Unification Theology and Christian Thought

YOUNG OON KIM (1914-89)

REVISED EDITION 1976

First Edition 1975, Revised Edition 1976

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Catalog Number 74-32590

About the Author, Dr. Young Oon Kim

Dr. Young Oon Kim was born in 1915 on Hwang-Hae Island in Korea. After she graduated in Theology from Kanzai University in Japan she became professor of Christology at Ewha Woman's University in Seoul. In 1948 she received a Master's degree in Theology from Emanuel College, Toronto University and in December of the same year an Honorary Doctor's degree in Humanism from Richard College.

From 1975 on she taught Systematic Theology at the Graduate School of the Unification Theological Seminary in Barrytown, New York. Some of her most important publications are.. Unification Theology and Christian Thought, Divine Principle and its Application, World Religions Volume I, II, and III, Unification Theology, An Introduction to Theology, and The Types of Modern Theology.

http://www.tparents.org/Library/Unification/Books/UtaCt/0-Toc.htm

Reformatted by „feliksch“

CONTENTS

6. ETHICS AND VALUE

7. HISTORY OF RESTORATION: THE OLD TESTAMENT AGE

PREFACE

COMMUNICATION SEEMS to be of prime importance in today's life. Despite highly advanced information systems and global interchange, there is a serious lack of communication between husband and wife, between generations and among groups and nations. Certainly it appears to be a major barrier between the Unification Church and other denominations of the world Christian community.

In writing this book I did not intend to present a confession of faith of the Unification Church. My attempt was rather to interpret and explicate Divine Principle or Unification theology from a historical theological viewpoint. Certain expressions in the Divine Principle, the teaching of Reverend Sun Myung Moon, I have found to be convincing and enormously helpful in clarifying my theological questions. Therefore I felt obliged to bridge the Unification Principle and historical Christian thought for the sake of communication.

It is my hope and prayer that this small book will broaden and deepen the thinking and understanding of the members of the Unification Church as well as various Christian denominations. Thus dialogue between them will begin. I want to express my deep gratitude for the diligent research efforts of Reverend Royal Davis and the associate editing of Mr. John Dolen which helped bring this book more quickly to the public.

Washington, March 1976 D.C. Young Oon Kim

CONTENTS

1. THE PRINCIPLE OF CREATION

EVERY GENERATION asks the same vital questions about God, man and his destiny but each puts them in some special form. When in 1966 the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in the Netherlands issued a new and very unusual type of catechism for the laity, among the questions they raised were: "What is the point of this world?", "How did our life begin?", "Is it an accident that things strive upward through such new and wonderful phases - existence, life, feeling, thought?". "Are we then to believe that human history, past, present and future, the whole evolution of the universe, with its pain and anxiety, its loves and joys, and its final end, is a meaningless jest?". "How can we harmonize all the sickness, disappointments and cruelty of this world with an infinitely good origin?". [1]

Similar questions have been raised and pondered through the centuries. The prophets and priests of the Hebrew Bible wrestled with them. So have Christian theologians and philosophers of religion. Earlier, Greeks from Socrates to Plato to Plotinus considered these questions. Nor were they overlooked by Hindu saints and Moslem sages. Even today these same questions are still being asked by Christians and non-Christians, theists and humanists, dogmatists and doubters.

Regardless of one's particular religious faith or lack of it, every individual sooner or later asks himself certain fundamental questions about human nature and destiny. Theology itself is merely the systematic and constructive consideration of these basic queries. A man must find his place in the society of which he is a member. He must relate himself in a positive fashion to the wider universe surrounding him. In short, he must come to terms with God.

According to Professor Emil Brunner of Zurich, "The first word of the Bible is the word about the Creator and creation. But that is not simply the first word with which one begins in order to pass on to greater, more important matters. It is the primeval word, the fundamental word supporting everything else. Take it away and everything collapses. Indeed if one rightly understands that which the Bible means by the Creator, he has rightly understood the whole Bible. Everything else is involved in this one word." [2]

POLARITY: CREATOR AND CREATION

An in-depth study of the meaning of creation would suggest answers to the basic questions regarding the Creator posed by the ancient and modern religions. By understanding the relationship of Creator and creature in its many ramifications, one can discover not only the reality and power of God, but also the nature and destiny of man, the value and purpose of the universe, the significance of human history, and the reasons for our hope of eternal life.

Creation relates the human to the divine. It connects human and cosmic purpose. It brings into clear focus the personal and the transpersonal, joining together the reasons why man acts and aspires as well as the inner causes behind the varied phenomena of nature. The Hebrew Bible (the foundation for Jewish, Christian and Islamic religion) opens with the verse,

1 *A New Catechism,* Herder and Herder, N.Y., 1967, pp. 4, 9, 11, 12, 17.
2 Emil Brunner, *Our Faith,* Charles Scribner's Sons, N.Y.,1936, pp. 4, 5.

CONTENTS

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." In the Apostles' Creed, the first article is "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth." In this Hebraic-Christian tradition, God is the ever-active Creator, an infinite and invisible Spirit who fashioned the universe in the light of His perfect reason and holy will. Wherever one looks, he beholds the handiwork of God. Whether we read the creation story in Genesis, the nature hymns in the Psalms or the majestic poetry of the theophany in Job, we are taught that behind and throughout everything visible man can sense the presence of a divine reality.

If this be true, the universe reflects the personality of God in much the same way that our facial expressions, gestures and overall appearance reflect our inner nature and attitude. In that sense, the universe becomes God's body. The temporal manifests the trans-temporal or eternal. With what then, does man sense the trans-temporal, the metaphysical - is it done with just our physical eyes? The Beatitudes teach,' 'Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall *see* God." It is an inner quality, an inner eye, that allows man to sense the living God.

The question then - which was posed among learned theologians during the High Middle Ages – is: "Can man achieve this beatific vision directly in its full splendor or merely in an indirect manner?" The Franciscan theologians, such as Saint Bonaventura, declared that we can see God face to face, here and now. Being itself, being in its fullness or being in any of its concrete forms, represents an accurate revelation of the infinite. What occurs in time as a whole and time in any of its various segments provides a full and convincing proof for the existence of the one God of love, beauty and power.

Dominican theologians, however, approached this cosmological question in a different manner. Following in the steps of Saint Thomas Aquinas, these men claimed that the universe provides only indirect revelations of the divine presence, heeding the Biblical warning that no man has ever seen God. That is, one can only reason from the finite and the temporal to the infinite and the eternal by means of analogy. To quote Augustine:

> *„And what is this God? I asked the earth and it answered 'I am not He'; and all things that are in the earth made the same confession. I asked the sea and the deeps and the creeping things, and they answered: 'We are not your God; seek higher.' I asked the heavens, the sun, the moon, the stars and they answered: 'Neither are we God whom you seek.' And I said to all the things that throng about the gateways of the senses: 'Tell me of my God, since you are not He. Tell me something of Him.' And they cried out in a great voice: 'He made us.' My question was my gazing upon them, and their answer was their beauty“* [3].

Much later, the Puritans in Great Britain formalized and systematized their concept of God. In 1640, at a crucial stage in this movement, the Westminster Assembly issued a theological statement which became a classic Protestant definition. The Presbyterian divines declared:

> *There is but one only living and true God, who is infinite in being and perfection, a most pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts, or passions, immutable, immense, eternal, incomprehensible, almighty, most wise, most holy, most free, most absolute, working all things according to the counsel of his own immutable and most righteous will, for his own glory; most loving, gracious, merciful, long-suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin; the rewarder of them that diligently seek him; and withal most just and terrible in his judgments, hating all sin, and who will by no*

3 F.J. Sheed, *The Confessions of St. Augustine,* Sheed & Ward, N.Y., 1943, Bk. X, sect. 6.

CONTENTS

means clear the guilty. [4]

The previous opinions intimate precisely *what Divine Principle* [5] states: that God is perceived both indirectly and directly. We can perceive God indirectly through nature, but in a much more direct manner through man. Man was created in God's image. God's likeness is in man. For theologians, this, of course, is not a new concept. As the Russian Orthodox philosopher Vladimir Lossky points out in his book, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church,* the early Church Fathers sought to find God's image in man and variously defined it as the soul, the intellect, the power of inner self-determination, as well as man's position as lord of the terrestrial world. In addition, it was identified with the gift of immortality, the ability of knowing God and the possibility of sharing the divine nature. According to one of the early Eastern Fathers, St. Gregory of Nyssa,

> *„His reason for creating human life is simply this.-.because He is good. Such being the nature of God, and such the one reason why he undertook the creation of man, there were to be no half measures when He set about to show forth the power of his goodness. He would not give a mere part of what was His own, and grudge to share the rest".* [6]

For Unification theology [7] the fact that man was created in the divine image indicates that God had applied the same principle operating within Himself directly in the creation of man and indirectly in the creation of the universe. By recognizing the fundamental principle of creation inherent in both man and the cosmos, we can comprehend the basic nature of God.

Looking at ourselves we discover that man is both heart [8] and body, inner self and its outer expression. Thought, emotion and will are reflected outwardly in one's facial expressions and indeed in one's whole body. The body is quite clearly directed by the heart, its inner cause and underlying purpose. Though the heart of man is invisible and his personality may not be known directly, we can know another's inner feelings by observing his behavior. To a considerable degree, a man is what he does, because he embodies what he thinks. The outer man we see mirrors the inner man that is otherwise hidden.

An examination of the world around us also indicates that purposiveness characterizes every level of existence. Life in a variety of forms is directed toward specific goals. In different ways, creation demonstrates its teleological character. Existence manifests design.

As a man embodies an inner spirit, so does the universe as a whole. There is a definite cause or purpose to all existence, which could be called the cosmic heart. Extraordinary new experiments reveal that even plants have emotions and memory. Everything visible is the expression or revelation of an invisible and eternal aim. This heart of all creation is God. He is reflected in all that we can see or hear or touch. He makes His presence known in the totality of creation which serves as His body, exemplifying His sovereignty and providing the outer form of His being.

---

4 *A Handbook of Christian Theology,* The World Publishing Co., N.Y., 1958, p. 148.
5 *Divine Principle,* Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity, Washington, D.C., 1973
6 *Vladimir Lossky, The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church,* J. Clarke, London, 1973, pp. 118-119.
7 The theological explication of *Divine Principle.*
8 While it has become somewhat customary to refer to the inner life of man in terms of his "mind", this Greek idea exaggerates the purely rational side of the human being and leads to intellectualist definitions of his nature. Though no single word conveys the richness and depth of personality, "heart" at least suggests the emotional and affective aspects of human nature. It should not be limited to these, however, and should be understood to mean the total range of one's inner life.

CONTENTS

From man and nature, which both contain the polarity of internal character and external form, we can see that their Creator, their Cause, also exists in polarity. The energy, the force behind all matter, is God's external form, whereas the inner qualities of emotion, intellect and will constitute God's internal character. It should be pointed out that emotion and intellect are quite distinct. Feeling is more basic, and within the heart or mind of God, is the guide, the subject, while reason as its object is a tool; together they work to bring a loving and intelligible direction through God's body. God's heart is subject and His body is object in the same way as man's mind is subject over his body. In the sense that energy is present in all creation, God is omnipresent; and to the degree that God's love, God's truth and God's will are present in men, so is God present.

Because God has mind and man has mind, their relationship with each other has often been similar to the relationships between men. This has led some to seek the nature of the Most High by an examination of interpersonal communication. Though often the language of Biblical devotion stresses the majestic authority of God by comparison with our human weakness, there is central to Biblical faith the notion that man and God can enter into a covenant as responsible partners. From this, they can enter into compacts of mutual assistance in the interest of justice and righteousness.

St. Paul said in Romans 1:20: *"Ever since the creation of the world His invisible nature, namely His eternal power and deity, has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made."* We have heretofore examined the polarity of God's nature in terms of inner and outer. However, there is another fundamental polarity that is "perceived in the things that have been made." Particles consist of both a positively charged part and a negatively charged one which exist in a paired, complementary relationship. Atoms consist of a nucleus of protons (of positive charge) and an electron cloud (of negative charge). Molecules exist in cation (positively charged ions) and anion (negatively charged ions). Plants have stamen and pistil in one plant or the masculine and feminine parts exist in separate plants. In animals too, we see these complementary pairs: rooster and hen, stallion and mare, ram and ewe. And finally in man, we see man and woman.

This basic polarity of positivity and negativity - masculinity and femininity - is fundamental in the structure of existent being; therefore we can assert that God Himself exists in such a polarity. In his Gifford Lectures entitled *Nature, Man and God,* Archbishop William Temple wrote:

> *„In nature we find God, we do not only infer from Nature what God must be like, but when we see Nature truly, we see God self-manifested in and through it. Yet the self-revelation so given is incomplete and inadequate. Personality can only reveal itself in persons. Consequently, it is specially in Human Nature - in men and women - that we see God".*[9]

Adam alone does not provide a complete image of God; but, Adam and Eve together are God's image. Male and female he created them. Adam and Eve stand on a ladder of polarity which descends to the protons and electrons at the base of the realm of matter. Man and woman relate to each other by divine design; physically and psychologically they complement each other's outer and inner structure.

In his theological anthropology, *Man in Revolt,* Professor Brunner indicates that the biological difference between the sexes is basic and deep-seated. Spiritually, he tells us, man expresses the productive principle while the woman exemplifies the principle of bearing and

9 William Temple, *Nature, Man and God,* Macmilfan Co., N.Y., 1949, p. 226.

nourishing. Man turns more to the outside world while the woman concentrates more on the inner realm. The male seeks the new and the female longs to preserve the old. While the man likes to roam about, the woman prefers to make a home. [10]

One may have already recognized this concept as the ancient Chinese philosophy of yin and yang. Yang refers to positivity: the sun, man, male animals, positive electrical charge; yin refers to negativity (not with a derogatory implication): the moon, woman, female animals, negative electrical charge.

Positivity is subject and negativity is object; that is, subject refers to the initiating force and object refers to the responding power. The male Adam represents the assertive, aggressive thrust of love while Eve suggests the receptive yet creative energy, responding with beauty. Thus the creation of man and woman as a pair provides a psychosomatic and objective manifestation of the fundamental bipolarity of God.

This aspect of God has not been emphasized in Western Civilization; traditional theology has seen God as masculine. [11] The psychotherapist Eric Fromm [12] asserted, however, that from a psychological standpoint there are deficiencies in a society based on the worship of an exclusively male deity. Fatherly love makes demands, sets up principles of appropriate behavior and establishes laws of correct action. Filial love thereby depends on the obedience of the son to paternal demands. However, if the child cannot live up to the demands, he may feel a lack of love and by self-accusation cut himself off from his father's love, thinking he could not possibly receive or deserve it. The result of this is frustration and depression.

Maternal love by contrast is unconditional, all-enveloping. According to Fromm, it does not need to be acquired, but comes as a natural gift of physical birth. The children come from the mother physically and psychologically, and she loves them simply because they are hers - not because they obey her commands and fulfill her wishes. The physical intimacy and psychic dependence are universal.

For Fromm, an understanding of God as both Father and Mother would lead to a more rounded and stable personality in its adherents. He pointed out, however, that even in a strict patriarchal society, Mary and the Church in Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy are referred to as ' 'Mother". Also Martin Luther's' 'justification by faith alone" implies a maternal love from God, in that we need not prove that we deserve it. Whether we accept Fromm's assertions or not, it is clear that considering God as both Father and all-embracing Mother broadens and clarifies what we need and seek in God. Each aspect by itself is incomplete and

---

10 Emil Brunner, *Man in Revolt,* Charles Scribner's Sons, N.Y., 1939, pp. 353-355.

11 Within the established Christian Churches, little if any serious consideration has taken place concerning the masculine-feminine polarity within the nature of God. Between World Wars I and II Father Sergius Bulgakov taught theology in Paris to the Russian emigre colony. He meditated particularly on the passages in the Bible about the divine wisdom (sophia) to which the scriptures assign a feminine nature. (Proverbs, chapters 8 and 9). He combined these Biblical studies with popular opinion and liturgical practice concerning Mary, the Mother of Jesus. Within the Christian tradition as a whole there seemed to be no other way to justify a feminine aspect to the divine nature.' "God-manhood", he concluded, "is to be found 'on earth as it is in heaven' in a double, not only a single form: not only that of the God-man, Christ, but that of his mother too. Jesus-Mary - -there is the fullness of God-manhood." Mary "is the personal subject of the humanity of Christ and his feminine counterpart." (Sergius Bulgakov, *The Wisdom of God,* Paisley Press, N.Y., 1937,p. 184). Although his sophiology in itself was a daring innovation he tried to qualify it enough to make it look tolerably Orthodox. He admitted that Mary is not divine or even theandric. Though she is a manifestation and revelation of the Holy Spirit ("the human likeness of the Holy Ghost") she remains a woman. Despite these qualifications, Bulgakov's sophiology won almost no support and was widely condemned by other Eastern Orthodox theologians.

12 Eric Fromm, *The Art of Loving,* Harper & Row, N.Y., 1956, pp. 65-66.

CONTENTS

onesided.

In his book *The Hebrew Goddess,* Raphael Patai points out that comparative religion reveals that man represents the nature of God in both masculine and feminine ways. Judaism is no exception to this pattern. In the Old Testament we learn that for about six centuries, from the arrival of Israelite tribes in Canaan to Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of Jerusalem, the Hebrews worshipped the goddess Asherah as well as Yahweh. Asherah symbolized the great mother and her statue was put in the temple at Jerusalem. When Elijah killed 450 prophets of Baal, he did nothing to the 400 prophets of Asherah. Patai concludes that she must have been regarded as the necessary or at least tolerable female counterpart of Yahweh.

Philo the Alexandrine Jew suggested that the cherubim symbolized two aspects of God: God the Father (Reason) and God the Mother (Wisdom). When the Torah uses the name Elohim to denote God, it refers to the Divine Father, Husband, Begetter and Creator. When the scripture speaks of God as Yahweh, it indicates the Divine Mother, Wife, Bearer, and Nurturer. Patai records Reb Qetina's (a Babylonian Talmudist of the 3rd-4th century) information that when Jews made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem the priest would roll up the veil hiding the Holy of Holies to show a huge statue of cherubim intertwined with one another as an illustration of the male and female characteristics of divine love. These two aspects of God later typified Talmudic theology and medieval mystical Judaism.

Divine Principle then recognizes that the very essence of the paternal and maternal instinct come from, and are perfected in, God.

GIVE AND TAKE

When Moses asked God for a name by which He could be called, He replied rather enigmatically,' 'I am who I am" (Exodus 3:14). According to Father John Courtney Murray, this Biblical definition of the divine name could mean any or all of three very different things. It could mean God is being itself and be translated "I am He who is." It could mean God is the Creator and be translated ' 'I am to be whatever comes to be." Or it could imply God is the ever present "I shall be there with you in power." [13] *Divine Principle* asserts that God is perpetual, self-generating energy, the first cause and the primal source of all that exists. This ultimate source energy is the outer form as heart is the inner character of the Godhead. The give and take between them forms the foundation for His eternal existence. Causing the visible creation and operating through it, God is responsible for the innumerable types of patterns which energy forms to make the world we touch, see and know.

Repeatedly the scriptures emphasize the amazing power and inexhaustible energy of God. In the Psalter, He is revealed in a wild storm: in the lightning flash and thunder He shakes the cedars of Lebanon and frightens the deer into giving birth to their fawns prematurely. [14] In the book of Judges, Samson was possessed with divine strength so he could pull down a Philistine temple with his bare hands. Some scholars say that Mount Sinai was considered sacred because it was a volcano symbolizing the awesome majesty of Yahweh. To quote an Old Testament authority,

> *„If this God has to be typified in one word, that word must be Power; or, still better, perhaps, Force. Everything about and around Yahweh feels the effect of this. He as it were*

13 J.C. Murray, *The Problem of God,* Yale University Press, New Haven, 1964, pp. 8-9.

14 Psalm 29:5-9. Variant reading in RSV.

electrifies his environment". [15]

The Hebrews spoke of God as a mighty king, an exalted judge or the commander of a vast army, literally the Lord of hosts. But even the purely moral attributes ascribed to Him are dynamic qualities. When we say God is love, God is justice, God is truth, we mean that He is a God of overwhelming power. Consequently, men of faith are known for their remarkable courage, steadfast conviction and lasting influence over others. God comes to man, as the Pentecost incident relates, like the rush of a mighty wind. Those gripped by His Spirit therefore become virtually irresistible and indomitable, men of granite and steel.

In his book *God and the World,* theologian John B. Cobb, Jr. claims that "God can be conceived as a very special kind of energy-event." Obviously, God is not physical in the usual sense of the word; He is physical, Cobb maintains, in the sense that there is a 'physical' energy-event behind each element of the world of matter, and that those energy-events include mental and spiritual phenomena. [16]

In what direction and for what purpose, then, does this energy move? We have heretofore seen that every element in the universe is part of or divided into subject-object pairs. Yet, if the elements existed by themselves, without a force or energy which causes them to be attracted to their complement, there would be no life, no multiplication, no existence. Therefore, the universal source energy emanating from God operates to stimulate and produce a give and take action between the subject and object. For example, through this source energy, protons and electrons interact to form atoms; positive and negative charges create a flow of electricity; male and female animals unite to produce young. This give and take process also extends to the exchange of energy between life systems; in an aquarium the plants utilize carbon dioxide exhaled by fish and discharge oxygen which is used by the fish in return. (In fact, the awareness of the give and take process, exemplified in the complex behavior of plants and animals in a specific geographical environment, is central to the new interest in ecology.) Zoologists speak of a vast web of life in which each constituent part plays both a productive (giving) and a receptive (taking/receiving) role.

The source energy from God is in a vertical relationship to everything else while the energy produced through give and take between other subjects and objects is horizontal. Hence, there is no creation in which God's spirit is not at work. This universal law of give and take is another aspect of God's omnipresence; nothing can exist without this connection to the living, ever-active God. Through the union provided by the give and take action, a receptive base is made between a subject and object and new life is produced. Each receptive base serves as a launching pad for new action by the spirit of God. In addition, through the receptive bases, the whole creation continues its existence and maintains its motion.

The ultimate in the series of give and take relationships is the love between man and woman, husband and wife. They are the separate images of God's fundamental polarity and therefore have the natural inclination and capacity to form a perfect reciprocal relationship. In so doing they feel exciting and stimulating joy; thus, they bring great happiness to each other and build a harmonious unity between them. From such a unity, children are produced. In Unification theology these three stages are called origin, division and union (God, male and female, children).

This process in turn establishes four positions: origin, subject, object and union. With God at the center, these four positions provide the basis on which the purpose of each being in

15 T.C. Vriezen, *The Religion of Ancient Israel,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1967, p. 131.
16 John B. Cobb, Jr., *God and the World,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1969, pp. 68-71.

creation is fulfilled. This 'group' with God at its heart is called in *Divine Principle* terminology the "base of four positions."

The base on the family level, parents and children with God at the center, provides the natural foundation of human society. This becomes the pattern for all other bases of four positions. On the community level, for example, the four positions would be God, the leadership, the people and the community formed among them. Of course, if the leadership were centered on God, then we would and could have an ideal community. Societal, national and international relationships are also derived from that pattern.

The importance of give and take on a cultural level was stressed by Arnold Toynbee; he calls this 'the challenge and response factor', and points to it again and again in his multi-volumed study of different civilizations. The Hellenic ideal, for example, interacted with the Roman, the Judaic and the Egyptian. Christianity itself has often been described as a result of the creative give and take between the Hebrew and the Greek. In our own century we are witnessing a world-wide meeting of East and West, a cross-cultural exchange of vast significance.

According to many sociologists and historians interaction of this sort is the very stimulus required to produce the flowering of a civilization or a step forward in its cultural evolution. To cite a single instance, the culture of Western Europe might have stagnated in the Dark Ages had the Crusaders not been introduced to the art, philosophy and general refinement of the Arab world.

Looking at the world today however, we see the give and take principle in action in society at large is not achieving the same effect as the give and take principle in nature. In nature, we see an infinitely delicate harmony, whereas in man we see a world of conflict. This is a result of the *quality* of the give and take as well as the *'cargo'*. If the cargo were love, and it was transported with understanding, then the result would be a world of harmony and cooperation. The reason why Christianity has flourished is because of its emphasis on the primacy of love. Love unites one to another and creates interpersonal harmony; the New Testament envisions a loving fellowship which binds together very disparate kinds of people - the Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, male and female, slave and freeman. However, we must have a warehouse from which to receive this cargo of love. It is somewhat like the people in a poor but partially industrialized nation; the railroad tracks are there, the train can come through - yet if there is no food in the cargo, the people cannot be satisfied. That is, in the world today the lines of give and take are established - and the foundation for a harmonious, satisfied society is being laid - we need more cargo.

St. Paul said: love is higher than faith or hope or the glory of martyrdom. The author of I John wrote:

> *„Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God, and he who loves is born of God and knows God. He who does not love does not know God; for God is love... God is love, and he who abides in love abides in God and God abides in him“ (4:7-8, 16b).*

Harmony among people can be achieved because they first love God; they have access to the warehouse and can pass this cargo of God's love to the rest of their neighbors. That is what Paul did: spreading this new faith throughout the Hellenistic world, he was well aware that in Jesus' eyes, the commandments to love God with all your heart and to love your neighbor as yourself were the most important of the hundreds in the Torah. He knew that harmony on the horizontal level was dependent on the vertical relationship with God; that

give and take flows freely between men only when it flows between men and God; that' 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom." (II Cor. 3:17)

THE PURPOSE OF CREATION

A. Traditional Viewpoints

In the Eastern Orthodox Church, the purpose of man's creation is to attain deification. As St. Athanasius and other Church Fathers put it, God became man in order that we might become God. The Divine became human so that the human could become divine.

According to one such Orthodox explanation, God appointed man to unite in himself the whole of created being. At the same time man was challenged to reach perfect union with God. From this, a true state of deification of the whole creation could be achieved.

To do this, it was first necessary that man should sublimate his sexual drive. He would thereby follow the impassible life according to the divine archetype. This idea is based on a Biblical interpretation of Genesis that sex was not part of the life of man in the Garden of Eden but is instead one of the most obvious marks of later or fallen humanity. Scholars differ as to whether such a conception was a natural outgrowth of the ascetic practices common to the pursuit of the monastic life or whether in large part it was derived from the dualistic world view of pagan Hellenism.

In the Eastern Orthodox view, by sublimating his sexual drive, man will be in a position to reunite Paradise with the rest of the earth. He would first bear Paradise within himself. Through ceaseless communion with God he could then transform the whole earth into a new Garden of Eden.

After this, man must overcome spatial limitations in his spirit and also in his body. The totality of the sensible universe, both the heavens and earth, must be reunited.

Having passed the limits of the sensible, man would be able to penetrate into the intelligible universe with knowledge equal to that of the angels. Finally, there will be no barriers between himself and God.

In an act of utterly ineffable love man would return to God the whole created universe gathered together in his own being. God could then in His turn so completely give Himself to man that by the gift of grace man could possess all that God possesses by nature. Man and the whole created universe would experience complete deification. According to the Eastern Orthodox view, since this task was not fulfilled by Adam it has become the work of Christ.

Since the time of St. Cyprian and more especially St. Augustine, Roman Catholics have generally identified the continual and final purpose of God with the life and ultimate triumph of the corporate Church, thought of as the Body of Christ. Man obeys God and lives according to the divine purpose on the earthly plane by nourishing his spiritual life with the sacramental graces provided by the altar and priesthood. Through his faithful membership in the institutional Church, his obedience to its instructions and his participation in its devotional life, he is promised divine guidance and help until death releases him and he is enabled to experience in its fullness the beatific vision. While the Church continues to preserve the story of Adam and Eve as part of the sacred canon, that account plays but a secondary role in the actual understanding of human nature. As for any final recreation of the world, this is left to the Second Coming of Jesus Christ at some unpredictable and remote future date. While there

are differences of opinion about such matters among the theologians and possibly even more variety among the laity, in general the emphasis is placed on the role of Jesus Christ rather than the creation story.

Protestant churchmen are even more divided in their views about the purpose of creation, partially because highly critical scriptural study has been prevalent in the theological seminaries for more than a century. Moreover, both clergy and laity have felt the brunt of attacks made upon the whole Christian world view since the Enlightenment of the 18th century.

Evangelical and evangelistic Protestants still lay great stress upon the Fall of man and the fact of original sin. This inevitably results in continual emphasis upon Adam and Eve, but seldom does the account of the first human pair become any sort of model for the present or the future. Such Protestants use the Fall of man to explain why our present world is a pathetic vale of tears and that man longs for the eternal bliss of a heavenly afterlife. Because man has fallen and without divine grace would be destined for everlasting hellfire, evangelicals plead that their fellow creatures abandon a life of pleasure-seeking and keep themselves unstained by the world. Christ rather than Adam plays the chief role in their understanding of human nature and destiny. Life here is treated as a temptation or at least a trial. Real concern is therefore restricted to resistance to the allure of this world in order to be rewarded with an eternity of supernatural happiness thereafter.

Though all evangelicals believe in a literal second coming of Christ, a last judgment and a millennial kingdom of divine righteousness to be established on a recreated earth, most hesitate to predict when such events will take place. They generally expect a speedy second advent because of the woeful state of the world, yet they tend to be safely vague in their predictions and almost uniformly critical of any apocalyptic movements which appear in their midst.

Liberal theologians for their part have abandoned belief in an infallible Bible, a literal last judgment and an actual second coming. For them the Adam and Eve story and the creation account represent primitive legends derived from Babylonian mythology and revised to suit the theological opinions of early Hebrew priests. Those of individualistic or mystical bent believe that the final purpose of man here on earth can be achieved by means of personal fellowship with God; this, coupled with brotherly love for one's fellowmen under the guidance and inspiration of the spirit of Jesus, illustrates God's pattern for a good life. Liberals of reformist temper identify the coming kingdom with every effort to better the human condition individually and socially. This goal is to be achieved gradually, over a long period of time.

Finally, Neo-orthodox thinkers between World War I and II turned against the liberal theology and criticized it for its facile optimism and its lack of prophetic realism. Returning to the classic theology of the Protestant Reformation, they were inclined to use orthodox and Biblical language wherever possible but treated the meaning of such in highly symbolic fashion. For example, Reinhold Niebuhr used the traditional language about the Fall and original sin but frankly confessed that in his mind the first was "legendary" and the second had "dubious connotations." Similarly he placed strong emphasis on New Testament eschatology with its special symbols of the Christ and anti-Christ meaning merely, as he put it, "that both good and evil grow in history and that evil has no separate history, but that a greater evil is always a corruption of a greater good." [17]

17 Preface to Scribner Library edition of *"Human Nature and Destiny",* pp. viii & ix.

B. Divine Principle View

The purpose of creation is three-fold yet one. Although nature is created for itself, its own beauty, joy and fulfillment, at the same time it exists for man - to please, serve and glorify him. Man too is created for himself, for his pursuit of happiness and his self-fulfillment; at the same time, nevertheless, his existence, the realization of his desires and his attainment of a mature state of mind are ultimately achieved in relationship with his Creator. In other words, man finds joy and achieves meaning in life by serving and glorifying God. Finally, God created man and nature for Himself so He could experience the fulfillment of His will and be joyful.

Let us elaborate and see what was the intention behind man's creation. In its interpretation of the following well-known passage of scripture, *Divine Principle* reveals a clear and deep purpose: „Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion. ..." (Gen. 1:28b) God is bestowing three blessings on Adam and Eve: be fruitful (unite with Him); multiply (unite with each other); have dominion (unite with creation).

In the history of theology man's relationship with his Creator has been characterized in several ways. The divine-human encounter is compared to a ruler and his subject, a master and his slave, a craftsman and his craft. Unification theology, however, insists on the importance of the most personal analogies: father and child, lover and beloved, bridegroom and bride. The intimacy possible with God not only allows man to reason with God, but also to live in joyous love with Him. By acting according to God's heart, man can establish a vital rapport between himself and God, resulting in perpetual, ever-expanding joy. Such was God's intention: be fruitful by uniting with Him.

As Thomas a Kempis wrote in *The Imitation of Christ:* "Ah, my Lord God, most faithful lover, when thou comest into my heart, all that is within me dost joy! Thou art my glory and the joy of my heart, my hope and my whole refuge in all of my troubles."[18]

Rabindranath Tagore, the Indian religious poet and philosopher, is no less ecstatic:

> *"Thou hast made me endless, such is thy pleasure. This frail vessel thou emptiest again and again, and fillest it ever with fresh life. This little flute of a reed thou hast carried over hills and dales, and hast breathed through it melodies eternally new. At the immortal touch of thy hands my little heart loses its limits in joy and gives birth to utterance ineffable... Life of my life, I shall ever try to keep my body pure, knowing that thy living touch is upon all my limbs. I shall ever try to keep all untruths out from my thoughts, knowing that thou art that truth which has kindled the light of reason in my mind. I shall ever try to drive all evils away from my heart and keep my love in flower, knowing that thou hast thy seat in the inmost shrine of my heart. And it shall be my endeavour to reveal thee in my actions, knowing it is thy power gives me strength to act. I ask for a moment's indulgence to sit by thy side. The works that I have in hand I will finish afterwards. Now it is time to sit quiet, face to face with thee, and to sing dedication of life in this silent and overflowing leisure".*[19]

Despite God's intention, the purpose of creation has not yet been realized; it is unrealized because man has not responded fully to God's love. He has not become perfect *("You must be perfect as your Heavenly Father is perfect". Matt. 5:48)* He has not become

18 *The Imitation of Christ,* 111:5.

19 Gitanjali, 1, 4, 5, *Collected Poems and Plays of Rabindranath Tagore,* Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1958, pp. 3-4.

God's temple *("Do you not know that you are God's temple and God's Spirit dwells in you"? I Cor. 6:19)* Therefore, for God, man has not become fruitful; consequently neither God's joy nor man's joy has been consummated.

When this first blessing is realized (to develop the capacity to respond to God's love is *still* the divinely ordained purpose of existence) God intends to bless men and women in true marriage. Had there been no Fall, Adam, Eve and their children would have formed the first God-centered four position foundation on the family level. Man experiences great vitality in his life when he finds a mate whom he can love with his whole being, and be truly loved in return. In this united state a woman and a man could be joyous, sensitive objects to God. Through their love, children would then be bom and the parents would experience their own creation of another person who would reflect and amplify their own nature. Such a family would serve as the foothold for God's sovereignty in the physical world and a fountainhead of love for each member of the family. A child first would learn to receive love from his parents and love from God; however, as he grows he would learn to give love to others in a mutual relationship; this would culminate in the ultimate giving of one's self to another in marriage. Finally, as a parent, he must be willing to love his children unselfishly.

Although traditional Christianity has considered marriage a sacrament through which one receives divine grace, marriage is not given the central position as in *Divine Principle.* Mystical religion, Eastern and Western, commonly culminates on the level of individual deification. Unification theology proceeds to an even higher goal to transcend the individualism of the ordinary mystic: from I and my Father are one to I and my spouse are one, centered on God. The third blessing,' 'Unite with creation" (have dominion) is fulfilled when spiritually mature men and women understand and appreciate the creation as God does. The creation then, would respond with beauty, abundance and a festive glow. According to the Bible, the creation eagerly awaits the sons of God (Rom. 8:19); though we may sometimes glimpse a vision of that eternal beauty in and behind creation, mankind as a whole has never realized its true value, nor presided over the earth in a true dominion. Though man was to be the lord of creation, he has often either been oppressed by his material environment or shamefully exploited his physical resources.

This base of four positions (God, man, creation, kingdom of God on earth) would complete the series of three bases of four positions and bring to fulfillment the promise of God's three special blessings for man. By becoming one with God, man establishes the base of four positions on the individual level (God, mind, body, perfected man) and thereby inherits God's all-encompassing love; with this love he grows and is blessed in marriage, forming the base of four positions on the family level (God, man, woman, children); finally, with God's standard of value and love, he and the creation become one in purpose in returning joy to Him.

We have been dealing with the purpose of creation centered on man. If man were created for God, so that God could see His image reflected and give and receive love from man, then why did He create the universe, the creation apart from man?

According to *Divine Principle,* its purpose is to bring joy to man and at the same time realize its own life. Since joy is produced when the object resembles the subject, God made all things after the pattern of man. In the animal kingdom, from the simplest to the most complex, all structures, forms and elements resemble man in varying degrees. In plants also, the root, trunk and leaves correspond to man's stomach, heart and lungs. One can even compare the structure of the earth itself to that of the human body. The earth's vegetation, crust, substrata,

underground and surface waterways, and its core and molten lava correspond in essence to the hair, skin, musculature, blood vessels, fluids, skeleton and bone marrow of the body.

Thus, all things were created after the model of man and resemble him particularly in their subject-object relationships. In everything we see the objective display of man's inner polarity. The give and take between subject and object in all things produces a state of oneness in which man feels joy. Ideally, if man cared for and truly loved the creation, every part of it would respond with beauty and service to him. Through man, then, the creation is glorified and becomes a substantial object to God and pleases Him. This is the base of four positions which fulfills man's dominion over all things.

This resemblance to man is not confined to nature, but extends to human society. The organs, structure and function of society resemble the organs, structure and function of the human body. Like a brain, political leaders provide executive direction for a nation; like the heart and lungs religious spokesmen and intellectuals revitalize a society with warm blood and fresh air; like the digestive system, agriculture and industry promote national growth; while like arms and legs, workers and soldiers offer means for social movement and self-defense. The entire creation is a creation of resemblance. Nature and society resemble man and man resembles God. [20] Since all creation resembles God directly or symbolically, a single person or any one part of creation is a concrete expression of divine truth.

The final and most important question is what does God gain from man and nature? The almighty Creator is a God of heart and the essential desire of heart is to experience lasting joy. What is the source of joy? Joy is produced when a subject projects his inner and outer nature into a substantial object and perceives his own nature in the object's response. As long as an artist merely conceives an idea without embodying it in a work of art, his joy is not fulfilled. But when his idea is perfectly expressed in some actual work, he feels great satisfaction.

In a similar fashion, as long as the Word (Logos), the divine idea, remained unrealized inside the divine mind, God's creative plan was unfulfilled. So, projecting His whole nature into His work, God produced man to manifest His invisible self in the form of a visible and tangible image. Thus, God created man to experience joy. However, great joy is born from love and love remains incomplete until it is reciprocated. Even God as the ultimate subject requires an object for the give and take of His love; God wants to pour out His infinite love to man and receive man's full, uninhibited response.

Being spirit Himself, why did God have to create man with both soul and body? God needs man to be the mediator for heavenly dominion. He cannot receive joy directly from the physical world but only through man.

The reason man and the physical universe are similar in structure and elements is so that man might have complete give and take with the visible world as well as dominion over it. The physical and spiritual worlds are entirely different. Things which belong to the former alone lack the inner sense by which to perceive the heart of God. He cannot relate to them directly with truth and love.

Being spiritual man can communicate with God and the invisible world; at the same time, being physical he can relate to the visible world. Through man these two realms have give and take: man becomes the dynamic center of joyous harmony between them. The infinite beauty, love and joy of God manifested in the material world, when felt by man, make

---

20 Professor A.E. Garvie points out, "God *is beyond* and *above,* not only men but the world around him, butHe is *akin to* and even within men." *Christian Belief in God,* Harper & Bros., N.Y., 1932, p. 32.

earthly life heavenly. On the other hand, the beauty and love of our physical universe - when sensed by man - are reflected in the spiritual realm, filling the heavens with joy. Thus God needs man to serve as a medium of conjunction and interaction between Himself and creation.

This is not only true of man in a collective sense but also on an individual level. As each one comes to the point where he can communicate with God through his mystical senses, a new relationship between them is made possible. Because God is infinite and man finite, God needs an infinite number of finite objects to complete His joy in which each relationship is different and each person reflects a special aspect of God's loving personality.

When man achieves lordship God can enjoy fully the creation through man. As the Creator can then fully appreciate the physical realm through man, the incarnation of God is at last fulfilled. In such a way without limiting Himself to the finite, God assumes a human body and receives everlasting joy from both worlds. Thus, the prophetic words in Revelation 21:3 come to pass: "I heard a loud voice from the throne saying, 'Behold, the dwelling of God is with man. He will dwell with them and they shall be his people, and God himself will be with them.' " A kingdom of heaven - a garden of Eden - would be the reality on earth. All of this waits to be realized.

The purpose of each person or thing is dual, with an aspect of the individual and an aspect of the whole. The purpose of the whole is causative, while the purpose of the individual is resultant. Therefore, the individual purpose depends on the whole. Furthermore, there is complete harmony between the purpose of each individual and that of the whole, though, in a limited view, conflicts may seem to exist. In all its movements, the universe is a unit of one purpose.

GROWTH AND DOMINION

A. The Biblical Creation Story

Some people may think that God created the universe instantaneously with a sudden and inexplicable miracle of divine power. However, a careful and reverent study of the first chapter of Genesis shows that God works according to principle and law. He would not have created the universe without order. There is order in space and in time. Spatial order can be seen, for instance, in the structuring of the human body and in the arrangement of heavenly bodies. There is order in the form and placement of everything in the universe, from atoms to galaxies. In a general but remarkable fashion, the Genesis creation account clearly resembles the scientific account to be found in the ordinary college textbook: God first created man's environment, the physical world; then He populated the earth with creeping things, fowl of the air and other animals; finally, the creation culminated in the appearance of man.

Since the time of the Christian catechetical school of Clement and Origen at Alexandria, Egypt in the second century, it has been customary to interpret the six "days" of creation as epochs of indeterminate time. Pope Leo XIII pointed out in his encyclical *Providentissimus* of 1893 that there can be no real conflict between the theologian and the natural scientist while both observe the limits of their respective sciences. He states that the Bible was not intended to teach men concerning the external structure of visible things.

B. Three Stages of Growth

In the creation of the world, all things grew through a series of stages. The process of growth is a universal characteristic of the world in which we live; to a certain extent the late 19th century scientists understood this. They saw that there is a gradual ascent in the overall course of the pre-animate and subsequent biological history of terrestrial creation. The age of the fishes, for example, was succeeded by the age of the amphibians and reptiles until the world was ready for the kingdom of the mammals.

The French Jesuit Teilhard de Chardin, who is well-known for his paleontology in China, notes that when observed in terms of millions of years, life can easily be seen to move in a definite direction. To prove this all one has to do is compare moments in the earth's history separated by a substantial interim. Teilhard explains that every ten million years life virtually grows a new skin.

Anti-religious scientists who maintain that development takes place randomly are clearly mistaken. According to Teilhard, from the lowest to the highest level of the organic world there is a persistent and clearly defined thrust of animal forms toward species with more sensitive nervous syterns. [21] The divine mind behind creation works according to a plan.

Divine Principle sets forth a model of the creation based on the significance of the number three, symbolic of completion. Not only does scripture offer profuse reference to the number three, but creation itself develops on every level in terms of three stages: formation, growth and perfection. Man passes through three periods of life: childhood (formation), adolescence (growth) and adulthood (perfection). Minerals go through three stages: gaseous, liquid and solid. Not only in growth but in structure as well, three stages occur. For instance, man and animals possessahead, abody and extremities. There are three primary colors: red, yellow and blue. There are three kingdoms: animal, plant and mineral. And all of this exists in a three-dimensional world.

C. Direct and Indirect Dominion

For Christian thinkers there has often been considerable tension between their faith that God rules man and the equally strong belief that man possesses free will. This was the crux of the debate between Augustine and Pelagius. Christians claim that from birth to death man is guided and governed by the strong love of a kind Heavenly Father. On the other hand, no less certain is the conviction that man is the master of his fate and the captain of his soul. Unification theology deals with this question in its penetration of "Direct" and "Indirect" Dominion.

According to *Divine Principle,* God's rule over man before he reaches perfection is an *indirect dominion.* Just as plants and animals have to reach a certain level of growth in accordance with natural law before man can harvest or have full use of them, so must we mature spiritually in accordance with divine law before God can ' 'harvest" us. That maturity is achieved as man becomes one with God's heart; when man fully responds to God, God bestows on him His love and His power. This is called *direct dominion.* It should not be confused with a one-sided domination, but rather understood as a mutual loving companionship. Nor should it be considered as a duty [22] : in fact, it is the crowning jewel in

21 Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *Let Me Explain,* Harper & Row, N. Y., 1970, pp. 30-32.

22 Professor Edgar Sheffield Brightman of Boston University criticized the duty-centered Protestant faith he found around him. At first sight, he observed, morality seems to fail to supply the joy which should characterize religion at its best. Morality is commonly interpreted in terms of carrying out disagreeable duties. We think that we can discover what we ought to do by consulting our inclinations and then doing the opposite. This makes the

one's interior life, opening on an immense new vista of effervescent joy and seraphic beauty.

For a true union, a perfect subject requires a perfected object; therefore, God, in His perfection cannot relate to man directly until man himself becomes perfect and is capable of a depth of understanding which is more compatible with God's understanding. Divine law or divine principle is a guide for man during the process of growth. Man's spiritual maturation through the formation, growth and perfection stages follows the pattern of physical growth through childhood, adolescence and adulthood. The three stages, though not sharply divided, of course, are nevertheless apparent; they flow into one another on a continuum with perfection not being a static state, but rather a new awareness, a new dimension of heart. The period before perfection, when God only governs man indirectly through divine principle, is called God's indirect dominion. The principle operates of its own accord to supervise and direct the spiritual development of man, much as natural law governs the workings of the physical universe.

However, man's spiritual growth follows a different pattern than that of physical creation; while the things of the material world grow to maturity according to the autonomous power of the principle, man does not grow to maturity automatically. Had he, then we would be living in an ideal world. Man must *himself* contribute to this growth by his own conscious, creative effort; he must become a partner with God in his moral, intellectual and intuitive development. That is, the creation process is not completed until man has fulfilled his own portion of responsibility. Figuratively speaking, we may say that God does 95% through the principle, but of man is required the 5% which will bring all things to fruition.

Why then, we may ask, is it necessary for man to go through a period of indirect dominion? Why is it obligatory for man to fulfill his "5%" of personal responsibility?

God is a responsible being; man is created in His image, also a responsible being. Man is challenged to become a co-creator with God and to earn his right to become lord of creation. Indeed, if one is to assume dominion over any aspect of creation, then that person himself must at some time participate in creation. Professor Brunner has pointed out that in man God created something special; he is distinct from other earthly creatures because of the divine likeness bestowed on him by God; and this divine image is most apparently expressed in his power to rule over other creatures.[23] So in God's sight man must first learn to rule himself - to actually *create* himself - before he can have the right to assume a true dominion of creation. This is the condition set by God.

God created man to be subject over the entire universe. In God's mind each man's life is very valuable because no two persons are alike; each has a unique role to fulfill. Each in his perfection is to be the lord of creation.

Hence the value of a perfected person - one who is spiritually alive - is precious to God. It is this type of person whom He dreamed of having as His child - and never saw it fulfilled; whom He sought over the centuries to pour out His love to but was consistently rejected; and

---

moral life long faced and somehow grim, a kind of exquisite misery. To the extent that religion puts duty in the foreground, it frequently takes on this quality of grimness. One who finds God or has been found by Him should exclaim, 'Rejoice with me!'

If joy should be the response of man when he experiences communion with God, it no less surely should characterize God when He is able to have fellowship with man. Hence,Dr. Brightman observes that the God of history, a God who somehow brings His will to expression through historical changes, must rejoice in the forward movement of human history as well as grieve at its delay and reverses. Edgar Sheffield Brightman, *The Finding of God,* Abingdon Press, N.Y., 1931, pp. 83 & 129.

23 Emil Brunner, *Truth as Encounter,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1964, p. 145.

whom God is seeking now - to redeem a bound and exploited creation.

This is the person who is qualified to be lord of creation. This is the person who will penetrate direct dominion.

SPIRIT WORLD

A. Parapsychological Evidence

Although not promoting undisciplined adventure in the world of the spirit, Unification theology does recognize astonishing new findings in the parapsychological field. Although the spirit world is considered a reality by all religions and has been experienced by mystic, seer and layman alike, it has been clothed in mystery, superstition and dogma for all but a few. Now, science itself is taking a lead in the investigation of this realm and will ultimately be a major force in leading man to cognizance of his eternal life. However, because of all the new research and revelation,it is necessary to bring an objective standard by which to judge the genuine from the counterfeit.

The Fourth Gospel says, "There are many mansions in my Father's house;.. .1 go to prepare a place for you." (John 14:2 - A.V.) The doctrine of eternal life has therefore always been a standard part of Christian faith. Less commonly taught is the idea that we can communicate with discarnate spirits. Several Christian denominations, nevertheless, pray for the 'dead' and rely on the guidance of past saints. Others believe in immortality while denying that rapport with spirit world is possible. Even an ardent advocate of psychical research like Professor Raynor C. Johnson of Queen's College, Melbourne, Australia says it must be remembered "how much fraud, charlatanry and sensation-mongering" have gathered around parapsychological phenomena.[24] Consequently, many churchmen are more apt to sidestep this field without objective inquiry. For centuries it has been a well-kept secret that the founder of Methodism, John Wesley, was very interested in the work of the great scientist Emmanuel Swedenborg, who is one of the major figures in bringing a rational elucidation of the laws and workings of the spirit world. Wesley recorded in his diary that he secretly read Swedenborg's books and was quite eager to meet him.

The parapsychologist today often runs into attitudes which do not always indicate the highest degree of intellectual honesty or scientific discipline. He confronts dogmatism not unlike that of a noted physicist of the late 19th century who declared emphatically that there is nothing more to be learned in the field of physics. And just a little later, Einstein turned the world of physics upside down!

For almost a century, eminent scientists, philosophers and men of letters have sponsored responsible investigation of parapsychological phenomena - especially through the Society for Psychical Research.[25] Among those who endorsed such studies have been William James, Henri Bergson, Carl G. Jung, Robert Browning and Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. The Society is noteworthy because it has been as interested in validating parapsychology as exposing numerous psychic hoaxes. While most of its prestige has been due to scientists and professors, a few prominent churchmen have also been sympathetic: Dean W.R. Matthews of St. Paul's cathedral in London, President Ozora S. Davis of Chicago Theological Seminary, Bishop

24 R.C. Johnson, *The Imprisoned Splendour,* Quest Book, Wheaton, III., 1971, p. 109. Cf. pp. 107-293 for a well-documented survey of parapsychological data.

25 A. Angoff and B. Shapin, ed *,,A Century of Psychical Research",* Parapsychology Foundation, N.Y., 1971

James Pike, Dr. Marcus Bach and Dr. Leslie Weatherhead. Sir Oliver Lodge, a world-renowned physicist, pioneered in this area as president of the Society for Psychical Research. He was knighted for his contributions in radio, x-ray technology and electronic theory as well as his service as the head of one of England's great universities, Birmingham. Three of his books, *Raymond, The Survival of Man* and *Reason and Belief* demonstrate his passionate and thorough dedication to the reconciliation of science and religion.

Sir Alister Hardy, professor of zoology at Oxford, has been a stalwart champion of parapsychology in recent years. An expert in marine biology and the leader of the first scientific team to explore Antartica, he was elected to the Royal Society in 1940 and knighted in 1957. Soon after retirement, he was invited to give the Gifford Lectures at the University of Aberdeen which were published under the titles *The Living Stream* and *The Divine Flame.* For the first time, psychical research was given the highest possible recognition in the Protestant theological world.

In America, Professor J.B. Rhine and his associates at Duke University have carried out important experiments under rigidly scientific conditions; their positive conclusions are of special importance. Also recently, the interdenominational Spiritual Frontiers Fellowship, which counts as one of its founders the Disciples of Christ clergyman Reverend Arthur Ford, has organized study groups throughout the world.

On the question of the existence of the spiritual world,[26] all of these men and groups, as well as traditional figures of religious history, side together to make one simple statement: "It's there."

B. Visible and Invisible Substantial Worlds

Wernher von Braun, recipient of the Smithsonian Institution's Langley Award, wrote:

> *Science has found nothing that can disappear without a trace.. . Nature does not know extinction. All it knows is transformation. Everything science has taught me, and continues to teach me, strengthens my belief in the continuity of our spiritual existence after death.*[27]

Besides the physical universe, which we call the visible world, there is a substantial world which cannot be perceived by the physical senses. In this world spirits live forever after separation from their physical bodies. God created both worlds, which together we call the cosmos. Ardent materialists deny the spirit world. They say that this mysterious world which cannot be sensed physically does not exist. The spirit world, however, is not a world of illusion which man cannot perceive. This world can be clearly experienced for the objective and substantial reality that it is; through spiritual senses we can perceive the spirit world.[28]

---

26 Besides the extensive writings of the 18th century Scandinavian mystic Emmanuel Swedenborg, the student desiring additional information may consult with profit Arnold Toynbee et al, *"Man's Concern with Death",* McGraw-Hill, N. Y., 1968, especially Rosalind Heywood, "Death and Psychical Research," pp. 219-250.

27 Wemher von Braun, "Immortality", *This Week* magazine, January 24, 1960.

28 In his important lectures on *Christian Mysticism,* Dean W.R. Inge asserted that mysticism rests on the following propositions: First, the soul as well as the body can see or perceive. Man has an organ for the discernment of spiritual truth which is as much to be trusted, in its proper sphere, as the physical senses in theirs.

Second, since we can only know what is akin to ourselves, man to know God must be a partaker of the divine nature.

Third, without holiness no man may see the Lord. Sensuality and selfishness are absolute disqualifications for obtaining spiritual knowledge. *Christian Mysticism,* Meridian Books, N.Y., 1956, pp. 6-7.

It is a mistake to think that reality lies solely within the physically perceptible world. Our physical senses are limited and we cannot perceive anything beyond this limit, even though it exists. Man hears only the range of sound from 16 to 16,000 cycles per second. Sounds below 16 cycles or above 16,000 cycles are inaudible. Man can see the world reflected by certain light rays, but those with shorter wave lengths, such as x-rays, are invisible to man. With the aid of the refined instruments of today we can verify the existence of things that were invisible and inaudible in the past. The day will come when, with the aid of science, man will be able to sense the world formerly regarded as the world of illusion. This does *not* mean that we can perceive this world only when science makes it possible; on the contrary, when man's spiritual senses are opened, he is able to perceive this world at will. In fact, there are numerous sensitives who perceive the spirit world and some have explored it extensively.

By the principle of polarity, the counterpart of the physical world must exist. As previously stated, God created all things in subject-object relationships. Man, the subject, has both spirit and body; therefore, his object - the world - must have a two-fold nature. Just as the physical world was created as an environment for man's physical body, so the spirit world was created as an environment for his spirit.

Of the two worlds, which is subject and which object? The relationship between the two worlds is similar to that between man's spirit and body: as man's spirit is subject to his body, so the invisible world is subject to the visible world. The body moves as the heart moves: thus, the events of the spirit world are reflected in the physical world since the spirit world is cause and the physical world, effect. Man's body is the encapsulation of the physical universe and man's spirit is the encapsulation of the spiritual universe. Therefore, man as a microcosm encapsulates the entire cosmos. Possessing both physical and spiritual senses, man becomes the medium of interaction between the two worlds. By having direct dominion over man, God has dominion over the entire universe.

C. Correlation Between the Spirit-Man and the Physical Body

Divine Principle teaches that a human being consists of a spirit-man (spirit) and a physical body, the former being the sub- ject, while the latter is its object. The spirit-man is an entity which can be detected by spiritual senses and whose form is identical to that of the physical body. In contrast to the physical body though, whose life is limited, the spirit-man lives forever as an individual in the spirit world. This understanding of the nature of the discarnate soul is in marked contrast to those religious philosophies which predict either a pantheistic absorption of the individual by a universal force or Godhead after death, or the immediate return of the soul in a new body.

The physical body requires various elements from the physical world for its growth. Likewise, the spirit-man requires for its growth certain elements from the physical body, which serves as its host or soil. As all things grow through three stages of formation, growth and perfection, so the spirit-man also grows through these three stages. A spirit-man in the formation stage is known as a form-spirit; in the growth stage, as a life-spirit; and in the perfection stage, as a divine-spirit. The spirits of different stages can be distinguished: form-spirits are imperfect; life-spirits are more developed and shine with reflective light, like that of the moon; divine-spirits are the most advanced and radiate a bright luminescence from within themselves. In other words, a divine-spirit is a person of perfected heart; he feels God's heart

fully, is one with Him, and walks with Him.

