



Course Companion

for AS / A Level Year 1 OCR
Religious Studies

Component 3: Developments in
Christian Thought

zigzageducation.co.uk

POD
10309

Publish your own work... Write to a brief...
Register at publishmenow.co.uk

Follow us on Twitter [@ZigZagRS](https://twitter.com/ZigZagRS)

Contents

Product Support from ZigZag Education	ii
Terms and Conditions of Use	iii
Teacher's Introduction.....	1
Key Terminology	2
Augustine's Teachings on Human Nature	2
Death and the Afterlife	3
Knowledge of God's Existence	4
The Person of Jesus Christ.....	5
Christian Moral Principles	6
Christian Moral Action	7
1A: Augustine's Teachings on Human Nature	8
Augustine and His Upbringing	8
The Historical Debate over Free Will and Evil	9
Other Influences in Augustine's Life	9
Augustine's Interpretation of Genesis 3	10
Human Nature Pre and Post Fall.....	10
Corruption and Concupiscence.....	11
1B: Death and the Afterlife	15
Judgement	16
Interpreting the Afterlife – A Closer Look at Matthew 25:31–46.....	17
Biblical Discussion of Heaven.....	18
Modern Interpretations of Heaven	19
Biblical Discussion of Hell.....	20
Modern Interpretations of Hell	21
Biblical Evidence for Purgatory	23
Modern Interpretations of Purgatory.....	23
The Different Interpretations of Election	25
Biblical Discussion and Election	26
Predestination and Salvation	26
Universalism	27
2A: Knowledge of God's Existence	30
Innate Knowledge.....	31
Beauty and Goodness	32
Order, Creation and Design	34
Faith and Grace	36
Scripture, Church and Revelation	37
Jesus Christ and Revelation.....	38
2B: The Person of Jesus Christ	41
The Gospels and Jesus' Divinity	42
Jesus' Humanity and Divinity	42
Jesus' Knowledge and Wisdom	43
Miracles	43
The Resurrection	44
Was Jesus' Relationship with God Unique?	44
Repentance and Forgiveness	46
Reversal and the New Covenant	47
Motivation and Purity	48
Jesus as a Political Liberator	50
Jesus as a Religious Liberator	51
Liberation and Sin	51
3A: Christian Moral Principles	53
Sola Scriptura	54
What's Wrong with Sola Scriptura?	54
Should the Bible be Viewed as Infallible?	55
The Role of Church and Tradition.....	56
Reason and Natural Law	57
Should We be Suspicious of Tradition?	58
Justice, Love and Wisdom.....	60
Is Agape the Only Guiding Principle?	60
3B: Christian Moral Action	62
The Early Life of Bonhoeffer	62
Bonhoeffer and His Life during Nazi Rule.....	63
Duty to God and Duty to the State.....	64
Civil Disobedience	65
The Confessing Church.....	65
Cheap and Costly Grace	66
Sacrifice and Suffering	67
Solidarity.....	67
Answers.....	70
Answers to Activities.....	70
Answers to Quick Quizzes.....	71

Teacher's Introduction

This course companion is written for the AS / A Level Year 1 OCR Developments in Christian Thought specification and is designed to offer students a comprehensive introduction to the material within that academic course. The sections and topics therefore mirror OCR's specification headings, and every care has been taken to not only help students to understand the key concepts and ideas within the course, but also sharpen their critical thinking skills.

Alongside the main bulk of the writing there are also a number of other features to help students with their learning and revision. Self-guided and group activities are included throughout the writing to better engage students with the material and I have also provided glossaries, textual references and information on key thinkers where appropriate.

I hope you enjoy working through this resource and it benefits both you and your students throughout the academic year.

Note on Suggested Reading

Stretch and Challenge

Any reading in these boxes is not strictly required for the specification. However, it is appropriate, creditable information students could include in an exam context.



February 2020



KEY TERMINOLOGY IN AUGUSTINE'S TEACHINGS ON HUMAN NATURE

The Fall	The wounding of men and women after Adam and Eve's disobedience.
Manichaeism	An ancient Christian religious movement including pagans, particularly, the dualistic conflict between light and dark.
Pelagianism	A subset of Christian belief that human beings are not sinful by nature and are able to freely choose between God and evil without the need for grace.
Concupiscence	Normally defined as lust or passion, but is often used by Augustine as a template for all baser human desires and to mean the inclination to sin.
Privation	An absence of something. Augustine regarded sin or badness as a privation of good.
Original Sin	The Christian doctrine that all people are born with the sin of Adam.
Massa Peccati	Means 'Mass of Sin' and was a term used by Calvin to describe the state of humanity.
Supererogatory	Moral actions that go beyond the call of duty.
Single Predestination	The idea that God chose, or has foreknowledge of, who will be saved.
Double Predestination	The idea that God not only knows or chooses who will be saved but also who will be damned.
Metaphysics	Philosophy that deals with abstract, fundamental concepts.
Allegory	The hidden meaning behind a story.
Total Depravity	Calvin's teaching that human beings are totally corrupt and incapable of good.
Authenticity	The philosophical distinction between those actions which are authentic (authentic) and those determined by outside influences.
Grace	The benevolence and mercy of God given to human beings.
Universalism	The Christian idea that every human being will eventually be saved.

INSPECTION COPY

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**





KEY TERMINOLOGY IN DEATH AND THE AFTERLIFE

Kingdom of God	A varied Christian term that has often been used to refer to judgement and eschatological events.
Parousia	Greek word meaning 'arrival' and used to refer to the return of Christ.
Beatific Vision	The moment when a person directly communicates with God, often thought to be the moment of salvation for a human.
Theosis	The process whereby a human being becomes divine and is united with God.
Eschatology	Theological teaching and doctrine associated with death and the afterlife.
The Parable of the Sheep and Goats	A parable in the Gospel of Matthew widely interpreted as describing correct moral life and God's judgement of humanity.
Second Coming	A belief that Christ will one day return to Earth.
Particular Judgement	The individual judgement by God a person undergoes immediately after death.
General Judgement	The judgement of all humanity that will occur on the day of resurrection.
Millenarianism	A belief in some Christian groups that there will be a thousand year age of the Kingdom of God before Christ's final return.
Preterism	A theological view that the prophecies of Revelation have already been fulfilled.
The Divine Comedy	An epic poem by Dante Alighieri about his journey through Hell, Purgatory and Heaven before finally meeting God.
Apostasy	The renunciation or leaving of a religion or set of religious beliefs.
Sheol	The Hebrew word for 'Hades' and sometimes translated as 'the underworld'.
Hades	A Greek word, generally thought to refer to the abode of the dead.
Gehenna	A Greek word commonly translated as 'hell' in the Bible, referring to the place of punishment.
Predestination	The idea that God has foreknowledge of, or determines, the fate of individuals.
Contrapasso	The ironic punishment souls undergo in Dante's <i>Inferno</i> , where the punishment fits the crime.
Purgatory	Often translated as 'purification', the place where imperious souls are purified of sin and prepared to ascend to Heaven.
Election	The doctrine that God chooses particular people to be saved.
Limited Election	The idea that God only grants a select group of people salvation.
Unlimited Election	The idea that God grants all human beings the possibility of salvation.
Principle of Accommodation	The idea that God manifests himself only in appropriate ways to human beings, as contrast to God, is finite and contingent.
Universalism	The Christian doctrine that all human beings will eventually be saved.

INSPECTION COPY

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**





KEY TERMINOLOGY IN KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF GOD'S EXISTENCE

Natural Theology	The theological idea that information or knowledge about God can be gained through the natural world and human reason (general revelation).
Revealed Theology	The theological idea that knowledge of God can only be gained through divine revelation (special revelation).
Sensus Divinitatis	The innate sense of God that each human being possesses.
Semen Religionis	An innate religious sense which predisposes human beings to religion.
Sparks of Glory	The ways Calvin argues that God is perceptible in nature.
Omnipotence	All-powerful, usually a characteristic given to God.
Benevolence	Loving, a characteristic given to God.
Unknown God	The entity Paul encounters the Athenians worshipping. It is used as evidence for Christian beliefs that human beings have a partial information about God in the natural world.
Imago Dei	The image of God, which human beings were created in.
Process Theology	A type of theology that depicts God as being radically different from his traditional character. It contrasts to his traditionally given character of immutability.
Dialectical Theology	John Macquarrie's defence of natural theology by placing it in a dialectical (discourse) between two different opposing concepts.
Immediate Revelation	Revelation that is presented directly to the receiver.
Mediate Revelation	Revelation that is mediated, translated or filtered through another person or medium.
Reformed Epistemology	A theological school of thought that seeks to demonstrate that religious beliefs can be justified without reference to empirical evidence.
Basic Beliefs	A foundational belief that does not require external verification and is not based on other beliefs.

INSPECTION COPY

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



INSPECTION COPY





KEY TERMINOLOGY IN THE PERIOD OF JESUS CHRIST

Christology from Above	Christology that begins with the idea of Jesus as the Son of God, analyses scripture from this perspective.
Christology from Below	Christology that begins with the Jesus of history, analyses aspects of the Gospels prior to making assertions about his identity.
Christos	The anointed one', a title for Jesus as the Jewish Messiah.
Messiah	The one chosen to lead and save the world in the Abrahamic religions.
Son of God	A title given to Jesus in the Gospels. Sometimes also used for other figures in the Old Testament.
Son of Man	An ambiguous title Jesus uses to describe himself in the Gospels.
The Nicene Creed	A profession of faith in a number of Christian theological statements adopted by the Council of Nicaea in AD 325.
The Chalcedonian Definition	A declaration affirming Christ as both fully God and fully human, adopted at the Council of Chalcedon in AD 451.
Homoousios	A Greek term meaning 'in one being', used in the Nicene Creed to describe the relationship between Jesus and the Father.
Christ Event	The term used by some theologians to describe the entire Christian faith as a single event in the modern-day world.
Good News	Another term for the Gospel, the message and significance of Jesus Christ.
New Covenant	The new agreement forged between God and humanity through Jesus Christ.
The Beatitudes	The list of blessings given by Jesus at the Sermon on the Mount.
Metanoia	Another word for repentance, or the changes one undergoes through penitence and spirituality.
Liberator	A term used to describe Jesus as freeing humanity from oppression.
Zealots	A group of political radicals aiming at restoring the Jewish kingdom by overthrowing the Roman occupation.

INSPECTION COPY

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**





KEY TERMINOLOGY IN CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES

Biblical Authority	The extent to which the Bible or scripture influence h
Theonomous Ethics	The idea that ethics is determined or given by God.
Sola Scriptura	'Faith by Scripture alone' and is a Christian doctrine th supreme authority in faith and ethical practice.
The Magisterium	The authority of the Pope and Bishops within the Catho doctrine and teachings.
Natural Law	The basic moral principles discoverable by reasoning or natural world.
Post-liberal Theology	A modern school of theological thought, focusing on a using the historical, communal and social aspects of Ch
Agape	A universal, unconditional, sacrificial love originating fr ideal motivation for moral action.
Sacred Tradition	The idea that both scripture and the Church are author revelation of Christ.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED





KEY TERMINOLOGY IN CHRISTIAN ACTION

The Confessing Church	A movement of German Protestants who opposed the Protestant Churches in support of Nazi ideals.
Civil Disobedience	A symbolic act of opposing a government's laws, policies or actions.
Visible Community	The importance of the Church for Bonhoeffer in being a community but also in politics and other social issues.
Finkenwalde	An illegal seminary directed by Bonhoeffer between 1934 and 1937 to train pastors and put the principles of the Confessing Church into practice.
No Rusty Swords	Bonhoeffer's call to the Church to continually be active in the world.
Cheap Grace	Grace without discipleship, the easy route of Christianity that neither reflected Christ's command or embodied his teaching.
Costly Grace	The difficult path of true Christian discipleship that involves sacrifice.
The Church and the Jewish Question	A 1933 essay by Bonhoeffer addressing the problems the Church faced under Nazi rule and how it should act regarding the Jewish people.
The Cost of Discipleship	Bonhoeffer's 1937 book that focuses on how Christianity's demands placed upon the world.
Letters and Papers from Prison	Bonhoeffer's collection of letters and works from prison in 1944.
Barmen Confession	A 1934 theological document that rejected the idea that the state was God and became the focal point for the Confessing Church.
Solidarity	A moral commitment to stand up and alongside those who are being oppressed.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



INSPECTION COPY



1A: AUGUSTINE'S TEACHINGS ON HUMANITY

What you will learn in this section:

Augustine's beliefs, teachings and ideas about human life, including:

- Augustine's interpretation of Genesis 3 and how this influences his conception of original sin and post Fall.
- The nature of original sin and how it affects human lives and societies.
- The role of God's grace in overcoming original sin and achieving the summum bonum.
- Discussion about whether Augustine's ideas about the human person are over-optimistic or pessimistic and for wider theological debate.

Starter Activity:

Write down three distinctive aspects that you believe define the human person. Are they theological or biological in nature? Note your reasons for identifying these aspects. How does Augustine's thought as you progress through this section.

Key Thinker

Name	Augustine of Hippo
Born	354
Died	430
Key text	<i>Confessions</i> (397–400), <i>The City of God</i> (early fifth century)
Why are they important?	Augustine is likely the most influential of the Early Church Fathers. His ideas about creation, eschatology and original sin paved the way for much of Western theology on a wide variety of topics including politics, epistemology and ethics. His views have often gathered controversy, especially in recent centuries. Many thinkers have criticised the dogma that arose out of Augustine's teachings.
Did you know?	Augustine was an unlikely advocate for the abolition of slavery. He wrote about releasing slaves and writing in <i>The City of God</i> that the institution of slavery was the result of original sin and unbefitting of those seeking God.

Introduction – The Early Christian Church

The world as we know it today was greatly shaped by the first Christians across the centuries. However, the history of these individuals is still remarkably slim. Most of what we know is given by their writings, which talk of their teachings and the fragments of other texts which reference the early church. From this slim pieces of evidence, it is possible to discern the major theological and philosophical ideas that shaped the church across the first five centuries of the Christian Church. The picture that emerges is one of a church that was constantly in flux. At every major theological decision taken at every major Christian council, there are dissenters who are discarded, excommunicated and declared heretical. Yet this process was slow even in the early years in the Christian Church accommodated a wide variety of views, from those considered downright mystical and esoteric to those that could be viewed as orthodox.

Augustine and his Upbringing

St Augustine of Hippo was born in Hippo, a small city in what is now Algeria, North Africa. At the time of his birth, the Roman Empire was in decline and trade had flourished and a wide variety of people passed through its streets. Augustine himself was born into a Berber family, although his father, Patricius, was a Roman citizen. Despite this more traditional setting he grew up under the influence of two different belief systems. Although he was not a Christian until his deathbed, his mother Monica was conversely a devout Christian. As a young man, he enjoyed a significant degree of privilege, acquiring a classical education in grammar, philosophy and rhetoric. This led him to mix with the academic elements of the world during his later moves to Carthage and Rome.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



The first significant theological shift in Augustine's life came from his conversion to Christianity. Although this was a philosophy he would later repudiate, he spent at least 10 years embracing its more radical mystical views until he later met Ambrose of Milan and was converted to Christianity. This conversion later became the focus of one of his best-known works, *Confessions*, in which he discusses his enlightenment to Christian ideas alongside musings about God, time, causality and free will. Augustine became a well-known name in Christian circles, becoming ordained as a priest in 374 and a bishop only four years after that. From his position in Hippo, he worked endlessly to spread Christianity to Christian beliefs and became equally well known for his polemics (attacks) against heresies and apologetics (defences) for the Christian faith.

This brief picture of Augustine's life nevertheless doesn't do justice to the myriad influences that shaped his development, for, in the fourth and fifth centuries, philosophers were debating about the problem of evil and the nature of human free will, two issues that would become central throughout his writings. It is, therefore, worth exploring this background and seeing how the intellectual climate of his time potentially influenced his overall theology.

The Historical Debate over Free Will and Predestination

We've previously mentioned Augustine's dedication to Manichaeism during his life before his conversion to Christianity. This religious movement founded by the prophet Mani in the mid third century, and for a time, it was one of the main rivals to Christianity across the world, spreading as far east as China. Mani's teachings of the major prophets throughout history, including Jesus, were incomplete. As a Manichaean, he had uncovered the deeper nature of the cosmos only partially given by the Bible. In particular, on old Gnostic beliefs in detailing a very rich dualistic cosmology, which posited a wholly good, spiritual world of light and an evil world of matter. Human lives are seen as a struggle between a good, but not omnipotent God embodying this world of light and an eternal, evil force governing the material world. This elaborate cosmology for believers helped to resolve the problem of evil. However, many have held that elements of Manichaeism influenced Augustine's thought, particularly his views on the corruption of human beings.

However, during Augustine's time as a Christian, he also opposed a less prevalent belief known as Pelagianism. This was named after the British monk Pelagius, who held that that through good efforts, could achieve salvation with the assistance of God-given abilities. However, this view was mischaracterised by both supporters and opponents of Pelagius into the view that it denied the role for the grace of God and human beings could achieve salvation wholly by their own efforts. Augustine's later life was dedicated towards criticising this view and he helped guide the church's discussion at the Council of Trent in 418, which ruled Pelagianism as heretical. For Augustine, human free will was put forward by many earlier Church Fathers, including Irenaeus, but he viewed Pelagianism as granting human beings a power only God could provide. Augustine focused much more on the fallen state of human beings, contending that only God's grace and his grace only, that enables human beings to reach salvation.

Other Influences in Augustine's Life

Both these theological movements are important to give context to Augustine's thought, but it is also worth mentioning some of the more personal influences Augustine encountered. Much of his life was arguably informed much of his thinking. Much of his life revolved around women. He mentions two people in particular. The first is an unnamed woman Augustine had a relationship with between the ages of 19 and 28, with whom he was faithful and had a son. The second was his mother, Monica, who encouraged him to give up this relationship with the unnamed woman and arranged another marriage for him. Augustine was devoted to Monica, this turmoil in his personal life, alongside his conversion to Christianity, led him to believe he had been a 'slave to lust' for most of his life, and potentially informed his views on the **concupiscent** nature of fallen human beings. Much of Augustine's discussion of sin, particularly lust, especially of the sexual kind, and historians have pointed towards Augustine's personal life as a key influence.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



However, Augustine's thought cannot be reduced to these historical influences, or might be. This introduction merely is intended to set the scene for our now deeper exploration of Augustine's ideas beginning right at one of the most important religious events: the Fall. This is the next part of this companion.

Human Beings and the Fall

As we have seen throughout our look at Augustine's life and upbringing, the problem of evil was a key philosophical issue for early Christians. Why is there suffering if God is wholly good and merciful? How can we achieve salvation through Christ? For many people in the fourth and fifth centuries, this question was less abstractly philosophical and more tied to particular religious views of the cosmos itself. The existence of evil, which challenged the power of God was not an absurd proposition, but one which was radically debated among many different societies. Augustine's ideas, although maybe difficult to uphold now, presented a view of evil that put to mind the action of other evil gods or beings. Instead, it placed the blame for evil in human history, contending that there was a series of events in the past that caused humans to become corrupted and so responsible themselves for this evil and suffering. In contrast to the grace of God that enables human beings to overcome this corruption and become more like the benevolent God.

But where did this idea arise? Well, Augustine primarily took his inspiration from the Bible, specifically Genesis. In particular he focused on the second creation account, where God created Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, only to later face their disobedience. It is to this account that we turn for an overview of Augustine's account of the Fall.

Augustine's Interpretation of Genesis

Genesis 3 can be viewed as the crux of the second creation account given in that it details the fall of man. While Genesis 2 gives a distinctly anthropological account of the formation of human beings, Genesis 3 is a more theologically focused account of the human personality. It details a crafty serpent tempting Eve to eat an apple from the forbidden tree in the garden, promising that 'your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil'. Thus she takes an apple and offers it to Adam also, and, upon eating it, they suddenly become aware of their own nakedness and the presence of evil. Natural law is discovered through this transgression and curses women to the pain of childbirth and the man to a life of toil. The key passage comes at the end in Genesis 3:22, where God states '...because the man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil; and now, he might reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever'.

There have been many interpretations of this chapter throughout history and many have viewed it as detailed as primarily metaphorical. However, Augustine draws a more metaphysical interpretation of Genesis 3. The awakening of man and woman to the nature of good and evil is not just a matter of consciousness, but a historic, metaphysical change in the nature of human beings that has lasted to the present day. This is what Augustine calls the fall of humanity; the transformation of the perfect state into an imperfect one.

The Human Nature Pre and Post Fall

We can delve into this idea further. Before the Fall, Augustine argues that human nature was in a state of perfection. This perfection is seen as a union between the actions of the body and the mind. In this state, we can think of human nature as a lack of conflict between the physical demands of the body and the rational inclinations of the mind. Therefore, the rational mind held complete control over the body, and we can think of what we can think of as passions or desires.

If this sounds a bit strange, then don't be surprised. Augustine thought that all of the human beings have in this state of perfection were settled in a purely rational way. For example,

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



involve lust but rather was a passionless task performed to fulfil God's command in Genesis 2:23. What was the most important aspect of human life was instead how human beings rationally respected the existence and needs of each other while engaging with the world. Exemplified this respect. Thus, the perfect human nature was purely driven by duty.

Augustine envisioned love, however, as having two dimensions. The kind that exists before the Fall is a love of generosity towards others that unites human beings and is the basis of Augustine's *caritas*. *Caritas* is also the kind of love that Augustine argues unites Christians together after the Fall in a more limited manner. Conversely, Augustine argues that post Fall another kind of love exists: a self-aggrandising love of material things that mirrors what we might think of as *cupiditas*. *Cupiditas* does not simply stop at one's own needs but extends out towards others, meaning that human beings are seen as a means to their own ends.

With these contrasting ideas of love, Augustine clearly sets up a contrast between human relationships pre and post Fall. On the one hand, before human beings disobeyed God, the absence of lust and other corrupting desires, lumped together by Augustine under the term *cupiditas*. Human relationships exemplified the notion of *caritas*, and all were united by friendship. After the Fall, human beings became corrupted and subject to concupiscence. As a result, human relationships became dominated by *cupiditas* and people organised themselves around ideas of mutual self-interest. This ultimately explains why wars, famines and poverty exist. With a lack of *caritas* to guide them, human beings are constantly engaged in social competition, without an idea of communal friendship. Human beings are in a way that benefits humankind as a whole. Yet there is more to explore here on how concupiscence manifests itself in the human will.

Corruption and Concupiscence

For an insight into how Augustine frames the concept of concupiscence post Fall, we turn to how he interprets Genesis 3. Augustine conceives of Adam and Eve's eating of the forbidden fruit as an act of pride. It is representative of humanity's desire to be God themselves, not just united with God. Knowledge as such is a symbol of the order of creation, and Adam and Eve's disobedience is construed as a failure to respect this order. Therefore, through the act of eating the forbidden fruit, the order which once characterised the world was effectively thrown into disarray. The order which once characterised the world was wounded and the unity between the body and soul was disrupted.

Augustine views this disruption as a strict division. Whereas the body pre Fall was under the control of the will of the soul, post Fall this will is weakened and the soul is left submitting to the desires of the body. The weakness of will Augustine terms *akrasia*. Usually used more generally to describe weakness of will, Augustine reframes the concept as a metaphysical deficiency in the power of the soul. Therefore, sexuality and other passions overtake the human person after the Fall, leaving them automatically mired in sin. However, this is not to suggest that this process is inevitable. Augustine argues that it is possible for human beings to deny these desires and achieve a state of subjugating themselves to God's will. However, this subjugation is naturally very difficult due to the inherited consequences of Adam and Eve's disobedience. These are what Augustine focuses on in the next part of this section.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**

Discussion Activity:

Augustine relies on Genesis 3 to develop his ideas about the Fall and original sin. What other biblical passages might temper his ideas, and how might they affect his view of human nature? Discuss in pairs or groups.



Original Sin

Interestingly, Augustine does not place the blame for the Fall at the feet of woman, as historically have done. He argues that both sexes were complicit in the original act, and that the betrayal of God's trust was no less than Eve's. This is important to note as we discuss a concept that has throughout history been influenced by a vast number of factors, and how it can be transferred by procreation and reproduction.

Original sin was not a concept that Augustine created but was developed from ideas of Paul, who set up a contrast between the original sin of Adam's disobedience to God and the redemption on the cross. It was later formalised and refined by Irenaeus of Lyon, who argued that all human beings have a solidarity with the sin of Adam, sharing in his guilt when they disobey God. However, Augustine compared this to what Aquinas later proposes, and his teachings greatly expand these early ideas. Augustine's doctrine while emphasising the innate corruption of all human beings at birth.

In the last part we looked at how human nature and relationships changed after the Fall. It is that this change was not limited to Adam and Eve, or the first human beings only, but was transmitted by concupiscent desires, most notably the act of procreation. Therefore, every human being carries this sin and so is subject to the same temptations and afflictions that Adam and Eve were. This is the basis of Augustine's overall doctrine of **original sin** and the reason why all human beings are effectively born into a **massa peccati** (mass of sin), as, regardless of the individual, they are continually subject to their sinful desires and passions.

