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**NOTES ON MOLTMANN**

Jürgen Moltmann, *The Way of Jesus Christ:*

*Christology in Messianic Dimensions* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).

***CHAPTER: I. THE MESSIANIC PERSPECTIVE***

* “There is no such thing as a Christology without presuppositions; and its historical presupposition is the messianic promise of the Old Testament and the Jewish hope which is founded on the Hebrew Bible. We can only truly and authentically understand Jesus if we perceive him and history in the light of the Old Testament promises and the history of hope of Israel today.” (p.1)
* “Jesus is the messiah; the church is the messianic community; being a Christina means being human in the messianic sense. The name Christian is not the designation of a party. It is a promise. It is what is messianic” (p.1)

**JM’s *Theology of Hope* (1964):**

* “There I set the revelation of God in the event of Jesus’ crucifixion and resurrection against the horizon of the expectation opened up by the OT history of promise.[[1]](#footnote-1) I summed up this view point in the following concise thesis: (1) It was *Yahweh*, the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob, the God of the promise, who raised Jesus form the dead. Who the god is who is revealed in and by Jesus emerges only in his difference from, and identity with, the God of the OT. (2) *Jesus was a Jew*. Who Jesus is, and what the human nature is which is revealed by him, emerges from his conflict with the law and the promise of the Old Testament. At the same time, however, I was primarily concerned with the Jesus’ resurrection and the eschatological horizon which the resurrection opened up. Here I am beginning with the Spirit-Christology which apprehends Jesus as the messianic prophet of the poor.[[2]](#footnote-2) I shall therefore stress even more strongly than I did in 1964 *the continuity* between the Christian gospel and the Jewish history of promise found in the OT.” (p. 3)

**JM’s *Crucified God* (1972):**

* “I confronted the metaphysical ‘Christology from above’ and the anthropological ‘christology from below’ with a Christology that points forwards.” (p. 3)

**His turn to an eschatological history of Jesus:**

* “In those earlier books, however, I concentrated solely on the resurrection and cross of Christ. This focus was partly due to the time at which the books were written, and their context in the history of theology. I am now surrendering this standpoint in order to set ‘the eschatological history’ of Jesus in a holistic christology.” (p. 3)
* “Unfortunately, from early on, Christian theology split up the unity of OT messianology into Christology on the one hand, and eschatological on the other . . . . This came about because the incarnational Christology of the patristic church presented the descent and ascent of the Redeemer in the vertical perspective of eternity, and moved the divine sonship of Jesus into the center. The horizontal history of the *ruach*—the Holy spirit—‘who space by the prophets’, as the Nicene Creed says, and who shaped the ministry and proclamation of the earthly Jesus, cased to be noticed. As a result Christology also lost the eschatological future horizon of Christ’s parousia. The theme of this truncated Christology became the person of the divine human being who came into the world to save sinners. In addition, in the early rivalry and dispute with the synagogue, a whole sector of futurist eschatology was vilified and excluded as what Article XI of the *Confessio Helvetica* describes as ‘the Jewish dream’. This was the sector generally termed ‘chiliastic eschatology’. Once that had been eliminated, eschatology lost its futurist orientation, and all that remained was its central aspect, in which all moments of time are equally present, and equally remote. Historical times were literally ‘in-different’. The Last Days gave way to a timeless next world, and the Last Judgment of world history was replaced by the hour of death of the individual person. In this way the Old Testament hope for the messiah was pushed out of Christology and eschatology alike. We shall rediscover the essential connection between the two only when we find our way back to the common roots of both, in the messianology of the OT. The lamentable cleavage between faith in Christ and hope for the future can be healed in an eschatological Christology which leads on to a Christological eschatology. This means that when we perceived Jesus as the Christ, we do so in remembered hope. It is this recollection of hope that is practiced in every Eucharist.” (pp. 4-5)

***#1The Genesis of the Messianic Hope***

* The historical origins of messianic hope in Israel.[[3]](#footnote-3)
* The David/Zion tradition:
  + 1 Sam 8
  + Ps 2,
  + Ps 72,
  + Ps 110
* “At the latest after the ark had been brought to Zion, the Davidic kingdom was at the same time a priesthood. Royally anointed with Yahweh’s *ruach*, the Davidic ruler became both king and priest. But because prophets like Samuel and Nathan confronted these priestly kings from the very beginning, the Israelite monarchy was subjected to prophetic criticism as well as prophetic assent. The prophets abandoned the direct, charismatic theocracy of the early period, but reminded the custodians of Israel and her kings; for Yahweh was ‘the true king of Israel’ and hence the prototypes and judge of the earthly kings on Zion (1 Sam 2:10. Because Yahweh had compassion on his unhappy people in Egypt, his justice and righteousness always means ‘giving deliverance to the needy’ (Ps 72; Isa 11:4). Kingly rule in the name of this God therefore can only mean defending the rights of the poor, having mercy on humble, unimportant pole, protecting the weak, and liberating the oppressed. What must be expected of the king in Yahweh’s name is in crass contrast to the tyrannical portrait of the king which Samuel warningly help up to the people (1 Sam 8).” (p.7)
* Two discrepancies in the story of how Israel’s monarchy came into being:
  + The transition from direct, charismatic theocracy of early period of a theocracy mediated through a priestly king.
  + “Yahweh’s kingship is not merely ‘charismatic’. As the first commandment says, it is rule that is grounded on liberation from slavery, liberation for ht freedom of the divine covenant. But if general dynastic rule is to remain enforceable, it is bound to be directed toward the legitimating, safeguarding and increase of its own power. A kingship like the kingship of ‘all the other nations’ consists of judging and ‘fighting battles’ (1 Sam 8:2). But a monarchy in Yahweh’s name, imbued with his Spirit, ought to mean defending the rights of the poor, having compassion on the humble, and liberating the oppressed.” (p. 7)
* “Under the onslaught of the Assyrian armies, Israel’s armies, Israel’s brief political independence ended. Her kings were too weak, too corrupt, and too incapable to stand up to the great Assyrian power. Yet ‘whereas everywhere else in Syria the royal ideologies behind the state structures disappeared with the coming of Assyrian hegemony, in Israel the image of the king actually acquired new depths: it was transformed into the image of the messiah’.[[4]](#footnote-4) Through this ‘transformation’ the defeated people were able to assimilate and come to terms with these annihilating experiences of the sufferings of history. That was probably only possible because Israel was able to compare and confront the priestly king with the prophet led by the Spirit. It was thanks to the voice of the prophets in the second half of the eighth century that, although Israel lost its identity as state, it preserved its religious identity by learning to understand its political catastrophes as the judgments of its God. The transformation of the image of the king to the image of the messiah is part of this dramatic process. OF course, no image of hope is every born out of pure disappointment and mere defeat. No real hope has its genesis in ‘creative despair’.[[5]](#footnote-5) Hope must always be preceded by some positive remembrance. We discovered a specific form of this positive remembrance in the early constitution of the theo-political monarchy, and especially in the David/Zion tradition. And viewed more generally, Siegmund Mowinckel is surely right: ‘Israel’s unique conception of God as the God of history is the root of eschatology.’” (p. 8)

***#2The Growth of the Messianic Figure***

***1) The Messiah***

* Key texts:
  + Isa 7:10-15.
  + Isa 9:2-7
  + Isa 11:1-9.
  + Mic 4
  + Zech 9[[6]](#footnote-6)
* “The figure of the messiah therefore evolves out of a remembrance of David. But in the prophetic counter-stroke to Assyria’s military destruction of the political independence of Israel’s monarchy, this messianic figure assumes forms of hope which go gar beyond any reminiscence of the historical David. What expands and deepens the specific recollection of David so greatly are the dimensions of hope for the final, and therefore . . . coming of the God of promise himself, the God of compassionate justice and righteousness. Isaiah’s messiah is the king of the future who will be filled with the spirit—‘the fulfilling king’ as Buber calls him.[[7]](#footnote-7) He is ‘God-like’ because he represents the archetypal divine rule. Yet is also god’s counterpart, in the way that ‘the son’ is a counterpart to his father, and ‘the counselor’ to the judge. But he is not a superman. He is ‘the messianic human being.’”[[8]](#footnote-8) (p. 10)
* See Moltmann’s discussion of Buber amid the image of the Messiah on p. 12.

***2) The Son of Man***

* “The expectation of the Son of man belongs to the Jewish apocalyptic that is associated with the prophet Daniel. Historically speaking, whether this universal figure of hope grew up out of Israel’s hope for the messiah, or whether it has different roots, is disputed. But in the tradition that followed, hope for the messiah and the expectation of the Son of man were fused into a single, unified vision of the future. This, then, does in fact point to common roots, and to an associated group of transmitters. IT is true that Gerhard von Rad considered it ‘quite impossible’ for apocalyptic to be interpreted as a ‘child of prophecy’,[[9]](#footnote-9) because they it looked at history was irreconcilable with the interpretation of the prophets. Yet even Daniel is not totally outside the complex of Israelite and prophetic tradition. The offers taken by his ‘sense of history’,[[10]](#footnote-10) at least, can be seen as ‘an inheritance from the great prophets’.” (p, 13)
* Key texts
  + Dan 7: 1-14
  + Book of Enoch
  + 4 Ezra
* “If we can call Israel’s messiah-king the messianic human beings, then the son of man is certainly the true human being, long awaited, but always impeded by the bestial empires of the world. He brings God’s righteousness and justice into the world. That is why his kingdom is the kingdom of freedom, and has no end. When the son of man comes out of ‘the clouds’, this symbolizes the inaccessible sphere of God (as it does with Moses: Ex 24:28). When ‘all power’ is given him, he is installed as earthly representative of God’s rule over the world. If all nations are to serve him, this universality is a reminder of the messianic hope in Isa 9 and 11.” (p. 14)
* Note this is a universal, speculative vision. There is universal apocalyptic desolation.

**A two-stage messianology:**

* “the messiah is the immanent side of the transcendent son of man, and the son of man is the universal side of Israel’s particular messiah. Messianism is the historical side of apocalyptic, and apocalyptic is the transcendent side of messianism.” (pp. 16-17)

**Summary:**

* “The messiah is a historical figure of hope belonging to nation, space, and time. The Son of man is a figure of expectation for all nations; he is above the world, because he overcomes the world. Both figures are transparent for the kingdom of god in its direct, unmediated glory. It is this which the two figures represent in history, and which they have to mediate to human beings who are estranged from God. That is why both figures are also provision and passing. In them, and through their rule, *the coming of God himself* announces his coming (Isa 35:4).” (p. 17)
* How shall we recognize this? What the Messiah and Son of Man signify: “We shall see God himself come when we see justice for the poor, and healing for the sick, when we see that the oppressed are freed, and that tears are wiped away . . . (Isa 25:8; Rev 21:5).” (p.18)
* “Look at from the opposite direction, the messiah and the son of man are figures on the way to God’s rest in his creation. They are formations and personifications of the eschatological history of the world’s redemption. In the perspectives of Wisdom, they are stages of God’s indwelling in his creation (his shekinah), before he arrives at his eternal Sabbath rest in the happiness of his perfect indwelling (cf. Ecclus. 24; Rev 21).” (p. 18)

***The Messiah as Priest and Prophet***

* “The messiah/son of man development” may be the most important line in OT messianology, but note the importance of another line dealing with the king-messiah: the messiah seen as priest or prophet.”[[11]](#footnote-11) (p. 18)

**The priestly tradition**

* Origins: The prayer for Levi in Moses’ blessing (Deut 33:8-11).
* “Just as in Jacob’s blessing Judah is declared the royal tribe, in Moses’ blessing Levi is designated the priestly one.” (p. 18)
* Ps 110:4: Enthrones the king himself as priest ‘after the order of Melchizedek’.
* Zechariah 4: But after the exile, hope for the messiah king faded. Instead the figure of the priest came to the fore again. In the prophet’s vision in Zech 4, one finds the ancient image of messiah distributed between two: anointed king and anointed priest.
* See also Zech 3:1-7

**The prophetic tradition**

* Moses as the prototype of all prophets (Deut 18:9-22). Note Sinai and the connection with prophetic office. “The promise t Moses is the promise that Israel will never lack prophets or a prophetic communication of God’s will. The promise was also understood as the assurance that ‘at the end of day’s God would raise up a new Moses, for the End-time exodus from the slavery of history into the land of the eternal home country. This tradition was passed down in the Qumran community. The king of Israel is ‘chosen’ by God; the Levite is appointed’ to serve in the sanctuary; but the prophet in the succession of Moses will be ‘raised up’—that is through a special, perusal and direct call. IT is this that gives prophecy its ‘charismatic’ ‘character. But no one is a prophet unless he is in the succession of Moses and remains faithful to the revelation given on Sinai. This lends prophecy in Israel continuity.” (p. 19)

**The Suffering Servant of God**

* “When Jerusalem was destroyed, Israel’s monarchy ended, and for a time the priestly ministry in the temple ceased as well. Only the prophets accompanied the people into exile. They preserved Israel’s identity by interpreting its history and awakening its hope. It is therefore not surprising that the prophetic office in the succession of Moses would have been the matrix out of which the hope for the ‘new servant of God’ grew.
* This hope is expressed in the Servant songs in Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 40-55).[[12]](#footnote-12)
* Moses is ‘God’s servant’ *par excellence* (Ex 14:31 and frequently), and the prophets in general are similarly understood as ‘God servants (Isa 44:26; Amos 3:7, and frequently). Like them, the new ‘Servant of God’ is fashioned by Yahweh, called from his mother’s womb, and chosen out of God’s good pleasure. He is forced to fulfill his mission because Yahweh’s *ruach* has seized him (Isa 42:1; 61:1). His people are the poor and the mourners, the blind and the prisoners, the weary, and those who have been scattered. He will bring the people to repentance. Then God will gather his people, and lead them out to the ‘exodus’. He will bring justice among the nations. Heaven and earth will rejoice. His redemption will ripple out from Israel, by way of the nations, to the whole creation.” (p.20)
* Post-exile: the prophetic vision—the Suffering Servant songs (Isa 40-55; Isa 42; 61; 53)
* “The figure of the new Servant of God who is promised, and who is victorious through his suffering, gathers up Israel’s whole prophetic movement. Through his vicarious[[13]](#footnote-13) sufferings for the people, he excels even the first of all the prophets, Moses, and his intercession for the people before God. The Suffering Servant of God is the image of the messianic completion of Israel’s prophecy.” (p.20)
* Who is this “Servant of God”? The text leaves it open, but because of the parallelism to suffering Israel, who is called ‘God’s servant’, we may think of a personification of the people.
* Yet who redeems the people? A figure chosen by God form Israel and raised up for this purpose.[[14]](#footnote-14)

**Summary**:

* “The promise of the suffering servant of God ad the promise of the messiah/son of man stand side by side in the OT and Jewish messianology, curiously unrelated to one another.[[15]](#footnote-15) There is never any mention of expiatory suffering on the part of the messiah. At the same time, it may be assumed that a messianic understanding of the sons of the Suffering Servant preceded Jesus’ ministry. Otherwise that understanding could hardly have become the normal pattern for a theological interpretation of Jesus’ history.” (p. 21)

***#3 Messianic Categories***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion of Martin Buber, on the one hand, and Gershom Scholem and Walter Benjamin, on the other. |

* “Beside the noisy messianism of the apocalyptic of catastrophe, and the wild messianism of revolutionary utopianism, the Sabbath is a still but stead, and thus lasting, messianism. It comes in everyday life, and brings the dream of redemption into the unnoticeable ordinariness of life as it is lived.” (p. 27)

***#4 Christology in Jewish-Christian Dialogue***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion on pp. 28ff. |

Jürgen Moltmann, *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in Messianic Dimensions* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).

***CHAPTER II. TRENDS AND TRANSMUTATIONS IN CHRISTOLOGY***

***#1The Identity of Christology and Its Relevance***

***1) Christology as a Biblical Theme***

**Jesus is recognized as the Christ of God**

* “Since it is reflection about the subject, function and real-life situation of Christian faith (its *Sitz im Leben*), every christolgoy presupposes *belief*—an *account* of Christ presupposes a living *faith* in him. Christian faith is alive where men and women confess that Jesus of Nazareth, ‘crucified under Pontius Pilate’, is Israel’s messiah, the reconciler of the nations, the deliverer of the cosmos, the Son of the Father, and whatever the other statements about Christ have to say. Wherever people confess that Jesus is the Christ of God, there is living faith. Where this is doubted or denied or rejected, there is no faith. Christianity is alive as long as there are people who confess with the disciples and the women—with Martha (John 11) and Peter (Matt 16)—‘You are the Christ, the son of the living God,’ people who is his discipleship spread and live the gospel.” (p. 39)
* Yet believing and thinking go together.

**God is believed to be the Father of Jesus Christ, who raised him from the dead**

* To confess Jesus is Lord is also to confess faith in God, the God who raised him from the dead. “In the Christ they confess, they do not merely perceive that Jesus is ‘theo-form’; they also discern that God is ‘christo-form’.
* This further means that Jesus *is* the Lord because God *has raised* him from the dead. His *existence* as the Lord is to be found in God’s eschatological *act* in him, which we call raising form the dead. Jesus’ identity is this eschatological identity. He is not the Christ apart from this act of God. He is the Christ in the eschatological history of God, which brings about the end of this world of death and the beginning of the new creation. As ‘the first-born of the dead’ (Rev 1:5) and ‘the author of life’ (Acts 3:15), he is God’s Christ for the world. Jesus ‘is’ the Christ in this eschatological sense.” (p. 40)

**The presence of Christ is experienced in the Spirit, who gives life.**

* “The theme of christology extends to his resurrection and his presence in the Spirit of the coming God. This is already made plain by the earliest Christian creeds, which say that he was crucified and raised, died and rose again, was humiliated and exalted, is past, present, and to come. Anyone who pares the theme of christology down to ‘the Jesus of history,’ anyone who reduces the eschatological person of Christ to the private person of Jesus, and anyone who historicizes his presence opt the time of his life on earth, must not be surprised to discovered to discover that christolgoy is no longer a subject that has any relevance at all.” (pp. 40-41)

***2) The Present Position of Christology***

* “The *Sitz im Leben* for Christology—its situation in life—is *the community of Christ*, with its elemental functions for living, and its tasks for the world surrounding it. That is why Christology is related to *the gospel* of Christ which the congregation hears, and to which it witnesses. The proclamation and the daily witness of believers show who Christ really is for the community of his people today. At the center of the gathered congregation is Christology in its relation to *Christ’s Eucharist*; for in the praxis of the Eucharist the congregation ‘proclaims Christ’s death until he comes’ (1 Cor 11:26). The ‘memorial of Christ’ in the eating and drinking of his feast is essential for theological Christology, because there the presence of Christ can be experienced, and because the Eucharist binds his presence organically with his past—that is, his death—and with his future—that is, his parousia.” (p.42)
* “Like the messiah himself, the messianic community is sent first of all to unimportant people, people ‘of no account’: ‘Preach: the kingdom of God is at hand. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out demons. You received without paying. Give without paying too’ (Matt 19:7-8; cf. also Matt 11:5-6).” (p. 43)

***3) The Therapeutic Relevance of Christology***

* How are the **identity** and **relevance** of christology related to each other?
* “Is Jesus really the Christ?
* Who really is Jesus Christ for us today?” (p. 44)
* “In the course of history, this second question has been answered in two ways”:
* **Apologetic christology**: “gathers together proofs for Jesus’ messiahship and his resurrection, in order to clear away doubts and make possible”
* **Therapeutic christology**: “confronts the mystery of the present with the salvation Christ brings, presenting it as a salvation that heals. Healing power belongs to salvation; otherwise it could not save.” (p. 44)
* These two approaches complement each other: “In the history of theology, the **doctrine of the person of Christ** has always provided the inner premise for the soteriology which is to be substantiated; while soteriology is the outward result of the christology. This unity between Christological foundation of soteriology and the soteriological explication of Christology is never extinguished, even when Christology is made the criterion for soteriology, so as to prevent soteriology from being delivered over to the caprice of people’s own religious desires and anxieties, which would turn it into the religious wish-fulfillment of the moment.[[16]](#footnote-16) Christian theology talks about *Christ’s* salvation, not just any salvation. But it can talk about the salvation which Christ brings only as healing. It therefore has to be aware of the mystery of the present—of any given present—and expose it for what it is. In the therapeutic circle of healing, it is the critical analysis of the misery, evil and suffering which first makes it possible for liberation and salvation to be experienceable at all, for the people affected. To put it in traditional theological language: the liberating and healing process of the forgiveness of sins involves both the exposure and the confession of sin, as well as the assurance of forgiveness, and the discovery of new life in the righteousness of God.” (p. 44)
* “In the therapeutic circle of healing, it is the critical analysis of the misery, evil, and suffering which first makes it possible for liberation and salvation to be experienced by all, for the people affected. To put it in traditional theological language: the liberating and healing process of the forgiveness of sins involves both the exposure and the confession of sin, as well as the assurance of forgiveness, and the discovery of new life in the righteousness of God.” (p.44)

***#2The Theme and Scheme of Cosmological Christology***

***#3The Theme and Scheme of Anthropological Christology***

***#4 Christology in the Contradictions of Scientific and Technological Civilization***

*1) The Contradictions of Modern Civilization*

*2) The Theme and Scheme of Eschatological Christology Today*

Jürgen Moltmann, *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in Messianic Dimensions* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).