The place where divine-spirits dwell is called heaven, whether it is on earth or in the spirit world. Since man becomes a divine-spirit, there is no question but that heaven must begin on earth. For this reason, Jesus came to earth. The spiritual heaven is the realm where divine-spirits live after their full life on earth, but is also the interior world within the perfected person while he is living on earth; for a living man the spiritual world and the physical world coexist in his body. Even though he may not visibly perceive the interior world, he is nonetheless connected to it via the channels of feeling and intuition.

Man was to become a divine-spirit in his earthly life and the ultimate destiny of every man is still to become a divine-spirit. Where do those who have not yet attained this level dwell after their separation from the physical body? Hell is the realm inhabited by spirits who have not yet even grown to the form-spirit level. Form-spirits dwell in the formation stage of the spirit world, and life-spirits inhabit paradise. Hell, paradise and all regions between them exist because of man's Fall.

What is the relationship between the spirit-man and the physical body? Examining their composition and growth, one can see that the physical body is made up of the flesh mind and the flesh body; these are comparable to the body and mind of animals. The flesh body grows by taking in the intangible elements of heat, light and air, and the tangible elements of food and water. The function of the flesh mind is to provide for the existence, protection, motion, perception and sensation of the physical body. Thus, it has the function of biological instinct. The spirit-man consists of the spirit mind and spirit body and requires elements for its growth as does the physical body. Corresponding to the elements of heat, light and air is the 'life element' from God which includes divine love, truth and a rich spiritual atmosphere; corresponding to the elements of food and water is the 'element of vitality' received from the physical body. Just as the physical body needs nourishment from food in order to be alive and vital, so does the spirit-man need nourishment to develop and sustain its vitality. This is why we feel joy and energy when the body is healthy, active and in harmony with the spirit. This energetic feeling which flows from body to spirit is the element of vitality. And the reverse is also true: a spirit filled with a divine ideal, hope and love imparts health and power to the body. The energetic feeling coming from spirit to body is again, the 'life element'.

Since the spirit-man grows in conjunction with the physical body, only to the extent that man experiences love, beauty and joy on earth can he sense them in the spirit world. He continues life in the spirit world with whatever degree of feeling he developed on earth.[29] This is why it is so important for everyone to develop his full capacity for love, both giving and receiving, which is best fostered in family life.

THE HEART OF GOD

Contemporary theology has seen a need for a deeper study of God's heart. Professor Kozoh Kitamori of Tokyo Union Theological Seminary has written a book entitled *Theology of the Pain of God.* In it he maintains that theologians have often denied that God was in any way moved by what happened to His creation. Because of an amalgamation of Hebrew

29 The stages and realms in spirit world are referred to in the writings of various mystics or psychics. For reference see Swedenborg's *"Heaven and Its Wonders and Hell",* Swedenborg Foundation, N.Y., 1970, pp. 20-25: his description of 'heaven' in three stages, "natural, spiritual and celestial."

religious feelings and Greek philosophical concepts, they suggest that God was without passion and that as a perfect Being, He would necessarily be free of change. But, if this were true, then God could never lament the creation of man, as is recorded in the Old Testament, nor could He fit the picture of a compassionate, caring and affectionate Father, as Jesus both embodied and related.[30]

Professor Whitehead complained that too many Christians think of God in terms of an absolute autocratic Roman emperor. He is joined with Dr. Norman Pittenger of Cambridge who commends 'process philosophy' because it recognizes the feelings of a living God in ways that other thinkers have ignored. He is in agreement with the view of Unification theology that God is affected by and enriched from the positive activity which occurs in this world; that God not only cares for the creation, but also finds satisfaction within it; that although God is not made any more or less divine by this world, He certainly can take delight in some of us, some of the time. However, Unification theology would go further than the somewhat optimistic interpretation of the process philosophers in recognizing the great burden that also rests on God's heart.

In *Pensees,* Blaise Pascal contrasts the impersonal God of philosophy with the personal God of the Christian believer:

> *"The god of the Christians does not consist of a God who is simply the author of geometrical truths and the order of the elements; that is the part of the pagans and Epicureans. He does not consist merely in a God who exercises Providence over the life and property of men, to give long life and happiness to those who adore him; that is the part of the Jews. But the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the God of the Christians, is a God of love and consolation. He is a God who fills the soul and the heart which he possesses".*[31]

For much of the Old Testament, God is portrayed as a strict judge and all-powerful monarch; He rules imperiously according to a hard and fast standard of righteousness. There are flashes however, of a God of tender heart and supreme sensitivity; Hosea particularly foreshadows the depth of understanding that Jesus revealed. Hosea's awareness of God grew out of his own experiences as the loving husband of a faithless wife; his knowledge of her infidelity coupled with his continuing love for her was a heart-breaking experience. What then must be the experience of God, whose love for us is so much deeper and sensitive? In the most profound and revealing of men's relationships, Hosea found the inner meaning of the oft tragic relationship between a faithful God and a faithless nation. For the prophet, his own broken marriage covenant became a living parable of the suffering heart of God.

The intimate relationship between God and man was brought into even better focus through the New Testament; here the object of divine love becomes personal rather than

---

30 Unlike Edgar Sheffield Brightman, the thought of a suffering God greatly bothers some Christian theologians. When John Wright Buckham prepared a series of lectures for students at the Divinity School of Doshisha in Japan on the meaning of the Divine Fatherhood, he raised the question whether God suffers and gave this circuitous answer: "on the one hand, one must answer - as did Jesus - in the affirmative. But Divine suffering must be of a kind which none but He can experience. God cannot suffer for Himself. All of His pain must be for others, that is, vicarious suffering. The Divine suffering may be greater than ours in extent because it is all-embracing, all-comprehending and all-compassionate. The Divine suffering must, however, be immeasurably less than ours in kind because He is aware, as we cannot be, of the relation of suffering to the end it serves." *("The Humanity of God",* Harper & Bros., N.Y., 1928, pp. 153-154.)

31 Article XXII, 3 (quoted), W.M. Horton, *Theism and the Scientific Spirit,* Harper & Bros., N.Y., 1933, pp. 18-19.

national. According to Professor A. W. Argyle of Oxford, Jesus' favorite word to describe God was *Abba,* meaning 'Father'; and we are reminded that it was deliberately preserved for Greek-speaking Christians by both St. Paul and St. Mark, because they thought it was so important.[32] Not only is God so near to us but also He is waiting in anguish as was the father of the prodigal son.

Unification theology underscores the fact that the almighty God is not only the source of energy, the origin and preserver of life, but also Father of Heart, Subject Being of limitless love. This is elaborated extensively in the section on the purpose of creation. Man was to be one with his Creator forming intimate relationships of father and child, friend and friend, lover and beloved, bridegroom and bride. Everyone then would have been like a mirror to reflect God's perfect image and likeness. The desire of God is to reason with man and have communion with him by intense give and take of heart enjoying everlasting, ever-expanding love. But in turning away from God, man shattered the mirror and could no longer reflect God's perfect image or perceive His love fully. Looking at fallen man, God sees His wounded and broken creature, still bearing the divine spark, the seed of protection, but unable to respond to Him freely. Almighty God cannot express His heart of love as He wishes, because His manifestation is limited by the degree of human response and capacity.

The truth, however, is that God was more hurt than man. God feels crushed by the betrayal of His trusted and beloved ones whose treacherous acts frustrated His ambitions and robbed Him of His sovereignty of the world. The injured heart of God - the suffering of the heavenly Father - and the cosmic mischievousness are beyond measurement and human comprehension.

Throughout thousands of years of history God's love has never been requited; God has never received true glory and lasting joy from man but continually suffers from a broken heart.

Ever since man's fall, God has been seeking His lost family with a grieving heart; from the time of Adam He has been calling, "Where are you?" (Gen. 3:9b)

> *Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth; for the Lord has spoken: "Sons have I reared and brought up, but they have rebelled against me. The ox knows its owner, and the ass its master's crib; but Israel does not know, my people does not understand." (Isaiah 1:2, 3)*
>
> *"The more I called them, the more they went from me; they kept sacrificing to the Baals, and burning incense to idols. Yet it was I who taught Ephraim to walk, I took them up in my arms; but they did not know that I healed them. I led them with cords of compassion, with the bands of love, and I became to them as one who eases the yoke on their jaws, and I bent down to them and fed them". (Hosea 11:2-4)*

On the other hand, mankind has been suffering from hunger and thirst in spirit, separated from the love of God.

> *"As a hart longs for flowing streams, so longs my soul for thee, O God. My soul thirsts for God, the living God. When shall I come and behold the face of God? My tears have been my food day and night". (Psalms 42:l-3a)*
>
> *"I am weary with my crying; my throat is parched. My eyes grow dim with waiting for my God". (Psalms 69:3)*

Man's separation from God brought spiritual death to man and has caused all the sorrow,

32 A.W. Argyle, *God in the New Testament,* J.R Lippincott Co., Philadelphia, 1966, pp. 58-59.

misery, tragedy and evil within himself and in the world.

Since the time of man's fall, many religions have developed in human society; to seek God through Jesus, or for that matter, any religious search, is man's attempt to restore the original relationship of love with God. If man had not fallen, he would now be living in the bosom of God's love, walking with Him, creating with Him.

The center of Unification theology is to alleviate God's sorrow, restore His sovereignty and to fill His heart with happiness. It is most painful for God to see man blindly oppressed by evil, going forward as if with scales over his eyes. God has been longing for His children and they, like orphans, long for Him. Only when the meeting between this anxious Father and these suffering children is sealed can restoration begin. That day, His reign will resume, the reign of Divine love. Until then, His grieving heart will not be comforted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY Ch. 1

Argyle, A.W., *God in the New Testament,* J.P. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia, 1966.

Brightman, Edgar Sheffield, *The Finding of God,* Abingdon Press, New York, 1931.

Brunner, Emil, *Man in Revolt,* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1939.

Our Faith, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1936.

Truth as Encounter, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1964.

Buckham, John Wright, *The Humanity of God,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1928.

Bulgakov, S., *The Wisdom of God,* Paisley Press, New York, 1937.

Cobb, Jr., John B., *God and the World,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1969.

Dutch Bishops, *A New Catechism,* Herder & Herder, New York, 1967.

Fromm, Eric, *The Art of Loving,* Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., New York, 1956.

Garvie, A.E., *Christian Belief in God,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1932.

Horton, W.M., *Theism and the Scientific Spirit,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1933.

Inge, W.R., *Christian Mysticism,* Meridian Books, New York, 1956.

Kempis, Thomas a, *The Imitation of Christ.*

Lossky, Vladimir, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church,* J. Clarke, London, 1973.

Marty, Martin E. andPeerman, DeanG., *ed.,A Handbook of Christian Theology,* The World Publishing Co., 1958.

Murray, J.C., *The Problem of God,* Yale University Press, New Haven, 1964.

Niebuhr, Reinhold, *Human Nature and Destiny,* Scribner Library edition, New York, 1964.

Patai, Raphael, *The Hebrew Goddess,* Ktav. Publishers, New York, 1967.

Sheed, F.J., *The Confessions of St. Augustine,* Sheed & Ward, New York, 1943.

Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre, *Let Me Explain,* Harper & Row Publishers, New York, 1970. Temple, Williams, *Nature, Man and God,* Macmillan Co., New York, 1949.

Toynbee, A., et al, *Man's Concern with Death,* McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968.

Vriezen, T.*C.,The Religion of Ancient Israel,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1967.

Divine Principle, Holy Spirit Association, Washington, D.C. 1973.

CONTENTS

2. THE FALL OF MAN

According to the Genesis creation account, God looked on all that He had made and beheld that it was very good (1:31). This may well represent what creation originally looked like from the divine perspective; but we contemplate the world around us and are filled with dismay. There is an obvious gap between the ideal and the actual, the Biblical vision and the human situation. Understandably, in 1948 when the World Council of Churches opened its constituting session at Amsterdam, the theme was "Man's Disorder and God's Design".

When good King Uzziah died, the prophet Isaiah saw a vision of the Lord lifted upon high; this vision clearly depicts the polar nature of religious experience: on one hand he was inspired to hear from the seraphim that the whole earth is filled with the glory of the Lord of hosts; on the other hand, no less real and no less important was Isaiah's abject confession:' 'Woe is me! For I am lost; for I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips...." (6:5)

In his *Theology of the Old Testament,* Professor Walter Eichrodt of Basle carefully analyzes what he calls "the pessimistic critique of the human heart", which was characteristic of Semitic religion as a whole and Hebraism in particular.[33] According to the Jewish scriptures, he points out, there is an infinite gulf between the all-purposeful God and impotent man; the whole of the creation is sunk in sin and guilt. Man rebels against the unconditional authority of God and his individual actions are often affronts to the divine will. The cosmic order has been disrupted by human contempt for the sacred, with man deliberately hardening himself against positive impulses. He becomes virtually enslaved to sin, and this inner proclivity toward evil reveals active opposition to God and worse, actual enmity towards God.

THE UNIVERSALITY OF SIN

According to Eichrodt, the common Hebrew word for sin means to go astray or to miss the mark. Men contravene an unconditional Ought, thereby transgressing divine law and becoming spiritual criminals. They wander from the path of righteousness, breaking the covenant binding God and mankind together and becoming estranged from the Most High. Every circumstance of man's existence seems to be at odds with his original destiny. Sin separates man from God.

Personal and collective sins, whether committed by the individual or perpetrated by the nation, are alike condemned by the Old Testament priest and denounced by the canonical prophets. The Ten Commandments, aside from purely ritualistic matters, deal primarily with individual wrongdoing: disrespect for parents, lying, stealing, murder, adultery and covetousness, for example. From the prophets came hard-hitting denunciations of social sins like oppression of the poor and unprincipled international relations. Biblical religion is as much interested in social righteousness as in individual rectitude.

Though there were sometimes said to be rare exceptions such as Enoch, Noah, Job and King Hezekiah (men whom the Talmud considered wholly righteous), most often the Bible

33 Eichrodt, Walter, *Theology of the Old Testament,* Westminster, Philadelphia, 1961, pp. 380-413.

insists upon the universal rule of sin over the human heart. A New Testament writer sums up the virtually unanimous verdict of the scriptures: "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (I John 1:8) In one of the older standard books on systematic theology, Professor Charles Hodge said: ' 'What the scriptures so clearly teach is taught no less clearly by experience and history. Every man knows that he himself is a sinner. He knows that every human being whom he ever saw is in the same state of apostasy from God.. . . We have no account of any family, tribe, or nation free from the contamination of sin. The universality of sin among men is therefore one of the most undeniable doctrines of scripture, and one of the most certain facts of experience."[34]

Particularly important in regard to scriptural belief in the universality of sin is the fact that the key proof texts come from a wide variety of writers. One is not surprised to learn that the unknown old cynic who wrote Ecclesiastes would say, "Surely there is not a righteous man on earth who does good and never sins." (7:20) Isaiah speaks in the same vein: "All we like sheep have gone astray." (53:6) In the Psalms we read,' 'If thou, O Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, Lord, who could stand?" (130:3) Even the compiler of the royal annals includes the observation: ". . .there is no man who does not sin...." (I Kings 8:46).

In the New Testament too, men of markedly differing temperament and outlook share the same basic conviction at this point. Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels exclaims, "Why do you call me good? No one is good but God alone." (Mk. 10:18) The Epistle of James observes, "For we all make many mistakes." (3:2) I John insists, "Ifwe say we have not sinned, we make Him a liar." (1:10) And of course, Paul's opinion is clear enough: ". . .all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God." (Romans 3:23)

Christian theology affirms without hesitation the utter goodness of God and the thorough-going sinfulness of man. This apparent contradiction is resolved by referring to the original sin by which the first couple, Adam and Eve, separated themselves from God. This primal sin flows from our first parents and infects us with an incurable malady. Because of what happened in the Garden of Eden, generation after generation suffers from a sense of guilt. No one has been born free of this hereditary taint: the apostasy from God is complete.

According to the Jewish Talmud, the rabbinical schools of Shammai and Hillel (prominent just before the time of Jesus) debated over whether it would have been better if man had never been created, in the light of his subsequent sins and tribulations. After two and a half years of argument, the majority of rabbis voted with Hillel that the creation of man was a tragedy. In line with this bleak opinion was the rabbinic view that from birth man is subject to an evil impulse, and that a good impulse from God is not granted to him until he is thirteen when he becomes a legal member of the synagogue. The Talmud would have us understand that while the evil impulse is king over all two hundred and forty-eight organs of the body, the good impulse is little better than a prisoner in jail. In stressing the grip of sin on the human personality, Paul was in agreement with a large number of the rabbis of his own time.

THE NATURE OF SIN

The Garden of Eden incident in the book of Genesis has long been considered of crucial importance for the Hebrew-Christian understanding of human nature and its interpretation has been a matter of acrimonious debate. Of those who claim to take the Bible literally often an

34 Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology,* vol. II, Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1970 reprint, p. 233.

exception is made with the Adam and Eve narrative; Philo among the Jews and Origen among the early Christians treated the narrative as pure allegory. Augustine, who was particularly important in working out the traditional doctrine of original sin, represents the majority position, arguing that the Eden account should be taken both literally and symbolically; that is to say, taken partly as historic fact, partly as spiritual truth.

Unification theology states that the fruit of the tree of knowledge is a symbolic expression. It is reasoned that even fallen parents would never test their children with deadly poison, so how could God do this? In addition, the eating of a literal fruit could hardly be the cause of the inherited sin which affects all humanity. Jesus said,' 'Not what goes into the mouth defiles a man, but what comes out of the mouth, this defiles a man." (Matt. 15:11) This discussion of the validity of kosher law is inapplicable to the Fall.

If the fruit is not a literal apple, fig or grape (some of the traditional conjectures), what does it symbolize? In the garden Adam and Eve were naked and unashamed. After eating the fruit, they realized their nakedness, felt shame, and concealed the sexual areas of their bodies (Gen. 2:25, 3:7). These actions suggest the symbolic meaning of eating the fruit. It is human nature to conceal anything that is wrong or defective. Had they eaten an apple, they would have covered their mouths or hid their hands. However, Adam and Eve covered the lower parts of their bodies, indicating that they had had a sexual relationship outside of that ordained by God. Their sudden experience of shame became an instinctive response to their loss of innocence.

In referring to their sexual actions, the Hebrews (as well as men of other cultures) commonly spoke of eating or picking a fruit. In the Bible and elsewhere "to know" a woman means to have sexual relations with her (Gen. 4:17, 25, 19:8). It is clear that to ' 'eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil" means to have sexual relations.

Although the majority Catholic, Protestant and Jewish opinion on the Fall does not consider it in terms such as this, there have been some who have attempted to demonstrate such a relationship.

Cardinal Jean Danielou, an expert on early Christian literature and a member of the French Academy, in his small book on Genesis asserts, "A majority of critics underline the fact that the sin has a sexual character."[35] He goes on to explain that the Eden story represents a Jewish attack on the Canaanite cults which involved worship of sacred serpents and sacred trees as well as the use of sacred prostitutes. However, one need not necessarily assume that the Genesis narrative originated as a denunciation of Phoenician phallic worship, even though it may have been used for that purpose later. References to lust are likewise found in the commentaries on the Eden story in the Jewish apocalypses[36] and Christian literature that later appeared in the subapostolic and patristic ages.

Nor can the unusual praise given to the practice of religious celibacy be ignored. Not only did Paul encourage chastity but Jesus also pointed out that there are some who are eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Hinduism, Buddhism and many forms of Christianity have taught that for the true seeker the highest path involved sexual abstinence, necessarily implying that marriage does not have the sanction of God but is a compromise for

35 Jean Danielou, *In the Beginning,* Helicon Press, Baltimore, 1965, p. 54.

36 For example, The Book of Enoch, the Book of Secrets of Enoch, Apocalypse of Abraham, Apocalypse of Moses. Detailed explanations and often the literal texts can be found in the writings of F.R. Tennant. Since most of these books were suppressed by the later Church and a few have come to light only in recent times, many theologians have not read them and for the laity they have been well described as "the lost books of the Bible".

those who are unable to realize such a path. Such religions hint that there is something fundamentally wrong with sexual desire. Does this not suggest that the original and originating sin is sexual? Does this not mean that marriage as we know it has never meant all that God intended?

Even the rite of circumcision can be related to the Fall of man if one sees its deepest meaning. According to Genesis, Abraham instituted this ceremonial act as a visible sign of the covenant binding the children of Israel to their God. The most obvious significance of the act is cultic, that is, the separation of Hebrews from others. Some modern commentators have tried to explain that the rite was designed for hygienic reasons but this modern view contradicts the Biblical explanation. Others treat it as part of very ancient puberty rituals by which a youth was recognized as an adult but that too is not the meaning given by Abraham. Certain anthropologists suggest that the rite was originally considered an act of symbolic castration. Something about sex is felt to alienate man from God. By cutting off his foreskin, he indicates his determination to cut off any ties he has with Satan. For *Divine Principle,* circumcision represents symbolic restitution for the original sin of Adam and Eve.

"Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it." (Gen. 1:28) This passage indicates God's intention to bless Adam and Eve in marriage. Marital love was to be sacred, and that blessing is the highest given by God; when a man and woman unite in perfection, they are in a sense a new, higher being even closer to God. Adultery in the Talmud is considered such a serious sin that it can only compare with idolatry and murder. It is obvious that the sexual action of Adam and Eve must have taken place outside of marriage and that this action was the original sin.

Although the books of the Old Testament are little concerned with the sin of Adam (which has led more than one scholar to deny that it was a matter of concern for the Hebrews), the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, Ben Sirach, the pseudepigraphal Book of Enoch and the apocalyptic literature of the Intertestamental period (quite ingeniously at times and not without fancy) devote considerable length to its discussion.[37] However, the most valid and important exegesis is found in the New Testament itself. In Romans, Paul wrote:

> *Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who was a type of the one who was to come... . Then as one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men; so one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men. (5:14, 18)*

Thus, we are told that the original sin is the cause of all subsequent transgressions and is responsible for the spiritual death and misery of all mankind. This has led both theologian and lay Christian alike to wonder how a single sin, whatever its gravity, could corrupt the entire human race. Professor Hodge compares it to one puncture of the eye which causes permanent blindness or to a single perforation of the heart which brings life to an end for the whole body. Several rabbis compare it to a poison whose effect is passed on from one generation to another. Psychoanalysts have often traced severe mental disturbances back to a single psychic shock. One.could further say that it is like the contamination of a water supply at its source which inevitably affects an entire city or like a disease that enters the roots of a tree and gradually infects every branch and leaf. In the family tree of mankind Adam and Eve were the roots.

37 For further information, cf. R.H. Pfeiffer's articles on the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, *"Interpreter's Bible",* I, pp. 391-436.

THE IDENTITY OF THE SERPENT

The Biblical story relates that a/serpent in the Garden of Eden tempted Eve to eat fruit from the tree of knowledge of good and evil even though God had forbidden it. She succumbed to the temptation, ate of the fruit and gave some to Adam. God had warned that if man ate of the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil he would die. Because of their disobedience Adam and Eve were cursed and cast out of Eden.

Professor F.R. Tennant of Cambridge University has written an exhaustive study of the Fall story using as his sources the Bible, the Talmud, extra-canonical Jewish and Christian literature and the writings of Church Fathers prior to Augustine. In his work, he reminds us that the serpent in the Garden was far more than an ordinary reptile. As the scriptures report, he was a speaking animal, more clever than any other beast of the field, who became the crawling creature in consequence of the punishment for his temptation of Eve. For Tennant, the Biblical account points back to a more primitive legend in which the serpent was a supernatural being who offered to mankind the gift of knowledge of sexual love. Clearly no animal can tempt man in the manner the Bible suggests.

The book of Revelation speaks of' 'that ancient serpent, who is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world". (Rev. 12:9) Such a passage brings together the last book of the Bible and the first. According to the commonly accepted Christian view, Satan was the serpent in the Garden of Eden. But such an identification did not originate with the Church. In post-Old Testament writings the serpent is the instrument employed by the devil to tempt Eve: *the Apocalypse of Moses,* the *Conflict of Adam and Eve,* th *eHistory of the Creation and of the Transgression of Adam, theNarratio Zosimi* and certain rabbinical literature. In *the Book of Wisdom,* the *Vita Adae* and elsewhere, the serpent is completely identified with Satan. A verse in the *Book of Enoch* mentions Gadreel as the tempter of Eve and in *theApocalypse of Abraham* he is called Azazel, a serpent in form but with hands, feet and wings.[38] Rabbi Hoschaia describes the serpent as a double-horned creature, walking upright as a stick, with hands and feet which angels cut off as punishment for the Fall.[39]

Some historians of religion, particularly of a liberal Protestant persuasion or of a rationalist temper, have maintained that the Hebrews did not conceive of Satan as the fallen archangel or the arch-enemy of Yahweh until after the Babylonian conquest, or even as late as the Persian period. It is said that at that time the exiles came in contact with the highly developed demonology of the Middle East and the dualistic theology of the Zoroastrians, who interpreted all existence as a conflict of cosmic proportions between the good God of light, Ahura Mazda, and the evil god of darkness, Ahriman. The Yah wist history of Hebrew origins, of which the Garden of Eden story is a part, is usually ascribed to the reigns of David or Solomon. It is argued that for this reason, Satan could not be the tempter referred to, because the whole idea of such a demonic power did not appear among the Jews for several centuries. Furthermore, in the one Old Testament book (Job) where Satan plays a prominent role, he is interpreted as a public prosecutor in the celestial court, a servant of Yahweh - not an archdemon or a rebellious and fallen archangel. How then can it be maintained that Satan tempted Eve in the Garden of Eden or that he was responsible for the Fall and original sin?

We do know that demonology goes back to the earliest days of the Hebrew people as it

38 Tennant, op. cit., pp. 245-246.
39 *Ibid,* p. 152.

does in all primitive cultures. One class of these devils that inhabited desolate places have been described as goat-shaped beings connected with fertility of the fields. These fertility spirits were placated by sacrifices during the Sinai Wilderness period. Isaiah 13:21 refers to them dancing in the ruins of the once-powerful Babylon. Lilith, associated with them, was conceived by the Babylonians as a wilderness-dwelling storm phantom. The spirit Azazel (Lev. 16) deserves particular notice because of his part in the Day of Atonement ritual: one he-goat chosen as a sin offering was sacrificed for Yahweh; a second was driven into the desert as an offering to Azazel. In later Judaism his name was attached to the leader of the fallen angels. While Walter Eichrodt strongly protests efforts to interpret this demon as an embodiment of Satan, it is possible that Azazel was one of several pseudonyms for the devil of the New Testament.

The Talmud adds many details about demons but it is difficult to decide which are early ideas and which represent much later theological development.[40] God is said to have turned the worst of the men who built the tower of B abel into apes, spirits, demons and night devils. Another opinion was that Adam and Eve mated with spirits and produced demons. Lilith was sometimes said to have been Adam's first wife.

Scholars like Edward Langton[41] assure us that Satan as a distinct human personality appears in only three Old Testament passages (Zechariah 3:1, Job 1 and 2, I Chronicles 21:1) - all of which are of post-exilic origin. This would seem to make any Hebrew identification of the tempter in Eden with Satan quite impossible. Nevertheless, several points can be made to resolve this difficulty. That the Hebrews believed in demons or malevolent spirits from time immemorial is granted by all the scholarly authorities. That the serpent in Genesis has extraordinary features of a demonic nature is likewise generally admitted. There is also the fact that the sacred Hebrew literature was strongly influenced by the party which so emphasized the sole reality and power of Yahweh that they consciously suppressed all ideas suggesting the existence of an anti-God force that could threaten the divine sovereignty. This might help to explain why the book of Job treats Satan as a servant of God instead of His chief foe. But when the Yahwist group lost their power as a result of the Assyrian conquest, Babylonian and Persian influence brought ancient religious ideas into the open and provided an atmosphere for their clarification.

During their exile, Hebrew religious leaders confronted a Zoroastrian theology specifically designed to explain the problem of evil in the most dramatic fashion; this brought to the forefront those elements of the traditional Hebrew faith previously played down in order to emphasize the exclusive power of God. The result is not new and foreign ideas transplanted on Hebrew soil, but old and widely-accepted beliefs which at last have an opportunity to appear above ground. Awareness of Satan surfaced.

During the Intertestamental period, particularly in Jewish apocalyptic literature, much thought was given as to the nature of the Satanic sovereignty as well as the character of Satan's agents. The New Testament comes out of this background.

In the Synoptic Gospels both the lesser evil spirits and Satan play prominent roles. If one were to read the Gospel of Mark alone, it would seem natural to think that Jesus was as well known for his power as an exorcist as for his ability in religious teaching. In Matthew and Luke the temptation of Jesus by Satan includes the idea that the devil has complete authority over the kingdoms of this world. Paul describes Satan as the ' 'god of this world" and

40 A. Cohen, *"Everyman's Talmud",* E.P. Dutton, N.Y., 1949, pp. 260-270

41 Edward Langton, *"Essentials ofDemonology",* Epworth Press, London, 1949, p. 53.

the Fourth Gospel refers to him as the "ruler of this world".

However, for at least two hundred years - since the Age of Reason - there have been fewer and fewer educated Western people who have accepted the existence of malevolent or benevolent spiritual beings other than God and the immortal souls of departed humans. That fact alone separated the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries from all previous ages. As Professor Henri-Irenee Marrou of the Sorbonne wrote, aside from theologians and others steeped in ancient writings, the reality of Satan is seldom considered these days.

M. Marrou, however, added that besides historians of ideas and traditionalist theologians, masters of the spiritual life still take Satan seriously.[42] For Christians and many others, one such master of the spiritual life is Jesus of Nazareth. If it is true that Christ believed in the existence of demonic.spirits, then most Christians would reconsider denying Satanic reality as part of either a scholarly or popular demythologizing of the New Testament. The usual argument is that Jesus accommodated himself to the language and religious convictions of his hearers. That supposition is, of course, patently false. He contradicted the highly treasured beliefs of both the Sadducees and Pharisees on such matters as the validity of the Mosaic Law concerning food regulations, the Sabbath and divorce. If he did not believe in the existence of Satan and the demons, it is very likely that he would have said so. In his book on demonology, Langton therefore concludes: ". . .it seems to be the indubitable fact that Jesus did believe in Satan as the personal head of the kingdom of evil which is opposed to the reign of God in the lives of men. If His language is not to be held to imply so much as this, it is difficult to see why Christ's belief in a personal God may not be eliminated also. . . ."[43]

Someone, perhaps C.S. Lewis, has quipped that since Satan is the father of lies, his most effective deception has been to tell people he doesn't exist. If we are not looking for him, he can do his work without much fear of discovery. If physical objects can skip our notice simply because we are preoccupied with other matters, how much more difficult it is to perceive spiritual reality which we cannot easily see or hear or touch.

In line with the above remarks, it is fairly obvious that since the Renaissance and even more since the Age of Reason, Western man has largely restricted his attention to the temporal rather than the eternal, the material rather than the spiritual, the human instead of the divine. This intellectual climate itself has distorted our vision. In this sense, the age of the machine and the technological revolution has been a curse as well as a blessing. Nicolai Berdyaev predicted that with the decline of the West, a new Middle Ages would be born. He did not think of a return to the past as such but of a reawakening of the human spirit to important dimensions of existence which we have overlooked in our preoccupation with material progress. In such an age God and Satan might again become as real as they once were for St. Anthony or St. Thomas, Maimonides and Avicenna, Roger Bacon and Swedenborg.

It is also imperative to distinguish the actuality of Satan from popular misconceptions handed down to us from folklore. There has been widespread attack upon belief in devils because it is easy to ridicule folk legends about spiritual realities. Those who believe in Satan have objectified his existence by describing him in language drawn from the physical world. For example, Satan is supposed to have horns and a tail, yet otherwise look like a human being; if we have never seen such a creature and no one can point him out to us, we reasonably doubt his very existence. It is important to recall that he is an expert at disguises

42 Quoted, Nicolas Corte, *"Who is the Devil?",* 20th Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism, v. XXI, pp. 112-113, Hawthorn Books, N.Y., Eng. trans., 1958.

43 Edward Langton, *"Essentials of Demonology",* The Epworth Press, London, 1949, p. 173.

and that he appears in a variety of ways depending at least in part upon what we expect. Baudelaire, the poet - and for a time a confirmed Satanist - reminds us, "The devil's first trick is his incognito." If he sometimes manifests himself in a manner which makes his identity crystal-clear, more often he appears masked in an attractive form.

ANGELOLOGY

Belief in friendly spirits has been as much a part of early human cultures around the world as fear of demonic beings. Since the Old Testament is primarily interested in history rather than cosmology, the Jewish scriptures contain no elaborately worked-out doctrine of angels. Again not until the Intertestamental period when Judaism had to explain its own views vis-a-vis the intricate theology of Persian Zoroastrianism can one discover an attempt at systematic angelology. *The Book of Enoch* gives us the names of a hundred and fifty angels. Christians, for their part, took over the views of apocalyptic Judaism, then modified and clarified them in the light of the spiritual experience of the Church. Here too, a wide variety of opinions can be found in the early literature; no real effort at theological systematization took place until the writings of an anonymous 5th century mystical theologian who used the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, a disciple of St. Paul. The scholastic theologians of the Western Church during the 13th century, of course, greatly refined the traditional teaching about angels as they did with all phases of Christian doctrine.

Although the Old Testament contains no theological treatise on the existence, nature and function of angels, belief in them is expressed in Genesis, Psalms, Ezekiel, Exodus, Judges and elsewhere. Father Pie-Raymond Regamey of the Dominicans quite wisely points out,

> *". . .it is necessary to make the reader realize the presence in the Bible of many references to angels drawn from different sources, obliging us to the greatest caution when we discuss what is guaranteed by Revelation. Animism, various kinds of polytheism, astral conceptions of Persia and Babylon, philosophical notions, productions of popular piety, all have a similar effect."*[44]

Because the medieval theologians were particularly concerned to demonstrate the intelligibility of the Christian faith, the definition of an angel according to the system of Aquinas may be of special value for those confused by pictures derived from folklore and religious art. Aquinas said that an angel is a pure spirit, a being entirely free from matter. Angels exist in countless numbers, unlimited by space. An angel is not confined by time or its changes. Angels both love and will. They can enlighten one another and speak to each other, but they do not know fully the innermost secrets of God nor can they completely read the secrets of the human heart.

Further, Aquinas held that they exist in three hierarchies, each with three subdivisions: the highest order of angels includes seraphim, cherubim and thrones; the second consists of dominations , virtues and powers; the lowest is comprised of principalities, archangels and angels. This arrangement - from Dionysius the Areopagite, based on his considerable meditation upon passages in the letters of St. Paul - was taught by Thomas Aquinas. If one has a little trouble accepting this classification, he may be comforted by the fact that a contemporary follower of Aquinas complains that Dionysius "has conceived of them in too

44 Pie-Raymond Regamey, *"What is an Angel?",* 20th Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism, v. XLVII, Hawthorn Books, N.Y., 1960, p. 14.

narrow and rigid a way, and has in too arbitrary a fashion fixed the order of his three hierarchies.[45]

Angels and archangels play particularly important roles in the Christian drama of salvation. In the Roman Catholic version of the Bible three good archangels are mentioned - Michael, Gabriel and Raphael (in the book of *Tobit* only) and one fallen archangel, Lucifer, who was renamed Satan. Rabbinic authorities add the names of Uriel (the angel who accompanied Enoch to heaven and gave Moses the Law), Phanuel, Jeremiel and Raguel to complete the sacred seven. For the Jews, Michael, commander in chief of the angelic armies, was titled viceroy of heaven. Lucifer, according to some, was considered the archangel assigned to govern the earth and hence could be called the ruler of this world.

Angels in the Old and New Testaments served three distinct purposes. They were courtiers around the throne of God or supernatural soldiers in the heavenly armies. They were envoys commissioned to make His will known or to carry out the divine commands. They were intermediaries between the Most High in heaven and men on earth. In all these ways they functioned as servants of God or as the Epistle of the Hebrews called them "ministering spirits" (1:14).

Sometimes certain angelic beings were conceived of in the Babylonian manner as cherubim with the body of a bull or lion but a human face or as seraphim with snake-like bodies but human heads. Also they were often depicted with wings so they could fly from place to place as God directed. Of course, the concepts used by artists were intentionally symbolic and should not be confused with fact. According to the scriptures, angels appeared in human form and could be easily confused with men. We could imagine that having never experienced life in the human world, they project a vibration different from that of spirit men.

A famous Psalm can be easily misinterpreted:' 'What is man, that thou art mindful of him. .. thou hast made him a little lower than the angels." (Ps. 8:4-5 A. V..) Because of this passage many mistakenly believe that angels are gloriously exalted beings far superior to man. Thus, certain early Christian writers assumed that men are saved to fill up the empty places left by the fallen angels. In the Greek Church, monks, because of the special religious quality of their behavior, are said to live the angelic life. According to Unification theology, man was actually created on a higher level than any of the angels and now exists on an inferior plane only because of the Fall. The roles which scripture ascribes to angels would indicate that they were created as servants of God, whereas men were designed to be his children. And of course, there is Paul's famous assertion: "Do you not know that we are to judge the angels?" (I Cor.6:3)

The different systems of angelology do not agree about the exact nature of Satan's position prior to the Fall. Certain Jewish authorities described him as chief of the seraphim and head of the order of virtues. Thomas Aquinas disagreed, putting Satan among the cherubim because as he explained, cherubim are associated with knowledge, which is compatible with mortal sin, while seraphim are associated with the heart of charity, which is incompatible with such a heinous sin.[46] Still others have seen him as one of the powers or one of the archangels. If Satan belongs to the seraphim or the cherubim, he ranks in the first or second orders in the celestial hierarchies described by Aquinas, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, Gregory the Great and Isadore of Seville. If he is only an archangel he drops next to the bottom of the list.

---

45 *Ibid,* p. 48.

46 Gustav Davidson, *"A Dictionary of Angels",* Free Press, N.Y., 1967, p. 261.

Possibly in the eyes of many simplistic Jewish believers there existed only two types of celestial messengers, ordinary angels and their leaders, the archangels. The Biblical saga is most intense if Satan was in actuality someone especially close to God. To be on the top rung of the angelic ladder he would have to be one of the seraphim, probably their chief.

Before the Fall, according to *Divine Principle,* Satan was the chief angel in the divine court and the special agent by which God blessed the myriad members of the angelic world. He appeared to be closest to God and seemed to be the divine favorite. In the Hebraic conception of God and His angels as a powerful monarch and retinue of courtiers, this particular angel would have been like the grand vizier.[47] *Divine Principle* identifies him as Lucifer.

THE SPIRITUAL FALL

In the Genesis narrative itself the serpent's motivation is not discussed. One source of information is the post-canonical writing of the Jews. In the Alexandrian book of *Wisdom* written under the name of Solomon we find this simple declaration:

> *"God created man for immortality, and made him the image of his own eternal self; it was the devil's spite that brought death into the world, and the experience of it is reserved for those who take his side." (2:23, 24)*

Unification theology is in agreement with this explanation. God loved Adam and Eve as His children whereas He loved the archangel as His servant. Quite naturally the angel who had previously been so close to God felt a lack of love; he perceived that the love God had for Adam and Eve was of a different character. He, the favorite in the celestial court, began to feel jealous. In his eyes, Adam and Eve were a threat to his well-established position; he knew that when Adam reached perfection, Adam would have dominion. Why, he wondered, should these new-comers be elevated to a place higher than his own? (In the Quran, the angel says,' 'Why should I serve them? They are but of dust while I'm of fire. "[48]) Why, he thought, should God degrade a servant who had always been faithful?

Rabbi Jehuda ben Thema and Rabbi Jehuda ben Bathera claimed that the angel envied Adam his special privileges in Paradise. He was particularly galled to see Adam reclining while attending angels roasted meat and strained wine for him. In the pseudepigraphalLj/e *of Adam,* Satan explains that God ordered the angels to fall down and worship Adam as the image of God. Michael immediately did so but Satan refused. After an argument in which God became angry, He expelled the proud angel from His presence. The Pirke di Rabbi Elieser also reports that Adam was envied because of his lordship over creation and his greatness in general.[49]

According to *Divine Principle,* not only did the angel envy Adam, but also, feeling a lack of love, he turned and focused his desire on Eve. Because Eve was sinless, she was very beautiful in the archangel's eyes. At the same time, if he could seduce her, he could control her and Adam through her. In open defiance of God's principle, he did not control this desire. Gradually, he drew her away from Adam and seduced her with his beauty and wisdom; Eve

47 Cf. Paul van Imschool, *"Theology of the Old Testament",* Desclee & Co., N. Y., 1954, v. I, pp. 109-115 on the angel of Yahweh as God's grand vizier.
48 The Holy Quran, VIII, Ch. 7, sect. 2, verse 12.
49 F.R. Tennant, *Ibid,* pp. 152, 199.

responded. The result was the spiritual fall of the archangel and Eve by an act of fornication forbidden by God's design.

Several ancient Jewish and early Christian writings agree with this interpretation of the Fall. Rabbi Asi and Rabbi Hoschais claim that Satan thought, "I will kill Adam and take Eve to wife."[50] Rabbi ben Chalastha explained that Satan intended to rule the earth with Eve as his spouse. The Slavonic *Book of Enoch* relates that Satan "entered and deceived Eve.. .but he did not touch Adam."[51]

A few early commentators claimed that Cain was the literal child of Satan and Eve,[52] although the majority of exegetes, Jewish or Christian, do not go quite so far. Tennant concludes from his careful examination of all the literature, "It is beyond question. . .that various legends concerning the monstrous intercourse of Adam and Eve with demons, and especially of Eve with the serpent or Satan, were both widespread and ancient among the Jews."[53]

However well documented in ancient Hebrew literature, this explanation of the Fall, or part of it, may be so startling that it almost forces us to ask important questions. In particular, how, we may wonder, can such an event ever have taken place?

Can one seriously believe that an angel could have sexual intercourse with a human being? To throw light on the problem, we must first examine the beliefs of the Jews and Christians recorded in the Bible. Both the Old and New Testaments take it for granted that spiritual beings can and do lust after mortal women. One key passage is a short account to be found in the sixth chapter of Genesis; in it "the sons of God," bene elohim, descended from heaven, successfully seduced certain women and produced offspring. Rabbinic authorities claim that two hundred angels were involved in this episode which Genesis associates with God's determination to cleanse the earth by the flood. We might dismiss this story as primitive myth if it did not reappear in two different parts of the New Testament. In the Epistle of Jude and the epistle called II Peter the story is revived and given the canonical authority of Christian scripture. For the Christians of the apostolic age, no less than for Hebrews writing in the time of Solomon, it was assumed without question that spirits and human beings could and did have sexual relations with each other. This Genesis story so impressed Jewish writers in the Intertestamental period that they even reported the names of some of the angels directly involved: Azibeel, Badariel, Baraqijal, Semyaza, Jeqon, for example. In fact, the incident continued to have such popularity with the mystical Jews that Simeon ben Yohai, reputed author of *The Zohar,* threatened to curse any of his disciples who believed angels had these capabilities.[54]

Having seen how deeply rooted this idea is in Jewish, Christian (as well as Muslim) religious tradition, let us further examine the Biblical perception of the angelic nature: 1. When two angels visited Lot at Sodom to warn him of the coming destruction of the city they looked so human that they were taken as men by the inhabitants of the city (Gen. 19:5). 2. An angel wrestled with Jacob so-vigorously that he dislocated the patriarch's thigh joint (Gen. 32:25). 3. When Mary saw an angel near the tomb of Jesus, he looked like a young man clothed in a long white garment (Mark 16:5). From this one can readily see that angels not

50 *Ibid,* p. 153.
51 *Ibid,* p. 208.
52 *Ibid,* p. 159.
53 *Ibid,* p. 156.
54 *Gustav Davidson, op. cit., p. 277.*

only possess powers of sensual perception similar to humans, but also take a form that can on occasion be perceptible.

Consider this experience of St. Teresa d'Avila with an angel she called "the Heavenly Bridegroom":

> *"I saw in the angel's hand a long golden dart with a fiery tip. Several times he thrust it into my deepest self in such a manner that it pierced my bowels. When he drew it out it seemed as if my bowels came with it, leaving me all on fire with great love of God. The pain was so intense that it made me moan; and yet so surpassing was the sweetness thereof that I could not wish to be rid of it."*[55]

Additional evidence of this phenomena comes from the Satanists who worship the prince of darkness. They have long maintained that in their mystic rites one could experience sexual union with their master or his supernatural confreres. During the Middle Ages down to the seventeenth century and even today they have confessed as much to clerical and secular authorities, not as an admission of guilt, but as their belief and experience.

Love unites two beings bringing a reciprocal influence. Having united with the archangel, Eve felt an uncontrollable sensation of fear and shame. The archangel, who wanted to hold the same position over Adam that he held over the angels, and who could not bring himself to love Adam and Eve as God did, felt intense fear and shame because of his conscious violation of principle; these sensations came to Eve immediately. People today often feel fear without apparent cause.- The presence of evil spirits brings an atmosphere of fear which men can sense but often are unable to explain.

Eve also learned that she was to be Adam's mate - not the archangel's - and with that she became aware of the seriousness of her transgression.

THE PHYSICAL FALL

According to *Divine Principle,* during their period of growth, Adam and Eve loved each other as brother and sister not as husband and wife. Upon realizing that Adam was her rightful mate, she desired to recover her previous position in God's favor. In addition, desperate to free herself from the state of fear that she had been plunged into, she looked to Adam who was sinless and still in a state of innocence. Feeling that she might reverse conditions by making love with Adam - cancelling the act of love with the archangel - she, no longer innocent, tempted Adam to behave as her husband. Adam responded and had sexual relations with her prematurely. Thus they disobeyed the command of God. Adam instantaneously felt the same fear as Eve did; he recognized his sinful act. Ashamed of what they had done, they concealed their lower parts and hid themselves from God.

By this action, Adam and Eve were cut off from God, much in the same way that an emotionally disturbed child is cut off from reality. In this internal world of fear and shame, Satan could control and dominate God's firstborn. Adam and Eve who had grown to the top of the growth stage where the blessing of marriage from God was imminent fell far below even the formation stage and became subject to Satan.

Such an account is not inconsistent with known behavioral patterns, nor has it gone altogether unsuggested in older manuscripts. The *Apocalypse of Moses* describes Satan

55 *Life, 29:17.*

climbing the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, putting upon its fruit "the poison of his wickedness, that is, of his lust; for lust is the head of sin."[56] Later, Clement of Alexandria, representing the early Fathers of the Church, wrote:

> *The first man, when in Paradise, sported free, because he was the child of God; but when he succumbed to pleasure (for the serpent signifies pleasure crawling on its belly, earthly wickedness nourished for the fuel to the flames) was a child seduced by lusts, and grew old in disobedience; and by disobeying his Father, dishonored God. Such was the influence of pleasure.*[57]

THE TREE OF LIFE AND THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE

In studying the Genesis account of the Fall of man it is important to remember that the Biblical text as we have it was not only written long after the events it relates, but also was composed in the typical Near Eastern manner with considerable use of symbolism. Near Eastern scholars such as Dr. George M. Lamsa emphasize how often we misinterpret Bible passages by ignoring the special literary forms used by the original writers. With this in mind we should look at the two trees mentioned in the Garden of Eden narrative. Many scholars have wrestled with this problem without coming to any unanimous conclusions. Some feel the original story made no reference to the tree of life. In their view, this was added later to show that when man had the chance to choose between immortality and sexual pleasure, he foolishly picked the latter.

According to Unification theology, the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil were not literal trees but were intended as representations of the two persons in the Garden. The tree of life was the symbol of man in perfection. ' 'Blessed are those who wash their robes, that they may have the right to the tree of life...." (Rev. 22:14) Man's hope was his perfection, total oneness with God; since the Fall man's innate desire for perfection has been unfulfilled; his ultimate desire is the realization of the tree of life. Adam was to become perfect with Eve in marriage blessed by God. Then they would have produced children of life because they would have been in a state of psychical and physical maturity.

Dr. N.R Williams[58] makes the incorrect inference that those who ascribe to the sexual nature of original sin must also believe that God required Adam and Eve's perpetual celibacy. This, of course, need not be so. One rabbinic view held that Adam and Eve were husband and wife before their fall, leading Satan to envy their bliss. Going even further Rabbi Jochanon ben Chanina taught that Cain and a sister were born while Adam and Eve were still in Eden. *Divine Principle*, however, is in agreement with nearly all Christian exegetes that the first children came subsequent to the fall.

The tree of knowledge of good and evil was the symbol of Eve, prior to perfection. Through God's blessing, Adam could have fulfilled goodness with Eve; however, by uniting with her prematurely he fulfilled evil and after, recognized his transgression. Trees multiply through fruit; mankind would multiply through the fruit of love - specifically, Eve's love. Thus Eve was represented as the tree of knowledge; and eating the fruit represents experiencing Eve's love.

---

56 Tennant, *Ibid,* p. 197.
57 Protreptikos XI.
58 N.P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin,* Longmans, London, 1927, p. 58.

THE EFFECTS OF THE FALL

Had Adam and Eve been united by the love of God, they would have produced children free of inherited sin. But because Adam and Eve joined with Satan through the act of unprincipled love, their descendents were children of the Fall, and the world came under satanic rule. In this sense the Fourth Gospel relates that Jesus told certain rebellious Jews, "You are of your father the devil." John the Baptist could likewise denounce his contemporaries as a brood of vipers and later, early Church Fathers could speak of men as "slaves of Satan".

In the Fourth Gospel Jesus called Satan the "father of lies" and" a murderer from the beginning" because he was the author of spiritual death. Jesus continued the use of the tree as a symbol of man, inferring that fallen men, fruit of satanically influenced parents, had to be grafted onto a new vine - himself.

Since the Fall, Satan has continuously tempted man and tormented him with accusations about his sinful nature. Even now he is constantly trying to alienate men from God.

Contemporary Roman Catholic theologians are now inclined to emphasize what they call "the sin of the world" rather than relying upon the traditional doctrine of the first sin. Professor Andre-Marie Dubarle, a French Dominican scholar, for example, writes ". . .original sin is not a unique catastrophe at the birth of our species; it is the continually perpetuated perversion of mankind, in which new sins are conditioned more or less by the preceding sins and carry on the existing disorder. Instead of a disturbance that would die away in three or four generations, there is a generalized and anonymous corruption, with everyone its victim and many its authors, but in such a way that more often than not it is impossible to pinpoint any individual responsibility."[59]

To the extent that this new emphasis serves to highlight the actual human situation and reminds us of our collective responsibility for the ills which plague mankind, it may be useful. The point of the traditional Fall doctrine, however, involves something quite different. It was designed to explain how a God-created world has turned out so badly. As N.P. Williams indicated in the opening sentence of his 1924 Bampton Lectures on the Fall, ' 'The problem of evil is at once the most momentous, most terrible and most intractable question which has ever vexed the thought of man."[60] How could it have happened? And how could we become so bound to it?

Unification theology asserts that ever since Satan dominated Adam and Eve, he has controlled the world in a deviated form of God's principle. With the accumulation of the sins and evils of mankind, Satan's power has vastly increased and the number of his subjects has multiplied. Satan's servants, traditionally termed evil spirits, are either fallen angels or evil people in the spirit world. Evil spirits can exercise power over people on earth only as long as men themselves become their objects for a reciprocal relationship. That is, man attracts Satan by making a base for him. If man rids himself of the satanic elements inherited from Adam and Eve, grafts himself to a "true vine", then Satan becomes powerless; without the unfortunate and unnatural rapport that mankind established (and maintains) with him, God could quickly bring His will, His purpose of creation to fruition.

---

59 Dubarle, "The *Biblical Doctrine of Original Sin",* Herder and Herder, N.Y., 1964, p. 224

60 Williams, *Ibid,* p. 3.

CONTENTS

An in-depth knowledge of Satan's crime and false dominion - which has heretofore only been intimated in the scriptures and dogmatized somewhat abstractly - will ultimately enable men on an individual and world-wide scale to encounter and overcome his power. Yet to do this man must exercise an important ingredient of his original nature given by. God: his free will.

Divine Principle's understanding of free will is similar to previous Christian views. Free will is the highest gift God gave man. If man were simply forced to serve God, there would be no beauty or life in man, and no joy or glory for God. It is most beautiful and precious when man serves God voluntarily and loves Him wholeheartedly, in free will. The flower turns its face to the sun because there is no alternative open to it; man's free will gives his existence a special dimension. From this man is supreme in all creation, validating his lordship.

Some believe that Adam and Eve fell because they had free will. Of course, their free will made it possible for them to fall. If they had fallen because of their free will, however, there would always be the danger of falling, even after they had become perfect. Insecurity would exist even in the kingdom of God where man is to have complete freedom. Such insecurity would then exist forever, and the promised attainment of perfection would be impossible.

Though free will did not cause the Fall, Adam and Eve lost their freedom because of their sin and became subject to Satan's domination. Hence, spiritually man does not have complete freedom to do what is right and good in God's eyes. He is inextricably enmeshed in voluntary and involuntary captivity; this has been brilliantly analyzed by Augustine, Calvin, Kierkegaard and Niebuhr as well as portrayed through our greatest novelists. On this point St. Paul lamented:

> *"We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin. I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate... . Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death?" (Rom. 7:14-15, 24)*

Hence, it is necessary for man to restore his original liberty before he can build the kingdom of God in his midst; though man may have free actions, those actions may not be the result of inner freedom. One of the signs, it is felt, of a growth in the spiritual life of mankind is that in present times there is a universal demand for liberation on every level; whether it be racial, national or theological.

In history, free will from a religious perspective is best illustrated in the lives of those who chose God and spiritual liberty atgreat risk or even at the cost of their lives, Joan of Arc, Martin Luther King, Cardinal Mindszenty, and numerous Christian martyrs.

COULD GOD HAVE PREVENTED THE FALL?

According to most of the standard forms of Christian theology, with the notable exception of Christian personalism, God is described as omnipotent and omniscient. By and large the average Christian assumes that God knows everything and can do anything: that there are no restrictions on the divine power and no limitations on divine knowledge. On the basis of such belief it follows that God could foresee the possibility of the Fall of man. Actually, orthodoxy pushes us even further; God knew that the serpent would seduce Eve and that she would successfully tempt Adam before these events took place. In Christian theology

God is said to see in His mind past, present and future as an instantaneous 'Now'.

According to such theology, God knew beforehand of the coming Fall with its calamitous effects on subsequent generations, yet did not prevent the momentous transgressions. Whenever this sort of theology is taught, sooner or later some genuinely troubled believer will ask, why did not God intervene? Confronted with this kind of dilemma, many sensitive and thoughtful people have concluded that God is either not all good or He is not all-powerful because, with our kind of world as evidence of His workmanship, He cannot be both.

When the devout Christian philosopher Leibnitz argued that ours was the best of all possible worlds, Voltaire demolished the theodicy with ridicule in his novel *Candide.* The classic book of

Job wrestles with the problem of God and evil without coming to a generally accepted solution. For a half century or longer the New England Theology derived from Jonathan Edwards employed the subtlest logic and sharpest insight in an effort to explain the difficulties to little avail.[61] Since that time many theologians have been content to declare that Christianity did not come to solve the problem of sin but to overcome the fact of sin. If *Divine Principle* can throw a fresh light on this matter, for this alone it will deserve the careful attention of theologians.

It might be asked, what force could possibly cause the archangel, Adam and Eve to deviate from God's principle and turn away from His love? That force is love. God made this power so absolute that even His principle that regulates the workings of the universe does not preclude expression of love in a way which violates His will.

