

THE THEOLOGY OF THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS
CHRIST, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO PAULINE
KERYGMA AND SOTERIOLOGY

By

REV. SAMUEL OYINLOYE KOLADE ABOGUNRIN,
B.A. HONS. (IBADAN),
M.TH. (ABERDEEN)

A thesis in the Department of Religious Studies
Submitted to the Faculty of Arts in partial ful-
filment of the requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN

August, 1978

TO THE DIRECTOR OF THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN
FROM THE DIRECTOR OF THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN

IBADAN UNIV	
ACC. NO.	79 05548
LOC. MAR:	7H BT 481 A2x

UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN LIBRARY

IBADAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
(IBADAN) NIGERIA
N 100 (1960)

IBADAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
IBADAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
IBADAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

A B S T R A C T

The heart of the New Testament message is the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Yet the nature of the resurrection has remained one of the riddles of New Testament studies. There is the perennial problem of the discrepancies between the various accounts of the unique event recorded in the Gospels. Of course, the variances are largely due to differences in theological outlook and varied interests in the early Church. Moreover, the interest of the evangelists was not in details but in the message. The actual resurrection of Jesus is not within the field of human vision; therefore, to find out what really happened one must start from the post resurrection appearances. But this investigation is chiefly concerned with the resurrection of Jesus as it affects Paul's teaching. The personal encounter with the Risen Lord Jesus on the Damascus road meant for Paul a new beginning. The resurrection of Jesus became central to the whole of Pauline thought on the role of Jesus as Redeemer and man's salvation, both now and in the future. Nevertheless, his 'theology' is not based on the Damascus road experience,

it is rooted in the apostolic tradition. It is Paul that gives us the earliest record of the apostolic resurrection tradition. The apostolic kerygma stresses the fact that Jesus was raised bodily from the dead. The death and resurrection of Jesus became the act of God for our present and future salvation. The resurrection of Jesus and the resurrection of the dead are two inseparable facts. Jesus' resurrection forms the basis of Paul's discussion on the resurrection of believers. For Paul the life of a bodiless soul is incomplete, distressingly dull and missing the gift of the Gospel. But the time of the investiture remains unsolved in Paul.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am greatly indebted to Rev. Dr. J.O. Awolalu, the Acting Head of the Department of Religious Studies, University of Ibadan who supervised this thesis. The prompt attention and encouragement he gave throughout the period of writing have meant so much to me in the production of this work. My gratitude goes to the Rev. Dr. G.K. Falusi who read through the thesis and offered many valuable suggestions and for making many of his books available to me for the purpose of this research. I am also grateful to Mr. R.G. Bomstad and Rev. Dr. W.T. Davis for helping to photocopy relevant documents and to place order for books not readily available here from abroad. I hereby express my deep appreciation to the University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria for offering me a scholarship to cover the first two years of this research. Finally, I am thankful to Mr. S.A. Olatunji of the Department of Religious Studies for kindly typing the thesis.

Certification Page

I certify that this work was carried out by
Rev. S.O. Abogunrin, in the Department of Religious
Studies, University of Ibadan.



(S u p e r v i s o r)

Revd. Dr. J. Omosade Awolalu, B.D.,
(Lond.), S.T.M. (U.T.S., N.Y.), Ph.D.,
Ibadan, Acting Head of Department,
Religious Studies, University of Ibadan.

August, 1978.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
I Title Page	i
II Abstract	ii-iii
III Acknowledgement	iv
IV Certification by Supervisor	v
V Table of Contents	vi- x

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: THE PROBLEM OF THE RESURRECTION
EVENT 1-15

CHAPTER TWO:

THE RESURRECTION NARRATIVES 16-126

I. The Gospel of Mark

(a) Mark 16: 1-18 19-36

(b) The Ending of Mark (16: 9-20) ... 36-45

(c) The Texts of the Ending ... 45-52

(1) The Long Ending (16: 9-20) 45-50

(2) The Short Ending 50-51

(3) The Expansion of the Long
Ending 51-52

II. St. Matthew 52-62

(a) The Guarded Tomb 27: 62-66 ... 52-54

(b) The Resurrection of Jesus 28: 1-10 54-62

III.	<u>Luke-Acts</u>	62-82
	(a)	The Resurrection Account	62-65
	(b)	The Walk to Emmaus	65-72
	(c)	The Final Appearance	72-77
	(d)	The Ascension in Acts	77-82
IV.	<u>St. John</u>	82-114
	(a)	The Burial Account (19: 31-42)	84-85
	(b)	The Empty Tomb	85-87
	(c)	Peter and the Beloved Disciple	87-89
	(d)	The Appearance to Mary Magdalane	89-94
	(e)	The Easter Evening	95-99
	(f)	Thomas' Doubt and Belief	99-103
	(g)	John Chapter 21	104-114
V.	<u>The Apocryphal Gospels</u>	114-123
	(a)	The Gospel of the Hebrews	114-115
	(b)	The Gospel of Peter	115-117
	(c)	The Epistula Apostolorum	117-120
	(d)	The Acts of Pilate	120-123
VI.	CONCLUSIONS	123-126
<u>CHAPTER THREE:</u>						
	THE RESURRECTION IN PAULINE KERYGMA	127-242

I.	<u>The Apostolic Kerygma</u>	127-140
II.	<u>The Pauline Kerygma</u>	140-218
	(a) Sources	140-145
	(b) <u>ΚΑΤΑ ΤΑΣ ΥΓΡΑΦΑΣ</u>			145-148
	(c) Burial	148-151
	(d) He was Raised on the Third Day			151-170
	(e) The Empty Tomb	170-192
	(f) Appearances	192-218
	(1) <u>ὤφθη κηφά</u>			
	(1 Cor. 15:5)	...		200-205
	(2) <u>εἶτα τοῖς δώ-</u>			
	<u>-δεσικα</u> (I Cor. 15:5)	...		205-208
	(3) <u>εἰπειτα ὤφθη ἐπ' αὐτῷ</u>			
	<u>στρεῖτα κοσίου & δεσφοῖς</u>			
	<u>ἐφ' αὐτῷ</u> (I Cor. 15:6)			208-209
	(4) <u>εἰπειτα ὤφθη Ἰακώ</u>			
	<u>βω</u> (I Cor. 15:7)	...		209-213
	(5) <u>εἶτα τοῖς & πρὸς τοῖς</u>			
	<u>πτασ. ιν</u> (I Cor. 15:7)	...		213-218
III.	<u>The Kerygmatic Speeches of Acts</u>	218-231
IV.	<u>History and Faith</u>	231-242

CHAPTER FOUR:

THE RESURRECTION IN THE EXPERIENCE AND SOTERIOLOGY OF PAUL	243-317
(a) Background to Paul's Conversion	243-252
(b) The Damascus Road Event	252-262
(c) The Appearance to Paul	262-270
(d) The Pauline Soteriology	271-300
(e) The Resurrection Ethics	300-317
(1) Grace	300-303
(2) Dying and Rising with Christ	303-309
(3) Putting off, Putting on	309-313
(4) The New Incorporation	313-317

CHAPTER FIVE:

ST. PAUL ON THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY (I Cor. 15: 12-57)	318-388
(a) Background to the Pauline thought	318-327
(b) The Corinthian Situation	327-337
(c) The Resurrection of Jesus as the Basis of Paul's teaching on the Resurrection of the Body (15: 12-19)	337-344
(d) The Resurrection of Jesus and its universal implications (15: 20-23)	344-348
(e) Evidence from Christian Experience (15: 29-34)	348-349

(1) Baptism on behalf of the Dead	349-354
(2) Christian Sufferings	355
(3) The beasts at Ephesus	355-364
(f) The Nature of the Resurrection Body (15: 35-54)	364-379
(g) The Parousia and the Resurrection	379-384
(h) The Last Enemy	384-388
<u>CHAPTER SIX:</u>			
II Cor. 5: 1-10 IN PAULINE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION	389-424
(a) Did Paul's Eschatology Develop?	389-403
(b) The text of II Cor. 5: 1-10	404-424
EPILOGUE	425-432
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	433-458

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: THE PROBLEM OF THE RESURRECTION EVENT

What exactly happened on the Easter morning? Can the modern man believe in the gospel accounts of the resurrection of Jesus from the grave? Is the resurrection of Jesus a historical event? If so, is it an event in the actual sense of the word or a mere expression of the early Christian faith in Jesus as a divine person? Or can the best solution be to leave the matter as an insoluble problem? These apparently simple questions constitute the most perplexing problems facing many modern Christians. Certainly, the world view of the modern man is in many respects different from the world view of the first century man. The first century man was very familiar with the supernatural and therefore, might not question an event, such as 'a resurrection from the grave'.

Over a generation ago, one of the greatest New Testament scholars of our time, R. Bultmann, spoke of the "incredibility of a mythical resurrection of a corpse".¹

1. R. Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology", in Kerygma and Myth Vol. I, ed. H.W. Bartsch, translated by R.H. Fuller, (London, S.P.C.K., 1953), p.39.

Of course, to Bultmann, this does not constitute a major problem of the Easter faith. It was not his intention to eliminate the resurrection from the Christian faith, but rather to interpret it correctly. In his opinion, the real meaning of the resurrection is not that an incredible event took place on Easter morning, but that the cross is permanently available to us in the Church's preaching as the saving act of God.

The resurrection of Jesus Christ constitutes the centre of the New Testament message. The cynosure of Christianity from its very beginnings is the fact that God had raised Jesus from the dead. The central fact of all true Christian experience is the resurrection of Jesus and it is ever the central miracle of the Bible. Throughout the Christian history, the resurrection has remained one of the major pillars of the Church's doctrine. The New Testament writers see the resurrection of Jesus as the climax of the Old Testament promises of salvation and the dawn of a new era. The resurrection of Jesus not only brought meaning and fulfilment to the Old Testament prophecies; it is a guarantee of the resurrection from the dead. Without the resurrection of Jesus, there could be no

gospel, no Church, no worship, no New Testament letters² and no clear and sure hope of the after-life. Or if these things exist at all, they would have been quite different from what we know today.

Jesus' resurrection and his victory over death have been of fundamental concern from the beginning until the present time. The resurrection in its various aspects has been the point of examinations by scholars over the centuries. One of the major problems has been the language of the resurrection. The New Testament and the Apostle's Creed speak unhesitatingly of Jesus' victory over death in terms of being raised or risen bodily. The thorny question of the empty tomb is closely related to the discussion on the nature of the resurrection and bears upon one's understanding of the nature of Jesus' resurrection. Many modern scholars are questioning the need to preserve such a language today. It is further questioned whether the resurrection from the grave is an accurate description of

2. G. Bornkamm, Jesus Of Nazareth (Translated by Irene & McLusky James Robinson, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1963), p.181.

what took place at Easter. Some scholars as well just *dismiss* as totally irrelevant the question of whether *Jesus was raised bodily from the dead*. This issue, they suppose, is of no importance to either the modern man or Christian. But such an assessment of the resurrection often overlooks the uniqueness of Jesus and that the resurrection was an eschatological intervention by God. Christianity itself would be irrelevant if the resurrection could be declared irrelevant.

Nevertheless, by saying that some scholars question the validity of the resurrection language, it does not mean that they are questioning the validity of Jesus' victory over death, which is essentially the Christian mystery that underlies the resurrection language. The liberals, for whom the fidelity of the New Testament is no longer a major issue speak of the necessity of divesting the New Testament of such a thing as the antiquated imagery of a dead body coming to life. But on the other hand the fundamentalists who are unable to distinguish between a truth and its formulation regard the questioning of the resurrection language as a loss of faith in Jesus victory

over death.³

According to the gospel accounts, the risen Jesus moved about, spoke and ate with his disciples. Immediately, one cannot but think of him as a reanimated body like Lazarus and the others whom Jesus raised from the dead. But the general testimony of the entire New Testament is that the risen Christ does not die any more. He has entered the eternal glory of the Father and he lives for ever. He possesses a body which is no longer subject to human limitations; a body which, though has identity with the former one, is essentially a new body. He is exalted as the risen Lord Jesus Christ - high above the heavens. He thus becomes man's new representative and the Lord of history.

Apart from the language and nature of the resurrection, there is the perennial problem of the gospel texts. There are many discrepancies between the various accounts of this stupendous event. Even if we grant the fact that this was a unique event involving a unique person, and that something

3. R.E. Brown, The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus, (G. Chapman, London, 1974), pp. 69-71; F. X. Durrwell, Resurrection: A Biblical Study, (Sheed and Ward, New York, 1960); D.M. Stanley, Christ's Resurrection In Pauline Soteriology (Rome, Biblical Institute 1961), pp. 4ff.

so incredible as "the resurrection of a corpse" took place on the Easter day, the event could be dismissed as incredible on the basis of the gospels' palpable inconsistencies. Fuller correctly points out that the best way to discredit a witness in court is for the cross-examiner to tie him up in knots and make his evidence to appear to be such a tissue of inconsistencies that the jury becomes convinced that he is entirely untrustworthy. And moreover, that one does not need to be a scientific New Testament scholar to do that with the resurrection narratives.⁴

Many modern scholars do not take seriously the gospel accounts of the Easter event and they treat it as one of the myths of the ancient world. One of the examples usually quoted is that of a popular Hellenistic philosopher, Apollonius of Tyana who was a contemporary of Jesus. He went about with his disciples, teaching and performing many miracles. Philostratus describing Apollonius' death said that he went into the temple of Dictynna, a Greek goddess. The doors opened wide to receive him. Philostratus further said:

4. R.H. Fuller, The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives, (Macmillan, New York, 1971), p.2.

And when he had passed within, they closed a fresh, as if they had been shut and there was heard a chorus of the maidens singing from within the temple and their song was this: "Hasten thou from the earth, hasten thou to heaven, hasten".⁵

Eusebius also tells us that for the above reasons Apollonius was considered to be divine.⁶ Scholars today do not take the story of Apollonius seriously. He is regarded as a charlatan and a quack.⁷ But if we treat Apollonius thus, why should we put a higher value on the story of Jesus' resurrection? Why can we not treat the account of the ascension of Jesus like the alleged ascension of Apollonius? The problem is a very intricate one. Nevertheless, the gospel account of the resurrection is in many respects different from the ancient myths of the dying and rising gods. This will become obvious later.

This undertaking is devoted mainly to Pauline theology of the resurrection. This investigation is not just about

-
5. Philostratus, The Life of Apollonius of Tyana, (Loeb Classical Library, New York, Macmillan, 1912) II, pp. 401, 507.
 6. Eusebius, H.E. VI, 36:3; A New Eusebius, ed. by J. Stevenson, (S³P.C.K., London, 1970), p. 208.
 7. Smaller Classical Dictionary, ed. Smith (New York, Dutton, 1940), p. 57.

the Easter event itself; that topic has been subjected to critical scrutiny from every quarter over the centuries and especially during our own time. The following investigation of New Testament research focuses upon the resurrection of Jesus and its implications on Paul's faith and teachings. The resurrection of Jesus is central to the whole of Pauline thought on the role of Jesus as Redeemer. The early writings of Paul contain such expressions as: "If Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is in vain and your faith is in vain" (I Cor. 15:14); "For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so, through Jesus, God will bring with him those who have fallen asleep" (I Thess. 4:4); and "Because if you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved" (Rom. 10:9). But the purpose of this study is not just to examine the place of Christ's resurrection in the "maturer theology of Paul", it is also to see how the progressively deeper and richer understanding of the resurrection as a central Christian truth greatly enriched his conception of how the events of Christ affect man and the entire creation.

159

This investigation carried out under the title: "The Theology of The Resurrection Of Jesus Christ, With Particular Reference To Pauline Kerygma and Soteriology". The words Kerygma and Soteriology take into view every aspect of Paul's preaching and teaching on the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Here we shall examine Paul's statement of facts concerning the resurrection and the interpretations of those facts. The word soteriology is all-embracing. This is about salvation as it involves the total man and the effect of man's salvation on the entire creation. We are also concerned with salvation as it affects man's past, present and future. Paul's soteriology is dominated by a realistic view of man, which is characteristic of his Semitic background. His conception does not concern itself mainly with the salvation of the soul as among the Greek philosophers. Salvation to Paul is what affects the total man both bodily and spiritually.

It is true that D.M. Stanley, S.J. had already published a book entitled "Christ's Resurrection In Pauline Soteriology,"¹⁸

-
8. D.M. Stanley, S.J., Christ's Resurrection In Pauline Soteriology, (Romae, E. Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1961).

but the scope of the present investigation is wider than Stanley's work and the approach is quite different. Stanley's work includes the study of each of the Pauline epistles, including the pastorals separately. Stanley is apparently more concerned with the cross and the atoning work of Christ than the theology of the resurrection itself. Moreover, his approach makes a systematic study of Pauline thought difficult. Nevertheless, Stanley made a great contribution to knowledge.

This work is unique in that it focuses its attention mainly on Paul's conception of Jesus' resurrection rather than the entire New Testament or the gospels alone. We shall examine critically all the issues raised by Paul regarding the resurrection, and see whether or not his theology of the resurrection developed. St. Paul in his writings places very much premium on tradition. On several issues in his letters he appeals to tradition. In Paul's earliest elaborate teaching on the resurrection in I Cor. 15, he bases his arguments on tradition. It is for this reason that this investigation begins where it does, that is: the gospel accounts of the resurrection. It is the resurrection tradition that forms a solid foundation for the

teachings of Paul. It is only in the light of what we have in the gospels that Paul can be correctly interpreted today. This is why it is necessary to examine the nature of the resurrection traditions before we look at Paul himself. Obviously almost, if not all, Pauline letters were already written before there was any written gospel. But the traditions which the gospels contain, in essence, date much earlier than Paul's letters and Paul certainly knew most of them.

Apart from Jesus Christ himself, St. Paul is the greatest figure in the history of Christianity. Christianity bears the mark of St. Paul's influence more than that of any other apostle. No other apostle had such a vividly marked theology. The Church has come to accept his permanent significance. Throughout the centuries, Paul's teachings have proved formative at any major turning point in Christian history. Great exponents of the Scriptures like Augustine, Luther, Wesley and Karl Barth, to mention a few, owed much to Paul. Paul throughout the ages has remained vocal in the Church. To grasp Paul, is to grasp the essence of Christianity. He is the greatest exponent of the mind

of Christ. His language differs greatly from that of his Master, but Paul's great doctrines are derived from Christ.

However, some are of the view that what we call Christianity today is in reality Paulinism. Consequently, it is suggested that we should cut Christianity free from everything that is Pauline in it, and revert to the simplicity of Galilee. Paul is alleged to have damaged the original form of the religion of Jesus by his speculative Christology. Jesus' simple gospel of trust in the heavenly Father is said to have suffered a radical transformation in the process of passing through the hands and brain of Paul. What we have today, it is further claimed, is virtually different from what Jesus intended. Paul is therefore, regarded as an arch-corrupter of the gospel. God sent his Son for solution, but Paul is said to have made him a problem. Jesus bade men to consider the lilies and trust like little children, but Paul speaks of a justifying faith, of the cross and of the doctrine of atonement. Consequently, we are urged to renounce the Christ of dogma in favour of the Christ of history. Also, there is said to be a great gulf between Jesus and Paul,

because Christianity today bears Paul's signature more clearly than Christ's. But Stewart correctly remarks thus:

A gulf indeed there was. That ought not to surprise us. How could there fail to be a gulf, when one was the Redeemer and the other was the redeemed? But between the gospel which Jesus brought by his life and teaching and death and resurrection, and the gospel which Paul in season and out of season proclaimed, there was no gulf at all.⁹

Obviously, Paul would have regarded both as rubbish and blasphemous any suggestion that he himself rather than Jesus Christ was the originator of the religion he was preaching. This certainly cannot be true of the man who told his converts: "Each one of you says: 'I belong to Paul', or 'I belong to Apollos' or 'I belong to Cephas' or 'I belong to Christ'. Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptized in the name of Paul?" (I Cor. 1: 12, 13). "I have decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified" (I Cor. 2:2). "I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting him who called you in the grace of Christ and

9. J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, (Hodder & Stoughton, London 1970 edition), pp. 17-19.

turning to a different gospel ... there are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ. But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we preached to you let him be accursed" (Gal. 1: 6-8). "I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me" (Gal. 2:20).

The Damascus road experience marked a decisive turning point in Paul's life. After a personal encounter with the risen Lord, he became a protagonist of the way he had violently sought to destroy. Saul the persecutor, but now Paul the Christian became convinced that God's purpose had been fulfilled in the death and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. The promises of God had found their "yes" in him (II Cor. 1:20). After the dramatic experience, the presiding element in his life was the love of Christ. Paul's whole life developed from this fresh centre of the reality of the risen Lord Jesus Christ.

Undoubtedly, Paul is no ordinary mind. He is sensitive, logical, simple, honest and infinitely tender with the

scruples of others. Yet, one could easily misunderstand him. Therefore, in our study we shall avoid speculations as much as possible. We are going to listen to Paul patiently, allowing him his own choice of language and manner of writing. In our endeavour we shall not try to fix on his own words a meaning which has become too technical. We shall not allow our mind to be disturbed by the echoes of past controversies. We shall examine St. Paul with a fresh open mind in order to feel his magic.

UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN LIBRARY

THE GOSPEL ACCOUNTS OF THE RESURRECTION

The efforts by several scholars to bring all the resurrection narratives together into one completely harmonious whole have produced little useful results. It is reasonable to think that the apostolic Church must have felt the need for a fairly standardized account of the events in the life of Christ. But it was apparently impossible to control the testimonies of the eye-witnesses and the variations that had crept in during the process of oral transmission. Unfortunately, the apostles as a body did not commission the writing of any particular gospel. Were this possible, we could have had a single gospel that is more comprehensive and accurate than any of the extant gospels. The fact is that we have four canonical gospels which give us four different accounts of the Easter events. But it is important to note that variations in eye-witnesses' accounts of the same event are in no way a strange phenomenon. Furthermore, it would be suspicious if all the eye-witnesses report the same event in an exactly the same way. The fact that the four canonical gospels manifest some discrepancies

in various places proves that we are not following "a cleverly devised myth".

Variations should in no way call for a rejection of the accounts. After all, there is a general agreement among the evangelists that the women went to the tomb early on Sunday morning; that they found the tomb empty; that they received a heavenly message and that they reacted to that message. Three of the gospels (that is, if we leave out Mark 16: 9-20) also agree that Jesus made some appearances. If the accounts had presented a complete agreement without any variations, they possibly could not have produced a truly convincing accounts of the resurrection. It would also mean that the four or three of them had a source which they all copied blindly. Moreover, some of the discrepancies are to some extent reconcilable, of course, some are certainly not. It is important to note here that the interest of the evangelists does not lie with the details, but with the message. If that had been the case, they would not have accepted some accounts of another evangelist and freely changed the details or arrangement of some accounts for certain reasons. It is not our aim here to effect a harmonization of the resurrection accounts, but to allow each

evangelist to speak for himself. Some of the variances are certainly due to differences in theological outlook and varied interests existing among various communities in the early Church. Other differences can also be attributed to diverse literary styles.¹

The resurrection of Jesus which is the basis of the Church's faith took place sometime and somehow in the past. It had taken place ever before the gospels were written. The gospels are, therefore, a product of the faith of the Church. This is why the gospels are not just pure historical records but they also contain the Church's meditation and reflections on the life of Jesus and the interpretations of the events of Christ.

The earliest written account of the resurrection is I Cor. 15: 1-8. This was followed by the Gospel of Mark in about 65 A.D. But there is overwhelming evidence to prove that Mark 16: 9-20 is not part of the original gospel. We are, therefore, left with a very scanty information. The fuller account did not come until between 80-100 A.D., that

1. E.L. Bode, The First Easter Morning: The Gospel Accounts of the Women's visit to the Tomb of Jesus, (Biblical Institute Press, Rome, 1970), pp. 17 & 18.

is between fifty and seventy years after the actual event occurred. Due to the nature of the Epistles, no cohesive account of the resurrection can be deduced from them. However, in spite of the various difficult problems in the gospels, they remain the major sources of our knowledge about the events of the resurrection of Jesus. Without the resurrection narratives that we have in the gospels, it will be difficult for us on the basis of what we have in the Epistles to understand adequately the nature and full implications of the resurrection of Jesus on the faith of the Church. The proper point to begin our study is, therefore, with the resurrection narratives in the gospels.

(i) The Gospel of Mark:

(a) Mark 16: 1-8:

According to all the four Gospels, the women were the first to receive the news of the resurrection. This is very significant in view of the attitude of Judaism to women. The fact that women figure so prominently in the resurrection story may point to old tradition. Judaism speaks of women as those to whom no spiritual truth can be entrusted. "Sooner let the words of the Law be burnt than delivered to women" (b Kidd 82^b). "Happy is he whose

children are male and alas for him whose children are female". And during the morning prayer the man would say: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast not made me a woman". But on this occasion the women were in the plan of God given precedence over men.

Early in the morning, on the first day after the Sabbath, three women came to visit the tomb. They were namely: Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother, or daughter of James (Μαρία ἡ Ἰακωβου), and Salome. But the repetition of the women's names in 16:1^a is strange since they have been mentioned in the previous verse

(15:47). Moreover, the second Mary is in 15:47 described as the mother or daughter of Joses (Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσ-

φιας), and in 15:40 the same Mary is described as the mother of James the younger and Joses (Μαρία ἡ

Ἰακωβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσηφ μῆτηρ).

But if we follow a group of MSS which pass straight from 15:47 to 16:1^b, the difficulty would be minimized. But 16:1^a could be by a later redactor who recognized the missing link between 15:47 and 16:1^b.

The visit of the women was entirely natural. It was customary for the relatives of the departed to visit his

tomb for three days after burial in order to avoid burial alive. It is also a custom for pious women to visit the tomb of a friend to weep and to pray. But the purpose of the visit is however surprising. If, Nicodemus had indeed anointed the body before burial (John 19: 39-40), the purpose of the women's visit seems to be out of place. Nevertheless, C.G. Montifiore correctly warns thus:

"The cause assigned to their visit is very unlikely. However, ... it must be admitted that those who first collected the Christian tradition were more familiar with Jewish burial customs and attitudes than we are, and in the absence of further data the Gospel statement... must be taken as evidence that this motive was possible"².

Of course, in Mark the body was never anointed before burial. Evans also thinks that the motive for their visit in a delayed embalming which accounts for their presence at all is dubious.³ But Cranfield is of the opinion that it would not be unnatural for the women to wish to make their own offering of devotion, even if they knew that someone else had already done what was required. Though their intention

-
2. C.G. Montifiore, The Synoptic Gospels, Vol. 1, 2nd. ed., (London, Macmillan, 1927), p. 401.
 3. C.F. Evans, Resurrection and the New Testament, (S.C.M., London, 1970), p.77.

to anoint a body that by that morning would have been dead for two nights and a day seems strange, it is not incredible since love often prompts people to do what from a practical point of view is useless.⁴ M. Goguel questions the possibility of the anointing two nights after the burial. He also feels that funeral anointings do not seem to have been practised by the Jews and therefore regards the motive as artificial. Similarly, A. Loisy is of the view that the motive behind the anointing is unnatural, but could be a means of getting the women to the tomb. E. Lohmeyer also thinks that the anointing is apparently senseless, in view of the previous anointing at Bethany for the same purpose (Mk. 14:8). But E. Dhanis feels that given the altitude of Jerusalem and the spring temperature the climate of the holy city would not pose a grave difficulty to anointing on Sunday morning.⁵ It is interesting to note that identifying

-
4. C.F.D. Cranfield, The Gospel According to St. Mark, (Cambridge, 1959), p. 464.
5. M. Goguel, Resurrection (Leroux, Paris, 1933), p.114; A. Loisy, L'evangile Selon Marc (Nourry, Paris 1912), p.478; E. Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Mark, 17th ed., (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1967), p. 353; E. Dhanis, L'ensevelissement de Jesus et la visite au tombeau dans l'evangile de saint Marc (Greg 39, 1950), p. 383; E.L. Bode, The First Easter Morning, (Biblical Institute Press, Rome, 1970), pp. 14-16.

Mary Magdalene as the woman who anointed Jesus at the meal appears to be a development much later than the gospels because none of the evangelists makes such an identification. Mark and Matthew speak of a woman in the house of Simon the leper at Bethany (Mt. 26: 6-17, Mk. 14:3). Luke talks of a sinful woman coming to the meal hosted by Simon the Pharisee in Galilee (Lk. 7: 36-37). But John names her Mary of Bethany, the sister of both Lazarus and Martha (John 10:38, 12: 1, 3). This consequently weakens the evidence that Mary Magdalene could not have performed two anointings. And even if she had done that, her action would not entirely be unreasonable. It is apparently better to allow the tradition to stand.

The purpose of the women's visit and the question about who would help them to roll away the stone reveal how the women were absolutely not expecting what they saw at the tomb. This marks the dramatic beginning of a new thinking

-
6. G. Hebert expresses the view that the stone could stand for the whole of Pharisaic legal righteousness and thus a removal of the stone would indicate that what was humanly impossible, is possible for God alone.- "The Resurrection Narratives in Saint Mark" in Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 15 (1962), p. 69.

among the disciples. On the other hand the question about the rolling away of the stone beties previous knowledge of the tomb having been sealed and guarded. (Matthew 27: 62-66). In Matthew the women only went to see the tomb (θεωρησαι τον τάφον). The change here is understandable because of the story of sealing and guarding of the tomb. No motive is mentioned in John. The suggestion in Mark appears to be that the women went to perform the rites that had been omitted and could not be carried out because of the Sabbath on Friday. V. Taylor feels that it is hard to credit the women with the intention to anoint the body a day and two nights after death and that on the whole, it seems more probable that the women merely went to see the tomb.⁷ Mark makes no attempt to explain how the stone was rolled away. He probably regards it as a divine act through the angel or the work of the Risen Christ himself.

By ΥΕΞΥΙΣ ΚΟΥ, Mark definitely means an angel. Similar usages can be found in I Macc. 3:26, 33; Jos. Anti. V, 8:2, and Rev. 7:6. The story of the angel

7. V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, (London, Macmillan, 1955), pp. 606-7. D.E. Nineham, The Gospel of St. Mark, Penguin Books, 1972, pp. 44 & 45.

does not appear to be a fantasy created by the women. In the four gospels, the angel (or angels) provides a link between the actual event and the visit of the women. No human eyes were permitted to see the actual event of the resurrection. In Matthew what the women and the soldiers saw was the earthquake and the rolling back of the stone by the angel and not the actual resurrection. But angels are constant witnesses of God's acts. Since the angels were the heralds of the news of his birth, it is proper that they should be the ones to announce his resurrection to man.

But a few authors are of the opinion that the ~~ΥΕΞ-
-ΥΙΟΚΟΣ~~ of Mark 16:5 is the same as the ΥΕΞΥΙΟΚΟΣ who appeared in Gethsemane in Mark 14:51. According to Morison, the young man overheard the promise of Jesus that he was going before the disciples into Galilee (14:28). Moreover, he says that the young man ran to the tomb before the women arrived when he heard the guards talking about the tomb which they had opened and found empty.⁸ H. Waetjen also argues

8. F. Morison, Who Moved the Stone?: The Evidence for the Resurrection (Faber & Faber, London, 1958), pp. 159-165.

on the basis of the usage of ΥΕΞΥΙΣΚΟΣ in 14:51 and the idea of Jesus sitting at the right hand of God in 14:62, that the young man of 15:5 is a reflection of Jesus' elevation to Lordship at the right hand of God.⁹ J. Cheek feels that the white robe suggests that the young man is an Essene.¹⁰

Obviously, the young man is an angel as we have earlier noted. The garb of the young man, the white robe signifies a heavenly dress (Dan. 7:9, Rev. 3:4, 5, 18; 7:13). The white garment further reminds us of Jesus' garments at the transfiguration (Mk. 9:3). The message of the young man came as a divine revelation and the first kerygmatic announcement of Jesus' resurrection. Apparently the women were afraid because they realized that the young man was a heavenly messenger. By sitting at the tomb, the angel was speaking with authority. This recalls the synagogue's chair of Moses (Mt. 23:2, cf. John 19:13).

-
9. H. Waetjen, "The Ending of Mark and the Gospel's shift in Eschatology" - Annual of Swedish Theological Institute, No. 4 (1965), pp. 114-131.
10. J. Cheek, "The Historicity of the Markan Resurrection Narrative", Journal of Bible and Religion, Vol. 27, (1959), pp. 191-201.

Three things probably alarmed the women. First, the fact that the stone was rolled back; second, the tomb was empty; third, they saw the vision of an angel. The words which follow ἡν ἔρθη stress the fact that

the tomb was empty - τοῦκ ἔστιν ὡσεὶ ἴδε ὁ τόπος ὅπου ἔθηκαν αὐτόν

The women were to convey to the disciples and Peter the resurrection news. In Matthew, Peter was not mentioned.

καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ is probably a later addition or partly an assurance of Peter's forgiveness after the denial.

By ἐξεθαμβήθησαν Mark expresses the women's amazement. The word is only found here in the New Testament. The word expresses a strong feeling of a shuddering awe before the Numinous.¹¹ It is only Mark that

-
11. It is characteristic of Mark to emphasize astonishment, fear and the like as effects of divine revelation or action. This idea pervades almost every chapter. He employed about twelve vocabularies to express this idea and only five of them are employed by the other evangelists. The words are: (1) ἐκίστημι; (2) ἐκστάσις; (3) ἐκπλήσσομαι (4) ἐκθαμβέομαι; (5) θαυβέομαι; (6) ἐκθαυμάζω; (7) ἐκφοβός; (8) φόβος; (9) φοβεύομαι; (10) τρέμω; (11) τρόμος; (12) θαυμάζω

uses εἰς εἰθούσα but in Matthew the stone which was rolled back and upon which the angel sat appears to be outside. Matthew omits Mark 16: 3-5 in favour of another tradition. But if Mark had used εἰθούσα instead of εἰς εἰθούσα the contradiction would disappear. The interpretation of verse 8 depends on whether or not it was intended to be the end of the Gospel. If it is not the end of the Gospel then their fear and silence will be justified. "They said nothing to anyone" would naturally mean that they kept their experience to themselves. Of course, this fear might only be temporary and which was ^{to be} overcome later through further experience, although such a record is no longer extant.

Mark's way of expressing astonishment is apparently not invented by him. The Old Testament contains records of such similar reactions to the appearances of angels or of Yahweh (Gen. 28:17; Ex. 3:6; Judg. 6: 22-23; Isaiah 6:5; Ezekiel 1:27). Allen compares the women's reaction at the empty tomb with that ^{of the disciples} at the transfiguration. The women's fear is therefore an emotion produced by an experience which transcends human experience, that is

religious fear in the lofty sense of reverential awe.¹² Or could the silence be part of Mark's Messianic secret theme? If so, this would be comparable with Jesus' commands to keep his identity as the Messiah secret. It can also mean that all the women kept silent except Mary Magdalene or that their silence ended when the fear subsided or when Jesus appeared to them.¹³ But another major problem is the historicity of the Marcan account of the silence of the women. The three other evangelists recorded a different reaction to the empty tomb by the women. What Mark probably wants to emphasize here is the human inadequacy, lack of understanding and weakness in the presence of the Numinous.

What does Mark mean by "He is going before you to Galilee; there you will see him, as he told you?" Does it refer to the post-resurrection appearances in Galilee or to

-
12. W. Allen, St. Mark 16:8 "They were Afraid. Why?", Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 47, (1946), pp. 46-49.
13. A. Plummer, Gospel According to St. Luke (5th edition, Edinburgh, Clark, 1922), p. 549; M. Tenney, "The Historicity of the Resurrection". Jesus of Nazareth, Saviour and Lord (ed.) by C. Henry, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1966), p. 137; C.E.B. Cranfield, "St. Mark 16:8" - Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 5, 1952, pp. 297 & 406.

the παρουσία? It may mean that before the disciples got to Galilee they would find that Jesus was already there waiting for them. If this assertion is correct, it will be relevant to 14:28 which says: "But when I am raised up I will go before you into Galilee". In 14:28 the future προάξω is used but in 16:7 it is the present προάγει. προάγει suggests that Jesus is already on his way to Galilee. But V.

Taylor says that if προάγει is a true present, προάξω cannot mean "I will lead you," and both cases must be that of going before.¹⁴ If 16:7 is taken with 14:27 then the statement may refer to the reconstitution of the disciples after the resurrection when Jesus would lead them like a shepherd to Galilee. But προάγει in this particular case cannot mean that Jesus will lead his disciples in a march to Galilee because αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε suggests that they would not see him on the way and πρό here refers to time rather than to place.

J. Weiss thinks that Galilee here refers to the Gentiles. That would mean that through Jesus' death God's

14. V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, (London, Macmillan, 1955), p. 608.

saving activities have extended to the Gentiles. The Risen Saviour will lead his followers out in a world-wide evangelistic mission.¹⁵ Although this idea is apparently fanciful, it cannot be dismissed altogether. In Isaiah 9: 1, 2, Galilee is referred to as Galilee of the nations where those who walk in darkness see a great light and those who dwell in the land of deep darkness have light shined on them. In Marcan tradition, Galilee the land of Jesus' ministry was a holy land, while Jerusalem stands for opposition and unbelief. Similarly, some scholars attribute this to a double resurrection tradition from two streams of primitive Christianity; one which centres its interest in Galilee as a land of Jesus ministry and eschatological fulfilment and the other with interest in Jerusalem. It is therefore concluded that Mark 16:7 must refer to the Παρουσία. It is argued further that αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς refers to something which could only happen in Galilee. While the proof of the resurrection can be given anywhere, the Παρουσία must take place in Galilee.¹⁶ E. Lohmeyer also

-
15. J. Weiss, History of the Primitive Christianity, Vol. I (London, 1937), p. 18; R. Lightfoot, Gospel Message of St. Mark, (Oxford, Clarendon, 1950), pp. 106-116.
16. A.M. Ramsay, Resurrection of Christ, (London, 1956), pp. 71 & 88; C.E.B. Granfield, op.cit., pp. 468-469.

thinks that it is a reference to the Παρουσία and that if it were only about the resurrection appearances one cannot see why it must be connected with Galilee alone. The prophecy is related to what can happen in Galilee alone, a land which perfects that which the resurrection began. Also "to see him" is not the expression used for appearances in the Gospels and Acts but ὄψασθαι.¹⁷

But the most probable thing is that Mark knew only the Galilean appearances. The claim that the verb ὄψεσθε is a technical term for the Παρουσία is untenable. Undoubtedly, Jesus must have wanted to meet his disciples in Galilee, the land where he spent most of his earthly days. Of course, Jesus could have meant more than the geographical Galilee. As we have earlier noted, it could not mean that Jesus was marching ahead of his disciples to Galilee as he had done in the pre-Easter march to Jerusalem; for that would make the Risen Saviour an earthly wanderer. If we take "He is not here" together with "Do not hold me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father" (John 20:17); it would mean that Jesus' appearances would henceforth be

17. R.H. Lightfoot, Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels (Haper, New York, 1938), pp. 52-65; 73-77; Lohmeyer, Galiläa and Jerusalem, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments No. 34 (1935), pp. 10-14.

from heaven. The fact is that on reaching Galilee, the disciples will find Jesus already waiting to reveal himself to them from heaven. Also for Mark, Galilee is not a place where the Gentiles are evangelized, but from where the mission originates (1: 14, 16, 28, 29; 37: 5:1, 7:30 31, 9:30). The Galilean meeting is therefore for the purpose of sending the twelve on a mission that would take them beyond the borders of Israel.¹⁸

C.F.D. Moule tries to relate the post-resurrection appearances to normal movements of pilgrims to and from Jerusalem's festivals. Therefore, the return of the Apostles to Galilee after the feast was the normal thing and not as a result of a dominical command. He treats the references to Galilee and Jerusalem as purely symbolic of universalism and Judaizing respectively. The journey from Jerusalem to Galilee and from Galilee to Jerusalem is not impossible between the two feasts. The two disciples on the way to Emmaus were normally returning home like the Galileans after the feast. "I will go before you into Galilee" may therefore mean "When you return (as you

18. R.H. Fuller, The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives, Macmillan, Paper edition, London, 1971), pp. 57-64.

naturally will) you will find me there already". Also that the appearances in Jerusalem and Galilee therefore represent different conceptions of the Christian mission. This would mean that Luke did not know the forty days tradition until after the completion of the Gospel and that Luke 24: 36-53 has suffered interpolation.

Moreover, Moule says that the puzzling word συνάλλι-
-γόμενος of Acts 1:4 is usually rendered "assembling with them", "eating with them" and "lodging with them" as though it were συνυλισσόμενος; a rendering which has attestation. He says further that, αυλιζομαι is used twice in the New Testament to refer to the temporary lodging of Jesus (Matt. 21:7; Luke 21:37). If the possibility is συνυλισσόμενος it then refers to festival lodging. This is probably the intention of the post-resurrection journey with Jesus in Acts 13:31 (ὡς ἠφ' ἡν ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πλείους τοῖς συναβασιν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ). Although Matthew implies that the final charge was given in Galilee he did not preclude a festival journey. The charge came at the eve of the Pentecost pilgrimage. Moule concludes that

the fact that the disciples were addressed at the ascension as 'Ἀνδρες Παλιδαῖοι means that they were countrymen temporarily living in Jerusalem for the feast of the Pentecost.¹⁹

Moule's fascinating argument is logical and reasonable in most part. One weakness of it as Moule himself realizes is that it offers no explanation of John 20 and of Luke 24 which state that the Church began in Jerusalem. In the light of Moule's idea, Acts 1 may also become a sheer fiction. The pilgrim festival hypothesis also reduces the impact the resurrection had on the disciples as it is made explicit in the four Gospels. The resurrection was the beginning of a new experience and a new understanding among the disciples. It is not evident in any Gospel that they went to Galilee and returned to Jerusalem as a matter of course. The fact that the disciples on the way to Emmaus raised back to Jerusalem to relate their experience contradicts Moule's conclusions. That Luke did not know about the forty day tradition until after the completion of the Gospel is challengeable. The opening of the Acts of the Apostles shows that it is a continuation of the Gospel. Also Acts

19. C.F.D. Moule, "The Post-Resurrection Appearances in the Light of Festival Pilgrimages" - New Testament Studies, Vol. 4 (19 pp. 56-61.

13:31 appears to be a reference to a pre-Easter journey and not to a post-Easter one. Those who accompanied him on the last journey to Jerusalem were witnesses of the Easter event. Mark, Matthew and John 21 ^{believes} any knowledge of the journey back to the Pentecostal feast. The value of Moule's ^{hypo-}thesis is that if taken ^{at} the face value, it helps to minimize the discrepancies between the appearances in Judea and Galilee.

B. The Ending of Mark (16: 9-20):

In his comprehensive study of 220 Armenian MSS, E.C. Colwell came up with eight reasons why this passage was not in the original Armenian version. (i) A large proportion of witnesses omit the passage. (ii) A fair number of the witnesses include the passage but indicate their doubt as to its authenticity. (iii) The chronological distribution of the MSS in three categories "include", "doubt" and "omit" suggests a late insertion. (iv) There is a large amount of textual variation in this passage. (v) The passage appears in various locations. (vi) The evidence of a daughter version is against the inclusion of the passage. (vii) A commentary written by an ecclesiastical official omits the passage. (viii) The evidence of the section numbers

favours the omission.

Colwell goes further to say that out of the 220 MSS, 88 include 16: 9-20; 99 end in 16:8; 33 which include it present it in a way which suggests that it was not there originally. In two codices the ending appears in a hand later than that of the original scribe; in six codices it is marked as distinct from the rest of the Gospel and in 23 codices the passage appears under various headings such as: "Other Gospel of Mark" or "Another Gospel of Mark" or "Besides this, is this Gospel". In four codices it is located elsewhere; two put it at the end of John's Gospel; in one it appears at the end of Luke. The most remarkable one is that which has 16: 9-20 at the end of Mark and 16: 1-8 at the end of Luke. Also there are variants between different MSS.²⁰

The Gospel end in 16:8 in the two oldest and best MSS (~~A~~ and B). It ends at the same point in the Syro-Sinaitic palimpsest in the Old MS of the Georgian version dated 897. In some other MSS, the longer ending is introduced thus: "This also is current (ἔστι καὶ ταῦτα φερόμενα)". Both Eusebius and

20. E.C. Colwell, "Mark 16: 9-20 in The Armenian Version", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 56, (1937), pp. 369-386.

^{tradition}
 Jerusalem did not accept it as authentic since it was absent from most of the MSS known to them. Eusebius omitted it from his canon. One tenth of Armenian MSS which have 16: 9-20 attribute it to the presbyter Ariston probably the same Ariston mentioned by Papias. The passage is also omitted by Δ B.K. say^s, Georgian, Aethiopic Version. The long and shorter endings are surprisingly combined together as alternatives in L and Y and in Sahidic Syriac and Aethiopic and African Latin K. There are apparently only two traces of the passage in the whole of the Greek anti-Nicene literature and it is completely wanting in the writings of both Clement and Origen.

Eusebius states that in the oldest and best MSS. known to him, the Gospel ends with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. The first copies of the Gospel to reach Africa, Alexandria, Caesarea and Antioch end here. But Iranaeus appears to have quoted from 16:19 in 185 A.D. and Tatian quoted from the long ending when compiling his Diatessaron in 170 A.D. The discovery of W adds another dimension to the problem by inserting another short ending between 16:14 and 16.²¹

21. B.H. Streeter, The Four Gospels (Macmillan, 1924), pp. 335-338.

From the above the evidence against the authenticity of the long and short endings is overwhelming. Right from the earliest stage doubts existed about their origin. The two short endings ~~show no~~ connection with the original Gospel. The W text is much in line with the apocryphal Gospels of the second century and is completely out of place between verses 14 and 15. If the three endings are not authentic what then really happened to the original ending of Mark? Or did Mark end his Gospel with ~~ΕΦΘ~~ ^{to acquire} three endings? ~~Βαυτο γαρ?~~ How did the Gospel come [^] three endings? What happened to the original ending of Mark is still one of the most puzzling questions of the New Testament critical studies, for which no satisfactory answer has been found.

Mark ends abruptly in the middle of the resurrection story, "Hurriedly they fled from the tomb trembling and alarmed and they spoke to no one for they were afraid" - (M.L.B.). It would be surprising if Mark ended up in this way without mentioning the reaction of the women to the strange experience or whether anything happened later to authenticate their experience at the tomb. In the Greek

the end is even more abrupt than it is in the English text. Here it ends with the word ~~νῦν~~ which means among other things: for, now, then, to wit, verily then, in truth, indeed, yea, why, however and also. ~~νῦν~~ is normally inadmissible at the end of a sentence. 16:7cf. 14:28 had already indicated that Mark would tell of Jesus's meeting with his disciples in Galilee.

Various hypotheses have been advanced for the lost ending of Mark. One hypothesis is that the Gospel is a torso. This would apparently mean that due to some accident of history the Gospel was never completed. Perhaps Mark died suddenly or fled Rome as a result of the Neronian persecution, leaving the Gospel unfinished. Another possibility is that due to some accident the ending of the original Gospel suffered damage or loss before copies of it were made. Or that for certain reasons the end of the Gospel was suppressed. This is thought to be so because Mark probably gave prominence to appearances in Galilee. According to 16: 1-8, Jesus never appeared in Jerusalem. The disciples had to go to Galilee before they could see the Risen Jesus. Of the four Gospels only Mark is ignorant

of the appearances in Judea. The suppression may also be due to an attempt to reconcile the Marcan and Lucan accounts of the resurrection story. It may also mean that before Matthew knew Mark the ending had already been damaged or suppressed. This would also mean that only the original copy was then existing. If the above is the case, then some individuals or churches who recognized that Mark ended abruptly in 16:8 must have supplied the various endings to rectify the abnormality. In doing this they probably made use of the already existing traditions.

Some hold the view that it is not that Mark breaks off abruptly in the middle of a sentence but that this is rather characteristic of his own manner (Acts 13:13). Also that this is eloquent of the way in which he understands the resurrection. The Marcan story of the resurrection is seen as a complete unit in itself. But can Mark, a prominent member of the early Church be ignorant of the stories of the resurrection appearances? Or did Mark bring his Gospel to an abrupt end on a note of silence, enforced by terror and awe because the rest

was silence that must not be told? If this is the case, there is no problem to be resolved by various hypotheses. Nevertheless, why must Mark bring his readers to the thresh-hold of the supernatural and leave them there. Of course, the problem here is that if what Mark refused to state is what the other evangelists wrote down, there is nothing which Mark could not have comfortably mentioned.

C.F. Evans suggests that for Mark, resurrection belongs within the wider concept of exaltation to God which cannot be described in terms of a risen man appearing among and alongside men.²² Guy thinks that Mark ended his Gospel in 16:8 because he was an unpolished writer.²³ Nineham correctly points out that the essence of a Gospel is a proclamation of the good news and while it is true that 16: 1-8 makes clear the fact of the resurrection, it hardly succeeds in redressing the balance or leaving the reader with a final impression of joyous

22. C.F. Evans, opt.cit., p. 69.

23. H.A. Guy, The Origin of the Gospel of Mark, (Hodder and Stoughton, 1954), pp. 162f.

victory and reversal of disaster.²⁴ The Roman Catholic scholar M.J. Lagrange says that 16: 9-20 is "canonically authentic" (that is, it is received as part of the canon of scripture by the Church); it is nevertheless not authentic in a literary sense. The author is other than Mark.

But E. Meyer feels that little or no explanation is needed because the Gospel as it stands^{was} always intended to end with the flight of the women from the tomb. The resurrection is hinted but not directly described. It was in Mark's view a mystery too sacred to be committed to writing.²⁵ But from the passage it does appear that Mark intended to analyse an appearance to Peter and probably including some other appearances.

Streeter is of the view that John 21 is based on the lost ending of Mark. A single un mutilated copy had reached Ephesus and there had been preserved or that Mark visited Ephesus in the course of Paul's imprisonment in Rome (Col. 4:10; II Tim. 4:11), and had there communicated to the church his account of the Resurrection

24. E. Nineham, The Gospel of St. Mark, (Penguin Books, 1963), p. p.439.

25. E. Meyer, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, Vol. 1, Die Evangelien Stuttgart, Cotta, 1921, p. 18; A.E.J. Rawlinson - St. Mark (17th ed. London, Methuen, 1946), pp. 268-270.

appearances which had survived locally as an oral tradition. Of course, Streeter says that this hypothesis is only a scientific guess. He observes that the passage is absent from the Caeserean text represented by ⓔ. The lost ending of Mark has not survived anywhere. Most probably the ending never existed because the Gospel was not finished.²⁶

Burkitt also argues that Mark contains nothing that interested the early Church which was not in Matthew and Luke. Hence for a generation or two after the Gospels had been completed, Mark ceased to be copied. Later in the face of the struggle with Gnosticism, ~~the~~ the canon of the Gospels had to be defined. The Roman Church then remembered that among the archives was an old copy of Mark and insisted on its being included. But the end of the roll had been torn off and there was no other copy in existence from which to repair the loss.²⁷

But a wider circulation of Mark in the first century

26. B.H. Streeter, Opt.cit., pp. 352ff.

27. F.C. Burkitt, Two Lectures on the Gospels, (Macmillan, 1901), pp. 33ff.

is suggested by its use by Matthew and Luke. It is incredible that all copies save one could have disappeared after circulating for about fifty years.

C. The Texts of the Endings:

1. The Long Ending 16: 9-20.

The long ending is the one that is found in most versions of the Bible that are now extant. The passage came into being by the end of the first century or the early second century A.D. It was probably composed by some one or Church from the readings of Luke, John and I Cor. 15: 1-7. The weakness of this is the clumsiness of the connection between 16: 1-8 and 9-18. Would the one or those responsible for the passage fail to recognize the clumsiness of the connection between the two passages? Most probably this ending and the other two existed in isolated units. Undoubtedly, such isolated units of writings existed in the early Church. Luke made use of such writings in the compilation of his Gospel (Luke 1: 1-4). This long ending as a unit was probably in wide circulation by the end of the first century and thought by many to be the lost ending

of Mark. This could easily happen in such an age when critical studies of the scriptural texts in the modern sense were almost nil in the Church.

Although we cannot accurately date the time that the long ending became part of the original Mark, it must be before 180 A.D. when Irenaeus quoted from it as such. Also if some words of Justin Martyr are quoted from it, it must have been known by 140 A.D., though it might not have been an accepted part of Mark by then. Its language betrays that of the other Gospels and the Acts. Papias' theory that it was written by Aristion, a disciple of the Lord's brother must be taken with caution. Certainly 16: 9-20 cannot be a continuation of 16: 1-8. John 21 cannot possibly be the lost ending of Mark. While it is probably true that John 21 may not have come from the same pen that wrote 1-20, the language is more akin to the fourth Gospel. The thought in John 21 also *contradicts* Marcan authorship. The opening of John 21 does not *logically* follow Mark 16:8 and it presupposes previous appearances of the Risen Jesus.

The content of the long ending does not presuppose 16: 5-8, Mary Magdalene was introduced as though she had never been mentioned before. The appearance to Mary is described by ἐφάνη which is not found elsewhere in Mark. Mary herself was characterized as παρ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἕπτὰ δαιμόνια (cf. Luke 8:2). The unreadiness of the disciples to believe the news is emphasized by verse 11. Verses 12 and 13 give a summary of what was probably the account of Luke 24: 13-35. Jesus was manifested (ἐφανερώθη) in another form. μορφῇ probably means that he assumed the heavenly form, μετὰ ταῦτα ἕτερος and μορφῇ are common in John. ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ suggests also that the form in which Jesus appeared to the two disciples was different from that to Mary. Verse 14 is probably a reference to the writer's own day. Mark attaches importance to the acceptance of the resurrection tradition. Evidence from the Acts and Pauline letters shows that there were equally Jews and Gentiles who

doubted the resurrection or who at least would not accept the bodily resurrection.

The sayings in 15-18 are very abrupt after the strong rebuke of verse 14. This perhaps sheds more light on the nature of the origin of the long ending. The great commission to preach the Gospel to the whole creation is independent of Matthew 28: 19-20 but the spirit is the same. Nevertheless, universalism here may represent the prevailing opinion in the Gentile churches regarding the scope of the Church's mission on earth. But if Mark 16: 15-16, Matthew 28:19 and 20 and Acts 1:8 can be attributed to Jesus how do we explain the original attitude of the Jerusalem Church to the Gentile mission (Acts 11: 1-18, 15: 1-29)? In the first place, we must realize that missionary work among the Gentiles is not new. What was in dispute was not the evangelization of the Gentiles, but making their first becoming Jews a precondition for Christian faith or salvation. ~~πᾶσιν τῶν~~
~~κτίστων~~ is better rendered "to every creature," that is to every man rather than to all the creation.

Man's attitude to the message of the Gospel will end either in life or death. Response in faith and baptism results in an eschatological salvation but unbelief leads to condemnation in the final judgment.

In Nineham's view, the atmosphere described in 17-18 is that of 100-140 A.D. since the proof of the truth of Christianity by the works of miracles is typical of the second century apologetic.²⁸ All the signs mentioned here can be found in other books of the New Testament except the drinking of poison with impunity (cf. Eusebius Hist. Eccl. III, 39:9; Acts of John 20 and the case of Justus Barsabbas quoted from Papias A.D. 130). The use of ΜΕΝ refers to the eschatological Jesus and ΣΕ to the mission of the apostles. The use of ἀναλαμβάνω for the ascension is found in Acts 1: 2, 11, 22, and II Tim. 3:16. The language is reminiscent of II Kings 2:11. Mark is silent on the fact whether or not the ascension was seen by mortal eyes. For Mark the Risen Jesus is now the Exalted Lord Jesus and the chief mission of the Church is to preach his Gospel. From

1. D.E. Nineham, Opt. cit., p. 452.

his heavenly throne the Risen Lord will continue to lead and guide his followers. The signs that accompany that proclamation of ^{the} Gospel are a mark of the presence of the Risen, Everliving Lord Jesus Christ.

2. The Short Ending:

The second alternative ending after 16:8 is as follows:

"But they reported briefly to Peter and those with him all that they had been told. And after this, Jesus himself sent out by means of them, from east to west, the sacred and imperishable proclamation of eternal salvation".²⁹

On linguistic grounds the Marcan authorship of the passage is ruled out. Like 16: 9-20 it was existing as a separate unit before it was affixed to Mark. The author took verse 8 to mean that the women did not make the event public but made a private report to the disciples about the incident. It is also completely silent about the resurrection appearances. He probably regarded the resurrection as a spiritual event. The last sentence presupposes that the Gospel has covered most of the then known world. It is also silent

29. The Greek New Testament edited by Aland, Black, Metzger and Wikgren, (United Bible Societies, London, 1967), p. 198.

about the manner in which the apostles received the commission for the world-wide evangelization.

3. The Expansion of the Long Ending:

Some MSS inserted the following between verses 14 and 15 of the long ending.

"And they replied saying The age of lawlessness and unbelief is under Satan who by means of evil spirits prevents the true power of God from being apprehended; therefore, reveal thy righteousness now. They were speaking to Christ and Christ said to them in reply: "The limit of the years of authority of Satan has expired, but other terrible things are coming even for sinners on whose behalf, I was delivered over to death, that they might turn to the truth and sin no more, in order that they may inherit the spiritual and incorruptible glory of righteousness, which is in heaven".³⁰

There appears to be some allusion here to the difficult experiences of the Church during the second century. The author tries to provide an explanation for the disciples' unbelief. The disciples also demanded an immediate parousia. Christ assured them that Satan's rule has come to an end, though more judgments over unrepentant sinners must still be expected. Jerome

30. Aland, Black, Metzger and Wikgren, Ibid., p. 197 - Note 4.

quoted it as being in some of the MSS with which he was familiar. But the Greek is still to be restored in one place on the basis of quotation by Jerome. The passage is in one of the Greek MSS of the fifth century.