***CHAPTER: III. THE MESSIANIC MISSION OF CHRIST***

***#1 SPIRIT CHRISTOLOGY***

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT:

* “Jesus’ history as the Christ does not begin with Jesus himself.
* It begins with the *ruach*/the Holy Spirit.
* It is the coming of the Spirit, the creative breath of God: in this Jesus comes forward as ‘the anointed one’ (*masi’h*, *christos*), proclaims the gospel of the kingdom with power, and convinces many with the signs of the new creation.
* It is the power of the creative Spirit: through this he brings health and liberty for enslaved men and women into this sick world.
* It is in the presence of the Spirit that God reveals himself to him with the name ‘Abba’, that Jesus discovers that he is the ‘Son’ of this Father, and that he lives out this intimate relationship in his community of prayer with God.
* The Spirit ‘leads’ him into the temptations in the desert.
* The Spirit thrusts him along the path from Galilee to Jerusalem.
* ‘Through the eternal Spirit’ (Heb 9:14) he surrenders himself to death on the Roman cross.
* By the power of the Spirit, who gives new birth and new creation, God raises him from the dead.
* In word and meal, in community and baptism, Jesus is present in the Spirit ‘for many,’ as the divine Kyrios.” (p. 73)

THESIS OF THE CHAPTER:

* In the introductory chapters, we talked generally about ‘the eschatological history of Jesus Christ’.
* We are now giving this a more specific designation, calling it the Spirit-history of Jesus Christ:
  + the coming, the presence, and the efficacy of the Spirit in, through and with Jesus, is the hidden beginning of the new creation of the world.” (p.73)

WHY JM STARTS WITH A PNEUMATOLOGICAL CHRISTOLOGY:

* “We are starting with a *pneumatological christology*, because we discover **the efficacy of the divine Spirit** is the first facet of the mystery of Jesus.
  + In this way we are taking up **Israel’s messianic history of promise** as the presupposition of every New Testament christology and are developing christology out of the Jewish contours of the messianic promise.
  + This allows us to comprehend the **messianic mission of the earthly Jesus**, which was neglected in the Christological dogma of Nicaea, and which has been passed down to us pre-eminently in the synoptic gospels.” (pp. 73-74)
* “**Spirit christology is also Wisdom christology**;
  + for in the Israelite tradition Spirit and Wisdom were initially closely related, and in later Wisdom literature they can even be used as interchangeable terms.” (p. 74)
* **Spirit or Wisdom christologies and Son of God christology:**
  + Spirit or Wisdom christology is the premise for every Son of God christology;
    - for according to messianic tradition, the messiah who is anointed with the Spirit of God is ‘the son of God’” (p.74).
  + “a Son of God christology is no substitute for either Spirit christology or Wisdom christology, and must not supplant them.
    - Spirit christology is not set up in opposition to incarnation christology, for every doctrine of the incarnation begins with the statement ‘conceived by the Holy Spirit’.
  + Nor is Spirit christology leveled at the doctrine of the two natures.
    - But it does make it possible to absorb the **exclusive christomonism** of a christology of the God-human being in to the **fullness of trinitarian christology**, with its wealthy of relationships.
* The notion that there is an antithesis between an **adoptionist and a pre-existence christology** is a nineteenth-century invention.” (p.74)

JESUS’ LIFE HISTORY AS THE TRINITARIAN HISTORY OF GOD:

* “When we are considering the NT testimony about the theological history of Jesus, it is impossible to talk about **Jesus** without talking about the **workings of the Spirit in him**, and about **his relationship to the God whom he called ‘Abba’, my Father**.
* The historical account of his life is from the very beginning a **theological** account, for it is determined by his collaboration—his co-instrumentality—with the **Spirit and ‘the Father’**.
* His life history is at heart a ‘trinitarian history of God’.” (p.74)
* The complex dimensions of Jesus’ life history are obscured if we talk about it only one of these dimensions—Jesus and God, or God and Jesus—so as to see him either as the **heavenly God-man** or as the **earthly man of God**.
* If christology starts by way of pneumatology, this offers the approach for a trinitarian christology, in which the **Being of Jesus Christ** is from the very outset a **Being-in-relationship**, and where his actions are from the very beginning **interactions**, and his efficacies **co-efficacies**.” (p.74)

NT SOURCES FOR JESUS’ LIFE:

* “In this Spirit christology, we shall first of all look at the early traditions in the NT about Jesus’ life—
  + the Logion source (Q),
  + the earliest form of Mark’s Gospel (proto-Mark), and then the
  + synoptic Gospels and
  + Gospel of John.” (p. 75)
* The four gospels in the NT “tell the story of [Jesus’] life in the light of his resurrection and his presence in the Spirit of God.

WHY THE NT GOSPELS TELL THE “GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST” (AND NOT HISTORY IN THE MODERN SENSE):

* “If the history of Jesus is made present through narrative in the light of his resurrection from the dead, what emerges is not a history in the modern sense of the word, but something new: ‘the gospel of Jesus Christ.’
  + Here the *history* of the person who proclaimed to the poor the gospel of the kingdom of God actually itself becomes the *gospel*. The **history of Jesus** and his **proclamation** turns into the **proclamation of Christ Jesus**: Jesus’ preaching of the kingdom is gathered up and made present in the apostolic preaching of the Christ.” (p.75)
  + “The gospels therefore really do tell ‘**the history of a living person’**, because they bring out the presence of the One past and the future of the One who has come. It is this that constitutes the unique character of the histories of Jesus in the gospels, compared with all the historicizations of his life.” (p.75)

WHY JESUS’ DEATH AND RESURRECTION IS SO SIGNIFICANT FOR UNDERSTANDING HIS LIFE:

* “In this making-present of past history, the salient point is the event of Jesus’ death on the **cross**, and the experience of the presence of the **risen One in the Spirit**.
  + The **cross** divides the **community of Jesus’** **followers** after Easter and their proclamation, from **Jesus and his**.
  + But the **Easter event** also links the **congregation** with **Jesus and his history** . . . [I]n the Easter appearances the risen One appeared as the one crucified, so that the resurrection witnesses could identify the living with the dead, the one present with the one past, the one to come with the one who had already come.
* It is the **Easter event** that prompts the confession of faith: ‘Jesus is the Christ of God.’
  + This event was called ‘raising from the dead’.
    - Raising from the dead is an eschatological symbol, and means that in the crucified Christ the future has already begun—the future of resurrection and eternal life, the annihilation of death and the new creation.
    - But if the crucified Christ has been raised into the eschatological life of the new creation, then the raising of Jesus cannot be understood as simply one more event in his life, an event which took place historically, after his death.
  + His **death** is a **historical** event and makes him a historical person. But his **raising** is much more: it is **eschatologica**l.
    - The eschatological moment of his raising from the dead must therefore also be understood as **God’s eternal moment**.
    - So the raising did not merely happen *synchronically* to the dead Jesus; it also happened *diachronically* to the whole Jesus is all the moments and aspects of his life and proclamation.
    - That is why he is present in the power of the Spirit, not merely in his last moment on the cross but in all his moments from birth onwards.
    - He is raised and present in the Spirit, not only as the one crucified, but also as the one baptized, as the healer, the preacher on the mount, the friend of sinners and tax-collectors, and the one whom the women accompanied to the moment of his death.” (p.76)

CORRESPONDENCES BETWEEN THE **EXPERIENCE** OF THE PRESENT CHRIST AND THE **REMEMBRANCE** OF THE HISTORICAL JESUS:

* “These already took on the structure of a mirror image very early one:
  + the One who is now raised from the dead to God is the One whom God once surrendered;
  + the One who is now risen is the One who died;
  + the One now exalted is the One who was once humiliated.
* The pre-Pauline human on Christ in Philippians 2 clearly shows the mirror-image correspondence between ‘humiliated—humiliated’, but with a trinitarian difference:
  + Christ humiliated himself-God the Father exalted him.
  + It is therefore understandable that the idea of the *incarnation* of God’s Son in Jesus of Galilee should be the inverted presupposition for the *exaltation* of Jesus of Galilee, and his installation as Son of God. The **descendance** and **ascendance** match.
* Systematically, this must be understood to mean that Christ’s **exaltation** and **presence** are the cognitive ground for his incarnation and his history; while the **incarnation** and **history** are the ‘true’ ground for his exaltation and presence.
  + According to Aristotle, the first in the **history of being** is the last in the **history of knowing**, and vice versa.
  + Consequently the being of Jesus Christ is known in the light of his end, and his origin is known in the light of his future.
  + In the light of the **eschatological revelation** in his revelation in his raising from the dead, his history can be understood.” (p.77)

TRACING THE WAY BACK STEP BY STEP:

* “[I]n the history of the tradition, the process of the remembering making-present of the history of Christ apparently meant tracing the way back step by step:

1. His presence in the Spirit in the community of his people is presence ‘since’ his resurrection from the dead and his appearances in glory.
2. The presence of the Spirit in him personally dates ‘from’ his baptism by John, when he was about 30 years old (Mark 1:10).
3. He was strong in the Spirit ‘from birth’ (Luke 2:40).
4. He was actually conceived by the HS (Luke 1:35).
5. He was in fellowship with the Father and the Spirit in eternity (John 1:1)
6. So the history of his Being presupposes the relationships of this Being to the Spirit and to the Father.” (p.78)

THESIS FOR THE REST OF THE CHAPTER:

* “The whole thrust of the experience of the presence of the Spirit of the risen Christ is towards presenting his whole history as the history of the Spirit with him. This is the point of approach for the pneumatological christology of the earthly life, ministry and way of Jesus Christ: the remembrance of the life-history of Jesus discerns Jesus’ endowment with the Spirit and the workings of the Spirit in him. This is the sphere of pneumatological christology. Jesus appears as the messianic human being in the history of the Spirit of God with him and through him.” (p.78)

***#2 CHRIST’S BIRTH IN THE SPIRIT***

THESIS:

* “In this section we shall not talk about Jesus’ virgin birth, as dogmatic tradition has done.
* We shall talk about **the birth of Jesus Christ from the Holy Spirit**;
* for what we are dealing with here is not a question of gynecology;
* it is a theme of Christian pneumatology.” (p.78)

***1) Christ’s Birth in the Spirit from a Historical Perspective***

* “Because these narrators [of Jesus’ birth, that is Matthew and Luke] make no distinction between history and legend in the modern sense, but intend to relate a ‘gospel’, no objection can be made to the modern designation ‘legend’ for the stories about Christ’s nativity.
* At that time the inherent truth of the nativity stories had to be expressed in the form of an aetiological myth. The truth is to be found precisely *in this mythical story* about Christ’s origin, not in the biological facts. It is therefore factually inappropriate to call the virgin birth historical, let alone ‘biological’; and modern positivist characterizations of this kind do anything but preserve the intention and truth of the story. In actual fact they destroy it. Their aim is to confess Jesus as the messianic Son of God and to point at the very beginning of his life to the divine origin of his person.” (p.82)

***2) Christ’s Birth in the Spirit from a Theological Perspective***

* Two ideas in the history of the tradition that express two different ideas about the way in which the origin of Jesus, as Son of God and Immanuel, can be told in mythical form.

1. **God brought about the miracle of Mary’s pregnancy through the Holy Spirit.**

* This is a way of saying that *God alone is the Father of Jesus Christ*.
* Cf. Matt 23:9: “Call no man your father on earth, for you have one Father, who is in heaven.”
* “The patriarchal succession of generations is broken off for the sake of the history of the promise” (pp. 82-83).

**What this means:**

* “[I]f the Son of God became wholly and entirely human, and if he assumed full humanity, then this does not merely take in human personhood; it includes human nature as well. It does not embrace adult humanity alone; it comprehends humanity diachronically, in all its phases of development—that is, it includes the being of the child, the being of the fetus and the embryo. The whole of humanity in all its natural forms is assumed by God in order that it may be healed. So it is ‘human’ and ‘holy’ in all its natural forms, and is prenatally by no means merely ‘human material’, or just the preliminary stage to humanity. That is they theologically the true and real birth of Christ has to be stressed.” (p.85)
* Cf. John 1:12: “the point of comparison with the birth of the Son of God is to be found in the rebirth of believers from the Spirit into divine sonship and daughterhood, then, and then especially we do not have to assume any supernatural intervention. We should rather view the whole process of the human begetting, conception and birth of Jesus as the work of the Holy Spirit.” (p.85)

1. **Behind the human motherhood of Mary is the *motherhood of the Holy Spirit*.**

* Cf. John 1:12, 13.
* “The ancient Syrian and the more recent Moravian doctrine about ‘the modern office of the Holy Spirit’ has its roots here, as well as in the function of the Paraclete, who comforts as a mother comforts.
* The point of comparison for understanding the birth of Christ is not a human process of procreation and conception; it is the experience of the Spirit encountered by the men and women who are born again to become children of God. Because this experience of the Spirit is to be found in the community of Christ’s people, through which Jesus Christ becomes ‘the first-born among many brethren’ (Rom 8:29) and sisters, this first-born brother must himself be the archetype of the divine sonship and daughterhood in the Spirit. That is why the ‘first-born brother’ is called ‘the only begotten Son of god’. The history of his primal and original birth from the Spirit of God merely brings out the difference that he is from the beginning and by nature that which believers become in his fellowship, through Word and Spirit: the messianic child of God.” (p.83)

**What this means:**

* “According to Jewish expectation, the messianic son of God is the human being who is filled with the Spirit of God. In a reverse movement, in the messianic era the messianic human being brings about the pouring out of the Holy Spirit on all flesh. He comes in the Spirit of the Lord, so that it fills the whole earth. If we now wished to say that Jesus was from the beginning (and hence in his whole existence) the messianic child of God, we should also have to say that from the very beginning he was filled with the Spirit of God, and that his whole being is the warp and weft of the Spirit.” (pp. 85-86)
* Cf. John 3:6; 1 Peter 1:3, 23; Matt 19:28.
* “The birth of the messianic Son of God ‘from the Spirit’ is the beginning and the sign of hope for the rebirth of human beings and the cosmos through God’s Shekinah. That is why the indwelling of the Holy Spirit has to be told at the same time as the birth of Christ.” (p.86)

***#3 CHRIST’S BAPTISM IN THE SPIRIT***

***1) John the Baptist and Jesus of Galilee***

* “It is historically probable that Jesus was one of the John’s disciples at the Jordan, and was convinced by his apocalyptic message.
  + It was only when John was thrown into prison by Herod for political reasons, and was silence, that Jesus returned to Galilee and preached his gospel of the kingdom of God publicly (Mark 1:14). He took John’s place in the eschatological history of the kingdom of god, to which John of course already belonged, since he too was ‘filled with the Holy Sprit’, as Luke says (1:15). John’s cruel end was the hour of Jesus’ public beginning.” (p.87)
* Who is John the Baptist?
  + “Everything John does is rich in symbolism and full of the remembrance of God’s age-hold history with Israel.
    - He baptizes repentant people in the Jordan, in preparation fro the new, final entry into ‘the land of God.’ John’s message, symbolism and baptism constitute an ‘eschatological sacrament of repentance’.
    - This baptism is different from ritual lustrations because of its eschatological finality . . . . It is the eschatological sign of the conversion of all Israel.
    - Although John had disciples, he evidently did not found any new sect. He proclaimed to the whole people a conversion in the awareness that all that was ahead was the free space of the imminent rule of God. John’s eschatology was the expectation of God’s imminent judgment, which opens the way for the kingdom of his justice and righteousness.” (p.88)
* Jesus and John:

|  |
| --- |
| * + See the comparison between Jesus and John pp. 88-89. |

* What is behind these external differences?
  1. Jesus did not experience “the forgiveness of sins for conversion” but the Holy Spirit (Mark 1:10; cf. Acts 10:38).
  2. Jesus has a vision of “the open heavens” (Mark 1:10; cf. Mark 1:11; Matt 3:17; enthronement psalm in Ps 2:7; John 3:34). “With the indwelling of Yahweh’s *ruach*, Jesus’ relationship to God becomes one of sonship, and he perceives God’s relationship to him is one of fatherhood.
  3. Jesus does not merely proclaim as prophet the far-off, sovereign kingdom of God the Lord; he proclaims as brother the imminent, loving kingdom of his Father (“Abba”); see Matt 11:27; John.
* Conclusions:

1. “When Jesus proclaims the ‘imminent’ kingdom of God (Mark 1:15), he is proclaiming the intimate nearness of God the Father, the nearness which is described through the name Abba; he is not proclaiming the coming of the wrathful judgment of the world.
2. He demonstrates the nearness of the kingdom of God, not through threats and asceticism but through signs of grace to distraught men and women, and through miracles of health for life that has been sick.
3. According to his own understanding, the era in which he preached and ministered is not the ‘last days’ before the judgment, with their harassing distress. It is the liberating ‘fullness of time’ of the messiah (Gal 4:4).” (p.91)

***2) The Kenosis of the Divine Spirit—Jesus’ Endowment with the Spirit***

THE OT CONTEXT FOR UNDERSTANDING THE SPIRIT:

* “According to the OT traditions (Gen 1:2; Ps 104:29f.), Yahweh’s *ruach* is God’s own power of creation, and the power of life which is communicated to all created things, in heaven and on earth.
* In considering Jesus’ baptism and his endowment with the Spirit too, we have to understand the Spirit as *the creative energy* of God and *the vital energy* of everything that lives. In the OT traditions, the Spirit is also the divine *saving power* through which God led Israel out of slavery into the land of freedom . . . . Yahweh’s *ruach*/the divine Spirit is also, and not least, the Spirit who speak through the prophets. In Jesus too he is *the prophetic Spirit*, who speaks through the messianic plenipotentiary (Isa 61).
* “If we understand Yahweh’s *ruach*/the Holy Spirit as the creative energy, the saving and prophetic power of God, then the continuing presence of this Spirit implies the beginning of the end-time deliverance of men and women, the new creation and the manifestation of God’s glory. The continuing presence of the Spirit in Jesus is the true beginning of the kingdom of God, and of the new creation in history.” (p.92)

THE SPIRIT AS JESUS’ DETERMINING SUBJECT:

* “In the first chapters of the synoptic gospels especially, the Spirit is presented as the divine determining subject of the way Jesus took. The divine Spirit, who indwells Jesus, initiates and makes possible the relationship of the Father to the Son and of the Son to the Father. In the Spirit. God experiences Jesus as the messianic child, and Jesus experiences God as ‘Abba’. Jesus’ relationship to God reflects God’s relationship to Jesus.” (p.92)

THE TEMPTATION IN THE DESERT:

* The temptation in the wilderness (Mark 1:12, 13; Matt 4:1-11; Luke 4:1-3) immediately follows the baptism.
* What the accounts have in common:
  + The Spirit led Jesus into the desert.
  + Satan tempted him.
  + The angels ministered to him.
  + He was among the beasts.
* “What is in question here is not a metaphysical divine Sonship, but the messianic kingdom of Jesus, which is put to the test through temptations, and which is more precisely defined in these temptations; for the possibilities which the tempter offers Jesus are ways of seizing messianic power over Israel and the nations:
  + bread for hungry masses;
  + universal power through renunciation of God and the worship of Satan, who can give this power;
  + the messianic sign for the liberation of Israel in the temple of the holy city.
* Interpreting this potential “messianic ‘seizure of power’” against the “background of Jesus’ helplessness in the story of the passion and his death on the cross.” (p.93)
  + Note that the way to the cross is the way God’s Spirit ‘leads’ Jesus.