Literature and history alike pay tribute to the omnipotent reign of love over the human heart. Freud and other psychoanalysts point out that in this fallen world the erotic impulse by itself is strong enough to disregard all the moral conventions which society and conscience ascribe to the will of God. Shakespeare has immortalized how love drove Romeo-and Juliet to suicide, how Hamlet's uncle was driven by passion to kill his brother in order to marry his sister-in-law, and how Lear became literally insane because he made a mistake about how much his daughters loved him. In our time, King Edward VIII abdicated the throne for the sake of love.

The sexual interpretation of the Fall has signal merit precisely because it points the finger at the one sin which is rooted in the biological structure of man. In one sense and apart from details of his theories, Freud correctly traced the human tragedy to the libidinous drive. Long before, the Fathers of the Church connected original sin with the sin of concupiscense even though they denied the one interpretation of Genesis which would justify their conclusions.

In the *Divine Principle* view, God created man as an object to whom He could send His limitless love and from whom He could receive a full response. Thus God wanted man to live in the highest expression of love. If the principle controlled man's love, then it could not be absolute. After reaching the state of perfection, man is no longer under the principle, but under the direct dominion of God, where the bond between them is unconditional and inseparable. However, before man reaches perfection, his desire may be misdirected. For this

61 The standard account can be found in Frank H. Foster, *"A Genetic History of the New England Theology",* 1907. A convenient summary of the discussion, '"Why Did God Permit Sin?" is included in *"Children of the Devil",* Philosophical Library, 1966, pp. 30-40, by Dr. William T. Bruner, a Conservative Baptist theologian.

reason, according to *Divine Principle,* man and woman should experience a full union of love with each other only after their love for God has crystallized. Through the commandment, God's children were directed to center their affection beyond themselves.

Unification theology further contends that God could foresee the possibility of man's fall; but though almighty and all-knowing, He does not intervene directly in the affairs of men until they have grown to perfection. Adam and Eve, though warned, fell when they were immature. Had God intervened, He would have violated His own perfect system and invaded man's responsibility.

Furthermore, God created man to be lord of all creation. To assume that position man must pass through a process of maturation; in this he must be given a large measure of responsibility to develop self-initiative and self-discipline. He has to grow to a secure state worthy of trust by God, by his children, as well as by creation. If God had exercised direct dominion over Adam and Eve at that point, He would have been recognizing them as mature, which they were not. Also, it would have been an indication that Adam could not be trusted to reach perfection. For this reason God did not explicitly forewarn Adam and Eve of the archangel's temptation. They had to use their judgment in all situations.

Thus far such reasoning has stressed the need for God to preserve the personal integrity of man. The other side of the matter is no less vital. In the analysis of original sin and the Fall one must in no way compromise the moral integrity of God. The Fall was man's affair alone. God is in no sense a responsible participant. He cannot recognize evil as part of His plan of creation. Christian theology has always been determined to avoid a dualistic world view in which God and Satan are co-creators and co-rulers of the universe. God is perfect goodness and utter holiness. Therefore neither the sin of Adam and Eve nor the non-principled act initiated by Satan can be related to the divine purpose of creation.

It is for man to discern evil and abolish it by exercise of his own free will. Quite appropriately Dr. William T. Bruner has insisted that the moral government of God depends upon 1. the righteousness of God and 2. the free moral agency and absolute personal responsibility of each individual soul.[62] No truly Christian hamartiology (study/doctrine of sin) can be produced by minimizing either. The world has not yet been restored because of failures in the second condition of Bruner; God continually tugs at man to draw him to direct dominion. For this purpose, one was anointed to dramatize that responsibility.

62 W.T. Bruner, *Children of the Devil,* Philosophical Library, N.Y., 1966, p. xvi.

CONTENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY Ch. 2

Bruner, William T., *"Children of the Devil",* Philosophical Library, New York, 1966.

Cohen, A., *"Everyman's Talmud",* E.P. Dutton, New York, 1949.

Corte, Nicholas, *"Who is the Devil?",* 20th Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism, vol. XXI, Hawthorn Books, New York, 1958.

Danielou, Jean, *"In the Beginning",* Helicon Press, Baltimore, 1965.

Davidson, Gustav, *"A Dictionary of Angels",* Free Press, New York, 1967.

Dubarle, Andre-Marie, *"The Biblical Doctrine of Original Sin",* Herder and Herder, New York, 1964.

Eichrodt, Walter, *"Theology of the Old Testament",* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1961.

Hodge, Charles, *"Systematic Theology",* vol. II, William B. Eerdmans, Grand

Rapids, 1970.

Langton, Edward, *"Essentials of Demonology",* Epworth Press, London, 1949.

Phipps, William E., *"Was Jesus Married?",* Harper & Row, New York, 1970.

Regamey, Pie-Raymond, *"What is an Angel?",* 20th Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism, vol. XLVII, Hawthorn Books, New York, 1960.

Tennant, F.R., *"The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin",* Schocken Books, New York, 1968.

Van Imschool, Paul, *"Theology of the Old Testament",* Desclee & Co., New York, vol. I, 1954.

Williams, N.P., *"The Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin",* Longmans, London, 1927.

CONTENTS

3. THE MISSION OF JESUS

HIS LIFE: REPRESENTATIVE VIEWS

According to orthodox Christians Jesus Christ is in no way like ordinary men. Basing their portrait of him on a harmony of the four gospels, they stress the completely supernatural character of the Master: he was born of a virgin, could walk on water and still a storm, raise the dead, feed 5000 with 5 loaves and 2 fishes, predict the future, outwit the devil, be resurrected from the grave, and after forty days ascend physically into heaven.

Everything about the ministry of Jesus shines with heavenly light - from the song of the angels at his birth to the earthquake at his death, signifying the cosmic anguish at the crucifixion of God's only-begotten Son. On the basis of such scriptural evidence the church taught the doctrines of Christ's pre-existence, the immaculate conception of Mary, the virgin birth of Jesus, his miracle-filled ministry, physical resurrection, literal ascension and the physical assumption of the virgin Queen of Heaven. To those who questioned such dogmas, Christian apologists pointed out that the scripture was inerrant revelation documented by eyewitnesses and guaranteed by the infallible authority of the church.

One by one these pillars of orthodoxy were shaken. The Protestant Reformation undermined the infallibility of the church. Biblical critics demolished the doctrine of an inerrant Bible. Scriptural scholars showed that the New Testament does not contain eye-witness reports but rather only the developing faith of second and third generations of Christians. Mark, our earliest gospel, was written about 70 A.D., almost forty years after the events it purports to describe, for example.

By the middle of the 19th century, because of the Age of Reason's disbelief in the miraculous and its contempt for popular superstition, Protestant theologians tended to stress the humanity of Jesus, his superior teaching and his moral example. Also, the secular historians devised rules by which literary sources could be dated and evaluated. By examining the New Testament record by the canons of historical criticism it became possible to see how the Jesus of history had been obscured by later legends.

Adolf von Harnack, the Berlin historian of Christian dogma, illustrates the liberal's quest for the historical Jesus. Among many scholarly writings, his *"What is Christianity"* (1900) is one of the few Works of modern theology which created much excitement and stirred up an enormous furor. It is still generally regarded as the one book which most directly represents liberal Protestant theology.

Following David Friedrich Strauss and Julius Wellhausen, for Harnack, Jesus was primarily and essentially a human religious figure, a genius but not a god. He was a Jew who uncovered the hidden treasures in the soil of the Old Testament, reaffirming everything lofty and spiritual in the Psalms and Prophets. His was a plain and simple gospel about God the Father and the brotherhood of man.

While orthodox Christianity focused upon the centrality of Christ, Jesus himself had been primarily concerned about the kingdom of God. In Harnack's opinion, the true Gospel is the good news of the reign of the righteous God to appear in the new day when men realize their citizenship in His Kingdom. Men who respond to Jesus place themselves under a new

law: whole-hearted love to God and one's neighbor. By self-denial, humility and heartfelt trust in God, man achieves perfection. Jesus, the meek and gentle one, shows us how kind the Lord is. According to Harnack, the Messiahship of Jesus means that he is the supreme teacher of righteousness. Jesus was the Christ because he taught the fatherhood of God, the infinite value of the individual soul, the brotherhood of man and the universal kingdom of love. He leads men to the gracious God and leaves them in His hands. By looking at Jesus and following him, a disciple becomes convinced that God rules heaven and earth as our Father and Redeemer.

Jesus provided the highest example of faith by voluntarily suffering death on the cross. His simple message of-love and forgiveness was, however, misunderstood by the disciples who thought of him in an apocalyptic manner and even more distorted by the later church who Hellenized the Hebrew gospel. According to Harnack, the New Testament itself represents the first stage in a mistaken interpretation of the real Jesus who was basically an ethical teacher. Hidden behind the Christ of dogma stands the Jesus of history, the Man of Nazareth.[63]

In 1905 a young Strasbourg theologian named Albert Schweitzer began piling books in his room as preparation for his epoch-making *Quest of the Historical Jesus.* After reading most of the available literature from Reimarus (1694-1768) of Hamburg to William Wrede (1859-1907) of Breslau, Schweitzer concluded:

> *"Those who are fond of talking about negative theology can find their account here. There is nothing more negative than the result of the critical study of the Life of Jesus.*
>
> *The Jesus of Nazareth who came forward publicly as the Messiah, who preached the ethic of the Kingdom of God, who founded the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth, and died to give His work its final consecration, never had any existence. He is a figure designed by rationalism, endowed with life by liberalism, and clothed by modern theology in an historical garb.*
>
> *This image has not been destroyed from without, it has fallen to pieces, cleft and disintegrated by the concrete historical problems which came to the surface one after another..."*[64]

Yet even after Schweitzer, the writing of new books on the life of Jesus has continued unabated. Before we speak of the view of Unification theology, it would be fruitful to summarize briefly some of the representative contemporary views. This will not only convey the atmosphere of present-day thought but will demonstrate how different scholars using the same materials can surface with radically contradictory ideas, and thus provide the reader with an awareness of the questions and problems which lie behind a troubled Christianity.

A. Albert Schweitzer

Albert Schweitzer provides a classic form of the argument that Jesus expected the kingdom of God to dawn imminently, as had been written by apocalyptic writers from Daniel to Enoch. His account, which he feels has made sense out of confused Gospel narratives and has depicted Jesus in his overwhelming greatness, can be restated as follows:

Jesus preached a speedy kingdom of God and was certain that the eschatological miracle

63 Sample liberal lives of Jesus were written by M. Goguel, Edgar Goodspeed, Harry Emerson Fosdick and Shirley Jackson Case, besides Harnack's.

64 A. Schweitzer, *Quest of the Historical Jesus,* Macmillan, N.Y., 1948, p. 396.

would soon occur; he even predicted its arrival by the very next harvest. Even though few in Nazareth could expect the kingdom so suddenly, he sent out his disciples to alert the people, confident that while they journeyed throughout Israel, the divine event would take place. Much to the astonishment of Jesus, the glorious reign of God still had not dawned when the twelve returned.

Jesus' prediction of the coming Son of Man and the tribulations, the birth pangs of the messianic age, was not fulfilled. He had chosen the disciples to hurl a firebrand into the world. The feeding of the multitudes immediately upon the return of the disciples became an eschatological sacrament, a foretaste of the messianic feast to come. Soon after, in a moment of ecstatic vision at the Mount of Transfiguration, Peter, James and John discovered the messianic secret: Jesus himself was the long-awaited Son of Man. Naturally, Peter spread the good news to the rest of the disciples.

Before the missionary tour of the twelve to all the cities of Israel, Jesus assumed that he and they together would undergo suffering in the great affliction to take place immediately prior to the glory of the messianic age. When they returned and no kingdom had dawned, he realized that the predicted affliction would be focused upon him alone. Meditating upon the fate of John the Baptist and inspired by the 'Suffering Servant' poetry in Deutero-Isaiah, Jesus decided that he must pass through pain and humiliation to permit the divine consummation of human history; the general affliction of the last times was transformed into the personal secret of the Passion.

Thus, the journey to Jerusalem was a funeral march to victory; Jesus was surrounded by people who continued to welcome him as the forerunner of the Messiah. Even if only the inner circle knew his true role as the Coming One, for him death was the necessary prelude to the kingdom. At the triumphal entry into Jerusalem the crowds hailed him as the herald of the imminent rule of God. In the Holy City, Jesus announced the coming day of the Lord.

Judas provided the Sanhedrin with the single bit of information they needed to convict Jesus of the capital crime of blasphemy. He divulged the messianic secret: the Nazarene prophet thought of himself as the long-awaited Son of Man. When he was arrested and interrogated by the High Priest, Jesus confessed his true identity (Luke 22:66-71). Hence without delay, the Jewish religious authorities handed him over to the Roman procurator for crucifixion.[65]

In what ways do Schweitzer's conclusions differ from popular lay conceptions? Clearly, though he views Jesus as a heroic figure, the genuine promised One, he brings in a realistic dimension to the awesome responsibility of Jesus; that is, Jesus as a man was in a sense learning his mission as the course of events bore down upon him, and reacting as he saw God's will revealed.

The dichotomy between the apocalyptic vision and reality of the path Jesus trod is also an element in the theology of Professor Wilhelm Bousset.

B. Wilhelm Bousset

Though Bousset's praise and reverence for Jesus is no less than Schweitzer's, he attempts to shear the legendary and the mythical from the historical Jesus by an explanation of the motivation of the original writers of the New Testament. At the same time, however, he maintains that fortunately enough, their motives have indirectly kept for us a clear picture of

65 A. Schweitzer, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God,* Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1950.

Jesus, notwithstanding the nimbus of the miraculous that surrounds the Biblical narratives. They interpreted him as the apocalyptic Son of Man to come rather than the later idea of Hellenistic Christianity that he was a lord of some mystery cult.

Kyrios Christos, Bousset's work of 1913, represents one of the landmarks in German New Testament criticism; his pioneering viewpoint that there is a distinction between the original Palestinian community and the later Hellenistic church has ever since been a presupposition for the historical study of early Christianity. In it he gives many illustrations to substantiate his claims.

In the Gospel of Mark, it is maintained that the trained reader can verify the manner in which the messianic thrust of the evangelical Palestinian community redirected history. For example, a popular disturbance which accidentally broke out when Jesus arrived at Jerusalem is reshaped into a pre-ordained messianic proclamation; an extremely powerful gift for healing was embellished and translated into the miraculous. Further, Bousset claims that fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies concerning his passion and resurrection was superimposed upon the image of Jesus.'

The following quotation best encapsulates Bousset's thinking:

> *Thus did the community embellish and decorate the life portrait of its master. But by doing so it accomplished more than that: it preserved a good bit of the authentic and original life. It preserved for us the beauty and wisdom of his parables in their crystalline form - a Greek community would no longer have been able to do this. It bowed down before the stark heroism of his ethical demands which were rooted in an equally daring faith in God, and it took practically nothing away from them; it faithfully preserved the picture of the great battler for truth, simplicity, and plainness in religion against all false virtuousness; it dared to repeat without weakening it his devastating judgment on the piety of the dominant and leading circles; it basked in the luster of his trust in God, and of his regally free, careless way with respect to the things and the course of this world; it steeled itself to his hard and heroic demand that they fear God and not man; with trembling and quaking soul it repeated his preaching of the eternal responsibility of the human soul and of God's judgment; with jubilant rejoicing it proclaimed his glad message of the kingdom of God and the duty of fellowship in righteousness and love and mercy and reconciliation.*[66]

In Bousset's Christology we see the same consciousness of the humanness of Jesus, the exaggerated expectations of the people and the need for clarity in visualizing his true situation that Schweitzer stressed. However, though Schweitzer and Bousset deny the 'mythology', they do not deny the authenticity of Jesus and his mission. Joseph Klausner, a professor at Hebrew University, would go a step further.

C. Joseph Klausner

From the noted Zionist Joseph Klausner has come one of the classic Jewish studies on the life and times of Jesus. An authority on Jewish Messianism and well-read in the field of New Testament scholarship, he is considered by some singularly talented for the difficult task of being fair to the founder of Christianity and at the same time pointing out that Judaism has grounds to reject him.

---

66 Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos,* Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1970, pp. 116-117. Bousset's study of Christology goes up to the work of Irenaeus. In somewhat the same critical spirit, Alfred Loisy of the College of France wrote his *Birth of the Christian Religion.*

For this Jewish professor, Jesus was born at Nazareth, a peaceful Galilean town cut off from the rest of the world. There, Jesus could not help being a dreamer, a visionary whose thoughts were far from his people's future or the heavy Roman yoke but turned on the sorrows of the individual soul and the value of inner reformation. As a spiritual redeemer of Israel, he believed he could automatically effect a social redemption without revolt against Roman power.

For Klausner, Jesus' father was Joseph and his mother Mary. Joseph was a carpenter who passed on that skill to his eldest son, and since Joseph died while Jesus was still young, as the eldest son he was compelled to support his widowed mother and orphaned brothers and sisters.

When John the Baptist attracted crowds to the Jordan River, Jesus came with the multitude to be baptized. The Baptist did not recognize him or pay any regard to his presence. For the Nazarene, however, this was the most decisive event in his life. Gifted with a strong imagination and dazzled by the blinding light of the Judean sun, Jesus thought he saw the heavens open. Suddenly there flashed through his mind the idea that he was the hoped-for Messiah.

Obsessed with this idea, Jesus withdrew into the desert to meditate on his future. He there rejected the thought of rebellion against Rome because' 'his dreamy spiritual nature" was not fitted for Zealot methods. Dismissing also the temptations to prove his Messiahship by becoming a great teacher in the Torah, or by bestowing material blessings upon his people, he found no way open to him but to conceal his claim until after John the Baptist was arrested.

As a wandering Galilean preacher, the former carpenter preached the near approach of the kingdom; he did not say who the Messiah was or where he might be. By calling himself the' 'Son of Man", he hinted 1) that he was only a simple, ordinary human being, 2) that he was a prophet like Ezekiel, 3) that he might be the apocalyptic Messiah of Daniel and the Book of Enoch.

In Palestine it was a common sight to see rabbis attracting disciples in large numbers. Although Jesus did not altogether follow the beaten track, he seemed like a Pharisee differing from others only in certain details. Klausner says, "Throughout the Gospels there is not one item of ethical teaching which cannot be paralleled either in the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, or in the Talmudic and Midrashic literature of the period near to the time of Jesus."[67] In the Capernaum synagogue, Jesus read from the Prophets and expounded like a scribe or Pharisee and was regarded as such. This enabled him to attract disciples and saved him from persecution almost to the last.

As a typical holy man, the Galilean itinerant was expected to perform miracles. Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai and Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus who lived in Jesus' day both were credited with such wonders. Neurasthenics and especially hysterical women were numerous in Palestine because of the wars, tumults and protracted oppressive rule of the Herodian dynasty and Romans. According to Klausner, Jesus obviously had the unusual power of "hypnotic suggestion" enabling him to cure various nervous disorders.

Four other types of miracles credited to Jesus are for Klausner far less believable. Some are due to the early New Testament writers' wish to fulfill statements in the Old Testament: if Elijah and Elisha raised children from the dead, Christians had to circulate stories about the daughter of Jairus or the young man of Nain. Certain poetical descriptions, the parable of the

67 Joseph Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth,* Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1943, p. 384.

barren fig tree, for instance, were transformed into miracles in the minds of the disciples. Some miracles, like Jesus walking on the water, were hallucinations of simple village folk. Finally, acts occurred which were only apparently miraculous: the stilling of the storm, for example. As for the miracles of healing, they were plausible enough; but Jesus discouraged relying solely on them possibly because he was not always successful in effecting cures and was therefore afraid to attempt them too often.

Because of his carelessness in regard to the cultic laws of Judaism, Jesus encountered direct opposition from the Pharisees, and because of his popularity with the crowds he aroused the suspicion of the Galilean ruler Herod Antipas. His own village of Nazareth rejected him and his own family said he was "beside himself" or mentally unbalanced. Frustrated and disheartened, Jesus fled from his enemies to Gentile territory. He was indignant against the places which rejected him and bitter about his worsening situation.

Later, a homeless wayfarer in a foreign land, Jesus at Caesarea Philippi was deeply touched by Peter's confession of his messianic status. He warned the disciples that when he proceeded to Jerusalem he would suffer greatly but in the end emerge victorious. The Passover crowds would hail him as the long-awaited Messiah. Peter protested that if they were not safe in Galilee, they courted far graver danger in the center of civil and religious authority. To stir their ardor, Jesus promised the disciples that they would not taste death until they saw the kingdom of God come with power. On the mount of his transfiguration, the three closest disciples therefore envisioned their leader as the triumphant Messiah.

At Bethphage on the outskirts of Jerusalem, Jesus planned to make a royal entry into the Holy City. As King-Messiah but also a simple Galilean, he rode not a war horse but a donkey. Before crowds of people at the city gates, Jesus publicly revealed himself as the Messiah.

To bring men to repentance and to draw all eyes to the Messiah, Jesus had to achieve some great public deed, performed with the utmost display, to gain the utmost renown. He therefore resolved to purify the temple now crammed with Jews from all over the world. What Jesus did was by sheer force. In contradiction to his own law, he resisted evil in an active and violent fashion. Yet the brief incident won him the applause of many pilgrims resentful of the temple aristocracy.

Further, in Klausner's theory, Judas, the only Judean member of the Twelve, became gradually convinced Jesus was a Pseudo - Messiah and false prophet. Jesus was not always successful as a healer. He feared his enemies and sought to evade them. There were marked contradictions in his teachings. What was worse, this Messiah neither would nor could deliver his nation. Judas' knowledge of Jesus' frailties blinded him to his many virtues. Since Judas had nothing against his fellow-disciples, to protect them against arrest he himself accompanied the Jewish police to the Garden of Gethsemane and pointed out the wanted man.

Once arrested, Jesus was put on trial first before the Sanhedrin, then before Herod Antipas, and finally before Pilate. Klausner maintains that the hearing before the Sanhedrin was not a legal trial but simply a preliminary investigation. Jesus taught nothing which by the rules of the Pharisees rendered him criminally guilty, even a claim to be the Messiah. The Sadducees were in control of the Sanhedrin, however, and the high priestly house of Annas was roundly condemned even in the Talmud. For the Sadducees,"messianic movements were dangerous owing to their disturbing effect on political conditions. When Jesus admitted he was the Messiah his fate was sealed. Klausner thinks the trial before Herod Antipas is unhistorical and wholly disbelieves the Gospel account of Pilate's opposition to the crucifixion. The Roman procurator was a cruel tyrant to whom the killing of a single Galilean

was no more than the swatting of a fly.

On the cross Jesus realized that God was not coming to his help, would not release him from his agony and would not save him with a miracle. Vanished was his life dream! In terrible anguish he cried out in Aramaic in the language of the book he loved most: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" In Klausner's view, the words from the cross mentioned in Luke and John are legendary.

Joseph of Arimathea put the body of the dead Messiah in a rock-hewn tomb and later at the close of the Sabbath removed it to an unknown grave. Some of the ardent Galileans subsequently saw their crucified lord in visions which became the basis for Christianity. Could the Jewish nation found its belief on such a corner-stone, the Zionist professor asks incredulously?

D. Morton Scott Enslin

From Klausner it is instructive to see not only the depth of the dichotomy between tremendous messianic expectations (some would say exaggerated) and the reality of what a personal messiah might do and say, but also to see the difficulties and agonies that such a mission would bring upon the person in that position as well as the people who had to recognize him.

While Enslin is a Protestant author, he is no less militantly critical of popular interpretations of the Biblical narrative than the Zionist Klausner. He has written a standard seminary textbook on New Testament life and literature and has provided an American contribution to the controversy over the historical Jesus. As professor at Crozer Theological Seminary he illustrates how easily a skeptical treatment of the Gospel sources could be accepted within the confines of American institutional church life in 1950 - by contrast with the general theological conservatism of a century earlier. In *"The Prophet from Nazareth",* Enslin espouses his theology.[68]

He asserts that we have no reliable information of Jesus' birth and early years except that he was a native of Nazareth. The infancy stories of Matthew and Luke are legends like those surrounding the birth of Augustus, Alexander the Great, Cyrus or Plato. In addition, it was customary to say of a great man that a god sired him. For Enslin the stories about the massacre of the innocents and the visit of the twelve-year-old boy at the temple are equally unhistorical.

Continuing in this vein, he claims that the year of Jesus' birth is unknown and we cannot be sure that he was thirty when he began his ministry. This figure is possibly derived from the Old Testament where Joseph and David were thirty when they came to power. Further, there is no real evidence as to the length of Jesus' preaching; probably Mark is right in making Jesus' public career brief and that his first visit to Jerusalem was his last - the Fourth Gospel which suggests a three-year ministry is worthless so far as chronology is concerned. Thus far, Professor Enslin merely follows common opinion among some Biblical scholars.

Unlike his colleagues, however, he doubts that there was any connection between Jesus and John the Baptist. The later Church brought John into the Christian picture and provided him with the role of forerunner to attract followers of the Baptist to the Christian movement. Besides, by making John the precursor for the greater Jesus, Christians could answer Jewish opponents who declared Jesus could not be the Messiah because there had been no return of

68 M. Enslin, *"The Prophet from Nazareth",* McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1961.

Elijah.

According to Enslin, the later Church paid tribute to the Nazarene carpenter by calling him Christ, Son of God, Lord and Logos, but his original disciples thought of him simply as "a prophet mighty in deed and word" (Luke 24:19), which is what Enslin maintains he was and all he claimed to be. He uses Biblical passages to illustrate this supposition. When he was being mocked by his captors, the guards taunted Jesus with the words:' 'Prophesy to us" (Matt. 26:48, Mark 14:65, Luke 22:64). At the dinner in which a harlot anointed Jesus, the Pharisaic host complains, "If this man were a prophet, he would have known who and what sort of woman this is who is touching him, for she is a sinner" (Luke 7:36-50). Jesus says of his own ministry: "A prophet is not without honor, except in his own country.. ." (Mark 6:4) and ".. .it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem" (Luke 13:33).

In the earliest stratum of tradition, Jesus therefore calls himself a prophet. Friends and foes agreed that he acted like a man ' 'possessed". According to his followers he was possessed with the spirit of God and was therefore the actual mouthpiece for Yahweh. For his critics, he had been seized by evil spirits and was the spokesman for Beelzebub. Probably Jesus would have explained his calling in terms of a prediction attributed to Moses in the book of Deuteronomy (18:15):

"The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you. ..."

Jesus preached that the bell had at last sounded and the age to come would soon appear. For Enslin, few things seem more certain than the belief of Jesus in the near approach of the apocalyptic kingdom. Going further, Enslin claims that the common people heard Jesus gladly, believed what he was saying and were not disillusioned by his death as a martyred prophet, in spite of Mark's insistence that almost no one understood Jesus and most deserted him. If Jesus had harsh words to say about the rich, the educated and the powerful, it was because they too understood him but opposed any change in the status quo. For many, however, any change would be a change for the better. Such people welcomed "the prophet of the age to come".

Did Jesus think of himself as the Son of David, the Messianic heir to the Davidic throne, or the Son of Man, the apocalyptic Judge of the New Age? That Jesus was in the slightest concerned with the re-establishment of David's throne would seem most unlikely, according to Enslin.

As for the title ' 'Son of Man", it is highly probable that Jesus used the phrase constantly, though not referring to himself. His disciples eventually thought of him as the Son of Man but this identification was made after his death. As God's prophet Jesus was to prepare the way for the Final Judge, the apocalyptic Son of Man. For a first century Palestinian to believe in the near approach of the end of the world is possible; however, for him to toy with the idea that he, a flesh and blood human, could be transformed into a supernatural, angelic figure would indicate a pathological departure from normalcy.

Apparently most of Jesus' brief prophetic activity was in Galilee, though he was probably in Jerusalem somewhat longer than five days before his execution. Even in Galilee, he had to make trips which according to Enslin, can only be explained as efforts to elude the police of Herod Antipas. However, Jesus did not flee Galilee because he was unpopular with the masses nor did he travel to the Holy City expecting to die. He may have thought the kingdom would dawn as he stood in Jerusalem and proclaimed his good news. So he walked south, confident that God was directing his steps and consummating His plan.

CONTENTS

Enslin is very skeptical about the Gospel narratives concerning the triumphal entry and the cleansing of the temple. To ride into the city instead of dismounting and entering on foot would be a claim to kingly power which Rome would not likely have tolerated. Jesus did receive a noisy welcome from pilgrims and city dwellers alike - a kiss of death, actually, for it made clear the potential danger of a movement which might become uncontrollable. If the Pharisees and scribes had earlier been outraged by the "mouthing of an ignorant and untrained peasant", now Jesus incurred the enmity of the Sadducees and the suspicions of the Romans.

One can doubt that Jesus would be unmolested by the temple police after an act easily construed as wanton violence in a sacred shrine. Jesus probably passionately denounced what the temple had become and predicted its speedy destruction. The early Church turned these sayings into an "enacted parable". What Jesus *said* was transformed into what he *did.* Neither the temple guards nor Rome would have permitted an act similar to the account in the Gospels; but a blasphemous speech against the temple was enough in itself to seal the fate of the Galilean.

Because of his denunciations of the temple authorities, Jesus could easily be accused of being a Zealot. The details of the betrayal, arrest and passion are uncertain. The Mount of Olives arrest scene may be based on a somewhat similar incident in the life of David (II Samuel 15-16). The trial before Herod, unmentioned by Mark, may have been invented by Christian meditation on Psalm 2. That Jesus was arrested and speedily turned over to the Roman procurator for condemnation is all we can be sure of; for Enslin, the details are forever lost in obscurity.

Pilate held office for ten years, a remarkable testimony to his ability when Tiberius kept a close watch on his agents and would not tolerate mismanagement. Of course, the fanatical prophet who had strayed into the Roman province and been arrested as a rabble-rouser provided only one more of many such troublesome incidents in the career of the Procurator. With little concern Pilate ordered Jesus to be crucified. Again, the details of the death scene are at best uncertain. On the cross, Jesus' confidence simply collapsed. God had failed him or he had failed God. The kingdom had not come!

The disciples fled back to Galilee but after this first grief and shock faded, they knew that Jesus was with God and would soon return. Their task was to carry on. The real Jesus was not dead but lived on in the hearts of those whom he endlessly calls. Out of that faith came visions of a risen Lord and legends of an empty tomb.

E. T.W. Manson

While German New Testament scholars busied themselves with the technicalities of form criticism and later redaction criticism, [69] British New Testament experts continued the "Quest for the Historical Jesus" which Albert Schweitzer had said would end with either thorough skepticism or consistent eschatology. Professor T.W. Manson of the .University of Manchestser was one of the eminent critics who denied both of those troublesome possibilities. His views are found in *The Servant Messiah,* a series of lectures given at Yale and the University of Cambridge.

69 Form criticism produced the epoch-making books of Martin Dibelius, *"From Tradition to Gospel"* and Rudolf Bultmann, *"History of the Synoptic Tradition"*. An introduction to and evaluation of redaction criticism can be found in Joachim Rhode, *"Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists",* Westminster Press, 1968. Briefly, form criticism deals with *oral* tradition behind the written Gospels while redaction criticism analyzes the special interpretations given by each of the evangelists.

CONTENTS

For the Jews the Messiah to come would be an irresistible, wise and just monarch, a conception clearly expressed in the Psalms of Solomon. He would be the agent of the triumph of God, a victory of which all Jews would be the delighted beneficiaries. Thus, from the outset there was a violent contradiction between the crucified Jesus of Christian experience and the conquering hero of Israelite fancy.

John the Baptist struck the first blow against the national hope. By calling all to be baptized, a rite required of the Jewish proselyte, John declared that the chosen people were not a whit better than unclean pagans. They must rediscover and relearn their Judaism from the beginning. John destroyed the ordinary confidence of the average Jew in order to create a new and fit Israel for the Messiah. Jesus saw in the activity of the Baptist the manifest working of God. Hence he took his place in the Johannine movement while sensing how far he must go beyond it. Christians later borrowed their rites of baptism, fasting and common prayer from John.

In the temptation story and elsewhere Jesus completely contradicted the messianic hope of his nation - and his own disciples. Jesus puts God on center stage and makes the Messiah only His servant; the messianic office was transformed from the administration of divine justice into a labor of love: Jesus thought of himself as the servant par excellence of the kingdom of God. Thus Jesus combines the suffering servant of Deutero-Isaiah and the Son of Man in Daniel.

Baptism by John gave Jesus his sense of vocation. Yet unlike the Baptist, the Nazarene was no ascetic. More importantly, he identified himself with the outcasts and failures of life and opposed all the forces that oppressed them. He consoled his hearers with a wealth of kindness offered to them in God's name.

In Galilee Jesus exercised an irresistible fascination over the multitudes; but because of his popularity he became more and more suspect to the religious and political authorities. In brief he was placed in a dangerous position between the nationalistic zeal of his followers and the suspicious fears of Herod Antipas. In the feeding of the five thousand, Jesus felt the threat of an army without a general, a nation without a national leader, a maccabean host without a Judas Maccabaeus. Jesus had no intention of becoming their king and so fled the country; he was more worried about the messianic enthusiasm of his friends than the fears of his enemies - this is why he repudiated Peter's idea that being Messiah means achieving power and glory.

Manson believes that as the Servant Messiah and therefore the embodiment of the true Israel, Jesus left Galilee to continue his ministry in the south in Judea and Peraea where there was nothing else for him to do but carry out his work in the old way with new surroundings. This Peraean period ended at the feast of tabernacles when Manson believes the cleansing of the temple took place. About six months later, from October to April, Jesus returned to the holy city for the last time.

Having entered Jerusalem amid cheers from his followers, Jesus cleansed the temple court of the Gentiles, which had teen turned into a general marketplace. However, though his followers expected him to clear the Gentiles out of the holy city, he amazed everyone by driving out the Jewish traders. For them, this was certainly not a part of the conventional anticipation of messianic action.

Because of the disturbance at the marketplace during the feast of tabernacles, the Jewish leaders were determined to eliminate Jesus before the next festival at Passover. Manson says we cannot decide whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal or not, because Mark and the

Fourth Gospel disagree. He thinks Judas betrayed Jesus because he was a fanatical Jewish patriot bitterly disillusioned by the Nazarene's spineless inaction in regard to Roman tyranny. And, like Klausner, he interprets the proceedings before the Sanhedrin as an informal inquiry rather than a legal trial. However, unlike Klausner and Enslin, who thought Pilate was a cruel tyrant to whom the killing of a Galilean was similar to killing a fly, Manson has Pilate thinking Jesus was harmless but giving in to the malicious Jewish leaders. Finally, the Servant Messiah was executed.

> *"And most of the people who had been concerned doubtless went to bed that night with a fairly easy conscience. Pilate had earned another day's salary as Procurator of Judaea; and his province was quiet and peaceful - at any rate on the surface. The Temple authorities could feel that they had made things secure against untimely reforming zeal - for the time being at least. Patriotic Jews could tell themselves that it had been a mistake ever to imagine that Jesus was the kind of leader they were looking for - and in that they were not mistaken. Devout Jews could reflect that such an end as that which had overtaken Jesus was hardly to be wondered at, after the way in which he had flouted the scribes and even criticised the provisions of the Law itself. We might almost say that Jesus was crucified with the best intentions; and that those who sent him to the Cross believed that they were doing their plain duty by the Empire or the Temple, or the Law or the hope of Israel. Doubtless many, perhaps most, of them did so believe."*[70]

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

Unification theology maintains that Jesus came in Adam's place to restore the lost Garden of Eden and to establish God's kingdom on earth. It likewise maintains that exaggerated notions and conflicting ideas about the precise meaning of the kingdom of God resulted in a vast gap between the actuality of his person and the abstract vision held by the religious in Israel. In this, we find that the essence of *Divine Principle* is supported by historical scholars and theologians alike. The question is, therefore, to what extent was the kingdom of God established, and to what extent were there failures and successes on the part of the Israelites themselves as well as the man whom God had chosen.

Jesus, like John, came preaching, "Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand." This proclamation itself has been the subject of interminable controversy among many Christians. The term "kingdom of heaven" (which was substituted for "kingdom of God" because of Hebrew restrictions on the use of the word "God") has led them to believe either that Jesus was primarily concerned with the fate of the believer after death or that he is interested exclusively in one's private spiritual fulfillment. Most scholars would agree that either of these views entirely misrepresents the intent of Jesus' message, ministry and mission. This is quite clear in the representative views we have previously given as well as that of Bultmann, who maintains that the dominant theme in the message of Jesus is the imminent reign of God that would destroy the Satanic power.[71] Coming to the same conclusion but from a different perspective, Professor Frederick C. Grant typifies scholarly opinion:

> *"Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God is absolutely and unequivocally and exclusively a religious conception: purely and simply religious, but religious in the sound ancient*

70 T.W. Manson, *The Servant-Messiah,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1953, pp. 87-88.
71 R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament,* Scribners, N.Y., 1951, v. I, pp. 4-5.

sense, as embracing all of life, society, politics, the labor of men, as well as their inner feelings, attitudes, and aspiration."[72]

Though Professor Stauffer of Erlangen and Cambridge scholar C.H. Dodd may hold opposing views to the above, Unification theology reaffirms the contention of Bultmann that Jesus was convinced that the fulfillment of divine promise was at hand and therefore the rule of Satan was ending; consequently, he could demand a complete renunciation of lesser loyalties and obligations. Unification theology is also in agreement with the realistic picture of Jesus drawn by Schweitzer, whose exegesis initiated a tendency toward scholarly consensus in viewing the mission of Jesus in the light of his apocalyptic vision. *Divine Principle* likewise concurs with Tillich that

"The greatness of the New Testament is that it was able to use words, concepts and symbols which had developed in the history of religions and at the same time preserve the picture of Jesus who was interpreted by them."[73]

That is to say, for *Divine Principle* the urgent and compelling apocalyptic vision spurred Jesus to promote the kingdom of God. He taught parables, and sent out disciples charged with the knowledge of the kingdom's immediacy. As Klausner and Enslin suggest, even though the man could not live up to the expectations of a desperate populace or fulfill the goals of the kingdom, even if at times he were dreamy or frustrated, this by no means negates the fact that for Israel he was indeed the Christ. Here again *Divine Principle* is supported by Tillich, who makes the following conclusion from his study of the New Testament symbols:

"The spiritual power of the New Testament was great enough to take all these concepts into Christianity, with all their pagan and Jewish connotations, without losing the basic reality, namely, the event of Jesus as the Christ, which these concepts were supposed to interpret."[74]

The kingdom that Jesus attempted to bring, was a literal, physical kingdom, according to Unification theology, a restored world based on God's original ideal. Central to that notion would be the immediate subjugation of Satan who had dominated man through the Fall, and the beginning of a new dawn on the individual, family, national and ultimately world levels. However, in his efforts, Jesus encountered barrier after barrier.

THE ZEALOT PROBLEM

Ever since the Babylonian Captivity, devout Jews dreamed of a restoration of their past glory. They conceived of the golden age in terms of a free Israel and Judah reunited under the wise government of a new King David. God would exercise His kingship over His chosen people through the instrument of a re-established Davidic dynasty. Mowinckel, among others, believes that such a this-worldly and political concept of the Messiah was the prevailing one among the masses of Palestinian Jews during the time of Jesus. As he explains, the hope of a greater national future appealed to popular feeling and aspiration, especially in troubled times when tempers flared because of alien rule, social problems, economic difficulties and disintegration of ancient religious customs. By contrast, the other-worldly and universalistic eschatology preserved in apocalyptic literature came from learned wisdom schools, interested

72 F.C. Grant, *The Gospel of the Kingdom,* Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1940, p. xv.
73 P. Tillich, *"A History of Christian Thought",* Simon & Schuster, N. Y., 1968, p. 16.
74 P. Tillich, *"A History of Christian Thought",* Simon & Schuster, N. Y., 1968, p. 16.

in Chaldean speculations, non-Jewish religious traditions and mystical experiences. It is important to realize, however, that for many Jews the Messiah was thought of as a victorious general, a political liberator and a capable ruler.

Although a political Messiah plays no overt part in the Gospel picture, there are other sources to consult for a more complete understanding of the religious milieu of Jesus' time. The Psalms of Solomon, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the ancient synagogue prayers and early rabbinic literature all testify to national messianic ideas among the Jewish upper classes. In the most practical sense, such writings bear witness to the hope that from within Israel a Messiah will appear to raise the standard of national freedom, drive the Romans into the sea, restore the ancient throne of David and establish a durable government guaranteeing justice and peace. God will be King, according to this conception, when a wise monarch rules a free Israel.[75]

Therefore, it is easily seen that if Jesus were the Messiah, the expectations of his countrymen were in no way undemanding. Clearly, to satisfy and fulfill these goals as a human, he would have to face opposition from nearly every quarter. Equally distressing and problematic would be the situation if the above stated goals were *not* his real mission; in that case he would have to gain acceptance on another basis, which had not been so well imbedded in the fabric of their consciousness. Then he would be faced with barriers even more severe.

However, if it were true that his essential mission was to restore the Davidic throne, many would say that the likelihood of Israel breaking the chains of Roman bondage was very small. The Sadducees, daily acquainted with Roman power, had shrewdly decided to make the best of a bad situation. The Pharisees remained aloof from practical politics but prayed for God to restore His rule with a miracle. Some of the Herodians felt that Herod the Great and his heirs provided the only kind of Messiah Israel could expect in the immediate future. Professor Grant concludes, ". . .only the utterly fanatical could still hope for a restoration of Jewish independence - or kingdom of David, or even a kingdom of the Maccabees."[76]

Yet there were just such people. They called themselves Zealots because of their unflinching loyalty to the cause of Jewish home-rule. Their opponents called them "bandits". Formed into an active group by Judas the Galilean, a noted rebel leader, the Zealots represented an important faction in Palestinian political life during and after Jesus' career. It might be added that history has shown that even less substantial political groups have risen to power, given a favorable turn in circumstance.

The Zealots believed in a kingdom of God on earth to be inaugurated by a Messiah who would lead his people against the Roman government. In 1931 Robert Eisler proposed the thesis, based on a reading of the *"Slavonic Josephus",* that Jesus should be seen in the context of the Zealot revolutionary cause. His book *"The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist"* aroused considerable controversy, but the New Testament scholars almost unanimously dismissed it as a monument of mistaken scholarship. Twenty years later the whole subject was reopened and again excited widespread interest.

In a series of American lectures, Professor Oscar Cullmann of Basle gave his evaluation of the subject. He maintains that for an understanding of the New Testament the insurrectionist movement is of extraordinary significance because Jesus was executed by the Romans as a Zealot. To illustrate and expand his thesis, Cullmann uses examples from the New Testament. In the book of Acts (5:36) Gamaliel places Jesus in the same category as the

75 S. Mowinckel, *"He That Cometh",* Abingdon Press, N.Y., 1954, pp. 280-284.
76 F.C. Grant, *Ibid,* p. 111

Zealot leader Theudas. In Acts 21:38 Paul is accused of being a Zealot by the Roman tribune. Further, Jesus had Zealots around him in his inner circle: Simon the Canaanite, a disciple mentioned in Luke and Acts, was Simon the Zealot, the word "Kananaios" being an Aramaic designation for the Jewish resistance party; Judas Iscariot may mean Judas *sicarius,* the Latin word for the Zealots; and even Peter could have belonged to this group if "barjona" is an old Akkadian word meaning "terrorist"; and finally, Cullmann states that James and John, sons of Zebedee, exhibit Zealot tendencies.

However, instead of continuing that line of reasoning to claim that Jesus was one of the Zealots, Cullmann asserts that Jesus considered them Satanic in their confusion of the kingdom of God with earthly domination. Jesus undoubtedly displeased the Zealots. For one thing, he welcomed the hated tax-collectors into his movement. If he ridiculed oppressive political rulers who called themselves "benefactors" (Luke 22:25), he no less clearly praised the Roman centurion from Capernaum (Matt. 8:5). In addition, the question of tribute money involved the Zealots directly because they saw this as intolerable subservience to a pagan power; no Zealot could have been pleased with the clever way Jesus avoided entrapping himself. Cullmann believes that the injunction ' 'resist not evil" is also directed against the Zealots and he conjectures that Jesus might have referred to them as false prophets who" come in sheep's clothing but inwardly are ravenous wolves" (Matt. 7:15). Also, the statement in the Fourth Gospel, "All who come before me are thieves and robbers. .." (10:8), could refer to the Zealots.[77]

On the other hand, S.G.F. Brandon of the University of Manchester labors valiantly to prove a positive connection between the Zealots and Jesus.[78] To do so he first has to show that Mark quite deliberately rewrote early Christian history in order to remove Roman suspicions concerning the Church. Mark, prepared soon after the Flavian triumphal parade in Rome celebrating the defeat of the Jewish rebellion (71 A.D.), carefully differentiates the Christian cause from that of the discredited Jewish insurrectionists. Having set the pattern, Mark is merely copied by Matthew and Luke. Only by reading between the lines can one discover the natural affinities of primitive Jewish Christianity and first century Zealotism.

According to Professor Brandon, since Jesus was brought up in Galilee he would have been sympathetic toward those of his countrymen who had died fighting against Roman rule. He never criticized the Zealots by name as he did the Pharisees. Brandon considers that he even took the Zealot position on the question of the tribute money: Jesus declared that Israel's land and its resources belong to God alone, meaning that no Jew could give to Caesar that which belongs solely to God. (Mark reinterpreted this authentic saying in a pro-Roman manner.) Going further, in Brandon's reasoning, two incidents in Jesus' life make him look like a political Messiah: the triumphal entry and the cleansing of the temple.

When Jesus entered Jerusalem he did so with a carefully planned demonstration of his Messiahship, knowing full well that such an act had political connotations. His subsequent attack on the temple trading system apparently took place at about the same time as a Zealot insurrection elsewhere in the city. For Jesus, the Jewish aristocracy in control of the temple appeared to be the chief obstacle to the preparation of Israel for the advent of God's kingdom. Jesus withdrew to Gethsemane accompanied by armed followers who could have offered serious resistance when he was arrested. At the end he fell victim to the counter-attack of the

77 O. Cullmann, *"The State in the New Testament",* Scribners, N.Y., 1956, p. 24.
78 S.G.F. Brandon, *"Jesus and the Zealots",* Manchester University Press, England, 1967.

CONTENTS

sacerdotal leaders who understandably regarded him as a danger to the establishment. Judged guilty of sedition, Jesus was crucified between two Zealots likewise paying the final penalty for revolt against Rome.

For Unification theology the Zealot problem was certainly a central one. Because Jesus as the second Adam had to fulfill God's dispensation on the national level, *Divine Principle* would rather concur with Brandon's thesis that the Jewish aristocracy was a major obstacle for Jesus and had certain factions in the temple been overcome, the Zealots most likely could have been a part of, though not the guiding force in, a restored Israel. The contradiction which seems apparent in scholarly opinion is thus resolved: though on the one hand, Jesus appears to estrange himself from their cause (because the spiritual foundation was not laid), on the other hand, he does not overtly deny them or their cause (because if the proper foundation is laid, he is indeed the one they are waiting for).

But, of course, we have seen that a foundation was never laid. This problem is dealt with in our discussion of John the Baptist. Jesus was received with accusations, threats, and denunciations. Not only did the religious doubt Jesus, but also there is strong evidence that his own family thought him mentally incompetent. This estrangement was not his intention. Nor was it his intention to die on the cross.

THEOLOGIA CRUCIS?

Because the man Pilate maliciously entitled the ' 'King of the Jews" was killed, it has become exceedingly difficult to recognize what the mission of the Nazarene originally involved. On the one hand, some have overlooked the original Gospel *of* Jesus because it has been clouded by the gospel *about him* which came much later. That is, the shadow of the cross has often blocked out the ministry of the one announcing the imminence of the kingdom. Far too often Christians have assumed that Jesus came among men only to die. The structure of the Gospels themselves allows one to make this mistake; one scholar has observed that they are merely Passion stories with an extended introduction. Contributing to this misinterpretation are the epistles of St. Paul in which overwhelming emphasis is placed upon the death of Jesus. One of the chief benefits of the century devoted to the search for the real Jesus is that scholars have labored to get behind the writings of the New Testament to see the man from Nazareth. Modern research notes that as time passes by in the chronological order of the Gospels the stark tragedy of the crucifixion is gradually covered up. In Mark, our oldest Gospel, Jesus utters a single agonizing cry from the cross: "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" (15:34). Even though Mark was probably written in Rome, the poignancy of that cry made such a lasting impression that the evangelist preserves it in the original Aramaic language spoken by Jesus. Matthew copies the same account without major alterations. Luke, however, omits the cry of agony and replaces it .with the serene words: "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit" (23:46). From a scene which evokes anguished despair, that recorded by Mark, the Third Gospel changes to a scene of confident acceptance. In John, the divine Christ proclaims from the cross in majesty, "It is finished." (19:30) Thus, as the Gospel writers succeed each other, any thought that Jesus might have considered himself a failure is discreetly expunged from the record. In fact, in the Syriac version of the scriptures used by the Nestorian and Jacobite Christians of the Near East, Mark itself has been altered to read not "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" but' 'My God, my God, for this I was spared!"

CONTENTS

In a series of papers prepared to honor Professor C.F.D. Moule of Cambridge we read:

> *Why did Jesus die?. . . The early Christians believed that they understood the meaning of Jesus, and this controlled their answers to the question. They worked backwardsjrom the answer to the question and said that Jesus died because it was God's will. They then retold the story complete with this theological explanation in order to illuminate for others the whole meaning of Jesus as they understood it. Whatever historical explanations they gave, such as the hostility of the religious leaders, the fickleness of the crowd and the weakness of Pilate, all of which contribute to the plausibility of their picture of an innocent man being condemned, are subservient to this theological explanation of the death of Jesus. This does not disprove the historical accuracy of what they relate, but it does cast a shadow of doubt over it.*[79]

Divine Principle would affirm this common theological view. Again the words of Schweitzer are reiterated. This Jesus of Nazareth who "died to give his work its final consecration *never had any existence."*

To give an exemplary illustration of evidence to support this view, let us consider the argument that Isaiah 53 proves Jesus came to die. In the traditional interpretation of the mission of Jesus, Isaiah 53, one of the suffering servant poems, has been of enormous influence. When the early Church was collecting scripture passages from the Old Testament to prove that the Messiah should suffer it was natural to quote such verses. But scholarship of the most painstaking sort has failed to prove conclusively that the suffering servant poems were interpreted messianically in the time of Jesus. It would not be unnatural for Christians to use such passages because their Messiah did suffer, but in all probability Jews thought of the suffering servant as the historic nation of Israel rather than the Messiah. This, of course, does not necessarily rule out the idea that Jesus himself reinterpreted the conventional messianic concept in the light of the suffering servant poems after it became obvious to him that he might well be rejected by his nation in Jerusalem. T.W. Manson, among others, assumes this to be the case. Against him Hans Conzelmann writes:

> *As for the title 'Servant of God', it is merely necessary to observe that it is entirely lacking in the oldest strata. Once it is taken up - in the latest stratum - it does not characterize Jesus as the suffering one, but as the 'savior' (Matt. 12:18ff). It is particularly striking that the later stratum of the Synoptic tradition occasionally, even though sparingly, works with Isaiah 53, but even then not with the Servant-of-God title. In Matthew 8:17, even Isaiah 53:4 ('he took our infirmities...') is cited without any allusion to the Servant of God and the passion. For the assumption that Jesus understood himself as the Servant of God in the sense of Deutero-Isaiah, there is no support at all in the sources.*[80]

Furthermore according to Mark, our oldest Gospel, Jesus did not speak of dying until the confession at Caesarea Philippi shortly before he headed for Jerusalem; from this and from the reasons given above, Unification theology assumes with modern scholarship that the theology of the cross was not the primary intention of Jesus though it quickly became the preoccupation of the Church. Jesus came that men might have life and have it more abundantly.

THE MESSIANIC MISSION

79 Robert Morgan in Ernst Bammel, ed., *"The Trial of Jesus",* S.C.M. Press, London, 1970, p. 139.
80 H. Conzelman, *"Jesus",* Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1973, p. 46.

Divine Principle holds that through the Messiah, God had intended to establish His kingdom on earth beginning with the Israel of 2000 years ago. The Christ would govern the covenanted people of God with justice and righteousness as prophesied in Isaiah. Reigning with wisdom as a wonderful counselor, he would be a prince of peace able to guarantee an eternity of universal harmony.

This vision was not intended as otherworldly but as a project for living men in a new but earthly social order. In such a community the restoration of the original purpose of creation and the inauguration of the direct reign of God would require a farreaching program involving action on every level - personal, family, national, global. In that kingdom, the spiritual fulfillment would be a part of the national fulfillment; so the kingdom would be neither purely private self-realization nor purely politically and nationalistically motivated.

In his first letter to the Corinthians, St. Paul interpreted the mission of Jesus as the work of the New Adam (15:45). It was one of those brilliant insights in Christology which quite regrettably was not taken up and elaborated upon when the next generation of Christians wrote their gospels. According to Unification theology, in becoming that New Adam, Jesus was to fulfill the divine mandate given to his original ancestor; that is, it was his mission to establish a God-centered personality, a God-centered family and a God-centered dominion.

To a certain extent, the Son of man and the man of perfected or God-centered personality are one. Professor Sigmund Mowinckel explains that in a measure the Son of Man is regarded as the ideal man. As such, he must be understood in the light of the ancient Near Eastern mythological figure, the divine Primordial man - the ideal representative and pattern for humanity. For Jews, the Son of Man appears as the ideal sage, the exemplary righteous individual, who enables man to fulfill the goals of God's creation; he is the pre-existent, heavenly ideal and pattern. In apocalyptic thought the Son of Man was considered the first of the righteous.[81] To the extent that the above definitions apply to the term "Son of Man,' (noting that later in the Gentile Church of the first century, the same term stood for a notion more congenial to its philosophy), Jesus was indeed a fulfillment of the man of perfected personality, in the view *of Divine Principle.* This means that Jesus on the individual level became truly one with God, knew God's heart, and shared divinity.

Few in the Western world whose traditional structure has been built on the foundation of Judeo-Christianity would be so rash as to find fault with Jesus as an individual. As Emerson put it, Jesus ploughed his name into the history of the world. In a very real way, since the fourth century Jesus has summed up the meaning of human life for European civilization, much as Socrates did for Hellenic culture earlier, and Confucius did for traditional China. On the basis of his parables alone, the reader is attracted to his magnetic personality. In these short, pointed stories, one can see the basic but simple principles by which he lived, as well as the divine dimension from which they are inspired. As C.H. Dodd concisely puts it, Jesus was guided by implicit obedience to the will of God, trust in God which asks no proof, and dedicated allegiance to Him which excludes all lesser claims.[82] On the purely individual level, Jesus has in a certain sense proved himself by out-living his critics. Who today would remember Pilate or Herod, Annas or Caiaphas if they had not become involved in the career and destiny of one who towers far above them?

Beyond this point, however, God's desire and Jesus' ambitions were thwarted at every

81 S. Mowinckel, *Ibid,* p. 385.

82 C.H. Dodd, *The Founder of Christianity,* Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1970, p. 124.

level.

According to *Divine Principle,* the new Adam should have united with a woman in the position of Eve, married with divine blessing and reared children who would provide the nucleus for a true family of God - that is to say, fulfilling in a God-centered fashion what man's ancestors fulfilled in a Satan-centered way. From that point the Messiah as the Last Adam and his bride as the restored Eve could move on to restore the whole creation to its pristine state, with the cooperation of a people willing to work to establish a second Garden of Eden.

Many conjectures have been made concerning the private life of Jesus. Professor William A.Phipps shows in a study of "the distortion of sexuality in the Christian tradition",[83] that Jesus himself has at various times been described as a celibate, a polygamist, a married man, a divorcee, a widower and a libertine. However, within the New Testament, it is not an uncommon conclusion that we can find no *direct* evidence to support any one of these conjectures.

