or spirit, lives on after death and is capable of experiencing blessing or curse,

---

1So also Volz, *op.cit.*, p. 253.
2The anthropological basis of the belief in an intermediate state will be briefly summarized in paragraph b. The anthropological basis of the belief in the immortality of the soul will be summarized in paragraph c. For details see above A, 1; B and the references cited there.
3See B above and also summary of Volz, *op.cit.*, pp. 247ff.
reward or punishment, is not the psychology of the Old Testament, though because belief in the resurrection is maintained, the Old Testament view of man still dominates. The view of the nature of man is actually a combination of Old Testament and Hellenistic views. Death is the separation of the soul (or spirit) from the body and the body now rests in the grave while the soul (or spirit) goes to its appointed preliminary destiny. That death is the separation of soul (spirit) and body and that the soul receives apart from the body the "first fruits" of the life of righteousness, or sin, is largely Hellenistic in outlook. The belief that at the resurrection the soul is reunited with the body and that it is the whole man who is to enter into the full fruits of blessedness (or punishment) rests largely on the anthropological presuppositions of the Old Testament. It is this combination of Hellenistic and Old Testament thought that assists in the explication of the doctrine of the intermediate state.

c. Immortality of the soul

The belief that the soul (or spirit) of man enters full and permanent bliss (or punishment) immediately after death was strongest in Hellenistic Judaism, though not confined to the Jews of the Diaspora. The Judgment and partition

---

2 What Volz, op. cit., p. 253 calls a "half-materialistic, half-spiritual view."
of souls occurs immediately on death. The anthropological basis of this belief is that man is essentially a being composed of parts. The soul is the essential part, the body the temporary dwelling or habitation of the soul. At death it is the body which dies, not the soul. On this view resurrection can neither be affirmed as desirable nor as essential. It is not needed at all, for the body is not really necessary to man as is the soul. Thus this view also was part of the environment surrounding the Christians, Jews and Gentiles, during the formative years of the New Testament period.

d. The concept of death.

As might be expected, the concept of death is varied in this period. It is a universal human fate and can be either tragic or the termination of human life with no tragic overtones and thus to be feared or not feared as the case may be. This is the view of death held by the Apocryphal writers in general. Other authors share in the main the view that death is a general human fate. For Hellenistic authors, in general,

---

1 cf. e.g. Heb. 9:27; II Cor. 5:8; Phil. 1:23.
2 On the above see A, 1 and see also Volz, op.cit., p. 118; Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 152ff.; et al.
3 See above in this section, sub-section 1.
4 Even those who adhere to a belief in a blessed future life assume death is the fate of all living beings. See also TWNT, op.cit., II, p. 857.
death is a liberating power.\(^1\) Death is a positive good, for at death the righteous soul departs to be with God (e.g. Wisdom 3:1; 9:15), or death can be an evil, for the unrighteous soul will be punished after death (e.g. Wisdom 2:24; 5:1-14; 6:5). Death is a power, hostile to and opposed to God and in the end He will destroy it (Isa. 25:7f.; II Esdras 8:53).\(^2\) Death is often closely connected with sin.\(^3\) All men have sinned and are thus worthy of death, according to some authors (e.g. Syriac Apoc. of Baruch 54:15ff.; Ecclus. 25:24; II Esdras 7:46; 8:35).\(^4\) Yet sinning is not a natural necessity—man cannot escape responsibility for his own acts (e.g. II Esdras 3:36; 7:18-24).\(^5\) Sin and its evil consequences, misfortune and death, rule man more and more harshly.\(^6\) Sin and death came into the world\(^7\) through Adam (II Esdras 3:7, 21ff.; 7:198; Wisdom 10:1f.; Syriac Baruch 17:3) or Eve (Ecclus. 25:24; B:10; 15ff.; II Enoch 31:6) or the envy of the devil (Wisdom 2:24; II Enoch 31:3ff.) or the fall of Angels (Enoch 6-8; 9:6, 8; 54:5-6; 100:4) or Demons (fallen Angels: Jubilees 5; Test.of Twelve, Naph., 3:5; Zadokite Document 2:14-3:12).\(^8\) The dependence of these ideas regarding the origin of death

---

3See also Bousset-Gressmann, op.cit., pp. 399-408; Volz, op.cit., pp. 332f., 65f., 300, etc.; and others.
4TWNT, op.cit., pp. 857f.
5Bousset-Gressmann, op.cit., p. 405.
6Ibid., p. 406.
7Ibid., pp. 406ff. References largely my own, for they are mostly lacking in Bousset-Gressmann, except those in Wisdom, II Baruch (Syrias) and II Esdras.
8See further Part II, Ch. 2, B, 1, d.
on Gen. 3 or 6 is quite obvious.


a. Retribution.

The desire for vindication on the part of the just for the wrongs suffered at the hands of the unjust played a prominent role in the rise and development of belief in a life after death, as we have seen earlier.¹ The departed, especially the martyrs, would receive their share in the blessings of the coming Golden Age. This is one of the motives for the resurrection of the just. But it is not only, by some, deemed just for the righteous martyrs to be rewarded with a happy future life but also it is not just that the wicked who have died and escaped punishment should be allowed finally to escape the judgment of God. This leads to a resurrection of the just and of the unpunished wicked. For others, all of the just and all of the wicked must receive the due recompense for their actions, faith and deeds in this life. But retribution is not exact in this life, for often the righteous suffer and the wicked prosper and even where the righteous receive some reward and the wicked some punishment in this life, justice requires more. Hence a new life is required where retribution is administered to all. Resurrection is now a general

resurrection. The theological basis of this is the belief that God is a God of justice and judgment.1

b. The prophetic teaching on the coming of God's rule.

The conviction of the prophets and their teaching regarding the certainty of the coming of God's absolute sovereignty over the world, with Israel at the center of this consummation of the purpose of God, was also influential in the development of hope for a life after death.2 The resurrection is an eschatological event and occurs as part of the action of God in completing history and establishing His universal sovereignty. The presence of the faithful departed must be included in the final coming of the Kingdom, according to some authors.3 The theological basis for this belief is that God is the Lord of history and the God of all power.

c. Communion with God.

The chief blessing of life in the Old Testament was communion with God, as we have seen.4 The chief motive in the

---

1 The prophetic concept of the Day of the Lord was very influential on the thought of the Intertestamental period. See esp. Volz, op.cit., and Bousset-Gressmann, op.cit., on the subjects of retribution, judgment and the Day of the Lord.

2 See on this aspect Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 205; Volz, op.cit., pp. 63-77, 97-117, 368ff.; Bousset-Gressmann, pp. 213-242; Charles, Eschatology, various pages (see index); et al.

3 Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 205. But it must not be thought that this belief was universally accepted. Just as there could be a kingdom of God without the necessity of a Messiah, so there could be a final realization of God's purpose without the necessity of a future life for the departed. See esp. Volz, op.cit., and Bousset-Gressmann, op.cit.

4 Part I, ch. 1; Part II, ch. 2.
rise of hope for a blessed future life is the hope for a continued communion with God after death.¹ So also in this period, communion with God is one of the chief motives for faith in a life after death,² whether in the form of resurrection or immortality. The man of faith in this period does not seek or hope only for an unending extension of temporal, earthly life, nor does he seek above all else for a reward or retribution after death.³ Rather he seeks an eternal realization of fellowship with God. The faith in a life after death is chiefly a faith in the prolongation of communion with God. He is raised from the dead by God, or at death is received into the presence of God. Life after death is an event of glory ( yapar).⁴ It is a participation in the eternal living community of the people of God—fellowship with one another, but above all, fellowship with God. Resurrection of the body is necessary, for some authors, in order to preserve individuality and identity, but above all it is necessary if it is to be man, as understood in terms of the Old Testament psychology, who is to enjoy this continued fellowship. As stated earlier,⁵ the belief in resurrection is more concerned with the "how" of continued fellowship than the "that" of the fellowship. But

¹See Part III, ch. 1.
³Nikolainen, op. cit., p. 206.
⁵Part III, ch. 1, 6, 2; D.
behind the conviction that resurrection is the means of continued fellowship stands the prior conviction "that" there is continued fellowship after death. This hope is grounded in the theological conception of God as a God of grace and deliverance.¹

Additional Note B.

Approximate Dating of Literary Documents of the Intertestamental Period.

For our purposes it is sufficient to establish only the approximate dates and period of these documents. The majority of them are prior to the Christian era and so their influence is contemporary with the New Testament period. It is thus only necessary to establish these dates in order to be able to place the development in some semblance of order and thus to portray the general pre-New Testament period.

The main sources utilized are Charles, Rowley and Pfeiffer.²

¹See Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 205.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption of Moses</th>
<th>Charles</th>
<th>Pfeiffer</th>
<th>Rowley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-29 A.D.</td>
<td>6-30 A.D.</td>
<td>c.30 A.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apoc. of Baruch</td>
<td>66 A.D.</td>
<td>c. 90 A.D.</td>
<td>First or 2nd century A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(II Baruch)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiasticus</td>
<td>200-175 B.C.</td>
<td>C. 180 B.C.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoch: 6-36</td>
<td>180-170 B.C.</td>
<td>C. 100 B.C.</td>
<td>150-100 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-71</td>
<td>94-64 B.C.</td>
<td>100-80 B.C.</td>
<td>Maccabean Age (c. 150 B.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-90</td>
<td>161 B.C.</td>
<td>163-100 B.C.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92, 94-105</td>
<td>95-64 B.C.</td>
<td>100-80 B.C.</td>
<td>c. 90 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Ezra</td>
<td>c. 120 A.D.</td>
<td>c. 90 A.D.</td>
<td>1 cent. A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilees^2</td>
<td>135-105 B.C.</td>
<td>c. 125 B.C.</td>
<td>c. 135 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life of Adam</td>
<td>60-30 A.D.</td>
<td>c. 40 A.D.</td>
<td>c. 100 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Maccabees</td>
<td>137-105 B.C.</td>
<td>135-100 B.C.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps. Solomon</td>
<td>70-49 B.C.</td>
<td>c. 50 B.C.</td>
<td>c. 50 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test. of Job</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>100-75 B.C.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test. of Twelve^3</td>
<td>109-40 B.C.</td>
<td>140-110 B.C.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td>c. 200 B.C.</td>
<td>180-170 B.C.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

^Milik, op.cit., pp. 33f. and Cross, op.cit., p. 150n. agree that Enoch 37-71 (Similitudes) belongs to the Christian era and is either a Christian work or a Jewish work edited later by a Christian. This is based on the failure to find this section in any of the Qumran copies and fragments of Enoch. Milik confirms the date as being earlier than 100 B.C. See Ten Years of Discovery, p. 32.

^Pre Christian date not confirmed by Qumran findings. See Milik, op.cit., pp. 34f.; Cross, op.cit., p. 149.

^Book is composite, according to Charles.
Where a date is not contested, blank spaces were not filled in from other sources consulted.

**Other works (Hellenistic Judaism).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Charles</th>
<th>Pfeiffer</th>
<th>Rowley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II Enoch</td>
<td>1-50 A.D.</td>
<td>1-100 A.D.</td>
<td>7th cent. A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Macc.</td>
<td>c. 50 B.C.</td>
<td>75-1 B.C.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Macc.</td>
<td>c. 100 B.C.</td>
<td>75-1 B.C.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Macc.</td>
<td>c. 70 A.D.</td>
<td>1-30 A.D.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wis. of Solomon</td>
<td>145 B.C. to</td>
<td>100 to 50 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 A.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part IV

The New Testament and Eternal Life
To give a full and complete picture and interpretation of the meaning and significance of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus is beyond the scope of our purpose. It is, further, not necessary to our purpose to present a detailed discussion of the atonement. We will, however, be touching upon various aspects in a brief way which will, we believe, illumine our purpose, namely, to consider the NT teaching on the subject of the nature of man in relation to death and the future life. To do this will require us to deal with certain relevant aspects of the topics indicated by the title to this chapter.¹

¹Detailed works on these subjects are numerous and the writer's dependence on them will be obvious. References to some of these will appear in footnotes and Bibliography, but others undoubtedly will be present, though without specific acknowledgement since they are now so much a part of the author's thought as to be no longer, to him at least, distinguishable as separate references. Among these must be mentioned esp. the works of Calvin, Luther, Brunner, and Barth.
A. Jesus’ Mighty Works Against the Powers of Evil.¹

1. The Messianic signs (Mt. 11:2-6; Lk. 7:18-23).

This passage from the Q document presents the story of the imprisoned John the Baptist sending some of his disciples, on hearing of Jesus’ deeds (ἐγέραντο), to ask Jesus if he is “The coming one” (ὁ ἐρχόμενος). Instead of directly answering the question and affirming (or denying) that he is “he who cometh,” Jesus replies in an indirect way:

Go and tell John what you hear and see: the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up (ἐγέραντο), and the poor have good news preached to them (RSV).

Bultmann² believes this passage was reshaped by the Christian community in order to serve the apologetic purpose of making John the Baptist into a witness to Jesus as the Messiah. This is, as Manson³ points out, a probable solution, but equally probable is that it may well have occurred as an incident in the life of Jesus as the story itself affirms. Further, the story itself lacks several items that would surely have served the apologetic motif, if indeed this motif is present. For one thing, the phrase (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) could have been replaced by a more direct title of Messiahship,

¹See also Part II, B, 1.
³Manson, Jesus, p. 38.
for this title was not, apparently, a common Messianic term, especially in primitive Christian circles.\(^1\) Secondly, no report is given of John's response to Jesus' answer. John's reaction surely would have clinched the case for any Christian apologist! We must hold, then, that there is good reason to take the incident as it stands\(^2\) -- a self-contained story.\(^3\)

Jesus, in pointing to His Messiahship, does not directly affirm it. Instead He points to what He is doing, the works of healing and preaching. Jesus thus points to His work as the fulfillment of the Messianic hope. Isa. 61:1 is the basic passage that illuminates this text.\(^4\) The text of Isaiah colors Jesus' answer to John, the answer being deliberately framed to point out its fulfillment.\(^5\) Kümmel writes that "Jesus' answer undoubtedly alludes to the promises in Isaiah; and in particular the idea of the eschatological good tidings to the poor is derived from there."\(^6\)

---


\(^2\)Manson, Jesus, pp. 381; Kümmel, op. cit., pp. 109ff.; et al. believe also that the story is fully authentic.

\(^3\)It is uncertain that the context of the incident is correct as given in Matthew or Luke, for they do not quite agree. But this problem does not affect our situation.

\(^4\)See also Isa. 29:18ff.; 35:5ff.; 42:6ff.

\(^5\)This may account for the absence of a reference to the casting out of demons which elsewhere is affirmed as a strong indication of the inbreaking of the Messianic age (cf. Mt. 12:28; Lk. 11:20). See J. Schmid, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, RNT, Vol. I, (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1956), p. 6189.

\(^6\)op. cit., p. 110.
The promises of the last days are being fulfilled. The Kingdom of God is present and beginning to manifest itself. Jesus focuses attention on himself in this connection on His deeds and message. "So Jesus' reply to the Baptist's question claims that the acts and message are to be regarded as a proof of the beginning of the Kingdom of God, and it sees this beginning taking place exclusively in Jesus and his activity." What is expected in the future is already taking place, the lame walk, the blind see, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, to the poor is preached the Gospel, lepers are cleaned. The detached logion in Mt. 13:16 refers to the same double aspect of seeing the deeds of Jesus and hearing His message, even as John's disciples are told, "tell John what you hear and see." This passage again affirms the presence of the eschatological age:

Blessed are your eyes, for they see, and your ears for they hear. Truly, I say to you, many prophets and righteous men desired to see what you see, and did not see it, and to hear what you hear, and did not hear it (Mt. 13:16-17; Lk. 10:23f.Q).

These are blessed times because the Messianic age is breaking in and the enemy in all its forms is being encountered and defeated.  

---

1Ibid., p. lll.  
2Ibid.  
3See e.g. also Acts 10:36ff. (esp. v. 38); 2:22; Lk. 13:16.
2. The encounter with the enemy.

a. General statement.

We have already seen\(^1\) that the OT refers to death as a power and that any lessening of the force of life is a manifestation of the power of death. This power is to be seen in such things as sickness, persecution, injury, etc. In the light of this OT teaching and in the light of the belief in the conquest of death as one of the blessings of the coming age, the answer of Jesus to the question of John the Baptist is particularly instructive. Each of the points covered in Jesus' answer can be illustrated from the Synoptic accounts of the ministry. Jesus' miracles, or mighty works\(^2\) as the Synoptists prefer to title them, may thus be understood not only as signs\(^3\) of the presence of the Messiah and the Kingdom of God but also as eschatological symbols in the sense of symbols of the attack on the powers of darkness.\(^4\) We now turn briefly to the activities described in Mt. 11:5 as the

---

\(^1\)Part II, Ch. 1, B, esp. 2c and 3.

\(^2\)ἐνεργεῖ

\(^3\)οὐσία

signs of the encounter with the enemy. Several of these will be considered at greater length: exorcisms and the raising of the dead. The examples of these signs are given by Matthew in chapters 8-9 of the Gospel. Luke gives fewer specific examples in direct connection with the answer to the Baptist, using instead a few examples and a summary statement: "In that hour he cured many of diseases and plagues and evil spirits, and on many who were blind he bestowed sight" (Lk. 7:21).

In Matthew 8 - 9 the blind receive their sight1 (9:27-31)2, the lame walk (8:5-13; 9:2-7), lepers are cleansed (Mt. 8:1-4).3

---

1 See also Mt. 12:22; 15:30-31; 21:14; Mk. 8:22ff.
2 Probably a doublet, repeated in Mt. 20:29-34 (Mk. 10:46-52; Lk. 18:35-43). The problems connected with this passage are discussed in Bultmann, Geschichte, pp. 228, 345; Taylor, Mark, pp. 44ff.; Schmid, Matthäus, p. 173; Klostermann, Markus, p. 109; et al. The solution to the difficulty does not alter the usage in Matthew as an example of the fulfillment of the signs of the Messianic age of Mt. 11:5. That healings of the blind were attributed to Jesus in the Synoptic tradition cannot be denied.

From Mark 2:1-12 (see Lk. 5:17-26). The problems raised by Bultmann, Geschichte, pp. 12ff., do not affect the contention that the passage in Mt. is a fulfillment of the signs in 11:5. Bultmann does not deny the authenticity of the miracle of healing, but does question the saying on forgiveness. In my opinion the solution given by Manson, Jesus, pp. 40ff., is quite correct on all grounds. He also points out the event is one of Messianic significance.

Other occasions of healing the lame (or paralyzed) can be found in Lk. 13:10ff.; Mt. 9:35; 4:23ff.

From Mark 1:40-45. See also e.g. Lk. 4:40; 17:12ff.; Mt. 10:8.
and the deaf hear (9:32-33), and the poor have the Gospel preached to them (9:35ff.; cf. Mk. 1:15; Mt. 4:23ff.; 5:3-5; Lk. 5:43ff.; 8:1f. and other passages where Jesus' teaching and preaching ministry is described.)

b. The dead are raised.

Two incidents in the Gospel accounts are directly relevant here. The first is the story of Jairus' daughter (Mt. 5:22-24, 35-43; Mt. 9:18-19, 23-26; Lk. 8:40-42, 49-56). Bultmann feels the story has many features in common with the Hellenistic miracle stories and is probably the production of the community designed to enhance the estimation of Jesus. He lists several elements in Mark's account which he regards as typical of such accounts. Yet many of these same elements are listed by Taylor as reasons for affirming the genuineness of the account. To Taylor, it has the ring of "a record based on personal testimony." The amount of detail does not give the
impression of a story formulated by the community.1 As Taylor has convincingly shown, the tendency in oral transmission is to abbreviation, not expansion.2 One might also ask why, if the early Church was given to this sort of glorification of Jesus as a wonder worker, there are not more stories of raisings of the dead.3 As Manson has well pointed out if such a tendency to produce the miraculous out of the non-miraculous were present in the early Christian community, why was not such a ready-made story, for example, as is found in Mk. 9:14ff. utilized in this connection? V. 26 expressly states that "the boy was like a corpse; so that most of them said, 'He is dead,'" Yet the Markan account is careful to present the story as a healing, an exorcism, but not a raising of the dead. Nor in the parallels in the later Gospels is such a tendency noted (Matthew's story is shorter than Mark's), for both authors have missed the opportunity to emphasize the idea of death found in germ in Mark 9:26, the verse being omitted in both Mt. and Lk. The stories of the raising of the dead do, however, have affinities with those in the OT attributed to Elijah and Elisha (I Kings 17:17ff.; 2 Kings 4:18-37). The story of the raising of the dead in Luke 7:11-17 has in common with these that they all involve the only

---

1So also Taylor, Formation of the Gospel Tradition, p. 123.
2Ibid., pp. 124ff., 202ff.
3There are only two in the Synoptic accounts: Mk. 5 and Lk. 7:11-17 from source L.
4Jesus, p. 46.
child (son) of the family.

We may now turn to the story in Mk. 5 as an account of resurrection of the dead. The raising of Jairus' daughter is a demonstration of Jesus' power in opposition to death. Jesus here encounters and defeats the power of death.

Again, in view of the OT teaching on death as a power, the raising of the dead differs only in degree from the healings. Both are encounters with and victories over the power of death. To be sure, miraculous deeds are attributed to other figures in antiquity and there are similarities with the Gospel accounts. But as Grundmann has pointed out, the stories in the Gospels are designed to portray the signs of the Kingdom and not to enhance the reputation of Jesus. Jesus does them in the power of God, not by His "own" power and these events are the signs of the advent of the Kingdom and the Messiah and of the conquest of the powers of death and sin in sickness. That there is little difference between the healings and raisings


2^Perhaps a preliminary fulfillment of Isa. 26 and Dan.

12? See also Mt. 27:52f.

3^Leivestad, op.cit., p. 62; Nikolainen, op.cit., 16.

4^Attention has already been called to Elijah and Elisha in the OT. See also 2 Kgs. 13:21. See also TWNT, op.cit., II, pp. 302f.; Bultmann, Geschichte, pp. 223ff., 248; Form Criticism, pp. 36ff.; Klostermann, Markus, pp. 50f.; et al.

5^TWNT, II, 302f.

6^Ibid.
of the dead, except in degree, and that there is not a pronounced tendency among NT authors to magnify Jesus as a wonder-worker can also be seen in that only two cases of the raising of the dead are to be found in the Synoptic Gospels: the text we are now considering and the story of the raising of the widow's son (Lk. 7:11-17). To return to our story, Jesus proceeds to the house of Jairus in spite of the news that the girl has died (v. 35). After excluding the skeptical mourners, Jesus enters the house with the parents and three of His disciples. The words of v. 39, "The child is not dead but sleeping" present a problem. Does Jesus mean to infer that the child is not really dead but only appears to be dead and is in what we would call a coma? From the face value of the language this must be regarded as a possibility meant by "she is not dead." Some commentators take the reference in Mark to mean that the child is actually dead. Some help is gained from the use of the verb διανοομαι, which is used elsewhere to refer to death as a sleep (LXX of Ps. 87:6; Dan. 12:2 and

---

1 Some commentators believe this is a possible, if not likely view. See e.g. Taylor, Mark, pp. 286, 295; A. Plummer, The Gospel According to St. Luke, 166, 4 ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1916), p. 237; Th. Robinson, Matthew, p. 82. Robinson regards this as probably being the meaning in Mark, while Matthew has asserted the actual death of the child. He also states, however, that Mark is uncertain.

also I Thess. 5:10). Of some 21 uses of ἐλέεινω in the NT, the majority refer to natural sleep. One case definitely uses it as a synonym for death (I Thess. 5:10). Eph. 5:14 may also refer to death in the sense of sleep—whether the passage is part of a Christian hymn of the resurrection or a hymn of spiritual life. The use in Eph. 5:14, however, is not certain. Nowhere in the NT is the verb used in the sense of "coma" or "trance". Mark 13:36 might be stretched to mean "coma" or "trance", but this is a very unlikely interpretation of the passage and no commentator has done this to my knowledge. Mark 5:39 is the only place, the only place, where the word is used in the sense of "sleeplike trance" or "deathlike sleep", if we take the line of interpretation suggested by some commentators. The parallels in Mt. and Lk. definitely mean it in the sense of actual death. Surely this is slim evidence upon which to build a case for Mark 5:39 meaning "trance". One must further note about the passage that Jesus makes the statement about "sleeping" prior to His entrance into the house. Since all the information regarding the girl up to this point has come from the father, his

---

1 ἱδρομένω is used more frequently in this sense than ἐλέεινω. See TWNT, III, pp. 431-440; III, p. 13 n. 60.

2 If the evidence of ἱδρομένω is considered, the case for "trance" becomes even more doubtful. Out of about 18 uses in the NT, 14 refer clearly to death. None refer to anything like a coma. The evidence for the use of "sleep" (whether ἐλέεινω or the more usual ἱδρομένω) in the sense of death is overwhelming—a fact of some significance in interpreting Mk. 5:39. The uses of the idea of "sleep" for death outside the NT are sufficiently numerous to confirm this impression. See also the following chapter.
messengers or the crowd around the house, one wonders where
He received His information that the girl is in a coma, if
such is the case, rather than being actually dead.\(^1\) Surely
the positing of some such extra, non-human (apparently),
source of information carries as many overtones of "magic",
the supernatural and mysterious as the raising of the dead
which some commentators seek to avoid! We conclude, then,
that the passage does not mean a coma, but rather, as the
most likely interpretation, means actually death.\(^2\) The
situation is, thus, a case of a raising from the dead by the
power of Jesus.\(^3\) The power of Christ in opposition to the
powers of sin, death and evil is illustrated and demonstrated
in this as in other acts of power. The dead in the presence
of Jesus' power (the power of God) are only asleep.\(^4\) Isa.
26:19 and Dan. 12:2f. are here fulfilled, though only in a
preliminary way. The raising of the girl is only a sign
of the eschatological resurrection,\(^5\) it is not itself the
beginning of the eschatological resurrection. It is a sign
that one is in the presence of Him who has the power over
death. The girl will yet die again, and this is thus not a

\(^1\) See Taylor, Mark, p. 295.
\(^2\) A coma, in view of the language, is still a possible
meaning, but not, in my estimation, a likely one.
\(^3\) It should be noted, however, that with either inter-
pretation (coma or death) an encounter with the power of
death is intended and meant. This is clear from earlier
remarks in this chapter and in the light of the OT teaching
on death (e.g. Ps. 107:17f.; 86:13; 116:8).
\(^4\) So Nikolainen, op. cit., p. 17.
\(^5\) Paul, for example, does not point to such events in
the tradition but rather calls the resurrection of Christ
"the first fruits" (I Cor. 15:20).
resurrection in the fully eschatological sense of the term. \(^1\) Jesus says that she sleeps and then says, "οὗτος γὰρ τὸ μικρόν κορίτσι ἔτεκεν ἡμῖν ("little girl, I say to you, arise"). \(^2\) Klosterman\(^3\) writes that "Jesus designates this death, which will immediately be annulled by the miracle as something not lasting: the girl is not finally dead, but sleeps so to speak for a time." Taylor\(^4\) concedes on this point that "it is possible that, while ἐκάθευσα does not mean death as men use the word, it describes it as God sees it, namely, as a sleep from which there is to be a speedy awakening."\(^5\)

The way is now clear for a brief consideration of the story in Luke 7:11-17 (the raising of the widow's son at Nain). Luke presents the story as a preliminary to the answer given to the question of John (7:18-23). It is indicated that John's disciples have witnessed this event, or at least heard of it (7:18). The act of raising the widow's son was performed in the presence of a large crowd, unlike the more private

\(^1\) See also Nikolainen, *op.cit.*, p. 18.

\(^2\) Bultmann's remark that such miracles are accompanied typically by a word in a foreign tongue (*Form Criticism*, p. 38) overlooks the fact that Aramaic would not be strange to any of those present!


\(^4\) Mark, p. 295.

\(^5\) One is tempted to think also that the remark of Jesus ("the child is not dead but sleeping") is intended as a rebuke of the Jewish mourning customs which in spite of a belief in the resurrection demonstrated extreme grief in the presence of death.
raising of Jairus' daughter.\(^1\) In this story there is nothing to indicate that a trance or coma could be the actual situation. The language is quite clear, although no word of Jesus is given to demonstrate this directly.\(^2\) We are told by Luke\(^3\) that Jesus' motive for the act is "compassion".\(^4\) In Luke the story is presented with obvious reference to the fulfillment of the signs spoken of in reply to John (7:22f.).\(^5\) Thus we have again the presentation of the events which herald the Messianic Age.\(^6\) "In the new world of the sovereignty of God sickness is annulled and death conquered."\(^7\)

c. Exorcisms.\(^8\)

That Jesus performed exorcisms is a fundamental part of the Gospel tradition.\(^9\) The details of particular exorcism

\(^1\)Bultmann, _Geschichte_, p. 230 remarks that it is "typical" of such stories that a crowd is present to serve later as witnesses. Yet on Mark 5:27–43 he remarks that it is "typical" that the crowd is excluded (p. 229; see also _Form Criticism_, p. 38 where he also noted as typical that no one is present at the miracle proper.). One wonders which of these is really "typical"!

\(^2\)In Jn. 11:11–14 Jesus is reported as saying of Lazarus that "he is dead." The reference in vs. 11 to sleeping in the light of this is instructive.

\(^3\)The story is from source L.

\(^4\)See also Manson, _Luke_, p. 77; et.al.

\(^5\)This is also noted by Nikolainen, _op.cit._, p. 19; K. Rengstorff, _Das Evangelium nach Lukas_, NTD (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1935), p. 85; et.al.

\(^6\)See Rengstorff, _Lukas_, p. 84.

\(^7\)Schniewind, _Matthäus_, p. 136 (to Mt. 11:5).


\(^9\)So Manson, _Jesus_, p. 44.
stories do not concern us\(^1\), for the main import of these stories is clear. They follow a somewhat typical pattern\(^2\): Jesus is recognized by the demons as the Messiah (e.g. Mk. 1:23ff.; 1:34.; 5:7), who are commanded to silence (e.g. Mk. 1:34, 3:12; 9:25), and are cast out by a word (command) of power (e.g. 1:25; 5:9, 13; 9:25). Usually also the effect of the demon on the one possessed is described and also some act of the demon as he leaves\(^3\) (e.g. Mk. 1:26; 5:2ff., 13; 9:20, 26) and the effect of the exorcism on the onlookers (e.g. Mk. 1:27; 5:14ff.). The connection of demons with certain forms of human malady was a common belief in the ancient world.\(^4\) This is especially the case with those forms of sickness, mental illness and the like which produce unusual aberrations in human behavior (e.g. epilepsy, Mt. 17:15).\(^5\) Satan and the demonic spirits cause much of the sickness and torment of man\(^6\) (e.g. Lk. 13:16; Mk. 3:23-30; Lk. 11:17-23; Mt. 12:25-37; cf. Acts 10:38, 2 Cor. 12:7). The exorcisms are

---

\(^1\) For details see commentaries on the respective passages where such stories are found and works cited in note \(^5\) above.

\(^2\) This pattern has influenced the form of other miracle stories (e.g. see the exorcistic pattern apparent in Mk. 1:42-44; 4:39). See Manson, *Jesus*, p. 44.


\(^5\) Lk. 13:16 forms a noteworthy exception of a case of normal illness being caused by demon possession. This is, however, in keeping with the view that the power of death manifests itself in any lessening of the power and enjoyment of life. The connection of Satan and demons with evil, sin and death is clear. See also Leivestad, *op.cit.*, p. 42.

\(^6\) TWNT, II, p. 19.
are regarded in the Synoptics as direct onslaughts on the power of the Satanic rule (e.g. see references above). They thus function as further signs of the advent of the Messianic Age.\(^1\) The demons recognize with whom they are dealing\(^2\) (e.g. Mk. 1:24, 34; 5:7; Mt. 8:29), and Jesus' power over them is demonstrated by His Casting them out with a word of command\(^3\) (e.g. Mk. 1:25, 27, 34; 5:8, 13; 9:25), the exercise of the divine power and authority working through Him,\(^4\) (e.g. see Mark 1:22ff.; 3:22-27; Lk. 11:20; Mt. 12:28).

---

\(^1\)The significance of Mk. 3:23-30 and parallels will be dealt with in the following section.  
3. The strong man plundered (Mk. 3:22-27; Lk. 11:14-23; Mt. 12:22-30).

In this event, a pronouncement story found in both Markan and Q sources,¹ is to be found further confirmation of the thesis that Jesus' ministry of preaching and healing is an onslaught on the forces of evil. Jesus is accused of casting out demons "by Beelzebul, the prince of demons" (Mk. 3:22; Lk. 11:15; Mt. 12:24).² Jesus replies to this charge by affirming that if such were the case, then Satan³ is divided against himself and his kingdom is at an end (Mk. 3:23-26). Jesus then gives the saying on the strong man: "But no one can enter a strong man's house and plunder his goods, unless he first finds the strong man; then indeed he may plunder his house" (Mk. 3:27). Jesus conceives of Himself as the stronger man (ὁ ἄρχων, cf. Lk. 11:22). Matthew's version of this saying follows Mark rather closely, while Luke presents a similar idea in a quite different form.⁴ The idea in any case is clear: "His exorcisms prove that He has penetrated into the house of the Strong Man, that he has bound him and plundered his goods."⁵ The exorcisms are

¹So. e.g. Manson, Jesus, p. 39, Taylor, Formation of the Gospel Tradition, p. 64; Bultmann, Geschichte, p. 10.
²Matthew has "a prince", Mk. and Lk. have "the prince".
³Jesus here identifies Beelzebul with Satan. On Beelzebul see esp. TWNT, I, pp. 605f.; Taylor, Mark, pp. 238-239; Klostermann, Markus, p. 37; et.al.
⁴For details see esp. Taylor, Mark, p. 242; Bultmann, Geschichte, p. 10-12; et.al.
⁵Taylor, Mark, p. 247.
signs of the kingdom. The comment of Fuller that the "first" of Mk. 3:27 refers to the decisive event of the future is a suggestive idea in the light of Jewish and Christian belief and the "binding of Satan" at the end of the age (e.g. see Isa. 24:21ff.; Rev. 20:2f.; Enoch 10:1ff.; Test. of Levi 18:12; Test. of Zeb. 9:8; Jub. 10:8). These signs performed by Jesus, of which exorcisms is one, are the preliminary plundering of the house of the "strong one" - his final overthrow and the final encounter with him are yet in the future. The Kingdom of God has already begun to come to pass, for if, as we have attempted to show, the exorcisms and other mighty works of Jesus are the power of God already at work against the forces of evil, than the strong man must already be bound, if Jesus is already despoiling him of his goods. But this is not yet the ultimate victory. It is only the victorious preliminary skirmish. The finally decisive battle is yet to take place - in the death of Jesus and His resurrection. Now only the signs are present.

1 Manson, Jesus, p. 39; Leivestad, op.cit., p. 47; Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, p. 168; Kümme, Promise, pp. 108f.; et.al.
2 Mission and Achievement of Jesus, p. 38.
3 See also Kümme, Promise, p. 109; Taylor, Mark, p. 241; TWNT, III, pp. 403f.
4 cf. Kümme, Promise, p. 109 ("Jesus here also sees the fight against Satan taking place in his acts of exorcism. But this fight has already been won, because Satan must be bound if he can be robbed of the children whom he has dominated.").
5 See B and C of this chapter. Cf. also Leivestad, op.cit., 49; Fuller, Mission and Achievement, p. 38
We must now turn to the Q reference in Lk. 11:20 (Mt. 12:28); "But if it is by the finger (spirit, Mt.) of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you." The critical word here is ἐφορέω. The word has two basic meanings: one, the older meaning, "to precede"; two, "to have just arrived", "to come". The first appears with certainty only once (ITh. 4:15), while the second meaning appears clearly in Rom. 9:31; 2 Cor. 10:14; I Th. 2:16; Phil. 3:16. The translation of the Q passage given above is widely accepted as correct. Thus the Kingdom has in a real sense already arrived -- its power is already breaking into the present world, though it has not arrived in all its fullness. "Jesus' conviction shows itself clearly that the future Kingdom of God had already begun in his activity."
The emphatic \( \varepsilon \gamma \nu \) of Mt. 12:28 must also be noted in this detached saying.\(^1\) The signs are seen in the activity of Jesus, in His person. The \( \varepsilon \gamma \nu \) denotes a Messianic consciousness in Jesus.\(^3\) Jesus' "actions and speaking are supported by the fact that he has the sovereignty over against the 'strong one', he has subdued the 'strong one' and brings the sovereignty of God in place of the sovereignty of Satan."\(^4\)

The late Prof. W. Manson has, I believe, put it well when he wrote:\(^5\) "There is no reason whatsoever for doubting that the historical Jesus saw in his exorcisms a break-up of the power of Satan and a sign that the Reign of God was not merely already knocking at the door, but had irrupted into the enemy's country."