THE KENOSIS OF THE SPIRIT:

* “If we talk about a ‘condescending’ of the Spirit, we have also to talk about a *kenosis of the Holy Spirit*,
  + which emptied itself and descended from the eternity of God, taking up its dwelling in this vulnerable and mortal human being Jesus.
  + The Spirit does indeed fill Jesus with authority and healing power, but it does not make him a superman; it participates in his weakness, his suffering, and his death on the cross. Through its indwelling, the Spirit binds itself to Jesus’ destiny.” (p. 93)
* “The history of God’s saving, creative and prophetic Spirit is indivisibly bound up with the history of Jesus Christ.
  + It is the one single history of the mutual relationship between the Spirit and Jesus, Jesus and the Spirit. This is what Jesus’ baptism means for the Holy Spirit.” (p.94)
* “Jesus was not baptized into the Spirit as a private person, but *pars par toto*, representatively, as one among many, and as one for many.
  + He received the Spirit for the sick whom he healed, for the sinners who sins he forgave,
  + for the poor whose fellowship he sought, for the women and men whom he called into his discipleship. He received the Spirit as the brother of men and women, as the friend of the poor, as the head of his gathered people, and as the messiah of God’s new creation.” (p. 94)

***#4 THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD TO THE POOR***

***1) The Gospel of Freedom***

* “The gospels present the history of Jesus in the light of his messianic mission, which was inaugurated through his baptism. His mission embraces his proclamation and his acts, his acts and his suffering, his life and his death.” (p.94)
* What is this gospel for the synoptics? (cf. Isa 61.1)
* In the OT, to proclaim a gospel means bringing a message of joy, heralding a victory, announcing salvation.
  + Divine victory over enemies (Ps 68:11; 40:9)
  + Messianic content into the concept of *basar* (Greek *evangelizein*): the prophet promises the people in Babylonian captivity a new exodus—the end-time exodus out of slavery into the land of enduring freedom (Isa 52:7).
* The gospel is “nothing less than the arrival of the coming God in the word.
  + We have to put it in these emphatic terms in order to be able to discern the gospel’s sacramental character: salvation runs ahead of itself and appears in the gospel; and the gospel is the beginning in word of the epiphany of the coming God.” (p.95)
  + The creative word which effects what it utters (4 Ezra 9:5f.).
  + The messianic gospel in universal terms (Deutero-Isaiah; Ps 96).
  + Isa 61.1ff.: “puts this gospel into the mouth of the end-time messianic prophet, who is filled with the Spirit of the Lord, and brings about salvation through his word. In relation to God, he proclaims the direct lordship of Yahweh without limits and without en, and in relation to human beings, justice, community, and liberty. His message is addressed to the poor, the wretched, the sick and the hopeless, because these are the people who suffer the most from God’s remoteness and hostility.” (p.96)
* A message of liberation:
  + See Isa 52:2, 12.
  + “The message ‘God is king’ makes the liberation of the people possible, and actually brings it about; and yet liberation is also the act of the prisoners, who liberate themselves, who break out of their imprisonment and return home on their own feet.
  + The messianic message about the coming rule of God is not a reduction of human freedom. It actually makes freedom possible and sets it ‘in a large room.’
  + Nor is the message a compound of authority and freedom; it is the authority of freedom itself.” (p. 96)

***2) The Kingdom of God and New Creation***

* What does it mean to say that kingdom is at hand?
  + “it has come so close that the signs of the messianic era are already visible: the sick are healed, demons are driven out, the lame walk, the deaf hear, the poor have the gospel preached to them. It is so close that we can already pray to God as ‘Abba’; dear Father. It is so close that the Torah has to be messianically interpreted through the Sermon on the Mount and can find its fulfillment in the discipleship of Jesus.” (p.97)
* The *basileia tou theou* can be translated as (1) lordship of God (the rule of God in the present) or (2) the kingdom of God (the future of this kingdom).
  + “What can actually be experienced is the immediate lordship of God in the liberating of those who have been bound, and the healing of the sick, in the expulsion of devils and the raising up of the humiliated.
  + But the conquest of death’s power, and the experience of eternal life, are undoubtedly future.” (p.97)
  + “We therefore have to understand the liberating activity of God as the *immanence* of the eschatological kingdom of God, and the coming kingdom as the *transcendence* of the present lordship of God. If we transpose the concepts ‘immanence’ and ‘transcendence’ on to the historical level, we can say that the present lordship of God determines the *messianic era* and the future kingdom of God is the definition of *eschatological certainty*.” (p.98)
  + Versus either a purely “spiritual” understanding of the reign of God or one that identifies the reign of God with some existing state of affairs.
  + “God’s *lordship* is the *presence* of his kingdom, and
  + God’s *kingdom* is the *future* of his lordship.” (p.98)
* “[T]he kingdom of glory is identical with the *new creation*.
  + In order to avert and surmount both the moralization and the spiritualization of the concept of the present lordship of God, I am proposing in what follows sometimes to translate ‘the kingdom of God’ by ‘new creation’.
  + The lordship of God whose efficacy already reaches into this history of injustice and death, is accordingly to be understood as the newly creating, life-giving activity of God.” (p.98)
* A new angle for viewing the ministry of Jesus:
  + “When Jesus expels demons and heals the sick, he is driving out of creation the powers of destruction, and is healing and restoring created beings who are hurt and sick. The lordship of God, to which the healings witness, restores sick creation to health. Jesus’ healings are not supernatural miracles in a natural world. They are the only truly ‘natural’ thing in a world that is unnatural, demonized, and wounded. As parables of the kingdom, Jesus’ parables are also parables of the new creation in the midst of everyday life of this exhausted world. Finally, with the resurrection of Christ, the new creation begins, *pars pro toto*, with the crucified one.”

***3) The Dignity of the Poor***

|  |
| --- |
| Note the centrality of the “poor” in the Jesus’ ministry, see pp. 99-10.2 |

***4) Liberation through Conversion***

THE CALL TO CONVERSION:

* “Jesus proclaims to the poor the kingdom of God without any conditions, and calls them blessed because the kingdom of God is already theirs.
* But the gospel of the kingdom meets the rich with the *call to conversion* (Mark 1:15 par.).

WHAT DOES CONVERSION MEAN?

* “True life begins here and now, the true life which will come for the whole of creation within the kingdom of God.” (p.102)
* “As we can see from the catalogue of these beatitudes in Matthew and Luke as they were expanded after Easter, the ‘people’ of the passive and active beatitudes are the people and disciples who turn to the Sermon on the Mount; they are the poor and those who are hungry for justice and righteousness, the people who suffer and are persecuted for the sake of justice, the sad and the gentle. Here it becomes evident how those who are converted become a single people, one with the poor, and welded into the new messianic community.
* Later on the Christian congregations shaped this new community of poor and rich in such a way that the rich gave alms, exercised the right to compassion by receiving strangers, clothing the naked, feeding the hungry, and visiting people in prison.” (p.103)

***#5 THE HEALING OF THE SICK—THE EXPULSION OF THE DEMONS***

* “In the discussion of Jesus’ miracles, the connection between the **healing of the sick** and the **expulsion of demons** is often overlooked.” (p.105)

***1) Healing and Exorcism***

|  |
| --- |
| Note the important connection between healing and exorcism in Jesus’ ministry—and note how central both are to his preaching and enactment of the reign of God. See pp. 105-110. |

***2) Healing Faith***

* “The healings are stories about faith just as much as they are stories about Jesus.” (p.112)

|  |
| --- |
| Note how important the stories of healing faith are in the Gospel accounts. See pp. 111-112. |

***#6 THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE OUTCASTS—THE RAISING UP OF THE HUMILIATED***

* “Jesus proclaimed *the kingdom of God* to the poor and bestowed *the power of God* on the sick; and in the same way he brought ‘sinners and tax-collectors’ *the justice of God*, which is the justice of grace. He demonstrated this publicly by sitting down at table with them. In the eschatological context of his own message, this shared meal is an anticipation of the eating and drinking of the righteous in the kingdom of God.” (p.112)

|  |
| --- |
| Note how important Jesus’ fellowship with “tax-collectors and sinners” is. See pp. 112-116. |

***#7 THE MESSIANIC WAY OF LIFE***

***1) Christian Ethics and the Ethical Knowledge of Christ***

* “Did Jesus teach a new ethic? Is there such a thing as a specifically Christian ethic today? Does Christian faith involve a new life style? Can one know Christ at all without following him?” (p. 116)

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s argument for why the *solus Christus* (only Christ) of the Reformation cannot be normative merely for the doctrine of faith, but must be the rule for ethics too on pp. 116-19. |

* “What is the importance of Christian existence for society generally? What does the universal horizon of the messianic way of Jesus Christ look like?” (p.119)
  + “If we call this horizon of Jesus’ messianic gospel ‘eschatological’, then his gospel will be universal to the degree in which the eschatological horizon begins to shape the history of humanity, or the measure in which the history of humanity, reaches this eschatological horizon of the end.
  + But this eschatological horizon once again manifests that which gives creation at the beginning its impress, and fills it with life: the Spirit and Wisdom of God.” (p.119)

***2) The Messianic Sabbath***

|  |
| --- |
| Note the connections Moltmann draws between Jesus’ first proclamation in Nazareth (Luke 4:18ff.)—and the proclamation of the imminent reign of God (Mark 1:15; Matt 4:17)—and the Lord’s “Year of Jubilee” in Lev. 25:10ff. (cf. Isa 61:1-2). |

***3) The Messianic Torah***

* “Taking the Sermon on the Mount seriously and following Christ go together. The discipleship of Christ, and the brotherly and sisterly life in the community of Christ, go together. Life in the community of Christ, and the expectation of the universal kingdom of God among the people of the poor, the sad and the suffering, go together. Hope for God’s kingdom and the experience of poverty among the people; the community of brothers and sisters and the discipleship of Christ—these things are a unity. And in this unity ‘the law of Christ’ is not an undue burden. It is a matter of course—‘the light burden’ (Matt 11:28-30) for all the wary and heavy-laden, who in its find rest. The Sermon on the Mount is the only ‘wise thing’, like ‘the house that is built on rock’, which cannot be swept away by the floods (Matthew 7:24-27).” (p. 126)

***4) The Messianic Peace***

***a) Non-violent action***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion of non-violent action and the Sermon on the Mount on pp. 127-130. |

***b) Responsibility for our enemies***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion of *loving one’s enemies* as *responsibility for one’s enemies* on pp. 130-132. |

***5) ‘Swords into Ploughshares’***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s argument for why the Sermon on the Mount is still valid for Christians on pp. 132-136. |

***#8 JESUS—THE MESSIANIC PERSON IN HIS BECOMING***

THE FINAL TASK:

* “We shall now enquire about [Jesus’] person, and shall make a first attempt to find our way from the conceptual angle into the stories about Jesus told by the synoptics gospels, so as to understand Jesus himself.
* Note how Moltmann seeks to move beyond the following ways of understanding Jesus’ identity:
  + The *metaphysical concepts of nature* or essence of traditional christologies; they define divine divinity and humanity by way of mutual negations: finite-infinite, mortal-immortal, passible-impassible.
  + The *concepts of efficacy* summed up in the Protestant doctrine of Christ’s “three-fold office” as prophet, priest, and king; they do not take account of Christ’s living relationships with other people.
  + The more modern (and especially feminist) concepts of Jesus’ being as *being-in-relationship*; they do not yet enter into Jesus’ being as *being-in-history* and the “learning process” of his life and ministry, his experience and suffering.
* What Moltmann attempts:
  + “Here we shall try to take up the different christological concepts of person and integrate them so as to arrive at a fuller, richer portrait of the person of Jesus Christ.
  + We shall look at
    - The divine person
    - The person in his messianic ministry
    - The public person commissioned by God
    - The person in the warp and weft of his relationships
    - The person in the emergence and growth of his own life history.

***1) The Messianic Person of Jesus***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion of Jesus’ “messianic secret” on pp. 137-141. |

***2) Jesus—the Child of God***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion of Jesus’ special identity as “Son of God” and relationship to his “Abba” on pp. 142-145. |

***3) Jesus—a Person in Social Relationships***

***a) Jesus and His Fellowship with Women and Men***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion on pp. 146-147. |

***b) Jesus and Israel***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion on pp. 147-148. |

***c) Jesus and the People***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion on pp. 148-149. |

***4) THE THREE-DIMENSIONAL PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST***

* “To confession Jesus as the Christ means perceiving him in his ***eschatological person***. In him are present Israel’s messiah, the Son of man of the nations, and the coming Wisdom of creation itself. He is the kingdom of God in person, and the beginning of the new creation of all things. In this way he is the bearer of hope for the world. In him believers recognize the ***messianic human being***
* To confess Jesus as the Christ of God also means perceiving him in his ***theological person***. He is the child of God, the God who he calls Abba, dear Father. As the child of God, he lives wholly in God and God wholly in him. He opens this unique relationship with God to all who believe in him and who, as children of God, like him cry ‘Abba’. They participate in Jesus’ joy. In him believers recognize *the childlike human being*.
* To confess Jesus as the Christ of God further means perceiving him in his ***social person***. He is the brother of the poor . . . the friend of the forsaken, the sympathizer with the sick. He heals through solidarity, and communicates his liberty and his healing power through is fellowship. In him men and women recognize *the brotherly and sisterly human being*.” (p.149)
* “Merely to take account of any single one of these dimensions in Jesus’ person as the Christ leads to a one-sidedness that has fatal consequences.
  + Traditional christology stressed only the *theological* person of the God-man Jesus Christ.
  + Modern eschatological theology stressed the *eschatological* person of Jesus Christ.
  + The most recent contextual theologies have disclosed the *social* person of Jesus Christ.” (pp. 149-150)

CONCLUSION:

* “We cannot close this chapter on the messianic mission of Jesus Christ without offering a suggestion for an addition to these two ancient creeds of the church. The intention is not to alter the words of the tradition; but one must know what has to be added in thought. After ‘born of the Virgin Mary’ or ‘and was made man’, we should add something along the following lines:
  + Baptized by John the Baptist,
  + Filled with the Holy Spirit:
  + To preach the kingdom of God to the poor,
  + To heal the sick,
  + To receive those who have been cast out,
  + To revive Israel for the salvation of the nations, and
  + To have mercy upon all people.” (p.150)

Jürgen Moltmann, *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in Messianic Dimensions* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).

***CHAPTER: IV. THE APOCALYPTIC SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST***

***#1: THE APOCALYPTIC HORIZON OF WORLD HISTORY***

THE ACTIVE AND PASSIVE SUFFERING OF CHRIST:

* At the center of Christian faith is the history of Christ. At the center of the history of Christ is his passion and his death on the cross. We have to take the word ‘passion’ in both its senses here, if we are to understand the mystery of Christ. For the history of Christ is the history of a great passion, a passionate surrender to God and his kingdom. At the same time and for that reason it became the history of an unprecedented suffering, a deadly agony. At the center of Christian faith is *the passion of the passionate Christ*. The history of his life and the history of his suffering belong together.” (p.151)

THE ‘SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST’ AS THE EPITOME OF THE THEOLOGY OF THE CROSS:

* “Like the *passio* in Latin and passion in English, *páthēma* in Greek has the double meaning of intense feeling or desire, and suffering.
* The ‘sufferings’, the ‘affliction’, the ‘reproach’ and the ‘shame’ of Christ are words used in the NT—and especially by Paul—to describe

1. the personal sufferings of Jesus from Gethsemane to Golgotha,
2. the sufferings of the apostle who proclaims the gospel of Christ, is therefore persecuted and has to suffer,
3. the sufferings of Israel, the prophets, and John the Baptist, and
4. the sufferings of the whole groaning creation in this present time.

* So ‘sufferings of Christ’ are not confined to Jesus. They have universal dimensions, because they belong within the apocalyptic sufferings of ‘this present time’ are gathered up into ‘the sufferings of Christ’ on Golgotha. Jesus suffers them in solidarity with others, and vicariously for many, and proleptically for the whole suffering creation.
* We shall look at the **exclusive** aspect of Christ’s sufferings and at their **inclusive** side, in order to develop a Christology which is relevant to the sufferings in our own time.” (pp.151-152)

PREVIOUS WORK:

* *The Crucified God* (1972): “In that book I was concerned with the question about God: what does the death of Christ mean for God himself? I tried to get over the ancient metaphysical apathy axiom in the doctrine of God, so as to be able to talk about God’s ‘essential’ suffering, and to do so not merely metaphorically but quite directly. I saw the God-forsaken cry with which Christ dies on the cross as the criterion for all theology which claims to be Christian. For me the theology of the cross came to be seen in the context of the theodicy question, confuting not merely abstract atheism, but abstract theism too.”[[17]](#footnote-17) (p.152)
* *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God* (1980): “I took this doctrine [a doctrine of God, which grew out of a theology of the cross] further, developing a doctrine of the Trinity founded on the essential love of God which can be discerned in the mutual relationships of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit and which, in the perichoresis of the divine persons, becomes the archetype of the community of human beings and all creation.”[[18]](#footnote-18) (p.152)
* “In chapter 3, ‘The History of the Son’, I went beyond cross and resurrection, integrating ‘the sending of the Son’ on the one hand and ‘the future of the Son’ on the other into Trinitarian Christology.” (pp. 152-153)
* “Here too, in taking as my subject the apocalyptic horizon of Christ’s sufferings, I am presupposing these earlier interpretations, and adding to them. I shall recapitulate where necessary, pointing out any modifications I have meanwhile come to make.” (p.153)

JESUS LIFE AND SUFFERING:

* “Jesus’ life is already marked by suffering the very light of his messianic message, not just at its end. His messianic passion brought with it the experience of apocalyptic suffering.” (p.153)
  + - Jesus’ answers the disciples’ question whether he is the messiah with the announcement of suffering, and the call to follow him in suffering (Mark 8:27-35).
    - **Apocalyptic and the kingdom of God:** Not merely the ethical side of the Sermon on the Mount that brings us face to face with the kingdom of God, but the apocalyptic side (Mark 13; Matt 24; Luke 21).[[19]](#footnote-19)
    - “Understood apocalyptically, the kingdom of God brings the end of this world-time and the beginning of the new creation. That is to say, its coming brings the tribulations and assailments of the end-time. For ‘this world’, they mean the catastrophic end. But in fact they are the birth pangs of the new world. These ‘worlds’ are ‘world eras’, eons, not heaven and earth themselves. Liberation from ‘the godless ties of this world’ frees people for ‘grateful service’ on behalf of ‘all those whom God has created’.[[20]](#footnote-20)
    - **Versus Manichaeism; hope for new creation**: “Apocalyptic has nothing to do with Manichaeism. It is hope in the Creator or a new creation. Since this new world-time of God’s kingdom comes into this world-time and its power-center Jerusalem in the form and message of the poor and defenseless Jesus from Galilee, the sufferings of the end-time manifest themselves in his conflicts and his sufferings. In the context of his message about the kingdom of God, his sufferings are not his own personal sufferings, which he suffers for himself. They are the apocalyptic sufferings which he suffers for the world. They are not fortuitous sufferings. They are necessary. They are not fruitless sufferings, through which something good is shatters. They are fruitful sufferings which, like labor pains, bring forth what is good . . . “(John 16:20-23).