Unification theology follows traditional doctrine in assuming Jesus to be an unmarried man, though it would go on to assert that had the proper conditions been made, he would have married. Because of his early death as well as failures within his family (Schweitzer said the family of Jesus thought him "mentally unbalanced"), he was unable to furnish the model for family life. If Jesus had not been forced to contend with abject opposition from religious leaders, obtusiveness on the part of his disciples, and supreme skepticism from his family, would he have remained unmarried? If the Messiah as Son of Man is to be the model and pattern for all others in a celibate state, what meaning does it have for conjugal or family relationships? Clearly, the same logic that argues that Christianity "worked backwards *from* the answer *to* the question" has application in the matter of his married life as it does in the question of the inevitability of his crucifixion. For *Divine Principle* there is no reason to believe that Jesus as a Jew would not follow the traditional Jewish emphasis on the importance of the family - the strength in Judaism - by fostering a family which Dr. Phipps assures us would have been considered blessed by God.

To examine the career and intentions of Jesus on a higher level, that of national and world restoration, (which in part is necessary to understand the conditions which thwarted family level Messiahship) from the standpoint of Unification theology, it is helpful to refer back to an earlier comment of Dr. Brandon. He contended that the Jewish aristocracy in control of the temple appeared to be the chief obstacle to the preparation of Israel for the advent of God's kingdom. To understand why Jesus faced such a barrier in this aristocracy, *Divine Principle* affirms that in reality the people were not waiting for the Son of Man, but for another figure.

ELIJAH REVIVIDUS

In a series of lectures given at the University of Oslo, Professor Mowinckel explained the widespread Jewish belief that the Messiah was to be heralded by forerunners.[84] Since the coming of the Day of the Lord depended on whether Israel repented, it was necessary that there should first come men who would restore everything to right order. Left without

83 W.A. Phipps, *Was Jesus Married?,* Harper & Row, N.Y., 1970.
84 S. Mowinckel, *Ibid,* pp. 298ff, 305.

prophets since the time of Malachi, Israel felt the need of inspiring men of God. Whom was it more natural to expect than Elijah who had been taken up into heaven alive? Such an idea, Mowinckel points out, can be found in Malachi 4:5, Ecclesiaticus 48:10 and the Book of Enoch. M.Goguel adds the Sibylline Oracles v: 187-9 and IV Esdras 6:26ff.

We should note particularly that the return of Elijah was debated in Justin *Mavtyf s Dialogue with Trypho* (circa 150 A.D.). Arguing with the Christian apologist, Trypho the Jew says, "Even if the Messiah should have been born and be living somewhere, yet he is unknown, indeed, he does not even know himself; nor has he any power, until Elijah comes, annoints him and reveals him to all."

Professor T. A. Burkhill of Cornell, in his study of the Markan Gospel,[85] mentions that rabbinic theology had at least three different views of the return of Elijah: 1) Elijah is a Gadite who prepares the way for God and is the redeemer of Israel; 2) Elijah is a Benjaminite who precedes the Messiah and announces His coming; 3) Elijah is a Levite who acts as the high priest in the messianic age.

Actually, Elijah was just the sort of holy man that many Jews at the beginning of the Christian era would have welcomed in Palestine. At a time when religious syncretism was favored by King Ahab, the prophet had waged a zealous campaign on behalf of the distinctive features of the traditional faith in Yahweh. This sort of exclusiveness would have appealed to a much later generation of Jews fearful of the encroaching hellenistic paganism of the Roman Empire. Elijah too as a desert saint was a vivid reminder of the early wilderness period in Israelite history when Moses received the Holy Torah at Mount Sinai. There were always Jews who looked upon their bedouin days as the golden age. Not least important in the eyes of first century Judaism was the blunt honesty with which Elijah denounced sin and corruption in high places. Who would not long for a similar man of God to speak frankly about the Herodian family, the Sadduceean temple aristocracy and the privileged classes collaborating with the Roman occupation authorities?

According to Mark and Matthew (who is said to have borrowed from Mark), John the Baptist modelled his life-style - even clothing - after Elijah the Tishbite. He adopted as his own the rough camel hair garb and leather belt which were the marks of the prophetic office since the reign of King Ahab. Luke and the Fourth Gospel omit this description, possibly because it meant little to the Gentiles in the growing church for whom they wrote.

Like Elijah, the Baptist poured fiery judgment upon the society around him. No one was safe from his withering denunciations. As herald of the one to come, John judged high and low without exception. Nor was his warning about the day of wrath merely vague rhetoric and apocalyptic dreaming. He spoke directly, pointedly, to the rich, the tax collectors, even the Jewish soldiers and the members of the Roman army of occupation. It was no wonder crowds gathered to hear the desert prophet. With unforgettable language, John handed down an indictment of every sector in the contemporary Palestinian social order.

John the Baptist plays a crucial role in understanding the dramatic mission of Jesus. Besides references to him in all four Gospels, we find him mentioned in the writings of the Jewish historian Josephus, the controversial *Slavonic Josephus,* some apocryphal Gospels and the religious literature of the Mandaeans, a still existing Iraqi sect which claims that John was superior to the founder of Christianity.[86]

---

85 T.A. Burkhill, *"Mysterious Revelation",* Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y., 1963, p. 15.

86 A convenient handbook on John in Catholic tradition, his alleged power to cure St. Vitus dance (cholera), his place in art, his role as a holy saint, festivals in his honor and the history of relics like his head and fingers, has

Actually, while it may look as though we had considerable material to work with, the early sources do not agree with each other on very important matters, some appear to have embroidered details and all of them have been questioned as to their historical reliability.[87] *Divine Principle* itself throws unexpected light on the ministry of the Baptizer which runs counter to the traditional Christian viewpoints, but is substantiated by modern historical scholarship.

The main problem with our sources is clear enough. To what extent are they reliable? Josephus, for example, in no way relates the preaching of John the Baptist to the agitation over the messianic problem confronting first century Palestine. Writing to commend Judaism to suspicious Romans, Josephus regularly played down such difficulties so the eschatological aspect of the Baptist movement was conveniently omitted. Christian sources, on the other hand, connect John with Jesus, subordinating the former to the latter in a way which arouses considerable suspicion. Each source has a particular bias and therefore we must be cautious in objective judgments; nor are there materials which come from inside the Johannine movement, but even they would be suspect. Therefore on matters relating to John, equally competent scholars disagree markedly.

In the opinion of most scholars, John was the notable leader of one of several sectarian groups emphasizing baptism in Judea. Of these, the people of the Qumran monastery, authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls, represent a similar general orientation to that of John. Until the Dead Sea manuscripts were discovered the average Christian was unaware that besides official Judaism there was a variety of non-conformist Jewish sects roughly parallel to that led by John. Based in the Jordan Valley and the Judean wilderness, they represented a protest against the temple priesthood and rabbinic Judaism by emphasizing their zealous faith in a coming day of the Lord. Some practiced celibacy and vegetarianism. Some were hostile to the whole concept of temple sacrifices, and most were strongly influenced by Iranian religious views. The Essenes persisted for several centuries and may have provided a stimulus for the Mandaeans surviving today.

In the Bible, the Gospel of Luke presents somewhat parallel infancy stories for John and Jesus. It is the general consensus of New Testament critics that these were not originally part of the Third Gospel but were added at the time a second edition was prepared. The stories were created according to Old Testament models which could mean that they are secondary legends. Equally possible is the conjecture that Luke (or his redactor) attached to the Gospel a written Hebrew or Aramaic document. It has even been surmised that the Baptist infancy stories came from followers of John who treasured them much as disciples of Jesus collected birth narratives about their Master.[88]

---

been prepared by the French author Jean Bergeaud. *"Saint John the Baptist",* Macmillan N.Y., 1962.

87 In the Synoptic Gospels, John is regarded as the returning Elijah, whereas the Fourth Gospel makes him deny this. In the Synoptics John and Jesus came in contact only at theoccasion of Christ's baptism whereas the Fourth Gospel asserts a period of working together. The Synoptics state that Jesus began his ministry after the arrest of John while this is specifically denied in the Fourth Gospel. John was probably more of an independent religious figure than the New Testament would have us believe. There is also a suspicion that John's message has been reinterpreted to make it look more Christian. So says Charles H.H. Scobie, *John the Baptist,* Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1964, pp. 15-16.

88 A popular New Testament Introduction states, "Chapter I of the Gospel of Luke deals with incidents that purport to relate the birth of John, but the reliability of this section has been seriously challenged. The section does show us, however, that John was an important enough figure to have become legendary, and it undoubtedly contains certain reliable historical data.... The section in Luke dealing with John's birth is part of a larger body of tradition about John that was no doubt originated and treasured by his disciples.

CONTENTS

According to the Johannine infancy narrative the Baptist was born to Zechariah, an aged priest, and his wife Elizabeth. Zechariah was not a member of the temple hierarchy but one of many rural priests whose sacrificial duties were limited to very occasional services at the Jerusalem shrine. Professor C.H. Kraeling of Yale in his book on John stresses that the rural priests had little in common with their temple colleagues and often harbored resentment against the way the religious establishment was managed. According to Luke, Zechariah and Elizabeth were deeply religious and that alone would set them off from the sophisticated, shrewd and often cynical hierarchy represented by the Sadducees in general and the High Priest Annas in particular. We know from the Dead Sea Scrolls that rural priests, presumably disaffected by the temple authorities, were held in high esteem in the Qumran community.

Even before his birth John was dedicated to the religious life. The Gospel says he took the vows of a Nazarite which included never cutting his hair or drinking wine. There is an old Christian tradition that John went to live in the desert at a very early age; Saint Augustine said at age seven. A modern conjecture is that he was adopted by one of the Essene communities. Another story, much older but not necessarily more reliable, claims that Zechariah was killed by angry soldiers because he helped his son flee to the wilderness before the massacre of the innocents.

The *Slavonic Josephus* describes John as looking like "a wild man". Luke claimed he lived on locusts and wild honey, in other words, whatever he might find in the hot, barren desert. The *Slavonic Josephus* insists he would not eat meat and lived on woodshavings. Such tales would have been popular in the heyday of Christian monasticism and some insist *"Slavonic Josephus"* is based on Byzantine sources written long after John had been transformed into a Christian saint.

Tradition says Zechariah and Elizabeth lived at the little village of Ain Karem about five miles from Jerusalem. John as an adult seems to have moved about from place to place on both sides of the Jordan but probably centered his activities at the ford in the river, southeast of Jericho and near the north end of the Dead Sea. The area was desolate enough for one who wanted to be alone with God, yet there were always caravans crossing the Jordan so that a preacher of righteousness could find hearers for a message of fiery doom.

Josephus and the Gospels agree that the wilderness prophet did attract crowds. Unfortunately, we have no examples of his preaching. Instead of lengthy sermons which John must have addressed to his followers and the curious, the historian has at his disposal only bare summaries of his message or a few vivid sentences which happened to be remembered.

Mark stresses John's main point: "Repent, for the Kingdom of God is at hand." A few colorful details are provided in the early collection of sayings which scholars call Q and date as early as 60 A.D. According to Q, the prophet warns of the impending day of judgment in terms of a "wilderness fire in which dry grass and scrub can blaze for miles, sending animals such as scorpions and vipers scuttling for safety. "[89] Already God has His axe in hand and is about to chop away. Even now He is winnowing the grain from the chaff. One can hear John angrily shout' 'You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" (Matt. 3:7b)

On the basis of literary criticism, a strong case can be made to demonstrate that the two birth stories, one of Jesus and the other of John, were brought together by Luke or by a source on which Luke was dependent." (Howard Clark Kee & Franklin W. Young, *Understanding the New Testament*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1957, p. 79.)

89 Scobie, *Ibid,* p. 60.

CONTENTS

The desert prophet linked his sermons of doom with the need for baptism in the waters of the Jordan. The Gospels speak of baptism of repentance for remission of sins; this would link John with the understanding of the sacrament in the Christian Church.

Josephus in the “Antiquities” wrote,

> *John was a pious man, and he was bidding the Jews who practiced virtue and exercised righteousness toward each other and piety toward God to come together for baptism. For thus, it seemed to him would baptismal ablution be acceptable, if it were used not to beg off from sins committed, but for the purification of the body when the soul had previously been cleansed by righteous conduct.*[90]

Though the Gospels interpret the Johannine rite in terms of Christian initiation, the explanation of Josephus is more like the practice of ablution in the Essene communities.

As an eschatological preacher John may well have thought that his baptism provided the covenanting ceremony for the new Israel of the coming Messiah - an initiation for the true chosen people of God. Scobie concludes:

> *Both John and the sectarians agree that membership of the old Israel is not enough, and in itself is no guarantee of salvation. For the sectarians, Israel had apostasized, and for John, those Jews who came to hear him preach were a brood of vipers, who must not think that they can place any reliance on their descent from Abraham. Following the analogy of the Qumran baptism, we can say with confidence that John's baptism too must have been thought of as admitting people to the eschatological community.* [91]

In order to understand the problems associated with the Baptist's relationship to Jesus, the student must examine the various New Testament sources one by one.

Q, used by Matthew and Luke, contains nothing about his baptism. In Mark and Matthew, following the accounts of John, Jesus appears abruptly on the scene. Personal contact between the two is reduced to the absolute minimum. Jesus comes to be baptized. As soon as that occurs the two men part never to meet again. In Mark, our earliest Gospel, Jesus alone hears the voice from heaven. Mark does not relate John's question from prison, "Are you the one who is to come or shall we look for another?" (Matt. 11:3). So in our oldest Gospel there is no suggestion at all that John wondered if Jesus were the long-awaited Messiah. Q, however, does contain this question but not the baptism, so for that editor John had not genuinely considered the possible messianic status of Jesus until he himself had been imprisoned by Herod Antipas.

Matthew, Luke and the Fourth Gospel bring the Baptist and the Christian Messiah together in different ways. Matthew makes John object to the idea of baptizing Jesus. Luke describes Jesus and John as cousins - or at least kinsmen - and has the Baptist acknowledge the superiority of Jesus before either were born. The Fourth Gospel has the Baptist hail Jesus as the Son of God and the Lamb of God, titles much more appropriate in the later Church. Beginning with Mark, the Baptist is pictured as the resurrected Elijah, yet the Fourth Gospel explicitly denies this role which the older evangelists have taken considerable pains to prove. From these brief observations made by historical critics who have carefully examined the extant record, one can clearly see that a large measure of reconstruction is necessary in order to make sense out of conflicting ancient testimony.

The most popular view assumed that Jesus was attracted to the Baptist movement after

90 *Antiquities* XVIII, 5, 2.
91 J Scobie, *Ibid,* p. 144.

its fame had spread to Galilee; he presumably heard of it as he travelled in the Judean wilderness area on the long route from Nazareth to Jerusalem. When he went out to hear John for himself, he became so moved by what he saw that he himself joined the crowd seeking baptism. Some Christians in the early Church, the Adoptionists, believed that Jesus became aware of his own messianic calling when he was immersed by John in the waters of the Jordan. Possibly for a time Jesus was actually affiliated with the Baptist movement and there may even have been an agreement with John that he would carry out in Galilee what the Baptist had in the Judean desert. According to this view, Jesus did not strike out on his own until John was imprisoned.

This scholarly reconstruction has won the support of Ethelbert Stauffer.[92] Relying on the chronology of the Fourth Gospel, he claims that Jesus cleansed the temple early in his mission when he was a radical follower of the Baptist. Scobie too accepts the theory that John and Jesus had a period of overlapping ministries. When John conducted a mission among the Samaritans, Scobie supposes that Jesus carried on for the Baptist in Judea. When John returned to his old haunts in the Jordan Valley, Jesus went up to Galilee. Scobie suggests that the two gradually came to a parting of the ways over the various Jewish rites of ritual purity. Jesus was simply not strict enough to stay in John's favor.

Unification theology claims that Jesus's own work was badly crippled by the fact that he did not win the enthusiastic endorsement of John. In the light of the enormous difficulties faced by any messianic movement in first century Palestine, there was no real chance for success if the forces for reconstruction remained divided. From the standpoint of the messianists, rivalry within the ranks could prove to be fatal.

As we look back over the story, it seems transparently clear that a forthright and unqualified endorsement of Jesus by the Baptist would have turned the tide in Jesus' favor. From the Christian viewpoint and in the light of history, John's mission apart from Jesus should have culminated with the baptism of the Nazarene carpenter's son. He thereupon should have joined Jesus and become his disciple. Had John followed Jesus after baptizing him and thrown all of his support on his side, the course of world history might well have been altered in the most dramatic fashion.

The objective historian can easily gauge the difficulties facing a first century Jewish Messiah. Palestine was occupied by Roman soldiers and governed by Roman officials or their puppets. The Sadducees in control of the temple and the privileged classes were collaborationists either out of conviction or to further their immediate interests. The Pharisees concentrated on purely religious matters. The Essenes abandoned the society around them expecting an eschatological miracle on the part of God to vindicate His Chosen People. As for the Zealots or political freedom fighters, they were committed to sporadic acts of terrorism which culminated in the disastrous uprising bloodily suppressed in 70 A.D.

John and Jesus alike depended upon the deep-seated religious hope for a coming reign of God and widespread popular unrest over conditions as they existed. But beyond that John had certain distinct advantages which could have greatly benefited Jesus. He undoubtedly had many sympathizers in the priestly class. His strictness surely attracted a considerable portion of the Pharisees, and it is likely that he could have rallied much of the Essene community to his side. Because of his preaching he was wellknown and favorably regarded in Judea and Samaria, whereas Jesus' supporters came largely from Galilee to the north. By throwing all of his support behind the Nazarene, the Baptist could have provided the base for a nation-wide

92 E. Stauffer, *"Jesus and His Story",* Knopf, N.Y., 1960, pp. 63-68.

program of renewal and reconstruction. In fact, even Sadducees and Herodians might have shifted their allegiance to such a messianic movement and against the occupation forces if the outlook appeared favorable for the reformers - thus removing the opposition in the temple hierarchy.

Maurice Goguel in his *"The Life of Jesus"* claims, "after Jesus had left him John only saw in him an unfaithful disciple and almost a renegade. "[93] The refusal of the Baptist to ally himself with Jesus - whatever the circumstances - in the view of *Divine Principle,* was not only crippling to the Messianic programme of the Galilean, but likewise dimmed the future of John. As is recorded, John was imprisoned and executed by Herod Antipas.[94]

In the *Divine Principle* view, it is suggested that the reasons John could not come to support Jesus were all too human. On the one hand, supporting Jesus would mean almost giving up his own following and accepting a position of lower esteem in the eyes of his disciples and the public, though this need not necessarily have been the case. Had John united with Jesus, they would have increased or decreased together. Furthermore, John may have had doubts about some of the things that Jesus espoused; critical and apologetic theologians alike have conceded that the sayings of Jesus were quite out of the ordinary, in many cases alienating his listeners by seeming to contradict the orthodox stance. Further, John may have compared himself to Jesus; and from that gathered that the Son of Man could not be all that human - of questionable birth, dubious education,and without a well-developed following. For *Divine Principle,* John himself, coming in the position of Elijah, was responsible for that following.

It is debatable whether John thought of himself as Elijah. Christians who believe that he did run up against the considerable authority of Albert Schweitzer. In his classic study, he asks,' 'Why did not the Jews take the Baptist to be Elijah?"; and answers, one, he never made such a claim; two, he performed no miracles or exercised supernatural powers; and three, John himself pointed forward to the coming of Elijah. In a unique declaration, Schweitzer proposed that the one to come about whom the Baptist preached was in reality not the Messiah, but Elijah.[95] Scobie replied to this that the idea of John being the forerunner of the forerunner is rather far-fetched. However that may be, if John did conceive of himself in the role of Elijah, he neither anointed Jesus, nor revealed him, nor encouraged widespread acceptance of him as the Messiah. It is very possible that there was some confusion in John's mind as to what position he held. If he were united with the Messiah, no such confusion would have existed, in the view of *Divine Principle.*

In Schweitzer's opinion, Jesus conceived of John the Baptist as Elijah revivid,us. He points that out in a discussion of the conversation between Jesus and his disciples that occurred during the descent from the mountain of transfiguration as is recorded in Mark:

> *That is to say, the conditions thereof, so far as they (the disciples) can see, are not yet fulfilled. Elijah is not yet come (Mk 9:11). Jesus puts their minds at rest with the hint that Elijah had already appeared though men did not recognize him. He means the Baptist (Mk*

93 M. Goguel, *The Life of Jesus,* Geo. Allen & Unwin, London, 1958 ed., p. 279.

94 Accounts of the circumstances surrounding that execution differ. According to the Jewish historian Josephus, Herod Antipas feared that the Baptist might spark an uprising. Mark, however, preserves a colorful story which is dealt with interestingly in A.E.J. Rawlinson's *"The Gospel According to St. Mark";* the story revolves around John's becoming enmeshed in Palestinian politics and the personal affairs of Herodias and her husband.

95 *Quest of the Historical Jesus,* pp. 371-372. A similar opinion has been maintained by G.S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man* and John A.T. Robinson; cf. Scobie, *Ibid,* pp. 74-75.

CONTENTS

9:12, 13).[96]

If the disciples' minds are restless and they are doubtful that Elijah has come and revealed Jesus as the Holy One, then how much more difficult would it be for the general populace to accept Jesus?

CONCLUSION

Earlier, representative views from major New Testament scholars were presented concerning the mission of Jesus. Then, we considered the extent of his success. Unification theology stresses the fact that conflicting concepts of the coming kingdom created a chasm between the expectations of the people of Israel and the actual work of the central figures in dispensation history. However,that tremendous dichotomy need not have caused the tragic crucifixion. Paul Tillich, in an exquisitely cautious manner, well describes that dichotomy in his discussion of the adequate and inadequate meanings of the terms Messiah and Son of Man:

> *"This symbol (the Messiah) was applied to Jesus by the early disciples, perhaps at the very beginning of their encounter with him. This was a great paradox. On the one hand it was adequate, because Jesus brings the new being; on the other hand it was inadequate, because many of the connotations of the term "Messiah" go beyond the actual appearance of Jesus.. ..*
>
> The same thing is true of the' 'Son of Man" concept. *On the one hand it is adequate, and perhaps used by Jesus himself, for it points to the divine power present in him to bring the new aeon. On the other hand, it is inadequate because the Son of Man was supposed to appear in power and glory."*[97]

Divine Principle suggests that had John united with Jesus, he could have greatly strengthened the latter's cause and helped to correct mistaken messianic conceptions, especially making inroads in the Pharisee community. Furthermore, the Baptist could have attested to the authority of Jesus and used his influence to create that glory and power which Jesus until the last still expected to be manifested. John and Jesus together could have even rechanneled Zealot enthusiasm into a positive force. The tremendous anticipation of messianic joy and hope that had kept the nation together through bitter trials could have exploded into unequalled spiritual glory had Jews but realized that their Elijah and their Messiah were in their very midst. Such power would have been irresistible, particularly if Jesus had been allowed to live out his natural years!

For *Divine Principle,* this would not be considered far off in the light of how God had been preparing His chosen nation and the central figures in His dispensation of restoration. The realization of such hopes are inherent in the story of those people, their aspirations and their times.

Then, the nation was ripe for the Messiah, ripe for someone to pray "Thy Kingdom *is* coming, Thy Will *is* being done."

> *Scarcely a year went by during this century (67 B.C. to 39 A.D.) without wars or other disturbances; wars, rebellions, outbreaks and riots, and all of them with their concomitant*

96 A. Schweitzer, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God,* Schocken Books, N. Y., 1964, pp. 202-203.
97 Paul Tillich, *A History of Christian Thought,* Simon & Schuster, N.Y., 1967, pp. 14-15.

of incessant bloodshed, and this state of things prevailed in the Land of Israel throughout the whole epoch which preceded Jesus and prevailed also during his lifetime. .. .[98]

In the light of these conditions the vision of the Son of Man's path was etched in his mind:

Jesus, like all those of his own nation who were really in earnest, was profoundly conscious of the great antithesis between the kingdom of God and that kingdom of the world in which he saw the reign of evil and the evil one. This was no mere image or empty idea; it was a truth which he saw and felt most vividly. He was certain, then, that the kingdom of the world must perish and be destroyed. But nothing short of a battle can effect it. With dramatic intensity, battle and victory stand like a picture before his soul, drawn in those large firm lines in which the prophets had seen them. At the close of the drama he sees himself seated at the right hand of the Father, and his disciples on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel; so objective was this picture to him, so completely in harmony with the ideas of his time.[99]

Again, according to *Divine Principle,* the awesome possibility of the dawn of the messianic age in power and glory may well have been more than a possibility. However, on the national level the Messiah was not received and the human conditions necessary to be set by Jesus were not, or could not be met. Without support, Jesus could not hope to lay a foundation for a godly kingdom. For this reason, the international level of restoration, also to be fulfilled through God's chosen one, must rest on conjecture alone. Very quickly after Jesus' death, Christianity moved to the world stage and caught hold as if it too were prepared to receive a Christ. However, on that world stage was a deeply anxious Christianity, waiting for his second advent with an implicit feeling that the first time he had left so much undone and left so much unsaid; the critical moral and theological problem for first generation Christians was thus the delay of the Parousia.

In spite of his untimely death and the ensuing age-long wait for his return in glory "Jesus is something to our world because a mighty stream of spiritual influence has gone forth from him and has penetrated our age also. This fact will never be shaken nor confirmed by an historical knowledge."[100]

And this spiritual power comes through one who was caught in a labyrinth of his own, his fellow Jews' and his nation's making -

The Baptist appears, and cries: 'Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.' Soon after that comes Jesus, and in the knowledge that He is the coming Son of Man lays hold of the wheel of the world to set it moving on that last revolution which is to bring all ordinary history to a close. It refuses to turn, and He throws Himself upon it. Then it does turn, and crushes Him. Instead of bringing in the eschatological conditions, He has destroyed them. The wheel rolls onward, and the mangled body of the one immeasurably great Man, who was strong enough to think of Himself as the spiritual ruler of mankind and to bend history to His purpose, is hanging upon it still.[101]

BIBLIOGRAPHY Ch.3

98 J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth,* Macmillan, N.Y., 1943, p. 167.
99 A. Harnack, *What is Christianity,* Harper Torchbook, N.Y., p. 53.
100 A. Schweitzer, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God,* p. 29.
101 A. Schweitzer, *"Quest of the Historical Jesus",* pp. 368-369.

CONTENTS

Bergeaud, Jean, *Saint John the Baptist,* Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1962.

Bousset, Wilhelm, *Kyrios Christos,* Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1970.

Brandon, S.G.F*., Jesus and the Zealots,* Manchester University Press, England, 1967.

Bultmann, Rudolf, *Theology of the New Testament,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, N. Y., 1951.

Burkill, T.A., *Mysterious Revelation,* Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y., 1963.

Conzelmann, Hans, *Jesus,* Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1973.

Cullmann, Oscar, *The State in the New Testament,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, N.Y., 1956.

Dodd, C.H., *The Founder of Christianity,* Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1970.

Enslin, M., *The Prophet from Nazareth,* McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1961.

Goguel, Maurice, *The Life of Jesus,* George Allen & Unwin, London, 1958.

Grant, Frederick C., *The Gospel of the Kingdom,* Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1940.

Harnack, Adolf, *What is Christianity?,* Harper Torchbook, N.Y., 1957.

Kee, Howard Clark & Young, Franklin W., *Understanding the New Testament,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliff, N.J., 1957.

Klausner, Joseph, *Jesus of Nazareth,* Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1943.

Manson, T.W., *The Servant-Messiah,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1953

Morgan, Robert, in Emst Bammel, ed., *The Trial of Jesus,* S.C.M. Press, London, 1970.

Mowinckel, Sigmund, *He That Cometh,* Abingdon Press, N.Y., 1954.

Phipps, William A., *Was Jesus Married?,* Harper & Row, N.Y., 1970.

Rhode, Joachim, *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1968.

Robinson, James M., *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus,* S.C.M. Press, London, 1959.

Scobie, Charles H.H., *John the Baptist,* Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1964.

Schweitzer, Albert, *Quest of the Historical Jesus,* Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1948.

The Mystery of the Kingdom of God, Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1950.

Tillich, Paul, *A History of Christian Thought,* Simon & Schuster, N.Y., 1968.

CONTENTS

4. CHRISTOLOGY

Much of Christian thought has been devoted to the vexing problem of Christology. Even while Jesus was alive, the question of his true identity was raised by foe and follower alike. For four centuries, his own query "Who do men say that I am?" was debated heatedly within Ecumenical Councils of bishops and theologians - all of whom claimed to be his disciples - yet could not agree how to explain his person. The New Testament as well as the various creeds indicate that the religion of Jesus became a religion about Jesus.

The discussion persists, Christian disagreeing with Christian. For example, in 1965 Methodist theologians gathered at Lincoln College, Oxford to discuss "the finality of Christ". When the conference ended, the British chaplain who led the Bible studies observed:

> *It is clear that we have reached no finality about the finality of Christ; we are still puzzled by the problem with which we came to Oxford.*[102]

This situation is by no means unique to a theological seminar sponsored by the World Methodist Council. Much the same conclusion could be drawn from a meeting of Anglican or Presbyterian, Lutheran or Congregationalist, Baptist or Roman Catholic theologians. In 451 A.D. bishops of the Christian world assembled at Chalcedon to settle once and for all time the questions about Christology which had greatly agitated the Church since New Testament days. What they succeeded in doing was to compose a creed that drove many Christians into open revolt and separation which continued until a few years ago when Nestorian and Monophysite Churches were welcomed as equal brothers in the membership of the World Council of Churches. It would be fair to conclude that Christology has been the most divisive factor in church history from the apostolic age to the present. Christians have broken fellowship with each other more often over the interpretation of the person of Jesus Christ than any other debatable aspect of their religion. The Lordship of Christ originally designed to cement the ties among Christians has more often than not caused what the majority party calls heresy and schism.

Standard textbooks of systematic theology from an earlier day treated Christology in terms of the decisions of Ecumenical Councils on the two natures of Christ and the Trinitarian controversies concerning the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son from whom proceed the Holy Ghost. That is, the main concern of the Christian theologian was to define properly the dual relationship Jesus Christ has: his ties with human beings and his connection with the eternal God. In most cases, however, theology was interested in demonstrating how Jesus the Messiah was unlike us and how he was like God. To a considerable degree, Christology has had for its primary purpose separating the Messiah from mankind and uniting him with Deity.

Beginning with the Reformation, a decisive shift in methodology took place. Whereas the older theologians stressed the person of Jesus Christ, the newer ones emphasized his function in the economy of salvation. Jesus Christ should be understood not by what he was but by what he did. Calvinism in particular brought to the fore the threefold office of Christ as prophet, priest and king Christology became an explanation not only of the metaphysics of the person of Christ but also his messianic mission. In other words, Christ was essentially what he was called upon by God to accomplish. The person and his purpose were brought together.

---

102 Dow Kirkpatrick, ed ,,*The Finality of Christ,* Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1966, p. 205.

THE HUMANITY OF JESUS

According to Professor J. Robert Nelson of Boston University "Christians assert that at a particular point of time, just thirty-three years in the human historical continuum, in a tiny tributary of that vast river of man's earthly existence, in a malodorous cowbarn in a village of small importance, the Master Mind and Maker of this whole dazzling and virtually endless universe became man."[103] That claim resounds in passages in the works of the Church Fathers, sermons by notable preachers and quotations from creeds, liturgies, and hymns of many different denominations throughout the centuries. Even membership in the very inclusive World Council of Churches is based on a credal confession that Jesus Christ is God and Savior. While exceptionally popular, such assertions tend to obscure or deny the historic fact that Jesus was a man like ourselves. Whatever conventional Christian opinion may assume to the contrary, Jesus was not an alien visitor to our planet from the superterrestrial world. He was one of us, a human among humans, flesh of our flesh, blood of our blood.

Professor Bultmann in a famous essay pointed out how the New Testament itself combines myth and history:

> *Jesus Christ is certainly presented as the Son of God, a pre-existent divine being, and therefore to that extent a mythical figure. But he is also a concrete figure of history - Jesus of Nazareth. His life is more than a mythical event, it is a human life which ended in the tragedy of crucifixion.*[104]

Christianity must be demythologized, he argued. By this, he meant, among other things, that the Gnostic myth of a divine redeemer who descends from an upper world of light to save men trapped in this lower world of darkness, which was used even in New Testament times to explain the mission of Jesus, has become meaningless to modern man.

Needless to say, Bultmann's essay aroused a storm of controversy and his ideas were denounced as heretical in an official pastoral letter circulated by the bishops of the United Lutheran Church of Germany in 1952. There is, however, among educated Christian laymen and a sizeable group of theologians, growing recognition that the humanity of Jesus must be reaffirmed in the clearest terms.

Professor Wolfhart Pannenberg, the German theologian, has written:

> *In the contemporary scene it no longer seems particularly remarkable that Jesus was a real man.... If Jesus lived at all, if his existence is not to be counted as a matter of spiritistic mysticism, then he was a man like us. The only question is where the uniqueness of this man in distinction from other men is to be seen.*[105]

Dr. Erik Routley, a Congregationalist clergyman at Oxford, has observed:

> *'Jesus is God!' - should Christians say that? The question is one which professional theologians do not find much difficulty in answering. Their answer must be that no statement of Christian faith produced in the first five centuries as carrying authority does say it.... What did the early Church say? Nothing in the New Testament urged men to say, 'Jesus is God.' 'Jesus is Lord' - yes: that was the church's earliest battle cry. Lord - and Lord alone to be*

103 Dow Kirkpatrick, ed ,,*The Finality of Christ,* Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1966, p. 103.
104 Rudolf Bultmann, *Kerygma and Myth,* Harper Torchbook, N.Y., 1961, p. 34.
105 Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Jesus - God and Man,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1968, p. 189.

sure: but not, precisely, God. The New Testament records large claims made by Jesus; but even His enemies did not, as there recorded, accuse Him of more than making Himself out to be 'equal with God'.[106]

Dr. Nels F.S. Ferre of Andover Newton Seminary declared:

Jesus was just as human as anyone else. If anything, Jesus was not less man but more. He was human the way God means us all to become human. We may even say that in a real sense he was the first fully human .being.[107]

In somewhat similar fashion Dr. Dow Kirkpatrick, a Methodist minister, reminded the delegates at the Oxford conference mentioned earlier:

Man needs to become true man. Jesus Christ is true *man. The finality of Christ is that he is Final Man. He is what every man was meant to be, and what man in his true humanity wants to be.*[108]

Finally, Dr. John A.T. Robinson, Anglican bishop and noted New Testament scholar, publicly ridiculed the conventional viewpoint about the divinity of Jesus by saying:

.. .the traditional supranaturalistic way of describing the Incarnation almost inevitably suggests that Jesus was really God almighty walking about on earth, dressed up as a man. Jesus was not a man born and bred - he was God for a limited period taking part in a charade. He looked like a man, he talked like a man, he felt like a man but underneath he was God dressed up - like Father Christmas. However guardedly it may be stated, the traditional view leaves the impression that God took a space ship and arrived on this planet in the form of a man.[109]

Unification theology teaches that Jesus of Nazareth was fully human because that is the evidence we find in the oldest and most authentic stratum of tradition in the New Testament. None of Jesus' contemporary followers thought of Jesus or treated him as a divine being who had temporarily deigned to visit the earth and dwell among mortal men. To those on the outside and no less to those in his inner circle, Jesus appeared and acted like another human. What set him off from others was not his personality or his nature but his mission. Jesus was different from ordinary men because he had been chosen by God to be the Messiah. Or as Paul phrased his own Christology, Jesus was called by God to do as the second Adam what the first Adam failed to accomplish. Because the first man did not carry out the purpose of creation, another man had to take his place and play his original role. This idea is compatible with Jesus' own description of himself as the Son of Man.

For Unification theology, the essential distinction between Jesus and any other Jew of first century Palestine is derived from his messianic mission. Because he was the ' 'Anointed" of God he towered above his contemporaries in authority and significance. Process theologians sometimes contend that one cannot explain in a rational fashion the two natures of Jesus Christ on the basis of Greek substance philosophy. We would not have this baffling problem if we returned to the historical humanity of Jesus on one hand while at the same time recognizing his divine function or office. Paul Tillich underlines the fact that early

106 Erik Routley, *The Man for Others,* Oxford University Press, N.Y., 1964,pp. 53-54.

107 Nels F.S. Ferre, *Know Your Faith,* Harper & Row, N.Y., 1959, p. 41.
108 Dow Kirkpatrick, *Ibid,* p. 204.
109 John A.T. Robinson, *Honest to God,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1963, p. 66.

Christianity was based on the confession: Jesus is the Christ.[110]

Trinitarian Christian theologians have an incurable weakness for using slippery language in that what they seem to say may not be exactly what they mean. In the case of Christology, for example, they frequently admit the full humanity of Jesus in one paragraph only to deny it in the next. While the humanity of Jesus is being welcomed at the front door, the deity of Christ is allowed to slip in through the back. We see this most clearly in certain theologians' treatment of the beginning and the end of Jesus' ministry. At the beginning they talk about the virgin birth and at the end they insist on his bodily resurrection. Because each of these historic dogmas effectively denies the full humanity of Jesus Christ it becomes necessary to consider them in some detail.[111]

THE VIRGIN BIRTH

Bishop Robinson paraphrased the popular Christian understanding of the virgin birth as' 'Jesus hadn't got a human father, but God took the man's part." Of this he observed:

> *Someone I know recently said to me, genuinely puzzled, 'But Jesus' mother must have been a virgin. If he had had a human father he couldn't have been the Son of God.' But let's be quite clear. This was not the issue for Jesus' followers or for early Christians. They were not convinced he was the Son of God because they knew he hadn't a human father or because of anything that happened when he was born. They were convinced ,, by what they saw in him. He showed them a new kind of living, a new kind of loving, quite out of this world.*[112]

The virgin birth of Jesus is not securely rooted in the New Testament as a whole. Paul knows nothing of such an idea and speaks of Jesus as one born of woman (Gal. 4:4). Since Paul seemed to have a distinct aversion to marriage, had he known of the virgin birth idea he would undoubtedly have used it to good advantage. Similarly, the virgin birth is absent from Mark, our oldest Gospel, and is missing from Q, the early collection of sayings used by Matthew and Luke. Even John, the most recent Gospel, has no reference to this unusual nature of Jesus' conception.

Matthew and Luke alone contain virgin birth stories. These agree only on the general

110 Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology,* University of Chicago, Chicago, 1957, v. II, pp. 97-98.

111 Earlier it was mentioned that primitive Christianity never considered Jesus to be identical with God and Dr. Routley was also quoted to that effect. While this assertion is true of the original disciples of Jesus and Palestinian Christianity, Professor Oscar Cullmann of Basel and the Sorbonne points out that the New Testament does make a few references to Jesus as God (O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1959, pp. 306-314). First it is important to note that Jesus is not called God (theos) in the Synoptic Gospels which represent the closest texts we have to Palestinian Christianity. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus is identified with God in 1:1,20:28 and according to some manuscripts 1:18 (a reading not accepted by the RSV). In I John 5:20 it also looks as though Jesus Christ is called "the true God". In Hebrews 1:8-9, Psalm45 addressed to God is applied to Jesus Christ. Cullmann interprets Rom. 9:5, adoxology, as another pi ace where Jesus Christ is designated as God, but again RSV prefers another reading. II Peter 1:1 refers to "the righteousness of our God and Savior Jesus Christ". In all these cases we must remember that the New Testament itself exhibits the doctrinal changes which took place as soon as Christianity spread outside of Palestine and was interpreted in Hellenistic ways. What Jesus said and was looked quite different when reinterpreted by or for the second generation of Greek-thinking Christians.

112 John A.T. Robinson, *But That I Can't Believe!,* Fontana Books, London, 1967, pp. 11, 24.

thesis that Joseph found Mary pregnant before he had consummated his marriage to her. In details, the two Gospel accounts vary greatly. Professor Martin Dibelius, the celebrated form critic, concludes that Luke has preserved for us an old Aramaic legend about the birth of Jesus in which he is considered to be the literal Son of God because he was fathered by the Divine Spirit. This sort of idea parallels the somewhat common Egyptian notion that the gods customarily practice intercourse only with virgins. Matthew defends the general idea of the virgin birth against an obvious objection by reporting that Joseph learned of the origin of Mary's pregnancy by special revelation. Matthew, however, is probably most interested in the virgin birth because he sees 'in it a fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy (Is. 7:14).

Pannenberg agrees with the Biblical scholars who believe the virgin birth legend probably emerged relatively late in circles of the Hellenistic Jewish Christian community. Others have suggested that the idea is more pagan than Jewish. But why then do we find it in Matthew, the most Jewish of the Gospels? Actually, the belief that divine beings have sexual relations with ordinary women is not totally alien to the Old Testament as we see in a Genesis story (Gen. 6:1-4).

According to Pannenberg, early Christians sought to demonstrate that Jesus was the Son of God from the very origin of his earthly life. It was not enough to say that Jesus was raised to the right hand of God after his death. It was insufficient to maintain that he was anointed the Messiah at his baptism. Jesus should have been at least equal to Samson (Judges 13:5), Jeremiah (Jer. 1:5) and the Servant of the Lord (Is. 49:5) who were called by God from their very birth. According to Luke and Matthew then, Jesus first *became* God's Son through Mary's conception. As Pannenberg indicates, this legend stands in an irreconcilable contradiction to the Christology of the pre-existent Son found in Paul and the Fourth Gospel.

The virgin birth is also connected with the doctrine of original sin. Because original sin is transmitted through the ordinary biological method of reproduction, Jesus was conceived in a miraculous way to keep him untainted by the sin of Adam. This, of course, really denies his full humanity. Perhaps worse, the whole argument is based on an ancient and false vew of the mechanics of human reproduction. The old notion was that the father alone produces the child; all the mother does is carry her husband's child in her womb. But we now know that the mother and father are equally responsible physically for the child they jointly produce. Consequently, even if Jesus were free of the original sin he would ordinarily inherit from his father, he would inevitably inherit the taint of original sin from his mother who is also a child of Adam. Roman Catholics only push the process one step further back into the past by affirming the Immaculate Conception of Mary as well as the virgin birth of Jesus.

The legend of the virgin birth may also be related to the encratic belief that sexual intercourse between a man and a woman is by itself sinful. Many religious groups have asserted that spirituality and chastity belong together. Sex, we are told, dirties the soul. In line with this attitude, Jesus was born from Mary without her ever succumbing to the sinful passion of ordinary human lovemaking. Jesus then was no byproduct of an act of lust. Since some of the Essenes in Palestine during the lifetime of Jesus practiced celibacy, this idea was not totally alien to the Jewish mind. How much it lies behind the creation of the virgin birth legend we have no way of determining.[113]

Once we have explained the legendary character of the virgin birth traditions in

113 Pannenberg's treatment of the virgin birth is to be found in *Jesus-God and Man,* pp. 141-150. He concludes that the item on the virgin birth in the creeds can be justified only because it protects the Church from Docetic and Adoptionist tendencies.

Matthew and Luke, it becomes imperative to replace them with something better. Many liberal Protestants reject the virgin birth myth and assume that as Mary was the natural mother of Jesus so Joseph was his natural father. Even the Gospel of John has Philip call Jesus "the son of Joseph" (1:45).

As attractive as this idea may be, especially as an illustration of the full humanity of Jesus, a different conclusion may better fit the history behind our New Testament traditions. Ethelbert Stauffer points out that when Jesus is called the son of Mary in the Gospels, to a reader in the first century this would mean he was an illegitimate child. If such be the case, the origin of the virgin birth legends becomes crystal clear. They were invented to explain and defend the fact that Joseph was not the real father of Jesus. In fact, in some Graeco-Roman circles, illegitimate children were explained by the assertion that the women involved had been seduced by an amorous god. In Mary's case, an early Jewish explanation was that she had a tryst with a Greek soldier, but this taunt probably did not originate until long after the Christian legend of the virgin birth was in general circulation.

If Joseph was not the father, who was? The New Testament itself is silent on such matters. Perhaps the fact that Joseph still married Mary and accepted Jesus as his legal son would indicate that he knew who the father was, that he was someone close to him or important enough to hush up the affair as quickly as possible. The suggestion has been offered that Zechariah, the priest and husband of Elizabeth, Mary's cousin, might be involved. The New Testament contains no textual evidence for such an idea or against it. Yet the suggestion has an intriguing quality about it. If Jesus were the child of Zechariah, he would bear the physical lineage of the Hebrew priesthood and the legal lineage of the house of David. Thus in one person he would fulfill the national concept of a Messiah who comes to restore the throne and also the common Hebrew dream of a priestly Messiah who would head a new theocracy. As the son of Zechariah, Jesus would become a half brother to John the Baptist producing in effect another Abel-Cain relationship at the very beginning of God's new dispensation. This explanation of Jesus' paternity would also serve to illustrate the traditional Christian comparison between Mary and Eve.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS

Professor Pannenberg in his book on Christology[114] makes several important points concerning the resurrection of Jesus. For the earliest disciples, the resurrection of Jesus was seen as part of the general apocalyptic hope. Only for the second generation of New Testament writers was it a special event which happened to Jesus alone. Originally the rising of Jesus from the grave was considered the beginning of the imminent universal resurrection of the dead. For the disciples if Jesus had been raised, then the end of the world had begun and the Last Days had arrived; he was the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep, the first born from the dead. The connection that once existed between the event of the first Easter and the expectation of the eschatological Day of the Lord is often overlooked.

Secondly, Professor Pannenberg sharply distinguishes the resurrection of Jesus from the resuscitation of a corpse. The daughter of Jairus, the young man from Nain, and Lazarus only temporarily returned to this life from the dead. Jesus' resurrection involves the concept of a transformation radically different from all life with which we are familiar.

114 Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Jesus - God and Man,* pp. 53-114.

According to this modern German theologian, the Easter traditions are of two types: those about appearances of the risen Christ and those about the empty grave. We should limit our concern, he says, to the Pauline account of the resurrection appearances. For those in the Gospels not mentioned by St. Paul "have such a strongly legendary character that one can scarcely find a historical kernel of their own in them." Even those in the Gospels corresponding to Paul's statements "are heavily colored by legendary elements, particularly by the tendency toward underlining the corporeality of the appearance."[115]

Pannenberg emphasizes that the Pauline report in I Corinthians, chapter 15 was very close to the actual events themselves. That is, the appearances were not freely invented in the course of later legendary development. Paul himself on the Damascus Road saw a "spiritual body" rather than a person with an earthly body. He presumes that what he experienced was like that imparted to the other apostles. His vision and theirs involved extraordinary appearances not perceived by all present. These in turn could be related to recent studies in parapsychology which suggest the possibility of visionary experiences that are more than subjective projections, and indeed manifest extrasubjective reality. However, Pannenberg becomes very cautious, probably too much so, at this point. We could compare the visions of Jesus by the disciples with other visions of him reported by the Christian saints or the similar visions of the Blessed Mother Mary occuring at Guadalupe, Lourdes and Fatima.

Next Pannenberg considers the Gospel accounts of the empty tomb. St. Paul nowhere mentions this report but Pannenberg feels that within the Jerusalem community there had to have been reliable testimony about the fact of an empty grave. He agrees with those who argue that the resurrection could not have been maintained for a single day in Jerusalem if all concerned had not agreed that the tomb was indeed found empty. He adds that Jewish polemic against Christianity never tried to deny that the grave was found empty, though that would have greatly strengthened their case.

Other possibilities have been mentioned, even though Pannenberg does not find any of them convincing. Jesus could have been buried as a criminal in any tomb that happened to be empty or in a mass grave without anyone having taken the trouble to inform Jesus' followers of its location. Or the tomb could have been broken into by grave robbers which were plentiful at that particular time. In any case there is general scholarly agreement that the empty grave in Jerusalem was far from Galilee where the first appearances of the risen Christ took place. We have two separate traditions.

Pannenberg doubts the historicity of the Gospel accounts of the resurrection appearances because they underline the corporeality of the risen Jesus. The logic of the Gospels seems to be that Jesus could appear in Galilee because he left his grave to travel there and remained in Palestine until his physical ascension into heaven forty days after Easter. If we believe in a spiritual immortality rather than a resurrection of the flesh, it would seem to be easier to treat the empty tomb as ah early Christian legend. Many scholars therefore follow Bultmann in denying the historicity of the empty grave stories.

Actually the Marburg New Testament critic goes much farther. He and his disciples deny that the resurrection of Jesus in itself can be called an historical event. Historical research cannot establish the actual facticity of the resurrection. All the New Testament scholar can affirm is the faith of the early Church. Christians like Paul and the authors of the Synoptic Gospels themselves regarded the resurrection as an event in time and space. The most the Biblical critic can conclude is that men believed they had seen Jesus alive after his

115 Pannenberg, *Ibid,* p. 89.

death.

Bultmann himself states quite flatly: "An historical fact which involves a resurrection from the dead is utterly inconceivable."[116] As he argues, the Easter event is an event of faith. It is not what happened to Jesus but what happened to his disciples that is important. The resurrection texts are only vehicles of a new self-understanding on the part of the first Christians and expressions ofthe faith of the original Palestinian community.[117]

Several very different questions are involved and one must carefully separate them. First, one has to look at the New Testa-ment accounts and judge their reliability as historical sources. This alone is a very complicated task requiring every help which the New Testament scholar can give us. The average layman lumps all the resurrection stories together and accepts or rejects them in toto. The careful student on the contrary may distinguish, for example, between what Paul says from the narratives in the Fourth Gospel, accepting the former and rejecting the literal historicity of the latter. Secondly, one must seek to discover the fundamental theological or Christological meaning behind the stories. What doctrinal purpose does the resurrection text serve to illustrate? Thirdly, one must try to understand in contemporary language what the New Testament authors were trying to convey. And lastly, ; but most importantly, we must decide the value the Easter faith has for us now.

Believing that the resurrection of Jesus was a spiritual one, *Divine Principle* is primarily interested in the final problem, an explanation of the significance of the resurrection for the contemporary Christian. How do we explain for ourselves what happened after Jesus was nailed to the cross?

In the conflict of good and evil which constitutes human history as we know it, Satan used the failure of John the Baptist, the betrayal of Judas Iscariot, the faithlessness of the disciples, the cowardice of Pilate and the narrowmindedness of the Pharisees to send Jesus to the cross. Satan, by exercising his power over men, crucified Jesus. God, in turn, by exercising His authority, raised Jesus from the dead. As the cross had been a triumph for Satan, Easter represented an even greater victory for God. From this time on Satan was on the defensive and God took the offensive. In the New Testament, this theory is stated quite symbolically. Jesus laid a foundation for his ministry by his forty day period of fasting and inner struggle in the Judean wilderness. The crucifixion effectively negates Jesus' messianic ministry on earth. Satan had removed him from the scene. From a purely historical perspective, the mission of Jesus was cut short by his death on the cross.

St. Luke alone among the Evangelists refers to a second forty day period which pre-pared for the witness of the later Church. In that length of time, surely intended as a symbolic figure, between the resurrection and the ascension, the risen Christ laid a new foundation by training his disciples for an important mission on their own. To put this idea in more technical theological language, God initiated a new dispensation based on the purely spiritual authority of Jesus. By uniting with Jesus who was no longer physically present with them, Christians could become the Body of Christ, his hands, his feet, his members. In the mind of the author of the Third Gospel and the book of Acts, salvation history *(Heilgeschichte)* goes from the first Advent to the Second Advent, from the Nativity to the Parousia.

---

116 R. Bultmann, *Kerygma and Myth,* p. 39.

117 For a summary of this debate in German theological circles see Carl E. Braaten, *History andHermeneutics,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1966, pp. 78-102. A defense of Bultmann's general position by an American Methodist theologian can be found in Carl Michaelson, *The Hinge of History,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, N.Y., 1959, chapter VIII.

LOGOS AND SOPHIA

The Fourth Gospel opens with a long poem or hymn about the Word of God (Logos) which the author adapts to explain his particular understanding of the nature of Jesus' work and office. The Logos idea comes from a Hellenistic mystical tradition and was employed by Philo of Alexandria in his unique synthesis of Platonic philosophy and Mosaic religion. Out of an analogous cultural milieu came the Christian Platonism of Clement and Origen. A further similarity in language and spirit is seen in the mystical higher paganism of the Egyptian Hermetic literature. C.H. Dodd uses these facts to provide the background for his commentary on the Fourth Gospel. Bultmann on the other hand prefers to relate the Johannine literature to the Gnostic philosophy derived from Iran. Others emphasize the homogeneity between the book of John and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

According to the prologue to the Fourth Gospel, the Word was with God from the beginning and was the means by which He produced the creation. As the Greeks saw it, the Word served as a mediator between the ideal and the actual. It provided a necessary bridge between the invisible world of spirit and the visible world of flesh. Augustine reports that all this is pure Platonism until we come to the uniquely Christian assertion that the Logos became flesh in Jesus of Nazareth and dwelt among us.

As Unification theology points out, the Fourth Gospel does not necessarily mean that Jesus, the man of Nazareth, was a pre-existent divine being who came to an alien material world for a brief visit. Rather, it indicates that the Word, Godlsjdea of man, was in the divine mind from the beginning. The Logos was God's plan for creation.

To understand another part of the teaching of *Divine Principle* in relationship to traditional Christian theology it may be useful to refer to a second Greek concept: Sophia. In Greek, Logos is the masculine term for Word and Sophia is its feminine counterpart, usually translated Wisdom. The Wisdom poems of the book of Proverbs provide the major canonical source for an understanding of Sophia (chapters 8 and 9). These in turn are said to have been originally derived from the cult literature of the Egyptian goddess Isis. Whatever the source, for Hebrew thought the Holy Spirit was commonly considered feminine rather than masculine. According to Unification theology, the eternal plan or idea of God for mankind involved both a masculine and feminine aspect. In the mind of God there always subsisted an eternal Adam and an eternal Eve. Since God and all things created by him have polarity, the Word must also have polarity. Perhaps to distinguish between the masculine and feminine aspects of the divine plan for creation we can speak of the eternal Logos and the eternal Sophia. Adam and Eve, the first human pair created by God, were intended to be incarnations of the divine Word. Adam was designed to be a physical manifestation of the Logos and Eve, his counterpart, an embodiment of the Sophia.

In the theology of *the Divine Principle,* God created one man, Adam, for whom He made a woman, Eve. Because of the Fall, they failed to fulfill the purpose for which they were created. God must, then, restore one man in Adam's position and, through him, a woman to take the place of Eve. Adam and Eve were to marry with God's blessing when they reached spiritual and physical maturity, thus becoming perfected Parents of a mankind wholly centered on God. So far Unification theology somewhat parallels common Biblical and Christian thought.

CONTENTS

Divine Principle goes on to emphasize an aspect of the New Testament teachings of Jesus largely overlooked in conventional Christian theology. More than once, Jesus referred to himself as the Bridegroom (Mark 2:19, Matt. 22:2-3, 25:1). Unification theology uses the concept of the divine Bridegroom and divine Bride as the key to its anthropology and soteriology, its doctrine of man and doctrine of salvation.

If Jesus, the incarnation of the Logos, had found his proper mate, he and his Bride would have become the true Parents of a new family of God in accordance with the divine purpose of creation. Why Jesus did not marry is one of the unfathomable puzzles of the New Testament history. From the Biblical record we gain not the slightest hint as to the reason he remained a bachelor.

After the crucifixion and in spite of it, the spiritual mission of Jesus continued. God used the masculine Logos previously incarnate in Jesus with the feminine Sophia to carry on His work of restoring mankind on the spiritual level. According to *Divine Principle,* the Holy Spirit works with the risen Christ in Eve's place.[118] Making restitution for Eve's part in the Fall, the Holy Spirit inspires and comforts the human heart leading us back to God. Through the give and take of love, the eternal Christ and the Holy Spirit give spiritual rebirth to all those who unite with them.

THE TRINITY

Although the Trinitarian controversy of the fourth century and the Christological controversy of the fifth can easily be separated, they should be viewed as two chapters in a single storyHealing with how Christians explained the relationship between the human Jesus and the eternal God. In this same sense, the Ecumenical Council of Nicea in 325 A.D. and that at Chalcedon in 451 really involved the same problem from different angles. That Father, Son and Holy Spirit are equal yet distinct persons in one divine substance and that Jesus Christ possesses two natures in a single person are highly complicated concepts from Greek philosophy to explain that the man of Nazareth was not just an ordinary man but one carrying out a divine mission. For some reason it seemed too simple to say that as Messiah, Jesus had answered God's call.