II. MATTHEW:

(a) The Guarded Tomb 27: 62-66.

Throughout, Matthew's chief concern seems to be about any possible allegation of deception. The soldiers were on the guard during the crucifixion, so that no body could remove Jesus from the cross before he was certified dead. The tomb was similarly under guard purposely to prevent any fraudulent practice. Matthew had already made reference to the resurrection (12:40). The passage explains further the peculiarities of Matthew's story of the empty tomb. The two stories (Matt. 27: 62-66 and 28: 11-15) are two parts of a legend which is more developed in the apocryphal Gospel of Peter 8:29 - 11:49. The Christians insisted that the empty tomb was a proof of the resurrection but their Jewish antagonists claimed that the body was stolen by the disciples.

Matthew refers to the Sabbath by the obscure phrase τῆς ἑβδομάδος (Mtt. 27: 62). The Jewish authorities also refer to Jesus as ὁ πλάγιος (an impositor). This refers to the claim of Jesus to be the Messiah. ^{following Wrede} Fuller thinks that Jesus historically speaking probably did not claim to be the Messiah but was thus proclaimed by the Church only after the resurrection.³¹ Matthew also employs ἐγείρομαι for "I will rise", that is, "I will raise myself" instead of ἀναστήσομαι. Mark uses ἐγερθῆναι ('I am raised'). The suggestion here is that somebody is responsible for the act of raising. The New Testament generally speaks of the resurrection as the very act of God himself. What the Jews refer to as the first fraud is Jesus' claim to be the Messiah and the last fraud would be for the disciples to steal the body and then turn round to claim "He has risen from the dead".

In Fuller's opinion the story suggests a later form of the burial tradition as found in Mark and that if the ~~Satan~~ ^{Satan} had disposed of Jesus as a last hostile act such a request would be unnecessary (Acts

31. R.H. Fuller, Op.cit., p. 72.

13:29). Also the story presupposes earlier stages of the tradition. These are; the earliest kerygma of the resurrection of Jesus on the third day, the Marcan story of the empty tomb and the Jewish polemic against the story.³² It is difficult to understand why it is only Matthew that has this tradition. But Allen has attributed it to a Palestinian source. While the story must have been written for apologetic purposes, it is obvious that the Jewish leaders must have taken some precautions to prevent any fraud by Jesus's supporters. Jesus must have spoken of his death and resurrection, at least in parables, if not plainly to the Jews. The other Gospels probably did not include it because the Gentile Churches from where they originated were not faced with this sort of challenge against the empty tomb. It will be too sweeping to dismiss the story as an "apologetic legend."

B. The Resurrection of Jesus (28: 1-10)

Matthew omits the name of Salome and fails to give the details that Mark gave about the second Mary. The purpose of their visit was to see the sepulchre. Here

32. R.H. Fuller, Op.cit., p. 73.

Matthew breaks with Mark. This is necessary in view of the fact that the tomb was sealed and guarded and Joseph of Arimathea had also completed the burial rites. The report of the two earthquakes is peculiar to Matthew, but one is probably a duplication of the other (Matther 27: 51-53, cf. 28: 1-2). The earthquake is an evidence showing that God is at work. (Cf. Judges 5:4, II Sam. 22:8; Ps. 68:8; II Kings 19:11). Josephus reported that similar signs took place before the destruction of Jerusalem. According to him the priests at ^{the} feast of Pentecost felt a quaking and heard a great noise. After that they heard the voice of a great multitude saying: "Let us depart hence".³³ B. Jona 39^b says that one of the signs that took place forty years before the destruction of the Temple was that the doors of the Temple opened themselves until Rabbi Jochanan ben Zaccai rebuked them saying: "O Temple, Temple! Why troublest thou thyself? I know that thy end is near".

Matthew also says that the resurrection of the *dead*

33. Jos. Wars VI, 229, W.C. Allen, The Gospel According to St. Matthew, (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1897), p. 296.

took place in consequence of the first earthquake.³⁴ But if the resurrection of the Old Testament saints had taken place three days before the resurrection of Jesus, how can Christ be regarded as the first-fruits of them that sleep? Probably conscious of this difficulty, a redactor adds that they did not appear in the city until after the resurrection of Jesus. Nevertheless, it is suggested as well that αὐτοῦ of 27:53 might be αὐτῶν originally. It will then read "after their resurrection" instead of "after his resurrection". The editor probably changed the pronoun in order to reduce the difficulty. But if they rose on Friday where were they hiding before Sunday and where are they now? Could it mean that Jesus removed the saints from Hades to Paradise because he said to one of the thieves: "Today you will be with me in Paradise"? The early Church believed that in between the crucifixion and the resurrection, Jesus

34. Matt. 27: 51-53 stands unique in the New Testament and we have no other scripture to help us to understand it. Moreover, there are no references to it in Jewish tradition as well. It was the earthquake that opened the tombs and made possible the resurrection of the saints. Matthew's own reticence shows that he himself cannot fully explain what actually took place. But the puzzling story which might have been originally a figurative teaching was taken to be a real event by Matthew.

went to proclaim liberty to the righteous dead (I Peter 3: 18-20, 4:6; cf. Luke 4: 18-19). The resurrection of the ἀγιοι is in line with the Jewish popular eschatology. But it is most likely that 27: 51-53 is an integral part of 28: 2-4. There was no rending of rocks in 28: 2-4 because an angel of the Lord had descended to roll back the stone and sat on it. It is doubtful whether Matthew could think that the stone had to be rolled back before Jesus could come out of the tomb. But this is plausible if Matthew was thinking of the resurrection in purely Jewish terms.

The angel was not sitting inside the tomb as in Mark but outside on the rolled stone. It was the angel that invited the women to come and look at the empty tomb. There is no mention of καὶ τῷ
πῆρσι In Mark the women fled the tomb with fear and astonishment and did not obey the command of the angel. But here it was when they were on their way to deliver the angel's message that Jesus met them. It has been suggested that 28: 8 and 9 is probably from the original end of Mark.³⁵ But Fuller is of the view

35. J.C. Fenton, St. Matthew (Penguin Books, 1963), p. 450.
 A.H. McNeile, St. Matthew (Macmillan, 1938), pp. 432-3.

that since Christophany to the women is absent from I Cor. 15: 5-7 and in Mark, the Matthean tradition is a later tradition. Also it is the angelophany that was later converted into Christophany.³⁶ Matthew materializes the appearance by saying that they touched his feet and worshipped him.

The story of the bribing of the guards further shows his own view of the nature of the resurrection, and interpretation of the empty tomb. In spite of the difficulties in this tradition, Matthew did not invent it. It is difficult to know whether the soldiers are members of the Roman army or the Temple guard. Justin Martyr in Dialogue with Trypho shows that the slander was still current by the middle of the second century A.D. Of course, Justin depended mainly on Matthew for details. In the Gospel of Peter, the soldiers reported directly to Pilate who warned them to keep silent for fear that the Jews would stone them.

The second and final appearance was at an unnamed mountain in Galilee which Jesus had appointed for this purpose. We are not told how soon after the resurrection

36. R.H. Fuller, Op.cit., pp.78-9.

this last appearance took place. We may speculate that the was either the mountain where Jesus gave the long sermon or was transfigured. The Gospel opens in the spirit of Jewish nationalism with the royal genealogy of Messiah to Abraham, the father of the Jewish nation and to David their ideal King. Also the Messiah was coming for the purpose of saving his people from their sin. But the Gospel now ends with Jesus as the Saviour of man-kind and the Supreme Lord of heaven and earth. At the two appearances, the disciples worshipped him as the Magi did at the beginning. Matthew is again bringing the Gospel into line with its beginning (Matt. 2:10f., cf. 28:9, 17). Christ declared that all authority (πᾶσα ἐξου-
-σία) is given to him in heaven and on earth. The delivery of all authority to the Son by the Father can be traced back to Daniel 7:14 where dominion (ἐξουσία) and glory and Kingdom was given to "one like the Son of Man" and that all peoples (πᾶν τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς) should serve him. The Church applies this to Jesus as the exalted Son of Man. In consequence of his new status

(οὐκ) Christ is now commissioning his disciples to go and make disciples of all nations μαθητεύ-
-σατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη). Though the missionary charge is paralleled by Mark 16:15, each of them apparently belongs to distinct traditions. The Synoptics also contain other mission charges. (Lk. 10: 1-6; Mark 6: 7-13; Matthew 10: 5-17). Matthew 28:19 is contrary to Matt. 10:5 and 6 where Jesus specifically charged the disciples not to go to the way of the Gentiles and not to enter the city of the Samaritans but they were to go only to τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἑπ-
-ιδιώματα οἴκου Ισραήλ . 37

Doubts have been expressed as to whether Jesus actually uttered the baptismal formular which is only found here in the New Testament. From all available evidence, the words stood in the original text of Matthew and they are found in all ancient MSS. The command to baptize must have come from Jesus himself,

37. The instruction that the Twelve are to go only to Jews occurs only in Matthew. A similar saying, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (15:24), also occurs only in Matthew. But in all the four gospels Jesus systematically continued his ministry to Jews. He never entered the homes of the Gentiles, but only rarely responded to a few Gentiles' pleas for help and then healed them from a distance.

though what we have now is apparently the official dogma of the early Church. If Jesus had not given any directive regarding baptism, how can we justify the universal practice of it which came with the birth of the Church? But if Jesus had commanded the baptism of all nations or creatures who believe (Mk. 16: 15 and 16 and Matt. 28:19) how can we explain the reluctance at the beginning to baptize the Gentiles (Acts 10: 1-11; 18)? Eusebius of Caesarea in quoting the passage often omits or varies the wording. In its place

he has ΠΟΡΕΥΘΕΝΤΕΣ ΜΧΘΗΤΕΘΑΤΕ
ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑ ἔθνη βαπτίζοντες ἐν τῷ
ὀνόματι μου He made no mention of the three-fold name. But it is difficult to explain why Matthew should have included it if it was not already part of the Church's baptismal liturgy.³⁸

The baptism has to be into his name, ΕΙΣ Τὸ ὄνομα
αὐτοῦ). Baptism into the name of Christ suggests that the baptized is publicly professing faith in Christ and the fact that he has a share in the "experience

38. Letter of Eusebius of Caesarea to his Church, on the Creed of Nicea - In A New Eusebius - ed. J. Stevenson, pp. 364-368.

of Christ" and thus his disciple. He has also entered into a state of allegiance and fellowship with Christ. To baptize into the name of Jesus means to baptize into the possession, protection and blessing of the God-head, and to establish a living union between the believer and the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The Didaché has it thus in chapter 7: ΒΑΠΤΙΣΑΤΕ
ΕΙΣ Τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ
υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος This may not necessarily be dependent on Matthew.

Matthew closes with the greatest assurance of the ever abiding presence of the Risen Saviour until the present order gives way to a new one. The evangelist opens with the announcement of the birth of the Emmanuel child and now closes on the same note of his unfailing presence. It is the greatest assurance and the summary of all the promises of Christ to his Church. The Church has lived by this experience from the beginning.

III. LUKE - ACTS:

(a) The Resurrection Account:

Luke's account of the empty tomb runs into that of Mark, nevertheless it differs in many respects. The purpose of the women's visit, though not mentioned, is

apparently the same as Mark's because they went with ointments. The Lucan list of women is somehow different from that of Mark. Joanna is second on his list (8:3), and Mary of James who is second on Marcan list is third in Luke and then "the other women with them". He did not mention Susanna here. The women entered the tomb on their own initiative and discovered the empty tomb for themselves. In Mark and Matthew they were invited to come and see ^{the} empty tomb. It was after they had discovered the empty tomb in Luke that their amazement began. In Luke two youngmen and not one appeared to the women. The phrase τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ is also used in connection with the transfiguration and the ascension (9:30; Acts 1:10). Some ancient authorities after "they did not find the body" add "Of the Lord Jesus" τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ }³⁹
 This phrase is missing from Codex Bezae and the Old Latin MSS. τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ is found

39. τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Sinaiticus, London, date, 4th Century; Alexandrinus, London, date, 5th Century; Vaticanus, Rome, 4th Century; Ephraem Rescriptus, Paris, Date, 5th Century; Moscow, Date 9th Century; Regius, Paris, Date, 8th Century; Freer Gospels, Washington; Date 5th Century; Munich; Date 9th Century; St. Gaul, Date 9th Century; Koridethi, Tiflis, Date, 9th Century, Leningrad, Date 9th Century; Athos, Date 8th or 9th Century.

only here in the New Testament. Also the women did not keep the news but made a full report of what they saw to the disciples. Verse 12 is also missing from Codex Bezae and the Old Latin MSS. It says: "But Peter rose and ran to the tomb; stooping and looking in, he saw the linen cloths by themselves; and he went home wondering what had happened". P. Scherer thinks that the verse is undoubtedly an interpolation of John 20: 3-10.⁴⁰ Plummer refers to the verse as "Of unknown and doubtful authority ... and has the look of an insertion".⁴¹ Most probably it is not entirely correct to say that the verse is a later interpolation summarizing John 20: 3-10 and largely echoing its language. There are notable differences in the language. Words like ἀναστὰς, νόμα and θαυμάζων τὸ γεγυός are not found in the Johannine passage. The verse is probably Lucan because ἀναστὰς, τὸ γεγυός and θαυμάζων appear frequently in Luke and the first two are not found in John. If Luke wrote it

40. "Luke and John", Interpreters' Bible, Vol. 8 by N.B. Harmon, p. 420.

41. Plummer, St. Luke, (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh), p. 550.

himself, it was probably omitted by a scribe. Of course, the problem here is that the normal practice by scribes is to add verses to texts rather than to take some out. Nevertheless, this is not a rigid rule.

B. The Walk to Emmaus 24: 13-35.

In the story of Jesus' appearance to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus we have the longest single narrative of the post-resurrection appearances. It is a counterpart of ~~the~~ appearance to Mary - Magdalene in John. There is also a brief allusion to the incident in the long-ending of Mark (16: 12 and 13). Nevertheless, the account is peculiar to Luke. Plummer regards it as one of "the most beautiful of the treasures which he alone has preserved for us". He also thinks that Luke received the tradition directly from the eye-witness account and that the narrator was probably Cleopas.⁴²

On the day of the resurrection Jesus met two of his disciples on the way to Emmaus, which was about eleven kilometres from Jerusalem. They took Jesus for another pilgrim from Jerusalem who must have witnessed

42. Plummer, Ibid., p. 551.

the event of the crucifixion. Jesus pretended ignorance about what they were discussing. Jesus asked them why they were so sad. They replied that the man they were talking about was One Jesus of Nazareth, a prophet great in mighty works and preaching. The Jewish leaders condemned him to death by crucifixion. But they had hoped (ἠλπιζομένον) that he was the one to redeem (λυτροῦσθα) Israel. This hope was later shattered by his death. λυτροῦσθα has the full implications of what it means in Jewish apocalypse rather than the later Christian understanding of it. They had hoped for a type of the Messiah pictured in Jewish apocalyptic writings, an earthly King, who would free them from being subservient to foreign powers. The two disciples concluded their story by saying that they were astonished by certain women who claimed that the tomb was empty in the early hours of that morning. Some of the disciples who went to the tomb confirmed the women's story but they did not see Jesus himself. Apparently, the hear-say evidence about the visions of angels and an empty tomb was unconvincing to them. This perhaps partly explains why they did not

believe the resurrection.

Jesus then began to expound the Old Testament scriptures to them on the predictions of the death and resurrection and exaltation of the Messiah. 24:22-23 is reminiscent of Peter's speech on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2: 22-23). Verse 27 also anticipates the Old Testament apologetic in the early Church. When they arrived at Emmaus they persuaded their companion to pass the night with them. At the meal table this companion suddenly assumed the role of the head of the family. He took the bread, gave thanks, broke it and gave it to them. It was now that their eyes were opened and they recognized Jesus. Such stories of hospitality to supernatural beings unaware are found in folklore, both biblical and profane. (Cf. Gen. 18: 1-8, 19: 1-3, Judges 13: 8-20). Heb. 13:2 says: "Do not neglect to show hospitality to strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unaware".

But the Emmaus story raises many fundamental issues. N. Huffman says that the walk to Emmaus is the most convincing of the resurrection narratives. Of course, he agrees that there are several obscurities in the

story and its relation to the other resurrection traditions remain an unsolved mystery. It has no support from any other sources and has left no trace on any other New Testament book. Also the physical reality of Jesus is only implied; it is neither emphasized nor demonstrated. His identity is unknown until the last moment and then suddenly he became invisible.⁴³

There are also problems about the identity of the two disciples. In the Emmaus story we have the reference to Jesus' special appearance to Peter. It was foreshadowed in Mark before his Gospel breaks off (16:7). But was Peter the first to see the Risen Jesus? If this is true ~~the~~ account has not survived. Paul also recalls this in his list of resurrection appearances (I Cor. 15:5). Several scholars have suggested that the unnamed disciple was Peter. This assertion is largely based on Tertullian's statement. He implies that one of the two on the Emmaus road was one of the twelve. He says:

"They ... are accustomed to saying that the apostles did not know all things... Was

43. N. Huffman, "Emmaus Among the Resurrection Narratives" Journal of Biblical Literature (1945), pp. 205-226; cf. K. Lake, Harvard Theological Review 14, pp. 95-97 (1921), D.W. Liddle, Journal of Biblical Literature, 59 (1940), pp. 169-180).

anything hidden from Peter who was called the Rock where on the Church should be founded? ... Was anything hidden from John, the beloved disciple of the Lord?... And were they ignorant to whom also after the resurrection, he designed to expound all the scriptures as they journeyed?"

Origen of Alexandria says:

"And in Luke's Gospel, when Simon and Cleopas were talking to one another about all that had happened to them, Jesus drew nearer to them and went with them and their eyes were hidden that they should not know him" (Against Celsus 262). Moreover, he says: "It is not impossible for the divine nature that Jesus should disappear whenever he wished... For it is written in Luke's Gospel that after the resurrection Jesus took bread and broke it and gave it to Simon and Cleopas. And when they took the bread their eyes were open and they knew him and he vanished out of their sight." (Against Celsus 268).⁴⁴

Zahn and P. Scheerer have suggested that on the basis of Eusebius' evidence that this Simon is the Son of Cleopas, who was the brother of Joseph and, therefore, an uncle of Jesus. Simon was elected bishop of Jerusalem to succeed the martyred James.⁴⁵ But it is unusual in the ancient world to list a son before the father, in spite of what the status of the son might be. Origen

44. R. Annaud, "He was seen of Cephas" Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. II, (1958), pp. 180-187.

45. R. Scheerer, "St. Luke", Interpreters' Bible, Vol. 8, p.422; Eusebius E.H. 312.

named Simon first. Another suggestion is that the unnamed disciple was Luke himself. While it is true that the unnamed disciple could either be a Jew or Gentile, the preface to the Gospel reveals that Luke was not one of the eye-witnesses from the beginning. In the Acts wherever Luke himself was present he uses the first person plural to describe the event. The suggestion that it might be Nathaniel seems ^{too} far fetched to be true. The couple also could not be a husband and wife because of the use of masculine pronouns for both. They were also referred to as "foolish men".

Baur has said that Cleopas is probably the Semitic Qlopa, while Cleopas is an abbreviation of the Hellenistic name Kleopatros. But this is unlikely since it is customary for the Jews to have Greek names alongside their Jewish names.⁴⁶ Another problem is that Codex Bezae has Oulammaous, a fact which may point to an early corruption of the text. Three Old Latin MSS turned Emmaus from a place name into a man's name, by referring to the two disciples as Ammaus and Cleopas. Also there is an unexplained comment by the Latin

46. R.H. Fuller, Op.cit., pp. 107-109

Father Ambrose on Luke 24:18 thus: "Alter Amaon alter Cleophas dicuntur". Amaon may probably be a corruption of Simon. Furthermore, there is resemblance between ΚΛΕΟΦΑΣ and the Hebrew form of Peter (Κηφᾶ)⁴⁷

The theory that the second disciple was Peter apparently has its origin in ῥοφθη εἰμωνι of verse 34. But the verse presupposes an earlier manifestation to Peter prior to the journey to Emmaus. But there is no record of such an early appearance. Most likely, Luke did not know the name of the second disciple. The verse seems to be out of place in the light of 24: 1-33. It might be an interpolation purposely to reconcile the Lucan account with the Pauline "ῥοφθη Κηφᾶ" and Paul's tradition that listed Peter as the first witness of the resurrection appearance. The second disciple could have been anybody, either among the eleven or the other disciples. The Cleopas here may also not necessarily be the Cleopas of John 19:25.

In spite of its difficulties, the walk to Emmaus narrative is the most vivid and effective account of

47. R. Annand, Op.cit., pp. 185ff.

all the resurrection accounts. Here we are made to perceive the life, mission, death and resurrection of Jesus in the light of God's revelation in the Old Testament. It thus forms a vital connecting link between the Old Testament promises and the Apostolic exposition on them. Here we learn that the resurrection body is not subject to the ordinary laws of time and space.

C. The Final Appearance and Parting - 24: 36-53:

This passage apparently reduces to one tradition what was once three traditions in Johannine circle. It is a combination of the appearances to the disciples without Thomas and the one to the disciples including Thomas on the eighth day and the one to the seven disciples on the Sea of Galilee (John 20: 19-29, 21). Perhaps the three traditions have been woven into one in the source that was available to Luke. But the manifestation in Luke 24: 33-43, appears to be to the eleven disciples and not to ten. If this is correct then ΤΟΥΣ ἑνδεκά must be wrong because according to Johannine tradition Thomas was not there. It is either that Luke uses ΤΟΥΣ ἑνδεκά

incorrectly or that Thomas withdrew from the eleven between verse 35 and verse 36. Another problem is that the Lucan appearance is mentioned in connection with fish, but according to John it took place in Galilee and was to seven disciples and not to the eleven. Here Luke has transferred the appearance in Galilee to Jerusalem.

Verses 36-43 provide a concrete demonstration of the resurrection, while 44-49 express what has become the kerygmatic Christology of the Church. Luke is silent about the Jerusalem location of this appearance. Like John's, the Lucan passage has some highly apologetic colouring which is absent from the earliest evidence of Paul. Here the Risen Christ invites his disciples to touch his body purposely to convince them that he was not a "spirit" or "ghost", but a figure of flesh and blood. According to Fuller this is quite contrary to the earliest kerygma of I Cor. 15:5 and to Paul's concept of ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΝ ΣΩΜΑ and the presentation in Mark 16: 1-8 and in Matthew 28: 16-20.⁴⁸ The disciples were not only invited to touch

48. Fuller, Op.cit., p. 115.

but to watch the Risen Jesus eating a fish meal. The problem of Luke is probably an attempt to prove that the Risen Exalted Jesus has identity with the earthly Jesus. While both Luke and John agree that the resurrected body of Jesus was no longer subject to physical restrictions, they tried to emphasize its solid corporeal nature. This is probably inherited from the Aramaic sources which speak of Jesus eating and drinking with his disciples (Acts. 10: 36-43). Normally the Greeks think of reality in abstract terms based on universal truths. But for the Jews reality is always particular and concrete. Therefore, for the resurrection to be real, the Risen Jesus must walk, talk and eat as he had done in the earthly life. For the Jews, a disembodied spirit could be nothing, but a ghost and not a living being. Materialistic imagery, therefore, must be used in order to prove the reality of the resurrection to the Jews. Also the early Church was faced with the challenge of Docetism which denied the reality of the human life of Jesus. The heresy teaches that the divine Christ came upon the human Jesus at baptism and departed just before

the crucifixion. The Johannine Epistles contain strong attacks against Docetism. Since the heresy was already rearing its head by the time Paul was writing some of his Epistles, undoubtedly such teachings must have become a real threat by the time that Luke was writing.

Scholars are divided as to what period of time the last section must be assigned (24: 44-53).⁴⁹ Lange assigns verse 44 to Easter day. Godet assigns verses 44 and 45 to Easter day. Euthymius says that 44-49 belong to that day. But Mayer assigns the whole passage to Easter day. This section reveals Luke's understanding of salvation history. He sees the Old Testament history of salvation as coming to perfection in the event of Christ. God was not only vindicating the Messiah by raising him from the dead, but through it God is bringing salvation to mankind. Luke tries to reconcile the idea of the conquering Messiah and the suffering Servant. The Jews have always taken the suffering Servant to be a reference either to different periods when Israel as a nation was undergoing sufferings or some of their past heroes. But for Luke before Jesus

49. R.H. Fuller, Op.cit., pp. 114-120; C.F. Evans, Op.cit., pp. 109-115.

could be the all-conquering Messiah, he must play the role of the suffering Servant. This re-echoes in the message of Philip to the Ethiopian Eunuch. Through the event of Christ, God is now extending forgiveness of sins and salvation to all nations. This is the message that the Risen Lord commissioned his Church to preach. The Apostles were to remain in Jerusalem for the descent of the Holy Spirit before going to proclaim this message. Unlike the other Gospels, the place from where the message of salvation should go to the whole world must be Jerusalem and not Galilee. Also it was in Jerusalem and not in Galilee that the Church took its origin.

At a glance it would appear as if all the resurrection events took place just in one day in Luke. But it sounds incredible that Luke thinks that the ascension took place on the night of the Easter day. Jesus could not have led them to Bethany and ascended into heaven in the night. The fact that there is no ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ of verse 13 either before verse 40^{or} verse 50, presupposes that there was a period of interval between these events. It is most likely that the use of δὲ in both verses 44 and 50 is meant to introduce new occasions.

There appears to be three interpolations from both Matthew and John. First καὶ λέγει αὐ-
-τοῖς Ἐβραῖν ὕμν (verse 36) is apparently taken from John 20:19 by a redactor. This is the normal Jewish way of greeting. Of course, it is omitted in many ancient MSS. Second "he shows them his hands and his feet" (v. 40) is probably from the account of Jesus' appearance to the eleven (John 20:28). The verse is also omitted in many ancient MSS. Third πρὸς κωνήσχυτες αὐτοῦ (v. 52) is apparently an insertion from Matthew 28: 9, 17 and it is similarly omitted from many ancient MSS.

Luke begins his Gospel in the Temple and ends it in the Temple. Apparently, the Acts of the Apostles is a continuation of the Gospel because the Gospel is the story of "all that Jesus began to do and teach until the day when he was taken up." The resurrection thus forms the bridge between the Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles.

D. The Ascension in the Acts (1: 1-11):

The authors of Luke-Acts and John make a clear distinction between the resurrection and ascension.

Here Luke recaptulates the substance of the Gospel's last chapter. He reminds his readers of how the apostles who first regarded the resurrection story as incredible gradually became convinced by several appearances of the Risen Lord. According to Acts, Jesus' appearances lasted for forty-days. It is unlikely that Luke was ignorant of the forty-days appearances and that the information only came after the completion of the Gospel. The most primitive kerygma by Paul contains no reference to local appearances. Yet it is only the Pauline account that gives room for lapse of time.

M.H. Shepherd Jr. has pointed out that the forty-days should not be taken literally but as a round number.⁵⁰ Forty is one of the few significant round numbers among the Jews. When the world was destroyed by flood, it rained continuously for forty-days (Gen. 7:4). Moses was twice on Mount Sinai for forty-days to receive the commandments (Ex. 24:18, 34:28; Dt. 9:9, 25, 10:10). During each of the forty days

50. M.H. Shepherd, "Paul and the Double Resurrection Tradition", Journal of Biblical Literature (1945), p. 236.

Moses did not eat any food. The spies went for forty days to spy the land (Numb. 13:25; 14:34). Elijah was sustained for forty days after eating a meal supplied by the angel. (I Kings 19:8). Ezekiel was to lie down on his side for forty days in order to atone for the sins of Israel (Ez. 4:6). Nineveh was given forty days to repent (Jonah 3:4). Jesus was in the wilderness where he fasted for forty days (Mt. 4:2; Mk. 1:13; Lk. 4:2). Moses' life was divided into three periods of forty years each. Israel wandered in the wilderness for forty years; they ate manna for forty years and throughout the forty years their clothes did not wear out upon them and their shoes did not wear out of their feet. (Dt. 29:4, 5). The number forty is associated with every new development in the history of God's acts, especially in salvation, redemption and judgment. Forty years is another expression for 'a generation'. The period of forty years is a recurring pattern of servitude and of rest in Judges, and of the reigns of many kings in Israel. In the light of the above, Luke's forty days may not mean more than "many days". But Luke perhaps meant his forty days to be taken literally.

δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα
ὅτι τὰ νόμενος αὐτοῖς does not mean
 that the resurrection appearances ~~were~~ a daily occurrence,
 but many times during the forty days. The verb
ὅτι τὰ νόμενος occurs here only in the New
 Testament. It is a new present formation on the model
 of aorist passive ἔφθη in its transitive sense
 "appear".⁵¹ Each appearance was for the purpose of
 teaching the disciples about the Kingdom of God.

Christ gave them specific instructions not to leave Jerusalem until they had received the promise of the Father which is the outpouring of the Spirit. The mission charge is unique to the Acts. As we have it in the Gospel the Church was to begin in Jerusalem. The endowment with the Spirit would empower the apostolic community for a world-wide witness. Acts 1:8 gives the order in which the Church carried out its missionary programme. The verse is apparently what later became the official statement of the Church relating to the missionary charge. Here the world-wide mission became a substitute for the delayed parousia. In a reply to the anxious disciple who wanted to know how soon the Messianic kingdom would be established, Jesus said that

51. F.F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles (Tyndale Press, London, 1956), p. 67.

the proclamation of the good news that would begin in Jerusalem must spread to the uttermost part of the earth. The terms Χρόνους and ἡ καιρ-
-ους overlap in their meanings. Χρονοῦν (times) lays more stress on the duration of the period while καιροῦν (seasons) lays emphasis on the crises which will mark the consummation. The new Israel must pass through various period of times and seasons before the Kingdom is consummated.

W. Neil says that the ascension is described with typical restraint and it is a pictorial way of saying that after the Lord had made it plain that the resurrection was a fact and had convinced a sufficient number of his followers, the appearances ceased. The crowd and the angelic figures are natural biblical accompaniments of divine mystery to show that Jesus is no more confined to Galilee, but is now exalted and enthroned in heaven. From there he shall continue to be present in the Spirit and he will return personally at the end of this era as the sovereign Lord of all.⁵²

52. M.M. Neil, One Volume Bible Commentary, Hodder and Stoughton, London, Paper edition, 1973), p.420.

But by ascension, Luke definitely means more than just ordinary cessation of appearances. For Luke the ascension provides a definite and visible end of his ministry on earth. The cloud is usually a symbol of divine presence; the cloud veiling the glory of God. Christ being received by the clouds means that he has been received into glory. This marks his elevation to the right hand of God. From there he will return in the clouds like the Son of Man (Dan. 7:13). The return will be visible and personal.

IV. ST. JOHN:

John's tradition is very unique. John is the latest of the canonical Gospels and was written about seventy years after the actual events. Tradition assigned the Gospel to John, the beloved disciple, of course, no such claim is made in the Gospel itself. Although 21:24 described the author as being the disciple whom Jesus loved modern critics found it difficult to accept the traditional view that the Gospel in its present form is the work of John the son of Zebedee⁵³. The resurrection narratives are regarded as the product of a long process of oral transmission and not that of an eye-

53. The question of the identity of the beloved disciple and the authorship of the Fourth Gospel is beyond the scope of this research. But since the second century, the Gospel has been designated "according to John" and that this John, according to the earliest traditions, is John the Son of Zebedee. Nevertheless, the traditional view is bedevilled with many problems.

witness. W. Marxsen thinks that the Fourth Evangelist did not know any of the Synoptic Gospels.⁵⁴ But this claim is doubtful. In spite of the major differences, John manifests some knowledge of the Synoptics or at least their sources. Both Luke and John reported the resurrection appearances in Jerusalem, and had a physical conception of the Risen Jesus. Both associate the gift of the Spirit with the Easter events. The resurrection and the ascension are also distinguished, nevertheless, both manifest some differences here. But the correspondence between the Synoptics and John are so minute that direct literary dependence between them cannot be exaggerated. One of the explanations for the differences is that John was writing for a specific purpose. Each historical event was recorded for its theological purpose. This does not mean that John's records are unhistorical. John made use of narratives as vehicles to explain certain theological issues. The stories are as reliable as those of the Synoptics. Perhaps John has a deeper insight into the events of the life of Christ than the Synoptics.

54. W. Marxsen, The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth (Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1970), pp. 55 and 56).

A. The Burial Account 19: 31-42:

John's burial account has some unique features. Mark brought to the scene the women who were to be witnesses of the resurrection event. But John mentions no women as eye-witnesses to the burial. Of course, Mary the mother of Jesus, her sister, Mary the 'wife' of Cleopas and Mary Magdalene were present at the crucifixion. John might have taken for granted that the women, except Mary the mother of Jesus, were also present at the burial. John does not say whether the tomb was rock-hewn and sealed. Nevertheless, the sequence of events speaks of the stone being removed (20:1). John also says that the tomb was in a garden which was close to Calvary. According to the Gospel of Peter 24, it was Joseph's Κῆπιος. This means a large garden, orchard or plantation and John is here thought to be alluding to the Garden of Eden. But if this is true, why was it that John did not use the Παράδεισος instead of Κῆπιος? Also Nicodemus who did not appear in the Synoptics is said to have provided a mixture of myrrh and aloes for the embalming. John says nothing about Joseph's ownership of the tomb, but it was chosen simply because it

was near Golgotha and it was the Jewish day of Preparation. It was also a new grave in which nobody had been buried before. If it was truly Joseph's family tomb, could it mean then that he had just moved from Arimathea to settle in Jerusalem where he acquired land for a new family tomb?⁵⁵

B. The Empty Tomb 20: 1-10:

All the four Gospels agree that the tomb was found empty on the third day. John's use of ΤΗ ΜΙΑ⁸² ΤΩΝ ΟΑΡΒΩΤΩΝ⁴¹ agrees with Mark. In John, Mary went to the tomb alone. As in the other Gospels, the stone had been rolled away. Immediately she ran ΠΡΟΣ⁸² ΧΕΙ and went (ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ) to inform Peter and the beloved disciple and said (ΛΕΥΕΙ) this to them. Singular verbs are used to express Mary's reaction to the empty tomb. But in her report to Peter and the beloved disciple, she uses the plural verb. "They have taken the Lord out of the tomb and we do not know (ΟΥΚ ΟΪΣΑΜΕΝ) where they have laid

55. C.H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, (Cambridge University Press, 1963), pp. 137-139.

him."⁵⁶ This suggests that Mary was not the only one at the tomb. Some scholars have suggested two different visits. At the first visit she came alone and after she had discovered the empty tomb she came back with a group of women. This is used to explain the sudden change from singular to plural and to force an agreement between John and the Synoptic traditions. But this hypothesis rather creates more problems. Of course, two traditions appear to have been blended together here; the appearance to Mary Magdalene and the visit of the women, including Mary Magdalene, to the tomb about which the author knows very little. He probably treated them as one tradition. But while verse 2 has οὐκ οἶδμεν, verse 13 has οὐκ οἶδα. Fuller has suggested that Mary Magdalene's tradition originally skipped from verse 1 to verse 11; thus giving a continuous account of her discovery of the empty tomb, the angelophany and the Christophany. Verses 3-10 were originally a separate tradition which John inserted into the first version and

56. John uses οἶδμεν eighteen times. Six of them have an immediate subject that is singular (3:2, 3:11, 9:31, 14:5, 20:2, 21:24; cf. 21:24). Thus "we know" of Mary Magdalene may be simply a manner of speech.

composed verse 2 to link the two traditions together.⁵⁷

C. Peter and the Beloved Disciple:

The visit of the disciples to the tomb appears to be what is succinctly summarized in Luke 24:12. The purpose of the visit was to verify the women's report.⁵⁸ If Luke 24:12 which is supported by non-Western texts is authentic, it would then mean that the visit by the two disciples has become that of Peter alone in the Lucan tradition. In the race to the tomb the beloved disciple got there first, but he did not enter the tomb. Peter was the first to enter the tomb, but he was not the first to believe. Peter is here presented as the primary witness of the empty tomb. John's original aim of this story is probably apologetic. The fact that Peter saw the cloths arranged in an orderly way proves that the body had not been stolen. Apparently John had in mind that the cloths were left collapsed and still lying wrapped, but the body of

57. R.H. Fuller, Op.cit., p. 134.

58. As we have noted earlier, the verse might be a later interpolation from John by a later redactor of St. Luke. The verse says: "But Peter rose and ran to the tomb; stooping and looking in, he saw the linen cloths by themselves; and he went home wondering at what had happened".

Jesus had miraculously escaped from them. The story will then serve the same purpose which the story of the guards served. In the Gospel of the Hebrews 7 the Risen Jesus himself handed the grave cloth to the servant of the High Priest.

But the faith of the beloved disciple did not lead to any dramatic consequences. There is no hint that he told the other disciples of his experience. It is strange that "he saw and believed" should be followed by "for as yet they did not know the Scripture, that he must rise from the dead". The two statements do not follow one another logically. In Marsh's opinion, it was really at this point that the beloved disciple came to believe in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God. He came to believe that the one who could thus rise from death must be what he had been claiming to be, the very Son of God.⁵⁹ Perhaps what John means by not knowing the scripture is that if they had known the purpose of what God declared in the Old Testament scriptures, the resurrection would not have taken them by surprise. It may also refer to the Christians' unending adventure of coming

59. J. Marsh, St. John, (Penguin Books, 1971), p. 631.

to know more and more of God's purpose and goal of history in the light of the new event. ΠΡΟΣ
ΑΥΤΟΥΣ which is translated "to their homes" seems improbable. Would John not have written ΠΡΟΣ
 or ΕΙΣ ΤΑ ἼΔΙΑ (cf. 1:11, 16:32) instead of the indefinite phrase if he was referring to their homes? If we take ΠΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ to refer to their residence, then "to their home" would be a better translation.

D. The Appearance to Mary Magdalene 11-18:

We have noted earlier that verses 11-18 could possibly be a continuation of verse 1 and that verses 2-10 should actually come after verses 1 and 11-18. Verse 2 tells us that she ran and went to inform Simon, Peter and the beloved disciple to relate her strange experience. But it is never mentioned why she is found weeping at the tomb in verse 11. If we accept that verse 11 actually follows verse 1 it would mean that there was no separate appearance to Mary Magdalene apart from that to the group of women, including herself. W.E. Brown says that there were two distinct groups of women who came to the tomb.⁶⁰ But according to L.

60. W.E. Brown, "The First Day of the Week" Scripture, Vol. 7 (1955), p. 48.

Sheppard, there were four different visits by four different groups of women. Each evangelist only narrates one visit, but at the same time aware of other visits. The four parties which visited the tomb on the Easter morning are as follows:

- (i) Mary Magdalene in the Gospel of John;
- (ii) the other Mary, the mother of James and Joses, together with some women in the Gospel of Matthew;
- (iii) Joanna and others in the Gospel of Luke; and
- (iv) Salome and others in the Gospel of Mark.

After this we have the return visit of Mary Magdalene. If we include the visit of Peter and John, that would make six visits altogether. As to why the five sets of people did not meet in six visits, Sheppard says that this can be explained by the darkness and the various streets used to approach the tomb.⁶¹ While Brown is probably correct, Sheppard's hypothesis merely complicates the problem the more.

61. L. Sheppard, "The Resurrection Morning" Expository Times No. 40, (1928), pp. 182-187.

As Mary wept she stooped to look into the tomb and saw two angels in white sitting where the body had been laid. The description of the angels is not as terrifying as it is in the Synoptics. The only statement the angels made was: "Why are you weeping?" There was no announcement about the resurrection to the women and the appearance in Galilee. In Matthew when Jesus first appeared to the women, he said ΧΑΙΡΕΤΕ (hail or rejoice). In John, Jesus questions Mary thus: "Woman, why are you weeping? Whom do you seek?" John reports that she mistook Jesus for a gardener. Then Jesus introduced himself by simply saying Μαρία. A later Jewish legend claims that a gardener named Judah had actually removed the body. If the Jewish legend was older than the Gospel this passage is probably an apologetic answer to the challenge posed by the legend.

Mary later recognized Jesus and addressed him as Ραββουκι. Jesus told Mary Μη μου αγγιζου which the A.V. translates "Touch me not" and the R.S.V. "Do not hold me". Such translations appear to be weak. The meaning of this phrase is disputed. Does it mean "do not start something" or "do not continue what

you are already doing?" In Matthew 28:9 the women took hold of Jesus' feet and in John 20:27, Jesus invited Thomas to come and touch him.

W. Marxsen suggests the following translation:

Touch me not although I am not yet ascended to my Father (i.e. you could still touch me, but at this particular moment I want you to do something else, that is:) go to my brethren and say to them...)⁶²

Barrett says that the present imperative with ~~in~~ in a prohibition signifies a breaking off of an action already in progress or something of an attempt to perform an action.⁶³ Tasker says that after Rabboni, some ancient authorities insert "and she ran forward to touch him" and that if this is accepted the English version would be correct. But here the phrase normally means "Stop touching me" or "do not touch me any more" or "do not cling to me".⁶⁴ E.C. Hoskyns says that it is a command to put an end to an action that is already in progress and that the translation is "Cease touching me".⁶⁵ Marsh also thinks that it should be rendered

62. W. Marxsen, Op.cit., p. 61.

63. U.K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (London, S.P.C.K., 1965), p. 470.

64. R.V.G. Tasker, St. John (Tyndale Press, London, 1964), p.225.

65. E.C. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, (Faber & Faber, London 1956), p. 544.

"Cease from clinging to me".⁶⁶ But Barnard suggests the possibility of a textual corruption. He thinks that the position of μου varies and that the original MS. might have simply read μη ἄτι του; this being itself a corruption of an earlier μη ἄτι του "Fear not".⁶⁷ Bernard's theory is very doubtful and there appears to be no just reason to resort to such a presupposition. The phrase is a command to stop an action that is already in progress.

Things have now changed and the relation between the Master and the disciples has assumed a different character. Reality no longer depends on the former physical contacts. By the resurrection a new and more intimate spiritual union is now made possible. Nevertheless, the strange man of Calvary is still the glorified Living Lord. οὕτω γὰρ ἀναβέ-
-βηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα is a difficult statement. ἀναβαίνω is the same word used for Jesus being "lifted up" in other places in the Gospel. The statement implies that it will be possible

66. J. Marsh, Op.cit., p. 637.

67. J.H. Bernard, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to John, (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh), p. 670.

or permissible to touch Jesus after the ascension. This would mean that between verses 17 and 22 the complete glorification of Jesus had taken place. In John, the last journey to Jerusalem, the crucifixion, the resurrection and the ascension are seen in terms of "ascending or being lifted up". Ascending up to the Father probably suggests another stage in the work of redemption.

It is the ascent to the right hand of the Father from where the reality of his presence will be felt through the activities of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit establishes the necessary continuity between the earthly Jesus and the glorified Christ. The relationship between the Risen Lord and worshippers will no longer be one of physical contact but a real personal relationship. He appeared in a form which is evidently different from that in which he had always been known in the flesh. Nevertheless, he had sufficient elements to convince Mary and help her to persuade others that the Risen Lord she saw was Jesus himself. Jesus met Mary at the precise point of transition. This was why Mary could boldly tell his disciples: "I have seen the Lord".

E. The Easter Evening 20: 19-23:

This appearance is similar to that of Luke 24: 36-43 but John's account is surely based on an independent tradition. The disciples present apparently include other disciples outside the twelve. The disciples gathered together ~~behind~~ closed doors because they feared the Jewish leaders. Suddenly the Risen Lord appeared in their midst with the doors still closed. He greeted them in the conventional Eastern way Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν is the ordinary Eastern salutation on entering a house. Jesus showed them his hands and his side τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν. But in Luke he invites the disciples to touch his hands and his feet τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας (Luke 24:40). Of course, John is the only one that speaks of a wounded side. Luke's τοὺς πόδας is the only New Testament evidence that Jesus' feet along with his hands were nailed to the cross. All the other Gospels simply say: "They crucified him". Both John and Luke agree that the hands were marked. The Gospel of Peter also speaks of drawing nails from his hands, but says nothing about

his feet and side. John did not say that they touched the body of Jesus or ^{were} invited to do so.

But Ignatius says of this incident thus:

"I know and believe that he was in the flesh even after the resurrection and when he came to Peter and his company, he said to them: 'Take, handle me, and see that I am not a bodiless demon'. And straight away they touched him and they believed, being mixed with his flesh and blood... And after his resurrection he ate and drank with them as one of his flesh, although spiritually he was united with the Father". (Smyrn. 3).

The attempt to combat Docetism probably influenced Ignatius' position. The view of Ignatius puts no practical distinction between the earthly Jesus and the glorified Risen Lord. Luke says that the disciples did not believe for joy when they saw the Risen Lord but John says that they were happy to see him. Jesus' appearance here shows that he is no longer bound by human limitations.

The mission charge is unique to John "As my Father has sent me even so I send you". In the great prayer (17:18) Jesus had previously said: "As thou didst send me into the world, so I have sent them into the world". In that prayer Christ was primarily referring to the Twelve. Some scholars feel that the mission

charge was specifically for the Twelve even if others were present. Justin thinks that only the apostles were present (Trypho 106). Origen and Cyprian also thought that the commission was for the apostles (Origen, Comm. in John 388, Cyprian de unit 4, Epist LXX 116). The mission charge as well as the authority may be for the community as a new Israel rather than the apostles alone. Jesus derived the authority for his mission from the Father and he is passing a similar authority to the disciples. He had already said: "He who receives anyone whom I send receives me and he who receives me receives him who sent me". (13:20).

After the commission Christ breathed on the disciples and said: "Receive the Holy Spirit". Luke separates the out pouring of the Spirit from the resurrection appearances and made it a separate event at Pentecost. The disciples are not charged to wait at any specific place and for a particular time for the receiving of the Spirit. Of course, what John says here does not rule out the spectacular event of the Day of Pentecost. The verb ἐμφύσω occurs only here in the New Testament. ἐνεφύσησεν is the verb used of God breathing into Adam's nostrils (Gen.

2:7), and of the command to the four winds to breathe upon the slain that they might live (Ezekiel 37:9). Just as Adam became ^a living being through God breathing out, by the same token Christ is now bestowing the gift of the Spirit of life ~~on~~ the disciples.

Bernard has said that John represents the Spirit as given and received on the day of the resurrection. Also this was not a fore-taste of the Spirit at Pentecost but that the action and words of Jesus are a complete fulfilment of the promise of the Paraclete. There is nothing in John to point to another kind of Pentecostal experience.⁶⁸ Jesus breathed on the new Israel as God breathed upon the first man and thus began a new creation. Christ thus becomes the new Adam and head of the new creation. Unlike the first Adam who became a living being, Christ became a life-giving Spirit. He gives life because he has become the author and dispenser of it.

The authority to forgive sin is similar to that of Matt. 16:19, cf. 18:18. But in Matthew the verbs used are δίδωμι and ἀφίημι as against the verbs κρατῆτε and ἀφήτε used by

68. Bernard, Op.cit., p. 677.

John. The binding and loosing of Matthew are Jewish technical terms of imposing or permitting or forbidding an action in accordance with the Torah.⁶⁹ The Greek verbs of Matthew are just the literal rendering of Aramaic. John avoids these technical terms for words which have wide implications; forgiving or remitting and retaining.

The statement does not rule out the fact that only God can forgive sin. This appears to be a description of the repercussions of accepting or rejecting the Gospel message. Those who hear and obey receive forgiveness but those who disobey are left in their sins. Yet, certainly the reference here is to forgiving and withholding of sins. But compared with Matthew 18:18, this authority seems to belong to the Church rather than just an individual. At Corinth, Paul was telling the Church to exercise this power (I Cor. 5; cf. II Cor. 2: 5-11).

F. Thomas' Doubt and Belief 20: 24-29.

Most modern critics agree that the Thomas episode was not the creation of the Fourth Evangelist. All

69. Strack, Billerbeck, Vol. 1, pp. 738-747; Hoskyns, Op.cit., p. 547.

that we know about Thomas in the Synoptics is that he was one of the Twelve but John gave prominence to him. The role of misunderstanding and doubt is always assigned to Peter in the Synoptics but in John, Thomas became a vehicle of misunderstanding and doubt. The name Δίδυμος is the natural rendering of דודים meaning "a twin, double or two-fold". But it is unlikely that the story is told merely to illustrate his name. The Fourth Gospel probably gave rise to the Thomas legend which is prominent with two incidents before. When Thomas heard of Lazarus' death his reaction was: "Let us also go, that we may die with him" (11:16). Also, when Jesus told the disciples that they already knew the way where he was going, Thomas replied: "Lord, we do not know where you are going, how can we know the way?" (14:5). The references show Thomas as a loyal but rather obtuse, and not as a doubtful and hesitating character. Of course, as regards to the resurrection, hesitation and unbelief are the common features of all the Gospels (Mk. 16:14; Matthew 28:17; Lk. 24:11, 25:37, 41). The disciples told Thomas about their experience in the

language of Mary: "We have seen the Lord". But Thomas was not ready to believe until he was certain that the earthly Jesus he knew so intimately was the one that ~~was~~ reanimated. He would not be satisfied with a substitute body which was not that of Jesus that died on the cross. The Risen Jesus must be personally and visibly identical with the Old Jesus. The narrative is probably included for apologetic reasons.

A week after the disciples were staying ~~behind~~ closed doors and the Lord appeared in their midst. Thomas was not rebuked by Jesus and he got what he wanted. Thomas apparently did not accept the invitation to touch the Lord's body; the sight was enough to convince him. For John, the resurrection body was physically real in spite of the fact that it could still pass through closed doors. Jesus told Thomas not to be ἄπιστος but πιστός. This could simply mean do not be an unbeliever but a believer.

Thomas' reaction to this was the great confession of faith: ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου. He broke out into joyful exclamation of recognition and devotion. Some people have claimed that ὁ κύριός μου is a reference to Jesus and that ὁ θεός μου

is a reference to the Father. This claim is very doubtful. According to John, Jesus has always claimed special relationship with the Father. John says that the Word was God (1:1). Jesus was accused of making himself equal with God (5:18, 10:33); he said that before Abraham was, he is 8:58); he that has seen him has seen the Father (12:45, 14:9); and that he and his father are one (17:11). Therefore, ὁ Θεός μου must be a reference to Jesus. Nevertheless, the present form "My Lord and my God" appears to be expressing what later became the Church's statement of faith.⁷⁰

Jesus reply to Thomas could be put this way: "Do you believe because you have seen me without touching me? Blessed are those who have not seen and yet believe". By the time John was writing, the majority of those in the Church were those who were not eye-witnesses of the resurrection event. What Jesus said to Thomas cannot be regarded as an indirect rebuke. Signs are always given to help the weakness of those who may have sincere doubts in their minds and it was

70. W.F. Howard, St. John - Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 8, p. 799.

the resurrection appearances that helped the apostles to over-come their cowardice. The apostles had heard enough teaching from Jesus to make them believe without the post-resurrection Christophanies. Probably there would have been no Christian faith if the Risen Lord had not manifested himself to the apostles after the resurrection. Or even if there was a Christian faith without the resurrection appearances, it would have been a different faith.

It is in consequence of the testimony of those who have seen and believed that those who have not seen can believe. Perhaps the following Rabbinic statement is illustrative of John's idea:

"A proselyte is more precious before God than those crowds who stood in Mount Sinai. If they had not all seen the thunder, and flames, and the lightning and the quaking of the mountain and had not heard the sound of the trumpet, they would not have submitted themselves to the dominion of God. But the proselyte has seen none of these things and yet he comes, and surrenders himself to God and takes upon himself the yoke of his will. Can anyone be more precious than he?"⁷¹

71. Tanhuma, 12 12 6, 32:9, Strack Billerbeck, Vol. 11, p. 586, El. Hoskyns, Op.cit., p. 549, C.K. Barrett, Op.cit., p. 478.

H. John Chapter 21

Opinions are still divided as to the position of John 21 in relation to the rest of the Gospel. For most scholars it is an appendix and perhaps did not come from the author of 1-20. But for some scholars, it comes from John and serves as an epilogue, just as 1: 1-18 serves a prologue to the Gospel. Except for one Syriac MS. all the extant MSS contain John 21. The first argument against its authenticity is that the original Gospel appears to have ended with 20:31. Indeed if there had been no chapter 21, no one would really have suspected that anything was missing from the book.

Also on linguistic and stylistic grounds arguments have been advanced to show that it came from a different hand. The chapter has about twenty-eight words which cannot be found in the rest of the Gospel. They are:

- | | |
|---------------------|----------------|
| (1) ἀγίασμός | (2) ἀλιεύειν |
| (3) ἀρισταῖν | (4) ἀρνίον |
| (5) βόσκειν | (6) ζεβεδαιός |
| (7) ἡ-
ρασκεύειν | (8) γυμνός |
| (9) δίκτουκ | (10) ἐκτείνειν |
| (11) ἐξέταξιεν | (12) ἔπενδύτης |

(13) ἰχθῦς (14) μακρὰν (15) νεώτε-
 -ρος (16) οἰεσθαι (17) πῆχυς (18) ποι-
 -μαίνειν (19) προβάτιον (20) προσφάγιον
 (21) πρῶιά (22) σῦρειν (23) τοῦμακ
 (24) ἀποβαίνειν (25) ἐπιστρέφειν (26) ζων-
 -νύχαι (27) ἰσχύειν and (28) τρίτον .

Bultmann also refers to some words which have peculiar usages in John: the use of ἀδελοί for Christians (verse 23), ἐξέταξεν instead of ἐρωτᾶν (verse 12), ἐπισραφήναι, instead of σπράφηναι (verse 20), ἰσχύειν instead of οὐκασθαι (verse 6). The disciples are also referred to as παῖδιά and the casual ἀπό (verse 6) and partive ἀπό instead of the usual ἐί; also ἐπί and φανερούκ are employed differently here, ἕως (verse 22) is used instead of ἕως οὔτου or ἕως οὔ (13:38). πλέον (verse 15) instead of μάλλον (3:1^a, 12:43); οὐ μακρὰν (verse 8) instead of ἐγγύς and πρῶιά instead of πρῶί⁷² But arguments based on linguistic and stylistic evidence are not

72. R. Bultmann, St. John, pp. 542f., C.K. Barrett, Op.cit., pp. 479f., Bernard, Op.cit., pp. 687f.

always conclusive. New experience, circumstances or influence may greatly affect the language and style of any writer. Some words which are used for net, fishing, beach, dragging, clothes and naked are words naturally confined to fishing and no such incident is recorded in 1-20. Such independent incidents in John 1-20 also have words and expressions which are peculiar to them.

Nevertheless 1-20 and 21 do manifest some similarities.

We have the use of ἀμην ἀμην (verse 18), and also the author's comment in verse 23 which is similar to what is often found in 1-20. There is verbal agreement between verse 19 and 12:23. The use of ἀπὸ in verse 8 corresponds with 11:18; ὁμοίως (verse 13) with 6:11; οὐ (verse 3) though rare in John corresponds with those found in 12:2, and 18:1, and ἤεντο (verse 4, cf. 12:42 and ὡς οὐν (verse 9, cf. 4:40) are purely Johannine. Of course, such similarities could be attributed to a conscious imitation of the characteristics of John, though it is unlikely in this particular case.

The above neither conclusively proves nor disproves the Johannine authorship of 21. Yet 21 appears to be a later addition either by John himself or by one of his disciples. The chapter was probably written to resolve

the question of dominical authority. Marsh says that it was written to clarify the relation between Peter and the beloved disciple after the death of both of them so that none may be elevated above the other.⁷³ The purpose also includes the attempt to correct the rumour that Christ had promised that John would never die until the parousia. The chapter could have been written just before or after his death. It might also be an attempt to correct the impression given by John 20 that all the resurrection appearances took place in Jerusalem. The purpose may as well include ^{the} attempt to explain Peter's restoration by the Lord. We read about his denial and repentance but not about his restoration. In the Synoptics Peter denied the Lord three times and here Jesus asked him three times whether or not he loved him more than the fish. The commission which had already been given to all of them is being given to Peter alone.

We may as well point out that though 20:30 and 31 appear to have been the end of the original Gospel,

73. Marsh, Op.cit., p. 655.

there is no reason why the author could not have added this later. Also, the fact that there is an apparent interpolation from Luke 5:1ff. may not be a sufficient evidence against its Johannine authorship. This case is similar to that of the anointing of Jesus in Luke 7:36-50 and in John 12: 1-8. Moreover, there is no overwhelming reason to show why the person who wrote 1-20 could not have been the author of 21. The extant MSS prove that the Gospel never existed without the last chapter. Some early Church Fathers like Origen and Tertullian quoted from the chapter. Although no dogmatic conclusion can be reached here, 21 appears to have been the handwork of the author of 1-20, probably written soon after the completion of 1-20.

Comparison between 21: 1-13 and Luke 5: 1-11 shows some significant similarities. John fails to give the account of the call of Peter, Andrew, James and John (Mk. 1:16f.; Mtt. 4:18f.; Luke 5:1f.). According to John, Andrew was a disciple of John the Baptist and it was actually John the Baptist that introduced Andrew to Jesus, Andrew in turn introduced Peter to Jesus. In Luke, we are not explicitly told about the call of the other fishermen, but it was only to Peter that Jesus

said, "Do not be afraid; henceforth you will be catching men". But in Matthew and Mark Jesus explicitly called them to follow him. Luke ends his story by saying that the four left all to follow Jesus. In Mark and Matthew Jesus said to Andrew and Peter: "Follow me and I will make you become fishers of men". The statement is perhaps meant for James and John as well. It was only in Luke that Peter's decision to follow Jesus was stimulated by the great catch of fish which Peter apparently attributed to Jesus' supernatural knowledge and power. The few verbal correspondence between John 21 and Luke 5 is insignificant and since the two passages are describing a similar event, a few verbal agreements appear normal.