THE SUFFERING OF JESUS’ FOLLOWERS:

* + - “Jesus’ call to discipleship leads men and women to break their existing ties and the forces that dominate them, for the sake of the new creation . . . . In the light of the new creation, the sufferings of those who follow Jesus are also sufferings belonging to the end-time (*peirasmós*) . . . . (Matt 10:34; Mark 13; Luke 12:51).” (p.154)

THE SUFFERING OF ISRAEL:

* + - “Jesus himself is bound into a community of tradition with suffering Israel and her persecuted prophets. John the Baptist was murdered by the powerful, like many other prophets before him (Luke 13:24; Matt 23:37-39) . . . . The apocalyptic sufferings of Christ also show the characteristic features of the sufferings of Israel, God’s people in this Godless world.” (p.154)

SUFFERING, THE KINGDOM OF GOD, AND A NEW AGE:

* + - “With his prophecy about the destruction of the temple and his announcement of the new temple of the messiah, Jesus apparently deliberately sets Zion in the context of the end-time he saw, thereby provoking the temple priests . . . . According to Mark 14:25, the Last Supper with the disciples links his death with the kingdom of God. According to Luke 22:18, Jesus will not drink wine again ‘until the kingdom of God comes’.” (p.154)
    - “It is in line with the link between messianism and apocalyptic when the synoptic gospels depict Christ’s death on Golgotha with the accompaniment of apocalyptic phenomena: darkness descends on the earth, the veil in the temple is torn in two, the earth quakes, the rocks burst apart, the graces open, saints rise form the grave and appear . . . (Matt 15:45-56par.). In the light of his messianic message about the kingdom of God and the new world eon, the opposition Jesus experienced and the suffering and death he endured is apocalyptically interpreted as the summing up and anticipation of the end-time suffering in which ‘this world’ will read its end and the ‘new world’ will be born.” (p. 154

SUFFERING AND EASTER:

* + - “Since this crucified Jesus of Galilee has been ‘raised from the dead’ ahead of all others, he is now already living in the new world of eternal life. God has already done for this ‘first fruits of those who have fallen asleep’ what he will do for all human beings at the end. In Jesus he has already broken the power of death.” (p.155)

SUFFERING AND JESUS’ DEATH:

* + - “But if Jesus’ resurrection is interpreted as the anticipation of the general resurrection of the dead, how is his death to be interpreted?
    - His death is then the **anticipation of the death** that is universal and absolute. It is not merely his private, personal end. As an anticipation of universal death, Golgotha is the anticipation of the end of this world and the beginning of a world that is new.
    - It is the **anticipation of divine judgment** out of which the kingdom of righteousness and justice proceeds. What has already happened to Christ is **representative** of what will happen to everybody: it is a happening *pars pro toto*.
    - Consequently he has suffered **vicariously** what threatens everyone.
    - But if he has suffered vicariously what threatens everyone, then through his representation he **liberates** everyone from this threat, and throws open to them the future of **the new creation**.
    - He did not suffer the sufferings of the end-time simply as a private person from Galilee, or merely as Israel’s messiah, or solely as the Son of man of the nations. He also suffered as the head and Wisdom of the whole creation, and died for the new creation of all things.
    - ‘The suffering in this cosmos is universal because it is a suffering with the suffering of Christ, who has entered this cosmos and yet burst the cosmos apart when he rose from the dead.’” (p.155)[[21]](#footnote-21)

THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST AND THE END-TIME SUFFERINGS OF THE WHOLE WORLD:

* + - “’The sufferings of Christ’ are part of the history of suffering endured by Israel and God’s prophets. So ‘the sufferings of Christ’ are open for ‘fellowship’ with them, the *koinonía pathēmátōn autoū* (Phil 3:10). This ‘fellowship of Christ’s sufferings’ is experienced by the apostles of the gospel, the martyrs of faith and resistance, the poor, and the whole sighing non-human creation.” The sufferings are in this way [i.e., through the phrase *ho nun kairós*, ‘this present time’, Rom 8:18] designated as the sufferings which inevitably arise from the antithesis between the Christ event and the nature of this eon. (p. 155)

THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLE:

* + - The sufferings of Christ are the sufferings which the apostles and martyrs endured for Christ’s sake.
    - They are not a supplement to Christ’s sufferings, a second Christ, or a prolongation of Christ; nor are they a ‘mystical way’ through suffering.
    - They are apostolic sufferings *with* Christ.
    - The apostolic sufferings are sufferings *with* Christ. Christ suffers in him, for in the apostolic passion for the gospel and for the new creation of the community of Christ’s people, Christ himself is present.
    - See Paul who is ‘always carrying in our body the death of the Lord Jesus, so that the life of the Lord Jesus may also be manifested in our bodies’ (2 Cor 4:10).
    - The apostle’s sufferings are sufferings for the birth and life of the community in Christ; cf. 2 Cor 5:17.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE MARTYRS AND THE COMMUNITY OF CHRIST:

* + - “The ‘fellowship of Christ’s sufferings’ (Phil 3:10) reaches beyond the special sufferings of the apostle and embraces the whole community of Christ’s people, where it witnesses to Christ and manifests the new creation in this world.
    - It then takes up the confrontation with the powers of this world, injustice and violence, and makes the conflict between the two world eras its own.
    - This gives the community of Christ the right and the duty to esteem its special martyrs, and to make their faith and their resistance an orientation point.” (p.156)

THE SUFFERINGS OF THE WHOLE CREATION:

* + - “But who are the first victims of ‘the sufferings of this present time’? They are the weak, the poor, and the sick. In the struggle for power which is the trademark of ‘this world,’ the weak suffer most, the oppressed sacrificed first of all, the children are the first to die.” (p.157)

THIS DEATH HAS ALREADY BEGUN:

* + - “If this death is viewed against an apocalyptic horizon, and not as something normal or natural, then the great apocalyptic dying, the death of all things, has already begun.” (p.157)
    - “The human systems of injustice in the world-wide economy and the political hegemonies cost the lives of millions year for year, first and foremost the lives of children in the Third World.” (p.157)
    - “In the face of this annihilation of the world caused an threatened by human beings, the victims of injustice and violence are today becoming the witnesses of God’s indictment, and witnesses too to the necessity of conversion; for they are the least of the brothers and sisters of the Son of man who is the judge of the world (Matt 25). But if these ‘least’ belong within the fellowship of Christ, their sufferings are also ‘sufferings of Christ’ for he is one of their own, and they are his people. The message of the human and non-human creation which is dying of injustice and violence is its collective martyrdom. ‘Jesus will be in agony until the end of the world,’ wrote Pascal.[[22]](#footnote-22) But the reverse is also true. In the agony of Christ this world finds its end.” (p.157)

THE END TIMES:

* + - I Pet 4:7; 1 Cor 7:31; Rom 13:12.
    - “The sufferings of Christ acquired their significance for salvation in the framework of the impending end of this world era and the dawn of the new eternal creation which is already beginning.” (p.158)

NEITHER *CHRONOS* NOR *KAIROS*:

* + - “Expectation that the end is near is not a calculation of limited periods of time according to the calendar; for here time is not understood as *chronos*. Nor is it an existential attitude, which expects eternity to arrive at any moment; for it does not view time as *kairos*. ‘Imminent expectation’ is the expectation of the end of this temporal eon, which in its temporality is transient. That is to say, it is the expectation of the end of time in the dawn of the new eon, which will endure eternally.” (p.158)
    - “What will come afterwards can only be described in paraphrase as a ‘time without time’ and as a ‘beginning without end’.[[23]](#footnote-23) This is not the absolute eternity of God. It is the relative eternity or eonic time of the transfigured new creation in which death, and therefore transitory time as well, will be no more.” (p.158)

METZ VERSUS BULTMANN:

* Bultmann thought that “the expectation of the imminent end is part of the Bible’s ‘mythical eschatology’ and that it ‘is untenable for the simple reason that the parousia of Christ never took place as the NT expected’ . . .” (p.158)[[24]](#footnote-24)
* Metz criticized this, arguing that the notion of a world history which will go on and on forever is nothing other than ‘a time myth of the modern world’ . . .” (p.158)[[25]](#footnote-25)
* “[T]he time myth of the modern world abolishes its true temporality, making the awareness of its limitation, its uniqueness and its finality impossible. This myth spreads the veil of an illusionary immortality over the modern world, so that its deadly perils are no longer perceived.” (p.159)

AFTER HIROSHIMA--NUCLEAR APOCALYPSE AND BIBLICAL APOCALYPSE:

* “Today no ‘sane person (Bultmann’s phrase) is convinced that ‘world history’ will continue ‘to run its course’ just by itself.” (p.159)
* “The apocalyptic horizon of ‘the sufferings of Christ’ also embraces the sufferings of this nuclear end-time. The cosmic sufferings of this ecological end-time also become ‘sufferings of Christ’.” (p.159)

***#2: THE HUMAN SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST: WHAT DEATH DID JESUS DIE?***

* “Jesus dies his own death.[[26]](#footnote-26)
* But who was he in this death of his?
* Did he die the death of Israel’s messiah?
* Did he die the death of God’s Son?
* Did he die the death of a Jew?
* Did he die the death of a salve?
* Did he die the death of all the living?
* The question how Jesus understood his own death is no more than the historical side of the enquiry.
* The question what his death means for us is the theological side.
* We have to distinguish between the two because the way Jesus himself may have interpreted his way to death is an understanding formed before Easter; and it is only because of Easter and since Easter that his death has a salvific meaning for us. Taken by itself, Jesus’ own interpretation of what he was is not a theological source, and not a criterion for Christological statements.”[[27]](#footnote-27)

***1) The Trial of Jesus***

* Why did Jesus and his friends leave Galilee for Jerusalem?
* To bring his messianic message to the holy city.
* The popular excitement of the people as Jesus enters the city (Mark 11.10 par.)
* Jesus is arrested in the Garden of Gethsemane (presumably by temple police, acting for the Jewish temple authorities).
* Why did the priests arrest Jesus?
* Probably because of his symbolic act in cleansing the temple court (Mark 11:15-17; 13:1-2 par.).
* “If the promise about building the temple goes back to the Nathan prophecy in 2 Sam 7:13, then it is bound up with the coming of the messiah.” (p.161)
* Mark 14:58: “I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not with hands”
* Mark 14:61: “Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?”
* “It was only when Jesus stood firm by his claim, and rejected this way out [the way out of dropping his claim to be Israel’s messiah], that the high priest and the Sanhedrin gave him up.
* Then all that was left to them was to hand him over to the Romans.” (p.161)
* Mark 14:62: Jesus direct and plainly spoken admission is now decisive—“I am”
* “The addition: ‘And you will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming with clouds of heaven’ may have been an embellishment of early Christian tradition. It links the future of the Son of man with the immediate present of the messiah, in accordance with the ancient two-stage Christology found in Rom 1:3ff.” (p.162)
* Jesus’ messianic acknowledgement before the high priest is viewed as blasphemy.
* “Did Jesus blaspheme God because, in spite of his helplessness, he wished to put himself on a level with God?” (p.162)
* “Did the very fact of his arrest without resistance stand in ‘blatant contradiction’ to his messianic claim?” (p.162)
* “Yet at the same time he was judged to be so dangerous politically that he was handed over to the Romans, on the grounds that he wanted to set himself up as ‘king of the Jews’.” (p.162)
* The Sadducee policy of survival under the Romans: “If this was indeed a policy of expediency . . . then the Sadducees were not so much afraid that the false messiah from Galilee would seduce the people from their God; what they were afraid of was Israel’s downfall, in the wake of a ‘utopian policy’ towards the Romans.”[[28]](#footnote-28)
* “The death sentence was pronounced on Jesus by the Roman procurator, Pilate, in the name of the *imperium Romanum*.” (p.163)
* “According to Roman law, execution through crucifixion was the punishment designed to deter rebels against the political order of the Roman empire, or the social order of the Roman slave-owning society.” (p.163)

***2) The Death of the Messiah***

* “Jesus must have considered himself to be a messiah of a special kind, a *paradoxical messiah.* He did not redeem his people through powerful signs and wonders of liberation. He redeemed them, if at all, through suffering and through hope. He liberated and gathered God’s people, not by driving out the Romans, but in a way hitherto unknown and unpredicted.” (p.164)
* Jesus was neither a messianic rebel against Rome nor a purely inner-Jewish, purely religious messiah, victimized for the religious sins of his own people.
* Three points:

1. The message about the kingdom of God, with which Jesus went to Jerusalem;
2. his prophecy about the temple, uttered in Jerusalem for the first time, and his cleansing of the temple forecourts; and
3. his acknowledgement of his messiahship before the high priest of his people, and before the prefect of the Roman occupying power.
   * “What we have to notice about all these three points is the contradiction between Jesus’ eschatological proclamation and his messianic claim on the one hand, and, on the other, the obvious confutation of both proclamation and claim by the political power, and by the fact of his helplessness and his resulting suffering, to the point of death on the Roman cross. Jesus evidently endured the tension between these antitheses to the very end.” (p.165)

* ***“***The clash between his messianic acknowledgement and his death on the cross points to the transcendent solution: God’s raising him from the dead, and his presence in the Spirit. This, at all events, was the early Christian answer to the contradiction in which Jesus ended. If we look at Jewish messianic expectation, Jesus is the **paradoxical messiah**—a messiah contrary to appearances, contrary to the ‘judgment of history’, and in defiance of the death sentence passed on him by the Roman despot Pilate. If we look at Roman fear of the messiah, and the history of his influence, Jesus is the only truly *revolutionary messiah*; for it was through Christianity that the Roman imperial power was fundamentally changed.” (p.165)

***3) The Death of God’s Child***

* ***“***Jesus died *the death of God’s child* at the hand of men; for Israel’s messiah is also ‘God’s son’ (2 Sam 7:14), and in his ‘Abba’ prayer, Jesus experienced himself as ‘child’ of the divine Father. This contradiction between his experience of himself and his experience of death is so profound that it has to be understood as *the God-forsakenness of the Son of God*.”[[29]](#footnote-29)
* Mark 14:32-42; Mark 15:34 (Ps 22): “My God, why hast thou forsaken me?”[[30]](#footnote-30)
* See also Hebrews 2:9: “far from God, he tasted death for us all”
* “The Gethsemane story (Mark 14:32-42) reflects the frightening eclipse of God in which Jesus died.” (p.166)
* “This death far from God is the agony of the one who knew that he was God’s child. Jesus’ death cry on the cross is ‘the open wound’ of every Christian theology, for consciously or unconsciously every Christian theology is a reply to the ‘Why?’ with which Jesus dies, a replay that attempts to give theological meaning to his death. But when Christian theologians do not accept what Jesus suffered form God, they are like Job’s friends, not like Job himself. The contradiction between the Sonship of God and forsakenness by God is a contradiction that cannot be resolved, either by reducing the divine Sonship or by failing to take the forsakenness seriously . . . . Early manuscripts of Mark’s Gospel intensity the cry into: ‘Why have you exposed me to shame?’ and ‘Why have you cursed me?’” (p.167)
* “The contradiction between the Sonship of God and forsakenness by God is a contradiction that cannot be resolved, either by reducing the divine Sonship or by failing to take the forsakenness seriously.” (p.166)
* “God’s silence, the hiding of his face, the eclipse of God, the dark night of the soul, the death of God, hell: these are the metaphors for this inconceivable fact that have come down to us in the traditions of Christian experience. They are attempts to describe the abyss, a sinking into nothingness; yet they are only approximations of Jesus’ final experience of God on the cross, his Job-like experience.” (p.167)

***4) The Death of the Jew***

* “Jesus also died *the death of a Jew* at the hand of the Romans.” (p.167)
* “[T]he sufferings of Israel are always at the same time the sufferings of the God who chose Israel, who sanctifies his name through Israel, and who himself, in his Shekinah, lives in Israel and makes Israel’s sufferings his own.[[31]](#footnote-31) Israel’s sufferings are not punitive sufferings which are a reflection of God’s judgment. They are sufferings which God himself suffers. So in this context Christ’s sufferings too are not sufferings far from God; they are sufferings close to hi. In the messianic child, God himself suffers the sufferings of God-forsakenness. in the image of the Suffering Servant of God from Isa 53, the sufferings of Israel and the sufferings of Christ are united. That is why the gospels always describe Christ’s passion with the features of the Suffering Servant and Isa 53. Hebrews 11-12:2 presents the chain of witnesses to faith from Abel to Jesus as the chain of martyrs who endures ‘the reproach’ of Christ (11:26). Here Christ’s cross and ‘shame’ (12:2) are stamped through and through By Israelite and Jewish experience.” (p.168)

***5) The Death of the Slave***

* “Jesus died *the death of a poor man*.” (p. 168)
* Phil 2: Jesus was in the form of a slave.
* Lazarus as a ‘figure’ for Christ (Luke 16).

***6) The Death of the Living One***

* “Finally, Jesus died *the death of all the living*, for he was mortal and would one day have died even if he had not been executed. Through his death struggle he participated in the fate of everything that lives—not merely the fate of human beings; for all living things desire to live and have to die.” (p.169)

THE DISPUTE IN CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY:

* **Paul and Augustine:** “death is the wages of sin”—both the death of the soul and the death of the body. Jesus was the “sinless” Son of God. Thus, the death he died was a death for sinners, vicariously, and only out of compassion. Death is only human death, not the death of all living things.
* **Schleiermacher:** Physical death is a natural death, Mortality belongs to creaturely finitude. Jesus could therefore died ‘the accursed death of sin’ vicariously for all sinners only because he was sinless and mortal at the same time.
* **Question**: “But how are we then supposed to conceive of the new creation in which ‘death shall be no more’ (Rev 21:4)? What is ‘eternal life’, if natural death remains?” (p.169)
* **Moltmann’s response**: “Jesus died the death of all living things. That is, he did not only die ‘the death of the sinner’ or merely his own ‘natural death’. He died in solidarity with the whole sighing creation, human and non-human—the creation that ‘sighs’ because it is subject to transience. He died the death of everything that lives. The death of all the living can neither be called ‘the consequence of sin’, nor can it be termed ‘natural’. It is a destiny to which everything living is subjected, and which hence spurs us on to yearn for cosmic deliverance. This death is the sign of a tragedy in creation; but because of the resurrection of the Christ who died, the sign is re-interpreted into a universal hope for a new creation in glory (Rom 8:19ff.). Jesus therefore dies the death of everything that lives in solidarity with the whole sighing creation. The sufferings of Christ are therefore also ‘the sufferings of this present time’ (Rom 8:18), which are endured by everything that lives. But we can also say, conversely, that created beings in their yearling for life suffer ‘the sufferings of Christ’. The Wisdom of the whole creation, which is here subject to transience, suffers in Christ the death of everything that lives (1 Cor 1:24).

***#3: THE DIVINE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST: WHERE IS GOD?***

* “[I]n the appearances of the risen One, it became clear to the women and the disciples concerned, *who* had died there on the cross on Golgotha, and who, in the truth of God, Jesus *is*.” (p.170)
* “[I]f , for the sake of the God who raised him from the dead, people have to acknowledge that this Jesus of Nazareth, crucified by Pontius Pilate, was Israel’s messiah, the Son of God and the Savior of the nations, then this accentuates the contradiction with which, and from which, Jesus died. And the contradiction becomes a theological one: ‘Why was it necessary for *the Christ* to suffer these things’ (Luke 24:26). Why was the true *Son of God* forsaken? Why did the risen *Lord*, the Wisdom of the new creation of all things, have to suffer and die in this way?” (p.171)

***1) The Theodicy Trial on Golgotha***

* “Yet because of Christ’s resurrection and in the radiance cast ahead by the glory of his future, the sufferings of Christ are already manifested here and now as divine sufferings, and have to be understood as *the sufferings of God*.