Three factors should be taken into account in order to set the stage for consideration of this basic issue. First, the brief statement that Jesus was the Christ rather quickly lost most of its meaning when the Christians took their religion out of Palestine into the wider Graeco-Roman world. Even in Jerusalem, people like Caiaphas and Pilate could think that being the Christ meant simply posing as a pretender to the long-vacant throne of David. Who in Ephesus or Corinth, Galatia or Gaul could care about a religion whose founder was merely king of the Jews? The messianic hope in its most restricted political and nationalistic form could have no attraction once Christianity severed its Palestinian roots. In the Graeco-Roman world, the Church was literally forced to find a new terminology to make its basic religious message understandable. Within the New Testament the careful reader can easily note the struggle to discover a new Christian vocabulary.

The non-Jewish world had a highly sophisticated metaphysical world view derived from

118 Elksai, the leader of a group of Jewish Christians during the reign of the Emperor Trajan, claimed his revelation came from two celestial beings, a masculineSon of God and a feminine Holy Spirit. J. Danielou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity,* Regnery, Chicago, 1964, p. 65.

Plato and his interpreters, a theology of the pagan Mystery religions based on the myth of a dying and a risen god[119] as well as the moral philosophy known as Stoicism. Consequently it was natural and almost inevitable for Christians to reinterpret their original faith along these lines. St. Paul himself attempted just such a theological reconstruction, though his efforts were but a prelude for what would follow. Hellenization then, began in the New Testament.

Secondly, the desire of the Church for a reasonable and convincing explanation of its doctrines about God and Christ was reinforced by the purely political concern of the Roman Empire for ideological unity. Constantine himself had become a Christian sympathizer and a patron of the new faith because he thought of the Church as a stabilizing and cohesive power in Roman civilization. Preeminent in his mind was the desire to have one faith for one world. To preserve political unity he sought ecclesiastical uniformity. When the acrimonious debate between Arius and Athanasius over the person of Christ threatened the internal peace of the Empire, he summoned the bishops to a meeting at Nicea to calm ecclesiastical passions. For him and in most cases, for his successors, the Ecumenical Council and an agreed-upon statement of belief were methods employed to end disruptive ecclesiastical bickering. This non-theological aspect of Christological and Trinitarian development should never be minimized.

Thirdly, theology must be viewed in the light of the uncritical devotion of the Christian masses. Theology is more than an adventure of ideas alone. It represents a rationalization of what people feel as a result of worship. Theology grows out of liturgy. When men hear Jesus, listen to his teachings and follow him as disciples they will have a very different attitude about him than when they pray to him or sing hymns about him. For the first century, Jesus was a man who commanded the loyalty of his followers. For the Christians of the fourth century he was the cult object of a very elaborate ritualistic Church. A theology based on the leadership of Jesus was replaced by one built on praising him. Even the Patriarch of Constantinople, like Nestorius, was unable to correct popular piety with the logic of a sound theology. When he protested that Mary was not the Mother of God (Theotokos - God bearer) but only the mother of Christ, he soon found himself denounced as a heretic even though reason was on his side. He was condemned and deposed because against him ranged the full force of popular Christian devotion. To quote the ancient Latin formula,"Lex orandi, lex credendi": the law of prayer is the law of belief. When Christianity sang hymns to Christ as a god, and this was reported to the emperor by the younger Pliny, it was virtually inevitable that soon the creed would define him as a god.

On the basis of a modern history of Christian dogma, for example, that prepared by the Latin American Professor Justo L. Gonzalez, one can view the transformation of Jesus who was the Messiah (Christ) into Jesus, the Son of God consubstantial and co-equal with the Father.[120] As we have suggested earlier, identifying Jesus as the incarnation of the Logos was the first big step in that direction. This claim, made first by the Fourth Gospel, was thoroughly worked out by Origen of Alexandria. In fact, as a result of his careful and consistent systematization of this thesis, the weakness of Logos Christology became apparent and Origen's followers were excommunicated as heretics.

Origen started with the common faith of his time that God can be described as Father, Son and Holy Spirit even if the divine nature is much higher than anything our intelligence

119 Samuel Angus, *Mystery Religions and Christianity,* Scribners, 1925; R. Bultmann, *Primitive Christianity,* Meridian Books, N.Y., 1956, pp. 156-161.

120 Justo L. Gonzalez, *A History of Christian Thought,* Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1970, v. I.

can conceive. The divine essence is beyond any definition man can frame. In agreement with the popular opinion, the learned Alexandrine Biblical scholar asserted that the Son was the same substance as the Father, co-eternal and co-equal. The Son proceeds from the Father much as an act of will proceeds from the understanding.

What then is the difference between the Father and the Son? According to Origen, the Father is the absolute transcendent God. The Son is the intermediary between the unspeakable One and the multiplicity of the world. In other words, the Son is the Logos, the bridge between the finite and the infinite. The Son, as the New Testament asserts, is the image of God, His name, His face. To use Origen's metaphor, God the Father is a statue of such immense dimensions that it is too big for man to see, so the Son is a small enough replica that it is comprehensible to the beholder. Or to quote another remark by Origen, Father and Son are two Gods who are one in power. While he takes care to assert the unity of Father and Son, he subordinates the latter to the former. Origen's disciples may have gone even further in making the Son somewhat inferior or less divine than the Father. At least so the enemies of Origen charged.

Origen was as famous a Biblical exegete as he was a theologian. His interest in scriptural interpretation stimulated the birth and growth of Biblical studies at Antioch. Lucian, founder of the school of Antioch, dropped Origen's allegorical exegesis and insisted that Biblical study concentrate on the literal meaning of the New Testament text. Arius was a product of the School of Antioch and in many ways could be called a left-wing Origenist.

Arius was a priest in Alexandria who carried the subordinationist ideas of Origen to their logical conclusion. He too began his theology with the concept of the Logos but he did so on the basis of the most absolute monotheism. Christ, he maintained, is not an emanation from God or part of the substance of God or of a similar nature as God. The Son is not God but the first creature made by Him. Although the Patriarch of Alexandria was also a disciple of Origen he felt Arius had gone much too far and convened a synod which deposed him. Arius promptly moved to Nicomedia where he was reinstated by his friend, Bishop Eusebius. Worried by the effects of an ecclesiastical row, the Emperor Constantine sponsored the Council of Nicea which declared Arianism heretical.

Bishop Eusebius was in charge of the diocese where Constantine had his summer palace. Once he got back from exile, he launched an attack on his anti-Arian foes. He persuaded the Emperor to command the Patriarch of Alexandria to restore Arius to communion, an act frustrated by Arius' death before the order could be carried out. Eusebius next moved against the Patriarch of Antioch whom he caused to be deposed for adultery, tyranny and heresy. Athanasius, the foremost defender of Nicea, was likewise condemned by a synod of bishops at Tyre directed by Eusebius.

Another leading Nicean, the Bishop of Ancyra, was denounced and banished as a result of a synod held in Constantinople. To add insult to injury to his enemies, Bishop Eusebius was the prelate chosen to officiate at the deathbed baptism of Emperor Constantine and under Constantius, the new ruler, became Patriarch of Constantinople.

Any reliable church history can be consulted for details concerning the final triumph of Athanasius and denunciation of Arianism at the Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D. Constantine had insisted that the equality of the Son and the Father be put into the Nicean Creed. Perhaps at the suggestion of Bishop Hosius of Cordova in Spain, the Emperor's theological expert, the Nicean Creed employed the word*Homoousion* - ' 'of one substance". As the debate persisted for more than a half century after the Nicean Council, some bishops

coined a compromise word *Homoiousion* - "of like substance". But the original word remained in the creed. After more than fifty years of theological controversy and ecclesiastical politics of the most disreputable sort on both sides had rent the Church from top to bottom, the disputants were back where Nicea had started out in the first place. Though there were still various ways to interpret it, the orthodox Christian conclusion was that the Son of God is co-equal, coeternal and consubstantial with the Father.

Many readers of church history feel uneasy about what took place in the age of the Fathers and the final results of Nicea and Chalcedon. Some contrast the simple appeal of the New Testament Gospels and the exceedingly complicated metaphysical distinctions mdde by the Patristic theologians. Others blame the Church for ever getting enmeshed in the subtleties of Greek philosophy. Not a few are critical of the way Christians concentrated on creeds rather than conduct. In an age of theological reconstruction and innovation like our own, Nicea and Chalcedon look like mosscovered gravestones over a very dead past.

Unification theology returns to the Biblical view that the Messiah is supposed to restore man to the position God intended for him before the Fall. When one starts with that ideal, most of Christian Trinitarian and Christological speculation looks like an unnecessary as well as unfortunate detour. If the essential work of the Messiah is to become the second Adam, subjugating Satan and restoring the position of Eve in order to lay the foundation for a new family of God, then trying to work out the relationships between Father, Son and Holy Spirit within the reality of the Godhead misses the point completely. Instead of looking at Jesus' role as the Messiah and second Adam, traditional Christology largely abandoned his historical position as a human being in order to emphasize his allegedly supernatural status: as a virgin's son who was miraculously resuscitated from the grave three days after his crucifixion. Once this mistaken direction became entrenched, Trinitarian speculation virtually exhausted the energy and ingenuity of the Church Fathers.

Of course, in one sense there is a trinity formed by the restored Adam and Eve centered on God and completely united with Him; but such a practical trinity based on the fulfillment of the purpose of creation has nothing in common with the dogma of the three hypostases in one ousia. By expending so much of its time and talent on such intricate definitions of the Deity, wondering how Christ could be "very God of very God", the ancient Church ignored the practical import of the central petition of Jesus' prayer, ' 'Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

THE ATONEMENT RECONSIDERED

In traditional formulations of Christological dogma there is usually an explanation of the Atonement. Ever since St. Paul's day, Christians have concentrated on the saving significance of the cross. As many have indicated, the early Church shifted its attention from the life of Jesus to his death. In the Apostles' Creed, an elaboration of an ancient Roman baptismal pledge, there is nothing said of the teaching and ministry of Jesus. Between the mention of his birth from the Virgin Mary and his suffering at the hands of Pontius Pilate, the creed contains only a comma. The essence of the Christian religion seems to be the single claim that Christ died for our sins.

Several historical factors can be mentioned to explain the change from a this-worldly hope for the kingdom of God to an other-worldly longing for heaven. Perhaps most important

was the widespread ' 'failure of nerve" which poisoned the atmosphere of the Hellenistic world. Then there was the conscious transformation of the original Jewish-Christian message into a Mystery religion theology which claimed that Jesus was the dying and risen Lord who offered men the medicine of immortality through mystical and sacramental union with him. Not least significant, of course, was the gradual recognition on the part of Christians that Jesus had not brought about the kingdom in the physical form envisioned by the eschatologically-oriented apostolic age. Since the kingdom had ' not come on earth, attention was shifted to the purely spiritual benefits which Christ might bestow upon individuals as they prepared themselves for the after-life.

Judaism knew nothing of a suffering, rejected and crucified Messiah. As Paul openly admitted, such an idea was a scandal and a stumbling block. Some scholars like T. W. Manson feel that Jesus himself combined the ordinary concept of the Messiah with Deutero-Isaiah's interpretation of the nation of Israel as the Suffer- ing Servant of God. However, this novel synthesis was not attemp- ted until Jesus had encountered serious opposition and his ministry seemed doomed to almost certain failure. As the Gospels plainly show, the disciples themselves could not believe that their Messiah must suffer and be rejected.

Once the attention of Christians became focused on the cross it was to be expected that they would adopt a variety of views by which the crucifixion was made to look like the work of Providence and an act of enormous benefit to the believer. Within the context of temple Judaism, for example, it was possible to interpret the death of the Christ as the sacrifice of the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. Another view, equally primitive, claimed that the cruel death inflicted on Jesus was the ransom God had to pay the Devil to purchase the release of a captive humanity. Yet another opinion was that Jesus became the voluntary substitute who restored God's offended sense of honor by suffering the punishment rightfully required of the race of Adam for their disobedience, rebellion, concupiscence and criminality. Since none of,these doctrines of the Atonement has been found convincing to all Christians, to say nothing of non-churchmen, an alternative explanation has been offered in which the cross is seen as the ultimate expression of how far divine love will go to show its concern for a prodigal humanity. According to this moral theory of the Atonement, God loves us so much that to bring us back to Him He is even willing to send His Son to die on the cross or, as another version of the same interpretation puts it, God cares for us so deeply that to restore us to Him, He Himself suffers the agony of the crucifixion.

It would be unfair to dismiss such Atonement doctrines without first recognizing the cultural, psychological and moral impact they have made on countless individuals and the general course of western civilization. Born in an age permeated by a failure of nerve, Atonement theories have reinforced a mystical and monastic escape from the world, as well as provided a religious underpinning for a general philosophy of world negation - one which seemed very realistic as the Roman Empire fell and European man entered the Dark Ages. Psychologically such doctrines undoubtedly assuaged the guilt complexes of a St. Paul, an Augustine, a young Luther and a Soren Kierkegaard by projecting them on a cosmic screen and making them the'key to redemption. There is little doubt that the pulpit message, Christ died for our sins, has given comfort to large numbers of distraught individuals who might otherwise have found it difficult to keep what Tillich terms "the courage to be". By preaching an evangelistic theology, the Wesley brothers, it has been said, turned frustrated British factory hands from social revolution to personal religion and saved industrial England from a bloody French-like Reign of Terror. And further, a rather crude and literalistic theology of the saving blood of Christ has been employed by some sects to console and often redeem social

derelicts and the despised outcasts of urban civilization.

In spite of all such extenuating circumstances, many have found Atonement doctrines and theologies of shed blood unjustifiable. First, they depart from the original interpretation of the messianic role. Second, a philosophy of world negation upon which they are founded represents a denial of the original purpose of creation. Third, they divert Christian efforts from the establishment of a true world-wide family of God so imperative in our time. By rediscovering the authentic meaning of messiahship Unification theology attempts to provide a Christian impetus for a much- needed "life affirmation", as our world prepares for a new social order, occasioned by the meeting of East and West in our global village.

CHRISTOLOGY: A NEW BEGINNING

Having commented at some length on the traditional Christological and Trinitarian formulas, let us briefly explain Unification Christology. At many points the following interpretation may seem to depart rather widely from well-known views handed down from the past. Nearly everyone is agreed, however, that Christianity must reinterpret its message in the light of intellectual and cultural changes going on all about us. When certain theologians like Thomas J. Altizer of Emory University shocked everybody by announcing that God died in our century, they meant in part that the old theology had become complete irrelevant for modern man. Something different, something new, is required if the Christian religion is to make a positive contribution toward a new, more progressive civilization.

To begin, *Divine Principle* rejects the notion that Jesus was God Himself. Patristic Christianity was right to condemn Docetic, Patripassionist and Modalistic Monarchian views that Jesus was God and not man. The Synoptic Gospels contain an early Palestin- ian stratum of tradition which makes the complete humanity of the historic Jesus quite plain. Jesus was in appearance no different from other men. Even his brothers failed to see anything unusual about him. In fact, one of them, James, did not join the Christian movement until after the crucifixion. Because of his very human qualities, Jesus was tempted in the wilderness by Satan. According to the earliest Gospels, he often retired to a lonely spot to pray because, as a man, he needed strength from God to continue his exhausting ministry. Like anyone else, he was hungry and sleepy at times. More than once the Evangelists tell us, he broke down and wept. Jesus also became disheartened by the opposition he encountered from the Pharisees and the disbelief of his fellow-countrymen even in his hometown of Nazareth. He was filled with distress when his inner circle betrayed, denied and then abandoned him to his fate. For proof that Jesus was thoroughly human, consider his agony in the Garden of Gethsemane and his lonely cry from the cross, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?"

Athanasius of Alexandria correctly argued that Jesus could be of help to us and could be our Savior only if he were one of us in every respect. Unification Christology maintains that if Jesus were not subject as a human being to the temptations Satan puts in front of us, he could not be in a position to overcome them and liberate mankind from Satanic domination. If Jesus were not human, his life, his teachings, and his example would be irrelevant.

If God in human flesh or a divine visitor Himself were to save mankind, he would have come a lot sooner. Besides, if it could have been done, man would be an eternally valueless being of creation and could certainly never be entitled to exercise dominion over it. If a great scholar does all the paperwork for his son, then the son will be inept in that area all his life.

When the Messiah is called, God can only help him to function in his role; but he, as a man, must use his own reasoning, will power, and intuition.

Traditional Christianity makes much of the complete sinlessness of Jesus. If he were morally flawless it was only because he never allowed himself to transgress God's moral law. He dedicated himself totally to the divine will. In this sense Albrecht Ritschl was right to think of Jesus as not one with God in essence but harmonious with Him in will. So was Paul of Samosata, Patriarch of Antioch, deposed in 268 A.D. for saying that Jesus and the Word were united only spiritually and that the Logos dwelt in Jesus as in a temple.

By his calling and work alone was Jesus set apart from his contemporaries, therefore his morality and capability are not unreachable. As Adam and Eve were to form the original trinity with God, Jesus in attaining perfection would have paved the way for all of mankind to receive the same blessing. The book of Revelation therefore intimates a final marriage of the Lamb (19:7-9), True Adam with True Eve, which *Divine Principle* envisions as the feasible hope for a new beginning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY Ch.4

Angus, Samuel, *Mystery Religions and Christianity,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, N.Y., 1925

Braaten, Carl E., *History and Hermeneutics,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1966

Bultmann, Rudolf, *Kerygma and Myth,* Harper Torchbook, New York, 1961

Primitive Christianity, Meridian Books, New York, 1956

Cullmann, Oscar, *The Christology of the New Testament,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1959

Danielou, Jean, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity,* Regnery, Chicago, 1964.

Ferre, Nels F.S., *Know Your Faith,* Harper & Row, New York, 1959.

Gonzalez, Justo L., *A History of Christian Thought,* Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1970, vol. I

Kirkpatrick, Dow, ed., *The Finality of Christ,* Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1966

Michaelson, Carl, *The Hinge of History,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1959

Pannenberg, Wolfhart, *Jesus - God and Man,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1968

Robinson, John A.T., *But That 1 Can't Believe,* Fontana Books, London, 1967. *Honest to God,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1963

Routley, Erik, *The Man for Others,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1964

Tillich, Paul, *Systematic Theology,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1957, vol. II.

CONTENTS

5. PREDESTINATION

Unlike Substance, hypostasis, Trinity and persona, non-biblical terms used by historic Christian theology to describe the nature of God, the scriptures clearly use the word predestination to explain the relationship of God and man. Borrowing from Paul and Augustine, John Calvin became the foremost Protestant expositor of predestination and bequeathed a system based on it to subsequent generations. Many have felt that this idea of predestination provides the core of Calvinist theology. Everything else revolves around it: the meaning of providence, the sovereignty of God, divine election and the divine majesty.

In contrast to other Christian theologians who made predestination an adjunct to their systems, Calvin focused upon it as a key , to everything else. Augustine, for example, was literally forced into his extreme position on this subject during a long and drawn out controversy with the British monk Pelagius and his disciples. Calvin, however, started where the North African bishop left off and assumed that the Augustinian explanation was the only scriptural one. The Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches held Augustine in high esteem but never accepted his conclusions in toto. Beginning with Arminius, a Dutch theologian from Leiden, Protestants too started to question the Calvinist position. Most Anglicans, in spite of a Calvinist orientation to the Thirtynine Articles, sided with Arminius rather than the Genevan Reformer. All Methodists took a stand with the Dutch theologian except for the minority who followed Whitefield and the Countess of Huntington. Congregationalists remained Calvinists until they were influenced by the evangelistic theology of Charles G. Finney or went Modernist after the decline of the Edwardian school. Even some Presbyterians once solidly in the Genevan camp now prefer to tone down the doctrine of predestination and are at best semi-Calvinists. In general one may say that Calvin failed to convert the Church at large to his view and has far fewer ardent disciples now than he did in 1600, 1700 or 1800.

The Genevan theologian made his position crystal clear, as one can see by examining the relevant sections of *The Institutes of the Christian Religion.*[121] He frankly admitted that divine election and predestination give rise to difficult questions; nothing seems more unreasonable than some men being predestined by God to salvation and the rest to destruction. Calvin puts emphasis on the absolute freedom of God. Because God is free to do as He pleases, He can save some and damn others.

Calvin refuses to accept the common argument that God predestines the fate of every individual because He knows beforehand that certain men will turn out to be good and the rest will prefer evil. The omnipotence of God is not dependent on His omniscience. In His knowledge all things are present; although from our standpoint they occurred in the past or will take place in the future. But God's eternal plan for each individual is founded on His gratuitous mercy, totally irrespective of human merit. He foreordains some to eternal life and the remainder to eternal damnation, yet not because He knows His adopted children will deserve His grace while the non-elect will be inclined to wickedness. Any consideration of merit is precluded because the choice was made before the foundation of the world.

121 A convenient abridgment of Calvin's view on predestination can be found in Hugh T. Kerr, *A Compend of the Institutes of the Christian Religion,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1964, pp. 127-140, 147-150.

CONTENTS

When some complain that God has no right to be angry with His creatures before they have provoked Him with actual offenses, Calvin asserts that God does not act with the caprice of a tyrant but rather like a fair judge. The will of God is the highest rule of justice. Everything He wills must be considered just for the very reason that He wills it. However, the reason of divine justice is too exalted to be measured by any human standard.

How can man be blamed for the faults rendered inevitable by the act of his predestination? If God created man to do whatever he later does, he ought not to be judged guilty for things he cannot avoid. Calvin replies to this objection that all things are at God's disposal to do with as He alone sees fit. Evil men cannot avoid the necessity of sinning but God's actions are guided by an indubitably certain equity unknown to us. Man's misery is derived from himself not from God. What this last assertion means in light of the absolute providence of God one has no way of knowing.

Calvin denies that God is any respecter of persons. Man by himself has nothing to attract the favor of God. His selection of one man and rejection of another proceeds solely from divine mercy. God may freely display and exert His grace wherever and whenever He pleases. In a famous sentence the Genevan theologian declares, "But when we come to election, we see mercy on every side. .. ,"[122]

Does not predestination undercut moral striving? Why worry about doing good or evil if one's destiny is already determined before the foundation of the world? Calvin and his followers have been noted for their zeal for civic righteousness and personal rectitude. In fact, Puritanism was a decidedly Calvinist movement which made major contributions to representative government, social reform and the creation of the bourgeois ethic. The Genevan theologian himself merely argued that the end proposed by divine election is our diligent performance of virtuous actions. Since the object of election is holiness of life, it should awaken and stimulate us to a cheerful practice of righteous conduct. Because we believe we are the chosen of God, we will act like it.

Calvin also opposes the common notion that man is a cooperator with God. This he feels, implies that the validity of God's election depends on the consent of man. To think so makes the will of man superior to the counsel of God. One would ordinar- ily doubt the logic of Calvin's conclusion. Why must a partnership between God and man suggest that the junior partner is superior to the senior? Calvin probably means that if man is free to accept or reject divine election, he has the power to frustrate the intent of God. That is, if man has any part, however small, in the fulfillment of the divine program the freedom, authority and omnipotence of God is limited. Any such idea would horrify the Genevan theologian.

Calvin intended his theology to comfort and strengthen Christian believers. On the other hand, however, if he were certain that God predestined some to eternal salvation, he was equally sure that others were predestined for eternal damnation. No one can avoid the inevitable working out of the divine decree, however much he might pray or do good. This notion of reprobation, it has been claimed, troubled Calvin right up to his death. Nevertheless, logic and scripture pushed him to the most extreme form of the double predestination doctrine:

> *Now as no description can equal the severity of the Divine vengeance on the reprobate, their anguish and torment are figuratively represented to us under corporeal images; as.. .gnashing of teeth.... For there can be no doubt but that, by such modes of expression,*

122 Kerr, *Ibid,* p. 135 (Institutes III, 24:1).

the Holy Spirit intended to confound all our faculties with horror.. . ,[123]

Calvin's Institutes provided a systematic theology for Protestants of the Reformation period and later was of enormous power and influence. It is interesting to see what a theologian like Paul Tillich, for example, thinks of it now. Unlike many earlier commentators, Tillich contends that the doctrine of predestination is not the main point of Calvinism. As he points out, predestination was not even developed in the first edition of *The Institutes*. For Tillich the central doctrine of Calvinist Christianity was the majesty of God. According to Tillich, Calvin provides apremature warning against the deist view of God. Deism wants to keep God at a proper distance from us. Calvin's God is continually involved in the world. Everything depends upon Him in the most literal and thorough-going sense.

For Tillich, Calvin thought of predestination as providence applied to mankind's ultimate aim. If we carry our belief in providence to its logical conclusion we end up with a doctrine of predestination. If we think that God is really in control of the universe, we must sooner or later confess that He is in control in every way. There is no half way point. In this sense Tillich points out that those who oppose predestination views are adherents of a moralistic interpretation of Christianity rather than a religious one. For this reason, Isaiah, Paul, Augustine and Luther believe in predestination.[124] Tillich even adds Jesus to the list, though many would find that questionable.

Tillich also argues that predestination is based on a certain type of empirical evidence. There is a selective instead of an equalitarian principle operative in human experience. In the most literal manner many may be called but few are chosen. However, double predestination bothers Tillich: for him if something is created by divine love it cannot be eternally condemned.[125] Calvin had remarkably little to say about the love of God; divine glory seems to be his primary concern. When Calvin does speak of God's love it is limited to His feeling for the elect; there is no universal love in Calvin's doctrine of God.

ARMINIUS AND THE REMONSTRANTS

John Calvin won many adherents to his cause in the Netherlands, in part because of the logic by which he silenced opponents, in part because his moral earnestness appealed to the powerful burgher and bourgeois class. The Dutch Reformed Church became and has remained a stronghold for Calvinist theology. But the nation also had a vital mystical tradition and a rational bent which inevitably produced a reaction against Calvinism when it became authoritarian and somewhat rigid. It was not surprising therefore when Jacob Arminius, a professor of theology at the University of Leiden, raised serious objections to the Genevan doctrine of predestination. Out of this protest was born the Remonstrant Brotherhood, a small fellowship of ministers and churches whose influence has always been far greater than the number of its members might indicate.

Arminius and his followers considered supralapsarian and infralapsarian interpretations of predestination but rejected both. The supralapsarians argued that from all eternity God

123 Calvin, *Institutes,* III, xxv, 12.

124 Does Tillich really mean that to believe in predestination makes one more religious than to believe in free will? Such a conclusion flies in the face of the facts of Christian history. Was George Whitefield more religious than the Wesleys? Are the Calvinistic Baptists less moralistic than the Freewill Baptists?

125 Paul Tillich, *A History of Christian Thought,* Simon & Schuster, N.Y., 1972, pp. 262-275.

decreed the election of some and reprobation of the rest, but His decision was in no way determined by the Fall of man. Infralapsarians agreed that predestination was decided upon from all eternity but that God made His decision because He knew the Fall of Adam would take place. The former was a way of insisting with Calvin that God acted freely and was in no manner influenced by the question of human merit. To make God's plan conditioned by the future deeds of men would limit His sovereign freedom and deny His absolute majesty. The latter opinion tried to protect the morality of God by providing an ethical rationale for predestination. He acted in the light of Adam's rebellion and sin which He knew would occur.

Arminius and the Remonstrants refused to accept either the supralapsarian doctrine or its infralapsarian variation. For them, divine decree refers solely to the overall plan of God. It does not predict the fate of any individual. God decided that man would be saved through faith in Christ. In any specific case, a man determines his own destiny by whether he allies himself with Christ or rejects him. Such a view preserves both God's final control over creation and man's free will in regard to his eternal future, the Arminians contended.

On another issue the Calvinists and the Leiden professor disagreed. Consistent Calvinists held that since God from all eternity had chosen His elect, Christ lived and died for them alone. What could Christ possibly do for the non-elect whose damnation had been made certain by eternal decree? Christ died for sinners, it is true, but only those whom God had freely predestined for heavenly bliss. Arminians argued that Christ died for all men even though each individual must decide for himself to accept or refuse salvation. Forgiveness guaranteed by the redemptive act of Christ became effective when one became of his own free will a believer.

At a third point the orthodox Calvinists maintained the absolute authority of God by claiming that a man could not refuse the free gift of salvation if it were offered to him. To do so would frustrate the divine will. Man cannot oppose God so he cannot reject election as one of God's chosen. Arminians naturally complained that this would make man a puppet rather than a human being.

Finally, can a man chosen by God ever lose the divine grace by which he is guaranteed eternal salvation? Naturally, the Calvinists insisted that one could not fall from grace. As he could not deny the gift God offered, once accepted it could not be thrown away. Once saved, forever saved. Arminians hedged a little, asking for time to study the matter in light of scripture. Tentatively, they were inclined to believe that a man could fall from grace. Any other conclusion would be a denial of man's power of selfdetermination.[126]

When the Calvinists were unable to persuade the Arminians by quoting scripture and appealing to logic, they resorted to more effective methods. The Synod of Dort was convened in 1618 for the sole purpose of silencing the Remonstrant dissidents. Jan van Oldenbarneveldt, a statesman favoring Arminius, was beheaded and Hugo Grotius, the famous jurist, was condemned to life imprisonment (partly, it is true, on political grounds). Ordinary Remonstrants were banished until 1625 and their brotherhood was not legalized until 1795. Inside Holland Arminian views were limited to a small minority. In Great Britain they were championed by Archbishop Laud and later even more openly by the Wesleys.[127]

In her book defending the Reformed doctrine of predestination, Professor Loraine Boettner of Pikerville College carefully listed the objections commonly urged against it:

126 J. Dillenberger & C. Welch, *Protestant Christianity,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, N.Y., 1954, pp. 90-94.

127 W. Walker, *A History of the Christian Church,* (revised edition), Chas. Scribner's Sons, N.Y., 1959, pp. 399-401.

1. That it is fatalistic,
2. It is inconsistent with man's free will and moral responsibility,
3. God becomes the Author of sin,
4. Predestination discourages all motives to exertion,
5. God is unjustly partial,
6. Predestination is unfavorable to morality,
7. It precludes a sincere offer of the Gospel to the non-elect,
8. It contradicts the universalistic passages in the Bible.[128]

Arminians raised each of these points but were outvoted at the Synod of Dort.

VARIOUS MODERN OPINIONS

Because of its doctrine of predestination and its concept of the arbitrary authority of God, Calvinism has obtained a very mixed reception during the past three centuries. While some have praised its consistent respect for the overwhelming majesty of God, probably a far greater number have revolted against its ultrapessimistic estimate of human nature, its implied denial of human freedom and its virtual abandonment of the ultimate grounds for ethical endeavor. All of these charges have been questioned and are often dismissed as unfair. Nevertheless the charges persist, continue to plague defenders of Calvinism in general and discredit the notion of predestination in particular. As Dr. George A. Gordon, the Boston theologian and pastor of Old South Church, exclaimed, "If Calvin is right, his God is our devil."[129]

Eastern Orthodox Christianity from the beginning had its doubts about the adequacy of Augustinianism, especially such controversial features as double predestination. When Pelagius ran into trouble in the Western Church he went East where he received the protection of Patriarch John of Jerusalem. In a similar situation a follower of Pelagius found an understanding friend in the eminent theologian, Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia.

If one really believes in Incarnational theology, as the Orthodox Churches have, human nature is glorified rather than being defamed in the fashion of Augustine or the Genevan Reformer. Hence, it is not surprising to read in one of the books of Nicolai Berdyaev, "Calvin's horrible doctrine has the great merit of being a reductio ad absurdum."[130]

Berdyaev believed that Calvin began with false presuppositions, thus demonstrating the religious inadequacy of Christian orthodoxy by extending them to their logical absurdity. This points to the end of a theology of monarchic monotheism and a recognition of tragedy within the divine life. Calvin's absolute monarch concept of God must be replaced with the God of sacrificial love.[131]

Karl Barth has long been regarded as the father of Neo-orthodox theology and the foremost modern representative of neo-Reformation thought. The unwary might therefore assume that he does little more than refurbish the main ideas of Luther and Calvin. Nothing

128 L. Boettner, *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination,* Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1932.

129 Gordon, a well-known Congregational theologian, summed up his thought in *Ultimate Conceptions of Faith,* Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1903.

130 N. Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man,* Harper Torchbook, N.Y., 1960, p. 24.

131 Berdyaev, *Ibid,* pp. 23-35.

could be further from the truth.

According to the Basle theologian, predestination primarily means that God freely and graciously decided before the creation to unite Himself with man in the person of Christ and through him with all the people he represents. God elected Himself to fellowship with man and elected (predestined) man to fellowship with Him. From all eternity He is the Electing God. God does not simply predestine mankind. More importantly He predestines Himself. God resolved once and for all to determine Himself in Christ for sinful man and sinful man for Himself. In the overflow of His love and freedom of His grace, He determined to be gracious toward man even though man would rebel against Him.

Barth complains that Calvin concentrated on the election of individuals in his doctrine of predestination whereas he should have focused his thought on the first concern of God which is the divine election of Christ. He is the Chosen. Others are elected in him, through him and because of him. In Christ the real meaning of God's election is revealed. Christ represents the eternal resolve of God to fellowship with man. In him, God's faithful covenant-partner, man can fulfill God's eternal plan.

Creation has for Barth the indelible character of the divine blessing. Evil therefore should not be conceived of as a power which has an independent existence. Barth coined the term *das Nichtige* (the Nihil) to express the ultimate powerlessness of evil. Since God can only create what is in conformity with His own nature, evil is the non-real. It can be called "the impossible possibility" because even if it exists it is excluded from the divine wbrk of-creation. Christ represents God's fore-ordained triumph over *das Nichtige.* Barth accepts the dreadful reality of evil, but insists that it is ontologically impossible.

God tolerates *das Nichtige* temporarily, we are told, to safeguard man's autonomy and freedom. Man must respond voluntarily to God's grace. This inevitably entails the risk of main's falling away from God. Salvation comes to a humanity situated at the very edge of an abyss. On the basis of such an interpretation of human nature and divine grace Barth assures us that we can escape from the false pessimism of Schopenhauer and the erroneous optimism of Leibnitz.[132]

In America, the intellectual and moral repudiation of Calvinism began in the middle of the 18th century. Before that time in the Congregational Churches of New England and the Presbyterian Churches further south, Calvinism was taught in the colleges and preached from the pulpits. The Unitarian movement in the Boston area spread among the ministerial graduates of Harvard provoking civil war in the Congregational Churches and finally resulted in open schism. Unitarians did not try to hide their opposition to Calvinism and all it stood for. From within the Baptist Churches Universalism was born and it too was anti-Calvinist on principle. By the middle of the last century the Congregationalists as a whole had lost their enthusiasm for Calvin and by 1900 were openly denouncing him.

Quite typical of clerical opinion in the big city churches were the views of Dr. Washington Gladden of First Congregational Church in Columbus, Ohio. In a book published in 1899 he explained that the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation was no longer palatable to educated Christians of any denomination. Modern theology, he claimed, is based on the righteousness and love of God - not upon His, sovereignty. Whereas the central idea of Augustine and Calvin is force, the central idea of modern theology is righteousness. The fundamental explanation of everything is now God's character rather than His will. The old

132 Herbert Hartwell, *The Theology of Karl Barth,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1964, pp. 105-112.

unmoral theology has been replaced by a moral one, Gladden declared.

The Congregationalist theologian stabbed the predestinationist at the weakest point in his armor: the damnation of infants. Why hesitate to speak of this quite openly? he asked sarcastically. It is of the very substance of election doctrine that every non-elect individual is damned from earliest infancy. There was never for one moment the slightest possibility for him to escape eternal doom. The most merciful thing that could possibly happen would be to send him straight to hell from his mother's arms. The sooner he is removed from our world the lighter will be the burden of his everlasting torment. The longer the child lives the more he sins and the more terrible his punishment. The non-elect sent to hell as infants are therefore the most mercifully treated of all the damned.

According to Gladden,

> *The whole grim, ghastly, appalling fabrication is built upon a deification of will. The central element of personality, men said, is the will. God's will must then be the foundation of theology. Take the principle of will, make it omnipotent and absolute, subordinate to it every other element of character, then deduce your theology from that principle, and you will have the Augustinian Calvinism.*[133]

Summarizing what is wrong with the doctrine of predestination, the Ohio pastor wrote,

> *The greatest fact in the creation of God is a fact of which this old philosophy never gained any adequate conception - it is the creation of a free human personality... . Having endowed man with freedom, God respects the work of his hands - let me rather say the offspring of his love; force is forever laid aside in appeals to his personality. The claims of reason, the impulses of affection, the dictates of righteousness, are the only powers that can rightly control his action. He is made for virtue, and there is no virtue where there is constraint. The kind of compulsion which the irresistible grace of the old theology assumed is a moral absurdity.*[134]

Calvin would have a difficult task today if he tried to gain approval of his predestination views in a general assembly of the World Council of Churches, but the debate continues between the Genevan preacher and the Leiden professor. The doctrine of election is far from a dead issue in contemporary theology even if the Calvinist formulation of it has been driven from some of its former fortresses of churchly power. Albert Einstein once remarked, "God always plays with loaded dice." Calvinism represents one of the most impressive elucidations of the epigram when infused with religious power and argued with consistent logic.

As recent as 1960 Professor Berkouwer of Amsterdam, an exceedingly learned theologian, published a book-length explication and defense of the doctrine of election which deviated not the slightest from Calvin and the 17th century Synod of Dort. He vigorously protests against willful and unintentional caricatures of Calvinism made by friends as well as foes. He admits predestination is a hard doctrine, but he holds that it is found in scripture. He points out that for Paul, Augustine and Calvin predestination was considered a comforting belief illustrating the gracious mercy of God toward His elect, and that it need not necessarily lead to fatalism, anxiety or immorality. But neither should it turn election into a reason for

133 W. Gladden, *How Much is Left of the Old Doctrines?,* Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1899, p. 213.

134 W. Gladden, *Ibid,* p. 217. Cf. the remark of George A. Gordon, "Predestination expresses the relation of the Absolute will to the universe and to mankind. But the Absolute will is absolute in goodness.... The derivation from this will of absolute goodness of two decrees, one of salvation for a certain portion of mankind, and another of reprobation for the rest of the human race, is a supreme instance of bad logic." Op. cit., p. 126.

pride or pretentiousness.[135]

DIVINE PROMISE AND HUMAN DESTINY

All Christian theologians, whatever their major or minor differences, agree that God is good and His purpose of creation is beneficial to man. In other words, the basic structure of the universe is neither hostile to human aspirations nor merely neutral in regard to human happiness. Unification theology therefore concludes with Berdyaev, Gladden, Barth and others that God never predestines anyone to fall from grace or perish or be eternally damned. What God preordains is His final plan for the restoration of mankind. He is determined to fulfill the purpose of creation; we are assured that His programme will be carried out. In this sense, God's sovereignty will be finally exercised in His world. The universe as a whole has a teleological character and history is filled with purposiveness. Predestination applies to the overall plan of God. It reflects His grand strategy.

To manifest this, God chooses and calls specific individuals. They become His elect, chosen to fulfill missions related to the dispensation of restoration. They are no longer persons preoccupied with their private search for happiness; through the process of divine election they become instruments of destiny. Moses, Isaiah, Jesus are illustrations of men so called.

However, we should not think of them as superhuman. They are men like ourselves. To designate them for a specific mission, God takes into account their ancestral background, their spiritual heritage, their intrinsic character and their potential. Further, He considers their heredity and environment before summoning them. Those He calls are equipped to be of value to Him. And as they fulfill their designated missions, He justifies and glorifies them.

The doctrine of election refers to such special instruments of the divine purpose. It is not intended to apply to man en masse or every individual. While God is interested in everybody because all men are created to be His children, He is particularly concerned with those who can play a direct role in the plan of restoration, and open the way for others. The doctrine of election was originally designed £o highlight this fact.

God calls a man to work with Him. The responsibility for carrying out the task of restoration, we might say, is divided between them. Each depends on the other, requires the other. Man and God must serve as working partners, according to *Divine Principle.* Only when man fully cooperates with God can His will be completely manifested.

God may call someone and the individual fail to do his part. Both Old Testament and New provide examples of men who did not succeed in their mission. Faithless leaders stain the record of Israel. John the Baptist, Judas and the high priest Caiaphas failed to support Jesus as they should have. However God cannot manipulate men, as men manipulate machines. They must voluntarily direct their will. For instance, in Paul's case it was not the spectacular call of God but Paul's wholehearted response which brought the success of the Gentile mission in the Mediterranean world.

Unification theology stresses the importance of human cooperation with God, whereas Calvinism prefers to overlook its significance completely. Calvinism implies that everything depends upon God. That is far from the case. If it were so would not a loving God have already restored this evil and suffering world? Without man's full cooperation the completion

135 G.C. Berkouwer, *Divine Election,* Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1960.

of His progamme is delayed, He is greatly frustrated, and His heart is greatly saddened.

This fact applies equally to the Israel originally chosen for a leadership position in God's plan of restoration and to the Christian Church chosen to act as the vanguard in their place, after the rejection of Jesus. Israel was called by God to carry out a specific mission; when the nation failed to fulfill that intention, the Christian spiritual nation was selected to take its place. If the Church does not live up to its responsibilities, its power will also wane and another instrument be employed in the realization of God's unalterable purpose of creation. In effect, Unification theology proclaims both a message of comfort and a strong warning. God is determined to regain His sovereignty but He is not tied down to any specific human instruments by which to accomplish it. The overall plan has not changed and will not; the details vary in accordance with the response obtained from God's chosen.

THE LAW OF RESTITUTION

We turn now to a consideration of the law of restitution or indemnity by which followers of the dispensational figure play their important roles. The words restitution and indemnity are borrowed from the world of business yet provide useful analogies to explain the law guiding spiritual development. Indemnity refers to protection or exemption from damage one has done. Restitution involves paying an equivalent for any loss. Descriptive of aspects of religious growth and maturation, they serve to explain the meaning of a single spiritual law. In restoration we must square our accounts with God and free ourselves from Satan.

From God man has received his very life; to Him he owes obedience and loyalty. But as a result of the Fall man has carelessly tossed aside his birthright; thus he needs to re-earn the privilege to fellowship and communion with God, restoring himself to his original state.

God does not and cannot forgive man unconditionally. The Fall of Adam and Eve was not an insignificant slight that could be easily overlooked and casually forgiven. It is therefore not enough simply for man to desire to return to God from the domain of Satan. Like the prodigal son of Jesus' parable, we must make our way painfully and step by step from the far country to our Father's house. Only when we get within sight of our birthplace will our Father run to meet us. Until then He can never be sure we really mean what we say. We are required to demonstrate by our will and actions that we truly intend to return to Him.

Unconditional forgiveness conflicts with the justice of God. However, because God is a God of love, He willingly makes concessions which result in man' s compensating for only a fraction of his total debt. When man fulfills this condition, his whole debt is discharged. Then he is acknowledged by God as though he had not sinned at all.

The law of indemnity operates like a case of bankruptcy. Imagine that you owe someone a large sum but all you can scrape together is a token amount. Your creditor accepts what you have and forgives the balance. God's action is somewhat analagous. If we pay only five per cent of our actual debt to God He will wipe out the rest - the ninety-five per cent. However, the pittance man can pay is all he has. The five per cent in God's eyes is one hundred per cent for man. Clearing up his debt to God requires man's utmost devotion and whole-hearted commitment.

Because of the Fall and subsequent sins throughout history, Satan claims man as his own. From Eden to the present day, man has been in bondage to evil. Willingly and

unwillingly, we are subjected to Satan. From the beginning he has dominated humanity, its civilization and its very soul. As Paul wrote, and Dostoievski and others graphically described, the whole creation groans for release.

Satan, however, is not so generous as God. He overlooks nothing, forgives nothing, writes off nothing. He demands one hundred per cent payment. Since man voluntarily sold himself into bondage to Satan, Satan expects total obedience, total loyalty, total submission. To buy freedom from him one must be willing to pay the full price. If it is not paid willingly, Satan exacts it in the form of pain, fear, anxiety, doubt, depression and sickness. Diverse and subtle are the methods by which he attempts to retain his servants.

In the Pharisaic Judaism of the first century it was customary to think of prayer, fasting and alms-giving as religious obligations. In his Sermon on the Mount Jesus criticized the debasement of these practices but did not really deny their usefulness and efficacy. For *Divine Principle,* personal and corporate prayer are enjoined as indispensable means by which man can call upon God, commune with Him and be inspired by Him. Fasting is likewise an exceedingly beneficial practice by which one pays indemnity and can be freed from Satanic bondage. Fasting helps to subjugate our bodies to the control of our mind. Since the realm of the flesh is an important part of the domain of Satan, by denial of its power one can be released from his rule. Therefore, for the purpose of spiritual freedom fasting has been held in high esteem among people of many religions, Occidental, Oriental, ancient, and modern. Like all religious practices it is subject to abuse and must be practiced with care, however.

As we have stated earlier, God offers us forgiveness by fulfilling certain conditions which involve only partial payment of our debt to Him. In this sense one can speak of God's graciousness and mercy. Nevertheless, for Unification theology, the restoration vertically between man and God should not be confused with the need for horizontal restitution between men. Injustices by man to another must be paid for, either on earth or in the spirit world to come. We must reconcile ourselves to those who may have suffered at our hands or to others in like circumstances.

Those who mistreat or harm others in any way will find themselves in the position of being themselves hurt if they fail to make amends. As the ancient Mosaic Law insisted, justice means an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. If men arrive in the spirit world with debts unpaid and sins unforgiven, they will perhaps have to assist the very ones they have hurt in order to atone for their faults. Since payment in the after-life is much more difficult, it behooves us to meet our obligations while we are yet in the flesh.

Earlier in this chapter Tillich was quoted to the effect that Calvin recognized that life itself seems to be guided by a selective rather than an egalitarian principle. For some happiness comes almost effortlessly. Everything cooperates to favor them. For others life is an uphill struggle with happiness at last crowning years of battle against unbelievable odds. And for not a few, whatever they do and however hard they labor, existence virtually begins and ends in disappointment and heartbreak. Jesus used a parable of the sower and the seed to illustrate how some reap thirty, sixty or a hundred fold from their planting. In that story he ignored those who sow good seed and harvest nothing but weeds. Nevertheless, such cases are far from rare. Why? we ask. *Divine Principle* does not try to whitewash the human predicament. According to its teaching, man does not live and labor for himself alone. He is part of a family which stretches far back into the past; he sows and reaps in conjunction with his ancestors. In effect, they labor with him, for him, also against him. If the sun always shines on his endeavors, a man may be blessed by the labor of those who preceded him.

Similarly, if the work of living seems to be cursed by frustration and defeat, a man could be paying for the indolence and mismanagement of his forebears. An individual is affected by what others have accomplished or failed to do. God's plan of universal restoration is helped or hindered by the record of past generations; God's justice is not revealed in the moment or in the individual, but in the overall scheme and course.

Such an interpretation of human existence helps to explain both success and failure. On one hand it keeps man from boasting of his own good fortune because in fact he is benefited by the strenuous efforts of his ancestors. On the other hand it may keep a man from sinking into helpless resignation and hopeless despair. He is carrying the burden of previous generations. If we are singularly blessed, perhaps it is because we stand on the shoulders of our forefathers. If we find ourselves consigned to a deep pit from which there appears to be no escape despite our greatest exertion, we may be working for the release of others earning their eternal gratitude.

According to Unification theology, God is the Father of all mankind and every person without exception bears His image. Because of this He loves mankind and therefore cannot forsake any of His children. When American theologians were debating the worth of Calvinism in the first quarter of the last century, Unitarians maintained that man was too good to be simply dismissed as a depraved sinner in the hands of an angry God, as Jonathan Edwards had argued. Universalists examined the problem from a different angle and insisted that God was too loving to damn anyone He had created. Whether one begins with a recognition of the dignity of human nature or the goodness of God, he ends up with a denial of the doctrine of eternal reprobation. To believe in everlasting damnation is really to deny that God's original purpose of creation can be fulfilled. Either God made an irremediable mistake in creating man or man can permanently frustrate the divine will. Both positions run counter to the basic intent of Christian teaching.

Divine Principle denies the double predestination doctrine because God will ultimately embrace all of His children. If God is to triumph completely He must restore His entire creation and even win the rebellious Satan to His side.

For Unification theology each individual is precious in God's eyes; He has infinite individual images, each of which can only come to expression by that man or woman's perfection. As a man fulfills his own purpose for existence he opens a unique dimension and enriches God's happiness. Each person therefore has a gift which he alone can make to the restoration of the whole creation.

Beside Unification theology, Universalists in the 19th century and Jehovah's Witnesses in our time are among those who have argued that if the scriptures are read properly one can see that the doctrine of an eternal hell to which the non-elect are consigned by divine decree is a non-Biblical notion. From the sermons of Reverend Hosea Ballou to the addresses of Pastor Russell one learns that hell is a pagan idea totally contrary to the Christian faith in a God of immeasurable love. Others have pointed out that the Hebrews did not get the idea of everlasting punishment from God but borrowed it from Persian Zoroastrianism when they were in Babylonian exile. If so, hell is not necessarily part of divine revelation.[136]

Bishop John A.T. Robinson writes that our error results when heaven and hell are objectivized as a description of the final condition of the universe. What is of eternal importance becomes what is of everlasting duration. For the English churchman this turns the

136 In contemporary theology the doctrine of hell has been attacked by Berdyaev and the hope of universal restoration considered a genuine possibility by Barth.

profoundest truth into the final lie. As two everlasting co-existent realities side by side, heaven and hell portray the most terrible defeat for the love of God. God's love must finally win and none can make hell their final home. In God's universe there must ultimately be no heaven which tolerates an eternal chamber of horrors. Everlasting reprobation would make a final mockery of the divine nature and that cannot be.[137]

This would be the *Divine Principle* position. God is intensely anxious to restore man. Therefore, at any time in history when God can work, His central figures are characterized by His sense of urgency, His sincere desire to hasten the day when His preordained ideal is actualized among men.

BIBLIOGRAPHY Ch. 5

Berdyaev, Nicolai, *The Destiny of Man,* Harper Torchbook, New York, 1960.

Berkouwer, G.C., *Divine Election,* Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1960.

Boettner, L., *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination,* Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1932.

Dillenberger, J. & Welch, C., *Protestant Christianity,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1954.

Gladden, Washington, *How Much is Left of the Old Doctrines?,* Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1899.

Gordon, George A., *Ultimate Conceptions of Faith,* Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1903.

Hartwell, Herbert, *The Theology of Karl Barth,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1964.

Kerr, Hugh T*A Compend of the Institutes of the Christian Religion,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1964.

Robinson, J.A.T., *In the End, God,* Harper & Row, New York, 1968.

Tillich, Paul, *A History of Christian Thought,* Simon & Schuster, New York, 1972.

Walker, W., *A History of the Christian Church* (revised edition), Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1959.

137 J.A.T. Robinson, *In the End, God,* Harper & Row, N.Y., 1968, pp. 132-133.

CONTENTS

6. ETHICS AND VALUE

STANDARD OF VALUE

Contemporary observers of morality agree that the modern age is experiencing a most serious crisis. Some trace this erosion of ethics back to World War I, which bled Western Europe white and occasioned the downfall of the traditional social order in Russia, Turkey, Germany, and Austria. Others feel that one should go back even further to the French Revolution, which sowed seeds of revolt harvested only in contemporary times. Still others maintain that the communist takeover in Russia is the landmark event altering the course of human history. Whatever the cause or causes, the overriding fact is that without exception every feature of traditional morality has come under fire. To describe this the Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset coined the phrase' 'The Revolt of the Masses" and Nicolai Berdyaev defined it as "The End of the Age."

One can gauge the extent of the crisis by the widespread repudiation of traditional moral standards in recent books on ethics. Michael Novak, a popular Roman Catholic author, for example, declares that we must be prepared to start our search for the good life with "the experience of nothingness":[138]

> *Many Americans, old and young, have seen too much, and absorbed too much pain to go on believing in mirages. Life is much more terrifying than easy hope pretends. . . . We know well the experience of nothingness, the contours of compromise and illusion, the masks of security.... Facile and illusory American hope has no power over us. Our hope is an acceptance of despair.*

Here a serious Roman Catholic declares that the only secure ethical base is an experience of nothingness. For Novak, however, this is not a negative experience: by the rejection of obligations and guides, are we not free at last to reshape our destiny? Are we not, with our ability to question and the imperative for personal choice, propelled into reconstructing our social order and emerging with a rebirth of freedom, honesty and courage?

Jean Paul Sartre and Albert Camus similarly accepted this experience of nothingness and likewise found in it a call to authentic living. In their eyes there is no obligation to be ethically indifferent, and consequently morality becomes a matter of creative inventiveness rather than obedience and obligation.

Ayn Rand, who sought refuge from the Soviet Union in the West, complains in her essays and novels that the world has descended to an ever-lower rung of hell, because our moralists think of ethics as a purely subjective issue, a matter of arbitrary postulates, emotional commitments and irrational whims. She argues that man has no automatic set of values, code of survival or course of action, yet she rejects vigorously any collectivist ethical system. For her the notion that right is based on the choice of the masses is at once a negation of all moral principles and a sanction for "mob" rule, legalized "lynching" and "wholesale looting" for the sake of the "moochers". Vigorously she advocates the "virtue of selfishness" without the by-products of false altruism - guilt and cynicism: guilt, because people dare not reject it openly; cynicism because selflessness proves futile to practice. She believes that the

138 M. Novak, *The Experience of Nothingness,* Harper Colophon Book, N.Y., 1970, preface, VII.

whole world would be better off under a system of laissez-faire capitalism, in which rationalism is the fundamental virtue and productivity the central purpose of man's life; that is, our highest moral goal is our rational self-interest and the achievement of personal happiness.[139]

GOOD AND EVIL

From the point of view of social institutions, we quickly recognize the relativity of good and evil; that observation is reinforced by a study of anthropology: being a good Zuni is very different from being a good Zulu.

In contemporary thought, due to the devastating abuses of the trust put by citizens in their leaders, particularly in the notorious totalitarian regimes of our time, moral relativism is confronted by the thrust of situation ethics, which says: thou shalt not steal *ordinarily,* thou shalt not lie *ordinarily,* thou shalt not commit adultery *ordinarily.* In this theory, we cannot rely on infallible and unchangeable standards because everything depends on the actual situation in which a person must make a decision. Therefore, freedom is required for specific responsible decisions. There are no inherent moral universals, and no abstract conception of goodness that overrides the rights of the individual in any concrete situation. Thus in situation ethics, the Mosaic, Protestant and Roman Catholic Scriptural Law are all regarded as inflexible legalisms.

For the Christian, this means adopting a more liberal attitude in revolt against Victorianism and embracing the "revolutionary" morality of today. An exponent of this ethic, Professor Joseph Fletcher of the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, maintains that the love commandment is a principle that does not tell us how to apply it. Thus, in a concrete way, good must be considered whatever helps; evil is considered whatever hurts.[140]

Though the standard of good and evil in the viewpoint of Unification theology is not based on situation ethics, it does recognize the necessity for a transitional stage between the dissolution of irrational allegiance and the adoption of new truth that will go beyond the existing religious, ethical and socio-political philosophies and come to grips with the problems facing humanity. However, in a time of transition, pure goodness is frequently impossible to determine and exceedingly difficult to practice. But the original inspiration of fading institutions and their inherent spiritual laws are by no means set aside. For *Divine Principle,* God is the author of the law of cause and effect; this law is as inexorable as any law of physics. Those who sow goodness have absolute assurance that it will be reaped. Thus God is a God of Justice. By His standard good and evil are determined.

Therefore, just as the definition of good and evil actions is not merely confined to the articles of situation ethics, neither is it necessarily determined by the majority of the people. The voice of the people does not necessarily represent the will of God. Often ethical progress depends on a minority of farsighted and deeply sensitive crusaders who go beyond their time. God works through central figures and not by any abstract class will.