The two passages manifest a few divergences. In Luke the water was called "lake Gennesaret" but in John it was the sea of Tiberias. In Luke only the names of Peter, James and John are mentioned. Before Jesus met them, they had anchored their boat and were washing their nets. Jesus then asked for permission to use Peter's boat for the purpose of addressing the multitude. It was after this only that Peter pulled out a little from the land. When

Jesus had finished preaching, he told Peter to let down his nets for a catch. But in John it was after the resurrection that Peter decided with six others to go fishing. The names of Thomas and Nathaniel did not appear in Luke. The name Nathaniel did not occur in the Synoptics. As in Luke they toiled all night and caught nothing. Instead of the formal request for the boat that we have in Luke, the question here is: "Children, have you any fish?" When Jesus told them to let down their nets, there was no comment on the order as we have in Luke.

The catch in Luke was a shoal of fish and the net was breaking. They had to call for the help of other fishermen. Two boats were filled with fish and they were sinking. But in John only one boat was involved and the number of the fish caught was 153 and the net was not torn. Only one net was involved in John but in Luke it was nets. In John there was no need to call for outside help because the catch was so small that only Peter hauled the net to the shore. And Peter did this because Jesus had asked for part of the fish for the break fast. In John Jesus was not in the boat with them but on the shore getting the break-fast ready and

when they had anchored their boat Jesus invited them for breakfast. According to Luke, Peter said to Jesus: "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord". But in John Peter was not terrified by Jesus' presence. After the meal, Jesus asked Peter three times whether or not he loved him. Peter's three replies were positive. In reply Jesus gave a three-fold charge to Peter: "Feed my lambs"; "Tend my sheep"; and "Feed my Sheep". Luke did not give any charge, but a promise of what Peter would be doing henceforward. He would be catching men, which is a reference to his future missionary activities. But here John is speaking of pastoral care which is quite different from a missionary charge. John is speaking about tending and feeding both the young and the old who are already in the fold while Luke is concerned with bringing new people in. Finally the material in John is in the context of a post-resurrection appearance.

The above has shown clearly that the similarities are not as great as some scholars would want us to believe. Certainly Luke 5: 1-11 and John 21 must have existed as independent traditions originally. It has been suggested that "Depart from me, for I am a sinful

man, O Lord", would be more appropriate in John 21 because it is natural that Peter would after the resurrection say this to the Lord whom he had denied. While this argument is logical, the statement is not out of place from the context of Luke 5. Peter had listened to Jesus preaching according to Luke and in consequence of the great catch, Peter was aware that Jesus was not an ordinary fellow like himself. All those who were there were astonished as well. Luke did not hide the fact that Peter made the statement under fear. Nevertheless, there might have been a cross-section borrowing as a result of the great catches of fish attached to the two stories where Peter was the central figure.

But if the two traditions are just one tradition, it would then mean that the story was taken directly from Luke and put in a different context in John. Or that this one tradition existed with variations in both Johannine and Lucan schools respectively.

Another problem is the claim that this was the third appearance to his disciples, but this is actually the Fourth one, if the appearance to Mary is included. It is also difficult to understand why the disciples

still could not recognize Jesus after two previous appearances. Or if we take for granted that it was probably still dark then, had Jesus changed so much, that they could no longer even recognize his voice.

In the entire Gospel, John gives us a profound account of the life of Jesus. He made use of rich traditions. Mark takes the story of Jesus back to the Old Testament prophets, Matthew to Abraham, the embodiment of the Jewish nation as a people in covenant relation with God; and Luke to Adam, the first man as well as the son of God by creation. This means that all those who are born of Adam have a share in the merits of what God has done in Jesus Christ. Of course, John takes the story of Jesus to the beginning, prior to the creation and the creative action of God through Jesus Christ. In Jesus all the Old Testament feasts and rituals found their perfection While Mark closes with a note of awesomeness and fear by those who first hear that the Crucified One was alive once again, Matthew with a world-wide mission charge, and Luke with a mission charge and final blessing; John closes with an account of the Risen Lord who still met

with the disciples at their resumption of life in the secular world. He charged them to continue with the universal mission and that this would involve the glory of martyrdom for some of them. The cross is no more a sign of shame and defeat but a manifestation of the glory and victory of God. This chapter is indeed more than an appendix. It is an epilogue or the crown of the Gospel. In the closing verses, he underlines the selective nature of his Gospel. He was concerned with such materials that would show the reality of the Living Eternal Word of God, who was made flesh. He came to tabernacle among us; he was glorified in his death and became victorious in his resurrection. He is the Light of Life, the eternal Light radiating the lives of all those who put their trust in him.

V. THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS

(a) The Gospel of the Hebrews:

According to this Gospel, when the Lord rose from the dead, he gave the linen cloth to the servant of the priest. He then went to James who had been fasting and promised not to eat until the Lord had risen from the dead. In James' house the table was set and he

broke the bread in the way characteristic of him. Jesus then gave the bread to James the just saying: "My brother eat thy bread, for the Son of Man is risen from among them that sleep".⁷⁴ This story probably explains the tradition in I Cor. 15:7. There is no reference to any special appearance to James in any of the canonical Gospels. It is very interesting that death is compared to sleep here. This is echoing both the Jewish apocalyptic and Pauline conceptions. Jesus also appeared to his enemies.

(b) The Gospel of Peter:

Like Matthew, the Gospel says that the Jews requested for soldiers to guard the tomb. They were afraid of the repercussion if Jesus' disciples should steal his body and thereafter claimed that he was risen from the dead. The tomb was covered with a great stone and sealed with seven seals. But during the early hours of the resurrection morning, there was a loud voice from heaven. The heavens were opened and two men descend from heaven. Unlike the Matthean account the stone rolled itself away. The young men entered the tomb. The soldiers on the guard woke the sleeping soldiers and the centurion to see what was

74. E. Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha Vol. I, (ed.) by W. Schneemelcher, English translation by R.M. Wilson, (Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1963), p. 165.; R.H. Fuller, Op.cit., p. 189

happening. Soon afterwards, three men came out of the tomb. The heads of the two men reached the heavens and that of Jesus reaching beyond the heavens. The voice from the heavens cried: "Hast thou preached to them that sleep?" (cf. 1 Peter 3: 18-20, 4:6).

It was the watchmen themselves that reported the incident to Pilate. It was also the Jewish leaders who pleaded with Pilate to command the centurion not to reveal what had happened to anybody. It is also reported here that Mary Magdalene came to the tomb early on Easter morning with a group of women because she could not perform what women normally perform at the burial of their beloved ones; not because of the Sabbath on Friday night, but for the fear of the Jews. The Gospel also reports that a great crowd had come on Sunday morning from Jerusalem and all the country around to see the tomb. As in Mark the women talked of rolling away the heavy stone. They did not show any previous knowledge of the tomb being sealed. They could not weep at the crucifixion scene for the fear of the Jews. Their visit to the tomb was still secret and their decision was if they could not open the tomb they would place what they have brought for a memorial

near it. They would also wait until they returned home. When they came they found the tomb empty and a young man told them that if it was for Jesus that they were seeking, he had risen and gone to where he was sent. If they doubted his claim they could come and see the empty tomb. Here Jesus went to where he was sent and not where he had told the disciples as in the Synoptics.

It is not clear whether the last day of the unleavened bread is referring to the crucifixion or to the resurrection day. It is strange that it was on the last day that the people were purifying their homes. This ought to have been done about eight days earlier. Twelve disciples were also said to be mourning instead of eleven. Here it was Peter, Andrew and Levi that went to the sea to fish. The list of a similar incident in John does not include Andrew and Levi and in John seven disciples were involved and not three. The Gospel of Peter teaches actual resurrection and not just an empty tomb.

(c) Epistula Apostolorum:

There are two versions of this document; namely: the Ethiopic and Coptic versions. The two versions

manifest significant variants. The Ethiopic refers to the One who was crucified between two thieves in the days of Pontius Pilate and of Prince Achelaus. But the Coptic speaks of those who were witnesses to the fact that the One who was crucified by Pilate and Achelaus between two thieves was Lord. According to the Ethiopic, when he was taken down from the Cross, he was buried in the place called Qarānejo (ΚΡΑΝΙΟΥ). But the Coptic says that he was buried in a place called Skull. The two versions say that three women went to the tomb with ointment, but the lists are different. Ethiopic gives the names as Sarah, Martha and Mary Magdalene, while the Coptic list reads Martha, an unnamed woman who belongs to Martha and Mary Magdalene.

According to the Ethiopic as they approached the tomb they discovered that the stone had been rolled away and they opened the door but did not find the body. The Coptic did not talk about the rolling away of the stone, but simply said that they came to look at the tomb and did not find the body. Both versions agree that when the women were mourning Jesus appeared to them and told them that he was the One for whom they were seeking. Jesus sent one of them to go

and call their brothers and inform them that the Master is risen from the dead. The Ethiopic says that it was Mary that went while the Coptic says that it was Martha. The two documents agree that the disciples did not believe the story. The woman came back to report the disciples unbelief to Jesus but Jesus sent another woman back with the same message. The Ethiopic says that it was Sarah who went this time while the Coptic says that it was Mary. Jesus finally went with the women to the Apostles who did not recognize Jesus but took him for a ghost. He told them not to be afraid and that he was their teacher (Coptic - Master) whom Peter denied three times (Ethiopic - before the cock crowed), and that would Peter still do the same thing? When they were following him, some of them were still doubting and Jesus still had to tell them that he was the one who had told them previously about his flesh, death and resurrection. He invited Peter to touch the nail-print on his hands and Thomas to touch the wounded side and see the foot-prints.⁷⁵ After they had touched him they asked Jesus to pardon their unbelief.

The first problem raised by this book is that Pilate and Archelaus are not contemporaries. Archelaus reigned

75. It was believed in those days that it was impossible to see the foot-prints and shadow of ghosts. The Yoruba share the same belief concerning ghosts and the dead.

without the title king but as the Ethinarch between 4 B.C. and 6 A.D. In consequence of the protest by both the Jewish and Samaritan leaders Archelaus was deposed by Rome in A.D. 6.⁷⁶ Also in the Synoptics, skull was the place of crucifixion and not of the burial. The passages indirectly teach actual bodily resurrection. Many of the features have no parallel in the four Gospels.

(d) The Acts of Pilate:

The description of the role of Joseph of Arimathea is almost a verbatim quotation from Luke 25: 50-53. When the Jews heard that Joseph had asked for the body, they were seeking after him. The Twelve who said that Jesus was not born of fornication and some others had to go into hiding. But Nicodemus who was a leader challenged the leaders' action. Joseph also came out of hiding to tell ^{the} Jews that they had no right to be angry with him. He told them that he had placed Jesus in his tomb and rolled a stone to seal the cave. He urged them to acknowledge their mistake in crucifying a righteous man. The Jews then arrested and detained Joseph in a windowless house until the first day of the week when he was to be executed and his flesh given

76. F.F. Bruce, "Herod", The New Bible Dictionary, (ed.) J.D. Douglas, (Intersivity Press, London, 1962), p. 522.

to the birds of the heaven. But to Joseph the Jewish threat was only an empty boast. The door of the detention was securely locked and Pilate kept the key. But on Sunday morning Joseph was not found in the room which was still securely locked. When the Jewish leaders were wondering about Joseph, some guards came to report the resurrection in the language of Matthew 28: 2-7.

The Jews asked for the identity of the women to whom Jesus spoke after the resurrection and why the guards failed to arrest them. They asked for the time the event took place but they did not believe the guards. But the soldiers replied that they were not surprised by the Jews' unbelief since they had refused to believe many signs they saw in Jesus previously. When the soldiers said that they would produce Jesus if the Jews could produce Joseph, the Jews replied that Joseph had gone to his home town. The soldiers replied that Jesus had also risen and gone to his home in Galilee. As we have in Matthew 28: 12-14, the Jewish leaders then bribed the soldiers.

Later on, Phinees a priest, Adas a teacher and Angaeus a Levite came from Galilee to Jerusalem to inform

the rulers that they saw Jesus sitting on Mount Mamilch with his disciples. They also reported the commission which Jesus gave his disciples in the language of Mark 16: 15-18. They also witnessed the ascension of Jesus. But the leaders fed them. They sent them back to Galilee. But when the Jews were wondering why God had allowed this to happen in Israel, Annas and Caiphas came up with an answer that it was the disciples that gave much money to the soldiers and took away the body. The soldiers therefore lied that an angel descended from heaven to roll away the stone. Yet they realized that the made up story could not solve the riddle of Jesus presence in Jerusalem. When the Jews still rejected the ascension story. Nicodemus reminded them of Elijah's translation and challenged the rulers to send people to every mountain in Israel to see whether Jesus' spirit had been cast on one of them. After a long search they did not find him but found Joseph in Arimathea (11: 3-15: 1).

Undoubtedly, the author is familiar with the Synoptic Gospels because he quotes them with minute

alterations. He gives us various myths about Joseph's miraculous disappearance from a sealed room. The Jews would not have left the body of a fellow Jew to rot away on a tree, not to talk of the time when the Sabbath was approaching. The myth is ignorant of the general Jewish practice of that day. Here we have ^{two} versions of the bribe story. Of course, the accusation of the bribe by the disciples and the counter accusation of the same thing by the Jews must be genuine. The mountain where Jesus met his disciples is named. We are not told whether the three men who came from Galilee were disciples or not. The story of ^{the} search for Jesus is myth that arose out of reminiscence of the story of Elijah.

V/ Conclusions:

So far we have seen that the resurrection is not within the field of human vision. No body knows what actually took place on the Easter morning and neither is the resurrection described. Most of what we have are stories of encounters with Jesus after the resurrection. But there is no doubt that something strange took place in the early hours of the Easter morning. Nevertheless whatever took place remained shrouded in

mystery since the event is never described or related except in the Gospel of Peter. It is this undeciphered mystery that we now call the resurrection of Jesus. To find out what actually happened one must start from the post-resurrection encounters tracing it back to what must have actually happened before these encounters could be possible. But in the light of the variant accounts in the Gospels this might not be an easy task. But since Jesus could be seen, touched and in fact ate with or in front of his disciples as if he had returned to the old life, it can be called nothing else but resurrection from the grave. Yet this impression is contradicted by other features. Although Jesus had an identity, it was one that was not easily recognizable to the disciples. On every occasion of the appearance either their eyes had to be opened or Jesus had to demonstrate to them in various ways that it was he himself. Why does the identity have to be so expressly demonstrated if the Risen Jesus was exactly identical with the crucified one?

The body of Jesus is conceived in different terms at different appearances. On the one hand it has material features, on the other hand it passed

through closed doors. Mark and Matthew did not tell us what became of the body of Jesus. Only Luke spoke of the ascension. It is simply difficult to harmonize these traditions, but it is not helplessly impossible.

Deeper than differences in geographical locations are those theological interpretations of the relation between physical and non-physical and between resurrection and exaltation. One impression is that of a figure who has been resuscitated to a fully physical, visible and tangible state. Another impression is one who is not immediately recognizable as what he had been, except through specific words and acts. The manner of the Risen One's coming and going; his being absent and his being present are described in different ways without explanations. While the Risen Christ of Luke moves towards ascension, that of Matthew stays with them until the end of the age, but not bodily as the Risen One. The early history of the Church in Judea makes it difficult to believe that the Apostles were aware of the explicit command to evangelize the world. Nevertheless the Easter event must have been responsible for the production of these traditions.

Both the events of the empty tomb and the resurrection appearances lie *deeply concealed within* traditions. To say that the resurrection was merely the resuscitation of the earthly Jesus or that the traditions have nothing to do with the rising of a dead body from the tomb would be too dogmatic. Nevertheless, the resurrection miracle was a reality. This is the beginning of a new beginning.

UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN LIBRARY

CHAPTER III

THE RESURRECTION IN PAULINE KERYGMAI. The Apostolic Kerygma:

According to Ladd, the Kerygma consisted primarily of heralding of certain recent events.¹ In the ancient world the herald was a figure of considerable importance. He was a man of integrity and character, employed by the king or state to make all public proclamations. "To preach" is strictly not an adequate rendering of κήρυξεν in the New Testament. Preaching is proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation. But κήρυξεν is not the delivery of a learned or edifying speech in well-chosen words and ^a pleasant voice. It is a declaration of an event or the proclamation of an accomplished fact.² κήρυγμα refers to the activity of the ancient herald, that is either to the act of proclamation or the contents of the proclamation. It is synonymous with εὐαγγέλιον, just as the verb εὐαγγελίζομαι is essentially the same as

1. G.E. Ladd, "Revelation and Tradition in Paul," in Apostolic History and the Gospel (Paternoster Press, 1970), p. 223.

2. R.H. Mounce, The New Bible Dictionary (London 1962), p. 1023.

κηρύσσω.

Except for Revelation, κήρυσσειν does not appear in Johannine writings probably due to his eschatological point of view. He prefers to use

μαρτυρεῖν rather than the dramatic outburst represented by κήρυσσειν.³ "John" in his

μαρτυρία says: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and touched with our hands, concerning the word of life, the life was made manifest and we saw it, and testify to it and proclaim to you the eternal life..." (I John 1: 3, 13):

The word rendered "proclaimed" here is ἔπαυσε λέγειν.

κήρυσσειν is also not used in Hebrews. The word is employed nine times each by both Matthew and Luke, fourteen times in Mark, eight times in Acts (with another four in D at Acts 1:2, 16:14, 17:15, 19:14), seventeen in Paul, two in Pastorals and one each in Peter and Revelation. If we exclude the four

3. It is uncertain that John the Apostle was the author of Revelation.

in D the verb occurs sixty-one times in the New Testament.⁴

The early κῆρυγμα is not a new idea or doctrine of God; it is neither that Christianity contains something decisively new. The decisive thing is the action of God in the event of Jesus or the proclamation itself. The decisive thing is the action of God which accomplishes what God had predicted through the Old Testament prophets. Nevertheless, through the proclamation God is doing a new thing and in that sense the proclamation is a new thing. This proclamation is not just a historical instruction regarding the words and action of Jesus. These are only meaningful in the light of the faith in the Risen Lord Jesus. The reality of the resurrection of Jesus constitutes the fullness of the κῆρυγμα. Therefore, it is ^{not} only a proclamation of salvation history but of the Risen Lord himself. The goal of the proclamation in the hearers is faith and therefore it demands faith.

4. Friedrich κηρύσσω, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. III, (ed.) G. Kittell (Eerdmans, Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1964-68), pp. 703-716.

This proclamation satisfies neither the Greek urge for knowledge nor the Jewish demand for religious proofs. But the believer accepts it because what is proclaimed means every thing to him. In spite of the foolishness of the proclamation, faith accepts what is preached. To such people the proclamation is the power of God for the salvation of all who believe.

E. Dinkler in presenting Bultmann's view says that the object of faith is the Christian Kerygma and nothing else. Also that the Kerygma in the New Testament contains the calling and challenging Word of God occurring in the redemptive act of Christ, the Word of God spoken in the man Jesus of Nazareth once and for all (Ἐφάπαξ). But he concludes that the kerygma as the proclamation of God as acting in the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ for us is part of the paradoxical event and cannot be objectified.⁵ According to Bultmann himself, the kerygma is not an enlightening nor merely historical account which like a reporter's story, reminds the public of important but by-gone facts.

5. Dinkler, "Existentialist Interpretation of the New Testament, The Journal of Religion, Vol. 32, (1952), p. 93; W. Baird, "What is the Kerygma: A Study of I Cor. 15: 3-8 and Gal. 1: 11-17" Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 76, (1957), pp. 181-191; A.M. Hunter, The Message of the New Testament (Philadelphia, 1954), p. 26.

It is by nature a personal address which accosts each individual, rendering his self-understanding problematic and demanding a decision.⁶ Bultmann has raised many valid points. But the kerygma cannot be separated from the historical facts that brought it into being. The apostolic tradition is the basis of Christian kerygma.

The first proclamation of the good news after the death of Jesus was based on the fact that he has risen from the dead. It was because Peter and the other disciples believed this that they began to proclaim Jesus as Lord and Messiah. Right from the onset the resurrection of Jesus was the core of the Apostolic preaching. In spite of the differences that crept up in the early Church, the fact of the resurrection was something upon which they all remained united. Recounting the basic facts of his gospel message - the death, burial, resurrection and appearances of Jesus to various people, Paul says: "Whether then it be I or they, so we preach and so you believed". Furthermore he says that if the resurrection claim is not true, then

6. R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, S.C.M. Press (1970), p. 307.

there can be no Christian Gospel, no message of salvation; our faith and proclamation are the sheerest vanity; the Christian Apostles are vicious liars, by claiming that God did what he had not done. Furthermore, forgiveness is impossible; believers who die in hope are hopeless and above all, those who still live and believe are the most pitiable of all men - (I Cor. 15:11, 14, 15, 17, 19). The truth of Christianity cannot be separated from the truth of the Apostolic proclamation that the crucified Jesus rose again from the dead.⁷

Paul apparently equates the Gospel and the Kerygma with the revelation of the mystery of God kept in secret for all ages but now made known to all nations. The mystery is the power of God unto salvation (Rom. 16: 25-26; Eph. 6:19). The Gospel is divine in origin and it is a divine activity performed for the benefit of men. The Gospel does not simply bear witness to salvation. It is itself a salvation history. Also the Kerygma is not just the activity of preaching but the message itself, the content of preaching. The foolishness of the

7. F.F. Bruce, The Spreading Flame, Vol. I (The Paternoster Church History, Vol. I, (Paternoster Press, 1970), p. 60.

Gospel through which God now saves men refers to the content of the message, which is "Christ crucified". This is a historical fact which is foolishness and offensive to all but believers. Therefore, the Gospel is the proclamation of the death of Christ, his resurrection and his appearances to his disciples. The Kerygma also include the interpretation of those events in history: "Christ died for our sins". It is the proclamation of the redemptive action of God. Through the proclamation the events which belong to the past history are now made present.⁸

The Pauline account of the resurrection is the oldest of all the extant records (I Cor. 15: 1-8). Paul usually refers to his preaching and teaching in the same terms as the Jewish traditions. Jesus contrasted the Jewish tradition with the word of God and warned his disciples not to imitate the Rabbis (Mt. 15:6, 23: 8-a0). But Paul praised the Corinthians for maintaining the traditions which he had delivered to them (I Cor. 11:2). He also encouraged the Thessalonians to maintain the traditions which he had taught

8. "The Gospel" by O. Piper in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. II, p. 414; C.H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development (London, 1937), p. 3; G.E. Ladd, Op.cit. p. 224.

them. They should also reject the traditions which they had not received from him (I Thesis. 2:15, 3:6).

The Corinthians and the Galatians received (ΠΑΡΕ-
ΛΑΒΕΤΕ) the Gospel which Paul preached (I Cor. 15:1; Gal. 1:9). This Gospel is changeless and so there

can be no other Gospel. The Thessalonians received ΠΑΡΑΛΑΒΟΝΤΕΣ as the word of God, the message they heard from Paul. They recognized in Paul's words something more than human traditions (I Thess. 2:13). The idiom reflects the handing on and receiving of an oral tradition with a fixed content.

Paul opens his kerygmatic passage, (I Cor. 15: 1-8) with the statement: ΠΑΡΕΔΩΚΑ ΓΑΡ
ΥΜΙΝ ΕΝ ΠΡΩΤΟΙΣ Ο ΚΑΙ
ΠΑΡΕΛΑΒΟΝ. He makes it clear that he is here citing tradition. The verbs ΠΑΡΕΛΑΒΟΝ (I received) and ΠΑΡΕΔΩΚΑ (I delivered)

are equivalents of the technical rabbinic terms

קָבַל and נָתַן. W. D. Davies speaking of the two verbs employed by Paul in relation

to the Lord's Supper says that they refer to the traditions which Paul had received from the Church

after his conversion.⁹ The following is an example of such rabbinic usage: "Moses received the Torah from Sinai, and he delivered it to Joshua; and Joshua (delivered it) to the Prophets; and the Prophets (delivered it) to the men of the Great Synagogue". Undoubtedly, Paul is speaking in a similar version here. By the above statement we also gain an insight into the nature of the early Apostolic tradition. Paul did not originate the tradition he delivered to the Corinthians. It is what he had himself received (~~Παρέλαβον~~) that he delivered (~~Παρέδωκα~~).¹⁰ In I Cor. 11:23, Paul categorically states that he received the tradition concerning the Eucharist from the Lord. But Otto thinks that this cannot refer to a direct revelation by vision from Jesus since Jesus could not have referred to himself in such a way as: "The Lord Jesus in the same night in which he was betrayed".¹¹ Also

-
9. W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (S.P.C.K., London, 1965), pp. 248-9.
10. P. Aboth I¹, R.H. Fuller, Op.cit., p. 10.; L. Morris, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (Tyndale Press, London, 1960), p. 205.
11. R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man (Lutherworth Press, 1943), p. 276.

Codex D. reads παρὰ while Codex G. reads ἀπὸ θεοῦ and W.D. Davies is of the view that παρὰ should be rejected in favour of ἀπὸ.¹² But some scholars take the expression "from the Lord" to mean that he received his knowledge of the Lord's Supper by direct illumination from the Risen Lord, exactly as he received the knowledge that Jesus was the Messiah on the way to Damascus.¹³ P.W. Marsh thinks, that this is not a reference to a direct revelation, but a transmission in chains from one to another. There was no need for a supernatural communication. The facts were readily available to Paul. Also Paul had already delivered this communication to the Corinthians.¹⁴ Craig is of the opinion that Paul is apparently referring to his interpretation of the Lord's Supper as what he received from the Lord.¹⁵

12. W.D. Davies, Op.cit., p. 248.

13. F. Godet, First Corinthians, Vol. II (Edinburgh, 1890), p. 149.

14. P.W. Marsh, "The First Letter to the Corinthians" in A New Testament Commentary, (ed.), G.C.D. Howley (London, 1969), p. 408, cf. Robertson and Plummer, p. 333.

15. C.T. Craig, I Corinthians - Interpreters' Bible, Vol. X, p. 136.

Most scholars feel that Paul is asserting that the traditions which he received from other Apostles had their historical origin in Jesus. Paul most probably used ἀπὸ and not παρὰ. The latter suggests direct reception from the Lord, whereas the former indicates ultimate source or that the historical tradition which Paul delivered goes back unperverted to the actual words of Jesus.¹⁶ Paul as a Christian teacher was handing on a set of established truth to the circle of his converts. Here Paul appeals to human testimonies prior to his experience. Deluz is of the view that 'tradition' is given as the basis of all Christian teaching. Paul does not give his own ideas, he teaches what he had received.¹⁷

Although Jewish traditions and Christian traditions are similar, the Christian tradition is distinct in that to receive tradition does not simply mean to accept the truthfulness of the historical facts or to receive instruction or intellectual knowledge. To receive the Christian tradition is to receive Jesus Christ as the Lord. God speaks to us through tradition

16. J. Hering, First Corinthians (London, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962), pp. 144f.

17. G. Deluz, A Companion to I Corinthians (London, Epworth Press 1963), p. 223.

and by the words of tradition God is actively present in the Church (Col. 2:6; I Thess. 1:13). This tradition is handed on in form of preaching (εὐηγγελισμός κηρυγμῶν) and the reception of the message involves a response of faith. Thus the resurrection tradition must be believed in the heart and confessed with the mouth (I Cor. 15:1; Rom. 10:8, 9). This confession, which issues in salvation, is made possible through the help of the Holy Spirit. (I Cor. 12:3). The event of the resurrection is prior to its proclamation. Yet it is only as witness is bore to it that the reality takes shape and root in human hearts and experience. The Christian tradition has its origin with Jesus himself. It is the historical Jesus that is now the exalted Lord Jesus Christ. Christ as the exalted risen Lord now stands behind tradition and speaks to the Church through it. Therefore the tradition that Paul received from the men who were in the faith before him came from Jesus and is also the word of the exalted Lord to Paul. This tradition is also the Gospel, the Kerygma and the mystery which is proclaimed by the Church (I Thess. 1:8, 2:8; II Thess. 3:1; Col. 1:25; I Cor. 1:18, 21; II Cor. 5:19; Gal. 6:6; Phil. 1:14;

I Tim. 2:6). But how can we reconcile the above stand with Paul's emphatic declaration elsewhere that the Gospel came to him as a direct revelation, through no human intermediatry? "For I did not receive ~~(ἵνα κεν)~~
~~ἀπαβέβη~~) it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came through a revelation of Jesus Christ." If we take this literally we may as well argue that when in I Cor. 15:3 Paul says: "I delivered to you ... what I also received" he means what he received through a revelation of Jesus Christ. The argument cannot hold because all that Paul knew about the death, resurrection and appearances to various people could not have come by revelation. According to Bruce the Gospel that Paul received without mediation on the Damascus road consisted in the revelation, not of a fact, but of the person, of the risen Lord. He closely associated his conversion with his call to the Gentile Apostolate. Paul did not come to know Jesus through the testimony of those who were in the faith before him. But certainly the historical events of the Holy Week and Easter and appearances were communicated to him by those who had experienced them first-hand. In this sense he received

the Gospel from others.¹⁸

II. The Pauline Kerygma (I Cor. 15: 1-8).

(A) Sources:

In the opening paragraph of I Cor. 15 Paul reminds the Corinthians of the content of the Gospel message that he preached when he first came to their city. It was this Gospel which they received, in which they stand and by which they are saved. Their faith will be nothing but sheer vanity if they do not hold fast the Gospel message. This message is "that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures and that he appeared ...". This was the common ground to Paul, James and the Twelve. Paul says: "Whether then it was I or they, so we preach and so you believed." But where and when did Paul received his tradition? Does the passage entirely belong to the traditional formula and if not how much had Paul subsequently added? Or is the passage a combination of various traditions

18. F.F. Bruce, Tradition, Old and New, (The Paternoster Press 1970), p. 31.

compiled or edited by Paul? How can we reconcile the Pauline account with the later Gospel traditions? Does the phrase καὶ ὡφθῆ in respect of every appearance fall into the same pattern? Certainly the appearance to Paul cannot belong to the traditional formula which he received.

According to Bode, by the implication of Paul's introduction and some non-Pauline terminology in the doctrine, the teaching is not Pauline in origin but something which he received and passed on.¹⁹ J. Jeremias expresses the opinion that the original language of this formula was Aramaic, which means that it stems from the earliest Palestinian stratum of Christianity.²⁰ But Conzelmann rejects Jeremias hypothesis and argues for a non-Pauline Greek origin. Therefore the formula originated after Christianity had spread to Greek-speaking communities. He holds that since the tradition is bound to Peter, the Twelve and Jerusalem, it was not drafted in Jerusalem.²¹ Wilckens

19. E.L. Bode, Op.cit., p. 91.

20. J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (Blackwell, Oxford, 1955), pp. 101-103.

21. H. Conzelmann, "The Analysis of the Confessional Formula in I Cor. 15: 3-5", Interpretation, Vol. 20, (1966), pp. 15-25.

suggests that most probably the formula was in use in *Damascus* and Antioch before 50 A.D. , and that the Semitic language does not necessarily make it Jerusalem ~~its~~ origin.²² Pannenberg also feels that the formation of this tradition was very close to the events themselves and that the tradition was possibly formed before Paul visited Jerusalem to confer with Peter and James.²³ Hooke speculates that the tradition represents that of Damascus about ten years after the resurrection and that it possibly expands the information of Peter and James prior to the crystallization of synoptic tradition.²⁴ Certainly Paul had some idea regarding the crucifixion and resurrection before his conversion. But obviously he regarded such teachings as false before the Damascus road experience. He must have learned more about these truths when he stayed with

-
22. U. Wilckens, "The Tradition—History of the Resurrection of Jesus, The Significance of the Message of the resurrection, For Faith in Jesus Christ," (ed.) C.F.D. Moule, (S.C.M., London, 1968), p. 57.
23. W. Pannenberg, Jesus - God and Man, Translated by L. Wilkins and D. Priebe, (S.C.M., London, 1968), p. 90.
24. S. Hooke, The Resurrection of Christ as History and Experience (Darton, Longman and Todd, Londone, 1967), pp. 36-37.

Peter and James the Lord's brother. If the passage had been in existence in writing before Paul made use of it, its origin can only be Palestine or Antioch. Nevertheless, Jerusalem seems to be the most probable place because of the Rabbinic method of exposition adopted in the passage. But there is no reason why the passage could not have come from Paul originally. Whatever might have been its source, the passage is true to the Apostolic tradition and expressing the established truth in all Churches. The attempts which try to ascribe one section of the passage to a Hellenistic source and the other to a Palestinian source, have only helped to complicate the question of origin. But if we claim Apostolic authority for Paul's kerygma, how do we account for the major differences between Paul and the Gospels which also claim in one form or the other some Apostolic authority? Of course such major differences exist *between* the Gospels themselves. But it is generally accepted that I Cor. 15: 1-8 is the oldest of all extant traditions and perhaps more reliable than the others.

The first Kerygmatic statement is: "that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures,

that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures".²⁵ According to Paul Christ's death and resurrection were in accordance with the Scriptures. The resurrection of Jesus was the newest thing in history; nevertheless, the first believers regarded it as a major event which had been foretold centuries ago in the Old Testament Scriptures. The resurrection is therefore, a fulfilment of the Jewish ancient Scriptures. In Fuller's opinion the statement proves that what Paul received was originally from Palestine, although it has passed through a Hellenistic Jewish milieu before Paul received it. It was in that milieu that the title ~~XPIOTOS~~ was first associated with the passion; there the atoning interpretation of Christ's death first developed (Mark 10:45, 14:24); there the statement about Christ's burial most likely originated; there the death and resurrection of Christ were first proclaimed as a fulfilment of the Scriptures. Though the formula was received from the Hellenistic community at Damascus, the substance still goes back to the

25. The statement "Christ died for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures" will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Aramaic speaking Church.²⁶ But while the final formula as a kerygmatic statement could have originated outside Palestine there is no idea in it that is foreign to the Palestinian Church. The reference to Jesus as ΚΥΡΙΟΣ may not entirely be due to Hellenistic influence. Also in the light of the Old Testament rituals and sacrifices, the atoning interpretation of Christ death may not be out of place in Aramaic Churches.

(b) ΚΑΤΑ ΤΑΣ ΥΡΑΦΑΣ raises many perplexing problems because it is not easy to find precise texts in the Old Testament proclaiming the atoning death and the resurrection of the Saviour. Although we can cite Isaiah 53, certainly Jewish antiquity never attribute the passage to the Messiah. Of course, according to Peter, the ignominious death of Jesus of Nazareth had been fore-ordained by God, though he never made any reference to any Old Testament Scriptures. Peter's reference to Jesus as ΠΑΤΕΡ ΘΕΟΥ (עֲבֵרָהּ בְּתוֹכָם) is in connection with the resurrection and exaltation rather than atonement. But he refers to the predictions of his passion

26. R.H. Fuller, Op.cit., pp. 10-14.

by the prophets. He refers to Christ as the stone rejected by the builders and made an allusion to the Old Testament by referring to the crucifixion as hanging on a tree. Philip interpreted Isaiah 53 as a prediction of the Lord's death, but surprisingly the phrase "because of the sins of my people" was omitted (Acts 2: 14-36, 3:13, 18, 4:11, 5:30, 8: 32-33, 10:40 cf. Ps. 16: 8-11, 117:22, 118:22, 132:11, 110:1).

The attempts to find scriptural proofs for the death and resurrection of the Messiah by the Apostolic preachers is one of the strongest evidence in favour of the historicity of the passion and resurrection of Jesus which are the basis of the Christian faith. The Church needs to prove that Christ's death was in accordance with God's plan in order to correct the scandalous presentation of the matter by the Jews. They similarly made use of the Old Testament and the apocryphal literature to corroborate their interpretations of the events of Christ. On this Barrett correctly remarks that Christ's death "was not fortuitous but, willed and determined by God... It formed part of the winding up of his eternal purpose...

It was one of those eschatological events that stand on the frontier between the present age and the age to come, in which the divine purpose reaches its completion." He is also of the opinion that ΚΑΤΑ ΤΑ ΣΥΦΡΟΝΙΑ calls for general interpretation in Old Testament categories of sacrifice, of punishment and of the remnant, and of the sufferings endured by the people of God on their way into the good time to come.²⁷

Speaking on the same issue Deluz says that the statement underlines the objectivity of the Apostolic tradition, that it was not simply asserted by the Apostles but that it was foretold by the prophets. Also that the Apostolic traditions can neither be a substitute for the Scriptures nor add something essential to it, else the tradition would become suspect. Tradition only proclaims the fulfilment of God's purpose as proclaimed in the Bible and that is why tradition and Christian doctrine must be measured against it.²⁸ Deluz is not entirely right here because indeed the Christian tradition adds new dimensions to the understanding and interpretation of

27. C.K. Barrett, The First Epistle to the Corinthians (A. & C. Black, London, Second Edition, 1971), pp. 338-339.

28. G. Deluz, Op.cit., p. 222.

the Old Testament Scriptures. Christian tradition as well does not confine itself to proclaiming the fulfilment of the Old Testament Scriptures alone but it also proclaims new truths about the purpose of God. Moreover it is doubtful whether we can measure all traditions and Christian doctrine against the Old Testament Scriptures, because sometimes the ancient Scriptures are measured against all Christian tradition and doctrine.

"According to the Scriptures" may also be a reference to the actual words of Jesus. According to the Gospels, Jesus quite often foretold his death and resurrection (Mk. 8:31, 9:31, 10:34, Mt. 16:21, 17:23, 20:19; Lk. 9:22, 11:29. In 10:11, 15, 17 and 18). In the early Church the actual words of Jesus had the strength of Scriptures and it is not out of place if Paul regards such prophecies as Scriptures like the Old Testament. The death and resurrection in that sense would be in fulfilment of Scriptures.

(c) Burial:

"Also that he was buried". This statement is of great importance in the light of the situation to which

Paul was addressing himself. Burial is the seal of death and by this Paul wanted to establish the fact that Jesus actually died. It was evidently to combat the gnostic and docetic ideas which contested the reality of Jesus death.²⁹ The burial was probably included in the early kerygma, not because it fulfilled the Scriptures but because it is the necessary stage between death and resurrection and confirms the reality of both. If Jesus was buried he must have been really dead and the resurrection is then a possibility. The burial is carefully recorded by all the Gospels. This is very important to all the evangelists since burial is an evidence of bodily resurrection and the empty tomb. According to the Gospels, the tomb where Jesus was laid was found empty on the third day. The burial is therefore a necessary prelude to the resurrection.

Everywhere in the New Testament there is insistence on the death and burial of Jesus. According to the Gnostics, God is pure spirit and cannot have any contact with matter. There can be nothing like an incarnation

29. J. Hering, The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (Epworth Press, London 1962), p. 160.

and the very thought of God becoming man is ruled out. God cannot suffer and if Christ is in any sense divine, he cannot suffer. Jesus was truly born of Joseph and Mary and later became more righteous and wiser than all other men. After the baptism, the power of the Christ came upon him in form of a dove. He then preached the unknown Father and worked miracles. But at the end of Jesus' ministry the Christ departed from him and it was Jesus who suffered and was raised, but that Christ remained incapable of suffering because he was entirely a spiritual being. The eternal came into **Jesus** at baptism, only to leave him to agony and the pain of the cross, the pain of death and burial. According to the Gnostic Gospel of Peter the cry of Jesus on the cross was: "My Power, my Power, **you** have you forsaken me". It is a cry of dereliction by the man Jesus forsaken by the divine Christ. Also in the apocryphal Acts of John, Jesus was holding conversation with John on the Mount of Olives at the time of the crucifixion. He told John that wrongly they thought that he Jesus was being crucified, but in reality he was not suffering at all. Cerinthus said that it was Simon the Cyrene who died on the cross and

not Jesus at all.³⁰

Deluz quoting F. Godet says:

"If we ask why the burial of Christ is numbered among the essential facts, the answer is that it continually reminds us of the empty tomb on which the faith is founded and which cannot be explained by those who deny the resurrection of the body of Jesus. It puts out of court the suggestion that the Apostles suffered hallucinations or that the appearances of Jesus after his death were purely spiritual".³¹

(d) "He was Raised on the Third Day":

By the use of ~~ΕΥΗΓΕΡΤΑΙ~~ Paul changes from the aorist to the perfect to signify the continued life after the resurrection. The passive is also used to stress the fact proclaimed generally in the New Testament that the resurrection of Jesus was in consequence of the activity of the Father (cf. Rom. 6:4, 8:11). ~~ΕΥΗΓΕΡΤΑΙ~~ is found used in this sense seven times in this chapter (I Cor¹⁵_λ 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20) and twice only in other New Testament books. After the resurrection Christ remains in the character of the Risen Ever-living Lord. "Christ died

30. W. Barclay, "The Plain Man Looks at the Apostles' Creed" (Collins 1971), pp. 115-117.

31. G. Deluz, Op.cit., p. 222.

but he is not dead, he was buried but he is not in the grave; he was raised and he is alive now".³² The resurrection of Jesus was an Act of God which happened once and for all. By his death and burial Jesus came down to our level and by his resurrection he raised us to his own level. In other words Christ became what we are in order that we may become what he is.

The act of raising the dead by God belongs to the Jewish apocalyptic idea which can be traced to some Old Testament passages: "Thy dead shall live, their bodies shall rise. O dwellers in the dust awake" (Is. 26:19). "And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake (Dan. 12:2). "The righteous will arise from sleep" (En. 92:3). In the above passages there is no major difference between the intransitive "will rise" and the passive "will be raised". In Isaiah they occur as synonyms. Here the resurrection is also thought of as a resurrection from the grave or from "the dust of the earth". This is made more explicit by John when he reported Jesus as saying: "All who are in the tombs will hear his voice

32. C.K. Barrett, Op.cit., p. 340; L. Morris, I Corinthians (Tyndale 1960), pp. 205 & 206, Robertson and Plummer, Op.cit. p. 334.

and come forth". In the apocalyptic usage, resurrection sometimes refers to the transition from one mode of existence in this aeon to a new one in the next aeon.

According to Acts many proof-texts appear in the preaching of the Apostles in order to validate the death and resurrection of Jesus. On the day of Pentecost Peter quoted Ps. 16:21 and the same passage was quoted by Paul at Antioch in Pisidia concerning the resurrection: "I beheld the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved; Therefore my heart was glad, my tongue rejoiced: Moreover my flesh also shall dwell in hope; Because thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt thou give thy Holy One to see corruption: Thou madest known unto me the ways of life; Thou shalt make me full of gladness with thy countenance" (Acts 2: 25-28, cf 13:35). The New Testament does not have any actual citations of proof-texts on the occurrence of the resurrection on the third day. The possible references like Johah 1:17; II Kings 20:5; and Hos. 6: 1-2 are very vague. But Matthew records the saying of Jesus thus: "As Johah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale so shall the son of man be three days

and three nights in the heart of the earth" (12:40). John quoted him as saying: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it" (2:19). Mark also reports Jesus' accusers as saying: "We heard him say, 'I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with hands'" (14:58). But we know for certain that Jesus spent only two nights and one full day in the grave. Of course, according to the Jewish counting the period between Friday and Sunday morning will still be three days. Jonah's deliverance from the belly of the fish is comparable to the raising of Christ from the dead. Therefore, Jonah's illustration is not out of place. According to ^{J.A.T.}Robinson it is what happened on the "third day" and the eschatological significance attached to it, that alone could make us think of applying τὸ τρίτον ἡμέραν to a point within history. The Gospels were a post resurrection records of the Apostolic Church. They were not written as documents to put on record how Jesus himself saw the event before hand. But it is an integral part of the Gospel records that Jesus

spoke unwaveringly of the coming vindication of his person by God in terms of resurrection out of death (Mk. 8:31, 9:31, 10: 33-34). ^{Robinson} points out further that the growing tendency now among scholars is to regard the predictions as coming from Jesus himself.

But he asserts

also that it is not impossible that Jesus saw his own vindication as the Son of Man in terms of Hos. 6:2 and in terms of resurrection in a pattern for the restoration of Israel long made classic by Ezekiel 37.³²

"Raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures" formed part of the earliest Church Creed.

τῆ ἡμέρᾳ τῆ τρίτῃ is of antiquity and firmly rooted in the tradition of the Church like the resurrection event itself. The ^{idea} is not only stated in the speech attributed to Peter (Acts 10:40) and the testimony of Paul but it is found in the oldest form of the Apostles Creed. If the statement is of no historical value, it could not have gained such an important place in the standard of the Church's faith.

According to Barclay, the significance of Jesus'

32. J.A.T. Robinson, "Resurrection in the New Testament" in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. ... pp. 43-53.

three days in the tomb is that the period in the Jews' eyes proved that Jesus had really and truly experienced death. The Jews believed that the spirit of the departed hovered around the body for three days and during that time might come back, but after that time it permanently departed. Therefore the Jews visited the grave daily for three days to see if the spirit had returned. The fact then that Jesus' body was in the grave for three days proves that he really did pass through the experience of death.³³

On this point Fuller suggests various possibilities: It refers to something historical, but since the resurrection itself is not historical in the sense of an observable event the phrase "the third day" cannot date the actual resurrection itself chronologically. No observer was present at the grave to pinpoint the moment when "he is not here" became true. Consequently the phrase is normally tied to either the discovery of the empty tomb or the first appearance to Peter (Mk. 16: 1ff.; Lk. 24:34). Also a strong point against a historical interpretation is that it occurs in the

33. W. Barclay, *Op.cit.*, (144; M. Ramsay, The Resurrection of Christ (London, 1956), pp. 19-28.

third (ΕΥΗΓΕΡΤΑΙ) and not in the fourth (ΨΑΦΘΗ) formula. It was tied to the meta-historical event "he was raised", and neither to the discovery of the empty tomb nor the first appearance since the resurrection is an inference from either the discovery of the empty tomb or the first appearance; the chronology is similarly an inference. Furthermore, there is no concrete proof that the early Church used Hosea 6:2 to prove the resurrection on the third day. The Old Testament texts which refer to the resurrection make no allusion to the third day. Jonah's episode was not used as a proof text or type of the resurrection prior to the comparatively late Synoptic tradition. Mtt. 12:40 probably originated from the evangelist himself.³⁴

H. Gunkel proposed its derivation from the history of religions. He refers to the wide-spread myth of a belief in the three days triumph of evil and the dubious evidence of the myths of the dying and rising gods. The appropriate source for New Testament concepts in the history of religions

34. R.H. Fuller, Op.cit., pp. 23-27.

is Judaism. Here the popular idea is that the soul leaves the body on the third day and this is the point at which decomposition sets in. In several Talmudic texts, the resurrection is to occur three days after the end of the world. The morning of the third day is seen as a critical moment. From this Gunkel concludes that "on the third day" as a chronological datum is untenable, but adequate assertion that Christ's resurrection marked the dawn of the end-time, the beginning of the eschatological process of resurrection.³⁵

Fuller's argument is very logical but not conclusive. The removal of the third day from actual history does not entirely solve the problem. It is true that no human eye witnessed the actual resurrection and that the event could have taken place any time between Friday and Sunday morning; not necessarily on Sunday morning itself. Nevertheless, there is strong evidence that the events which led to the empty tomb and the resurrection appearances did not occur until

35. B. Landers, New Testament Apologetic (London, S.C.M., 1961) pp. 60-61; H. Grass-Ostergeschehen und Osterberichte (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1926), pp. 136-138; G. Kittel, "Die Auferstehung Jesu" Dusche Theologie 4 (1937), p. 160, Str-Bill, I, p. 747.

Sunday morning. According to Matthew the earthquake and the descent of the angels that heralded the resurrection to the watchmen did not occur until the morning after the Sabbath. Also the vision of the angels and the first appearance did not occur until the early hours of that morning. Although the Gospel tradition came much later than the Pauline account, it is evident that the "third day" tradition existed side by side with the earliest resurrection tradition and was not a later addition.

Aristides (C. 150) says in his Apology: "He was pierced by the Jews and he died and was buried; and they say that after three days he rose and ascended to heaven" (XV 2). Part of the baptismal interrogation in Rome by C. 200 says:

"Dost thou believe in Christ Jesus the Son of God who was born by Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary and was crucified under Pontius Pilate and was dead and buried and rose again on the third day and alive from the dead and ascended into heaven and sat at the right hand of the Father..." (Hypolytus, Apostolic Tradition 21).

In his Rule of Faith, Tertullian says "... was crucified and rose on the third day" (Tertullian De Praescriptione

Haereticorum 13). The letter of Eusebius of Caesarea to his church on the Creed of Nicaea says:

"We believe ... in One Lord Jesus Christ... Who for our salvation was incarnate, and lived among men and suffered and rose again on the third day and ascended to the Father ..."³⁶

From the above it is clear that the 'third day' is unequivocally ~~an~~ essential part of the early resurrection tradition. The story of the resurrection of Jesus is unique and could not have been influenced by the myths of those days. While we do not know all that took place between Friday evening and Sunday morning, the signs that revealed that a new thing had occurred did not take place until Sunday morning. Therefore, it is still safe to say that the resurrection took place on the third day. But according to later tradition, between Friday and Sunday morning Jesus went into Hades. Athanasius' Creed says of Jesus: "Who suffered for our salvation; descended into hell, rose again on the third day from the dead." The statement appeared officially in A.D. 570 in the Apostles Creed. The word "hell"

36. A New Eusebius, Op.cit., 301:3; Socrates, H.E. 1:8; Theodoret H.E., 1:12; Opitz, Urkund 2:2, pp. 42ff.

here is misleading. The A.V. similarly rendered the Hebrew word שְׁאוֹל and the Greek word Ἅδης, both of which refer to the abode of the dead, as hell (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27; Num. 16:33; Gen. 37:35). The proper rendering ought to be: "He descended into Hades". The Greek idea of Hades is similar to that of the Hebrews. Hades was apparently a person rather than a place originally. In Revelation Hades is a person: "And I saw, and behold a pale horse, and its rider's name was Death and Hades followed him" (6:8). "And the sea gave up the dead in them, death and Hades gave up the dead in them" (20:13). "Then Death and Hades were thrown into the lake of fire" (20:14). Hades was the king of the dead and it was to his shadowy ^{existence} that all men went.

The New Testament uses γέεννα or γέεννα for hell, the place of punishment. γέεννα is derived through the Aramaic גְּיֵנוֹן from the Hebrew גְּיֵנוֹן (Neh. 11:30); גְּיֵנוֹן (Job 18:15); גְּיֵנוֹן (II Kings 23:10); the valley of (the son, sons) lamentation. Gehenna or the valley of Hinnom outside Jerusalem, was the place where those who worshipped Molech, the fire divinity

used to burn their children in fire as offerings to him. Josiah stopped this practice and desecrated the place by making it the official rubbish dump (II Kings 23:10). By the time of Jesus it was the public incinerator of Jerusalem. There the fire burned continuously and different types of worms bred and multiplied. The terrible valley was a symbol of destruction and later it stood for the popular idea of hell or a place of future punishment.

"He descended into hell" (Hades) means that he went to the place of the dead or probably that he was truly dead. Peter was quoted as saying: "For thou wilt not abandon my soul to Hades (A.V. = hell) nor let thy Holy One see corruption" (Acts 2:27). Paul in several places speaks indirectly of Christ's descent into Hades: "Do not say in your heart", "Who will ascend into heaven?" (that is to bring Christ down) or "Who will descend into the abyss?" (that is to bring Christ up from the dead) (Rom. 10: 6-7). "When he has ascended on high he led a host of captives and gave gifts to men. (In saying, "He ascended" what does it mean but that he had also descended into the lower parts of the earth? He who descended is he who also ascended far above all

heavens, that he might fill all things)" (Eph. 4: 8-10).

In Rev. 5:13 Christ's victory extends to under the earth: "And I heard every creature in heaven and on earth and under the earth and in the sea ^{and} all therein saying: "To him who sits upon the throne and to the lamb be blessing and glory and honour and might for ever and ever".

In the Romans passage Paul is saying that there is no longer any need to hasten the coming of the Messiah to participate in the incarnation since he had already appeared. The advent of Christ was already a past event. It is therefore meaningless to talk of hastening the incarnation through perfect obedience to the law and penitence for its transgression. Christ had already been raised from the dead, it was therefore out of place to talk about bringing him up from the abode of the dead. αβυσσος refers to both the sea and Hades (Cf. Ps. 107:26).³⁷ No doubt Christ's descent in the Ephesian passage refers to the reality of the

37. L.C. Allen, The Letter to the Romans, in A New Testament Commentary (ed.) G.C.D. Howley (Pickering and Inglis Ltd., London, 1969), 361. C.K. Barrett, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (A. & C. Black, London 1967), p. 199; F.F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Romans (Tyndale Press, London, 1963), pp. 202-205.

incarnation, but it must mean more than this. His descent into Hades is the real parallel to his being lifted up far above the heavens. Traditionally this is taken to be a reference to Christ's descent into the lowest parts of the earth and to the deliverance from there ^{of} those who had believed in the previous ages. The captives may also include spiritual powers and the redeemed (Col. 2:15; Cf. II Cor. 2:14f; I Pet. 3:22). In Foulkes' opinion, the deepest depths of the earth may refer simply to this earth, so low in comparison to the heavenly home or it may refer to the fact that he suffered great humiliation when he endured death itself and thus descended into what the Scripture sometimes calls the depths of the earth.³⁸ One of the early Gnostic hymns says:

"And to lead captive a good captivity
for freedom I was strengthened and made
mighty and took the world captive ...
and the Gentiles were gathered together
who had been scattered abroad" (Odes of
Solomon 10: 3-6).

The most problematic passages in this connection are: I Pet. 3: 18-20 and 4:6: "Christ also died for

38. F. Foulkes Ephesians, (Tyndale Press, London, 1968), pp. 115-117; J.L. Houlden, Paul's Letters from Prison, (Penguin Books), 1970, pp. 309-311, The Letter to the Ephesians, by G.E. Harpur; Howley, Op.cit., p. 465

our sins ... being put to death in the flesh but made alive in the Spirit; in which he went and preached to the spirits in prison who formerly did not obey when God's patience waited in the days of Noah, during the building of the ark". "For this is why the Gospel was preached, even to the dead, that though judged in the flesh like men, they might live in the spirit like God." It has been suggested that the passages are referring to the Spirit of Christ that was speaking in Noah just as he spoke in the prophets (I Pet. 1: 10-12; II Pet. 2:5). On the basis of II Pet. 2:5, it has been suggested that the spirits in prison are not men at all but the wicked and rebellious fallen angels.

Moffatt adds another dimension to the problem by translating I Pet. 3: 18-20 thus: "Christ himself died for our sins ... in the flesh he was put to death, but he came to life in the spirit. It was in the spirit that Enoch also went and preached to the imprisoned spirits who had disobeyed at the time when God's patience held out during the construction of the ark in the days of Noah". According to Moffatt ^{EV W} of EVW verse 19 was a corruption of the name EVW. The

early copyists were prone to mistakes and since there was hardly ~~no~~ space left between the words; words which looked alike or sounded the same were often left out. Therefore because ΕΥ Ω ΚΑΙ sounded like ΕΥΩΧ ΚΑΙ, consequently the word ΕΥΩΧ was missed out in the course of copying. But Moffat's thesis is nothing but a good guess. He has not told us why there are no manuscripts today which have such 'correct' original version. While it is true that the New Testament ~~does~~ manifest textual differences largely due to the fault of copyists, there is no evidence to prove that this is true of this passage.

Parker also took the word hell literally when he said:

"What then? Christ in his own person, according to his humanity, suffered the penalty of hell which we should have suffered".

Thinking on a similar line, Calvin says:

"If Christ is said to have descended to the dead, it is nothing to be surprised at, since he bore the death which was inflicted by God on sinners".³⁹

But Dake in his Bible, thinks that by the Holy Spirit's

39. Barclay, Op.cit., p. 127.

anointing Christ preached to the angels in Tartarus while his body was in the grave. They were the angels who sinned in Noah's day; the author would have been specific if they were human souls. The Gospel can never be preached to any particular generation after death, else God would be a respecter of persons. He made no announcement to human souls in hell but liberated the righteous souls, taking them to heaven with him when he ascended on high. He left angels in hell until the judgment. It was Christ himself who went to preach to them in hell.

Parker, Calvin and probably Dake following after the A.V.'s error, thought that Christ went to hell, a place of punishment as part of his suffering for sin. There is nothing in the passages to suggest that it was Christ's Spirit preaching in Noah or Enoch. Dake's suggestion that they were the angels who sinned in the days of Noah is only a good guess. Certainly it was believed in the early Church that Christ went to preach to the dead in Hades. This idea appears to be implicit in Matt. 27: 51-53 cf. Rev. 6: 9-11. There is an allusion to this in the teaching of Jesus in Luke 4: 18-19: "The Spirit of

the Lord is upon me because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and the recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord". John also records: "Truly, truly I say to you, 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". "... for the hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice and come forth, those who have done good to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil to the resurrection of judgment" (5: 25, 28, 29).

In Jewish belief, death does not write 'finis' to man's life. He continues in a shadowy existence after death. Questions must have arisen in the early Church as to what Christ was doing between Friday and Sunday morning in the grave. The probable explanation was that he went to preach to the Old Testament people or at least to announce to the saints that the redemption in the hope of which they lived and died in faith had been accomplished, and also gave the disobedient ones the second chance of amending their ways and believing the good news. This belief must have existed early enough

so as to have implicit expression in Paul and explicit expression in Peter.