***2) The Theology of the Surrender of Christ***

* “An early way of understanding the sufferings of Christ as divine sufferings may be found in the theology of surrender in the NT.”[[32]](#footnote-32)
* “Because many systematic theologians today go back to this, in order to reduce to a common denominator the unique Christian idea of God, the theology of the cross and the doctrine of the Trinity (as I also tried to do in 1972 in *The Crucified God*), I will sum up this theology of the cross briefly here . . .” (p.172)
* **Negative meaning of *paradidónai***:
  + “The gospels present the death of Jesus in the light of his life and the gospel he preached; and in this presentation *paradidónai* has an unambiguously negative significance. It means to deliver up, betray, hand over, cast off. When Jesus is forsaken by God on the cross, it means that he has been cast off by God.” In Rom 1:18ff.: ‘give up’ for the divine wrath (p. 172)
* **Paul’s reversal of the meaning of “delivered up”:** 
  + He views the God-forsakenness of Jesus no longer in the light of his life, but in the light of his resurrection.
  + Paul: The God who raised Jesus from the dead is the same God who ‘gave him up’ to death on the cross.
  + Rom 8:32: “He who did not spare his own Son but gave him up for us all, will he not also give us all things with him?” (Rom 8:32)
  + 1 Cor 5:21: “For our sake he made him to be sin”
  + Gal 3:13: “He became a curse for us”
  + “The Father forsakes the Son ‘for us’—that is, he allows him to die so that he may become the God and Father of the forsaken. The Father ‘gives up’ the Son that through him he may become the Father of all those who are ‘given up’ (Rom 1:18ff.). This transforms ‘the almighty Father’ too; for Christ was ‘crucified in the weakness of God’ (2 Cor 13:4). The Son is surrendered to this death in order to become the brother and savior of all the men and women who are condemned and cursed.” (p.173)
* **In the surrender of the Son the Father surrenders himself too—but not in the same way**:
  + “The Son suffers his dying in this forsakenness. The Father suffers the death of the Son . . . He suffers it in the infinite pain of his love for the Son. The death of the Son therefore corresponds to the pain of the Father. And when in this descent into hell the Son loses sight of the Father, then in this judgment the Father also loses sight of the Son. Here what is at stake is the divine consistency, the inner life of the Trinity. Here the self-communicating love of the Father becomes the infinite pain over the death of the Son. Here the responding love of the Son turns into infinite suffering over his forsakenness by the Father. What happens on Golgotha reaches into the very depths of God in eternity. In Christian faith the cross is always the center of the Trinity, for the cross reveals the heart of the triune God, which beats for the whole creation.” (p.173)
* **Jesus surrenders himself:**
  + Gal 2:20: The Son was not merely given up by the Father. He also ‘*gave himself* for me’. In the event of surrender, Jesus is not merely the object, he is the subject too. His suffering and dying was a *passio activa*, a path of suffering deliberately chosen, a dying affirmed because of his passion for God.
  + Phil 2: “the self-giving of the Son means that he empties himself of the divine form, and takes the form of a servant; his self-giving consists in his self-humiliation, and in his ‘obedience unto death, even death on a cross.’” (p. 173)
  + Heb 5:8: “’he learnt obedience through what he suffered.’ He suffered paradoxically from the prayer that was not heard, from his forsakenness by the Father. Through this, he on his side ‘learnt’ surrender.” (p. 173)
* **An inward conformity between the will of the surrendered Son and the surrendering will of the Father:**
  + “On the cross the Father and the Son are so widely separated that the direct relationship between them breaks off. Jesus died a ‘Godless death’.
  + And yet on the cross the Father and the Son are so much at one that they present a single surrendering movement. On Golgotha it is true in a special way that ‘He who sees the Son sees the Father’.
  + The Epistle of the Hebrews expresses this by saying that Christ sacrificed himself to God ‘through the eternal Spirit’ (*diá pneúmatos aiōníou*; 9:14). The surrender of the Father and the Son is made ‘through the Spirit’. The Holy Spirit is the bond in the division, forging the link between the originally lived unity, and the division between the Father and Son experienced on the cross. It was the Holy Spirit through whom Jesus proclaimed with authority, and performed signs an wonders; but the Spirit who was Jesus’ active power now becomes his suffering power. The One who sent him in power to the poor, to bring them the kingdom of God, made him himself poor, in order that through his sufferings the poor might be made rich (2 Cor 8:9). The sufferings of Christ are also the sufferings of the Spirit, for the surrender of Christ also manifested the self-emptying of the Spirit. The Spirit is the divine subject of Jesus’ life-history; and the Spirit is the divine subject of Jesus’ passion history .This means we must even add that Jesus suffered death in ‘the power of indestructible life’ (Heb 7:16), and through this power ‘of the eternal Spirit’ (9:14) in his death destroyed death. Consequently, through the slain Christ, indestructible life is opened up to all the dying.” (p.174)
  + “Paul interpreted the event of God-forsakenness on the cross as the surrender of the Son, and the surrender of the Son as the love of God. What the love of God is, ‘from which nothing can separate us’ (Rom 8:39), happened on the cross of Christ, and is experienced under the cross. The Father, who sends his Son into all the depths and hells of God-forsakenness, loneliness and annihilation, is in his Son everywhere among those who are his, so that he has become omnipresent. With the surrender of the Son he gives ‘everything’ and ‘nothing’ can separate us from him. This is the beginning of the language of the kingdom of God, where ‘God will be all in all***’.*** Anyone who has once perceived God’s presence and love in the God-forsakenness of the crucified Brother, sees God everywhere and in everything (Ps 139:8), just as a person who has been face to face with death senses the living quality of everything in a hitherto undreamed-of way.” (pp. 174-175).
* **God is love:**
  + Cf. John 3:16—God loves us in this way, on the cross.
  + Cf. John 4:16: God is love. His being and existence is love. In Christ he constitutes himself as love.
  + “The definition ‘God is love’ acquires its full weight only if we continually make ourselves aware of the path that leads to the definition: Jesus’ forsakenness on the cross, the surrender of the Son, and the love of the Father, which does everything, gives everything, and sufferings for lost men and women. God is love: that means God is self-giving. It means God exists for us: on the cross. “(p.175)
* **Soelle’s critique**:
  + See pp. 175ff.
  + “Every attempt to view suffering as caused indirectly or directly by God is in danger of thinking about God sadistically . . . . God is not solely and not centrally understood as the Christ who loves and suffers; at the same time he is forced to retain the position of dominating, almighty Father.”[[33]](#footnote-33)
* **Moltmann’s response**:
  + “Is this the notion that is at the root of the theology of surrender, and the Trinitarian interpretation of the event on the cross? Is the ‘surrender’ of Jesus is interpreted to mean that the Father is the active subject and the Son is the passive object, then it would seem so.
    - If the surrender of Jesus on the cross is understood as a sacrifice made to appease the Father’s wrath, this would appear to be the case.
    - If the surrender of Jesus is understood to mean that God acted on Jesus through Judas, Caiaphas, Pilate and his torturers, then this is true.
    - But then the Father and Son are not one. They are divided. They are not present together. They are opposed to one another.
    - The church’s later theology about the expiatory sacrifice suggests notions of this kind.
    - The hymn book made these ideas common coin.[[34]](#footnote-34)
  + But in the NT the Father of Jesus Christ is always on Jesus’ side, never on the side of the people who crucified him; for he is Israel’s God, not Jupiter, the god of the Romans. So the giving up of the Son reveals the giving up of the Father. In the suffering of the Son, the pain of the Father finds a voice.” (p. 176) Christ is crucified “in the weakness of God” (2 Cor 13:4).
  + “For Jesus suffers dying in forsakenness, but not death itself; for it is impossible to ‘suffer’ death, since suffering presupposes life. But the Father who abandons him and delivers him up suffers the death of the Son in the infinite grief of love.” (p. 177)
* **Golgotha as theodicy trial:**
  + “If we understand Golgotha as a theodicy trial, we ask: Jesus dies with the cry of abandonment—and where is God? Let us look at the answers that have been given:

1. **God hides his face and is silent**: That is not answer. It merely lends extra rigor to the ‘why?’ question.
2. **God permits Jesus’ death in forsakenness by abandoning him**: This is not an answer either, for it merely leads to the other question: how can God permit this?
3. **God wishes Jesus to die in this way**: “God is the agent who is at work in everything, and he resolved that Jesus should die this death. Betrayer, judges and executioners are doing to Jesus what God charges them to do, so that he may die. This is not an answer at all. It is blasphemy, for a monster like this is not God.” (p. 177)
4. **God himself was in Christ (2 Cor 5:19):** “Jesus’ weakness was God’s weakness too; Jesus’ suffering was God’s suffering; Jesus’ death also meant his death for God his Father: ‘I am in the Father and the Father is in me’, says the Johannine Christ. By virtue of this mutual indwelling (perichoresis) of the Father and the Son, Jesus’ sufferings are divine sufferings, and God’s love is love that is able to suffer and is prepared to suffer. The power of the divine Spirit *in* Jesus is transformed from an active power that works wonders to a suffering power that endures wounds.” (p. 177)
5. **God protests Jesus’ death by raising him from the dead:** “Jesus was betrayed, condemned, and murdered by human beings and *God protests* against Jesus’ death by raising him from the dead. Through the resurrection, God confutes Jesus’ betrayers, judges, and executioners.” (p. 177)
6. **God turns the cross to good for the betrayers**: “’As for you, you meant evil against me; but God meant it for good’ (cf. Gen 50:20). After he had been sold into Egypt, Joseph became the savior of the brothers who had sold him; and in the same way, through the resurrection of Christ God *turns* the cross on Golgotha to *good* for the betrayers, the judges, and the executioners, Jews and Gentiles. Those who destroyed the living Christ by crucifixion are saved from their own final destruction by the cross of the risen Christ. History confutes Jesus through crucifixion. The raising of Jesus confuses history.” (p. 178)

***3) The Com-passion of Christ***

* “The theology of surrender is misunderstood into its very opposite unless it is grasped as being ***the theology of the pain of God*, which means the theology of *the divine co-suffering or compassion*.** 
  + The Pauline and Johannine term ‘delivered’ or ‘given up’ certainly brings out only one side of this process.
  + The other side is brought out by the words ‘love’ and ‘mercy.’
  + What the divine ‘surrender’ really means can be discerned best from the path Jesus Christ took in his passion. Without violence, Israel’s messiah king goes his way to the Roman cross. The Son of God empties himself of his divinity and takes the way of a poor slave to the point of death on the cross. If we look at the divine power and sovereignty, this is a path of self-emptying. If we look at the solidarity with the helpless and poor which it manifests, it is the path of the divine love in its essential nature. If we abide by our conviction that Jesus *is* the messiah and the Son of God to the point of his death on the cross, then he brought the messianic hope and the fellowship of God to all those who have to live in the shadow of the cross, the men and women who suffer injustice, and the unjust. **God’s delivering up involves an *active suffering*** (Acts 2:23: ‘according to God’s plan . . .’). But God does not cause Christ’s suffering, nor is Christ the meek and helpless victim of suffering. Through his surrender God seeks out the lost beings he has created, and enters into their forsakenness, brining them his fellowship, which can never be lost.” (p.178)
* The **vicarious** quality of Christ’s surrender and his resurrection ‘for us’ and ‘for many’—linked with the **self-giving of God**:
  + “the inner secret of Christ’s vicarious act ‘for us’ is the vicarious act and self-giving of God.
  + “If God is **for us**, who can be against us?” (Rom 8:31f.).
  + “But this is what all recent doctrine of the Trinity do, in considering the theology of the cross, because they have surmounted the metaphysical apathy axiom in the concept of God, and instead start from the love which is of its very essence capable of suffering, as the divine mercy.” (p.179)
  + Origen: “In his mercy God suffers with us (*sumpásxein*), for he is not heartless . . . . He (the Redeemer) descended to earth out of sympathy for the human race . . . . What is this passion which He suffered for us? It is the passion of love (*caritas est passio*). And the Father Himself, the God of the universe, ‘slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy’ (Ps 103:8), does He not also suffer in a certain way? . . . Eve the Father is not incapable of suffering (*ipse pater non est impassibilis*). When we call upon him, He is merciful and feels our pain with us. He suffers a suffering love of love . . . .”[[35]](#footnote-35)
  + “This suffering in solidarity, vicarious suffering which in its vicariousness saves, is the suffering of God. If we are to understand its full scope, we have to grasp it in Trinitarian terms.
    - It is the suffering of the Creator who preserves the world and endures its conflicts and contradictions, in order to sustain it in life.
    - It is the special suffering of Christ, who in his community with us and his self-giving for us, suffers the pains of redemption.
    - It is, finally, the suffering of God’s Spirit in the birth-pangs of the new creation.” (p.179)
* “The idea of the **com-passionate God**, the God who suffers with us, is **an ancient Jewish idea**.
  + The God who led Israel to freedom and made his covenant with her is a God with the passion and jealousy of love (Exod 20:5).” (p.179)
  + “That is why the rabbis also discovered in their people’s history of suffering the history of the sufferings of Israel’s God.” (p. 180) This theme dominates the thought of the Midrash and the mysticism of the Jewish tradition.[[36]](#footnote-36)
* **Christian mystics**:
  + Catherine of Sienna: “To discover in one’s own pain the pain of God means finding fellowship with God in one’s own suffering, and understanding one’s own suffering as participation in ‘the sufferings of Christ’.” (p.180)
* The answer of the theology of surrender to the God-cry of the God-forsaken Christ:
  + “My God, why have you forsaken me?”
  + “For a brief moment I forsook you, so that you might become the brother of forsaken human beings, and so that in fellowship with you nothing can separate anyone at all from our love.” (p.180)
  + “The Christ who in his dying was so totally given up to us and was forsaken for our sake its the brother and friend to whom we can confide everything because he knows everything and has suffered everything that can happen to us, and more.” (p.180)
* Summary:
  + “Solidarity [**God is with us**], vicarious power [**God is for us**], and rebirth [**We come from** God] are the divine dimensions in the sufferings of Christ.
  + Christ is with us, Christ is for us, and in Christ we are a new creation.
  + In what sense is God love?
  + God is the power of solidarity, vicariousness, the regenerating power.” (p.181)

***#4: RIGHTEOUSNESS FROM THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST: WHY DID CHRIST DIE?***

* What was the meaning and purpose of ‘Christ’s sufferings’?

***1) The Goal of the History of Christ***

* Why did Christ die?
* Why did Christ rise again?
* What future is hidden in his death and resurrection, and when will this hidden future be revealed?
* “When we examine the answers which emerge from the experiences of Christian faith, we discover that the question ‘why?’ is a difficult one. It relativizes all the answers supplied by experience and perception, moving them into the eschatologically open dimension.[[37]](#footnote-37) To think eschatologically means thinking something through to the end. But what is the end of the history of Christ’s suffering and his resurrection?” (p.181)

1. **JUSTIFYING FAITH: Christ ‘was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification’ (Rom 4:25)**.

* “The meaning and purpose of his suffering is our liberation from the power of sin and the burden of our guilt.
* The meaning and purpose of his resurrection from the dead is our free life in the righteousness of God.
* Forgiveness of sins and new life in the righteousness of God: this is the experience of faith. And in this experience Christ is there ‘for us’.” (p.182)

1. **LORDSHIP:** ‘**Christ died and lived again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living’ Rom 14:9)**

* “If justifying faith is the purpose of the history of Christ which is proclaimed and experienced first of all, then the meaning of justifying faith is the redeeming lordship of Christ over the dead an the living. IN community with him, those who are separated by death again find their community with one another. The dead Christ became the brother of the dead. The risen Christ gathers the living and the dead into his community of love because this is community in a common hope. He is head of the new humanity, and the future of those who belong to the present *and* those who belong to the past.” (p.182)

1. **CONQUEST OF DEATH AND NEW CREATION: ‘For Christ must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death . . . so that God may be all in all’ (1 Cor 15:25f., 28)**

* “The fellowship of Christ with the dead and the living is not a goal in itself. It is a fellowship on the way to the raising of all the dead to eternal life, and to the annihilation of death in the new creation of all things. Only then will ‘all tears be wiped away’ and perfect joy unite all created beings with God and with one another. So if the meaning of justifying faith is community with Christ, then the meaning of the community in Christ of the dead and the living is the new creation in which death will be no more.” (p.182)

1. **GLORIFICATION OF GOD: ‘Therefore God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name which is above every name . . . that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father’ (Phil 2:9, 11)**.

* “Even the universal salvation of the new creation is not yet in itself the goal but serves the justification of God—that is, the glorifying of God, the Father of Jesus Christ. All created beings find their bliss in participation in his glory. But God only arrives at his rest in the Sabbath of his new creation. Only then will the theodicy trial—which is also a theodicy process—be finished. Only then will all created beings be able to say: ‘True and just, Lord, are all they judgments’ (Rev 16:7).
* The final goal of the history of Christ therefore lies in the healing of all created beings for the glory of God the Father. The goal is **soteriological**, yet it is at the same time **doxological** through and through. The bliss of the new creation finds expression in the eternal song of praise.” (p.183)
* Summary:
* **“Justification** is not a unique event, pin-pointing to a certain moment in time.
* It is a **process** which begins in the individual heart through faith, and leads to the just new world.
* This process begins with the **forgiveness of sins** and ends with the **wiping away of all tears**.
* Here Luther’s question about the gracious God is answered,
* And Job’s question about God’s justice is kept open until it finds reply.
* With God’s raising of the Christ murdered on the cross, a universal theodicy trial begins which can only be completed eschatologically with the resurrection of all the dead and the annihilation of death’s power—which is to say through the **new creation** of all things.
* Then the pain of the theodicy question will be transformed into the universal **cosmic doxology**.
* Because this is the ultimate goal, this doxology is already anticipated here and now in faith and in fellowship, in consolation and in hope.
* It is anticipated as a ‘song of the Lord in a strange land’.” (p.183)