It will have been noted, finally, that in this discussion of the Messianic signs present in Jesus' mighty works we have avoided mention of the class known as "nature

---

\(^1\) Lk. 11:20 has \( \varepsilon \gamma \nu \) in some MSS, but it is lacking in others. The support on both sides is strong and it is difficult to say which is the correct reading. On the basis of Mt. 12:28 and my own opinion that the evidence is stronger for \( \varepsilon \gamma \nu \) (Nestle prints it in the main body of the text, 23rd ed.) than against it (see Nestle ed.), \( \varepsilon \gamma \nu \) will be assumed for both passages.

\(^2\) So Kümmel, Promise, pp. 105f. Otherwise Mt. 12:27; Lk. 11:19 would mean the Jewish exorcists are also giving signs of the Kingdom's arrival!

\(^3\) So also Kümmel, Promise, p. 108; Leivestad, op.cit., p. 46.

\(^4\) TWNT, III, p. 404.

\(^5\) Jesus, p. 39, commenting on Mk. 3:22-30; Lk. 11:14-23; Mt. 12:22-37.
miracles". This has been deliberate for two major reasons: one, space limitations, since our case is adequately demonstrated in the other mighty-works; two, the questionable aspects of these stories. We may, however, indicate the lines along which such a treatment would follow in the light of the above discussion of the other signs. We would use primarily the line of thought based on the OT conception of death and its realm. In this light the stilling of the Storm (Mk. 4:35-41) and the Walking on the Water (Mk. 6:45-52) could be seen as demonstrations of Jesus' power over the ocean as a realm of death (see also Ps. 89:9f.; 107:29). The Feeding of the Five Thousand (Mk. 6:34-44) would be the demonstration of Jesus' power over the desert (resp. wilderness) as a realm of death. As consequence, these would be


2 See above Part II, Ch. 1, B, 2 and 3.

3 Just as the Raising of the Dead demonstrated His power over Sheol, and the Grave. Possibly the Draught of Fishes (Lk. 5:1-11) could be also seen in this light.

4 The Feeding of the Four Thousand (Mk. 8:1-10) would also be included if it were regarded as a separate event rather than, as is more likely, a doublet.

5 See e.g. again Ps. 107 (esp. vv. 4ff., 35ff.). Ps. 107 is a remarkable Psalm in the light of the realms of death and God's power over them. Wm. Manson has well noted in this connection that such OT passages must have influenced NT tradition (see Jesus, p. 45). One might also draw a parallel between Jesus' feeding people in the Wilderness with the story of Moses and the feeding of Israel in the Wilderness (e.g. Exodus 16; Ps. 105:40f.). Perhaps the Ten Plagues (Ex. 7-12) could be regarded as preliminary signs of the great deliverance as Jesus' miracles are preliminary signs.
further Messianic signs of the onslaught of the Reign of God against the Reign of Evil. Perhaps, in view of this, the Raisings of the Dead would be regarded as nature miracles.¹

B. Jesus Death as the Final Encounter with the Power of Death.

1. Cullmann on the Death of Jesus.

Prof. O. Cullmann has in a recent study² presented a view of Jesus' death which has aroused much discussion. The view he has presented appears destined to have a great impact on theological thought: for or against it.³ Dr. Cullmann affirms that his presentation of the view of Christ's death⁴ is based on exegesis and that it therefore faithfully presents exegetically the NT portrait of the death of Christ.⁵ In fact, he reproaches his critics on this basis: "So far, no critic of either kind has attempted to refute me by exegesis, that being the basis of our study."⁶ It seems, therefore, that a presentation of Dr. Cullmann's view is a good

---

¹ On the above paragraph see esp. K. Barth, Dogmatics, III, 2, p. 600; Manson, Jesus, p. 45; Richardson, Wordbook, p. 154; Richardson, Theology, pp. 10ff.
³ As a secondary source we shall also refer to Wm. Strawson's book, Jesus and the Future Life, which has in the main, and largely uncritically, followed Cullmann's interpretation.
⁴ Not just the contrast with the death of Socrates.
⁵ See p. 10.
⁶ p. 10 (also "The attacks provoked by my work would impress me more if they were based on exegetical arguments." p. 10).
way to approach the subject of Jesus' death in the NT (esp. Gospels) in terms of the aspect of Jesus' death of concern and relevance to our subject. We shall, therefore, present Prof. Cullmann's view, then survey some of the key NT texts (those suggested by Dr. Cullmann and others deemed significantly relevant) and concluded by estimating how far Prof. Cullmann, in our opinion, is correct.

The starting point for Cullmann's study is the contrast between the death of Socrates and that of Jesus.¹ Socrates goes to his death in complete peace and composure. It is a beautiful death in which nothing is seen of the terror of death. Death because it is the liberator from the body is "the soul's great friend." So Socrates teaches, and "so, in wonderful harmony with his teaching, he dies -- this man who embodied the Greek world in its noblest form."²

The death of Jesus is quite dissimilar. True, they both expect death, but Jesus, unlike Socrates,³ begins "to tremble and be distressed" (Mk. 14:33).

¹pp. 19ff. In so doing he seeks also to present the Greek view of immortality which leads to the major theme of his work: resurrection in Christian faith over against the Greek view of immortality.

²Quotations above from p. 21.

³Strawson, op.cit., p. 96 does not feel that the comparison of Socrates and Jesus adds anything to the argument. Beyond this mild objection he accepts in full Cullmann's interpretation, except to affirm the death in view is nothing but physical death (see pp. 97, 99, 101f., 106). On this aspect of Strawson's view see below, D.
"Jesus is so thoroughly human that he shares the natural fear of death. Jesus is afraid though not as a coward would be of men who will kill Him, still less of the pain and grief which precede death. He is afraid in the face of death itself. Death for Him is not something divine; it is something dreadful.\(^2\)

During His last hours Jesus does not want to be alone -- He seeks God as well as the company of His friends. In the Garden Jesus cries to God "all things are possible with thee; let this cup pass from me" and when He concludes, "Yet not as I will but as thou wilt",\(^3\) He does not mean that now at last He regards death as the friend but rather, "If this greatest of all terrors, death, must befall me according to Thy will, then I submit to this horror."\(^4\) Jesus knows that in itself dying means to be forsaken, for death is the enemy of God. Thus He cries to God for He does not wish to be alone, for "whoever is in the hands of death is no longer in the hands of God, but in the hands of God's enemy."\(^5\) Thus Jesus seeks assurance not only from God but from His disciples -- "He does not want to be alone". For this reason He repeatedly interrupts His prayer to go to them and awaken them: "Could you not watch one hour?" (Mk. 14:37). Cullmann

\(^1\)cf. Strawson, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 97 ("He does not so cry out because he is a coward, but because he is realist.").
\(^2\)pp. 21-22 (cf. also "all His human fear"; "He is afraid of death" and Lk. 12:50 and Mk. 15:34).
\(^3\)Mk. 14:36.
\(^4\)Mk. 14:36.
\(^5\)p. 22.
points out a further contrast between Socrates and Jesus: the one quietly discussing immortality, the other before His
death, "trembles and begs His disciples not to leave Him
alone." At this point Prof. Cullmann refers to Heb. 5:7: that Jesus "with loud cries and tears offered up prayers and
supplications to Him who was able to save Him." Again the
contrast: Socrates "Calmly and composedly speaking of the
immortality of the soul; here Jesus, weeping and crying." The
contrast further appears in the manner of the death:
with "sublime calm Socrates drinks the hemlock"; but Jesus
cries the cry of dereliction (Mk. 15:34). This is death as
the enemy. "Because it is God's enemy, it separates us from
God, who is life and the creator of all life . . . . To be in
the hands of the great enemy of God means to be forsaken by
God . . . . Jesus suffers this abandonment, this separation
from God, the only condition really to be feared." Jesus
must die thus for victory is possible only by actually dying
a real death not just dying in one sense but really "living
on as an immortal soul, thus fundamentally not dying." Life
can only issue out of this dying by an act of creation --
a resurrection. No act of creation is needed in immortality
for the soul lives on and does not die at all. For Christian
faith dying is not just bodily but the "destruction of

\[\text{1Ibid.}\]
\[\text{2A reference to Gethsemane, he writes (p. 24, note 1.).}\]
\[\text{3p. 24.}\]
\[\text{4pp. 24-25.}\]
\[\text{5p. 25.}\]
Finally, it should be noted that Dr. Cullmann acknowledges that Jesus is aware of the task given Him in dying before He dies. He quotes in this connection Lk. 12:50, "I have a baptism with which I must be baptized, and how distressed (or afraid) I am until it is accomplished" (emphasis and parenthetical alternate translation are Cullmann's). But this does not play a very important role in his view of the death of Christ, since it is the manner of the death and not its purpose that is in view here.

As noted earlier, Mr. Strawson follows Prof. Cullmann's interpretation carefully until the end. Unlike Cullmann he limits Jesus' death to a physical dying, not a spiritual dying. He writes:

The death of Jesus is, . . ., physical death. Nowhere in the accounts of the death of Jesus is it said the he faced 'spiritual' death. Jesus shrank from contact with physical death, . . ., yet it is a great help to Christians to know that Jesus has tasted the bitterness of death, and shares our natural fear of death.

2. The Biblical picture of Jesus' death.

In view of the preceding section on the Messianic signs of Jesus, it would seem a natural conclusion that on the Cross Jesus encounters the enemy in a final and decisive

---

1Ibid.

2The reference is misprinted as '9:50 in the book, p. 22. Although, I must confess an inability to see how they may be so neatly separated!

3Strawson, op.cit., pp. 101-102. See also pp. 97, 106. It should also be noted that Strawson sees that death in the Gospels is the enemy of God, but holds that this explains the sense of abandonment felt by Jesus, "without reference to spiritual death!" (p.101).
way. If death is the enemy which Jesus has already met and defeated in a preliminary way in His healings and exorcisms, His death is the ultimate encounter. We must now enquire of the Gospels to see if this is in fact the case.2

a. General Gospel viewpoint.

Mark's account of the passion of Jesus is short and to the point. His account is sombre and contains tragic overtones. No beams of light from the Easter triumph illumine the scene.3 The only words of Jesus during the scene are those of the Cry of Dereliction (Mk. 14:34). The tragic and dreadful character of the event is starkly emphasized. There is an absence of any reference to the glorious aspect of the cross. Even the curtain of the Temple is torn - perhaps, in the light of mourning customs, a sign of divine sorrow?

Matthew is in most respects similar to Mark.4 Yet in the additions in Matthew there are certain other factors present which give a slightly different coloring to the story. For example at His arrest Jesus speaks of His ability to

---

1 Part II, Ch. 2, B must also be referred to as background for this whole section.

2 Leivestad, op.cit., 65ff. has given a good summary of the general picture of the Gospel's picture of Jesus' death. The following brief descriptions of the Gospels owes much to his work. See also Taylor, Formation, pp. 44-62; Bultmann, Geschichte; Manson, Jesus, esp. pp. 121ff.

3 Leivestad, op.cit., p. 65.

4 Taylor notes that Matthew gives no indication of an awareness of any other account of the passion than that of Mark. His additions are taken from popular narratives and serve to amplify the Markan story. See Tradition, p. 54.
summon the divine power to His aid, if He so desires ("Ten legions of angels"), but He will not, for the Scriptures must be fulfilled (Mt. 26:53ff.). The events that accompany the death of Jesus also suggest His death is no ordinary death, but a cosmic event. There is an earthquake, the tombs are opened and many of the dead saints are raised and seen after Jesus' resurrection (Mt. 27:57ff.).

Lukes' account is quite different from those found in Mark and Matthew. This suggests he is working from a different account than Mark's and only uses Mark to supplement some details.1 Here Jesus takes on a more heroic manner. He is the perfect martyr, who is also more than a martyr — He is the Lord.2 The note of demonic power in conflict with Jesus and the temptation of Jesus not to die is more pronounced (e.g. see 22:3; 22:53; 24:7 and cf. 4:13; 22:40, 46). The agony of suffering is present but not emphasized so much as in Mark. Rather the heroic element is more pronounced.

Jesus is concerned about others and prays for their forgiveness (23:34), promises life to the repentant thief (23:43) and earlier warns the people of Jerusalem to weep for themselves, not for Him (23:27-31). Jesus' struggle was more in the Garden (22:39-46) than here on the Cross. On the cross He

---

1 So also Taylor, Formation, pp. 51ff.
2 So Leivestad, op. cit., p. 72
submits to the Father's will and dies not with an inarticulate cry but a statement of peace (23:46). His example in dying causes the multitude to beat their breasts as they return to Jerusalem (23:48). This and the darkness and rending of the curtain perhaps symbolize an impending divine judgement.  

John works from a separate tradition. Here again, the heroic element predominates. Jesus is in full control of the situation. The arresting party falls back when He speaks (18:6) and only arrest Him when He consents. Jesus interrogates the High Priest more than He is Himself interrogated and commands the situation (18:19-24). Before Pilate He states clearly that Pilate has no power to harm Him except that given him from God (19:11). He has a regal bearing and dignity and affirms a heavenly kingship (18:36ff.). He dies in victory, showing His concern for His own (19:25ff.), drinking to the full the cup of suffering (19:28) and with mission accomplished gives up His life (19:30; cf. 10:17ff.; 17:4).

This much appears, then, after a brief survey of the Gospels. Nowhere in the Synoptics is Jesus' death explicitly and clearly portrayed as an encounter with and triumph over the devil, death and/or cosmic powers. Luke comes closer

---

1 Perhaps Lk. 23:27ff., 44, 48 are an indirect way of referring to the destruction of the Temple and city in 70 A.D. (cf. Lk. 21:5ff.).
2 So Taylor, Formation, p. 53f. The parallels with Luke are accounted for on the basis of overlapping traditions, according to Dr. Taylor.
to it in the portrayal of the heroic aspects of Jesus' death. Only in John do we read of the triumph over death and of victory (e.g. 3:14f.; 5:26ff.; 6:51; 7:37ff.; 8:28; 10:11, 17f.; 11:25f.; 12:31ff.; 16:33; et al.). Yet a closer look at the Synoptics disclose hints that Jesus' death is the crowning fulfillment of His mission.¹

b. The Synoptic evidence of Jesus' predictions of the passion.

Prof. Wm. Manson has written that the New Testament doctrines of Christ and salvation have their origin in the facts presented in the Gospels. "The death of Jesus, for example, did not illustrate a love of God in which Christians otherwise believed. It was the event by which they came to know the love of God."² We might add that our contention is that similarly the NT belief in the victory over sin, death and the cosmic powers of evil has its origin in the fact of that victory in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. If in His ministry Jesus has performed the signs of the Kingdom and has invaded and conquered that power of death which has manifested itself in sickness, demon-possession and death itself, His death is the ultimate sign and encounter with that same power.

We must now ask whether Jesus did in fact present a belief in His coming death which portrayed that death in

¹cf. Manson, Jesus, p. 121 (the death of Jesus was "the climax of the revelation, as the supreme sign under which the whole manifestation of God in Jesus had henceforth to stand").²Jesus, p. 125.
these terms -- as an encounter with evil and death, as related to and part of His mission. We cannot here deal with all such passages which speak of the predictions of His death, but will select a few of these. We do not require to validate every prediction but only to demonstrate that death is related to, in fact is an integral part of, the mission of Jesus.

In the Gospel of Mark a series of such references occur (e.g. 8:31; 9:12, 31; 10:33-34, 45). In the other Gospels will be found still other references (e.g. Lk. 12:50; 17:24-25; 22:22). Bultmann\(^2\) rejects these (and other similar predictions of passion and/or resurrection, e.g. Mk, 9:9; 14:21, 41; Lk. 24:7; Mt. 17:12) with the simple statement: "I do not however dwell on the suffering and resurrection predictions which long ago were known as secondary community-formulations." These are all statements after the fact.\(^3\) One wishes he had given a more complete discussion of these in order to clarify his reasons rather than simply dismissing

\(^1\)For a good detailed discussion of these passages see Manson, Jesus, esp. pp. 121-146, a work to which the present writer is deeply indebted. See also J. Denney, The Death of Christ, (New York; A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1903); V. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, (London: Macmillan & Co., 1937); et al.

\(^2\)Geschichte, p. 163, and note 2, p. 163.

\(^3\)See also p. 152 on Mk. 9:12b where he states this part of the verse is an interpolation.
all such references and leaving the impression that his reason is not a critical one but rather a dogmatic presupposition. Taylor's treatment is much more moderate, regarding them as in the main genuine traditions which "have been sharpened in the light of subsequent events." An examination of the passages listed above yields several general observations. One such observation is the general similarity of several of them (Mk. 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34). Two of these, Mk. 8:31 and 10:33-34, are quite detailed and appear to have the most additional features written in after the event of the passion. A second general observation is that all of the key passages use the phrase "Son of Man" and not a more direct phrase such as "I am". The tradition appears very firm in this respect and is evidence that these sayings were quite old. Prof. Manson remarks on this:

The natural inference is that the underlying tradition had acquired so definite a stamp at this point as to secure the preservation of the style against variation. Jesus on some great occasion, or more probably on a series of occasions, had announced to his followers a mystery concerning the Son of Man: the Son of Man could only attain his triumph through suffering, and the paradox had made an indelible impression on their minds.

A third observation grows out of the second, namely, that the prediction passages conform rather closely to a similar pattern when placed together and when details added after

1Formation, p. 150. Cf. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, pp. 85ff.; Manson, Jesus, pp. 128ff.
2Jesus, p. 130.
the passion event have been excluded. The approximate general pattern would then run: "The Son of Man must suffer" and be killed." Not only Mk. 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34; conform to this pattern but also such passages as Mk. 9:12; Lk. 17:24, 25; 22:23; Mk. 10:45; 14:21, 41 et al. A fourth observation is the surprisingly large number of statements in this category. We would conclude, then, that the element of the prediction of the passion is an authentic element of the primitive Christian tradition and goes back to an origin in the mind and teaching of Jesus.

1Phrases such as "be rejected by the elders" etc., "be condemned", "scourged" and the like would be details used to clarify the suffering. Fuller, Mission, p. 55ff. has made a similar suggestion.

2The prediction of the resurrection, it seems to me, must be left an open question. Jesus may have predicted the resurrection, but more likely presented the belief in His future glory without details (e.g. Mk. 14:62; 8:38; 9:1). That He expected the resurrection, on the other hand, seems quite likely. See further c, 1.

3Surprising only if one is prepared to reject the possibility of Jesus predicting this.

By my count, about eleven passages fall into this category of referring to the Passion of the Son of Man, all in Mark and L.

4The rigidity of the form noted above is a strong testimony to this. In this respect it compares favorably with the passion story itself, which is widely acknowledged to have attained a settled pattern and continuous form early in the formative period, (See e.g. Taylor, Formation, pp. 13, 44-62; Bultmann, Jesus, p. 14.).

So Taylor, Formation, pp. 149f.; Manson, Jesus, pp. 128, 130; T. W. Manson, Teachings of Jesus, pp. 226ff., 235; Fuller, op. cit., pp. 55ff.; Kümmel, Promise, pp. 67ff.
It would appear that the concept of the suffering and death of the Messiah owes its origin to the creative mind of Jesus Himself. But does this only mean that He sees His death as being that of a martyr, a fate as irrevocable as the death of John the Baptist and other martyrs? Does He simply envision that it is the fate of the prophets and righteous to be rejected and die? That this is not the case is indicated by the repeated word δεῦτε (must) and similar expressions (see Mk. 8:31; 9:12; Lk. 17:25; 22:22; Mk. 10:45; 14:21). The δεῦτε expresses clearly the concept that suffering and death are a part of the mission. Jesus combines the ideas of the Servant of the Lord found in Deutero-Isaiah with that of the Son the Man.1 Thus the conclusion that Jesus does not believe He is the Son of Man in spite of death but rather that the glory and triumph of the Son the Man leads of necessity through suffering and death seems most plausible. Schniewind's remarks on Mk. 8:31 are apt at this point: "It is therefore a divine must that stands over Jesus' suffering; . . . "2

There are two other sayings in the tradition that also should be considered here. The first of these is Lk. 12:50

1So Taylor, Mark, p. 378; Manson, Jesus, pp. 130f.; Schniewind, Markus, pp. 83f.; Klostermann, Markus, p. 82; Fuller, op. cit., 55ff.; TWNT, W, art. "Πώς ὁ Θεός", pp. 709-713.2 Markus, p. 83 (cf. earlier on same page: "God's will is the suffering of the Son of Man, is the offering of Christ.").
"I have baptism to be baptized with; and how I am constrained until it is accomplished"). Bultmann holds, as usual, that this is a saying after the event, a creation of the Christian community. I can see no good reason why this should be the case. As Dr. Wm. Manson has pointed out, the enigmatic character of the saying is not the kind of trite and conventional saying which the later community would invent. The additions made to such sayings as Mk. 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34 came to mind in this connection. Further, the hint that Jesus shrinks from the suffering does not support the belief that the saying is after the event. The relation of this saying to that in Mk. 10:38-39 should also be noted. This also would be, then, an

1 σύνεχόμενός, Oullmann, Immortality, p. 22 indicates the word means "oppressed" in the sense of "afraid". I can find no justification for this word in the sense of "fear". See Arndt & Gingrich, op.cit.; Liddell-Scott, De.cit.; Moulton-Milligan, op.cit. The word carries the meaning of a strong inward feeling but not the idea of fear. It can mean to be seized or tormented by something (e.g., Lk. 8:37 uses the word but adds the word "fear" to indicate fear is meant. It is not carried by the verb alone.), to be distressed or oppressed. Manson, Jesus, p. 126 translates Lk. 12:50 by the word "oppressed". Paul in Phil. 1:23 uses the same word to indicate the idea of being "tormented", i.e. "I am torn between the two," but hardly means he is afraid.

2 Geschichte, p. 156.
3 Jesus, p. 69.
4 In the sense of "I wish it were over with" (τελεσθείσαι).
5 So also Kummel, Promise, p. 70. Kummel also notes that Bultmann's attempt to relate Lk. 12:49 f. to a Gnostic myth of a Savior is not convincing (Promise, p. 70, n. 168).
6 Paul's concept of baptism in terms of a dying with Christ (Rom. 6:11ff; Col. 2:12) would appear derived from sources like these, not the reverse. Rom. 6:3 indicates the belief is part of early tradition, not a Pauline innovation derived from mystery religions (να ξύνεται). See also Fuller, op.cit., pp. 60ff.
authentic statement that most likely had its origins in the
mind of Jesus.1 \( \tau\lambda\varepsilon\vartheta\hat{o} \) means not only that the suffering
is a necessity and that Jesus looks forward to the time when
it is over with ( \( \pi\nu\varepsilon\chi\omicron\kappa\iota \) ) but that this "baptism" must
occur in order that His work may be finished. Dying, in other
words, is an integral part of the mission. That both these
verses, 49-50 belong together is indicated by the poetic struc-
ture. The verses are Hebraic poetry of the synonymous form:

I came to cast fire upon the earth;
and would that it were already kindled!
I have a baptism to be baptized with;
and how I am oppressed until it is accomplished!

Lines 1 and 3 are parallel as are lines 2 and 4. Thus the
ideas conform to a pattern: the fire is the fire of the Messiah-
ianic judgement, one of the woes of the Last Times. Thus the
image of fire portrays the future glory, the image of baptism
the present suffering. Both are a part of the Messiah's destiny.2

The second passage of relevance in Luke is found in

---

1 The authenticity of the baptism sayings is accepted
by, among others, Manson, Jesus, pp. 69f., 126; Fuller, op.cit.,
pp. 59ff.; Kämmel, Promise, pp. 69f.; Taylor, Jesus and His
Sacrifice, pp. 164-167, 97-99; Mark, pp. 44ff. Others do not
accept either or both as authentic: e.g. Bultmann, Geschichte,
pp. 165f.; Klostermann, Markus, p. 107; Branscomb, Mark, p. 189.

2 See e.g. Apoc. of Baruch 70:8-10; Sibyllene V, 376ff;
III, 635ff. See Volz, op.cit., pp. 147-163, esp. p. 157; Bousset-Gressmann, op.cit., p. 221, TWNT, VI, "\( \pi\Sigma\rho\) ", pp. 937,
942ff. cf. e.g. Lk. 3:9, 16, 17; 2 Pet, 3:7, 10, 12; Rev. 20:

3 See also Manson, Luke, p. 160.
13:31-33. It may be, as Bultmann suggests,\(^1\) that verses 32 and 33 consist of two parallel sayings and that v. 33 does not belong here.\(^2\) In any case v. 32 is the chief one for our purpose. V. 33 only adds the locale of the death envisioned in v. 32.\(^3\) The important factor here is the connection made between Jesus' exorcisms and healing ministry with the threat of death. The inference is twofold: one, what Herod plans is not the vital thing in the mission of Jesus,\(^4\) two, the mission is not completed in the exorcistic and healing activity. \(\tau\epsilon\chi\iota\alpha\iota\mu\epsilon\) indicates again that Jesus is not only going to die, but must die if His mission is to be completed.\(^5\) "By stating that it is as a 'prophet' that he is to perish at Jerusalem, Jesus brings his death into organic relation with his prophetic proclamation, 'the Reign of God has drawn nigh.'\(^6\)

We may conclude then that Jesus not only predicted and envisioned His death,\(^7\) but saw it as an integral part of His

---

\(^1\)Geschichte, p. 35. Bultmann's reasons for this are not convincing. See Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 171, n. 2.

\(^2\)See also Kümmel, Promise, p. 71.

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 72.

\(^4\)See earlier remarks on the will of God in the death of Jesus and see also Schniewind, Markus, pl 83; Manson, Luke, p. 169.

\(^5\)See also Leivestad, op.cit., p. 64; Kümmel, Promise, p. 72; Fuller, op.cit., 62ff.

\(^6\)Fuller, op.cit., p. 63.

\(^7\)That Jesus could never have foreseen His death seems to me incredible. It surely required no great genius or "crystal ball" to see not only what had happened to John the Baptist and other known Jewish prophetic and heroic martyrs, but also to see the portent of the future in the growing antagonism on the part of the Jewish religious leaders.
mission. If in His ministry He has encountered the forces of death and evil, then here at the end of His life He must encounter death in a decisive way. The Synoptic Gospels do not directly describe Jesus' death as this encounter but rather indirectly describe it as the culmination of Jesus' ministry against the forces of death, sin and evil and as a part of His announcing and effecting the sovereign rule of God. We will turn again to the Synoptic description of Jesus' manner of death in the section evaluating Cullmann's presentation outlined above.

c. Paul on the death of Jesus.

Paul, more directly than any other NT author, describes the death of Jesus in relation to sin, death and the cosmic powers. That Paul does not do this on his own authority is clear from I Cor. 15:3 ("I delivered unto you in the first place that which also I received, namely, that Christ died on behalf of our sins according to the scriptures."). The natural inference of "received" is that Paul here refers:

to the tradition current in the church when he entered it, and since the death of Jesus qua historical fact was known to him without any instruction from that quarter, the thing which he 'received' must have been the particular interpretation of that death as for our sins. In some sense that death was interpreted as a sacrifice. The

1See Part II, Ch. 2, E, esp. #2.
2That is, of primary importance (ἐν τῷ θαύματι).
3Manson, Jesus, p. 123.
most immediate Synoptic contexts at this point are the traditions connecting Jesus' authority to forgive sins (Mk. 2:5) and Jesus' death as being for sins (Mk. 10:45). The sayings at the Lord's supper are also relevant here (Mk. 14:22ff.). The connection of Jesus' death and sin belongs to the primitive tradition. This tradition Paul has expounded and deepened in a significant way.

Sin is viewed in two ways by Paul: as a power and as guilt. In relation to guilt, Paul speaks of the forgiveness of sins or of the removal of the guilt (e.g. Rom. 3:25; 4:25; 5:6, 8; Col. 1:14; 2 Cor. 5:21). Since the two aspects of sin, as guilt and as a power, are closely related, we may treat the subject more generally. Col. 1:13f. is a good example of the use of sin in both aspects: God "has delivered us from the dominion of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved Son, in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins." Forgiveness of sins is related to the deliverance from the power of darkness. This forgiveness and deliverance Paul

---

1 The authenticity of Mk. 10:45 has been denied (e.g. Bultmann, Geschichte, p. 23). In my judgment the general authenticity of the passage is substantiated by the arguments presented in Hanson, Jesus, pp. 131-134; Fuller, op. cit., pp. 57-58; Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, pp. 99-105; Mark, pp. 444ff. (esp. 445-446). See also Schniewind, Markus, pp. 109-110; TWNT, IV, "λυτρον", pp. 343-351.

2 On this see also Manson, Jesus, pp. 134-146; Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans. A. Ehrhardt (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), esp. pp. 125ff., 144 (on Mk, 10:45); Fuller, op. cit., pp. 64-77; et.al.

3 See further Part II, Ch. 2, B, esp. 2.
grounds in the death and resurrection of Christ. In the Synoptic portrayal of the Christ event, the mighty works are emphasized as the main area of the encounter, with the death seen as the culmination of that ministry and the final encounter. Paul is concerned to emphasize the final encounter with the powers of sin, death and evil in the death and resurrection of Jesus. The preliminary signs of the encounter and victory seldom come directly into view but rather the emphasis is upon the death and resurrection and the completion of victory at the Parousia.¹

We have earlier² described the sovereignty of sin and death over man. We have now to briefly describe Paul’s view of man’s deliverance from that sovereignty. This is expressed most clearly in Paul’s letter to the Romans, though of course it appears elsewhere. Sin and death are so closely related that Paul can on one occasion refer to τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας (Rom. 6:6) and in a later passage speak of τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Θεοῦ (Rom. 7:24).³ The freedom from sin and death is clearly brought out in Rom. 5:12-21, a passage already discussed in another

¹See Leivestad, op.cit., pp. 84f.
²Part II, Ch. 2, E, I, c, and 2.
³Literally ἐν τῷ σῶμα τοῦ Θεοῦ.
connection. The passage contrasts the old humanity with the new humanity: the one from Adam, the other from Christ (the new Adam). This basic contrast of the old humanity with the new humanity is further described by the contrast of the characteristics of the old humanity with the new: law, sin and death over against grace, righteousness and life. Adamic humanity is under the law (5:13, 20) and the life of that humanity is characterized by its violation of the law. The chief emphasis of this section, however, is on the sovereignty of sin and death over the Adamic humanity and the freedom from that sovereignty accomplished by Christ for those who in Him are constituted the new humanity. The contrast between Adam and Christ is related by comparing their deeds. The act of one man's disobedience made many sinners, while the act of the other man's (Christ) obedience makes many righteous (5:19).

The transgression of one man led to condemnation for all men,

---

1See esp. Part II, Ch. 2, B, 1, c and d; B, 2. On this passage see esp. Grundmann, "Die Ubermacht der Gnade", op. cit.; K. Barth, Christus und Adam; and the various commentaries, esp. C. K. Barrett, Romans; Michel, Der Brief an die Römer; Dodd, Romans; P. Althaus, Der Brief an die Römer, NTD (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954); A. Nyren, Commentary on Romans, (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949); et al.

2Rom. 5:14 (πρόσεκακω): "Death reigned from Adam until Moses also over those not sinning in the likeness of Adam's transgression (πράξεως)." Until, the Law was given, men still sinned (πράξεως and πράξεως) but did not πρόσεκακω. That is, they did not violate the Law, since there was no law. πράξεως properly means to violate a law (Arndt-Gingrich, op. cit.). Therefore the sin of man after Adam could not be like his, for he violated a law. But men did sin (πράξεως and πράξεως).
While Christ's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men (5:18; cf. 5:16). Many died through the trespass of one man, but through Jesus the free gift and grace of God abounded for many (5:15). Through the one man sin and death came into the world, and thus sin reigns in death (5:12, 21). Through Christ righteousness and life come in and thus grace reigns through Him (5:21). These acts of the founders of the two humanities have consequences for the members of the two humanities. Over the one humanity sin and death reign. Over the new humanity grace reigns for the purpose of life (5:21, εἰς ἔσορριν χίουμον). Those who are members of the respective humanities are such on a particular basis. For the one, Adamic humanity sin and death entered the world through one man and "death spread to all men because all men sinned" (5:12, emphasis added, cf. 3:23). Thus the "many" of vv. 15, 19 means "all". For the other, new, humanity in Christ righteousness and life entered the world through the One Man and life is open to all who receive it (5:17). Thus, just as "many" in reference to Adam means "all", so "many" in reference to Christ means "all". But the "all" in each case means "all" who belong to the respective races: all who are Adam's, all who are Christ's.1

1So also e.g. Barrett, Romans, p. 114; Grundmann, "Die Übermaßt der Gnade", op. cit., pp. 50ff. "Many" is a Semitism and provides a contrast of "many" ever against "one" or "some" not a contrast with "all". See Barrett, Romans, p. 114; Michel, Römer, pp. 125-126. The use of "many" reminds one of its use in Mk. 10:45; 14:24 which has in back of it Isa. 53:11-12, on this see e.g. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp. 148ff.; TWNT, "πολλοί", VI, pp. 535-545.
All men have sinned and therefore share Adam's condemnation of death. All who believe belong to Christ and therefore share His victory. To summarize this passage we should note Paul's reference to sin and death as ruling powers. God has dealt with these powers in Christ. The reference, as the context of the chapters before and after this passage shows, is to the cross and resurrection. "Only in virtue of divine action can humanity cease to be what it is and become a new humanity in Christ. The scandal of the Incarnation and the Cross cannot be avoided."

The victory over the powers of sin and death, then, takes place in the death and resurrection of Jesus. "The wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6:23) and Christ died that death of the

---

1 Rom. 5:1-11 is the proper preface to this section, for here Paul brings out the significance of the Christ-event for our justification through faith (e.g. cf. 4:24). Works lead to death for our works are sin, faith leads to life for it accepts and trusts in God's mighty deed for us in Christ. On faith see esp. Dodd, Romans, pp. 14ff.; Michel, Romer, pp. 48f.; Barrett, Romans, p. 28; Althaus, Romer, p. 42; E. D. Burton, Galations, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T. Clark, 1921), pp. 475-485 (esp. 482f.); TWNT, "πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ", VI, esp. pp. 218-224.

2 See also Part II, Ch. 2, B, 2.

3 To some extent the law is also a power, but it does not belong on the same level as sin and death. It is not a demonic power but a servant of God (e.g. Rom. 7). But the law is based on works and its fatal weakness is that man cannot do the deeds of life (e.g. Rom. 8:3; Gal. 3). Life comes through faith as a gift and not through works. Law has as its function the revealing and increasing of the awareness of sin (Rom. 5:13, 20; 7:9ff.; Gal. 3:19ff.).