The following statements from some of the Church Fathers further confirm this belief in the early Church: Irenaeus says:

"It was for this reason that the Lord descended into the regions beneath the earth, preaching his advent there also, and declaring the remission of sins which is received by those who believed in him, who had hoped towards him, that is those who proclaimed his advent and submitted to his dispensations, the righteous man, the prophets and the patriarchs, to them he remitted sins in the same way as he did to us. The death of the Lord became the means of healing and remission to them".

Tertullian also says:

"Jesus was crucified under Pontius Pilate and departed in peace in order to preach to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and all the saints, concerning the end of the world and the resurrection of the dead".

Both Irenaeus and Justin Martyr also made use of the following which was attributed to either Isaiah or Jeremiah:

"The Lord God remembered his dead people Israel, who lay in the graves and he descended to preach to them his own salvation."

The Jewish apocalypticists made explicit statements on the resurrection in an attempt to solve the question of the fate of the dead righteous in the new age. Probably the doctrine of Christ's descent into Hades arose in an attempt to solve the question of the salvation of the Saints and perhaps the wicked who lived before the advent of Christ.

(e) The Empty Tomb:

The question of the empty tomb has been intentionally delayed until now. This is because we want to examine the Gospels and Paul together on this problem. The question of the empty tomb directly affects the nature of the resurrection and indirectly the reality of it. Opinions are still widely divided on whether or not Paul actually believed in the empty tomb and preached about it. Apart from Matthew's record which is confirmed by Justin Martyr (Dialogues 108), there were those who in Tertullian's days, claimed that the body was stolen by the gardener lest his lettuce should come to harm (De Spectaculis 30). Also J. Klausner quoting from the Tol' doth Yeshu says that the body was removed by the gardener and cast into a canal where the waters flow over it.⁴¹ Holtzmann is

41. J. Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth (A. & C. Black, London, 1923), pp. 48ff.

also of the opinion that the body was removed from its resting place and buried somewhere else by the distinguished councillor who was unwilling that a man who died on the cross should lie in his family tomb.⁴²

J.S. Kennard Jr. says that the empty tomb is not necessarily a later fiction. It may derive from memories that in Paul's day, the use of the empty tomb as an evidence of the resurrection was precluded. Also when stripped of its supernaturalism the empty tomb may point rather to a removal of the body from the place where the women had seen it laid and its burial elsewhere. He refers to the contradiction between Luke and Mark as to when Jesus was buried. This he thinks possibly furnishes a clue to what really happened. According to Luke the women stood a distance off to watch where the body was laid (23:49). During the burial rites they still had to go home to prepare ointment and spices before the Sabbath. If the home was Bethany, the disposal of the body could not be later than about 4 p.m. In Mark 15:46 and Luke 23:53 Joseph of Arimathea took

42. O. Holtzmann, The Life of Jesus (1904), pp. 493ff.

the body. In Acts 13:29 Jesus' enemies took the body and laid him in a tomb. In John Joseph took the body away (ἤρξα) but in Mark he took the body down (ΚΑΤΕΘΑΚΕ) John 19:38).⁴³

But any attempt to explain away the empty tomb or strip it of all supernaturalism would be against the entire spirit of the New Testament. It may also not be true that the prevailing circumstances in Paul's day prevented his use of the empty tomb as a proof of the resurrection. There appears to be no contradiction between Luke and Mark. While Mark says that the evening had come, Luke says that the Sabbath was beginning; both of which means that it was getting nearer to 6 p.m. after which they could no longer engage in the burial rites.⁴⁴ "The women stood at a distance and saw these things" is an apparent reference to all the scenes at the crucifixion rather than the burial. Lk. 23:55 speaking about the burial says: "The women ... saw the tomb and how his body was laid".

43. J.S. Kennard, Jr., "The Burial of Jesus", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 74, (1955), pp. 227-230.

44. Of course, Jewish tradition affirms that the Sabbath law allowed those who died on the Sabbath day to be buried on that day.

They certainly drew nearer to watch the burial rites. Also Luke does not mention the place to which they returned to prepare the spices and ointment. Could they not have returned to the house of Mary, John, Mark's mother to get these things ready for immediate use? Even if the preparation was in Bethany the statement does not imply that they returned to Jerusalem that day to complete the burial rites. The statement that followed "They returned and prepared spices and ointments" was "On the Sabbath they rested according to the commandment". In the light of Lk. 24:1, it is apparent that they were not intending to return with the spices and ointments until after the Sabbath.

Concerning Acts 13:29, Paul is only giving the summary of what happened by the use of the indefinite pronoun "they" for those who took part in the arrest, trial, crucifixion and burial. This cannot therefore be said to contradict the Gospel. Moreover, the ἵππευ of John 19:38 is referring to the request to take away the body of Jesus by Joseph and the κατέθηκεν of Mark 15:46 is referring to the action of Joseph after Pilate had granted his request. Therefore, there is no contradiction here either.

Celsus compares the Christian story of the resurrection ~~with~~ various resurrection myths of different nations thus: The tragedy of the cross cannot be regarded as noble; neither can the story of earthquake and darkness be convincing. While he was alive he did not help himself, but after death he rose again and showed the marks of his punishment. But who saw this? A hysterical female and perhaps some others^S deluded by sorcery who either dreamt in a certain state of mind and through wishful thinking had a hallucination due to some mistaken notion or wanted to impress the others by telling fantastic tales; and so by this cock-and-bull story to provide a chance for other beggars. To him Christianity is only for the ignorant, the stupid, any-one uneducated, anyone who is a child, the foolish, the dishonourable, the slaves and the women.⁴⁵

Some modern critics take a position similar to that of Celsus. They regard the entire story of the Gospels, including the resurrection as a development

45. "Celsus, On the Resurrection" - Origen against Celsus, II 55; "Celsus: Christianity is for Fools Only" - Origen Against Celsus III, 44, A New Eusebius (ed.), J. Stevenson, 117 and 121, pp. 139 and 142.

of a system of theology which was anthropomorphised in the ^{of the Apostles} minds in response to very definite needs.

Such a development was modelled on the pattern of myths of other similar religions already existing in the ancient world.⁴⁶ Baldensperger says that it was in order to meet the Jewish polemics that the Christians recalled the old tradition which states that when the women came to embalm Jesus' body they found the tomb empty, and the brave act of Joseph who removed the body. The two traditions soon fused in the minds of the faithful. Thus was formed the legend recorded in the Gospels according to which the women and Joseph acted in common accord, whereas in reality they acted separately and without the other party knowing the intention of the other. He cited the Nazareth Inscription to back his argument:

"Ordinance of Caesar. It is my pleasure that graves and tombs remain undisturbed in perpetuity for those who have made them for the cult of their ancestors or children or members of their house. If, however, any man lay information that another has either demolished them or has in any other way extracted the buried, or has maliciously

46. S.V. McCasland, "The Basis of the Resurrection Faith", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 50 (1931), pp. 211-226.

transferred them to other places in order to wrong them or has displaced the sealing or other stones, against such a one I order that trial be instituted".⁴⁷

By the style of the apology we can date it between 50 B.C. and A.D. 50. If Caesar refers to Augustus, the inscription must have been derived from somewhere in Samaria and Decapolis ^{since} Galilee was under the rule of a client prince until the reign of Claudius. Because of the mention of Nazareth many scholars see a connection between the inscription and the removal of Jesus' body. But the connection between this inscription and the empty tomb is very remote. The Gospels reported that the resurrection took place in Jerusalem and not in Nazareth. The inscription only gives support to local customs as codified by Rabbis. The legislation purposely seems to be against those who disturb tombs in order to disrupt religious practices mainly connected with ancestral worship and the story of the empty tomb has no connection with this. Also the story of Joseph's role and the empty tomb are two distinct traditions in the Gospels. There is no

47. *Le Tombeau Vide; la legende et L'histoire* by Guillaume Baldensperger, (Paris: F. Alcan 1953). J. Kennard Jr. *J.B.L.* Vol. 74:4, pp. 231-232; Monugliano *Claudius* (trans. 1930), pp. 35ff.; ~~Comment~~, "Unrescrit, imperial sur la violation de sepulture" in *Rev. Hist.*; CLXIII (1930); pp. 241 ff.; F.E. Brow: *A.J. Ph.* LII, (1931), pp. 1 ff.

evidence of the two traditions fusing into one in the Gospels.

According to Buchler, the Fourth Gospel lends support to the idea of a two fold burial by implying that Joseph's sepulchre was not the one visited by the women. The place of Jesus burial was chosen because it was close to Calvary and because it was the Jewish day of preparation (19:42), Joseph's own tomb must have been somewhere else. No Jew of Joseph's distinction would have chosen a location near the Roman place of execution for his family tomb. His piety would be inclined to locate his tomb on the slopes of the Kedron valley.⁴⁸

Kennard also thinks that the Fourth evangelist must have thought that Joseph was planning to remove the body after the Sabbath. The removal of the body by Joseph therefore explains the empty tomb. But the fact that John gave additional reasons for burying Jesus in a nearby tomb and the fact that he fails to mention that it was Joseph's tomb are not sufficient proofs to lend support to a two-fold burial or that the tomb

48. A. Buchler, 'L' Enterrement des Criminels ... Rév. Ét. Juives XLVI, (1930) 87 cf. 74-88; J.B.L. 74, Vol. 4, p. 233.

was not Joseph's. A man of liberal mind like Joseph, who could choose to differ from other Jewish leaders, would probably not mind to have his tomb in any location outside Jerusalem. Moreover there is no strong evidence to support the idea that Calvary was the normal place of all Roman executions. Also Mary Magdalene was at the tomb when it was still dark on Sunday morning. It is very unlikely that Joseph would remove the body under the cover of darkness on Saturday night. Kennard affirms the historicity of the attempt by the women to embalm the body of Jesus after the Sabbath and Joseph risking his life to appeal to Pilate to obtain the custody of the body. Also from the Roman side, Matthew is correct when he talks about the sealing and guarding of the tomb. But Joseph paid the bribe to Pilate. Thus when the Jews spread abroad that the disciples had 'stolen' the body they spoke the truth.⁴⁹

It is true that in the East the practice of refusing burial to criminals was common. For example, Tobit risked his life in burying the Jews who were

49. J.S. Kennard Jr., Op.cit., pp. 234-238.

killed by king Sennacherib. He stole their bodies for a secret burial. When the king heard of his action, he sent men to put him to death but he escaped and the king confiscated his property (Tob. I: 18-22). But under the Roman rule the situation was different.

According to the Sentences of Paulus the law stipulates:

"The bodies of persons who have been punished should be given to whosoever requests them for the purpose of burial". (Digest 48:24, 3:34).

Also Ulpicin in the 9th Chapter of his Duties of the Proconsul says:

"The bodies of those who are condemned to death should not be refused their relatives and the divine Augustus, in the Tenth Book of his Life, said that this rule had been observed. At present the bodies of the punished ones are only buried when this has been requested and permission granted, especially where persons have been convicted of high treason". (Digest 48:24).

Also if anyone has been deported to an island, his punishment continues to exist even after his death, for it is not permitted for him to be taken elsewhere and buried without the consent of the emperor. Therefore, from Pilate's side Joseph's life was not in danger and it is difficult to understand why he should bribe Pilate if he ever did so. What Matthew says still appears to be the most reasonable thing.

Furthermore, Barclay is of the view that in spite of the discrepancies in the Gospels, the empty tomb remains constant and unvarying^{Factor}. Surely, there is no difficulty in holding that an event of such supreme wonder as the resurrection would tend to acquire still more wonder in its accompanying detail. In Matthew no one denied that the tomb was empty. It was only the explanations on how the tomb became empty that were different on the part of the Jews and the disciples respectively. If it is true that the disciples stole the body of Jesus and concealed and disposed of it and then claimed that he had risen from the dead, it would mean that the whole Christian faith is founded on a deliberate lie. But within forty years of the cross, the majority of the apostles had died as martyrs. While men might possibly die for a delusion, they cannot die for what they know to be a deliberate lie. Also hallucinations on individual basis could be possible but not on a large scale.⁵⁰ Lake also expresses the view that the disciples after the crucifixion went to Galilee where they had an experience

50. W. Barclay, *Op.cit.*, pp. 140-149.

which made them to believe that Jesus was still alive. On their return to Jerusalem they found the women telling the story of the empty tomb. The women's story strengthened the belief of the disciples that what they had seen was Jesus in his resurrection body. The disciples' story also strengthens the belief of the women that the tomb was actually empty. But Lake contended that they possibly went to the wrong tomb and a young man directed them to the right one saying: "He is not here, behold the place where they laid him". Codex Bezae has it thus: "Behold there his place" (ἸΔΕΤΕ ἘΚΕΙ ΤΟΤΟΥ Αὐτοῦ). This terrifying experience and misunderstanding form the basis of the Marcan story. On why no pre-Gospel records cited the empty tomb, Lake says that Paul was not trying to convince the Corinthians that the Lord was risen, but that he had already convinced them. He concludes that the story of the empty tomb must be fought on doctrinal basis rather than historical or critical grounds.⁵¹

Streeter in his volume entitled Foundations says

51. K. Lake, The Historical Evidence of the Resurrection of Jesus^s Christ (Putnam, New York, 1907), pp. 253ff.

that the resurrection of Jesus from the tomb involves intolerable difficulties concerning the nature of ^{the} future life. It was only the spirit of Jesus that survived and which was able to convey to the disciples the certainty of his presence with them, possibly showing himself to them in some sort of supernatural body or ~~some~~ some psychological experience similar to that of the mysterious means of communications between persons known as telepathy, or possibly in some way no longer perceptible. The resurrection interpreted in this way is unique and miraculous and implies an intervention of God altogether beyond experience. This interpretation is nearer to our experience and more credible than the traditional belief that the body was raised and glorified. Nevertheless, he holds that the evidence of the empty tomb is historically convincing. The tomb was found empty not because the body had been raised but because it had been mysteriously removed by human hands. Similarly, Luce thinks that the modern mind cannot accept the idea of bodily resurrection for humanity. The future life is viewed as spiritual and not physical existence, in which personality and not physical

organisms survive . Therefore, apart from the question of the miraculous, the story of the empty tomb seems unnecessary, inconsequent, even crude; it is an improper inference from the fact of the resurrection.⁵²

Reimarus is of the opinion that the whole affair was the clever intention of the disciples after the death of Jesus in order that they might continue the easy life which they lived while with Jesus.⁵³ Another argument is that Jesus did not really die on the Cross. According to John 19: 33-34 when the soldiers came to kill the crucified victims in order to remove them from the crosses before the Sabbath, they found that he was dead already. Secondly one of the soldiers then pierced Jesus and there came out water and blood from his side. But the physical fact is that with death all bleedings stop at once. For this reason some hold the view that Jesus did not actually rise from the dead, but was miraculously kept alive by the power of God in a series of mental and physical experiences which

52. H.K. Luce, St. Luke, (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges) 3rd edition, p. 366.

53. A Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus (Translated by W. Montgomery, (New York, 1962), pp. 20ff.

would certainly have normally and universally produced death. Others feel that Jesus only lost consciousness in a swoon and that when he was laid in the cool of the tomb he revived and somehow made his escape, and that from this the whole resurrection story developed. Likewise Strauss refers to the founder of Christianity as "a being who had been stolen half-dead from the sepulchre, who had crept about weak and ill, wanting medical treatment, who required bandaging, strengthening and indulgence and who still at last yielded to his sufferings."⁵⁴

None of the above theses can serve as an adequate explanation in place of what the Scriptures declare and what the Church believes about the resurrection. Most of them started their investigations from the stand point of presuppositions rather than with a spirit of detached impartial investigation. A sincere honest historian or a student of a faith must not start with presuppositions if he is seeking for the truth and nothing but the truth. It is true that

54. S.V. McCasland, Op.cit., pp., 24ff.; M. Ramsay, The Resurrection of Jesus Christ (Collins, London, 1961), 45-57, Schweitzer, Op.cit., pp. 46, 53, 62; Barclay, Op.cit., pp. 146, and 155.

history without interpretation is meaningless, but there would be little to interpret if the basis of the historical facts are destroyed just because they do not agree with our own reasoning. It is wrong to determine the reality of an event by what happens to mankind in general. What happens to mankind in general cannot always be used to determine the credibility of God's once and for all unique act in Jesus Christ in consequence of which death was conquered on our behalf. Many modern biblical scholars think that whatever is contrary to either the ancient Greek or modern philosophical thoughts cannot be true, since they have the notion that the body has no place in the future life, therefore, the resurrection of Jesus is interpreted with this preconceived idea. Also because the human race is destined for a spiritual immortality, through the survival of the soul after death, ^{they suppose that} Christ's survival of death as a member of the human race cannot be different. By this the resurrection of Jesus loses its uniqueness and merely becomes an exemplary edifying symbol of our own survival after death.

Certainly we cannot ignore the difficulties created by the narratives and neither can we discard presuppositions altogether; but we cannot use presuppositions as historical conclusions. Ramsay correctly remarks:

"If the evidence is pointing us towards a resurrection of an utterly unique sort we will not be incredulous, for Christ himself is a unique and transcendent fact in history. If the evidence is pointing us towards a miracle we will not be troubled, for a miracle will mean not only a breach of laws that have been perceived in this world but of a manifestation of the purpose of the Creator of a new world and the redeemer of our own. And if the evidence is pointing us towards an act wherein spirit and body are strangely blended and exalted our minds will have no terrors: for the message of the New Testament is pervaded through and through by the belief that the spiritual and the material are interwoven in the purpose of the Word-made-flesh. Why is it judged incredible with you, if God should raise the dead."55

It is true that the earliest records do not speak specifically of the empty tomb, but these records and the Gospels speak of a full tomb. The burial was specifically mentioned in the Pauline primitive summary (I Cor. 15:4; Rom. 6:4; Acts 13:29). The empty

55. A.M. Ramsay, Op.cit., pp. 56-57.

tomb, though not specifically mentioned in the earliest records, is implicit in Pauline letters. It is inconceivable for an orthodox Jew to think of a bodiless resurrection. The problem as stated in I Cor. 15:35 is "How are the dead raised?" It is not whether it will be bodiless or not, but with what kind of body they will be raised. In whatever manner the resurrection was proclaimed by the Apostles, it must have included the empty tomb. Regarding the silence of Paul, Kee and Young warn that it is precarious to conclude that Paul knew nothing about the tradition because of his silence on the matter. This is because I Cor. 15 is designed to prove bodily resurrection. What is placed in the grave is raised although in a transformed condition (15:43 and 44). There is no suggestion that Paul believed that only the spirit is raised* Paul's insistence on the identity of what is buried with what is raised suggests that he would have expected the tomb of Jesus to be empty after the resurrection. Perhaps in Paul's day there was no need to appeal to the empty tomb in order to prove the resurrection.⁵⁶

56. H.C. Kee & F.W. Young, The Living World of the New Testament (Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1973), p. 199.

If the body of Jesus is still lying in the grave then the appearances of the risen Jesus would be sheer hallucinations. The women who first saw the empty tomb simply thought that Jesus' body had been removed elsewhere. The early Christians did not just believe in the resurrection because they found the tomb empty but because they encountered the Risen Lord. The emphasis in the early preaching was not ^{on} the fact that they found the empty tomb but that they saw Jesus alive. Peter in his message on the Day of Pentecost said David the Patriarch "both died and was buried and his tomb is with us until this day", meaning that David's bones still ~~laid~~ within the grave. But no relic of Jesus remained in his tomb. Thus by including the burial in the early proclamation, the Apostles implied continuity between the body that was buried and the body that was raised, even though it was buried a natural body and raised a spiritual body. Bruce rightly points out thus:

"It is morally and psychologically incredible that such men as the Apostles and their associates could be deliberate deceivers. Men and women who are prepared to die for what they affirm are usually sincere in affirming it, even if they are sincerely mistaken ... But what gave rise to the "resurrection faith"

if it was not the "resurrection fact"?⁵⁷

In spite of the differences in details, the Gospels are unanimous in their witness to the empty tomb. These differences do not impugn the authority of this particular fact. Such differences are normally what to look for in account of such a confused and confusing situation. The absence of uniformity or harmonization belies the theory of fabrication or of an agreed story. To conclude that the story of the empty tomb is a product of wishful thinking is to ignore the fact that it was the last thing the women or the disciple could have wished. When they found the empty tomb their sole desire was to recover the body. And even when they saw the risen Jesus, they mistook him for the gardener since they were not expecting such a miracle. Also the theory of unidentified or unidentified robbers who mysteriously vanished with the body does not solve the riddle of the empty tomb. Neither does the hypothesis which states that the women went to the wrong tomb. The theory that Jesus swooned on the cross and subsequently came out of the tomb to wander around looking for medical care cannot command

57. F.F. Bruce, The Spreading Flame, The Paternoster Church History Vol. I, Paternoster Press 1970) Pp. 63 & 64.

any serious support.

The fact that water and blood came from the pierced side of Jesus has received a great deal of expert medical attention and opinions are still divided on the issue. Surely the Jews must have requested that care was taken to ensure that the crucified were dead before the Sabbath. Of course, some early texts of the Gospel of Matthew insert this incident at the end of 27:49 and that it took place when he was still alive. According to Barrett John is describing a real event and not merely a symbolic event because of the emphasis laid on the eye-witness. Moreover, he says that the event described is physiologically possible. Blood might flow from a corpse if only a short time had elapsed since death; and fluid resembling water might issue from the region described as Πλευρά.⁵⁸ J. L. Cameron in his paper entitled "How our Lord died" which he presented to the Third International Congress of Catholic doctors in June 1947 said that the unexpected early death of Jesus

58. C.K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, (S.P.C.K., London, 1965), p. 462.

is a clear indication that a fatal complication had suddenly developed. The insatiable thirst and the post-mortem treatment described in John 19:34 suggest an acute dilation of the stomach. The soldiers are sufficiently trained to know where to pierce in order to obtain a speedily fatal result to be doubly certain that the victim is dead. The wound below the left side chest would penetrate the heart, the lung and the upper abdomen to permit the blood from the greatly engorged veins together with water from the acutely dilated stomach to flow out in abundance.⁵⁹

But above all, the anti-docetic interest of John must be recognized here. For John the death of Jesus is quite real. The incarnate Son of God lived like and died like man in the fullest sense. The water and the blood in the theology of John also symbolize the salvation and the new spiritual life made possible by the sacrifice of Jesus.

We may conclude that the empty tomb is by implication part of the early kerygma. Apparently the resurrection story had never existed without it. Since

59. Cf. R.V.G. Tasker, St. John, Tyndale Press, London, 1964), pp. 212-213.

all attempts to separate it from the event of the resurrection have proved unconvincing; we cannot but accept it as an essential part of the resurrection tradition. The theories that try to explain away the empty tomb are inadequate and too simple to account for the fervent devotion of the disciples to their Lord and for the origin of the living Church. The denial of the empty tomb cannot dispose^{of} the evidence upon which the resurrection faith is based. Such hypotheses certainly belie the testimony of Paul.

(f) Appearances:

ὤφθη is the third person singular aorist indicative passive of ὄραω meaning 'to see', 'to perceive' or 'to experience' something. To see is to take part in life itself. It also speaks of spiritual light and also of perception in other senses so that ὄραω could be used for ἀκούω. In the Greek language there are many words for seeing

or for sight and they cover a wide range of meaning.⁶⁰
 The Greeks were specially called "a people of the eye".⁶¹
 This is why seeing is of great religious significance among the Greeks and their religion to a great extent could be described as a religion of vision. Greek mythologies show that the gods could be seen, though not without reservation. The gods show themselves only to a few elect. A god may appear in human garb and later disappear in form of a bird. Stress is laid on the fear and astonishment which seize men when a god discloses himself but there is no idea that a theophany

60. e.g. (1) ὄραω (2) εἶδον (3) βλέπω
 (4) ὀπτασία (5) ὀπιτανόμα (6) θεω-
ρέω (7) ὄρατος (8) ὄρατός (9) ὄρασις
 (10) ὄρασις (11) ὄραμα (12) ὀπτασία
 (13) αὐτόπτης (14) ἐπόπτης
 (15) ἐποπτεύω (16) ὀφθαλμός (17) καθαράω
 (18) προσράω (19) προεἶδον.

61. The Hellenes enjoyed in high measure the gift of seeing and of contemplating. They were a people of the eye, with a fine sense for what is seen in different forms and at different spiritual levels.

can lead to death as among the Israelites. Such appearances are visionary and hallucinatory experiences.⁶² In most cases the Suptuagint usage of ὄραω does not refer only to sense perception as such but also to intellectual perception: ὄραω and εἶδον are often used for spiritual perception.⁶³

What is the nature of the appearances of Jesus? Are they ὄραματα (visions) or not? The appearances cannot be regarded as part of Jesus' last stay with his disciples. There is no evidence that in the times in-between the appearances he was somewhere on earth, though not with the disciples. The appearance near Damascus is described as the appearance of the Risen Lord from heaven. It is true that in the first instance the phrase ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (Acts 9:3, 22:6) refers to the light. But it tells us the origin of the whole incident. Both the Gospels and Acts agree that none of the recorded appearances took place during sleep, or in dreams or even simply

62. The early Greek period did not believe that it is possible for man to see gods after death because of the dead's stay in Hades.

63. Michaelis ὄραω in Theological Dictionary of the N.T., Vol. V, edited by G. Friedrich, Translated by G.W. Bromiley (W.M.B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1970), pp. 315-382.

under the cover of darkness. The appearances are not in the sense of exclusively visual dream-visions or in the revelation of κατ' ὄνειρον such as we have in Matthew. In certain respect the appearances have some similarities with angelophanies which usually take place by day; of course, there is always room for exceptions (Luke 22:43; Acts 5: 19-55; 12: 7ff.). But it also implies some distinctions from the revelation by night (Acts 16:9, 18:9, 23:11, 27:23). The first two instances here are described as ὄραματα. The fact is that the appearances are never called ὄραματα, and nowhere is the Risen Lord said to have spoken ἐν ὄραματα. Usually ὄραματα do not occur in a reality perceptible to the natural senses. The appearances therefore must have occurred in a reality to which ὄραματα do not belong.

Paul does not reckon the Damascus road experience among ὀπτασίαι and ἀποκαλύψεις κυρίου. In II Cor. 12:1 he says nothing about seeing the κύριος in his rapture and the passages where he does speak about seeing the Lord always refer to the Damascus road experience. He did not call the

Damascus road experience ὄπτασις as Acts 26:19 did. He uses it only at II Cor. 12:1 and did not at all use ὄραματα. Therefore, we can reckon the ὄραματα of Acts 9:10, 16:9f. and 18:9 among ὄπτασις or ἄποκαλύψεις but would distinguish them from the Damascus road experience. The rapture in II Cor. 12:2 was an estatic experience, but the Damascus one was different in nature. Therefore, the statement in Acts 22:17 cannot fully explain the Damascus road experience. In I Cor. 9:1 we have a brief reference to the experience thus οὐχὶ ἴησόν τον κύριον ἡμῶν εἴραρα. In Gal. 1:16 he uses ἀποκαλύπτω and not the verb of seeing to refer to the revelation of divine truth or reality.

Paul uses ὥφθη for various appearances and even for the Damascus road experience. The word is found in connection with the resurrection in Lk. 24:34; Acts 9:17, 13:13, 26:16 and with angelophanies in Luke 1:11, cf. 22:43. The prominent thought is that the appearances are personal encounters with the Risen Lord who is revealed or reveals himself. When Paul classifies the Damascus road experience with others, he regards it

not only as equivalent but similar in kind. But according to Robertson and Plummer the meaning of ὤφθη is determined by the context, either "was seen by" or "appeared in a vision to". Here ἐγήμερται decides for the former.⁶⁵ The verb ὤφθη literally means "was seen" but when used with dative it means "appeared". The niphal form of פָּרַח with לְ which is usually rendered ὤφθη in the LXX has the same meaning. The verb is used in the Old Testament in connection with the appearances of angels: "And the angel of Yahweh appeared (ὤφθη) to him (Moses) in a flame of fire" (Ex. 3:2). It is also used of theophanies: "I appeared (ὤφθη) to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob as God Almighty - (אֱלֹהֵינוּ) Ex. 6:3). The question of whether Moses actually saw Yahweh with his natural eyes or by spiritual insight is undetermined and unemphasized. The revelation did not depend upon Moses but upon Yahweh who desired to reveal himself. Gen. 12:7 says: "Yahweh appeared to Abraham and said ...". In the Old Testament sometimes the mere hearing of a voice or dreams or other divine

65. Robertson and Plummer, Op.cit., p. 336.

manifestations are described as "seeing God" or "the appearance of Yahweh himself" (Ex. 33: 20ff.; Num. 14:14, 12: 6-8; Dt. 5:4, 34:10; Gen. 28: 12-17). Nevertheless, WofΘη in the Old Testament has both the ideas of actual appearances and visions.

In Fuller's opinion, what is seen and what is heard can only be described as "revelation". These are not disclosures of something which is visible or discernable within this world or age by ordinary sight or insight; they are disclosures that come from heaven above to the world or from the eschatological future to the present. Such disclosures often include a preview of the end and WofΘη it is in this context that we must place ^{the?} WofΘη of I Cor. 15: 1-7. Also they do not necessarily designate physical seeing nor visions in the subjective sense of ecstasy or dreams but revelatory self-disclosure or disclosure by God of the eschatologically resurrected Christ.⁶⁷ None of the list of witnesses was actually a witness of the actual resurrection. But they all experienced a post-resurrection appearances. Nevertheless, they are

67. R.H. Fuller, Op.cit., pp. 30 and 31.

witnesses in the proclamation of the resurrection.

Apparently the use of ὥφθη is apologetic against the attempt to strip the resurrection event of its objective character and thereby change it from an event of God to an event of the disciples. The use of ὥφθη by Paul is firmly rooted in the Old Testament as part of the uniform historical revelation of God. In that sense ὥφθη signifies a reception of truth with one's own eyes. As we have earlier noted, such a meaning is confirmed by the Septuagint and Rabbinic usages (I Mac. 9:27; II Mac. 2:8, 3:25). Josephus uses ὥφθη for seeing with one's eyes but φαίνεσθε for Joseph's dream (Rosh-hashanah II 6, 8; Abot V.5). ὥφθη is making visible by God a reality which is hidden. ὥφθη therefore has bearing on the interpretation of the appearances and the empty tomb tradition. We cannot dismiss the resurrection appearances as subjective visions on the basis that Paul described his Damascus road experience by ὥφθη. Obviously, primitive Christianity certainly made^a distinction between ecstatic visionary experiences and the fundamental encounters with the Risen Lord Jesus. In the mind of Paul his

experience is the same as the experiences of the others who saw the Risen Lord. But that does not necessarily prove that others really experienced appearances in the way Paul thought they did. It is worthy of note that Paul is at pains to authenticate his apostleship.⁶⁸

(I) Ὁφθαλμὸν Κηφᾶ (I Cor. 15:5)

The appearance to Cephas is mentioned in Lk. 24:34, though not described. Apart from this there is no other mention of the incident in any of the Gospels. Peter is first in all the four lists of the apostles. He was specifically referred to as ΠΡΩΤΟΣ in Mt. 10:2. But it is not absolutely certain that Cephas is referring to Peter. Some early documents refer to Peter and Cephas as two distinct personalities. Epistula Apostolorum says:

68. E.L. Bode, Op.cit., pp. 91-96; H. Anderson, Jesus and Christian Origins, (Oxford University Press, New York, 1964), 204; W. Marxsen, "The Resurrection of Jesus as a Theological and Historical Problem" in The Significance of the Message of the Resurrection for Faith in Jesus Christ, ed. C.F.D. Moule (S.C.M., London, 1968), pp. 26-27.; U. Wilckens, ibid. p. 58; Pannenberg, Op.cit., pp. 94-95.

"(We,) John and Thomas and Peter and Andrew and James and Philip and Bartholomew and Matthew and Nathanael and Judas Zelotes and Cephas, we have written to the Churches of the East and West towards the North and South recounting and proclaiming to you concerning our Lord Jesus Christ, how we have ... heard and felt him after he had risen from the dead and how he has revealed to us things great, astonishing, real" - (verse 2).

The Apostolic Church order also includes a Cephas as different from Peter. The distinction also occurs in Clement of Alexandria. Also Eusebius in Book V of the Hypotyposes reports that Cephas concerning whom Paul speaks in Gal. 2:11 was one of the seventy disciples who bore the same name with Peter.⁶⁹

Of course, it is clear from the Gospels which are much earlier than these documents that Peter and Cephas refer to the same person. Κη φῶς or Χηφῶ is the Aramaic equivalent of the Greek Πέτρος. It is very doubtful that the Cephas which Paul referred to in Gal. 2 and I Cor. 1 and 3 is another person other than Peter the Apostle. If it was a different person, Paul would not have given such prominence to him.

69. E. Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha (Westminster Pres, Philadelphia, 1963), p. 192, Vol. II, pp. 64ff.; Eusebius: H.E.I., 12:2.

"On the third day" apparently does not reflect the date of the appearance to Peter. Paul does not say categorically here that Peter was the first to see the risen Jesus. In Chrysostom's opinion Christ appeared to Peter first among the males because he was the first to confess the Messiahship of Jesus and that Paul does not reject the non-official testimony of the women who visited the tomb. The dating of the appearance will depend on the location. But if the appearance is the same as that of Lk. 24:34 then it is probably on the day of the resurrection.⁷⁰ Weizsäcker is of the view that the fact that Peter was the first to see the Risen Lord is the most certain historical fact in this whole obscure history. It is a fact of first importance historically because upon it rests the new development, making clear the historical position of Peter. He was undoubtedly the first man in the primitive community. Also that he first saw the Risen Lord and then set out spreading the fiery faith and as the leader his experience became the experience of his

70. Of course, the problem here is that Luke presents the resurrection appearances as if it were all a one day affair.

companions.⁷¹

According to Trompf, the conflicting traditions of the appearances of the Risen Lord can be reduced to two main classes. The first group of traditions give Peter pride of place. He heads the list of Paul's official Παράδοσις and takes priority in both Lk. 24:34 and in the second century Gospel of Peter (13: 57-14:60). The appendix of John (21) also reflects the pro-Petrine traditions. Matthew gives a brief account of Jesus meeting with the three women who had visited the tomb. But John 20: 1-18 and the long ending of Mark (16:9) single out Mary Magdalene as the single recipient of the first appearance. It is surprising that this tradition persisted in contradiction to the Pro-Petrine material, in spite of the growing importance of the fact that witnessing the appearances of the resurrected Κύριος is necessary for establishing the apostolic authenticity and leadership (I. Cor. 9:1, cf. 15: 7-10). It has been suggested that the story of the appearance to the women was invented by Matthew in order to bridge the

71. Weizsacker, Apostolic Age, pp. 11ff.; Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity- Its Writings and Teachings in their Historical Connections, Vol. III (New York & London, 1906-1911), pp. 401-402.

gap created by Mark's story of the empty tomb. Trompf concludes that Matthew is pro-Petrine to a large extent (16: 17-19). And though although Luke has no account of Jesus' appearance to Peter; he insisted on Petrine priority.⁷²

Marxsen is of the view that the story of the appearance to Peter has a functional aspect that meets us in double form. First, the three fold charge to Peter refers to the disciples who had drifted away from one another after the crucifixion. Second, on the saying: "When you were young, you girded yourself and walked where you would, but when you are old, you will stretch out your hands, and another will gird you and carry you to where you do not wish to go"; he feels that the interpretation in the Gospel is a secondary one. Actually, that it refers to a kind of missionary charge meaning that hitherto Peter had acted in his name but from now on he will act in the name of another (cf. Lk. 5:10). He is to fish for men in the name of Jesus. The functional elements are the gathering and guidance of

72. G.W. Trompf, "The Resurrection Appearances and the Ending of Mark's Gospel" New Testament Studies, Vol. 18, (1972), p. 308.

the Church and mission. Moreover, that this fact is connected with the priority of the appearance to Peter or a reflection of successive events. Also that from Lk. 24:34 we may assume that the fact that Peter was the first to believe in the Risen Lord was a piece of knowledge cherished by the early Church. In John the priority is not connected with the appearance but with the first entry into the tomb. He feels that the passage brings out the priority of Peter's faith and that the others arrived at faith later.⁷³ One may also add that the special mention of ὡφθην Κηθῶ is to distinguish this from the appearance to the Twelve. It is also designed to emphasize the unique position of Peter in the early Church.

(2) Εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα (I Cor. 15:5):

The use of δῶδεκα cannot be taken literally here. δῶδεκα is one of the symbolic numbers in the Bible. After Jacob had directed that the two sons of Joseph should have equal rights with his other eleven sons, the Old Testament still refers to them as twelve tribes instead of thirteen.

73. W. Marxsen, Op.cit., pp. 86-90., 95-97.

The promised land was to be divided into twelve and the Levites were to have no landed portion, but were supposed to live in cities. Ishmael was also to give birth to twelve princes. Moses at Sinai built twelve altars and twelve pillars to represent the twelve tribes of Israel. On the dress of the High Priest there was a seal with twelve precious stones containing the names of the twelve tribes. On every Sabbath day twelve new loaves of bread were placed on the table of the Presence. Joshua was asked to pile up twelve stones in the midst of Jordan as a memorial of the crossing of Jordan by the twelve tribes. Elijah in his contest with the prophets of Baal set up a twelve-stone altar, with each stone representing each tribe of Israel. The list of the tribes in Rev. 7 unlike the Old Testament includes the names of Joseph and Levi. But in order to still retain the symbolic number twelve, the names of Dan and Ephraim were dropped. Jesus attended the first Passover when he was twelve years old. He chose twelve disciples who later became Apostles. After the feeding of the multitude there were twelve baskets left over. At the ~~τῶν δώδεκα~~ the twelve disciples will sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes

of Israel. The heavenly Jerusalem will have twelve gates and twelve guarding angels. The city will have twelve foundations with the names of the twelve Apostles. There the tree of life will bear monthly twelve various fruits. Similarly, the number twelve is synonymous with the College of the Apostles. Judas and Thomas are each referred to as one of the Twelve.⁷⁴

In Weiss's opinion ΤΩΙΣ ΔΩΔΕΚΑ in 1 Cor. 15⁵ is probably a later addition to conform with the evangelical narratives (Mtt. 28:7; Lk. 24:36ff.; John 20:19-23).⁷⁵ While Weiss might possibly be wrong, some ancient texts appear to lend support to Weiss' claim.⁷⁶

-
74. Gen. 48: 5-6, 17:20; Ex. 24:4, 28:21, 39:14; Lev. 24: 5-9, Josh. 4: 1-9; I Kings 18:31; Matt. 14:20; Mk. 6:43, 8:19; Lk. 9:17; John 6:13; Mtt. 19:28, Lk. 22:30, Mtt. 26:47, Mk. 14:10, 43, Lk. 22:47; John 6:11, 20:24.
75. J. Weiss, History of the Primitive Christianity, Vol. I (London, 1937), p. 24.
76. There is the pedantically correct insertion of the Eleven in one of the main families of textual descent - chiefly: Western D*, G, the Latin version, Old Latin & Vulgate both the Harc leian Syriac margin. The three variants of the harmless particle are also significant (then, afterwards, after these things). Another difficult problem is the difference between the appearance to the Twelve and the one to all the Apostles.

Undoubtedly, Paul is using the number twelve symbolically here. He is referring to the College of the Apostles rather than to an accurate number. This particular appearance might be the one to the Ten without Thomas or to the Eleven with Thomas.⁷⁷

(3) ἘΠΕΙΤΑ ὩΦΘΗ ἘΠΑΝΩ ΠΕΝΤΑ-
-ΚΟΣΙΟΣ ἌΔΕΛΦΟΙΣ ἘΦᾶΠΛΑΣ
(I Cor. 15:6)

This appearance has no parallel in the Gospels. Some scholars have tried to identify it with Acts 2:1ff., but the incident is a Christophany and not ^{an instance of} glossolalia. Fuller suggests an earlier stage of the tradition of an appearance in which the Risen Lord imparted the Spirit to 500 brethren as he did in John 20: 19-23.⁷⁸ Barrett expressing a similar opinion says that the early Church ~~made~~ little distinction between the bestowal of the Holy Spirit and the appearances of the Risen Lord.⁷⁹

77. Another example is the symbolic use of the number seven in the Bible. Number seven means perfection, e.g. In Hannah's song, she praised Yahweh that "the barren has borne seven", while in actual fact she had five children altogether.

78. R.H. Fuller, Op.cit., p. 36.

79. C.K. Barrett, Op.cit., p. 342.

Although the early Church regarded the bestowal of the Spirit as a παρουσία of Christ through the Spirit, it does appear that they did not confuse this with the resurrection appearances. Some have identified the passage with Matt. 28:16 but only the Eleven were mentioned here. Of course, the presence of others seems to be implied by "some doubted". The Eleven were probably specifically mentioned because the Great Commission was for them. The Pauline account may also be identified with Acts 1: 6-15. But the number of those who witnessed the ascension and later went to the upper room is given as 120. Of course, it may mean that only 120 of them went to the upper room to await the promise. Paul appeals to their testimony with confidence by insisting that the majority of the 500 were still then alive and they could be interrogated for confirmation. This was only about twenty-five years after the incident.

(4) ἑπείτα ὡφθην ἰακώβω
(I Cor. 5:7).

None of the Gospels recorded this appearance. But the apocryphal Gospel of the Hebrews records the following:

"And when the Lord had given the linen cloth to the servant of the priest, he went to James and appeared to him. For James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour in which he had drunk the cup of the Lord until he should see him risen from among them that sleep. And shortly thereafter the Lord said: Bring a table and bread! And immediately it is added: he took the bread, blessed it and broke it and gave it to James the Just and said to him: "My brother eat thy bread, for the Son of Man is risen from among them that sleep".⁸⁰

According to McBirnie, there is no clear distinction between this James and James the Son of Alphaeus, otherwise known as James the "Less" or 'Younger'. He says further that James the 'Less' was the brother of Matthew Levi and the Son of Mary who was probably the wife of Cleopas which could be another name for Alphaeus. James and Matthew were from Capernaum and their home was the lodging place of Jesus. Also they were Jesus' Cousins and were acquainted with Jesus before their call. They belonged to the tribe of Gad but were probably Levites. He feels that it is difficult to distinguish between this James and the brother of Jesus. Both the Roman Catholic and American Orthodox regard

80. E. Hennecke, Op.cit., p. 165.

both figures as one individual person. Of course, he explains that the reason for this attitude is the attempt to protect the doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary. The early heresy of Docetism also believed all sexual intercourse to be evil. The elevation of Mary to the status of demigoddess led to the idea that the brothers and sisters of Jesus may be the children of Joseph's previous marriage and therefore senior half-brothers and sisters of Jesus. Most scholars in the past took Mary the mother of James the 'Less' to be a sister of Mary. This makes James the 'Less' to be a cousin rather than a brother.⁸¹

There is no evidence in the New Testament that Mary remained a perpetual virgin after the birth of Jesus. Mary the mother of James the "Less" could be a relation of Mary the mother of Jesus but definitely not her sister. It is unusual for two sisters to bear the same name. When the Bible refers to certain ones as brothers and sisters of Jesus it means just that. The fact that Jesus lived an ordinary human life as a

81. W.S. McBirnie, The Search for the Twelve Apostles (Tyndale Press, 1973), pp. 183-194.

carpenter in Galilee proves that Mary also must have lived like any other married woman after the birth of Jesus. If there is any other thing special about Mary apart from what we have in the Gospels and Acts records, a few of about ten other writers of the New Testament could have made reference to it. The Gospel records show that the members of Jesus family were hostile to him (John 7: 2-5; Mk. 3:20 and 21). James the Son of Alphaeus was so obscure that he could not be the James to which Paul made reference (Mk. 3:18; Acts 1:13). This James also cannot be the Son of Zebedee who had earlier been killed by Herod Agrippa I in 44 A.D. Were it so he would have become one of those that had "fallen asleep". Therefore, we are left only with James the brother of the Lord (Gal. 1:19; I Cor. 9:5).

After the ascension, Acts 1:14 reported that Mary and the brothers of Jesus were with the Apostles in the upper-room awaiting the promise of the Holy Spirit. As from Acts 12, this James becomes prominent in the Church at Jerusalem and Paul confirmed that this was already the case when he visited Jerusalem three years after his conversion (Gal. 1:19, cf. Acts 12:17, 15:13). We have no record of when the hostility of

Jesus' family towards him ceased. Most probably it was the resurrection appearances that led to their conversion. This appearance must be of great significance to James since most cases of appearances involved forgiveness. James by the appearance was able to see a new reality.

About 300 years ago Dorman Newman (1685) in his work "The Lives and Deaths of the Holy Apostles" says of James that prayer was his constant business and delight. He seemed to live by it and engaged in nothing but the frequent returns of converse with heaven. At about the age of ninety, during the procuratorship of Albinus, James was taken to the top of the temple from where the Jewish leaders urged him to curse Christ. But instead he urged the crowd to glorify the blessed Jesus. He was pushed down and loaded with a shower of stones before he was finally clubbed to death by a fuller. He was later buried on the Mt. of Olives.⁸²

(5) ΕΙΤΑ ΤΟΙΣ & ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΛΟΙΣ ΠΑΘΕΙΝ

(I Cor. 15:7):

The difficulty here is the difference between ΤΟΙΣ & ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΛΟΙΣ ΠΑΘΕΙΝ and ΤΟΙΣ ΕΩΣ ΘΕΙΝΑ

82. W.S. McBirnie, Idb, pp. 187-188; D. Newman, The Lives and Deaths of the Holy Apostles (1685)

Fuller refers to the four positions so far held by scholars as follows:

- (1) that the Apostles and the Twelve were identical;
- (2) that all the Apostles included the Twelve and others as well;
- (3) that it included some of the Twelve and some others as well; and
- (4) that it included none of the Twelve and it was a different group.⁸³

In addition to the above, we may also suggest: (1) that the mention of the 'Twelve and all the Apostles' may be due to two versions of a tradition which Paul received from two different sources and since Paul was not an eye-witness he could not discriminate between the conflicting forms of one and the same tradition; (2) that Paul means that Jesus appeared to all those who were then regarded as Apostles except himself who later became an Apostle by a special appearance. If this is the case 'Apostles' here would refer to an indefinite number of people. (3) It may also refer to all the mentioned and unmentioned appearances to all the Apostles.

83. R.H. Fuller, Op.cit.,

(4) Or this may be a reference to individual appearances to each of the Apostles. (5) Or could this also mean an indirect statement of fact that not only the Twelve were the Apostles and that there were others who became Apostles through personal encounters with the Risen Lord? 'Apostles' would then refer to a wider circle. But it then raises the question of who an Apostle really is.

There are 79 fully attested occurrences of the word ἀπόστολος in the New Testament and there are some others, especially in Luke, which are secondary reading (Lk. 9:1, Acts 5:34). It occurs once each in Matthew, Mark and John. It appears 29 times in Paul, if we exclude the five occurrences in the Pastorals. It is employed six times in Luke and 28 times in Acts. It is used once each in I Peter, Hebrews and Jude. It is found twice in II Peter and thrice in Revelation. Thus, eighty percent of the usage is found in Paul and his followers. They are therefore of particular importance in the fixing of the meaning of ἀπόστολος in the New Testament. ἀπόστολος in the New Testament denotes a person who

is sent with full authority. While the Greek gives the concept, the πῦψ of later Judaism provides the content. It is used exclusively for men in the New Testament, although it does appear from the look of things that some women could justly be so described. Also we find μαθήτρια as a counterpart of μαθητής in the New Testament (Acts 9:36). In John 13:16 there is full identity between δουλος and κύριος and ἀπόστολος and πέμψας. The δουλος stands under the jurisdiction of the master and all that he is, is from the master. Like πῦψ, ἀπόστολος denotes the commissioned representative of a congregation. In II Cor. 8:23 Paul calls those who were to accompany him to Jerusalem with the collection for the poor ἀπόστολος ἐκκλησιῶν. In the same way Epaphroditus is an ἀπόστολος of the Philippian Church. The ἀπόστολος as a conveyance of the message or proofs of love gives the term a religious rather than legal significance. It is a comprehensive term for the bearer of the New Testament message. Acts 14:4, 14 call Paul and Barnabas ἀπόστολοι; thus for Luke the college of the Twelve are

not the only apostles. Paul also uses the term for Junias and Andronicus, two otherwise unknown fellow-workers of Paul (Rom. 16:7). James the Lord's brother is also included in the wider circle of the apostles (I Cor. 15:7).

Of course there is close relation between μαθη-
ται, ἀπόστολοι, and σωσεκα
μαθηται are the larger fellowship and the more
 general group without which there can neither be an
ἀπόστολος nor σωσεκα.
 An ἀπόστολος must always be a μαθη-
της but not every μαθητης needs to be
 an ἀπόστολος. The use of σωσεκα
 and ἀπόστολοι interchangeably is normal
 but there is no need to force an identity between them.
 The Apostles are witnesses of the resurrection
 appearances but not all those who witnessed the
 appearances became Apostles. Later some became
 apostles without actually being witnesses of the
 resurrection appearances. Nevertheless the circle of
 apostles appears not to be very large. The membership
 did not include ^{the} women who were the first to see the
 Risen Lord. Certainly the 500 of I Cor. 15:6 did not

all become apostles. Of course, Paul links his personal encounter with the Risen Lord with apostolate (I Cor. 15:8f.). James who was never a μαθητής later became pre-eminent in the Jerusalem Church and was regarded as one of the ἀπόστολοι by Paul, although he was never directly called by that title (I Cor. 15:7; Gal. 1:19, 2: 9, 12). From the above we may conclude that while δώδεκα belong to the College of the Apostles, the ἀπόστολοι belong to a wider circle of μαθηταί. Yet it is evident that only those who could lay claim to some personal encounter with the Risen Christ or who had by revelation received a special commission could rightly be called an apostle. But the majority would still be those who knew Jesus personally during his earthly life. That the 70 disciples mentioned in Luke formed the majority of this wider circle is a possibility

III. Paul's Kerygmatic Speeches in Acts:

Although some of Paul's reported speeches in Acts had been given before any of his letters were written at all, Acts which gave the record of the speeches was not written until well after Paul's death. This means that Paul had written all his letters before Acts was

written. The question of the historicity, texts, and the relation of Acts to the whole of the Pauline Corpus is beyond the scope of this study but we shall examine this briefly as it relates to our study.

Dibelius (1833-1947) for three decades remained the single greatest influence on Lucan studies, particularly the Acts of the Apostles.⁸⁴ Dibelius is of the view that the speeches are not meant to be reports of what Peter or Paul or any other person said on different occasions. They are messages for the readers or rather examples and models of Christian preaching. The speeches as they stand are inventions of the author. For they are too short to have actually been given in this form; they are too similar to one another to have come from different persons, and in their content they occasionally reproduce a later stand

84. Although Dibelius never wrote a commentary on the Acts, he published about eleven essays which were very influential in Germany and later in North America. Some of these publications are in his: Aufsatz zur Apostelgeschichte, 4th edition (Go Hingen 1961) E.T. - Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. (London reprinted 1973). His essay "Zur Formgeschichte des N.T. (ausserhalb der Evangelien). Th. R., 3, (1931), pp. 209-42; W.W. Gasque, "The Speeches of Acts: Dibelius Reconsidered" in New Dimensions in New Testament Study (Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1974), pp. 232-250.

point.⁸⁵ According to him the Areopagus' speech (Acts 17: 19-34) is a Hellenistic speech concerning the true knowledge of God, the synthesis of rational Hellenism and Christian missionary message. The speech is in sharp contrast to the Old Testament, and the speech and Romans chapter 1 move separately in different worlds. The most important duty of an ancient author is not the establishment of the actual words of the speech but rather the introduction of speeches in a meaningful way into the complete structure of the work. To support his hypothesis, he quotes from the History of ^{the} Peloponnesian War by Thucydides which says:

"With reference to the speeches in this history, some were delivered before the war began, others while it was going on; it was hard to record the exact words spoken both in cases where I was myself present and where I used the reports of others. But I have used the language in accordance with what I thought the speakers in each case would have been most likely to say, adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what

85. "The speeches of Acts Reconsidered" by W.W. Gasque in New Dimensions in New Testament Study" (editors) R.N. Longenecker and M.C. Tenny, pp. 233-234.

was actually spoken".⁸⁶

Of course Dibelius agrees that Luke did inculcate into his speeches older formulae of a Kerygma.⁸⁷

Higgins also suggests that the contacts between the early speeches in Acts and the Pauline epistles and other parts of the New Testament, particularly the use of testimonia from the Old Testament is less probably due to mere imitation on the part of Luke, than to parallel use of firmly established features of the primitive preaching. The author of Acts reveals that he was not ignorant of what the apostolic preaching was like.⁸⁸ But Conzelmann following after Dibelius says on Acts 17: 22-31 that in as much as Luke draws upon the form of secular historiography, we must interpret the Areopagus' speech first of all as a literary speech of Luke, not a real sermon by Paul. Also that we must take this for granted in our interpretation of the speeches. Luke makes Paul say what he considers

86. Aufsätze, pp. 10, 14, Studies, p. 3, 7.

87. "A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature" by M. Dibelius (London, 1936), p. XV; E.T. of Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur (Berlin und Leipzig 1926).

88. "The Preface to Luke and the Kerygma in Acts" by A.J.B. Higgins in Apostolic History and the Gospels, eds. W.D. Gasque and R.P. Martin, pp. 83 and 84, cf. R.C. Hanson - "The Acts" (Oxford, 1967), pp. 35-39.

appropriate for the situation.⁸⁹

Writing on the same subject Dodd says that the speeches accredited to Peter represent the Kerygma of the Jerusalem Church at this time rather than what he actually said on this or that occasion. The speeches cover substantially the same ground with slight variations in phraseology and order of representation; but there is no essential advance from one to another. They give the comprehensive content of the early Kerygma which may be summarised as follows: First, God has fulfilled what was spoken by the prophets and the Messianic age has dawned. Second, this fulfilment came in the ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus. Third, by the resurrection Jesus has been exalted to right hand of God and God has made him both Lord and Christ. Fourth, the Holy Spirit in the Church is the sign of Christ's present power and glory. Fifth, the Kerygma closes with appeal for repentance, the offer of forgiveness of sins, of salvation, of the Holy Spirit and of the life of the world to come.⁹⁰ Dodd also notes

89. "The speeches in Acts and Thucydides" by H. Conzelmann in Exp. T., 76, (1964).

90. C.H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments (Hodder & Stoughton, London), pp. 37-45.

some significant differences between the Pauline kerygma and what he calls 'the Jerusalem Kerygma'. In the Jerusalem Kerygma Jesus is not called "Son of God". His titles are taken rather from the prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah. He is the Holy and Righteous 'Servant' of God. Also Acts reported that Paul was the first person to preach that Jesus was the Son of God. But he agrees that the idea of Jesus the Messiah as the Son of God which is embedded in the Synoptics is apparently not subject to the influence of Paul, and also that Rom. 1: 1-4 may not be Pauline in origin. Also that 'the Jerusalem Kerygma' does not assert that 'Christ died for our sins' or forgiveness of sins in consequence of the event of Christ. Also it does not include the fact that the exalted Christ intercedes for us. Nevertheless, he says that since the idea is in Heb. 7:25 and implicit in Matt. 10:32, it may also not be Pauline in origin.⁹¹

Bruce feels that although Luke to some extent, recasts in his own style the primitive preaching but there is much in the content that is not essentially Lucan. The regular appeal to Hebrew Scriptures is not

91. C.H. Dodd, Ibid., pp. 47-50.

something characteristic of Luke's narrative. This method was characteristic of the apostles and Paul (Acts 18:4; I Cor. 15:3ff.) To say that the Areopagus address is more Lucan than Paul does less justice to his policy of "all things to all men" (I Cor. 9:22). He told the Athenians that hitherto God has overlooked their culpable ignorance of his nature and the resurrection of Christ has introduced a new dispensation in which God calls for repentance in view of the coming judgment to be executed by the Risen Christ. His other speeches are integral to the hope of the resurrection (Acts 26: 6-8, 28:20, 24:15, I Cor. 15:17, 19, 23: Rom. 1:4).⁹²

Five of the Kerygmatic speeches of Acts contain the idea of witnessing. The apostles are witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus.⁹³ Peter says: "This Jesus God raised up and of that we are witnesses". (2:32). "But you ... killed the Author of life, whom God raised from the dead. To this we are witnesses". (3:14 and 15). "And we are witnesses of these things - the resurrection and the exaltation (5:32). The apostles

92. "The Speeches in Acts - Thirty Years after" by F.F. Bruce in Reconciliation and Hope (ed.), R. Banks (Paternoster 1974) pp. 58 and 59.

93. M. Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles (ed.), H. Greeven (London, 1956), p.3

are chosen witnesses of 'all' that Jesus did and taught and of his resurrection (10: 39-41). In Acts 22:15 Paul relates how he had been told by Ananias that he would be a witness of the Risen Lord who had met him on the way. Although Luke makes a chronological separation between the resurrection of Jesus and his farewell appearance forty days later, both the resurrection and exaltation are seen as one saving event.⁹⁴ Certainly Luke has thoroughly re-written his sources in his own vocabulary and style. This helps to explain the Lucan characteristic of Acts. There is no proof that other sources are not being used. This also explains why the search for radical Semitisms is not very likely to be successful. The absence of Semitisms does not necessarily make the material unprimitive. Some of the speeches before the Jewish audience could have been in Greek since Greek was spoken in Palestine.⁹⁵

Luke shows us in two main passages how the early Church laid stress on the resurrection in their debate

94. "The Resurrection in Acts of the Apostles" by I.H. Marshal in W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin, Op.cit., p. 92.