***2) Justifying Faith***

* “Only **justifying faith** corresponds to the **Christ crucified** ‘for us’,
  + for it is only through justifying faith that the liberating power of Christ’s resurrection is experienced.
  + That is why Christology and the doctrine of justification are inextricably bound up with one another theologically.
  + This was the insight of the Reformers, and in arriving at it they were going back to Paul himself.” (p. 184)[[38]](#footnote-38)
* **The law of God versus the gospel of Christ:**
  + Paul developed his Christology is the conflict between the **law of God** and the **gospel of Christ**, with the help of the idea of dialectical conversion.
  + The **law**—the power in whose name he himself had persecuted the Christians.
  + Christ died the accursed death on the cross, condemned in the name of God’s law.
  + If he has been **raised by God and ‘justified’**, then he redeems from the curse of the law those who are his (Gal 3:13).
  + If Christ met his earthly end through the law, then the law ends eschatologically through his resurrection.
  + If the crucified Christ was counted among the sinners and ‘made sin’,
  + then the risen Christ liberates from the power of sin.
  + “The **gospel of Christ** fulfills and surmounts in itself the **divine Torah**, ushering in the messianic era for Jews and Gentiles.
  + ‘The just shall live’ was the promise of the Torah . . . .
  + The **power of the life-giving Spirit of God** is now immanent in the **gospel of Christ’s resurrection**.
  + Consequently, his gospel now mediates the Spirit of the resurrection and of the new creation of all things, anticipating in believers the victory of life over death by liberating them from the power of sin.
  + God is just because he makes the unjust just and creates justice for those who suffer injustice.” (p.184)
* **The righteousness of God and sin:**
  + “Paul understood the **righteousness of God** as God’s creative acts in and for those who are threatened by **absolute death** because they have come under ‘**the power of sin’**, which is contrary to God.
  + We understand by **‘sin’** the condition in which a person closes himself off from the source of life, from God.
  + A closing of the self like this comes about when the purposes for which human beings are by nature destined are not discovered or not fulfilled, because of hubris, or depression, or ‘the God complex’, or because of a refusal to accept what human existence is about.
  + This leads to the self-destruction of the regenerating energies of life, and thus to death.
  + The **self-deification of human beings** is the beginning of their self-destruction, and the destruction also f the world in which they live. This death has to be understood as absolute death, because it is not identical with the natural life process
  + ‘**Sin’** in this sense means missing the mark of being, and has to be used in the singular.
  + It is a happening in the created being as a whole, and it precedes morality, although it is the source of the acts and kinds of behavior which in a moral sense can be recognized as infringing the laws of life—that is, sins in the plural.
  + Because every created being belongs to a social context shared with other beings, ‘sin’ always destroys life in the social sense too.
  + We talk about the **trans-personal ‘power of sin’** because sin involves the inescapable structural processes of destruction over which Paul cries out when he acknowledges for himself personally: ‘I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do’ (Rom 7:19).
  + Today everyone can see these processes at work in the developments for which he shares responsibility and at the same time helplessly deplores.
  + Ordered systems which one ministered to life are toppling over into their very opposite so that they now work for death.” (p. 185)
* The **time of the gospel**:
  + ***“***The gospel has its own time. Its kairos is ‘this present time’ in which ‘the **wrath of God**’ as Paul puts it ‘is revealed . . . against all ungodliness and wickedness of men’ (Rom 1:18).
  + People are becoming best by this end-time tribulation because universal death is descending on their godless injustice—since injustice has this death as its inescapable consequence . . . .
  + Against the apocalyptic horizon where men and women sink into the nothingness which they are preparing for themselves and nature, the gospel of Christ brings the saving power of God into the world.
  + It saves because it justifies.
  + It is the power of rebirth from the life-giving Spirit and the beginning of the new creation.
  + Here we may think too of the apocalyptic tribulation of all creation in ‘the sufferings of this present time’ (Rom 8:18).” (p. 185)
  + “Through the **forgiveness of sins** the gospel breaks through the compulsive acts of sinners which are the enemies of life, cutting sinners loose from sin, and creating the possibility of ‘conversion,’ a turn to life.
  + Through the **justification of sinners,** the gospel brings men and women who are closed in upon themselves into the open love of God.
  + Through **rebirth from the Spirit**, it brings people who have been subject to death into touch with the eternal source of life, setting them in the closer framework of the rebirth of human community and against the wider horizon of the rebirth of the cosmos.” (p. 185)
* The **universal meaning of the gospel**:
  + “The universal meaning of the gospel of Christ for Jews and Gentiles is founded on the character of Gods’ justifying righteousness, which is prevenient and has no preconditions . . . The gospel of Christ saves and justifies ‘sinners’, and therefore turns to all human beings in what they are *not* and in what they do *not* have (Rom 3:23), whatever differences there may be in the things they are and have.” (p. 186)
* On the **Lutheran theology of the Reformation**:
  + “The Lutheran theology of the Reformation based **justifying faith** solely on the **suffering and death of Christ ‘for us’**. But this was one-sided . . . They . . . understood the justification of the sinner too narrowly as ‘the forgiveness of sins’, but not as **new life in righteousness**. The meaning of Christ’s **resurrection** was reduced to this **saving significance o his death on the cross**.[[39]](#footnote-39)
  + But according to Paul, Christ was **raised** ‘for our justification’ (Rom 4:25) and so that we might be saved (Rom 5:10). Christ’s resurrection has an added value and a surplus of promise over Christ’s death: Christ ‘died, yes, was raised form the dead . . .’ (Rom 3:34).[[40]](#footnote-40)
  + This surplus of Christ’s resurrection over his death is manifested in the surplus of grace compared with the mere cancellation of sin: ‘Where sin increased, grace **abounded all the more**’ (Rom 5:20).
  + If while we were enemies we were ‘reconciled’ with God through his death, ‘**how much more** shall we be saved by his life’ (Rom 5:10).
  + So **justifying grace** is not merely a making-present of the **Christ crucified ‘for us’**; it is even a more making-present of the **risen and coming Christ**.” (p. 186)
* **Christ’s resurrection // justification – sanctification – glorification**:
  + “What happened to the dead Christ in his resurrection to eternal life happens to us in a corresponding way in the justification of sinners . . . . Because the raising of Christ shows this added value and surplurs over against his death, he justification of sinners initiates a process of exuberant intensification: **justification – sanctification – glorification** (Rom 8:30).
  + Justifying faith is not yet the goal and end of Christ’s history.
  + For every individual believer it is no more than the beginning of a way that leads to the **new creation** of the world and to the **justification of God** . . . . [Cf. Matt 5:6, 10; Isa 25:8; Rev 7:17; 21:4] . . .
  + “The person in whose heart God has put peace can no longer come to terms with the discord in th world, but will resist it and hope for ‘peace on earth’.” (p. 187)
* **Justification and Reconcilation**:
  + “Justification is more than reconciliation.
  + Through Anselm in the middle ages, through Hegel in the nineteenth century, and through Karl Barth in our town time—even if in different ways—‘reconciliation’ was made the quintessence of soteriology, and the framework for understanding christology as a whole . . .
  + But even a simply glace at a concordance to the NT shows that the words for reconcile, *katallássein* and hil*ásxesthai* are relatively rare, and are neither central nor fundamental.” (p. 187)
  + “Reconciliation is only emphasized to any considerable degree in the sphere of the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians. In the original Pauline letters, ideas about **atonement** and **reconciliation** are integrated into the event of the **divine righteousness**.” (p. 187)
* **Atonement and reconciliation**:
  + “Historically, the ideas about **atonement and reconciliation** evidently go back to the Jewish-Christian community. There, Jesus’ death was already interpreted very early on as expiation, and the preaching of the cross echoed with the ideas about **expiatory sacrifice in Lev 16**, and with reminiscences of the **Suffering Servant in Isa 53**. ‘That Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures’ (1 Cor 15:3b) is an ancient Jewish-Christian conception which Paul presupposed and accepted. With the help of this idea, the salvific meaning of Christ’s death ‘for us’ could well be expressed in a limited framework: as expiatory sacrifice Christ takes our sins and God’s judgment on himself, and saves us from them and their consequences.
  + But a ‘scapegoat’ like this, that ‘takes away the sins of the world’ and even a Suffering Servant of God on whom lies ‘the chastisement that made us whole’ are bound to disappear once the sin disappears. In either pattern of ideas, the return of this ‘scapegoat’ or ‘Suffering Servant’ by way of resurrection is inconceivable. Applied to Christ’s death, the concepts about expiation say that the cause of our suffering is our sin, the cause of Christ’s suffering is God’s gracious will, the purpose of his suffering is the restoration on our behalf of the broken covenant.
  + It is immediately evident that these ideas about salvation can be applied to Christ’s death, but not to his resurrection, and that they cut Christ’s death off from his resurrection, so as to relate that death to the restoration of a covenant with God which is the premise of the idea. “(p. 188)
* What **reconciliation presupposes (cf. Bultmann’s theology)**:
  + “Reconciliation is a backward-looking act. It presupposes an unscathed world which was destroyed by human sin, and which reconciliation restores. Reconciliation is the negation of the negative, its purpose being to put into effectg once more the original, positive condition: *restitution in integrum***.”** (p. 188)
  + It is the old mythical pattern: primal condition – apostasy – return home.
  + “Here [on Bultmann’s position] the **divine righteousness** is reduced to the ‘**forgiveness of sins’**, and consequently its goal is supposed to be the **restoration of creation** as it originally was.
  + But the statement says nothing about the **totally new thing** which the **resurrection** has brought into the world.” (p. 188)
* Barth’s theology:
  + Incomplete notes.
* Moltmann’s position:
  + “But if, as we have said, the **resurrection of Christ** has an added value over and above the significance of his death, then it promises a ‘new creation’ which is more than ‘the first creation’ (Rev 21:4) . . . . Christ’s resurrection does not say: *restitutio in integrum* through reconciliation. It says: reconciliation in order that the world may be transformed and newly created. It says: justification of sinners so that there may be a just word for all created beings. We may therefore say that the **process of the justification of God and human beings** has at least the following components: (p. 189)
    1. **Forgiveness of sin’s guilt**
    2. **Liberation from sin’s power**
    3. **The reconciliation of the God-less**
    4. **New life in the service of righteousness and justice**
    5. **The right to inherit the new creation**
    6. **Participation in God’s new just world through passionate effort on its behalf**

***3) The Community of the Living and the Dead***

* **Christ is lord over the dead:**
  + “The lordship of Christ therefore reaches far beyond the ‘new obedience’ and a life of sanctification. Because through his death and resurrection Christ has become Lord of the dead ad the living, it is impossible to reduce his sovereign rule to ethics.
  + But how can Christ be Lord over the dead?
  + And how can he draw the dead into fellowship with him?” (p. 189)
* **The meaning of descent into hell**
  + “There is more to the death of Christ than merely the vicarious suffering sin and absolute death which justifying faith discerns.
  + Through his death, he also became the brother and deliverer of those who have died.
  + It was this which the mythical images about Christ’s descent into hell and ‘the realm of death’ wanted to express.”[[41]](#footnote-41)
  + See 1 Peter 3:19f.; 4:6.
  + “Christ is ascribed **saving potentiality** **for the dead**. So the dead are not lost . . . . communication and energies of the divine Spirit belong to the fellowship of Christ even beyond death.” (p. 190)
  + “Certainly **Israel’s dead** first of all, because ‘the sufferings of Christ’ also include Israel’s sufferings. But, beyond that, all the dead are meant, as the hymnal conclusion of Phil 2:9-11 explicitly declares.” (p. 190)
* **Christ as the redeeming ancestor**:
  + **“**So if Christ is experienced in faith as the brother and redeemer of the living, then this same faith sees him as the brother and redeemer of our ‘ancestors’. Through his ‘descent into the realm of death’ Christ himself became the ‘redeeming ancestor’.[[42]](#footnote-42) Through his fellowship with the dead, he brings them God and the redeeming power of the Spirit, and liberates them from death’s power.” (p. 190)
* **Lutheran orthodoxy on Christ’s descent**:
  + “It was therefore not wrong when in the seventeenth century Lutheran theologians saw Christ’s ‘descent into hell’, not as the nadir of his sufferings, but as the beginning of his exaltation and his sovereign rule over the universe. (Contrary to the Reformed position, which here followed Luther himself).[[43]](#footnote-43)
  + Nor is it wrong when on the day of divine silence between Christ’s death on Good Friday and his resurrection on Easter Sunday, Catholic ‘Holy Saturday mysticism’ remembers his hidden and inconceivably mysterious activity for the dead.”[[44]](#footnote-44)
* **Descent of Christ as the lordship of Christ over the dead**:
  + Rom 14:9: “To this end Christ died and lived again, that he might be Lord both of the dead ad the living”
  + Col 3:4: When Christ “appears” the dead will appear with him “in glory”.
  + Rom 8:38: Death cannot separate us from God’s love, but this love of God is not yet the glory of God through which death itself will be annihilated.
  + “The existence of the dead in the lordship of Christ is therefore not yet ‘resurrection’ but only a *sheltering* for the resurrection. It is a “being with Christ,” as Paul writes (Phil 1:23), but not yet the redeemed Being in eternal life.”[[45]](#footnote-45)
* **Eschatological proviso**:
  + “In this ‘intermediate state’ of Christ’s fellowship with the dead and the living, the dead are not separated from God, but they are not yet perfected in God either. They are ‘in Christ’ and with him on the way. Their fate depends on the future of Christ.” (p. 191)
  + Walter Benjamin: Even the dead will not be safe from the enemy if he conquers. And this enemy has never ceased to conquer.”[[46]](#footnote-46)
* The contract across generations.
  + Incomplete notes.
* Political theology in German after Auschwitz:
  + Incomplete notes.

***4) The Wiping Away of the Tears***

* “The fellowship of Christ with the dead and the living which is experienced in the present points beyond itself to the consummation of the lordship of Christ.
  + This means that it turns suffering over this ‘unredeemed world’ into conscious pain.
  + In the grief over the death of every beloved person and every abandoned child, we hear the eschatological cry: How long? ‘Come Lord Jesus, come soon’ (Rev 22:20).” (p. 193)
  + “The fellowship with the dead preserved in the fellowship of Christ makes the hope which counters death both social and cosmic.” (p. 193)
* Paul’s vision of the eschatological perfecting of the lordship of Christ (1 Cor 15:20-28):
  + “Christ completes his rule over the whole creation by abolishing every ‘rule, authority, and power’ and by making life alive through is peace.
  + Rev 21:4
  + “The annihilation of death is the cosmic side of the resurrection of the dead, just as the resurrection of the dead is the personal side of the cosmic annihilation of death.” (p. 194)
  + Phil 2:9-11.
  + Ephesians and Colossians: “this eschatological vision of Paul’s becomes the impressive picture of the cosmic Christ, through whose Wisdom everything was created, through whose blood everything has been reconciled, and through whose exaltation all things will be ‘gathered together’ (Eph 1; Col 1).” (p. 194)
* Note the links with ecological catastrophe.
  + Incomplete notes.

***5) The Joy of God without End***

* The inner meaning of Paul’s christocentrism is his theocentrism: “’The inner mystery of Christ’s lordship’ is the glorification of God.” (p. 195)
  + Rom 15:7; Phil 2:11; Rom 6:10; Gal 2:19’ Rom 4:25; 2 Cor 5:21.
* What does Paul mean by “glory”?
  + God’s righteousness // God’s glory (2 Cor 4:4)
  + The sinners loses the glory of God’s image (Rom 3:23)
  + Christ’s resurrection as his transformation into God’s glory (Phil 3:21).
* Summary:
  + “Through the justification of the unjust, and th creation of justice for those who know no justice, God glorifies himself on earth. Only when the theodicy trial is finished, the trial opened through the election of Israel and the surrender and raising of the messiah Jesus, will the accusing theodicy question turn into the eternal song of praise But until then the tears and the dreams remain together. Until then the experience of the forgiveness of sins is entwined with the indictment of God because of the suffering in this world.” (p. 196)

***#5: THE FELLOWSHIP OF CHRIST’S SUFFERINGS: MARTYROLOGY TODAY***

***1) First Example: Paul Schneider***

***2) Second Example: Dietrich Bonhoeffer***

***3) Third Example: Arnulfo Romero***

***4) The Apocalyptic Side of Martyrdom***

* “the martyrs anticipate in their own bodies the sufferings of the end-time, which come upon the whole creation; and dying, they witness to the creation which is new.
* Anyone who participates in ‘Christ’s sufferings’ participates in the end-time sufferings of the world.” (p. 204)

***#6: THE REMEMBRANCE OF CHRIST’S SUFFERINGS***

* “A practice which corresponds to the Christology of the crucified One cannot be merely **ethical** and **political**. It must be **sacramental** too, for it is the practice of Christ before it determines our lives.
* In discipleship, men and women try to become like Christ. But in his Supper, Christ is wholly there for human beings, so that through his self-surrender, he may taken them with him on his way into his future.
* The saving meaning of Christ’s sufferings is to be found in the fact that Christ suffered and died vicariously, for our benefit—‘for us’.
* This saving meaning is ‘practiced’ in the breaking of the bread and the drinking of wine in the Lord’s Supper.
* Theological interpretations of his death have to presuppose the Eucharistic presence of his saving significance. Unless they do this they are abstract.
* The Lord’s Upper is practiced theology of the cross. If we understand the Supper in the wider framework of the Eucharist, we can add: the eucharist is the practiced doctrine of the Trinity, for in the cross the triune God reveals himself.” (p. 204)

***1) The Remembrance of Christ and the Reminding of God***

* What does it mean when in this meal we remember Christ’s sufferings?
  + “In the meals he had celebrated earlier with sinners and tax collectors, Jesus had anticipated messianically with these rejected people the eating and drinking in the kingdom of God . . .
  + But in his last meal Jesus links the breaking of the bread and the outpouring of the wine with the surrender of his life.
  + And ever since, bread and wine make the kingdom of God present in Christ’s person, and in his body broken ‘for us’ and his blood shed ‘for us’.” (p. 205)
* Jesus is the kingdom of God in person:
  + “In his death the kingdom of God has not merely ‘come very close’ as it does in his proclamation. It is actually ‘there’. That is why his vicarious suffering and dying opens the kingdom fo God to all who exist Godlessly and far from God. Through his dearth, the mercy of God which he presented and represented is realized in history. ‘God was *in* Christ’, as Paul says . . . In this way the feast of the kingdom becomes the memorial of Christ’s suffering and dying, but the memorial of Christ’s suffering and dying expands the horizon of the kingdom to embrace all abandoned creatures in this world.” (p. 205).
* The context of the Last Supper according to the Synoptic Gospels:
  + Mark 14:9: Jesus is anointed messianic king by an unknown woman.[[47]](#footnote-47)
  + Jesus’ supper with the disciples; Judas’ betrayal, the disciple’s flight, Peter’s denial, etc.
  + 1 Cor 11:29: Betrayal at the heart of the feast.
* The feast as a “sacrament of time.”
  + “In the coincidence, the simultaneity, of remembrance of Christ and expectation of him, the feast is a sign of the grace that liberates now, in the present, a *signum demonstratium* gratiae.” (p. 206)
  + “We do, however, have to distinguish between the tenses or times here: what is made present is the history of Christ’s suffering and his dying. It is made presenting the Spirit of the resurrecitno. IUt therefore opens up for ht suffering and tidying the expectation of his universal coming in glory. The remembering is historical but the expectation is apocalyptic. Christ’s past suffering is made present—the coming of the resurrection and the new creation is expected. In the Eucharistic experience of time, past and future do not lie on a single temporal line. These are two different world times: the passion history of death on the one hand—the resurrection history of life on the other. ‘The future of Christ’ does not lie on the line of future time (*futurum*). It belongs to the coming eternity which will end time (*adventus*).”[[48]](#footnote-48) (p. 206)
  + “The remembrance of Christ’s sufferings is **direct** and without mediation. But the remembrance of Christ’s resurrection takes place only **indirectly**, mediated through the remembrance of Christ’s sufferings.”[[49]](#footnote-49) (p. 207)
* Memory as a pre-eminent characteristic of the people of Israel.
  + Israel’s religion as a historical religion.
  + The remembrance of Israel’s suffering is both thanksgiving and lamentation.
  + It is not only a bridging of past and present, but of God and human beings.
  + Incomplete notes.
* What remembrance means in the Lord’s Supper:
  + “For men and women, the remembrance in the Lord’s Supper of Christ’s sufferings means communicating the liberty which springs from his ‘sufferings for us.’ But it has another meaning too. It reminds God of these sufferings of Christ, in order through this reminding-remembrance to hasten the promised redemption for which this suffering world waits.” (p. 208)
* The exclusive and inclusive sides of the remembrance of Christ’s sufferings:
  + Exclusive: “the unique, human and divine suffering of the lonely Christ” (Mark 14:24; 1 Cor 11:24).
  + Inclusive: “the gathering together of human and divine sufferings in him, the messianic Jew, the brother of men and women, the Child of God, the first-born of creation.” (p. 209)
* The protest against sacrificial cults:
  + “This ‘liberation through the sufferings of Christ’ was often interpreted by way of ideas about expiatory sacrifice, and was represented in the mass through sacrificial rituals. IN a world full of acts of violence and their victims, interpretations of this kind have a limited value. They can be misused to justify a world in which there will always be victims. But they can also break through the sacrificial cults of a violent world (whether they be religious or secular and modern), presenting Christ as the sole and sufficient sacrifice, made one and for all; and in this way they can be a protest against the sacrificial cults.” (p. 209)
* The mutual identification between the Christ who died for us and we who are alive in Christ:
  + “Properly understood, the remembrance of Christ’s sufferings evokes an event of mutual identification: Christ who died for us—we who are alive in Christ. A ‘Christ for us’ in the Lord’s supper without the experience ‘we in Christ’ would lead to a forgiveness of sins without new life in righteousness.” (p. 210)
* The collective solidarity of the apocalyptic Christ
  + With the sufferings of Israel, with the sufferings of the people, with the sufferings of human beings as such, and with the sufferings of all living things.
  + “[T]he sufferings of Christ are universal and all-embracing, because through his resurrection from the dead they reach the apocalyptic end of this world of death, and have themselves been made birth-pangs of the new world, in which all the tears will be wiped away, because death will be no more.” (p. 210)

***2) The Cry from the Depths***

* “In the biblical traditions every experience of salvation begins with a *cry from the depths*.”
  + Israel’s exodus from slavery: Exod. 3:7; cf. Deut. 29:7.
  + Christ’s tortured cry on the cross: My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?

Jürgen Moltmann, *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in Messianic Dimensions* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).

***CHAPTER V. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL RESURRECTION OF CHRIST***

* **The importance of resurrection:** “If Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is in vain and your faith is in vain”, declared Paul (1 Cor 15:14). For him and for earliest Christianity as we know it, God’s raising of Christ was the foundation for faith in Christ, and thus the foundation of the church of Christ as well. And it is in fact true that the Christian faith stands or falls with Christ’s resurrection. At this point faith in God and the acknowledgement of Christ coincide. Faith in the God ‘who raised Christ from the dead’ and the confession that ‘Jesus is the Lord’ are mutually interpretative.” (p.213)
* **Three questions about the resurrection**:
  + HISTORICAL: What does the original Christian belief in the resurrection say, and what does it not say?
  + THEOLOGICAL: How can belief in the resurrection be understood in the conditions and cognitive forms of modern times?
  + ETHICAL: How can faith in the resurrection be convincingly maintained today? What are its consequences?
* **“The event which is called ‘raising’ or ‘resurrection’** is an event that happened to the Christ who died on the cross on Golgotha. Where he himself is concerned, the cross and resurrection are mutually related, and they have to be interpreted in such a way that the one event appears in the light of the other.” (p.213)
* **“Christ’s death on the cross is a historical fact—Christ’s resurrection is an apocalyptic happening.** 
  + Christ’s death was brought about by human beings—his raising from the dead is an act on God’s part.
  + The cross of Christ stands in the time of this present world of violence and sin—the risen Christ lives in the time of the coming world of the new creation in justice and righteousness.” (p.213)
  + “Anyone who describes Christ’s resurrection as ‘historical’, in just the same way as his death on the cross, is overlooking the new creation with which the resurrection begins, and is falling short of the eschatological hope. The cross and resurrection stand in the same relation to one another as death and eternal life. Since death makes every life historical, death has to be seen as the power of history. Since resurrection brings the dead into eternal life and means the annihilation of death, it breaks the power of history and is itself the end of history. If we keep the two together, then the cross of Christ comes to stand at the apocalyptic end of world history, and the raising of the dead at the beginning of the new creation of the world. That is why we are talking about ‘the eschatological resurrection of Christ’.” (p.214)
  + “Paul expressed the incommensurability of Christ’s death on the cross and his resurrection by using the phrase ‘how much more’ (Rom 8:34).” (p.214)

***#1: The Genesis and Unique Character of the Christian Faith in the Resurrection***

**Introduction:**

* “Jesus was crucified publicly and died publicly. But it was only the women at his tomb in Jerusalem, and the disciples who had fled into Galilee who learnt of his ‘resurrection.’ These disciples thereupon returned to Jerusalem, where they openly proclaimed the crucified Jesus as the Lord whom God had raised from the dead.” (p.215)

**Paul’s testimony:**

* 1 Cor 15 (AD 55 or 56): Paul refers to the testimonies that Christ had appeared to Cephas, to the twelve, and then to 5,000 brethren at once.
* Paul *saw* Christ (1 Cor 9:1; Gal 1:15f.; Phil 3:12; cf. Acts 9: 3, 5)

**The women at the tomb and the disciples in Galilee:**

* They report that they say Jesus as the “living one” not that he had been resuscitated.
* The disciples flee from Jerusalem to Galilee
* The women have experiences of Christ that changed their way of seeing the world—a transition from one kind of beholding to another—a shift in seeing, knowing, loving.