Barrett, Romans, p. 119.
sinner. He died fully and completely the death of man as sinner. Christ not only had to enter sinful flesh in order to condemn sinful flesh (Rom. 8:3) but He had also to die. "The death he died he died to sin, but the life he lives he lives to God" (Rom. 6:10). Death and sin have no power over him (Rom. 6:9), for He was raised from the dead by the power of God (e.g. Rom. 6:4; 2 Cor. 4:14; 13:4; I Cor. 6:14; 15:15; Rom. 1:4; 8:11; Eph. 1:19ff.; et al.). "He who has died is freed from sin" (Rom. 6:7), and therefore Paul speaks of the Christian's sharing in this victory of Christ. We have died with Christ (Col. 3:3) to sin (Rom. 6:2, 11, 14, 18, 22). In baptism we share His death and resurrection (Rom. 6:4) and are thus raised to newness of life.\(^1\) We have, in Christ, died and are free from sin (see references above), the Law (Rom. 6:14; 7:4, 6; Gal. 2:19ff.) and death itself (Rom. 8:11; 6:4ff.; Col. 2:12; I Cor. 6:14; Eph. 2:14ff.; et al.). Christ is the Lord of life and death, the dead and the living (e.g. Rom. 14:9; I Cor. 15:45) and thus death cannot separate us from God in Christ any more than sin can (e.g. Rom. 14:8; 6:5ff.; 8:11, 17, 31-39; 2 Cor. 5:14ff., 17-21; Gal. 2:19-21; Eph. 1:4ff., 11ff.; 2:4ff., 13ff.; Phil. 1:21ff.; 3:10ff.; Col. 1:11ff.; 2:10-15, 20; 3:1-4; I Thess. 4:14; 5:9ff.).

Paul believes, therefore, that nothing can separate us

\(^1\)See further Ch. 2.
from God in Christ. To this end he emphasizes the triumph over sin and death, as we have seen. But Paul with customary thoroughness adds phrase to phrase and term to term to emphasize that the triumph is complete. The triumph therefore is also over Satan (e.g. Rom. 16:20; 2 Thess. 2:1-12) and in general over the cosmic powers (e.g. Col. 2; I Cor. 2:6-8). By way of example we may note that in Colossians Paul writes that we are delivered from the dominion of darkness and transferred to the Kingdom of God's Son (1:13f.). It was through the death (and resurrection) of Christ that all this has occurred. God has made us alive together with Christ and cancelled the bond against us, nailing it to the Cross (2:14; cf. Eph. 2:15, Gal. 3:13). "He disarmed the principalities and authorities, exposing them openly, triumphing over them in it" (2:15).

1 For details on this see esp. Leivestad, _op. cit._, pp. 92-115; C. E. Caird, _Principles and Powers_ (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956); the various articles in _TWNT_ dealing with the terms mentioned in Col. and I Cor. 2:6-8 and the commentaries (esp. those on Colossians).

2 _καταφθάνασιν_. The sense of the verb is "to strip off" or "to render naked". See Col. 2:17; 3:9. Here it means "to strip off" in the sense of "spoil" or "disarm". See Arndt-Gingrich _op. cit._ and commentaries.

3 _εξωθήκατο_. The sense is "public", "a public example". The meaning is not certain. Does it mean "it" (the cross) or Him (God or Christ)? The meaning "God" would properly require a reflexive (_εξωθήκατο_ is found in G). Here we take it to mean "it" (the cross) referring to V. 14. I Cor. 2:6-8 supports this view.

4 It is of interest to note how Paul degrades the powers in Colossians. They are first stated to be only creatures and thus subordinate to Christ (1:15-17); then they are titled fallen creatures who themselves need reconciliation (1:18-20); and finally are described as defeated hostile powers (2:15). Thus again does the superiority of Christ appear, in whom all the fullness dwells (1:15-20).
A detailed analysis of these powers is not profitable, for Paul is fond of piling up terms to make the meaning clear. One should sense the rhetorical feeling of the passage rather than analysing terms. Thus Paul writes that we are free from everything which has heretofore dominated us. This note appears frequently in his letters, as we have seen. By way of summary we may note some examples of this. We are saved from the wrath of God (e.g. Rom. 5:9), from sin (e.g. Rom. 6:22), from death (Rom. 6:4ff.) from the law (Rom. 7:4; Gal. 3:23ff.), from the cosmic powers (Gal. 4:8f.; Col. 2:20), from the power of darkness (Col. 1:13f.; Eph. 5:8f.). We are even saved from ourselves (Col. 3:3, 9; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 4:22ff.).


The heart of Prof. Cullmann's treatment is that Jesus approaches death as a real death of the whole man and therefore fears death, fears it in a fully natural human way. The Socrates-Christ contrast does not really influence this view except by way of illustrative contrast. We will not, therefore, have occasion to go into this contrast in detail.

---

1 Rom. 8:38f. is a good example of this. cf. I Cor. 3:21-23.

2 In my opinion, however, the contrast is overdone. This is in part due to Cullmann's interest in emphasizing the contrast and in part to his desire to portray Jesus as a man who fears death while Socrates is a man who does not. By this means he seeks to discover and illuminate the basic reason for the contrast, viz. Socrates' belief in immortality and Jesus' belief in resurrection. As a whole I believe the treatment of Socrates and Christ is much more judiciously presented by E. Fascher, "Sokrates und Christus", ZNW, Vol. 45 (1954), pp. 1-41.
We have already dealt with Prof. Cullmann's translation of Luke 12:50. He does not really justify the translation as "distressed (or afraid)", but merely asserts it to be correct. The other key texts quoted by Dr. Cullmann are Mk. 14:33ff; 15:34, 37; Heb. 5:7. We first consider Mk. 14:33ff. Verses 33-34 are the key ones for Dr. Cullmann. His comment on this passage is that Jesus begins "to tremble and be distressed" and says to the disciples, "My soul is troubled, even to death". Then writes Cullmann, "Jesus is so thoroughly human that He shares the natural fear of death." The words έκθυμβίζων and άφημοεήν are extremely difficult to translate. The first appears only in Mark and then only in the passive. It means, basically, "to be amazed" or "astonished" and carries an overtone of consternation. Cullmann understands it in the sense of "tremble" or "shake" (Ger. Zittern). In the face of the difficulty no firm judgment can be given. The sense of the term here appears to be that of extreme amazement in the sense of distress, or shuddering. The other word, άφημοεήν, is easier to translate. It means "anxiety", "distress", "troubled",

1 Misprinted as Luke 19:50 (see Cullmann, op. cit., p. 22).
2 p. 21.
3 Arndt-Gingrich, op. cit., Liddell-Scott, op. cit., refer only to Balen for a use of the passive apart from Mark.
4 See Taylor, Mark, p. 552.
5 See the various translations: e.g. "greatly distressed" (RSV), "appalled" (moffatt), "feel distressed" (Goodspeed), "deeply agitated" (Torrey).
6 Arndt-Gingrich, op. cit.
"be in anguish", dismayed. Cullmann understands it as "shrink" (or fear, Ger. Angst). "To be troubled" or "in anguish" seems to best fit the context and setting. The words portray the extreme distress and anguish felt by Jesus in the face of death. But is this a human fear and anguish, as Cullmann asserts, at the prospect of death? We shall return to this in a moment. Mk. 14:34, "my soul is deeply grieved unto death" is explained by Cullmann as meaning "my afflication is so great that I am sinking under the weight of it", with Weiss, rather than "I am so sad that I prefer to die" with Klostermann. With this we agree. Jesus refers to a "sorrow which threatens life itself." With this should be compared Lk. 12:50. The meaning of Mk. 14:33f. is, then, that Jesus is facing death and knows it! From this death Jesus "steps back", as it were, in distress and anguish. He does not wish to die. But again, why does He not wish to die? Because He is human and as a normal human shares the human dread of death, says Cullman. Next let us look at Mk. 15:34, 37. Mark 15:34 is the cry of dereliction. Jesus

1 Liddell-scott, op. cit.
2 p. 21, note 2.
3 Markus, p. 150 (based on Jonah 4:9).
4 Taylor, Mark, p. 553. The words spoken by Jesus reflect Ps. 42:5; 11; 43:5. But as they are addressed to the disciples by Jesus, they are an echo, not a quote, for the Psalmist addressed God. See Taylor, Mark, pp. 552-553; Schniewind, Markus, p. 152; Klostermann, Markus, p. 150; et al. After these words Jesus does, however, seek the Father in prayer: "hope in God", my help (Ps. 42:5, 12; 43:5).
is forsaken by God as He feels Himself in the grip of death, the great enemy of God. Mk. 15:37 reads "and Jesus having uttered a great cry expired (breathed his last)." This only reinforces, for Cullmann, the statement that Jesus experiences death in all its horror as the "last enemy" of God (I Cor. 15:26).

Heb. 5:7 is the next passage. This again is used to support Cullmann's contention that Jesus in His last hours before death trembles and fears, crying to God and His friends not to leave Him alone. The passage reads: "in the days of his flesh he offered up prayers and supplications to the one able to save him from death, with strong cries and tears." The passage recalls the scene in the Garden and the thrice repeated prayer: "Abba, father, all things are possible to thee; remove this cup from me; yet not what I will but what thou wilt" (Mk. 14:36).

In the actual translation of these passages by Dr. Cullmann there is little to argue with. The strength of his argument,

---

2 Ibid., p. 24.
3 Ibid., p. 23.
however, does not lie in the Biblical references themselves, but in the conclusions he draws from them. And it is just here that we must take issue with Prof. Cullmann. His contrast between the deaths of Socrates and Christ is only partially correct. Socrates does indeed die peacefully and with great composure and confidence. Jesus does indeed shrink from death and seeks release from the obligation to die. Prof. Cullmann has also correctly seen that Socrates dies in conformity with his conception of death: he meets death as the liberating friend. Jesus also dies in conformity with His conception of death. It is here that Prof. Cullmann has gone astray, in my opinion. He has only imperfectly, in my judgment, seen the nature of death as Jesus faced it. It is not "the natural fear of death" that Jesus shares with man. Death is not the great unknown, the threat of the end of life. Matthew 10:28 (Lk. 12:4) records the saying of Jesus: "do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul; rather fear Him who can destroy both body and soul in hell." This passage is a clue to the meaning of death for Jesus. As the prayer in the Garden certainly shows.

Strawson, op. cit., p. 98 misses the point by understanding the passage to mean Jesus teaches his disciples not to fear the men who kill you but, as I do, fear death itself. He writes, "There is a great difference between being afraid of men and being afraid of death." There is also "a great difference" in the conception of the death that is feared! For Strawson that death is physical, not spiritual.
death did not fear those who put Him to death. But neither was He less a man than the martyrs before Him and after Him and the many others who faced death without fear. "He is afraid in the face of death itself." Does one who has a "human fear", who "shares the natural fear of death" react in the way that Jesus reacted? Does He speak to His friends, "are you still sleeping and resting? It is enough; the hour has come; the Son of Man is betrayed" (Mk. 14:41)? Does He, while escape may still be possible by the back way go out to meet those who will arrest Him, if He thus fears to die? Does He speak to the arresting group and in effect say, "what has delayed you? you could have arrested me easily while I was teaching" (Mk. 14:48f.)? Where are the pleas, the trembling, the begging for life? None of these are found. Instead He goes to meet death with the assurance that it is the Fathers' will and with the conviction that only thus will the Scriptures be fulfilled (Mk. 14:36, 49). What conception of death could lead to such apparently contradictory attitudes as the anguish and dread expressed in the scene in the Garden, on the one hand, and the calm confidence and courage exhibited thereafter until the cry

---

1 So rightly Cullmann, op. cit., p. 22 and Strawson, op. cit., p. 48.
2 Cullmann, op. cit., p. 22.
3 Ibid., pp. 22, 21.
4 The disciples all escaped.
5 Note Mk. 14:42 ("rise, let us be going; see, my betrayer is at hand").
6 As Dr. Cullmann would agree, for Jesus did not fear those who killed Him.
of Dereliction is heard? Dr. Cullmann himself supplies part of the answer: death is the enemy.\(^1\) Jesus, knowing death is the enemy which separates man from God, does not want to experience this separation. But it is the Father's will and so He goes to meet, and defeat this enemy.\(^2\) But this is only part of the answer. The rest of the answer is given in the passage from Q quoted above (Mt. 10:28; Lk. 12:4). Jesus "fears" the death that is not only the enemy but is also the judgment and condemnation of God.\(^3\) Death is also the divine penalty for sin (e.g. Rom. 6:23; Mk. 10:45).\(^4\) It is the weight of sin that is the occasion of the anguish and distress in the Garden. Dare He, must He, drink that cup? Must He endure this judgment? The answer can only be "yes". In this respect I believe Paul to be a more accurate interpreter of the meaning of Jesus' death than Dr. Cullmann.\(^5\) Paul clearly presents both aspects of the death of Christ: on the one hand, the encounter with and defeat of the enemy (e.g. I Cor. 15:24ff.; Rom. 5-8), on the other hand, the removal of the penalty of sin (e.g. Rom. 3:23ff.; I Cor. 15:3-4, 17, 54ff.; Rom. 5-8). Paul's words in 2 Cor.

\(^2\)So correctly Cullmann, op.cit., p. 25. See also preceding section of this chapter.
\(^3\)See K. Barth, Dogmatics, III, 2, p. 603.
\(^4\)See above, esp. section 2 and also Part II, Ch. 2, B, 2.
\(^5\)Karl Barth, in my opinion, correctly sees Jesus' death in this way. See Dogmatics, III, 2, esp. pp. 600ff. See also on Jesus' death in relation to sin and judgment the article by R. W. Stewart, "Jesus' own thoughts about His Death", ET, vol. 64 (1953), pp. 174-178.
5:21 portray this side of death in a most appropriate way, bringing out both the anguish (He knew no sin and yet died the sinner’s death) and the removal of sin and its penalty in His death. It was sin, therefore, in all its horror as that which cuts a man off from God, which is the reason for the anguish in the Garden. How else could He, for whom the abiding presence of God was so unfailingly and in a way never equaled by man a constant part of life (e.g. Jn. 4:34; 5:30; 6:38), react? Thus also does Jesus cry out on the Cross: "my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Mk. 15:34). It is not that God has forsaken Jesus, but rather that as one who experiences the depths of the sin of man, He experiences the depths of the sin of man, He experiences that God-forsakenness which sin brings. He feels He is forsaken, but is not forsaken by God. According to Luke, Jesus speaks to the arresting party: "This is your hour and the power of darkness" (22:53). That same darkness is in Mark the "darkness over the whole land" (15:33). We recall, then, at this point earlier remarks on the relation of darkness and evil and the meaning is clear.

1"For our sake he made him who knew no sin to be sin, in order that (in expressing purpose) we might become the righteousness of God in him."
2See Barth, Dogmatics, III, 2, p. 603 ("In Him God Himself suffers what guilty man had to suffer by way of eternal punishment").
3cf. Rom. 4:25 ("who was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification"); 2 Cor. 5:21; et al.
4cf. Col. 1:13; Eph. 6:12; Mt. 6:23; 2 Cor. 4:6.
It is now clear wherein we must disagree with Prof. Cullmann. His attempt to contrast the Greek and Biblical views of death and thus of immortality and resurrection deserves commendation. It is a stimulating piece of work. But this must not blind us to what are, in my opinion, its shortcomings and defects.¹ When we recall the remarks made earlier on the preaching, teaching and healing ministry of Jesus as the signs of the Kingdom and of the Messianic Age, when we recall particularly the exorcisms and the raisings of the dead as onslaughts against the power of death, it becomes uncertain that Jesus could have feared death itself in a purely human way. When we further recall the close connection of sin and death and the seriousness of the Biblical view of sin, it becomes clearer that while Jesus does feel distress and anxiety before this final encounter with the enemy, death, the primary cause of His greatest distress and anguish is the cup of suffering on behalf of the sins of man.

C. Jesus' Resurrection as the Victory over Death.

While the Gospels differ in many ways in their accounts of the resurrection,² they also agree on the main points. These

¹ These remarks also apply to Strawson's book which follows Cullmann so carefully. His major defect is that he did not follow Cullmann closely enough so that he defends the view that physical death is what Jesus feared. See further D of this chapter.

are: one, the tomb was empty; two, Jesus rose from the dead; three, "he showed himself alive after the passion by many proofs" (Acts 1:3). The differences are in the details used to illustrate and describe these main points. None of the accounts attempts to give the full story but rather chooses those incidents which conform to the purpose of writing. For this reason each account has material of its own and yet in places hints at or refers to material found in other places. Matthew follows Mark more closely than Luke and John do. Luke and John, and also Matthew, have selected, at times similar, at times unique, events out of the total complex of the traditions of the resurrection. In each of the Gospels the resurrection is the victory of Jesus over death, or as Peter in the Pentecost sermon expressed it, "God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified" (Acts 2:36). It is in the Fourth Gospel that the theological motif of victory is seen most clearly. Jesus must rise to fulfill the scripture (Jn. 20:9). He is

---

1 e.g. Jn. 20:2 hints that Mary was not alone at the tomb ("we do not know . . .").
2 See Ramsay, op. cit., pp. 63, 64, 66, 67.
3 e.g. Paul clearly indicates an awareness of traditions witnessing to more appearances than are found in the Gospels (I Cor. 15:5-8).
going to the Father\(^1\) (Jn. 20:17f.; cf. e.g. 13:1; 14:2ff.; 16:10, 16; 17:24), He bestows the Holy Spirit (20:21ff.) and acknowledges the homage of Thomas (20:28-29). His death and resurrection are the judgment on the world and the prince of this world (e.g. 12:31; 16:33).

1. Elements of victory in the Synoptics.

We must first take up the question of the predictions of the resurrection and glory of the Son of Man, for if these are genuine, the motif of victory is established in the mind of Jesus Himself. The only references in the Gospels which refer to a resurrection "on the third day" are Mk. 8:31, 9:31; 10:34. We have already discussed elsewhere these passages in connection with the death of Jesus.\(^2\) As noted then, the passages have been questioned, in whole or in part, because of their detailed description of Jesus' passion and resurrection. However, our conclusion there was that the passages preserve a genuine tradition, though the details are most likely an "after-the-event" addition. Thus the exactness of the reference to "three days" renders that portion of the passages suspect. On the other hand, it is possible that the expression "after three days" is a general expression for a short interval of

\(^{1}\)An indirect manner of referring to the tradition of the exaltation at the right hand of God. Note the expression of 20:17, "My Father and your father", "my God and your God." Jesus' relationship to God is unique, the disciples' is secondary. cf. Paul's "sons by adoption" in Rom. 8:14ff., 23.

\(^{2}\)See above B, 2, b.
time, as it is in Hos. 6:2, which may have influenced this statement of Jesus. If so the predicting of the resurrection may be genuine, but it is by no means certain either way. We must, therefore, place these passages in the doubtful category, unless more positive evidence can be found to support the idea of Jesus predicting His resurrection.

Mark 9:9 and Luke 24:7 also contain clear references to the resurrection. Both of these have also been questioned and their genuineness rejected. Those who reject the genuineness often appear to do so on primarily dogmatic grounds: viz. Jesus could not have foreseen His death and resurrection and therefore these must be vaticinia ex eventu. It is difficult to find in such ex cathedra statements cogent and convincing evidence for the supposed conclusion. Among more cogent arguments against Mk. 9:9 is the remark of Kümmel that it is "an ending formulated by the evangelist and not part of the old

---

1 This is suggested by, among others, Kümmel, Promise, pp. 67f.; Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 89; Mark, p. 378 (where he hedges a bit more on the question of predicting the resurrection).

2 Nikolainen, op. cit., pp. 46ff. defends the full authenticity of these statements on the resurrection, but many scholars are more cautious, as indicated above. Kümmel, Promise, p. 67; Dibelius, Jesus, p. 91;


4 e.g. Bultmann, Theology, I, p. 29, "But can there be any doubt that they are all vaticinia ex eventu?" To this we reply, "yes, there is doubt!"
Another argument against Mark 9:9 states that it is a dogmatic editorial work of Mark as an attempt to explain why the Transfiguration event was not more widely known in the early Church. In my opinion the authenticity of such passages largely stands or falls on the general impression of such passages on the reader rather than on scholarly arguments for or against them. The section in which the passage is found does not prevent the form of a literary construction produced from ulterior motives. It is abrupt and devoid of literary unity. In short, its form impresses one as being reminiscent of an actual conversation. This leads me to accept the authenticity of the passage. However, due to the doubt cast on the passage by many scholars and its being

---

1 Promise, p. 67. The parallel ref. in Mt. 16:20 is an elucidation of Mark’s charge to be silent (Mk. 8:30). Kümmel feels Matthew’s elucidation is essentially correct, but that even so nothing can be learned from Mt. 16:20; Mk. 9:9 of Jesus’ own point of view.

2 Some have suggested (e.g. Bultmann, Geschichte, pp. 278-281) that the Transfiguration is a post-resurrection narrative read back into the Gospel accounts, a solution which raises, to my mind, more problems than it solves (so also Taylor, Mark, p. 287). (In defense of the post-resurrection theory see more recently, C. E. Carlson, “Transfiguration and Resurrection”, JBL, Vol. LXXX (1961), pp. 233-240).

3 This is based on Wrede’s Messianic secret theory, which has considerably influenced many scholars on this subject. Bornkamm grounds his rejection of Mk. 9:9 and other passages of similar context on this theory. See Jesus of Nazareth, p. 171 (esp. n. 2).

4 Cf. Taylor, Mark, p. 343, “a decision depends on the impression which the narrative makes upon us, our view of community-sayings and our general estimate of the historical character of the Gospel.” Taylor finds the Gospel reliable and is therefore pre-disposed to accept the authenticity of most passages (though not uncritically). I find myself, on the whole, in the same position. To defend this at this point would take more space than we can spare – I can only state my conviction.
in Mark (probably the original form) an editorial summary, we must class the passage in the doubtful category, at least until we have seen the full picture of the Synoptic evidence on the subject. Luke 24:7 cannot be utilized without care as a prediction of the resurrection. It may be an editorial modification of Mark. Others have also questioned the reliability of this passage. Others see it as possibly a special tradition of Luke and thus possibly genuine. The passage occurs in the resurrection narrative in Luke and is not a statement of Jesus. It recalls 9:44 (if a special tradition of Luke is recalled by 24:7) or 9:22 (Luke's version of Mk. 9:31). The genuineness of 24:7, then, really hinges on the reliability of these already discussed Markan passages (and parallels). If those are editorial recastings of original sayings, the other (Lk. 24:7) could also be a reflection of the recasting of the original prediction. This passage must also be placed in the doubtful category.

There are, however, other passages which may refer to the resurrection. One of these is the group of sayings on Jonah

---

1 It is the only Son of Man passage which is exclusively a reference to resurrection. (Noted also by Fuller, op. cit., p. 97, n. 3).
2 So Fuller, op. cit., p. 96, n. 5.
3 See e.g. Kümmel, Promise, p. 72; Rengstorff, Lukas, p. 279; et al.
4 Kümmel, Promise, p. 72; Rengstorff, op. cit.; recognize this possibility.
Kümmel has argued for the authenticity of Lk. 11:29 (Mt. 12:39) over against the longer form of Mk. 8:12 (without mention of Jonah). If Kümmel is correct, the saying refers only to a comparison of Jesus and Jonah in a quite general way. Fuller understands it this way and refers it to the sign of Jesus' preaching. Mt. 12:40 is thus rejected as not being genuine, and there is no prediction of the resurrection. It is held that it is a quite inaccurate prediction, if it is genuine, for it speaks of "three days and three nights" whereas Jesus was only two nights in the grave. But, on the other hand, the inaccuracy is itself an evidence for genuineness, for an after-the-fact statement would surely not be so inaccurate, as the additions to Mk. 8:31; 9:31 and 10:33-34 prove. We conclude, therefore, that the saying is genuine and is meant to mean: as Jonah spent a short time in the whale, so the Son of Man will be only a short time in the grave. A prediction of the resurrection is thus clearly, though

1 Promise, p. 68.
2 Fuller, op. cit., pp. 40f. Kümmel limits the preaching to judgment. So also Klostermann, Matthäus, in Mt. 12:38-40.
3 Robinson, Matthew, p. 115 concurs in the rejection of vs. 40, as does Bultmann, Geschichte, p. 124.
4 Robinson, Matthew, p. 115.
indirectly taught. 

A group of sayings on the Temple may also be included as referring to the passion and resurrection of Jesus (Mk. 14:58; 15:29; Mt. 26:61; 27:40; cf. Jn. 2:19-22). One of the accusations made against Jesus at the trial is that He claimed to be able to destroy the temple and rebuild it in three days (Mk. 14:58; Mt. 26:61) and He is mocked on the cross with the same words (Mk. 15:29; Mt. 27:40). It is difficult to see how and to what purpose such an accusation would be developed by the Church if there is not behind it an actual saying or incident in the life of Jesus. In the Fourth Gospel the saying is referred to the resurrection (2:19-22; cf. Acts 6:14). Nowhere in the Synoptics is the actual prediction given, Mk. 13:2 being the closest. Apart from John we have no statement of the actual prediction. The judicious statement of Prof. Wm. Manson should be followed here: "As regards ... the saying about the dissolution of the temple, the question is complicated for us by the difficulty of recovering the original terms of the prediction." We accept the sayings as genuine, but cannot speak confidently of their meaning. Probably the saying was

---

1 What Schniewind, op. cit., p. 162 calls an "enigmatic saying".

2 We would also agree that the sign of Jonah is the preaching of Jesus, as is indicated by the context in Mt. 12:41-42.

3 Jesus, p. 67. Prof. Manson also recognizes the possibility that Jn. 2:19 may preserve a valid tradition, but cannot offer assurance that in fact it does preserve such a tradition.
on the Temple and its rebuilding.\(^1\) If so, it probably refers not to the resurrection but the building of the eschatological temple,\(^2\) and does not refer to the resurrection.

The next saying that concerns us is the saying on fasting (Mk. 2:18-22). Kümmel, after considering the arguments for and against the section, pronounces 2:19-20 as genuine.\(^3\) I can find nothing to add to his argument and agree that it is a genuine saying.\(^4\) The reference is clearly to a time when Jesus will no longer be with the disciples: the present is a time of Messianic blessing for the disciples, so why fast? The time will come when He will no longer be with them and then they can fast. Nothing is said as to whether the time

\(^1\)See e.g. Klostermann, Markus, p. 155; Schneewind, Markus, p. 157; Kümmel, Promise, p. 100; Taylor, Mark, p. 566f.; et al.


\(^3\)See further, Taylor, Mark, pp. 211f. Among others who accept the saying are: Schniewind, Markus, p. 29; TWNT, IV, p. 933. For those who deny it see e.g. Fultmann, Geschichte, pp. 17f.; Ernscomb, Mark, pp. 53f.; Klostermann, Markus, p. 28. The argument of Ernscomb, op. cit., and others that the saying is too early in the ministry to be genuine does not hold up in the light of investigation. The saying occurs in a series of Markan accounts of conflict with the Jewish leaders and is given as an example of the conflict which may well and probably did occur later in the ministry (see Taylor, Mark, pp. 211f.). The poetic structure of vv. 19-20 is a telling argument in favor of the saying, as Taylor also points out.
is short or long or whether it refers to the interval between
death and the resurrection or death and the parousia. With
Kümmel, I feel that no difference is intended and both intervals
come into view. Thus the passage refers to the resurrection
and glory of Jesus as the Son of Man, though in an enigmatic
way.

We come at last to a group of sayings which speak of
the exalted Son of Man. Both His exaltation and parousia
are referred to in a large group of sayings, the authenticity
to which is widely accepted. We may, without examination in
detail of the passages, conclude that Jesus spoke of the glor-
ified and returning Son of Man. That He intended it to be
understood to refer to Himself is, I believe, quite likely.

What may we now conclude with regard to the evidence

\[1\] The enigmatic method has been noted before in e.g.
Mt. 12:39f. Both there and here the group addressed consists of
Jesus' enemies.

\[2\] These are found in all four sources: Mk. 8:38; 13:26;
14:62; Q (Lk. 12:8; 40; 17:24, 26, 40); M (Mt. 10:23; 13:41;
Others not classified by sources are Lk. 11:30; 17:30; Mt. 16:28.

\[3\] Some individual sayings can be questioned, but most
are widely accepted: Manson, Jesus, pp. 114, 115, 119; Bultmann,
Theology, I, pp. 29ff. (See Geschichte on the various pages);
Fuller, op. cit., pp. 95-108; Kümmel, Promise, pp. 43ff. (and
other places on the separate passages); T. W. Manson, Teachings
29ff. accepts only this group of sayings as genuine.

\[4\] So also e.g. Kümmel, Promise, p. 45; Fuller, op. cit.,
pp. 102f.; Manson, Jesus, pp. 115, 117; Taylor, Jesus and His
Sacrifice (various pages).
and discussion thus far presented? We need to recall at this point the discussion and conclusions regarding the question of Jesus' predicting His passion. We concluded there that Jesus undoubtedly predicted His passion. We have now affirmed that He predicted His exaltation. These two must be contradictory, for if He were dead, He could not be the exalted Son of Man. Yet both types of sayings are amply demonstrated as genuine. The solution must be that Jesus expected His resurrection before the parousia and the general resurrection. Our first conclusion, therefore, is that Jesus expected His resurrection and exaltation after the suffering and death and that both were integral to His thought and destiny. The words of Prof. Wm. Manson well summarize this conclusion: "The Synoptic evidence states with deliberate intention that Jesus predicted his death . . . as a definite necessity appertaining to the exaltation of the Son of Man, and that He invested this necessity with a redemptive significance."^4

---

1 B, 2.
2 I regard the theory that Jesus as the dying Son of Man and the Heavenly exalted Son of Man are two separate figures as most unlikely. The theory is, in my estimation adequately disproved by Manson, Kümmler and others. See references listed above.
3 This is so even when heavily disputed sayings are excluded. See B, 2.
4 Jesus, p. 127 (cf. also p. 130). See also e.g. Fuller, op.cit. p. 103, "Between Jesus and the fulfillment of Daniel's vision there stands the decisive event through which God is to inaugurate the Kingdom—the cross."
The second conclusion is that Jesus on several occasions referred to His resurrection in highly figurative and enigmatical language (e.g. Mk. 2:18ff.; Mt. 12:40). This was part of His challenge to the Jewish religious authorities. The third conclusion is that Jesus must have spoken of His resurrection to the disciples. If He spoke of His suffering to them and if He spoke of His exaltation as the Heavenly Son of Man, both of which we affirm, it is unthinkable that He would not attempt to instruct the disciples in this matter. We must therefore conclude that such was the case and that in particular such passages as Mk. 9:1; 14:9, 25, 28 represent such attempts.

It is further quite likely that, in the light of the above remarks, some of the previously discussed doubtful passages (e.g. Mk. 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34; 9:9; Lk. 24:7) as well as others (e.g. Lk. 13:31-33) must be regarded as embedded in genuine tradition. Whether the resurrection was as specifically predicted as, for example, Mark 9:31 indicates or whether the prediction was more generally presented is more difficult to decide. As Kümmel expresses it, "Therefore there can be no serious doubt that Jesus reckoned with a violent death to be followed by his resurrection, although we cannot of course know whether he entertained this expectation from the beginning of his ministry."

There are further several parables and

---

1 On Lk. 13:31-33 see Kümmel, op. cit., pp. 71f.
2 Promise, p. 72.
sayings which indicate the same thing (e.g. Mk. 12:1-9; 13:28ff.; 12:8; the substitution by Jesus of Son of Man for Messiah in Peter’s confession in Mk. 8:31). Further, the term Son of Man itself used in connection with suffering carries the idea of future exaltation and therefore indirectly the idea of resurrection. In all these ways do the Synoptics bring out vividly their belief in Jesus as Messiah and Lord. Thus again, the passion stories in the Gospels have behind them the rays of light from the Easter story and therefore of the triumph even in death of the Son of Man over the forces of sin, death and evil which He encountered and defeated in His ministry. He is the Servant — Son of Man who can only, paradoxically, enter His glory by way of suffering and death—He must (σταυρωθησον) go to His throne by way of a cross. Both—cross and resurrection—are an integral part of His destiny. In fact, His ministry of sin and death, His death as the final encounter with them and His resurrection and exaltation in triumph over them—all of these are integral parts of the same mission.

2. The resurrection of Jesus in Paul.

---

1 It should be noted also that Isa. 53 which is so influential in the understanding of Jesus’ ministry contained references to a future glory of the Servant (esp. 53:10-12). See on the Servant of the Lord esp. Manson, Jesus, esp. pp. 110-113, 121-146; Fuller, op.cit., esp. pp. 86-95, 107, 57ff., 63, etc.; Cullmann, Christology, pp. 51-61; TWNT, V, art. "μαρτυρία του θεού", pp. 653-713 (esp. pp. 698ff., 709-713).

2 On this section see esp. Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 137-149; Stewart, A Man in Christ, esp. pp. 122-145; Bultmann, Theology, I, esp. 292ff. Also other works on Paul heretofore cited and listed in Bibliography (e.g. Kennedy, St. Paul’s Conceptions of the Last Things).
Paul places his entire theology within the sphere of the resurrection faith.\(^1\) His conversion is the product of an encounter with the Risen Lord (Acts 9:1-22; 22:4-16; 26:9-18; I Cor. 15:8ff.; 9:1; Gal. 1:16). He is aware of the early church traditions of the death and resurrection of Jesus (e.g. I Cor. 15:1-8). Frequently Paul refers to the resurrection on the basis of a commonly known Christian tradition (e.g. Gal. 1:1; Rom. 1:4; I Cor. 15:1-8, 12-20; et al.). The reference to the resurrection of Jesus occurs frequently in Paul. It was an act of God (e.g. Rom. 6:4; 8:24ff.; 8:34; 10:9; I Cor. 15:4, 15, 20; Col. 2:12; Eph. 2:5ff.; I Thess. 1:10). The resurrection of Christ is so basic to Paul's thought that we may summarize his teaching by referring to the teaching of Paul on the victory achieved in the death of Christ.\(^3\) For Jesus is not for Paul the crucified and dead Jesus, but rather the crucified and resurrected one, who as such is, therefore, the Living Lord and Savior. Thus, for example, when Paul speaks of the forgiveness of sin through Jesus, he writes in one place that righteousness is "reckoned to us who believe in him that raised from the dead Jesus our Lord, who was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification" (Rom 4:24f.;

\(^1\)cf. Stewart, op. cit., p. 135, "From this point right on to the end of his life, the resurrection was central in the apostle's thinking. It could not be otherwise." Also Nikolainen, op. cit., p. 137.

\(^2\)The frequent use of the passive "he was raised" (Rom. 4:25) indicates this also.

\(^3\)See E, 2, c.
cf. Rom. 7:4; 6:5ff.). Or again on the same subject, Paul writes "If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are yet in your sins" (I Cor. 15:17; cf. vv. 18-19). That this is not a strictly Pauline formulation is clear from I Cor. 15:1-4, where Paul in referring to the common Gospel of the Church writes of the death of Christ for sin and of His resurrection. Because Paul does not separate the death and resurrection of Jesus but rather sees them so to speak, as the necessary "two sides of the same coin", we have had to mention the resurrection repeatedly in connection with other subjects. When Paul speaks of our freedom from death, it is because Christ died and rose (e.g. Rom. 6:5ff.). When he speaks of forgiveness and freedom from sin, it is because Christ died and rose (e.g. Rom. 4:24f.; 6:2ff., 6ff.). Freedom from the Law (e.g. Rom. 7:4; Gal. 2:19-21; 3:13; Col. 2:13-14), from the powers of darkness (e.g. I Cor. 2:6-8; Col. 2:15, 19) all is again because Christ died and rose. All this, Paul writes, God has done for us in Christ (e.g. 2 Cor. 5:17-21; cf. 5:15). Thus also can Paul state that Christ lives in him and the life he now lives is "by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and

1See Wm. Manson, Jesus, p. 123f.; Stewart, op. cit., p. 230.
2For examples see esp. B. 2. c. Also see Part II, ch. 2, where the subjects of life and death in Paul were discussed.
3Note should be taken that this is frequently stated to be on behalf of man (e.g. Rom. 5:6, 8).
gave himself for me" (Gal. 2:20). The Christian owes all he has to the riches of the grace of God manifested in the crucified and risen Lord and Savior (e.g. Eph. 2:1-10; Phil. 2:19; Eph. 1:3; and frequently). "In Jesus risen and alive there had sounded forth the great divine "yes", affirming all the most glorious promises that God has ever given." We have listed above and discussed elsewhere the freedom from sin, death, law and cosmic powers through Christ. These benefits would not have been realized if Christ had not risen from the dead. The resurrection is the demonstration "in power" (Rom. 1:4) of the victory won for us in Christ. Thus the Gospel of Christ is the "power of God for the purpose of salvation to all who believe" (Rom. 1:16; cf. I Cor. 1:18, 24; I Thess. 1:5). The power that raised Christ from the dead (e.g. Rom. 1:4; I Cor. 6:14; 2 Cor. 13:4; Eph. 1:19ff.; Phil. 3:10), now works in Paul as he carries out the mission given him by God (Rom. 15:19; I Cor. 2:4; 2 Cor. 4:7; 12:9; Eph. 3:7; Col. 1:29).