Activity:

Read the Catechism of the Catholic Church on original sin (396–409 linked below) and compare it to Augustine's thought. Why do you think these differences exist?

Link: [zzed.uk/10309-vatican](https://www.zzed.uk/10309-vatican)

The Importance of God's Grace

If Augustine's doctrine of original sin seems a bit pessimistic, then it only gets worse. He held that human beings could reach salvation through their own free will, with the help of God's grace. Now Augustine didn't radically depart from this idea until later in life, and he held that human free will was weakened by original sin, but still able to choose the good in certain circumstances. However, he eventually moved further away from this belief, arguing that human beings cannot freely choose sin. This means the only way that human beings can achieve salvation is through God's grace. Only those that have been blessed by his **grace** can overcome their sinful natures.

This stricter doctrine was envisioned by Augustine to support practices such as infant baptism. If every individual, child or not, had been opened up to the grace of God, their original sin would be washed away and they would be condemned. Therefore, human beings have no means to escape their own sinful nature and must receive the supererogatory (freely given) grace of God, which is only bestowed upon those who have the inclination to receive it. Regardless of whether it appears fair or just, there are some who are blind to this grace and automatically condemned.

Augustine's ideas of original sin and grace have some important implications for the overall fate of humanity. Particularly important is the idea of **predestination**, which has become a bit of a difficult concept to unravel among his writings. Augustine held that God has foreknowledge of who will accept God's grace and who will not. However, he was unsure about whether this idea means that Augustine commits to either **single** or **double** predestination.

Single predestination is roughly the position of the Catholic Church and holds that God foreknows who will achieve salvation. Such an idea is often couched in the belief that God must know to some degree how and which human beings will overcome sin, and so must know to some degree how and which human beings will overcome sin. It is a necessity considering God's omniscience; his all-knowing nature. However, double predestination is a more extreme view, holding that God predestines some to salvation and others to damnation.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



predetermines or foreknows who will be saved *and who will be condemned*. While heresy, there is a certain amount of evidence in Augustine's writings to suggest the predestination, especially since it is coherent with his more radical beliefs about original sin. Regardless, what is important to note is how Augustine's emphasis on the necessity of grace fits with his wider beliefs about predestination and original sin.

Discussion Activity:

What philosophical issues are there with Augustine's views on grace and predestination? Discuss objections or thoughts in pairs or small groups.

Evaluating Augustine's Thought

In comparison with much of modern Christian thought, Augustine's account of original sin is extreme. Modern thinkers now reject such a strong idea of predestination and hold that human nature is free, able to choose good and evil with equal power. In fact, upholding such a strong idea of predestination is thought to be important to do justice to the themes of moral responsibility present in the New Testament. Yet Augustine seems to argue that when human beings perform a good act, it is only because of grace and only evil acts are freely done.

As a result, many have criticised Augustine's conception of original sin as overly pessimistic. If human beings are completely beholden to their sinful desires and God already knows who will be saved, what motivations do human beings have to do good? Many individuals have even excuse these acts as unavoidable rather than work to be better people. In the end, the belief in a strong version of original sin potentially counter-intuitive, it is also counter-intuitive. It stands in tension with much of the moral teaching of the Bible (especially the New Testament) which encourages people to love their neighbour and seek to be better human beings in the eye of God.

Perhaps an even deeper issue concerns the depiction of God in Augustine's thought. If God is a benevolent and just God, then why would he create a world in which the rest of humanity suffer simply because of Adam's actions at the beginning of time? If God would a benevolent and just God, why would he predetermine who would be saved and who would be damned? The metaphysical issues regarding sin and human nature seem far from what an all-powerful and just God would be. Such issues are also present in Augustine's interpretation of the Fall. If human beings were in a complete state of unity between body and soul, why would they make a choice to sin? Friedrich Schleiermacher argues that the only way such a choice could occur is if God himself was enacting the Fall through creating imperfect human beings, meaning God himself was corrupting humankind as a whole! Augustine therefore struggles with internal contradictions in his interpretation of scripture.

A final problem it is important to mention is how Augustine's thought can be reconciled with modern understanding of the human person. Evolution and other scientific theories not only challenge the Genesis account Augustine relies upon, but the idea altogether that human beings have an innate tendency towards sin. Many modern **humanist** thinkers even hold that morality can be derived from naturalistic religious discussion, either through an appeal to philosophy alone or to notions of naturalism. If the case, then human beings may have an innate tendency towards good and cooperation. While these debates are closer to ethics or philosophy of religion, it is important to note that the reconciliation between Augustine's proposition and modern ideas about the human person. Modern day religious discussion has to account for the secular or non-religious knowledge of the human person.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Karl Barth and Augustine

Within this section, we've looked at how Augustine's concepts of grace and sin are pessimistic. However, Karl Barth identifies an important, often overlooked aspect of the fact that God's grace itself is a necessarily free action. God cannot be influenced by human beings and so whatever salvation is offered to human beings comes from God.

Now Barth diverges from Augustine by presenting a more Christological view on the reconciliation of God and humanity. This has already taken place through the saving earthly ministry of Jesus Christ. In this sense, Barth takes a very different approach to the debate. He does contend that Augustine is perhaps correct about not committing to any powers or knowledge of free will. Whoever shall be saved, Barth contends, is known by God. If such, there is no use imposing restrictions or ideas about salvation or condemnation. It is simply not within human power or knowledge to contest whatever God has decided. The best we can do is have faith in election of man through Jesus Christ as the Son of God.

For some, Barth still hasn't answered key issues with Augustine's account of predestination. If God's saving actions are free and unknowable does not disavow philosophical reasoning that they entail based on his nature. However, for others, Barth eschews too much of Augustine's pessimism. He has been accused of adopting **universalism**, the idea that all human beings will eventually be saved. In this debate, it is nonetheless useful to note that a pessimistic interpretation of Augustine's account is presumptuous. Rather, Augustine might simply be acknowledging the fallibility of human beings in the face of a supreme and almighty God.

The Influence of Augustine on Modern Christianity

Before we continue onwards to other theological discussions in Christian thought, Augustine has influenced thinkers throughout history. Augustine's greatest contribution to Christian thought. Whether it be original sin, grace, or predestination, many of his ideas can be found verbatim in key texts such as the Catechism of the Catholic Church. In fact, many of the key concepts of Christianity have been proposed and developed by Augustine, especially his views on sin. For example, the Protestant theologian John Calvin proposed an even more radical view based on Augustine's human theology, arguing that all human actions, even ones that seem good, are tainted by sin and selfishness. Calvin also held a similarly strong belief in predestination, believing that God has predestined some for salvation and leaves the rest to condemnation.

However, Augustine's account has also conversely inspired opposing proposals about human nature. His thought ironically inspired a lot of Continental philosophers in the twentieth century. For example, Husserl, although many existentialists, such as Sartre, contended that, contrary to Augustine's view, human beings have no specific nature or purpose to human life. Instead, human beings are born with no predetermined nature and radical freedom to choose a course of life. What these myriad influences highlight is how Augustine's thought is simply narrowly interpreted through the lens of modern Christian dogma. There is much more to be discovered, and it resists easy categorisation, and it is worth approaching the source material in this way.

Quick Quiz

1. What is the Fall?
2. What is original sin?
3. What biblical chapters does Augustine look to for his interpretation of the Fall?
4. What was Augustine combating with his doctrine of original sin?
5. What is the difference between single and double predestination?
6. What is the difference between caritas and cupiditas?
7. What is concupiscence?

1B: DEATH AND THE AFTERLIFE

What you will learn in this section:

- Christian teachings and ideas regarding the nature of heaven, hell and purgatory,
- Traditional religious beliefs in these concepts as actual places or realms in the afterlife,
- Modern proposals that these concepts are spiritual states or degrees of separation from God,
- More radical suggestions that these concepts should be viewed as symbols or metaphors for experiences on Earth.

Christian teachings and ideas regarding the existence and nature of election, including:

- The differences between limited and unlimited election.
- The advantages and disadvantages of universalist approaches to election.
- How different interpretations of scripture influence ideas about election.

Starter Activity:

Where do you stand on the existence of an afterlife? Write down a paragraph before class, about whether heaven, hell and purgatory should be conceived of as real places or just ideas that we go through.

Key Thinker

Name	John Hick
Born	1922
Died	2012
Key text	<i>Death and the Eternal Life</i> (1976)
Why are they important?	Hick is perhaps simultaneously one of the most influential and controversial thinkers of the twentieth century. Although Protestant, he argued that heaven, hell and purgatory should be viewed as myth and that other contentious ideas such as universalism and pluralism, should be adopted by Christians.
Did you know?	Hick, in the late 1950s, accepted a place at Cornell University. At the time, Cornell was also becoming more liberal at that time and he faced severe opposition from conservative academics, with many even accusing him of heresy for his views on the doctrine of the virgin birth. This hostility eventually led to him leaving Cornell and taking a place at the University of Cambridge in the early 1960s.

Introduction - What is the Afterlife?

It is safe to say that, for the most part, the nature and form of the afterlife is one of the central theological debates in Christianity. While nearly all religions have their own theories about what happens after death, the duality of heaven and hell has governed Christian thought throughout history. This has led to countless works of art and literature. This may be due to the highly speculative nature of the afterlife, often termed **eschatology** in Christian circles. While there are plenty of theories about the worlds and realities beyond our material existence, by their very properties they are often unappreciable while we still live. So while concepts such as heaven and hell have been around since the early days of Christianity, theological interpretations certainly vary. Concepts such as purgatory have also arisen in the history of the Christian Church and have been debated by believers. Therefore, it is essential to be careful when talking about Christian beliefs, as different denominations may have a radically different view from the next.

So what are the basic options? Well, the persistent view throughout most of Christian history is that heaven and purgatory are actual places. They are where people go after they have been judged, whether they have lived morally good or bad lives. Heaven is most commonly thought of as a place where individuals are reunited with God after death and enjoy eternal bliss or ecstasy. Hell is commonly conceived as a place of eternal suffering, where those who have failed

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



or have shunned God entirely go after judgement. However, while these quite literal and hell hold a broad scriptural appeal, many thinkers, both secular and religious, have interpreted in recent years. If a benevolent God exists, it would seem strange to expect beings to undergo eternal suffering for mortal crimes. Therefore, especially in recent years, it is often preferred to view heaven and hell as degrees of separation from God. Those who are faithful lives are spiritually united with God after death, while those who haven't are separated. Some have gone radically further, however, and even suggested that heaven and hell should be seen as a person's spiritual and moral life, eschewing talk of what happens after death altogether.

Regardless of the position one takes, it is most necessary to look at the key elements of the afterlife. Much of the talk of the afterlife found up in quite artistic, symbolic and metaphorical language. The Bible as a source of evidence can at first be quite confusing. Even when heaven and hell are described, the realms or places of thought is rarely unified, with thinkers referring to various notions of the coming of a 'New Jerusalem' or 'New Earth'. As a result, some have even argued that the afterlife is construed as a transformation or perfection of the created world rather than a spiritual realm. Nevertheless, we can begin at the first key concept of the afterlife, the foundation of which is developed: **judgement**.

Judgement

Judgement necessarily precedes an individual being sent to hell. However, when does this judgement occur? Different forms are presented throughout the New Testament but the concept can broadly be divided into two kinds: **personal** and **general judgement**. Personal judgement is individual and is generally conceived to occur straight after a person's death. On the other hand, general judgement is of the whole of humanity and is more commonly conceived to occur at the **Second Coming**, which brings about a new spiritual age.

For the most part, the Bible refers more to personal judgement. In Matthew 25:32–46, Jesus describes when all will be judged based on whether they have been righteous or apathetic. Similarly, in Revelation, it alludes to a future event where a final judgement, rather than each person facing judgement after death. Yet, in examining the nature of judgement in scripture, it is always worth considering the landscape of the Middle East in the first century was very different from now. Many have anticipated, based on Jesus' words, that the Second Coming was imminent and would occur within lifetimes. For, while passages such as Matthew 24:2 maintain an ambivalence about the timing of the Second Coming, Luke 21:32, are much more direct, with Jesus stating, 'Truly, I say to you, this generation has taken place' (NRSV). This means that the idea of a general judgement was a much more central concept to early Christians and so a more developed theology about personal judgement was developed.

This anticipation of the afterlife, or Second Coming, is often referred to as **parousia**. While most present in early Christianity, it has been a theme throughout much of the history of theology, with successive generations of Christians giving their own predictions about the end of the world. In fact, it is likely you've occasionally seen various Christian figures on the news, especially in places such as the USA, give their own prophetic insights into when Jesus will return to Earth in one guise or another. Nevertheless, over successive centuries after the death of Jesus, there was a greater development of the idea of personal judgement. Passages such as Luke 16:19–31, which details the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, highlight the possibility that some people are immediately judged after death.

To this extent, most modern Christian denominations sign up to belief in personal judgement, while remaining open about a future general judgement event. The Catholic Church, for example, holds that both forms of judgement are important and the Gospels give every indication that the Second Coming of Christ will return to the world and judge humanity as a whole. As we have noted, the teachings attributed to Jesus in the Gospels paint a less than clear picture of the core concepts of the afterlife.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



about the afterlife. Yet, although this ambiguity extends to all the concepts we will not mean that ideas about heaven and hell are confused. As an illustration, we can look at a key passage on the afterlife, Matthew 25:31–46.

Interpreting the Afterlife – A Closer Look at Matthew 25:31–46

This Matthean passage is often used as a benchmark for Christian theology about the parable of the sheep and goats, an eschatological story. Jesus uses to outline the general judgement and the nature of heaven and hell. The central narrative is that the sheep (who will receive eternal life, while the goats who are not (the goats) will receive eternal punishment). The simple idea is more interesting than it initially appears. For one, it seems to suggest that good works are not enough for eternal life, but rather, it is faith. Secondly, there is an emphasis on universal salvation, which is not necessary to form these works under Christ. Rather, Jesus seems to be implicit that salvation could extend to all who are righteous. The parable in this way potentially reflects Jesus himself during his earthly ministry. Through the Gospels, Jesus does not simply perform miracles to encourage faith in God but instead in order for human beings to live better lives and well-being for others. This cohesiveness in particular arises in v45, where Jesus states that he did not do it to one of the least of these, you did not do it to me' (NRSV).

So what ambiguities remain? Well, the passage as a whole has to be reconciled with what we have already noted, give somewhat conflicting perspectives. In fact, one major difficulty is in drawing together sayings and teachings from different Gospels, which, perhaps due to the fact that they offer distinct, thematic looks at the life of Jesus. Another issue is that, despite the fact that the passage being concretely outlined by Jesus, the nature of the eternal life and punishment in the afterlife passage is not developed. Does this eternal punishment occur in a particular place or is it a state of condemnation? Although the nature of judgement provides some clues as to how the Christian afterlife, there is still a theoretical gap between the process of judgement and the actual afterlife. Nevertheless, scripture does potentially offer more clues, and, through the next part of the course, we will evaluate the relevant evidence for each of the competing interpretations of heaven, hell and the afterlife.

Revelation and Eschatology

In our discussion of eschatology in this section, it would be remiss not to talk about the Book of Revelation upon ideas of heaven and hell. The Book of Revelation is the final book of the New Testament, a highly symbolic and imagery-filled account of the apocalypse. It is thought to have been written between AD 70 and AD 90 and is attributed to an unknown author, 'John'. As one would expect of an apocalypse, it deals largely with a vision of the end times and the arrival of a new world. However, it does also potentially give clues about the nature of heaven and hell. In Revelation 21:1–8 heaven is described as a place containing no death or pain, where those who are faithful to God will live. Perhaps most significantly, Revelation is at least partially responsible for the belief in the millennium throughout the history of Christianity. Millenarianism is the idea that upon his second coming, Jesus will rule for 1,000 years before the general judgement of humanity occurs.

There is no easy way to interpret Revelation, however. Some have viewed it as a collection of prophecies about different events that will occur at the end of time. Others have examined it in the context of the community struggles of the first century. One popular idea is that it is a symbolic account of the struggle between good and evil, employing allegory and metaphor. It is a popular representation of Christian teaching. Regardless, if you read Revelation, you will find that it was not written to garner a literal interpretation, and many of the details and symbols will contain meanings lost on modern audiences.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Heaven

What do you envision when you picture a place or state of eternal reward and happiness? Your view differs from nearly everyone else's throughout the world. The sheer abstractness is automatically difficult to outline how heaven should be talked about. Yet that has made it a somewhat intoxicating idea for ordinary Christians. Typically it has been viewed as removed from the material concerns that dominate our lives. However, others have seen heaven as some future reality on Earth yet to be initiated.

In fact, how one interprets the nature of the 'Kingdom of God' has a significant bearing on the location, state or symbol of heaven. Throughout the Bible, the term is used in a variety of ways. The Kingdom of God can encompass the entirety of creation, while others use it to refer to a place where God dwells. This makes discussion of heaven a little more complex. When considering the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, the temptation may be to use the idea of heaven as a place where human beings are united with God in the afterlife. This nonetheless may be an unhelpful idea, especially considering talk of ideas such as 'New Earth' (see Isaiah 65:17, 66:22, Revelation 21:1). Some Christian thinkers contend that the afterlife may be a future utopia born out of the current world of human beings. If this is the case then heaven is better thought of as a transformation of the current world rather than a separate place. Such an idea is also not contested tremendously in the Bible, as the vision Jesus puts forward is most concerned with the promise of eternal life, not the location of heaven.

One particularly revealing passage comes in 2 Peter 3:10–13, which talks not only of the cleansing or reforming of the Earth that will occur in the afterlife. Similarly, in Acts 1:6–7, Jesus speaks about the restoration of all things on the return of God to the world, an indication of a new creation rather than another realm. It is important to note also that the timing of personal and general judgement also affects this debate. The idea that heaven comes after the final judgement creation better fits with a notion of general judgement rather than personal, since the final judgement is the moment when heaven is brought to Earth rather than human beings brought to heaven.

However, it is also worth noting that the 'New Earth' idea is only one part of Christian thought. The correct interpretation of the Bible is a number of different philosophical and theological positions. On the one hand, all the previous discussion still assumes further that heaven has to be a location, either physical or spiritual, and it may be better to think of eternal life as a state beyond anything physical. There is plenty to think about this suggestion, and it is worth taking a deeper look at the idea.

Biblical Discussion of Heaven

There are many passages in the Bible which, if interpreted literally, seem to present heaven as a physical place. For example, in 2 Corinthians 5:1–2, St Paul compares the 'earthly tent' of the world to the 'building from God... eternal in the heavens' (NRSV). Going further, various elements of both the Old and New Testaments offer specific dimensions and details of heaven. Ezekiel and Revelation (see 3:12 and 21:2) both speak of a New Jerusalem, with various features based upon an idealised version of the city in the Old Testament. Such literalist thinking has dominated much of Christian history, with theology, art and literature often chipping in different visions of the physical form and nature of heaven.

On the other hand, such interpretations have often been tempered also by philosophical ideas of immateriality and incomprehensibility of heaven itself. Many accounts also suggest that the present form cannot be known or that human beings begin to understand the realms of divinity only at the moment of the **beatific vision**. Developed by theologians such as Thomas Aquinas, adheres to this idea that the final moment in a person's ascent to heaven where they fully perceive God and the divine is the final moment in a person's ascent to heaven where they fully perceive God and the divine. Such ideas are certainly as artistic as they are theological, but they hint at a deeper understanding of heaven. Rather than risking **anthropomorphising** it as a realm with human-like features, it is better to think of it as a state of being.

Such ideas are certainly as artistic as they are theological, but they hint at a deeper understanding of heaven. Rather than risking **anthropomorphising** it as a realm with human-like features, it is better to think of it as a state of being.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



features, it may be best to view heaven as a specific kind of spiritual state, where reconciliation and relationship with God after death. In fact, if one did become un process undergo **theosis** (self-divinisation), then one might well expect to leave the Earth and achieve an immaterial state more reflective of God's being and nature.

There is plenty of biblical evidence to support such a suggestion. Revelation 22:5, heaven as not needing 'light or sun', implying physical concepts are an irrelevance. Similarly, Hebrews 9:24 states that Christ 'did not enter a sanctuary made by human hands, but entered the true sanctuary that is not made by hands, but is of another reality entirely to the physical one on earth. Moreover, it may simply about the afterlife literally is a theological misstep. If heaven is a place so fundamentally different from the material world, the only way scripture to describe it might through using metaphor. Therefore, what appear to be literal statements about the nature of heaven are not comprehensive in form of reality completely at odds with ordinary human existence.

Modern Interpretations of Heaven

Many Christian denominations in the last few hundred years have shifted to view heaven as a state or communion with God, although there are still plenty who view it as an actual place. The Catholic Church endorses quite a broad view of the afterlife, describing heaven in terms of 'a state of life and love with the Trinity' and a 'state of supreme definitive happiness' (n. 1033). This view had the support of recent popes, with Pope John Paul II describing heaven as meeting God after death and not 'a physical place in the clouds'. Therefore, despite popular imagination of heaven as a physical place, much of the academic theological discussion has preferred the afterlife to physical concepts and things.

However, if a more subjective and metaphorical approach is taken to interpreting the afterlife, this raises a thornier question about the nature of the afterlife itself. To say that heaven is not any knowable or conceivable reality is tantamount to a tacit recognition that the concept is entirely meaningless in the context of human existence. As some modern thinkers have argued, a fruitful approach is to view heaven as a **symbol** of the presence of God in a person's life. Existentialist theologians take this view, arguing that 'heaven and hell must be taken as the polar ultimates of the human experience of the divine'.

What does this mean? Well, at a core level, heaven and hell are states of mind that are shaped by the psychological power over human beings. Whatever a person's religious inclination, the concept of God may be somewhat hellish in the sense that there is a void of meaning when life is filled with sufferings. Conversely, a life enjoyed through a relationship with God is one that is filled with meaning. To this extent, this view is also supported by scriptural evidence. Many of Jesus' teachings focused on the spiritual betterment of human beings, implying that the well-led Christian life provides meaning to one wholly concerned with material circumstances. Some scholars, such as C H Dodd, have interpreted Jesus' teachings a form of 'realised eschatology', where the symbolic nature of Jesus' life and death is the instantiation of the Kingdom of God on Earth, which all human beings can participate in.

This symbolic approach to heaven and hell is quite radical. Although it avoids a lot of linguistic problems with describing heaven as a place or a state, for many it makes heaven meaningless altogether. It becomes reduced to a mere idea rather than a concrete reality that can be experienced by the faithful. Equally, the critical theologian might raise the point that the expectation of eternal life is a morality. If one is motivated by the prospect of eternal reward, one is not really acting out of genuine faith. Yet at the same time, taking up the idea that heaven is a symbol also allows for the possibility of **eternal**, a key theme in the Gospels. Many critics as such might point out that the concept of heaven or other realms of the afterlife equally requires some concrete basis in reality. The nature of eternality, if such realms are primarily psychological. Even if this is possible, one is taking too many liberties with the interpretation of scripture to support it.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



The nuances of this discussion nevertheless emerge more when one turns to heaven and hell. It is this concept we will examine in the next part in the same fashion, with the intricacies of theological debate about the afterlife.

Discussion Activity:

How were you taught about heaven as a child? In small groups, compare your different perspectives on the nature of eternal reward and discuss how they inform your perspective on the nature of eternal punishment.

Hell

Throughout the history of Christianity the concept of hell has held a pivotal role in the development of the faith. It is a concept that is often disagreeable to many, yet it is a concept that is central to the faith. Yet the nature and form of hell is perhaps more complex than its counterpart, heaven. One of the main philosophical issues has been how to reconcile a benevolent God, a problem that inspired many of the more mystical beliefs we looked at in the section on Augustine. Yet without some idea of eternal punishment, that judgement altogether loses meaning, for why be morally responsible for one's actions if there is no punishment? Therefore, there is a clear tension at the heart of Christian belief in the afterlife. The concept of hell is a part of the overarching reality it threatens the very sovereignty of God, yet if it is part of God's plan, it threatens God's benevolence.

Like heaven, hell has traditionally throughout the history of Christianity been viewed in a variety of ways. The descriptions are accompanied by lurid ideas about the kinds of sufferings humans are capable of. There has been a certain grim fascination shown by theologians and artists alike in detailing the punishments of the condemned. However, in recent years, this idea about hell has been challenged. Instead, hell is viewed as a spiritual state; a holistic separation from God in the afterlife. Those who have failed to have faith or live well do not enjoy the reward of union with God in heaven. This is a concept that is difficult to unpack in scripture and it is to its various incarnations in the Bible we now turn. Our understanding of its form and place in Christian belief is shaped by these scriptural references.

Biblical Discussion of Hell

What is first to note is that there is no unified concept of 'hell' present in the Bible. There is a number of different terms used to describe negative realms of the afterlife that are used throughout the Bible. For example, in the Old Testament, the term *sheol* is sometimes used to describe the underworld, meaning would be the Greek concept of 'Hades', a temporary underworld where the souls of the dead await judgement. In fact, the term *Hades* is used similarly in the New Testament to the abode of the dead where individuals await judgement and resurrection. The term *Gehenna*, which is commonly translated as 'hell', is used throughout the New Testament to refer to a place where the body and soul are painfully destroyed (e.g. Matthew 5:22).