**Experiences of the Spirit:**

* See Acts 1: 40 days.
* “The early Christian faith in the resurrection was not based solely on Christ’s appearances. It was just as strongly motivated, at the very least, by the experience of God’s Spirit. Paul therefore calls this Spirit ‘the Spirit’ or ‘power’ of the resurrection. Luke makes the end of the appearances with Christ’s ascension be followed by the outpouring of the Pentecostal Spirit. Believing in the risen Christ means being possessed by the Spirit of the resurrection . . . . It means being possessed by the life-giving Spirit and participating in the powers of the age to come (Heb 6:5).” (p.218)

**What does “Christ was seen” mean?**

* “With the expression ‘Christ appeared’ and ‘Christ was seen’ (Mark 16:17; John 20:18; 1 Cor 6:9; Luke 24:34; Acts 13:31; 1 Cor 15:3-8) the theological interpretation of these phenomena already begins, for these are the words used in the OT to describe the revelation of God and the light of the first day of creation.
  + God ‘appeared’ to the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses.
  + At the beginning of the messianic era, according to Isa. 40:5, ‘the glory of the Lord shall appear, and all flesh shall see it together.’
  + The words ‘appear’ and ‘see’ are revelations formulas. They intend to say that God reveals himself in Christ and that Christ appears in the glory of God. The activity issues solely from the One who allows himself to be seen. The person affected is passive, and suffers this divine appearance. For that reason this kind of theophany is unrepeatable.” (p.219)
* “Paul links these christophany conceptions with the expression *apokálypsis*, and by doing this he gives them a special meaning: God unveils something ahead of time which is still hidden and inaccessible to the cognition of the present aeon, or world time.
  + Under the present conditions of knowledge, the secrets of the end-time and God’s future new world are still veiled and unknowable, for the present world of sin and violence cannot sustain the new world of God’s righteousness and justice. That is why this righteousness of God’s is going to create a new world, and will be manifested only at creation. Only then will ‘the glory of the Lord appear.’
  + But even in the history of this world there are already revelations of the new world to come, revelations ahead of time.
  + In the Old Testament, these revelations of God’s future are linked with the callings of his prophets, and these calls are often founded on the vision of this coming divine glory (Isa 6).
  + The people who experienced the christophanies became apostles, both women and men—Mary Magdalene and Paul and the rest. The anticipatory beholding of the glory of God and to service in this transitory world for what is to come. The christophanies were not interpreted as mystical translations into a world-beyond. They were viewed as radiance thrown ahead of itself, the radiance of God’s coming glory on the first day of the new world’s creation. And these christophanies are daylight visions, not phantasms of the night.” (p.219)
* Jewish resources for interpreting “the totally contradictory experiences of Jesus’ death on the cross in shame and helplessness, and his appearances as the eternally living One in the presence of God.” (p.220)
  + The pattern of the exaltation of the Servant of God who had been humiliated in suffering and death (Isa 52:13ff.)
  + The pattern of the just man carried up to God at the end of his life (Gen 6:24; 2 Kings 2:1-8)
  + The pattern of the one raised from the dead (Isa 26:19; Dan 12:2).
* The texts about the resurrection are the oldest and the most widespread.
  + The disciple’s immediate framework of interpretation—their own belief in Jesus’ message about the imminent coming of the reign of God and their helplessness in Gethsemane and forsakenness in Golgotha,
  + The prophetic and apocalyptic traditions of the Judaism of the time.
  + Christ’s appearances themselves as the “first fruits of those who have fallen asleep”
  + “The annihilation of death through the coming of eternal life is already in process. New creation is beginning in Christ in the very midst of this world of violence and death.” (p.221)

**Double event: cross and resurrection:**

* “If this **eschatological symbol** is applied in its **transformed Christian form** to the **condemned, forsaken, and crucified Jesus**, the question about God’s justice and righteousness is the result. If God raised Jesus, he puts all those who condemned, abandoned, and crucified him in the wrong. Then the raising of the One crucified is the divine justification of Jesus of Nazareth and his message, for which he was put to death (Acts 2:22ff.). With the raising of the condemned and executed Jesus, God himself re-opens the trial of Jesus, and in this theodicy trial of Jesus Christ the apostles are the witnesses. If in this context the raising of Jesus means the justification of Jesus as the Christ of God, then the resurrection endorses Jesus’ proclamation of the compassionate justice of God, which sets everything to rights; and the double event of his surrender to death and his raising becomes the revelation of the messianic righteousness of God—which is to say his justifying righteousness.
* This is how Paul saw it when he interpreted this double event as ‘delivered up for our trespasses, raised for our justification (Rom 4:25). The God who calls into being the things that are not, who makes the dead live, is also the God who makes the Godless just. In the framework of eschatological symbolism this can only be interpreted to mean that in his death on the cross Christ has vicariously anticipated the final judgment of God for al the Godless and the unjust, so that as a result his raising from this death manifests to everyone the righteousness and justice of God which puts everything to rights and makes the unjust just. His own raising from the dead was not a raising for judgment, such as Daniel 12 envisages for all the dead; it was a raising into the glory of God and eternal life. And the Christian resurrection hope which is grounded on the remembrance of Christ’s sufferings and resurrection is therefore an unequivocally ‘joyful hope’ for the resurrection and the life of the world to come. It is not a fearful expectation of a Last Judgment whose outcome for the human beings concerned is uncertain.” (pp. 224-225)

**“Raising from the dead” and “risen from the dead”:**

* “The one whom God wakens from sleep must rise himself; and the one who has to rise must first of all be wakened. In considering Christ’s history with God his Father we have to draw on both ideas if we are to grasp the mutual relationship of the Father and the Son: the raised Son rose in the power of the life-giving Spirit.” (p.225)

**Transition from “seeing” Christ to “faith” in Christ’s gospel:**

* John 20:29: “Blessed are those who have not seen and yet believe.”
* What is the relation between faith and sight?
* “Whereas the seeing of Christ allowed those involved no freedom of choice, the word of the proclamation brings men and women face to face with the decision of faith. Faith of this kind—faith in response to the Word that a person has heard—is possible only when Christ’s ‘appearances’ cease. It is only by returning to the hidden safe-keeping of God that Christ makes this faith possible Yet because faith in the gospel of Christ came into being for the seeing of Christ in his appearances, this faith in its turn, waits and hopes for the seeing of Christ ‘face to face’ (1 Cor 12:12), and in doing so it waits also for that ‘coming again’ of Christ in visible, universal glory which we call his parousia.” (p.226)
* “The *successio apostolica* is nothing other than the *succession evangelii* and is a true historical *procession*—a moving forward in expectation of the universal future of Christ at the end of history.” (p.226)

**Three dimensions of these christophanies and the Easter seeing of men and women:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Prospective**: “they saw the crucified Christ as the living One in the splendor cast ahead by the coming glory of God.” (p.220) | The gospel is “the anticipation in the Word of Christ’s parousia, and therefore has itself a promissory character.” (p.227) |
| **Retrospective**: “they recognized him from the marks of the nails and in the breaking of the bread: the One who will come is the One crucified on Golgotha.” (p.220) | The gospel is the Word of the cross’ that “makes the crucified present” (p.227) |
| **Reflexive**: “in this seeing they perceived their own call to the apostolate: ‘As the Father has sent me, even so I send you’ (John 20:21). (p.220) | “The gospel which proclaims the one crucified as the one to come, the one humiliated as the one exalted, and the one dead as the one who is alive is ***the present cal****l* into the liberty of faith. Accordingly the Christian faith is **a life lived out of Christ,** a life lived with Christ and a life lived in expectation of Christ. And in being these things it is also **a life of new creation** in the midst of the shadows of the transient world.” (p.227) |

***#2: History and the Resurrection of Christ: the Theological Problem***

**Thesis:**

* “It is one thing to see Christ’s resurrection in the perspective of history, where we are faced with the inescapable question: is the resurrection an event, or an interpretation of faith? It is another to see history
* in the perspective of Christ’s resurrection. Then we are brought up against the eschatological question about the end of history and the new creation of the world.” (p.227)

**The modern paradigm of history:**

* “In this paradigm time ceased to be conceived of in terms of the cycle of recurring seasons; it was now thought of as the line of human goals and purposes. In the human project ‘scientific and technological civilization’, correspondence with nature and harmonizations with the cosmos were replaced by the new blueprint of progress from an ageing past into the new era of the future.” (p.227)

**How this affects our view of the resurrection**:

* “If, taking our stance in the modern paradigm ‘history’, we look at the tradition about Christ’s resurrection with the categories of the modern historical mind, the resurrection appears to be a product of fantasy or an irrelevant miracle.” (p.228)
* “Theologians who allowed themselves to be drawn into this position looked for different categories as a way of proving that the Christian faith was well founded and meaningful. They left the field of history to ‘the historical mind’ and the historical sciences without calling these into question.” (p.228)

**Troeltch’s influence:**

* “It is true that even for historians Troeltsch no longer as the last word, but in the 1920s his treatise on ‘Historical and Dogmatic Methods in Theology’ (1898), enjoyed authoritative status for the theology of the resurrection. Troeltsch carried over scientific methods into historical scholarship and laid down three axioms for the critical historical method, as a way of arriving at soundly based knowledge.” (p.228)
* Troeltsch’s three principles:
  + **Probability**: “Historical judgments can never arrive at absolute knowledge—only at judgments based on probability. Can theology based the assurance of faith on judgments of historical probability?
  + **Correlation**: “All the phenomena of historical life influence one another mutually. These reciprocal effects provide the ontological foundation for the cohesion of cause and effect, which is universally applicable. Is the resurrection of Christ an exception, and a breach of the natural laws to which all life is subject?”
  + **Analogy**: “Since it is a general rule that historical events affect one another, we have to assume that historical events are in principle identical in kind. Analogy is the necessary guild line for historical understanding. ‘The almighty power of analogy’ is based on the homogeneity of all historical happening. Can an event without analogy such as ‘Christ’s resurrection from the dead’ be understood in historical terms?” (p.229)
* Troeltsch’s questions:
  + “How can we talk in a historical sense about the acts of a transcendent God in history generally and about the raising of Christ by God in particular?” (p.229)
  + “If these principles are considered to be valid both for history as past events and for history as the record of those events, then Christian theology is brought up against the fundamental question: in what category can it talk about God and resurrection at all?” (p.229)
  + “Can this mental split be overcome by a new ‘public’ theology, or must theology detach itself from the view of truth publicly held in modern society, in order to maintain its own truth?
  + Does Christian theology enter into the public dispute about the truth, or is it become a sectarian ideology on the fringe of society?
  + Is it going to be a critical potential in the common future of humanity, or is it losing itself in the religious pluralism of modern society?” (p.229)

1. ***The Category of Divine History: Barth***

**Barth’s position:**

* “For Karl Barth, even in the earlier, ‘dialectical’ phase of his theology, the horizontal question about the connection between the events of the past which are accessible by way of historical investigation was unimportant compare with the vertical question about the reality of God, whose eternity confronts all the times of history simultaneously. In his interpretation of 1 Corinthians 15, *The Resurrection of the Dead* (1924), Barth therefore interprets that Pauline history of the end in the sense of the eternal and primal history, and by doing so—as Bultmann already remarked in his 1926 review—fundamentally demythologized Paul’s apocalyptic.” (p.230)
* “Even in the *Church Dogmatics* (IV/1 #59) Barth adheres to the conviction that in the Easter stories there is no disagreement among the witnesses about the fact that ‘in the story which they recount we have to do with an ‘act of God’, the act of God in which it was revealed to the disciples that the happening of the cross was the redemptive happening promise to them, on which therefore the community and its message were founded.” (p.230)

**JM’s critique:**

* “For Barth, Troeltsch’s axioms about history and the knowledge of history have no meaning for the theology of the resurrection. If Christ’s resurrection is a divine act *sui generis*, then the theology that corresponds to it is a thinking *sui generis* also. But if the resurrection of Christ is viewed only in the category of God’s history with the world, then all that emerges from it is the idea of God’s revelation of himself. This resurrection of Christ’s resurrection to God's sovereignty does not merely demythologize the resurrection; it de-historicizes it as well. The way Jesus took from Galilee to Jerusalem to his cross and resurrection, and the way of the risen Lord to his parousia and new creation lose their importance. When Barth sees in the raising of Jesus only ‘the verdict of the Father’ about the reconciliation accomplished in the death of the Son as divine revelation, this is then longer an eschatological happening. It is simply and solely the transcendent endorsement of the redemptive significance of the cross of Christ. The raising of Christ form the dead then has no saving meaning of its own. Nor does it mean a ‘how much more’ compared with Christ’s death. It simply reveals the truth of this redemptive fact.
* With this Barth has excised the historically irritating and objectionable element from the message of the resurrection. What really happened in human history is only Christ’s death. The message about his resurrection sets this historical event in the light of God’s eternity, and in that life pronounces the divine verdict on the already accomplished reconciliation with the world.” (p.231)
* “God understood as the Wholly Other does not interfere with this at all. But God experienced as ‘the fact that changes everything’ breaks open the closed system of the world. Is the resurrection of Christ and the annihilation of death in him not the one ‘fact’ which changes all that history means here?” (p.232)

1. ***The Category of Existential History: Bultmann***

**Bultmann’s position:**

* “In Bultmann too a reduction statement à la Feuerbach is at the center of his new interpretation of the resurrection faith: ‘If the event of the Easter Day is in any sense an historical event additional to the event of the cross, it is nothing else than the rise of faith in the risen Lord, since it was this faith which led to the apostolic preaching.’ For Bultmann as for Barth, the meaning of the resurrection is to be found in the revelation of the redemptive meaning of Christ’s cross for the reconciliation of the world. But unlike Barth, Bultmann does not see Christ’s ‘resurrection’ as an act of God in the category of divine history. He sees it as an experience of faith in the category of existential history. He takes over the premise of Troeltsch’s axioms, which is that history means human history and that human beings are its determining subject. For him, ‘Easter’ is therefore not an act of God in and for the dead Jesus, but an existential happening to the disciples from which their faith emerged.” (p.232)
* “For the interpretation of the Christian faith in the resurrection, this means that the ‘resurrection of Christ’ is a mythological expression for the birth of disciples’ faith in the redemptive meaning of the cross of Christ. It is ‘simply an attempt to convey the meaning of the cross’. Historically, no salvific meaning can be discerned in the cross on Golgotha. It also becomes a ‘saving event’ only as the ‘permanent historical fact originating in the past historical event which is the crucifixion of Jesus.’ The cross of Christ becomes historically significant when it touches a person’s historical existence, is grasped as an expression of the judgment of God because a person has become a prey to the world, and is absorbed into his own existence as an experience that liberates him from the fetters binding him to this present world. ‘Believing’ in the cross of Christ means ‘to undergo crucifixion with him,’[[50]](#footnote-50) and that means understanding oneself in the light of the transcendent God, no longer in the light of the world as it now exists. This significance of Christ’s cross is made a present reality in the proclamation of the Word of the cross. Faith frees people for authentic being from God, liberating them from the idols of power and possession.” (p.233)

**JM’s critique:**

* “The stress on the presentative existential significance of the statements about the cross of Jesus means that the existential significance of the statements about the cross of Jesus means that the really historical significance of the statements—their importance for historical reality—becomes unimportant. In the process of entering existentially into Christ’s crucifixion, the saving meaning of his death *for us*, ‘while we were still enemies’ (Rom 5:10) gets lost. All that remains is the ‘Christ in us’ of Christian mysticism. Once the existential categories of human historicity are elevated into theological categories, theological statements can quite well co-exist with historical ones. the ‘closed cohesion of cause and effect’ which determines the underlying world view is in no way infringed.” (p.234)

***#3: The Resurrection of Christ and History: the Historical Problem***

**Introduction**:

* “Whereas in his research the historian has to work analytically and inductively, he also has the task of writing history. He then has to gather together the details analyzed into their wider contexts. He has to present the phenomena against the background of their time and put what has been transmitted into the context of this own present. He has to grasp the future for which the phenomena have a meaning. As far as historical facts are concerned, he may come to definite conclusions; but history itself, it has been rightly said, must be continually re-written. And this means that in the writing of history particular ideas about history as a whole have to be presupposed, however related to the present and to the particular stance of the writer these may be . . . . In this respect written history also takes over the task of developing a **theory of reality as a whole**, in so far as this is part of history, and of apprehending and clothing the times in ideas.” (p.234)
* “From the end of the eighteenth century onwards, universal history became a blueprint for finding one’s way in time. History, not metaphysics, was now the universal science.[[51]](#footnote-51) But because human beings exist in history, not in the next world, ‘we should first have to await the end of history in order to possess the complete material which would permit their meaning [i.e., the meaning of the individual parts] to be defined.’[[52]](#footnote-52) ‘Universal history’ is therefore only possible in the perspective of the expected ‘end of history’. This is also confirmed by the life history of every individual: ‘Every design for living is the expression of a particular understanding of the meaning of life.’ To exist ‘in anticipation of the future’ is the unique character of all historical being.[[53]](#footnote-53) It is true that people in history do not know the end of history, but this end is nevertheless at stake in every historical present. The modern survey of the times in the form of universal history was determined either messianically as ‘the new time’ or apocalyptically as ‘the end-time’.” (p.234)

1. ***The Category of Universal History: Pannenberg***

**Pannenberg’s position:**

* “It is in the framework of general reflections like these that Wolfhart Pannenberg has developed his ‘theology of universal history’,[[54]](#footnote-54) drawing first conclusions for a theology of history from the resurrection faith.” (p.235)
* “Jesus’ proclamation of the imminent kingdom of God was a proleptically eschatological proclamation, and was as such aligned towards future endorsement. What the disciples proclaimed as his ‘resurrection from the dead’ embodied the eschatological endorsement of his anticipation of the kingdom of God, because the resurrection of the dead was the symbol under which the end of history was imagined. But since initially only Jesus was raised, not all the other dead as well, his resurrection must for its part be understood as a proleptically eschatological event, which remains dependent on its eschatological verification. Yet in Jesus’ resurrection ‘the end of the history story’ is nevertheless present in the midst of history. Consequently, it is not merely possible to grasp the concept of universal history; this is even required by the Christian viewpoint. The verdict of the disciples about Jesus’ resurrection is not a reflective verdict of their faith. It is a reality judgment about Jesus’ fate: he has in very truth been raised. This judgment is certainly not verifiable in terms of positivist historical reconstruction, but it can be authenticated from the viewpoint of universal history, in the perspective of the end of history. So in the framework of an anthropology based on the openness to the future of human existence, in the framework of a historical ontology, and in the framework of a concept of anticipatory reason, the proleptically eschatological resurrection faith is intelligible and by no means alien. Christ faith in the resurrection must lay claim to being the true philosophy of world history.” (p.235)

**JM’ critique:**

* + “Christian theology enters the field of history and reason once more, in order to join issue with other view of reality about the truth of history and the meaning of its future . . . .
  + [I]t can easily become the confirmation of what takes place in history and human reason anyway.” (p.235)

1. ***The Horizon of Historical Expectation and the Sphere of Historical Experience***