Further, this power also works in the Christian. We shall also be raised by the same power that raised Christ (e.g. I Cor.

---

1 Stewart, op. cit., p. 135 (on 2 Cor. 1:20).
2 See B. c and also Part II, ch. 2.
3 ἐν δυνάμει.

Paul's messenger from Satan leaves him weak. "How can I thus hindered fulfill my mission", he cries. The answer is "my grace is sufficient for you, for my power (δυνάμει) is made perfect in weakness." Thus also was Christ crucified in weakness but lives by the power of God (2 Cor. 13:4).
6:14; 1 Cor. 15:43; cf. Eph. 1:19ff.; 2 Cor. 13:4). Not only so, but the present life of the Christian is lived through the power of God or the Spirit (Rom. 15:13; I Cor. 1:5; Gal. 3:5; Eph. 1:19; 3:16; 20; Col. 1:11). Eph. 3:16 (cf. Col. 1:11) is a particularly beautiful expression of this: "that according to the riches of his glory he may grant you to be strengthened with power through his spirit in the inner man."

We must also briefly mention one more point, a point to which we shall later return. Paul writes more on the subject of the resurrection of believers than any other NT author. While there is much in his writings on the subject that still occasion disagreements, disputes and conflicting interpretations, the basis of Paul's hope in the resurrection is not in an anthropological or psychological view of man, whether of "the immortality of the soul" or the "essential indestructibility of human personality." Neither of these phrases can be found in Paul as the basis of resurrection faith, nor would he subscribe to them on the above suggested basis. Paul's faith here is not based in any human factor of religious knowledge or theory. It is rather firmly based on the twin factor of the nature of

---

1 The above sentences on "power" are based on Paul's use of the word ἐνεργεῖν. In this respect it should be noted that the miracles of Jesus were "mighty works" and that the same word is used in the Synoptics to describe them. Paul also speaks of miracles by Christians and uses the same word (e.g. I Cor. 12:10, 24; Gal. 3:5).

2 cf. Phil. 4:19.
God and the already occurred resurrection of Christ. Since these two are not to be separated we have used the singular "factor", for God's nature is only disclosed in His self-disclosure in Jesus Christ, whom He raised from the dead. A glance at the great chapter on the resurrection in Paul confirms this. He begins the chapter with the acknowledged primitive tradition of the death and resurrection of Jesus and continues throughout to argue on that basis.

Space prohibits our delving deeply into the other literature of the NT, but we may make a few general remarks. The NT in general is grounded in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. We have attempted to point this out for the Synoptics and Paul. Resurrection faith is also deeply rooted in the book of Acts, as the preaching of the Apostles recorded in the book shows¹ (2:24-33, 36; 3:13, 15, 26; 4:10-12; et al.). The Fourth Gospel which speaks so often of life and of union with Christ and appears to spiritualize life nevertheless² also emphasizes the resurrection, both of Jesus and of others (e.g. Jn. 20-21; 5:24-29; 11:25f.; 6:39f., 44, 54). The resurrection, both of Christ and of man, is also prominent in the

²Not just "nevertheless" but rather all else is the consequence of God's victory in Christ.
rest of the NT (e.g. Heb. 1:3; 6:2; 8:1; 12:2; I Pet. 1:3, 21; 3:21f.). This is seen, not so much from direct references to the resurrection of Christ or of others, for apart from I Peter and Revelation such terms scarcely or not at all appear in the rest of the NT, but by the manner of referring to Jesus as the presently reigning Messiah, the Lord of Glory, exalted to the right hand of God (e.g. Heb. 1:3; 8:1; I Jn. 1:3; 2:1, 13; 3:1-2; Jude 1:4, 17, 21, 24; James 1:1; 2:1; 5:7).

D. Jesus' Humanity and His Death and Resurrection.

In point of fact this has already been answered in all of our preceding discussion. Jesus was a real man who died a real death and whose resurrection was a real rising from the dead. But we deem it advisable at this point to make clear that we do not intend it to be meant as a sham and not a real dying and rising of our Lord. This can be done most easily by referring again to Mr. Wm. Strawson's book, Jesus and the Future Life. Time and again he maintains that death in the Gospels, unlike death for Paul, is physical death only. We have already dealt with the subject of death in an earlier chapter. Our conclusion there was that death only rarely is described in natural terms and we also noted that many of the passages which are usually so classified carry overtones

---

1 Statements on the nature of death apply here also. See Part II, Ch. 2, E.
2 E.g. pp. 70, 72ff., 78, 79f., 97, 101, 106.
3 Part II, Ch. 2, E.
that suggest death is not natural. Death is in the NT connected to sin and conveys an aspect of judgment. It is unnatural and horrific. Mr. Strawson is not able to produce any examples that definitely present death as only physical death. The examples he cites lead him to the conclusion that the Gospels' approach is "realistic". He writes:

> Death is a fact to be faced without too much special concern; it is important but there is no need to be continually speaking about it. Especially important is the fact that death is not 'spiritualized': there is no implication in the term except plain, inevitable physical death.

Yet none of his examples prove that death is only physical. He cites the death of Herod and the murder of the children at Bethlehem as illustrations that "death is a perfectly ordinary, indeed inevitable, fact. . . ."\(^1\) One wonders how the illustrations prove to be "perfectly ordinary". That Herod's death is a point of reference used by the Gospels to date Jesus' birth does not prove very much except that men die. He cites other examples: Simeon (Lk. 2:25-35), which is admitted to be an example of the effect of Christ upon a man's attitude to death;\(^2\) Mk. 9:1 (and parallels) where he maintains "to taste death" means merely "to experience death," "to die"\(^3\); violent death (Mk. 6:14-29; Lk. 13:1-5; et al.) and deduces from the

\(^1\) op. cit., p. 79.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 70.
\(^3\) Thus Simeon dies "in peace"!
\(^4\) But the phrase refers to the Kingdom come with power and in that relation can the death meant be only "physical"? cf. Heb. 2:9.
use of the plural "the dead" and its infrequent use in the singular that it refers to the idea that all men die and "we die together just as much as we live together." In discussing Lk. 13:1-5 he admits that Jesus does connect the incident with a call to repent or otherwise all will perish. But how can this mean death is an ordinary event? He discusses the word "perish" and concludes it means in Lk. 13:1-5 simply "to die." His examples do prove death is recognized in the NT as a fact and an inevitable one, but scarcely that death is "physical" over against "spiritual." Again in dealing with the two Synoptic incidents of the raising of the dead (Mk. 5:21-43; Lk. 7:11-17), he stresses the idea that Jesus was concerned for the bereaved and showed no indication that He regarded the dead as being in any great danger. He misses entirely the point that the Synoptics portray the raisings of the dead as well as other aspects of Jesus' ministry as encounters with the power of death and sin and that these events are signs of the Kingdom of God. This is, in fact, the most generally noticeable weakness in his treatment of the subject. My other criticism is the failure to see the Biblical concept of death in relation to man, viz., that death is the death of the whole man. The NT does not, any more than does the OT, recognize man as being

---

1 op. cit., p. 75 (other references: pp. 70-76).
2 Ibid., p. 76.
3 "Spiritual" in this context apparently means for Mr. Strawson death as a judgment and desolation, especially in terms of what follows death, (e.g. See pp. 79, 85, 88, 90f., 92).
4 See pp. 85, 87, 88, 89, 90.
5 See above section A.
composed of separable parts: when man dies, it is man who dies, totally and finally. It is the merit of Cullmann that he has recognized this and sees the death of Jesus as a full death.\(^1\) In fairness to Mr. Strawson it should be pointed out that he is arguing against the idea of death as being exclusively a "spiritual death and desolation, a judgment which persists after physical death,"\(^2\) not arguing against an anthropological view of man. Nevertheless, it must also be pointed out that he uses categories (physical-spiritual) which in his use of them, carry more of a Greek connotation than a Biblical-Hebraic one, especially in the area of the view of man's nature and death. Thus in his conclusions on the death of Jesus, Mr. Strawson is misleading when he writes: "Nowhere in the accounts of the death of Jesus is it said that he faced 'spiritual' death."\(^3\) This introduces a false contrast into the picture of the death of Jesus, for such a death as He died "according to the Scriptures" would be expressed, not by saying "thus for us He died a spiritual death" or some such words to that effect, but rather simply "that He died" with all that this implies. Further, a proper account of the death of Jesus cannot be given, in my estimation, without reference to the idea of the fulfillment of His mission, as we earlier sought to demonstrate. His death must then be seen as one "on behalf of many"

\(^1\)Cullmann, *Immortality*, pp. 25ff.  
\(^2\)See e.g. p. 92 on death of Jesus.  
\(^3\)op. cit., p. 101.
(Mk. 10:45; 14:24), as the agony of abandonment under the judgment of sin which is the death (cf. Mk. 15:34; Mt. 10:28; et al.). To interpret death otherwise is to render inexplicable the "cowardly" manner in the garden and on the cross of this man. Will He, therefore, die less courageously than, for example, John the Baptist? than other martyrs before or since? Only if we understand aright that His death was the hour of the power of darkness, can we, in my judgment, understand it correctly. It is worthy of note that the conception of death as "physical death" has an impact on the later development of the nature of the future life, the main theme of Strawson's book.

It is surely an occasion of amazement that a book on "Jesus and the Future Life" gives so little space to the subject of resurrection, either that of Jesus or of man through Jesus. We may conclude, then, by again affirming that the death Jesus died was a real death, in the full Biblical meaning of that term: the death in the power of death which is indeed the enemy and death which is God's judgment on sin.

1 The resurrection of Jesus appears seldom (6 times, according to the index) and then the theme is scarcely developed. In the only place where it is given some treatment, it is to refute the idea that the basis of future life is based on the resurrection of Christ (e.g. pp. 229f.; cf. p. 219). Elsewhere the idea in relation to the resurrection of others is even more rarely mentioned (4 times according to the index, the only extended reference being a discussion of the Sadducee's question, Mk. 12: 18-27).

2 The expression in Luke 23:46 ("Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit") is not an anthropological statement. It rather portrays for Luke the heroic element in Jesus' death, that at the end He trustfully commits Himself into the hands of the God with whom He lived in such close communion. See commentaries on this. Mark simply writes "with a loud cry Jesus expired", expressing a violent death, a death occasioned by the intense spiritual suffering endured by Jesus (see Taylor, Mark, p. 596). Luke's version is therefore a commentary on Mark's account, which nevertheless modifies it to some extent.
As the death of Jesus was a real death, so also, according to the Gospels, His resurrection was a real rising from the dead. This is indicated indirectly by such words as "you will see him" (Mk. 16:7) and the similar words in the other Gospel accounts: "The Lord has risen indeed and has appeared to Simon" (Lk. 24:34), "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have" (Lk. 24:39). See also Mt. 28:7, 9; Jn. 20:18, 20, 27; et al. Thus also Jesus speaks with the disciples, breaks bread with them (Lk. 24:30, 35) and eats in their presence (Lk. 24:43; Jn. 21:13). All these materialistic references and the appearances themselves are designed to show that Jesus had indeed risen from the dead. The whole man died and the whole man rose. It is thus a resurrection of the body. "It is death, not the body, which is conquered by His resurrection, for the New Testament teaches the bodily resurrection of Christ."  
He is seen, handled and heard. In some respects the evidence in the Gospels is ambiguous. That it was a body all agree. But there is a noticeable tendency in the Gospel narratives toward materialism. Paul calls the resurrection body a spiritual

1 The verb here and in Mk. 16:7 is ἀνέβαλε, a verb which has an optical sense, according to W. C. Robinson, "The Bodily Resurrection of Christ", TZ, Vol. 13 (1957), p. 89. See also Arndt-Gingrich, op.cit.
3 cf. I Jn. 1:1 (a reference to the resurrection?). Paul also sees and hears Jesus at His conversion (Acts 9:4; 22:7; 26:14; I Cor. 15:8; 9:1; Gal. 1:16).
body. In the Gospels it is a body of "flesh and bones" (Lk. 24:39). Further Jesus eats with the disciples (Lk. 24:43; cf. Jn. 21:13). He invites them to handle Him (Jn. 29:27) and is touched by Mary (Jn. 20:17). It should be noted that the materialistic tendencies are most pronounced in Luke and John, not found at all in Mark and scarcely in Matthew (e.g. 28:9). On the other hand that the body is not just like other bodies, that the body of the resurrected Jesus, while it is a body and therefore material to some degree at least, it unlike pre-resurrected bodies and is a glorified (or spiritual body) is indicated in several places. Jesus appears and disappears (Lk. 24:30, 36, 51) at will and is oblivious to things like locked doors and other physical things (Jn. 20:19, 26; 21:14; Acts 1:9, 10). It is difficult to reconcile these. Perhaps the best conclusion is that these are attempts to portray in human language the almost indescribable. Jesus was risen in a body, but a body which transcended ordinary physical limitations.

---

1 To be further discussed in Ch. 4.
3 Cf. Wm. Manson, Luke, p. 281, "the tendency of popular tradition is to give a more sensual and physical form to apprehensions of the spiritual consciousness, and this naiver interpretation of the spiritual is specially characteristic of Luke's Judean source."
CHAPTER II

DEATH AND THE CHRISTIAN

As Paul is the New Testament author who has the most to say on this subject, we shall in the main be dealing with him. Where the teaching of other authors is relevant, we shall also refer to their teaching. Our purpose is thus only to introduce the New Testament teaching on this subject and not to exhaust it. To attempt to deal adequately with the full range of the subject in the entire New Testament could well lead to a "book-length" treatment. 

A. Death as a Past Event.

1. Death with Christ and the resultant freedom.

We have already referred to this, and thus need not

1 Albert Schweitzer remarks in the preface to his work, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. W. Montgomery & F.C. Burkitt (New York: Macmillan Co., 1956), that the writing of one chapter of it grew into a book (Paul and His Interpreters). We hope, at this time, to avoid doing the same.

go into great detail on it again.¹ The Christian in a real sense has death behind him.² He has not himself died, but he has died with Christ (Rom. 6:2ff., 11; 7:4; Gal. 2:20; Col. 2:20; 3:3; II Cor. 5:14). As noted before, the Christian has died to all that belongs to the present age: sin (e.g. Rom. 6:2); the law (Rom. 7:4; 8:2ff.), death (Rom. 7:3-9; 8:2ff.), the powers of this world (Col. 2:20). In uniting with the death of Christ we are freed from all of these.

For example, in Rom. 8:2ff. Paul writes,

For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set you³ free from the law of sin and death. What the law was powerless to do, in that it was weak because of the flesh, God has done:⁴ sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh and on behalf of sin,⁵ he condemned sin in the flesh in order that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk according to the Spirit not according to the flesh.

The law is not regarded by Paul, here or elsewhere as evil per se. The key is that the Law was weak because of the flesh, i.e. the law depended on man's weakness for fulfillment and thus became the law of sin and death (the proper commentary on this is in Rom. 7:4-25); cf. Gal. 4:4ff.; 3:21-29; 3:10ff.; 2:16ff.). This is also clear from σιναθρίκη of vs. 4 which does not mean something unfair or evil, but rather a commandment

¹See Part II, Ch. 2, B and esp. Part IV, Ch. 1, B, 2, b.
⁴No equivalent in Greek, but supplied on basis of θευνικτος in previous clause to make translation smooth.
⁵For sin offering. θευνικτος is used as such in LXX. See Barrett, Romans, p. 156; et al.
in the sense of "reasonable requirement." This man, under the bondage of sin and death, could not do and thus the law became for him a curse (e.g. Rom. 7:4-25; Gal. 3:10-14, 21-29). God has, accordingly, sent His Son in order that the "just (or "reasonable") requirement" of the Law may be fulfilled in us. He sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh to condemn sin in the flesh. That is, Christ had Himself to come in the flesh—an incarnation is meant (cf. e.g. Jn. 1:14). Similar thoughts are expressed elsewhere in Paul and the New Testament. Heb. 2:14 affirms that Christ had to experience the death of man in order to free man from death. II Cor. 5:21 states that Christ who knew no sin was made sin in order to redeem sinners. Or again in Gal. 4:4f. Christ was made subject to the law to deliver us from the law. Ἰησοῦς Μαθαύρατ, does not mean that Christ was not a man of flesh but only appeared as such. He was fully man, but was Himself without sin¹ (cf. Heb. 4:15). The language of vs. 3 is particularly pointed in this respect: God "condemned sin in the flesh." It is "sin in the flesh" not "sin in his flesh," for there is no sin in Christ. His flesh is "representative of all flesh"² and by conquering sin in the flesh, Christ has broken its dominion (cf. Rom. 6:6-11). For Paul, the power of sin in the flesh is broken by Christ—in His life but supremely in the death of Christ in obedience to the will of the Father (cf. Phil. 2:8). "He who has died

¹See Barrett, Romans, p. 156; Michel, Römer, pp. 160f.
²Leivestad, op.cit., p. 118.
is freed from sin" (Rom. 6:7) and thus sin and death no longer rule (Rom. 6:9-11; 5:12-21). God has condemned sin in the flesh through the life and death of Christ and those who have died with Christ have therefore died to sin and death: "The death he died, he died to sin, once for all, but the life he lives, he lives to God. So you must also reckon yourselves dead to sin but living to God in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 6:10-11). The condemnation was borne by Christ and thus "there is therefore no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1). "Those in Christ" are under now "the rule of the Spirit of life" (Rom. 8:2). The Christian does not now live according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit (Rom. 8:4-13). It should be emphasized at this point that Paul is not thinking of a mythical redemption from material existence: we are free from the flesh and its power but we still live an embodied existence (Rom. 8:11). "The deliverance is freedom from the flesh, but not from the body, but the freedom of the body from the flesh, i.e. from sin and death." We have thus with Christ died—death is for the Christian a past event. The power of the enemy over us is broken. The death of Christ was for us. He was "put to death for our trespasses" (Rom. 4:25). We were helpless in our bondage but Christ died for the ungodly, the helpless, the sinner (Rom. 5:6, 8-11). He was made sin, though He was not Himself a sinner, in order that

1On flesh and spirit see above esp. Part II, Ch. 2, B, 2. Also Part I, Ch. 2, G, 2 and D, 4. See also Althaus, Römer, pp. 76-79 (excursus on "Flesh and Spirit in Paul").
2Althaus, Römer, p. 76.
we might be made the righteousness of God in Him (II Cor. 5:21). In no other way could we be freed from the powers that have enslaved us. The payment (or wages) for the life of the flesh, of sin, is death—that payment was made for us by Him in whom we have been set free (e.g. Rom. 3:23-25; 4:24-25; 5:8, 12-21; 6:2, 10, 20-23; Gal. 2:19-21; 4:4f.; et al.). The return (καὶ τὸ δικαίωμα, fruit, result) for the new life is sanctification and eternal life (Rom. 6:22-23). Death is God's judgment on sin (Rom. 3:23; et al.), but the Christian has this judgment behind him. He is now no longer condemned (Rom. 8:1) for the condemnation has been borne by God's own Son (Rom. 8:3-4; cf. 6:23; Gal. 3:13; 4:4f.; et al.). We are freed from the wrath of God's judgment (Rom. 6:9, 18, 20-21; cf. I Thess. 1:10; Mt. 3:7; Jn. 3:18, 36) and are at peace with God who has reconciled us to Himself in Christ—His love overcoming our enmity (e.g. Rom. 5:1; 8:11; II Cor. 5:14-15, 17-19; Phil. 4:7).

2. Faith as the means of union with Christ.

We must now very briefly ask and answer the question of "how do we die with Christ?" How are we to understand the phrase "died with Christ" and the cognates such as "crucified with Christ" (e.g. Gal. 2:20; Rom. 6:6; Gal. 5:24), "baptized into his death" (Rom. 6:3f.; Col. 2:12; Gal. 3:27)? How are we to

---

1See e.g. Althaus, Die letzten Dinge, p. 117 (The Christian believer "knows a last judgment is still before him, but 'in Christ' he stands on the other side of this judgment."). Cf. Barth, Dogmatics, III, 2, p. 606.
understand the meaning of union with Christ.\(^1\) It should be noted at the outset that Paul nowhere posits a mystical absorption into the divine.\(^2\) He never sees man or himself as one with the divine. Rather man (or himself) is seen as "with" Christ or "in Christ."\(^3\) Paul's description of a tremendous mystical experience never intimates a loss of personal identity (II Cor. 12:1ff.). The closest that Paul ever comes to an identity is in Gal. 2:20 ("it is no longer I who live but Christ lives in me"). Yet even here Paul affirms the "I," for the words that follow definitely state that he lives ("the life that I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God"). A definite I—Thou relationship is preserved.\(^4\)

Union with Christ is, further, no mechanical process. Here we must disagree with Schweitzer when he writes\(^5\) that union with Christ takes place in the sacraments automatically. He writes, for example:

The idea that it is only through a believing self-surrender to absorption in Christ that the Elect can bring about the

---


\(^3\) We will treat this in our next section.


mystical fellowship with Him is quite outside of Paul's horizon. He assumes as self-evident that a grafting into Christ takes place in Baptism and is bound up with this ceremonial act.1

Of the Lord's Supper he writes: "It effects fellowship with Christ."2 On the contrary, we assert that faith is the means of uniting with Christ.3 We may begin with the mystical passage of Gal. 2:20. Paul here affirms union with Christ and clearly relates it to faith.4 The life he now lives he lives by faith in the Son of God.5 His life in the flesh is now lived in the sphere of faith—the faith which brings him into close fellowship with Christ and thus shares in His victory. Another passage which connects "in Christ" with faith is Gal. 3:26 ("for in Christ Jesus you are all sons of God through faith.")6 Faith, for Paul, is the response to the Grace of God. It is the response to God's prior deed in Christ on man's behalf. "It is the yes—the complete response—of the soul to the grace of God embodied in Christ crucified and risen."7 That is

1Ibid., p. 19 (cf. also p. 117).
2Ibid., p. 20 (cf. p. 21).
4On faith see above Part IV, Ch. 1, B, 2, 6 and references listed there and also Stewart, op.cit., 173-186; Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, pp. 32ff.; C.A. Scott, op.cit., pp. 98-108; et al.
5Tacking refer to e.g. op. cit. as an objective genitive (see Burton, Galatians, pp. 138f.; Stewart, op.cit., p. 182; et al.).
6Cf. also e.g. Gal. 3:14, 22; I Thess. 4:14; Eph. 1:15.
7Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, pp. 32-33. Also C.A. Scott, op.cit., p. 133; Stewart, op.cit., pp. 173, 182, 186; Althaus, Römer, p. 42; et al.
to say, faith as man's response to God's mighty act of salvation in man's behalf, means to accept and depend on what God has done for us in Christ. This faith is not, however, simply a passive trust or acceptance. It is a dynamic term. It includes obedience, the way of life of the Christian (e.g. Rom. 1:5; Gal. 2:20; Phil. 2:8-10). We conclude by quoting two passages of relevance to the discussion of union with Christ and its relation to faith. The first is Eph. 3:17, "that Christ may dwell in your hearts by means of faith." This passage may well be compared with Gal. 2:20. It is clearly stated in Eph. 3:17, that the indwelling of Christ in the heart is by means of faith (στηρισθείσα). The second passage is Phil. 3:8-11, a passage which connects faith with the ideas of the death, suffering and resurrection of Christ with the believer sharing in them. The passage runs:

For his sake I have suffered the loss of all things, and count them as refuse, in order that I may gain Christ and be found in him, not having a righteousness of my own, based on law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness from God that depends on faith; that I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and may share his sufferings, becoming like him in his death, that if possible I may attain the resurrection from the dead. (RSV).

3. Union with Christ's baptism.

Baptism, writes Paul, is significant in this matter of union with Christ. For we are baptized into his death (cf. Lk. 12:50; Mk. 10:38-39). Baptism sets the seal on faith (II Cor. 1:22;...

---


2Baptism, op. cit., p. 185; Hunter, op. cit., pp. 33ff.; et al.
Eph. 1:13, 4:30; I Cor. 6:11; 12:13). It means more than this, however. It also means the believer is dead with Christ, as we have said before. It means freedom from condemnation and that means free from sin: "consider yourselves dead to sin" (Rom. 6:11; cf. vv. 2, 5-8). The old man, sold under sin and destined for death, has died. We are "buried with Him in baptism" (Rom. 6:4). The old man is thus dead and we now live with Him in newness of life (Rom. 6:4; II Cor. 5:15, 17). As the Apostles' Creed has expressed the finality of the death of Christ in the expression "crucified, dead and buried," so Paul writes that we have been crucified (e.g. Gal. 2:20; Rom. 6:5, 6; Gal. 5:24), dead (e.g. Rom. 6:3; Col. 3:3) and buried (Rom. 6:4). The rite of baptism is for Paul grounded in the historical act of God in Jesus Christ and therefore cannot be a rite of mythology. It has its roots in Jesus' own baptism (Mk. 1:9-11) and in His baptism of death (Lk. 12:50). His disciples shared in the baptism of death (Mk. 10:38-39; Rom. 6:2ff.; Col. 2:12). But more than that is meant by baptism. It is also an incorporation into the Body of Christ as the rite of initiation into the Church. Gal. 3:27 relates baptism in


2Stewart, op.cit., p. 191.

3See I Cor. 1:13 where Paul again relates the death of Christ and baptism in the name of Christ. Union with Christ is always based on the historical fact of Jesus Christ. See esp. Barth, Dogmatics, III, 2, pp. 469ff.

its corporate sense (cf. Eph. 4:24; Col. 3:10). The Church was "baptized" at Pentecost (Acts 2) and received the Spirit. To this corresponds the baptism of Jesus and the coming of the Spirit upon Him. Common to each are the ideas of mission and power. Thus the Christian at baptism is not only baptized into the death of Christ but also receives the Spirit of mission and power (e.g. Acts 2:38; Rom. 6:4). Rom. 6:4 presents the idea of Christian life as a newness of life in Christ by the Spirit (cf. 6:13, 17; I Cor. 12:13). With Rom. 6:4 should also be compared Gal. 5:16 which speaks of "walking by the Spirit" (cf. also Rom. 8:4ff.). Baptism portrays thus the dying with Christ of the sinful nature of man and the believer's rising with Christ to newness of life.

B. Death as a Present Status.

1. "In Christ" (έν Χριστῷ).

This phrase, so short in wording, is one of the richest in meaning as well as one of the most frequently used in all of Paul's writings. It is used with several meanings, all of

---

1 Scott, op. cit., p. 118.
2 What for Jesus was two baptisms is for the believer only one, for the Christian by faith is baptized after Jesus' death and into it and receives the Spirit. Thus the duality of Christ's baptism (of mission and of death for sin) is preserved in New Testament baptism. Heb. 6:2ff. speaks of a "crucifying" of the Son of God aresh by a second baptism (cf. Eph. 4:5; I Cor. 12:13).

3 The phrase, including cognates such as "in Him;" "in the Lord," is used about 200 times in Paul's letters. So Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, p. 37. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, p. 152, and Delassmann, Paul, p. 140 count 164. The different figures depend partly on cognate phrases included, partly on the question of Pauline authorship of the letters.
which we cannot discuss here. The phrase is seldom used outside of Paul's writings and does not appear at all in the Synoptics. At times it has the meaning "Christian," a word not used by Paul (e.g. Philemon 16, Rom. 16:7,11). The deepest significance of the term for us is the use of the term to denote communion with Christ. The meaning of "in Christ" is illuminated by the parallel phrase "in the Spirit." The two phrases are often almost interchangeable. One can see this, for example, by comparing the uses of "in the Spirit" with "in Christ" in terms of sanctification (Rom. 15:16; I Cor. 1:2), joy (Rom. 14:17; Phil. 3:1), righteousness (Rom. 14:17; II Cor. 5:21) love (Col. 1:8; Rom. 8:39), being filled (Eph. 5:18; Col. 2:10), fellowship (II Cor. 13:13; I Cor. 1:9), one body (I Cor. 12:13; Rom. 12:5) and others. In Rom. 8 Paul describes the life "in the Spirit" (Rom. 8:9), which is an outgrowth of the phrase in 8:1, "there is therefore no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus." To be "in the Spirit" is to live in the sphere of the Spirit which is

---

2TWNT, II, p. 537; Scott, on cit., p. 151ff.
3See TWNT, II, p. 537; Stewart, on cit., p. 158; Scott, on cit., p. 153; Bultmann, Theology, I, p. 329; Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, p. 37.
4Deissmann, Paul, pp. 138ff.; Schweitzer, Mysticism, pp. 122ff. illustrate and enumerate this use of the phrase (esp. Schweitzer) at some length. See also TWNT, II, p. 537ff.
7So Stewart, on cit., p. 157.
now the power of the believer's life. The Spirit is the Spirit of Christ (Rom. 8:16). Through the Spirit Christ is made real and comes to the believer; to belong to the Spirit is to belong to Christ (e.g. see Rom. 8:9-11). Both ideas express the sense of an intimate closeness and fellowship. He who is in Christ is a new creation (II Cor. 5:17), the new man in Christ Jesus. The Spirit and Christ are now within (e.g. Eph. 3:16ff.; Gal. 2:20). The phrase "in Christ," writes Deissmann, "must be conceived as the peculiarly Pauline expression of the most intimate possible fellowship of the Christian with the living spiritual Christ." "With the living Christ"—this is the key that the phrase, as Deissmann rightly sees, does not mean a mythical union with a mythical figure but a communion with an historical figure who nevertheless is not just in history as an admired figure with whom we may commune as we do with other past and dead historical figures (e.g. Shakespeare or Paul) but a living and present Christ. It is not remembrance that is in view but an I-Thou communion. We are men in Christ by the Holy Spirit. As Deissmann so well expresses it:

Just as the air of life, which we breathe, is 'in' us and fills us, and yet we at the same time live in this air and breathe it, so it is also with the Christ-intimacy of the apostle Paul: Christ in him, he in Christ.

---

1 That Christ and Spirit may not be identified but are closely related was discussed earlier (Part II, Ch. 2, esp. A, 3). Deissmann, Paul, p. 138 and others are wrong, thus, to simply identify Christ and the Spirit.

2 Paul, p. 140.

3 Cf. also Barth, Dogmatics, III, 2, p. 468ff.

To be in Christ means, further, to be in the community of Christ, the body of Christ. That is, membership in the community of Christ is meant. Thus Paul can in I Cor. 12 practically identify Christ and the church: "Just as the body is one and has many members . . ., so it is with Christ" (v. 13). He is the head of the Church which is His body (Col. 1:18; Eph. 5:23). The Church is the body of Christ and we are members of that body. In the person of Christ can be expressed the corporate solidarity of the new humanity in Him (see e.g. Rom. 5:12-21; I Cor. 15:20-23; Eph. 1:22-23; Gal. 3:27; et al.). The two, believer and Christ, Church and Head, are not identical but their community of fellowship is complete as a social organism, a society, a community. Paul "is clear that to be in Christ, while it is a great personal experience and privilege, is a privilege which inevitably puts a man into the Church and binds him to his fellow-believers in the 'one body of Christ' (esp. I. Cor. 12:27), . . ." "Being in Christ" is at once an individual and corporate experience of fellowship. Life in Christ is life also in the fellowship of the Church. Thus Paul avoids both a rank individualization of Christian life and an equally rank absorption of the individual into a "society,"


2See also Part II, Ch. 2, B, 1, c, d; B, 2, and Part IV, Ch. 1, B, 2, c.

3See e.g. Scott, op.cit., p. 158.

4On this see also ref. above to "body" and Rom. 5:12-21. See also e.g. Scott, op.cit., p. 158; Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, p. 43.

a humanism. Both communion and community are properly emphasized and there cannot be one without the other.

Paul became this "man in Christ" at his conversion and his life thereafter was one of constant growth in both communion and community. Union with Christ is given by God, not achieved by man (e.g. Gal. 1:15f.; I Cor. 1:9, 30; II Cor. 1:21f.; Rom. 6:23; 8:28ff.).

Very briefly we must now deal with the contention of Deissmann that the "in Christ" concept is Paul's innovation. We should first note that the phrase does appear outside Paul's writings in Acts, Peter and the Johannine literature. Expressions similar to Paul's use of the term abound in these writings.

For example, Paul writes of speaking in Christ (Rom. 9:1; Eph. 4:17) and in Acts, the Apostles preach in Christ (Acts 4:2), while I Peter attributes the speaking of the Old Testament prophets to the Spirit of Christ (I Pet. 1:11). John speaks of abiding in Christ (e.g. Jn. 17:21, 23, 26; Ch. 15; I Jn. 5:20) expressing in much the same manner as Paul the sense of intimate fellowship with Christ. Or again, John 16:33 and I Peter 5:14 speak of peace in Christ (cf. e.g. Phil. 4:7; Rom. 5:1). John, as does Paul, speaks of the gift of the Spirit to dwell in us (e.g. Jn. 14:17; I Jn. 4:13; cf. Rom. 8:9ff.). Life or salvation are in Christ (e.g. Acts 4:12; Jn. 4:14; I Jn. 5:11; I Pet. 5:10).

---

1 Note e.g. the plurals in Rom. 8:1; Col. 3:1-4 as well as the singulars in II Cor. 5:17; et al.
2 See e.g. Stewart, op.cit., pp. 161ff.
4 Paul, p. 140 ("peculiarly Pauline expression"). cf. TWNT, II, p. 537 ("Paul is its proper bearer, perhaps its creator").
5 Scott, op.cit., p. 152.
We are freed from sin (I Jn. 3:5) and from all else (Acts 13:39). The same sense of intimate communion with Christ is expressed as is found in Paul and with the same benefits. The means of communion is faith (e.g. Jn. 4:14; 14:10ff.; 12:36; Acts 4:10-12; I Jn. 5:13; I Pet. 1:3ff., 21; 2:24f.). If Paul originated the phrase and the concept, it was taken over by others to express the same sense of intimate fellowship. But is there not to be found also in the Synoptic Gospels the warrant for Paul's teaching? The phrase in the Pauline sense is almost lacking in them, although the germ of Paul's "indwelling Spirit" is to be found in Mt. 10:20 ("for it is not you who speak but the Spirit of your Father speaking through you")\(^1\). In Mark 6:14 Herod is referred to as recognizing "powers are at work in him"\(^2\) (Christ), which is at least a foretaste of Paul's concept of power in Christ.\(^3\) Further, the idea of fellowship with Jesus, though not expressed by means of the Pauline formulae, is surely present in the Gospels.\(^4\) The association of Jesus with the disciples is never described as an \(\epsilon \nu \chi r i s t \) experience\(^5\) in these exact words. But the idea is found in the Synoptics in the expression of the close fellowship between Jesus and His

---

\(^1\)\(\epsilon \nu \chi r i s t \) (cf. Mt. 14:2).

\(^2\)In Mark it is frequent that what Jesus does, and in particular who He is, is recognized and confessed by others (e.g. see on the confession of Jesus as Son of God by others Mk. 1:1; 1:11 and 9:7; 3:11 and 5:7; 14:61; 15:39).