When talking about hell, it is this final term that proves most pertinent. Nevertheless, there are many other descriptions of forms of eternal punishment in scripture. As we have studied already, the parable of the sheep and goats (Matthew 25:36–45) refers to an 'eternal fire' for the condemned, and many passages in Revelation adopt similar imagery. For example, Revelation 20:15 describes hell as a 'lake of fire', while 14:10 holds that sinners will be 'tormented with fire and sulphur in the presence of the holy angels'. Similar imagery prevails through the Gospel also, with the phrase 'weeping and gnashing of teeth' appearing seven times (see Luke 13:28). The image of 'unquenchable fire' given as a consequence of sin is also a recurring theme (Matthew 5:22, Luke 12:49–50, Mark 9:43–48).

All this certainly can seem quite morbid at first, and early Christians did not shy away from discussing the different evils one might find in hell. Such discussion naturally oriented itself around the actual place the condemned went to, just as the saved ascended to heaven. It is only in later centuries that the assumption was made. The talk of hell in the Bible is very easy to take literally, especially when the imagery is so vivid.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



as 'fire' are invoked. These very physical terms are rooted in the human imagination. The contact human beings have with suffering is that of the body, rather than a spiritual one.

Yet it can be questioned to what degree a literalist interpretation of hell in the Bible assumes to some degree there is a **resurrection of the body** in the afterlife. If not, why physical suffering would be considered undesirable in the same way on Earth. This is a philosophical problem, there are perhaps clues early Christians did subscribe to this (see 1 Corinthians 15:35–40). However, it is also not clear from the writings of biblical authors what form a new body in the afterlife would take and whether it is comparable to the body in this life. Perhaps more important is the **immortality of the soul** in Christian theology, which is the belief that the soul between the spiritual and the human person in this life and their spiritual existence in the afterlife. If this is the case, then it might be more appropriate to view hell as a form of spiritual punishment rather than being united with God in the afterlife.

Such a view is certainly appropriate if one interprets talk of hell in the Bible to be metaphorical. This is not a far-fetched approach, as texts such as Revelation were likely to be written with artistic intent and are full of symbolism and metaphor, even if interpreted literally. The storied form of passages such as the parable of the sheep and goats naturally invites spiritual or moral conclusions about the afterlife, not simply assume it to mirror this life. This understanding is perhaps also supported by the dual meanings of many terms. When John the Baptist announces in Luke 3:15–18 that Jesus will arrive to baptise humanity in 'fire', yet, in this context, it is clear that fire is intended to conjure up a different meaning to describe hell. Whatever punishments are, therefore, posited by biblical authors to be, a fruitful approach to interpret these as symbolic expressions of a certain kind of suffering rather than them literally.

Modern Interpretations of Hell

Similarly to heaven, many Christian denominations for a long time endorsed a literalist interpretation. However, this has accordingly changed, especially in the twentieth century. For example, the Catholic Church states that the chief punishment of hell is eternal separation from God and the loss of the happiness for which he was created and for which he longs'. While this interpretation downplays the possibility of physical punishment, it does downplay such possibilities in favour of a spiritual state. This interpretation also makes it easier to reconcile hell with the existence of free will. It is simply human beings' free choice to deny a relationship with him and be separated from him.

Yet it is also not clear how this interpretation coheres with biblical interpretation. The Bible that talk of hell naturally uses 'symbolic language' and that hell is better viewed as a state of being and definitively separate themselves from God'. Yet if this is the case, why invoke the concept of hell in describing the punishments of hell? Just as we explored with heaven, if the Bible is interpreted metaphorically there may be philosophical grounds to simply view it as a moral symbol altogether. The punishments described in the Bible simply refer to the pains and difficulties the individual with the faith in God contrast to the believer who has the security and joy of their faith in God.

This idea also completely avoids the tricky process of reconciling hell with God, for a spiritual state prima facie dodges the question of how God would physically punish human beings. One important idea related to this is **universalism**, the idea that a benevolent God would choose to eventually save all human beings for their actions on Earth. There are many corresponding issues with this idea, but the main issue is that all physical punishments are interpretations of hell since the very existence of hell itself is opposed to the existence of a benevolent God unless one invokes an event such as a final judgement.

Nevertheless, one idea might well come to the rescue here: **purgatory**. Although posited as a solution to the philosophical conundrums that come with heaven and hell, it is a state of being where souls are purified before entering heaven.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Depictions of the Afterlife in Art and Literature

Art and theology have always gone hand in hand throughout history. Yet the concept of the afterlife perhaps proved most enduring in artistic imagination. If you've been to any Catholic church, you are likely to have seen a vast array of images inspired by various conceptions of the afterlife. This reflects a longstanding tradition in Christianity of treating heaven and hell as literal places. Augustine, who contended hell was a physical place with no purpose but the torment of the damned, gave rise to plenty of artistic and literary ideas about what these punishments would be like.

Yet the most important literary work about the afterlife is probably the *Divine Comedy*, written in the thirteenth-fourteenth century Italian poet Dante Alighieri. It details, in a highly allegorical fashion, the first three stages of the afterlife: purgatory and hell, outlining the soul's journey through the afterlife to reconciliation with God. The first part, *Inferno*, for example, deals with Satan, his punishment, and the suffering within it, while the last part, *Paradiso*, describes how the soul ascends to heaven before undergoing the **beatific vision** with God.

However, the *Divine Comedy* does more than simply narrate a story. It also outlines the concepts of morality, justice and religion. For example, in his conception of hell each circle represents a different historical and religious figure shown suffering in various ways according to their sins. The poem is highly allegorical, containing a variety of symbolic and metaphorical illustrations. Scholars in particular have identified what is often called a **fourfold method** of interpretation in Dante, which held that to draw the most amount of meaning from a particular text, one should consider its historical, moral, political and spiritual elements. The idea was that the *Divine Comedy* offered a kind of interpretation, where each story at each level of the afterlife offered greater insight into the spiritual lives and philosophies of human beings.

Purgatory

The word 'purgatory' means 'purification' and most commonly refers to an intermediate state between heaven and hell where individuals are purified of their excess sin before ascending to heaven. Purgatory, and whether it exists at all, is still a heavily debated idea. It is most commonly associated with the Catholic Church, although there are some sections of the Eastern Orthodox Church that also believe in the possibility of an intermediate stage between death and the afterlife. A large part of the concept of purgatory comes from a lack of scriptural support. It does not appear as a distinct concept in the Bible and has largely been developed out of a choice reading of a few passages and philosophical speculation about the nature of the afterlife.

One key issue purgatory potentially solves is answering how sinful human beings can be saved and not condemned, for it is far from clear in the Bible what kind of acts will send a human being to hell. It is practically impossible for anyone to live a blameless life, yet in order to achieve salvation from God, human beings will have to achieve perfection of some sort. Accordingly, the Bible distinguishes between **mortal sins** and **venial sins**. The former are sins that are unforgivable and lead to eternal damnation. On the other hand, the latter are sins which result in only temporal punishment, and through prayer and reflection, they can be cleansed from an individual in the afterlife.

Therefore, it can clearly be seen that purgatory as a concept provides an intuitive way of thinking about the afterlife in which human beings are sent to heaven or hell, even if there is no easy way of distinguishing between mortal sin or a venial sin. Furthermore, although its official adoption by the Catholic Church did not occur until the thirteenth century, the idea of an intermediate state between death and the afterlife has a long tradition stretching back beyond the birth of Jesus. Plato and Heraclides, for example, both believed in a 'celestial habitation' or intermediary state or place souls went to after death before ascending to a higher plane of existence. Similarly, the idea of praying for the dead and the various stages of the afterlife has been suggested to be not uncommon in older Jewish traditions. In the early Church theologians posit basic forms of purgatory. Clement and Origen suggested a 'spiritual fire and punishment' in between death and the afterlife while even Augustine suggested a possible intermediate stage existed before heaven and hell.

Yet there is still a major difference between acknowledging the possibility of inter-purgatory as an actual place. It is, therefore, important to first consider what biblical evidence for purgatory (however limited it may be) and whether belief in it is justified.

Biblical Evidence for Purgatory

While critics of the Catholic Church have often argued that there is no solid biblical evidence, a number of passages have been cited in its support. The most important is Mark 12:32. In a discussion about forgiveness, Jesus alludes to a 'second coming' beyond the present one. This suggests that forgiveness is possible even after death. An argument put forward by Pope Gregory VII and other Catholic theologians in the 11th century drew upon this passage as an indication of a stage between death and the afterlife. A similar passage can be found in 1 Corinthians 13:12, which uses the metaphor of a builder for early Christians in the process of developing their faith. The phrase 'the builder will be saved, but only as through fire'. Once again, this implies purification for the early sins and imperfections present in each human being.

Yet these passages are still only indirect support, so why hold a distinct belief in purgatory? If different denominations conflict here, differences are in large part due to the sources of evidence that each holds to be important. This is a discussion we will focus on in the next section, but it is an essential tool when interpreting the Bible. If there is a philosophical gap in the understanding of which a scripturally coherent solution exists, then it is fair to posit a concept such as purgatory. Protestants, who typically hold the Bible to be centrally important, if there is no biblical evidence for purgatory, then it should not be argued for even if it solves some abstract problem.

Nevertheless, even if belief in purgatory is reasonable, there is little scriptural evidence for it. While it might be natural to view it as another actual place, similar to that of heaven or hell, it is more often viewed as a kind of spiritual state. If this latter interpretation is the case, then purgatory is not a place where a soul coming to terms with its own sinful life undergoes union with God, but rather another stage in the process of salvation. This is certainly a view that has been adopted by many Christians as we will analyse in the next part of this section.

Modern Interpretations of Purgatory

The Catholic Church itself acknowledges there isn't a huge amount of biblical evidence for purgatory. It contends that a reasonable perspective on scripture and the nature of God reveals that purgatory is a real place. For example, Pope John Paul II in 1999 described purgatory as a 'condition of existence'. If purgatory is a physical place, it is a state after death where people have their sins cleansed by Jesus. If purgatory is a spiritual state, it is less clear whether viewing purgatory as a condition or state is altogether meaningful. It is a painful purification necessary to enter heaven, and to what extent does the idea of purgatory challenge the notion of a forgiving God? Usually, forgiveness does not require a punishment of any kind, and purgatory simply the exact opposite.

Karl Rahner, a famous modern Catholic theologian, answers such questions by arguing that purgatory is something inflicted by God on individuals. Instead, it is a metaphor for a person's struggle with their own imperfect state in light of an utterly perfect God. Purgatory is, therefore, not a place, but a process of conscious reflection on one's own sins. It is as this causes a certain degree of suffering, but this reflection causes a similar but not overwhelming suffering in the afterlife as the meaning of their actions in their life and the ways they might have hurt others. The notions of fire and punishment invoked in discussion of purgatory are useful metaphors. If interpreted in this way, it is possible to describe the process of purgatory without the characteristics of a physical place.

A similar argument is also an unlikely part of John Hick's theology. Despite being a theist, Hick argued that purgatory is an essential part of his **universalism**, the idea that all people will eventually be saved. For Hick, purgatory is similar to Rahner's; an intermediate stage between this life and heaven.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



they understand the meaning and importance of their actions during their life. Yet there is no hell and all human beings will go through purgatory on their inevitable Purgatory therefore becomes a way of reconciling the existence of evil human act beings will eventually be saved by God. Although for many Hick's ideas here deval the present ages, it is an important example of how the doctrine of purgatory has years as theologians are more willing to step outside the bounds of traditional chu

Yet both Hick's and Rahner's ideas perhaps lend support to viewing purgatory as psychological anguish they postulate in a intermediate state in the afterlife can be symbolic state in this life when one reflects on one's own sins in light of one's faith eventually one might for a person and become a better person, this causes its cannot be a and in the early believes in Christian ideals. Therefore, just as with purgatory a spiritual state may be somewhat of a slippery slope to viewing it as

Which Interpretation Should We Favour?

Throughout this section, we've looked at different proposals about the afterlife. No purgatory have been outlined as potentially actual places, spiritual states or symbols yet there is no easy way of evaluating which one of these interpretations is best. The realms of the afterlife as actual places is scripturally simplest and does not require when it comes to analysing the Bible. However, this literal interpretation of script the rich symbolism in the Bible and leads to difficult philosophical issues when att hell and purgatory with the God of classical monotheism.

On the other hand, viewing the realms of the afterlife as spiritual states or symbols philosophical problems, as it is not required to explain in the same fashion why a would choose (or allow) physical punishment to be enacted on human beings in th these positions makes interpreting scripture a tricky process since no declaration face value. Instead, careful analysis needs to be made of individual passages and t and messages drawn out. The difficulty of this kind of interpretation mean that t of the afterlife simply become whatever the reader reads them to be, and ideas al become overlobject whatever the case, when discussing Christian ideas abo to accomm both these scriptural and philosophical problems when supporti

Activity:

Pick five of the Bible passages mentioned throughout this section. Read through sentences about the interpretation of the Christian afterlife you think each best

Election

We've partially explored in our discussion of the afterlife how different interpreta nature of salvation. Perhaps most important to such discussions is detailing who v not, and this has led to a large amount of theology on **election**. The word 'elect' h might guess, the doctrine of election in Christianity stipulates that there are some specifically chosen by God to be saved. Yet this is a more controversial claim than human beings be eventually saved regardless of their choices or are there some v God know who will be saved in his infinite wisdom, could human beings able to d whether they reach salvation?

Such questions make clear that election is not an easy concept to unfold and ties i about **predestination** and the afterlife. Predestination is the idea that God in som occur on Earth. Typically this means that God foreknows or predetermines all thin individual human soul. Both the Catholic and Protestant Churches traditionally be they are often more split as to what this entails. At the core, there is the idea that humanity but the entirety of creation, yet the nature of this plan is more difficult t natural to believe as a Christian that one ought to be saved due to one's faith, the about election and the extent of God's benevolence and omniscience.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Before we delve into these issues, it is worth exploring the differing views that have existed throughout history and how they reflect different strands of Christian thought.

The Different Interpretations of Election

Wrapping your head around the different forms of election can be a tricky process. However, Christians have remained consistent in their use of terms, and they often make quite symbolic use of the nature and form of salvation. One early key distinction that is often clear is between **election** and **salvation**. Theologians who propose limited election are generally contending that only some people are chosen by God for salvation; everyone else is destined for perdition. Conversely, those who believe God grants all human beings the possibility of reaching heaven. For the most part, the latter view has upheld limited election, but it is only in more progressive forms of modern Christianity that it has been proposed, including radical strains of **universalist** Christian belief.

Yet this distinction can still be clarified further, especially in the case of limited election. If only some people are to be saved, when was this choice made? Although this might seem like a simple question, it has been a key area of theological debate, especially in the last 1,000 years. The Calvinists (in the writings of John Calvin) have traditionally favoured what is called **unconditional election**. This means that God determined who would receive salvation before the creation of the world. Naturally, this entails quite a strong interpretation of predestination. If God knew who would be saved before the world, then it seems equally true that he willed some to be condemned also. This view of predestination also arguably fits well with a wholly omniscient and omnipotent God.

On the other hand, the Arminians (following the life and writings of Jacobus Arminius) favour **conditional election**, where God determines who will receive salvation based on whether they believe in Jesus Christ. Under conditional election, there is a much greater place for free will. It is not about whether someone is saved, but whether they themselves exercise belief in the life of Jesus. This diversion in doctrine between Calvinists and Arminians also results in another difference. In contrast to unconditional election, there is also **limited atonement**; where Christ dies for the sins of the elect by God before creation. Arminians, however, argue for **unlimited atonement**, where Christ died for all humanity's sins without exception.

It is not necessary to know the details of these historical differences in views on election but it is important to understand how Christian theologians have diverged in their interpretation of the doctrine. As we analysed in the section on Augustine, a strong belief in election prior to creation (as endorsed by Calvinists) can potentially lead to **double predestination**, the view that God predetermines both who will be saved and who will be condemned. Naturally, this is a very controversial view, one not widely adopted by few denominations today. Most, including the Catholic Church, favour **single predestination**, believing that God only elects individuals who will be saved. In this view, God does not play a part in those who will be condemned.

However, to characterise the debate around election as philosophical is at least partially misleading. Reconciling the actions of a benevolent God with the nuances of election is undoubtedly a complex task. Much of the disagreement has also arisen due to competing interpretations of scripture. We will look in the next part of this section.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



Salvation and the Fall

Interestingly enough, the theological debate about election doesn't just end at the creation. There is a further debate among thinkers about when God chose people for the Fall. **Antelapsarianism** (Supralapsarianism) is the view that God determined who would be condemned before the Fall, while **Postlapsarianism** (Sublapsarianism) is the opposite view, that God determined who will be saved after the Fall. This is a technical discussion but it has significant implications for belief. If God chose who will be saved before the Fall, it implies that God enabled human beings to become corruptible. However, if God chose the elect after the Fall, it implies that God's plan for humanity began only after the corruption.



Biblical Discussion and Election

There is no simple way to encapsulate the scriptural debate around election. The broad nature of the language within the Bible and the difficulty in extracting precise meanings from its passages means that for any passage there is a variety of ways of reading it. For example, a well-known verse, the subject of much debate concerning election, is John 15:16. Here Jesus declares, 'you did not choose me but I chose you and appointed you to go and bear fruit'. Now here it is clear there is an overriding theme, but the dimensions of this theme are not clear. Whether all human beings are chosen or not is not transparent. Although Jesus' speech in the chapter is directed towards the disciples, it is a standalone address to the reader of the Gospel, as emphasised by the author himself. The theme of election from their context throughout the chapter.

A similar case emerges with Romans 11:1–3. Here St Paul directly states that 'God whom he foreknew'. For those who favour limited election, this is a clear indication of God's power, set apart some people to be saved. However, for others this interpretation is problematic in the context of the chapter, which concerns how God's promise to the Jewish people is fulfilled. The talk of foreknowing is, therefore, referring to the Jewish people God safeguarded.

A final example of a verse used extensively is Acts 17 and Paul's charge against the Athenians that their unknown god is the Christian God and created human beings so they might search for him. In contrast to Romans 11:1–3, there is no indication that God chose some people, instead Paul gives the impression that all human beings are the offspring of God, and that the ministry of Jesus) when human beings can be reconciled with him. This passage is often interpreted as supporting unlimited election, or even universalism, for the emphasis is on all human beings hearing the message of Christ and repenting, not only a select few.

Therefore, even from a basic overview of the scriptural references to election, it is clear that there is no clear biblical evidence for either position. For all the possible philosophical scruples about unlimited election, there is also a scriptural gap in the discussion, and any argument for limited election has to somewhat creatively engage a number of biblical passages. To some extent, these ambiguities themselves may be reflective of the uncertain attitudes of the writers of the New Testament, which wasn't written long after the death of Jesus and for many the eschatological vision of the Kingdom of God was a distant promise for their followers' lifetimes. Nevertheless, this equally does not mean that a coherent doctrine of election is scripturally supported, simply that there are no straightforward answers to be found.



Predestination and Salvation

So far we've looked at a basic outline of the different forms of election but there is still much to delve into. In the current day, most Christian denominations have shifted to a view closer to unlimited atonement, but throughout much of Christian history a doctrine of limited atonement was favoured. Why was this the case? Well, there are certainly historical reasons. Although Christianity nowadays

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



the largest religion across the world, it had its own humble beginnings. Early Christianity, could be argued to resemble what we might view as a cult now. It had a small following, the teachings of a man little known outside the region of Judea, even after his death. It was a man who preached about a future coming Kingdom of God. Maintaining Christian religious commitment far beyond what many modern-day Christians adhere to, with an insular outlook about the nature of election.

Yet this is only a small part of the story. Christianity has been coloured by many influences in history. Theology on the whole has been largely accommodating of those of other faiths. It suggests that religions did not compete or influence each other, but instead to point to a whole taught **exclusivism** that held that only one religion holds the truth about salvation. We can learn more about this in the next section, but it is useful to mention now, as it informs why limited election has been a Christian belief for such a long time. One theologian we can look at in particular is John Calvin. Calvinist forms of Christianity. Typically these held up a strong doctrine of predestination. Limited election meant God also foreknew those to be condemned. For example, the *Shorter Catechism*, set out by the early Church of England in 1646, declared that 'some men are predestinated unto everlasting life; and others foreordained to everlasting death'.

Yet Calvin himself held slightly more nuanced views about predestination. In his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, he affirms a doctrine of predestination at the time, similar to that of the *Westminster Confession*. He argues that since human beings cannot draw upon their own free will or powers to understand their place to try to comprehend the nature of predestination and election altogether. What has set into motion is of his own free will, and whoever God has chosen is the subject of his mercy. The real motives of God for these actions are ones beyond human comprehension. Treating individuals as elect and some as condemned is misleading, placing a human perspective on God's actions.

This is an interesting suggestion and highlights perhaps the intricacies of limited election on the surface. Calvin throughout his works applies a principle which he calls the **principle of accommodation**. That God only reveals himself in ways that are suitable for human intellect and capacity. Being too vastly transcendent for human beings to understand. This means the doctrine of election, although it might appear simpler or difficult, is perhaps only this way because human beings have a limited ability to see things on a larger scale. What this suggests, at least for Calvin, is that human beings are predestinated to election as having decided their fate already, and in effect treat themselves morally whenever they can, and not presume to know what God's overall plans are.

This kind of thinking still pervades most modern denominational interpretations of predestination. They do not adhere to double predestination as Calvinists did but still hold that God imposes his will even if the exact reason is not known why. For example, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* on predestination, declaring that 'God predestines no one to go to hell'. However, it does hold that at the Last Judgement that human beings will understand the entire 'economy of salvation' for humanity. Therefore, there is an overriding role for faith in many forms of limited election. For many Christians, Jesus has simply revealed that some or all human beings are elected to salvation. Accordingly be placed in him that following his teachings will lead to salvation over time.

Universalism

Reading through justifications for limited election and limited atonement, you might find yourself thinking: why should we maintain philosophical ambivalence about God's will? If God is truly benevolent and omniscient, would he not seek to reconcile all human beings to himself, not just the elect? Such thinking can eventually lead to the theological doctrine of **universalism**, or apokatastasis. This holds that all of humanity, regardless of their sin, will eventually be reconciled with God and achieve salvation. It's a contrasting view to limited election. It has seen significant adoption within many Christian denominations. However, it has been a proposed idea in the last 100 years and may find a place in future Christian dogma.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



This lack of support throughout history is not to suggest there is no history at all. Such as Origen, did propose forms of universalism. However, as the centralised belief gradually became established, universalism became a heretical idea. Yet there are still those in favour of it, and it has become increasingly popular with modern liberal versions of Christianity. Universalists often question whether hell can be reconciled with the idea of a benevolent God. The idea of God 'choosing' individuals for salvation is at all just or good. The Christian belief that charity should extend not just to human interactions but also to the treatment of animals and the environment. Therefore, universalists often stress the importance of freely willed good over predestination or limited election. Rather than individuals being marked as corrupt or evil, they are naturally imperfect beings who work in unison with God towards a greater good.

The most influential universalist theologian in the twentieth century is John Hick, who developed the notion that a loving God would never condemn any human being to, or allow any form of, punishment. Instead, he develops a theology that transcends ordinary Protestant beliefs about the afterlife and its intermediate stages explain how human beings, although perhaps imperfect, reflect upon their actions and eventually be reconciled with God. Simply put, if everyone is given the opportunity for moral and spiritual growth, then it is not far-fetched to think that the afterlife is a process of such, although a Protestant, Hick argues in favour of purgatory, contending that a necessary stage in the journey to achieve salvation. Therefore, if Hick is correct, contrary to the beliefs of Catholicism, human beings will go through purgatory in some form or another.

Therefore, under Hick's view, all human beings are elect and human beings are deities. The journey for those who are evil is likely to be a longer and more painful one. It is this that Hick's ideas within his wider theological framework. Hick advocates **pluralism**, the idea that no religion has exclusive access to the truth about salvation. All religions, therefore, including Christianity, are a partial truth, and the limitations of religion as a whole are exposed in the afterlife. Hick's view of the teaching of Jesus in Christianity, which reveals a distinct way for human beings to achieve salvation, which can be refined and learned not only through contact with other religions but also through the knowledge we gain about the world itself.

As mentioned, however, Hick's views are quite controversial, and many thinkers have questioned the proper Christian belief. Cardinal Ratzinger, for example, criticises Hick's universalism and the central importance of Christians' sacrifice and atonement. As Karl Barth notes, election is not a Christian faith with Christ himself, and declares that he is 'both the electing God and the elect'. Hick, who decentralises the process of salvation from Jesus and his divinity, in effect forges a new path for Christianity. Now it is unlikely that Hick would even disagree with the traditional Christian thinking about whether Christian beliefs about election should necessarily commit to a specific view about Jesus and his teaching, especially if the doctrine of election is revealed through scripture, which presents a transparent difficulty when it comes to justifying universalism through scripture, which does not support some idea of limited or unlimited election in the pages of the Bible.