For *Divine Principle* then, that which helps an individual fulfill the purpose of creation

139 Ayn Rand, *The Virtue of Selfishness,* New American Library, N.Y., 1961.
140 For a rather thorough discussion of this approach, pro and con, see Harvey Cox, editor, *The Situation Ethics Debate,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1968.

is good. That which goes in the opposite direction is evil. Though civil laws are good in a relative sense to the degree that they protect the innocent and restrain the evil, theocentric individuals will always go beyond their minimal obligations.

This shift in moral standards of our time is described by the long-time American Marxist scholar Howard Selsam. Capitalism, he admits, was once an advanced system for carrying on the production and distribution of the needs and luxuries of life; however, the ethics of the future can no longer be found in the class morality of those who have a stake in the capitalist social order. With increasing knowledge of human economic relations and worthwhile social institutions built upon them, he avows that socialists alone point to a new society; this is made possible by the public ownership of the land and the instruments of production. Socialism's goals are:

(1)raise the material and cultural level of all the people;

(2) increase collective mankind's ability to bring his economic, political and social relations under intelligent control;

(3) provide more fully and continually for the development of the sciences and their utilization for human good than could any previous form of society; and

(4) be able to formulate and achieve through the utilization of all the sciences and arts higher standards of human life and ideals of what it can and should be.[141]

According to Selsam, traditional morality has lost its hold over the modern world because it reflects the ideology of a preda- tory class society; socialism by contrast has as its long range goal the abolition of all exploitation. The socialist is practical rather than merely idealistic, mass-oriented rather than individualistic, scientific instead of religious, progressive rather than conservative. For Selsam he is set apart from the Judeo-Christian ethic in general and its present bourgeois form in particular:

The distinctive contribution of Marxism to ethical theory and the great moral issues of our time lies in its teaching that the key to world progress toward peace and freedom and a good life for all is not to be found in mere ideas of what is good, and right, and ought to be, but in the actual needs, hopes and desires of the great masses of people... . These people want for themselves only what they know it is possible for all to have - self-determination, mastery of their own re- sources, freedom to achieve higher material and cultural well-being.[142]

For Marxists, the establishment of socialist societies in Russia and China, the end of British and French colonialism, the revolutionary aspirations of Latin Americans, Africans and other Third World peoples, and the thwarted imperialism of American capitalists are signs that the traditional ethic has become outmoded. As for religious morality, its vision of saving souls for heaven must be discarded to allow for creation of a better life on earth.

One type of morality that Marxists would discard, but which many are not so willing to give up, is Confucianism, the traditional philosophy of pre-Maoist China. Lin Yutang explains that Confucianism built its moral system around common human truths of the family; thus, good society flows naturally from good breeding. He quotes Confucius, "A great man feels he is serving God when he serves his parents, and feels he is serving his parents when he serves God."[143]

---

141 H. Selsam, *Ethics and Progress,* International Publishers, N.Y., 1965, p. 31.
142 H. Selsam, *Ibid,* p. 66.
143 Lin Yutang, *From Pagan to Christian,* Avon Book, N.Y., 1959, p. 85.

CONTENTS

If at home one learns to be a good child, a good son or daughter, and a good brother or sister all other values will be added as a matter of course. "Li", the fundamental principle of propriety in society, established the proper status of rulers and the ruled, parents and children, husband and wife, elders and juniors, friend and friend.

When husbands and wives are dutiful, parents and children are affectionate towards each other, and leaders manifest proper discipline, all else follows; when these three relationships are right, everything becomes right. If "Li" is observed, society can be restored from even a condition of disgraceful confusion.

After the Russian Revolution of 1917, Christian ethics was often put in the awkward position of protecting the status quo - a status quo seemingly very unjust. For many Christians, however, their God is not bound up with the success of a specific social order; as the Hebrew God survived the Assyrian conquest and the Babylonian captivity, their God was not silenced by the guns of Verdun or the dethroning of the Czar.

In the view of Unification theology, there was a vacuum created. Those disillusioned with either the status quo (and Christianity's identification with it) or the idea best promulgated by Barth - that of the wholly "otherness" of God - were caught in the wake of moral frustration. Therefore, a new affirmative standard of value which will absorb the essence of past tradition as well as respond effectively to the needs of twentieth century man must be proposed. This can be accomplished with the effort by a world brotherhood which will work to fulfill the *goals* of socialism (or capitalism) but with the methods and inspiration of God. Therefore, the traditional concern of Confucianism for the sanctity of the family and the practice of the presence of God best expressed in Christianity will be combined to give a new and more powerful standard for labor, art and human relationships. Eastern tradition and Western thought will become united in the essence - though not the form - of their ethical God-centeredness, overcoming the atheistic principle attempting to nullify both, and emerging to fulfill the inner and outer needs of the twenty-first century man.

AGAPE AND EROS

Bishop Anders Nygren of the Swedish Lutherans has become famous in modern theology for sharply separating Agape, the distinctively Christian type of love, from all other kinds which he calls Eros. According to Nygren, Christianity came into the pagan Graeco-Roman world with a completely novel concept of love. Our concern here is not so much with the historical distinctions, but rather the value judgments placed on the alleged differences between Agape and Eros.

Nygren defines the "ordinary" concept of love as Eros. It is fundamentally egocentric rather than theocentric; this love comes from an individual's desire for good - it is self-assertive and above all, it involves a will to have and to possess. Such love can be measured and evaluated by the worth of the object which attracts its attention and arouses its desire. Eros is not limited to purely selfish love; it can be altruistic, Platonic, romantic.

The concept of Agape, on the other hand, is best expressed in the letters of St. Paul and the Johannine writings. Agape comes from above rather than being a natural aspiration. Agape is self-giving instead of self-assertive or self-fulfilling. One cannot understand it on purely natural grounds; it is spontaneous, uncaused, and God is completely free to bestow it without conditions. Human values can in no way control or limit His actions. Justification is by grace

alone.

In many ways what Nygren did was to reaffirm the standard Lutheran attack upon "salvation by works" by contrasting in the most radical fashion that aspect of Greek love which is only Eros with that aspect of Gospel love which is pure Agape. Catholic scholars, like Father Martin D'Arcy of Oxford, spotted this immediately and replied vigorously. Nygren, D'Arcy points out, causes confusion by neglecting the fundamental distinction between nature and grace; much that is called Eros is reconcilable with Agape.

Though God initiates, He does so with constraint and without defiance of what is best in human nature; His grace perfects what is already human. Agape and Eros, God's abundance and man's freedom, must commingle, as in marriage.

From the perspective of Unification theology, D'Arcy's qualification is justifiable: Nygren's stress upon the unconditional nature of Agape can lead to a mistaken interpretation of both divine love and human love.[144] Has not God been reaching for our love

throughout history? First, by trying to raise an individual, a tribe, a nation that could understand Him; then, asking them to recognize His love, by showing man how much He loves him. He longs for our devotion as much as we benefit from His.

Therefore, for *Divine Principle,* Agape love is each person's inheritance based on the conditions he makes with God to receive it; and when it is received, his love is broadened to go beyond his own family and friends, to his countrymen and to the world. In the case where it is more specific - in the relationship between a man and a woman - its quality is not lessened. The joy that God receives from and reflects in every true love relationship is of great value.

Of course, others have thought analagously: Origen of Alexandria once wrote that God is Eros as truly as He is Agape[145]8 Augustine saw no irreconcilable difference and rightly merged the two loves in a synthesis he called Caritas; and today, Sorokin urges us to frame our relationships in a much greater "Total Love".[146]

THE ETHICS OF BEAUTY

For *Divine Principle,* the love that unites a subject and an object, for example, a husband and his wife or a lover and his beloved, is stimulated by an object perceived as beautiful. The presence of beauty evokes love; thus love and beauty are polar complements in a give and take action.

Aesthetic pleasure, of course, goes beyond the above example. Santayana in introducing *The Sense of Beauty,* describes the striking presence of the aesthetic impulse:

---

144 A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros,* Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, 1932, vol. I, chap. 1-7, pp. 1-40, 158-182. This three volume work has had enormous influence but its conclusions have also been widely contested. Martin D'Arcy in *The Mind and Heart of Love* subjected it to Roman Catholic criticism; Nels F.S. Ferre in his *Swedish Contributions to Modern Theology* showed his disagreements from the liberal Protestant perspective. For a very persuasive exposition of Nygren's general position by a distinguished Japanese philosopher of religion one should look at Seiichi Hatano, *Time and Eternity* (English trans. 1963), pp. 101-116.

145 Nygren, *Ibid,* p. 156.

146 P. Sorokin, *The American Sex Revolution,* Porter Sargent Publisher, Boston, 1956, pp. 156-157.

The fine arts, however, where aesthetic feeling appears almost pure, are by no means the only sphere in which men show their susceptibility to beauty. In all products of human industry we notice the keenness with which the eye is attracted to the mere appearance of things: great sacrifices of time and labour are made to it in the most vulgar manufactures; nor does man select his dwelling, his clothes, or his companions without reference to their effect on his aesthetic senses. Of late we have even learned that the forms of many animals are due to the survival by sexual selection of colours and forms most attractive to the eye. There must therefore be in our nature a very radical and wide-spread tendency to observe beauty, and to value it. No account of the principle of the mind can be at all adequate that passes over so conspicuous a faculty.[147]

However, in varying degrees men have tried to limit this faculty. Marxist theory emphasizes the sociological roots and collective justification for all artistic endeavor; that is, art can be a more or less permanent monument to a specific social order as are the Parthenon in Athens or the Baroque palace. Because proletarian art is conscious of the need to memorialize and extend the socialist revolution, it serves to embody in visual, tactile or auditory ways the aspirations of the toiling and triumphant masses. For this reason Marxists believe that socialist realism is the only genuine artistic enterprise. By comparison with ideologically aesthetic works, such as a mural depicting the heroism of the October Revolution or a Chinese opera laudatory of Mao, all other types can be labelled decadent, formalistic or deviationist. Therefore the symphonies by Shostakovich, the novels by Solzhenitsyn and the ballet dancing by Nureyev are considered unjustifiable.

At the opposite end of the spectrum there is the aesthetic endeavor whose chief role is to criticize the weaknesses and injustices of the social order. The truly creative aesthete of this mold bewails the manifold sins of the establishment. From the rebel in the poetry of Lord Byron to the denunciation of the abandonment of classical Japanese values in the work of Yukio Mishima, art becomes the voice of an outraged conscience.

To a considerable degree, *Divine Principle* seems to be allied to a moral interpretation of aesthetic experience; the deep, subtle beauty that assumes a crystalline form when a man and woman become one in the love of God is the foundation. The fidelity that is fulfilled between them is reflected in the filial piety displayed toward them by their children. The beauty that a follower returns to his leader is termed loyalty. Through human relationships beauty is experienced and multiplied.

However, beauty is not restricted to a morality of relationships. The argument for this is one also put forth by those who hold the philosophy of art for art's sake. The question could be asked, is it true that artistic masterpieces are valuable only to the extent they are moral? Does not a Ming dynasty vase or a painting of Van Gogh stimulate aesthetic response quite independent from the moral intent of its creator? Clearly, art transcends ethical standards.

It is in the transmoral dimension of aesthetic experience that beauty approaches God. All of the laws from and within God - give and take, polarity, harmony - connect beauty from all cultures . And to the extent that they more clearly amplify and substantiate God's nature they evoke a response of love and appreciation from man. Since God represents absolute love and freedom, beauty is never confined.

The aesthetic attitude in its deepest and most profound form is far from alien to religion in general and *Divine Principle* in particular. Ever since the marriage of Hebrew piety and

147 George Santayana ,*The Sense of Beauty,* The Modern Library, N.Y., 1955,pp. 5-6.

Greek philosophy Christians have insisted that God could be discovered in the true and the beautiful as well as the good. In a famous passage in the *Symposium* Plato himself indicated the way by which the aesthetic leads to the theological:

> *When anyone, having the right kind of love, mounts up and begins to see the beauty present in the beautiful person, he is not far from the final goal. For the right way of love, whether one goes alone or is led by another, is to begin with the beautiful things that are seen here, and ascend ever upwards, aiming at the beauty that is above, climbing, as it were, on a ladder from one beautiful body to two, and from two to all the others, and from beautiful bodies to beautiful actions and from beautiful actions to beautiful forms of knowledge, till at last from these one reaches that knowledge which is the knowledge of nothing else than Beauty itself, and so knows at last what Beauty really is. And when one has attained thither, O Socrates, said my Mantinean friend, there if anywhere is the life that is worth living, in the beholding of Beauty itself.*[148]

SOME PERPLEXITIES OF SOCIAL ETHICS

Since the time of the prophets of social justice in Judah and Israel, Biblical religion has never limited its concern to purely individual matters. Professor Paul Ramsey of Princeton appropriately stresses the collective morality implicit in such basic scriptural concepts as the righteousness of God, the kingdom of God and the covenant between the Lord and His people. The will of God involves reconciliation and reconstruction on the national and global levels as well as the achievement of personal happiness and family well-being.

But a social ethic is far from easy to formulate and far from simple to apply. Reinhold Niebuhr in particular has reminded Christians of its perplexities and pitfalls. Christianity, he observes, has been more frequently a source of confusion in political and social ethics than a source of insight and constructive guidance. Why? It is because Christianity has a tendency to destroy the dialectic of prophetic religion by sacrificing time to eternity - or by giving ultimate significance to the relativities of history.

A religious interpretation of life which is able to understand the ultimate possibilities of good and evil does not find it easy to deal with the relative goods of historical existence. Orthodox Christianity has been so aware of the fact of sin that it could see only the inevitable imperfections of any social order. Why try to change society if a new economic and political system will be as imperfect and sinful as the one we are accustomed to? Also, fear of the possible disintegration of a sinful world into anarchy prompts commendation of the established order.

Niebuhr posits that in regularly expressing gratitude for the goodness of life and creation there is a tendency to increase complacency toward established modes of social organization. Prophetic religion quite paradoxically asserts that our world is both good and evil, good because it is the creation of God, evil because it always stands under divine judgment. This can make the Christian unduly tolerant of inequalities because he believes that what exists is ordained by God. Niebuhr feels that religious appreciation of the world must be associated with religious criticism of the world to evaluate good and evil in specific instances; otherwise,the Church may thank God for social order when it should be promoting social

148 Quoted in M.C. D'Arcy, *The Mind and Heart of Love,* The World Publishing Co., Cleveland, 1967, pp. 70-71.

CONTENTS

reforms.

Niebuhr calls the Christian commandment of love an "impossible possibility". Love forever points toward an ultimate perfection of unity and harmony which cannot be realized in any historic situation. He believes the ethics of Jesus fail to deal with the immediate moral problem of human life - how to arrange an armistice between contending factions and forces. The Gospel ethic concerns only the purely vertical dimension between the will of God and will of man, and its rigorism fails to make concessions to even the most inevitable self-regarding impulses. It is therefore in obvious conflict with the necessities of ordinary men in typical social situations; with respect to human actions, neither natural needs nor social consequences are taken into consideration.

In Niebuhr's view we must live our lives under conditions of finitude. At best we can seek only a relative harmony among many human interests and vitalities, something which can never be a final norm, though such is a desirable end of historical striving. Sinful egotism makes all existent and possible combinations of interests partial and incomplete. Agape, however, transcends all particular rules of justice and stands above history; thus life has meaning only when measured by an ideal transcending the inevitable conditions of history. Human nature has no final norm within history because it is not completely contained in history. The ultimate integrity of spirit is only validated in eternity.

While many have questioned the thought of Niebuhr on social ethics, particularly interesting is the criticism of the Moslem scholar Isma' il Faruqi. He complains that for Niebuhr the only function that the ethic of Jesus has is to preserve for Western man his age-old bad conscience; that makes it irrelevant for social life, and man is free to apply the law of the jungle. Niebuhr, he concludes, is oblivious to the power of love, the efficacy of Christian charity, and consequently, of every noble, disinterested, unselfish deed.[149]

In reply, Niebuhr would undoubtedly insist that Christian social ethics has too long been Utopian and perfectionist. His own approach therefore has been that of "a tamed cynic", as he once called himself. When asked to prepare a study paper on "God's Design and the Present Disorder of Civilization" for the Amsterdam meeting of the World Council of Churches, he made these points. As Christians we are aware of the fragmentary and imperfect character of all human societies; none has been free of corruption, injustice and domination. Thus, God's order can never be identified with any specific form of social organization - all are tentative and ambiguous methods for preserving a tolerable social harmony. While we must make judgments upon men and societies according to the relative degree of justice and community they embody, we cannot afford to make such judgments final.[150]

On the whole Niebuhr does a far better job as a social critic than as a proponent of a constructive Christian ethic for a new society. Though he personally engaged in numerous practical crusades for a better America, his warnings about perfectionism and utopianism tend to cool the ardor of anyone committed to social reconstruction on the grand scale. The reasons for this should be noted. Niebuhr lived through an age often caught up in ambitious schemes of social engineering which turned sour in the end. Also, since 1900 the Christian churches have seldom been in a position to determine the course of political or economic history. As a Catholic would put it, the Constantinian age has come to an end. Without exception Christian leaders lack both the power and the prestige to make any decisive impact upon world or national affairs. The reins of power are held in other hands.

149 Isma'il Ragi A. al Faruqi, *Christian Ethics,* McGill University Press, Montreal, 1967, pp. 289-293.
150 R. Niebuhr, in *Man's Disorder and God's Design,* Harper, N.Y., 1948, vol. Ill, pp. 13-28.

CONTENTS

THE FAMILY

Sociologists report that the Western institution of marriage began to be threatened sometime after World War I. Various explanations and contributing factors have been cited: the radical change from an agricultural society to an industrial one, the urbanizing of civilization, the working mother, the mobility made possible by the automobile, and the widespread repudiation of middle class values - the end of the Protestant era. Although it was still customary to extol the central importance of the family, social trends moved almost inexorably in the opposite direction. World War II and its aftermath only increased the momentum of social change which moralists found alarming. A considerable number of prophets and pundits asserted that the institution of the family was rapidly becoming an anachronism. An ever-rising divorce rate and the growing popularity of a permissive ethic could hardly be denied. Marxists almost gleefully looked to a new age in which the state took over all of the functions previously assigned to the bourgeois family. Non-communists were no less outspoken in their ridicule of romantic love, individualism and puritanism upon which the monogamous family had relied for support. Whatever one's political views or social stance, many would agree that it had become imperative to reevaluate marriage, child rearing, sexuality and family organization.

Since the Christian religion for centuries had been considered the arbiter of good taste in such matters, it had faced a crisis in morals no less traumatic than its crisis of faith. During the Victorian age the skeptic abandoned Christian theology; after World War I he no less thoroughly criticized Christian ethics. Roman Catholics on the whole were more effective in temporarily resisting what their hierarchy called moral breakdown. Protestantism, in spite of eloquent protests, more easily moved with the tide. Neither were in a position to alter the general direction human life and thought had taken.

Fairly typical of contemporary sociological opinion is the view expressed by Jerome and Arlene Skolnick of the University of California at Berkeley. In a 1971 anthology of articles on every phase of the family situation, they explain that probably never before have people in a single society held such widely differing opinions on such a basic subject. One can believe that the family is a biological phenomenon rooted in organic structures and physiological drives. Another can think of the mother and child as the basic human couple with the husband only a casual visitor. A third can feel that a taste for family life is something any sophisticated adult naturally outgrows. Still another can hold conventional assumptions about the necessity of the nuclear family of mother, father and child, the inherent nature of sex role differences and the unchangeability of human nature.

As for the Skolnicks, they frankly challenge the ideology of the nuclear family and question whether there is only one best way for people to live their lives. While cherishing the importance of a lasting love relationship, they doubt that the nuclear family is indispensable for such an experience. In fact, the isolated nuclear family common in industrial society may be only an unstable and transitional stage to a wider sociability based on ties of common interest, they suggest.[151]

The attitude of churchmen may be illustrated by the little book on *The Discovery of Family Life* by Quaker theologian Elton Trueblood and his wife. Lamenting the withering

151 A. &J. Skolnick,fam;7y *in Transition,* Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1971, preface.

away of the family in contemporary society, they contend that the non-communists are doing by neglect what the Marxists have accomplished by deliberate social planning. Lenin made his point of view clear: the economic and educational functions of the separate household should be transferred to society as a whole, and, for the Marxist, the family unit should not be culturally independent.

The Truebloods point the finger of judgment at various aspects of American society. They say the mother feels that our present culture accords no prestige to the role of homemaker. Adults and children find the real centers of their lives outside the home. The school takes over many of the functions formerly associated with the family. Worse, the general uprootedness of people in the industrial age leads to easy divorce and the lowering of standards of sexual morality.

Professor Daniel Day Williams of Union Theological Seminary in his book *The Spirit and the Forms of Love*[152] makes several useful points which represent a sort of consensus of opinion on the subject of sexuality in contemporary Protestant theology. In direct contrast to the traditional Roman Catholic view that the only legitimate function of sex, even within marriage, is the procreation of children, Protestants and Jews value sexual love as part of the general enrichment of the relationship between man and wife.

Dr. Williams makes five general observations. Sexuality enters into the whole of man's life and makes an impact upon all human reactions. Sex is one way the self seeks and communicates with another. The power and value of sexual emotion enter into the celebration of life and the enjoyment of God as ecstasy and companionship. Sex involves responsibility for oneself and others as well as responsibility for the full consequences of each personal act. Finally, sex must transcend itself to become love as a partnership in a shared life.

With these general remarks as a foundation, Williams becomes quite specific in regard to the values derived from the monogamous marriage. Romantic passion becomes genuine personal love in the willingness of two persons to commit their lives to one another in a relationship of fidelity. By leading two persons out of themselves into a new dimension of love, marriage can turn the mystery of sex into a manifestation of the love of God and neighbor which is the true foundation of life. Man bears the divine image in his power to enter an enduring, mutually supportive and deeply personal community.

At the same time this theologian does not overlook the distortions of sexuality produced by sin. He labels it a modern heresy to believe that sexual satisfaction by itself virtually constitutes the good life, lamenting that there is so much attention paid to sexual intercourse and so little to what love for another person means. While complaining that the Church has failed to provide a climate and an ethic which release the full power of sexual love to enrich married life, he is no less critical of casual premarital sexual encounters which can inflict permanent emotional damage on the girl and the scar of callousness on her partner. His final warning is that sexuality must be shattered in its self-centeredness and redirected to a more ultimate goal.

Trueblood would concur with Williams. He reminds us that Christians have in the past maintained that the meaning of marriage involves the biological, economic, psychological, legal, social - and the sacred. ' 'Marriage is the attempt to return man and woman to Paradise where they can live without sin."[153] It represents an endeavor to create a sanctuary out of a natural need. Marriage should be thought of as man' s effort to facilitate holiness within the

152 D.D. Williams, *The Spirit and the Forms of Love,* Harper & Row, N.Y., 1968.
153 E. & P. Trueblood, *The Recovery of Family Life,* Harper, N.Y., 1953, p. 46.

natural order.

According to the Judeo-Christian tradition, the sacredness of marriage contains three emphases. Marriage involves an unconditional personal commitment as well as a legal contract between a man and woman. Secondly, marriage has a public character. It is not simply a device designed to provide personal pleasure to a couple who pool their selfish interests, but is a contribution to the total good or ill of society at large. Thirdly, Judeo-Christian matrimony limits the undisciplined self-expression of two people by the free acceptance of a bond. On the basis of these three factors, Christian marriage can be a foretaste of what the world ought to become. As the Truebloods conclude,' 'The categorical imperative for every family is this: So act that the fellowship of the family becomes an advance demonstration of the heavenly kingdom."[154]

The *Divine Principle* family concept would be thoroughly compatible with the eloquent and well-founded ideas of Williams and Trueblood. It would affirm their hope, direction and clarity and further assert that though this ideal is in essence not yet actualized, the eventual merging of the profundity of Christian love with the practicality of the Confucian ethic will assure its realization.

THE TRIBUNAL OF CONSCIENCE

Lecturing on the Psalms, Martin Luther declared, "Conscience is our place within where we must live with God as man and wife."[155] Among the Greek dramatists of the fifth century B.C., conscience regularly referred to the remorse occasioned by the knowledge of wrong-doing or by self-conviction of criminal activity. Philo - the Alexandrine Jew and heir to the Hellenistic moral tradition - described conscience-inflicted wounds that knew no healing until death. Greek moralists were thus intensely aware of the terrible fury of the guilty conscience.

Surprisingly, the term conscience is completely lacking in the teachings of Jesus. It first appears in the New Testament epistles of St. Paul. The word was common in the Greek-speaking pagan world of the apostolic age and was regularly used by the popular Stoic teachers. Paul borrowed it from Christians in Corinth who questioned his authority, maintaining that the right to eat meat sacrificed to idols was a matter involving their freedom of conscience. The apostle merely adopted their method of argument to clarify his own position on that question. While the word was occasionally used by other New Testament authors, it was not until a later time that conscience became an important concept in Christian thought.

Under the influence of Scholasticism, particularly that of Aquinas, conscience became domesticated. It took on a positive as well as a negative function. The uneasy conscience and the clear conscience became companions. Conscience became the bond between the universal principles and specific human action: in a positive fashion conscience can prod or urge, defend or excuse us; in a negative manner it can accuse us and cause remorse. It was thought of as a built-in device for distinguishing right from wrong.

In the ethics of Immanuel Kant, conscience underwent further redefinition. Duty and obligation relate us to the moral law. Conscience is an inner tribunal in man, and interior

154 Trueblood, *Ibid,* p. 53.
155 M. Luther, *Lectures on Psalms,* WA, 3, 593, 28-29.

voice of judgment - an internal voice of an external authority - the will of God. There is something definitely legalistic and quite authoritarian about the Kantian ethic. Conscience becomes our ultimate judge. It reminds us of our obligations. It demands of us that we carry out our duty. Conscience hands down the verdict of the moral imperative. God says, "Thou must"; man replies, "I will".

Sigmund Freud marks still another chapter in Western ethics. As he put it, God has been guilty of an uneven and careless piece of work where conscience is concerned. For the psychoanalyst, conscience originates in a certain dread of society (the taboo) and represents a neurotic complex produced by the conflict between the pleasure principle of the instincts and the external pressures of the social environment.[156] For large numbers of people Freud is credited with the virtual dethronement of conscience.

Even certain Christian theologians of the 20th century have looked askance at the claims of conscience. Dietrich Bonhoeffer was particularly distressed at the autonomy and self-centeredness implicit in the authority of individual conscience. He felt that Christianity was right in demanding the surrender of the ego in selfless service to Christ and neighbor, and it is here that the proper unity of the self is found - *outside itself.* When the Nazi declared, "My conscience is Adolf Hitler," he provided an extremely direct and significant parallel to the Christian truth - as well as a contrast with it. The Christian surrenders his autonomy for the sake of the unconditional heteronomy of a redeemer,[157] as is classically put by the contemporary of Bonhoeffer, Pastor Martin Niemoeller, who once said, "God is my Fuhrer."

The view of Unification theology would not consider Bonhoeffer's and Kant's positions irreconcilable. It conceives of the conscience as an inner tribunal - yet at the same time, in its most intrinsic part - the surrogate to a greater authority - God. The impelling inclination of man's heart toward goodness is represented in this distinctively human faculty. A clear conscience is the result of a balanced flow of give and take between an individual's spirit mind (pneuma) and physical mind (psyche). Freud stressed the fact that impressions received by the physical organism and conveyed to the brain challenge and affect the conscience; this is similar to the *Divine Principle* teaching that this faculty acts as a mediator and center of harmony between our moral aspirations and our instinctive desires. However, the conscience itself cannot be the true center if it is not in proper focus.

Voltaire and skeptics since have scoffed at morality, asserting that it is only a matter of geography. The Ottoman Turk obeying his conscience refuses to drink wine while keeping a harem, and the Russian Christian over the border loves vodka and condemns polygamy. Thus we find in a fallen world there is a variance of standards in direct correlation to man's awareness of God - an awareness that varies from place to place and age to age but is approaching in an evolutionary way, its omega.

For *Divine Principle,* a subtle division is made between intrinsic and external conscience. The former is similar to the Biblical conception of heart meaning the nexus of human responsibility. It is this part that allows God to develop and refine the conscience itself and thereby, the resultant ethical system and standard of value. This process represents a progression in the development of mankind which is at once inner - man relating with God on an internal level - and at the same time outer - God having an absolute standard only gradually being grasped by man.

---

156 The above history of conscience comes from Paul Lehmann, *Ethics in a Christian Context,* Harpers, N.Y., 1963, pp. 326-343.

157 Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Ethics,* Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1965, pp. 242-248, 24-26.

COMMUNISM AND CHRISTIAN ETHICS

The communism of today is regarded by many as the most powerful organized alternative to the traditional Christian ethic. To confront the growing Marxist influence, the World Council of Churches adopted a statement at their-ecumenical assembly of 1948:

> *The points of conflict between Christianity and the atheistic Marxian communism of our day are as follows:*
>
> *(1) the communist's promise of what amounts to a complete redemption of man in history; (2) the belief that a particular class by virtue of its role as the bearer of a new order is free from the sins and ambiguities that Christians believe to be characteristic of all human existence;*
>
> *(3) the materialistic and deterministic teachings, however they may be qualified, that are incompatible with belief in God and with the Christian view of man as a person, made in God's image and responsible to Him;*
>
> *(4) the ruthless methods of communists in dealing with their opponents;*
>
> *(5) the demand of the party on its members for an exclusive and unqualified loyalty which belongs only to God, and the coercive policies of communist dictatorship in controlling every aspect of life.*[158]

In 1954, their resolution was:

> *But the Christian must press on to point out the illusions by which the Marxist creed itself is vitiated. First the denial of God and the rejection of His sovereignty over all human history opens the way to the idolizing of the party or the economic system. Second, the Marxist belief in the capacity of proletarian man to lead human history to its consummation, to be the Messiah of the new age, is belied by the facts of human nature as we know it. Third, the belief that mere stripping away of economic disabilities can abolish the strife and self-seeking that have marked all human history finds no support in actual Marxist behavior. The Christian doctrine of man's nature and destiny stands on more realistic ground.*[159]

In the commission of 1954, the condemnation of tyranny was out and mounting conciliatory feelings were in: first, the Churches were almost apologetic in their acknowledgment of guilt for the lack of social equity in the world; and secondly, points of contact were defined between the Marxist and Christian ethic. This trend continued, and some years later, funds from the Council were openly funneled to Marxist liberation movements in the Third World. Many people who had worked in ecumenical circles felt greatly betrayed by this direction. In reaction to this there was a rebirth in intellectual circles of what came to be called the conservative ethic.

Conservatives claim to take account of the whole man. Spiritual needs and desires reflect the superior side of human nature and thus take precedence over material wants. This is in contrast to the liberal, who regards the satisfaction of economic needs as the dominant mission of a social order. The liberal emphasizes the common man, while the conservative asserts that each has an individual soul, is not part of an undifferentiated mass, yet it is the

158 *Man's Disorder and God's Design,* Harper & Bros., N.Y., 1948, p. 194.
159 *The Christian Hope and the Task of the Church,* Harper & Bros., N. Y., 1954, p. 35.

initiative and ambition of uncommon men that should deserve our attention - though, of course, not to the exclusion of others. The liberal, leaning toward the Marxist ethic, would insist that history advances through the movement of groups of people in simultaneous motion; the conservative would counter with the fact that history is moved by certain great individuals who develop not by the regulations of external forces.

To the extent that conservatism embodies the above assertions, *Divine Principle* would be in sympathy. However, to the extent that conservatism becomes narrowed down to a racial, creedal or nationalistic doctrine - or an unqualified defender of the status quo - *Divine Principle* would be incompatible. Unification theology is internationalist rather than nationalist in scope; consequently it is spiritual without being reactionary. And further, whereas western conservatism looks back to previous ages for inspiration and guidance - the Spanish age of Charles V or Philip II, th *eancien regime* of Louis XIV in France, the merry England of the Stuart Monarchs - *Divine Principle* looks ahead to an imminent consummation of history as separate nations, religions and races become unified.

For Unification theology, the growth of communism is directly related to failures not in the Christian ethic but in Christian practice; Marx, of course, was not the only socialist; but his violent brand of socialism received the leverage and legitimacy it needed by the failure of the Christian world to respond to less materialistic, less destructive forms of socialism in late 19th century Europe - where reform was desperately needed. And the situation is further aggravated by the growing refusal in Christianity to take a decisive ideological stand against dialectical materialism.

Divine Principle, though embracing the principles of coexistence, co-prosperity and common cause, is unequivocal in its opposition to materialism and the totalitarian state it fosters; this protest is based on spiritual, scientific, historical and logical grounds, as well as ethical. Its view of the Marxist ideology would be similar to that expressed by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn in his *Letter to the Soviet Leaders:*

> *This ideology that fell on us by inheritance is not only decrepit and hopelessly antiquated now; even during its best decades it was totally mistaken in its predictions and was never a science.*
>
> *A primitive, superficial economic theory, it declared that only the worker creates value and failed to take into account the contribution of either organizers, engineers, transportation or marketing systems. It was mistaken when it forecast that the proletariat would be endlessly oppressed and would never achieve anything in a bourgeois democracy - if only we could shower people with as much food, clothing and leisure as they have gained under capitalism! It missed the point when it asserted that the prosperity of the European countries depended on their colonies - it was only after they had shaken the colonies off that they began to accomplish their "economic miracles." It was mistaken through and through in its prediction that socialists could never come to power except through an armed uprising. It miscalculated in thinking that the first uprising would take place in the advanced industrial countries - quite the reverse.... And it's the same with many other things too boring to list.*
>
> *Marxism is not only not accurate, is not only not a science, has not only failed to predict a single event in terms of figures, quantities, time-scales or locations (something that electronic computers today do with laughable ease in the course of social forecasting, although never with the help of Marxism) - it absolutely astounds one by the economic and mechanistic crudity of its attempts to explain that most subtle of creatures, the human*

being, and that even more complex synthesis of millions of people, society. Only the cupidity of some, the blindness of others and a craving for faith on the part of still others can serve to explain this grim jest of the twentieth century: how can such a discredited and bankrupt doctrine still have so many followers in the West! In our country are left the fewest of all![160]

BIBLIOGRAPHY Ch. 6

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, *Ethics,* Macmillan Co., New York, 1965.

Cox, Harvey, *The Situation Ethics Debate,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1968.

D'Arcy, M.C., *The Mind and Heart of Love,* The World Publishing Co., Cleveland, 1967.

Faruqi, Ismal'il Ragi A. al, *Christian Ethics,* McGill University Press, Montreal, 1967.

Lehmann, Paul, *Ethics in a Christian Context,* Harpers, New York, 1963.

Novak, Michael, *The Experience of Nothingness,* Harper Colophon Book, New York, 1970.

Nygren, Anders, *Agape and Eros,* Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, 1932, vol. I.

Rand, Ayn, *The Virtue of Selfishness,* New American Library, New York, 1961.

Santayana, George, *The Sense of Beauty,* The Modern Library, New York, 1955.

Selsam, Howard, *Ethics and Progress,* International Publishers, New York, 1965.

Skolnick, A. & J., *Family in Transition,* Little, Brown and Co., Boston, 1971.

Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr, *Letter to the Soviet Leaders,* Harper & Row, New York, 1974.

Sorokin, P., *The American Sex Revolution,* Porter Sargent Publisher, Boston, 1956.

Trueblood, E. & P., *The Recovery of Family Life,* Harper & Bros., New York, 1953.

Williams, D.D., *The Spirit and Forms of Love,* Harper & Row, N.Y., 1968.

Yutang, Lin, *From Pagan to Christian,* Avon Book, New York, 1959.

Man's Disorder and God's Design, Harper, New York, 1948, vol. III.

The Christian Hope and the Task of the Church, Harper & Bros., New York, 1954.

160 A. Solzhenitsyn, *Letter to the Soviet Leaders,* Harper and Row, N.Y., 1974, pp. 41-43.

CONTENTS

7. HISTORY OF RESTORATION: OLD TESTAMENT AGE

THE FOUNDATION OF RESTORATION

Martin Buber (1878-1965) wrote:

. . .when God created man, he set the mark of his image upon man's brow and embedded it in man's nature, and that however faint God's mark may be-come, it can never be entirely wiped out. According to Hasidic legend, when the Baal-Shem conjured up the demon Sammael, he showed him this mark on the forehead of his disciples, and when the master bade the conquered demon begone, the latter prayed, 'Sons of the living God, permit me to remain a little while to look at the mark of the image of God on your faces.' God's real commandment to man is to realize this image.[161]

His commandment to man, and the hope of man, is the realization of his original nature, according to Unification theology; and notwithstanding error, frustration and failure, God has worked since the Fall to restore this promise. The record of that work distinguishes ancient Hebrew literature from others of its time: whereas the Egyptians and Babylonians focused their attention upon nature, Israelites were peculiarly attracted to history.

Professor G. Ernest Wright of McCormick Theological Seminary describes it thus:

Biblical theology is first and foremost a theology of recital, in which Biblical man confessed his faith by reciting the formative events of his history as the redemptive handiwork of God. The realism of the Bible consists in its close attention to the facts of history and of tradition because these facts are the acts of God.[162]

The Israelites concentrated not merely on the individual exploits of great warriors and powerful kings, or the recitation of court annals, but rather on the "unity and meaningfulness of universal history from the beginning of time until the end of time."[163]

Scripture records the central action of God in a specific history, presenting to all history the certainty of its redemption. The Bible is the chart of God's involvement and direction, His divine dispensation of restoration.

A. Adam's Family

Since man was created an eternal being, God could not leave him to exist forever in his fallen state; God is obligated by "[. His purposive, loving nature to work for man's resurrection, and cannot be truly satisfied until all have returned to him. Adam and Eve, created good in the image of God, became a blend of good and evil as a result of their voluntary alliance with Satan. Thus, neither God nor Satan could completely claim them.

Because of the unprincipled relationship between Satan and Eve, *Divine Principle* claims that the father of evil was able to get a grip on man. But God cannot reclaim man

161 W. Herberg, ed., *The Writings of Martin Buber,* Meridian Books, N.Y., 1956, p. 269. The Baal-Shem (1700-1760) was the founder of Hasidic Judaism. 197

162 G.E. Wright, *God Who Acts,* Alec R. Allenson, Chicago, 1952, p. 38.

163 *Ibid,* p. 39. Wright has repeatedly insisted that the Old Testament should be ^ understood *against* its environment.

unless man voluntarily sets a condition for his return by demonstrating his faith. Through such an act, the offering of an acceptable sacrifice, man demonstrates his rejection of Satan and a foundation for restoration can be established. For some contemporary Christians and Jews the original significance of the sacrificial offering has been lost; frequently it is only considered as an obsolete, primitive, form of worship without relevance to man today. However, the point behind the temple sacrifices is as valid as ever: man's offerings were visible signs of his dedication and devotion to God. Adam, a virtual battleground between the power of God and the legions of Satan, was unable to offer a sacrifice because he was no longer thoroughly committed to God.

Note: For more than a century the Old Testament accounts from Adam to Abraham have been the subject of considerable debate. Parallels to surviving Babylonian stories are frequently cited to discredit the value of the Genesis narratives. Scholars since 1900 have generally favored some form of the Graf-Wellhausen theory that our Pentateuch (the first five books of the Bible) represents an interweaving of several distinct documents produced at different times and representing varied religious outlooks. These literary sources are commonly identified as J, E, D, P and have been dated roughly 850, 750, 621, 500-450, and the redactor (R), 400 B.C. For our purposes it is important to note that the Creation story of Genesis comes from P, the latest source, and the Eden narrative from J, a much older tradition. The Flood story as we have it is a fusion of two documents quite easily separated. For a thorough treatment of the literary , sources, the reader should consult R. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, Harper, N. Y. 1948, pp. 129-292.

B. Cain and Abel

In his book *The Religion of Ancient Israel,* the Dutch Old Testament professor T.C. Vriezen dates the Cain-Abel story and the rest of the Yahwist document between the period of the Hebrew judges and the first kings, and thus it reflects a period of transition from a semi-nomadic to an agrarian way of life. The semi-nomadic shepherd is felt to live in closer fellowship with Yahweh than the farmer; cities are condemned as dens of sin and pride. While Abel is the shepherd, the murderous Cain is the first builder of cities. Therefore, in Vriezen's view this early Hebrew chronicle comes from the circle of those for whom life in the city was still something totally alien.[164]

Robert Graves and Raphael Patai think differently. This narrative, where the offering of Abel is preferred to that of Cain, explains the origin of the camel-herding bedouin with tribal tattoos, who entered Palestine later than the goat-and-sheep owning semi-nomads. According to Hebrew tradition these desert raiders were sons of Cain for whom murder came naturally. Their tattoos were really marks that God put on them as a sign of His punishment of their fratricidal ancestor.[165]

Without necessarily denying the sociological interpretation, Professor H.H. Rowley prefers to emphasize the moral aspect of the Cain-Abel account. Vriezen interprets the Cain-Abel story sociologically. Graves and Patai come to slightly different conclusions from the same standpoint. Each of these methods of exegesis is in a sense from a purely horizontal perspective. *Divine Principle* looks at Hebrew history and Biblical literature from a vertical,

164 T.C. Vriezen, *The Religion of Ancient Israel,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1967, p. 166.

165 R. Graves andR. Patai, *Hebrew Myths: The Book of Genesis,* McGraw-Hill, N.Y., pp. 91-97. This book contains much useful information about Jewish and Christian elaboration of the Biblical text plus non-Jewish parallels.

and oft mystical, perspective as the process of restoration. Because Adam was a mixture of good and evil and sacrifice had to be made for the foundation of restoration to be laid, God separated good and evil in Adam's children, so that one could offer his sacrifice from the position of relative goodness. However, this meant that the other could be claimed by Satan, in the position of evil.

Eve had fallen through two unprincipled acts of love: her relationship with Satan and after, with Adam. Of the two, the first was relatively speaking, more evil; the second, which would have been natural in their maturity, was relatively good. As the firstborn, Cain, who should have belonged to God, symbolized Eve's first act of love, and stood in Satan's position. As the second son, Abel represented relative good, and the position of Adam before the Fall, and God.

Yahweh accepted Abel's offering and rejected Cain's. Why? Some have posited that Cain's offering was meager and that he kept the choicest of the harvest for himself; some suggest that he did not observe the proper ritual; others claim that Yahweh was the God of nomadic shepherds and would be highly offended by the sort of worship offered to an agricultural god of the soil, Baal. *Divine Principle* asserts that God rejected Cain's offering because of his position as a representative of Satan and that Cain had to establish a condition of "indemnity" to be accepted by God. That is, he had to make restitution by reversing the process of the Fall of Satan. Jealous of Adam, Satan had abandoned his proper position in order to dominate man. To reverse this, Cain should have to be in a position to serve Abel and love him as the archangel should have served and loved Adam. He had to show love for Abel in a situation where he could be equally jealous.

Cain also had to humble himself to Abel by waiving his superior position as elder brother and receiving God's favor through Abel. In this act of humility Cain would have made restitution for Satan's act. Had he been successful, he would have rid himself of his fallen nature with the result that through him all of Adam's family could have been restored. Then God would have accepted Cain's offering. God required that Cain come to Him through a mediator, Abel. However, Cain failed. [Just as Satan had killed Adam spiritually, Cain in his jealousy Skilled Abel physically. Because of this, God's dispensation for Adam's family was frustrated and effectively nullified. The foundation of faith could not be laid in Adam's family and 1600 years elapsed before another family, that of Noah, was chosen.

The Cain-Abel story illustrates how often younger sons were chosen by God and uniquely blessed rather than their elder brothers. For example, God loved Jacob and "hated" (the Hebrew word for "loved less") Esau while they were still in the mother's womb. Similarly, when Joseph brought his two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim, for blessing Jacob crossed his hands and laid his right hand upon the head of Ephraim, the younger, and his left hand upon the head of his older brother (Genesis 48:14). This indicated that Jacob gave a greater blessing to the younger son than to the elder. In these instances, the position of the elder son represented that of Cain whereas the position of the younger represented that of Abel.

Unification theology points out that the restoration of the Cain-Abel relationship of sibling jealousy will be a key to sociological reconstruction. Cain who represents all that is unacceptable to God must be subjected with love to Abel who symbolizes all degrees of goodness. Cain-like individuals, families, churches, nations and ideological factions can approach God only through their Abel-like counterparts. However, at the same time, Abel cannot come to God alone; he has the responsibility to bring Cain with him, to win him over,

to show him the clearer way. Human history can be seen as countless variations of this struggle.

C. Noah's Family

Reverend E. Basil Redlich, Canon Theologian of Leicester, provides a typical liberal Anglican interpretation of Noah and the flood.[166] By unraveling the Biblical text and placing the P and J sources in parallel columns, Redlich finds it easy to show the fundamental discrepancies between the two stories. In J, Noah brings to the ark seven of each clean animal and a pair of the unclean. In P he saves two of every kind. In J the flood lasts 7 + 40 + (3 x 7) = 68 days whereas in P it continues for a whole year and ten days. The Anglican canon next points out that whereas J and P both declare that the flood was a universal calamity, we can assume that this is an exaggeration of a par- ticularly disastrous flood in Babylonia. Sir Leonard Woolley, the archeologist, unearthed proof of a flood about 320Q B.C. which covered Sumerian villages over an area of 40,000 square miles with eight feet of clay and rubble. This disaster may have given rise to the Biblical flood story even if it did not destroy the walled cities built on mounds in the Babylonian plain. (The American expedition which claimed to have found half-fossilized timbers of Noah's ark near Mt. Ararat in Armenia dates its discoveries at 1500 B.C. which means what they uncovered has nothing to do with Woolley's flood 1700 years earlier.)[167]

Redlich also connects the Genesis account with a flood tale found on clay tablets in the library of Ashurbanipal. Though there are striking differences, the resemblances are remarkable - Utnapishtim is warned by the god of wisdom that the other gods plan to destroy mankind in a great flood. He built a six-decked ark in seven days in which he, his family, servants and animals managed to live during a seven day storm. When the rain stopped he sent out a dove and then a swallow but both returned for want of a resting place. A raven was released which found carrion to eat so never came back. Utnapishtim left his ark which had become grounded on a mountain, offered a sacrifice, and was blessed by the creator god who placed him and his wife in Paradise.[168]

Professor Theodore H. Robinson, a Biblical scholar who taught at the University of Wales, agrees that there is a connection between the Noah story and older Babylonian sources but insists that the differences are more significant than the resemblances. If this is folklore, it is consecrated folklore, he declares.[169] This would also be the conclusion of R.A.F. MacKenzie. This Jesuit Biblical scholar illustrates the general approach to the Noah story now accepted in Roman Catholic circles.[170] In lectures at the University of Minnesota in 1960, he admitted that we cannot tell if the flood story had some historical foundation in a particular catastrophe in Mesopotamia; but for him this has little interest. The Hebrews transformed a common Near Eastern myth into an impressive portrayal of Yahweh's reaction to sin. The God who sends the flood is a God touched to the heart with sorrow, but cannot let sin go unpunished; God vindicates justice yet preserves those faithful to Him.

---

166 E.B. Redlich, *The Early Traditions of Genesis,* Gerald Duckworth, London, 1950, pp. 98-115.

167 Graves and Patai, *Ibid,* p. 117.

168 A detailed account of the Akkadian legend found in the Gilgamish Epic can be read in Graves and Patai, *Ibid,* p. 116.

169 4 9 T.H. Robinson, "Genesis," *Abingdon Bible Commentary,* Abingdon Press, N.Y., 1929, pp. 226-227

170 R. MacKenzie, *Faith and History in the Old Testament,* University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1963, pp. 68-71.

Traditional patristic exegesis of the Noah story tries to transcend the purely literal meaning of the Biblical text. Christians have interpreted the ark as a symbol of the Church which Christ provides so that believers may escape the wrath of God directed against the flood of sin. For *Divine Principle,* the ark was the symbol of a new beginning and its three decks symbolized the three stages of creation. Inside the ark, Noah assumed the position of God, his family represented mankind, and the animals represented the rest of creation. Noah was a descended of Seth, who inherited the position of Abel after his death. By constructing the ark, he made a condition of indemnity for Adam's fall, and laid the foundation of faith for God to recommence restoration. On this basis, Noah was also placed in Abel's and thus, Adam's position. The forty days of the flood is symbolic; forty is derived from the four positions Noah was called upon to restore plus the cycle of ten generations from Adam to his own. The primary goal of creation was to establish a base of four positions consisting of God, Adam, Eve and their children. What do the ten generations signify? The number ten here represents full union with God or perfection. The number forty refers to the time intervals used to separate man from Satan and restore the four position foundation. Other illustrations are given in scripture: the 400 years from Noah to Abraham, the four centuries of slavery in Eygpt, Moses' forty years in the Pharoah's palace, his four decades in Midian and in the wilderness, the forty day fast at Mt. Sinai, 40 days of spying on Canaan, the four centuries of rule by the judges, the 40 year reigns of Saul, David, and Solomon, Elijah's 40 day fast, Jesus' 40 day temptation, and the 40 generations from Abraham to Jesus.

Alfred Lapple, the German Catholic scholar, in his *Key Problems of Genesis* places himself among those who recognize the fact that the chronology in the Biblical proto-history prior to Abraham is not always to be understood as arithmetic measures. To a great extent, he claims, these quantities are based on the number symbolism of the ancient Near and Middle East. In geneologies, even in the New Testament, the authors did not intend an exact chronology. The numbers are rather a symbolic means used in salvation history to interpret and highlight certain important points.[171]

The eight members of Noah's family - Noah and his wife, their three sons and their wives - were equivalent to the eight in Adam's basic family - Adam, Eve, the three sons and their wives. Adam's family of eight was lost because of Cain's failure. The eight members of Noah's family signified the start of a new creation (after the first seven days of creation, the eighth started another cycle), free of Satan's control as a result of the faith manifested in the building of the ark. But another episode occurs.

Noah became a farmer and planted a vineyard. One day as a result of drinking too much wine he fell asleep naked in his tent. Ham, his second son, saw the nakedness of Noah and felt shame. Ham told his brothers, Shem and Japeth, who then took a garment, walked backward so as not to face his nakedness, and covered their unconscious father. When Noah awoke and learned what Ham had done, he cursed Ham's son, Canaan, to be a slave to.Shem and Japeth (Gen. 9:20-25).

In Gerhard von Rad's commentary on Genesis he finds difficulties in combining this story with the flood account, but concludes that it could not take place prior to the flood because if Canaan were cursed he would not have been allowed on the ark.[172]

---

171 A. Lapple, *Key Problems of Genesis,* Deus Book, Paulist Press, Glen Rock, N. J., 1967, pp. 121-125.

172 G. von Rad, *Genesis,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1961, pp. 131-133. V13 T.H. Robinson, *Ibid,* p. 226.

T.H. Robinson writes that this passage contrasts the mockery of Ham with the modest piety of Shem and Japeth. He notes that the Semites were peculiarly sensitive to the shame of nakedness and that none but a drunken man would allow himself to be exposed. He feels that the text indicates that Ham insulted his father by laughing at his nakedness.[173]

For *Divine Principle,* though this text may have been confusing to some scholars, it is nevertheless part of the story of divine restoration, a unified theme connecting separate incidents in the Bible. The fact that this Satanic sense of sexual embarrassment and shame appeared in Noah's family was a devastating blow to God's hope that the innocence of Adam and Eve before the Fall could be recaptured and preserved. Ham's behavior thus proved that Satan still could claim a member of Noah's family. Therefore, not being completely separated from Satan, this family could go no further as a vehicle for God's dispensation.

D. Abraham

The call of Abraham has always marked a major turning point in the study of the Old Testament. Jewish and Christian tradition alike have seen this man as the father of the Hebrew people and a pivotal figure in the development of the Jewish faith. When Rabbi Isidore Epstein wrote his informative 4000 year history of Judaism, he quite naturally began with the migration of Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees to the land of Canaan. The Biblical story prior to Abraham is usually termed protohistory. With Abraham the secular historian sees the clear light of day, and Biblical history can be read with the invaluable aid of the archeologist.

Fundamentalist writers like Professor Leon Wood[174] of Grand Rapids' Baptist Bible Seminary lay particular emphasis upon recent archeological research. They claim it supports their concern for the historical accuracy of the patriarchal narratives. He notes that equivalents of the Biblical names Jacob, Abraham, Benjamin and Terah appear in texts from the first half of the second millenium B.C. and that archeological excavations in Palestine tend to confirm social conditions reflected in the patriarchal stories. Further, Abraham's journey of more than a thousand miles from Ur to southern Canaan is now known to have been not at all uncommon in his age, as is shown in Hittite, Assyrian and Akkadian records.

For Wood, God's call of Abraham represents a significant change in the divine program. God had previously dealt with all men in a general way. Abraham marked the end of this worldwide approach. God decided to choose one man from whom He could rear a special nation. Beginning with Abraham, redemption was focused upon Israel and her alone.[175]

Epstein explains that Abram and his family were probably refugees from the destruction of the capital of the Sumerian Empire at Ur when that prosperous city was taken and sacked by Elamite invaders in I960 B.C. Terah and Abram wanted to relieved the secluded hill country of Canaan would provide an ideal refuge. Terah was a polytheist probably worshipping the moon god Sin among others; Sin was the chief deity at both Ur and Haran. In Epstein's view Abram was an ethical monotheist who realized God had saved him to found a new nation, which was to bring knowledge of God to the world. Canaan offered not only hill country where Abram could serve God in comparative peace, but also, as the crossroads of important trade routes, provided him with a unique center for spreading his faith.

173 T.H. Robinson, *Ibid,* p. 226.

174 L. Wood, A *Survey of Israel'sHistory,* Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1970, pp. 27-46.

175 L. Wood, *Ibid,* p. 30. Relying on the Biblical chronology, Wood dates the birth of Abraham at 2166 B.C. As he admits, scholars are by no means agreed on this point and date Abraham from the latter half of the fifteenth century to somewhere in the twentieth century ; B.C.

Epstein explains that Yahweh made a covenant with Abram by which the elect people were "chosen for the sake not of domination, but of universal service".[176] In fact, the visible mark of this covenant, the circumcision of all male Hebrews, had a two-fold significance: one, it was a national rite as a mark of special consecration of all Hebrews to the service of God; two, it was universal because foreigners willing to join the Abramic nation were included in this communion of service. To emphasize this, the patriarch's name was changed to Abraham, "father of a multitude (of nations)".

There are three points that the Jewish scholar makes which have been debated: 1) that Abram was a monotheist, 2) that his religion was ethically quite different from that of this contemporaries, and 3) that he was very much interested in converting others. Though Epstein's argument is appealing some Biblical scholars think that a nationalistic interpretation of the chosen people was the original one, and that the universalist view was a later addition accepted - if at all - only after a bitter struggle in the age of the prophets. Historians deny too that the rite of circumcision set Hebrews apart from their neighbors because the , Egyptians, Moabites, Edomites, Ammonites and Arabians likewise practiced the custom.

Many Old Testament critics have claimed that the basic covenant of Yahweh with Israel originated with Moses. Beginning with J the tendency was to push this Mosaic covenant back into earlier Hebrew history - the days of Abraham or even the time of Noah. Was there no covenant prior to Moses? Professor Ronald Clements of New College, Edinburgh was one to study this complicated problem. He concludes that when Abraham migrated into Canaan he naturally worshipped the Canaanite El-gods established at the sanctuaries of the land. In order to obtain the title deed to land around Hebron, he agreed to remain loyal to the god at the shrine of Mamre and promised to give the deity a tithe. This god may have been called El-Shaddai meaning god of the mountain or god of the field. Abraham's descendents treasured the thought that their title to the land around Hebron was divinely-given and centuries later the Yahwist historian J incorporated the story into his account of Hebrew beginnings. Clements' typical attempt to get behind the written sources yields the idea that Abraham was not a monotheist.[177]

Historical considerations aside, Jewish commentators insist that their special election is for service rather than domination. A commonly repeated Rabbinic tradition is that Yahweh offered His covenant to every nation to no avail before He forced it upon Israel which was too weak to refuse. Professor Abraham Heschel, speaking to a Quaker conference in 1938 at Frankfurt-am-Main, explained:

> *There is a divine dream which the prophets and rabbis have cherished which fills our prayers, and permeates the acts of true piety. It is the dream of a world, rid of evil by the grace of God as well as by the efforts of man, by his dedication to the task of establishing the kingship of God in the world. God is waiting for us to redeem the world.. .. The martyrdom of millions demands that we consecrate ourselves to the fulfillment of God's dream of salvation. Israel did not accept the Torah of their own free will. When Israel approached Sinai, God lifted up the mountain and held it over their heads, saying: 'Either you accept the Torah or be crushed beneath the mountain.'*[178]

For Unification theology the appearance of Abraham signalled the time that all the

176 I. Epstein, *Judaism,* Penguin Book, Baltimore, 1959, p. 14.

177 R. Clements, *Abraham and David,* Studies in Biblical Theology, second series, Allenson, Naperville, Illinois, 1967, 96 pages.