\(^4\)The Synoptics use \(\mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \) not \(\epsilon \nu \). See Scott, *op.cit.*, p. 152; Stewart, *op.cit.*, p. 155.
followers. Mt. 18:20 comes easily to mind in this connection: "for where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (cf. Mt. 28:20). The command to follow is the command to leave all and follow Jesus in the path of fellowship and service (e.g. Mt. 10:38; Mk. 8:34, 35, 38; Mt. 8:22; Mk. 10:28-30). On this aspect E. Schweizer remarks: "Following Jesus means togetherness with Jesus and service to him." It is expected that the disciples must share also in the fellowship of the suffering of the Son of Man (e.g. Mt. 5:11-12; Mk. 8:35, 38). If Jesus saw His ministry in terms of, at least in part, the Servant described by Deutero-Isaiah, he must also have seen as part of this mission the creation of a fellowship people: the Servant Lord and the Servant people. The Last Supper is in part a fellowship meal. Those who obey the will of God are part of the family of Jesus (Mk. 3:31-35). Those who accept the disciples whom He sent accept Him also (Mt. 10:40; cf. 18:5-6). Jesus calls His disciples "friends" (Lk. 12:5; Jn. 15:13ff.) or a "little flock" (Lk. 12:32) and other terms denoting fellowship. Even the idea of the Kingdom of God in Jesus' preaching includes the concept of a fellowship-community.

1 Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship, p. 20 (see same, pp. 11-21 on following Jesus).
2 See on this Ch. 1, B, 2 and also e.g. Hanson, Jesus, p. 110ff.; Cullmann, Christology, pp. 51-82; Fuller, op. cit., 86-95, 193ff.
3 The Servant idea in Isaiah is also a corporate idea. See e.g. references above and TWNT, V, esp. pp. 664-672, 696-713; C.R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, (London: Oxford University Press, 1956), Mowinckel, op. cit., pp. 187-257.
4 See also the logion on the bridegroom and fasting (Mk. 2:18-20).
Jesus "declared that in the fellowship with Him on which they had entered His followers had already the guarantee of future fellowship with the Son of Man."  

2. Dying and suffering daily.  

a. Synoptics.  

Fellowship with Christ involves suffering and even death. Jesus often warned His disciples to expect rejection, suffering and death (e.g. Mt. 5:11-12; Mk. 8:35, 38; 6:11; Lk. 10:6, 10ff., 16; Mt. 10:16-25, 34-42; et al.). Because the Son of Man is rejected, suffers and dies (e.g. Mk. 8:31, 9:31; 10:33-34) so also those who are His must be rejected, suffer and die. Mark 8:35, "for whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it," is a good text on this subject.  

"Soul" (ψυχή) has here a double meaning. One meaning comes to light from the preceding verse: whoever comes after me must deny himself and taking up his cross, follow me. To renounce or deny oneself means to give oneself entirely to follow Christ, denying himself the easy road of conformity. It carries the same idea as Paul's concept of dying to self and selfish desires (Gal. 5:24; 6:14). The second meaning

1 Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, p. 105 (see p. 109, "He brings them again and again face to face with the thought that by fellowship with Him they have fellowship with the Son of Man.").  

2 In Acts, Luke records not only the spread of the Gospel but also the opposition, suffering and death experienced by Jesus' followers.  

3 In Paul and the Synoptics reference is made to the cross.
involved here is the ultimate meaning that if in following Christ your life itself is lost, be not dismayed at such a prospect for in such an event you will have gained the life eternal. 1 Out of suffering (daily dying of the old self?) and dying comes life in Christ. 2

b. Paul.

It is in Paul that the concept of suffering and dying is brought to a clear expression. 3 For Paul it is not just "for my sake" (Mk. 8:35) but also suffering in and with Christ. The key texts here are: II Cor. 4:10ff., 16; 3:18; II Cor. 1:5; 15-31; Rom. 8:17ff.; 12:1ff.; Eph. 4:22ff.; Phil. 3:8ff.; Col. 1:24.

We may begin with Col. 1:24 where Paul speaks of his suffering as completing "that which is lacking in the afflictions of Christ for the sake of His body, the Church." What is meant by lacking? It could not be the sacrificial work of Christ that is meant for Paul elsewhere affirms its completeness (e.g. Rom. 3:24ff.; 5:1ff., 6-11, 12-21; II Cor. 5:17, 21; et al.). There can be little doubt that this is not what is meant.

---

1 Ψυχή has the double reference of life and personality (self). On this passage see esp. Taylor, Mark, pp. 381-382; A. Schlatter, Die Evangelien nach Markus und Lukas, (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1947), pp. 82ff.; Schniewind, Markus, p. 85.

2 "for my sake" is the key. It is not suffering and dying in general but "for my sake" (cf. Mt. 5:11-12).

3 On this see esp. Stewart, op.cit., pp. 190ff.; Leivestad, op.cit., pp. 138-150; Schweitzer, Mysticism, pp. 142-159.
"Never for a moment would he allow any obscuring of his central conviction that Christ had finished the work God had given Him to do." Col. 1:21ff. demonstrates this clearly. What is lacking is Paul's participation in that suffering in order that the "old man" may be put to death so that the new man in Christ may live. The lack is the correspondence of Jesus' suffering in the life of His body, the church. 

I Cor. 15:31 and II Cor. 4:10-12 may be considered also in this light. Paul speaks in II Cor. 4 about his suffering as an apostle (4:7-9) and then writes: "always carrying in the body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our bodies" (v. 10). Paul means that his suffering as an Apostle is a suffering with Christ, a suffering "for his sake and the Gospel's," which may very well end in death. His life was never free from peril, but in his sufferings the glory of life in Christ was being manifested. 

Thus "while we live we are always being given up to death for Jesus' sake, so that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh" (v. 11). They are living prey to the enemy.

---

1 Stewart, op. cit., p. 190; cf. Barth, Dogmatics, III, 2, p. 622.
2 So Barth, Dogmatics, III, 2, p. 622 (see also Barth's remark in the same place: "Those who have been crucified and are dead and therefore live with Him (Gal. 2:20) cannot help bearing the traces of this event, suffering the aftermath of His woes, and living in His shadow").
of God, but life is victorious in Christ and the witness even in the midst and partly as a consequence of suffering and death produces life (v. 12). In I Cor. 15:31 a similar thought is expressed. In fact, II Cor. 4:7-12 is the proper commentary on I Cor. 15:31, "I die every day" (cf. v. 30 "why am I in peril every hour?"). II Cor. 1:5 is probably to be taken as expressing a similar thought. Yet, in these passages still more is meant. To that we now turn by considering the second group of passages.

The second group of passages, Eph. 4:22ff.; Phil. 3:10ff.; Rom. 8:17ff.; 12:1ff.; II Cor. 4:16 introduce us to the final key to Paul's thought on dying and suffering with Christ. It is not only that Paul's calling as an apostle to proclaim the word of redemption in Christ leads him along a similar path as was trod by his master—a path that meant loyalty to Him would and did result in a recapitulation of the opposition, persecution, suffering and death of His Lord. It meant this also. But Paul never felt himself equal to His Lord and thus saw in his suffering the constant dying of that man he was before Damascus. It is the old man, the body of flesh (sin and death) that is still with him that must daily be put to death in order that the new man in Christ may become more and more a reality in Him. This is the meaning of, for example, Phil. 3:8-11, "for his sake I have suffered...that I may gain Christ and

1So also Plummer, op.cit., pp. 11f.; Lietzmann, op.cit., pp. 99f.  
be found in Him, . . . that I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and may share his sufferings, becoming like him in his death.\(^1\) Paul must die to the old self in order to realize the new self, die to the old world to gain the new world. For this reason he knows he is not perfect but presses on to that perfection (Phil. 3:12). He must "put to death the deeds of the body" (Rom. 8:13). We must suffer with Christ in order to be glorified with Him (Rom. 8:17) and be conformed to His death that the newness of life in Him might triumph now in our mortal bodies. II Cor. 4:16f. portrays the same thought: "though our outer man is wasting away, our inner man is being renewed every day. For this slight momentary affliction is preparing for us an eternal weight of glory beyond all comparison" (cf. 4:7-12). Paul does not mean here "that part of us" which is described as the inner man is "the highest part of our immaterial being; that which is capable of being the home of the Holy Spirit and of being ruled by Him."\(^2\) It is rather the whole man which we are as the new creation in Christ (II Cor. 5:17).\(^3\) The Christian is still in flesh, still the

---


\(^2\) Against Plummer, op. cit., p. 136. Quotes are from Plummer.

\(^3\) See Nikolainen, op. cit., pp. 165f.
man opposed to God for whom Christ died and is yet at the same
time the new man in Christ, delivered from the flesh. The
new life is hidden in the old and the conflict of the two
occurs always in this life until we are finally divested of
the old completely with the redemption of our bodies at the
parousia of the Lord Jesus (Rom. 8:23; cf. I Cor. 15:42ff.;
Rom. 7). The life of the Christian is this daily dying of
the old man and daily renewing of the new man. Thus the
present afflictions are "slight momentary" ones, not worthy
of comparison with the eternal weight of glory that is coming
(v. 17). II Cor. 4:7-12 should be seen in the same context
of the dying of the old man and renewing of the new. Eph. 4:
22ff. is another passage in similar vein: "Put off the old
nature. . . and put on the new nature." Paul in this passage
leaves no doubt that the new is not a part of man as he is but
is a gift of God and His creation ("created after the likeness of God," v. 24). Again the speech is of renewal by the
Spirit (v. 23). Paul is writing here, as he wrote in II Cor.,
that the Christian life is a putting to death (or away) the
old man and his way of life. It is as if he has said, 'become
what in Christ you are.' In all of this Paul is saying to

---

1 See the remarks of H. Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther,
(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954). p. 167, which are
in most respects similar to mine.

2 It is surely a tribute to the faith of this "man in
Christ" that in the light of the afflictions he had to endure
in his work that he could nevertheless call them "slight momentary"
one! (cf. Rom. 8:18). Such faith is rare and only a man of
such faith could speak these words meaningfully.

3 From Dodd, Romans, p. 93.
the effect that 'you have died with Christ and the old man is 
freed from sin and death. You must now seek to live the life 
that is yours as a man in Christ, raised with Him to newness 
of life.'¹ In the Christian's life must be manifested the fruits 
of the Spirit which now indwells him (Rom. 8; Gal. 5:22-25). 
The striving for the fullest possible realization in this life 
of the life of the Spirit must be the goal of Christian life. 
Such a life will bear its proper harvest in due time (Gal. 6:7-10). 
Does Paul mean to imply now a salvation by works? or a per¬ 
fection of the given Christian life by human efforts? Neither is 
meant. The problem of a works salvation need not delay us (see 
e.g. Gal. 5:2ff., 11ff.; Phil. 3:8-11). That a human effort 
to become perfect is both included and excluded is not so easily 
expressed. If what we have said earlier be correct, viz. that 
a man is only in Christ by faith as the acceptance of and trust 
in what God has given us in Christ, it follows that the life 
of faith is also God's gift.² We are to live by the power of 
the Spirit given us by God (resp. Christ). At the same time 
we must ourselves strive for the fullest possible realization 
of the new life in Christ. It is "by the Spirit" that we put 
to death the deeds of the body (Rom. 8:13). It is he who sows 
to the Spirit who reaps eternal life (Gal. 6:8). Both are a

¹Rom. 6:2ff. See similar remarks in Stewart, op. cit., 
pp. 190-191; Wendland, op. cit., pp. 164ff. (on II Cor. 4:7-12). 
²See above A.
part of the new life: the Spirit as the power of the new life; we who are the new creation in Christ Jesus living the new life. "If we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit" (Gal. 5:25). It is the paradox of life: 1 "I live, yet not I live but Christ lives in me;" "I live by the faith of the Son of God" (Gal. 2:20). I am dead but yet I live in Christ (Col. 3:1-4), therefore, put to death the old man and live the new life in Christ (Col. 3:5ff.).

We may now summarize Paul's teaching on this subject. Death for Paul is also a present status. The Christian must constantly put to death the old man and by the Spirit renew the new man in Christ. For Paul that man who died then 2 must continually suffer and die as he sought to fully realize the new life in Christ and grow into the likeness of the stature of Christ (Rom. 8:29; Eph. 4:13, 15). This growth is a continual growth into the likeness of the death of Christ. Our dying is 3 partaking of Christ's suffering and dying. We do not

1See Leivestad, op.cit., p. 140.
2At Damascus, not baptism. Paul's experience is grounded in his encounter with the risen Christ. But since other Christians did not so encounter Christ, he describes their encounter as taking place at baptism. Paul's experience of conversion on the road to Damascus is the starting point of his Christ-mysticism and therefore his mysticism is grounded in the experience with the crucified and living Savior. See esp. Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 153; Barth, Dogmatics, III, 2, pp. 468 ff.; Stewart, op.cit., p. 164.
actually die in our sense of the term but rather present ourselves as a living sacrifice to God so that our lives may be transformed (Rom. 12:1f.). This living death is a mortifying (putting to death) of our old life and an intensification of our union with Christ until our union with Him is completed and perfected at the Parousia when the full life of the resurrection takes place. It should be noted in this respect that in most of the passages we have been considering Paul speaks of the resurrection with Christ when our redemption is completed and perfected (e.g. See Rom. 6:4, 5, 8, 11; II Cor. 1:9; 4:14; Eph. 4:30; Phil. 3:10, 11, 20f.; Col. 1:19, 27 which are taken from the contexts of the passages where the suffering and dying of the old man is taught). We thus grow toward the fullness of our life in Christ (e.g. Col. 2:6-7) but only achieve that fullness at the resurrection when our mortal bodies will be changed to the likeness of His glorious body (Phil. 3:21; cf. I Cor. 15:51ff.).

c. I Peter and John.

The idea of suffering and dying with Christ scarcely appears in the Johannine literature. The struggle present in the Christian life between the old and the new man brought

---

2We shall say more of the present experience of the resurrection in Ch. 4.
out so strongly in Paul receives only indirect reference. The mood of the Johannine literature is not the same as that reflected in Paul's letters. One suspects the author of the Johannine literature is not only a more mystically inclined person but also one who has endured far less strife and struggle in his life. The words of this writer dwell with confident assurance on the believer's life of communion with Christ and the assurance of victory in Him. "He who is in you is greater than he who is in the world" (I Jn. 4:4; cf. 5:18, 19). Love casts out fear (I Jn. 4:18). Yet the note of struggle is present. "In the world you have tribulation" (Jn. 16:33) which is followed by the assurance "but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world" (See also Jn. 15:18ff.). John warns against the world which can corrupt (I Jn. 2:15-17) and urges the believer to purify himself (Jn. 3:3). Judgment is a threat also for the believer as for the unbeliever (I Jn. 4:17; Jn. 5:24, 29). Some are saved and others are not (e.g. 3:16-21, 36; 5:34; et al.).

The idea of suffering is more prominent in I Peter, who, unlike Paul, speaks of suffering but never of dying with Christ.¹ The believer's suffering is connected to the suffering of Christ (I Pet. 2:21; 4:1, 3; cf. Heb. 13:12-13). Suffering, according to these passages, is an imitating of those endured by Christ. Suffering is also a means of growing

¹On I Peter see esp. Schweitzer, Mysticism, pp. 141f., 145f.
in the new life toward perfection (I Pet. 1:6-7, 11; 2:20; 3:14; 4:1-2; 13, 16, 19; 5:9, 10). I Pet. 5:10 is a good example; "the God of all peace ... will restore, establish and strengthen you, after you have suffered a little while." Or again 4:13, "But rejoice in so far as you share Christ's sufferings, that you may also rejoice and be glad when his glory is revealed" (RSV). Salvation, however, is not obtained through suffering: "as the outcome of your faith you obtain the salvation of your souls" (1:9). Suffering is one means of growth.1

C. Death as a Future Departing.

1. Death as sleep.2

The belief that death is a sleep or that death or dying can be described in terms of sleeping or falling asleep respectively is not a New Testament innovation. Sleep as a euphemism for death is found in classical Greek literature and has been noted in some Greek grave inscriptions.3 We have already noted

---

1Feeding on the Word of the Gospel is another means of growth. See 2:2f. (cf. 1:25).


3See Kennedy, St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things, p. 267; TWNT, II, p. 13, n. 60; 439f.
the use of the term in the Jewish literature of the Intertestamental Period. The Rabbis also used the term "sleep" to describe the dead, meaning that the righteous dead are in a sense alive. Resurrection means thus to awake from the dead (e.g. Dan. 12:2; II Esdras 7:32). The term is used in this literature (Jewish and Rabbinic) most frequently of the righteous, whether a resurrection is affirmed or not (cf. Gen. 47:30 and II Esdras 7:32), carrying the connotation of "peace" or even "rest."

In the New Testament sleep (usually ἐκάνειν) as a reference to death is used only of believers. Col. is used about 18 times (by my count) in the New Testament and of

---


3 The conclusion may not be drawn from this that "sleep" is always a reference to resurrection. Ecclus. 46:19 (cf. II Sam. 7:12; I Kgs. 2:10; Jub. 10:23; Job 21:26; et al.) expresses only that the dead sleep forever.

4 So also Volz, op. cit., p. 257.

5 ἐκάνειν appears rarely in this sense: I Thess. 5:10; Mk. 5:39 (and parallels) and possibly Eph. 5:14. See above Part IV, Ch. 1, A, 2, b.

6 Acts 13:36 speaks of David in this sense, and may be an exception that only believers are spoken of as dead in the sense of "asleep." As an Old Testament saint, however, David qualifies as a "believer" and thus Acts 13:36 is not a true exception.
these 14 refer to death or the dead, the majority of uses occurring in Paul (9: I Cor. 7:39; 11:30; 15:6, 18, 20, 51; I Thess. 4:13, 14, 15). Two technical points need to be made on this verb: one, it appears only in the passive in the New Testament; two, Paul uses the term in only two of his letters, both among his earlier writings. The question is: what is meant by the term as a reference to death, dying or the dead? Does it describe the status of the dead? Some help is given by consulting the passages and arranging them in categories. Several facts again come to light. One fact is that in only two cases where death or dying are meant does the verb appear in the present tense: I Cor. 11:30 (some who have abused the Lord's Supper are falling asleep) and I Thess. 4:13 (do not grieve over "those who are asleep"). The other uses of the verb appear in the aorist (8: I Cor. 7:39; 15:6, 18; I Thess. 4:14, 15; Acts 7:60; 13:36; II Pet. 3:4), perfect (3: Jn. 11:11; Mt. 27:52; I Cor. 15:20) and future (1: I Cor. 15:51). A second
fact of relevance is that the majority of uses can be translated quite simply as "died" (or equivalent).\(^1\) In two of the uses it is the manner of death that is described (Acts 7:60; 13:36). Acts 7:60 clearly refers to the manner of death, for Stephen dies in peace while being stoned to death. The manner of his dying in the process of being killed by a violent means is thus pointed up sharply by the phrase "he fell asleep." In only one usage can a good case be made out for sleep as a description of the status of the dead (I Thess. 4:13). The departed are described as asleep. Yet this case is also a doubtful one, for MSS evidence indicates an alternate rendering in the perfect tense. The evidence for the perfect is not strong (K, L, D, G and some miniscules). It would seem quite precarious to assume the status of the dead is described by the word "sleep" when only one passage appears to indicate it and when, further, that passage itself is open to some question.\(^2\) That "sleep" does describe the status of the dead is a clearly established use of the Intertestamental literature,\(^3\) but here it is only clearly so in the literature that on other grounds affirms belief in blessed after life. The association of the

\(^1\)e.g. Jn. 11:11 ("our friend Lazarus has 'fallen asleep'"); cf. Jn. 11:14, which interprets 11:11, ("Lazarus is dead"). Thus also: I Cor. 11:30; 7:39; 15:6, 18, 20, 51; I Thess. 4:14, 15; Mt. 27:52; II Pet. 3:4.  
\(^2\)Quite a good sense results from translating simply "are dead."  
\(^3\)See above Part III, Ch. 2, B, 3, 4; D, 2, b and see Charles, Eschatology, p. 127 (n.l) who warns that the term is not to be identified with resurrection.
word "sleep" is not that of a proper designation of the Intermediate State per se, but may in context denote the righteous dead in contrast to the wicked dead—the former are at rest, or in peace. The dead are on occasion said to be resting in caverns or chambers (e.g. II Esdras 7:32, 75, 95, 121; II Baruch 30:2; Enoch 22). Paul never refers to departed Christians as waiting in "chambers" until the resurrection.1

We conclude that the term 'sleep' is a euphemism for death2 and probably does not primarily describe the state of the dead as being asleep (a sort of soul-sleep).3 The term, however, is more than just a euphemism and indicates both the manner of dying (e.g. Acts 7:60) and the meaning of death for the Christian.4 As in the Old Testament one could die in peace having lived a full life and achieved the goal of life in communion with God,5 so in the New Testament could the Christian "fall asleep" in peace.6 In the New Testament it

1See above Part III, Ch. 2, B, 3.
2The closest to this idea anywhere in the New Testament is Rev. 6:9 which speaks of "souls under the altar."
3See also Fries, "Jesu Vorstellungen von der Auferstehung..." pp. 306-307; et al.
4Against Gullmann, Immortality, pp. 51ff., 55, 56, 57. See also Kennedy, Last Things, p. 268 who also denies a soul sleep is meant by Paul.
5We must dispute Gullmann's statement against K. Barth that the term "finds no support in the New Testament" as a description of a "peaceful going to sleep" (Immortality, p. 51, n. 6). Acts 7:60; I Cor. 7:39; Acts 13:36 all indicate this is partially the meaning of the term.
6See Part II, Ch. 1, B.
7On this see Barth, Dogmatics, III, 2, pp. 638ff.
is an even stronger statement than in the Old Testament for Christ has risen and become the "first-fruits of those who have fallen asleep" (I Cor. 15:20). Those who die "in the Lord" or "in Christ" (e.g. I Thess. 4:16) have the terror of death (judgment of condemnation and separation from God) behind them. They are at rest (Rev. 14:13). This does not describe the state of the dead, but rather speaks of death as it affects the Christian. The believer may no longer fear death, for its terror is no longer. To fall asleep is the closest the New Testament ever gets to conception of death as a "natural death," but it is not really a "natural death." On the contrary, death is even for the Christian unnatural. There is nothing in the freedom from death (or should we say the freedom for death--death devoid of its power and sting?) that is a natural capability for man, a natural possession of the soul now restored. It is rather a gift of God. It is said or assumed in most of the passages using "sleep" for the death of the Christian that

---

1Sleep and death in the Old Testament and elsewhere has its origin in the appearance of the dead. They appear to be sleeping, but in death the sleep is forever. (See Thomson, "Sleep: an Aspect of Jewish Anthropology," pp. 423ff.). Sleep is man at less than full vigor. The dead are also at less than full vigor. The dead are weak and bereft of strength. Later rabbin illustrated man's sleeping and rising each morning as a miniature resurrection (see Thomson, "Sleep: . . .", pp. 424f., 430.).

2See above A and B on freed from sin and death.

3Against Barth, Dogmatics, III, 2, pp. 637f., 639.

4See also Michel, "Zur Lehre vom Todeschlag," p. 289. He states that sleep is not a speculation on the nature of the soul but affirms the promise of the resurrection.
they "die in Christ." Only in the light of His resurrection can our death be called a "sleep," for death still retains outwardly its character of the enemy and destroyer. But death can never annul the one fact that stands against it: viz., Christ is risen from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep (I Cor. 15:20). Only thus can it be said of the dead in Christ that they "fall asleep." Because Christ is risen, the dead in Christ do not perish in death (I Cor. 15:17ff.). The key is once again, then, union with Christ. Those who are in Christ are freed from death as the enemy and destroyer. The future hope is to be "with Christ." Death as sleep designates death in the light of promise of the resurrection, while death as it affects the unbeliever is death without that promise.

2. Death as a sign of God's judgment.

We have noted earlier that one of the results of being in Christ is freedom from the judgment of condemnation. Death is God's judgment on sinful man. In Christ, the Christian has

1Barth rightly sees that the term properly means "to fall asleep" not "be asleep" when referring to the dead. See Dogmatics, III, 2, 639.
2See below sub-sections 3 and 4.
3See Michel, "Zur Lehre vom Todeschlaf," p. 286. J. C. Bowmer notes that οὐρνθέωκϊ is used of believers less frequently than κωμάκαω, while ουμάκαω is the regular term for unbelievers ("A note on οὐρνθέωκϊ and ουμάκαω," pp. 355-56). See also Althaus, Die Letzten Dinge, p. 113, who remarks that of the dead only this may be said: they are in the hands of their Creator.
4See above A, 1.
5See esp. Part II, Ch. 2, B, 1, c and 2.
judgment already behind him, for Christ has borne our judgment and condemnation.1 "There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1), for those who have died are freed from sin and its consequences, and we have died with Christ in baptism2 and have been raised with Him to newness of life (e.g. Rom. 6:7; 6:2-11; et al.). "He who hears my word and believes him who sent me has eternal life; he does not come into judgment, but has passed from death to life" (Jn. 5:24; cf. 5:25, 29; 3:18ff., 36; Jn. 3:14; 4:17). Paul frequently expresses this aspect of judgment by the use of the phrase "wrath" (of God).3 It was part of John the Baptist's message "to flee from the wrath to come" (Mt. 3:7; Lk. 3:7). Jesus never used this phrase "wrath" but does speak in synonymous terms of the coming Judgment (e.g. Mt. 10:15; 11:22, 24; 12:36, 41f.; 23:33; et al.). Paul uses the term also as an eschatological expression. "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven" against all human evil and ungodliness (Rom. 1:18). Even for the Jew who attempts to follow the Law but cannot, wrath awaits (Rom. 4:5). Outside of Christ all

---

1See above esp. A, 1.
4Lk. 21:23 may be an exception, but the word "wrath" is lacking in the parallels (Mk. 13:19; Mt. 24:21).
man are "children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3; 5:6). On all such does God's judgment (Rom. 2:2f.), His wrath (Rom. 2:5,8) fall. From this judgment, this wrath, has Christ delivered us "Since, therefore, we are now justified by his blood, much more shall we be saved by him from the wrath of God" (Rom. 5:9). We are to wait for God's Son from heaven, "whom he raised from the dead, Jesus, who delivers us from the wrath to come" (I Thess. 1:10), for we are not destined for wrath but for salvation through Jesus Christ (I Thess. 5:9). We are delivered from condemnation in Christ (Rom. 8:1; cf. 5:16, 18; 8:33f; Jn. 5:24; et al.). We have passed from death to life (Jn. 5:24) but yet we will still die. Even the Christian must yet face judgment (Rom. 14:10-12; II Cor. 5:10; Heb. 9:27; II Tim. 4:1; Jn. 5:29; Mt. 25:31-46; et al.), when he must face His Savior to render account of his life. But this is not the wrath of God that is to be faced, for condemnation is behind the Christian. But, because we have been delivered from wrath and condemnation and now abide in Christ, in the love of God in Christ, "we may have boldness in the day of judgment" (I Jn. 4:17). We thus stand yet under death as the sign of God's judgment. As all

1cf. Jn. 3:36, "he who does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God rests upon him." See also e.g. Rev. 6:16, 17; 11:18; 14:10; 16:19; 19:15; Heb. 3:11; 4:3; Rom. 12:19; Col. 3:6; I Thess. 2:16.
2See e.g. Althaus, Die Letzten Dinge, p. 117; Barth, Dogmatics, III, 2, pp. 609, 604ff., 615, 629; Richardson Theology, pp. 341ff.; Stewart, op.cit., pp. 269f.
3The boldness is only in Christ in whom alone may we have confidence and boast (cf. e.g. Phil. 2:16; 3:6; 1:26; Heb. 3:6).
4So Barth, Dogmatics, III, 2, pp. 609, 615, 624, etc.
men must, so must the Christian die. And also, as all men must, he meets God in death. But unlike all other men, the believer meets the God whom he encounters not in wrath but in love. Death is still for him the judgment, but only as the sign of judgment and not the judgment of God's consuming wrath. In the midst of death, even our own death, we are delivered out of it\(^1\) by Him who has tasted death for every man (Heb. 2:9).

We for whom Jesus took to Himself the judgment of God in death have been freed from our sin and guilt and therefore released from that sentence of death and delivered from having to suffer that second death. The end of Jesus Christ has made our end simply the sign of God's judgment.\(^2\)

In ourselves we must confess to being worthy of God's wrath, but in Christ we are delivered and stand now only under the sign of God's wrath, for the reality of condemnation is behind us, buried with Him who for us died. He rose—the condemnation shall never rise.

3. Death as departure.

The future destiny of the believer is to be "with Christ." This prepositional phrase, "with Christ" (συν Χριστοῦ),\(^3\) is not so frequently used as "in Christ." It nevertheless has a role to play in Paul's thought. Like "in Christ," "with Christ" denotes fellowship, communion, of the most intimate sort. This phrase has a past reference, as in Rom. 6:8, "died with

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 611.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 629.
\(^3\)and cognates as, for example, "with him," "With the Lord."
"Christ" (cf. also Col. 2:13, 20, 3:1; Eph. 2:5; Rom. 6:4, 6). It also can refer to the present life, as in Rom. 8:32, "will He not also give us all things with him?" (cf. also Col. 3:3; II Cor. 13:4 Eph. 2:6). The use that concerns us here is the future use, as in Phil. 1:23, "my desire is to depart and be with Christ" (cf. also I Thess. 4:14, 17; 5:10; Rom. 6:8 Col. 3:4; II Cor. 4:14; 5:8). Some of these future references refer to the being with Christ at the Parousia (I Thess. 4:14, 17; Col. 3:4; II Cor. 4:14), others to being with Christ immediately after death (Phil. 1:23; I Thess. 5:10; II Cor. 5:8) and still others refer to the future in an indefinite sense (Rom. 6:8). Those who are in Christ have as their future goal a "being with Christ." The "being with Christ" in the future is a "higher stage than the 'in Christ' which can be experienced on earth."¹ But, it should be noted, the "being with Christ" in the future depends on being "in Christ" now.² As being in Christ now is fellowship with Him so in the future shall we be with Him, beholding "face to face" (I Cor. 13:12). Paul emphasizes the being with Christ as an "endless and unhindered fellowship with his Savior, finding in that his perfect consummation and bliss."³ It is no absorption into the divine that is the goal of Christian life: it is rather "in a personal relation between the saved and the savior."⁴ Thus "if we have died with him, we believe that we shall also live with

¹Peissmann, Paul, p. 217.
²Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel, p. 53.
³Scott, op. cit., p. 236.
⁴Ibid., p. 242.
him" (Rom. 6:8). At the Parousia the focus is on "so shall we ever be with the Lord" (I Thess. 4:17). Though Paul does not elaborate on the mode of our being with Christ after death, he affirms that we are with Him. "Whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord's (Rom. 14:8; cf. I Thess. 5:10). Death is in some sense a transition\(^1\) to a higher stage of eternal life. Paul, out of the richness of his present experience with Christ, can yearn for even more of that fellowship.\(^2\)

Because there is more, he writes, "for to me to live is Christ and to die is gain" (Phil. 1:21). Why, if living is Christ (cf. Gal. 2:20), is dying a gain? Because dying is "to depart and be with Christ for that is far better," (Phil. 1:23).\(^3\)

But his longing goes beyond the experience of fellowship with Christ after death to its consummation "when Christ who is our life appears" and those who are in Christ "will appear with Him in glory" (Col. 3:4). Paul's citizenship is in Heaven, from which he "awaits a Savior, The Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body" (Phil. 3:20-21). Paul's hope is grounded in his experience now of the new being in Christ, his future expectations of being with Christ after death and the still future consummation of hope in the resurrection of the dead at the Parousia.\(^4\)


\(^2\)Stewart, *op.cit.* pp. 201ff.

\(^3\)cf. II Cor. 5:8, "we would rather be away from the body and at home with the Lord."

\(^4\)II Cor. 5 and Phil. 1:21-23 will be considered further in the next chapter. The belief in resurrection will be treated in Ch. 4.
In the belief that he will "depart and be with Christ", Paul expresses his faith in the "that" of fellowship, not the "how" of that fellowship.


The richness of Paul's language can be seen in the manifold way in which he describes the meaning of Christian faith. We have in this chapter been emphasizing the prepositional phrases: "in Christ" and "with Christ." There is a third prepositional phrase used by Paul which completes the expression of Paul in a trinity of faith. This is the cognate phrase "through Jesus Christ" (e.g. Rom. 1:8; 5:1, 11, 21; 7:25; I Cor. 15:57; I Thess. 5:9; cf. Rom. 3:22, 24; 5:5; et al.). All three phrases express both the intimate communion of the believer "with" Christ and the benefits received "through" God's mighty act of grace "in" Him. To this set of prepositional phrases might be added the great trinity of I Cor. 13 (faith, hope and love). As Prof. Stewart has put it:

When he spoke of faith, which was the outgoing of the soul towards God, and of love, which was its outgoing

---

1 and its cognates "through Him," "through our Lord Jesus Christ," etc. See esp. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 124; Deissmann, Paul, p. 142; Richardson, Theology, p. 296; TWNT, II, "art. "τόπος," pp. 64-69 (esp. pp. 67f.).

2 Outside of Paul's writings such passages as I Pet. 2:5; Heb. 13:15 come to mind.

towards men, he also spoke—of hope, which was its outgoing towards the final redemption.

We are related to God's mighty act in Jesus Christ, the past victory, by faith, which has thus a backward reference. We live our lives in Christ through the love of God abiding in us, which relates to our present status in Christ. We have a hope of being with Christ beyond this present life, which is a hope in the future which does not disappoint.¹ Faith relates to the past, love to the present, hope to the future—yet it is not just this, for faith is also our present life (Gal. 2:20) and is pointed to the future (Rom. 6:8, "we believe that we shall live with Him"), just as also hope relates to the past (e.g. Rom. 8:24, we were saved in hope) and to the present (e.g. I Cor. 1:7, hope acting in the present: "our hope for you is unshaken"). So also love relates to the past (Rom. 5:8) and future (I Cor. 13:8, 13).

¹See Rom. 5:1-11 where all three forms (faith, hope, love) appear. Cf. e.g. Col. 1:3-5; Eph. 1:11-15; et al.
CHAPTER III

THE INTERIM STATE (BETWEEN DEATH AND RESURRECTION).

A. The Problem of the Interim.

1. The problem.

The problem relating to the presentation of the NT view on the Interim State of the dead between death and the resurrection is one that is difficult, if not impossible, to solve with any conclusiveness. It is a quite complex problem, compounded out of both the scarcity of NT material dealing with the subject (especially material that presents the subject and conclusions on the subject clearly) and also the varied and disputed opinions on the subject among scholars. The content of the NT teaching on this Interim State is a much disputed and controversial subject among present day scholars.¹ Part of the reason for the scarcity of NT evidence on the subject, and therefore part of the reason for the difficulty of interpretation of NT evidence,

¹Consider, e.g., both the number and variance of views on 2 Cor. 5:1-10 in the various articles, commentaries and portions of books that deal with the passage. See further B, 1 of this chapter.
was the dominant factor of the expected soon Parousia of Jesus and the resultant consummation of the Age. Paul in his earlier letters expected to be alive at the Parousia and was not concerned to develop his thought regarding the Interim State. When writing to the Thessalonians about the imminent return of Christ and the resurrection Paul affirms "the dead in Christ will rise first" and then adds "then we who are alive, who are left" (I Thess. 4:16-17). It was not until later, when the delayed return raised the problem more acutely, that the question of the Interim State began to occupy the minds of Christian thinkers to a greater degree. By this time, however, the greater portion of the NT had been written and it should be relatively scarce. The author of 2 Peter faced this problem of the delay of the Parousia and defends it as a constituent of Christian hope (see 2 Pet. 3:3-14). For us, of course, the problem

---

2 Cf. the similar thought in I Cor. 15:51-52.
3 In later letters Paul reckons with the possibility that he may not survive until the Parousia (e.g. Phil. 1:23), though he does not abandon the doctrine of the Parousia. On this see e.g. W. Grundmann, "Überlieferung und Eigenaussage im Eschatologischen Denken des Apostels Paulus", NTS, Vol. 8 (1961), pp. 234f.; Charles, Eschatology, pp. 383ff.; R. F. Hettlinger, "2 Corinthians 5:1-10", SJT, Vol. 10 (1957), pp. 186f.; et al. See also commentaries on 2 Cor. 5:1-10 (e.g. Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 117). This aspect will be further considered in B. below.
is still present. What does the NT say, directly or indirectly, about this interval between death and resurrection?¹

2. Did Jesus envision an Intermediate State?

This question is in part related to the question of whether Jesus envisioned an interval, of longer or shorter duration, between His death and Parousia as the Son of Man. We cannot here go into this question in detail, but will consider it quite generally.² We have already argued that Jesus saw the inbreaking of the Kingdom to be taking place in His own person and work.³ We had occasion to refer also to the question of the predictions of the resurrection and again concluded that Jesus foresaw both His resurrection, and His triumphant exaltation and return.