Nevertheless, Hick does mount an effective challenge to many of the assumptions underlying the doctrine of election. Should God really be viewed as a monarchical figure directing the course of the universe? The picture seems to contrast so much with our intuitive idea of God as a figure of benevolence? Such questions and to a great extent draw off how we come to believe we have knowledge of God, which is a topic that will be discussed in the next section.

Discussion Activity:

Is it possible to have single predestination without it collapsing into double predestination? Discuss in pairs or small groups and give your opinions on the most coherent form of election.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Quick Quiz

1. What is eschatology?
2. What is heaven?
3. What is purgatory?
4. What is hell?
5. What is the difference between personal and general judgement?
6. What is the difference between limited and universal election?
7. Give one Bible passage that potentially supports a doctrine of limited election.
8. Who is a key twentieth century proponent of universalism?



**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



INSPECTION COPY

2A: KNOWLEDGE OF GOD'S EXISTENCE

What you will learn in this section:

- Christian teachings and ideas regarding how one arrives at knowledge of God's existence.
- Whether human beings possess a natural, innate sense of the divine.
- Whether God can be observed in the order and purpose of natural things.
- The fallibility of the senses and the rational need for faith and grace in order to know God.
- How scripture and the life of Jesus can reveal knowledge of God.
- The philosophical and theological debates surrounding whether natural or revealed theology is the primary source of religious teaching.

Starter Activity:

In a basic list, write down, in order of importance, the sources you would employ to gain knowledge of God's existence. At the end of this section, compare this list with your class and see if anything changed in your view?

Key Thinker

Name	John Calvin
Born	1509
Died	1564
Key text	<i>Institutes of the Christian Religion</i> (1536)
Why are they important?	Calvin was one of the most important theologians and figures in the sixteenth century, and his work gave rise to the Christian Reformation. Throughout his life, his ideas were very influential in the development of the doctrines of salvation and predestination. However, his writings were influential throughout the history of Christianity, for Protestantism.
Did you know?	When Calvin died, initially his body was laid out in the open for three days. His friends and compatriots eventually became worried that if people arriving to see it, they would be thought to be encouraging idolatry, and so they buried it in an unmarked grave the next day.

Introduction – How Do We Know God?

Questions about knowledge of God's existence might initially seem more philosophical. Yet even religious thinkers have disagreed among themselves how human beings can know God, what sources of knowledge should be prioritised over others. In fact, such questions are more important now than ever, as theological enquiry has to reconcile itself with the evolving scientific knowledge human beings come to possess. Whether we come to know God through reason or through scripture greatly affects not only the conception of God we develop but also our place altogether in our everyday lives. If human beings are naturally disconnected from God, then a reliable point of contact comes from the revelations God has granted humanity at various times. On the other hand, if God granted human beings the natural faculties to witness him, then the continuing element of our observations of the world can be a source of knowledge of God.

Such questions cast a divide between two types of knowledge, often termed **natural** and **revealed** theology. Natural theology focuses on the capabilities human beings have to gather knowledge about God from the world around them, be from an innate sense of the divine or from specific observations of his work in the world. Revealed knowledge, though, is knowledge that is given to human beings with God's help. Though natural theology is, therefore, often termed **general revelation**, revealed theology, conversely, looks at how God has revealed himself to human beings through various forms of revelation. As such, knowledge gained through revealed theology is often termed **special revelation**; it is only available to individuals at particular times and places. Those favouring revealed theology often cast doubt on the reliability of the senses, arguing that observation and reason should be a good argument for distrusting natural theology. At those times when God's grace has enabled direct communication between God and human beings, the knowledge of God is often seen as more certain than that gained through natural theology.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



It is divide we shall focus on in this section, for while many theologians have main between these two approaches, many have also argued that they are two sides of ways God has communicated himself to humanity as a whole. First, we shall look at various arguments put forward that human beings can come to knowledge of God in the natural world and its properties.

Discussion Activity:

What do you believe is the most important source of knowledge about God? Discuss in pairs or small groups.

Natural Theology

Before we come to this topic, we can ask a much more fundamental question: what is an issue that has so far eluded an easy answer for philosophers, yet, in asking this, reveals some interesting dimensions to the debate around knowledge of God. On the one hand, we shall focus on **propositional knowledge**. This is the kind of knowledge which focuses on 'God created the world'. Here many philosophers have developed theories out of which such knowledge can be defined as 'justified, true belief'. For Plato, each of these three conditions must be met in order for a statement to count as knowledge, and certainly, even in theology, such a statement must have a place. The theist will generally contend not only that their belief in God is true but also that it is justified in a variety of ways, from personal experience to philosophical argumentation.

Yet, especially in religious discussion, it is not clear whether propositional knowledge is at play. In particular, we can note another kind: **knowledge by acquaintance**. This is knowledge gained through direct experience or a direct connection with a particular thing and may well apply to the knowledge Christians believe they have about God, for such knowledge may be of a much more personal nature than can be captured by truth-evaluable statements. Especially if given by a religious authority. This distinction certainly comes to the fore at least when we ask the question whether human beings can have knowledge of the existence of God. This might be a more controversial proposition nowadays, as scientific and neuroscientific explanations of mental phenomena are commonplace, but it is one that will be the first form of knowledge we will look at in this section.

Innate Knowledge

The discussion around the different forms of knowledge is very pertinent when we ask whether human beings possess an innate sense of the divine, for although supporters of natural theology have pointed towards the widespread practice of religion in the world as evidence for such a sense, it is less clear what nature or form such a sense should have. Is it the sense of the divine a particular set of capacities that allows human beings to detect and understand the presence of God in the natural world, or is it an intuitive awareness of God in all things? Discussion around innate knowledge of God has often tended to be confused together, even if this innate knowledge might manifest itself in different ways. As important as it is, what is important is that the innate sense of God human beings possess allows for special knowledge that would not be available without this sense.

For example, the Catechism of the Catholic Church states that because man is created in the image of God, 'the desire for God is written in the human heart'. Therefore, even if there are different religions, it is still fair to refer to human beings as 'religious' beings, for all have some sense of the divine manifesting itself differently across cultures. John Calvin, a famous sixteenth-century theologian, agrees with this idea. He distinguishes between what he terms a **sensus divinitatis** (sense of the divine) and **religionis** (sense of religion). The former is the innate understanding human beings have of the divine, the latter is what predisposes human beings to engage in religious activity. For Calvin, religions can be so different but share a belief in God. Whatever joint sense there is of the divine is necessarily reflected in the way human beings are predisposed to religious practice.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Moreover, the idea of an innate sense of the divine is well scripturally supported. In Acts 17:16–34. Here St Paul speaks to the Athenians about their idolatry and their practices. In the process he notes an altar with the inscription of an ‘unknown God’ to their worship which is wrongful but rather their ignorance of the thing they are supposed to worship. For many theologians, this passage is evidence for some innate sense of the divine. Even in effect worshipping idols and false Gods, they still had an understanding of something revealed to the world properly through Jesus Christ.

Nevertheless, even if this sense is established, as we’ve noted previously, it does not mean that an innate sense manifests itself, or what exactly understanding it brings of God, for while it may give a partial comprehension of a larger divine power, similar to what the Athenians possessed, it is far from what would be a complete knowledge altogether. In fact, the most it might tell us is whether God has any real personal connection to human beings altogether. To understand this, we can look at two aspects of how this innate sense might manifest itself: through beauty and goodness.

Beauty and Goodness

What do you see when you are looking at a beautiful painting or a magnificent landscape? In all feeling, chances are you might get a sense of awe or wonder. This is not to suggest that ordinary objects; the philosophical study of **aesthetics** is often preoccupied with the question of beauty and whether there are any real underlying principles to what we regard as beautiful. It simply instead is that there is an underlying innate sense from which human beings perceive beauty in the natural world.

How does this apply to religion? Well, for the theist, the fact that human beings can sense the divine world is a result of one’s innate sense of the divine. When one gets feelings of awe or wonder at beautiful or magnificent phenomena, one is actually getting a sense of internal appreciation. For art as a whole is reserved for human beings and not other creatures. The religious view of the perception of beauty is a natural expression of every human being’s innate sense of the divine.

The same is true for goodness. Nearly all Christian denominations appreciate the moral compass of human beings, and it is a key faculty that enables joint moral knowledge of humanity. When one feels the prick of conscience, it is this innate sense responding to the right as human beings with a particular moral understanding of what is right and wrong. Conscience is certainly controversial. Many psychologists in the last 100 years have given explanations for this moral sense of the world. Yet, for the everyday Christian, the sense of goodness is a facet of this innate sense of the will and being of God. Moreover, for Catholics, it is a key part of **natural law**, which is thought to represent moral truth and is used for reasoning about the world and God.

Such a view is a step beyond simply possessing an innate sense of the divine. While accepting that human beings can sense God on some instinctual level, there is still the question of whether the human intellect itself is able to reason about and develop knowledge of the divine. We examine in more detail in the next part of this section.

Intellect and Reason

It is easy to see why theists might argue for God in our rational capacities. Genesis 1:26–27 states that human beings were created in the **imago dei**, or **image of God**. This is generally held to mean that human nature reflects God’s nature. Moreover, this passage potentially explains why human beings have an innate sense of the divine. If they contain aspects of God’s nature, this is likely to be reflected in the religious perceptions of the world itself. Similarly, one could go further and argue that the moral sense is also reflected in human beings. We explored two in the last section: beauty and goodness. Theologians go even further than this and contend that human rationality is a reflection of God’s power. Through using reason, human beings can come to knowledge about God’s nature and the capacity used to develop knowledge about the world in general.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



This idea that reason is a key tool for arriving at knowledge of God is an important element of **natural theology**. Many different arguments have been put forward to reason to claim some attribute is a part of God's being, or that it is reasonable to believe in the existence of God altogether! In philosophy of religion, for example, Aquinas' **Five Ways** are particularly famous arguments which attempt to deduce the existence of God from basic features of the universe. While these may not prove the existence of God outright, even for many theists, they do in the eyes of believers provide strong evidence that God's existence is a reasonable proposition and help define how God relates to the natural world.

So at first glance, it seems that a natural theologian is in a strong position. However, the theological position of Augustine, looked at in the section on Augustine, **the Fall** is typically corrupted human nature, making human beings not only aware of good and bad but also the human soul to make reasonable decisions. Therefore, the Fall seems to present human beings: although we were once created perfect in the image of God that is no longer we believe we have is limited and we no longer have the connection or union with God that enabled us to naturally appreciate God's will.

One important theologian we can look at here is Calvin. Now, on the whole, Calvin's views on reason are a little difficult to decipher. Although generally quite perceivably a natural theologian, his views often shifted throughout his lifetime. At certain points he prescribes the powers of human reason while at others he acknowledges the natural abilities human beings have in the mysteries of the natural world. One key distinction we can initially make, nonetheless, is the **twofold knowledge of God (duplex cognitio Domini)**. The first kind of knowledge is the knowledge of God as creator of the world. This forms more natural observations of the world and how the natural world reflects his greatness. The second kind of knowledge, however, is the knowledge of God as redeemer of humanity. This is a much more religious form of knowledge which comes from the lives of humanity and his saving power.

Why is this distinction important? Well, for Calvin it forms the background for his view of natural theology. He holds that to some degree all human beings can come to know God since all can observe his work in the natural world. These points of connection are the **sparks of glory**, the reflections of the creator in the created object. Yet Calvin argues these sparks are not true knowledge. He holds instead that whatever revelations one can arrive at through natural theology are filtered through the **principle of accommodation**. This principle is a consistent view forward that God only shows himself to humanity in ways that are appropriate to human beings since God is transcendent and infinite while human beings are finite. This means that the sparks of glory becomes a **mirror** of God, it only reflects an imperfect or accommodated image of God and being. Human beings can certainly develop ideas about God from this reflection, but all these ideas will naturally fail to do justice to his true nature and omnipotence, but all these ideas will naturally fail to do justice to his true nature and partial understanding.

Therefore, it can be seen there are a number of limitations on natural theology for it can only provide partial knowledge of God as creator and even this knowledge is liable to the nature of human beings. Whatever knowledge we can come to is always restricted by human rationality and Calvin contends that points of contact with God such as conscience or the individual receives God's grace. This means that the natural order of the world, or the goodness, are not automatic pathways to knowledge about God and must be subject to the revelations presented by the Bible.

However, while such a conclusion might seem initially extreme, Calvin does not eschew natural theology entirely. In fact, he acknowledges that general revelation is extremely important. If there were no ways of observing God as creator in the natural world then there would be no way for a person to witness Christ to be prompted into ideas about God. Christianity as a whole does not build off the innate sense of God individuals possess. Furthermore, natural theology is only once an individual understands the revelations given by Christ; it just cannot be replaced.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



grant decisive and accurate knowledge of God. If we turn back to Acts 17:16–34, it is applied. The Athenians understand God the creator through their worshipping of many gods. Their knowledge was at best partial and at worst horribly misguided due to their extensive ignorance. St Paul and his deliverance of Jesus' message that provided the Athenians with a new perspective.

There are a lot of unanswered questions in Calvin's theology. For one, it still relies on the Fall and many modern critics question whether human reason is subject to the corruption supposed by Calvin. This has resulted in somewhat of a split in theologians drawing on natural theology. For example, Emil Brunner argues that the standards of logic presented by Calvin do prove a connection between human beings and God, but that although human beings are materially created, they have an important innate sense of the divine that manifests itself in forms such as conscience. Barth leans more in line with Calvin's view of the Fall and contends instead that human nature is corrupted by the Fall, such that there are no formal or natural ways human beings can come to know God's freely given grace that allows a connection with God.

Nevertheless, if we suppose that there are at least some reliable ways human beings can know God through general revelation, what conclusions can we arrive at? This will be the focus of the study of natural theology.

Order, Creation and Design

The idea that human beings can discover God in the order or design of the world is one unique to Christianity, although theologians have fleshed out its implications extensively over the last 2,000 years. Although Calvin and others have drawn doubt over the reliability of human rational capacities, there is an extensive body of both philosophical and theological literature that discusses what can be known of God through his creation. Some of this you will study in the Philosophy of Religion module. We will look at the process of extrapolating attributes and characteristics of God from the natural world. We can examine the scriptural basis for such an approach and examine whether there is a connection between natural and revealed theology that has not yet explored.

There are many different arguments which draw upon the order of the natural world to argue for the existence of God. One classic example is the argument from design, which argues that the complexity of the world demands that the world must have a designer; the world simply could not have come into existence by chance. Moreover, many thinkers have claimed that it is possible to infer the nature of God from the properties in the world. For instance, its complexity and scale require a designer of immense power, and its order and goodness indicate a designer of benevolence. Altogether, proponents of the argument from design have held it is possible to infer the God of classical monotheism from certain features of the natural world.

This idea is supported in particular by Romans 1:19–20. Here St Paul states that God's eternal power 'has been understood and seen through things he has made', such that for any individual there is no good excuse for acting immorally out of ignorance. This seems to support the idea that the attributes and characteristics of God are observable within the order or design of nature. If this is the case, then it may cast doubt on the validity of Calvin's arguments. If scripture, the very thing which Calvin argues should have priority over general revelation, calls for human beings to use natural theology, then it may be that his strong views on the corruption or defectiveness of reason may be unfounded. It is a duty for human beings to use their intellectual abilities when discussing or debating the existence of God.

There is perhaps another important implication if we take Romans 1:19–20 to be correct. If there is no distinct split between general and special revelation. If God intended human beings to use natural theology to arrive at an understanding of his being then both are valid. The only reason to suppose there is a split between the two approaches is if either the forms of knowledge about God or one approach is naturally defective. In the former case, we can question whether it is right to differentiate between God the creator and God the redeemer while in the latter case, we can question whether the Fall really rendered human beings incapable of using natural theology when attempting to arrive at knowledge of God.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Nevertheless, one difficulty arguments from natural theology face is that they are theists and atheists alike. In the case of the design argument, critics often point out that the characteristics out in nature are far from transparent and potentially don't exist at all. Although nature might be perceived as ordered and purposeful, theories such as evolution offer an alternative view that it is chaotic and purposeless. Similarly, while to some the natural world is beautiful and good, to others it might be brutal and full of evil. In either case, the design argument doesn't provide meaningful knowledge about God and so doubt is cast over whether a natural theology is possible at all. It may be that Calvin is right and special revelation should be prioritised over natural theology.

However, revealed theology also faces its own set of issues that cannot be ignored. In the next section, we shall turn to these issues.

Discussion

Do human beings have an innate religious or spiritual sense? Or are there reasons to think that religion is just another phenomenon or feeling misinterpreted by theists?

John Macquarrie and Dialectical Theism

Macquarrie presents in his works a defence of natural theology, beginning with the claim that theologians have been guilty of painting God as 'just another object in the world'. The traditional, hierarchical depiction of God as creator has often been assumed, rather than a picture of God developed within natural theology. As such, Macquarrie argues that if this view is discarded, it is possible to see how natural and revealed theology intersect.

His main proposal is that God effectively lies in a **dialectic** (discourse) between two opposing attributes. A classic example of this is **being** and **nothingness**. In this case Macquarrie argues that God is better revealed when one analyses the idea of God within the context of these two attributes. It can be noted that the existence of God is quite unlike that of a conventional object, in that it is not a being in the basic terms we use to talk about the being of things. Yet God is not just nothingness either. Therefore, the existence of God is contained within a tension between these two attributes.

Importantly, the same is true for the knowability and unknowability of God. In this sense, we can know God by his recognisable presence throughout the entirety of creation, but we cannot know him in any way beyond comprehension, not reducible down to a set of properties or characteristics. For Macquarrie, understanding dialectics such as these allows one to form an idea of God by drawing insights from natural theology while drawing upon the inspiration that revealed theology provides. He takes God's transcendence to be an indication of his separation from human beings and argues that to analyse how humanity's rational capacities can come to understand his nature is to understand how God can be understood within and outside of the world.

Macquarrie's approach is quite complex at times, but the key idea is that the way we think about God is the kind of theology we think is appropriate. If God is seen as an immanent part of the world, natural theology seems appropriate, but if God is viewed as a being far beyond human comprehension, revealed theology seems redundant. But what Macquarrie contends is that God is a being who exists in the tension of respect of these competing conceptual ideas of his being, and this process requires a dialectical natural theology to make sense of him. There is no competition between the two or a

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Revealed Theology

Revealed theology is the study of God through means of special revelation, which, as we defined before, refers to cases where God has deliberately chosen to reveal himself to humanity. Special revelation can come in many forms and it is not always clear what counts as a case of special revelation versus general revelation. Typical forms such as prophets, visions, scripture or prayer are held up as examples of special revelation, but, equally, others have questioned whether the Bible is an example of special revelation considering it is written by human authors and is not necessarily the literal word of God.

The broad distinction between revealed and natural theology was mainly formed by issues about the state of human nature at the moment of the Fall were at the heart of the debate. On the one hand, the Catholic Church upheld the importance of human reason and tradition. On the other hand, the Reformist movement viewed many traditional Catholic arguments as flawed. They argued that greater priority had to be given to revealed theology, as exemplified in the Bible. This view to some extent still exists today. You might note that more evangelical Protestant movements emphasise special revelation for guidance, whereas many modern liberal Christian denominations emphasise natural theology and revealed theology.

Nevertheless, it is rare to find Christian believers who do not emphasise the importance of the free gift of God's grace through Jesus Christ, among other means, is held up as the special revelation for Christians and is generally viewed as the foundation of the faith. This view leads to some issues. Compared to general revelation, special revelation may only be available to some people and to varying degrees. For example, only some people will have religious experiences in their lifetime, while others might simply rest their faith on readings of scripture. This has led to the distinction between **immediate** and **mediate** revelation. The former is where God has revealed himself directly to a person, for instance, through visions – whereas the latter is where people gain revealed knowledge through the Bible or hearing the words of prophets.

But could religion rest on revealed theology alone? This is a difficult question to answer. As has been pointed out, to hold revealed theology as of primary importance is to grant any of the information we receive from our senses or rational capacities. This means one must have a belief in the truth of this account of creation, even if it disagrees with the knowledge gained from science. Such a position is often called **fideism**, the idea that belief in the existence of God is justified on faith alone. A very strong commitment to revealed theology is often aligned with this position. However, there are various issues with believing that faith itself is wholly sufficient for belief.

Nevertheless, as we examined in the section on natural theology, there are thinkers who have argued for the primacy of revealed theology. Here there is a strong interpretation that human capacities have been so readily damaged by the Fall it is simply folly to prioritise natural theology. For such theists, it is only the freely given grace of God, revealed at moments of special revelation, can give true knowledge of his being and nature. Calvin, for example, states in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* that 'man now experiences God either as Father or as Author of salvation, or favourable in a mediator comes forward to reconcile him to us'. It is this position we will probe through the next section.

Faith and Grace

Why is faith so central to special revelation? One part of the answer lies at least in the nature of the truths of special revelation themselves. In the last section, we noted how Calvin argued that natural theology could give no truth or knowledge about God the redeemer. What special revelation offers in terms of knowledge and how it is received is often opposed to what appears rational. Beliefs and ideas regarding salvation or moral teachings are arguably not self-evident, and a voluntary assent to these ideas requires moving beyond evidential certainty and into the realms of faith. Moreover, for figures such as Calvin, faith necessarily has to be understood through Christ. It is when human beings voluntarily accept salvation

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



through Christ and cultivate faith in their lives that they become assured of his guidance. The amount of rational reflection as such can lead one to understand Christ as the redemptive God.

Yet putting faith on a pedestal here is a controversial proposition. Many theologians typically held that reason and faith are reconcilable. While there are some elements that require faith, they do not have to rest on faith alone and can be reasonable on philosophical grounds. For example, Thomas Aquinas famously distinguishes faith from *scientia*, the matters of everyday experience of the outside world. What Aquinas maintains is that these matters of the world are not in conflict with Christian belief. So the creator not only can be observed but also granted human beings rational capacity so they could learn particular truths about God through reflection. This means that the truths revealed by sources of special revelation may be confirmed by reason, not refuted. However, it is not clear on further examination whether it is reason which leads to knowledge of God.

However, proponents of revealed theology may point to a further issue in this debate. God's **grace** in special revelation, for while God might be able to be partially understood through the natural world if it bears signs of his creation, special revelation involves the free communication of truth to human beings. For those who favour revealed theology, this is a clear sign of its divine origin. It is considered in light of the **Trinity**. Most Christians hold that special revelation has involved the mutual work between God and the **Holy Spirit**, which allows God to be immanent in a way that human beings can understand. For example, the Catechism of the Catholic Church states that 'God [has] made man with his own breath and impressed his own form on the flesh [and] fashioned, in such a way that man might bear the divine form' (704). This implies that the natural capacities of human beings are the power of the Holy Spirit, and that natural knowledge may be the result of God's grace.

Nevertheless, it can still be questioned whether grace necessarily has to be understood in this way. Many Christians hold that the Holy Spirit is present at all times and works through the natural world. The Catechism of the Catholic Church also states that 'God [has] made man with his own breath and impressed his own form on the flesh [and] fashioned, in such a way that man might bear the divine form' (704). This implies that the natural capacities of human beings are the power of the Holy Spirit, and that natural knowledge may be the result of God's grace.



Scripture, Church and Revelation

One significant aspect to special revelation you might have already picked up on in previous parts is the role of scripture. Within revealed theology, the Bible is not just a historical document but a witness to God's actions in the world. It reveals his actions through the person of Christ as well as the wisdom of other prophets and writers inspired by the Holy Spirit. This means that not only does scripture potentially reveal knowledge beyond that of reason and observation but also that it is the primary source by which the key teachings of Christianity are revealed. Therefore, much research is done on how the Bible is a unique case of special revelation, and one's interpretative approach influences the position it holds in respect to other forms of revelation and knowledge.

This is a topic that will be covered in more depth in 3A: Christian Moral Principles, where we will explore whether a literal interpretation of the Bible is appropriate. However, human beings are not the only ones who evaluate its teachings in light of present-day knowledge. Those favouring revealed theology often argue for the former. Martin Luther famously argued for *sola scriptura*, contending that the Bible is the sole source of knowledge about God. He even went as far as to say that 'a simple layman armed with Scripture is as mighty as pope without it'. This emphasises the priority he gave to revealed theology over the teachings of the church.

On the other hand, other Christians argue the Bible naturally has to be interpreted in light of modern ethical and philosophical issues. The Catechism of the Catholic Church, for example, warns against a literal reading of the Bible, arguing that reducing the source of theology down to just the Bible is a reduction of the wealth of wisdom from figures inspired by God throughout history and restricting the teachings in light of modern ethical and philosophical issues. Such a position therefore

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



importance of natural theology in examining the Bible and accordingly grants other sources a greater level of significance. Under this view, while the Bible is still a vitally important source, prophets, it was written by authors bound to a particular time and place and so relevant to the extent of its message.

If this position is upheld, it grants the Church a significant level of importance, not just in natural theology but revealed theology also. It is the position of the Catholic Church that the Bible is not the sole source of revelation, but that during worship, the Bible is made manifest to human beings. This often marks out a key difference between the Catholic Church and Protestant Churches. The former believes that the Church, the traditions it upholds and scriptures are the primary source of the grace of God making its way into the world, whereas traditionally, under reformist principles, the Bible is the sole reflection of the Word of God. While most Protestants would not take this position, it is useful to contrast the two approaches. For special revelation encompasses not only the continuing life and work of the Church and its adherence to the Bible but the continuing life and work of the Church and its adherence to the Bible.