* “Historical studies do not merely have history as their subject. They themselves are embedded in history and are part of it. We therefore have to fit historical methods and categories into the meta-historical concepts and categories on which they are based.
* Heidegger tried to make the historicity of human existence the foundation of history, but this was too subjective. History is interaction and process between human beings, groups, classes and societies, and not lest between human beings and nature. We therefore have to formulate the unique character of historical experience more broadly and also more flexibly if we are to do justice to the experience of history.” (p.236)
* “Reality is only experience as history as long as there is a perception of time. Time is only perceived as long as the difference between past and future exists. The difference between past and future is determined in the present of both—the present of the past in experiences and remembrances, the present of the future in expectations and hopes. It is the difference between ‘the sphere of experience’ and ‘the horizon of expectation’ that determines the historical perception of historical time.[[55]](#footnote-55) If there are no longer any remembered experiences, the expectations also slip away and cease. Remembrance and hope are the conditions for possible experiences of history. That is why they are also the metahistocial conditions for the concern about history and the knowledge of history.” (p.236)
* “The experience of reality as history presupposes hope for its future. Hope for the future is based on remembrance. This, as has been shown, is the disclosure of reality as history, which came about through the Jewish and Christian faiths.[[56]](#footnote-56) We shall therefore look at the fundamental difference between expectation and experience in order to unfold the nature of history in the perspective of the resurrection of the dead. To talk about Christ’s resurrection is meaningful only in the framework of the history which the resurrection itself opens up—the history of the redemption of human beings and nature from the power of death. In the framework of a history determined in any other way it has no meaning. Anyone who talks about Christ’s resurrection form the dead and who believes in the power of God to raise the dead is talking in a single breath about the foundation, the future and the praxis of the liberation of human beings and the redemption. This means that *we can know* historically about Christ’s resurrection must not be abstracted from the questions: what *can we hope*from it? And *what must we do* in its name? The resurrection of Christ is *historically* understood in the full sense only in the unity of knowing, hoping, and doing.” (pp. 236-237)

**“Israel’s experience of ‘history’ was disclosed through her *faith in the promise*.” (p.237)**

* Abraham’s following of the call of God’s promise.
* The exodus from Egypt.
* Phil 3:13: “exodus means leaving what is behind and reaching out to what lies ahead” (p.237)
* “The three Abrahamitic religions—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—are religions of history, aligned towards the future. This is made plain in every encounter with the Asiatic religions of external and internal equilibrium—equilibrium in nature, as in Taoism, equilibrium in society, as in Confucianism, and equilibrium in one’s own soul, as in Buddhism.” (p.237)
* “In the ‘historical’ religions, reality is understood as history to the extent in which reality is disclosed by God’s promises. Of course there are also promises in these religions which history has superseded, and which have therefore been forgotten. But what is really promised in all the specific promises is the presence of the promising God himself.” (p.237)

**Experience and expectation and resurrection hope:**

* “This horizon of expectation makes events in the human world and the world of nature temporal, and events are then experienced in their time, historically. They are not finished processes, and are not in this sense ‘facts’. They are moments in a process and point beyond themselves. They do not yet have heir meaning in themselves, but only in relation to the goal of the history of promise. It is not only the already pronounced *words of promise* which are called to mind through narrative and remembrance, in order to awaken hope; the *events* experience in the past have not passed away either, but point to what is future, so that they too must be told and made a present reality . . . . In the historical religions, the precedence of the horizon of expectation over the sphere of historical experience is based on the surplus of promise, which exceeds the historical fulfillments of promise. This surplus for its part is founded on the inexhaustibility of the creative God, who ‘arrives at his rest’ only when heaven and earth are in complete correspondence with him.” (p.238)
* “Faith in the resurrection has often been interpreted as a transcendent fulfillment of God’s promises, so that people surrender all their hopes in this world. But a resurrection faith of this kind is not Christian. It is merely apocalyptic. It literally shows ‘no spirit’, because between the accomplished fact of the raising of Christ, and the raising of the dead expected in the transcendence, it is unaware of the presence of the risen Christ in the life-giving Spirit of the resurrection. “(p.239)
* “If we apply the fundamental meta-historical concepts of experience and expectation to the Christian faith in the resurrection, we see that ‘the resurrection of the dead Christ’ talks about the future of this past, and that the hope which it establishes for the raising of all the dead also ascribes a corresponding future to those who have gone. This is a totally unique interlocking of future and past. The resurrection of the dead does not say merely that the past is open to the future, and that it is pregnant with future. It also talks about a future for those who belong to the past, and in so doing it reverses time’s direction.” (p.239)

1. ***The Historical Process of the Resurrection***

* “Seeing history in the perspective of resurrection means participating through the Spirit in *the process of resurrection*. Belief in resurrection is not summed up by assent to a dogma and the registering of a historical fact. It means participating in this creative act of God. A faith of this kind is the beginning of freedom. If God reveals himself in the raising of the Christ crucified in helplessness, then God is not the quintessence of power, such as the Roman Caesars represented. Nor is he the quintessence of law, such as the Greek cosmos reflects. God is then the power that quickens into life that makes the poor rich, that lifts up the humble and raises the dead. Faith in the resurrection is itself a living force which raises people up and frees them from the deadline illusions of power and possession, because their eyes are now turned towards the future of life. The proclamation of the resurrection of Christ is a meaningful statement against the horizon, or in the context, of the history which the resurrection itself begins—the history of the freeing of human beings and the whole sighing creation from the forces of annihilation and death. Understood as an event that discloses the future and opens history, the resurrection of Christ is the foundation and promise of life in the midst of the history of death.” (p.241)
* Rom 8:11: “If the Spirit of him who has raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who has raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit which dwells in you.”
* “In talking about Christ’s resurrection we have therefore to talk about a *process of resurrection*. This process has its foundation in Christ, its dynamic in the Spirit, and its future in the bodily new creation of all things. Resurrection means not a *factum* but a *fieri*—not what was once done, but what is in the making: the transition from death to life.” (p.241)
* “If we see resurrection as this process, it is then possible to integrate the fundamental ideas of Barth, Bultmann and Pannenberg, and to correct their one-sidedness.” “
* **Response to Barth: “**As the beginning of the annihilation of death and the appearance of eternal life, the raising of Christ form the dead is ‘the fact that changes everything’ and is therefore in itself the revelation of God. As the Wholly Other, God is the radical criticism of this world . . . . The ‘liberating judgment’ pronounced over the bondage of existence to the world of sin, power, and possession is the beginning of the rising of true life. “(p.242)
* **Response to Bultmann:** “In order to grasp the process of resurrection, we ought to make it a rule in theology never to separate Kant’s three questions the theoretical ‘What can I know?’, the practical ‘What ought I to do?’ and the eschatological ‘What may I hope for?’ These questions have to be answered in relation to one another and therefore together. Only then can we understand the event, the Spirit and the future of the resurrection in their integrated whole.” (p.242)
* **Response to Troeltsch:**
  + **Probability:** “Faith in the resurrection takes the historical ascertainable testimonies about those first appearances of Christ as remembrances—which are also reminders—of its hope for the seeing of Christ face to face. The horizon of expectation of the resurrection of the dead is wider than the sphere of remembrance of the origin of the Christian faith in the resurrection. And the sphere of remembrance of the first Christian testimonies of the resurrection is again wider than the sphere of historical research and historical judgments. Judgments of faith cannot be founded on historical judgments based on probability, but in the historical religions judgments of faith for their part make historical judgments necessary, while at the same time holding them in the balance in which judgments based on probability exist.” (p.243)
  + **Correlation:** “There is an interplay between the phenomena of historical life. But the nexus of causality is no more than one process in the many-sided network which goes to make up the living person. Death cuts life short, and with it the interplay of the living person. The eschatological resurrection of Christ means that what has been cut short is fathered up into the eternal life of the new creation . . . History is not merely the production process of inexhaustible life. It is also the destruction process of insatiable death. A historical view of the world without a perception of the power of death is an illusion. History in the perspective of the resurrection leads to a perception of the history of death because it communicates hope contrary to death.” (p.243)
  + **Analogy:** “The beginning is the encounter with what is strange and *the discovery of the other*. Anyone who begins instead with the corresponding always finds in everything that is strange and different only himself. He projects himself and his own unique character into what is alien and different, whether it be other cultures or other times. But this is blind cultural imperialism.”[[57]](#footnote-57) (p. 244)

**“Like is known by like” versus Anaxagoras’s comment: “What is not different is to the other who is no different a matter of indifference.” (p.244)**

* “What Troeltsch describes as ‘the almighty power of analogy’ makes all happening ‘indifferent’ and destroys all true interest in history.” (p.244)
* “If we apply this insight to historical knowledge, we see that its beginning is the discovery of others, the pain which their difference causes, and our own preparedness to let ourselves be changed through this encounter. Our knowledge of ourselves develops in our understanding emptying of ourselves in confrontation with the other.” (p.244)
* “The perception of the dead Christ in the eternal livingness of God has to be understood as the most profound and most primal form of knowledge of the other—namely ‘the Wholly Other’; for there is no greater antithesis than that between absolute death and eternal life. The knowledge of God in the perception of the crucified Christ must be grasped as a painful knowledge which transforms one’s own existence for its very foundations. Here knowing God begins with suffering God. Anyone who perceives God in the crucified One dies and is born again to new life from the Spirit of the resurrection, as we see in the symbol of baptism. Only then are the healing analogies to God perceived in the life-giving Spirit.” (p.245)
* “In this warp and weft of humanity and nature, we cannot proceed from a center, as do both modern anthropocentricism and the cosmocentricism which claims to be post-modern. If we wish to understand the history of the interplay between civilization and nature, we have to give up the notion of centricism altogether. If history is interaction and interplay, then we no longer have to ask: are human beings the subject of history, or is God? This alternative no longer arises. History is what takes place between God and human beings, human beings and God. History, we might say, putting it generally, is the community of human beings and nature, and the community between that humanity-and-nature relationship and God. It is a community in contradictions and correspondences, in expectations and disappointments.” (p.245)

***#4: Nature and the Resurrection of Christ: the Theological Problem***

* “Christian theology is not going far enough if—as in the last one hundred and fifty years—it discusses belief in the resurrection only in the framework of the paradigm ‘history’ and in critical acceptance of the corresponding historical sciences. Theology must go deeper than this, and look beyond the world of history to the ecological conditions of history in nature. But when we are considering the natural conditions of history, it is not so much the eschatological ‘act in history’ of the God who raises from the dead which is important; it is rather the bodily character of the Christ who died and rose again. The bodily character of his dying and his resurrection raises the critical question about the resurrection in the perspective of nature, and the constructive question about nature in the perspective of the resurrection. Earlier, in the era preceding modern times, Christology took these perspectives into account by way of the doctrine of the two natures. This was superseded in the historical Christology of modern times. But today modern historical Christology must be, not abolished, but gathered up into an ecological Christology—and at the very points where the paradigm ‘history’ has proved to be insufficient and destructive.” (p.247)
* “[N]o attempts have yet been made to move from the historical-eschatological theology of the resurrection to a historical-ecology of rebirth.” (p.247)

1. ***The Rebirth of Christ from the Spirit***

* “The apocalyptic symbol is God’s *‘raising from the dead’*. Here God alone is active; Jesus is passive. The theological pattern of thinking is theistic, the Christology adoptionist.
* The theological symbol of God’s raising from the dead is logically balanced by its anthropological correspondence which is *the resurrection of the dead*. The person who is wakened has to get up. Unless he does, the waking is ineffective. The reaction from below has to meet the action from above. In the symbol ‘raising’, the dynamic comes from above. In the symbol ‘resurrection’ the dynamic comes from below. Here the theological pattern of thinking is Christological.
* If we put the two symbols together systematically, then the event meant has to be thought of as a *reciprocal relationship* of *raising* and *resurrection*. On the one side, God is the one who ‘has raised Christ from the dead’. On the other side God was himself ‘in Christ’, who has risen from the dead. Here the theological pattern of thinking is theological-Christological.
* ‘Raising’ and ‘resurrection’ are symbols for God’s activity and Christ’s own act. But when Christ dies and lives again, these acts also take place ‘in the Holy Spirit’. Christ offered himself through the eternal Spirit (Heb 9:14) and he lives ‘in the life-giving Spirit’ (1 Cor 15:45). In the divine Spirit he endures the pains of dying and out of the divine Spirit he was born again to eternal life, just as Ezekiel 37 sees the living breath of God blowing over the wide valley of dry bones . . . . What is understandable in the paradigm ‘history’ as the eschatological *act of God the Father* in and for the Son—the act which raises the dead—must in the wider ecological paradigm ‘nature’ be understood as *the rebirth of Christ* from God’s life-giving Spirit. Here the theological pattern of thought is pneumatolgoical-trinitarian. In the pneumatological context, metaphors from nature are used for Christ’s dying and his rebirth, not metaphors from history.” (p.248)
* 1 Cor 15:36: “What you sow does not come to life unless it dies”; cf. vv. 42-44; 1 Cor 15:20: “Christ as the “first fruits” of the dead. John 12:24: “Unless a grain of wheat dies . . .”
* John 16:20-22: A woman’s labor pains and her joy over her newborn.
* Rom 14:9; 1 Cor 15:45; 2 Cor 13:4: Instead of “raising” and “resurrection,” Paul also talks about Christ’s “becoming alive,” even about his “becoming alive again” (p. 249).”
* Col 1:18; Rev 1:5: Christ is the first-born from the dead.
* Phil 3:21: “Paul expects the parousia of Christ in glory will being with it *a complete change of form* (*metasxēmatízein*) . . . “ (p. 249)

1. ***Nature’s Openness for Analogy***

* “The natural process of dying-and-becoming is embodied in many myths and metaphors of what are called ‘nature’ and ‘animist’ religions. It is not syncretism when the Christina theology of the resurrection takes them up and uses them in ‘Easter theology’, as a way of grasping the cosmic significance of Christ. After seedtime and harvest, the most important process in the regeneration of life is the process of birth. It is symbolized in the myth about the death of the woman who dies in giving life. The pains of birth and the natural blood shed, bring new life into the world. In many myths the birth of life is imagined with the death of the mother, or as the rebirth of the mother in the child, out of her death throes.[[58]](#footnote-58) It is only against this feminine background of deity that the dying and reborn gods emerge as cultic figures.” (p. 252)

***#5: The Resurrection of Christ and Nature: The Natural Problem***

1. ***The Cosmic Dimension***

* ***“***The experiences of life’s transience and the unceasing suffering of all living things no longer end only in grief, but also already lead to hope. Creation is ‘subjected’ but ‘in hope’ (Rom 8:20) . . . . This eschatological reinterpretation of transience has to be concentrated on a single pint: death; for death is the end of all the living. But in the eschatological vision of the new creation, ‘death will be no more’. New creation is new from the root up only if it issues from the cosmic annihilation of the death of created being.” (p.252)
* See Gregory of Nyssa on the “cosmic bond between Christ’s resurrection and new creation” in Holy Saturday (p. 254)
* Col 1:20—a cosmic Christology; cf. the OT notion of the Wisdom of God; cf. Col 2:9: “Christ is ‘the head’ of this new community of creation because ‘in him the whole fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily’ (Col 2:9), and through him this Shekinah overflows into the new fellowship of creation, so that with the Orthodox theology we can truly talk about a ‘deification’ of the cosmos.” (p. 255)
* “If we were to confine the meaning of the resurrection within narrower boundaries, whether existentially in the faith of the individually, or historically in the hope of humanity, Christology would remain bogged down in the unreconciled nature of this world, and would itself become a factor of enmity. It is only a cosmic Christology which completes and perfects the existential and the historical Christology. It is only the peaceful vision of the reconciliation of the cosmos which opens up the horizon of expectation in which the nature wounded by human violence can be healed through a human history of peace.” (pp. 255-256)

1. ***‘Christ’s Transition’ to the New Creation***

* “Let us gather together once more the terms that are used—raising, resurrection, making alive, transfiguration, transformation—seeing them as words describing a *transition*, a passage.[[59]](#footnote-59) They all point analogically to a progression, a way: from sleep to waking, from defeat to walking with the head held high, from death to life, from shame to honor, and so forth. When they are applied to the experienced with the dead Christ and to Christ’s ‘appearances’, the terms are talking about *Christ’s transition* from human violation to divine glory, from mortal existence to immortal divine being. This did not make him a god. But his mortal human body was transformed so that he now ‘lives’ I the body of glory which is wholly and entirely permeated by the life-giving divine Spirit, and is in this transfiguration that he ‘appeared’ and will apart. What men and women fragmentarily experience here and now, even before their deaths, in rebirths to true life in the energies and powers of love, happens in perfected form and right into mortal flesh itself in the resurrection of the dead. The person who is wholly and entirely seized and pervaded by the living power of the divine Spirit becomes immortal, because death loses its power over him.” (p. 257)
* “The raised body of Christ therefore acts as an embodied promise for the whole creation. It is the prototype of the glorified body. Consequently, a transfiguring efficacy emanates from it. It is wholly and entirely permeated by the life-giving Spirit. It therefor3 radiates the Spirit which already gives life here and now. It stands in the light of God’s perfection, so ‘from the raised body of the Lord streams boundless ocean of life’.[[60]](#footnote-60) It is the perfected body, as it provides the hope for ‘the resurrection of the body’. It partakes of God’s omnipresence, so its bodily presence is freedom of its spatial limitations. It partakes of God’s eternity, so its presence is no longer temporally restricted. It lives in the heave of God’s creative potencies and reigns with them, and is no longer tied to the limited potentialities of earthly reality. So in this body and through its powers of the new creation act upon and penetrate the world. “ (p. 258)
* “On the level of theological reflection, Christ’s passage from death to new creation is the point where we can again take up and reinterpret the ancient doctrine of the two natures, seeking it in the context of a ‘psychical’ doctrine of redemption, which is what is required today. On the cross Christ died the violent death of human beings. But he was mortal, and died the death of vulnerable human nature too. Through his resurrection, not only was the violent death of human beings conquered; the mortality of vulnerable human nature was also overcome. But if through his resurrection the mortality of human nature was overcome, this also meant the conquest of ‘the death of all the living’, under which enslaved creation here ‘sighs’. But if he has overcome this death too, then his resurrection is indeed the beginning of the new creation of that world in which death will be no more. With the raising of Christ, the vulnerable and mortal human nature we experience here is raised and transformed into the eternally living, immortal human nature of the new creation; and with vulnerable human nature the non-human nature of the earth is transformed as well. This transformation is its eternal healing. But if this mortal human nature was accepted, raised and transfigured like this, then Christ’s resurrection also raised and gathered up the original good creation which is the ground of human nature, perfecting it in its own new creation. In Christ’s resurrection human nature in its primordial form triumphs over its unnatural imprisonment in transience.” (pp. 258-259)
* “The mystery of Christ’s transition is unveiled in several different strata:
  + **The raising of the crucified Jesus** has the direct historical relevance signified by the historical Roman cross.
  + **Giving life to the Jesus who died** has the present natural relevance which is determined by the mortality of human nature.
  + **The glorification of this human being** in God has the created natural relevance which is determined by the human character of the human race.
  + **Christ’s exaltation** to be the head of the new creation brings into the light of the eternal peace between heaven and earth and all created being.” (p. 259)

1. ***The Resurrection of the Dead—the Resurrection of the Body—the Resurrection of Nature***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion, pp. 259ff. |

***#6: Becoming Alive in the Spirit of the Resurrection: the Uniting of What has been Separated***

* “Life in the Spirit of god is consequently a life in the power of the resurrection. Traditionally it was understood as rebirth through the Spirit, and was symbolically sealed in baptism. Taken literally, it means ‘being born again to a living hope through the raising of Christ from the dead’ (1 Pet 1:3). This spiritual rebirth of a human being is nothing less than the anticipated rebirth of the whole cosmos. It is a personal happening with cosmic relevance. The people who are ‘born again’ through the Spirit of the resurrection are not redeemed from ‘this wicked world’. They are called on the liberation of suffering and are made alive for that purpose. The living hope to which we are reborn is an inclusive hope by virtue of its very origin—that is, it is a vicarious, a representative hope for all sad created beings, but never an exclusive hope in which believers assure themselves complacently of their own salvation and let the rest of the world go to hell.” (p.264)

1. ***The Unity of Body and Soul***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion, pp. 265ff. |

1. ***The Unity of the Person in Time***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion, pp. 267ff. |

1. ***The Unity between Person and Community***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion, pp. 268ff. |

1. ***The Unity of the Human Race in the Generation Contract***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion, pp. 269ff. |

***5. The Unity between Human Civilization and Nature: : Expectant Creativity: the Expectation of the Parousia and Affirmed Embodiment***

|  |
| --- |
| See Moltmann’s discussion, pp. 270ff. |

Jürgen Moltmann, *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in Messianic Dimensions* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).
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