The already discussed Mark 2:19-20,⁴ containing the reference to fasting after the bridegroom is taken away, implies an interval between the present enjoyment of the disciples with Jesus and a longer or shorter period after His death when He and the disciples will be separated — a period of fasting" (deprivation). Mark 14:25 ("I shall not drink


³See Part IV, Ch. 1, A.

⁴Ibid., C, 1.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Kümmel, Promise, pp. 77.
again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God") "has a meaning in fact only if the Kingdom of God is not expected in the most immediate future and if the disciples are to come together for meals for some time without their departed Lord."¹ Mark 9:1 presents also the same concept of an expected interval: "there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Kingdom of God come with power." There are many problems connected with this passage into which we cannot enter here.² The form of the introductory formula indicates Mk. 9:1 was a detached saying.³ Fuller does not agree but rather asserts the saying must be understood in relation to the context of following Jesus and means that Jesus told his followers that some would escape the martyrdom predicted for others in Mk. 8:34ff.⁴ Bultmann, typically, regards the saying as a formulation of the community, used by it to explain the delay of the Parousia⁵. Mark apparently saw a partial fulfillment of the saying in the

¹Ibid. See also Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 165ff.
²The apparent lack of fulfillment is one such problem. Thus many commentators have sought to explain it as referring to some event which did occur: the Transfiguration event, Fall of Jerusalem, etc. The resurrection could be considered its fulfillment, at least in part. Paul frequently connects the idea of power and the resurrection, as we noted earlier (e.g. Rom. 1:4). See Part IV, Ch. 1, C, 2.
³So Kümmel, Promise, p. 25; Bultmann, Geschichte, p. 128.
⁴op. cit., pp. 27f.
⁵Geschichte, p. 128.
Transfiguration, which he places after the saying (9:2-13), and in this Mt. seems to agree (cf. 16:28-17:8). That the saying refers to the future, many commentators agree, as is also clearly indicated by Matthew’s version (16:28, some will "not taste death before they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.") There are many other sayings that attest the futurity of the Kingdom in the mind of Jesus (e.g. sayings about "the Day" such as in Mt. 10:15; 11:22; Mk. 13:32; Lk. 17:24, 26; sayings on Judgment such as in Mt. 5:21f.; Mk. 8:38; Mt. 19:28; 25:31-46; etc.). To the High Priest Jesus speaks of the Son of Man’s (His) future exaltation and coming (Mk. 14:62). But Jesus does not predict the time of its coming but rather only that it is assuredly coming. Mk. 13:32 ("of that day and hour knoweth no man, not even the angels in heaven or the Son, but only the Father") clearly warns against date setting. We conclude, then, that both the presentness of the Kingdom and its future consummation "in power" are found in Jesus’ teaching. We can also conclude that Jesus envisioned an interval between His death and the Parousia-Consummation.

---

1 So Kümmel, Promise, pp. 25ff.; Fuller, op. cit., pp. 27f.; Bultmann, Geschichte, p. 128; et al. See commentaries.
2 The Parables of Watchfulness and Preparedness are in a similar vein (e.g. Mt. 25:1-13; Mk. 13:34-36; Lk. 12:39f.) See Kümmel, Promise, pp. 54ff.
3 Cf. e.g. Bright, Kingdom of God, p. 238 ("so the New Testament assumes, as it must assume, a double view of the Kingdom: it has come ("The Kingdom of God is at hand"); it is yet to come ("Thy Kingdom come").") See also Manson, Jesus, p. 49.
4 See esp. Kümmel, Promise, pp. 64-83; Manson, Jesus, esp. pp. 49, 66; et al.
We may now ask, did Jesus say anything about the Interim State of believers between their death and resurrection? There are only two places where anything like an Intermediate State can be found in the Synoptics, and both are found solely in Luke (16:19-31; 23:43). Some find in either or both of these passages a teaching of Jesus in the Intermediate State¹, while others deny either or both refer to the Intermediate State at all.² The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk. 16:19-31) appears to give quite a full and complete description of the condition of the departed after death. Jesus here draws upon contemporary and traditional material to develop the structure of the parable.³ This traditional material ends with v. 26 (the "great gulf") and what follows is Jesus own contribution giving the lesson of the parable.⁴ It is always a questionable procedure to take literally all the details of a parable.⁵ The point of this parable is that present life is decisive, and that present conditions of life are often reversed after death.⁶

² Strawson, op.cit., p. 211; Salmond, op.cit., pp. 277-283; Gullmann, Immortality, p. 50; et al.
³ See commentaries on this.
⁴ So Manson, Luke, p. 191; et al.
⁵ See e.g. Dodd, Parables of the Kingdom, pp. 18ff.
⁷ See Strawson, op.cit., pp. 212ff.; Rengstorff, Lukas, p. 193; Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 29; et al.
But what does the parable say about the condition of the dead? V. 26 indicates the fates of the rich man and Lazarus are final and irrevocable. This militates against the idea that the condition described is intermediary and preliminary and that therefore an interim state is not described. On the other hand, the description of the place of the dead as Hades (Sheol) and of Abraham's bosom as the place to which the blessed Lazarus goes is a description of the Intermediate State in the literature of the Intertestamental Period as is the concept of torment (Gehenna). It is also quite possible that Abraham's Bosom is not to be located as a part of Hades, at least at the time of the parable of Jesus. References to Abraham's bosom are relatively late. What appears to be meant is that Lazarus is in fellowship with Abraham (and the other Patriarchs) and the phrase should be understood in that light. The background is then readily seen in such passages as Luke 13:28-30; Mt. 8:11-12. That a bodiless existence is not meant is clear from the descriptions of the fate of the rich man and Lazarus (they speak, can drink, etc., see vv. 23ff.) and that when a return to life is en-

---

1 So also Strawson, op. cit., p. 211.
2 See above Part III, Ch. 2, B, esp. 4. See also commentaries; Nikolainen, op. cit., pp. 27ff.; TWNT, V, p. 767, n. 37; et al.
3 So Glason, Greek Influence, p. 84; TWNT, V, p. 767 n. 39.
4 See Volz, op. cit., pp. 267f.
5 Jeremias in TWNT, V, p. 767 calls it "Tischgemeinschaft". See also Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., II, p. 225; Manson, Luke, pp. 190ff.; et al.
visioned it is described in terms of a resurrection. The fellowship idea is the vital description of the blessed in the life after death.

The second passage of relevance is Lk. 23:43 ("today shalt thou be with me in paradise"). That paradise should be thought of in terms of the late Jewish concept of Paradise is probably correct. But there are several problems in the passage. Jesus says that today he will be in paradise yet according to tradition Jesus was in Hades (Sheol) from His death to resurrection. There are no references to Paradise as being in Hades (Sheol) earlier than about 60-80 A.D. It could be that "today" should be taken with "I say" to read "today I say to you" or that today is symbolic of the eschatological victory. That this saying is not attested elsewhere in the tradition possibly indicates it does not rest on an old tradition. Mark makes no differen-

---

1 See Nikolainen, *op.cit.*, pp. 28ff. It is thus not a concept of immortality that is presented here in Luke.

2 See also Strawson, *op.cit.*, p. 211.

3 So Kämmel, *op.cit.*, p. 74; Nikolainen, *op.cit.*.


6 See TWNT, V, pp. 768; Nikolainen, *op.cit.*, p. 31; Rengeforth, Lukas, p. 273. The latter is preferred (see Rengeforth, Lukas, p. 273).

7 So also Kämmel, *Promise*, p. 74; Bultmann, *Geschichte*, p. 337.
tiation between the two criminals (15:32) and Matthew follows Mark (Mt. 17:44). It could well be, of course, that Luke here, as elsewhere, has preserved an authentic saying of Jesus.¹

In any case, the emphasis falls on "with me". The criminal asks to be remembered when Jesus comes in kingly authority.² He is instead promised immediate fellowship after death with Jesus. The resemblance to Paul's concept of being with Christ as the real content of future life is striking.³

We may conclude that while Jesus says very little about the concrete content of the Interim State,⁴ He affirms that life after death is in any case a "being with Him."⁵ It is Jesus who opens again the closed door of Paradise to the faithful.⁶ "To sinful dying man, it is enough that his community with the Lord is complete and inviolable."⁷

The Synoptic concept of the disciples' fellowship with Jesus (e.g. Mk. 10:28ff.; Mt. 18:20; Mk. 3:14) which reaches here in Luke a high point of expression is even more clearly brought out in the Fourth Gospel.⁸ John 12:26

¹The authenticity is accepted by, among others, Manson, Luke, pp. 260ff.; Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 30ff.; Rengstorf, Lukas, p. 273. ²I.e. the parousia—judgment. See TWNT, V, p. 768; Manson, Luke, pp. 261; et al. ³See above Ch. 2, C, 3. ⁴See above Ch. 2, A, B, 1) and "with Christ" (C, 3). ⁵Only Lk. 16:19-31 gives details and these should not be pressed. ⁶See earlier remarks on "in Christ" (Ch. 2, A; B, 1) and "with Christ" (C, 3). ⁷See Gen. 3:24 and Test. of Levi 18:10ff. See also TWNT, V, pp. 770ff. ⁸Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 32 (cf. also Rengstorf, Lukas, p. 273). ⁹We have earlier noted Paul's teaching as well as the Synoptic antecedents of the "in Christ" — "With Christ" concept.
is a clear presentation of this concept of community and fellowship with Christ: "If anyone serves me, he must follow me; and where I am, there shall my servant be also; if any one serves me, the Father will honor him." Or again in John 14:2f., "In my Father's house are many rooms; if it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you? and when I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will take you to myself, that where I am you may be also." The concept of abiding in the Vine also illustrates this concept of fellowship (Jn. 15). The characteristic of the fellowship is love (e.g. 13:34f.; 14:15, 21; I Jn. 4:7-21). The Spirit is sent by Jesus to abide with the disciples and they shall never be alone (e.g. 14:16, 25ff.; 15:26ff.; 16:7ff.), for the Counselor (Spirit) will be with them (cf. Mt. 28:20). Thus do the Gospels present the heart of their message on this life and the hereafter. It is a being in and with Christ.

More than this it is difficult to say in the light of the evidence, which only indicates that whether there is or is not an Interim State, the goal of life in Christ is life with Christ. This is the key point in the Gospels.

B. The Intermediate State in Paul.

The key texts in Paul on this subject are not many in number. Besides those which speak of sleeping, with which we have already dealt, the key texts are 2 Cor. 5:1-10 and Phil. 1:21-23. Paul's concept of the Interim State

---

1 See also 17:9f., 11, 13, 20ff., 26; I Jn. 1:3, 6f.; 3:1ff., 24; 4:7-21; et al.
2 cf. e.g. also Rev. 7:9-17.
3 See Ch. 2, c, 1.
4 Col. 3:1-4 will be dealt with in the next chapter.
depends on the interpretation of these basic texts.

1. 2 Cor. 5:1-10.

a. General discussion of viewpoints.

This passage is one of the most difficult and most disputed passages in the entire NT. For every interpretation that has been offered there are many who stand ready to either attack or defend it. In general, three main lines of interpretation have been advocated (though scholars within the main lines still disagree on many of the sub-points of interpretation). 2 One line of interpretation sees in 2 Cor. 5 a doctrine of the Intermediate State between death and the Parousia. Those who accept this view usually see a development in Paul’s thought which contradicts his earlier resurrection thought by modifying it along the lines of an interim state for the soul between death and resurrection. 3 It must, however, be noted that it is next to impossible to classify authors in a single category. Thus, for example, some authors listed below see 2 Cor. 5:3 as referring to a

---

1 Such other texts as Rom. 8; 14:3 are related to the two to be discussed.


disembodied existence of the soul but do not see any development or contradiction between I Cor. and 2 Cor.\(^1\) Other authors see a development and change in Paul's thought from I Thess. to I Cor. to 2 Cor., but give no details as to whether Paul is referring to the Interim State.\(^2\) The source of the change for Paul is to be found in Greek thought, according to some authors.\(^3\) Schweitzer finds that Paul's thought can be quite adequately explained in late Jewish thought.\(^4\) Deissmann finds in Paul Jewish and Hellenistic thought running side by side, with Hellenistic thought dominating here but Jewish thought in I Cor. 15.\(^5\)

\(^1\) e.g. Thornton; Berry, Gouge. Kennedy, op. cit., pp. 270 sees no development and only recognizes disembodiment as a possibility while on p. 266 he discounts the idea that Paul anywhere describes in detail the Interim State. Cullmann, Immortality, p. 50f., sees 2 Cor. 5 as a reference to the Interim state in terms of sleeping and thus does not feel there is any change in Paul's view.


\(^3\) So e.g. Lietzmann, op. cit., pp. 117-121. So also Bultmann, Theology, I, pp. 201-212, though without accepting the view that Paul believes the soul is naked after death until the Parousia; W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, (Cambridge: University Press, 1939), pp. 128-143, though again with a different view of the meaning of the passage.

\(^4\) Mysticism, p. 134. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 308-314 agrees the key is in Jewish thought but offers a different interpretation of the passage. So also Ellis, op. cit., pp. 217, 220, though again with a different interpretation. See also Grundmann, TWNT, II, pp. 62-64.

\(^5\) Paul, p. 218.
Other commentators see Paul's view as referring to the reception of the glorified resurrection body immediately at death. Most authors who hold this view see it as a change in Paul's view from earlier views. The key phrase is "we have a building from God" which must be taken literally. "having been formed at death when "the earthly tent we inhabit is destroyed." Paul is held to reject the "nakedness" of the soul as impossible for the Christian who thus need not wait until the resurrection at the Parousia, but rather will be enclothed with the spiritual body (I Cor. 15) at death.

The detailed approaches of the advocates of this view differ on so many points that we cannot attempt to present them. They agree on the point that the Christian is resurrected at death.

The third main view does not see in 2 Cor. an intermediate state at all and also rejects the view that believers


2 So e.g. Kettlinger, Davies, Charles, Pilcher.

3 E.g. see Charles, op.cit., p. 400. See Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 226ff. for details on this view.

4 2 Cor. 5:1-4. See Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 226.

5 It should also be obvious that commentators of the third group also would agree on denying an Interim State for believers.
receive their resurrection body at death. 1 To many of those
who hold this view there is little change in Paul's doctrine
and the emphasis here as elsewhere in Paul is the transfor-
mation of the body, the glorified spiritual body, at the
Parousia. 2 Some see the destruction of the earthly tent in
terms of 2 Cor. 4:10f.; 16; 1 Cor. 4:9ff.; 15:21; 2 Cor.
6:4ff., as a gradual destruction of the body through tribu-
lations, and death is not really at issue in 2 Cor. 5:1ff.
For others, though Paul does have in mind the possibility of
death, Paul's thought "overleaps all between death and
resurrection, and hurries to its goal for reunion with
Jesus." Oepke sees "nakedness" as the fate of the non-
Christian rather than of the Christian and thus understands
Paul to hope for death lest he should become apostate and
suffer the fate of the unbeliever. 5 Others see the "naked-
ness" as applying to all the dead in the event of death

---

1 e.g. L. Brun, "Zur Auslegung vom II Kor. 5:1-10", ZNW, Vol. 28 (1929), pp. 207-229; Bultmann, Theology, I,
pp. 201-202, 346; Salmon, op.cit., pp. 452ff.; Ellis, op.
cit., p. 224; Plummer, 2 Corinthians, pp. 160ff.; TWNT, I,
Kennedy, op.cit., p. 270ff.; Leivestad, op.cit., p. 127;
H. Wendland, Die Briefe an Die Korinther, pp. 168ff.;
et al. 2 Gudge, op.cit., also sees no change in Paul's
doctrine and that the emphasis is the Parousia-resurrection,

---

2 Gudge, op.cit., also sees no change in Paul's
doctrine and that the emphasis is the Parousia-resurrection,
though he holds to a "nakedness" of the soul until the
Parousia for those who die. Berry, op.cit., agrees as does
e.g. Robinson, The Body, p. 77; In the End God. (London:
James Clarke & Co., 1958), pp. 94ff.).

---

4 e.g. Brun, op.cit.

---

before the Parousia-resurrection. One cannot but help wondering how to find his way around in this maze and wealth of interpretative variants.

b. Consideration of the passage.

Let us first make some general observations. The view that Paul has changed and modified his views drastically between the writing of I Thess., I Cor. and 2 Cor. 5, whether under the impetus of Greek thought or Jewish Thought or under the pressure of the hazardous experiences described in 2 Cor. 1:8ff., et al., faces the major difficulty that Paul teaches in all of his letters the Parousia-resurrection. Hettlinger admits this and attempts the rather novel explanation that it is explained by the fact that once the impression of the dangers Paul had experienced, which led him to the conclusion voiced in 2 Cor. 5, had faded, it was the Parousia hope that filled his thought. Further, we should note that the menace and threat of death is referred to in many of Paul's earlier letters (e.g. I Thess. 4:13-18; I Cor. 15:30) and

---

1 e.g. Brun, Leivestad, Nikolainen.
3 e.g. W. L. Knox, op. cit., pp. 128ff.
4 e.g. Davies, op. cit., pp. 310f.
5 e.g. Hettlinger, op. cit., p. 183f.
6 See e.g. Phil. 3:10ff., 20f.; Col. 1:18; 3:1-4; Eph. 1:13f.; 4:30. See also remarks of Sevenster, op. cit., p. 296 (Paul retains throughout the center of his eschatology: "die Geschichte des Heils, die in der Parousia, der Auferstehung der Toten, dem Gericht vollendet werden wird"). So also Schweitzer, Mysticism, pp. 52f.
therefore death, even his own, could not have been a new
problem for him. Finally, as Brun and others have shown,
2 Cor. 5:1-10 must not be isolated from its context. The $o\nu\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\rho$ of v. 1 must refer to the preceding context, and in
this context is a clear reference to the resurrection at the
Parousia (4:14, 16ff.). Both the sufferings described in
2 Cor. 4:7-18 and also the Parousia-resurrection hope must
be seen in the background of 2 Cor. 5:1-10.

We now turn to the passage itself. The key phrases
as Ellis rightly sees, are found in v. 1 "earthly tent",
"building from God . . . the heavens"), v. 3-4 (the "nakedness")
and v. 6-8 ("away from the body and at home with the Lord").

Verse 1, $\kappa\alpha\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon$, "destroyed", must refer to death,
whether the death be a constant weakening of the physical
life under oppressions or in the general fashion "to die".
And $\epsilon\nu\pi\gamma\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omega\omicron\varsigma$ probably refers to the present body in its

---

1 The view that Paul changed his mind in view of the
threat of his own death also involves one in the view that
Paul could teach in one vein when the death of others was in
view and in quite a different one when he "suddenly" realized
he himself might die.
2 Brun, op. cit., pp. 207f.; Grundmann, "Überlieferung
. . . .", p. 23; Hettlinger, op. cit., p. 183; Plummer, op. cit.,
p. 140; Nikolainen, op. cit., p. 233.
3 op. cit., p. 216.
4 Brun, op. cit.
5 So Nikolainen, op. cit., p. 233. Most commentators
take it to mean death. See Arndt-Gingrich, op. cit., p.
415; Moulton-Milligan, op. cit., p. 329.
transitory character. The present life is referred to in V. 4 again as a being in the "tent" (σκηνής) and is referred to as "mortal" (θνητός). On the meaning of οἶκος ομοίων it is not so easy to find agreement. Many commentators understand it to refer to the spiritual body of the individual Christian to be put on at death or at the Parousia. Ellis, following Robinson, questions whether this individualization is correct. He presents three arguments in favor of regarding οἶκος ομοίων as referring to a corporate solidarity: (1) Paul's use of οἶκος ομοίων as the Body of Christ elsewhere (e.g. I Cor. 3:9; Eph. 2:21; 4:12, 16); (2) οἶδαμέν in v. 1 does not suggest a new teaching but a well-known Christian concept; (3) the parallel complex of Pauline uses of corporate terms such as The Body of Christ, the New Man, 

---

1 So TWNT, V, art. "σκηνής, σκηνῶς", p. 135. Ellis op.cit., p. 217 refers to Job 4:19 as a comparison. See also Plummer, op.cit., pp. 141ff.; Wendland, op.cit., p. 169; et al.
3 E.g. Berry, op.cit., p. 62; Goudge, op.cit., p. 47; Lietzmann, op.cit., p. 117; Wendland, op.cit., p. 169.
4 Fills, following Robinson, questions whether this individualization is correct.
5 Ellis, following Robinson, questions whether this individualization is correct. He presents three arguments in favor of regarding οἶκος ομοίων as referring to a corporate solidarity:
6 (1) Paul's use of οἶκος ομοίων as the Body of Christ elsewhere (e.g. I Cor. 3:9; Eph. 2:21; 4:12, 16);
7 (2) οἶδαμέν in v. 1 does not suggest a new teaching but a well-known Christian concept;
8 (3) the parallel complex of Pauline uses of corporate terms such as The Body of Christ, the New Man,

---

7 From Robinson, The Body, p. 76.
the New Temple. On the use of \(\varepsilon\chi\omicron\upsilon\), Wendland remarks that it has a future sense. Thornton argues that it means a house in the process of building and that the spiritual body already exists in some sense. But if the individual body is already prepared, partially or fully, Paul would need have no fear of "nakedness" nor of anxiety for he would be in no danger - he would be clothed upon at death. We also feel that the arguments of Ellis are convincing and the "building" is the Body of Christ. In this respect it is also noteworthy that Paul locates this building from God \(\varepsilon\upsilon\tau\eta\omega\) \(\delta\upsilon\rho\alpha\upsilon\omicron\)\(\iota\), According to Christian tradition this is where Christ is, following the Ascension (see e.g. Acts 1:9-11; 7:56; Phil. 3:20; Eph. 1:3, 20; 2:6; Rom. 8:34). The body that is "in the heavens" is the already risen body - thus can Paul say "we know" that one fact stands over against death: viz. we may die but there is one who has died and risen and lives in the presence of God. A further argument in favor of this interpretation is one noticed by Ellis, that in Mk. 14:58 appear three of the vital words of this

---

1 *op. cit.*, p. 217. Grundmann, "Überlieferung . . .", p. 24 refers to Ellis' last point with approval.
4 The Parousia becomes superfluous if the resurrection body can be built by a process, for no change takes place then. But this is not Paul: see I Cor. 15:51ff. and cf. e.g. Phil. 3:20f.
5 *op. cit.*, p. 217.
verse ("we heard him say: I will destroy¹ this temple that is made with hands and in three days I will build² another not made with hands³). In Jn. 2:19 this saying is referred to the body of Jesus and His death.⁴ We take the passage then, to refer to the body of Christ, the corporate solidarity of the New Adam. The σκηνος of v. 1 would then refer to the older corporate solidarity of the first Adam. In v. 1 is contrasted the old humanity ἐν Ἄδει and the new humanity ἐν Χριστω. The individual is in view in the first part of v. 1 (the earthly tents) but in the second part the corporate solidarity of the Body of Christ is to be understood and individuality as incorporation into the Body of Christ. The individual comes more clearly into view in the following verses (2-4, esp. 6-8,) and in fact an individual-corporate dualism can be seen in the entire passage.⁵ The use of "to put on" in the following verses also supports our conclusion,⁶ for Paul elsewhere speaks of putting on the new man in Christ (Col. 3:10, ἐνυπόμενοι) or putting on Christ (Gal. 3:27, ἐνδοῦκατοικον), or putting on the new nature (Eph. 4:24, ἐν δύσκολοις).⁷ "Putting on Christ" or the new man is both present

¹. Κατα λύσι Seminarium Biblicum.
². Συναξας Ιουνιούς.
³. Χρηστοποιήσων.
⁴. See above Ch. 1, 6, 2, b.
⁵. We will return to this in our summary of this passage.
⁶. Ἐνυπόμενοι; (v. 2, 4); Ἐνδοῦκατοικον (v. 3).
⁷. See also Rom. 13:14 ("Put on the Lord Jesus Christ", ἐνυπόμενοι); I Cor. 15:53l. ("Put on the imperishable", "put on immortality", ἐνδοῖσε χοιρίν).
(in the Body of Christ, the Church) and future (the resurrection body at the Θεόσια).

VV. 2-4 Thus, in light of the above, Paul can speak of the longing (v. 2 στενάξωū lit. "to groan or sigh") for the habitation from the heavens, inasmuch as (εἰς γὰρ) being clothed we shall not be found naked" (vv. 2-3). For, Paul continues, while in this tent we groan with anxiety, "because (or 'for this reason') we do not wish to be unclothed but to be clothed upon," in order that the mortal may be swallowed up by life." "Unclothed" in v. 4 corresponds to "naked" in v. 3, while "clothed upon" corresponds to "put on the dwelling from heaven" of v. 2. But what is meant by γυμνός and ἐνδυσάμεθα? This is the crux of these verses. The usual interpretation is that a disembodied state is meant.

1Arndt-Gingrich, op.cit., p. 773; Moulton-Milligan op.cit., p. 588.
See Arndt-Gingrich, op.cit., p. 152. Another translation using εἰς τὸ ἐκπαίδευσαι as P-46, B, D et al. would be "since" (as Arndt-Gingrich, op.cit., p. 219).
A repeating in somewhat stronger fashion of the first part of v. 2.

εἰς γὰρ ἐνθαμδέωμεν should be taken in proper order and not wrenched out of order as if it were εἰς ἐπέκειται. The latter is the usual way this phrase is translated (e.g. RSV, "not that we would be unclothed") and is defended by Kettlinger, op.cit., p. 191, n. 2. Plummer, Robinson, Ellis, Berry and others rightly prefer the natural order and translation.
Translation of εκπαίδευσαι from Plummer, op.cit., p. 142; Thornton, op.cit., p. 285; Lietzmann, op.cit., p. 120; Wendland, op.cit., p. 170; et al.
So e.g. Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 134; Lietzmann, op.cit., p. 120; Plummer, op.cit., pp. 147ff.; Berry, op.cit., pp. 63ff.; Robinson, The Body, pp. 77ff.; et al.
Ellis objects strongly to this and sees in these verses a reference only to judgment. He argues at length and convincingly for the view that the "nakedness" means the shame and uncovering of the guilty under the searching light of God's judgment, and notes parallels, in his view, in Mt. 22:11; Rom. 10:11; I Jn. 2:28. His major objections to the usual view, are basically only two: (1) it contradicts Paul's anthropology by positing a dualism never found elsewhere in Paul; (2) it contradicts the sense of the passage, for what Paul shrinks from (disembodiment) in vv. 2-4 he is later (vv. 6-8) said to embrace. Some support for this may be found in other commentators to some extent. Robinson notes that "It looks as if almost a technical term for being 'discovered' at the Parousia" (see I Pet. 1:7; 2 Pet. 3:14; Phil. 3:9 and cf. also Mk. 13:36; Mt. 24:46). It is, however, doubtful if this use of can be defended in the light of other passages using it, and that

1op.cit., pp. 219ff. The germ of the idea as judgment is from TWNT, I, p. 774 (by Oepke).
2In the OT see e.g. Gen. 3:10; Ezek. 16:7ff., 37ff.; 23:26, 29; et al. See Ellis, op.cit., p. 220.
3op.cit., p. 219.
5The Body, p. 77, n. 1. Berry doubts Robinson's suggestion, but gives no reasons (op.cit., p. 64).
Robinson is not right to see it as an "almost technical term" (e.g. 2 Cor. 11:12; 1 Cor. 4:2; 2 Cor. 2:13; 12:20; et al.). Ellis concludes, "The opposite of being clothed upon by the house from heaven, i.e. the righteous Body of Christ, is not to be disembodied but to stand in the judgment ἐν ἀδικίᾳ, i.e. in the Body that is naked in guilt and shame."¹ This judgment is the Last Judgment.

In the light of the above it would appear that the question of "nakedness" and "being unclothed" is settled and does not refer to a disembodied state at all. But I wonder, however, if it is really quite this simple and if the "usual view" is so far wrong. Do we really have an "either-or" here or a "both and" — i.e. both the idea of judgment as nakedness and the idea of an interim nakedness? That this is in fact quite likely the case can be seen by referring to Ellis’ arguments. For example, Paul can recognize an existence of man apart from the body,² for in 2 Cor. 12 he refers to an ecstatic experience and says of it "whether in the body or out of the body I do not know, God knows" (2 Cor. 12:2-3; cf. Rev. 6:9; Heb. 12:23). We noted in an earlier section³ that Paul's anthropology is basically that of the OT. Dr. Ellis makes much of the OT background in his arguments⁴ but appears to overlook some other aspects

¹ op.cit., p. 221.
² So also Bultmann, Theology, I, p. 202; RGG, IV, p. 865. See also Part II, Ch. 2, A, 4, b.
³ Part I, Ch. 2.
⁴ e.g. op.cit., p. 220.
of that background. The OT knows of an existence after death in a semi-disembodied state, though not of an existence of the soul.\(^1\) Further, in the Intertestamental literature\(^2\) can also be found the idea of a disembodied state both in a Palestinian form of an Interim condition and Hellenistic form of the immortality of the soul.\(^3\) It is hard not to see a reference in 2 Cor. 5:2-4 to Greek ideas, expressed by Paul in terms of his Jewish anthropology, i.e., a reference to a disembodied existence from which he shrinks back, as it were. There is, thus, in Paul an indirect polemic against the idea that death is the redeemer which sets the soul free from the body.\(^4\) We also find in the Jewish literature of the Intertestamental Period references to "being clothed" referring to the resurrection body (e.g. see Enoch 22:8ff.; 62:15ff.; Ascension of Isaiah 7:22; 8:26; 9:2, 8, 9, 17, 21ff.; 2 Esdras 2:39; Odes of Sol. 33:10).\(^5\) Paul in the light of all of this could quite naturally think of a survival after

---

\(^{1}\)See Part I, Ch. 1 and esp. Part III, Ch. 1, B.
\(^{2}\)See Part III, Ch. 2, B.
\(^{3}\)Many scholars have noted Paul's familiarity with this literature, esp. the Book of Wisdom. See e.g. Lietzmann, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 117; Plummer, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 142; et al.
\(^{5}\)See Volz, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 298; Lietzmann, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 119ff. Texts found in Kautzsch, \textit{op.cit.}. Compare e.g. Mt. 22:11; Rev. 3:4ff., 17ff.; 4:4.
death, not in terms of a Greek dualism, but in OT terms of the person surviving. This would not be a desirable thing for Paul and hence his horror of it. The second argument of Ellis, that to understand vv. 2-4 as a disembodied existence contradicts vv. 6-8 by making Paul embrace (vv. 6-8) what he earlier abhors (vv. 2-4) does not hold up in the light of closer examination. Ellis does not here take his own earlier arguments on corporate solidarity seriously enough.

As individuals we must endure the Interim State in a condition of nakedness, but as εἰκόνις τοῦ θεοῦ, we are clothed with the heavenly habitation until the Parousia and thus Paul can long for this state for it does not mean nakedness to those who are in Christ. The being away from the body means being at home with the Lord (v. 8). The individual corporate tension in Paul's thought is again the key.

Vv. 6-8. The understanding of these verses may now be clearer in the light of our preceding discussion. Paul contrasts a being at home in the body (v. 6) with a being at home with the Lord (v. 8), the former meaning a being away from the Lord, the latter a being away from the body. Ellis wishes to see in this a reference to the Parousia and in

---

1As many commentators rightly see: e.g. Wendland, op.cit., p. 170; Plummer, op.cit., pp. 147ff.; Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 134.

2In either sense: disembodiment or the shame of judgment.

3In this respect Robinson, The Body, pp. 77ff.; rightly sees the individual-corporate conception.

4op.cit., p. 222.
this he is partly correct, for Paul has always in mind his desire to live until the Parousia so that he might escape the condition of nakedness. Paul also expresses here the assurance that nothing can separate the Christian from his Lord and that in death he will still be with Him. In the being at home with the Lord, sight will replace faith and so Paul prefers it as a higher experience of fellowship than he now knows (cf. e.g. Phil. 1:23), for he will see "face to face" (I Cor. 13:12). 1 There is present in these verses again the earlier individual-corporate tension. Ellis is correct to see in these verses (6-8) a reference to the solidarity of present earthly existence ("at home in the body" - the Body of Adamic humanity) and a reference to the Body of Christ as the new corporate solidarity ("at home with the Lord") but he does not sufficiently, in my judgment, bring out the individual aspect. 2 Paul's comfort and courage are based on the certainty of the future Parousia-resurrection to which his thought continually turns. But in the meantime, whatever may happen, "whether we are at home or away" his assurance is "in Christ" from whom He cannot be

---

1See Wendland, op. cit., pp. 1701.
2Op. cit., p. 222. This same failing can be noticed in Robinson, The Body, which for all its excellent material, does not always see the individuating aspect of Paul's concept of the Body. The Resurrection Body of Christ and the Church are almost identified by Robinson. See also Ch. 4.
separated. Thus do we seek to please Him in view of the prospect of Judgment (vv. 9-10) where we will give our account for the life in the body and incur the commendation or displeasure of our Lord. Though the judgment of condemnation is behind us, the judgment of "the deeds done in the body" still awaits. The phrase "with the Lord" must be given its proper weight: communion with Christ now and hereafter is a reality and this communion requires obedience.

We may now summarize the main results of our consideration of 2 Cor. 5:1-10. Paul longs for the heavenly habitation as the only refuge from the nakedness that follows death. His hope is for the resurrection of the body which alone means life: life which is human life is corporeal life. There are many contrasts present in this passage. Dr. Ellis has summarized some of these in an "In Adam" — "In Christ" contrast. The basic contrasts are not sufficiently recognized by him. These are: (1) the individual-corporate tension; (2) seen and transient—unseen and eternal (2 Cor. 4:18). Throughout the passage Paul basically contrasts

---

1See also Wendland, op. cit., pp. 171ff.
2Cf. the imperatives to moral action that frequently appear in Paul in connection with the "In Christ" concept. See e.g. Col. 3:1-17; Rom 6:12ff.; Gal. 6:7ff.; Eph. 2:10; Col. 2:20ff. See esp. Stewart, op. cit., pp. 194-199.
3op. cit., p. 223. e.g. naked—clothed, sight—faith, tent—house from heaven, away from the Lord — at home with the Lord.
4Partially recognized by Ellis, op. cit., p. 223.
the transient reality of the present age with the eternal reality of the New Age.\(^1\) This contrast of the two aeons is basic to the understanding of the passage. The New Age has already broken in, in the life, death and resurrection of Christ. We are living, in Christ, in that New Age. But we also are in the Old Age and long for full release for the life of the New. We are yet in the Old Adam and must die but as also in the New Adam we live with Him.\(^2\) The basic two contrasts intertwine and inform one another throughout. We are clothed with the Body of Christ until we are clothed with our own body of the resurrection. Thus we long, not only to be at home now with the Lord, but also for the Parousia-resurrection being with the Lord. That Paul's hope is not a vain illusion is brought out in v. 5 ("He who has prepared us for this very thing is God, who has given us the \(\chi p\) of the Spirit."). The Spirit present in our life is the certainty of our hope. "The Spirit is the beginning of the new heavenly man within this old world time."\(^4\) The new age is already being experienced through the Spirit

---

\(^1\) Ellis, op. cit., pp. 213ff., 223; Grundmann, "Überlieferung...", pp. 23ff.; Davies, op. cit., pp. 314ff. rightly see this contrast of the old and new aeons.

\(^2\) For details see above works (esp. Grundmann) and also see on this Part II, Ch. 2, B, 1, c and d; B, 2; Part IV, Ch. 1, B, 2, c and esp. Grundmann; "Die Übermacht der Gnade"; Barth, Christus und Adam; Davies, op. cit.

\(^4\) \(\chi p\) will be discussed in Ch. 4, C, 1.

\(^5\) See earlier on "in the Spirit", Ch. 2. Wendland, op. cit., p. 170.
which indwells us. ἐγγυητεῖται means not only "guaranteed" but also "foretaste".