Jesus Christ and Revelation

There is one final important aspect of special revelation to cover and that is the role of Jesus Christ. Jesus is one of the most, if not the most, significant examples of special revelation. On Earth, he represents the most direct contact with God throughout human history. The Bible states that God has freely chosen to reveal himself to humanity as a whole. Therefore, for special revelation necessarily requires talk of Christ as the mediator by which God chooses to reveal himself. For it is by the Son and through the Holy Spirit that God communicates with humanity.

For example, Calvin argues that throughout the incarnation, Jesus Christ was God. However, what we understand is that Christ is also not a full revelation of God's being. Whatever is revealed is not necessarily follows the **principle of accommodation**, meaning God has to appear in a way that humans can understand. Therefore, God appears in human form and talks to people through the Bible, allowing them to partially discover knowledge about God. The redeemer, even if certain aspects of God are not able to be revealed. More specifically, Calvin argues that when human beings receive Christ, they receive a **double grace**. The first grace is that of **justification**, where God looks at the eyes of God through the Holy Spirit, seeing him as the Father and not simply as a judge of human beings. The second grace is that of **sanctification**, whereby human beings open themselves up and become good in the eyes of God according to the will of God.

Why is this double grace important? Well, it signifies that revealed knowledge of God is given to God to human beings regardless of their actions. It is freely given to those who are open to the true recognition of Jesus Christ as the mediator of salvation. Simply put, one could receive the redeemer without recognising Christ also. Therefore, salvation is exclusively open to those who are open to receive God's grace outside of the Christian faith.

Throughout history, most Christian denominations have maintained this role for Christ. However, as we noted in the last part, there are potentially ambiguities in how the Bible is given by revealed theology. Like scripture, there is debate as to whether the figure of Christ in history requires consistent reflection. Whereas Calvin and other reformers tended to see special revelation was given through the coming of Christ and his testimony, the Catholic Church places the responsibility of Christians to engage with and live this revelation through the Bible, similar to the role of scripture in special revelation. Catholic teaching holds that the Bible is not the sole source of revelation in this process. For example, the Catechism of the Catholic Church states that while the revelation was completed in Christ, 'it is not yet completely explicit'. This supports the idea of the Church as being the 'living word' of Christ, responsible for continuing the ministry of Christ into the present through the Bible and the Holy Spirit. Therefore, it is important to note that, similar to scripture, the Bible is not the sole source of revelation. Therefore, it is important to note that, similar to scripture, the Bible is not the sole source of revelation. Therefore, it is important to note that, similar to scripture, the Bible is not the sole source of revelation.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Alvin Plantinga and Reformed Epistemology

One standard philosophical argument levelled against revealed theology is that it is for prioritising matters of faith over reason in comparison to natural theology. However, in religion Alvin Plantinga contrarily argues that natural theology itself cannot give rise to belief in God when one can always doubt the veracity of the senses or reason. For natural theology cannot by itself accommodate Christian ideas such as grace, it cannot justify religious teaching!

Therefore, under what is now termed **reformed epistemology**, Plantinga puts forward attempts to justify revealed theology on its own terms. He develops Calvin's idea of the notion that there is a general religious sense among human beings, to contend that properly basic knowledge refers to the kind of statements or propositions that are sensibly doubted. For example, our ordinary perceptions of the outside world are general as we do not regularly doubt them unless there is good reason. Plantinga argues that the fundamental knowledge of God's existence. However, this is only true for the Christian. The damage to the religious sense from the Fall means that without accepting the presence of Christ, basic knowledge of God cannot be held or appreciated.

This is quite a controversial claim. In essence it states that the religious person is justified in their beliefs that the atheist cannot possess, and one common criticism is that this idea of 'basic knowledge' can be applied to any strongly held, inaccessible beliefs. For example, Satanists could argue that the Devil is properly basic and only by accepting the Devil into one's life can it be revealed. This is criticised by various religious denominations. The Catholic Church sees such ideas as problematic and argues that reason and other sources of authority are essential in moderating any claims about God that human beings hold.

Is Faith a Sufficient Reason for Believing in the Existence of God?

Throughout this section we have looked at both natural and revealed theology, examining how they might lead to different views about God and the pitfalls of each. However, a key philosophical question during this is to what extent do humans possess or rely on the ability to observe and reason. If one is a strong advocate for revealed theology, it might be tempting to suggest that humans fundamentally cannot rely on their senses or reason. Both are corrupted by the Fall and fallible beliefs should not take precedence over the knowledge that God has freely granted to humanity through his grace. On the other hand, it can also be suggested that these observations have led to a vast array of knowledge not directly granted by God, and that as beings in his image, he also gave them the natural capacities to arrive at knowledge. Both positions have their merits and both to a degree are supported by biblical evidence.

So choosing one is not necessarily a case of weighing up the philosophical advantages. Christians now simply support a mix of both natural and revealed theology, using both to form a balanced and accurate conception of God that still draws on faith as a necessary part of receiving grace. Yet, at the same time, there is something arguably decisive about special revelation leading towards a belief in God purely dependent on faith. Whatever your choice, it is necessary to acknowledge what philosophical weaknesses there are with both natural and revealed theology and to worship and come to belief in God in the context of everyday lives. For an outside or secular perspective, it is reflective of how belief and faith are viewed from within.

Activity:

Do you believe natural theology or revealed theology is a better way of acquiring knowledge? For your exercise, take the other side and write down three ways in which you would criticise it.

Quick Quiz

1. What is the difference between natural theology and revealed theology?
2. What is the *sensus divinitatis*?
3. Name two ways that a person might arrive at knowledge of God through natural theology.
4. What is the principle of accommodation?
5. What is believed to have damaged the human ability to discover God using only reason?
6. What is the difference between mediate revelation and immediate revelation?
7. What is the theological position which claims that belief in God can be justified by natural theology?



INSPECTION COPY



INSPECTION COPY



INSPECTION COPY

INSPECTION COPY

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



2B: THE PERSON OF JESUS C

What you will learn in this section:

Christian teachings and ideas regarding the person of Jesus Christ, including:

- Jesus as the Son of God, with reference to his miracles, resurrection and self-
- Jesus as a teacher of wisdom, with reference to his moral stances on repentance and motivation.
- Jesus as a liberator and whether this role is best understood in a political or spiritual context.
- Whether any of these roles are more important than the others and their relationship to each other.

Starter Activity



Read the Sermon on the Mount (excerpt Matthew 5:17–48) and the Sermon on the Plain (excerpt Luke 6:1–49). What differences do you note in their comparative presentations of Jesus? Note these as you progress throughout this section.

Introduction – The Different Faces of Jesus

Jesus is an inordinately iconic figure across the religious world. However, in the modern world, where secularism and spirituality, it is easy to forget that Jesus was a historical figure, whose life as a human being is recorded in the Gospels by a number of different authors. In this respect, the study of Jesus is not a matter of faith, but of historical enquiry. In fact, the last century in particular has seen a variety of approaches to the **historical Jesus**, as many different thinkers attempt to get to the bottom of not only who he was, but also the meaning of his words and actions in the cultural milieu of first-century Judea.

This does not mean that the historical Jesus is a separate figure from the divine Jesus. As we shall see in the first part of this section, there are various titles used for Jesus to signify his relationship with God, and any historical account of the life of Jesus has to bear in mind these various aspects. What is potentially more important is the various other faces of Jesus. There is Jesus as the **teacher of wisdom**, who imparted important moral and spiritual teachings to his followers. If that is not enough, there is also Jesus as a **liberator**, who offered a way to escape their spiritual and political bondage under the Roman occupation. Which of these particular aspects to Jesus' identity are more important than others is up to you to decide. The knowledge about Jesus is contained within the New Testament, and there are few other sources. Therefore, any number of competing arguments can be formed as to his true identity. This will be the focus of the study in the upcoming parts of this section.

Discussion Activity:

How have you traditionally viewed Jesus as represented in the Bible? Discuss your views with your peers in pairs or small groups and see where you might have an incomplete or misleading understanding of Jesus in the Gospels.

Jesus as Son of God

Jesus as the Son of God is perhaps the most enduring title he has occupied throughout history. It is generally regarded as one of the most important titles given to Jesus through the affirmation of the intimate and often uniquely relationship between Jesus and God. It is a confirmation of his divinity and his authority over all aspects of human life. Yet it is one of the most contested titles in the Gospels for it occupies a far-from-simple place. Jesus himself never referred to call himself the Son of Man. As such, in the early Christian era, the Father (pater) and his relation to Christ as Son were the subject of an uncounted number of debates, with many positions eventually being branded heretical. It is now generally accepted that the unique, co-substantial, divine Son of God that has emerged triumphant in modern Christianity is the result of a long and complex process.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



Part of the difficulty with assessing the title lies in the Gospels themselves. Although Jesus directly refers to himself as the Son of God, especially in the Synoptic Gospels, the relationship between Jesus and God is regularly stressed. Now this could mean a number of things, and there have been suggestions throughout history that Jesus is just a messenger or was infused with divine power at baptism, but the divine power Jesus wielded, along with his direct communication with God, evidently support the idea that Jesus himself was altogether divine, even if he only became so at the end of his lifetime. It is worth giving an overview of this before we progress to the next section about the nature of Jesus and the kind of self-knowledge he possessed.

The Gospels and Jesus' Divinity

Giving an overview of the divine aspect of Jesus' life from the Gospels is a very tricky task. The Gospels themselves are dedicated to revealing this part of his life! So, to a certain extent, the actions and words of Jesus are intended to establish his special relationship with God. For example, moments such as Jesus' baptism and Transfiguration, God calls down from the heavens to affirm his son. In other passages, such as the 'I am' sayings in the Gospel of John, Jesus is seen to assert aspects of his personality. The same is true of other characters, such as the centurion who, in witnessing the death of Jesus and the tearing of the temple curtain, exclaims 'Truly this man was altogether, witnesses to the divinity of Jesus are very common throughout the Gospels. Each particular reflects key moments where this divinity is asserted.

Nevertheless, there is a variety of other sources of evidence for the divine nature of Jesus. One source are the miracle accounts, where the power Jesus wields over nature is presented as something beyond human capability. An example is Mark 6:47–52, where Jesus walks on water and calms the winds, recalling the power of God in Genesis. Other instances include the various healings Jesus performs as well as his authority in the Gospel of John. Such powers were generally thought an authority to be only possessed by God in Jewish tradition, and so these various miracles were thought to verify Jesus' relationship with God. However, perhaps the most important miracle is the resurrection. For many Christians, the resurrection is proof of the divine nature of Jesus, and it will be discussed in more detail later in this section.

Jesus' Humanity and Divinity

One key question that emerges when examining Jesus' divinity is how this aspect of his life fits with his more human elements. At various points in the Gospels, Jesus' humanity is emphasized, such as suffering on the cross, or through moments in which he feels tired or emotional. Yet, these such human aspects to his personality seem out of place. Would a divine being feel such human aspects? This creates a fundamentally a tension behind Jesus' divine and human aspects that is still discussed today. One of what is known as **Christology**, the study of the relationship between Jesus and God. The Council of Nicaea in 325 asserted the full divinity of Jesus, but the tension between the earthly life of Jesus is still a controversial issue.

Importantly, how Christological questions are answered often depends on the approach taken. Some represent what is often called **Christology from above**, which focuses on the divine nature of Jesus and its significance for humanity when examining scripture. Conversely, **Christology from below** focuses on Jesus first, drawing out his teachings and messages before asking questions of divinity. The latter way of deciding which approach is more suitable for many theologians. On the one hand, focusing on the divine nature of Jesus can easily lead to misrepresentation of the earthly, human aspect of his life. On the other hand, focusing on his human nature can obscure the theological ramifications of his person.

What is key to understanding the tension between reconciling how Jesus viewed himself and God in the Gospels is his divine nature. While it is clear in scripture that Jesus did enjoy privileged access to God, it is less transparent whether Jesus saw himself as divine. This has become known as the **filioque** and will be the focus of the next part of this section.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Jesus' Knowledge and Wisdom

If Jesus was truly the Son of God, it is a fair question to ask to what extent he was aware of his divinity. A divine being would surely be thought to be omniscient and knowledgeable about their own divinity, yet the Gospels paint a less-than-clear picture of Jesus' self-awareness. For example, in Mark 5:30, Jesus is seemingly ignorant of touching his cloak in order to receive healing, but this ignorance would be strange for a divine being. It seems here either that Jesus is pretending to be ignorant or that such ignorance is by Jesus' divine knowledge. Conversely, in Luke 9:41, where Jesus heals a blind man, it is an example of Jesus possessing a full understanding of his divine nature, with the intent to restore the blind man's sight in order to allow him to witness the true divinity of Jesus. There are key biblical passages that raise questions about how Jesus' divine and human natures co-existed and how Jesus' self-knowledge related to the dimensions of his own divinity.

There have been many solutions to this issue proposed throughout history. Medieval theologians suggested that the divine knowledge Jesus held was simply different from his human knowledge. This is simply not a case where divine knowledge is pertinent as it concerns material circumstances. Such as the 'I am' sayings in John, Jesus is referring to an aspect of himself that does not relate to human knowledge. However, this risks being a little arbitrary since anything could be classified as divine knowledge if one desired. The issue is not discerning what Jesus should know at a given time, but understanding how Jesus' divine self-knowledge should be framed considering his human nature.

Karl Rahner, the Catholic theologian, gives a more nuanced solution to this issue. He suggests that Jesus was being possessed consciousness in such a way that his awareness of his divinity was not always overt. This means that whatever self-knowledge Jesus had of his divinity, it was not overtly accessible at all times. Instead, it was a deeper recognition of God's power working through him in such a way that it was not always available. We can contrast Rahner's account here well with ordinary human experience. Through our limited capacity, we often have an understanding of things they cannot immediately recall or summon. We may have a language or distant memories about a historical event. In a similar fashion, Jesus possessed a deeper knowledge of his divinity but it was not always available at certain moments.

Rahner's solution is a nuanced one but we can still question why Jesus' divinity was manifested in such a way that it was not overt and able to be accessed at any point? One response is that if Jesus' humanity would be non-existent. In order for his divine and human natures to co-exist, both have to be fully present. This was also the problem with early formulations of the Trinity by the Church, which sometimes pictured Jesus as a wholly divine, omniscient being, regardless of his human persona in the Gospels. What is key, therefore, in talking about Jesus' self-knowledge is not to simply develop theological responses to specific instances in the Gospels but to develop a framework that explains the radical way that human and divine natures interacted in his person.

Miracles

In investigating Jesus as Son of God, we can also delve a little more deeply into the miracles and how they exemplify Jesus' divinity, for while it is undeniable that the miracle accounts in the Gospels play an important role in understanding the divinity of Jesus and his relationship to God, they also have deeper meanings that it is useful to appreciate. For instance, many biblical scholars emphasise the highly symbolic nature of many of Jesus' miracles. The healing miracles, in particular, recall the prophecies of the Old Testament that reinforce the idea that Jesus' unique relationship with God as the culmination of the messianic line. Scholars, such as N.T. Wright, identify the healing miracles as exemplifying Jesus' power over the socially marginalised, his intimate relationship with God, thereby symbolising the authority he possesses to bring together disparate figures into a new spiritual community. What the miracles therefore point to is not just the divine power Jesus possesses but the nature of his relationship with God and how Jesus encourages humanity to act.

INSPECTION COPY

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



However, it is also possible to question the authenticity of the miracle accounts. The highly symbolic nature of the miracles in the Gospels potentially suggests there is authorial editing involved in order to fit Jesus' actions into older prophecies and events. At least at first glance, it is difficult to tell what the genuine intention behind a miracle act was and what the Gospel authors interpreted it to be. As such, it may be a step too far to suggest miracles uphold a unique relationship between Jesus and God.

In fact, in many modern liberal forms of Christianity, the literal significance of many of the miracle accounts has been downplayed in favour of analysing them in relation to Jesus' moral teachings. This is in part due to secular criticism. David Hume famously argued that it is always more reasonable to believe that a report or testimony is wrong than to believe that nature has been broken. However, it is also due to further criticism of miracles in the Gospels. It is important to note that there is no fixed word for 'miracles' as actions are generally referred to as 'mighty works' or 'signs', and they are often contrasted with misleading 'wonders' performed by false prophets of the time. In an important sense, miracles are performed to show the divine power or strength Jesus possesses but rather to open up the possibility of God invested in their moral and spiritual lives. If this is the case, the idea that miracles are potentially less important than the teachings they impart.

The Resurrection

Although, as a whole, it is possible to interpret Jesus' miracles as teachings rather than events, the resurrection stands apart in this respect. While much doubt has been cast upon miracles in general, most Christians hold that at least the final event of the Gospels, the resurrection, is true for a number of reasons. The first is that the resurrection of Jesus is seen as central to the Christian relationship with God; it is the most groundbreaking and miraculous affirmation of Jesus' ministry and the beginning of a **new covenant** between human beings and God. The resurrection is perhaps the one truly unique event within the Christian faith. Many religions claim where their spiritual leaders healed individuals or wielded power over nature, but Christianity possesses a number of dimensions not present in other major religions.

This notion is supported by scripture. In 1 Corinthians 15:13–15 St Paul states that if Jesus is dead, all his teachings and life would be in vain. It is the resurrection that guarantees the truth of Jesus' ministry and backs up the claims throughout that Jesus is divine and/or has divine power. Yet the uniqueness of the resurrection does not necessarily preclude a single interpretation. Some theologians, such as Wolfhart Pannenberg, claim the resurrection is the decisive event that 'visibly and unambiguously' revealed to God, they maintain that Jesus is still just a human being infused with divine power for the purposes of appearing once more before the disciples. Others, however, might see there might be good reasons to view the resurrection as evidence for Jesus as Son of God, affirming his innate divinity.

Was Jesus' Relationship with God Unique?

Throughout this section we've looked at various aspects of the Gospels which can be used to argue for Jesus' divinity. Yet, at each juncture, we've also noted ways in which doubt might be cast on the divine nature of God title. For all the various miraculous events contained in the Gospels, there is still a range of views on Jesus' identity. These range from questioning the human and divine aspects of Jesus to criticising miracles themselves as evidence of divinity, especially in light of modern scientific understanding. As such, it may be that although a literal reading of the Bible supports a divine account of Jesus, other aspects may prove more important if one takes a more holistic perspective of the various stories and teachings.

In fact, the issues surrounding the nature of Jesus' divinity are far from modern. From the early Christian Church, various different parties around the ancient world debated the nature of Jesus' relationship with God. For example, in AD 325 the First Council of Nicaea was convened to address the Arian controversy, a conflict over the remarks made by a priest, Arius, who had

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Father begat the Son, he must have created him. This suggests that Christ was not himself but instead a lesser divine or human person who had a beginning. At the Council of Chalcedon in AD 451, the orthodox view that the Father and the Son are of the same substance (homoousios) was affirmed, rejecting the Arian heretical and the Nicene Creed, a document formed by the members of the council.

A similar controversy led to the formation of the Council of Chalcedon in AD 451. The bishop Nestorius, who had argued that there were two separate natures in Christ, together in one will. However, another bishop, Cyril of Alexandria, criticised this proposal as it was adopted by God rather than being co-created with him. This led to Nestorianism being condemned. The proposal put forth that Christ possessed both a truly divine and a truly human nature.

Yet, as you have seen, in these conflicts, simply declaring one position to be correct doesn't really address the underlying philosophical issues. As such, debate has continued over whether Jesus had what can be called a **unique** relationship with God, or simply argued for the unique side, Jesus had a relationship with God that no other human being the privileged sole messenger of God or simply being God himself. There are two positions, however. One is that calling Jesus the unique messenger of God denies the possibility that other religions may have of God. It places Jesus at the centre of all religious thought, a position which is hard to hold up unless one places absolute faith in his message. The second is that a claim to uniqueness is simply a claim to divinity. While the Gospels suggest that Jesus was divine, this does not preclude the existence of other divinely inspired individuals. Furthermore, it suggests that the connection Jesus had with God cannot be replicated, rather than a future union which all human beings can aspire to.

John Macquarrie nonetheless presents quite a distinctive argument for a unique relationship with God. He argues that any claim of uniqueness is justified not just when looking at the Gospels, but when looking at the entirety of Jesus' life, influence and place in history. Therefore, taking small moments of his life such as the baptism to justify a unique relationship is not sufficient, but not so when one notes the defining moment for humanity as a whole that the Gospels present. Therefore, for Macquarrie, Jesus is not simply another prophet. The revelations given to him through their own unique trajectory through human time and space that has not been repeated throughout history. His continuing impact in the present day is a continuation of the testament of his unique relationship Jesus had with God.

Although Macquarrie's argument is forceful here, it is also a little high-minded. If a relationship with God is bound to be unique due to the vast number of contingent facts about their lives, then the relationship to God could be argued to be unique, and, while this doesn't invalidate the argument, it perhaps does render them less meaningful than initially supposed. A more grounded argument comes from E P Sanders, who simply puts forward that it is impossible to know whether a relationship with God is unique simply from analysing the historical evidence in the Gospels. In fact, 'unique' relationship is a matter of faith rather than a reasonable argument. Taking the Gospels, the various miracles and mighty events of Jesus' life make him a person of unique significance, nothing more.

Sanders' argument here displays a clear priority of a **Christology from below** approach, which emphasises **Christology from above**. As we noted at the beginning of this section, the way in which Jesus' identity potentially greatly influence how his divinity is depicted and so it is important when evaluating a title such as Son of God. There are myriad interpretations which lean towards the idea that Jesus' life to be more important than the others. However, in the next part we will explore the idea of an **element of Jesus' ministry** which perhaps emphasises the importance of his human nature, the **of wisdom**.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Gerard O'Collins and Jesus' Self-knowledge

O'Collins deeply analyses the issues around the nature or kind of self-knowledge that it is impossible to give a satisfactory answer to the questions they pose. The forward. The first is noting the natural difficulty in investigating any person's inner gleaned from outwards words and actions, it is hard to know even while a person consist of. The second reason is that in the case of Jesus there is no written text left after his death. All we have to go on is 'reports' and accounts of his ministry, time after it had ended.

Therefore, O'Collins argues that questions about self-knowledge don't really have analysis of consciousness would have to not only have a more detailed understanding of workings of mind than available today but also significantly more sources about nature of consciousness is different from that of straightforward knowledge, and aware of himself as divine or divinely inspired then it would be an awareness that pattern of thought we can easily identify in other human beings.

Nevertheless, O'Collins does state that it is possible to determine at least a basic contends it is clear that Jesus, in knowing he had a special or unique relationship salvation, would have had some natural intuition about his divinity. It is deeply to undertake his ministry without it. Therefore, Jesus' self-knowledge might not awareness of a divine presence within himself but it would have at least held an of the relationship between himself and God.

Jesus as Teacher of Wisdom

In the theological frenzy that comes with discussing the nature of Jesus' divinity and role Jesus has as a teacher of wisdom can get lost along the way. In fact, even a cursory reveals many figures who are reckoned as saints simply due to the timeless knowledge brought into public discussion. Such a line of thinking can also lead to a much. Perhaps the key to understanding his life doesn't lie in identifying some unique or the impact Jesus had upon individuals' moral and spiritual lives. If Jesus were or found him in a position to impart knowledge of God, then this surely is the most?

Throughout scripture, this role certainly isn't played down. The bulk of the Gospel recounting the various universal spiritual and moral truths Jesus taught in the form of sayings. Often he is referred to by followers as a 'Rabbi', a term generally applied to and respected, signifying that above all Jesus was a figure of wisdom. However, the numerous different interpretations, for while liberal Christians might view Jesus' role regardless of the nature of his person, many more orthodox Christians would reckon such importance is because Jesus is divine. There is a continual risk that examining Jesus as teacher once again becomes another debate about his divinity. However, through apart a number of key teachings proposed by Jesus and examine how they can be used to answer questions about his relationship with God.

Repentance and Forgiveness

The Gospels, as per their name, present the 'good news' to those who are reading about the coming of the Messiah and the possibility of salvation for all those who hear his message. Yet, it is important to identify what the core of this message is, and, for theologians, **Repentance** is the fundamental means by which human beings come to be adopted within the Christian faith. A central part of Jesus' message throughout his ministry is that human beings are not the ultimate judges of each other's lives. They are only belonging to God. Therefore, it is the duty of all human beings to help those who have whatever vices or bad actions they had in the past and concentrating on living the

This has some important ramifications. The first is that there is no particular spirit to Jesus' message in the Gospels. All human beings are capable of repenting and change. The theme is that Jesus' followers were not just the rich or educated. His message reached the typically marginalised in society at the time, such as sinners, tax collectors or those without automatic purity, cleanliness or virtuous living but on a willingness to change in their lives.