95. I.H. Marshal, Op.cit., pp. 94 and 95.

with the Jews. Acts 23:7f. made reference to popular dispute between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The Jewish leaders arrested the apostles because they were proclaiming in Jesus the resurrection of the dead (4: 1ff.). This opposition came mainly from the Sadducean party but the Pharisees were less ready to condemn the Christians unheard (5: 33f.). The link between the old and the new is Judaism. But the Sadducees were not real Jews nor pure sceptics as Luke represents their position. Their denial is based on the fact that they accepted the Torah as the only source of religious authority. Of course, the dispute between both parties on the resurrection is correctly recorded. Also the idea of the resurrection of both the righteous and the unrighteous to stand before God in judgment is common to both Judaism and Christianity. Regarding the Lucan statement that Sadducees denied the existence of angels and spirits, R. Meyer and E. Haenchen have challenged this since it is not confirmed from Jewish sources and the Torah which is their sources of authority refers to angels. Meyer feels that the Sadducees and early Christians might have rejected

demonology.⁹⁶ In Judaism it is always not clear whether the resurrection refers to the raising of the dead to face judgment or to the raising up of the righteous to eternal life. But since the belief in the final judgment was incompatible with the view that the unrighteous would simply be left in Sheol or Gehenna, it is probable that the Christian belief in the general resurrection reflects the Jewish belief. Haenchen thinks that the Pharisees did not believe in the resurrection of the unrighteous, but that this is perhaps due to the influence of Josephus.⁹⁷

The whole missionary preaching was mainly trying to explain the reason why Jesus had to suffer and rise again from the dead. In speaking about the resurrection Luke prefers the active form of ἐγείρω in order to show God's initiative in raising Jesus from the dead.

96. E. Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 567, note I.R. Meyer

"ΞΕΣΘΟΥΚΑΤΟΣ", Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (ed.), G. Kittel, Vol VII (Eerdmans, Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1964-68), pp. 35-54.

97. P. Aboth 4:22 T. Sanhedrin 13: 3f.; Strack Billerbeck IV 2, pp. 1172-1198; G.F. Moore: Judaism, Vol. II, pp. 317f., E. Haenchen, Op.cit., p. 583, note I; I.H. Marshall, Op.cit., p. 97.

But it is incorrect to say that Luke prefers ἐγείρω to ἀνίστημι. He uses ἐγείρω 18 times in the Gospel and 12 times in Acts. Out of these, three active forms in the Gospel and six passive forms refer to Jesus. The verb ἀνίστημι is used intransitively of the resurrection of Jesus four times in Luke and twice in Acts and transitively with God as subject five times in Acts. ἐγείρω is found both in active and passive forms with reference to Jesus in the early usage. The noun ἀνάστασις can be used alike for the resurrection of men and Jesus. But there is no belief that men can raise themselves up. Both Jew and Christians believe that this is God's prerogative alone. The use of ἀνίστημι for both men and Jesus apparently suggests that the verb may not necessarily mean that Jesus would be raising himself from the dead. Moule correctly points out that it was the Son of Man that was vindicated by God and therefore this should warn us not to ascribe too great degree of independent authority to the Son of Man.⁹⁸ According to Marshal,

F.C.D. Moule
98. ¹ "From Defendant to Judge and Deliverer" in Phenomenon of the New Testament (London, 1967), pp. 82-99. It is only in the Johannine tradition that Jesus is said to possess the power to lay down his life and to take it again, nevertheless, this authority is still from the Father (John 10: 17-18).

Luke's stress in Acts on the raising of Jesus by God is fully consistent with the teaching of the early Church. The use of the active ~~ἑξίστημι~~ with God as subject is the only new feature which is probably motivated by a desire for literary variation.⁹⁹

On the surface Paul's three sermons in Acts are completely different. In Antioch Paul was preaching to Jews, Proselytes and God-fearers. He therefore validates his points by reference to Jewish history. He declares: "For those who live in Jerusalem and their rulers, because they did not recognize him nor understand the utterances of the prophets which are read every Sabbath, fulfilled those by condemning him. Though they could charge him with nothing deserving death, yet they asked Pilate to have him killed. And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took him down from the tree and laid him in a tomb. But God raised him from the dead and for many days he appeared with those who came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are now his witnesses to the people" (Acts 13: 16-41). But in Athens he began with local religious worship (17: 22-31) and quoted from a

99. I.H. Marshall, Op.cit., pp. 101-103.

Greek poet. He made reference to neither Jewish history nor Scriptures. He realized that it would be futile to talk about a history or quote from an unknown book the authority of which no one would readily accept. Lystra was out in the wilds and had not the type of diversified culture of Athens. It was therefore unnecessary either to quote from Jewish history or from a learned literature. He began from nature - from the sun and the wind and the rain and the growing things. In his missionary stance, Paul had no set scheme and formula, his approach was completely flexible. He always began where his audience was. In Athens Paul presents the coming of Christ as a decisive event. He proclaims the fact of the resurrection and the coming judgment through the Risen Jesus. In the three sermons Paul sees history, whether of various events in the life of the Jewish nation or of the Gentiles' search for God as a preparation for the coming of Christ. Since God has so acted decisively in Jesus and since God has by such a confrontation entered into man's situation, life can never be the same again.¹⁰⁰ Thus, Luke gives us the correct picture of

100. "A Comparison of Paul's Missionary Preaching and Preaching to the Church" by W. Barclay (eds.) W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin, Op.cit., pp. 165-168.

what Paul's missionary preaching was like.

IV. History and Faith:

Although Bultmann acknowledges that the historical Jesus is the origin of the Kerygma, he says that we must speak of God as acting only in the sense that he acts with me and now.¹⁰¹ He says the cross certainly has a mythical character as far as objective setting is concerned. The crucified Jesus is mythologically presented as the sinless pre-existent Son of God, as the victim whose blood atones for our sins and as the one who vicariously bears the sins of the world and who delivers us from death by enduring punishment. But such mythological interpretation is no longer tenable today. Furthermore, he says that the cross as the judgment and defeat of the world and its rulers becomes the judgment of ourselves as fallen creatures enslaved by worldly powers (II Cor. 2;6ff.). To believe in the Cross of Christ means to make the Cross of Christ our own. The Cross is not just an event of the past but an eschatological event in and beyond time. Its meaning for faith is concerned with an ever-present

101. R. Bultmann, Jesus Christ and Mythology (New York 1958), P. 78.

reality. The Cross becomes an ever-present reality in the Sacraments of baptism and of the Lord's Supper and in the believers' daily life (Rom. 6: 3-6; I Cor. 11:26, 10:16; Gal. 5:24, 6:14, 2:20; Phil. 3:10). Also the meaning of the Cross is not derived from the life of Jesus as a figure of past history. On the contrary Jesus is not proclaimed merely as crucified, he is risen from the dead. The Cross and the resurrection form an inseparable unity.¹⁰²

To Bultmann, the resurrection is not an event of past history with ^aself-evident meaning. The Cross is not an isolated event, as though it were the end of Jesus, which needed the resurrection subsequently to reverse it. Both the legends of the empty tomb and the appearances which insist on the physical reality of the risen body of Jesus are most certainly embellishments of the primitive tradition (Lk. 24: 39-43). Paul's list of the eye-witnesses was not to prove the fact of the resurrection but to prove that the preaching of the apostles was the preaching of the Risen Lord. The list

102. "New Testament Mythology" by R. Bultmann in Kerygma and Myth (ed.), by H.W. Bartsch, Translated by R.H. Fuller (S.P.C.K. 196), pp. 35-38.

therefore guarantees Paul's preaching and not the fact of the resurrection. He says that an historical fact which involves the resurrection is utterly inconceivable and the mythical event of the resurrection of a corpse is incredible. Also the real difficulty is that the resurrection is an article of faith and one cannot establish an article of faith because it is far more than the resurrection of a corpse; it is an eschatological event. Christ meets us in the preaching as one crucified and risen. The faith of Easter is simply faith in the word of preaching which confronts us as the word of God. If the Easter Day is in any sense historical like the event of the cross; it is nothing else but the rise of faith in the Risen Lord, since it was faith which led to the apostolic preaching. All that historical criticism can establish is the fact that the first disciples came to believe in the resurrection. The historical problem is scarcely relevant to Christian belief in the resurrection. What the historical event of the rise of faith means to us and the first disciples is the self-manifestation of the Risen Lord.¹⁰³

103. R. Bultmann, Ibid., pp. 35-43.

Speaking after the same manner, Marxsen says that when the accent is placed on the present the statement "Jesus is risen" can mean "Jesus is alive; consequently he is of immediate concern to me." If the accent is laid on the past, the statement can mean "God raised Jesus from the dead on the third day." In his view, miracle is to be found where the stress lies on the present tense or on the contemporary faith. Also while the past event can possibly be a miracle; it is impossible to recognize the miraculous character of a past event. One can only guess that it was a miracle if one is acquainted with the corresponding miracle today. He regards as interpretation the statement: "God raised Jesus from the dead." This is because no one saw the actual resurrection or at least no one could claim to have done so. The statement is therefore an inference derived from personal faith. Even if Peter found faith because he saw Jesus, the talk about the resurrection of Jesus would still be reasoning from effect to cause or an interpretation.

The reality in the early Church was the birth of personal faith which is interpreted with the help of "Jesus is risen". Therefore, the miracle is not the resurrection but the founding of faith. It is only those who believe that could see Jesus and confess that 'Jesus is risen'. To talk about the resurrection of Jesus apart from one's arrival at faith is to talk about it without believing in it.¹⁰⁴

In a reply to Bultmann, Schniewind points out that I Cor. 15 does not really go beyond what Bultmann himself admitted to be important - that is, the witness of the original disciples to the resurrection. In the unique occasion, men really saw the Risen Messiah after his death and burial. This was a privilege given to the apostles. To accept the words of the apostles and to believe in the Risen Jesus means one and the same thing. (Rom. 10: 8-10). The testimony tells us that the Christ who rose again on the third day is one and the same as he who was hanged on the cross and laid in the grave. The apostolic witness testifies that the crucified

^{W.}104 Marxsen, Op.cit., pp. 112 and 113, 138-140.

Jesus lives and reigns and that the crucified Jesus and the Risen Lord are identical. This bears witness to the uniqueness and finality of what God has done in Jesus of Nazareth. The crucial point with the cross and resurrection is the uniqueness and finality of Jesus.¹⁰⁵

Of course, as we have earlier noted, Bultmann does not eliminate the resurrection from the Christian faith but insisted that it must be interpreted correctly. But this interpretation cannot adequately represent the meaning of the resurrection as found in the New Testament.

Fuller correctly states that the New Testament asserts that something over and above good Friday even happened in the experience of the first disciples; something more than their coming to a new assessment of the meaning of the Good Friday event. Also that the New Testament is quite clear on the fact that the tomb was empty on Sunday morning and that Jesus appeared to his disciples as one risen from the dead.¹⁰⁶

105. "A reply to Bultmann" by J. Schniewind in H.W. Bartsch, Ibid., pp. 72 and 73.

106. R.H. Fuller, Op.cit., p. 2.

It is impossible to interpret the resurrection simply in terms of man's self-understanding, for then Christianity would make a wholesale withdrawal from the world. The early community could not have created the resurrection story. A situation can only create a community but a community cannot create a situation. The early disciples did not create the miracles, the resurrection etc., but merely responded to them. Christianity cannot dispense with the apostolic tradition about Jesus and still remain the historic Christian faith. The interpretations of the events of Jesus that we have both in the Gospels and epistles would be meaningless without what we know about the life and deeds of Jesus. The New Testament invites us to behold the divine and human qualities in the life of Jesus, we have to keep both aspects in our examination of the events of Christ. The New Testament at the same time invites us to see Jesus of history and Christ of faith. We cannot see ^{the} Christ of faith except in the light of ^{the} Jesus of history. If there are exaggerations in the Gospels there are understatements there also. The resurrection took place before its proclamation, but it is only by the witness borne to it that the reality takes root and shape in

individual hearts and experience.

According to Ramsey, the resurrection is a miracle because it is the unique redemptive, creative intervention of God. Also it interrupts the hitherto normal workings of historical cause and effect and the hitherto normal workings of the order of human sinfulness and ushers in a new stage in the cosmic process.

A miracle may be called an event wrought by God which does not fit into the hitherto observable laws of nature. On the one hand it resembles the way man uses his free will to disturb the dispositions of nature and on the other hand the operations of grace of God in human lives. If we recognize the potentialities of man to use his free will to distort the divine design, we must not deny God his own freedom in his work as a redeemer. If the resurrection breaks what appears to be law, it does so in order to vindicate another higher aspect of law. A miracle is a revelation, unveiling, a new order of being and a new level of glorified human life. Though the resurrection is a miracle in relation to the natural laws of nature, in relation to the new order it is natural, inevitable and lawful. It reveals the goal of human existence when men shall be completely free from the law of sin and death.¹⁰⁷

107. AM. Ramsey, Op.cit., pp. 34-35.

Of course, if Christian faith is rational, it cannot avoid philosophical questions. If Christian faith is rooted in history, it should abide critical probing and the evidence as well must be convincing. Although the existence of the Church, the Gospels, and the Lord's day are inadequate proofs of the resurrection, yet the continual existence of the Church cannot be explained on the basis of the presence of the Risen Lord and his resurrection power. Every attempt which tries to relegate the resurrection to some supra-historical sphere in order to escape the risk resulting from attachment to history has proved unsatisfactory. The appeal for faith and commitment cannot ultimately ^{be} separated from historical investigations that one can be brought to the borders of faith when confronted with strange realities that transcends self-understanding.^{108.}

Nevertheless, in the proclamation of the resurrection we cannot treat it as a nature miracle made wonderously impressive to appeal to the superstitious side of the modern man. The resurrection is not just a miraculous happening in the dead past but an ever-abiding reality. Just as the resurrection cannot be interpreted to mean

108. N. Clark, Op.cit., pp. 102-103.

the survival of a corpse, it also cannot be an unidentifiable happening in some supernatural realm of meta-history, completely removed from the world of time and space. The resurrection also cannot be a mythological symbol of the divine meaning of the death of Jesus as it affects man's existence. But the only safe road to take in our proclamation of the resurrection today is the one taken by the Gospels. They tell the story of the Word which became flesh, of the life, deeds and words of Jesus. They do not begin from the resurrection and the exaltation. Certainly, the evangelists were men of faith, but they wrote this because they knew that Christ rose from the dead. If it were not so, there would be no testimony to bear, no story to tell and no Gospel to proclaim. The resurrection has its indelible mark on the story of each of the evangelists from the beginning. Each record shows a movement towards both the cross and the resurrection as a climax and a new beginning. According to the Gospel records, the apostles did not come to understand or believe everything from the beginning. It was only as they lived with the earthly Jesus, listened to his teaching, wondered at his authority,

questioned his identity, fled from the cross and saw their hope quietly buried in the grave before the new act of God transformed their hope and they saw the Risen Jesus, that they came to know him as the Risen Exalted Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, faith in the Risen Lord is not faith in a supernatural figure from the world beyond history. It is the confession that the same crucified Jesus has been raised by God as Conqueror of sin and death. Such a faith introduces a believer into a world where everything is made new and where things are viewed from a new perspective and new light. The cross thus becomes a new path into a new future.

The main theme of the apostolic message is not that Jesus spiritually survived but that he was raised. The entire New Testament shows that Jesus truly underwent all the facts of death in all its bitterness. His soul was exceedingly sorrowful unto death. He made himself one with mankind by tasting death. His death was real and complete. The kerygma also stresses God's act in raising Jesus from the dead. But the heart of the New Testament message is that Jesus is alive for ever more. The resurrection is not just a mere illustration of human immortality or that every good man will survive death.

But it speaks of a unique victory by which mankind may share in Christ's resurrection. Here God not only communicates himself and redemption to man, but also reconciliation and eternal life. In the proclamation of the cross, the crucified Risen Jesus confronts man and communicates to him the benefits of his redeeming death and resurrection. This is the heart of the Pauline Kerygma.

UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN LIBRARY

CHAPTER IV

"THE RESURRECTION IN THE EXPERIENCE
AND SOTERIOLOGY OF PAUL"(a) Background to Paul's Conversion:

In order to assess correctly the true meaning of St. Paul's experience on the Damascus road, it is necessary to understand the nature of his former life and the motive that made him a bitter persecutor of the Church. He was a most fervent Pharisee, a sect most notorious for their isolationism. The Apostle was satisfied with his life as a Pharisee. By his own admission, he was irreproachable according to the standard of the Law (Gal. 1:4; Phil. 3:6). His membership of the elect race meant so much to him (II Cor. 11:22; Rom. 11:1; Phil. 3:5). According to Paul, Israel is loved by God because of her election and even after his conversion he was still deeply convinced of Israel's prerogatives as an elected race (Rom: 9: 4-5, 11:28). He says that those who are Jews by birth are not like Gentile sinners who are by nature children of wrath (Gal. 2:15; Eph. 2:3). The above clearly shows the belief in which Paul was schooled, his pride as a member of the Jewish race and the confidence that these

gave him before God. Furthermore, the Apostle within the elect race, belonged to a spiritual elite that gave the most strict and rigorous obedience to the Law and the traditions of the fathers. He was a fanatic of the fanatics. In faithfulness to the Law and the traditions of the fathers, he was more advanced than any of his contemporaries (Acts 22:3, 26:5, 23:6; Gal. 4:1; Phil. 3:6). Paul, as a zealot was naturally fitted to lead the persecution of Hellenistic Christians in Palestine and beyond its borders. Throughout his life, the mere recollection of his frenzied persecution of Christians aroused bitter regret in his soul (I Cor. 15:9; Gal. 1:23; Phil. 3:6; I Tim. 1:13). Paul associated his bitter persecution of the Church with the zeal which motivated him at that time. Paul's zeal here can be compared to that of Mattathias who "was fired with zeal; stirred to the depth of his being" and his zeal became a devastating wrath when he saw an Israelite committing apostasy. (I Macc. 2: 24-29; cf. Num. 25: 1-8).

According to the Lucan report, the reaction of Saul the Pharisee to Christianity is very similar to the reaction of the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem to Paul's teachings. James warned Paul about the risk he

was running. A large number of Jews who had become Christians were still zealous for the Law (~~Ἰσραὴλ~~-
~~ΤΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΝΟΜΟΥ~~) The Jerusalem Christian Jews had heard the report that Paul was inducing the Jews of ^{the} Diaspora to forsake the Mosaic Law and the customs of the Fathers and not to circumcise their children any longer. James appealed to Paul to find ways of alleviating the fear of the Christian Jews; else he might have to face the consequence of Jewish Christian fanaticism just as his own fanaticism had moved him against Christians before he became a Christian.

Paul regarded Christians as impositors because Jesus could not be the Messiah. To Paul and to all Jews, a crucified Messiah was a stumbling-block and a contradiction in terms. The general expectation was that the Messiah would appear suddenly in power and glory to wind up the present era and inaugurate the Kingdom of God. No Jew expected a Messiah who would be a peasant, a carpenter, a homeless vagrant; one who instead of restoring the Kingdom to Israel would be crucified by foreigners. The law is quite explicit on the crucified (Dt. 21:23). All Jewish patriots who love their race,

its hope and aspirations, and who was conscious of the mockery by foreigners have every reason to revolt against the Christian propaganda that the crucified Jesus was the expected Messiah. But the cross which was the point of attack became the very centre and inspiration of Paul's religion. He remained sensitive to the shame of it. He knew exactly what the Jews felt about it, because he had felt the same over it. Jesus had been condemned by the highest authority within Judaism and consequently by God himself who had allowed Jesus to suffer the shameful death of the cross and to fall under the sentence of the Law. (Dt. 21:23; Gal. 3: 10-14; I Cor. 1: 17-24).

Ph.H. Menoud is of the view that Paul's aberration while he was still a Pharisee and persecutor of the Church was to be found precisely in his Messianic belief. Paul was furious at seeing Christians identify the promised Messiah with an individual who was put to death on the cross as a man accursed by God. But on the road to Damascus he received the revelation that Jesus was indeed the Messiah who was promised to Israel; it is therefore, a truly Messianic revelation which led to his conversion. Here Paul saw the necessity

to re-interpret the shameful death of Jesus; that is in his office as the Christ he bore the curse which rested on the sinners and his death was the price for human redemption.¹ Also speaking similarly, U. Wilkens says that it was Paul's devotion to the Jewish law which turned him into a persecutor of Christians. By attributing the saving role to Jesus, the Law is robbed of all its value for salvation. Paul was violently hostile to Christians because of the importance which he attached to the Law as a way of salvation. But after the Damascus road experience he recognized in Christ the only principle of salvation without the Law. Both before ^{and} after his conversion faith in Christ seemed to be incompatible with faith in the Law. Therefore, the choice had to be made: Christ or the Law? There could be no compromise. The dilemma presented itself in an essentially Christological perspective. The question is knowing for certain, whether salvation came

1. Ph.H. Menold, "Revelation and Tradition - the influence of Paul's Conversion on his Theology", in Interpretation, 7 (1953), pp. 131-141. Cf. M. Goguel, Introduction au Nouveau Testament, IV 1, Paris (1925), pp. 183f.

to men by Christ or by the Law.²

There have been various suggestions as to what prepared Paul for conversion. There is the suggestion that the death of Stephen and his arguments with Hellenistic Christians had prepared the stage for his conversion. Through such arguments he had come to know the basis of Christian teachings. Therefore, when he suddenly became aware of whom Jesus really was, he no longer regarded Jesus as a destroyer of the most holy sacred foundations of the Jewish faith. He realized that Jesus' death and resurrection have soteriological significance for himself and the world as a whole. Some also hold the view that Paul was not satisfied with his former religious life as a Pharisee. Roman 7 is regarded, by the exponents of this view, as the personal testimony of his life as a Pharisee.³ Deissmann is of the view that the conversion of Paul the persecutor to a follower and an apostle of Christ

-
2. "Die Bekehrung des Paulus als. religionsgeschichtliches Problem", by U. Wilckens, Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 56, (1959), pp. 273-279.
 3. G.A. Deissmann, St. Paul - English Translation by L.R.M. Strachan, (London, 1912), p. 122, E.W. Hunt, The Portrait of Paul (Mowbray & Co. Ltd., London, 1968), pp. 27-30; 37-38. C.H. Dodd, Romans p249

was a sudden one, but was no magical transformation.^f
 It was psychologically prepared for, both negatively and positively. Negatively by the experience which his soul in its passionate hunger for righteousness had had under the yoke of the Law. According to him, we hear the echo of his groanings, even after twenty or thirty years later in some of his letters. He made the awful discovery that even for the most earnest conscience, it is impossible really to keep the whole Law. Positively, the conversion was certainly prepared for on the one hand by a relatively close familiarity with genuine tradition about Jesus and the effects that Jesus was able to produce in the persons of the converts whom Paul persecuted.

But the 'I' of Rom. 7: 7-25 is used with a universal sense to portray the misery of an unredeemed man held under the power of the flesh and as a prisoner under sin, Law and Death. Paul's understanding here is in the light of Christ-event.⁴ The

4. G. Bornkamm, "The Revelation of Christ to Paul on the Damascus Road and Paul's Doctrine of Justification, and Reconciliation - A Study in Galatians", in Reconciliation and Hope, New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology - Presented to L.L. Morris on His 60th Birthday, (ed.), R.J. Banks, (Paternoster Press, Exeter, 1974), p. 92; Bornkamm, Early Christian Experience (1969), pp. 87ff.; Cf. R. Bultmann, Existence and Faith (Collins, 1960), pp. 152ff.; W.G. Kummel Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus (1927).

passage is therefore not a recollection of the experience that Paul underwent under Judaism, but the reflection of a Christian Theologian meditating on the mystery of sin, with the experience of redemption as the basis. Through the revelation of Christ, God has put an end to the proud zeal for the Law by Saul the Pharisee. God has brought him to surrender his own righteousness and instead given a new life and righteousness, a new activity, a new beginning and a new goal. Paul regarded his conversion not as a matter of gradual process but ^{as an} entirely of free and sovereign act of God.

Bornkamm dismisses as fanciful the idea that Paul's conversion was prepared long in advance because of his religious background as a Pharisee. He also refutes the idea that Paul increasingly realized how shaky were the foundations of his faith and practice because he was dissatisfied with his efforts to comply with the high ideals and strict demands of the Law. Bornkamm says that Paul's words point ^{in an} opposite direction. Also that when Paul encountered the Risen Christ and ^{was} called by God, he was the very reverse of one haunted by qualms of conscience and

gone to pieces because of his own inadequacy. No, he was a proud Pharisee whose unremitting boast was his membership of the chosen people, God's law and his own righteousness. His conversion was not that of a man without faith finding the way to God, but of one zealous for God, more earnest than anyone else about his demands and promises. It was a devout man whom God blocked through the Christ who had died a shameful death on the cross.⁵

Whenever Paul refers to his Jewish past, whether in passing or in greater detail, he does not speak of it as a contrite sinner, but with pride and gives this as the reason for the persecution of the Church. After meeting with Christ, he came to regard as loss and refuse, his faultless righteousness which he once regarded as wealth and gain. (Phil. 3:4ff.; Gal. 3:13ff.). By this experience, all he attributes to his "active" life became sharply "passive". According to the new set of values now revealed to him, things that were once precious to him had lost their values. The newly discovered values find their highest boom in the

5. G. Bornkamm, Paul, Translated by D.M.G. Stalker, (London, 1971), pp. 23, 24, 125ff.

knowledge of Jesus or in gaining Christ. Through this new knowledge Paul has become the possessor of a righteousness which is not gained through the keeping of the Law, but that which comes from God through faith in Christ. This also means to know the power of his resurrection which also implies a share in his sufferings and becoming one with him in his death and resurrection. The new perspective which comes to Paul causes him to regard as refuse all that he had previously boasted of as a Jew. The experience near Damascus is a discovery of what the pith of Christianity contains. It is clear, therefore, that in order to assess correctly the distance that separates Saul the persecutor from Paul the Apostle, one needs to grasp the significance of the momentous meeting between Saul and Christ near Damascus.

B. The Damascus Road Event:

Here we shall review the accounts of Paul's conversion as reported by Acts as well as the references made to it in his letters. Luke speaks of Paul persecuting the Church in Jerusalem, but Paul made no reference to such in his letters (Acts 7:58, 8:1,

22:4ff.). Also it was legally impossible to bring Christians in bonds from Damascus to Jerusalem. Under the Roman administration the Supreme Court never possessed such a jurisdiction. Damascus is far beyond the frontier of Judea. But it is possible to assume that he, Paul was acting under the internal penal power to scourge, ban and ex-communicate granted to Synagogues. There is striking verbal agreement in the dialogue between Christ and Paul as recorded by Luke: "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?" "Who are you Lord?" "I am Jesus whom you are persecuting." Nevertheless the narrative of this event manifests the most diverse forms. Only the brief exchanges between Christ and Paul are given in exactly the same words in the three accounts in Acts. There is also a closer connection between Acts 9:3 and Acts 22:6 than between the two texts and Acts 26: 12-14. Lake thinks that Luke had access to three sources, all of which gave the account of the Damascus road event. The first source is Paul himself; the second source is the tradition of the Church in Jerusalem and the third source is the tradition handed down in the Church at

Antioch.⁶ Acts 9:7 says that the companions heard the voice but saw no one (μηδενα) and this shows a contrast between Acts and Paul. Christ's words in Acts 26:16 suggests that Paul has seen him (cf. Acts 9:17 and 24:4). Apparently, the writer of Acts believes that Paul saw Jesus, although he avoided saying so while narrating the event. Paul also clearly declares in his letters that he saw Christ near Damascus. We may then ask why Acts failed to report this directly. Of course, Paul himself simply says that he saw Christ without going into detail or describing what he saw. He merely spoke of a light from above. There is agreement between Acts and Paul, that Paul saw Christ near Damascus, but beyond that we learn nothing more. Paul probably did not relate how he saw Christ because he was very reserved about giving information about his own religious life (cf. I Cor. 14: 18 and 19; II Cor. 12: 1-10).⁷

The general view of many scholars is that Acts 22 and 26 are irreconcilable with Paul's autobiography in Gal. 1: 11-17.⁸ But according to H.G. Wood, such

-
6. K. Lake, Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. I (Macmillan, 1920-26), pp. 188-191. G. Bornkamm, Op.cit., pp. 15-16.
 7. J. Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind (SCM, London 1959), pp. 33-35.
 8. J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul (A.& C. Black, London, 1954), pp. 35-36.

arguments are by no means unassailable and that if we do not accept the stories in Acts of the event on the Damascus road and of Stephen's martyrdom as history, then we shall have to invent for ourselves stories of the same character which would be nothing but a work of superogation.⁹ J. Dupont also observes that we must note that Paul was writing about twenty years after the events and it is normal for such an account to be mentioned succinctly.¹⁰ While Wood and Dupont are right in their observations it is impossible to lose sight of the problems raised by Acts and Pauline letters.

Paul himself believed that Jesus literally spoke to him from heaven and that the sudden dazzling brilliant flash indicated his presence. The verb

ΠΕΡΙΣΤΡΑΨΙΤΩ employed in Acts 9:3 and 22:6 is similar to δοτράτη the common

9. H.G. Wood, Jesus in the 20th Century, pp. 161-162. Cf. S. G.F. Brandon, The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church (S.P.C.K., London, 1951), p. 58.
10. J. Dupont G.S.B., "The Conversion of Paul, and its Influence on His Understanding of Salvation by Faith" in Apostolic History and the Gospel, Biblical and Historic Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce (ed.), W.W. Gasque and R.P. Martin (Paternoster Press, 1970), pp. 186ff.

Greek word for lightning. Historians have maintained that the sound of Jesus' voice was heard and his presence only perceived by Paul's imagination. According to Acts 9:7 his followers heard the voice but saw no one, but Acts 22:9 denies that his companions heard the voice but says that they saw the light.

Whether or not we accept the historicity of Acts and whether or not we regard the appearance of Jesus here as subjective or objective, it is clear from the Pauline epistles that Paul's conversion came in consequence of the belief that he had seen Jesus on the Damascus road. Hunt says that it is Paul's thought, his belief, his conviction that the historian emphasises. Also that Paul himself seems to do the something in Gal. 1: 15-16

(ὅΤΕ Δὲ Εὐδόκησεν --- ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ)

By the use of ἐν he means that God disclosed his Son within his personality. This interpretation is further strengthened by ἀποκαλύπτω

which denotes a disclosure of something by the removal of that which until now conceals it, and especially the subjective revelation to an individual mind. Lightfoot thinks that ἐν is instrumental referring to God's

action of revealing his Son in and through Paul to mankind.¹¹

The Risen Lord surrounded by the light, which is symbolic of his celestial origin, reveals his identity as Jesus of Nazareth who had been put to death on the cross. Paul now came to know Jesus as "One risen from death". His firm faith in the resurrection as a Pharisee apparently did not make the reception of the new truth difficult in the mind of Paul. He was told that his attack on Christians was directly an attack on the Risen Lord Jesus. The notable point of difference between the appearance to Paul and those to the disciples after the resurrection is that it is the Risen Christ exalted in divine glory that appeared to Paul. There is no record of a similar revelation of his glorified humanity from heaven during the forty days before the ascension. He described the revelation as that of seeing rather than hearing. Yet he did not endeavour to describe what he saw since that would be to attempt the impossible. Paul in his testimony claimed that he was privileged to receive a post-

11. Hunt, Ibid., pp. 36-37; E. de W. Burton, Commentary on Galatians, I.C.C. (Edinburgh 1921), p. 50.

resurrection appearance which is unparalleled by apostolic experience. Yet it is only by quoting Ananias that he indirectly asserts that he saw Christ. The Apostle contrasted the effects of the heavenly vision upon himself with that of his companions. They saw the light without being affected by the miracullous illumination like himself. They heard nothing. They were neither blinded nor receive the spiritual light of faith. Paul's blindness which is the physical effects of the light radiating from the Risen Lord is symbolic of Paul's faith which is the spiritual effect of the light. Paul was aware of the full implications of the light that struck him blind. The term סוֹפָא which is technically employed in the New Testament as in the LXX, is the equivalent of the Hebrew כְּבוֹד, meaning the sensible manifestation of the divine presence. The restoration of Paul's sight at baptism is symbolic of the new creation effected in him in consequence of faith.¹²

In Acts 26: 12-18 Paul regards Christ's appearance

12. D.M. Stanley, S.J., Op.cit., p. 44.

as his own inaugural vision. He calls it an heavenly vision and sees it as the beginning of his apostolic activity. Paul identifies his apostolic message with that of the Old Testament prophets by declaring that it contains nothing more than what the prophets had foretold. They prophesied the death and resurrection of Jesus and that he would be light to both Jews and Gentiles. The essential difference between Paul's message and that of the Old Testament prophets is that while the prophets foretold the events of Christian salvation, Paul declares that they have occurred in the death and resurrection of Jesus. Paul feels that he was called to play the role of the servant of Yahweh. Christ has appeared to him to constitute him both servant and witness. His future mission is described in terms borrowed from the Servant Songs: "to open their eyes; to turn them from darkness to light and from Satan to God; so that they may receive the remission of their sins and an inheritance among those consecrated by faith in me" (Acts 26:18, cf. Isa. 42:7, 16, 61:1, 2). Ananias spoke of the great sufferings he was to endure. He is therefore called to perform the work of Ebed Yahweh in the apostolate. Significantly,

Paul speaks of the Father's revelation of his Son in him. By the use of "in me" instead of the dative "to me", Paul stresses the personal interior nature of the experience. The revelation that convinced Paul that the crucified Risen Lord is God's own Son had a great impact on his theology.¹³ God was pleased (Εὐσδο

κνησεν) to reveal his Son in him. This was an experience in which Paul felt himself seized (κατε-
διήμφθη) by Christ (Phil. 3:12). Paul, a deadly foe of Jesus by the strange experience suddenly and unaccountably became a devoted follower of Jesus. In Judaism Paul already knew God as the Sovereign Lord of history, therefore his conversion and call had been pre-determined before his birth (Gal. 1:15). Nevertheless Paul does not deny the fact that man has free will because his whole soteriology is based on the idea that man is responsible for his own actions.

Since Paul ranks the appearance near Damascus after those which Jesus made to his disciples, he regards himself as belonging to the group of witnesses

13. Ibid., p. 46.

to the resurrection (I Cor. 9:1, 15:8).¹⁴ Although the three Lucan accounts do not make it explicit that Paul actually saw the One speaking to him, the Lucan picture cannot silence the clear unmistakable witness of Paul that he actually saw Jesus who revealed himself to him in an unresistable way. The Risen Lord laid hold of Paul like a runner holds to his prize of victory (I Cor. 9: 16-17). Paul did not give himself to Christ, but it was Christ that seized him all at once without any option to break free. Christ charged him with a mission as a matter of necessity. In Gal. 1:12 he speaks of this appearance as an ἀποκάλυψις - ἀποκάλυψις: a glorious manifestation where Christ showed himself to Paul as the glorified Son of God. It also has the idea that what Paul saw reveals in what form Christ will appear at the end-time. In II Cor. 4: 4-6 Paul alludes to his conversion by saying that God has caused a glorious light to shine in his heart purposely to radiate the light of the knowledge of God's glory, the glory on the face of Christ, who is God's perfect image. After the dramatic experience, all that matters to Paul is "to know Christ and the power of his resurrection". (Phil. 3:10, 20, 21). Paul now shares

in the glory of Christ's resurrection. For Paul the Risen Lord has achieved the work of salvation and to be saved means to share in the glory of the Risen Lord. Paul now becomes the herald of salvation by faith apart from the Law to the Gentiles who did not know the Law. His mission, therefore, after his conversion implies a soteriology which wholly depends on Christ. As the Saviour of all men by faith, Christ has removed all significance from the Law as a principle of justification and salvation. Now there is righteousness and salvation for all who believe (Rom. 10: 4, 9, 10).

(C) ἘΣΧΑΤΟΥ ΔΕ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ὡΣΤΕ
ΡΕΙ Τῷ ἘΚΤΡΩΜΑΤΙ ὡφθη κάμοι

In I Cor. 15:8 Paul uses ὡφθη which he used for the Easter appearances to describe his own experience on the Damascus road. There is the usual tendency to translate this verb as aorist passive. The simplest rendering would be "he was seen". But if we assume the deponent meaning, it could be translated "he appeared" or "he allowed himself". But the passive can also be interpreted as a way of avoiding

the use of the divine name and this will be in conformity with the Jewish practice. In this case it could be rendered "Jesus revealed".¹⁵ In Marxsen's view, Paul experienced an ἠφθην, although it was later and not identical with Peter's. He says further that it was significant that Paul described his experience by means of ἠφθην, thus putting it in the same category as Peter's ἠφθην. The Damascus road experience was Paul's Easter. This is obviously so here since every appearance is related to Easter. But how Easter could Paul's experience be some years after the actual Easter? Paul was broadly informed about the purpose, character and message of the Church and that was why he became a persecutor.¹⁶

Paul says that Jesus had appeared to him even as he had appeared to other Apostles and over five hundred Christians. Earlier he had asked a rhetorical question: "Have I not seen our Lord Jesus?" (I Cor. 9:1). The sentence begins with the adverb οὐχι which normally requires a categorical affirmative answer.

15. Marxsen, *Op.cit.*, p. 98.

16. *Ibid.*, pp. 99-100.

Some hold the view that 9:1 refers to the occasion or occasions on which he had seen Jesus in the flesh.¹⁷

But the context here shows that Paul was laying claims to apostleship because he too had experienced an

ὤφθη. Paul uses the term κύριος and not Ἰησοῦς which he normally uses when he is speaking about the historical Jesus (I Thess. 4:14;

II Cor. 4: 10-12; Phil. 2:10). He speaks of Jesus as

Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν, the living Jesus whom Christians acknowledge as Lord. The

use of the perfect tense ἐώρακα denotes that what began in the past still continues. If Paul was

referring to an occasion when he had seen Jesus in the flesh, he would perhaps have used εἶδον. In

using the perfect tense he is stressing that the Jesus he had seen is still the Jesus who can still be seen,

the Risen Lord. It is true that he uses ὤφθη

in 15:8, but the context shows that he was emphasizing a particular past action and therefore, the particular tense is correct.¹⁸

17. W.M. Ramsay, The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the present Day, (London, 1913), pp. 21-30; J.K. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, Tr. by W.F. Stinespring, (London, 1942), p. 435; "The Gospel According to Paul", by J.H. Moulton, in Expositor, 8th series No. 2 (July 1911), p.16.

18. E.W. Hunt, Op.cit., p. 35, note 13.

According to Paul, the appearance to him on Damascus road was the "last of all" such post-resurrection appearances (ἜΣΧΑΤΟΝ ΔΕ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ). Paul's version here has been questioned by various scholars. This is because, while the appearance near Damascus could be the latest to date, there were others later (cf. Rev. 1:10, 12-20). But in a sense any later appearances can be excluded on the ground that all the appearances mention in I Cor. 15: 1-8 are connected either with the inauguration of the mission to the Jews or Gentiles. In Fuller's opinion, with the founding of the Church in Jerusalem, and the inauguration of the mission to both Israel, and the Gentiles, the post-Easter period of salvation history prior to the parousia has been decisively set in motion. The appearance to Paul completes the Christ event. There may be future adjustments of salvation history, but this would not require such type of resurrection appearance to set them in motion. Certainly there is no record of a similar appearance during the last twenty years - between the Damascus road event and the time Paul was writing.¹⁹

19. R.H. Fuller, Op.cit., pp. 42-43.

But Barrett is of the view that the statement could be taken to mean "last in importance" and that this would agree with verse 9.²⁰ This interpretation is of course doubtful.

Paul puts his name last as unworthy of the name Apostle because he had persecuted the Church of God. The more fundamental reason for his depreciation is the fact that he is an ἔκτρώμα. The meaning of ἔκτρώμα here constitutes a problem. It is not a very common word in literature. It comes from ἔκτρώσκειν, meaning "to cause a miscarriage", "to cast the fruit of the body".

ἔκτρώμα is "untimely birth" "miscarriage" or "abortion". The reference is often to an untimely birth whether or not the child lives. The main feature is the abnormal time of birth and the unfinished form of the one thus born. In the LXX ἔκτρώμα is employed only three times. In Numb. 12:12 it was used to translate לִלְדָה which denotes a child which has no life, even in the womb, and thus a still-born.

The fact that it is used for לִלְדָה gives

20. C.K. Barrett, Op.cit., p. 344; cf. L. Morris, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (Tyndale Press, London, 1960), p. 207.

ἔκτρωμα the sense of still-birth. In Job 3:16 and Eccl. 6:3 it is used to translate פגול which means miscarriage or untimely birth.

The word occurs only in I Cor. 15:8 in the New Testament.

According to Schneider, Paul is stating here that he is

the last to see the Risen Lord. He likens himself to

an ἔκτρωμα. Also that since the phrase ὥστε πρὸ τῶ ἐκτρώματι is

directly related to the preceding words in which Paul

calls himself ἔσχατον σε πάντων, it

might be conjectured that ἔκτρωμα denotes

one who is born late. But this meaning is impossible

since ἔκτρωμα always has the sense of a ^{speaking,} birth which is too soon. Strictly then ἔκτρωμα

and ἔσχατον contradict each other. Hence we

have to take ἔκτρωμα in a very general sense.

Paul from the spiritual point of view was not born at

the right time because he had not been a disciple during

the life time of Jesus. His calling to the Apostolic

office which presupposed having seen Christ, did not

take place in the normal, orderly, organic sequence.

He is turned from his previous course of life by a

powerful intervention of the exalted Christ, and set in

the Kingdom of Christ. His apostolic calling was also by a different route from that of the other apostles. The main emphasis is on the abnormality of the process which took place when the Risen Lord had ceased to manifest himself to the disciples, and the suddenness of his coming to faith.²¹

ἘΚΤΡΩΜΑ is probably a term of abuse hurled at Paul by his opponents to call into question his apostolic office, to show that he actually does not deserve it because he was a persecutor of those who saw the earthly Jesus and the Risen Lord. ἘΚΤΡΩΜΑ was a current term of abuse with religious connotation. His enemies probably called him an ἘΚΤΡΩΜΑ in relation to his coming to faith as ^{an} incomplete, deficient, misguided Christian who is unworthy to be called an Apostle. Paul is the only Apostle to have met Christ in this way outside the normal order of the apostolic band. This extraordinary grace shown to him became a source of joy. He is aware that his own case is quite abnormal. He is unworthy to meet the Risen Jesus. The appearance to him after the ascension is also abnormal, since by

21. J. Schneider, "ἘΚΤΡΩΜΑ" in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. II (ed.), G. Kittel, translated by G. W. Bromiley, pp. 465-467.

then all post resurrection appearances have come to an end. If the resurrection experience changed the cowardly timid disciples who betrayed and denied their Master into courageous men who bore witness to their faith in the face of death, it is not incredible that a similar experience brought a total change in the life of Paul. Robertson and Plummer express the view that Paul's Jewish adversaries called him an ἑκτιρωμα because of his small stature. But such ^{an} hypothesis appears unnecessary here. The term indicates his intense feeling with regard to the errors of his previous career.²² It is also clear from the above that ἑκτιρωμα is not a late birth as the context might suggest, but the very opposite. The comparison does not lie in the timing of his conversion but in the idea of inferiority and unworthiness. The article ἰω might also suggest that the coarse insulting word had been applied to him by others. He owes everything in his apostolic career to sheer grace.²³

22. Robertson and Plummer, Op.cit., p. 339.

23. J. Hering, The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (Epworth Press, London, 1962), p. 162.

But the abnormality is not all that matters to Paul. He is exclusively concerned with the religious value of the event. The event led Paul into a new world and all his religious values changed "His natural prerogatives, his long and careful training, his pride as an expert in the Law, his importance as a Pharisee, his prospect as a leader in the religious life of his people - everything was sacrificed on the altar of devotion".²⁴ The event was unique. It came to an unbeliever in Jesus of Nazareth and turned him to faith.²⁵ Paul received not only a new life and knowledge but a new power also. The conversion removed the stumbling-block of a suffering Messiah, the career of whom he had thought would be one of glory and triumph from the beginning to the end. He now sees the cross not as a tragic incident but in accordance with God's will. Through the resurrection appearance, God the creator of light has illuminated his heart in order to enable him to communicate the light of faith to others (II Cor. 4:6).

24. H.L.L. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, (London, 1952), p. 52.

25. H.B. Swete, The Appearances of our Lord After the Passion, (London, 1908), pp. 130ff.

(d) The Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology:

The Damascus road event meant a new beginning and an illumination shining in the midst of darkness (II Cor. 4:6). It was a reversal and great diversion from the course which Paul formerly pursued with vigour. Paul could no longer evade the fact that the man Jesus who had been brought down to such a deep disgrace has now been raised to the heavenly glory and declared to be the Son of God with power (Rom. 1:4). Paul now sees the death of Jesus from a new perspective. His crucifixion was no longer seen as God's judgment on a criminal. The cross is the work of God himself and the sacrifice of an innocent person for the salvation of mankind and for the expiation of the past sins (II Cor. 5:21; I Cor. 15:3; I Thes. 3:9f.; Rom. 3:25). The liberation which Paul, had until now regarded as a future event, has already taken place. But it was not a political deliverance but emancipation from sin and a redemption from the curse of the Law. Of course, Paul did not come about these ideas overnight, they gradually developed in him. It dawned on him that salvation could not be achieved by human endeavour but through the merits of what God had done in the cross of Christ.

J. Dupont O.S.B. says that as far back as we can trace, Christian faith attributed a redeeming value to the death of Jesus. Paul would know of an interpretation which considered the death and resurrection of Jesus as an act of God for our salvation by grace without the Law. Furthermore, the Hellenistic Christians undoubtedly founded the Church in Antioch, just before Paul's conversion. This community contained Christian Gentiles, untouched by circumcision and Jewish observances. Therefore, the Hellenistic community from which Paul learned Christianity had a less orthodox Jewish view point. Otherwise, how would they have arrived at the conclusion that only faith in Christ was enough to make a person a member of the community of salvation without the necessity of practising the Law.²⁶

While Dupont is right in part, Paul's experience on the Damascus road had a major influence on Pauline ideas. His faith, commission and his preaching of salvation are essentially based on the revelation. Paul not only appeals to being an eye-witness of the

26. J. Dupont, O.S.B., "The Conversion of Paul and its influence on his understanding of Salvation by Faith", in Apostolic History and the Gospel, pp. 186-187.

resurrection appearance but includes himself in the great circle of all others, and especially the original Apostles. He says, "Whether then it was I or they, so we preach and so you believed" (I Cor. 15:11).²⁷ Apart from the Gospels, the words "cross" and "crucify" appear exclusively in Pauline letters. The other very few occurrences in the New Testament are in the literal sense (Acts. 2:36; Heb. 6:6, 12:12; Rev. 11:8). In Pauline letters, the cross is used purely as a theological concept. Of course, this is also true of the Gospels (Matt. 10:38; Lk. 9:23). This in no way suggests that the historical events of the cross had become less important for Paul or that he has replaced the historical event with theological interpretation. As far as Paul is concerned the theological interpretation cannot be separated from the historical occurrence. The phrase ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ
ΡΩΜΕΥΟΣ is found mostly in I Cor. 1-4 and Gal. 3. The cross is the mediation of God's power in prophetic wisdom. "Christ crucified as God's wisdom is set in opposition to all the wisdom of this world. The use

27. G. Bornkamm, "The Revelation of Christ to Paul on the Damascus Road and Reconciliation: A Study in Galatians I", in Reconciliation and Hope, pp. 92-94.

of the perfect participle ΕΣΤΑΥΡΩΜΕΝΟΣ with reference to the exalted Risen Lord shows that Jesus will ever remain the "crucified One". ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΑΥΡΩΜΕΝΟΣ is the indispensable σκάνδαλον of the Christian message.²⁸

The formula "Christ died for our sins" explains the redemptive character of Christ's death. Certainly, this was an old already existing formula prior to its use by Paul. In I Cor. 15, Paul is dealing with those who deny the resurrection of the dead. One would therefore, expect Paul in his argument to deal exclusively with the resurrection. But he begins with the significance of the death of Christ. This was essentially part of the traditions which he had received and then communicated to the Corinthians at the initial stage. Paul relates Christ's death to our sins in a way that has the implication of atonement. Paul is also ^{being} very specific here ^{rather} than general. Christ's death not only relates to our sinful existence and guilt but *signifies* that our sins have been removed. In Rom 3:24 Paul says

28. M.E. Ellis, "Christ Crucified", in Reconciliation and Hope, pp. 69-75, V. Furnish, Theology and Ethics in Paul, (Nashville 1968), pp. 224-227.

that God has put Christ forward as an expiation for our sins. It is only here that we have atoning sacrifice explicitly mentioned by Paul. Of course, the thought is present wherever he refers to the cross, death or blood of Christ (Rom. 5: 6-8, 8:32; I Cor. 5:7, 11: 25, 27; 14:15; Eph. 2:13; Gal. 2:20). In the death of Christ God appears as the righteous Judge by judging and condemning sin through that death and at the same time justifies and acquits those who believe in Jesus.²⁹

From Bultmann's point of view, Paul's interpretation of the redemptive character of Christ's death follows the tradition dating from the earliest Christian Church, but Paul's most typical concept is not contained in that tradition. Also in the statements where Paul describes the death of Christ as the atoning sacrifice designated by God do not represent the most essential element of Paul's concept. The death of Christ is not merely a sacrifice that takes away the guilt of sin but also becomes a means by which one is liberated from the powers of this aeon, of sin, of law

29. H. Riderbos, "The Earliest Confession of Atonement in Paul", in Reconciliation and Hope, pp. 76-82.

and death. God's deed of grace consists in the fact that he gave Christ up to die as propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men. Adam's fall brought death over mankind but the obedience of Christ brought life which came as the free gift of God's grace. The love of God and the grace of God are synonymous. "God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8).³⁰

The Gospel can be called "the word of the cross" because Christ is preached as "the crucified" (I Cor. 1:18, 23, 2:2; Gal. 3:1). The early preaching in Acts regards the cross as man's most glaring crime. It was sin's crowning horror, originating from the very slums of the human heart (3:14f., 7:52). But for Paul it is the cross that gives the clearest picture of God. It is the demonstration of the eternal love of God, in consequence of which Christ died for us the ungodly while we were still sinners. Käsemann says:

"Under the cross man attains manhood because that is where God reveals himself as what he really is - As our Creator, God is for us

30. R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, (S.C.M. Press, 1952), pp. 288-292.

and claims us as his creatures; that is the truth and proof of love."31.

To Paul it is the cross that made all the difference.

"Everything has been different since the Son of God climbed Calvary. Life has been different, death has been different, sin has been different, faith and hope and love have been different. Round the wide universe; the arms of the cross have reached its head has touched the heavens; its shaft has gone as deep as hell".³²

Through the cross, God reconciled Man to himself. Man is the prodigal who needs to be reconciled. He cannot in his own effort bridge the unfathomable gulf between himself and his Creator. The preaching of the cross exposes man's illusion in the belief that he can change his own life and work out his own salvation. It shows the futility of trusting in one's own wisdom or religious piety before God. Käsemann says:

"Everyone is foolish, vain and godless who wants to do without God and contrary to God what only God himself can do. Whether it is the devout man who makes the attempt or whether it is the criminal,

31. R. Käsemann, Jesus Means Freedom - A Polemical Survey of the New Testament (SCM Press Ltd., 1969), p. 76.

32. J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1972 edition), p. 228.

is in the last resort unimportant.
Only the Creator can be the creature's
salvation, not his own works."³³

Paul strongly attacks everything that stands in opposition to the cross. Both Judaism and Hellenistic philosophy have failed to help man to attain righteousness before God. This is why God is now saving man by the folly of the cross. Humanly speaking, it is weak and paradoxical, but from the divine point of view, it is wisdom and power (I Cor. 2:24).

In the incarnation and the cross Christ became what we are in order that we may become what he is. He was born in the likeness of the sinful flesh. As a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. There he was made both sin and curse for us (Phil. 2: 5-11; Gal. 3:13, 4:4; II Cor. 5:21).³⁴ Man's failure to keep the law places him under a curse (Gal. 3:10). But this curse was annulled by Christ for us when he bore the curse on the cross. He redeemed (ἐξῆλυτο ἡμᾶς)

33. E. Käsemann, Perspectives on Paul (S.C.M., London, 1971), p.41

34. Ibid., p. 43, M.D. Hooker, "Interchange in Christ" in Journal of Theological Studies (Vol 22, 1971), pp. 349ff.

us from the curse of the Law (Dt. 27: 15-26). Paul in Gal. 3:13 quoted from the LXX form of Dt. 21:23 but omitted (ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ = ~~Ο ΠΡΟΣΧΗΤΟΣ~~). Bligh says that the price Jesus paid was himself and that he submitted his own person to the curse of the Law in order to free us ^{from} the curse and also that the ransom was paid to the Law or its angels (Gal. 3:19; Col. 2:15).³⁵ But while ~~εξαγορασω~~ has the idea of buying some one out of the power of somebody else, Paul does not say anything of the price paid or to whom it was paid.³⁶ Jesus fell under the curse of the Law in that he was tried, condemned and crucified under the Law. He died as one upon whom the curse of the Law had fallen. He embodied in himself the totality of the curse for us. Whiteley says: "Christ has incurred the curse of the Law and exhausted its power, like the one who explodes a mine and destroys its power at the cost of physical annihilation."³⁷

-
35. J. Bligh, Galatians in Greek, (University of Detroit Press, 1966), p. 141.
36. In connection with the redemption of the people of Israel from the Babylonian captivity Yahweh is reported to have said: "For thus says the Lord: "You were sold for nothing and you shall be redeemed without money" (Is. 52:3).
37. D.E.H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul, (Oxford, 1984), p.88.

Similarly, Christ was made sin for us (II Cor. 5:21). γνώματι in the verse refers to a knowledge gained by personal experience μὴ γνόντα would therefore mean that Jesus had no personal experience of sin (cf. Heb. 4:15; I Pet. 2:22, 3:18; I John 3:5; Acts 3:14; John 8:46, 18:38). Here man's attention is drawn to the paradox of the redemptive love of God, a paradox that often baffles man's finite mind. He was sinless and yet he was made ἁμαρτία for us. The LXX uses ἁμαρτία for sin offering (Lev. 4:24).³⁸ It is the sacrifice by a ruler for his errors. Before the he-goat is killed the ruler lays his hand on it confessing his sins. But this cannot be an adequate explanation of how Jesus was made sin for us. It is rather that in some unfathomable way Christ became identified with the sinful race both in the incarnation and on the cross, in order that we might become the righteousness of God in him. In some ways not perceptible, Christ became involved in human sin. He helped mankind by completely entering into their situation, taking their place and sharing their

38. R.V.G. Tasker, II Corinthians, (London, 1969), pp. 90-91.

sufferings. By the ignominy and punishment of the cross, He embodied in himself the guilt of mankind.

But the strange man of the cross cannot redeem man, if he is not at the same time the Risen, Ever-living Lord. If Christ did not rise from the dead, no efficacy could be attached to his death. His resurrection is victory over death and leading of a new creation into a new world. In the divine wisdom Christ's death and resurrection are linked together as two co-ordinating forces that bring about the death and resurrection of man at the same time. The death and the resurrection of Jesus are bound together in the unity of one salvation occurrence because he who died is also the one who is raised up (Rom. 8:34; II Cor. 5:15, 13:4).

In every passage where Paul mentions Adam, there is a specific reference to Christ (Rom. 5: 12-17; I Cor. 15: 21, 22, 45-49; Phil. 2: 5-11). The first Adam was placed in favourable conditions and the only obligation laid on him was to live in humble obedience to and dependence on his Maker. In return Adam was to exercise authority over all created things. But instead Adam chose to seek independence from God and

deal with God as an equal. Consequently, he lost the privileges granted him and brought the whole world under the sway of evil powers.

Philippians 2: 5-11 is one of the most difficult passages in the New Testament. It is difficult to make any statement on it that will not be subject to scholarly controversy. The origin of the hymn has also remained a subject of controversy. But the scholastic controversies are of little moment for our present study. Nevertheless, there is general agreement that the hymn-like passage forms a separate unit and that it is doctrinal, speaking about the nature and redemptive work of Christ and his exaltation after the resurrection. The hymn is a summary of the mysteries relating to the incarnate Son of God which the Church has professed from the beginning.³⁹

Paul says that Christ did not count equality with God ~~ἄρτα γμο's~~. If we follow the A.V. rendering: "thought it not robbery" or the R.S.V. rendering: "a thing to be grasped" we can see the

39. It is difficult to decide conclusively to which world of thought the hymn belongs. How did Paul come about these words and concepts to describe the Christian faith? Is the hymn Palestinian or Hellenistic in origin? If Paul is the author has he altered the original wording of the hymn? The answers to these questions are not all that clear cut. But the hymn is apparently pre-Pauline and of Antioch in Syria's origin. Nevertheless, the thoughts are not alien to the early Palestinian Church and they are found elsewhere in Paul (cf. II Cor. 5:21, 8:9; Eph. 4:9f.; Rom. 10: 6-7).

picture of what Adam did; it was by snatching at equality with God that he fell from the high position granted him by God among the creation. A few other translations also render the phrase variously thus:

"Did not cling to his prerogative as God's equal" (Philips). "Yet he did not look upon equality with God as above all things to be cling to" (T.C.N.T.)

"Yet he did not cling to his equality with God" (J.B.).

"Yet he did not prize his equality with God" (N.E.B. note g.). All the above are apparently an over

translation. The entire passage itself raises the problem of whether this equality with God was already possessed before the incarnation or that it came to be so after the exaltation. Verses 6-8 seem to suggest that it was pre-incarnation while verses 9-11 apparently see it as a post-exaltation thing. Paul speaking similarly in Rom. 1:3f. says: "... designated Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead; Jesus Christ the Lord".

Paul's addition of ΕΝ ΣΟΥΧΗ suggests that Christ has been the Son of God in weakness (during his earthly ministry) but at the resurrection he had become the Son of God ΕΝ ΔΥΝΑΜΕΙ.