We need to now notice several more points. First, there is no contradiction between Paul's earlier thought (I Thess. 4; I Cor. 15) and that expressed in 2 Cor. 5. The correspondences of thought and phraseology are too pointed for this to be the case. In all areas the resurrection and life everlasting is God's creative deed (cf. I Cor. 15:28, "God gives it a body" with 2 Cor. 5:1, 5). In all of the passages the "in Christ" and "with Christ" themes are present and these concepts are for Paul the fundamental ones.

There is no contradiction with Rom. 8 or Phil. 1:23 to be found here either, for again the fundamental basis of Paul's thought is "union with Christ". The same question is treated from different perspectives (I Cor. 15 deals primarily with the nature of the resurrection body and the question of resurrection itself; 2 Cor. 5 deals with the question of 'if we die before the Parousia, what then?'). Second, there is a change in Paul's emphasis over the period from I Thess. to 2 Corinthians. Paul in his earlier letters re-

---

1 The arguments are presented in detail in Thornton, op. cit., pp. 284-286 (with reservations on some points, as will be clear from our discussion); Nikolainen, op. cit., pp. 233-235; Kennedy, op. cit., pp. 262-273; Plummer, op. cit., pp. 160-164; Ellis, op. cit., p. 224.

2 Immortality properly belongs to God, not to man. He bestows it as His own gift. See e.g. also A. M. Hunter "The Hope of Glory", Interpretation, Vol. VIII (1954), p. 140.

ferred to the dead with the euphemistic expression of "sleeping".¹ Never after I Cor., does he refer to the dead under the figure of sleep, though the figure appears in later literature such as John, 2 Peter and the early Church Fathers. All of Paul's uses of the term are found in I Thess. and I Cor., both relatively early letters. Yet in spite of this fact much is often made of this concept as "the proper term" for the Intermediate State.² Nikolainen, for example, writes at the conclusion of his study on Paul and the Intermediate State:³

Death is only a sleep, which does not break communion with Christ, which means even no intermediate state, because the awakening will certainly follow it, whereby the night will be forgotten. Paul has therefore preserved his doctrine of death as sleep (κατ' ανάπαυσιν, I Thess. 4:13; I Cor. 15:20) in II Cor. 5, Rom. 8 and Phil. 1.

Cullmann would agree, for he states "the most usual image for Paul is: 'They are asleep'".⁴ Cullmann equates the "nakedness" of 2 Cor. with 'sleep', and indeed sleep is the term he most frequently uses of the dead.⁵ But that this is not the case in Paul is easily seen by noting the frequency and places of usage. Paul comes more and more to see the dead under a different terminology: "in Christ" and "with Christ". In I Thess. Paul speaks of the dead as "sleeping

---

¹ on sleep see above Ch. 2, C, 1.
² So e.g. Michel, "Todesschlaf", p. 290.
³ op. cit., p. 239.
⁴ Immortality, p. 51.
⁵ Ibid., pp. 50-57.
through Jesus" (4:14) and that "whether we wake or sleep we might live with Him" (5:10). The major idea even in 1 Thess. is thus communion with Christ. This is brought out even more strongly in 1 Cor. 15:18, for the dead "sleep in Christ" who is the "first-fruits of those who sleep" (15:20). Again it is the community with Christ that is the basic term in the expression of Paul's thought. The dead do not ΚΟΙΜΑΙΩΝ, rather they ΚΟΙΜΑΙΩΝ ἐν ΧΡΙΣΤῷ. In later letters Paul drops the ΚΟΙΜΑΙΩΝ, but the ἐν ΧΡΙΣΤῺ and οὖν ΧΡΙΣΤῺ formulae remain as the basis of his message and hope. Paul's emphasis, not his basic idea, has changed for he sees more clearly that it is ἐν ΧΡΙΣΤῺ - οὖν - not ΚΟΙΜΑΙΩΝ, that is the heart of the truth in this area.2 Third, this life in Christ is hidden, is unseen (2 Cor. 4:16; 5:1-10; Col. 3:1-4). It is for this reason, that Paul speaks of the revelation of that life hidden in Christ at the Parousia. He does not mean that our life can only be revealed because at death we put on the resurrection body and the believer does not wait until the Parousia for the resurrection.3 The use of φως ἰναπώ(2 Cor. 5:10; Col. 3:4) to refer to the Parousia is abundantly demonstrated in the NT writings4

1 cf I Thess. 4:16, "The dead in Christ".
2 So also Grundmann, "Überlieferung . . . .", p. 25f.
3 Against Hettlinger, op. cit., p. 188; Davies, op. cit., p. 318; Charles, Eschatology, p. 402.
4 So also Ellis, op. cit., p. 213.
(see e.g. I Jn. 2:28; 3:2; 2 Tim. 4:8; I Pet. 5:4; 2 Thess. 2:3; I Cor. 3:13; 4:5), though to be sure, it is not a technical term for the Parousia. The use of "revelation" in connection with the Parousia is generally accepted.¹ This hiddenness of the life of the believer corresponds to the hidden present reality of the Kingdom of God (e.g. Parable of Leaven, Mt. 13:33. See also Mk. 4:26-32; Mk. 13). Both will be fully revealed at the End and what is now present, though hidden, will then be fully realized and perfected.

Rom. 8:18-25 must be understood in this context of cosmic-individual redemption. As Grundmann has written:² "Here is the redemption of the body, which Paul waits for as transformation, understood as a being revealed (Offenbarwerden) of the hidden life with Christ."³

2. Phil. 1:21-23.

In the light of the preceding discussion the interpretation of Phil. 1:21-23 can be given more briefly. Paul expresses the individual hope of the life after death more certainly and assuredly. He does not fear death, for the "nakedness" that follows death does not fill his thoughts. Rather it is "being with Christ" that fills his mind. But Paul has not given up the Parousia hope nor the resurrection at the Parousia. Phil. 3:10-11, 20f. make this abundantly

² On Col. 3:1-4. The words apply also to other passages.
³ "Überlieferung ...,", p. 26. See also Althaus, Römer, p. 83 (on Rom. 8:23f.).
clear (e.g. vv. 20f., "Our citizenship is in heaven, and from heaven (lit. "it") we await a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body"). We should note the "await" of v. 20. Nor is there a deprecation of present life, for it too is in Christ and rich in the enjoyment of labor in the Lord as also in His presence. Thus he writes of the present life "for me to live is Christ" and "if it is to be a life in the flesh, that means fruitful labor for me." Yet "to die is gain" for it means to be with Christ. This is his desire, but he is, as an apostle, governed by the will of Him whose slave he is. Thus when Paul writes that he is "torn between the two" (v. 23), he means just that, for life for Paul in the flesh is a life with the Lord, but dying means the partaking of that communion in a far fuller way (note v. 23, departing is "by far more better", ἐρχομένων ἐπὶ μεταμόρφωσις). We see here, then the same thoughts as were expressed in 2 Cor. 5, and indeed in all of Paul's letters: the "in Christ"-"with Christ" formulae. Phil. 1:21-23 expresses in a personal way what in 2 Cor. 5 is expressed in principle. The indestructibility of the life of communion with Christ is affirmed again. This is not a special privilege granted to

1 See the above Wendland, op.cit., p. 174.
2 See on this aspect Stewart, op.cit., pp. 202, 264;
Beare, Philippians, pp. 62f.
3 Grundmann, "Überlieferung . . .", p. 25.
4 See Wendland, op.cit., p. 174.
Paul in the light of his service as an Apostle and forthcoming martyrdom, but his abiding conviction that whether in life or in death Christians belong to the Lord (e.g. Rom. 14:8f.; I Thess. 5:9f.; 2 Cor. 5:1-10; I Thess. 4:17 ("so shall we be ever with the Lord"); Rom. 8:31-39). This passage is therefore at one with Paul's other expressions of Christian hope. The thought of being with Christ after death because it is "Christ-community, which exists in the Spirit and in faith, which is a life of Christ in the believer (Gal. 2:20) because it is indestructible, triumphs over death."  

C. Other Biblical Evidence.

1. Rev. 6:9-11 (Souls under the altar).

Into all the various ideas of this passage we cannot enter here, but we will examine it from the point of view of its relevance to the Intermediate State. The scene is set in heaven where the altar is located in the presence of the throne of God (e.g. 6:9; 8:3, 5:9:13, 14:18; 16:7).

---

1 Against Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 136f.
2 So also Wendland, op.cit., p. 174; Beare, op.cit., pp. 64f.
3 Note Rom. 8:38 where death and life are among those things listed which cannot separate us from God in Christ.
4 Wendland, op.cit., pp. 174f. This section of Wendland's commentary on Corinthians is an excellent presentation and refutation of the view that Paul's thought has drastically changed (see pp. 172-175).
6 So Charles, Revelation, pp. 172, 226ff.; Lohmeyer, Offenbarung, p. 60.
Under the altar are the souls of martyrs ("those slain for the word of God and the witness"), who cry out for vengeance. What is meant by "souls" (ψυχα)? Is it to be understood literally? If so we have a clear reference to a survival of the soul after death in a fully conscious way. In the light of NT usage the term here could be taken as meaning simply "person" rather than a part of man that survives death. This latter interpretation is probably the correct one. In either event a survival after death is indicated which is personal and to some extent blissful. The martyrs are "told to rest a little longer", but their bliss is not complete as can be seen both from their cry of longing for vengeance (v. 15) and the statement that they must wait until the number of their fellow martyrs is complete (v. 11). To these martyrs is given "a white robe" (v. 11). We have already remarked on the use of "clothing" as a designation for the resurrection body (cf. e.g. 2 Cor. 5:1-4), and many commentators so understand the reference in this verse (v. 11).

---

1See Part I. Ch. 2, B, 1.  
2See B, I and references there.  
3So Charles, Revelation, p. 176 (also pp. 82ff.; Lohmeyer, Offenbarung, p. 61.)
The evidence presented by Dr. Charles is impressive\(^1\) and his opinion is weighty. But that an alternative possibility exists can also be demonstrated,\(^2\) for clothing or garments is also used in the sense of righteousness, not of body (e.g., see Mt. 22:11; Gen. 3:7ff.; Micah 1:8ff.; \textit{et al.}). This latter sense also appears in Revelation. In 3:18, in the letter to the Church in Laodicea, we find this clearly expressed: "buy from me . . . white garments to clothe you and to keep the shame of your nakedness from being seen" (cf. 16:15; 3:4ff.; 7:14). When to this we add the teaching of Revelation on the Parousia, resurrection and judgment, to understand 6:11, "white robes", as meaning the resurrection body must be regarded as a doubtful interpretation. Resurrection in this book is associated with the End\(^3\) -- the Parousia and Judgment (e.g. 20:4-6, 11-15).\(^4\)

To conclude, the main teaching of this passage is that "souls under the altar" means to infer primarily a sense of the closeness to God of the martyrs during the Intermediate State. The concept expresses a special proximity to God\(^5\) and in this respect accords with Paul's teaching on

---

\(^1\) esp. the arguments on pp. 184ff.

\(^2\) See earlier B, l and esp. Ellis, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 221.

\(^3\) There is a preliminary resurrection for the martyrs (Rev. 20:4-6) but this is prior to the Millenium, not at death, and therefore still future.


the same subject, though not identical with Paul's hope.1

"What is here said concerning the martyrs holds true in Paul for all who have died in Christ."2

2. Christ between His death and resurrection.

The full range of this subject cannot be dealt with fully here for it is fraught with many difficulties and problems. The subject of the Descensus ad infernos has been and still is the subject of much debate.3 The texts which are most relevant are Eph. 4:8-10; I Pet. 3:18-22; 4:6.4 Of these texts, the one in Ephesians 4:8-10 is quite vague and offers little that can be utilized. That it does refer to the descensus is disputed by many, but appears to me to be a possibility but by no means a certain one.5 We are

---

1So also Bultmann, Theology, II, p. 173.
2Cullmann, Christ and Time, p. 240.
3For detailed exposition of the problem see e.g. Leivestad, op. cit., pp. 172-177; Salmond, op. cit., pp. 364-387; Charles, Eschatology, pp. 376ff.; S. Johnson, "The Preaching to the Dead", JBL, Vol. LXXIX (1960), pp. 48-51; W. Bieder, Die Vorstellung von der Hölle nach Jesu Christi, respective passages. (e.g. E. G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, (London: Macmillan & Co., 1945), pp. 195-215; 314-362). The most complete account of the whole problem known to the author of this paper is that of Bieder who treats not only the various possible NT references but also relevant literature from the early centuries outside the NT.
4Many other texts are often suggested as embodying this motif, but are too obscure to be of any help, see Bieder, op. cit.
5Bieder, op. cit., p. 90 concludes that there is no reference to descensus.
We are left with the references in 1 Peter as the significant ones. Charles remarks that only two possibilities are present regarding the interpretation of "the spirits in prison": they are either the residents of Sheol or the fallen angels who sinned before the flood (see Gen. 6). I find this to be correct but from this point on the debate really begins: which, angels or men, are meant? Probably that "spirits" means departed humankind in Sheol is the correct interpretation, though fallen angels may be included. The main trend of Bieder's work is to deny the descensus idea appears in the NT, though I find it hard to agree with this. The point of the passage for our purpose is twofold. Firstly, we see again that an existence which is in some way a conscious one is asserted, though it is regarded as unsatisfactory.

We take 4:6 to be in the same vein as 3:19 and thus "the dead" of 4:6 are the same as "the spirits" of 3:19, while "νεφελη" of 3:14 is the same as "δασος" of 4:6. Secondly, the prospect envisioned by the author of 1 Peter is that all must receive their chance to hear the Gospel, for if even those who were as wicked as the people of Noah's day will hear the Good News, it must certainly be allowed that others will hear it. It must not, however, be understood that

---

1 Eschatology, p. 376.
3 The "spirits" can hear and understand.
4 They reside in "prison".
5 So e.g. Leivestad, op. cit., p. 176; Johnson, op. cit., pp. 49ff.; Charles, Eschatology, p. 377; et al.
this means "universal salvation", for the passage nowhere states that all who heard the preaching of Christ received it. The inference is that some of those, at least, who heard believed.\(^1\) The passage should be understood in terms of the preaching the Gospel to the whole world (Mark 13:10),\(^2\) which our author extends even to the underworld.

D. Summary.

1. Problematic status of the doctrine.

We have seen that the question of the Intermediate State in the NT is replete with problems and variances in interpretation. The major reason for this is the scarcity of evidence, especially in the Gospels, on the subject. We have usually had to go elsewhere than to the Gospels and found again a scarcity of material, ranging from the obscure (preaching to the dead) to the disputed (the interpretation of 2 Cor. 5). "About the Intermediate State between death and resurrection the NT contains no express statements."\(^3\) We found most of our evidence on the subject in Paul. Yet even here one should note that Paul never uses the express phrase "Intermediate State" or any near equivalent and one must infer what he thought from the few statements made on

---

\(^{1}\)The captivity captive led by Christ according to Eph. 4:8?

\(^{2}\)cf. Jn. 5:28f., where all will hear the voice of the Son of Man, but not all are resurrected to life.

\(^{3}\)TWNT, III, p. 17.
the subject. One reason for the scarcity of material lies in the dominance of the Parousia expectation. Paul and the NT in general have always this in view and for this reason they tend to leap forward over the time barrier and see the intervening time period in a foreshortened manner. For those with such a view, the Intermediate State would not be of great interest. Further, Paul was not a systematic theologian writing in an academic tower of learning, but an active missionary whose short letters have always a "Sitz-im-Leben." In all of this, in Paul and the rest of the NT, we have sought for the basic foundation of the teaching, scarce as the material is. To this, in summary, we now turn.

2. Main Conclusions.

The basic form of the concept of the Interim State is, we believe, for the whole NT that one idea we have found so dominant for Paul, viz., communion with Christ (resp. God). For example, it was not the promise of Paradise as such which Jesus promised the repentant thief (Lk. 23:43), but rather the prospect of being with Himself. Truly, where He is, that is Paradise! Or as Jeremias has put it: "For Jesus and the primitive Church the Garden steps back as a self-sufficient quantity. It does not depend on the blessed-

1Sevenster, "Zwischenzustand", p. 292.
2See Kennedy's quote of Wernle, St Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things, p. 272.
3See Kennedy, op. cit., p. 263f.; Sevenster, op. cit., p. 293.
ness of Paradise, but on the restoration of the communion with God destroyed by Adam's Fall.1 Paul sees this fellowship as already restored in Christ (e.g. 2 Cor. 5:18-19; 1 Cor. 1:9; 10:16f.) and to be fully perfected at the End (e.g. I Thess. 4:17, "so shall we ever be with the Lord"). This fellowship is, in Paul, conceived in different stages. The first stage is the present, though only partial, experience of union with Christ.2 After death a fuller stage of fellowship is attained, as we have sought to demonstrate in this chapter. Thus, for example, in Phil. 1:21-23 the present stage and the future intermediate stage are both represented: "to live is Christ" but to die is gain, is "better by far". Though he consistently adheres to the concept of the Intermediate State as "sleep", Cullmann acknowledges that in some way the dead are closer to Christ.3 In fact, he quite strongly brings out this aspect: e.g. "Here we find fear of a bodiless condition associated with firm confidence that even in this intermediate, transient condition no separation from Christ supervenes."4 The future stage is the full realization and perfection of this communion with God in Christ, and with the community of believers.5

---

1TWNT, V, p. 771.
2See above, Ch. 2. The concept of the Spirit as ἀρρέτα, "foretaste", illustrates this point. See further, Ch. 4.
4Immortality, p. 54. Cullmann's suggestion (ibid., p. 11) that the pleasant dreams of sleep form an illustration of the Interim State of sleep is an attractive one, but without Biblical warrant.
5The two commandments to love God and one's neighbor (Mk. 12:28-34) also involve a notion of community with God and one's fellows. See also e.g. I Jn. 1:3, 6ff.; 4:7-21.
We have also noted in this chapter the possibility of disembodied existence.\(^1\) The dead in Christ are not called souls\(^2\), though it is conceivable that this is what is meant. If the immortality of the soul is meant as the state of the dead in the intermediate state, this does not mean a NT form of the Greek view. In the NT, even if the soul of the believer survives death, this is a gift of God and not, as in the Greek view, predicated on the essential nature of the soul itself.

Finally, to sum up, the NT is nowhere concerned to fully describe the Intermediate State. In particular, how one survives and fellowships after death with Christ is rarely brought into focus. We hear rather that the dead sleep, or are naked, or are at home with the Lord or are with Christ and so on, but not how one is with Christ in the sense of an anthropological concept of man's nature. The closest Paul comes to this is the thought of nakedness in 2 Cor. 5, but even there his thought centers on the fellowship with Christ itself and not on anthropology. If we may borrow again a phraseology we have used before when speaking of the OT,\(^3\) the concept of the "that" as over against the "how", Paul and the NT in general are concerned

\(^1\) See also Part II, Ch. 2, A, 4, b.
\(^2\) Rev. 6:9ff. is an exception, as is also, possibly, I Pet. 3:18-22; 4:6.
\(^3\) Part III, Ch. 1 (esp. C, 2 and E, 2).
to express "that" the communion exists not "how" it exists.¹

Two quotations will both summarize our view and conclude our discussion of the matter.

Nothing is said in the New Testament about the details of the interim conditions. We hear only this: we are nearer to God.²

We know of nothing before the resurrection than death and that the dead are in God's hand. That is sufficient.³

---

¹When the "how" is thought of Paul's thought leaps ahead to the Parousia-resurrection, as 2 Cor. 5 shows.
²Cullmann, Immortality, p. 57.
CHAPTER IV

THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE EVERLASTING

A. The Nature of Man and the Resurrection

1. The essential corporality of life and the resurrection.

As we have discussed at length in earlier chapters the Biblical understanding of the nature of man,¹ we need not go into every detail here. In earlier sections we also sought to demonstrate that for Biblical authors the life of man as man requires a body.² What Mânek has written of Paul is valid in general for the New Testament: "Paul does not know life without a body."³ On the basis of our earlier anthropological discussion we showed also that when Hebrew man thought of the future life in the sense of a happy or blessed life he thought of that life in terms of a corporal existence.⁴ The same basis in anthropology was found in the literature of the Intertestamental Period, among those whose roots were in

¹See esp. Part I, Ch. 1 (Old Testament), Ch. 2 (New Testament).
²See above and also Part II, Ch. 2, A, 4 and B, 3.
⁴See above Part III, Ch. 1, esp. B and D, 2.
the Old Testament. Thus Hebraic thought turned to life in a body when a future life came into view because the inner necessity of their view of the nature of man required it. Before a different view (viz. immortality of the soul) could be held, a different anthropological basis must be adopted (viz. the Greek dualistic view of man's nature). It is our view that in the New Testament the Jewish resurrection faith is the fundamental background for the New Testament belief in resurrection. Resurrection of the body is the faith of the New Testament, for the life of a man requires a body. Man in the New Testament is always body. Christianity continued on the way of the Old Testament and Palestinian Judaism and focused its hope in the resurrection of the body. The essential immortality of man, either as a whole or as soul, is denied by Biblical religion. Man as man is not immortal

---

1 See Part III, Ch. 2 esp. A, 1 and 2, a.
2 See Part III, Ch. 2, esp. A, 1 and 2, b.
3 The fundamental basis of New Testament resurrection faith is the already occurred resurrection of Jesus. This will be further discussed in B of this chapter.
4 See above Part II, Ch. 2, 4, and references and literature cited there (e.g. Althaus, Die Letzten Dinge, pp. 121-128).
5 Cf. Nikolainen, op. cit., p. 189, "man is always body, ἀνθρώπος" (on Paul).
6 So e.g. Cullmann, Immortality, pp. 36f.; Hunter, The Hope of Glory, p. 140; Althaus, Die Letzten Dinge, p. 114 (see also pp. 96-115); N. Snaith, "Life After Death," Interpretation, Vol. I (1947), pp. 309-324 (esp. 324); J. Baillie, "Believers about Last Things," p. 213; et al. (see for details Part II, Ch. 1, B, 4).
in the true sense of the term. Life is primarily a value statement—the quality of life is primary. It is not survival but life that is meant by the New Testament hope in Christ. It is not to simply go on existing forever nor even to go on living in the sense of our present life that is placed before us by the New Testament. "Nobody ever wanted an endless quantity of life until discovery had been made of a new and quite particular and exceptional quality of life." Life that is life (e.g. Jn. 18:3; 10:10) is not mere survival but rather the life of the Kingdom of God, the life of communion with God in Christ. This life in the New Aeon is an embodied life, and hence the New Testament teaching on eternal life is the resurrection of the body.

2. The body and personal identity.

It has often been maintained that the reason for the New Testament stress on the resurrection of the body is the

---

1There is, of course, a survival but it is only that—a survival not a genuine immortality. (Against J. Bear, "Is Man as Man Immortal?", Interpretation, Vol. I (1947), pp. 493-498). See Part I, Ch. 1 & Ch. 2 and in general Part II, Ch. 2, B, 3.

2Bear, op.cit., pp. 493f. objects to Snaith's use of the term life in this qualitative sense (see Snaith, "Life After Death," pp. 309-324). We would tend to agree with Snaith.

3See earlier Part II, Ch. 1, A. See also the remarks to the same effect in J. Baillie, And the Life Everlasting, Wyvern Books rep. (London: Epworth Press, 1961), pp. 158-163, an excellent statement with which I am in essential agreement.

4Baillie, And the Life Everlasting, p. 158.

5Baillie remarks, "Eternal life, then, is the kind of life characteristic of the Age to Come." Ibid., p. 159.
necessity of the body to preserve personal identity. There are those, on the other hand, who deny that the term body has anything to do with personal individuality. The body as individual may be regarded as a safeguard against any concept of personal absorption as a characteristic of the future life. The real issue, therefore, is not only the body as the bearer of personal identity, but also the matter of individual survival in general. We have already seen that in his concept of union with Christ, Paul does not teach on absorption or loss of personal identity. The concept of future life as a "with Christ" is itself an indication that the individual personal remains such during this future life. Those in the future life with Christ are not, to be sure, isolated individuals but are part of the corporate solidarity of those in and with Christ, but this does not mean loss of individuality but rather is a community or fellowship concept. The real basis of individuality for Biblical religion, as we have earlier sought to demonstrate, is that God addresses us as a "Thou" and thus places us in a position of relationship and responsibility to Himself. This is clearly seen in the Biblical concept of judgment whereby we know we are held accountable for the things we do (e.g. Mt. 12: 30-37; 25:14-30, 31-46; Rom. 14:12; I Cor. 3:10-15; 4:4f.;

1 e.g. Stewart, op.cit., p. 267.
2 e.g. Robinson, The Body, pp. 15, 29, 78.
3 See below C, 2.
4 Part I, Ch. 1, and Ch. 2.
II Cor. 5:10; et al.). The concept of God's choice of us in Christ and the gift of forgiveness and life through His atoning death present the concept of our destined relation to God. This destined relation is our individual relation in the new community of God. The individual concept is not annulled by the corporate.¹

But if the body is not per se the guarantor of personal and individual survival, this does not mean it has no relation at all to individuality. Robinson is correct to see the body as a term for corporate solidarity: "The body is that which joins all people, irrespective of individual differences, in life's bundle together."² The corporate aspect of the term is strongly emphasized and vigorously defended by Robinson and others.³ But there is a danger here if this is pressed to the final limits. The Church and the Body of Christ cannot be simply identified,⁴ and thereby threatening the individual and historical existence of Jesus Christ, the risen Lord.⁵ Both the corporate and individual aspects of the concept of

---

¹See further C, 2.  
²The Body, p. 29; cf. pp. 31, 49ff, 58, 79, etc.  
³e.g. Thornton, op. cit.  
⁴See further C, 2.  
⁵Just as it is also possible that Christ-mysticism, pushed to one extreme can result in the loss of the believer's individual identity and pushed to the other extreme (Christ in us) Jesus Christ's identity is threatened. We cannot here enter into these problems, but their existence must be recognized.
Body must be recognized. It is the former which Robinson stresses while the latter is minimized. The individual side of ἁρμαί can be seen, for example, in such uses as Rom. 12:1ff. where "bodies" stands for the self and means "yourselves" (cf. also I Cor. 6:18ff.; Eph. 5:28ff.; Phil. 1:20; Rom. 6:12ff., where the meaning can be brought out by the personal pronoun in place of "body"). That ἁρμαί can be used by Paul to designate physical presence is another point that illustrates its individual aspect (e.g. II Cor. 10:10; I Cor. 5:3, 9:27; 13:3; Col. 2:23; Gal. 6:17). We should also note that the fact that life for Biblical thought is always an embodied life also requires the body to be understood in an individual sense. Man is only an "I," a "self" as he is this psycho-physical unity. As Althaus has put it, "The living 'I' of men is our self-consciousness only as an indissoluble unity of the corporal and spiritual." The individuality of the body in the resurrection is also strongly emphasized in Paul, though not in the materialistic fashion of identity of physical substance to preserve recognition. Thus in Rom. 8:11 Paul speaks in the plural: God will "give life to your mortal bodies," emphasizing

1 See above Part I, Ch. 2, B, 5. Robinson also recognizes this use but does not emphasize it, his concern being the corporate aspect. See The Body, pp. 27ff.
2 We have confined our attention primarily to Paul, for it is there that the heart of the problem is found.
3 See above section 1 and also Part I, Ch. 2, B, 5; Part II, Ch. 2, A, 4; B, 3; Part III, Ch. 1, B and D; Ch. 2, A.
4 Die Letzten Dinge, p. 122.
5 We found in, e.g. II Baruch, the idea that bodily resurrection was regarded as necessary for recognition (II Baruch 50:1-4). See Part III, Ch. 2, C.
the individuals who will be raised. In Rom. 8:23 the singular is used so that literally it reads we wait for "the redemption of our body," whereby the corporate aspect is emphasized. I Cor. 15 is devoted to the subject of the resurrection and is concerned in part with the nature of the body which the resurrected individual will have. Phil. 3:21 has a corporate aspect—the lowly body is the corporate solidarity of the Adamic humanity while the body of glory is the corporate solidarity of the new humanity in Christ. Thus both the corporate aspect and the individual aspect of the body must be kept in view. ¹

We conclude, then, that our personal identity and survival as individuals does not depend on the possession of a body but rather on God's grace and promise. Yet the body is connected with the individual life of man. For the term "body" has both a corporate and an individual aspect. We do survive as individuals, and that means an embodied existence.


It would be impossible in a paper of this scope to go into every aspect of the New Testament on the subject of resurrection or even deeply into the one great chapter of Paul in I Cor. 15. We shall confine our interests to those which properly fall within the scope of our purpose: the nature of the resurrection body, using I Cor. 15 as the primary basis

¹See further C, 2.
for our study, for it is here that we find the most detailed
New Testament exposition of the nature of the resurrection
body.\textsuperscript{1} We will then compare the basic ideas of I Cor. with
other selected passages.

1. Some remarks on I Cor. 15 and the nature of the resurrection
body.

a. The basis of hope (vv. 1-19).

We must begin where St. Paul begins, with the resur-
rection of Jesus.\textsuperscript{2} Paul firmly grounds his faith and teaching
concerning the resurrection of man in the common Christian
tradition and Kerygma of the redemptive event of God in Jesus
Christ: His death, burial and resurrection. First Corinthians
15 begins with a pointed reference to the \textit{Heilsgeschichte} (vv.
1-11). This, not philosophy or general principles, is the
heart and basis of Paul's Gospel as it was likewise for the
entire primitive Christian community. This means that the
basis of Paul's teaching on the resurrection is twofold.\textsuperscript{3}
The \textit{first} is what we may call the Christocentric aspect of
Paul's hope. That is to say, it is grounded in history: the
resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.\textsuperscript{4} He can only

\textsuperscript{1}See also Part IV, Ch. 1, D on the nature of Jesus' 
resurrection body.
\textsuperscript{2}On the New Testament concept of Jesus' own resurrection 
see above Ch. 1, C.
\textsuperscript{3}On the following see also Part IV, Ch. 1, C, 2.
\textsuperscript{4}Paul's view of the resurrection was presented earlier 
in Part IV. See Ch. 1, C, 2.
start from this astounding and central fact of the resurrection of Jesus. The second basis of Paul's thought we may call the Theocentric aspect. We have earlier pointed out that Paul constantly affirms that the resurrection of Christ was an act of the power of God. God is the God who raised Jesus (e.g. Rom. 4:24; 6:4; 8:11; 10:9; Col. 2:12; I Thess. 1:10) and the God who will also raise those who are Christ's (e.g. Rom. 8:11; I Thess. 4:14; Eph. 2:4ff.; II Cor. 4:14; 5:1-10).

This basis of the resurrection stems from the teaching of Jesus. In His reply to the Sadducees, Jesus grounded belief in the resurrection firmly on the essential nature of God (Mk. 12:26-27). Those who are in fellowship with God have entered an indisoluble relation which is maintained by Him who is "God of the living." Similar remarks to the effect that the promise of the resurrection grows out of faith in the essential nature of God revealed in Scripture and in the life, death and

1The basis of Paul's teaching in the resurrection of Jesus is widely acknowledged. See e.g. Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 175, 179, 197ff., 202; Kennedy, Last Things, pp. 228ff.; W. C. Robinson, "The Bodily Resurrection of Christ," pp. 81, 97; Grundmann, "Die Überracht der Gnade. . .," p. 67; Leivestad, et al. See also commentaries (e.g. Wendland op.cit., pp. 120ff.; C. Hodge, First Corinthians, (New York: R. Carter & Bros., 1860), pp. 312ff.; et al.).

2See esp. Ch. 1, C. 2.

3So Kümmel, Promise, p. 89; Kennedy, Last Things, pp. 99, 234; Schniewind, Markus, p. 125; Taylor, Mark, p. 484; et al. Bultmann, Geschichte, p. 25 regards it as a later church formulation (but see Taylor, Mark, p. 480.).

4Luke adds "for all live to him" (20:38).
resurrection of Jesus can be found in the New Testament (e.g. I Pet. 1:3ff.; Jn. 5:26; Heb. 13:20; Acts 2:24–36).

Paul supports his arguments by referring to the eyewitnesses of the resurrection, concluding with the appearance of Jesus to himself (vv. 5ff.). Paul's modesty can be seen in vs. 8-9 where he refers to himself as one untimely born and as the least of the apostles. There is also, however, another meaning indicated in vs. 8, "as it were to one untimely born." This meaning is that the Post-resurrection appearance of Jesus to Paul did not take place during the period prior to the Ascension when the appearances to the others occurred. It was, so to speak, an appearance "out of season." Stephen also saw the risen Lord after the Ascension (Acts 7:55ff.) but this is not listed among the appearances in the Tradition. Why? Probably because Stephen saw the glorified and ascended Christ in heaven, not the glorified Christ as He appeared after the resurrection and prior to the Ascension, for these are located on earth. Paul witnessed the same kind of appearance, though at an "untimely" season, as did the other apostles, i.e. an earthly appearance.

In vv. 12-19 Paul argues against the view of some of the Corinthian Christians that there is no resurrection, a view which he regards with grave seriousness. If the dead are not raised, writes Paul, then Christ is not raised and he and

---

1 Translation based on Blass-Debrunner, op.cit., p. 224 (section 433, 3) and Arndt-Gingrich, op.cit., p. 246. "εκτρώματι" means "untimely birth," "miscarriage."
the other apostles are "falsewitnesses of God" for they have all testified that God raised Christ from the dead (vv. 12-15). The resurrection of Christ is of central importance, for if He has not been raised faith in Him is futile, i.e. to no avail or purpose. There is no freedom from sin and death and all believers are "yet in their sins" (v. 17), and those who have died in Christ have perished (v. 18). Christ had to enter real human life in order to conquer sin, death and corruption, for they could only be conquered from within. The resurrection of Christ is the proclamation of the reality of this victory.1

The resurrection of Christ is thus central for Christian faith. The resurrection of those who are Christ's is grounded in the already occurred resurrection of Christ.2

b. Cosmic consummation (20-26).

In this section Paul's thought ranges from the resurrection of Christ to that of believers to the complete and ultimate victory when God's Lordship is an effective reality over everything, over the universe itself, after the

---


2 So Nikolainen, op. cit., p. 175.
destruction of all opposing powers. We cannot discuss here the latter aspect (cosmic consummation) fully.

Christ is the "first fruits (\(\pi\rho\chi\nu\)) of those who have fallen asleep" (v. 20). \(\pi\rho\chi\nu\) means the first of a series or a part of a whole. This is the sense of the word as it is used to refer to a single convert as the "first fruits" of believers in an area of missionary endeavor (Rom. 16:5; I Cor. 16:15) or to Christians as the first among mankind to believe (Jms. 1:18; cf. Rev. 14:4). The relation of the part to the whole is expressed by the use of this word in Rom. 11:16, "If the dough offered as first fruits is holy, so is the whole lump; and if the root is holy, so are the branches." The meaning of \(\pi\rho\chi\nu\) in I Cor. 15:20 as the first in a series is similar to Col. 1:18 (the "first-born from the dead" (cf. Rom. 8:29; Acts 23:26). That Christ is the "first fruits" is then the guarantee that others are to follow: He is only the first of a series of those who will rise (I Cor. 15:23). We thus

---


2 We have touched upon some aspects of this already in reference to the defeated powers. See esp. Part IV, Ch. 1 and Ch. 2, A, 1.


see once again that Paul's faith is grounded in the act of
god in Jesus Christ and not in theoretical argument. In the
face of the obvious fact that men, and we ourselves, continue
to die and that accordingly death's power seems inviolable
stands this other fact: there is One who has broken its power.
In the light of this One who is now risen\(^1\) can be seen that
"the omnipotence of death over man is once for all ended, since
there is one man who 'has taken from death its power' (II Tim.
1:10).\(^2\)

Paul then proceeds to present the Adam-Christ contrast
(vv. 21-22; cf. 45-49; Rom. 5:12-21), of which we have already
written.\(^3\) We must here affirm anew that the "all" in v. 22
means on the one hand, all who are Adam's (Adamic humanity)
and therefore means "all men," and on the other hand, "all
who are Christ's" and therefore all believers, not all
humanity.\(^4\) That Paul here affirms a universalism is difficult
of proof, and it would be truer to say that Paul "preserved a
reverent agnosticism."\(^5\) Universalist expositions of this
passage attempt to force Paul into a system of rational logic,
forgetting that Paul is not that systematic in the writing of
his letters and that he has in mind in I Cor. 15 the Christians

---

\(^{1}\) Resurrection is thus a past fact. See Cullmann, Christ and Time, p. 235.
\(^{2}\) Ibid.
\(^{3}\) See Part II, Ch. 2, B, 1, c and d; B, 2; Part IV, Ch.
1, B, 2; \(^{2}\) Ibid. See also Wendland, op.cit., p. 128; Lietzmann, op.cit., pp. 80, 193; Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 195ff.; TWNT; VI, p. 418.
\(^{5}\) Stewart, op.cit., p. 266.
to whom he is writing. Following the Adam-Christ contrast Paul presents the orders (στόχοι) of the New Age: first, Christ, then those who are His are to be raised (v. 23), third comes the final consummation of all things. Redemption is cosmically consummated (vv. 24-28).

c. The nature of the resurrection body (vv. 35-49).