178 A. Heschel, *Man's Quest for God,* Scribners, N.Y., 1954, p. 151.

conditions were met for God to continue his program of restoration. Four centuries (ten generations)after Noah, God chose Abraham to lay a foundation of faith. Through Abraham, God sought to restore the positions of Adam, Noah and Ham. Abraham left his homeland, representing the Satanic world,, and went to Canaan. Since there was a famine in Canaan, Abraham continued on to Egypt. Before entering the land of Pharoah, however, the patriarch told his beautiful wife to pretend to be his sister, whereupon Pharoah later took Sarah into his harem. But before the Hebrew could become one of the Egyptian's wives, God inflicted upon the Pharoah's household a terrible plague. Realizing the cause of the affliction, the ruler returned Sarah and ordered the pair out of the country.

Christians are often troubled by the action of Abraham in this incident. Consequently, various explanations have been of- fered. One is that the Hebrew patriach of 2000 B.C. should not be judged by modern standards: in the ancient Near East, a wife was considered the property of her husband to be used in any way which was to his advantage. Another is that the story was treasured to show that Hebrew women were far more beautiful than those of any other nation. A third hypothesis is that the narrative illustrates how shrewd Abraham was in being able to outwit the powerful and proverbially wise Egyptians.

Since the Pentateuch contains three different stories on this same theme, one involving Abimelech rather than Pharoah, another about Isaac rather than Abraham, scholars often conclude that Genesis preserves three separate traditions about a single event.[179]

Like the incident with Ham in Noah's family, *Divine Principle* sees this situation in light of God's attempt to reverse conditions of the Fall. While Adam and Eve were still as brother and sister, Eve was taken. Abraham and Sarah had to face a situation having the same potential as that which Adam and Eve had encountered with the archangel. Sarah had been sought by the Pharoah, but remained untouched and returned to Abraham safely. By taking back Sarah, as well as Lot and all their goods, Abraham symbolically restored the wife, children and dominion that Satan had taken from Adam, and emerged from Egypt victoriously, having restored the position of the first family.

E. Abraham's Covenant with Yahweh

Genesis chapter 15 dealing with Abraham's covenant with Yahweh poses almost insur- mountable obstacles for the literary source critic and historian.

The actual covenanting rite has parallels among other ancient peoples but some of the meaning here is obscure. Von Rad explains that when the slaughtered animals are halved and laid opposite each other, the partners to the covenant stride through the path that has been created. By doing so they solemnly lay a curse upon themselves if the pact is ever broken.

A covenant establishes a legal relationship between two parties. In the older conception the more powerful partner grants a pact of alliance to the weaker. By means of a covenant, a great king, say of Assyria or the Hittites, promises support to a tribal chieftain or petty prince who becomes his vassal. According to von Rad, Yahweh Himself enters into such a legal contract with Abraham. In the most literal sense, Abraham promises to be the ever-faithful ally to his divine Lord.

Von Rad thinks that the birds of prey descending on the bloody carcasses could be an evil omen. Are they demonic powers who try to thwart the final ratification of the covenant?

179 Abraham and Sarah in Gerar (Gen. 20:1-18), Isaac and Abimelech (Gen. 26:1-11).

he asks. The vultures or ravens may point to obstacles which stand in the way of the success of the mutual oath-taking. In any case, with nightfall Abraham falls into a deep trance-like sleep to prepare him for a mystical revelation of Yahweh's presence.[180]

Professor Cuthbert Simpson notes that in the Biblical text no conditions are attached to the covenant. He believes that before a preface was added to the original narrative it mentioned as conditions Abraham's faith in leaving his Babylonian homeland and the magnanimity with which he had treated Lot. He also thinks that the covenant idea came from the Canaanite cult of Baal-berith (lord of the covenant) which means that it did not go back as far as Abraham.[181]

T.H. Robinson suggests that missing from our text is the fact that Abraham too walked between the slaughtered animals in order to fulfill his part of the covenanting ritual.[182] He explains that in the life taken from the slain creatures, the patriarch and Yahweh found a unifying force which bound them one to another. God and man were no longer separate entities but be- came sacramentally united. Against Robinson's view one might insist, as some commentators do, that the point of this Biblical narrative is that God acts unilaterally. His covenant is made with man unconditionally and on the divine initiative alone. Abraham is a mere spectator in an action which is exclusively God's.

Professor Nahum M. Sarna of Brandeis University agrees that this Genesis story utilizes the outward forms of an ancient ritual, the precise meaning of which eludes us in regard to details.[183]

The covenant-making incident has strong mystical overtones, so it is not surprising for *Divine Principle* to suggest a hidden meaning behind the literal text. According to this interpretation the ritual Abraham was to conduct could have provided the foundation of faith for the restoration of mankind. The animals slain symbolized the three stages of restoration: the turtledove and pigeon represented the formation stage; the she-goat and ram, the growth stage; and the heifer, the perfection stage. But Abraham failed to complete his offering by cutting the turtledove and young pigeon in two as he had done with the heifer, kid and lamb. Though other commentators neglect to mention this significant detail it means that the patriarch failed to carry out the proper liturgical procedure in regard to the solemnization of the covenant. Looking at the matter theologically, *Divine Principle* points out how Satan thus came to establish a base for nullifying the intended covenant. Abraham should have

cut each of the animals in two, one half representing Cain's position and the other half, Abel's. In order to carry out the dispensation of restoration, a complete separation between good and evil had to be made. Abraham's carelessness in this regard meant that he and Yahweh were not truly united. As a later Hebrew editor of the tradition realized, the lack of a complete covenant between God and the patriarch would lead to the most dire consequences, namely four centuries of slavery in Egypt. Representing the formation stage, the doves were the foundation of the entire covenanting rite. The ominous appearance of the "unclean" birds of prey clearly suggests that something had gone wrong with the covenanting ceremony.

F. Isaac

180 G. von Rad, *Genesis,* Westminster, Philadelphia, 1961, pp. 176-185, 194.

181 *Interpreter's Bible,* Abingdon, N.Y., 1952, I, p. 603. C.A. Simpson assigns this chapter to J with a secondary elaboration (vs. 8-18), an editorial gloss (vs. 19-21) and a later prefix (vs. 1-6).

182 T.H. Robinson, *Ibid,* p. 230.

183 N.M. Sarna, *Understanding Genesis,* McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1966, p. 126.

CONTENTS

Abraham's failure to lay the foundation of faith was the third such unsuccessful effort to restore mankind. The dispensation had twice been unfulfilled: first through Adam's family and then through Noah's. Three is the number of completion. Because Abraham was the third to be chosen by God, it was imperative that he succeed.

God gave him a second chance. His new opportunity would naturally be more difficult than the first, to make restitution for his earlier failure. The way open to him involved Isaac. God commanded Abraham to sacrifice his only son. Isaac was particularly precious to his father because he was his only heir and an almost miraculous product of his old age. Isaac too was the only guarantee Abraham possessed that his descendents would be as numerous as the stars. By accepting this mandate, the patriarch would demonstrate his devotion to be incontrovertible.

Some commentators interpret this story (derived from the Elohist chronicler, E) solely in the context of the history of religious development in the Near East. At the time the narrative was written, to say nothing of the much earlier age of Abraham, ^human sacrifice was a normal part of religion. Prisoners of war, slaves and children were regularly offered up as signs of devotion to the gods. Some of the ancient deities1 like Moloch, the Carthaginian god of war, were particularly thirsty for human blood. For the chronicler, the point of the story was not that Abraham would sacrifice his son - that sort of devotion was taken for granted. Rather the Hebrew historian was emphasizing that the God of Israel would accept an animal sacrifice in place of a human one, thus representing a great forward step in man's understanding of religion. Protesting against the cultic practices of the surrounding peoples who accepted human sacrifice without question, it prepares in a very important way for the prophetic insistence that God prefers a humble and contrite heart above any sacrifices, human or animal.

For other commentators, Abraham's unquestioning obedience to God's command should be given the chief emphasis. Actually, the story contains no explicit condemnation of human sacrifice. It rather assumes that such practices were known and sanctioned in patriarchal times among the Hebrews as well as other peoples. Abraham did not argue with God. He received a divine command and he proceeded to carry it out. The patriarch was that kind of believer. He had pulled up his roots and left Mesopotamia because God asked him to do so. Similarly, he did not hesitate to kill and burn his only son as an offering if that was what God wanted. All ordinary ties and sentiments were freely cast aside in a life of utter commitment to the divine will.

Soren Kierkegaard uses Abraham as a typical knight of faith in his book *Fear and Trembling.* He speaks of the sacrifice of Isaac as an example of "the teleological suspension of the ethical" which is a primary characteristic of faith in its purest form. Kierkegaard also dwells upon the human feelings of the- patriarch when he is called upon to offer up his child, which is actually looking at the story from a modern and somewhat romantic perspective. The Biblical account, however, is bare of such psychologizing. There is no suggestion of doubt, anguish or despair on the part of the patriarch. God commands; Abraham obeys.

Professor Sarna, looking at the trial of Abraham from a Jewish perpective, sees three important lessons which this anec- dote was supposed to teach. First of all, faith is not merely intellectual assent to certain ideas about God but an active expression of the believer's trust in Him. Belief means concrete proof of one's steadfast loyalty to Yahweh. Secondly, Abraham's inner motivation was as important as his visible action. Yahweh valued the readiness of the patriarch to perform the sac- rifice as much as if the deed had been carried out. Thirdly, this

event shows how far Abraham had progressed in his spiritual odyssey. When he left Mesopotamia at God's command he did so in part at least because he had been promised a reward: a numerous progeny from whom would be born a great nation. This time he obeyed God even though it seemed to mean the complete nullification of the covenant and the tragic end of his hope for descendants. Abraham now exemplified disinterested loyalty to God.[184]

For *Divine Principle,* Abraham, by his whole-hearted obedience, succeeded in partially reestablishing the foundation of faith in accordance with the divine command; and as a result of his cooperation, Isaac became one with his father and succeeded him as an instrument of God's will. The Abraham-Isaac story then transcends its importance as a protest against human sacrifice or as an example of zeal, and marks a major accomplishment of God's overall efforts to carry out the original intent of creation

G. Jacob and Esau

Yahweh is referred to as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Yet when one reads the Jacob stories in Genesis he is quite apt to be shocked by that patriarch's cunning. He tricks his brother, deceives his father and takes advantage of his uncle. For Jewish scholars like Sarna this side of Jacob's character is a cause for concern. How can one justify Jacob's heartless exploitation of the suffering of his own brother and the crafty deception practiced upon his blind old father? Sarna argues that Jacob has a claim on the birthright solely because of the predestined act of God and not at all because of any moral worth on his part. Furthermore, the Bible itself implicitly judges Jacob's behavior and shows how his later life was an unrelieved series of trials and tribulations. An explicit denunciation, the scholar reminds us, could hardly have been more scathing. (Some readers, however, may doubt whether Genesis really contains the implicit moral judgment which Sarna sees; there is, they say, no apparent Biblical connection between Jacob's early opportunism and his later troubles.)

T.H. Robinson is one of many scholars who sees more in the Jacob-Esau stories than biographies of two individuals.[185] For him the exchange of the birthright and the theft of the blessing were created to explain the hostility between the nations of Israel and Edom and the fact that for much of the monarchic period the latter was subject to the former. The stories contrast the wild, hairy Esau who lives by his prowess as a hunter with the nomad shepherd Jacob who quietly and patiently cares for his flocks. Such utterly different types must have fought each other in their mother's womb, we are told.

For Unification theology, the hostility between Jacob and Esau is comparable to the sibling rivalry between Abel and Cain. If Abraham had not acted maladroitly in the covenanting rites, Ishmael, his first son, and Isaac would have been in the positions of Cain and Abel. By subjugating himself to Isaac, Ishmael could have made a condition of indemnity and the two brothers could have overcome their fallen human nature. Since this was not accomplished, God gave Isaac twins to carry out the roles of Cain and Abel. Esau (wild like Ishmael), the first son, was in Cain's position and Jacob (a shepherd like the first Abel) served as a new Abel.

Because Satan asserted his dominion over man, he stole man's birthright to be lord of all creation. God used Esau and Jacob to reverse this situation. The Jacob stories hence illustrate

184 N.M. Sarna, *Ibid,* pp. 162-163.

185 T.H. Robinson, *Ibid,* pp. 236-237. HISTORY OF RESTORATION: THE OLD TESTAMENT AGE / 217

a major victory for God and man against Satan. Rebekah's part too is of great dispensational significance. Without her Jacob could never have received from his father the blessing which would ordinarily have been bestowed upon Esau. The fall of Adam's family began with Eve and was completed by Cain. Evil came into the world by way of a mother and son. By an act of restitution, the cooperation of another mother and son, the effects of evil in Adam's family were blocked and the downward direction of human life was reversed.[186]

According to our earliest source, as a result of Esau's wrath Jacob had to flee to Haran. A later source is said to try to cover up the reason for his hasty departure, claiming that Jacob left to find a wife from the family of his kinsman Laban. It has been suggested that this was also designed to illustrate opposition among the exclusivist faction of Yahwists to intermarriage with the Canaanites.

Something very mysterious occurred to Jacob at the River Jabbok twenty years later when he was returning home; the result of which was the changing of his name to Israel. According to one possible reading of the account he wrestled all night with Yahweh Himself, succeeded in overpowering Him and only let Him go back to heaven after literally forcing Him to bestow a blessing. Another reading of the account finds Jacob struggling and overcoming an angel rather than Yahweh Himself, though some claim that this was an alteration by later Hebrew theologians who thought the idea of a man wrestling with God was highly offensive. Or was the patriarch grabbed by a demon with whom he had to wrestle throughout the night? Perhaps worried over what might take place when he encountered Esau, Jacob had a nightmare in which he struggled against his bad conscience. There is no consensus among the Old Testament scholars as to what took place at Jabbok.

According to *Divine Principle,* Jacob wrestled with an angel and prevailed over him. Thus he made indemnity for the restoration of man's dominion over the angels which had been lost at the time of the Fall. By winning a new name Israel, "he who strives with God", Jacob laid the foundation on which to form the chosen nation. Simpson points out that what occurred at the River Jabbok transformed the whole character of the patriarch. The "crafty rogue" becomes "the patient old man."[187]

Rebekah had assured Jacob that after a time Esau's fury would subside. She was right; when the two brothers finally did meet, they reunited in overwhelming love.

Unification theology explains that representing the positions of Cain and Abel, Esau and Jacob paid restitution by acting exactly opposite to the way their predecessors had done. By forgiving his brother, Esau obtained God's favor and his life in Canaan was blessed with prosperity. By slaying Abel Cain had taken his brother's birthright. Esau, Cain's representative, lost his birthright to Jacob, Abel's representative. With the restoration of the heavenly birthright, Jacob was at last able to bring God's blessing to himself and to Esau as well. What looked like indefensible behavior on Jacob's part from a purely horizontal perspective turned out to represent something quite different from the vertical perspective.

Divine Principle notes that twelve generations passed from the time of Noah before the foundation of faith could be established by Jacob. Significantly, for the restoration of the twelve generations God gave twelve sons to Jacob. God's dispensation with Abraham was fulfilled in three generations of his family. Because of this the Israelites prayed to the God of

186 Significantly this pattern of cooperation of mother and son is also demonstrated in the families of the other major figures of Moses and Jesus; in each case, like Jacob, the mother saved the son from a certain ill fate.

187 C.A. Simpson, *Interpreter's Bible,* I, p. 726.

Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Since God's will had at last been accomplished through Abraham's grandson, the Hebrews called themselves the house of Jacob. In Jacob the positions of Adam and Abel, Noah and Ham, Abraham and Isaac were now all restored. Therefore, the blessing originally given to Adam was extended to Jacob.

Jacob had succeeded in laying the foundation on the family level. The next step was for God's work to embrace a tribe. Jacob's posterity, the people of Israel, were chosen for this mission.

Joseph was the first son born of Jacob's marriage with Rachel, his favorite wife. He naturally represented Abel and his ten older half-brothers, the sons of Leah, were collectively in Cain's position. Since the epic of Joseph is well-known there is no need to retell it here. The very charm of the Joseph biography as literature has often made it suspect in the eyes of the critical historian.[188] How much is fact or based on fact and how much is ancient legend? From what we now know of Egyptian history certain conclusions seem tenable. That a fairly sizeable number of Hebrews moved from Canaan into Egypt seems certain. That a talented individual like Joseph could rise to a position in the Egyptian court second only to the Pharoah is not at all unlikely during the Hyksos period, especially since that group of invaders would consider the Hebrews as their kinsmen. And that the expulsion of the Hyksos usurpers might well have led to reducing resident Hebrews to the position of slaves is a reasonable assumption.[189] The Joseph story seems then to be built upon a solid substratum of historical fact.

As has been stated, for Unification theology God's will is predestined. So, to a certain extent, is the course of a central figure in His restoration history. Therefore, though the pattern for Jacob, Moses and Jesus is predestined, the course for each is built on the successive achievements of the past and the stages of history that intervene. With each course of the central figure (in the Abel position) a refinement as well as a broader level of enactment is unfolded. These differences, as well as further distinctions due to the unpredestined character of the figure and the unforeseen response of the people, exist, but striking parallels also can be seen - though oft hidden - in the Biblical account.

For example, on the level of the restoration of relationships there are the restored Cain-Abel relationship of Esau and Jacob (on the individual level), Aaron and Moses (on the national level), and the bond that should have been established between John and Jesus (on the international level). John should have supported Jesus as Aaron had supported Moses, according to *Divine Principle.* Also, the relationship of the cooperation between the mother and son, most dramatically similar in the fact of each mother's prominent part in saving her son from death (Jacob from Esau, Moses from the Pharoah, Jesus from Herod), also provides an interesting parallel. Further, we see each central figure having to overcome a tremendous spiritual assault in order to make a condition for the spiritual dominion lost to Satan. Jacob encountered an angel, Moses was assaulted by God, and Jesus was attacked by Satan in the

188 Von Rad suggests that our written version of the Joseph epic may be related to the Hebrew Wisdom literature of the united monarchy. Its original purpose then was to illustrate model behavior for a well-bred young courtier who wished to advance his position in the royal household. B ecause it was so popular as a manual of proper etiquette, von Rad asserts that a later compiler found it useful to conclude his collection of tales about the lives of the patriarchs.

189 B.W. Anderson of Princeton Seminary connects the entry of the Hebrew tribes into Egypt with the Hyksos invasion and the later oppression to the Egyptian revival during the XVIII and XIX dynasties. *Understanding the Old Testament,* Prentice-Hall, N.J., 1966, pp. 30-32. Siegfried Herrmann, *Israel in Egypt,* Allenson, Naperville, 1973, pp. 7-18, disagrees.

desert.

The Bible also records the seven days of creation were lost to Satan when he became the "god of this world"; thus Jacob had to set up a condition of indemnity to separate Satan based on the number seven. Jacob had 70 family members (Gen. 46:27); Moses, 70 elders (Ex. 24:1); Jesus, 70 disciples (Luke 10:1). In this each group played the central role in each respective course. The significance was similar in the twelve disciples of Jesus and twelve tribes under Moses, coming from the twelve sons of Jacob.

According to *Divine Principle,* the new phase of the course of restoration was guided by Joseph. His half-brothers in the position of Cain, became jealous and threatened to kill him, as Cain had Abel, and as Esau had desired to do to Jacob, but like Jacob, he sought refuge in a foreign land, and his half-brothers were later reconciled to him. From this point seventy people of the house of Jacob, including his twelve sons, started the course of indemnity on a tribal level.

HISTORY OF RESTORATION: MOSES TO MALACHI

A. Moses

For more than a century Biblical scholars have labored to get behind the late Hebrew texts to discover the historical Moses, an effort at least as difficult as the quest for the historical Jesus. The results have been somewhat inconclusive. The Old Testament narratives about the great Jewish law-giver are a compilation of many different sources which were subject to revision and expansion until the time of the Babylonian exile. Within the Pentateuch our oldest source was written in the age of the united monarchy. If the Exodus took place during the reign of Pharoah Raamses II, several centuries of oral tradition preceded the appearance of the Yah wist history (J). The actual events thus were subject to interpretation and reinterpretation as one can easily see by comparing J, E, D and P. If J did with the oral traditions what E, D and P did to his record, the task of recovering the historical Moses is indeed formidable.[190]

The Christian interpretation of Moses has generally followed a method of exegesis practiced since the time of St. Paul. He found in the Torah clear signs of the later ministry of Jesus. For example, the rock in the Sinai desert which gave water to the thirsty Israelites really pointed to the saving work of Christ (I Cor. 10:1-4). Looking beyond the literal meaning of the Old Testament text Paul discovered a spiritual message unknown to rabbinic Judaism. Tradition thus gave scripture an esoteric meaning and mystical significance. Behind the history of the Jews the eyes of faith revealed various "types" of Christ. The Old Testament was thereupon read in the light of the New.[191]

---

190 Ample resources exist for the student to examine the difficulties in the historian's search for the real Moses. The standard modern commentary on Exodus by Martin Noth of Bonn shows how the various sources can be disentangled. Martin Buber's *Moses* and the Exodus commentary by Umberto Cassuto of Hebrew University present two capable Jewish studies. Albrecht Alt of Leipzig prepared a famous monograph relating the faith of Moses to the older patriarchal religion of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, "The God of the Fathers," *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion,* Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 1967, pp. 1-86.

191 An excellent example of this kind of exegesis is found in *the Epistle of Barnabas* For text see E.J. Goodspeed, *Apostolic Fathers 1650; for interpretation and historical* background, see , J. Quasten *Patrology,* Spectrum, Utrecht, 1960, v.I. pp. 85-92.

The typological interpretation of scripture was brought to perfection in the Church of Alexandria. Philo, the learned Alexandrine Jew, had earlier employed allegorical exegesis to explain the Mosaic Law to well-educated Greeks. Origen and his successors used a similar method to show the deeper meaning of the Christian scriptures. Naturally, a reaction to the Alexandrine school appeared, particularly among the leaders at the equally famous Church of Antioch in Syria. In fact, the whole history of Christian exegesis could be explained in terms of the conflict between the literal and historical method of the Antiochans and the typological or mystical interpretation of the Alexandrines. Like the Antiochans, the modern historical critics of the Bible insist on sticking to the literal meaning. Unification theology represents a contemporary fusion of the Alexandrine mystical approach and that of the Antiochans.[192]

A single sample of allegorical exegesis from the Middle Ages is illustrative. According to medieval theology, Isaac is a figure for Jesus Christ and Abraham represents God the Father. The three days journey Abraham and Isaac took to the mount of sacrifice signifies the three ages of the Jewish people: from the patriarchs to Moses, from Moses to John the Baptist, from John to Jesus. The two servants are the two portions of the Hebrew nation - Israel and Judah. The ass is the unenlightened synagogue. The wood carried by Isaac is the cross.[193]

According to *Divine Principle,* during the four centuries after Jacob's family migrated to Egypt, his twelve sons became twelve tribes and the seventy people of the house of Jacob multiplied to more than 600,000. The Israelite sojourn, however, had to be prolonged an additional thirty years because a foundation for the Exodus had not been laid.

Because of Joseph's post of grand vizier the Hebrews had originally been welcomed into the grazing lands of Goshen east of the Nile. But after they had prospered and greatly multiplied, a new Pharoah began to fear the Hebrews, probably because he considered them an unsafe ally in case of invasion from the Near East. As a result the wandering shepherds were rounded up for slave labor. Then in a desperate effort to curb the alien population on the frontier of the Empire, Pharoah ordered that all newborn male Hebrews be killed.[194]

Although Moses lived amid the splendor of Pharoah's palace he never forgot his Hebrew origins. According to Exodus, he remained deeply attached to the cause of his people, though as a privileged member of the Egyptian aristocracy Moses had every reason to take advantage of his high position and ignore the plight of his despised countrymen.

As Professor Umberto Cassuto of Hebrew Univerity wrote:

---

192 For the regular use of the typological method of exegesis in the early Church one should consult Cardinal Danielou, *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture,* Westminster, Philadelphia, 1973. He illustrates and defends the typological exegesis of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Origen and Methodius (pp. 197-302). This Alexandrine technique has returned to Protestantism because of the theology of Karl Barth. A Protestant defense of typology has been made by Professor Wilhelm Vischer, *The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ* (Eng. trans., 1949). G.W.H. Lampe of Birmingham and K. J. Woollcombe of Oxford in *Essays on Typology,* Allenson, Naperville, 1957, point out both the value and weaknesses of this sort of interpretation.

193 Andre Parrot, "Abraham Iconography," *Abraham and His Times,* Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1968, p. 144.

194 Epstein believes that Joseph became viceroy of Egypt when the Hyksos ruled the country (c. 1730-1580 B.C.). Pharoah Thothmes III (1485-1450 B.C.) oppressed the Hebrews in order to complete his vast building program but this became more ruthless under his son Amenophis II. Moses may have been the adopted son of Hatshepsut, the sister of Thothmes III. Epstein dates the Exodus at 1447 B.C. (*Judaism,* pp. 15-17). J. Coert Rylaarsdam of the University of Chicago thinks Seti I was the oppressor (1319-1301 B.C.) and Raamses II (1301-1234 B.C.) the Pharoah of the Exodus. *(Interpreter's Bible,* I, p. 836).

Moses showed the qualities of his spirit, the spirit of a man who pursues justice and is quick to save the oppressed from the hand of the oppressor, the spirit of love of freedom and of courage to rise up against tyrants. A man possessed of these attributes was worthy to become God's messenger to deliver Israel from the bondage of Egypt.[195]

Having unmistakable proof of Moses' great love for the Hebrews and his opposition to their oppressors, the Israelites should have rallied around him and accepted his leadership. His forty years in the royal palace could then have been the foundation for their deliverance. Moses could have led the Hebrews out of Egypt and into the promised land of Canaan within the course of a 21-day march. The Israelites made no move to unite behind Moses and so to escape the wrath of Pharoah he fled to Midian. God's first plan for the Exodus was not carried out and Moses had to prepare another foundation which took forty years.

In the Exodus account, Moses is credited with unusual powers, which were put to the test. Egypt, considered by both Greeks and Romans the storehouse for the highest esoteric wisdom, provided the background for the strange contest. Like the Alexandrine exegetes, *Divine Principle* attributes mystical significance to the nature of the three signs which God gave to Moses, foreshadowing the word (rod) of the Messiah, the recovery of God's children to His bosom, and the revitalization of the lifeless fallen world.

Since Moses was not a persuasive speaker, he asked God for someone to serve as his spokesman. Yahweh recommended that Aaron, his older brother, accompany him to the palace of Pharoah. Exodus puts it, "He shall speak for you to the people; and he shall be a mouth for you, and you shall be to him as God" (4:16). Historical critics feel that this was inserted into the original story in order to legitimize the functions of the Jewish priesthood in the later temple of Solomon. In temple Judaism the priests considered themselves the successors of Aaron and the recognized interpreters of the Mosaic Torah. Even if this incident did serve such an historical purpose, according to *Divine Principle* a deeper significance is inherent in it. Exodus reports that Aaron's sister, the prophetess Miriam comes to play a part also. Adam and Eve as brother and sister would have formed an original trinity with God; with Moses in the position of God, Aaron and Miriam formed a trinity through which God could manifest His power. In some such way, of course, this was later carried out through God, Jesus and the Holy Spirit. With this base, Moses was equipped to battle Satan.

In mystical theology, Canaan has always represented the heavenly world. Canaan was the land which God had blessed and by comparison with the desert of Sinai and Transjordan itlooked to the Hebrew nomads like a land flowing with milk and honey. Jacob returned triumphant to Canaan after his struggle in Haran; by this victory Jacob fulfilled the dispensation of personal restoration. Moses was to lead his people from Egypt into Canaan, his mission being on the tribal level. Consequently, his work followed the pattern set by Jacob. The ten times Pharoah deceived Moses corresponded to the ten times Laban deceived Jacob.

The miracle of the sea dividing for Moses and contracting on the hapless Egyptians in pursuit has been variously interpreted in order to make the event a little more reasonable. Cassuto thinks that whatever happened took place not at the Red Sea but at a sea of reeds, a marshy area at one of the Bitter Lakes north of Suez.[196] Buber mentions the Sirbonian Lake of the Gulf of Akaba.[197] Rylaarsdam doubts that Lake Sirbonis on the coastal highway is the

195 U. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus,* Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1967, p. 22.
196 Cassuto, *Ibid,* p. 159.
197 Buber, *Ibid,* p. 75.

correct location and prefers the marshy area north or south of Lake Timsah.[198]

What took place is again a matter of conjecture. Rylaarsdam gives a typical liberal Protestant explanation. He contends that the actual event was lifted out of its setting in the context of natural process by means of communal embellishment until the account took on a supernatural dress.[199] The factual basis, he says, is that God used an east wind to drive back the water enabling the Israelites to cross over safely. Buber speaks of unusual winds causing tremendous tides and the possible effect of distant volcanic phenomena on the movements of the sea.

From early Christian times the miracle of the Red Sea has been given a mystical inter pretation considered far more important than what took place at the level of history. In his study of the typological meaning of the crossing of the Red Sea, Cardinal Danielou pointed out that even in Jewish thought this event became a symbol of the future victory of Yahweh over the powers of evil. Christians applied the Old Testament story to explain the spiritual significance of baptism. *Divine Principle* with Tertullian interprets the event as deliverance from the world and leaving behind the devil who tyrannizes man.[200]

After the Israelites overcame the Egyptians, God provided them with quail, manna, and pure drinking water which sprang forth from a rock. Noth explains that great flocks of quail still appear along the Mediterranean coast of the Sinai peninsula on their spring and autumn migrations. As for manna, it is a drop-like formation on the leaves of the tamarisk shrub produced by the sting of a tree louse. Because of its sweet taste manna is still a favorite food of the Arabs who gather it in the early morning because it dissolves in the heat of the day. Noth believes the story about water gushing forth from the rock originated to explain a rock spring familiar to the desert nomads.[201]

According to Exodus, the Israelites were also able to drive off an attack by marauding Amalekites.[202] Then, led through the desert by means of a pillar of cloud by day and pillar of fire at night, the Hebrews reached Mount Sinai. This spot is so important in the development of Hebrew faith that many Christians will be surprised to learn that the experts cannot agree on its location. Since late in the fourth century A.D. the mountain of God has been identified with Jebel Musa, a peak 8,000 feet high near the apex of the Sinai peninsula. Other possibilities are a volcano in Midian to the east of the Gulf of Akaba or at Kadesh-Barnea in the wilderness of Paran southwest of Edom.[203] Cassuto feels that it is fitting that we cannot associate the great theophany of Moses with a specific time or link it with a definite place; this event should remain shrouded in the mists of sanctity.

Scholars have often tried to explain that the God of Israel was originally a storm god or volcano god who was believed to reside on the top of Mount Sinai. Such gods were common enough in the ancient Near East. The Babylonians built their temples on top of artificial mountains called ziggurats and the Canaanites believed that thunder was the voice of Baal.

198 Rylaarsdam, *Ibid,* p. 930.

199 *Ibid,* p. 936.

200 J. *Danielou, The Bible and the Liturgy,* Notre Dame Press, Indiana, 1956, pp. 86-98.

201 M. Noth, *Exodus,* Westminster, Philadelphia, 1962, pp. 132, 140.

202 Up until modern times desert nomads have raided and plundered whenever the opportunity presented itself. For detailed analysis of this particular raid, see Cassuto, pp. 204-207 or Noth, pp. 141-144.

203 See Rylaarsdam, *Ibid,* pp. 836-837 for explanations given in favor of each of these sites. Noth, *Ibid,* pp. 158-160 treats the evidence for the thesis that Sinai was an active volcano. Rylaarsdam prefers the Kadesh-Barnea site. Leon Wood defends the traditional location at Jebel Musa, *A Survey of Israel's History,* pp. 137-138.

Professor William F. Albright of John Hopkins University, however, has protested the easy identification of Yahweh with a primitive storm god or mountain deity. The God of Moses dwells in heaven from which He may come down to Sinai or any spot he chooses. Quite possibly, the archeologist admits, the picture of the theophany in Exodus was influenced by folk memories of terrific thunderstorms in the Syrian mountains or volcanic eruptions in Arabia but there is nothing in the Mosaic tradition which demands the derivation of Yahweh from an early volcanic deity or storm god.[204]

According to the Exodus narrative, the cloud covered Sinai for six days and on the seventh God spoke to Moses. He remained on the holy mountain for forty days and forty nights. As *Divine Principle* explains, in order to receive God's word of a new dispensation, the Hebrew leader had to establish a forty day period of separation from Satan. During his mystical dialogue with God, Moses received the Ten Commandments and instructions about the building of a tabernacle which would be the Hebrew shrine during the wilderness period.

Emerging from Sinai, Moses became the great law-giver of the Hebrew people. For Judaism religion is primarily conceived of as obedience to the Torah of Moses, the Law he received from God. Albrecht Alt's monograph on the nature of Hebrew law distinguishes between two types found in the Pentateuch: apodictic and casuistic. Casuistic legislation is the more or less common corpus of customary laws very much like the Babylonian code of Hammurabi (c. 1700 B.C.), the Hittite laws of the 14th century B.C. or those of Assyria two hundred years later. All of these go back to the Sumerian jurisprudence of the third millenium. Such laws ascribed to Moses are in no basic way novel.

Apodictic laws, however, are unique to Israel. The Ten Commandments are the most famous examples. These are specific prohibitions which Yahweh Himself makes. Whereas casuistic legislation in the Pentateuch is of the sort that presupposes a settled type of life quite unlike that of the wandering Hebrew tribes, there is nothing in the apodictic laws that conflicts with conditions among the Israelites at the time of Moses. Alt therefore argued that the apodictic code could very well have originated then and was hence considered so sacred that it was later recited annually in connection with the autumn feast of Tabernacles.[205]

According to *Divine Principle,* whenever God accomplishes a significant work, Satan is also very active. When the Hebrews saw that Moses was so long up on the mountain, they gathered before Aaron, made a molten calf by melting down their gold earrings and worshipped the idol. The idol, probably made of wood covered with thin gold plate, was presumably an image of a young bull, whose worship was associated with licentiousness.

As Moses neared the Hebrew encampment on his descent from Sinai and saw what was taking place, he became enraged by both the idolatry and the immoral worship associated with it. He angrily threw down the stone tablets of the Torah and broke them at the foot of the mountain. Striding into the camp, he seized the golden calf, burned it, ground the metal into powder, scattered it upon the water and made the people drink it.

After this angry chastisement of his people, Moses implored God to forgive their sins. Cutting two tablets like the first he again climbed up Mount Sinai as God commanded. He stayed on the peak another forty days and nights without eating or drinking. Having prepared

---

204 W.J. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity,* Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 1957, pp. 262-263.

205 Valuable contemporary studies of the Decalogue have been published by the Scandinavian scholar Edward Nielson, *The Ten Commandments in New Perspective* (1968) and the German Old Testament authority Johann Jakob Stamm, *The Ten Commandments in Recent Research* (1967). Both have been translated into English for the series of Studies in Biblical Theology.

himself for a reappearance of Yahweh, Moses once more received the Ten Commandments as a sign of God's renewed covenant with the Hebrew tribes.

The book of Exodus concludes with a description of the tabernacle which was to serve as the focal point of Hebrew worship during the wilderness period (chapters 25-27). Throughout their sojourn in the desert, the Israelites carried a portable sanctuary. It was a simple tent-like affair which Moses pitched outside the Israelite camp and in which Aaron ministered. Like the much later temple of Solomon, the tabernacle had an inner shrine, a Holy of Holies, into which only the high priest could enter once a year. Exodus asserts that when Moses went into the tabernacle, a pillar of cloud symbolizing the divine presence would descend over the doorway and Yahweh would meet the Israelite leader face to face.[206]

For *Divine Principle* the significance of the tabernacle went beyond the beliefs of the Jews at that time and pointed to a more ultimate ideal. The outer area represented the body and the inner part the spirit of the Messiah to come. The most holy shrine represented heaven and the rest of the tabernacle signified the earth; hence, the tabernacle as a whole pointed to Christ, the ideal of perfect man in whom heaven and earth were to be harmoniously reunited.

For *Divine Principle* the ark in the inner shrine symbolizes the entire cosmos. Because the tabernacle as a whole was a symbolic representation of the Messiah, the Israelites were to make it the very center of their life. They united, of course, with Satan rather than Moses when they constructed the golden calf and worshipped it. After their leader's second forty day fast the Hebrews did construct the tabernacle but they remained rebellious to God, complained to Moses, grumbled about the constant diet of manna, and even expressed a desire to return to Egypt.

Moses' dedication was unquestionable but his followers would have to pay indemnity for their faithlessness. Twelve men, one from each of the tribes, were selected to spy in the land of Canaan for forty days. Ten of them brought back a very discouraging report. They believed the Israelites would be unable to enter the Promised Land because of the great strength of the Canaanites and the many fortified cities which stood in the way of a conquest. Upon hearing this, the Israelites became frightened and murmured against both Moses and God. Two of the scouts, Joshua and Caleb, were optimistic. They begged the Israelites to have faith in the God who had promised them a successful entry and occupation of Canaan.

Because the Israelites were so faint-hearted, the forty days spent by the spies were fruitless. Hence, God chastised the faithlessness of His people by letting them wander aimlessly in the wilderness for forty years. According to *Divine Principle,* the Jews should have united with Joshua and Caleb. But because Satan was allowed to invade, this attempted entry to the Promised Land failed. At the end of that time only Joshua, Caleb and the new generation under twenty years of age were allowed to enter Canaan.

B. Joshua

Later Judaism often looked back upon the wilderness period as an almost ideal time in

206 Scholars are agreed as to the purpose of the tabernacle. As Yahweh had revealed Himself at Sinai and covenanted with the twelve tribes, He would continue with them by dwelling in the sacred portable shrine they were to make for Him. As for the description of the tabernacle presented in Exodus, that poses problems. Many Protestant commentators think that the scriptural account derived from the late source P represents an idealized picture of Mosaic worship based on the temple of Solomon (Noth, pp. 199-201, Rylaarsdam, pp. 844-846). Cassuto, however, defends the general historicity of the Exodus account (pp. 319-324).

which Israel and Yahweh were remarkably close to each other under the leadership of Moses. Such a romantic view was not held by the Hebrew historians J, E, D and P. According to the Pentateuch the Israelites were constantly grumbling about the desert life and its hardships. In all of their faithlessness, Joshua almost alone had remained steadfast and confident. God therefore chose him to succeed Moses and lead the people into Canaan.

According to the book of Joshua, this ardent champion of Yahweh and resourceful military leader, invaded Canaan from the east and achieved a series of stunning victories. Old Testament scholars and archeologists have not, however, been able to verify this. Professor M.A. Beek of the University of Amsterdam rather cautiously states that the Biblical records "do not lend themselves to a satisfactory reconstruction of the actual events but that Biblical data are in general agreement with archeological findings." [207]

It is claimed that archeology disproves the contention of Joshua (chapter 6) that he conquered Ai and Jericho. Excavations at Ai indicate that the city was inhabited from 3300 until 2400 B.C. and not again until the Israelites settled there in 1000 B.C. When the Hebrews migrated into Canaan in the thirteenth century, Ai had been deserted for centuries. Albright tries to save the credibility of the Joshua story by saying it meant Bethel rather than Ai. As for Jericho, where no caved-in walls have been found, more than one scholar has rejected the historicity of Joshua 6. The Swiss scholar Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich concludes, ' 'The narratives in the book of Joshua are in part not historical sources but legendary tradition."[208]

According to the Old Testament experts, the main phase of the Israelite conquest under Joshua occurred after 1250 B.C. and before 1219 B.C. and there was no single campaign which wrested Canaan from its original inhabitants. Rather, a few individual cities fell to the Israelites and slow fusion with the Canaanites took place elsewhere. The native population as a whole was not brought into full subjection for three centuries, until the reign of Solomon. Palestine at the time of the Israelite invasion was made up of a large number of squabbling city-states governed by local princes who gave nominal allegiance to the Pharoah. Because of the internal weakness of the Egyptian empire, the Hebrews were able to establish themselves in the hill country of Palestine and Transjordan. The Canaanites managed to hold the most important towns, control the trade routes and keep the fertile coastal plain.

For *Divine Principle,* Joshua's function was to lay the tribal level foundation for the messianic age to come. As a military hero Joshua served to unify the Hebrew tribes following the death of Moses. Taking a suggestion made by Alt and Noth, Old Testament scholars suggest that a confederation of Israelites was established in the vicinity of Shechem.[209] While the city itself was not attacked by the Hebrews and therefore could not serve as a capital, probably the ruler of that city-state became their ally and would permit them to assemble in the immediate area. The rather loosely-organized tribal league has usually been described as an amphictyony comparable to those set up in Greece. What bound the Israelites together was

---

207 M.A. Beek, *Concise History of Israel,* Harper& Row, N.Y., 1963, pp. 42-44. For detailed evidence, see M. Kenyon, *Digging up Jericho,* London, 1957. General Yadin, the Israeli archeologist, conjectures that the Canaanite city of Jericho had no walls of its own when Joshua attacked it. Y. Kaufman, *The Religion of Israel,* University of Chicago Press, 1959, p. 247.

208 E. Ehrlich, *A Concise History of Israel,* Darton, Longman & Todd, London, 1962, p. 21. Bernhard W. Anderson of Princeton says of the Joshua account: "Admittedly the picture is too neat, too simplified, too idealized; but there is considerable archeological evidence to support the tradition that the Israelites made a decisive assault upon the hill country in the latter part of the thirteenth century." *Understanding the Old Testament,* Prentice-Hall, N.J., 1966, pp. 86-87.

209 M. Noth, *The History of Israel,* Adam & Charles Black, London, 1960, pp. 85-110.

their common loyalty to Yahweh.[210]

C. Judges

According to the ancient Hebrew historian, the four hundred years of slavery in Egypt were matched by a second period of four centuries used to complete Israelite occupation of Canaan. For *Divine Principle* both figures are symbolic, indicating distinct phases of God's dispensation.

After Joshua's death, whatever unity the tribes retained was due to a series of administrators and military heroes known as judges. The Hebrew title "shofel" conveys a somewhat more inclusive meaning than our English translation would suggest. While some scholars believe that the judge was a regularly appointed or elected official of the Israelite amphictyony centered at Shechem, the majority feel that he was a charismatic figure who appeared at different critical periods in Israelite history and rallied the followers of Yahweh for self-defense or aggressive action.

Y. Kaufmann of Hebrew University argues that ancient Israel vested authority in two institutions. On one hand, the Hebrews relied on a tribal council of clan heads, a primitive democracy of the elders, supervising all secular matters. Above these from time to time as need arose messengers of God, the judges, appeared. Normally the intertribal council of elders sufficed but at moments of crisis the people looked for an "apostle-savior" to be raised up by Yahweh. Always one came - a prophetess like Deborah, a visionary like Gideon, a fighter like Jepthah, a Nazarite like Samson.[211]

Gradual and widespread assimilation of the Hebrews and the Canaanites was a characteristic feature of Palestinian life in the period of the judges. For the deuteronomic historian of a subsequent age this syncretism was looked upon with disgust and dismay but the average Israelite of that day was far from hostile to the process of adaptation. All scholars agree, however, that Canaanite religion tended to demoralize the tone of Hebrew culture. Canaanites believed in a chief god El but popular worship was centered on Baal, the storm deity, and his consort Asheroth, a goddess of fertility.[212] From what archeologists have unearthed we learn that in material civilization the Israelites remained far behind their

---

210 Adolphe Lods of the Sorbonne published one of the most informative studies of Israelite history and customs with particular emphasis on what Palestine culture was like before the conquest and how it changed as a result of the Hebrew invasion. *Israel,* Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 3rd printing, 1953.

211 Y. Kaufmann, *Ibid,* pp. 256-257. The Hebrew historian clearly states that the age of the judges lasted four centuries but he may have meant this to be a purely symbolic figure reminding his readers of the length of Egyptian bondage because both periods were filled with trouble for Israel. By adding up the years of separate judges, one reaches a total of 410 years. On the basis of archeological evidence and non-Biblical sources, scholars like Ehrlich, op. *cit.,* p. 25, assert that the time of the judges lasted from circa 1200-1020 B.C., about half the deuteronomic figure. Even a fundamentalist writer like Leon Wood *(Ibid,* p. 207) does not try to defend the scriptural chronology. He explains that some of the judges may have ruled simultaneously so one should not simply add up their times to understand the length of the era of judges. *Divine Principle* holds to the symbolic interpretation of the total number of years, so the fundamentalist "problem of chronology" is of little importance.

212 Noth reports that the cults which flourished among the Canaanites were the immemorial rites of the great mother deity, generally called Astarte in Canaan, and of a youthful deity who represented the annual blossoming and dying of vegetation. These cults involved the celebration of a holy marriage at a sacred place with female representatives of the deity and the cultic sacrifice of female chastity. *The History of Israel,* pp. 143-144.

Canaanite neighbors so it was natural for the more primitive hill tribes to adopt the customs of the more sophisticated city-dwellers. The judges then were remembered because they kept Israel from being swallowed up and were champions of Yahweh against the immoral Baal.

Besides the danger of absorption, the Israelites also faced invading newcomers who sought to occupy Canaan. About 1187 B.C. the Philistine sea-peoples swarmed into Palestine and set up a group of city-states on the coast. Moabites tried to move in from the east; the Midianite camel-riding nomads attacked Israelite settlements from the desert. The stories of the judges depict valiant efforts on the part of the Hebrews to protect themselves and drive back a variety of aggressors. When the Philistines and Canaanites joined forces, a real catastrophe overtook Israel. The ark was captured, the shrine city of Shiloh destroyed and Philistine garrisons were established on Israelite territory. The tale of mighty Samson came from this age of troubles. At such a time of political and military weakness, faith in Yahweh served to strengthen and unify the Hebrew tribes.

D. The United Monarchy

The deuteronomic history of Israel, based on earlier traditions, claims that as a result of an attack upon the city of Jabesh, a military commander by the name of Saul was acclaimed king at the central Hebrew sanctuary of Gilgal. The reign of Saul is dated from about 1020-1000 B.C. and he was called to his new post to defend Israel against external dangers. The king held his position because of support from the last judge and influential priest-prophet Samuel. Historians today explain that Saul had certain advantages as the first monarch of an united Israel because he came from the relatively minor tribe of Benjamin so would not incur the jealousy of the more powerful tribes. Besides, Benjamin was located in a central geographical position in reference to the other Israelites. Saul subsequently failed, we are told, because of a combination of factors: his suspicious nature and overweening ambition, the opposition of the religious authority embodied in Samuel and the appearance of a rival, David, his former armor-bearer. Already the kingdom was breaking up. At a battle in the plain of Esdraelon which turned against Saul, the king committed suicide and most of his sons fell.

> *Thus died Saul, the aging champion, battered to his knees, one of the most human and touching figures in all literature. His was a heroic and tragic role in a crucial period in Israel's career. It was his hard lot to bear the brunt of reaction which is always evoked by deep social change. His own tribe of Benjamin, while not the smallest and weakest, was not one of the most influential. His sick nature, moreover, was a scourge. Yet the fact remains that Saul laid the foundation for an effective opposition to the Philistine advance, for an attack on their valuable monopoly of iron, and, perhaps most important, for a measurable degree of unification among the individualistic tribes of Israel.*[213]

The Philistine domination of Palestine seemed assured. God, however, had decided otherwise.

Most scholars believe that we have contemporary sources about the reign of David. The second king was a southerner so could command the loyalty of the Israelites in that sector. As the husband of Saul's daughter he could claim authority over the northern and central area of Palestine loyal to the former monarch. After ruling the southern tribes for seven years, David at Hebron was recognized as the king of all Israel. By defeating the Philistines in two decisive battles, he removed that threat, and by making the newly-captured stronghold of Jerusalem his

213 Harry M. Orlinsky, *Ancient Israel,* Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1954, p. 66.

capital, he established a political and religious center on neutral territory. Henceforth, Jerusalem was the city of both David and Yahweh. Through military conquest and wise diplomacy, the second king carved out for himself a miniature empire which he skillfully ruled for forty years.

What Solomon, David's son, lacked as a military man he made up for as a shrewd politician, builder and merchant. By imposing a levy on all goods crossing his lands, the king accumulated a vast treasure. A large part of his wealth was derived from selling horses from Asia Minor to Egypt. Even so, the costs of his resplendent court and vast construction projects required the ruler to rely on heavy taxation and forced labor from the Israelites.

Solomon's religious policy was rather complicated. As a devout worshipper of Yahweh, he constructed a royal temple at Jerusalem which for centuries served as the center of Jewish activities. At the same time he took many foreign wives and allowed them to worship their gods just outside his capital city. From the standpoint of the deuteronomic historian, such tolerance was a heinous sin. However, for the tragic consequences of the idolatry and syncretism the chronicler ordinarily blames the harem rather than the monarch. As for the temple, while it was an architectural masterpiece for the time, it was "not much larger than a modern village church".[214]

Unification theology looks at the reigns of Saul, David and Solomon in terms of their dispensational importance. The forty year reign of Saul should have made restitution for the four decaces the Hebrews spent wandering aimlessly in the wilderness. Because of Saul's disobedience to God this could not be accomplished so David was anointed to carry out Yahweh's mission. David was willing to build the temple at Jerusalem but was forbidden to do so since he had shed so much blood in the proc- ess of establishing his kingdom. The forty years Solomon sat on the throne saw the accomplishment of that task. The erection of a national shrine at Jerusalem foreshadowed the coming of the Messiah. The temple of Solomon followed the design of the tabernacle of Moses sense it was also the described in the Pentateuch. In a mystical symbol of Christ. As one receives Christ, the incarnation of the Word, a mercy seat is formed within him and God is enthroned above it. Anyone uniting with Christ becomes a temple of God. To make the people a tabernacle for the presence of God by drawing them to himself is one way to interpret the purpose of Jesus' coming and ultimate mission. From this standpoint, the lasting significance for Solomon's national sanctuary is central in terms of the dispensation of restoration.

E. The Divided Kingdoms

However, Solomon paved the way for the breakup of his kingdom. By the time of his death the danger from external foes like the Moabites, Edomites and Syrians was matched by internal unrest and. popular resentment. Rehoboam was called to replace his father on a very shaky throne. When the brash monarch summarily rejected a formal plea for tax relief and disregarded the policy of moderation advanced by the older courtiers, most of the nation joined an insurgent government organized by the former prophet of Shiloh, Ahijah. Ten of the twelve tribes seceded from Jerusalem and formed a new nation at Shechem. Rehoboam was left with little more than the area surrounding his capital.

Jeroboam ruled for twenty-two years over the northern kingdom called Israel. He moved his capital from Shechem to Penuel to Tirzah which suggests that it took some time for the

214 M.A. Beek, *Ibid,* p. 87.

new government to get firmly organized. Worse, he ran into religious difficulties. Since the temple of Solomon was in loyalist hands, he made the old shrines of Dan and Bethel the headquarters for the religion of his subjects. To show his devotion to Yahweh and royal support for Dan and Bethel, the king erected two golden bulls ("calves"). For the pro-southern deuteronomic chronicler, the setting up of the golden bulls was sheer idolatry of the most unforgiveable kind.

Few historians would accept the simplistic judgments the deuteronomic editor hands down in regard to the monarchs of the divided kingdoms. Perhaps, however, there is a case to be made in his favor. Even if there was good reason for the protest against Solomon's extravagance and Rehoboam's shortsightedness, the breakup of the Hebrew united monarchy was a tragedy. Even united, the Israelites could only establish their hold over Palestine because the great imperial powers, Egypt and Mesopotamia, were in a period of temporary decline. By dividing, the Hebrews could easily be overwhelmed by any invader. Conquest was almost inevitable as a result of the dismemberment of the Davidic kingdom.

Religiously too, a divided Israel produced unfortunate consequences. The power of the Yahweh party to overcome the temptation to assimilate older Canaanite views and practices was greatly hampered by the lack of political unity. Possibly the secession of the ten tribes made religious centralization in Judah much easier but this came at the price of virtually abandoning most of Palestine to the syncretists. As for the northern region, whatever Jeroboam's original intent may have been in erecting the golden bulls at Bethel and Dan, the long-range effect was to make the worship of Yahweh look like the cult of Baal. Whereas the northern kingdom should have provided resources for religious reformation, in fact, faith in Yahweh had to depend upon what happened to the remnant in the south. In this sense, possibly the most vital one, the Bible was right to conclude that the kings of Israel did evil in the sight of God.[215]

According to Unification theology, because King Solomon had united with Satan, God divided his kingdom. The northern kingdom of Israel was in Cain's position and the southern kingdom of Judah was in Abel's. Therefore Israel should have come under the dominion of Judah much as Esau came under Jacob in the patriarchal age.j Through persistent efforts toward rapprochement and diligence in rooting out the evils in Judah which provoked secession, jthe southern loyalists could have rewon the support of their dissident brethren. As it turned out, however, the most that the tvJp nations accomplished was an occasional and temporary alliance. The rest of the time Israel and Judah were rivals and often foes.

The appearance of Assyrian war chariots and the rapid growth of a new empire in the Near East were clear warnings of the fate to befall the mini-states in the Palestinian corridor. Yet at just such a time of international crisis God raised up a series of prophets who initiated a religious reformation. Beginning with Amos Hebrew faith started to emphasize the social responsibilities of political and economic righteousness implicit in the covenant between Israel and her God.

On the basis of a lifetime study of the Hebrew prophets and their counterparts in a variety of cultures, J. Lindbom at the University of Lund describes their essential attributes as

215 The scholarly consensus is that syncretism of Baal worship and devotion to Yahweh Ionian exile. Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel,* : conclusions of this Israeli scholar are well worth reading. For the opposite thesis that the scholarly consensus does not go far enough in recognizing the appeal of syncretism in Hebre^v religious history, see M. Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament,* Columbia University, N.Y., 1971.

follows:

> *They are entirely devoted, soul and body, to the divinity. They are inspired personalities who have the power to receive divine revelations. They act as speakers and preachers who publicly announce what they have to say. They are compelled by higher powers and kept under divine constraint. The inspiration which they experience has a tendency to pass over into real ecstasy. One further attribute may be added: the special call. A prophet knows that he has never chosen his way himself: he has been chosen by the deity. He points to a particular experience in his life through which it has become clear to him that the deity has a special purpose with him and has designated him to perform a special mission.*[216]

Lindbom recognizes the marked differences between the early prophets and their far greater successors but also insists on the similarities. Kaufmann tends to stress the unique features of what he calls "classical prophecy". In the work of the literary prophets, he reminds us, Israelite religion reached a new height. Beginning with Amos, these men were the first to realize the primacy of morality in religion, and that the essence of God's demand is ethical rather than cultic.[217]

F. Babylonian Exile

The northern kingdom was invaded by the Assyrians and destroyed in 721 B.C. The southern kingdom was invaded by the Babylonians in 597 B.C. In spife of opposition from the prophet Jeremiah, King Zedekiah joined a rebellion against the Babylonian empire. Chaldean armies entered Palestine to suppress the insurrection and approached the gates of Jerusalem. They withdrew temporarily to attack an Egyptian army but soon returned to beseige the Judean capital. Jeremiah repeatedly urged surrender. In 586 B.C. the victorious Babylonians stormed the city, pillaging and burning at will. Zedekiah tried to flee across the Jordan but was captured. As an example to future rebels he was forced to witness the execution of his sons and was then blinded by his captors. Mass deportations were ordered, beginning a whole new period in Israelite history: the Babylonian exile.