We cannot press the analogy between Adam and Christ too far without running into difficulty. In Barrett's view it would be a simple clear-cut picture if we could say Christ like Adam was a man ^{but} unlike Adam was an obedient man, and did not clutch at that which was above him, also that God rewarded his obedience and humility with the leadership of creation for which Adam was made but lost. But Paul cannot accept this with all its implications because they are inconsistent with his Son-of-God Christology.⁴⁰ The problem here is the paradox of the person of Jesus who is confessed as both truly man and truly God at the same time. The act of Jesus was, though that of an obedient man, the act of a gracious merciful God. As the eternal Son of God Christ is equal with God, but he emptied himself and became obedient. As Man Christ did not regard it as a thing to be grasped but accepted the incarnation with all its implications. Therefore, in Christ the obedient and believing man was found. Through the incarnation Christ entered ⁱⁿ to the world which had fallen under the sway of evil powers in order to set it free once and for all. Through the disobedience of

40. C.K. Barrett, From First Adam to Last (A. & C. Black, London, 1962), p. 71.

Adam all men were made sinners but through the obedience of Christ the mass of men shall be constituted righteous. "All men" in Romans 5: 12-19 refers to the universal effect of sin and Christ's redemptive act. But as Barrett points out a distinction must be made between the anthropological and cosmic effects of Adam's sin and Christ's work. Christ's victory over the demonic powers must be universal nevertheless the same cannot be said of its anthropological achievement. These powers are certainly defeated for mankind, but that does not mean that every man is now rightly related to God.⁴¹

By the time of Paul there were wide speculations among the Jews about Adam. Philo who was greatly influenced by various philosophical ideas noted that Gen. 1:26ff. and 2:7 contain two distinct accounts of the creation of Adam and inferred that God created two primeval men, One was made in the perfect image of God and the other from the material world and he is the ancestor of the human race. The Septuagint uses Εἰκὼν to translate image in Gen. 1:26, a word

41. C.K. Barrett, Ibid., p. 73.

which Paul used frequently of Christ (II Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15). ~~μορφῆ~~ is used in the same sense in Philippians. ~~μορφῆ~~ refers to essential attributes that reveal the inner reality of an object. According to Houlden ~~ἀρτυματός~~ is a common popular word meaning "a lucky find," "a piece of good luck".⁴² While remaining essentially divine, the Son assumes a human nature. Christ did not think of his divine glory as something that must be clung to at all costs. If he so desired, he could have impressed the world by appearing like a king. His exaltation also was not snatched, but received only as God's gift after he had trodden the path of obedience. He assumed the role of a Servant or the Ebed Yahweh of Isaiah. Just as Christ's divine nature expresses his divinity, so also does his Servant character express his humanity, which is subject to suffering and death. His death is the greatest self-surrender and the final act of obedience by the Man Jesus. There is no direct reference to his resurrection in Philippians but to

42. J.L. Houlden, Paul's Letters from Prison, (Penguin Books, London 1970), pp. 69-84.

his exaltation to the right hand of God and the conferment of the unique name Jesus. The passage apparently speaks of Christ's exaltation as a reward of obedience. It is only here in the Pauline Corpus that Christ's glorification appears in terms of merit.⁴³ But as Stanley points out, this is a soteriological complex stressing the solidarity of men with Christ as the second Adam.⁴⁴ Here the honour that is due to God alone must be rendered to Jesus as the Exalted Risen Lord. All creation is expected to give divine worship to the exalted name, Jesus. The divine adoration paid to Christ finds concrete expression in the confession of the primitive Church (Rom. 10:9). Christ died and lives again purposely to become the Lord of both the dead and the living (Rom. 14:9).

As we have earlier noted, Christ's resurrection is the indispensable complement of his death for our

43. But the Reformed theologians were opposed to the idea that Christ's glorification was given to him as a reward. Calvin also adopted the useless expedient of translating *Si quo facto*. The Arians in the fourth century used the verse to buttress their subordinationist theory (cf. Heb. 1: 1-4, 12, 2-3).

44. Stanley, Op.cit., p. 99

sins. Christ's death alone is for that reason insufficient.⁴⁵ In Romans 4:24 and 25 Paul explicitly expresses the central point of his kerygma thus: "... Jesus our Lord, who was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification". Here Paul speaks of our being acquitted by God. As God extended his judgment over sin in delivering Christ up to death, so God executed our acquittal and justification in Christ's resurrection. The crucifixion was not particularly a bloody execution. Therefore whenever Paul makes reference to the blood of Christ, it is not the manner of his death that is being considered, but its significance as a sacrifice. He speaks of Jesus' death as a paschal sacrifice and as an offering for the eradication of sin (I Cor. 5:7). His concept of the atoning sacrifice has the idea of forensic justification. In Christ's death God reveals himself as the righteous judge who in Christ's death judges and condemns sin and also at the same time justifies and acquits those who put their trust in Jesus.

In Dunn's opinion, the key idea that runs through

45. H.N. Ridderbos, "The Earliest Confession of the Atonement in Paul", in Reconciliation and Hope, Op.cit., p. 78.

Paul's Christology and binds it to his soteriology is that of solidarity or representation. Jesus became one with man in order to put an end to sinful man in order that a new man might come into being. He became what man is in order that by his resurrection man might become what he is. Paul's points of comparison between Adam and Jesus rest on the representative significance of the two men. For Paul, Adam represents mankind and what man might have been and what man now is. But Jesus represents a new kind of man who only dies but lives again. Christ in his earthly life represents the fallen man, man who though he lives again is first subject to death. He represents what man now is and by his obedience what man might become.⁴⁶

Like the writer of Hebrews, Paul in his conception of soteriology has Ps. 8: 4-6 in mind. Jesus was the man who fulfilled the destiny God had originally intended for man. Man had been made a little lower than the angels but had not yet been crowned with glory and honour and granted lordship over all things. But in contrast to the first man, Christ had fulfilled that destiny. By becoming man, he too was for a short

46. J.D.G. Dunn, "Paul's understanding of the Death of Jesus", in Reconciliation and Hope, Op.cit., pp. 126-127.

while lower than the angels. But in consequence of his suffering and resurrection he has now been crowned with glory and honour (Heb. 2: 6-9). Jesus entered his new destiny after living, suffering and dying like man. Adam missed his original destiny because of sin and his destiny became death. Christ lived after that destiny by dying. Nevertheless, through the resurrection he created for man a new destiny of life. But Christ must as necessity live out the destiny of the first Adam before the destiny of the new Adam can become a reality.

As for Paul, Jesus in his life and death is a representative of the fallen man. "One man died for all; therefore all mankind (ΟΙ ΠΑΝΤΕΣ) died". What is true of Christ as man's representative is true of all men in general. The fact that Christ died means that there is no other possible end for man. If there is any other means of overcoming man's fallenness and subjection to various powers it would not have been necessary for Christ to die. It is only through death that the new Man can emerge in risen life. But Christ's identification with fallen men is up to and into death. Beyond death Christ in a sense no longer represents all men. In his risen

life he represents those who have become one with him in his death and resurrection and have made him their Lord (Rom. 10; I Cor. 15:15). To die with Christ is also to live with him. This would then mean that the "all" of II Cor. 5: 14-15^a is different from the all of 5:15^b, the second all refers to believers only. This therefore means that Christ's representative capacity at death differs from his representative capacity after the resurrection (Rom. 8:3; cf. I Cor. 15: 44-45). All men die but only those in Christ who is the Life-giving Spirit can experience the new life. Christ represents men not just on the cross, but his death was ours; not just that he died in our stead but that as man he died for all. The fallen man can in no way escape death; he either dies his own death without identifying himself with Christ, or he can identify himself with Christ and so die with Christ in order to live with him (Rom. 7:24f., 8: 10-13; I Cor. 5:14f; II Cor. 4: 10-12; Phil. 3:10f.).

In Romans Paul deals with the divine election, the role of faith in justification, the atonement offered by Christ's death and resurrection. In the statement: "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God"

(Rom. 3:23), Paul is stressing the reason for the universality of redemption. All have sinned and consequently fallen short of ^{the} ideal splendor of God's glory. In the LXX, the term δοξα (דוֹא) always speaks of divine presence as manifested and communicated to man (Ex. 24: 16-17, 40: 34-38). Of course, in certain aspects δοξα in Paul refers to the eschatological blessings connected with the resurrection from the dead and therefore remains an object of hope during the present life. Nevertheless, those already justified by faith can have a fore-taste of that glory now. Similarly he says that Christ was raised up by the glory of God (Rom. 5:2; 6:4; 8: 18, 21, 30; II Cor. 3:18). Using Abraham as ^{an} illustration Paul says that justification comes through faith in God's promise. The object of Abraham's faith is the God who has power even to raise the dead and calls into being what is non-existent. Christianity is also faith in the God who raised Jesus from the dead (Rom. 4: 18-25, cf. Heb. 11: 17-19). Paul relates Christ's death to the forgiveness of sin, while his resurrection relates to our justification. God's justice is shown in forgiving

sins through the merit of Christ's death and his act of raising Jesus resulted in our justification. The event of Christ therefore, liberates man from sin and death its consequence; from selfish ego and from the Law (Rom. 5: 12ff.; 6: 1-11: 1-6). No one can deprive us of this salvation accomplished by the love of God in Christ Jesus (Rom. 8: 32-39).

The idea that salvation is something already acquired is more explicit in the captivity epistles than the first ones. But the attitude which places emphasis on the Christian present life is consistent with Paul's earlier conception of salvation as the supreme eschatological reality. The salvation which was inaugurated by the death and resurrection of Christ will also be consummated at the parousia by the glorious resurrection of the body (Phil. 3:20; Rom. 8: 23-24). Paul speaks of the mystery of salvation wrought by God in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. God in his undeserved mercy has predestined us for the purpose of adoption as sons and daughters. Another mystery of this salvation is that it has brought the Jews and the Gentiles together as one people in the divine commonwealth. In Stanley's opinion, Paul's initiation into the meaning of the Christian mystery at this conversion

stands in striking contrast to the Pentecostal experience which constituted the first disciples into the Church. He says that the disciples' experience was essentially that ^{of} the Spirit as distinct from Jesus Christ exalted as Son of God who sent his Spirit upon the community, and distinct from the Father, from whom the glorified Lord Jesus had received him as object of divine promise (Acts 2: 32-33). It was through the presence of the Holy Spirit that the Apostles had been given the revelation of Christ's divinity and the salvific nature of his death and resurrection. Also on the other hand Paul's momentous meeting with Christ near Damascus revealed to him first and foremost that the One raised from death was the Son of God and the God who raised him from death ^{his} Father. It is only after being received into the Church that Paul received the Holy Spirit through baptism. Furthermore, ^{Stanley} says that this distinctive character between the experience of the early disciples and that of Paul accounts for variations in the conception of salvation. It was the identity of the One raised from death as God's Son with the crucified Jesus that made a profound impression on

Paul's mind. Thus from the beginning Paul was preaching salvation through the death and resurrection of Jesus and that Christ was the Son of God.⁴⁷

But the distinction between Paul's experience and that of the early disciples is not as sharp as Stanley tries to portray it. It is true that Paul's experience was sudden and dramatic. It is difficult to believe that the Holy Spirit had no major part to play in Paul's conversion until after his baptism. The suddenness of his conversion cannot rule out what we can call "prevenient grace" which prepared his soul for its entrance into the initial state of salvation and this is always the work of the Holy Spirit. This grace operates on the unified integrated personality of man who is made a free and responsible agent. The grace awakens the soul to the reality of sin and enlists the heart on the side of the truth. This means that there must be continuous co-operation between God's grace and the human will before salvation can take place. Also there appears to be no doubt in the minds of the early disciples that the crucified Jesus is also the Risen Exalted Lord who now manifests himself

47. D.M. Stanley, S.J. Op.cit., pp. 250-251.

through the Holy Spirit. If the disciples had not been convinced of resurrection and if Jesus had not met and dealt with them as the Risen Lord, Pentecost and all that followed would perhaps not have taken place. The early apostolic preaching had its foundation on the resurrection experiences which had a profound impression on the disciples. The special descent of the Holy Spirit after Paul's baptism came purely as a seal of what God had already accomplished through faith in Paul. In spite of the above we cannot deny the fact that there are marked differences between the soteriological conception of Paul and that of the first disciples, at least at the earliest stage.

Paul in his conception of salvation was faithful to the apostolic tradition in the belief that the work of Christian salvation is the work of God himself. The primitive Apostolic Kerygma presented the death and resurrection of Jesus as the work of God and are expressly attributed to God (Acts 2:24, 3:15, 4:10, 5:30, 10:40, 13:20, 37, 17:31). Although the death of Jesus is always presented as the criminal work of the Jews and Romans due to malice and ignorance, its redemptive significance is always made clear. It is therefore,

not surprising that the conception of Christ's death as God's work gradually became explicit in Paul, though not without hesitation. (Acts 2:23, 36, 3: 15, 18, 4:10:39, 13:28, 17:3; Cf. I Cor. 2:8; I Cor. 15:3; I Thess. 2: 14-15).

Paul's recognition of the Risen Jesus as the Son of God brought about in him a new consciousness of the nature of God as Father. This new knowledge of the Fatherhood of God surpasses all that Paul had learned in Judaism and this was particularly clear to him. He refers to God quite often in his letters as "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ". Also in his epistolary greetings we have the common expression "grace and peace from God our Father". Paul regards the event of his conversion as the Father's revelation of his Son to him. (I Cor. 1: 2-3; Gal. 1: 2, 3, 16; Eph. 1: 2, 3; II Cor. 1:2; Col. 1:2, 3; II Thes. 1:1; Rom. 1:7). It was as the Son of God that Christ died on our behalf. God in his incarnate Son effectively condemned sin through Christ's death and resurrection. The most significant thing for Paul as regards to Christ's death is that he died as the Son of God; that God did not spare his own Son (Rom. 8:3, 32). His

resurrection as God's Son prefigures the pattern of that which we have been predestined to be as Christians (Rom. 8:29). The Pauline soteriology emphasises the unity of the work of the Father and the Son in effecting redemption and reconciliation. While Christ's redemptive death is attributed to the Father's initiative, Paul affirms often that it is also the work of the Son (Rom. 4:25, 8:32; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 2:16; II Cor. 5:18; Col. 1: 20-22; Rom. 5:10).

Apparently, according to Acts, the primitive preaching laid greater stress on the resurrection than his death. But for Paul, the crucified Christ was the centre of his Kerygma. He decided to know nothing among the Corinthians except Jesus Christ and him crucified (I Cor. 2:2). He described his preaching in Galatia as a placarding of Jesus as crucified (Gal. 3:1). But the use of ΕΟΤΑΥΡΩΜΕΝΟΣ by which stress is placed on his death also includes the thought of the resurrection. This is made plain in the statement. "... is it Christ Jesus who died, yea who was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who indeed intercedes for us". (Rom. 8:34). The Redeemer is the same Christ who died and was raised

(II Cor. 5:15). In Paul's conception redemption is both eschatological and an accomplished fact. Its total reality is found in the glorified humanity of the Risen Christ. Since the resurrection is involved in the forgiveness of sins and man's justification, it is therefore an intrinsic cause of salvation (Rom. 4:25; I Cor. 15:17). By his death we are dead to sin and by his resurrection we are alive to God (Rom. 6:11, 8:10). Christ's death and resurrection have issued in a new life.

Apart from the life of every individual Christian, the whole salvation history is governed by the dynamism of Christ's death and resurrection. Israel's rejection and re-admission is seen as a kind of dying and rising (Rom. 11:15; cf. Ez. 37). The present corrupt state of material creation is like death but its glorious liberation from the bondage of corruption and share in the redemption of God's children is like resurrection (Rom. 8: 19-22). Thus Paul's conception of salvation consists in a series of crises and restorations, dyings and risings involving individuals, nations and the universe. This is the form in which salvation has been accomplished for all men, since Christ died for all and

was raised for all (III Cor. 15:15).

(e) The Resurrection Ethics:

(1) Grace:

In Rom. 6:1ff. Paul describes the Christian life as life under grace. ~~Χάρις~~ or ~~חסד~~ is used almost exclusively of Yahweh in the Old Testament and of Christ in the New Testament. ~~Χάρις~~ speaks of God's loving kindness towards helpless mankind. Yahweh is a gracious compassionate God, slow to anger and full of mercy. He will abundantly pardon and he will not nurse his anger forever (Ps. 103:8ff.; 86; Ex. 34:6, 7, 33:19; Jonah 4:2). ~~חסד~~ is the unmerited favour or covenant love suggesting the idea of God's loyalty to the covenant. But it also connotes the faithfulness which both parties to a covenant must observe (Lam. 3:22; Hos. 6:6). The election of Israel was not based on Israel's righteousness but on God's choice in grace (Dt. 7: 7-8). Nevertheless it was Paul who thoroughly developed this doctrine of grace. The death and resurrection of Jesus has brought man into faith-covenant relation with God based purely on grace. By faith in Christ God graciously treats a sinner as 'though he had not sinned. Faith is the human response

to God's grace and even this faith is the gift of grace (Rom. 5:2, 10:9; Eph. 2: 8, 9). Paul's Gospel is the Gospel of grace and the idea of salvation as a gift is absolutely essential to the meaning of Χάρις. There can be no question of one's righteousness before God, but salvation is all of grace (Ro. 5:17; 10:3; Gal. 1:6; Phil. 3:9; Acts 20:24).

But grace is not a means of introducing man to an unethical or a spiritual religion that knows no law. This grace is morally vital in itself. Paul's opponents misrepresented his Gospel as being tantamount to: "Why not do evil that ~~grace~~ may come?" In a reply Paul asks: "Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound?" This Paul vigorously repudiates without qualification (Rom 6: 1 & 2). This decisive negation shows the absurdity and inherent contradiction of the supposed inference, from Paul's teaching. "No, no! We died to sin: how can we live in it any longer? Death and life do not co-exist. Therefore, it is impossible to be dead and living with regard to the same thing simultaneously. By the use of ἅπτεσθαι, Paul has in mind a death that occurs, once and for all in believers in relation to sin through the events of

of Christ. Death to sin frees a believer from the domain of sin. The grace changes man's nature so effectively that he can no longer continue in sin. The victory of grace through the works of Christ inaugurates a new existence and places man under a new imperative. It establishes a reality from which a believer risen with Christ could not again depart.

Bornkamm says:

"The basis of the incompatibility of sin and grace, and therefore of sin and Christian life, is not initially a duty, but a fact; not a decision to which we called, but a decision that has happened to us. We have died to sin;... We have no more life that we could leave to it. Therefore, it means no less than this: we have death behind us, at our back, no longer before us. Our own existence, which sin could still have at its disposal, is past".⁴⁸

Obedient submission in faith to the grace of God and the acceptance of the cross should be a surrender of the old nature. Grace speaks of the total self-givingness of God. The cross marks the overcoming of sin by God (Rom. 8:3) and by it the power of sin is condemned and destroyed. The resurrection makes the

48. G. Bornkamm, Early Christian Experience (SCM Press, Ltd., New York, 1969), p.73.

conquest of sin valid for all ages (Rom. 6:10; I Cor. 15:56). This is why the preaching of the cross is ΣΥΝΑΜΙΣ ΘΕΟΥ and ΣΟΦΙΑ ΘΕΟΥ (I Cor. 1:18ff.). The knowledge that Jesus died for man's sin, even when they do not deserve such sacrificial love should awaken a better instinct in man to resist and overcome sin. A Christian who is redeemed no longer belongs to himself. Therefore, a Christian can no longer remain in sin as if nothing had happened on the cross and in his baptism with Christ.

(2) Dying and Rising with Christ:

The Apostle employs various concepts of baptism to describe the life of a Christian. He realizes that Christians everywhere cannot be ignorant of the universal symbolism of baptism or ritual washing.

(Rom. 6:3). But Paul is giving baptism a new deeply profound meaning in the light of Christ's death and resurrection. Ritual washing is common to ancient Near Eastern religions, Judaism, Hellenism, African Traditional Religion and Islam.⁴⁹ It is generally

49. H.W. Turner, African Independent Church, Vol. II (Oxford, 1967)pp. 188-198.

accepted that ritual washing is effective for the purification of the body. The Qumran community practised baptism as a rite of initiation into the community. It was also ^{requirement} ~~one~~ for receiving the Gentiles into the ~~Covenant-race~~. In the preaching of John the Baptist, baptism was a seal of repentance and forgiveness ^{for all Israel} in preparation for the Messianic age that was about to break forth (Matt. 3: 1-12; Mk. 1: 2-8; Lk. 3: 2-17). In early apostolic preaching baptism was also regarded as purification and the rite of initiation into the Kingdom Community (Acts 2:38, 41; 9:18, 10: 47-48). Paul sees baptism as an integral part of God's plan for salvation and places it in a covenant setting. Paul equates spiritual deadness in trespasses with uncircumcision. Baptism is the circumcision of Christ by which we put off the old existence in exchange for the new. In the way the circumcision became the seal of Abraham's faith in the Promise of God, baptism has become the seal of faith in the fulfilment of the Abrahamic Promise. If a Christian knows the reality of the symbolism of baptism, he will experience divine quickening in the way

Abraham was made new (Gen. 17:6; Col. 2: 11-12-13; Rom. 4: 16-22; Cf. Heb. 11: 11-14). In baptism we are brought into contact with Christ in his death and resurrection and become identified with him in these events. Death with Christ means death to sin and rising with him means a new life of righteousness.

All those who have been baptised into union with Christ have been baptised into his death (Rom. 6:4). It is an act of incorporation into Christ. A Christian dies because he has died and this is made a reality in the symbolism of baptism. Christ's death becomes the death of the believers in baptism. Union with Christ in his baptism brings victory over sin. Through baptism a Christian is introduced to the very act by which Christ died to sin. On the cross sin as a personal power lost its case. It is death that brings release from all entanglements and all binding obligations. Dying to sin in Christ cannot be different. Christ has died once and for all to sin and it then follows that man who thus dies in Christ is released once for all from the dominion of sin. On this basis, therefore, all those who have been baptised into Christ should live

(6: 5-11). In baptism we also go into the act of burial with Christ. We die in him, we are buried in him, and our grave is in his death. The burial symbolises the total submission of the old-self in union with Christ. Just as death is sealed and made certain by burial, ~~so~~ our being immersed is a sort of funeral publicly proclaiming the certainty of our death to sin. Before a new humanity can emerge, the old humanity must die and be buried.

Our emergence from the water is our resurrection with him. This is nothing else, but the life of Christ himself or a new kind of supernatural life (Rom. 6:4, 12:1, 2). This is the possibility and reality of life now opened to us in Christ. The resurrection of Jesus is a once for all act which rules out the future possibility of another death. Continuing in sin after publicly identifying ourselves with Christ's events in baptism amounts to putting Christ to death the second time and denying the power of his resurrection (Phil. 3: 18-21; I Cor. 15: 14, 17, 32). We must make this resurrection a reality by focusing our attention on spiritual things (Col. 3: 1-4). We have died to earthly

things and we should now live to God, the source of our new life. The oúv of Col. 3:5 means that our death and resurrection in baptism must be a putting to death of the old existence and absolute separation from it (Col. 3: 5-9). The old personality must be stripped off and the new man put on. But why this imperative to put to death if it has already taken place in baptism? The imperative apparently removes the impact of the indicative - "you have died". This is the obvious reason for the oúv here. What Paul is saying is: "You have died, therefore put to death," "You have died, therefore you have been raised". And, "You have put off, therefore put on". It is a call on Christians to claim what is already theirs; a call not only to understand what they are but to behave thus. It is not a discrepancy between what is theoretical and what is practicable or an ideal and reality. The imperative follows because the fact of the indicative is already established. This is brought into realization by daily practical experience and spiritual growth. Although Christians still live in the flesh which is susceptible to temptation, with determination any attempt by the old existence to gain ascendancy must

be mortified. There must be a radical self-denial to guide against sins of impurity, anger and sins of the tongue. In the actual sense sin and flesh do not die, but we should reckon ourselves as dead to them (Rom. 6:11). These powers, are still as effective as before and constantly seeking to gain ascendancy over every freed man of Christ. But in Christ believers can be triumphantly victorious. By becoming what we are, we are kept victorious always over the body which can still be enticed by sin, because it is yet a mortal body. We are already freed from the bondage of the body and we are no longer its slaves.

According to Schweitzer, at baptism the old life certainly comes to an end and entry into the kingdom is given as a definite divine promise. Dying to the old life of sin has definitely taken place in baptism but rising to the future state of eternal life is still future. Nevertheless, this future life penetrates the still earthly existence of the baptised through the presence of the Holy Spirit. The baptized have been transferred into Christ, anointed and given the Spirit

as a pledge.⁵⁰ Similarly, Stanley says that those who are to share in the Kingdom must pass through the experience of death and resurrection with Jesus and thus acquire the resurrection existence. Dying and rising with Christ occur during our present existence as Christians. The futuristic sense of rising with Christ in Rom. 6 is that Paul believes that the indicative of the life of grace has a corresponding imperative.⁵¹ The purpose of redemption is the orientation of the Christian life to that of the Risen Christ. Baptism not only signifies a participation in the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus but also in his absolute obedience to the Father. In Col. 3: 9-11, Paul apparently has the First Adam and Christ the Last Adam in mind, and describes baptism as the breaking of the old sinful solidarity with the first parent and entry into a new solidarity of grace with Christ.

(3) Putting off, Putting on:

In Baptism we put off the old existence and we put on the new man. As in Jewish circumcision we put off the old body of the flesh ^{by spiritual circumcision.} (Col. 2: 10-15). The

50. E.D. Schweizer, "Dying and Rising with Christ" in N.T. Studies, Vol. 14, (1968), p.7.

51. Stanley, Op.cit., p. 7

circumcision of Christ introduces us into the fullness of life (ΠΕΤΤΑΝΡΩΜΕΝΟΙ) in Christ and to the new Community of God. Like the old circumcision, the new one is a seal of our new existence. Our death, burial and resurrection with Christ are vividly portrayed in the new circumcision. The radical change is effected by God who has manifested his power by raising Jesus from the dead. Our emergence from the Baptismal water signifies the putting off of the old nature through which sin has enslaved us and caused our spiritual death. All those who have been baptised into Christ have put on the Lord Jesus Christ (Gal. 3:27). It is an establishment of a new personal relationship with Christ. We symbolically put off all that we are in Adam (Eph. 4: 22-24; Col. 3: 9-17).

ἀποθέσθαι, & νανεοῦσθαι and ἐνδύσασθαι literally refer to the changing of dress. We symbolically put off the corrupt old nature in our resurrection and the life of God is reactivated in us. Man was originally created in the image of God (Gen. 1: 27), but this image was affected by the Fall. Rising with Christ, therefore means a restoration of the original image and it becomes the

pattern after which God now fashions our lives.

Eph. 4: 25-5:18 and Col. 3: 12-17 give the list of the things we should now put away and what we should put on as new garment - (ἀποθέμενοι). Paul in Colossians uses ἀπεκδυσάμενοι and ἐνδυσάμενοι for putting off and putting on. Putting off the old existence must mean total separation from the old ways of life. The gross licence that marked the former existence must forth-with be done away. Prevailing sins like lying, dishonesty, quarrelsomeness, bitterness, filthiness and drunkenness must stop. The integrity of the new life lies in honesty, truthfulness, forgiving-spirit, edifying-speech, philanthropy, compassion and humility. The indwelling Holy Spirit who is the Sealer of our faith quenches all unholy desires, banishes every selfishness and inaugurates the love of God in our hearts. We should patiently and meekly cultivate a forgiving spirit. We shall forgive and love more when we realize how much God in Christ has forgiven us.

By becoming identified with Christ in his death and resurrection,* we form one mystical corporate unity with him (Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:11). The new incorporation

brings sexual discrimination and traditional class distinction to an end. Religious barriers, cultural and linguistic differences have been put to death on the cross (Eph. 2: 13-17). In the new incorporation nationality does not count. You can no longer refer to your fellow men as barbarians - meaning uncivilized or untutored; no longer can you call another circumcised or uncircumcised dogs, which is religious discrimination; no longer can any one be called Scythian - that is, northern savages. In Christ there is no slave or free, which is civil discrimination and a denial of the common brotherhood of man; nor is there male or female, which is a claim of sexual superiority, that seeks to enslave that which is regarded as the weaker sex. By being baptised into Christ believers have formed one Organic Body, though they are still distinct individuals.

In spite of the above, Paul never says that baptism which is not accompanied by faith magically transforms a person's life. He stresses that salvation is by faith in response to the gift of God's love. Baptism will be in vain if it does not signify the possession of the transforming faith. Baptism is a token of what the grace of God has wrought within man.

In Baptism we outwardly acknowledge and express the inward change. It is a solemn promise that we shall behave as Christ has made us.

(4) The New Incorporation:

ΕΝ ΤΩ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ or its equivalent appears in all authentic Pauline letters except for II Thessalonians. It is a phrase that brings all the Pauline teachings together or a short summary of all the salvation events wrought by God in Christ for man. It is a discription of how man now stands in relation to God through the events of Christ. It is an expression of mystical union with Christ who is now our life. It is a short definition of ^{being a} Christian. Kennedy says:

"This supremely intimate relation of union with Christ constitutes for Paul, the presupposition of everything that counts in salvation".⁵²

Barclay also says:

"The phrase is not so much the essence of Paul's theology, as it is a summary of his religion... It is something to be known and experienced, by every Christian man and woman... It is the essence of every Christian life".⁵³

Union with Christ is a brief summary of all that the

52. H.A.A. Kennedy, Op.cit., p. 124

53. W. Barclay, The Mind of Paul (Fontana Books, 1972), p.92.

apostle means by salvation.

"In Christ" is a place of refuge, security, comfort and hope. We live because we abide there; we die fast when we withdraw from our refuge. To be in Christ and to be in God equally means the same thing. If one wants to know the key to the secret of Paul's Christian life, it is "Living in Christ". This mystical union is not subject to time and space; it is an endless relation with the Risen Exalted, Life-giving Saviour. Certainly, the basis of Paul's teaching on mystical union with Christ came from his own personal experience. His conversion was not subject to an intellectual change, but a deep personal apprehension of the Risen Christ who is now the Lord of his life. It is a complete identification with Christ in his death, resurrection and life (Gal. 2:20; Phil. 3:10). He saw various stages of Christian life as corresponding to all that took place in the redemptive work of Christ. In Christ, Christians part with the old past to embrace a real new life and embark upon a new career, for now and for ^{the} future. In

Christ we wholly identify ourselves with the power that has penetrated through us by radicalising our lives. "Therefore if any one is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away, behold the new has come" (II Cor. 5:17). ~~Τὸ Πᾶντα~~ is not in the ancient Mss. Nevertheless, Paul means that the entire world of the old existence changes for a man who is in Christ and he now lives eschatologically in a new world. This consciousness transforms the will to make it the source of moral life.

St. Paul's Gospel is one that patterns the adherent's life after the life of God. The Pauline ethics is not a replacement of the Mosaic Law with a new legal system. It is a call on Christians to behave as what God has already made them in Jesus Christ. Christians should make all that is theirs in Christ their own. Love is a mutual thing, and man must show his appreciation of the undeserved love of God; this can only be shown by living according to his will. This is why every theological argument of Paul ends with ethical admonition. The long arguments on salvation in Romans and Galatians end in ethical demands (Rom. 12-15; Gal. 5: 13-6:10; cf. Eph. 4: 17-6:9;

Col. 3: 1-4:6; I Thess. 5). Christ has got the right to control man's life because of what God has done for man in him. The demand of Israel's redemption from Egypt and her election is the same as the Christian call and redemption. Yahweh says to Israel: "O people of Israel ... which I brought out of the land of Egypt: You only have I known of the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities. Do two walk together unless they have made an appointment?" (Amos 3: 1-3). In this way through the Gospel call, God has predestinated us to be conformed to the image of his Son so that we may be members of the community of the new creation. This is to be transformed into the image of Christ who is the image of God himself (Rom. 8: 28-30; Eph. 1: 3-10; Col. 1:15). The goal of man's creation is to be a perfect image of God in the created order; but the first creation could not achieve this goal. Christ after his redemptive work, became the first-born among the brethren in his resurrection and consequently becomes the head of the new creation. It is only by patterning our lives after that of the Risen Christ that we can really attain the image of God. Those who responded

to the Gospel call in faith have been justified and in this the glorification of man which is the goal of creation is accomplished. In return we should now live holy and blameless lives to the praise of the glorious grace of God which is freely bestowed upon us in Jesus Christ. Our justification must issue out in obedience and self-surrender to God in love.

UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN LIBRARY

CHAPTER FIVE

ST. PAUL ON THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODYI COR. 15: 12-57(a) Background to Pauline Thought:

The doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body has remained a stumbling block both in the ancient times and in the modern world. It was a subject of ridicule in Athens and of disbelief among some Christians in Corinth. During the last century and until recently, it was the opinion of liberal scholars that the belief in the resurrection of the body be removed from the Church dogma or else be interpreted in terms of the Greek concept of the immortality of the soul.

According to Ramsay, to have succumbed to the critics would have been a disaster. This would have blunted the cutting-edge of the Gospel and removed a doctrine which sums up the genius of Christianity in its belief about man and the world. He remarked further that with the recovery of a truly biblical perspective today and with the abandonment of rigid antithesis between spirit and matter, the wheel has turned.¹

1. A.M. Ramsay, The Resurrection of Christ (London, 1956), p. 100.

Similarly Hunter expresses the view that we have witnessed in this generation a notable revival of biblical theology which has led us to rethink many of our cardinal doctrines. Christian theologians who for long had been unconsciously deeply influenced by Greek views of time and eternity are beginning again to study the biblical conception of those things. He says further that the time is ripe for a fresh approach to the whole subject of Christian eschatology and the history of our own times testifies that if religion does not furnish man with such a hope, they will very soon devise secular substitutes for it.²

We cannot reconstruct in every detail with complete certainty Paul's conception of the after-life before his conversion. He was certainly schooled in the common Pharisaic belief in the resurrection of the dead. Another difficulty is that there was no uniform doctrine of the resurrection in the first century. Josephus' account which was based on inside information and which could have been most reliable, suffers from his effort to translate his ideas into the Greek system

2. A. M. Hunter, Interpreting Paul's Gospel (S.C.M., London, 1955), p. 123.

of thought. For example he says:

"They believe that souls have power to survive death and that there are rewards and punishments under the earth for those who had led lives of virtue or vice: eternal imprisonment is the lot of evil souls, while good souls receive an easy passage to a new life"; (Jos. Anti. 18:14).

But in his earlier work he says:

"They hold that every soul of the good alone passes into another body, while the soul of the wicked suffers eternal punishment"; (Jewish War 2:163).

Also in his warning to Jotapata who wanted to commit suicide instead of falling into the hands of the Romans he says:

"Those who departed from this life in accordance with the law of nature... win eternal renown ... their souls remaining spotless and obedient are allotted the most holy place in heaven whence in the revolution of ages, they returned to find a new habitation in pure bodies" (Jewish War 3:347).

Death certainly inspires horror in the Hebrew mind as it can be clearly seen from the Old Testament. In the Old Testament life is an opportunity for all enjoyment and ^{the} good things of life. In early Hebrew thought, apparently there is no idea of one part ^{of man} surviving death.

Of course, the spirit, the ruach which is imparted by God returns to God who gave it (Ps. 146:4; Eccl. 12:7). But the nephesh, the natural principle of life which is closely dependent on ruach and is the bearer of personality, shares in the fate of physical organisms.

Death is not a mere separation of soul and body. The conception of a disembodied soul which is largely Hellenistic, is foreign to the Old Testament.³ For the Hebrews death is the reducing of the person in ~~sum~~ total of his energies to a nerveless and phantom-like existence in Sheol.

Paul uses the term death in its current significance but with some distinct corroboration of fact. For Paul death signifies something much deeper than the natural end of life. Death is one indivisible experience,

3. Plato Cratylus 403^b: ὅτι γὰρ εἰπεῖσαν
& πᾶς τις ἡμῶν ἀποθνήσκει εἰ ἐκεῖ
ἔστι φοβούται, καὶ ὅτι
ἡ ψυχὴ γυμνὴ τοῦ σώματος πᾶρ
ἐκείνον ἀπέρχεσθαι καὶ τοῦτο
πεφοβῆνται.

"For they fear that when once any of us dies, he is always there, and this also they are afraid that the soul disembodied departs to him", H.H. Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery Religions (Hod. & Stoughton, London, 1913), p.106.

the correlative of sin. Like all biblical writers he never distinguishes between moral or spiritual and physical death. His position is clearly stated in Rom. 3:23: "All have sinned (ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΓΑΡ ἠμαρτοῦ) and fall short (ὥστε ρουῦνται) of the glory of God. Death passed upon all men because all have sinned (ἐφ' ᾧ ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ἠμαρτοῦ). Death speaks to the sensitive conscience of man as the shadow of the wrath of God and therefore the Apostle shrinks from it in terror (Rom. 7:24; I Cor. 15: 55-57).

In the Old Testament death is sometimes seen as God's final word on human destiny and becomes a synonym for hopeless doom. This is probably why Paul sees death as the appalling penalty for sin which paralyses the personality being. The awful crisis of death and the revelation of eternal life in Jesus Christ present a vivid contrast to his mind. Undoubtedly biological science would rule out as irrelevant the intimate connection between sin and death. But this is one of the cardinal teachings of the Apostle Paul. We must realize that science has its own limitations in making pronouncements on the origin and meaning of death and what happens ultimately after death. Of course, there

is no doubt that Paul was to a large extent influenced by the Old Testament and the Rabbinic teachings of his own day.

The Hebrews thought of man as consisting of flesh (basar) soul (nephesh) and spirit (ruach). But caution must be taken in analysing the difference between nephesh and ruach. Strictly speaking the difference between them is not all that clear-cut. The conception of basar (σάρξ) which predominates in the Old Testament as a definition of the bodily nature is of great importance in Pauline teaching. Beside it in Paul can be found the cognate term σωμα not often found in the Septuagint as a translation of basar. In Paul flesh belongs to man's moral and religious experience. It is this part of man that does not submit itself to the law of God and cannot, but instead constantly revolts against God's will. Paul did not fully explain how man came about this nature or whether it was so from the beginning. The question would certainly have been difficult for Paul as it is for us today. It is not difficult for anybody who has ^a conscience to know what flesh means.⁴ Man as a living person is

4. Expos. VI, 3, pp. 291 & 293

made up of body and soul. These elements have been affected by sin and so are both corrupt. σάρξ is the principle of ψυχή and so each of them depends on one another, σάρξ is meaningless apart from ψυχή but ψυχή also has what may be described as a higher aspect and this Paul generally calls νοῦς - the power of moral discernment. Another closely related term is ὁ ἕσω ἄνθρωπος (Rom. 7:22). The late semi-philosophical term is συνείδησις which occurs quite frequently in Pauline letters, but almost exclusively where he is discussing Christian freedom. Paul never uses the term in connection with deeper Christian experience.

The word apparently reveals one of the few links between Paul and Hellenism. νοῦς is the thinking spirit, peculiar to man, which animals do not possess. But the use of the term in the New Testament is almost confined to Paul. The word occurs in the Septuagint as the translation of לֵב or לִבָּי (heart). The Aristotelian πνεῦμα rarely finds it parallel in the New Testament. πνεῦμα in Paul denotes an element

of the inner life of man. It is a direct divine gift directed to individuals or their souls as transformed by the Holy Spirit. In earlier Hellenistic conception

Πνεῦμα denotes a kind of air or breath which came to be regarded as the bearer of vitality and link between σῶμα and ψυχή. Among the

Stoics Πνεῦμα is the creative principle through which the organic development of things takes place. It is also the all-penetrating quickening power and soul of the world, the breath of life in all and the Deity himself. It is, therefore, considered

as the most highly refined "body". It came to be regarded as λόγος (reason). In Paul's conception Πνεῦμα is the Spirit of God mediated

through the exalted Jesus Christ. He identifies Πνεῦμα with Christ (I Cor. 3:17). It is the

undwelling Πνεῦμα in believers that is the basis of their eternal life. Of course, in a few

passages Paul uses Πνεῦμα in a lesser sense (e.g. Rom. 8:16; I Cor. 2:45, 12, 7:34, 16:18; II Cor. 2:13;

I Thess. 5:23). Also in Paul Πνεῦμα represents the entry of the divine power into the inner life.

Through the ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΜΑ every soul that accepts the love of God is brought in touch with the living God. The new life is the renewal of the old life from its very root. Its contrast lies in death that ruins man's personality; it is a life after the nature of the glorified Christ.

Another thing that certainly controls Paul's thought is not ^{so much} the antithesis between matter and spirit but between the disobedience of the first Man and the final obedience of the last Man. Jesus the last Man thus opens the way of eternal life to every man who comes to God through him. Apart from his Jewish background, his opinion about materiality and immortality came in consequence of his experience of Christ. He realizes that matter is not necessarily evil but ^{which} that can be transformed into obedient submission to the will of God. Of course, unlike the literalistic Pharisaism of his day, he did not believe that matter is just to be preserved as it is in the resurrection of the dead. The body at resurrection will be ^f transformed to something which transcends the material body.

B. The Corinthian Situation:

I Corinthians was written two years after Paul had left the place and by this time the Jewish element in the Church had declined. This is natural for a Church in such a cosmopolitan Greek city. No intelligent educated Greek would believe in a subterranean Hades.⁵ There was nothing in the authority of either Homer or Plato to save such a doctrine. Reincarnation after the next period of incandescence and purification in the stars with a possible escape into the firmament was the general form in which the Stoics offered ^{hope of a} future life to mankind. Although they were not consistent in their presentation, none of them believed in Hades. Nevertheless, among the less educated groups, belief in the ancient abode of the dead continued to be a living force. This belief remained a powerful force in the practice of magic which included the evocation of demons and the spirits of the dead.

It ^{would} be difficult for the learned Corinthians to accept a system which by implication accepts that at death the soul departs into Hades or Sheol and that at

5. Cæcero, Tusc. Disp. I, 5:10; Seneca, Ad. Marc. de Cons. 19:4; 19:14; Juv. Sat. 2:149.

the resurrection, it will be reunited with the body. Christianity has accepted the Jewish teaching without questioning but with some modifications. It is only on Palestinian soil that such a teaching could meet with less opposition. Obviously at Corinth, some prominent people had rejected the Jewish-Christian conception of the after life.

Celsus was bitterly against the Jewish-Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body. He attacked the Jewish idea that they were a chosen race and had a particularly privileged position in God's sight on the basis of the angelic messengers sent by God. He went further that this fantastic conceit is equally manifested in their self-centered conception of the resurrection which came in consequence of their delusion that they were the centre of the universe and that the world was made for them. Moreover Celsus says:

"It is foolish also of them to suppose that when God applies the fire ... all of the rest of mankind will be thoroughly burnt up and that they alone will survive, not merely those who are alive at that time but also those long dead will rise up from the earth, possessing the same bodies as before. This is simply the hope of worms.

For what sort of human soul would have any further desire for the body that has rotted? The fact that this doctrine is not shared by some of you (Jews) and by some Christians shows its utter repulsiveness and that it is both revolting and impossible. For what sort of body after been entirely corrupted could return to its original nature and that same first condition in which it was dissolved? As they have nothing to say in reply, they escape to a most outrageous refuge by saying that "anything is possible with God". But indeed neither can he do what is shameful, nor does he desire what is contrary to nature. If you were to desire something abominable in your wickedness, not even God would be able to do this and you ought to believe anything at all that your desire will be fulfilled. For God is not the author of sinful desire or disorderly confusion but of what is naturally just and right. For the soul he might be able to provide an everlasting life; but as Heraclitus says: Corpses ought to be thrown away even more than dung (Heraclitus Frag. B 86 Diels). As for the flesh which is full of things which is not even nice to mention, God would neither desire nor be able to make it everlasting contrary to reason. For he himself is the reason for everything that exists, therefore, he is not going to do anything contrary to reason or his own character".⁶

6. H. Chadwick, "Origen, Celsus and the Resurrection of the Body", Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XLI, (1948), pp. 83-84.

To a large extent Celsus' view must have represented the view of certain Christians in Corinth.

In Hellenism a dualistic anthropology was maintained, that is what distinguishes between the soul and the body or between the "I" and the flesh. In their conception, the future life relates to the soul exclusively, since it is the only immortal part of man. The future, therefore, relates to the "I", the inner-self, the inner nature of man. This dualism is shown by the contrast of "I" with the body. When the earthly being dies, the soul returns to God, enters on a heavenly journey or goes to the place determined for it. But in this connection opinions vary. Not every soul goes on ^{the} heavenly journey because certain conditions have to be fulfilled. That is the soul must have acquired gnosis on the path of which it is to enter. The knowledge is imparted to the soul by a saviour who has descended to the earth from heaven. Another idea

is that the preconditioning must have taken place in the mysteries in which, through cultic observances, the votary was initiated into the divine way. The god dies and comes back to life again. Through baptism and sacred meals the votary was enabled to partake of the god-head and the partakers of such meals thus have the assurance of future life.

The flesh is matter and remains earth after death. At death it decays and the soul is liberated as if from a prison house and thus from every earthly conditions. Therefore, it is difficult for anyone who belongs to this school of thought to believe in the hope of a bodily resurrection; to do otherwise will be to destroy his hope of being freed from the body at death. Nothing could be more disastrous to him than to be presented with the prospect of the bodily resurrection. When the Corinthians denied the resurrection it was not a denial of the after-life (15:12).

In Hellenism the term resurrection could be employed in a sense, but then it would mean the resurrection from the body, the ascent of the soul on its journey to heaven. The matter becomes more complicated

when some of them hold the view that the resurrection is past already (II Tim. 2:18). The idea is that the soul had already received the gnosis while in the body, it is not only certain of its future but already risen. The soul which was thus raised no longer has any contact with ^{the} body. Consequently ^{this view} brought about moral license; since the soul ~~was~~ sure of its future one can do whatever he likes with the body.⁷ But for some Corinthians, this resulted in asceticism since the risen ~~soul~~ despises the body in which it ~~was~~ still forced to remain temporarily. Consequently, the term resurrection was rejected as being ridiculous. Therefore, the Corinthians understood the term resurrection to mean either the return of the soul to heaven after leaving the body or that the salvation of the soul had already taken place.

Schmithals and Pagels like Bultmann see the whole

7. W. Dykstra, "I Cor. 15: 20-28, An Essential Part of Paul's Argument Against those who deny the Resurrection", in Calvin Theological Journal, Vol. 4 (1969), pp. 195ff.

problem in Corinth as due to Gnosticism.⁸ While many of the points they made are very valid, the whole problem cannot be attributed to Gnosticism which did not take concrete forms until the second century. Nevertheless, it was a rudiment of Gnosticism. The teaching of Epicureanism had greatly influenced the society. This was a system that sought to achieve happiness by serene detachment. Democritean atomism also removed all fear of divine intervention in life or punishment after death. The gods also lived a life of serene detachment and did not concern themselves with man's mundane affairs. Death brought about the destruction of man's atoms. This was why Paul's teaching was ridiculed in Athens (Acts 17:32) and later on rejected at Corinth. Although the earlier teachings of Epicureanism tried to place some limitations on man's

8. This is the idea which Schmithals propounds in his book Gnosticism in Corinth (Abingdon Press 1971). He dedicated the work to Bultmann. In the second book entitled Paul and the Gnostics (Abingdon Press, 1970), he associated most of the major problems which Paul dealt with in the other letters with Gnosticism; E.H. Pagels, "The Mystery of the Resurrection: A Gnostic Reading of I Cor. 15", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 93, (1974), pp. 276-288.

desires, the whole teaching was later perverted to give way to libertinism.⁹ Epicureanism taught that the soul was closely connected with the body and could not survive after the destruction of the body. This doctrine erased all the hopes of the after-life and gave rise to the principle of: "Let us eat and be merry for tomorrow we shall die" (I Cor. 15:32).

But as for those who regard the body as the perishable, godless prison-house of the soul, the redemption is only for the soul and not the body which must by nature disintegrate. When the Corinthians say:

~~ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν.~~

to them it was the triumphant cry of the man who already possesses his freedom, resurrection and salvation. During the ecstatic experience, the soul, they think, is temporarily detached from the body. The pneumatic does not live

~~κατὰ σάρκα~~, that is as if he were in the flesh, since he has gnosis. By this special

knowledge he possesses freedom from all earthly powers.

But what they mean by not living ~~κατὰ σάρκα~~ is very un-Pauline. It is looking on the body as vain and empty and that whatever is done to it cannot affect

9. H.M. Cressy, "Epicureans" in The New Bible Dictionary (ed.) by J.D. Douglass, Op.cit., p. 383.

the inner-man. This makes everything lawful for man. A man who possesses γνῶσις and ἐλευθερία is no longer bound by food taboos since "food is made for the belly and the belly for food". Both cannot affect man's destiny because they have a transient existence. Man's sexual life is similarly free from restrictions because none of the sexual organs will survive death. Man can therefore use his sexual organ to satisfy his appetite without any restriction. This to Paul, is a total rejection of Christian morality.¹⁰

"The Corinthians are behaving as if the age to come were already consummated; as if the saints had already taken over the kingdom... for them, there is no "not yet"... to qualify the "already" realized eschatology... They misinterpret the Gospel and faith and change both into gnosis and enthusiasm".¹¹ Pneumatic experience they suppose, has placed them on a new plane of life to behave the way they like and rule like kings (I Cor. 4:8). They regard themselves as dead to the flesh, in the sense that their physical conduct becomes a matter of indifference. The libertines and the ascetics appear to have the same

10. W. Schmithals, Gnosticism in Corinth, pp. 156ff.

11. C.K. Barrett, Op.cit., p. 109

view on the relationship between the soul and the body, yet this leads to two radically opposing views on the treatment of the body which is the prison-house of the soul. The more a Greek thought religiously either as a philosopher or as a mystic, the more he took flight at the idea of the resurrection which is directly opposed to his hopes. The cultured Greek would never forget the teaching of the dying Socrates. He loved the exercise of his intelligence before all else, and cherished the hope of finding it in full bloom when he came to Hades (Plato Phaedo 6:9^a-8:4^b). This Greek hope and the Christian hope are drastically opposed because the former is based on liberation of the soul from the body, while the latter speaks of the resurrection of the body as its foundation. The Orphics and Pythagoreans were in agreement that the philosopher purifies his soul in this life and frees it from the shackles of passion, pleasure and pain, that is from the bondage of the body. Death is the magnified occasion of total liberation. From Plato's Phaedo through Posidonius to Tusculan letters of Cicero, the same disdain of the body is common. In them also we have the same hope of

purification and immortality of the soul when separated from the body in its return to divine and immortal life. As much as Paul had the zest to preach the resurrection so also the Corinthian opponents have as much zest to ridicule it.¹²

C. The Resurrection of Jesus as the basis of Paul's Teaching on the Resurrection of the Body (15:12-19):

Paul sees the resurrection of Jesus as the evidence of the resurrection of the believers. Apparently the Corinthians accepted the resurrection of Jesus Christ as an isolated miracle and did not recognize its implications for the salvation of believers. Therefore, it was difficult for them to see the Christians ~~being raised~~ like Jesus from the dead. This does not mean that they hold the view that death writes 'finis' to man's life. Like many modern Christians, the Corinthians confused the Greek doctrine of immortality with ^{the} Christian teaching on the resurrection. Since the Christian concept of the resurrection was repugnant to them, they rejected it in favour of ^a Hellenistic conception of the after-life in which they had all along

12. L. Cerfaux, Christ in the Theology of Paul, Translated by G. Webb and A. Walker (Geoffrey and Chapman, London, 1967), pp. 70ff.

been schooled and which appeared to be more logical. In [Corinthians 15: 1-11 Paul had already shown that the resurrection of Jesus is the heart of the Gospel message. Paul's reply to the Corinthians is his best contribution on the topic. The resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of the dead are two inseparable facts. If we can dismiss the resurrection of the dead as impossible, we must logically write off that of Jesus as impossible. The resurrection of Jesus would be meaningless if it does not guarantee the resurrection of believers. A quick reading over the chapter would suggest that Paul's opponents were libertines who denied any form of life after-death. Some are of the opinion that Paul misunderstood the situation and wrongly supposed that they denied all forms of future life. We cannot rule out totally the presence of such a group in Corinth. But the real fact is that some of those who denied the resurrection believed that at death their souls are received into heaven.¹³ Moreover, the problem is not all that simple. There appears to be various schools of thought on the

13. A. Schweitzer, Mysticism of Paul, (A. & C. Black, London, 1956), p. 93.

resurrection in Corinth. Certainly there were Jews in Corinth, who like Paul, believed in immortality as well as the resurrection of the body. There were also people who equated pneumatic experience with the resurrection and for such, the resurrection had already taken place and they were already in the kingdom. Obviously some verses in the passage reveal that there were those who totally deny any form of survival after-death. There might be some, who in spite of their former background accept the resurrection as a possibility but were wondering about its nature and timing as well. Of course, Paul agrees in part with those who believe that the resurrection had already taken place since he believes that the resurrection is the actual source of our spiritual life, but this is not to the extent of leaving nothing over for a resurrection in the future. Although the idea that the resurrection had already taken place is genuinely Pauline, especially with regard to the daily lives of believers, Paul maintains throughout against his opponents that the actual resurrection of believers is something expected to happen in future.

By ἐν δὲ Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται
ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγερται,

Paul is saying that now if Christ is continually preached that he has been raised from the dead how come that some of you are saying that the dead would not rise again. Paul had just given the unanimous declaration of all Apostles and many other eye witnesses that Jesus has been raised and lives forever as the Risen Lord Jesus Christ. The fact that Jesus rose from the dead was apparently not contested at Corinth. Then if one man has risen from the dead the position that the resurrection is impossible no longer stands. If Christ was raised by God others can be raised as well. To deny the resurrection of the dead is to deny the fact that God raised Jesus from the dead. It then becomes a matter of whether or not we believe that God is able to raise a man from the dead. However incomprehensible such a miracle may be to his Corinthian opponents, Paul says that it is the touch stone of the Christian faith. Deluz says:

"For in practice, to deny the resurrection is to deny the living God. It means that we think of the universe as obeying fixed laws, ending inevitably in death and

eventually in immortality. God gave the world its "initial fillip" but having set it going, he leaves it alone. That makes him a passive, remote God; we can expect no help from him and it is useless to pray to him. He is the God of the deists. But in fact a world without miracles is an atheist world - a world without God. If on the other hand we believe that God can raise from the dead, we believe in a living, active God, a God who can intervene as Sovereign Lord in Nature, in History and in the life of each of us. That is the God revealed in Christ Jesus".¹⁴

The denial of the resurrection is therefore the falsification of the apostolic teaching, the destruction of the Christian faith and hope. The resurrection of Jesus Christ is not a fact that can be accepted independently of the other Gospel truths. Without the resurrection of Jesus Christ the whole of Christianity is nothing but a fraud. The Easter story would be simply a myth and a bogus lie. The preaching of the Gospel and the promises it makes ^{be} ~~would~~ the greatest deception. The whole Christian faith must collapse when the

¹⁴. Deluz, Op.cit., p.227.

resurrection of Jesus its chief corner-stone is removed. Christians' claims become null and void and the ministry of the Church superfluous. If on the other hand all men are inherently immortal, it is worthless trying to convert them to the Christian faith since every man is certain of survival regardless of what he does. If on the other hand the promise of immortality and resurrection are false and no one could escape destruction, the Christian faith is empty. The logic behind Paul's argument is that if the whole man is subject to death and only a miracle of God - a resurrection can save him from the grave and if God will work that miracle only for those who have lived in obedience to the faith, then there is nothing automatic about salvation, preaching and faith are needed to reconcile man to God and keep him in communion with him.¹⁵

If there is no resurrection of the dead, it means that Christ did not rise from the dead and man is still subject to the dominion of sin with death and destruction its consequences. In other words Christianity is

15. Ibid., p. 228.

completely destroyed. It would have been better never to be Christians at all. The whole talk about justification by faith and freedom from sin and death is pure sham. God's judgment still rests squarely on believers just as it ~~did~~ before they became Christians. Christ's death is therefore made a nullity since no redemptive significance could be attached to it. A dead Christ cannot save others from death which is the penalty of sin and neither can he rescue others from the grave from which he has not rescued himself or has not been rescued. If there is no resurrection all those who died in faith would have perished forever since they would still bear the punishment due to them as sinners. "Death and sin are partners. If sin persists death triumphs; if death triumphs, sin persists".¹⁶ If dying in Christ is a real possibility, those who died in Christ would be dead like him.

Here Paul apparently makes the Christian faith dependent on historical research into the fact of the resurrection. But this only appears to be so because the resurrection event itself is largely accessible to

16. Ibid., p. 229.

faith.¹⁷ If Christ did not rise from the dead Christian preachers are ΕΥΡΙΣΚΟΜΕΘΑ ΣΕ ΚΑΙ ΨΕΥΔΟΜΑΡΤΥΡΕΣ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ. Here the statement means more than just being divine witnesses telling lies or falsely claiming to be God's witnesses. It properly means that they have been detected or found guilty of bearing false witness against God; accusing God of performing an act which he did not perform. Paul finally concludes his argument in this section by saying that if our hope in Christ is limited to this life only, without the possibility of another life beyond the grave, nothing could be more pathetic.¹⁸ This would mean that Christians have lost the benefits of this present life and the eternal life for which they hope. Not only are they to be pitied, but are the most pitiable of all men.