This section falls into two parts (35-44a and 44b-49), each centering in an analogy. The first of these (35-44a) uses the analogy of the seed. Because it is an analogy it would be a mistake to attempt to press the analogy to a detailed analysis. The basic contrast presented by the seed analogy should be seen in the light of vv. 42-44a. Paul is speaking of the transformation of the old into the new—of the seed into the plant. There is thus both a similarity and a difference expressed. The seed and the plant correspond to the present life and resurrection life respectively. Between the two stands death, for the plant cannot come about unless the seed gives up its own life, its own existence and autonomy (cf. Jn. 12:24ff.). For Paul death is two-fold: the death at the

---

1M. E. Dahl, The Resurrection of the Body, (London: SCM Press, 1962), a book that came too late into my hands to be consulted thoroughly, argues for the universal resurrection, but not necessarily a universal salvation (see p. 76, n. 3). My brief preliminary reading required that I insert a reference to this excellent book which contains also a summary of the main exegetical approaches to I Cor. 15.

end of life (cf vv. 18, 20) and the already having died with Christ and the resultant constant dying to self (cf. Rom. 8: 10-13 in which the intertwining of "already dead" yet "will die" can be seen). To Paul's opponents the resurrection is impossible because it is conceived as an embodiment. Paul is concerned to show that, on the contrary, it is an embodied existence that is meant but not one of the same earthly substance. "The earthly man dies." There is a great difference between the "bare seed" and the plant that follows. This is a deed of the Creator who gives to each kind of seed a body of its own (v. 38). The resurrection body is also given by God—a different body than that of the earthly body. Paul speaks next of different kinds of "flesh" (v. 39) and different kinds of bodies (vv. 40-41), the former of animals, the latter of heavenly objects which do not have flesh. In view of these manifold differences of flesh and bodies, it cannot be regarded

1See above Ch. 2.
3So Wendland, op. cit., p. 132.
4Ibid.
5Ὅλος ἄνθρωπος ἐγέρεται.
as impossible that God can give another body for the resurrected which is different from their earthly body. It should be noted that in both contrasts, earthly (v. 39) and heavenly (vv. 40-41), a corporal existence is meant. Yet even among these "bodies" there are differences, for their glory is not the same and the heavenly glory differs from the terrestrial (vv. 40-41). Paul now draws the first analogy to a close with four contrasts between the earthly body and the resurrection body: perishable (or corruption) and imperishable (incorruption), dishonor and glory, weakness and power, natural (ψυχικόν) and spiritual (vv. 42-44a). The series of contrasts is the familiar Pauline method of "piling up" a series of statements (as in e.g. Rom. 8:38-39) to clarify the point, viz. that of the difference between the natural body and the spiritual body. The contrast is not between a material and non-material, a physical and a non-physical (or spiritual). It is the sphere and quality of existence that is meant by ψυχικόν and πνευματικόν. The natural man is fallen man, man whose life is bound by the life of "flesh," life in opposition to God (e.g. see I Cor. 2:14; Rom. 8:4ff.). The terms describe man in his totality as man under the bondage of sin, death and corruption on the one hand, and as man created

1Nikolainen, op.cit., p. 190.
2So Wendland, op.cit., p. 133.
3That "glory" here should not be pressed and means simply "differences of splendour" is shown by Kämmel, in Lietzmann, op.cit., p. 185. See also Wendland, op.cit., p. 133.
4See above Part I, Ch. 2, B, 4; C, 2; Part II, Ch. 2, B, esp. #2. See also commentaries, esp. Wendland, op.cit., pp. 134f.; et al.
anew by God in Christ on the other hand.¹

The second analogy is that of Adam and Christ (vv. 44b-49). As we have already discussed this in several places earlier, we need not go into details here. Adam and Christ are first contrasted (vv. 45-47) and then Adamic humanity and "Christ-humanity" (vv. 48-49). Adamic humanity stands under the signs of corruption, dishonor, weakness and is in bondage to decay and death. He and they are of the dust (v. 47; Gen. 2:7), a "living being" (lit. "living soul," Gen. 2:7).² We bear the image of this first Adam and are from the earth just as he is (vv. 48-49). But as the first Adam’s destiny was toward God, created in His image (Gen. 1:26f.), so that destiny is given anew and realized in God’s mighty creative act of redemption in the Last Adam (the man from heaven³).⁴ Paul’s thought is thus rooted in the Old Testament and Christian experience and thought, not Hellenism and Gnosticism.⁵ The first Adam was simply "living" and his act involved mankind in the bondage to decay, sin and death. The last Adam is a "life-giving Spirit," not a living spirit (v. 45),⁶ i.e. a

¹See also Kennedy, op.cit., pp. 252f.; Wendland, op.cit., pp. 134f.; et al.
²On this use of ψυχή see Part I, Ch. 1, B, 1.
⁵Ibid.
⁶TWNT, VI, pp. 417f.
creative life-giving power, by whose act of redemption 1 freed those who are His from the bondage.  Paul's argument is complete: his analogies have shown the difference between the old and the new. 2

d. Resurrection and transformation (vv. 50-57).

With v. 50 we come to a problematic passage. What is the meaning of "flesh and blood"? The usual meaning is to take it as referring simply to "human nature" per se, in contrast with God. 3 Others refer the phrase to fallen human nature. 4 From other uses of the term (cf. e.g. Ecclus. 14:18; 17:31; Mt. 16:17; Gal. 1:16; Eph. 6:12; Heb. 2:14) it is probably correct to see the term as a neutral term — man in his fallen nature would be σάρξ alone. 5 Prof. Jeremias in a recent article 6 has convincingly argued that v. 50 is poetic of the synthetic type and that therefore "corruption" of the second line is not identical with "flesh and blood" of the first line. "Flesh and blood" refers to the living, while "corruption" (φθορά) means the dead. Verse 50 is thus not a summary of the preceding but an introduction to the

---

4 e.g. W.C. Robinson, op.cit., p. 99; Robinson, The Body, pp. 201, 31; Gullmann, Immortality, p. 46; Thornton, op.cit., p. 269; Guy, op.cit., p. 115; et al.
5 Plummer, op.cit., p. 376.
6 "Flesh and Blood . . .", p. 152.
following verses.\textsuperscript{1} \(\phi\theta\psi\rho\alpha\) means, according to Prof. Jeremias, "corpses in decomposition" (ref. to Acts 2:27; 31, 13:34-37; I Cor. 15: 42, 52).\textsuperscript{2} "Neither the living nor the dead can take part in the Kingdom of God—as they are."\textsuperscript{3} This parallelism continues in the following verses:\textsuperscript{4} "we shall not all sleep" (some are alive)—we all (including the dead) shall be changed (v. 51); the dead—we (the living) (v. 52); corruptible (the dead)—mortal (the living) (v. 53, 54). Paul is thus referring to the event of the Parousia ("the last trumpet," v. 52) when both the living and the dead are rendered fit for the Kingdom of God. The dead are raised as spiritual bodies, the living are transformed into spiritual bodies, for man as he is (belonging to the solidarity of Adam) cannot enter eternal life. We should note again that the "all" of v. 51 means "those who belong to Christ," and does not imply a universal salvation. The resurrection and transformation are the acts of God's creative power. For the living—transformation; for the dead—resurrection which is itself transformation.\textsuperscript{5} The corporality of the transformed is identical with that of the resurrected.\textsuperscript{6} Both are clothed in the new spiritual corporality. When this has happened, then can be sung the hymn of victory over death.

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., pp. 154f.
\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. 152.
\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., Similarly Plummer, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 376.
\textsuperscript{4}So Jeremias, p. 152.
\textsuperscript{5}Nikolainen, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 201.
\textsuperscript{6}Ibid., p. 200; Wendland, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 138.
(vv. 54-55; from Isa. 25:8; Hos. 13:15), for God has given what we would never have been able to accomplish ourselves: the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ (cf. Rom. 7:24f.).

e. Conclusions and summary.

First, we have noted that Paul's hope is based on the theological understanding of God's essential nature and on the historical fact of the resurrection from the dead of Jesus Christ. For Paul, the evidence (Jesus Christ) corroborates the theory (God's essential nature). Second, the faith in the future resurrection of Christians is also founded on the already occurred resurrection of Jesus Christ who is the first fruits. Third, the resurrection involves a radical difference between the old and the new humanity. But this difference is not so radical that an absolute gulf is created between the old and the new. The present body of flesh, belonging to the old order of the fleshly Adamic humanity, will be destroyed. Resurrection is of the body, not the flesh. The old order, subject to the bondage of the powers of sin, death and corruption, is totally overcome in the New Age of the Last Adam. The victory is won through Christ and given to us by God through the power of the Spirit — the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus

---

1 That Paul believed in a general resurrection is probable, as his teaching on Judgment indicates. For details on this see e.g. Nikolainen, op. cit., pp. 206-221; Stewart, op. cit., pp. 266, 268ff.; Althaus, Die Letzten Dinge, pp. 115ff., 172-230; Kennedy, op. cit., pp. 275ff.; et al. But here in I Cor. 15 he has primarily in view the resurrection of believers (see Jeremias, "Flesh and Blood . . .", p. 159).

2 So Gullmann, Immortality, p. 46; Althaus, Die Letzten Dinge, p. 132; W.C. Robinson, op. cit., p. 99; et al.

from the dead (e.g. Rom. 8:11). There is a gulf, a difference between the old and new. But while the gulf cannot be bridged by Adamic man, it is bridged by the New Adamic man. God Himself erects the bridge—between the old and new stands the creative power and act of God.  

By this creative power of God the new humanity, the new corporality is created. Fourth, there is also a continuity between the old and the new. This is indicated in the analogies used by Paul (the seed and Adam-Christ). It is also indicated in the Gospel accounts of the resurrection of Jesus where the similarity is emphasized. Jesus says to the disciples "see my hands and my feet, that it is I myself" (Lk. 24:39). The similarity is twofold, The first similarity is that of corporal existence. The new humanity is an embodied humanity as the old was embodied. That the old body is transformed into the new body indicates this same principle of continuity and similarity. The materiality of existence is not lost in the transformation but "the body will ever more be body" through the relation with the Spirit. "The resurrection body is not less material

---


2 See above Part IV, Ch. 1, G, 1; D


4 H. E. Hengstenberg, Der Leib and die Letzten Dinge, 2 ed. (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1955), pp. 240f. This book is a good exposition of the subject from a Roman Catholic point of view.
than the former, but it has another "glory." 1 The second similarity is that of the continuity of the self. "The new body will be my body, as the old body was my body, the form of my individual being." 2 The form of the body alters completely 3 but I yet remain myself. Yet even this "self" is changed. Thus, fifthly, the manner of life is no longer directed from "soulish" (ψυχικός) and fleshly (σαρκικός) motives and desires but is rather directed by the Spirit. 4 That spirit is not the "material" of the new body is clear from the parallel expression for the old body, σωματικός ψυχικός. 5 The "natural body" is the body adapted to and determined by the sphere of this existence, and means the whole man as he lives his life now. The "spiritual body" means the body governed and controlled by the Spirit. The mode or manner, the quality of life is meant in each case. 6 Each form of life has a body appropriate to

1 Ibid., p. 242.
2 Althaus, Die Letzten Dinge, p. 133. So also many others: e.g. Nikolainen, op. cit., 188f.; Manek, op. cit., p. 278; Kennedy, op. cit., pp. 232.
3 Even as we know it does today in the biological sense of the total change of body cells in about seven years. There is also the change in physical appearance over the years from birth to death and yet the identity of the self is not lost.
5 Against the view that the spiritual body is composed of spirit as found, e.g. in Lietzmann, op. cit., p. 84; Weinel, op. cit., pp. 372f.; Cullmann, Immortality, pp. 45f.
6 With the above interpretation the following scholars agree: Nikolainen, op. cit., pp. 193, 204; Althaus, Römer, p. 77; Stewart, op. cit., p. 268; Robinson, op. cit., p. 80; Plummer, op. cit., p. 372; et al. See also Part I, Ch. 2 on the uses of soul and spirit to describe the way of life. Also Part II, Ch. 2, A.
itself in its qualitative mode of existence and direction. The new life is determined and directed by the Spirit. Sixth, the nature of the resurrection body is not theory. Paul has seen a resurrection body, for the risen Jesus appeared to him. Thus, while the resurrection body is described in terms like spiritual, glory, incorruptible, etc., in the last analysis, little more than this can be said— it will be like His (cf. Phil. 3:21 and I Jn. 3:2). From this Paul derives certain fundamental characteristics: it will be spiritual, it will be corporal, it will be "glorious," it will be a self. "Glory" is perhaps the best term to describe the spiritual body. 

Seventh, the transformation of the believer into the spiritual body like that glorious body of Jesus (cf. Phil. 3:20f) takes place at the Parousia. In this world we live in the tension of the what is already a reality and the not yet consummated reality. We are now risen but only with Christ. At the Parousia is the full consummation of our present hidden resurrection life (Col. 3:1-4).

2. Brief comparison with selected Pauline passages.

a. I Thess. 4:13-17.

---

1. The concept of "glory" (τὸ ἀρχηγόνον) is too large a subject to be summarized here. See special works on τὸ ἀρχηγόνον (esp. TWNT, II, 236-237).

2. So Cullmann, Immortality, p. 46; Nikolainen, op. cit., p. 204. See TWNT, II, pp. 253f. Note the appearance of "light" when Jesus appeared to Paul (see Acts 9:3 and parallels).


5. See further below C, 1 and also Ch. 3, B.
The same motif of resurrection as is found in I Cor. 15 is found in this earlier passage. Here also we do hear of the Last Trump (I Cor. 15:52; I Thess. 4:16) and of the Parousia affecting both the living and the dead (I Cor. 15:23, 52; I Thess. 4:16). We do not hear of the "transformation" but we do hear that the Parousia affects both the living and the dead. The "mystery" referred to in I Cor. 15:51 is the concept of the transformation of the living, which in I Thess. is expressed by "caught up together with them in the clouds." The difference is thus one of detail.

b. II Cor. 5.

The same contrast of the living and the dead appears again, though not as clearly expressed. The earthly body (the tent) is again placed over against the resurrection body (the dwelling from God) and the resurrection is God's creative act.

c. Rom. 8.

The contrast of living and dead appears more clearly here (8:11, 23). The emphasis is on transformation. "Your
mortal bodies" (v. 11) are those still living who will be transformed. The waiting for the "redemption of our bodies" means both the living and the dead, who will experience the new embodiment (v. 23). Further, it is a resurrection of the body that is again in view, for we are freed from the flesh, not the body.¹ The creative deed of God is also found here, for the new life is the work of the Spirit (8:11, 23).² That the coming life is a spiritual life (an embodied life) is brought out by the phrase "first fruits of the Spirit" (v. 23) which means there is more to come after the first fruits.

The resurrection body is the glorified body (8:17). Again, our destiny is to be like Christ and with Him.

d. Phil. 3.

We have only to quote vv. 20-21 to show the similarity to I Cor.: "Our citizenship is in heaven, and from it we await a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the power which enables him even to subject all things to himself" (cf. 3:10-11). Transformation of all, living and dead, is meant.⁴ It is again the product of divine power, though in

¹Nikolainen, op. cit., p. 203.
²See TWNT, VI, p. 419; Robinson, The Body, p. 72.
³ἡμεροκράτισις I Cor. 15:51, ἀληθομορφευ. The Phil. 3:21 passage uses the stronger word, but in any case a transformation is meant as the context of I Cor. 15 shows.
In form and meaning Phil. 3:20-21 is a summary of I Cor. 15:50-57.
⁴See Jeremias, "Flesh and Blood ...," p. 159.
Phil. it is stated that Christ has that power, while elsewhere it is usually attributed to the power of God or the Spirit (cf. I Cor. 6:14; Rom. 1:4). The modification is only one of detail and perhaps should be understood from I Cor. 15:45 (Christ is a "life-giving Spirit"). Nikolainen sees 3:10-11 as referring to the dead who will be raised, while 3:20-21 refers to the living who will be transformed.¹ This idea is suggestive and may well be what Paul had in mind, but I do not feel that it can be demonstrated in quite the fashion as Nikolainen proposes. That both resurrection and transformation are found here I regard as certain, but not that vv. 10-11 speak of one while vv. 20-21 speak of the other.² The correspondence to I Cor. 15 is again considerable.³


Very briefly we wish to point out several things in this passage which also tend in the same direction as the teaching of Paul. There is no direct statement of a transformation per se, but there is an indication of it. Paul and

¹ op.cit., p. 205.
² One should note the cognate words used in vv. 10 (conformed to His death) and 21 (conformed or formed like His glorious body). Transformation begins prior to the Parousia, but is not consummated until then. Beare, Philippians, p. 124.
³ So also Nikolainen, op.cit., pp. 204-206; Jeremias, op.cit., p. 159; Beare, Philippians, pp. 125ff., 138ff.; TWNT, VI, p. 418.
Jesus agree that the resurrected life is a different order of life lived in a different sphere.\(^1\) The resurrected are "like the angels" (12:25).\(^2\) This indicates the same concept that Paul explains at greater length of a difference between the "natural" and "spiritual" bodies. This is the first thing to note. The second that is worthy of note here is that there is a continuity indicated. The resurrected remain themselves for Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are still the persons they were. There is no loss of personal individuality meant by "being like the angels."\(^3\)

C. Resurrection and the Life Everlasting.

This section will be used to summarize our main results. There will, thus, be little that is new and our presentation will be brief.

1. Resurrection life as present reality.

We have touched upon this earlier in several sections, but need here to clarify the concept.\(^4\) In chapter two of this part we noted Paul's teaching on the mystical being in Christ

---

\(^1\)See Schniewind, *op. cit.*, p. 125, who also notes that the teaching of Paul and Jesus are similar.

\(^2\)cf. Enoch 51:4; II Baruch 51:10. See Part III, Ch. 2, C. The dating of both references above is probably later than the saying of Jesus. Certainly II Baruch (late first cent. A.D.) is.

\(^3\)Due to space considerations we cannot go into the Johannine literature. I am convinced that the same ideas of resurrection are found there (see e.g. I Jn. 3:2; Jn. 11:25-26; 15).

\(^4\)See above Part II, Ch. 2, A; and esp. Part IV, Ch. 2. Note especially the references (Bible and modern) in Ch. 2, A and E.
and with Christ. We have died with Him, been buried with Him and been raised with Him. (e.g. Rom. 6:2-5). The New Age has already broken into this present world, the Old Age.\(^1\) Now is Christ risen from the dead (I Cor. 15:20) and those who believe in Christ are already with Him risen from the dead (Col. 2:12; 3:1; Eph. 2:5-10). The presupposition of rising with Christ is dying with Him (cf. e.g. Rom. 6:5, 11; 8:11; Col. 3:3 with Col. 3:1; 2:12; Gal. 3:27; 2:20). "The power of the resurrection of Christ already works in this time."\(^2\)

Thus any man who is in Christ (by faith) is already a new creation, raised to newness of life (II Cor. 5:17; Rom. 6:5). The presence of the new resurrection life in the believer is associated with the Spirit. The coming of the Spirit is associated with the Last Days in Jewish thought (e.g. Joel 2:28-32).\(^3\) The Spirit is bestowed on the Church at Pentecost (Acts 2) and on the believer at Baptism.\(^4\) The whole life of the Christian is now \(\pi\nu\epsilon\sigma\mu\mu\alpha\) life, is \(\pi\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\eta\iota\kappa\omega\) (e.g. Rom. 8:9; 7:6; I Cor. 12:3; 2:15; 3:1; 14:37; \textit{et al.}). The newness of resurrection life already experienced results in a new way of life for the believer (e.g. "Walk by the Spirit," Gal. 5:16-25; Rom. 8:4ff.). By the Spirit the believer shares in the new being of Christ (e.g. see I Cor. 1:9; II Cor. 13:13;

---

\(^1\) cf. with Jesus teaching on the presence of the Kingdom of God. See above Ch. 1, A.


\(^3\) See TWNT, VI, pp. 382ff.

\(^4\) See above Ch. 2, A, 2; B, 1. See also TWNT, VI, pp. 407ff., 410ff., 420ff.
Phil. 2:2). "The foretaste of heaven is the gift of the Spirit." 1

It is this "foretaste" that is the clue to the present resurrection life. In I Cor. 15:20 the resurrection of Jesus is the "first fruits of the Spirit" (Rom. 8:23). First fruits means, then, not only the first of a series but also that through which the whole is determined. 2 The resurrection is not, as for Judaism, a distant future hope but is a present reality for the Christian believer. The Spirit is the partial bestowal in the present of the yet to be finally perfected future bestowal of the resurrection (Rom. 8:23; cf. Gal. 6:8). The Spirit is also the "first fruits of the future dwelling from God (II Cor. 5:5). 3 'First fruits' means "earnest" in the sense of the part for the whole. It carries the sense of the token given of the totality yet to follow: 4 as a first installment of grain with the full amount to come later. 5 It is not only the "guarantee" (RSV of II Cor. 5:5) but also the "foretaste." 6


2 See above B, 1, b.


4 See above Ch. 3, B, 1, b.


appears in two other passages in Paul: I Cor. 1:22 and Eph. 1:14. In the three places where \( \text{\textgreek{y}p\textgreek{e}n} \) is used, it is used in relation to the Holy Spirit. In I Cor. 1:22 the Spirit is the \( \text{\textgreek{y}p\textgreek{e}n} \) of the promises of God which "find their yea in Him" (Christ). That is, the promises of God are certainly to be fulfilled in us and we have even now a foretaste of them. In Eph. 1:14 the Spirit is the \( \text{\textgreek{y}p\textgreek{e}n} \) of our redemption: that is, both the foretaste of it and the pledge (guarantee) of its future full realization (cf. Rom. 8:23 where redemption is future and Eph. 1:7 where we already have redemption in Christ). The new life is thus a pledge and present foretaste through the Spirit and a yet to be consummated possession of the believer through the Spirit (cf. also Eph. 1:13; 4:30): of the new corporality (II Cor. 5:5); of the eschatological promises of God (I Cor. 1:22); of redemption (Eph. 1:14). The foretaste of glory in us now by the Spirit indwelling us is a hiddenness in the inner man (II Cor. 4:16). Our new lives are now hidden in Christ (Col. 3:3).¹ This hidden resurrection life is yet to be revealed and perfected (e.g. Col. 3:4; Phil. 1:23; 3:21; et al.).² There is thus a tension in the believer’s life between the already experienced resurrection power and the future consummation of it (see e.g. Rom. 8:

¹ See above Ch. 3, B, 2, b. and Ch. 2, A and B, 1.
We are risen now but only in Christ and have but the foretaste of the new life. "The present gift of the spirit is thought of as the life of heaven proleptically imparted to human life." What still remains is the resurrection of our bodies, the manifestation in a full and finally complete way of what we already are and have. The Spirit's work in us is already changing us from the glory of the present experience of Christ to prepare us for that new glory when we shall be like Him (II Cor. 3:17–18). Then will faith become sight, hiddenness be revealed.

The same thought of present reality and future perfected reality is found in the Johannine literature. The believer has eternal life now and yet will be raised at the last day (Jn. 5:24–29). He now abides in Christ (Jn. 15:17) and has eternal life but will be raised at the Last Day (Jn. 6:54). Similar thoughts appear elsewhere in the New Testament. For example, Hebrews 6:4–5 speaks of tasting the powers of the age to come and of partaking of the Holy Spirit. Or again, according to I Peter, we have been born anew to a lively hope (1:3, 23; cf. 2:24; 3:18) and have an inheritance which shall be revealed (1:4–5; 1:21).

Because of this, we are now about midway between the

---

1Mitton, op. cit., p. 263. See also Gullmann, The Early Church, pp. 165–173; Christ and Time, pp. 235ff.
2TWNT, VI, p. 420; Hamilton, op. cit., p. 21.
5See Part II, Ch. 2.
old and new. The believer does not yet possess the transformed spiritual body and yet is not just the body of sin and death, for he has been freed from it. But he will be transformed into the likeness of His Lord at the Parousia (Phil. 3:21; I Jn. 3:2). Christ bore our likeness before His death and we will bear His likeness at His appearing (cf. I Cor. 15:49; Phil. 3:10 and Phil. 2:7).

2. Fellowship as the chief characteristic of the New Life.

Throughout our study the note of fellowship has kept coming up. This could not but be the case for it is this note that dominates Biblical religion. The future life is one of fellowship. On the vertical plane it is fellowship with God (resp. Christ and the Holy Spirit) while on the horizontal plane it is fellowship with one another in the community of saints. In view of the previous treatments of the subject we need only to summarize here. Several things need to be noted in this connection. The individual finds his fulfillment in this communion with others. Biblical religion is not bound up with individual destiny per se but only as it is related to the corporate and social aspect. The corporate aspect dominates

---

1See Käsemann, Leib und Leib Christi, p. 123.
2The chief places where this has come up are: Part II, Ch. 2, A, 1, b; Ch. 2, A, 2; 3; Part III, Ch. 1, C; D, 1; E, 2; Ch. 2, D, 3, c.; Part IV, Ch. 2, Ch. 3.
3This is true even of our present life. See Althaus, Die Letzten Dinge, pp. 124ff.; Dodd, New Testament Studies, pp. 143-159.
the individual aspect. The believers now are one Body, the Body of Christ, the community of believers.¹ This is the living community now, and in the consummation this will be the sphere of the fellowship.² We are members of His Body now and will be hereafter (e.g. I Cor. 12). However, this concept of corporate solidarity does not mean the end of individuality.³ We may not totally identify either the believer or Christ with the Church.⁴ The Church is the Body of Christ in the same way the believer is in Christ and this only in an incomplete way: both must await fulfillment (see e.g. Eph. 4:11-16; 2:20-22; Col. 1:24). The individual aspect is brought out in, e.g. I Cor. 12:27, "you are the Body of Christ and individually members of it" (cf. 12:14). Life is individual life and also corporate in the fellowship community. We have earlier spoken of the individual-corporate tension in Paul's writings (e.g. II Cor. 5).⁵ Both the individual and corporate aspects must be kept in view. There is now the corporate ("you are the Body of Christ") aspect, the fellowship of believers. Inclusion within this present body is by the act of faith in response to God's actions in us and for us (Eph.

¹See esp. Cullmann, The Early Church, pp. 165-173; Nikolainen, op.cit., 154-162; Robinson, The Body, pp. 49-83; et al. ²On the whole subject see, in addition to the above, Thornton, op.cit.
³See above A, 2; B, 1.
⁴As both Robinson, The Body (e.g. pp. 51f.) and Cullmann appear to do (e.g. The Early Church, p. 168f.).
⁵See Ch. 3 above, B, 1 and also A, 2 of this chapter.
2:8-10; Col. 2:12; Gal. 3:27; et al.). There is now, therefore, the individual aspect (1 Cor. 13:12, 14, 27). Both are bound together by the Spirit and live now in the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:13; cf. Gal. 3:27), the ἐπαράστασις of what is yet to come. Both aspects will be consummated at the Parousia, the individual believer rising to share the blessing of triumph in the new community, the fellowship of Saints, the Kingdom. The life of the believer is life lived in fellowship: partial now and consummated in the future. There is no loss of individuality but rather its fulfillment in the community of believers—the perfect realization of fellowship with God (Father, Son and Holy Spirit) and with those who are His. We saw earlier that resurrection involves both a difference from the old life and a continuity with it. The continuity is of the person whom God calls to fellowship with Himself. It is this calling of God that guarantees both that death is not the end of existence and that future life does not mean its extinction through absorption. God will call this "I" which is myself from death to the new resurrected life.

The I, that God raises, is I myself in the totality and corporeality of my being as the one whom God calls in all the vicissitudes of life to one and the same special responsibility and whom God places under one and the same personal promise, addressed by one and the same personal name. . . God calls me also on the other side of death by my name.

1 See Hamilton, op.cit., pp. 39f.
3 Althaus, Die Letzten Dinge, p. 120.
I am called to the indestructible communion with God and those who are His. The individual and corporate aspects are both included in the fulfillment.

3. A note on the duration of life with God.

The problem of the categories of time and eternity is a complex one, and we cannot deal with it here. We do need, however, to say a word on the duration of life with God. However, much the meaning of time (esp. \( \chiρονος \), \( \kappaα\rho\iota\omicron\sigma \)) and eternity (esp. \( \alpha\iota\omicron\nu \)) may be debated, there is nearly no disagreement that in so far as duration is meant \( \alpha\iota\omicron\nu \) means "everlasting" or "forever," as we commonly mean these words. Whether this being with God forever be understood as unending time, as simultaneity, or whatever, the duration of eternity is unending or everlasting. This is also clear from the use of the word \( \alpha\thetaαν\iota\sigma\iota\omicron\alpha \), "immortality" (i.e. not subject to death). This immortality which only God has (I Tim. 1:13; 6:16) is granted to those who are His (I Cor. 15:53-54).

That the life with God lasts forever does not, however,

---

3As e.g. Cullmann, Christ and Time, pp. 48, 61-68; TWNT, I, pp. 198ff.
4As e.g. Barth, Dogmatics, III, 2, p. 526; Baillie, And the Life Everlasting, pp. 165ff., 173.
depend on "words" as the above. It depends fundamentally on
the nature of God Himself. He who is related to God knows that
nothing can separate Him from God (Rom. 8:38-39). For Biblical
religion the duration of life as the qualitative eternal life
does not depend on anything in man's nature or power but rather
on God. "We know nothing of an immortality of the 'soul,' but
of an immortality of our God-relation."¹ The ground and basis
of the abiding duration of the life of man is in God and His
love given in Christ and in the presence of the Spirit with
man. We have seen this hope expressed in the Old Testament,²
and have seen it come to a resounding crescendo in Paul's
concepts of "In Christ" and "With Christ"³ and also in the
Fourth Gospel's presentation of "life" as eternal fellowship.⁴
"The decisive consideration is not, are you a man and therefore
an immortal being, but are you in Christ and therefore assured
that not even death can separate you from him?"⁵ In the nature
and purpose of God, then, are to be found the assurance of not
only our existence as individuals within the corporate solidarity
of Christ (the Last Adam), not only of life that is life indeed
and of life that is therefore embodied, but also the duration of
that life forever. This is indeed eternal life, "that they know
thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent"

¹Althaus, Die Letzten Dinge, p. 110.
²See Part III, Ch. 1, C, 2 and E, 2.
³See Part IV, Ch. 2.
⁴See Part II, Ch. 2.
⁵Kantonen, op.cit., p. 36.
(Jn. 17:3). Therefore "thanks be to God, who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ" (I Cor. 15:57), so that we may ever abide in communion with Him (Lk. 23:43; I Thess. 4:17; Jn. 14:20; I Jn. 1:2-3).
Main Conclusions.

1. The Biblical view of man is remarkably consistent in both Testaments. I say "remarkably" because these documents were produced over a long period of time and by many authors of varying as well as related viewpoints. Yet the "unitary conception of personality" is adhered to in all basic respects throughout, though minor variances occur. The Biblical view of man as a psycho-physical unity is, I believe, of permanent value and is confirmed in many ways by modern scientific views.¹

2. A second point that seems valid to me is the Biblical view of life as pertaining more to life as it is lived, to the quality and content of life rather than simply life in a durative sense. This is true of both Testaments but finds its culmination and high point in the New Testament conception of life. This is a healthy corrective to the view which focuses too much attention on the external accoutrements of life rather than the inherent values of life. In some of our modern popular expressions we approach somewhat nearer to the Biblical view. The following will illustrate: "the American way of life"; or even a contemporary American "Teenager's" reference to a town in which little that interests him happens as a "dead town." Yet this is still not the Biblical meaning of life. The NT especially brims

over with life and inspires life in the highest, the Hebraic sense of that term. It is no accident that the author of the Fourth Gospel chose "life" as his keyword, for that is the inherent message of the NT itself: in Christ is the life that is life indeed.

3. The seriousness with which the New Testament in particular regards "death" is another valid result of this study. The theological understanding of death points up the seriousness of life and of man's situation in life. Apart from the conception of death not only as the Divine boundary of life but also as the enemy and judgment on sin, the redemptive significance of the death and resurrection of Christ is rendered obscure and hollow. The "light" of His victory shines in the midst of this "darkness" of death. In this light the Christian can face death, even his own death, with confident assurance and hope. In this light he can live knowing that the death is behind him in Christ and that death has "lost its sting," and that the new life in Christ is even now conquering the "body of this death."

4. While our curiosity regarding the Interim State is not fully satisfied in the New Testament, there is one result that is significant. We may not know with assurance how we shall survive during the Interim, nor know much regarding those "who have never heard", but the "one thing needful" is known. This one thing is that death cannot separate us from God in Christ. We will be with Him and this communion is the vital and essential element of faith.
and hope. This community with God and those who are His as the goal of life here and hereafter is another result of importance and abiding worth.

5. The belief in the resurrection of the body is quite in keeping with the NT concept of man's nature. With this must be excluded any depreciation of physical or material nature. Yet NT faith avoids the crass materialism of Judaism: the resurrection is of the spiritual body. Though in places the NT tends toward materialism, it is never allowed to dominate the conception of the nature of the body as spiritual. Future life is embodied life but lived in the mode or manner of the Spirit. Both personal identity and spirituality are preserved and kept in proper balance. This is especially true of Paul and John who have developed the concept of life, communion and embodiment more deeply than others.

6. The form of Biblical expression, especially in the Apocalyptic sections, seems to me, at least, as open to question. It is fraught with the danger of literalism, and the use of such symbolic language has questionable values today. "Angels of wrath", "anti-Christ"s" and "golden Streets" have less relevance for modern ears. The message they express must by heard, but we must not place the message and the symbolic vehicle of that message on the same level of validity. It was for this reason that we emphasized the concepts themselves rather than some of the "symbolic trappings" that expressed these concepts.
7. As indicated above (#4), communion (or fellowship) is the central characteristic of the future life. This involves what we have called the individual-corporate tension. Fellowship is a present reality in the Body of Christ and a fully realized fellowship in the community of the resurrected Body of Christ. The individual, however, remains an individual, for only he can believe and he will be called by God to resurrection life. But this life is not individual *per se* but life lived in fellowship with God and His people.

8. The relevance of our repeated references to the reality of eschatological life in present life points up that it is a mistake to limit eschatology to just a future life. The future life has broken into the present and is a presently realized foretaste of what is yet to be fully consummated.
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ET  Expository Times
EVV  English Versions
HAT  Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HDB  Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible
HERE  Hastings, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics
HNT  Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HTR  Harvard Theological Review
ICC  International Critical Commentary
JBL  Journal of Biblical Literature
JBR  Journal of Bible and Religion
JR  Journal of Religion
JTS  Journal of Theological Studies
KEK  Kritisch-exegetisches Kommentar (Meyer)
LXX  Septuagint
MSS  Manuscripts
NS  New Series
NT  Novum Testamentum
NTD  Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTS  New Testament Studies
RGG  Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart
RSV  Revised Standard Version
SJT  Scottish Journal of Theology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
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