Yet this also requires a parallel duty from human beings, and that is the **forgiveness** of others. If we can repent, it is necessary for them to forgive the sins and wrongs committed against them. We must not hold grudges against those they perceive to have wronged them. These dual duties of forgiveness and repentance mirror the goodness of God as judge and forgiver. Individuals display forgiving attitudes in their lives and too will be forgiven by God. This can be seen in Luke 15:11–32, the parable of the Prodigal Son. In this parable, a father has two sons, one who is hard-working and one who is lazy and wasteful. The lazy son becomes destitute. While the hard-working one thrives, the lazy son returns home in poverty and asks to come back to his father for help. His father, on seeing his son return, forgives his past actions, much to the chagrin of his harder-working brother.

The main thrust of this parable is detailing the radical nature of Jesus' teachings. In the parable, one's instincts might be to typically reject the lazy, destitute son. However, the father exemplifies the forgiving attitude required of Christians. The father's instincts, is simply happy the destitute brother has returned and can be in their lives. The parable makes clear the difficult psychological requirements of Jesus' teachings. The son's brother, who has lived his life well, is resentful of the treatment of his prodigal brother. The parable is meant to present a moral truth that is somewhat hard to stomach. The process of **metanoia** (repentance) and forgiveness of sins are hard, complex processes that require time and effort at all stages.

Reversal and the New Covenant

The presentation of the quite radical teachings of repentance and forgiveness in the last part gives pause for thought about the nature of Jesus' message. Most notably, we can ask whether Jesus envisioned himself as creating a new religious system of thought or whether he saw himself as a continuation or amendment of previous Jewish teaching. This is a question we won't look at in too much detail but that is essential in understanding Jesus' role as a teacher, as well as his potential role as a liberator, which we study later in this section.

Throughout the Gospels, the idea of **reversal** is a consistent theme. Reversal here means the overturning of expectation and is used in a variety of ways. In Luke, for example, reversal is often used in the sense of the reversal of fortunes, where the poorest and most marginalised face riches in heaven while those who were rich face punishment in hell. However, reversal can also apply to Jesus' moral teachings. To the extent Jesus sought to overturn Jewish tradition versus simply reforming it in light of new insights, it is important as it reflects the kind of teacher Jesus envisioned himself as. Was he a messenger of wisdom that had been lost throughout history?

Part of the Gospels seems to emphasise the former. A key passage we can examine is the Sermon on the Mount where Jesus, having given the Beatitudes, overturns Jewish law. Now the scene for this teaching is already a matter of interest. Prior to Jesus' teaching, Moses ascends a mountain, recalling how Moses in Exodus 19:1–17 led up Mount Sinai. This is a key moment in Jewish history, with Moses as a moral prophet in the same vein, especially in the Ten Commandments, only to elaborate on and overturn many of people's thoughts or actions. One important example is the overturning of a common view of justice at the time: 'an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth'. The Gospels present this kind of moral thinking as commonplace, and so Jesus' teaching has radical connotations. When Jesus argues individuals should 'love your enemies' and 'do not resist', it illustrates his later teaching that all human beings should 'love your enemies and persecute you'.

However, despite this overturning of preconceptions, there is equal reason to suspect that Jesus sought to subvert Old Testament teaching here. There is a key ambiguity where Jesus states

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



have come to abolish the law or the prophets; I have come not to abolish but to fulfil. For I say to you, until heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law or the prophets. But whomever you shall bind on earth, I will bind on heaven, and whatever you shall loose on earth, I will loose on heaven. But do not think that I have come to abolish the law or the prophets; I have come not to abolish but to fulfil. For I say to you, until heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law or the prophets. But whomever you shall bind on earth, I will bind on heaven, and whatever you shall loose on earth, I will loose on heaven.

fulfilment is not entirely clear but a reasonable interpretation may be that Jesus views the law as a summation of God's will, as partially realised in the teachings of other prophets. In this case, then the idea of reversal is more muted, referring to simply the expectations of Jewish law itself. Nevertheless, what is important is understanding that the teaching of Jesus is a new way of thinking for Christians but also part of a **new covenant**. 'Covenant' here means a promise where the life and death of Jesus give way to a new relationship between human and God. This includes certain rules, including the moral teachings presented by Jesus throughout his ministry.

Motivation and Purity

One of the typical criticisms presented against religious ethics is that the end of acting well is not to be to help others but to secure salvation. To some extent this is fair when discussing how religion is practised, but in the Gospels Jesus takes care throughout his ministry to discuss how his teachings should be implemented. One important aspect of this discussion is the kinds of motivation people should possess when acting well. Jesus is often disparaging about those he identifies as hypocritical, and one of the most common targets of his disdain were the Pharisees and religious authorities, who he accused of an obsession with observing religious customs and a failure to act from a place of moral goodness and purity. Therefore the criticisms Jesus presents of preconceived moral attitudes in the Gospels do not extend simply to outward behaviour but the very inner lives of those seeking to do God's will. If a person acts well just for the expectation of reward, they are not truly acting out of the right motivations.

This idea plays an important part throughout the various sermons Jesus gives. For example, on the Mount, in Matthew 5:48, Jesus commands that all who hear 'be perfect, therefore as your Father in heaven is perfect'. The implication of this is that one should be perfect for the sake of being good. Thus, one's motivations should always be in line with one's actions. Religious obedience but is about the right kind of intention someone should hold in their heart. The principle concerns **purity**. The Gospel portrays the Pharisees and religious leaders to the extent where they do not mix with the poor and marginalised for fear of contamination. This is a wholly false conception of purity. What matters most is that one's intentions are pure. Outward appearance or actions. Therefore, individuals who simply act to maintain religious laws are missing the point of those laws entirely, and that is to reflect a person who naturally seeks to help others and sacrifice one's fortunes for the betterment of humanity.

All these teachings naturally present a much more human aspect to Jesus but one who is reconciled with his divinity. Nonetheless, more liberal Christians on the whole prioritise the more divine roles, for the argument can be made when looking at Jesus' moral teachings that his moral teachings are much more important than religious devotion. If Jesus is correct in his criticism of the Pharisees, then many of the rituals practised by Christians should take a diminished place in religious practice. The ideas about repentance, forgiveness and purity that Jesus presents throughout his ministry lead to a vastly different perspective on Jesus; that of a **liberator**.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**

Discussion Activity:

To what extent do you think Jesus should be viewed as a moral teacher over more of a religious figure? Does a less theological perspective help to reconcile any scriptural conflict between the Gospels? Discuss in small groups.



John Hick and Demythologisation

John Hick is a Protestant theologian who holds some quite radical ideas about how Christianity should be viewed in relation to other religions. In his 1977 collection of essays, *The Myth of God*, he argues that Jesus' awareness of God is not unique and a similar relationship is seen across many other religions. Any claim that Jesus' relationship to God is unique, he contends, is simply an attempt to elevate his own religion above others, rather than a real reason for a philosophical proposition. A more reasonable solution instead is simply to view Jesus as one of many individuals perceiving God. Removing the idea of the incarnation is not a loss for Christian belief. He holds that if one sees religion metaphorically, one can appreciate many of the traditional theological issues presented in the Bible as up more productive relationships with other religions who claim prophets with similar experiences.

The natural consequence of such a view, as Hick puts forward himself, is that Jesus' power came from the power of his message and his engagement with the important moral and ethical issues of his time and humanity. The focus of Jesus' ministry becomes not his unique relationship with God but the insights he brings to human beings about their spiritual lives, insights that persist across cultures and time.

Hick in fact applies similar thinking to much of the Gospels, engaging in a process of demythologisation. This involves examining scripture from a scientific perspective, discounting the elements that are not in line with the knowledge of the world today and instead drawing out what can be considered as the core teachings (or are teachings). Through this myth-removing process, the idea is that not only is the truth about God's wisdom discovered, but one gains a clearer perspective on the relevancy of Jesus' teachings to modern human beings.

Jesus as Liberator

What do we mean when we call someone a liberator? Typically, there are two dimensions to this. First, that in order for someone to be liberated they must first have to gain some freedom from a state of oppression. While this could be a physical freedom, any liberation refers to more generalised forms of oppression or slavery. The second dimension involves the notion that the liberator has removed the constraints upon this freedom, such that those who have been liberated do not have to return to their previous state. If we take this definition as a starting point, we can still question whether Jesus was. What freedoms did he bring his followers, and what constraints did they leave behind?

The idea of Jesus as a liberator gained a lot of traction in the 1960s, especially with the rise of the Black Power movement. Brandon's *Jesus and the Zealots* and the rise of liberation theology in Latin America in the 1970s studied more extensively in Year 2 but, in short, liberation theology blended theology with social justice, arguing that the two are inseparable and encouraging a reading of the Bible which leaned towards the struggles of the poor. As part of this, the traditional belief in Jesus as an other-worldly, divine figure was challenged, much more human and political interpretation of his actions in defending the poor against persecution by the authorities of the time. The theory was that Jesus cannot be understood without his actions and words had particular political and social connotations at the time that he lived. Jesus was who was eventually killed for his radical beliefs.

However, naturally this interpretation has been resisted by more orthodox elements of Christianity. When they speak of liberation, it is typically in a more spiritual context, where Jesus liberates people from sin and a life without God. In the 1970s, the European Catholic Church often criticised liberation theology as the Bible as too narrow in scope for failing to accommodate the religious circles of the world. Nevertheless, it is true that, for many, the image of Jesus as a liberator is a powerful one. It is a figure in the everyday political and social struggles people face and is often popular. Many forms of Christianity are viewed to have failed to enact the material changes Jesus preached. Throughout the rest of this section, we will look at the various ways Jesus can be seen as a liberator, outlining the evidence for each one.

Jesus as a Political Liberator

It is often overlooked by modern Christian thought that during Jesus' life, Jewish people lived under Roman occupation. Although the presence of Roman soldiers and figures was tolerated on the whole, many individuals still looked to the day when a figure would liberate them from Roman rule and restore Jewish control of Judea. In fact, the idea of a 'Messiah' at the time could not be separated from these political expectations. While it would be important for them to be a religious leader, the Messiah would be the one to restore Israel to its former glory, and many religious thinkers were coming of this liberator. One particularly important group leading a resistance during this time was the Zealots. This was not a properly organised group of individuals but was a loose collection of violent resistance against the occupation.

As we've covered before, Jesus is regularly called Messiah throughout the Gospels. We have begun to question whether the use of this term carries the same political connotations as Jewish thought at the time. Some have even occasionally portrayed Jesus as closer to a spiritual man of peace. Whether this is true or not, the coming of Jesus did not fulfil the messianic expectations many Jewish people had during the first century. Although the Gospels of Mark, and potentially Matthew, were thought to be written prior to this date, and Jesus in some way fulfilled the political ideals of his followers.

There are many ways this can be observed in the Gospels themselves. Throughout his ministry, Jesus showed favourable dispositions towards the poor, sick and marginalised. This tendency is often referred to as the **preferential option for the poor** in modern theology. Yet this preference by itself does not make Jesus a political liberator. Many instead are forced to creatively interpret a number of passages in the Gospels against the historical background we have analysed so far. One key passage is the **mission statement**. Here, Jesus reads from Isaiah to the crowds gathered in the synagogue at the very early point in his ministry. Alongside his theological ideals, he proclaims that 'proclaim freedom for the prisoners and set the oppressed free'.

These are significant words, and typically in orthodox Christian thought these have been seen as Jesus fulfilling his role during his ministry. However, a more radical view is the idea that Jesus was bringing involves challenging the political orthodoxy of the time. In fact, the call to 'set the oppressed free' square with a purely theological reading of Luke, which often expresses strong theopolitical views. Liberation theologians as such have argued that to ignore this political dimension is to ignore its rightful place as a declaration of resistance to the social, religious and political status quo.

There are other passages in the Gospels which might support such a view of Jesus. For example, in Matthew 10:34, Jesus declares 'I did not come to bring peace, but a sword'. This statement has rightly been greatly discussed throughout the history of Christianity. It challenges Jesus' reputation as a person of peace. However, considering the mission statement, it is a reasonable reason to believe that Jesus viewed political resistance as involving more than words. It also comes to light when one considers the nature of Jesus' trial. When Jesus rides into Jerusalem (**triumphal entry**), the nature and form of his entry allude to the Messiah's entry. Scholars have pointed out the important connotations this would have for an audience familiar with Jewish expectations. Others have noted that Jesus was tried as King of the Jews, a crime against the Roman Empire, not a religious one. Although, as some theologians have argued, the High Priest who convicted Jesus where he had committed no crime, overlooks the political dimension, it is clear that Jesus was in fact a figure of political and social resistance.

However, this last example also sets up a competing explanation of Jesus as a liberator. The theory or engagement in the Gospels has led to equal speculation that Jesus might have been a political liberator instead of a political one. This is the idea we shall delve into within the next section.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



Jesus as a Religious Liberator

One other plausible possibility is that Jesus was more focused on liberating people from religious oppression than political. Many of the examples we examined in the previous part were noted to not always have clear political connotations, and required examining against the historical background of the conflict between the Jewish people of the first century and the occupying Roman authorities. Yet, conversely, there is plenty of evidence that Jesus challenged religious authorities. Whether it be the Pharisees, Sanhedrin or High Priests, Jesus often accused those in the hierarchy of being hypocritical and dishonest. Such opposition potentially explains why he was executed more reasonably than his political activities. If his teachings and message were the machinations of a religious elite at the time through liberation of ordinary people, it is on a good ground to take the passion narratives in the Gospels at face value.

There are many other Gospel passages which support this view. For example, in Matthew 23:38, Jesus predicts the Temple's destruction and claims to build a new one. While this is being false, it supports the idea that the religious authorities saw Jesus as a legitimate challenger. True considering how throughout the Gospels Jesus is unsparing in his criticism of the Pharisees and other religious figures. For instance, he lambasts the importance they give to tithing in Luke 18:12. In Matthew 23:13, he provides an especially damning challenge, stating 'woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you lock people out of the Kingdom of Heaven.'

From such declarations, the theologian Gerard O'Collins points out that the original intent of Jesus was not to challenge the religious rules that, in his view, prevented people from true reconciliation with God. But is this the same as ending religious rules? A difficult question, for although the religious rules may have been a theological nuisance, they were also preventing people from living fulfilled and healthy lives. If this is true then Jesus was not liberating people from a sinful religious life than from specifically religious oppression.

Nevertheless, there is other biblical evidence to suggest that people were to an extent bound by the orthodoxy of the time. Throughout his ministry, Jesus meets and shows preferential treatment to those typically marginalised by the more wealthy religious communities. For example, in Luke 10:25–37, Jesus draws out a moral teaching about generosity and compassion from a Samaritan as the upstanding protagonist, even though these individuals were often viewed as outsiders by Jewish orthodoxy. A more pressing example can be found at Mark 5:24–34, where Jesus heals a woman who had been bleeding for 12 years, a person who under the Torah would have been considered unclean and not to be seen with. This theme is often prevalent throughout the healings in the Gospels, where Jesus typically treats those who the religious authorities would not venture near. As such, there is evidence in the Gospels that not only are people prevented from reconciling with God through tradition, but the religious rules established by the authorities are also failing to protect the communities they oversee.

Liberation and Sin

It is worth briefly mentioning at the end of this section the more traditional theology of sin as a contrast to the other positions we have studied. The central idea behind this view throughout history is that Jesus' death on the cross was an act of atonement, liberating humanity from the original sin created by the Fall. This means that human beings are not only no longer bound by sin but also be granted a new freedom to reconcile with God and receive his grace. For Paul states 'for the wages of sin is death but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.' We have a clear presentation in many of the figures we have studied throughout the Gospels, such as Calvin, and the view of Jesus as liberator is very theology heavy, so much so that it threatens it.

As we have looked at different facets of Jesus, from his divine nature, to his roles as a teacher and liberator, we can see that the idea of Jesus one draws as much relies on one's pre-existing ideas of God and sin.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



The traditional view of liberation as referring to sin naturally draws on other orthodox concepts such as original sin, the Fall and atonement. Yet if one examines the Bible without relying on traditional interpretation, one is perhaps more likely to arrive at the ideas of Jesus as religious reformer. Moreover, if one interprets the Gospels in light of the historical context of first-century Palestine, it is even more difficult to ignore the importance of various forms of historical oppression. The poor and marginalised. Regardless, what is important to recognise is that there is potential for a liberating person of Jesus. There may be a number of different important characteristics that can be identified in significant ways, all of which should be taken into account when reading the Gospels.

Activity:

Research the life of Jesus and find three examples of passages in the Bible (not in the company of Jesus) where Jesus could be described as encouraging political or religious liberation. What is the view of Jesus as primarily a liberator?

E P Sanders and Jesus as a Reformer

E P Sanders is one of the main scholars of religion who argues that Jesus primarily was a reformer in Judaism rather than create a new religion. He contends that while the Gospels are narratively shown to be in opposition to the religious authorities, it is likely consistent with the attitudes at the time that Jesus was closer to Judaic traditions than is recognised. If this is the case, then Jesus may not be best cast as a liberator, as he may have sought to modify or renew Jewish law rather than break it. Sanders even suggests that the Gospels have embellished certain stories for dramatic effect, such as the Pharisees surprising Jesus, which can be reasonably doubted to be accurate.

Another important aspect Sanders highlights is that throughout the Gospel, Jesus is shown applying Jewish law, not the Pharisees. Figures such as the Pharisees simply do not understand the meaning and intent behind the law, and Jesus is often presented as a prophet rather than a reformer who stands outside them. Therefore, if Sanders is correct, Jesus is a reformer, not a liberator. A more nuanced than some have suggested, and a balanced portrait of Jesus in Jewish tradition and scripture is needed to accurately identify where and why Jesus is a political authority in the Gospel narratives.

Quick Quiz

1. What is the difference between Christology from above and Christology from below?
2. What is the question of Jesus' self-knowledge?
3. What title in the Gospels is typically used to refer to the divinity of Jesus?
4. What key section of Matthew involves Jesus giving many important moral teachings?
5. What does Jesus teach is of equal importance to the obedience of laws?
6. What is a liberator?
7. What is Luke 4:16–21 often called?

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



3A: CHRISTIAN MORAL PRINCIPLES

What you will learn in this section:

The various sources and forms of Christian ethics, including:

- Use of the Bible as the primary authority for Christian ethics and the principles it contains.
- The role of the Church and tradition in guiding Christian ethics principles.
- The importance of reason in evaluating Christian ethics and applying them to modern dilemmas.
- The role of agape love in governing Christian ethical practice and the theological basis of this concept.

Starter Activity



Do you think the Church should play a role in evaluating Christian ethical principles? Give three examples of ethical issues you believe support your view, and refer back to them when working through the section.

Introduction – How Should Christians Live?

Although centred around a common set of religious principles, the Christian community is a broad church. Each denomination, and even elements within these denominations, have different views on the right way to live, especially when it comes to modern-day ethical dilemmas. One of the central concerns of Christian ethics in this light is how to interpret the Bible. Although this is a complex issue, the guidance for any Christian, the kind of teachings one finds inside greatly depends on how one interprets it. Should one take its messages literally, or is there room to read between the lines in the light of depth of current human knowledge? These questions aren't easily answered and have been debated for centuries, with precedents set by earlier thinkers as they are by the thoughts of theologians today.

We can first make the distinction between **propositional** and **non-propositional** approaches to biblical ethics. The former holds that the Bible should be seen as direct revelation from God. This means that the moral teachings inside should be treated as direct messages sent by God to inform ethical practice. This approach is often associated with the Ten Commandments, which are fixed and inflexible. Irrespective of time or space, the same moral laws apply to all human beings. Non-propositional approaches, on the other hand, view the Bible as a collection of stories on biblical ethics. Instead, they generally view the Bible as accounts of individuals' lives and how they relate to concerns his birth, ministry and death, and the narratives given about the life of Jesus. This means that the moral teachings in the Bible are not seen as direct laws, but rather as a moral example whose virtues provide guidance for the right kind of character to have during ethical dilemmas. There are no hard and fast laws which the Bible propose.

It is possible to see immediately how this distinction raises more questions than it answers. While traditional approaches to biblical ethics often regard the inflexibility as a virtue; while others see it as a hindrance to one's life, it is possible for the Bible to provide a straightforward, honest answer to many ethical dilemmas. Many conversely argue this inflexibility is far from meaningful. Many modern ethicists argue that the Bible provides basic moral laws, and it is necessary to use one's reason and prior precedents to evaluate ethical dilemmas, a task that is perhaps only possible if one adopts a more subjective stance towards the Bible presents. It might even be that in some issues few laws or no laws what the Bible presents. It might even be that in some issues few laws or no laws what the Bible presents. It might even be that in some issues few laws or no laws what the Bible presents. It might even be that in some issues few laws or no laws what the Bible presents.

The Bible in Christian Ethics

It is very rare to find a Christian denomination or movement that does not draw upon the Bible for its principles and ethics. However, as we noted, the extent to which the Bible is held as the ultimate authority is a matter of theological debate, and many historical schisms in the Christian Church have arisen from disagreements about whether the Bible should be the ultimate, or even only, source of ethical guidance.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



who focus on it as authoritative typically argue in favour of **theonomous ethics**, the principles are determined by God's commands and that the only guaranteed source of text which documents the fashion by which God has revealed them to humanity. This has been the preserve of the Protestant Church. While many modern denominations have moved to accommodating other sources of ethics, the original reformist theologians held **scriptura**, the focus of this part of the section.

Sola Scriptura

We looked at sola scriptura briefly in the previous section when we examined special revelation, and there were some questions about how Christians can gain knowledge of God and the authority of the Bible. For Christians who hold to special revelation are likely to view the Bible as the primary source of knowledge of God and his commands. The doctrine of sola scriptura, meaning 'by the scripture alone', is a theological position, holding that the Bible is the sole authority in all matters of faith and practice. Those who endorse sola scriptura accordingly usually maintain that the Bible is infallible, meaning it possesses no errors, while a smaller subset of Christians put forward a **self-authenticating** view. This means that not only does the Bible contain no errors but it is self-evident to the rational reader and does not require any debate over the correct method of interpretation.

But what is the justification for such a view? Holding that the Bible is infallible or self-authenticating involves a number of additional assumptions, not all of which are necessarily reasonable. Considered biblical laws, such as the Ten Commandments in Exodus 20:1–17, should be seen as timeless and unchanging. If contents seem intuitively wrong or misguided in present-day contexts. Similarly, some Christians at least partially endorse the view that the writers of the Bible are not fallible authors but inspired secretaries or translators for what God has commanded, a view also known as **amanuensis**. Many Christians also cite passages such as 2 Timothy 3:16, which states 'all scripture is inspired by God and is useful for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness'. Other similar sentiments are found in 1 Peter 1:23, which puts forward that 'no prophecy of scripture is a matter of one's own interpretation, but as it came from God'. These verses suggest that at minimum the Bible is a wholly reliable source in all matters of faith and practice.

Yet there are also potential practical advantages to sola scriptura. One sometimes views the Bible as a source of moral authority that prevents the conceptual confusion found among denominations. The schism between the Protestant and Catholic Churches throughout the 16th century was caused by the various Catholic teachings and practices that were not seen to be supported by the Bible, such as purgatory or the selling of indulgences. Upholding the doctrine of sola scriptura in moral matters and there are less likely to be theological conflicts over extra-biblical sources of authority. However, there are reasons to suspect sola scriptura has its disadvantages also, which we will examine in the next section.

What's Wrong with Sola Scriptura?

As mentioned before, many modern Protestant denominations no longer uphold sola scriptura, moving to the weaker view of **prima scriptura**, which holds that the authority of scripture is primary but not exclusive. Only more fundamentalist or evangelical elements of Christianity tend to still press for sola scriptura, and there are a number of reasons why. The first is the potential impossibility of avoiding personal bias creeping in. It is clear that when interpreting a text a certain degree of personal bias and ideas is needed, and these draw on a person's own experience and beliefs. If this is the case, an argument against the Bible being self-authenticating emerges. However, if this subjective element is always present, then sola scriptura is difficult to uphold also, for interpretation always requires the use of reason and tradition to form a conclusion. Whether one believes in sola scriptura or not, one is always drawing on scripture alone in ethical matters, so the claim of sola scriptura as the sole source of authority is problematic.

This issue can be noted strongly in cases where the Bible itself seems to present conflicting accounts. For example, although the Gospels all present accounts of Jesus' life, they vary in style and content. The Gospel of John in particular stands apart from the Synoptic Gospels, presenting a much more detailed account of Jesus' life and teachings.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



account of Jesus' ministry compared to Matthew, who is transparently more concerned with Jewish scripture and tradition. There are also issues in the internal conflicts we have studied, the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew potentially shows Jesus overruling Old Testament commandments, making it difficult to decide how Exodus should be interpreted in the New Testament. Similarly, there are many rules and practices in the Old Testament that seem absurd, such as the rule against planting two crops in the same field in Leviticus 19:19.

In fact, a case can be made against sola scriptura from Jesus' words themselves. In the Gospels, Jesus warns against blind religious observance, criticising the Pharisees for focusing on the letter of the law rather than acting to help their fellow human beings. For many this is an indication that the Bible should not be treated as an infallible document and instead should be measured against other sources of authority, such as human conscience and common knowledge. So sola scriptura faces criticism from two angles: the first that it is not necessary when examining any religious text and the second that it is not a reliable source of authority. This does not mean that key ethical principles cannot be derived from the Bible, but that in order for these principles to be meaningful in modern ethical dilemmas, other sources of authority may prove just as important as the Bible itself.