D. The Resurrection of Jesus and its Universal Implications (15: 20-23):

Now Paul turns the page and asserts his unshakable conviction in the fact that Jesus had been raised from the dead. This event has inaugurated the age of the

17. C.K. Barrett, Op.cit., p. 349.

18. We have a similar thought in Apoc. Baruch 21:13: "For if there were this life only, which here belongs to all men, nothing could be more bitter than this".

resurrection and that of hope; also the age of destruction, death and despair have passed away. Consequently, the apostolic preaching and the Christian faith are neither void nor futile. The redeemed Christians are no longer in their sins. Those who fall a sleep in Christ ~~have not~~ perished since Christian hope is not limited to this life. Therefore, the resurrection is not a one day show, neither was Christ raised simply for his own sake. He by his resurrection inaugurates a new era which leads into eternity. The ἡ ἀνάστασις of verse 20 brings the joyous outburst. ἔγρηθη ἐκ νεκρῶν implies a bodily resurrection. Christ could therefore not be regarded as among those who are spiritually dead.

Jesus by his resurrection became ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων. The idea here is reminiscent of the first sheaf from the field brought to the Temple in thanksgiving and offered to the Lord, a promise of full harvest and thanksgiving yet to follow after seven weeks (Lev. 23: 10-25). The first sheaf offered in the

Temple on the morrow of the Passover was the same in kind as the one offered for the feast of Pentecost. The sheaf brought seven weeks earlier foreshadows the event of Christ. Since Christ has been raised from the dead, the resurrection of the rest of mankind or at least that of the believers is assured. In actual fact Jesus rose from the dead on the morrow of the Sabbath after the Passover, the day the first fruits were being brought into the Temple and that of the fiftieth day incidentally fell on the day of Pentecost. Christ was not the first person to rise from the dead. In fact he had raised some himself, but they all died again. But Jesus was raised to a life which knows no death. In that case he was the forerunner of all those expecting to be raised to eternal life. We must not confuse Jesus' resurrection with the resuscitation of a corpse. Jesus was not restored to ordinary life. His risen existence is glorious and eschatological, transported beyond the limitations of time and space.

Two great ages in human history were inaugurated by Adam and Christ as man's representatives. The first

Adam involved mankind in death but Christ, the second Adam, brings man back to life. By raising Jesus from death, God performed a decisive and creative act similar to what happened at creation when he made the first man. Through this act God restored the creation ruined by the Fall and thus provided a new leadership for man in Christ Jesus. This theme is more fully developed in Rom. 5: 12ff. as we have earlier seen. ἘΠΕΙΔὴ γὰρ δι' ἀνθρώπου θάνατος refers to the penalty pronounced on the first sin (Gen. 2:17). Adam's historic disobedience brought the historic entry of death as a phenomenon; his own death of course, because this does not explain why all men should die in Adam. Paul says that all men die because each man has sinned like Adam. Nevertheless, Paul emphasises the fact of the solidarity of human race in that the sin of the first man constituted the mass of mankind as sinners. Adam's act not only brought disaster on himself but also on his generation. But just as Adam's sin had such far-reaching consequences, so ~~does~~ Christ's resurrection. Paul, here, points out the reality of the

incarnation. Like Adam, Christ was truly man. Death and corruption came through the first man; in Christ man has triumphed over them.

~~ΕΝ ΤΩ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ~~
~~ΠΛΥΤΕΣ ΣΩΘΗΝΘΗΣΟΝΤΑΙ~~ constitutes a problem. Does the Apostle mean that in the end everybody without exception will be saved by Christ? It is difficult to make such a sweeping generalization in the light of later ideas. Verses 23-28 is part of the universal implications of the resurrection of Jesus and what we can call Paul's little apocalypse; but this will be discussed later on in the chapter concerned with the Parousia.

E. Evidence from Christian Experience (15: 29-34):

With abruptness typical of Paul, he turns from Christ to the Christian himself. Certain practices in Corinth and some experiences common to other Christians and himself have destroyed the basis of those who deny the resurrection. He refers to certain practices connected with baptism which logically imply resurrection. He mentions the dangers which he and other Christians are experiencing. To risk their lives in such a manner or to have denied themselves of so many worldly things for the sake of Christ would have been

utter folly if there is no resurrection. The denial of the resurrection therefore threatens to undermine not only the Christian experience but the Christian hope itself.

(1) Baptism on behalf of the Dead:

He refers to the question of those who were baptized on behalf ^{of} the dead. Why would ~~it~~ be necessary for a living person to go through baptism for the dead if there would be no resurrection? Such a baptism would be absurd without the hope of resurrection. We know very little about baptism on behalf of a dead person. It is mentioned only here in the New Testament. The reference is vague because Paul only makes a passing reference to it. Paul merely picked on it as an illustration to drive his point home. Tertullian expressed the view that the early Church carried out a baptism by ^a deputy; a living Christian would have himself baptized on behalf of one who had died without baptism (De Resur. 48; Adv. Marcion V: 10). Luther thinks that it refers to baptism on the dead, that is on the tomb of the dead martyrs. Like Luther some take ὑπέρ to mean above, that is baptizing on the grave of the dead Christians to express their

unity in Christ with them. Godet also feels that it might be the baptism of blood and not of water, that is to die as a martyr. If there is no resurrection what will the martyrs gain by undergoing the baptism of blood or martyrdom? If this is right, it will be in agreement with Jesus' idea of the cross, when he refers to his suffering death as baptism or drinking a cup (Lk. 12:50; Mk. 10: 38-40). To some others the statement is simply ironical: If there is no resurrection why do these dead people have themselves baptized? They are going to end up in death. Others as well feel that it is receiving baptism on behalf of the martyrs who died before they could be baptized and such is called baptism into the Church of the dead.

The language of Paul here is clear enough and means simply what it says. The words imply the existence of a practice of vicarious baptism at Corinth presumably on behalf of Christian friends or relatives who had died without receiving baptism. There is a proof for such practice among heretics. According to evidence from Chrysostom and Lietzmann, when a catechumen among the Marcionites dies, they hide a living man under the dead

man's bed. The priest then approaches the dead man and asks if he would like to be baptized. The man hiding under his bed then answers on his behalf and he is baptized on behalf of the departed. In II Macc 12: 40-45, we see Judas commanding that sacrifice should be made on behalf of their fallen fellow soldiers who were believed to have died because of their sins. Judas did this because he took full note of the resurrection;

"For if he had not expected the fallen to rise again, it would have been superfluous and foolish to pray for the dead... This was why he had this atonement sacrifice offered for the dead so that they might be released from their sin".¹⁹

Schwéitzer also points to a similar practice among the Greeks, though not ^{as} a precedent for the practice in Corinth.²⁰

The early apostolic emphasis on baptism for the remission of sins and Paul's interpretation of Christian baptism could have in part given rise to this practice. Many verses in the New Testament speak of baptism not just as a symbol of the remission of sins but almost as

19. Quotations from The Jerusalem Bible

20. A. Schweitzer, Op.cit., pp. 283ff.

something possessing some magical power to wash away the sins of the receiver completely. In Rom. 6:3ff. Paul speaks of baptism as an act of dying, being buried and rising into new life with Jesus. Also by baptism we are united with Christ both in his resurrection and death. Paul says: "And you were buried with him in baptism in which you were also raised with him through faith in the working of God who raised him from the dead. And you who were dead in trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, God made alive together with him having forgiven all your trespasses" (Col. 2: 12-13). Similarly Eph. 2:1 says: "And you he made alive when you were dead through trespasses and sins". In Colossians Paul sees Christian baptism as a spiritual circumcision and an act of being buried with Christ in order to be raised into new life. On the basis of the Pauline teaching it ^{would} be possible for them ^{Corinthians} to feel that one must of necessity pass through the symbolic act of death and resurrection with Jesus through baptism in order to experience the reality later. Since death is also very much connected with sin, cleansing is necessary before one can be freed from death the consequence of sin and baptism is thought to cater

for this. This idea persisted in the early Church for a long time. Many people delayed their baptism until about the time of their death for fear that sins committed after baptism might not be forgiven. ^{The} Emperor Constantine who delayed his baptism until his health was failing, just about six months before his death is an example of this. This is why Paul is asking:

"Will those who receive baptism on behalf of the dead not look like fools if it turns out that there is no resurrection?"

"On behalf" seems to be the most appropriate meaning of ὑπὲρ here, but if it could be rendered "above" it may suggest that the baptism on behalf of each dead Christian was performed on his grave. It is apparently ~~beside the~~ point here to discuss whether Paul supported this practice or not. The statement fails to disclose this. What Paul is mainly concerned with is their local practice which destroys their argument against the resurrection. Some are of the opinion that Paul could not have mentioned it without condemning it if it was an error. But such people normally conclude that Paul could not be referring to actual baptism since ^{they think} that Paul did not practise ^{it} himself.

Barrett rightly concludes thus on this:

"The idea of vicarious baptism... is usually supposed to be bound up with what some would call high sacramental, other magical view of baptism. Immersion is believed to work so effectively that it matters little ... what body is immersed. The immersion of the living body can secure benefits to a dead man. This however was not Paul's view. He himself did not give close attention to baptism (1: 14-17), and though most members of his churches were baptized ... it is quite possible that some of the Corinthian Christians had not been baptized ... and that a number of them might have died in this condition. There was no question of making these persons Christians; they were Christians even though unbaptized. But baptism was a powerful proclamation of death and resurrection, and in this setting it is not possible to conceive of a rite ... which Paul, though he evidently took no step to establish it as a normal Christian usage, need not actively have disapproved."²¹

21. C.K. Barrett, Op.cit., p. 364.

(2) Christian Suffering (6:15:30-31):

Paul turns to the common experience of Christians. Even though there is no official persecution of Christians yet they live in constant danger. Without the resurrection, the whole Christian endurance then becomes non-sense. What is the benefit of accepting the Christian faith if death is the end of everything? He mentions these various sufferings in II Cor. 11: 23-29 • "I die daily". The danger is real and very constant and he wants the Corinthians to appreciate this common lot of the apostles. But inspite of their failings in Corinth Paul still saw much in them for which to give thanks. Paul was boasting in their conversion, but it is not human boasting in human achievement, but in what God had accomplished through him. Though Paul was at death's door daily, he rejoiced because he knew that death is not the final end of man.

(3) The Beasts at Ephesus 15:32:

The Words

ἐλὲ κατὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐθ-
ηριολάχησα ἐν' ἐφέσω τί μοι
τὸ ὄφελος

have remained a riddle for New Testament exegetes from the beginning. On this scholars are divided into two. Some take the statement literally,

while others regard it as a metaphor. The literalists find support in II Tim. 4:17 where Paul speaks of being delivered out of the mouth of a lion (ἐφρουσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος). Some others are of the opinion that it is purely an emphasis on verses 30 and 31. Furthermore, the literalists are of the view that Paul must be referring to the incident when he says: "For I think that God has exhibited us apostles as last of all, like men sentenced to death, because we have become a spectacle, to the world, to angels and to men" (I Cor. 4:9). Here Paul speaks of the Apostles as gladiators in the amphitheatre. Paul's statement ἐν θαλάτοις τοῦ λαοῦ in II Cor. 11:23 is also important to them. In his commentary on Dan 3:29, Hippolytus says: "For if we believe that when Paul was condemned to the beasts, the lion that was set upon him lay down at his feet and licked him, how shall we not believe that which happen in the case of Daniel". Also the Acts of Titus says that in Ephesus Paul fought with beasts, when he was thrown to a lion. The Acts of Paul also speaks in a similar fashion.²² It is argued further by the literalists

22. R.E. Osborne, "Paul and the Wild Beasts", in Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 85, (1966), p.225.

that though it was illegal to sentence a Roman citizen to death by fighting wild beasts in the arena, ~~but~~ his Roman citizenship had not always protected him. For example, he was beaten thrice (II Cor. 11:24). Morris says that the fact that Paul as a Roman citizen could not have been compelled to fight wild-beasts could not be pressed, for even Roman aristocrats appear in the arena. An example of this was Acilius Glabrio an eminent Roman, who was compelled by Domitian to fight wild beasts.²³ Moreover, the literalists say that the description of this incident was omitted in Acts and ~~the~~ Pauline letters just as many episodes in his life ~~were~~ not recorded either in Acts or his letters. Also, though it was rare in ~~the~~ provinces to see Roman citizens being compelled to fight wild beasts, in Gaul and Spain Roman citizens were condemned to wild beasts. The theatre where the riot took place in Ephesus can still be seen. Excavations in the Corinthian theatre have shown a wall round the Orchestra on which there are paintings of life-sized figures engaged in fighting beasts but the paintings ~~have~~ been partly destroyed.²⁴

23. L. Morris, Op.cit., p. 220.

24. R.E. Osborne, Op.cit., pp. 227 and 228.

But the statement for various reasons appears to be a metaphor. The Lucan account of the Ephesian riot made no mention of fighting with beasts or even any imprisonment. Instead, Paul was persuaded by his friends not to enter the theatre. Also the list of his sufferings in II Cor. 11:23ff. does not include such. His influential friends would not have allowed that to happen. It is true that Luke did not account for all that happened in Paul's life but it would be a great surprise if he should omit such an important episode in his record. Fighting with beasts was only common in the Roman capital but rare in the provinces. Paul is apparently referring to his struggle with opponents here. If this is true, Paul is using a very unusual language to describe a usual experience. Roman citizens might in serious cases be so condemned but they have to be stripped of their Roman citizenship first. But the fact that Paul was allowed to appeal to Caesar later on in his career shows that he had not lost his citizenship.²⁵ Osborne expresses the view that the beasts were

25. A.M. Malherbe, "The Beasts at Ephesus", in Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 86, (1967), p. 71.

hostile Jewish legalists, Judaizers.²⁶ The words of Ignatius (Ad. Rom. 5:1) seems to support this.

ἈΠὸ Συρίας μέχρις Ῥώμης ---
 νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, δεδε-
 μένος δέκα λέοντά ρόδων
 ὅ ἐστιν στρατιωτικὸν
 πάλμα

("All the way from Syria to Rome, I am fighting with beasts, by land and by sea, by night and by day, bound to ten leopards, namely, a detachment of soldiers").

As early as Plato human passions and the pleasure of the flesh are described as beasts which fight against man.²⁷ In pre-Christian times philosophical schools and gymnasia taught that these warring passions should be subdued by the wise man. In Cynic Heroes, Heracles and Diogenes were the ideals. Heracles was the most important of the Cynic patrons. His hardness had arrested the imagination of the Hellenistic period as an example of the man who could control himself and is truly independent. As fighter of beasts, he had been

26. R.E. Osborne, Op.cit., pp. 228-30.

27. Rep. 589^A; Phaedo 66^C, 83^B; Protr. 352^D, 355^B; Aristotle Eth. Nic. 11: 2, 9; Cicero, de Fin. 11: 2, 9.

called Θήροκτόνος and was also called Θήρομάχος. People referred to him as Saviour of men in that his example has continued to show men how to conquer themselves and how to be victorious over tyrants oppressing them. This probably provides a background for Paul's statement.²⁸

By the fourth century Heracles the glutton was a familiar figure. He was known by the time of Antisthenes who was considered by Diogenes as the founder the Cynic sect. Dio Chrysostom tells that Heracles purified himself of the ἡσούαι, which are the beasts. Every Cynic has Heracles as his model and he is himself fighting against pleasures, thus seeking to purify his own life.²⁹

The Cynic struggle is not only an inward one. Men who live shameful lives and dishonour philosophy by their actions are shameless beasts (δυνασχυρῆρία). These men bite like beasts and devour one another. Heracles was said to have been sent to destroy them (Pise. 36; cf. Vit

Auct 10). Likewise Lucian under the alias of Παρ-
-θηαία announces before he engages with philosophers

28. A.M. Malherbe, Op.cit., p. 74; D. Dudley, A History of Cynicisms, from Diogenes to the 6th Century (Methuen, 1937), p. 13.

29. Dio Chrys, Orat. 63:6, 8: 26ff., 8:20.

that he was about to enter into battle with no ordinary beasts.³⁰ Heracles was concerned with the Epicureans who speak for Hedone who makes men to live a bestial life. Plutarch also perhaps smarting under the charge that his sect lived like wild beasts said that it was lack of proper laws that would result in leading the life of savage beasts. Life would become savage, unsocial and bestial not just because of the absence of laws but because of Epicurean philosophy which incites men to pleasure, to live like brutes which know nothing better nor more honest than pleasure.³¹

On the grave of Assyrian, the founder of Tarsus, in the seventh century B.C., which is at Anchiale about fourteen miles from the city is written ΕΘΔΙΕ
ΤΙΒΕ ΙΤΑΙΣΕ. Chrysippus says that the full statement was by Sardanapollis and part of it reads: "... knowing fully well that thou art but mortal, indulge thy desire, find joy in the feasts. Dead, thou shalt

30. A.M. Malherbe, Op.cit., p. 75.

31. Adversus Colotem 2, 1108^D; 30, 1124^B, 1125^C, cf. Epic. 4, 1089C.

have no delight" (Ap. Athenaeus Deipn vii, 336A.B.). As we have noted earlier, the Epicureans did not believe in the after-life; man's total life should therefore, be lived under the perspective of the present life. Paul's use of ~~ἄνθρωπος~~ ^{ἄνθρωπος} ~~καὶ~~ ^{καὶ} ~~ζῆν~~ ^{ζῆν} might have come from the language used by moralists of his day to describe man's struggle against hedonism.

In I Cor. 15 Paul was arguing against men who denied the future resurrection of the body in favour of the present one of the spirit because the eschatology had been radically realized, therefore, their moral life is not governed by any futuristic hope. There were probably those who shared the Epicurean view that there was no hope beyond this life. This idea gains support from the statement that follows Paul's statement thus: "Let us eat and drink for tomorrow we die". This statement is ^a word for word quotation from Isaiah 22:13. Yahweh was speaking about the destruction of Jerusalem and the people's hopeless situation because of their impurity. It is true that not all those who deny the resurrection draw this conclusion from their premiss. Paul is suggesting that this is the motto of life that most of those who deny

the resurrection are likely to adopt. But in verse 33 Paul warns that such moral carelessness, whatever may be the reason behind it, and how attractive it may appear, is unchristian. The Christians would ruin their testimony if they mix up with those who call themselves Christians, but do not share the resurrection hope and live as they please.

Earlier on in 5: 9-12, Paul had just urged them to break relation with men living scandalous lives. But the Corinthians pointed out that they lived among idolaters, robbers and unscrupulous people and if they must break relation with them, it might mean withdrawing from the world to ~~the~~ life of a hermit. But Paul says that he is not urging such a Pharisaical withdrawal from the world. Christians must take the world as they find it, as Jesus himself had done, eating freely with publicans and sinners (Mk. 2: 15-17; Lk. 19: 1-10). But this is not a denial of the prophetic freedom to rebuke and reprove the world when necessary, But Christians must break relations with Christians who think that ^{the} Christian life is compatible with idolatory, prostitution, drunkenness or any other disorderly

behaviour.

Paul finally appeals to them to come to their senses and stop living as if this life is the end of everything. Those of them that claim to have a special knowledge are in utter ignorance of God's ways and purposes. This is a disease from which they need healing:

"Their inability to recognize the power and the goodness of God was shown in their dogmatic assertion that he does not raise the dead".³²

(F) The Nature of the Resurrection Body 15: 35-54:

The central point in Cor. 15 is that the bodies of believers will be raised and transformed and made like that of Jesus' resurrection body. The nature of Christ's resurrection forms the basis of Paul's discussion on the nature of the resurrection of the faithful.

Pannenberg says:

"Paul must have had the same mental image of the resurrection of Jesus because he describes the resurrection of Jesus and that of Christians to be ^{two} completely parallel events".³³

The Corinthians had wanted to know what would be the nature of the resur-

32. Robertson and Plummer, Op.cit., 30, p. 364.

33. W. Pannenberg, "Did Jesus Really Rise from the Dead?", in Dialogue IV (1965), p. 130.

rection body. Will skeletons and corruption come forth from the tombs with all the bodily weakness? If so, what is the value of the resurrection? It is probably not the possibility of the miracle that the Corinthians called into question, for there is no doubt that God could reanimate corpses. But what is the purpose of reanimating corpses which have fallen into decay? Of course, one of the major problems is the correct translation of the first question: ΠΩΣ ΕΥΞΕΙΡΟΝ-

ΤΑΙ ΟΙ ΝΕΚΡΟΙ; Most bible translators and commentators render it: "How are the dead raised?". This rendering connects it closely with the following

question: ΠΟΙΩ ΔΕ ΣΩΜΑΤΙ ΕΡΧΟΝΤΑΙ;

Philips renders it: "How is the resurrection achieved?" Others have argued that the correct translation should be "Is it possible that the dead are raised?" According to Robertson and Plummer ἀλλὰ is the writer's words and not the objector's and that the translation "How are the dead raised?" is probably wrong. In other words the Corinthians are saying that they cannot be expected to believe what is impossible and inconceivable.³⁴ Sider

34. Robertson and Plummer, Op.cit., p. 368; L.S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ, (Dacre Press, West Minister 1941), p. 262; G. Vos, "Alleged Development in Paul's Teaching on The Resurrection", Princeton Theological Review, Vol. XXVIII, p. 199.

also holds a similar view that the second alternative is a real probability. ΠΩΣ frequently introduces rhetorical questions which change or reject an idea and that Paul had used ΠΩΣ in this sense three times before (14:7, 9, 16).³⁵ Nevertheless, "How are the dead raised?" still appears to be a better translation in the light of what follows. By the second question: "With what body do they come?" They mean to laugh the whole idea of the resurrection out of court, obviously they know that the body decomposes immediately after death and what kind of body would arise from such decomposed rubbish? Paul replies sharply: "You fools". They must be foolish to imagine that the risen body would be exactly like the mortal body or a continuation of the earthly life. Paul tries to make it clear that what he is saying about the resurrection is not without its parallels in the things which are not only familiar but upon which they engage themselves. If only they would be sober for a moment, they themselves have answers to their objections by what they practice often.

35. R. J. Sider, "The Pauline Conception of the Resurrection Body in" Corinthians 15: 35-54," in New Testament Studies, Vol. 21 (1975), pp. 428-429.

It is a common knowledge that new plants never appear unless the seeds first die and decay. The seed which dies and decays is in fact quickened. Therefore every time they sow, they provide ^{an} answer to their objections. The fact that ^{the} human organism is destroyed in the grave is no argument against the resurrection. Man does not enter eternal life with his earthly body. He as well, must first die and decay.

"Just as the ear of corn is different from the grains from which it came and the oak from the acorn and the flower from the seed, so the risen body is something new and completely different from the mortal body. The difference is absolute and unmeasurable. When we look at a seed we cannot possibly imagine the plant which will grow out of it... Similarly, when we look at the mortal body of human being we cannot possibly picture the risen glorious body".³⁶

Deluz also points out correctly that Paul was not discussing the biological laws here, the birth, the growth and blossoming of a plant, in terms of natural evolutions. If

36. Deluz, Op.cit., p. 242.

we interpret Paul's illustration in that fashion we will reach the wrong conclusion; for this will make the resurrection an outcome of quas-automatic processes. But for the Apostle the birth of a plant is a miracle from God, who gives to each seed body and life. Man as a mortal being would revert into nothingness if God did not miraculously give him a new body. The doctrine of the resurrection presupposes a miracle and this is what essentially makes it different from the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. If every soul is by nature immortal God does not need to take steps to ensure its survival.

In spite of the fact that there is difference between the seed and the plant, there is also a mysterious relationship between them. The shoot is different from the seed, but all the same perpetuates its properties and its essential characteristics. Similarly, God gave each man a new body which still expresses his personality although a transformed body. There is a mysterious identity between the dead man and the personality which survives death. If the resurrection means that entirely new beings with no links with the dead persons would be raised, then that

would be no resurrection at all. That would simply mean that God is creating new beings with no identity with the present human race. Paul sets before the Corinthians, the spectacle of the infinite variety of bodies in the world of nature. The Corinthians find it impossible to imagine how God can raise man in an entirely new form or to conceive that man may be one day different from what he is now. Since God made different bodies of plants, animals and heavenly bodies, he can certainly provide man with ^a suitable resurrection body.

But what exactly does Paul mean when he speaks of body? σῶμα in Paul is related to the Hebrew idea of the body, which connotes, not the body as opposed to form, but the whole man. Man does not have σῶμα; he is σῶμα. If man were no longer σῶμα, he ^{would} have no relationship with himself and therefore no longer a man.³⁷ σῶμα does not mean that aspect of human body which decomposes at death. This aspect is called σάρξ which corresponds to the Hebrew basar (I Cor. 15:50); σῶμα in the

37. R.J. Sider, Op.cit., pp. 431f.

real sense has no Hebrew equivalent. σῶμα is what makes all men into a life bundle. It is the necessary vehicle of man's relations to the cosmos, to other men and even to God. As σῶμα he is related to the realities external to himself, including those that transcends him like God. σῶμα is the most comprehensive word in Pauline anthropology. It expresses the human person from his situation as a sinner and up to his final glorification in God. The dualism which sees man as body-soul is incompatible with Paul's notion of σῶμα. That is why Paul rejects the idea that only part of man will survive death in I Cor. 15. Whether you talk of ψυχή as for the Platonist or πνεῦμα as for the Gnostics, what survives death is the entire man and that is what rises again.³⁸

As a Jew, Paul's capacity for abstract thinking is not a developed one and so he does not distinguish terminologically between σῶμα in the characteristic sense of human existence and σῶμα as the phenomenon of the material body.

38. L. Andet, "What is the Risen Spiritual Body?", in Theology Digest, Vol. 21 (1973), pp. 4ff.

In spite of the above Paul believes that our σῶμα is at present a death laden body (τὸ σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου Rom. 7:24). It is mortal (νεκρὸν ἐστὶν Rom. 8:10f.); it is perishable (τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο I Cor. 15:44 and 46); it is a humiliated and humiliating body (τὸ σῶμα τῆς πατεινώσεως ἡμῶν Phil. 3:21); it constitutes a condition in which we groan (ἐν τούτῳ στενάσσομεν II Cor. 4:2, 4). Yet it is capable of being transformed into imperishable, spiritual, glorious body. God who by his glorious power raised Jesus Christ from the dead is able also to raise us up. Christ who is thus raised up can change our humiliated and humiliating bodies to be like his own glorious body. It is God's triumphant act of conquest in Jesus Christ (Rom. 6:4, 8:10f.; I Cor. 15: 21ff.; Phil. 3:21; Col. 3: 1-4).³⁹

The use of πνευματικός by Paul in relation to the spirit appears twenty four times in Paul besides the two occurrences in I Peter 2:5. This adjective which never occurs in the Old Testament has no Hebrew equivalent despite its basic affinity with

39. C.F.D. Moule, "St. Paul and Dualism: The Pauline Concept of the Resurrection", in New Testament Studies, Vol. 12 (1966), p. 108.

ruach. In connection with σῶμα it would mean the whole rational man as influenced by the spirit.

σῶμα ψυχικόν never implies that the body is made up of soul or the Hellenistic-Gnostic idea that it is made up of the spirit. Remarkably, Paul uses the noun πνεῦμα 145 times as against 113 occurrences of ψυχή. But ψυχή certainly corresponds to the Old Testament use of nephesh which is also very common in the intertestamental literature. Nephesh forms the core of the Semitic philosophy of man in relation to life. But Paul abandons this centrality and makes πνεῦμα the key word. Paul is here dealing with Greeks who think that since the soul is immortal, it is of no profit for the body to survive. Its survival would jeopardise the hope of a happy future since the body is the prison mill-stone of the soul.

In I Cor. 15 σῶμα is made to appear as something of material substance or as the "form" of such a thing. But since the substance of the resurrection of the body cannot be flesh and blood, the unfortunate consequence is that πνεῦμα must be conceived ^{of} as a substance of which that σῶμα

consists.⁴⁰ In this chapter σῶμα means εἶδος as opposed to substance or material. Of course, it is the Greek that raises objection here because of the body-soul dychotomy concept. This is what calls for the seed and plant analogy. Of course, Moffatt criticised Paul for using the seed analogy because it implies greater continuity than the Apostle intended.⁴¹ In verses 42,44^a, the Apostle mentions the nature and extent of discontinuity and continuity implied in the seed and plant parable. He grants that the present perishable body which is subject to decay (φθορά) must indeed be sown corruptible but raised incorruptible. By φθορά Paul means more than mere physical decomposition of death. According to Paul corruption is an evil power, which affects all creation in consequence of Adam's disobedience. Death and corruption are products of sins. But through the resurrection the present physical and moral responsibility of the present σῶμα will disappear. The resurrection body will be powerful over sin because of the Spirit. The body is in no sense bad; it is the gift of the

40. R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I (S.C.M. Press 1970), p. 198.

41. J. Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1938), p. 261.

Creator who made all things. The visible, the corporeal is just as truly God's creation as the invisible. It is the temple of the Holy Spirit. The body and the soul are not opposites. God finds the corporeal good after he has created it. Sin and death embrace the whole man. Nevertheless, the visible creation is still wonderful, although corrupted by sin and death. But behind Paul's pessimistic interpretations of death stands an optimistic view of creation. Behind the corrupted creation under the sentence of death Paul sees the future creation brought into being by resurrection.⁴²

The contrast between the first Adam and the second Adam is to help us to understand the concepts of natural body (ψυχικόν) and the spiritual body (πνευματικόν). Paul's reference to the first Man as a man of dust apart from the Genesis record has a parallel in Syr. Apoc. of Baruch 48:42ff. "Thou didst of old command the dust to produce Adam and thou knowest the number of those who are born from him and how far they have sinned against thee." But instead of death and corruption which came through the

42. O. Cullmann, Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead - the Witness of the New Testament (Epworth Press, 1958), pp. 29ff.

first man who was made a living being or made with natural body (ψυχικόν), the last Adam is made a life-giving Spirit. The life-giving Spirit is certainly the power of God at work in the Lord Jesus. In this present body we bear ^{the} image of the man of dust but at the resurrection we shall fully bear the image of the heavenly man. Instead of predicting what Christians would be like in verse 49, he enjoins the Christians now living to bear the image of the heavenly man. That is, even before the resurrection a living Christian in the material body can become a σῶμα πνευματικόν. The process towards the ultimate victory begins here and now. The spiritual body therefore becomes something closer to a total person controlled by the Spirit. Verses 42-44 suggest that there is a genuine bodily continuity because it is what is sown perishable that is raised imperishable; it is what is sown in dishonour that is raised in glory; it is what is sown in weakness that is raised in power. But there is also a significant discontinuity; this is because there must be a significant and radical transformation. He explicitly says that the spiritual

heavenly body is totally different from the material body. There are two interpretations of verse 50. One idea is that it refers to those who are still living at the parousia and who must of necessity be transformed since they still possess bodies subject to death and corruption. Another interpretation connects the verse with those living ^{an}immoral life ~~who~~ have not undergone a spiritual rebirth. Three elements of discontinuity are clear in Paul: mortality and immortality, perishability and imperishability, sin and death ^{its} consequence and freedom from sin and death. ⁴³

At this stage Paul employs apocalyptic language to describe the End or what will usher in what he has been talking about. With an emphatic introduction he says: ἰδού μυστήριον ^{ὁμν} λέγω. This is the mystery of the sudden resurrection of the dead and the transformation of the living. Whenever Paul speaks of mystery he means a secret which man is wholly unable to penetrate., Yet it is mystery which God has now revealed or ^{which is} to be fully revealed in future. μυστήριον has the idea of the impossibility of knowing God's

43. R.J. Sider, *Op.cit.*, pp. 433ff.

secret by man and at the same time of the love of God which makes God's hidden purposes known to man. Sometimes, it is what is revealed to the believers alone and not a common knowledge among men, and therefore, remains hidden to non-believers. Man cannot work out in his own wisdom what will happen at the End, but God revealed it in part through the resurrection of Jesus and the hope of his second coming.

The clause ΤΙΧΥΤΕΣ ΟΥ ΚΟΛΥΜΘΗΣΟ-
ΜΕΘΑ has been subject to two interpretations. One is, "None shall sleep". But most scholars agree that the clause cannot mean this. It has to be taken in the sense of "Not all of us shall sleep". Robertson and Plummer say that the desired antithesis requires that both clauses should begin with ΤΙΧΥΤΕΣ ΟΥ and not ΟΥ ΤΙΧΥΤΕΣ. That all of us will undergo the great transformation is true.⁴⁴ 'Sleep here is the synonym of death and it means that not all Christians will die since some will still be alive at the coming of Christ. While the living experience a direct change, the dead will rise with a new body and thus will under-

44. Robertson and Plummer, Op.cit., p. 376; C.K. Barrett, Op.cit. p.380.

go a comparable change. ~~Alternative~~ Alternative readings are: "We shall ~~sleep~~ sleep, but we shall not all be changed". (~~X~~ ~~A*~~ C. G. 33), or "We shall rise, but we shall not all be changed" (D* lat-Marcion). The first alternative fails to take into account the fact that Paul was expecting that the parousia might take place during his life time.

Both alternatives are concerned with the fact of the wicked. But it is obviously a misrepresentation of Paul's view.

The whole event will occur ἐν ἁπολή, ἐν
ῥιπῇ ὀφθαλμοῦ This expression occurs only here in the New Testament. The mysterious wonderful change from death to life, from corruption to incorruption and from mortality to immortality will not take a long

process, but will be instantaneous and final. Also ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ σαλπύγγι σαπίσει
γὰρ (cf. I Thess. 4:16; Matt. 24:31; Rev. 8:2).

"One word command, one shout from the Archangel one blast from the trumpet of God and God in person will come down from heaven" (Philips). The end of the age is not to be ushered in by an intermediary but by the appearance of Jesus himself. The trumpet

signifies a note of authority and of urgency. The language is certainly symbolic according to the apocalyptic idea of the time. The important thing here is that the resurrection of the dead and the transformation of the living will be simultaneous, obeying one signal.

(G) The Parousia and the Resurrection:

Here it is important to consider the relation between the ΠΑΡΟΥΣΙΑ and the resurrection.

ΠΑΡΟΥΣΙΑ is an abstract term based on ΠΑΡΕΙΜΙ. The term usually means presence and by implication arrival. In Hellenistic period the word took a technical sense, both religious and political. It denotes joyful entry of rulers or their representatives. In religion, it denotes the presence or manifestation of a god. In places where kings are treated as gods and gods are received as rulers, it is possible for the two technical senses to colour each other. The customary honours on the ΠΑΡΟΥΣΙΑ of a ruler are: Flattering addresses, tributes, delicacies, asses to ride on, and for baggage, improvement of streets,

golden wreaths, and feeding. These and other honours had to be paid to a visiting king and his ministers by the populace favoured by the royal parousia. It was usual to tax the populace for this purpose and the ΠΑΡΟΥΣΙΑ might result in a new era.⁴⁵

For example, the decree issued in the city kingdom of Pergamum for honouring Attala III (138-3 B.C.) reads:

"As he approaches, all the crown-bearers of the twelve gods and of the god-king Enmemus, will take their crowns while the priests and priestesses will open the temples of the gods and offer incense, saying the ritual prayers on behalf of king Attala Philometor Evergetus that he may be granted health, salvation, victory and power on earth and at sea, whether he be at war or engaged in defence and that his kingdom may remain for ever and in all safety. The priests and the priestesses will go out to meet him, with strategoi, the archontoi, and the victors of the games, with the crowns they have won, the gymnasiarch, also with the youths and the tutors with the boys. All citizens shall go out to meet him and all women and young girls, the whole populace wearing white garments

45. Oepke, "ΠΑΡΟΥΣΙΑ and ΠΑΡΕΜΗ" in

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, p.860.

and crowns. It shall be a feast day..."⁴⁶

Josephus also giving the account of Titus' visit to Antioch says:

"When the people of Antioch learned that Titus was coming to the city their joy was such that they could not rest within the walls until he came. Instead they went out to meet him, going a distance of more than thirty stadia. Not only men went, but multitude of women also, with their children and when they saw Titus coming they stood on either side of the road saluting him with their hands raised. They brought him to the city with acclamations of all sorts and they applauded him..."⁴⁷

Also trying to explain Paul's words in I Thessalonians St. John Chrysostom says:

"When a city receives the emperor, the high dignitaries and those who are in his favour go out from the town to meet him, while the criminals are kept within the walls under guard to await the emperor's sentence upon them. Likewise when the Lord comes, those who are his in his grace will go up to meet him in the air, while sinners and those whose consciences are darkened by many evil deeds will remain on earth to await

-
46. W. Dittenberger, Orientalis Graeci Inscr, n. 332, 1, 26-39;
L. Gerfaux, Christ in the Theology of Paul - trans. by G. Webb and A. Walker (New York), p. 34.
47. Josephus, Jewish War - Bell. Jud. VII, 100-103.

their judge"⁴⁸

Primitive Christianity waits for Jesus who has already come and as the one who is still to come.

παρουσία as a term for the coming of Jesus in glory apparently found its way into primitive Christianity through Paul. The term that occurs frequently in the Gospels is ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου, but it is also used about twelve times by Paul as compared with eight instances of παρουσία (I Cor. 1:18, 15:23; I Thess. 2:19, 3:13, 4:15, 5:23; II Thess. 2:1, 8). The word does not occur in Acts, yet the belief in the παρουσία is explicit there. Paul hoped that many of his readers would experience the παρουσία. All Jewish eschatology is concerned with the future, in apocalyptic terms. Although in Thessalonians Paul's eschatology is close to that of Daniel, in most cases Paul avoids speculations about the future as much as possible. It is only in Thessalonians in the extant letters of Paul that we find the type of speculations close to that of the Synoptics and the Old Testament. According to Paul, the Messiah the Jews were expecting

48. L. Cerfaux, Op.cit., p. 40.

had already come though the end of history is still being delayed and no body knows how long the delay will last. In the light of the resurrection of Jesus the eschatology has already begun. What is now expected in future is the consummation, consisting of the final victory over death. The resurrection from the dead is already in operation. But the ΠΑΡΟΥΣΙΑ is yet to bring the transformation of the creation from the perishable to imperishable, and the destruction of death and all evil powers. In this way Paul links up the form of eschatology that transfers the resurrection of the dead to the ΠΑΡΟΥΣΙΑ and views history as a cosmic whole which he divides into aeons. Paul imagines the ΠΑΡΟΥΣΙΑ in terms of the apocalyptic Son of Man in Rabbinic literature. Jesus the ΚΥΡΙΟΣ would come down from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire to judge the world (I Thess. 4: 13-5:11; II Thess. 1: 7-10, 2: 1-12; I Cor. 15:52). The resurrection of Jesus opens a new act of saving drama, the transformation of this aeon into the future aeon and of the earthly into the heavenly existence. In Jesus the first Man has risen from the dead and this constitutes a token and a pledge

that the ultimate age has in fact been inaugurated. But with the παρουσία comes the ultimate victory.

(H) The last Enemy:

In Gethsemane death stands before Jesus. The Synoptics were unanimous in the fact that Jesus trembled and was distressed at the horror of death. He was thoroughly human in that he shared the natural fear of death, but Jesus was not a coward. But it was actually by dying that Christ conquered death. He went to realms of the dead and abandonment by God. This genuine death makes a new act of creation necessary. By this new act God calls back to life the whole man, all that God had created in the first Man and which death has destroyed. God's glory suffers outrage through death that reigns through the first man. Paul says that at the parousia, after the resurrection, believers will burst into the victory song: "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin and the power of sin is the law. But thanks be to God who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." Here Paul quotes from

Hosea 13:14 and Isaiah 25:8, using the Septuagint version. He turns the prophetic sayings into a hymn of victory. The resurrection ends in the song of Triumph. Death the mighty king has been vanquished by the Lord God Omnipotent who now reigns supremely. Like a deadly snake that has lost its venom, death has lost its poisonous sting once and for all. "The sting of death is sin and the power of sin is the law." Death came in to the world only by ^{the} sin of man. Death is a curse and the whole creation has been involved in that curse. This has necessitated the story of redemption. Death can only be said to be conquered when sin, its sting, is removed. Sin affects the whole man-body and soul and consequently death involves the whole man and similarly the resurrection involves the whole man, though not in the physical or material sense.

Likewise Paul speaks of the present creation in relation to Man's final redemption in Rom. 8:18-25. Paul is emphasising the certainty of the future salvation of Christians and that in this lies the hope of the whole creation. The present creation through sin

is subject to futility, frustration and enslaved to malignant powers of decay. Barrett calls ^{them} "inferior spiritual powers".⁴⁹ For Paul, the creation apart from the death and resurrection of Jesus has no real meaning and goal. Thus it is not only man that needs redemption but the whole creation. Of course, the whole creation has never been without the hope of redemption at any time. The redemption and glorification of the children of God through the resurrection at the perousia will also mean the redemption of the whole creation.

Similarly, in Col. 1:20 Paul speaks of reconciliation in the cosmic sense (ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα cf. Eph. 1:10; Rom. 5:10ff; II Cor. 5:19ff.). Paul says that the cosmic powers which the Colossians worship also stand in need of reconciliation. But ἀποκαταλλάξαι is a verb which relates exclusively to persons. Although the idea of reconciliation which includes all creation is, odd yet the cosmic redemption of Rom. 8: 18-25 and the acceptance of the authority of Christ by the whole

49. C.K. Barrett, The Epistle to the Romans (A. & C. Black, London, 1967), p. 166.

cosmos (Phil. 2: 9-11) will only make sense in terms of cosmic reconciliation, or redemption. Alford says:

"No reconciliation must be thought of which shall resemble ours in its process, for Christ took not upon him the seed of angels, nor paid any propitiatory penalty in the root of their nature. But in as much as he is their head and ours ... it cannot be but that the great event in which he was glorified through suffering should also bring them nearer to God."⁵⁰

Behind the corrupt creation under the sentence of death, the Christian sees the future creation brought into being by the resurrection just as God wills it. The Old creation was delivered to death by sin. But Christ is risen. We now stand in a new era in which death is conquered and in which corruptibility is no more. But now we live in the interim period between Jesus' resurrection which has already taken place and our own which still awaits the παρουσία. But the quickening power of the Holy Spirit is already at work among us, preparing us for the life eternal. Paul says that before the παρουσία Christ reigns in the world through the Church, but in a certain sense

50. Quoted by T.K. Abbott in Ephesians and Colossians, (I.C.C.), p. 212.

his rule is hidden, his power contested and his will opposed. But God has commissioned Christ to fight until the final victory is won, all enemies are defeated and the whole universe subdued. After the final victory has been achieved he will make his report to God, the King of kings and will then submit himself to God his Father. He will take his place again as the dearly beloved Son; he will be in God and God in him. The ultimate goal of history is thus achieved. "The kingdom of this world has become the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever". Our prayer will cease to be: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven". Instead, our victorious song shall be: "Thy kingdom has come. Thy will is already achieved on earth as it is in heaven".

"II CORINTHIANS 5: 1-10 IN THE PAULINE
DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION"

A. Did Paul's Eschatology Develop?

II Cor. 5: 1-10 constitutes a major problem in the Pauline doctrine of the resurrection. Many scholars believe that the passage reveals that Paul's eschatology has undergone modifications. But what actually constitutes progression in Paul's eschatological concept is disputed. One argument in favour of development is based on the chronology of the Pauline letters. It is said that the comparison of his earlier letters with the later ones shows that Paul's view of the end and his understanding of the nature of the eschaton had undergone some changes. It is alleged that his early preaching in Thessalonica created a great excitement about the nearness of the parousia and that the early death of some Christians in Thessalonica brought disappointment.¹ Moreover, it

1. J.M. Robinson, "Kerygma and History in the New Testament", in The Bible and Modern Scholarship (ed.) J.P. Hyatt, (New York, 1963), p. 119.

is said that his answer to the problem shows that he expected the majority of his readers and himself to witness the parousia. But the major change is said to have occurred between the writing of I Corinthians and II Corinthians respectively. In II Corinthians Paul is said to have abandoned completely the hope to live until the parousia. In II Corinthians Paul speaks of the destruction of the earthly tent in which we live ~~—~~ and of being away from the body. In Philipians Paul wished to depart and be with Christ.

According to H.A. Guy II Cor. 5: 1-10 and Phil. 1:23 is at variance with Paul's expectation in I Thess. 4:17 where he expressed the hope that he would be caught up with Christ.² J.A. Robinson is also of the view that the change is a shift from an apocalyptic to a non-apocalyptic form of eschatology.³ In Bultmann's opinion, II Cor. 5: 1-10 only comes closer to Hellenistic Gnostic dualism, not merely in the form of expression by speaking of σῶμα under the figure of "tent

2. H.A. Guy, The Doctrine of the Last Things (London, 1948), p.117.

3. J.A.T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming (New York, 1957), p. 161.

dwelling" and "garment" but also in thought itself.⁴

E.E. Ellis also says that Paul's earliest view followed the ancient Jewish idea of physical resurrection at the last day (I Thess. 4: 13ff.) but that this is modified in I Cor. 15 by distinguishing between the σωμα ψυχικόν and σωμα πνευματικόν. He goes on to say that II Cor. 5 completes the process view of the transition in Greek fashion as occurring at death rather than at the parousia and that in contrast to I Cor. 15 that resurrection takes place at death in II Cor. 5. But he mentions the fact that those who see a transition from Paul's earlier eschatology have certain problems to overcome, especially Rom. 8: 10-18. "He who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your θητὰ σώματα" (verse II). We also groan for consummation (Rom. 8: 23-25, cf. II Cor. 5:4, Roms. 6:8; Phil. 3: 10).⁵

The theory of gradual development in Paul's eschatology is saddled with many problems. The relation of Paul's eschatology to his chronology is a

4. R. Bultmann, The Theology of the New Testament (Vol. I, (S.C.M., London, 1971), p. 201.
5. E.E. Ellis, "II Cor. 5: 1-10 in Pauline Eschatology" in New Testament Studies, Vol. 6, (1960), pp. 211-212.

complex one. This theory is best supported by the traditional chronological arrangement of his letters. I Thessalonians is dated earlier and Philip^{pians} late. The theory also rests on particular interpretations of certain passages in Paul's letters. The chronological sequence of his letters is uncertain. Any criteria used for grouping ^{the} Pauline letters for the purposes of comparison must be arbitrary. The Pauline correspondence is mainly occasional. All the extant Pauline letters were written within a short period, one after the other, during the second half of his missionary career and his imprisonment in Rome. Most of his letters were written between twenty and thirty years after his conversion. By this time Paul can fairly be supposed to have reached Christian maturity.⁶

If it were possible to know the absolute dates of all the Pauline letters and we were certain of the authenticity of all the letters ascribed to Paul, this would lead to two possibilities: Either that Paul had changed his mind or his emphasis had changed and this

6. M.J. Harris, "II Cor. 5: 1-10. Watershed in Paul's Eschatology" in Tyndale Bulletin No. 22, (1971), p. 32.

created a new development. Or that Paul had changed his style by bringing out new weapons from his theological armoury and employing them as the need arose. Obviously we cannot know for sure whether it is in Paul's thought that the change took place or in the need of his readers or in both. Since we are not too certain of the authenticity of all the letters that bear Paul's name, it is impossible to know whether his eschatology developed or took a dramatic turn or not. I feel that Paul continued to grow in his thought and ideas into maturity but the core of his teaching remained the same and his doctrine did not develop. While the needs of his flocks in each locality continued to change, Paul as an able Apostle met every new challenge with fresh ideas.

Moreover, contrary to the idea of development, a wide reading of Paul's early and late epistles shows that Paul's belief in the imminence of the parousia is maintained throughout. Also, he recognized the possibility of his death before the parousia. (I Cor. 7:29; Rom. 13:11; Phil. 4:5; I Thess. 4:17, 5:10). The theory of development also hangs on a particular interpretation of II Cor. 5: 1-10 and Phil. 1: 21-23. Through-

out II Corinthians one could hear the rustling wings of death's angel, especially in 4:7-5:10 where he discusses the apostolic sufferings and the reward of the apostolic office. Paul saw himself surrounded by afflictions and persecutions that were exhausting his physical strength. Nevertheless, he was conscious of the divine life

(ζωή) operating in and through him and made apparent in his bodily existence. Yet he speaks of that existence as νεκρωσις, ἀνακαίνω-
-σις and διαφθορά (II Cor. 4: 10-16).

Along with the steady irreversible wasting away of the physical strength was the process of daily spiritual renewal.

II Cor. 5: 1-10 is essentially concerned with the outcome of these processes: the dismantling of the earthly tent-house and the swallowing up of mortality by immortality (5:1, 4). That is κατάλυσις (5:1) is to διαφθορά (4:16) what κατάπο-
-σις (5:4) is to ἀνακαίνωσις (4:16). Paul was certainly aware of the fact that ἐνέργεια
τοῦ θανάτου could reach its climax in his own very death. However, evidence abounds that Paul simultaneously reckoned on the possibility of his survival until the

parousia. He uses the expression ἤμεις two times in I Thess. 4:15 and 17.

Dodd, one of the advocates of development in Paul's eschatology, is also of the view that Paul's eschatology shows signs of development. He sees difference of emphasis between the early and later epistles, that is Romans, II Cor. 1-9, and the captivity epistles on the one hand and I and II Thessalonians, I Corinthians: II Cor. 4:14-7:1; II Cor. 10: 1-13:10 on the other. He says that II Cor. 6:14-7:1 is probably the fragment of the harsh puritanical letter referred to in I Cor. 5:19 and that the letter caused the Corinthians to write a letter containing questions which Paul answered in a non-puritanical way in I Corinthians and this was followed by a letter of thanksgiving in II Cor. 1-9. This final letter to the Corinthians reflects his new attitude.⁷ Dodd reached this conclusion because in I Thess. 4:15 and 17 Paul apparently thought that himself would survive until the parousia but in II Cor. 4:12 and 5:4 he accepts the possibility that he might die before the Lord's return. Also in the earlier epistle Paul would appear to teach that the parousia

7. C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures (London, 1952), pp. 62-63; D.E.H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul (Oxford, 1974), pp. 244ff.

was at hand. Although Dodd's argument is very reasonable, Paul nowhere categorically stated that he would live until the parousia. Paul only speaks of this as a probability. Dodd maintains that apart from Rom. 13: 11-14 emphasis on the parousia is lacking in later epistles. But the Roman passage has a close parallel with I Thess. 5: 4-8. Here Dodd appears to be too dogmatic.

Lowe says that there are eschatological elements in latter epistles as well. Rom. 5: 9-10 says: "Since therefore, we are now justified by his blood, much more shall we be saved by him from the wrath of God. For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, now that are reconciled shall we be saved by his life." Although the passage is connected with soteriology, God's love which brought about our reconciliation and justification remains unexhausted until its purpose is accomplished at the parousia. Furthermore, in Philippians Paul says: "... He who began the good work in you will bring it to completion at the day of Jesus Christ" (1:6). "So that you may approve what is excellent and may be pure and blameless for the day of Christ" (1:10). "Holding fast the word of life, so that

in the day of Christ, I may be proud that I did not run in vain" (2:16). Also in 4:6 he says: "The Lord is at hand". But Dodd says that ὁ κυρίος ἐγγύς should be interpreted in the sense of Ps. 145:18.

"The Lord is near to all who call upon him". "At hand" here would then mean "ready to hear" without any reference to time. While Dodd's interpretation is a possibility "at hand" is used here without the usual qualifying phrase as we have in Ps. 145:18. The phrase probably represents the Μαρουσία of I Cor. 16:22).⁸

Also in Phil. 3:20, 21, we have: "But our commonwealth is in heaven, and from it we await the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the power which enables him to subject all things to himself."

The above passages clearly show that when Paul was writing Philippians he had the parousia in the foreground of his mind. Of course, this assertion does not deny completely the fact that Paul's eschatology developed in certain directions. T.W. Manson has suggested ~~with~~ the possibility that Philippians was an earlier letter written soon after

8. J.G. Davies, "The Genesis of the Belief in an Imminent Parousia", in Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 14, pp. 104-107.

the founding of the Church.⁹ But the claim of Manson is very doubtful. Furthermore, in Ephesians and Colossians Paul did not spiritualize the parousia out of existence. He still speaks of ἡμέρα ἀπολύ-
τρου (Eph. 4:30, cf. Phil. 1:6) and φανερω-
σις of Christ, upon which the Christian hope rests (Col. 3:4). "When Christ who is our life appears, then you will also appear with him in glory". But as Smalley remarks, Paul's eschatology is essentially different in that for him the ἔσχατον has already begun, nevertheless, some events still lie in the future.¹⁰ Of course, the idea of "realized eschatology" is not peculiar to Paul, but common in the New Testament as a whole. Similarly, Cullmann says that the Christ-event has given a new centre to time which means that the focus of Paul's hope lies in the

-
9. T.W. Manson, "The date of the Epistle to the Philippians" in Studies in the Gospels and Epistles (Manchester 1962), pp. 150-167.
10. S.S. Smalley, "The Delay of the Parousia", in Journal of Biblical Literature Vol. 83 (1964), pp. 41-54.

past, not in the future and neither a delay in ^{the} parousia, nor anything else affects it; rather the hope for the future can now be supported by faith in the past. He says further that the important fact about the Kerygmatic proclamation of the nearness of the kingdom is not so much ~~the~~ the temporal location of the parousia as ~~the~~ the assertion that we are already in the new period of time.¹¹ While Cullmann makes a strong point here, it is not entirely correct to say that Paul's hope is based purely on the past and not on the future. It is true that Paul believes that with the Christ-event, the new age has begun. But in all his letters Paul recognizes the "not yet" aspects of our salvation and this "not yet" will not be perfected until the parousia or the consummation of all things. In all his letters his hope and faith in the future never varies. Also from the point of view of the Kerygmatic proclamation in the New Testament, it is impossible to separate the nearness of the kingdom from the actual event of the parousia.

II Cor. 5:1-10 is a notoriously difficult text.

11. O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, (S.C.M., London), pp. 86-87.

Most scholars agree that Paul is here contemplating his own death. Some believe that he hopes to put on a heavenly habitation at death, while others believe that he does not expect this until the parousia. In the former he longs not to be naked or to die without receiving the spiritual body; in the latter he longs to live until the parousia in order not to experience the nakedness of the intermediate state. Ellis says that if II Cor. 5: 1-10 and Phil. 1: 21-23 can be interpreted to mean a resurrection, at the parousia, the alleged shift between I and II Corinthians can be minimized. I Thessalonians and II Corinthians are sometimes interpreted as implying ^{an} intermediate state.¹²

In Phil. 3: 10-11, Paul speaks of sharing Christ's suffering and that death is a pre-requisite to resurrection. In Phil. 3: 20-21 he refutes the Gnostic hope of a bodiless existence.¹³ Schmithals propounds the theory that I and II Thessalonians are made up of four books (a) II Thess. 1: 1-12 + 3: 6-16; (b) I Thess. 1: 1-12 + 4:2 + 5:28; (c) II Thess. 2: 3-14 + 2: 15-17 and 3: 5-17; (d) I Thess. 2: 13-4:1. According to him

12. E.E. Ellis, Op.cit., p. 317.

13. Ibid., p. 319.

the letters came from Ephesus and ^{were} directed against the kind of Jewish Christian Gnostics that Paul encountered in Corinth. Of course, the effort to interpret Paul's eschatology in polemical terms seems to improve on the theory of gradual development. But Schmithals theory that Paul's opponents everywhere are the same kind of Christian-Jewish Gnostic is not supported by Paul's various eschatological formulations. Each of his letters reveals that in every locality Paul had to deal with various particular groups of people. A thorough examination of Pauline writings shows that it is difficult to have what we can describe as a systematic Pauline doctrine of eschatology. Paul apparently does not have a clear simple apocalyptic picture of the end. Some of his terms are drawn from external sources, and not used consistently. Paul as well does not have ^a distinct Hellenistic doctrine of the afterlife. His ideas are tainted with Jewish apocalyptic elements. The changes in his eschatological language are due in part to various situations of writings. Paul made use of the available language in order to make his eschatological

teaching meaningful to his readers. The fact that Paul employs a variety of eschatological expressions ranging from apocalyptic to cosmic in Romans, which least reflects polemic situation, indicates that varieties are a distinctive feature in Paul's understanding of eschatology (Rom. 2:5ff., 3:11ff., 8:18).

Nevertheless, certain things remain constant in Paul's eschatology. These are: That in the death and resurrection of Jesus, the decisive eschatological event has occurred and the hope of the resurrection at the parousia is based on these two events. Paul's belief in being clothed with life is based on the conviction that God who raised Jesus from the dead will raise us up also with Jesus (II Cor. 4:14; I Cor. 15:3, 12-24; Rom. 8:17; Phil. 2: 8-11; 3:18, 20-21). Also God's purpose will be perfected at the consummation of all things, but since the future is only open to the purpose of God and remains hidden from man, it is therefore, difficult to give the final episode a definite description. Although Paul uses variety of eschatological expressions, he

says: "We hope for what we do not see". (Rom. 8:25). But even though the precise form of the future remains indefinite both our present union with Christ and our being glorified with him is made explicit in Paul. The fact, of course, is that the Christ-event has already inaugurated the future and the future is being realized in part, but this is only apparent to the eyes of faith. However, for the unbelievers the world has continued as before. While Paul's eschatological language might have undergone some changes, there is no gradual development out of Jewish into Hellenistic forms. His eschatological thought became increasingly personal and he faces death with realism. The shift in eschatological language in Philippians and II Corinthians does not necessarily imply a change in Paul's idea of the future events but a change in his understanding of his relationship to the end time.¹⁴

14. W. Baird, "Pauline Eschatology in Hermeneutical Perspective", in New Testament Studies, Vol. 17 (1971), pp. 314-327.

(B) The Text of II Cor. 5: 1-10:

In 5:1 Paul speaks of the nature of the believer's death. He starts with οἶδαμεν γὰρ. γὰρ concludes what he has been discussing in the previous chapter, that is the things visible and invisible, the present and the future which is already to some extent being realized in the renewal of the inward man. There he speaks of the priceless Gospel being channelled through the earthen-ware vessels; humble and frail Apostles. For Paul, this has a special application to ^{the} question of life after death. Through Christian hope, Paul brings out the meaning of the present by which Christians are already having a foretaste of what they are not yet but what they will certainly become eventually. By οἶδαμεν he apparently assumes that the problems that gave rise to I Cor. 15 are no longer causing trouble. He speaks of death as the dismantling of a tent-house or the καταλύσις of an οἰκία τοῦ σκηνῶος. The phrase ἡ ἐπιγείος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκηνῶος refers to our earthly tent-house or the tent which forms our earthly house. The words τοῦ σκηνῶος therefore define more closely the nature of the οἰκία.

Also οἰκία like σκήνους is a metaphor describing σῶμα. According to Harris, to a Cilician σκηνοποιός, σκήνος would readily evoke the notions of travel or transitoriness, nomadic existence and pilgrimage. For a Jew σκήνος would naturally be associated with desert wanderings and ^{the} festival of booths celebrated for seven days during the seventh month to commemorate the desert wanderings. For Christians, it may symbolize the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ in the believers during the earthly pilgrimage of faith.¹⁵

If it is the concept of σκήνος that pervades the mind of Paul, καταλυθῆναι would simply mean the dissolution of a building or the dismantling of a tent. But here the event is seen as a specific single occurrence lying in future. If we take 5:4^b to be referring to the resurrection body of the believer, it becomes easier to decide whether ἔχομεν denotes a present or future possession.

15. M.J. Harris, "Paul's View of Death in II Cor. 5: 1-10" in New Dimensions in New Testament Study, (eds.) R. Longenecker and M.C. Tenney, pp. 318-319.

But some scholars regard οἰκοδομήν ἐκ θεοῦ as ~~the Church~~, which is the Body of Christ or the New Temple. Others equate it with heaven itself, with celestial beauties or a heavenly Temple with a celestial dwelling place or with a vestment of celestial glory or with a heavenly mode of existence. But Harris' opinion, is that in view of 4:16^a, apparently 5:1 refers to the physical body. Moreover, he says that the language of 5:1 and the description of the spiritual body in I Cor. 15, unmistakably points to ^{the} identification of οἰκοδομή with σωματικόν and that both are of divine origin (ἐκ θεοῦ, cf. I Cor. 15:38).¹⁶

Harris says that Paul views himself as donning the resurrection without having first doffed the earthly body and that it was to be the case of an addition without prior subtraction, a case not of investiture succeeding divestiture, but super-investiture succeeding divestiture. Also that the earthly house has to be destroyed does not militate against this conclusion, since unlike verse 1, verse 2

16. M. J. Harris, Tyndale Bulletin, 22, Op.cit., pp. 38ff.

is a development, the transformation, not the exchange motif in relating σῶμα ψυχικόν to σῶμα πνευματικόν. He concludes by saying that in 5:2, 4 Paul may be reinforcing the effect of ἔχομεν by emphasising that the moment of death is also the moment of investiture and that κατάλυσις is virtually a co-incident.¹⁷

The Apostle could have regarded the σῶμα πνευματικόν as a real, as opposed to an ideal present possession only if he regarded it as ^{an} actually pre-existent type of heavenly "body bank". At the time of writing the final ἔχειν was still future. Also the act of acquisition is dependent on a prior destruction-first κατάλυσις then ἔχειν.¹⁸ But when does a believer become a possessor of the glorified body? Is it at death or at the parousia? Paul clearly declares in I Cor. 15:52 that this will be at the parousia. But the present tense ἔχομεν can also mean that the acquisition takes place immediately after the κατάλυσις. That means that

17. Ibid., pp. 44 and 45.

18. M.J. Harris, New Dimensions in New Testament Study, Op.cit., p. 322.

immediately after the ΚΑΤΑΛΥΣΙΣ we become possessors of a building from God, and that between the evacuation of a building and inhabiting another, there is no dismal period of homelessness. Against those who interpret 5: 6-10 as referring to the parousia, verse 8 seems to suggest that a temporary distinction can hardly be drawn between the ΚΑΤΑ-
-ΛΥΣΙΣ of the earthly house of verse 1 and the departure from the mortal body of verse 8, referring the former to the time of death and the latter to the parousia. The ἔκδημοι of verse 8 like ΚΑΤΑΛΥΣΙΣ of verse 1 transpires at death. Apparently no interval of time separates the ἔκδημοι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος from the ἐνδημοι πρὸς τὸν κύριον. According to Harris, as in Phil. 1:23 the καὶ joining the infinitives is implicative: to have departed this life is to have taken up residence in the presence of the Lord. Moreover, the state of ἐνδημεῖν ἐν τῷ σώματι and the state of ἐκδημεῖν πρὸς τοῦ κύριου are coincident. As soon as residence in physical embodiment ceases, so also does the absence

from the Lord. Also verse 7 envisages walking

διὰ πίστεως and seeing πρόςωπον
πρός πρόσωπον as two mutually and

immediately successive states of Christian existence.

If death terminates the believer's life of faith, it also inaugurates his face to face vision of Christ.

ἐνδημησάτι πρὸς τὸν κύριον accordingly describes the location and state of Christians immediately after their deaths. Harris says that this phrase

implies spatial proximity to Christ and since Paul believed that Christ after his resurrection ascended

to heaven and occupies the right hand of God, the dead in Christ must be "located" in heaven prior to the

advent of Christ. Furthermore, once it is recognized that the ingressive aorist ἐνδημησάτι has no

implication of movement or direction, the idea that πρὸς denotes both linear motion and familiar

arrival loses its attractiveness. Harris says further that in Hellenistic Greek, the distinction

between motion and rest has become obscured so that πρὸς with the accusative, when used to

indicate a relationship between persons may simply mean

"with", "in the presence of". Therefore, it is inadequate to conclude that believers dwelling with the Lord merely implies incorporation into Christ or a state of semi-consciousness or suspended animation. Paul is certainly referring to some form of lightened interpersonal relationship.¹⁹

Harris concludes that with the drastic and permanent reduction of Paul's life expectancy about the time of II Corinthians, his parousia hope, although undeviatingly maintained throughout his life, became less frequently expressed in his letters and that the intensity in the early letters is lost in the later ones. Of course, the idea that he might die before the parousia did not reduce the significance he attached to it, but it was expected less excitedly. This is not because he felt that he would no longer be a personal participant of the parousia events but because it has ceased to be the next personally significant event in the eschatological timetable. Also in the latter years his eschatological expectation became less apocalyptic but more mystical in form. The advent now became essentially

19. M.J. Harris, Tyndale Bulletin, 22, Op.cit., pp. 46-47.

an open manifestation of a personally hidden state rather than the inauguration of a new era. Also that Paul now became convinced that the transformation from σωμα ψυχικόν would occur either at death or at the parousia, which ever is earlier. The parousia is a manifestation of the present realities rather than a new creation, a manifestation of the glorified saints. In that case it is no longer an event lying in the future but a continuing individual process inaugurated at baptism and consummated at death with its outcome manifested at the parousia.²⁰

Harris also feels that while Paul saw death as the end of an earthly life, death also allows ἐν

Χριστῷ to achieve its goal in consummated σὺν Χριστῷ fellowship. Death may terminate the pilgrimage of faith but it ushers Christians into the presence of Christ. Paul resorts to metaphor because he was not ready to give a physiological analysis of the believer's post-mortem state as he was not ready to describe the anatomy of the spiritual body or the geography of heaven. For

20. Ibid., pp. 48-55.

Paul, κατά λυσίς left untouched the believer's incorporation in Christ and that ἐκδημιόω led an ἐκδημιόω πρὸς τὸν κύριον. The death and resurrection of Christ actually marked the death of death and on the other hand foreshadowed its final eradication at the parousia. Paul never despised mortal embodiment or longed for freedom from corporeality. He did however eagerly await the termination of imperfection of the earthly life. Death means the end of exile from Christ.²¹ In spite of Harris' laudable effort in his two articles, he still leaves many questions unanswered. His position so far is that the investiture of those who die before the parousia takes place at the moment of death and that of those who still survive until the parousia will take place at the parousia.

Various attempts have been made to solve the problem of the time of the investiture - whether at death or at the parousia:

21 M.J. Harris, New Dimensions in New Testament Study, Op.cit., pp. 326-328.

- (1) That Paul invariably taught immediate glorification of the body at death, never really at the resurrection of the dead at the parousia, although the Rabbinic eschatology in earlier epistles might afford this impression.
- (2) That Paul oscillated between two mutually exclusive views of the resurrection at the parousia and the transformation at death.²²
- (3) That Paul believed that the investiture with^a a spiritual body was a privilege reserved for him or for Christian martyrs in general.
- (4) That the hope of a resurrection transformation at death presented Paul's tentative groping after the truth or was a rapturous intuition that half-consciously grew on him.
- (5) That the idea of embodiment at death is an aberrant aspect of Pauline eschatology, the product of exceptional circumstances and

22. O. Pflleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, Vol. I, Tr. W. Montgomery (London, ed.), W.D. Morrison (New York, 1960), pp. 446-463; *Paulinism*, Vol. I, Tr. E. Peters (London, 1891), pp. 259-276.

therefore not normative in Paul's thought.²³

- (6) That Paul held to the Rabbinic conception of the age to come as both eternal reality and a future event and therefore could teach both resurrection at death and resurrection at the parousia without any sense of contradiction.²⁴
- (7) That the ~~οὐκίαι ἀχειροτονίας~~ received at death is a temporary phase of the eternal body of the deceased, just as the physical body is a temporary phase of the eternal body of the survivors until the parousia.²⁵
- (8) That Paul clearly rejects a crassly material conception whereby the risen body would resume the qualities of life as we know it - a conception that was current in Paul's time as we see in II Baruch 50:2: "For the earth shall then

23. R.F. Hettlinger, "II Cor. 5: 1-10" in Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 10, (1957), pp. 191ff.

24. W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London 1955), pp. 314-320.

25. D.E.H. Whiteley, Op.cit., p. 260.

assuredly restore the dead ... It shall make no change in their form; but as it has received them, so it shall restore them". Moreover, Paul is said to be positing a transformation and spiritualization of the earthly body.

- (9) That II Cor. 5, unlike I Cor. 15 does not deal with the resurrection of Jesus at all, and may have moved to a new problem, namely, how the faithful dead live with Christ in the interim between death and resurrection and so may be a poor guide to what the resurrection really involves.
- (10) That while I Cor. 15 implies a general analogy between the resurrection of Christians and the resurrection of Jesus, Paul must face the problems about the earthly bodies of Christians that did not arise like the earthly body of Jesus. Their bodies would have decomposed or been lost by the time of the general resurrection of the just, whereas, Jesus was raised on the third day".²⁶

26. R.E. Brown, Op.cit., pp. 86 & 87.

- (11) That Paul could regard death as a moment of investiture with the glorified body because the departed Christian is not aware of any interval between death and investiture.
- (12) That the doctrine of the resurrection of the righteous at death represents a development in Paul's eschatology. What is implied in I Cor. 15: 35-49 is categorically stated in II Cor. 5: 1-8.
- (13) That II Cor. 5 is written from the perspective of an individual Christian envisaging transformation at death, while I Cor. 15 expresses the corporate hope of the Church and places the resurrection at the parousia.

In verses 3 and 4, Paul reverting to the image of clothing states his hope explicitly and so fostered a bright hope of eternal life. According to Barrett instead of ἐίτε, P. 46 BDG have εἴτε, implying more strongly that the supposition agrees with the fact. "Since when we have put it on we shall not ...". This reading is certainly old and may be

accurate.²⁷ Cullmann's opinion is that Paul is thinking of an intermediate state here.²⁸ He says that the dead in Christ share in the tension of the interim period between Christ's resurrection and the general resurrection at the parousia. They are nearer to Christ than before and the possession of the Holy Spirit brings them closer to the final resurrection but their bliss is not complete. Paul fears the state of nakedness, the condiction of the inner man without the body. Cullmann's idea is based on the interpretation of ψυχῶς. He contends that verse 2 describes the resurrection at the parousia and that ἐπιτελευτούμεθα refers to the glorious change described in I Cor. 15:54 and also that he still hopes to be alive in order to put on the spiritual or heavenly body.²⁹

-
27. C.K. Barrett, The Second Epistle to the Corinthians (London, 1973), p. 149.
28. K. Hanhart, "Paul's hope in the face of Death" in Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 88 (1969), p. 445; H.A.A. Kennedy, Conceptions of the Last Things (London, 1904), pp. 266ff.; A. Schweitzer, Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, (1931), p. 131; J.A. Robinson, The Body (1952), pp. 29, 78.
29. O. Cullmann, Immortality or the Resurrection of the Dead? (London, 1958), pp. 51-54.

But this argument is faulty in that neither in the New Testament nor in the Jewish literature of the time is the term 'naked' used to describe the interim state.³⁰ Paul's desire not to be found naked reveals a characteristically Jewish horror of nakedness and though the language here has some Hellenistic connotation, he does not use it in the normal Hellenistic sense. It is only outside the Jewish and Christian folds that the nakedness of the soul was never dreaded but longed for, at least among the educated ones. For the educated Greek, stripping was necessary if the soul was to enter the highest heaven. Philo shared the Hellenistic view of nakedness of the soul as a necessary thing. He says that Moses at the end of his life began to pass over from mortal existence to life immortal and ^{was} gradually conscious of the disuniting of the element of which he was composed. The body, the shell-like growth which encased him, was being stripped away and the soul laid bare (ἀπογυμνωμένης) and yearning (παθούσης) for its natural removal hence.³¹

30. Hanhart, Op.cit., p. 446.

31. Leg. Alleg II 57, 59; F. Cumont - Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism, pp. 154f., C.K. Barrett, Op.cit., p. 154.

Nevertheless, Paul might as well meant that at at one moment we may be found naked according to Hanhart, but that he does not write in terms of a longer or shorter state of nakedness. Also the supposed fear of an interim state would be in strange contrast to the exultant language before and after this verse (II Cor. 4: 14, 5:8; cf. Phil. 1:23). The text also does not suggest an abrupt transition of 5: 6-10 as dealing with after death. Both centre around the idea of dwelling in a home or building or a home country (5: 1-4). "If the earthly tent is destroyed ..." certainly refers to the moment of death. Paul as a tent maker here compares our transitory life with the life of a Bedouin pitching his tent from place to place or with wandering Israel through the wilderness. The time of death is when the tent collapses.³²

YOM VO'S has often been interpreted in terms of an anthropological dualism as the naked or disembodied intermediate state so that ΕΚΘΥΟΑ

οθυοα could not mean anything else than parting with the body of flesh. Moule says that the new

32. Hanhart, Op.cit., p. 447.

clothing cannot simply be put on over the old one, the old must be given up in exchange or the old progressively parted with in exchange for the new.³³

It is true that Paul derived the expression and dualism from the Hellenistic world, ^{but} he has modified it in the light of his Hebrew background. According to Ellis, for Paul "nakedness" was patently undesirable ^{but} that his use of the term was actually a polemic against the Gnostics in Corinth who depreciated material existence. Moreover, he says that it is not in Greek anthropology but in Hebrew eschatology that the meanings of γυμνός and ἐκδύω in II Cor. 5 are to be found. In the Old Testament defeat and captivity were viewed as judgement of God upon sin. "Nakedness" a term used of the abbreviated dress of slaves and war captives came to have the connotation of guilt and judgment (Is. 47:3; Ezk. 16:37, 23:29; Dan. 4:30^b; Hos. 2:3; Amos. 2:16; cf. Is. 3:17; Heb. 3:13; Zeph. 2:11). Such attire might be adopted in symbolic proclamation of the coming calamity. Thus Isaiah

33. C.F.D. Moule, New Testament Studies, Vol. 12, p.119.

goes naked as a sign of God's verdict of destruction upon Egypt and Ethiopia. Michah does the same thing concerning Judah (1:8). Such actions are symbolic participation of the prophets in the guilt and judgment of their people (II Sam. 15:30; 16:11f.). This may also emphasise the sin-guiltiness of man in the presence of a holy God. The fallen Adam heard the voice of God and he was afraid because he was naked (Gen. 3:10). Israel naked of virtue is clothed with God's covenant blessings (Ez. 16: 7f.). γυμνός ἐκδύω and αἰσχύνω (shame) are sometimes found together. Ellis sees "not to be found naked" in the light of Matt. 22:11 and therefore to prepare for the Messianic banquet one must have a wedding garment. Without this garment of righteousness, those within the professing community are naked and when Christ comes suddenly their nakedness and shame will be revealed. Therefore, no body who believes in him will be stripped naked (καταίω χυκ θήσεται (Rom. 10:11)). Ellis therefore concludes that both γυμνός and ἐκδύω in II Cor. 5 have the judgment scene in view. It is not at death,

but at the parousia that those without the wedding garment, the spiritual body or heavenly house to be put on, will be discovered stripped naked. Ellis is of the view that the passage is not a change in Paul's theology of the intermediate state. The passage deals throughout with the contrast between this age and the age to come.³⁴ Ellis' view like many other views is not without its difficulties. Nevertheless, in the light of II Cor. 5:10, we cannot dismiss his view altogether.

What is called a garment here is the new immortal body. What Paul is apparently saying is that we do not want the old body stripped off, but our desire is to have a new one put over it in order that our mortal part may be swallowed up by immortality. God is already shaping us towards this end and the gift of the Holy Spirit is a pledge of this (5:4f.). Here it is difficult to distinguish between the new body he is looking forward to from the spiritual body for which Paul waits at the parousia according to I Cor. 15. Attempts have been made to interpret the

34. E.E. Ellis, Op.cit., pp. 219-224.

heavenly body as a corporate entity or a body of Christ and that the believers membership of that body is related to this present mortal life, rather than the life to come.³⁵ It is true that Paul speaks of the Church as a corporate body but never in terms of the resurrection as we have it in either I Cor. 15 or II Cor. 5.

Bruce also expresses the opinion that the new body that Paul is speaking about in II Cor. 5 is the same as the spiritual body of I Cor. 15, then he no longer thinks of waiting until the parousia before he receives it. It is not just a temporal covering that he hopes to receive at death pending his investiture with the resurrection body at the parousia, it is an eternal house prepared by God. According to Paul there will be no interval of conscious nakedness between one and the other. Also Paul is apparently suggesting here that ^{for} those who do not survive until the parousia, the new body will be

35. J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, pp. 76ff.; E.E. Ellis, Paul and His Recent Interpreters (Grand Rapids, 1961), pp. 35ff.; M.E. Thrall, Greek Particles in the New Testament (Leiden, 1962), pp. 82; R.F. Hettlinger, Op.cit., 10, (1957), pp. 174ff.; A.E. Harvey, Companion to the New Testament (Oxford and Cambridge, 1970), p. 583.

immediately available.³⁶

The tension between our experience of mortality and our hope of immortality is very real to Paul and it has remained so down the ages. But Paul shows us how we can in faith live with this tension. There can hardly be any view taken on II Cor. 5: 1-10 that will be without its various problems. But taking the entire Pauline writings together he apparently remains consistent in his view about the end. If this is so, the moderate views of Bruce and Ellis will perhaps minimise the difficulties. II Cor. 5: 1-10 cannot be interpreted alone without taking into account the letters written before and after the writing of II Corinthians. We must realize that Paul is here speaking about "What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him" (I Cor. 2:9). Paul also accepts the fact that as for the present: "Our knowledge is imperfect and our prophecy is imperfect, but when the perfect comes, the imperfect will pass away... For we now see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face" (I Cor. 13: 9-12).

36. F.F. Bruce, "Paul on Immortality", in Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 24 (1971), pp.470-471.

E P I L O G U E

The problems that we have discovered so far are those that must be faced and discussed by all Christians today. The resurrection of Jesus Christ which constitutes the centre of the New Testament message is the core of what can be described as the Gospel of St. Paul, the greatest of the Apostles. The resurrection of Jesus brought into reality the hope of the resurrection expressed dimly in the Old Testament but explicitly during the inter-testamental period. That God has raised Jesus from the dead has formed the key note of the New Testament message from the beginning. The purpose of this study as it has been clearly shown is not just to give doctrinal answers as if biblical criticism were the ultimate court of appeal, but to survey the evidence objectively and see what biblical scholarship has contributed to the discussion of the problem of the resurrection of Jesus and its implications in the New Testament, especially in Paul.

So far, we have seen that it is not only the resurrection of Christ that is controversial but the nature of the resurrection of the believers as well.

The resurrection of Jesus does not fit into the modern world of things calculable and manipulable. It is an historical event among other historical events that took place in the event of Jesus; and ^{one} that is still taking place and will yet take place in the future. Many Church men and non-Church men alike today cannot find grounds for such a hope in reality because it does not afford them experiencable meaning. They feel that such hope can no longer offer satisfactory answers about the future of this earth at which mankind is presently working. Systematic theology is now being challenged to say whether or not it can still present the resurrection of Jesus as an historical fact and defend the Christian hope for the resurrection in the modern world and how it might be done. As we have seen the resurrection of Jesus was the heart of the primitive Christianity. ~~The~~ Easter was the origin of the various Christologies, the foundation of salvation and the Christian hope. Jesus' words were proclaimed as the words of the Exalted Lord Jesus Christ. His activities, miracles and healings were proclaimed as those of the Risen One.

His historical appearance and activities were made present in the light of the Easter presence through the Holy Spirit. His death on the Cross was interpreted and proclaimed as the soteriological work of the eschatological person exalted through the Easter event. For the primitive Christianity his death was his real beginning.¹

But if we question the Christian resurrection faith and its reality today, we must as well question the modern world which thinks historico-critical research is the only access to reality. The New Testament has been consistent in the claim that Jesus was crucified, dead and buried that he was raised on the third day and that he appeared to many witnesses. Yet the Christian hope is not based on the isolated event of Jesus resurrection but on his total person and entire history. In the risen Christ the whole promises of God became effective. Jesus became the first fruit among them that have fallen asleep. But the Christian hope is not a one way road

1. J. Moltmann, "Resurrection as a Hope", in Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 61, (1968), pp. 129-131.

which leaves the present behind in order to flee into the future. The future is drawn into the sufferings of the present since the future has become flesh in Jesus the crucified Risen Lord. The God who raised Jesus from the dead is the God of hope and the Lord of the future. Through the act of God in Jesus we become certain of the future when forsaken~~ness~~ death and Hades will be abolished. That is why Christian hope is joined with the expectation of a future which has not yet existed before. The resurrection will fulfil itself in the future in which God is really God and will be all in all and in which man is man and in a future where the negatives of death, sufferings, tears, guilt and evil will disappear. Moltmann says:

"Where freedom has come near, the chains begin to hurt. Where life is close, death becomes deadly. Where God proclaims his presence, the god-forsaken~~ness~~ of the world turns into suffering".

Thus suffering and pains negatively mirror the positive hope of God's future.²

2. Moltmann, Ibid., p. 146.

Of course, as Wiles rightly says:

"All belief about God is problematic. For in our beliefs about God we are reaching out to speak of a realm beyond the level of our ordinary experiencing ... Much the same is true about the future".

He says further:

"God is sovereign and free but not in the sense of being unpredictable. He is the same yesterday, today and forever. Knowledge of what God has done and is doing can therefore be claimed to include in some measure the knowledge of what God will do. Eternal life is spoken of in the Scripture and in Christian tradition, not simply as a future hope but as a present experience. In other words, traditional Christian beliefs about the future have always had at least an important part of their grounding in past and present experience. They are not of such a kind that they have to be ruled out in advance on the ground that they could only exist at all on the basis of unacceptable epistemological foundations".³

We have also seen clearly that the Hebrew understanding of man as a psycho-somatic unity makes it the most natural form in which to express the concept of the future life which is to be something more than a pale shadow of the present existence.

3. M. Wiles, The Remaking of Christian Doctrine, (S.C.M., London, 1974), pp. 125-126.

That is why the resurrection of Jesus is reported as taking a bodily form. Traditional Christianity has always insisted upon distinguishing the Christian concept of the resurrection from the philosophical belief in the immortality of the soul, not because it is irrelevant and untrue but because it is incomplete, distressingly dull and missing the gift of the Gospel. While it is accepted that the soul survives death, the life of a soul without the body is one that is un-Pauline. It is incomplete because the self is far more than the soul and the soul without a bodily expression is not a complete personality. This is why Christianity teaches a future wherein the soul is not going to be naked but clothed upon by a bodily expression, where the mortal life will put on immortality. No where either in Jewish or Hellenistic idea is the belief in the future life so vivid, immediate, central and triumphant as we find in Christianity. Christianity also combines the consciousness of the nearness of the end with moral exalting of life in the present world. Christians are not hoping for a flight into another world leaving this

world behind. But in the present life they are already linked with the life of the world to come. Paul also stresses the fact that although the future life is to be transformed far beyond imagination, far beyond flesh and blood, there is identity and continuity as we have in the resurrection of Jesus. That is why Paul does not exclude the body from its relevance to the moral issues of faith and from the Christian hope. "Waiting for the adoption to wit the redemption of our bodies". Nothing less than this was Paul's greatest expectation. He yearns not to be naked but to be clothed, so that mortality might be swallowed up by life (II Cor. 5:4). Food and digestion belong to this earth but the body belongs to Christ who had already paid a price for it. The body therefore has a place in the great plan of man's redemption through the resurrection of Jesus. Although the body of Christians is still liable to death through sin yet the real man is renewed through the life of Christ.

The Lord who raised Jesus from the dead will give life to our mortal bodies through the indwelling Spirit. At the present the Spirit prepares our bodies for the day when our hope will be consummated at the parousia.

According to Ramsey, the divine kingdom will be realized by God's act of raising mankind and delivering it from the conditions which neither history nor immortality can solve. Yet the divine kingdom will not be far removed from nature and history since in it, both nature and history will be clothed upon and fulfilled. He says that the resurrection of the body is something which the mind cannot conceive, just as the mind of man cannot conceive a purely spiritual immortality. But whereas a bodiless immortality is inconceivable because it seems to make the future life maimed and meaningless, the resurrection of the body is inconceivable because it suggests a richness of life in the blending of old and new in a way that apparently defies human thought. But the end is soon reached when the apostolic words confronts us: "Behold I tell you a mystery ... Death is swallowed up in victory".⁴

4. Ramsey, Op.cit., pp. 114-115.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHYARTICLES:

- Andet, L. - "What is the Risen Spiritual Body?" in Theology Digest, Vol. 21, (1973), pp. 4ff.
- Annand, R. - "He was seen by Cephas" Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 11, (1958), pp. 180-187.
- Baird, W. - "Pauline Eschatology in Hermeneutical Perspective", in New Testament Studies, Vol. 17, (1971), pp. 314-327.; "What is the Kerygma? - A Study of I Cor. 15: 3-8 and Gal. 1: 11-17, Ibid., Vol. 76, (1957), pp. 181-191.
- Balch, D.L. - "Background of the I Corinthian Saying of the Lord in Q, Moses. As an Ascetic, Θεός Ἄνθρωπος. In II Corinthians 3", in New Testament Studies, Vol. 18, (1972).
- Barclay, W. - "A Comparison of Paul's Missionary Preaching and the Preaching of the Church", in Apostolic History and the Gospel, (eds.), W. Gasque and R.P. Martin, (The Paternoster Press, 1970), pp. 165-175.
- Barrett, C.K. - "Paul's Opponents in II Corinthians", New Testament Studies, Vol. 17 (1971).
- Barrett, C.K. - "Things Sacrificed to idols" New Testament Studies, Vol. 11, (1965)

- Black, M. - "The Eschatology of the Similitudes of Enoch", New Testament Studies Vol. 3, (1957), pp. 1-10.
- Bornkamm, G. - "The Revelation of Christ to Paul on the Damascus road and Paul's Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation - A Study in Galatians", Reconciliation and Hope, New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology (ed.), R.J. Banks, (The Paternoster Press, Exeter, 1974).
- "The Missionary Stance of Paul in Corinthians 9 and in Acts", Studies in Luke-Acts (eds.) L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn, Abingdon Press, New York, 1966).
- Bruce, F.F. - "Paul's Changing View of the Resurrection", Theology Digest, Vol. 21 (1973), pp. 8ff.
- "The Speeches in Acts - Thirty Years After", Reconciliation and Hope, Op.cit., (1974), pp. 53-68.
- "Paul on Immortality" Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 24, (1971), pp. 457-472.
- Bultmann, R. - "New Testament Mythology" Kerygma and Myth, (ed.), H.W. Bartsch, translated by R.H. Fuller (S.P.C.K., London, 1960).
- Burns, J.B. - "The Mythology of Death in the Old Testament", Scottish Journal of Theology Vol. 26, (1973), pp. 227-340.
- Calston, C.E. - "Transfiguration and Resurrection", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 80 (1961), pp. 233-240.

- Card, D.H. - - "The Conception of the Future Life According to the Greek Translator of Job", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 73, (1954), pp. 137-143.
- Cardbury, H.J. - - "Acts and Eschatology" Background to the New Testament and its Eschatology (eds.) W.D. Davies and D. Daube.
- Chadwick - - "Origin, Celsus, and the Resurrection of the Body", Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XLI, (1948), pp. 83-102.
- Colwell, E.C. - - "Mark 16: 9-20, in the Armenian Version", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 56 (1937), pp. 369-386.
- Conzelmann, H. - - "The Speeches in Acts and Thucydides", Expository Times, Vol. 76, (1964).
- Conzelmann, H. - - "Current Problems in Pauline Research" New Testament Issues, (ed.), R. Batey, (S.C.M., London, 1970)
- Craig, J.C.G. - - "The Eschatological Ministry" The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective (eds.) H. Anderson and W. Barclay, (Oxford, 1965)
- Dahl, M.A. - - "Christ, Creation and the Church", Background to the New Testament and its Eschatology, Op.cit.
- Daly, D. - - "Theological Models in the Doctrine of the Original Sin" O.S.A., The Heythrop Journal, April, 1972.

- Davis, J.G. - "Factors Leading to the Emergence of the Resurrection of the Flesh", Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 23, (1972), pp. 448ff.
- Duling, D.C. - "The Promises to David and its Entrance into Christianity", New Testament Studies, Vol. 20, pp. 55-77.
- Dun, J.D.G. - "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus", Reconciliation and Hope, Op.cit., pp. 125-141.
- "II Corinthians 3:17 - The Lord is Spirit", Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 21, (1970), pp. 309-320.
- "Spirit and Kingdom" Theology Digest, Vol. 19, (1971), pp. 247ff.
- Duncan, J. - "Fresh Light on Luke 16", Dives and Lazarus and the Preceding Sayings" New Testament Studies, Vol. 7 (1961) pp. 364-380.
- Dupont, J. (O.S.B.) - "The Conversion of Paul and its Influence on His Understanding of Salvation by Faith", The Apostolic History and the Gospel, Op.cit., pp. 186ff.
- Dykstra - I Cor. 15: 20-28, An Essential Part of Paul's Argument Against Those Who Deny The Resurrection" Calvin Theological Journal, Vol. 4, pp. 195ff.
- Ellis, E.E. - "Christ Crucified", Reconciliation and Hope, Op.cit.
- "II Corinthians 5: 1-10 in Pauline Eschatology", New Testament Studies, Vol. 6, (1960), pp. 211-224.

- "Jesus, The Sadducees, and Qumran", New Testament Studies, Vol. 10, (1964), pp. 274-279.
- Faley, R.J. - "Eschatology and Christian Social Action", Theology Digest, Vol. 19, (1971), pp. 148ff.
- Frank, E. - "The Ascension and Eschatology, Luke-Acts", Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 23, (1970), pp. 191ff.
- Fraser, J.W. - "Paul's Knowledge of Jesus in II Corinthians, 5:16, New Testament Studies Vol. 17, 1971.
- Crasque, W.W. - "The Speeches of Acts, Dibelius Reconsidered New Dimensions in New Testament Study (eds.), R.N. Longnecker and M.C. Tenny, Zondervan Publish^{ing} House, 1974.
- J.G. Grager, Jr. - "Functional Diversity in Paul's use of End-time Language, Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 89, (1979), pp. 325-336.
- Gilmour - "Easter and Pentecost - Correction of J.B.L. 80, Journal of Biblical Literature Vol. 81, (1962), pp. 66ff.
- Grech, P. - (O.S.A.) "Interprophetic Re-interpretation and Old Testament Eschatology", Theology Digest, 18, (1970), pp. 154ff.
- Gressy, H.M. - "Epicureans", New Bible Dictionary (ed.), J.D. Douglass
- Hamilton, A.K. - "Created Soul - Eternal Spirit - A Contemporary Theological Thorn", Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 19, (1966), pp. 23-34.

- Hanhart, K. - "Paul's Hope in the face of Death", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 88, (1969), pp. 445-457.
- Harris, M.J. - "II Corinthians 5: 1-10 - Watershed in Pauline Eschatology", Tyndale Bulletin, No. 22, (1971), pp. 32ff.
- Harris, M.J. - "Paul's View of Death in II Corinthians 5: 1-10", New Dimensions in New Testament Study, Op.cit.
- Herbert, G. - "The Resurrection Narrative in St. Mark", Scottish Journal of Theology Vol. 15 (1962), pp. 66-73).
- Hettlinger, R.F.- "II Corinthians 5: 1-10", Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 10, (1957), pp. 194ff.
- Higgins, A.J.B.- "The Preface of Luke and the Kerygma in Acts", Apostolic History and the Gospel, Op.cit.
- Hooker, M.D. - "Interchange in Christ", Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 22, 1971.
- Horst, P.W. Van der - "Observations on a Pauline Expression", New Testament Studies, Vol. 19, 1973.
- Huffmann, N. - "Emmaus - Among the Resurrection Narratives", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 64 (1945), pp. 205-226.
- Käsemann, E. - "An Apologia for Primitive Christian Eschatology", Essays on New Testament Themes - Studies in Biblical Theology, 41, (S.C.M., London, 1971).
- Kennard, J.S. (Jr.) - "The Burial of Jesus", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 74 (1955), pp. 227ff.

- Kempthorne, R. - "Incest in the Body of Christ" New Testament Studies, Vol. 14, 1967-68.
- Knox, J. - "Acts and the Pauline Corpus" Studies in Luke-Acts, Op.cit.
- Ladd, G.E. - "Revelations and Tradition in Paul", Apostolic History and the Gospel, Op.cit.
- Leon-Dufour, S.J. - "Resurrection as the Victory of Love", Theology Digest, Vol. 21 (1973), pp. 111ff.
- Liefeld, W.L. - "Theological Motifs in the Transfiguration Narrative" New Dimensions in New Testament Studies, Op.cit.
- Lohse, E. - "Pauline Theology in the Letter to the Colossians" New Testament Studies Vol. 15, 1968-69.
- Malherbe, M. - "The Beasts at Ephesus", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 87, (1969), pp. 71-80.
- Manson, T.W. - "The Date of the Epistle to the Philippians", Studies in the Gospels and Epistles, (Manchester 1962)
- Marshall, I.H. - "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles" - Apostolic History and the Gospel, Op.cit.
- "The Development of the Concept of Redemption in the New Testament" Reconciliation and Hope, Op.cit.
- Martins, R.P. - "Reconciliation and Forgiveness in Colossians", Ibid.
- Mc. Casland, S.V. - "The Basis of the Resurrection Faith", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 50 (1931), pp. 211-226.

- Mc. Caughey, J.D., - "The Death of Death, Reconciliation and Hope, Op.cit.
- Menoud, Ph. - "Revelation and Tradition - The Influence of Paul on his Theology, Interpretation, Vol.7, pp. 13ff.
- Moltmann, J. - "Resurrection as a Hope, Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 61, (1958), pp. 129ff.
- Moule, C.F.D. - "St. Paul and Dualism, The Pauline Concept of the Resurrection, New Testament Studies, Vol. 12, (1966), 106ff.
- Moule, C.F.D. - "The Post-resurrection Appearance, in the Light of Festival Pilgrimage, New Testament Studies, Vol. 4, (1958)
- Nolam, B.M. - "The Meaning of the Parousia Today, Theology Digest, Vol. 18, (1970), pp. 150ff.
- O'Collins, G. (S.J.) - "Karl Barth on the Resurrection, New Testament Studies, Vol. 16, (1970), pp. 85ff.
- Orsborne, R.E. - "Paul and the Wild Beasts, Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 85, (1966), pp. 225-230.
- Pagels, E.H. - "The Mystery of the Resurrection - A Gnostic Reading of I Corinthians 15, Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 932 (1974), pp. 276-288.
- Palmer, T.W. - "Resurrection of Jesus and the Mission of the Church Reconciliation and Hope, Op.cit.

- Pannenberg, W. -- - "Did Jesus Really Rise from the Dead?", New Testament Issues, Op.cit., and Dialogue, 4, pp. 130ff.
- Piper, O. - "The Gospel" Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. II, pp. 414ff.
- Prentice, W.P. -- - "St. Paul's Journey to Damascus" Z.N.T.W., Vol. 46, pp. 250ff.
- Ridderbos, H.N. - "Earliest Confession of Atonement in Paul", Reconciliation and Hope, Op.cit.
- Robinson, J.A.T. - "Resurrection" Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 4, pp. 39ff.
- Robinson, J.M., - "Kerygma and History in the New Testament" Bible and Modern Scholarship (ed.) J.P. Hyatt, (New York 1963)
- Schilling, O. - "Resurrection" Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology, Vol. 2 (ed.) J.B. Baner.
- Schneider, J. - "ΕΚ ΤΩ ΜΑΡΚ, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. II, (ed.), Co. Kittel, translated by G.W. Bromley, pp. 465ff.
- Schniewind - "A Reply to Bultmann" Kerygma and Myth, Op.cit.
- Schweizer, E. - "Dying and Rising with Christ", New Testament Issues Op.cit., New Testament Studies, Vol. 14.
- R. Scroggs & K.I. Groff - in
- Baptism/Mark: Dying and Rising with Christ - Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 924 (1973), pp. 531-548.

- Shepherd, H.M. - "Paul and the Double Resurrection Tradition, Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 64, pp. 227ff.
- Sleeper, C.F. - Pentecost and Resurrection, Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 84, (1965), pp. 381-399.
- Smalley, S.S. - "The Delay of the Parousia" Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 83, (1964), pp. 41-54ff.
- Stein, R.H. - "Is the Transfiguration - (Mk. 9: 2-8), a Misplaced Resurrection Account?", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. Vol. 951 (1976), pp. 79-96.
- Talbert, C.H., - The Concept of Immortals in Mediterranean Antiquity," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 943, (1975), pp. 419-436.
- Thrall, M.E. - "The Origin of Pauline Christology" Apostolic History and the Gospel, Op.cit.,
- Trompf, G.W. - "The Resurrection Appearances and Ending of Mark", New Testament Studies, Vol. 18, pp. 308ff.
- Vielhauer, P. - "The Paulinism of Acts" Studies in Luke Acts, Op.cit.,
- Walker, W.O. - "Post-Crucifixion Appearances and Christian Origins", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 88, (1969), pp. 157-165.
- Wedderburn, A.J.M. - "Theological Structure of Romans 5:12", New Testament Studies, Vol. 19, (1973)

- Wilder, A.N. - "Variant Resurrection Tradition in Acts, Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 62, (1943), pp. 307ff.
- "Eschatological Imagery and Early Circumstances", New Testament Studies, Vol. 5 (1959), pp. 229ff.
- Wilson, R.M. - "How Gnostic were the Corinthians?", New Testament Studies, Vol. 19, 1972.
- Wortherspoon, H.J. - "Resurrection of the Dead", Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels (ed.), J. Hastings.

B O O K S

- Alsop, J.E. - "The Post Resurrection - Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition, C.V. Stuggart, (California, 1975).
- Anderson, B.C. - "The Living World of the Old Testament Longman, 1967
- Aulen, G. - "The Faith of the Christian Church (Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1960)
- Barclay, W. - "Ambassador for Christ, (St. Andrew Press, Edinburgh, 1973)
- Barclay, W. - "The Mind of St. Paul, (Fontana Books, 1972)
- Barclay, W. - "The Plain Man looks at the Apostles' Creed (Fontana Books, 1971)
- Barrett, C.K. - "From First Adam to last, (Adam and Charles Black, London, 1962).
- Barrett, C.K. - "The New Testament Background: Selected Documents (London, S.P.C.K., 1961)

- Bartsch, H.W. and Fuller, R.H. (eds.) - Kerygma and Myth - A Theological Debate (London, 1960)
- Bickerman, E. - From Ezra to the last of the Macabees (Schocken, New York, 1947).
- Bode, E.L. - The First Easter Morning: The Gospel Accounts of the Women's Visit to the Tomb of Jesus (Rome, Biblical Institute Press, 1970)
- Bornkamm, G. - Early Christian Experience (Harper and Row, New York, 1969)
- Bornkamm, G. - Paul, trans. by D.M.G., Stalker, (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1971)
- Brandon, S.G.F. - The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church (S.P.C.K., London, 1951)
- Bright, J. - The Kingdom of God (Abingdon Press, New York)
- Brown, R.E. - The Virginal Conception and the Bodily Resurrection of Jesus, Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1974.
- Bruce, F.F. - The Spreading Flame, The Paternoster Church History, Vol. I, 1970.
- Bruce, F.F. - Tradition Old and New, (The Paternoster Press, 1970).
- Bultmann, R. - The Theology of the New Testament, Vols. 1 and 2, (S.C.M., London, 1970 and 71)
- Bultmann, R. - Jesus Christ and Mythology, New York, 1958)

- Burkitt, F. - Two Lectures on the Gospels
(Mac., 1901)
- Cerfaux, L. - Christ in the Theology of Paul
Translated by G. Webb, and A. Walker,
(Geoffrey & Chapman, London, 1967)
- Charles, R.H. - Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish and Christian (London, 1899)
- Clark, N. - Interpreting the Resurrection,
(S.C.M., London, 1967.)
- Craig, C.T. - The Beginning of Christianity,
(Abingdon Press, New York).
- Cullmann, O. - Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead? (Epworth Press)
- Cumont, F. - Oriental Religion in Roman Paganism, Open Court Publishing Comp., Kegan Paul, Chicago, 1911).
- Davies, W.D. - Paul and Rabbinic Judaism,
(S.P.C.K., London, 1965)
- Deissmann, A. - St. Paul, English Translation,
(Hodder & Stoughton, 1912)
- Deissmann, A. - Light from the Ancient East -
Translated by L.R.M. Strachan
(Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1909)
- Denny, J. - The Death of Christ (ed.) by
R.V.G. Tasker, (London, Tyndale Press, 1964)
- Dibelius, M. - Studies in the Acts of the Apostles
(ed.), H. Greeven, London, 1956).
- Dodd, C.H. - The Meaning of Paul for today,
(Fontana, London, 1971)

- Dodd, C.H. - The Bible and the Greeks
(London, 1954)
- Dodd, C.H. - Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge University Press, 1963).
- Dodd, C.H. - The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1937).
- Dudley, D. - A History of Criticism, from Diogenes to the 6th Century, (Methuen, 1937)
- Durrewell, F.X. - Resurrection - A Biblical Study
(Sheed & Ward, New York, 1970)
- Eichrodt, W. - Theology of the Old Testament, Vols. I and II, (S.C.M. London, 1967)
- Ellis, E.E. - Paul and His Recent Interpreters,
(Grand Rapids, 1961)
- Ellis, E.E. - Paul's Use of the Old Testament,
(Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1957)
- Enslin, M.S. - The Ethics of Paul, (Harper and Brothers, New York, 1930)
- Evans, C.F. - Resurrection and the New Testament - Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series, No. 12, (S.C.M., 1970).
- Fuller, R.H. - The Foundations of the New Testament Christology (Fontana, London, 1971)
- Fuller, R.H. - The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives (Macmillan, London, 1971)
- Furnish, V.P. - Theology and Ethics in Paul,
(Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tennessee)

- Goppelt, L. - Jesus, Paul and Judaism,
Translated by F. Schroeder, (Nelson,
New York, 1964)
- Grant, M. - St. Paul, Weidenfeld and Nicolson,
London, 1976.
- Guy, H.A. - The Origin of the Gospel of Mark,
(Hodder & Stoughton, 1954)
- Guy, H.A. - The Doctrine of the last Things
(London 1948).
- Hennecke, E. - New Testament Apocrypha (Vols. I-II
(Lutherworth Press, London, 1965).
- Hester, J.D. - Paul's Concept of Inheritance
(Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh, 1968)
- Holtzmann, O. - The Life of Jesus (1904)
- Huegel, F.J. - The Cross through the Scripture,
(Minneapolis Minnesota, 1970)
- Hunt, E.W. - Portrait of Paul (A.R. Mowbray &
Co. Ltd., 1968)
- Hunter, A.M. - Paul and his Predecessors, (S.C.M.,
London, 1961)
- Hunter, A.M. - Interpreting Paul's Gospel, (S.C.M.,
London, 1955)
- Jackson & Lake (eds.) - The Beginnings of Christianity,
Part I. The Acts of the Apostles
Vol. 5, Macmillan, 1933)
- Jacob, E. - Theology of the Old Testament,
translated by A.W. Heathcote and
P.J. Allcote, (Hodder & Stoughton,
1958).
- Jeremias, J. - The Parables of Jesus, (S.C.M.,
London, 1963)

- Kantsky, K. - Foundations of Christianity, (London, 1925)
- Kasemann, E. - Jesus Means Freedom - A Polemic Survey of the Testament (S.C.M., London, 1969)
- Perspectives on Paul, (SCM, London, 1971)
- Kee, H.C. & Young, F.W. - The Living World of the New Testament, (Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1973)
- Kelly, J.N.D. - Early Christian Doctrines (A. & C., Black, London, 1968)
- Kennedy, H.A.A. - "St. Paul and the Mystery - Religions" (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1913)
- Kennedy, H.A.A. - The Theology of the Epistles (Duckworth & Co., London, 1919)
- Kennedy, H.A.A. - St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things, (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1904)
- Klausner, J. - From Jesus to Paul, Translated by W.F. Stinespring, (London, 1942)
- Klausner, J. - Jesus of Nazareth, translated by H. Dauby (Allen & Unwin, 1923)
- Knox, J. - Chapters in Paul's Life (A. & C. Black, London, 1954)
- Knox, W.L. - St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles (Cambridge, 1961)
- Ladd, G.E. - I believe in the Resurrection of Jesus (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1975)

- Ladd, G.E. - Jesus and the Kingdom - The Eschatology of Biblical Realism, (London, S.F.C.K., 1966)
- Lake, K. - The Historical Evidence of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ (Putnam, New York, 1907)
- J.F.ukes, Jackson and
^ Lake, K. - Beginning of Christianity I, Macmillan, 1902-26)
- Linders, B. - New Testament Apologetic, (S.C.M. London 1961)
- Lightfoot, R. - Locality and Doctrine of the Gospel (Harper, New York, 1938)
- Lightfoot, R. - The Gospel Message of St. Mark, (Oxford Clarendon, 1950)
- Longenecker, R.N. - Paul, Apostle of Liberty, (Harper & Row New York, 1964)
- Luce, H.K. - St. Luke, Cambridge, Bible for Schools and Colleges, 3rd Edition.
- Marxsen, W. - The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, (S.C.M., London, 1970)
- Mc. Birnie, W.B. - The Search for the Twelve Apostles (Wheaton, 1973).
- Moltmann, J.M. - Theology of Hope, (S.C.M., London, 1967)
- Montefiore, G.G. - The Synoptic Gospels, Vol. I, Second Edition)
- Moore, G.F. - Judaism, Vol. I-III, (T.E.F. Book Grant, 1927)
- Morris, L. - The Cross in the New Testament (Paternoster Press, 1967).

- Morris, L. - Studies in the Fourth Gospel
(Paternoster Press, 1969).
- Motyer, J.A. - After Death: A Sure and Certain Hope
(Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1965)
- Munck, J. - Paul and the Salvation of Mankind
(S.C.M., London, 1959)
- Oesterley,
W.O.E. &
Robinson, T.H.- Hebrew Religion: its Origin and
Development (London, 1930)
- Otto, R. - The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man
(Lutherworth Press, 1943)
- Pederson, J. - Israel I-II, Oxford
University Press, London, 1954)
- Pfleiderer, O.- Primitive Christianity, Vol. I
translated by W. Montgomen (ed.),
W.D. Morrison, New York, 1906).
- Pfleiderer, O.- Paulinism, Vol. I, Translated by E.
Peters (London, 1891)
- Philostratus - The Life of Apollonius of Tyana
(Leob Classical Library, New York,
Macmillan, 1912).
- Ramsay, A.M. - The Resurrection of Christ, (London,
1956)
- Ramsay, W.A. - The Teaching of Paul in terms of the
Present Day, (London, 1913)
- Richardson, A.- An Introduction to the Theology
of the New Testament (S.C.M., London,
1961)
- Robinson, J.A.T. The Body, (SCM, London, 1957)

- Robinson, J.A.T. - Jesus and his Coming (New York 1957).
- Stauffer, E. - New Testament Theology (S.C.M., London, 1963)
- Schmithals, W. - Paul and the Gnostics, Translated by J.E. Steely, (Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tennessee, 1970)
- Schmithals, W. - Paul and Jesus, Translated by D.M. Barton, London, 1965).
- Schmithals, W., - Gnosticism in Corinth (Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tennessee, 1970)
- Schmithals, W. - The Office of the Apostles in the Early Church, Translated by J.E. Steely, (Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tennessee, 1969).
- Schoeps, H.J. - Paul, Translated by H. Knight, Westminster, 1961).
- Scott, C.A.A. - Christianity According to St. Paul, (Cambridge, 1927)
- Scroggs, R. - The Last Adam, (Blackwell, Oxford, 1966)
- Schweitzer, A. - The Quest of the Historical Jesus, (translated by W. Montgomery, New York, 1962)
- Schweitzer, A. - Mysticism of Paul, ^{the Apostle,} (Adam and Charles Black, London, 1956)
- Shaw, R.D. - The Pauline Epistles, (Edinburgh, 1903)
- Smith, D.A. - The Life and Letters of Paul, (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1919)

- Stevens, G.B. - Pauline Theology, (New York, 1911)
- Stewart, J.S., - A Man in Christ (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1972 Edition)
- Streeter, B.H. - The Four Gospels, (Macmillan, 1924)
- Swete, B.H. - The Appearances of our Lord After the Passion (London, 1908)
- Strachan, R.H. - The Individuality of St. Paul, James Clark & Co., (Edinburgh, 1916)
- Tannehill, R.C. - Dying and Rising with Christ (Berlin, 1967)
- Thornton, L.S. - The Common Life in the Body of Christ (Dacre Press, Westminster, 1941)
- Unnik, W.C.
van - Tarsus or Jerusalem, Translated by G. Ogg, (Epworth Press, London, 1962)
- Vermes, G. - The Dead Scrolls in English (Penguin Books Ltd., 1962)
- Wagner, G. - Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries (London, 1967)
- Wand, J.W.C. - What St. Paul Said (Oxford 1952)
- Weiss, J. - History of the Primitive Christianity, Vols. I-II (London, 1937)
- Wilder-Smith, A.E. - Man's Origin, Man's Destiny - A Critical Survey of the Principles of Evolution and Christianity (Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1975).
- Wiles, M.F. - The Divine Apostle, (Cambridge, 1967)
- Wiles, M.F. - The Making of Christian Doctrine (Cambridge, 1967)

- Wiles, M.F. - The Re-making of Christian Doctrine (S.C.M., London, 1974)
- White, R.E.O. - The Apostle Extraordinary (London 1962)
- Whiteley, D.E.H. - The Theology of St. Paul (Oxford, 1974)

COMMENTARIES

- Abbott, T.K. - Ephesians and Colossians (I.C.C.) (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1897)
- Allen, W.C. - The Gospel According to St. Matthew, (T. & T. Clark, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh)
- Barrett, C.K. - The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, (A. & C. Black, London, 1971)
- Barrett, C.K. - The Gospel According to St. John, (S.P.C.K., London, 1965)
- Barrett, C.K. - The First Epistle to the Corinthians, Second Edition, (A. & C. Black, London, 1971)
- Barrett, C.K. - The Second Epistle to the Corinthians (A. & C. Black, London, 1973).
- Barth, K. - The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, Translated by E.C. Hoskyns, (Oxford, 1968)
- Bernard, J.H. - The Gospel According to St. John (I.C.C.) (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh)
- Blacklock, E.M. - The Acts of the Apostles (Tyndale Press, London, 1964)
- Bligh, J. - Galatians in Greek, University of Detroit Press, 1966)

- Bruce, F.F. - The Epistle to the Romans (Tyndale Press, London, 1963).
- Bruce, F.F. - The Epistle to the Ephesians, (Pickering and Inglis Ltd., London, 1961)
- Bruce, F.F. - The Book of Acts, (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, London, 1965.
- Burrowside, W.F. - The Acts of the Apostles in Greek, (Cambridge, 1916)
- Burton, E.W. - Galatians (I.C.C.) (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1921)
- Caird, G.B. - The Gospel of St. Luke, (Penguin Books, 1963)
- Carson, H.M. - Colossians and Philemon, Tyndale London, 1970)
- Cole, A. - The Gospel According to St. Mark (Tyndale Press, London, 1969)
- Cole, A. - The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, (Tyndale Press, London, 1969)
- Cranfield, C.E.D. - The Gospel According to St. Mark, (Cambridge, 1959)
- Deluz, G. - A Companion to I Corinthians Edited and Translated by G.E. Watt, Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1963.
- Fenton, J.C. - St. Matthew, Penguin Books, 1963.

- Filson, F.V. - The Gospel According to St. Matthew,
(A. & C. Black, Second Edition, 1975)
- Foulkes, F. - The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians,
(Tyndale Press, London, 1963)
- Godet, F. - First Corinthians, (Edinburgh, 1890)
- Haenchen, E. - The Acts of the Apostles (St Black
& Oxford, 1971)
- Hering, J. - The First Epistle of Paul to the
Corinthians (Epworth Press, Lond
1962)
- Hoskyns, E.C. - The Fourth Gospel (Faber & Faber
London, 1956)
- Houlden, J.L. - Paul's Letters from Prison (Penguin,
Books, London, 1970).
- Howley, G.C.D.
(ed) - A New Testament Commentary,
(Pickering & Inglis, London, 1969)
- Hunter, A.M. - Romans, S.C.M., London, 1971.
- Ironside, H.A. - The Prophet Isaiah Neptune, 1952.
- Knight, G.A.F. - Hosea, S.C.M., London, 1960.
- Knox, W.L. - The Acts of the Apostles (Cambridge,
1948)
- Leenhardt, F.J. - Epistle to the Romans (Lutterworth
Press, London, 1961)
- Marsh, J. - The Gospel of St. John, (Penguin
Books, London, 1968)
- Martin, R.P. - Philippians (Tyndale Press, London,
1969)
- Martin, R.P. - Colossians (Paternoster Press,
Exeter, 1972).

- Mauchline, J. - Isaiah 1-39, (S.C.M., London, 1970)
- Mc Donald, H.D. - Freedom in Faith, (Pickering and Inglis, Ltd., London, 1973)
- Mc. Neile, A.H. St. Matthew, Macmillan, 1938.
- Moffat, J. - The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, London, 1938)
- Morris, L. - I and II Thessalonians, (Tyndale Press, London).
- Morris, L. - I Corinthians (Tyndale Press, London 1960)
- Moule, C.F.D. - Colossians and Philemon (Cambridge, 1968)
- Murray, J. - The Epistle to the Romans, Vols. I-II, (Grand Rapids, 1960 and 65)
- Nineham, D.E. - The Gospel of St. Mark, (Penguin Bks. London, 1963)
- Neil, M.M. One Volume Commentary, (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1962)
- Robertson and Plummer - I Corinthians (I.C.C.) (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1897)
- Sanday and Headlam, A.C. - Romans (I.C.C.) (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1896.
- Scott, E.F. - Paul's Epistle to the Romans (SCM, London, 1947)
- Tasker, R.V.G. - The Gospel According to St. Mark, (London, 1969)
- Tasker, R.V.G. - The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (Tyndale Press, London 1969).

- Tasker, R.V.G. - The Gospel According to St. John
(Tyndale Press, London, 1964)

GENERAL REFERENCE TOOLS

- Abbott, S. - A Manual Greek Lexicon (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1964)
- Aland, K. - The Greek New Testament (United Bible Societies, London, 1966)
- Bettenson, H. - Documents of the Christian Church,
(Oxford University Press, London, 1959)
- Buttrick, G.A. - The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vols. I-IV, (Abingdon Press, 1962)
- Cross, F.L. - The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, (Oxford University Press, London, 1957).
- Cruden, A. - Cruden's Complete Concordance,
(ed.), C.H. Irwin, (Lutterworth Press, London, 1959)
- Davidson, B. - The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, (Samuel Bagster and Sons, Ltd., London).
- Douglas, J.D. - The New Bible Dictionary (Inter-
Varsity Press, London, 1965)
- Feyerabend, K. - Langescheid's Pocket Hebrew Dictionary to the Old Testament,
(Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1965).
- Friedrick, G. - Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vols. I-IV
(Bromley) Eerdmans Publishing House Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1914-68) Trans

- Hastings, J. - A Dictionary of the Bible
Vols. I-IV, (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh,
1906).
- Hastings, J. - Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels,
(T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1906)
- Kittel, G. (ed.) - Theological Dictionary of the New
Testament
- Phillips, J.B. - The Interlinear Greek-English New
Testament, Samuel Bagster and Sons
Ltd)
- Polano, H. - Translator, The Talmud (Frederick
Warne and Co. Ltd., (London, 1973)
- Snaith, M.H. - Hebrew Old Testament (Oxford
University Press, London, 1966)
- Stevenson, J. - A New Eusebius, (S.P.C.K., London,
1970)
- Vaughan, C.
(ed.) - The New Testament from 26 Translations
(Zodervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids
1967)
- Hebrew English Lexicon, (Published by
Samuel Bagster and Sons Ltd., London)
- The Lost Books of the Bible and the
Forgotten Books of Eden, (Collins, 1976)