Should the Bible be Viewed as Infallible?

This is a more difficult question that arises out of the debate on sola scriptura. Many Christian denominations are still reluctant to hold that the Bible could contain errors, often fearing that if they do, they might open the floodgates to a wealth of criticisms about its content. Many instead argue that careful and infallible reading is necessary to ensure its truths are not misinterpreted. In the light of the wealth of knowledge held in modern times, this position is under strain. In the current debate about what counts as an 'error', many of the biblical narratives concerning the Old Testament) can appear intuitively wrong, as we discussed in the last part. So some people may equally question the infallibility of Christian scripture.

In fact, many theologians deviate from the position held by Christian denominations. The Catholic theologian, Karl Barth, warned against regarding scripture as infallible. He argued that giving the status to the Bible risked idolatry, when only God himself can be accurately thought of as the keystone of faith. Barth's argument is a refashioning of Calvin's principle of accommodation: the Word of God could not be fully captured in any human language. Rather it can only be understood insofar as it is understandable to human beings, which means that it can never literally represent God as it is, but only as it is graspable by humanity. The Bible, Barth concludes, is best thought of as a witness to the accounts of people who have had first-hand experience of the grace and revelation of God.

Discussion Activity:

Should the Bible be viewed as infallible, or is there room for human reason when interpreting it? Discuss in pairs or small groups.

The Church and Reason in Christian Ethics

So, if the Bible is not the only source of authority, what other sources should we look to? Our discussion in the last part of this section neatly leads us onto the next, for in contrast to Protestant tradition, the Catholic Church has always endorsed the importance of reason and tradition in deriving Christian moral principles. Why is this the case?

Well, it must be noted that the Bible itself is not necessarily a first-hand account of Jesus' teachings. Much of the New Testament was written a number of decades after the death of Jesus. At the time, it is likely that his teachings were passed down through the Christian community via oral tradition and smaller writings. These very first years of the Christian community represent the early Church. Catholic tradition argues that its beliefs are rooted in the actions of these early Church fathers, a concept known as **apostolic succession**. This idea holds that the Catholic Church can trace back an unbroken line of authority from the apostles, meaning it holds a significant claim to being a true reflection of what was taught by Jesus.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Yet the Church in the Catholic tradition is also not a static entity, simply passing on the teachings of the earliest Christians. Instead, as the **living expression** of Jesus' message, it holds the authority of its teachings upon his teachings and ensuring they remain meaningful and relevant to modern times. The Church itself becomes a source of revelation for its followers, providing collective insight into the meaning of traditions that allow human beings to communicate with God. Importantly, there are no absolute commitments that support this authority given to the Church. The first, as expressed in the Catechism, is that interpretation of scripture is never objective. Its insights are rooted in history and the tradition of the Church to preserve but also translate for modern audiences. This process requires input from theologians if the Bible is to address modern ethical dilemmas. More vital, however, is the authority of Church and tradition such authority as the Church gives human reason itself authority. The Church believes that human rational capacities and the process of interpretation could never arrive at objective truth. As explored before, the Catholic Church regards natural theology as an important approach to understanding God and the world.

However, there is much more to say here, and throughout the next part of this section, we will explore ways Church tradition and reason can possess authority when it comes to matters of faith and morality.

The Role of Church and Tradition

It would be a mistake to say tradition does not play a role in nearly all Christian denominations. Since most Protestant Churches now maintain **prima scriptura** rather than **sola scriptura**, there is a lesser authority they grant reason and tradition to adjudicate matters the Bible does not easily address. However, the Catholic Church is a bit different: it holds that Church tradition itself is of equivalent authority to the Bible, calling it **sacred tradition**. The reasons for this are simple. As we noted in the introduction paragraph, the Catholic Church believes in **apostolic succession**, meaning that the teachings themselves are not developed in a vacuum. Rather, they reflect principles and ideas that have come from Jesus himself and been passed down by the apostles. To the Catholic Church, tradition is a continuing function of the Holy Spirit, which inspires new ways of understanding scripture and the world.

You will have encountered the consequences of sacred tradition many times throughout this course. The Catechism of the Catholic Church, which has been quoted often throughout this course, is a summary of many of the traditions and doctrines the Church has developed through centuries of teaching its followers with moral guidance on many different ethical and religious issues. Other denominations have their own statements. For example, the Anglican Church developed the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, which itself from the Catholic Church, even if they aren't completely adhered to by ministers. The Anglican Catechism at the back of the Book of Common Prayer provides an easy way to understand the practices of the Anglican Church. The difference at times between denominations is the importance different denominations give the traditions contained in these various texts.

But how are these texts formed in the first place? The process varies between denominations. Some have **synods** which meet to draw up new developments on Christian doctrine which address contemporary ethical concerns among their members. For the Catholic Church, great authority is vested in the body of the Bishops, Pope and Church Councils which is seen to provide authentic teaching in line with the Word of God. The Magisterium is the centre of ethical development for the Church and regularly gives guidance on new ethical issues, whether it be about abortion or contraception. Now, this does not mean that Catholics are necessarily required to adhere wholly to the decisions made by the Magisterium. The Catholic Church recognises the authority of reason and scripture, and it is true, though, that ordinary Catholics are required to follow the teachings of the Magisterium as an important source of moral authority in their life.

The same is true of other Protestant Churches but often to a lesser degree. Various levels of the Church to discuss religious and ethical issues, sometimes with official statements or resolutions accompanying their conclusions. For example, in the Anglican Church, the General Synod is the primary assembly and is primarily responsible for developing nationwide Church legislation.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



regional synods that take place to debate more local issues that do not necessarily. Importantly, everyday churchgoers are not required to hold up Church legislation in their lives, although it may prove useful for moral guidance. What is most important about this is that practising Christians engage with the Bible and its core teachings per prima

Nevertheless, the authority of the Church across most Christian denominations rests on ethics as fundamentally **communal**. Simply put, so long as one invests in the Church's authority, one is also engaging in a form of ethical authority that places less emphasis on individual inclinations. Instead, one is part of a wider community of Christians who contribute to a shared scriptural teaching and are willing to be bound to decisions about moral issues as a result. There are also elements of Christian teaching that seem to disavow this kind of communal thinking, according to which other sources of authority presents a more **personal** interpretation. One of these sources of authority is **reason**, and this potentially stands in tension with the Church and Bible as authoritative.

Reason and Natural Law

Reason itself as a concept is tricky to pin down. While we might ordinarily think of it as a means to achieve certain ends, the value of it as a faculty has often shifted throughout history. During the Enlightenment period it was seen as a thoroughly objective way of discovering truth, but modern-day perspectives often tend to be a bit more sceptical. Some critics have argued that reason is partially conditioned by one's own culture and circumstances. Alasdair MacIntyre, for example, argues that because rationality is always developed with tradition, the two are inseparable, meaning that there can be a corresponding idea of reason and rationality.

These philosophical quibbles may seem trifling against the larger theological background, but the question of whether reason is subjective to a degree is important when discussing ethics for it is still often seen as necessary in Christian ethics as a bridge between the world and the present-day ethical dilemmas. However, reason itself is not always objective and can lead to different conclusions, then this potentially affects its use and function in Christian theology. Some might well claim that use of reason shows that God himself is illogical, while the Catholic Church would see the exact opposite.

Understanding these issues also gives a certain flavour as to the role reason might play in Christian ethics. For example, approaches from reason may be both **communal** and **personal**, with individuals arriving at their own moral conclusions based upon the other sources of authority. Many religious thinkers have often argued that conscience itself is based upon reason, and if that is the case, of conscience one is simply intuitively recognising a situation where a moral law is at work. Therefore, there is a slight tension when it comes to analysing the place of reason in Christian ethics as churches and denominations provide their own doctrines on current social issues, often based on their reason and interpretation of scripture. However, reason itself may at times provide a clear direction for Christian ethics. Although an individual might subscribe to a denomination, their reasonable thought disagrees with some of its teachings.

For an example of this in action, we can look to the Catholic Church. In the Catholic view, natural law can be developed from reasonable analysis of the natural world, which reveals what is good and bad. The foundation for natural law comes from the idea that the world displays the marks of a Creator, and every living thing was created to possess a particular purpose by God and so the right way of living is derived from observation of natural behaviour and purpose, including human beings. Thomas Aquinas, the best-known Catholic philosopher of natural law and was responsible for developing Aristotle's ethical framework into a Christian one. Many of the ethical principles which underlie Catholic thought

Aquinas argued that reason is the primary characteristic that distinguishes human beings from other animals. Human beings to understand the will of God as well as rationally act upon their knowledge. For Aquinas, natural law was embodied in a set of universal primary precepts that govern human behaviour. These primary precepts derive from an innate principle called **synderesis**, which is

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



be sought, evil avoided'. From these primary precepts, secondary precepts can be developed. Christians can then use these to help them navigate ethical issues that are context-dependent to a particular time, social situation, and place. The Bible, therefore, promises to provide guiding principles in ethical living for ordinary Christians. It is up to them to understand whether their actions comply with or contravene God's will.

Yet it is also possible to see how cracks could emerge in this fashion of thinking. For any primary precepts one develops accurately reflect the will of God? It might be argued that this is not possible, but disagreement is always possible when it comes to interpretations of and reasons for the Bible. Although most Christians would claim that God created human beings with a purpose, how it relates to particular ethical dilemmas is still a matter of debate. For example, one primary precept is that human beings should not perform any action that threatens the well-being of others. This is a vague statement. What most anything could threaten the ordering of society if or how it is interpreted, and it might be necessary to question why primacy should be given in Christianity to the Bible, for example, one may end up with an ethical system vastly different from that of the Bible.

Should We be Suspicious of Tradition?

We've noted before when discussing the person of Jesus that there is, at least on the surface, a conflict between Jesus' teachings, which are often wary of the tradition of the Jewish elders and Pharisees, and many modern-day Christian denominations which are often very close to tradition for guidance on moral issues. This creates an interesting tension between the sources of authority that we've analysed so far. For some, it supports the notion that sola scriptura is the only correct way forward when analysing Christian ethical issues, while for others it simply reaffirms the importance of multiple sources of authority. Yet it is certainly true that this conflict can't be overlooked. In Matthew 23, for instance, Jesus directly equates the Pharisees' traditions with transgressions of God's will, and throughout history such passages have been used to support challenges to Church authority. Luther's call for reform in the 16th century is perhaps the best-known example of a theologian criticising the abuse of Catholic traditions for the material gain of its leaders.

This raises the issue of whether tradition itself should be given an authoritative status in ethical issues. Should the past works of theologians and Church figures be given the same weight as the Bible in light of modern advances in knowledge? One particularly difficult criticism, which has been made by many, is that holding tradition to be sacred has through the history of Christianity meant that many attitudes have been upheld rather than challenged. For example, Rosemary Radford Ruether, a feminist theologian, argues that sexism is rife within Christian tradition as it has been shaped by male perspectives and women's experiences have rarely been taken into account. Modern news will reveal regular conflicts within many Christian denominations as the social norms around the inflexible traditions of their churches.

This is not to suggest that tradition should play no role in the Christian Church. Looking at the thoughts and ideas of past thinkers is an incredibly useful way of developing more complex theological ideas, but the question remains whether this tradition should be viewed as sacred or as a benchmark for future study rather than a body of timeless knowledge that should be followed. Especially if Jesus himself questioned blind adherence to tradition in the Gospels.

Such thinking, however, potentially leads down a bit of a rabbit hole, for if tradition is questioned and reason can lead down different paths, what is distinctively 'Christian' about the teachings of Jesus? If Jesus' teachings are so original and have been mirrored by many other religions in history, this might well mean that Christian ethics are just secular ethics in religious clothing. For a worry for some, there is one final interpretation of Christian ethics we can explore. It is concerned with a particular conception of love.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Stanley Hauerwas and the Christian Community

Hauerwas is a well-known American theologian who exemplifies what is often called the 'thick' description of this thought, he holds that the individualism at the heart of secular ethics is different under Christianity. The Christian ethic, for Hauerwas, does not simply involve identifying principles or laws. Rather it has to be situated within the narrative and context of Christian history. This means that understanding Christian ethics is not just about what it provides, but also how it was created and developed as a response to the issues the community faced.

One example of this is Jesus' teachings at the Sermon on the Mount. Here, the old values of Judaism and his teachings are only truly illuminated when one understands the meaning in the context of the struggles of the early Jewish and Christian communities. Christian ethics is as much about the trials and difficulties of the Christian community as it is about ideas about what is right according to the will of God. Furthermore, Christian ethics is not about the personal ideals of an individual matter less than how various moral principles respond to larger material and spiritual issues for the community at large.

Discussion Activity:

Do you believe Christianity offers personal or communal moral insights? Is the Bible or a text which illuminates the future of the Christian community? Discuss in pairs.

Agape in Christian Ethics

We questioned at the end of the last section what might be distinctive about Christian ethics if there are no sources of authority that it could be held up as sacred or infallible. Well, one short answer might be love, specifically **agape** love. This is commonly held to be an important form of **selfless, altruistic** love that forms the bedrock of Jesus' moral teaching in the Gospel, especially concerning the importance of love as the motivation behind all actions. The idea that some thinkers have put forward in the twentieth century is that agape love is the only ruling moral principle drawn out of the Gospels, and all Christian ethical principles can be defined by the

This is less dramatic than it might initially sound. Agape love has long played a huge role from the two commandments given in Mark 12:28–31 to 'Love the lord thy God' and 'Love yourself'. Similarly, in John 15:12–13, Jesus states the commandment that all should 'Love one another as I have loved you'. It is likely that you have heard these two teachings before, and when you reduce Christian ethics to a set of basic principles it is usually some variation on these two. The idea that love is the foundation of all Christian relationships is extended not just to human relationships but to God's sacrifice of his Son on the cross to fulfil the atonement of the sins of humanity. The paradigmatic example of agape love, while Jesus' interactions with other human beings are often thought of in the same way. For instance, in Matthew 5:43–46, Jesus contrasts Old Testament law to love one's enemies, while similarly in 1 Corinthians 13:4–8, St Paul provides an elaborate description of the nature and importance of the Christian ideal of love, contrasting it to the temporal nature of knowledge and language.

So there is a strong basis for agape love being the foundation of Christian ethics and moral positions. However, there are deeper questions about whether agape love is the only moral authority in Christian ethics. Many modern thinkers on both sides have drawn a distinction between law-based Christianity and newer forms that draw on agape love. For example, American theologian, distinguished between forms of orthodox Christianity which are based on tradition or law and later prophetic Christianity which looks to agape love as the primary moral principle. Yet, despite the important position given to agape love, many Christians today still find that moral principles aren't easily derivable from this concept alone. In fact, there are numerous complex issues dealing with the implementation of agape love, and many critics have contended

source of authority. First, however, it is necessary to go into a bit more detail about how love plays in Christian ethics.

Justice, Love and Wisdom

One natural issue that emerges when it comes to outlining agape love is how it plays out in practice. If we understand what love is in a Christian context, it is not always clear what action it requires. Therefore, many thinkers have proposed different ways of applying agape love in moral decision-making and what principles there may be to applying it within one's life.

Take Paul Tillich, for instance. He proposed that there were three ultimate ethical norms: love, justice and wisdom. The most important was love, but of equal necessity were justice and wisdom. These three norms were to be applied in ethical decision-making. Tillich argues that the Church has often been guided by rules rather than by these ultimate authorities in any Christian's life. Instead, through understanding the nature of these norms, a person's own intellect should be consulted in any ethical dilemma, with love being the motivating factor behind any action. Thus, Tillich explicitly and implicitly criticises Christianity, which focuses on obedience to rules. Instead, moral thinking should be based on maintaining loving relationships with others and how one can act in the most loving way. This means there are also no hard or fast moral rules or principles in one's life other than the principle of love towards others. Any beliefs about the right action in a situation might be re-evaluated and rejected when they might fail to uphold one or more of the three ethical norms.

A similar line of thinking can be found in **situation ethics**. This is a system of ethics that places the centrality of love within moral decision-making. Its best known proponent is J.I. Packer, who argues that a proper reading of the Gospels shows that Jesus was distrustful of **legalistic** ethics being largely based on laws throughout its history. Instead, he argued that the guiding principle should be the law of love, which holds that, in any situation, Christians should do what is most loving. This means that situation ethics is **relativistic**; there are no hard or fast rules about what is the most loving action. This is a more radical proposal than Tillich's, but Fletcher does argue similarly that justice is simply 'love in a more objective form'. When deciding loving actions, however, Fletcher argues that justice is simply 'love in a more objective form'. The most loving action is naturally also the most fair, since it cannot be loving to treat others unfairly.

Nevertheless, an interesting observation can be made of these agape-based approaches. While love is central to their ideas about Christian ethics, other important concepts enter to help flesh out their ideas. Importantly, it might be argued that for any agape-based approach reason is also central. Reason is used in helping evaluate what action to take in any ethical dilemma. Without the entry of reason, it may well be impossible to judge what is loving and what isn't. However, this does raise difficulties faced by Christian ethics built upon the idea of love. On the one hand, love really offers moral guidance, and on the other hand we can also ask whether the principles given by scripture and other sources are really loving.

Is Agape the Only Guiding Principle?

One common criticism given of agape-based approaches to Christian ethics is that the concept of love is too vague to apply to everyday ethical dilemmas. This criticism can be broken down into two main parts. First, for example, arises when one considers how human beings are naturally fallible. The use of reason could lead to conflicting views about ethical principles, and the same could be said for love. Perhaps even to a greater extent, if agape is used solely as a criterion for moral action, then a Christian could justify an immoral act out of what they believe to be love. This is because an action is permitted for selfish or sinful reasons. What may appear loving to some, but not to others, and there are no strict external rules on how to apply agape to ethical dilemmas. This is not permitted by such an approach. Another problem is that love just doesn't seem to offer much guidance in situations very well. If I were deciding between giving to two different charities, how would I know to see which action could be more loving than the other.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



However, a greater problem for many Christians is that if love is the foundation for effect reduced to secular ethics, for many non-religious people would claim that they act well. This means ultimately that the Christian aspect of ethics is meaningfully longer **distinct** from other ethical systems. This might initially seem to be a trivial foundation of all ethical behaviour, then why does it matter whether Christian ethics is difficult, as noted before, is that many Christians believe moral laws are God-given by a separate principle, what need is there for the Christian God? The religious aspect to be meaningful if it prescribes little more than common relations or belief systems, little more than an intellectual curiosity rather than being a real moral force.

This issue has also led to many theologians proposing how aspects of Christianity can moral proper. For example, love might not be the only influencing factor for many they believe. The centre of ethical decision-making. One could look to other foundations in the Bible, such as the Kingdom of God, repentance and redemption, and argue that this develops good moral intentions and practices when applying agape within one's ethics. It could be a good argument that such concepts are essential to ground, or give practical meaning to agape love.

The theologian Richard Mouw makes the important point that even if love is the central truth does not necessitate that there are not other commandments that should be considered in theological matters. In particular, if the Bible is the main source behind the knowledge of a commandment, why should its other commandments not be taken seriously? It is the right intention behind ethical action but the Bible additionally provides instruction on important ethical practices. The aim should be then to find correlations between the Bible and the various ethical dilemmas human beings find themselves evaluating in their lives. He notes that not all of the Bible presents moral commands. Many passages are to describe human beings and God, and, regardless of the foundation of Christian ethics, these human beings choose to live their lives, whether they be personal choices or choices made by a community. Although agape love might play a very important role in Christian ethics, it can't be the only commandments or sources of authority might still play a vital role in people's moral lives.

Activity:



What would be the most loving action in the following scenarios? Write down your answer. How might the difficulty in evaluating the most loving action exemplify Christian ethical principles other than agape love?

1. Helping a friend cheat in their exam so that they can become an accountant to support their struggling family.
2. Assassinating a military dictator who is oppressing the citizens of their country.
3. Lying to a relative about your religious beliefs when they are on their deathbed.
4. Giving positive feedback to a friend about their tuba playing despite thinking they are terrible.

Quick Quiz

1. What is theonomous ethics?
2. What is sola scriptura?
3. What is sacred tradition?
4. What is the Magisterium?
5. What is the apostolic succession?
6. What is natural law?
7. What is agape love?

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



3B: CHRISTIAN MORAL ACT

What you will learn in this section:

The life and teachings of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, including:

- Bonhoeffer's teachings on the relationship between religious faith and one's views on civil disobedience.
- Bonhoeffer's views on community and discipleship in the context of his own Church and his seminary at Finkenau.
- Bonhoeffer's ideas of solidarity and sacrifice, including the distinction between 'cheap' and 'costly' grace.
- The development and relevance of Bonhoeffer's theology for modern Christians.

Starter Activity:

Research the rise of the Nazi Party in 1930s Germany and how it developed relationships with different denominations at the time. Write down notes in particular about the activities of the various churches and how they used them to inform your understanding of Bonhoeffer's life and theology through his writings.

Key Thinker

Name	Dietrich Bonhoeffer
Born	1906
Died	1945
Key texts	<i>The Cost of Discipleship</i> (1937); <i>Letters and Papers from Prison</i> (1953)
Why are they important?	Bonhoeffer is one of the most impactful theologians of the 20th century. His political resistance to the Nazi regime during the Second World War led to his execution. His theology that arose out of his witness for Christians to truly live and solidarity with others is a key part of the Gospels.
Did you know?	Although Bonhoeffer was executed in 1945 due to his being involved in the plot to assassinate Hitler a year previously, historians are still unsure if he was actually involved in the plot, or whether he had a substantive role at all.

Introduction – The Life of Dietrich Bonhoeffer

Dietrich Bonhoeffer was one of the most prominent and distinctive theologians of the 20th century. As an example of how Christian moral principles should be put into practice by Christians throughout the history of Christianity, he advocated a radical system of Christian ethics. He believed that Christians should be much more active in challenging the state when it routinely endorsed the endorsement of civil disobedience didn't arise in a vacuum, however. It was motivated by the rise of the Nazi Party in Germany during the 1930s and a fundamental opposition to the actions they undertook during their time in power. This led to a theology which emphasised sacrifice in Christian belief and the need for Christians to stand in solidarity with the oppressed, even if it meant endangering their own lives. Throughout this section, we will extrapolate upon the various ways in which Bonhoeffer was influenced by a variety of sources and analysing his continuing impact on Christian thought.

The Early Life of Bonhoeffer

Bonhoeffer was born in 1906 into a large, educated family in Germany. His father was a psychiatrist and his mother was a teacher, and they both encouraged Bonhoeffer's intellectual development from an early age. He completed his doctorate in Theology at the age of 21, in 1927, and, since he was already ordained into the Church, he chose to go to America for postgraduate study in 1929. He spent time in the world at large. The Great Depression, which had its greatest impact in the world, and fascist movements such as the National Socialist Party in Germany were not a fan of the American seminaries, believing there was a lack of engaging theological academic study there, and during this time he began to form stronger beliefs about the role of the Church in society.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



'from below'. This encouraged thinking about Christian principles from the perspective of the oppressed rather than from the perspective of those who enjoyed significant wealth.

Bonhoeffer eventually returned to Germany in 1931, but his ecclesiastical career was cut short by the rise of the Nazi Party to power in 1933. This rise was met by a variety of different views in the Church. Some of the clergy had capitulated to the power of the party and avoided speaking out against its policies, while others, such as Bonhoeffer, had criticised them. The Nazi Party's anti-Semitic and political policies within the Church, and Hitler capitalised on this, eventually announcing his intentions shortly after taking power. Despite criticism, these elections were rigged, and positions were given to Nazi collaborators. The German Protestant Church effectively became a part of the Nazi Party, still offering religious services throughout the German provinces for Hitler's regime. This situation set the stage for the most significant part of Bonhoeffer's development, as he moved towards more radical elements of his theology.

Bonhoeffer and His Life during Nazi Rule

Despite the Nazi Party managing to take over a significant portion of the German Church, there were still many who criticised their rule. In response to the rigged elections, a section of the Church broke away and created what became known as the **Confessing Church** in an attempt to remain alive and separate from Nazi ideology. Bonhoeffer himself declared his allegiance to the Confessing Church in 1933 with a radio broadcast titled *The Younger Generation's Altered View of the Church*, which was heavily critical of the Nazi Party and described the way Bonhoeffer perceived it to be more than a real political movement. This broadcast was ended early, with historians stating that the Nazi Party itself was responsible, but it marked a clear division between those Christians who sought content to appease the political powers at the time and those who felt it was their duty to stand against what they believed injustice was occurring.

Throughout the next five years, Bonhoeffer was involved in mixed efforts in working to oppose the Nazis. Between 1933 and 1935 he lived in England, despite criticism from Karl Barth that he was involved in important conflicts at home. However, in 1935 he returned to Germany and began working at a seminary, Finkenwalde, to teach a new generation of ministers away from the influence of the Nazi Party. Yet, despite these efforts, Himmler declared that it was illegal to educate in the Confessing Church, and in a short time, Finkenwalde was shut down. Bonhoeffer continued to work, nonetheless, moving from town to town in secret and instructing students as best he could.

In 1939, with war on the horizon, Bonhoeffer faced perhaps his greatest dilemma: whether to leave Germany, as he was likely to be conscripted, and while on a trip to the USA that year he began to plan his return to Germany. However, he eventually resolved to take action and moved back to Germany to help the small but significant resistance at the time. Joining the Abwehr, a German intelligence organisation, in 1941 he began to realise this promise and started feeding information to the Allies, as well as helping German Jews escape to Switzerland, which was neutral despite its military successes, he was arrested on 5th April for this latter act and, further still, on 24th July for his involvement in a failed plot to kill Hitler (historians are still unsure as to the extent of his involvement). He was imprisoned for these actions, but he was also sentenced to death and was hanged alongside his alleged fellow conspirators on 9th April 1945.

Bonhoeffer advocated a Christian theology that should be altogether radical in contrast to traditional Christianity, which historically has regarded obedience to authority as a virtue. This endorsement of civil disobedience sprung from a reinterpretation of Luther, who viewed the Church and the state as equivalent in many ways, as well as a resistance to the Nazi ideology, which was growing in influence in Germany in the run-up to World War II.

Bonhoeffer rejected Nazi beliefs and ethics and, as a founding member of the Confessing Church, he protested against many of the Nazis' practices. He argued particularly that the Church should be a place of support for people, but also a place to assist with spiritual discipline in the face of the world, primarily an ethic placing others first before the self. The Church should, therefore,

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



performing rituals and rites, or comfortable adherence to a set of theological beliefs concerned with playing an active part in shaping the ethical environment of the world.

Obedience and Leadership

As you might have gathered from the overview in the last section, Bonhoeffer's life was marked by a fundamental moral conflict between what he perceived as Christ's relationship of these to a state power that engaged in fundamentally immoral actions. The German Christian Churches came under severe scrutiny for their part in facilitating the worst abuses of power, and many found in Bonhoeffer's writings an easily digestible critique of the attitudes within these Churches. However, at the same time, the dramatic events of his life meant he never managed to develop a systematic theology around his ideas, and thinkers have had to interpret his work for themselves. On the one hand, he heavily emphasises the importance of following Christ for all Christians, yet he often presents very universal commitments to justice that appeal to people of all faiths and beliefs. However, despite the fragmentary nature of his work, there are plenty of concepts to unpack, the first being the relationship between the Church and the State.

Duty to God and Duty to the State

Typically throughout the history of Christianity, the Church and the state have gone hand in hand. Although there have been significant conflicts, for the most part the clergy have maintained a large degree of political power, and the laws and rules imposed by them have reflected Christian ideals in Western societies. This is partly due to the nature of these societies, which wish to see their religious ideals exemplified in everyday life, but also because theologians have also pointed to a key biblical passage to support this status quo. The scriptures state that Christians should obey the 'governing authorities', since their power is instituted by God himself. This includes not only following laws but also paying taxes to a leadership position. On the surface, if one takes this narrative literally, it seems to be a duty not just to their own religious beliefs but also to the state itself.

However, this creates various dilemmas for Christians where their moral principles may digress. Should a Christian obey a law given by the authorities if it transgresses their own moral principles? Throughout history, there are many documented examples of religious authorities that have been guilty of corruption and committed crimes others have not. Yet an ethical dilemma is created when scripture presents moral laws that Christians are arguing that they should also display complete obedience to the state. For many, the solution is simple; institute a Christian society and the conflict is dissolved.

However, Bonhoeffer recognised the reality was more complicated and rarely found a way to resolve this conflict, he simply argued that the call to discipleship in the Gospels called for obedience only to Christ and God. It is not the case that they should weigh their different beliefs against each other, picking the one they believe to be correct. For Bonhoeffer, being a Christian is concerned fundamentally with the leadership and authority of God above all else. This 'single-minded obedience' to God is a faith, and one's duty towards God as a result should not be tempered by human considerations of agreeable or convenient. More importantly, if Bonhoeffer is correct here, it means there is no obligation to the state whatsoever beyond their religious beliefs. This results in significant ramifications, as we shall explore next.

INSPECTION COPY

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



Civil Disobedience

Many researchers have often contended that Bonhoeffer's theology can be in part explained by his historical background. It would certainly be wrong to ignore it, but, equally, care should be taken to analyse his theology on its own terms as well, especially when it comes to one of the key ramifications of his doctrine of disobedience: the legitimacy of civil disobedience. Since Bonhoeffer held that Christians are only required to serve God, then any law issued by the state that contradicts God's will should be resisted. This is a natural break from theologians in the Lutheran mould, who saw the Church and the state as two sides of the same coin, but the rise of the Nazi Party created there was a significant moral gap between one's duty to God and one's duty to the state.

However, there are many other political conditions under which civil disobedience for Bonhoeffer should not just be framed as duty to God but also as a duty to God's will. God's will presents a series of moral rules and principles Christians are required to follow. If these rules are being transgressed by the state it usually results in the persecution or oppression of single-mindedness can be seen to be exacted at various moments in Bonhoeffer's life. He lost his job for speaking out against the Nazi Party in the 1930s, but at various moments the Confessing Church for not doing enough to help Jewish victims of Nazi persecution.

Yet a common issue, which we will explore in more detail later, is that it is unclear whether civil disobedience should be endorsed during more peaceful times. Bonhoeffer's ideas appeal in political climates where persecution and oppression are rife, but are Christians required to state for any difference between its laws and their moral principles? To what extent is violence to achieve their aims? These are more difficult questions that arise out of his ideas and create issues when trying to implement it in different political and social contexts. To some extent, individuals do owe some allegiance to the state, either because they are citizens or because they have important social or financial links with, or due to what the state provides, such as healthcare, a livelihood or other important services. Therefore, it is worth considering how his theology is ultimately applicable for present-day Christians.

Discussion Activity:

Do you believe, like Bonhoeffer, that human beings should not obey the state when it contradicts their religious beliefs? What issues could this cause?

Church, Community and Discipline

Bonhoeffer's ideas about the importance of obedience extend not just to the individual but to the Church. Throughout his life, Bonhoeffer stressed the need for the Christian Church to be a source of moral guidance that the Church should be not only a place of worship for Christians but also a source of moral guidance when the Church functions to help Christians enact God's will in their own lives and in the world during times of difficulty. Therefore, in Bonhoeffer's theology, the Church has a more active pastoral role than most Christian churches do now. The moral guidance it offers is not just in times of difficulty where a person fails to live up their duties as a Christian, the Church should encourage and discipline.

The Confessing Church

The idea of the Church as a moral community was reflected in the original principles set up by Bonhoeffer and other key German clergy in the early 1930s in order to oppose the Nazi-aligned Protestant churches. One key document it released was the Theological Declaration of Barmen by Karl Barth. It set out six primary theses that stressed the separation of church and state, the authority of Jesus Christ for Christians and denied that any other leader could possess authority. The Confessing Church also put these principles into action. In 1934 and 1935, the military and civil service personnel were required to undertake a civil oath towards Hitler, which the Confessing Church strongly opposed and which ended up costing Karl Barth his professorship.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



Nonetheless, perhaps the most significant implementation of Bonhoeffer's ideas at the time leading his secret seminary at Finkenwalde. This took place in a disused school building taken down by the Nazi government, who ruled that members of the Confessing Church were new ministers. Certainly Bonhoeffer himself saw one of the primary aims of this seminary as he saw it necessary to train new pastors who were free of Nazi influence. Yet he also saw a chance to enact other values he saw as essential to a Christian community. There was emphasis on discipline but also on Bible study, education and brotherhood with the aim of preparing for the purpose to Christian work in the world.

Despite Finkenwalde embodying Bonhoeffer's ideals for the Christian community, it was not for the Confessing Church. At heart, Bonhoeffer viewed the ideal Church as being one that was being persecuted or oppressed, and increasingly throughout the 1930s he felt the Church was failing on this count. While it professed opposition to Nazi policy and in principle stood against the difficulties living under their rule, it did not always encourage action in the same manner as Bonhoeffer was when, at a synod meeting, the Confessing Church refused to oppose the requirement for pastors to take the civil oath to the Nazi Party. Similarly, he felt that the Church was not vigorously speaking up on behalf of Jewish people, instead only focusing on its own process avoiding its Christian responsibilities. Eventually, he offered a more damning critique of the Church, arguing that in any Christian community there should be 'no rusty swords' and that in the face of oppression, Christians were required to do everything in their power to prevent it.

Discipleship

We've noted so far Bonhoeffer's emphasis on obedience and discipline within Christian belief, both for the individual and the Church. It is possible to delve a little further into Bonhoeffer's theology. In 1937, he published one of his best-known texts, *The Cost of Discipleship*, which outlines the commitments required by the individual who wishes to follow Christ's example. It is primarily focused on the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew and details a number of important concepts which not only guide Bonhoeffer's concept of discipleship but also the criticisms Bonhoeffer made of the Christian Church during the 1930s. One of the key teachings of Jesus throughout the Gospels, reflected in the summaries of the Beatitudes, was to live by Christ's teachings but a real model for how Christians should live their lives. He contended that too often the Church treated this as a sacred ideal, which diminishes the responsibility of humans on Earth when it is even possible to emulate his example whenever possible. Obedience to Christ is not just accepting his teachings but denying oneself and taking up the cross just as Jesus did. In accordance with this, he set out a number of ideas which encapsulate the thrust of his argument.

Cheap and Costly Grace

Bonhoeffer naturally as part of his strong call to discipleship criticised the direction taken in many Western countries. He argued that in attempting to meet the demands of modern people's work lives, many Churches had become deeply secularised and placed a ritual over real obedience to Christ as depicted in the Gospels. In doing so, the Church had become an ineffective, capitulating institution incapable of addressing oppression in the world, preferring to engage in academic discussions about abstract theological concepts rather than a source of discipline and strength for suffering individuals.

This criticism, along with Bonhoeffer's views on discipleship, led him to distinguish between **cheap grace** and **costly grace**. Cheap grace is the comfortable, unchallenging form of Christianity where one is truly committed to be a disciple of Christ. Within institutions that embody cheap grace, there is no significant moral struggle or cost, and this practice not only devalues the sacrifice of Christ but also denies the presence and force of the living Word in a Christian's life. Costly grace, in contrast, is the embodiment of Christian discipleship. Costly grace is the acceptance and expectation that following Christ requires any disciple to make radical changes to their lives in order to obey God's commands. It is not faith as the need to simply quietly follow rituals and practices and instead accepts that following Christ means one is sacrificing the comforts and luxuries of the material world.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



The distinction Bonhoeffer makes here is key to understanding his overall concept of the Christian life. The Christian life can cherry-pick the aspects of the religion that suit a person. For Bonhoeffer, the surrendering of one's autonomy to the wisdom of a higher power is essential. That surrender. Importantly, what Bonhoeffer argues with the ideas of cheap grace is that there might be some future idyllic world where Christians are united in brotherhood, far from being a utopia. Real Christian belief requires sacrifice and suffering on behalf of others, two ideas we will explore in the next part.

Sacrifice and Suffering

As we've noted, Bonhoeffer's ideas about cheap and costly grace are linked to the Christian life. The Christian life is given by God, and by extension of his will, the rest of humanity. Therefore, the Christian's existence for others is essential. Bonhoeffer argues one only truly encounters God when one's neighbours are above oneself. The road to salvation is not simply having faith in God, but through obeying his will and sacrificing oneself for the benefit of others.

Bonhoeffer links this stricter idea of discipleship to the Passion in the Gospels. Just as Jesus sacrificed for others, so Christians are expected to do the same. Jesus' death on the cross, while an atonement, was also an example for human beings on how to live their lives. Christians are to take the guilt of the world onto themselves; any act of persecution and oppression is treated as an act against oneself. Therefore, the sacrifice given by Jesus is not simply the kind of sacrifice that Christians should be undertaking throughout their lives in the world.

Naturally, the act of sacrifice also involves suffering, and this is also a key element in the Christian life. The charity that comes easily is worth little. If one can help someone else without any sacrifice, life is a sign that no real sacrifice has been made. For example, the wealthy individual donating their money to a charity, however great a sum, is far from embodying the Christian ideal. As commanded in the Gospels, the disciple must give of their wealth to others and with the poor and marginalised. This is quite a radical proposal, but, for Bonhoeffer, the failure of the Church of inaction when push came to shove, and only engaged in charitable actions that funded the Church's wealth and power, and failed to make a real political and social difference, was a necessity of the Christian life. Along with sacrifice that true discipleship can be attained.

Solidarity

There is one final concept to cover and that is **solidarity**. The term is often used with reference to standing up for or alongside someone in their struggles. By doing so, one not only supports a person's struggle against another power but also helps them achieve their ends. For Bonhoeffer, there is a strong emphasis on the importance of solidarity. Christians, in living the Christian life, are to take on others' struggles and stand alongside them. In standing in solidarity with others, one becomes connected with the experience of God, who also stands alongside humanity. Furthermore, it is only by standing in solidarity with others that the Christian Church can bring about moral change in society. If the Church restricts itself to Christian affairs only it becomes part of the same immoral acts as the oppressive power.

This emphasis on solidarity to a great extent inspired Bonhoeffer's criticism of the churches as well as the Confessing Church. As noted, Bonhoeffer criticised the Confessing Church enough to help Jewish people in Germany who were being persecuted, and in 1937 he co-edited the *Church and the Jewish People*, which argued that the Church was obligated to stand in solidarity towards Jewish people, even though their religions presented conflicting teachings.

These strong ideas about sacrifice and solidarity are certainly applicable in the context of the 1930s. It was agreed that more decisive action was needed to stop the rise of fascism in Germany after the First World War, even if it was catalysed by larger-scale political decision-making. Bonhoeffer's ideas challenged a lot of conventional Orthodox Church teaching precisely because a lot of the Church was unheeded by a Church too preoccupied with its own quibbles and issues, instead of standing in solidarity with others.

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



wider oppressive forces gathering around it. However, this also creates an issue still relevant in other political and social contexts? Are Christians expected to sacrifice tremendously in peaceful, agreeable situations? This is what we shall explore next.

Activity:

What are some modern-day situations in the Christian Church you think Bonhoeffer would display a lack of true discipleship? Write out three and give your justification.

Bonhoeffer and the Churchless Christianity

As has been noted in this section, the circumstances of Bonhoeffer's life and struggles have shaped his thought. He managed to gather or write a systematic theology on his ideas. As such, his sermons, letters, and many of his letters reflect Bonhoeffer's own internal theological dilemmas. While in prison in 1944, Bonhoeffer directly questions the place of religion in an increasingly secular world. In particular, he said he had become disillusioned with the Church as a whole and the failure of the religion to prevent the rise of the Nazi regime.

As part of this questioning, he pondered the possibility of a future 'religionless' Christianity. Can effectively be secular individuals participating in God's will without the rituals of the Church? Bonhoeffer posited that it may well be the practices of Christianity, whether the rituals or the hierarchy of the Church itself, that prevented it from focusing on the important aspects of faith. He also debates what he perceived to be the present reality of 1944 where people are religious yet display none of the duties required in their own lives. The question is whether Bonhoeffer of what religion actually means. Is it a metaphysically meaningless term, or is it a moral obedience to God, or is it just a term that has no place in the modern world?

Discussion Activity:

Has modern Christianity become complacent when it comes to taking action on the teachings of Jesus in the world today? Should Christians be willing to sacrifice more? Discuss in your groups.

Evaluating Bonhoeffer's Thought

Bonhoeffer's theology is naturally difficult to evaluate. It was written during the struggles of the twentieth century and many have reflected whether it has relevance today. For instance, come critics have claimed that Bonhoeffer places too much emphasis on suffering. People doesn't necessarily require hardship; a good Christian can enjoy helping others from the idea that other people's lives are improving. In particular, this might be true of Christians during peacetime, when it may well be excessive to expect all Christians to suffer for others; a situation which might just result in pointless suffering in aid of other Christians. Such critics also potentially overlook Bonhoeffer's ideas about solidarity. Living in a world of peace and happiness. Naturally, sacrifice is needed to get there, but Bonhoeffer's view about this solidarity is what allows oppressive forces to thrive.

Others have found issues in Bonhoeffer's stance on civil disobedience. In his time, during the Nazi regime, it is theoretically easy to support civil resistance to their oppressive rule. However, other ethical dilemmas arise. The choice is not clear. For example, should a Christian support the use of force or euthanasia which they perceive them to be against God's will, even if such actions are for the good of a population? The call to obey the state may simply be pragmatic in certain difficult situations. That difficult political decisions can't be made without some party being negatively affected. What extent a Christian should endorse civil disobedience without a full understanding of the situation to suggest that collaboration with the Nazis was the correct action for the Christians. The complete separation of duties Bonhoeffer puts forward is more difficult to apply in the modern world.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



One important difficulty that arises out of these questions is how to reconcile Bonhoeffer with human fallibility in knowing the will of God. We've explored in previous sections how to read the Bible without interpretative bias or the use of reason. Therefore, for Bonhoeffer there may be a shortfall of moral guidance offered by scripture which needs to be supplemented by our own moral intuitions. Yet this creates an issue for Bonhoeffer, for it may be that we cannot interpret the will of God. In these cases, alongside Bonhoeffer's notion that an individual has a duty to obey God, then his teachings may encourage people to act irresponsibly, or even violently, in the name of God's will.

One response to such worries is to appeal to Bonhoeffer's ideas about community. Human fallibility only comes into the fore when one considers discipleship to be a requirement. In part the Church has a duty in supporting, but also regulating, the actions of Christians. Therefore, there is no licence to do whatever a person wishes, but instead a justification to oppose secular powers where there is clear evidence of persecution and oppression.

However, these restrictions don't wholly allay the concerns of critics. There are many examples in the present day where there is considerable conflict between Christian groups and denominations. Theologians, as a result, have argued that Bonhoeffer's theology is perhaps an example of a theology that was only valid under Nazi rule and that his calls for strict discipleship no longer possess the same relevance outside of this context. It is perhaps easy to initially agree with this assessment for a variety of reasons. One is the continued suffering of many poor and marginalised people. Wherever one looks, there are still many political and military conflicts where Bonhoeffer's theology has an intuitive appeal and may carry significant weight. Some might even argue that the current state of modern capitalism and its structures is an example of the injustice Bonhoeffer's theology in the present day.

Similarly, it is easy to point out many countries where state power overextends itself into their everyday lives. Under these circumstances Bonhoeffer's call to obedience to the state might be more relevant. Similarly, the importance of solidarity with marginalised groups is a message that many charitable organisations across the world. Therefore, Bonhoeffer's message is timeless and critics of his theology, guilty of the complacent thinking Bonhoeffer criticised, might be under pressure to modernise and adapt to secular contexts. However, this does not invalidate Bonhoeffer's call to sacrifice and solidarity, and it is still possible to argue that in the face of injustice and persecution still need addressing across the world. Therefore, when applying Bonhoeffer's teachings it is important not to take for granted the difference in political contexts. One has to consider the responsibilities discipleship might embody in the modern world and examine what might help inform ethical action.

Quick Quiz

1. What is the Confessing Church?
2. What is civil disobedience?
3. Who did Bonhoeffer argue that Christians have a duty to?
4. What is the difference between cheap and costly grace?
5. What is solidarity?
6. What did Bonhoeffer argue was essential in discipleship?
7. What was the name of Bonhoeffer's underground seminary?

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**



ANSWERS

ANSWERS TO ACTIVITIES

Augustine

Read the Catechism of the Catholic Church on original sin (1297–1409) and identify similarities with Augustine's thought. Why do you think these differences exist?

This task might seem initially tricky but the aim is to get students to compare theological positions. It can sometimes be a bit obtuse, but students might hopefully see the way Catholicism's contextualisation of sin is toning down some of the more extreme aspects of Augustine's original sin and the way it affects human behaviour.

Afterlife

Pick five of the Bible passages mentioned throughout this section. Read through them and decide about the interpretation of the Christian afterlife you think each best fits. Why is this?

This is quite a straightforward exercise, but it gets students analysing some of the key passages in detail. Students should try to offer justification for each. For example, if talking about the unknown God, why the unknown God does not fit a contrary position rather than just stating it fits. Elimination is common in biblical studies at higher levels.

Natural/Revealed Theology

Do you believe natural theology or revealed theology is a better way of acquiring knowledge? If you exercise, take the other side and write down three ways in which you would criticise the other.

This is also a straightforward exercise but is useful for students when beginning to think about the relationship between natural and revealed theology. Criticising one or the other is a good way of getting started to avoid taking the easy route.

The Person of Jesus

Research the life of Jesus and find three examples of passages in the Bible (not including the Gospels) where Jesus could be described as encouraging political or religious liberation. Do you think Jesus was primarily a liberator?

There are still plenty of passages in the Bible which support the idea of Jesus as a liberator. This activity is intended to shift students' attention from the Gospels to look at how Jesus is portrayed in other parts of the Bible. Examples of passages might include Romans 6:18, 6:22, 8:21, Galatians 5:1, Matthew 23:23.

Agape Love

What would be the most loving action in the following scenarios? Write down your answer. How might the difficulty in evaluating the most loving action exemplify the need for principles other than agape love?

There are many different possible answers to each situation. The idea is to get students to think about how a Christian might apply agape love and get an understanding of the relativistic nature of love which might conflict with biblical laws.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer

What are some modern-day examples of Christians in the Christian Church you think Bonhoeffer would describe as lacking true discipleship? Write out three, and give your justification for each.

There are many possible examples, and students should be careful to differentiate between those who simply adhered to Christian teaching as they see it and where they have displayed a lack of true discipleship. Examples might include standing up for the rights of the poor or homeless across the world, abuse in the church, the environment, etc.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



ANSWERS TO QUICK QUIZZES

Augustine's Teachings on Human Nature

1. The Fall is the theological event where the first human beings disobeyed God and ate the forbidden fruit.
2. Original sin is the post-Fall corruption of Adam and Eve, passed down to successive generations through procreation.
3. Genesis 3
4. Pelagianism
5. Single predestination puts forward that God only preordains those who will receive salvation. Double predestination puts forward that God preordains both those who will be saved and those who will be damned.
6. Caritas is generous love towards others, whereas cupiditas is greedy love of material things for one's own ends.
7. Concupiscence is a strong desire, typically sexual in nature.

Death and the Afterlife

1. Eschatology is the theological study of the afterlife and the final events of human history.
2. Heaven is a realm or state which people enter who have been good and righteous in this life.
3. Purgatory means 'purification' and is a state or realm where people are cleansed before entering heaven.
4. Hell is a realm or state which people enter who have been evil or unfaithful throughout their lives.
5. Personal judgement is the singular evaluation of one's sin immediately after death. Final judgement is the evaluation of all of humanity's sin at a future point in time.
6. Limited election states that only some human beings have the possibility of achieving salvation. Unlimited election states that all human beings have the possibility of achieving salvation.
7. Romans 11:1-3
8. John Hick

Knowledge of God's Existence

1. Natural theology looks at the ways God can be known through observation of, and reasoning about, the natural world. Revealed theology looks at the ways God can be known through the events and teachings of the Bible.
2. Sensus divinitatis is Calvin's term for the innate, general sense of the divine humanity has.
3. Beauty, goodness, reason and morality.
4. The idea that God reveals himself to human beings in a way that befits their capacity to understand.
5. The Incarnation.
6. Mediation occurs through one or more mediums, such that any knowledge of God is mediated. Immediate revelation is directly given knowledge of God through experience.
7. Fideism

The Person of Jesus Christ

1. Christology from above studies Jesus in the Bible assuming the truth about his divine nature. Christology from below studies Jesus beginning with the notion that he is first and foremost a human being.
2. To what extent Jesus was aware of his divine nature during his life.
3. Son of God
4. Sermon on the Mount
5. Good moral motivations and purity
6. A liberator is someone who ends the oppression of others and offers them new freedom.
7. The mission statement

Christian Moral Principles

1. Theonomous ethics is the view that moral laws and principles are reflections of God's character.
2. Sola scriptura is the view that the Bible is the sole source of authority for Christians.
3. Sacred tradition is the view that the Bible and religious tradition is of equal authority in the Christian Church.
4. The Magisterium is the body of bishops and the Pope in the Catholic Church who have the authority to rule on doctrinal and ethical matters.
5. Apostolic succession is the belief that there is an unbroken line of authority that passes from the apostles to the bishops to the present day.
6. Natural law is a field of theology which holds that moral laws can be derived from reason and logic upon the natural world and human nature.
7. Agape love is selfless, altruistic love often thought to be at the heart of Christianity.

INSPECTION COPY

COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED



Christian Moral Action

1. The Confessing Church is a church set up by dissenting clergy after the Nazi Party took the key positions of the major German churches.
2. Civil disobedience is the active rejection of a state's laws, orders or powers.
3. God and Christ
4. Cheap grace is easy practice of religious belief, involving little sacrifice or effort to Christian ideals, involving both sacrifice and suffering.
5. Solidarity is the standing up for, or awareness of, other people's struggles, creating a sense of community in the process.
6. Sacrifice
7. Finkenwalde



INSPECTION COPY



INSPECTION COPY



INSPECTION COPY

INSPECTION COPY

**COPYRIGHT
PROTECTED**