Y. Kaufmann points out the decisive effect of this tragedy:

> *The fall of Jerusalem is the great watershed of the history of Israelite religion. The life of the people of Israel came to an end, the history of Judaism began. To be sure, the people lived on and were creative after the fall, but the form of their life and the conditions of their Existence and creativity were radically transformed. Israel ceased to be a normal nation and became a religious community.*[218]

Scholarly opinion has shifted in regard to the extent of the deportation carried out by Nebuchadnezzar. The common opinion now is that the deportation involved not more than 45,000 including women and children. What this means is that the conquerors exiled the governing class and a sizeable percentage of the Judean army while leaving most of the inhabitants alone.[219] S.W. Baron estimates that one-third of Judah was exiled,[220] but that guess is on the high side.

---

216 J. Lindbom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel,* Blackwell, Oxford, 1963, p. 6.

217 Y. Kaufmann, *Ibid,* pp. 343-347.

218 Y. Kaufmann, *Ibid,* p. 447.

219 W. Foerster, *From the Exile to Christ,* Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1964, p. 12.

220 S .W. Baron, *A Social arid Religious History of the Jews,* Columbia University Press, N.Y., 1952, vol. I, p. 105.

Once the exiles reached their destination, the journey in itself a harrowing experience, their new life was not an exceptionally difficult one. Jewish scholars like Baron admit that the policy of Assyrian and Babylonian monarchs toward deported nations was very favorable. The Hebrews rather quickly entered the active industrial] and commercial life of the empire. One family earlier exiled from Israel was in charge of the greatest private banking firm in Assyria. Within a century Hebrews had become landowners, merchants, contractors and rent collectors. Some at least gradually won high administrative positions in the Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian governments. Religious tolerance was taken for granted by the great empiresso there was no hostile interference with the spiritual life of the Jews. They could pray, sing psalms or study the Torah as they pleased. And they did.

In 538 B.C. Cyrus the Great of Persia captured Babylon and made it the capital of his far-flung empire which at its height extended from India to the Balkans. Babylonian Jewry had decided against the building of a temple in their new home. Like all refugee groups, they idealized and romanticized their past. It was natural therefore for the Jews to treasure everything which reminded them of the old days so a large part of our Old Testament was collected, edited and written down during this exilic period. Persian tolerance provided an opportunity for peaceful, undisturbed concentration on religious problems for Jews who remained loyal to their heritage.

Cyrus, with typical Persian broadmindedness, ordered the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem at government expense and returned to the Jews some of the sacred treasures taken by the earlier Babylonians. Darius I and Artaxerxes I (or II) even instructed the provincial governors to defray part of the cost of sacrificial worship at Jerusalem. A number of exiles returned at this time, more came with Nehemiah and third group with the priest Ezra. Most of the Jews, however, stayed where they had settled. They sent their best wishes, prayers and considerable amounts of money but had no interest in the hard life of a pioneer.

Nehemiah, a Jew in high position at the imperial court, returned to Judah to help in the reconstruction of Jerusalem. In spite of considerable local and official interference he succeeded in rebuilding the walls of the city. To Ezra, another former exile and a priest, belongs the credit for sparking a Jewish religious rebirth. Assembling the faithful he read from the Torah and expounded upon its significance for a revitalized faith. One could say he raised the pillars upon which post-exilic Judaism was henceforth built: scrupulous observance of the Law of Moses contained in the Pentateuch, regular study of it in the synagogue and respect for a new teacher class called rabbis. Ezra planted the seeds for the type of Judaism which was normative in the time of Jesus and persists today.

G. Preparation for the Messiah

Alexander of Macedon succeeded in defeating the Persians and took control of their huge empire. Greek civilization was planted from Egypt to India. Upon Alexander's death, his realm was divided among his top generals. For a century Palestine was ruled by the Ptolemies of Egypt and then it came into the hands of the Seleucid dynasty of Syria. Greek ideas and customs became fashionable even in Jerusalem. Among the young aristocrats, it was common to wear Hellenic-style clothes, shave, exercise in the gymnasiums and adopt Greek names. A Jewish high priest of the period was named Jason. Probably the Hellenization of Judea was limited to the wealthy and educated; if unchecked, it would have spread to the population as a whole.

CONTENTS

Antiochus Epiphanes (IV), the Seleucid monarch, vowed to complete the Hellenization of his subjects. Some called him a madman because of his rash actions against the remaining Jewish traditionalists. First he forbade the practice of circumcision and observance of the Sabbath. When those edicts aroused a storm of controversy, he had a pig sacrificed at the altar of the Jerusalem temple and forced the Jewish priests to eat the unclean meat. The Jewish temple itself was converted into a shrine of Zeus. Finally, the Syrian king outlawed the religion of Moses and decreed a death penalty against anyone caught practicing it.

Open rebellion broke out when a village priest killed a Jew offering pagan sacrifice and a royal official in charge of the affair. Mattathias and his sons Judas Maccabeus, Jonathan and Simon organized the Jews to drive out the Syrian overlords. Judas Maccabeus in 165 B.C. was able to enter Jerusalem and rededicate the desecrated temple. Almost a decade later Jonathan became the high priest and king of an independent Judea. But Rome entered the picture in 64 B.C. and the freedom of the Israelites was again lost.again.[221]

All this served to accentuate the expectation of divine intervention by the Messiah. By the exile and the disastrous subjugation of Israel by a whole series of conquerors, the Jews also became aware as they never had before of the reality and power of Satan. The priests of Qumran demonstrated that awareness:

> *From the God of Knowledge comes all that is and shall be.. . . The laws of all things are unchanging in His hand and He provides them with all their needs. Those born of truth spring from a fountain of light, but those born of falsehood spring from a source of darkness. All the children of righteousness are ruled by the Prince of Light and walk in the ways of light; but all the children of falsehood are ruled by the Angel of Darkness and walk in the ways of darkness. The Angel of Darkness leads all the children of righteousness astray, and until his end, all their sin, iniquities, wickedness, and all their unlawful deeds are caused by his dominion...*[222]

However, the Jews were not overwhelmed by Satan. No matter how often they had to walk through the valley of the shadow of death, they were confident that at the end of the road a messianic banquet would be theirs. A modern scholar has expressed the Jewish outlook at the end of the Old Testament age:

> *Israel's life story. . .cannot be told adequately apart from the conviction that God had called this people in his grace, separated them from the nations for a special responsibility, and commissioned them with the task of being his servant in the accomplishment of his purpose. Because Israel remembered her sacred past, she was able to live in the present with her face set toward the future - the time of the new covenant, the new creation, the Kingdom of God.*[223]

While it js common to speak of the events of Biblical history as "the acts of God", and while it is likewise common to speak of history as a progression, for Unification theology, the unique aspect of Hebraic history is the constant and clearly defined cycle of indemnity and restoration. Where Israel failed, she was quick to pay. This was not just numerical restoration.

---

221 Werner Foerster of the University of Muenster, Germany provides a detailed analysis of the historical situation from the Babylonian captivity to the end of the Hasmonean dynasty, *From the Exile to Christ,* Fortress, Philadelphia, 1964, pp. 11-81. Harry M. Orlinsky, *Ancient Israel,* pp. 118-141, gives a brief Jewish interpretation of the exile and restoration.

222 Quoted from the Essene Manual of Discipline (III), G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English,* Penguin Book, Harmondsworth, 1962, pp. 75-76.

223 B.W. Anderson, *Ibid,* p. 559

A keen spiritual readiness had to be developed to the exclusion of all other attachments. The Old Testament is an account of such a pruning process by God. This was achieved not only by God and man in interaction - but by the forces of God and man in a bitter struggle to overcome the destructive power of Satan.

> *By the waters of Babylon, there we sat down and wept, when we remembered Zion. On the willows there we hung up our lyres. For there our captors required of us songs, and our tormentors, mirth, saying, "Sing us one of the songs of Zion!" How shall we sing the Lord's song in a foreign land? If I forget you, O Jerusalem, let my right hand wither! Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I do not remember you, if I do not set Jerusalem above my* highest joy! (Psalms 137:1-6)

The passion which is expressed in Psalm 137 as the Jews long for Jerusalem when in a foreign land represents a victory for God in the providence of heart. Nevertheless, though God would direct history, when man failed He had no choice but to rechannel His directive energies, according to principle. In its attempted unfoldment of the clear lines of this struggle lies the uniqueness of Unification theology. From the prehistoric age to the time of Abraham, to the actual restoration programme begun in his family, particularly with Jacob, it is maintained that there was incisive motion on the part of God as well as fierce opposition from the side of Satan. Treading this path Israel walked between distress and hope. As the age drew to a close that distress - but even more so that hope - was at its height.

BIBLIOGRAPHY Ch. 7

Albright, William F., *From the Stone Age to Christianity,* Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1957.

Alt, Albrecht, *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion,* Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1967.

Anderson, B.W., *Understanding the Old Testament,* Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1966.

Baron, S.W., *A Social and Religious History of the Jews,* Columbia University Press, New York, vol. I, 1952.

Beek, M.A., *Concise History of Israel,* Harper & Row, New York, 1963.

Cassuto, Umberto, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus,* Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1967.

Clements, Ronald, *Abraham and David,* Studies in Biblical Theology, Allenson, Naperville, Illinois, 1967.

Danielou, Jean Cardinal, *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1973.

The Bible and the Liturgy, Notre Dame Press, Indiana, 1956.

Ehrlich, Ernst L., *A Concise History of Israel,* Darton, Longman, & Todd, London, 1962.

Epstein, Isidore, *Judaism,* Penguin Book, Baltimore, 1959.

Foerster, Werner, *From the Exile to Christ,* Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1964.

Graves, Robert and Patai, Raphael, *Hebrew Myths: The Book of Genesis,* McGraw-Hill, New York, 1966.

Herberg, W,*,The Writings of Martin Buber,* Meridian Books, New York, 1956.

CONTENTS

Herrmann, Siegfried, *Israel in Egypt,* Allenson, Naperville, Illinois, 1973.

Heschel, Abraham, *Man's Quest for God,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1954.

Kaufmann, Yehezkel, *The Religion of Israel,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1959.

Lampe, G.W.H. and Woollcombe, K.J., *Essays on Typology,* Allenson, Naperville, Illinois, 1957.

Lapple, Alfred, *Key Problems of Genesis,* Deus Book, Paulist Press, Glen Rock, New Jersey, 1967.

Lindbom, *J., Prophecy in Ancient Israel,* Blackwell, Oxford, 1963.

Lods, Adolphe, *Israel,* Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1953.

MacKenzie, R.A.F., *Faith and History in the Old Testament,* University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1963.

Noth, Martin, *Exodus,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1962.

The History of Israel, Adam and Charles Black, London, 1960.

Orlinsky, Harry M., *Ancient Israel,* Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1954.

Parrot, Andre, "Abraham Iconography," *Abraham and His Times,* Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1968.

Redlich, E. Basil, *The Early Tradition of Genesis,* Gerald Duckworth, London, 1950.

Robinson, T.H., "Genesis," *Abingdon Bible Commentary,* Abingdon Press, New York, 1929.

Rylaarsdam, J. Coert, "Exodus," *Interpreter's Bible,* Abingdon Press, New York, 1952.

Sarna, Naham M., *Understanding Genesis,* McGraw-Hill, New York, 1966.

Simpson, Cuthbert, "Genesis," *Interpreter's Bible,* Abingdon Press, New York, 1952.

Smith, M., *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1971.

Vermes, G., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English,* Penguin Book, Harmondsworth, 1962.

Von Rad, Gerhard, *Genesis,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1961.

Vriezen, T.C., *The Religion of Ancient Israel,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1967.

Wood, Leon, *A Survey of Israel's History,* Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1970.

Wright, G. Ernest, *God Who Acts,* Alec R. Allenson, Chicago, 1952.

CONTENTS

8. HISTORY OF RESTORATION: NEW TESTAMENT AGE

CHRISTIANS IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Judaism has often been noted for teaching that there is only one God and that all men should be brothers. A third concept is even more deeply embedded in Hebrew tradition: God works in history. History does not move in cycles, as the ancient Greeks believed. Nor, as the Romans thought, did it start with a golden age which has been in continual decline. For the Jews and the Christians, history has a definite direction, because God is using it to realize His goal for mankind. For Jews who escaped from Egypt and built a kingdom, history had begun with the Garden of Eden and would be consummated in the messianic age. For Christians too there is an intelligible meaning to the sequence of events.

Unification theology accepts the Biblical affirmation that God works in history and applies it in the most concrete fashion to the course of events which occurred after the death of Jesus. God did not cease His work because of the crucifixion. If his- tory before the coming of Christ illustrates God's plan for the restoration of mankind, subsequent history records the ways He is employing to fulfill it. By the crucifixion of the Messiah of Israel - and thus the hope of Israel - God's will was effectively thwarted. The two thousand years since have been a prolongation as well as an intensification of His original design.

Divine Principle suggests that there is a definite pattern to salvation-history. The New Testament age resembles the Old Testament age. As there are six periods in Jewish life from Jacob to Jesus, there are six parallel periods in the two thousand years from Jesus to the present. A pattern of correlation can be traced in the events and chronology of the two ages.

Christianity was once a new religion, and the epistles of St. Paul could be described, in Canon Phillip's words, as "Letters to Young Churches"; but the world into which the religion of Jesus was introduced was filled with fear, mistrust, bigotry, hatred and disillusionment. It took Christians about 400 years (from Christ's birth, about 4 B.C. to the Edict of Milan, 392 A.D.), a period comparable to the Hebrew sojourn in Egypt, to obtain freedom of worship and a fair hearing for the New Testament. From the reign of Tiberius Caesar to the accession of the Emperor Constantine (14-323 A.D.), the followers of Jesus were misunderstood, maligned and persecuted. Immoral emperors like Nero hated Christians because of their high ethical standards and their obvious disapproval of the wantonness so common in a permissive society. Despots like Domitian thought of them as a threat to law and order because they placed obedience to God above loyalty to Caesar. Even good emperors like Marcus Aurelius defended persecution of Christianity because they felt it to be a primitive faith which fostered superstition among the masses and was alien to the ideals upon which a rational social order must be built.

For a variety of reasons, the early Christians were imprisoned and often executed. By the time churches had been established in most parts of the empire, Rome was already in decay. Because the social order itself was shaky, many Romans felt insecure and threatened. Anything new and different aroused fear and gave rise to anxiety. Violence is an inevitable by-product of social disintegration; and the Christians provided a convenient scapegoat for a troubled and resentful majority.

CONTENTS

The Apostolic Fathers and Greek Apologists spent their lives expounding the reasonbleness and moral uprightness of the Christian faith. It was their task to defend the new religion against its detractors, Jewish or pagan. Especially at Alexandria, Christian scholars appeared who equalled the best of the Graeco-Roman philosophers. Origen, for example, was as learned and profound in his thinking as the Jewish Philo or Egyptian Plotinus. Because of the writings of Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and Athanasius, Christianity gradually became as intellectually respectable as Stoicism or Neoplatonism.

The first four centuries saw Christianity spread from the insignificant Roman province of Judea to every part of the empire and far beyond. In spite of official hostility and mob violence at times, churches were formed by Saint Paul in present-day Turkey and Greece, while others whose names have been forgotten established Christian fellowships in Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Italy, southern France and Spain. Coptic Christians of Egypt believe that St. Mark founded their church at Alexandria, and Jacobite churchmen claim that St. Thomas brought Christianity to them in southern India. Gregory the Illuminator, an Armenian aristocrat, converted his king and nation to the faith during the third century.

Persecution of the Christian minority, previously merely sporadic and local, reached full fury from 249 A.D. during the reign of Decius to 303 A.D. in the rule of Diocletian. The tide turned when Constantine in 312 A.D. saw a vision of a cross of light in the sky and the inscription "Conquer by this". He won his way to the imperial throne and the following year made Christianity one of the legal faiths of the empire. Constantine built many churches when he moved his capital to Byzantium and encouraged his officials to become Christians. His mother Helen became known for her piety and Constantine himself was baptized on his deathbed. With imperial patronage, Christianity became securely rooted in Roman civilization and began to witness mass conversions. By order of emperor Theodosius, the Church became the state religion and all its rivals were outlawed.

As a result of growing differences of opinion among Christians on matters of theology and worship, efforts were made to unify and standardize the faith. In the second century, there were as many different kinds of Christians as there are denominations in contemporary America. Three methods were employed to counteract this confusing and divisive situation. Beginning with Ignatius of Antioch (35-115 A.D.) the bishop was made the unifying force in church life. Loyalty to Christ was considered synonymous with obedience to one's bishop. As the Syrian churchman insisted, "Where the bishop is, there is the Church." By establishing a regular clergy and placing them under the authority of a bishop, Ignatius believed the unity of the faith could be restored and the effectiveness of the church guaranteed. According to the argument put forward by the centralizers, Christ bestowed his authority to his twelve apostles and they transmitted their power to their successors, the bishops. Irenaeus of Lyons (circa 180 A.D.) emphasized the fact that there was a direct and uninterrupted chain of command from God to Christ and from the apostles to the bishops. Understandably, at that time (and ever since for that matter) some doubted that episcopal government provides the proper or apostolic. means for insuring Christian unity.

A second unifying force was the canonization of the New Testament. Whereas Palestinian Jews met at Jamnia in 90 A.D. to determine which books would be included in the Old Testament, the formation of our New Testament took place gradually and was never finalized in quite the same manner. Marcion (circa 160) rejected completely the authority of the Old Testament and prepared a New Testament made up of the Gospel of Luke, the epistles of Paul (excluding the Pastorals) and a work of his own called the "Antitheses". About 150

A.D. Tatian combined Matthew, Mark, Luke and John into a single narrative which became the standard Gospel in the Syrian churches until the fifth century. Most Christians quite early accepted the authority of the four Gospels, thirteen Pauline epistles, Acts, I Peter, and I John but many doubted the value of Hebrews, James, II Peter, II and III John, Jude and Revelation. A number of churches treated as scripture the Epistle of Barnabas, the letters of Ignatius, Clement and Polycarp, the Shepherd of Hermas, Acts of Peter, the Didache and the Gospel of Thomas. The church of Rome read 22 (not 27) books at their worship services; Clement of Alexandria had 30 books in his New Testament, including Hermas, Barnabas, Clement and the Apocalypse of Peter. Origen in the third century quoted Hermas and Barnabas as scripture. For two centuries the Eastern churches shied away from the book of Revelation and the Western churches from the Epistle to the Hebrews. Not until an Easter letter of Athanasius (367 A.D.) do we have a list of approved New Testament books like our own.

Much earlier the churches had employed a third method to counteract division; individually, they prepared statements of faith, excluding certain Christians from their ranks. The Apostles' Creed, for example, based on a baptismal oath in the church of Rome, was expanded to refute Gnostic and Docetic ideas popular in many Christian circles. The Nicean Creed was designed to combat Arian Christianity and later confessions of faith were adopted to eradicate Nestorianism and Monophysitism. Without exception, credal statements served to buttress the orthodoxy of the majority while expelling the minority as heretics and schismatics.

Beginning with the ecumenical council at Nicea called by the emperor Constantine in 325 A.D., assemblies of bishops convened to restore doctrinal and liturgical unity to the badly divided Christian church. Seven of these are considered authoritative among the Eastern Orthodox. Roman Catholics continued the practice without the approval of the Eastern Christians and later without support from Protestants. Since the birth of the ecumenical movement, conciliar Christianity has been revived but none of the meetings of the World Council of Churches is considered as important as the councils of Nicea or Chalcedon.

AGE OF THE PATRIARCHS

By the fourth century, Christianity had been built upon a solid foundation in the Roman Empire and was already spreading beyond the area governed by the Caesars. The next stage in Christian history is comparable to the 400 years the Bible assigns to the age of the judges of Israel. Just as early Christianity witnessed the growth of the power of local bishops, the imperial Church saw power being further centralized in the person of the patriarchs. A patriarch was the bishop of one of the chief cities of the Roman Empire. Christians looked for guidance, inspiration and authority to the influential bishops of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch or Jerusalem.

Since there were comparatively few Christians in Palestine after the disastrous Jewish revolts of 70 and 135 A.D., the bishop of Jerusalem was a minor figure and was not recognized officially as a patriarch until 451 A.D. However, the fact that Christians regularly made pilgrimages to the Holy Land gave this ecclesiastic enormous prestige and the liturgical customs of Jerusalem were introduced into nearly every church. Antioch, besides being an influential imperial city, was known as the place where followers of Jesus were first called Christians and was famous for its school of Biblical studies. At the height of his power the

patriarch of Antioch governed the Christians of Syria, Lebanon, southern Asia Minor, Cyprus, Palestine, Iraq, Iran, Georgia, and south India. Alexandria, a noted university city (second only to Athens) was as well a commercial center. Its patriarch ruled Egypt, Libya and Ethiopia. Constantinople, the capital of the empire, contained the most important church; its bishop served as an advisor to the government and was known after 587 A.D. as the ecumenical patriarch.

Besides these four patriarchs in the East, the bishop of Rome was called the patriarch of the West. Though he emphasized the fact that he was the successor of Peter, the Roman bishop was largely overshadowed by the ecumenical patriarch of Constantinople who had the ear of the emperor and reigned at the heart of the empire. Only recently have Christians in the West come to recognize the validity of Eastern Orthodox claims that for many centuries the focal point of Christian life and thought was in the East. The bishop of Rome, however, had several long-range advantages. In the pentarchy of patriarchs, he alone was far enough away from the center of imperial power to be able to act as a more or less independent agent. The patriarch of Constantinople was repeatedly subjected to the will of the emperors and empresses, was often embroiled in party politics, and fell prey to the practitioners of Byzantine statecraft of the most notorious sort. Because Antioch and Alexandria were committed to theological discussion, their patriarchs became involved in questions of orthodoxy and heresy which split their churches and weakened their authority. If the Roman Church had few prominent theologians, for that very reason she was able to preserve a reputation for untroubled orthodoxy. Furthermore, the Roman prelate soon found how easy it was to use the jealousy of Alexandria and Antioch toward Constantinople to his advantage.

In the West the bishop of Rome gradually assumed greater authority. While the eastern patriarchs saw their power decrease as a result of the Christological and Trinitarian controversies, Latin Christianity produced able theologians like Augustine and strong-willed administrators like Popes Leo I and Gregory the Great. The West was untouched by the Mohammedan invasions which devastated the Near East and threatened Constantinople. The patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem had to learn how to survive in a Moslem world and the ecumenical patriarch lost hundreds of thousands of his former adherents to the new religion of Islam. When the Byzantine emperor was preoccupied with foes, the bishop of Rome was free to exercise political as well as ecclesiastical power. Although a strong theoretical case can be made for the primacy of the ecumenical patriarch, the primacy of Rome was assured for all practical purposes after the Moslem advance.

During the first eight centuries of Christianity, the monastic way of life was adopted by large numbers of believers. St. Anthony about 250 A.D. founded Christian monasticism when he gave up all of his possessions and retired to the Egyptian desert to live the life of a hermit. Pachomius (circa 320 A.D.) established the first Christian monastery in Egypt. Monasticism was favored by Jerome and Augustine. Martin of Tours founded the first French monastery about 362 A.D.; but western monasticism owes most to Benedict of Nursia who created the mother-house of the Benedictine order at Monte Cassino in 529 A.D. Monasteries were soon common throughout the Christian world, among the most notable being the Byzantine community at Mount Athos in Greece and the Celtic ones of Ireland and Scotland. A Protestant church historian says of monasticism, "that not only the best men supported the institution; they were to be found in it."[224] *Divine Principle* compares these early monks to the ancient Israelite prophets who flourished at the time of the Judges.

224 W. Walker, *A History of the Christian Church,* Scribners, N.Y., 1959 revision, p. 128.

UNITED CHRISTIAN EMPIRE (120 YEARS)

Just as the united kingdom of Israel and Judah under Saul, David and Solomon lasted 120 years, so a united Christian empire was created by Charlemagne which continued for about the same length of time. The prophet Samuel anointed Saul to serve as king of the Hebrew nation and Pope Leo III crowned Charlemagne as Holy Roman Emperor at St. Peter's Church on Christmas day, 800 A.D. Secular historians explain that the Roman bishop was greatly indebted to the Frankish ruler be- cause of protection he had earlier received when disaffected Italian nobles threatened to drive the pope from his throne. From a purely political perspective, the papal act merely restored the 1 empire to the West where it belonged before the time of Constantine. In fact, there had more than once been two Roman emperors, one for the East and a second for the West. Emperor Leo V at Constantinople recognized as much and treated Charlemagne as his equal.

Charlemagne was more than a successor to Augustus for he became the visible embodiment of a great ideal. A theocratic stamp had been placed on the empire. God's consecration had been given to a western emperor by the hands of His highest representative. To Charlemagne it seemed like the fulfillment of Augustine's dream in the *City of God.* Western Christendom was at last united in a kingdom of God of which the Frankish ruler was the earthly head. Church and state resembled two sides of the same shield, one leading man to temporal happiness, the other to eternal blessedness.

Charlemagne himself realized the religious as well as political nature of his mission, though he was also coached in his role by the scholar Alcuin who compared him to King David. Speaking to Pope Leo, the Frankish monarch declared:

> *My part it is, in accordance with the aid of divine piety, to defend on all sides the holy church of Christ from pagan incursion and infidel devastation abroad, and within to add strength to the Catholic faith by our recognition of it. Your part it is, most holy father, having raised your hands to God, like Moses, to aid our arms, in order that by your intercession, God granting and leading us, the Christian people may everywhere be always victorious over the enemies of its holy name.*[225]

Charlemagne's kingdom was interpreted in the same way that Byzantine theologians explained the role of the Eastern Roman Empire. They referred to the desirability of a symphony between church and state. Spiritual and civil authorities should work in harmony, each supporting the other.[226] But the Holy Roman Empire represented a new ideal for the West. As an empire it was to unite western Europe. As an instrument for the diffusion of civilization it was to protect and promote the ideals of Latin culture. Most importantly, the emperor was expected to be the guardian and patron of the Christian faith.

Charlemagne's empire did not last but the dream behind it persisted for many centuries. Charles V who reigned during the Protestant Reformation believed that it was his task as a Hapsburg to realize the ideal represented by Charlemagne. Even Napoleon consciously modelled himself upon the pattern set by the earlier Frankish ruler (though when it was his turn to be crowned by the Pope, he yanked the crown from the pillow and crowned himself)

---

225 H. Fichtenau, *The Carolingian Empire,* Harper Torchbook, N.Y., 1964, p. 60

226 C. Manschreck, *A History of Christianity in the World,* Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1974, pp. 111-112.

CONTENTS

DIVIDED CHRISTENDOM

When King Solomon compromised his devotion to Yahweh by allowing his foreign wives to worship their own gods, and neglected to fulfill the unifying purpose of the temple, the seeds were sown which resulted in the breakup of his united kingdom. Likewise, Charlemagne's Holy Roman Empire was split asunder in deadly rivalry between what later became modern France and Germany.

Religiously the two parts of the imperial church of the Caesars gradually divided. The patriarch of Constantinople and the pope of Rome came to treat each other as enemies rather than fellow servants of the same Christ. Customs between East and West had differed for centuries. Eastern Christendom used leavened bread for Communion, had a married clergy, and refused to have statues in the churches. Western Christendom used unleavened sacramental bread, insisted on a celibate priesthood, and venerated statues of the saints. None of these differences was of crucial importance until the popes claimed that they were successors of St. Peter and therefore the rightful head of the entire church. Finally, the legates of Pope Leo IX in 1054 laid a sentence of excommunication on the altar of Constantinople's patriarchal church Santa Sophia. Patriarch Michael Cerularius replied by pointing out that since Pope Leo had just died his legates had no power. According to the Orthodox historian Nicolas Zernov, the momentous excommunication of the senior Greek prelate was offered in the name of a dead pope; its contents displayed the exceptional ignorance and prejudice of the hot-tempered Cardinal Humbert, and the act has never been approved or repudiated by the popes even to the present day.[227] Be that as it may, Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism were now separated. According to *Divine Principle,* the Western church from henceforth became the object of God's dispensation in the Abel position, as Judah had in the period of the divided Hebrew kingdom. The aspect which distinguished the Hebrew tribe from others was that through them, God would send the Messiah; similarly, though God continued to work on other levels where possible, His direct will for the expansion of providence shifted to the Roman Church.

Meanwhile the papacy improved greatly its political and financial position. Throughout the Dark Ages and the medieval period, the Vatican was equal to most secular sovereigns. During the reigns of Gregory VII (1073-1085) and Innocent III (1198-1216), the papacy reached the height of temporal and spiritual power. The bishops of Rome believed they were vicars of Christ and acted accordingly. Since they were convinced that St. Peter had given them the keys to heaven and hell, they ordered kings to do their bidding or face the terrible consequences of excommunication. When Henry IV of Germany was placed under an anathema in 1076, Pope Gregory made the penitent monarch stand in the snow for three days, barefoot and thinly clad, before he would pardon him.

However, in the long run the ambitions of the papacy proved detrimental to the Roman Catholic cause. A recent church historian remarks:

> *The great struggle of the Middle Ages was the struggle for independence and sovereignty. It was a struggle between titans, church and state, and in the end, after multitudinous ups and downs it might be said that the church won. But it was a Pyrrhic victory, for the papal primacy and implied infallibility on which the church built its case suffered from what*

227 N. Zernov, *Orthodox Encounter,* James Clarke, & Co., London, 1961, p. 27.

Augustine identified as the essence of all sin - the attempt on the part of man to imitate the liberty and omnipotency of God.[228]

As Israel and Judah were warned by the prophets to repent of their sins, so monks and saints of the Catholic Church denounced the greed, pride and sensuality of many of the powerful ecclesiastics. Dominic, a Spaniard (1170-1221), founded the Order of Preachers (Dominicans) to reform the church through preaching and teaching, especially in university towns. Francis of Assisi (1182-1226) formed the Minor Brethren bound together by love and practicing the utmost poverty to go out into the world two by two, preaching repentance, singing, and caring for lepers and outcasts. Church historians praise Francis as the highest and most inspiring representative of medieval piety.[229]

Intellectually too, the Middle Ages produced noteworthy achievements. Anselm, Abelard, Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus but particularly Thomas Aquinas, labored to reconcile the claims of faith and reason. All of the Scholastics taught in the newly-created universities to show that there was nothing incompatible with being a Christian and accepting the rediscovered philosophy of Aristotle or the scientific learning introduced to the West from the Arab world. The religious philosophy of Aquinas proved to be the most influential Scholastic achievement, gradually becoming normative in Roman Catholic circles and in our own day revived by Jacques Maritain and Etienne Gilson.

During the Middle Ages, mysticism was cultivated by Hugo of St. Victor, Meister Eckhart, John Tauler and Thomas a Kempis. Through meditation and self-discipline, the mystics sought to transcend ordinary human experience and bring themselves into direct union with God. Most influential among the numerous medieval mystics were Bernard of Clairvaux and Francis of Assisi. At a time when Christianity often degenerated into external ceremonies or simple obedience to the will of the local priest, the mystics rediscovered the reality of the God of heart.

When the Israelites refused to heed the prophets, God used the Assyrians as the rod of His wrath. In a parallel way, He employed the Mohammedans to chastise a corrupt papacy. Though the popes organized seven great Crusades to wrest the Holy Land from the Arabs and later the Turks, in the end the Moslems remained in control of Jerusalem. The failure of the crusades damaged papal prestige and resulted in widespread skepticism. Christians asked why the pope would send the faithful to die for an impossible cause.. Why did Christ allow his own homeland to be held by infidels? Some of the crusaders recognized the superiority of Moslem culture and many of the scholars in the universities began teaching ideas derived from Islamic philosophers like Averroes or Avicenna. For the first time the West was able to judge itself in the light of a very different and in some ways more advanced civilization.

PAPAL EXILE AND THE RENAISSANCE

Unification theology suggests that there are many direct parallels between the fate of Israel and Judah at the hands of the Assyrians and Babylonians and the calamities which befell the Catholic Church after the close of the Middle Ages. When the hierarchy refused to follow the direction indicated by dedicated monks and friars, the papacy was forced to undergo its own type of Babylonian captivity. Since the Church had so often and so

228 C. Manschreck, *Ibid,* p. 121.
229 W. Walker, *Ibid,* p. 232.

disastrously meddled in politics, the powerful king of France ordered the papal court to move from Rome to Avignon where he could keep his eye on it. For seventy years (sixty-nine recorded years) the popes were little more than vassals of the French monarchy (1309-77). It was a period of humilia-tion for the Vatican and dismay for the Church as a whole.

At the end of 70 years of exile in Babylon, Cyrus permitted the Hebrews to return to Palestine. This joyous homecoming was accomplished in three stages over a period of 140 years. When the 70 years of papal captivity finally ended, Western Christianity had to recover its self-respect and sense of mission. Urban VI became the pope at Rome and Clement VII was crowned pope at Avignon. When the two anathematized each other and divided western Christendom, a council of reform-minded cardinals at Pisa denounced both and elected Alexander V to the office. For six years Roman Catholics found themselves with three popes. From 1414-1418 A.D. a council was held at Constance, deposed them all, and selected Martin V to occupy the papal see. The schism was over at last.

Avignon and the Great Schism marked the end of the medieval papacy. Loyalty to the pope as the symbol of a unified West was replaced by allegiance to the sovereign of one's particular national state. Henceforth it was more important to be an Englishman, Frenchman, Spaniard or Italian than to be a Catholic. For good or ill, the dream of a united Europe bound together by common Christian traditions and respect for Latin civilization had become for many an illusion and for some a nightmare. Whereas earlier western man was first of all a Christian, now he thought of himself first as a citizen and the subject of an earthly monarch.

The Councils of Pisa and Constance had taken upon themselves the right to criticize the pope and when necessary depose him. For the first time, canon lawyers argued that a general council of the church was superior to the bishop of Rome. An issue had been raised which would vex Catholicism for centuries. Traditionalists would seek to restore the papacy to the place which Gregory, Innocent and Boniface had taken for granted. Against heavy odds and despite numerous defeats they would work for a reversal of conciliarism in favor of a forthright declaration of papal infallibility - a victory achieved at the Vatican Council in 1870. Out of the same agonizing reassessment of the church and its role in society, a second group of Catholics would seek to decentralize and simplify the church. Vatican Council II in large part represents the triumph of this attitude.

The Renaissance too signals the passing of the medieval ideal. Whereas the Middle Ages promoted asceticism and otherworldliness, man now delighted in the beauty of nature and glorified physical pleasures. We live in this world, men said, and our chief aim in life is to enjoy its satisfactions. The revival of classical learning restored the Greek ideal of man. Michelangelo's "David" symbolized the beauty of the human body. Rubens' paintings depicted a world of sensuous enjoyment totally different from the Franciscan model of the saint dedicated to Lady Poverty. Boccaccio and his ribald love stories were in; Benedict and his monks at Monte Cassino were out. Medieval man thought of life as a pilgrimage through a vale of tears on the way to the happiness of heaven; Renaissance man believed that a good God had created the earth to be enjoyed to the fullest.

While *Divine Principle* recognizes the evils which the new worldliness produced, it emphasizes the positive contributions of the Renaissance. The revolt against medievalism represented a philosophy of life affirmation. Man discovered the value of the individual, the significance of earthly existence, the importance of freedom and the inspiring beauty of nature. The objective of divine providence is to restore man and the world in their totality. If man's earthly life is neglected, his restoration would be incomplete.

CONTENTS

Professor Roger L. Shinn of Union Theological Seminary has advocated the celebration of the secular:

> *One aspect of the new humanism is its profound appreciation for the secular - that is, an appreciation for the history in which we live as a realm of real possibilities and opportunities, not simply as a meaningless process or a preparation for a life to come. The ethos is that of a rejoicing in this world rather than a resigned endurance.. . . The Renaissance, the Enlightenment, the romantic movement, the industrial revolution, and more recently the anticolonial and racial revolutions all mark stages in this victory of freedom. They are the Heilgeschichte, the salvation history of the secular spirit.*[230]

PREPARATION FOR THE SECOND ADVENT

A. The Protestant Reformation

Four centuries before the outbreak of World War I, Martin Luther, converted in a thunderstorm he mistook for the second advent, arose to nail his 95 theses on the door of the Roman Catholic Church and thus the door of history. Though the Reformation did not accomplish as much as he wanted - one of his desires was to throw James and Revelation out of the Bible - as a result of Protestantism, Christianity was able to have a greater impact on the world. For *Divine Principle* the period he heralded parallels the time of preparation that Malachi 400 years before Christ proclaimed, a time to make way for the great day of the Lord.

During the post-exilic period, Judaism encountered many foreign ideas, incorporated some into its theology and spurned the remainder. The Hellenism and Hebraism of pre-Maccabaean times in Israel paralleled the Hellenic and Hebraic revivals of the Renaissance and Reformation. Though both were necessary, in their relationship to each other the humanistic and secular Greek revival was Cain to the theocentric, Biblical, Hebraic revival which, for *Divine Principle,* was of an Abel-type inspiration.

The Reformation, besides the basic action of moving the Bible out of the hands of the priests and its Latin garb by means of some courageous men and the timely invention of the printing press, can be understood as the rediscovery of certain basic scriptural ideas applied to every area of life. Protestants asserted the sole authority of the Bible as their guide in matters of faith and conduct, the priesthood of all believers, justification by faith, the rights of private conscience and the sanctity of the common life. Each of these affirmations was a protest against the medieval interpretation of Christianity; each was a call for the thorough reorientation of the church. A modern Roman Catholic historian states it thus:

> *Since the needed reform of the Church so ardently desired by the majority of Christians did not take place at the proper time, there occurred in the second decade of the sixteenth century that appalling catastrophe which is usually, but not correctly, designated as the Reformation; for the original desire to improve conditions in the Church ended in downright revolution.*[231]

Hus, Wycliffe, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and others believed that only a complete renovation of Christian life and thought could enable the Church to carry out the mission God intended for it. If the final result was to wreck the organizational and institutional unity of

230 R.L. Shinn, *The New Humanism,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1968, p. 50.

231 K. Bihlmeyer & H. Tuchle, *Church History,* Newman Press, Westminster, 1966, vol. Ill, pp. 1-2.

western Christendom, that was not the Reformers' goal. Roman Catholics responded to the Protestant revolt, as they termed it, with a counter-Reformation of their own. Many abuses were corrected in order to stem the tide which threatened to engulf the Catholic world. France, Spain, Italy and Poland remained loyal to the pope only because of the efforts of reform-minded bishops and the zeal of new Catholic orders like the Society of Jesus. The Council of Trent (1545-1563) was unable to bring Protestants back into the Roman church but it checked the worldliness of the upper clergy which had disgusted so many of the laity.

B. Two Currents in Modern History

Desiderius Erasmus, one of the Catholic humanists and an early supporter of Luther, believed that man's reason was a good guide to happiness here and hereafter. Neither the Protestants nor the Catholics had much sympathy for such a view, so the Age of Reason which appeared in the 18th century owed little to the papacy or the Reformers. Following the Protestant revolt and the terrible wars of religion came the period called the Enlightenment. Largely limited to the bourgeois and educated classes, it espoused rationalism, liberalism, humanitarianism and the scientific outlook. Voltaire was its most famous spokesman, Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin, two of its celebrated disciples.

Peter Gay gives the gist of the Enlightenment philosophy:

> *The men of the Enlightenment united on a vastly ambitious program, a program of secularism, humanity, cosmopolitanism, and freedom, above all, freedom in its many forms - freedom from arbitrary power, freedom of speech, freedom of trade, freedom to realize one's talents, freedom of aesthetic response, freedom, in a word, of moral man to make his own way in the world. In 1784, when the Enlightenment had done most of its work, Kant defined it as man's emergence from his self-imposed tutelage, and offered as its motto Sapere aude - 'Dare to know': take the risk of discovery, exercise the right of unfettered criticism, accept the loneliness of autonomy.*[232]

And Voltaire's "Ecrasez l'infame" (crush the infamy) directed toward the Catholic Church, has been resounding against the Christians ever since, albeit often for different motives.

The Enlightenment had little immediate, direct influence on the churches, Catholic or Protestant. Conservatives would agree with Gay that the Enlightenment signified "the rise of modern paganism". Yet the long-range, indirect effect of this movement was enormous. The Enlightenment believed in reason rather than revelation. It eschewed dogma in favor of ethics. Because it was sure of natural law it doubted the existence of the miraculous.

Deism was the name given to Enlightenment views in regard to religion. The deists exercised some influence in the Church of England, more in the British Presbyterian churches and among the American Congregationalists. But this direct impact upon the clergy was of minor importance by comparison with the enthusiasm with which the Enlightenment was taken up by the secular universities. The historian of ideas can trace a straight line from Voltaire to Bertrand Russell.

As the rationalism popular in some circles extended the current of the Renaissance, German Pietism and the Methodist revivals of the Wesleys carried the current of the Reformation.

---

232 P. Gay, *The Enlightenment,* Knopf, N.Y., 1967, p. 3.

Once the Protestants had won the right to exist, much of their energy was directed toward the careful formulation of rigorous doctrinal orthodoxy and the achievement of cultural respectability. They set about proving to the world that they were not just wild rebels but were staid, stable citizens. As a result, the fire of early Protestantism seemed to die down. Faith became interpreted as adherence to correct doctrine and the Protestant churches looked like bastions of conventionality.

With Pietism, however, a sudden burst of enthusiasm made the churches of Europe and North America more vital. Philipp Jakob Spener (1635-1705) was disturbed by the decay into which Protestantism had fallen and to remedy the situation he recommended associations within German Lutheranism for the promotion of experiential Christianity. These colleges of piety would foster devotional reading of the Bible. Faith is not simply knowledge but a living power out of which an actual experience of Christian renewal proceeds. Inner spiritual phenomena and individual experience are more important than questions of dogma.

Besides Spener's movement, other notable leaders appeared emphasizing the need for an experience-centered faith. Count Zinzendorf welcomed a group of Czech Protestant refugees to his estates, became impressed by their personal devotion and dedicated the rest of his life to a promotion of their ideals. John and Charles Wesley formed a Holy Club at Oxford out of which grew the revival preaching which produced Methodism. George Fox (1614-1691) earlier founded the Society of Friends which believed in direct guidance by an inner light. This was also the time of Swedenborg (1688-1772), who applied his learning as a Scandinavian scientist to an exploration of the wonders and mysteries of the spiritual world. Through his monumental writings many have been helped to experience the immediacy of God's presence. Spener, Zinzendorf, Fox, the Wesleys and Swedenborg differ markedly but they agree that Christianity should be a spirit-centered religion based on direct personal experience.

Another in this tradition was Friedrich Schleiermacher, who with Kant, Fichte, Hegel and Schelling developed spiritually constructive philosophical systems to counter mechanistic and materialistic theories. One of Schleiermacher's greatest contributions to the history of theology was his effort to go beyond Hegel who overemphasized the intellectual side of religion and Kant who was inclined to reduce religion to morality alone. For Schleiermacher the heart of religion is an intuitive sense of dependence upon God which is more important than simply correct doctrine or proper behavior. We have an immediate awareness of the divine in the depths of our being. Man has an intuitive consciousness of oneness with God. Religion is not merely theoretical knowledge or just moral action but man's feeling of absolute dependence on God. We can *feel* our oneness with the universe and our kinship with God.[233]

In addition, at this time, and in this vein, Romanticism did much to provide an atmosphere conducive to the revival of Catholicism among men of letters, artists and ladies of fashion. Chateaubriand became the spokesman for aesthetic Roman Catholicism and John Henry Newman sparked a High Church revival in Anglicanism. American Protestantism gained many new members because of the passionate preaching of evangelists like Lyman Beecher, Charles G. Finney and Dwight L. Moody.

C. Industrial Revolution

233 For appreciative evaluations of this theologian, see Paul Tillich, *A History of Christian Thought,* pp. 386-410, and Robert W. Funk, ed., "Schleiermacher as Contemporary," *Journal for Theology and Church* #7, Herder and Herder, N.Y., 1970.

Europe and America were completely transformed by the transition from a stable agricultural society to modern industrialism. The machine age bettered economic conditions for large numbers of people and greatly improved man's physical environment in preparation for the New Age, according to *Divine Principle.* Protestantism generally favored capitalism, the rising middle class, the factory owner and industrialist. European Catholicism was ordinarily more sympathetic to the landed aristocrats and the peasants. This meant that preachers were inclined to view what was happening as a sign of God's favor and human progress, while priests lamented the alienation of modern man and his flight from God.

In the United States Protestants and Catholics gradually switched positions. When waves of immigrants from Europe swept into Boston, New York, Chicago and St. Louis, the older Protestants bewailed the sins of the city, extolled the virtues of the small town and looked back nostalgically at the old-time religion. Catholics, on the other hand, thought of the blue collar worker, local policeman and party boss as symbols of an American type of Catholicism ever-faithful to the parish, the priest and the pope. Industrial America became the stronghold of Roman Catholic power whereas Protestantism came to rely on the suburbanite, the farmer and the small businessman.

A few Protestants, however, refused to abandon the cities. William Booth (d. 1912) and his wife Catherine in London felt called to bring the gospel to all those cast off by respectable society. Through difficult struggles, they brought dramatic change in the lives of thousands. Booth mobilized them into a Salvation Army which has continued to minister to that class of society unreached by most churches.

D. Democracy and Imperialism

European social critics, whether of the left or right, begin their analysis of modern civilization with the French Revolution of 1789. Leftist commentators praise the way the masses of France rose up with righteous indignation to eradicate the absolutist Bourbon monarchy, behead the decadent aristocracy, outlaw a corrupt church and proclaim the universal rights of man. On the other side, men point to the atheism of the revolutionary ringleaders, the wanton destructiveness of the street mobs and the Reign of Terror which finally led to the dictatorship of Napoleon. Both sides agree, however, that the storming of the Bastille signifies the beginning of a new world.

For Unification theology, the French Revolution was the descendent of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment; the American Revolution, of the Reformation. Parisian revolutionaries were deliberately opposed to everything traditional Christianity stood for and determined to found a secular state. The American tradition was quite the opposite.

While some dissenters in England were having their ears cut off for listening to Puritan sermons, a radical Separatist group of 101 persons came across the Atlantic in a ship with lessliving space than a contemporary one-bedroom apartment. Producing the first democratic government since the time of ancient Greek city-states, the United States was founded on the basis of religious toleration. A century after Alexis de Tocqueville, another Frenchman realized the importance of America:

> *And, as a matter of fact, America is today the area in the world in which, despite powerful opposite forces and currents, the notion of a Christian-inspired civilization is more part of the national heritage than in any other spot on earth. If there is any hope for the sprouting of a new Christendom in the modern world, it is in America that the historical and ethico-*

social ground which could become a soil for such a sprouting may be found... .[234]

Historians have recognized two traditions of Christian philosophy behind the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. On the one side were John Adams, John Hancock, and Roger Sherman raised in the Calvinist tradition. The Congregationalists of New England and the Presbyterians of the middle Atlantic states believed that since all men are corrupted by original sin, the less power an official has, the less sin he can commit against his fellowman; from this come checks and balances. On the other side stand men no less pious. Thomas Jefferson, though often denounced from the pulpit, was connected with the Deists; he, with Franklin, thought that since man is created good he is endowed with certain inalienable rights. Political liberty is a right guaranteed by nature and nature's God.

Imperialism like democracy was a by-product of the modern age. As a result of the explorations of adventurers like Columbus, Yasco da Gama and John Cabot, Christendom awakened to the realization that there existed a world far greater than western Europe and the lands surrounding the Mediterranean Sea. For the man of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the discovery of North and South America, the trip around the southern tip of Africa and the reopening of regular trade routes to the Far East were as important as our successful moon landings. Soon after the explorer came the conqueror. Beginning with the Spanish and Portuguese, great trade empires were set up by several western European nations. The largest of these were organized by the French and British. Colonies all over the world provided raw materials and new markets for the mother countries benefiting from the Industrial Revolution.

Christianity prospered as a result of the imperialist expansion of the Spanish, Portuguese, British, French, Dutch and Germans. With the conqueror came the cross. However, the motivation was more often mercantilism than Christianity. The Spanish and Portuguese came for gold but gave little in return. The development of those areas reflects this. In North America where the focus was religious (however imperfect), Christian progress has been phenomenal. Then when America sent her missionaries abroad, they were not to colonize but to Christianize.

But World War I sounded the death knell for the Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian and German empires, and World War II wrote "finis" across the empires of the Dutch, French and British. For western Europe the age of imperialism had come to an end. About a hundred independent nations were created out of lands over which the French tricolor and Union Jack had flown for a century or more.

However, at the same time that resurgent nationalism dis- mantled the western empires, a new imperialism swept eastern Europe. Russia built a slave empire out of the previously sovereign nations in the Baltic, the Balkans, Poland, Czechoslovakia and half of Germany, and became the self-declared foe of democracy and Christian religion. Leo Tolstoi, there as the wheel began to turn in that direction, was said to have asked a prophetic question when confronted with a belligerent socialist student who had tried to tell him Christ did not exist. Deeply saddened, he said, "Is this what the children of the future have to face?"

E. Missionary Movement

When Latourette wrote his history *Christianity Through the Ages,* he observed of the Church:

---

234 Jacques Maritain, *On the Philosophy of History,* Scribners, N.Y., 1957, p. 161

As a religion it has had a wider geographic spread and is more deeply rooted among more peoples than any other religion in the history of mankind. Both that spread and that rootage have been mounting in the past 150 years and especially in the present century.[235]

The nineteenth century was a great Protestant era. In addition to sweeping changes in the outward conduct of life, the century witnessed two outstanding religious developments: the organization of Protestant missionary activity on a worldwide scale and the rapid expansion of the Sunday School movement.

Missionary work characterized Christianity from the very outset. After the apostolic age, Roman Catholics evangelized the barbarian tribes which invaded the empire and the Eastern Orthodox converted Russia. Nestorian Christians took their faith from Syria to Mesopotamia to China, and Monophysite Christians established the church in Ethiopia. Jesuits in particular were noted for their missionary zeal and St. Francis Xavier was a virtual apostle to the Far East. Franciscans labored valiantly to Christianize the Indians of Latin America.

Despite opposition, the missionary movement came to full force. Extreme Calvinists among the Baptists and Disciples of Christ declared that God had already predetermined His elect, so what was the use of sending out missionaries? Some questioned the use of church funds for such a purpose.

However, others were of a different mind. One group of students at Williams College, caught in a thunderstorm, took refuge at the side of a haystack; during the storm they came to a decision. They would be personally responsible for sending the gospel to India. Six years passed and in 1812 these "new world" Christians set sail to eventually establish the first outposts of American missions to the East in Bombay, Ceylon and later Burma. Resulting from the "haystack meeting", the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was formed by Congregational clergymen of Connecticut and Massachusetts.[236]

Their counterpart in England had already been started in 1795. The interdenominational London Missionary Society sent the famous missionary David Livingstone to Africa. During the 19th century the majority of Catholic missionaries were French and the majority of Protestants were British and American.

Robert Raikes organized the first Sunday School in England in 1780. Soon the idea spread across Europe and North America. The Sunday School became a normal feature of Protestant religious life in the nineteenth century. In 1907 the World Sunday School Association was created. With the secularization of the public school and the separation of church and state, Christian education became one of the major problems facing the churches.

The church's global mision served to integrate Christians of all races and lands. While direct evangelism was the main purpose of missionary activity, no less significant has been the impact made upon non-western cultures by the Christian colleges and hospitals set up in Asia and Africa.

President Henry P. Van Dusen of Union Theological Seminary stated:

By any appropriate calculus - numbers of conver- sions, increase in membership, adventure into new areas, launching of new enterprises, founding of new churches and societies - this (the 19th century) was the epoch of Christianity's greatest vitality and most remarkable advance. Christianity had become at last, a world religion. More than that. It had validated its claim to be a universal faith, embracing men and women of every race

235 K.S. Latourette, *Christianity Through the Ages,* Harper & Row, N.Y., 1965, p. ix.

236 Gerald C. Brauer, *Protestantism in America*, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1965, pages 133-134.

and culture and stage of civilization. .. .[237]

In the tangible advances made by the 19th century, *Divine Principle* sees a pattern of preparation for the messianic age. Both the hearts of people and their physical environments have been constantly improved so that men might be ready for the long-awaited second advent. Scientific and technological development filled men with hope. The future seemed bright with promise.

BIBLIOGRAPHY Ch. 8

Bihlmeyer, K. and Tuchle, H., *Church History,* Newman Press, Westminster, 1966, vol. III.

Brauer, Gerald *C., Protestantism in America,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1965.

Fichtenau, Heinrich, *The Carolingian Empire,* Harper Torchbook, New York, 1964.

Gay, Peter, *The Enlightenment,* Knopf, New York, 1967.

Latourette, K.S., *Christianity Through the Ages,* Harper & Row, New York, 1965.

Manschreck, C., *A History of Christianity in the World,* Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1974.

Maritain, Jacques, *On the Philosophy of History,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1957.

Shinn, Roger L., *The New Humanism,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1968.

Van Dusen, Henry P., *World Christianity,* Abingdon-Cokesbury, New York, 1958.

Walker, W.. *A History of the Christian Church,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1959.

Zernov, N., *Orthodox Encounter,* James Clarke & Co., London, 1961.

237 Henry Van Dusen, *World Christianity,* Scribner's, N.Y., 1958, p. 51.

CONTENTS

9. CONSUMMATION OF HUMAN HISTORY

RENAISSANCE OF APOCALYPTICISM

Some Representative Thinking

Auguste Comte, the founder of sociology, theorized that man progresses through three stages: the theological, the metaphysical, thepositivist. This doctrine of progress, adopted since the time of the French Revolution, details the cultural ascent of man from ancient times to modern similar to the physical evolution of man from the animal kingdom. For many, this rational approach to history directly parallels (though often not taking into account) religious evolution and revelation.

A. Nicholai Berdyaev

If belief in progression blossomed during the French Revolution, it withered during World War I. Shortly before his expulsion from the Soviet Union by Lenin, Professor Berdyaev delivered his final lecture in which he discussed "the doctrine of progress and the goal of history".[238] He held that Russian thought had a special mission to resolve on a speculative level the urgent European problems raised by the crisis of Renaissance-inspired humanism. This was so because Russian religious philosophy had remained faithful to the apocalyptic vision.

He asserted that not only had the authors of the doctrine of progress not taken into account the manifestly spiritual direction of history, but also neglected to realize that the concept of progress itself grows out of the messianic and millenarian faith of the Hebrew people. In fact, he claims, except in relation to this religious trust in the hopeful and just resolution of history, a belief in progress is groundless.

Berdyaev further charges that the secularized doctrine of progress is an entirely illegitimate deification of the future at the expense of the present and past. Progress postulates the coming of a time when all historical problems and antagonisms will be resolved; thus man is supposed to be advancing steadily to an untrodden height, for which all that has gone before is but an instrument. Every individual, human generation, and historical epoch are but means to this ultimate goal of perfection. But, says Berdyaev, such an apotheosis of a future race has no compassion for either the present or the past; it is revolting to man's conscience because of its infinite optimism toward the future and infinite pessimism to the past and stands in direct contradiction to Christianity in which each generation is not simply a means to an end.

The Russian thinker also criticized the Utopian illusions and pretensions implicit in the doctrine of progress. He complains that the anticipated terrestrial paradise is a distortion of the religious vision of God's kingdom. Naively looking forward to a solution of man's destiny within the closed circle of temporal forces, it falsely envisions an immanent rather than transcendent state of beatitude.

Basing his own philosophy of history on the apocalyptic vision found in the book of

238 N. Berdyaev, *The Meaning of History,* Meridian Books, Cleveland, 1962, pp. 561-177.

Revelation, Berdyaev concludes that human destiny admits of no resolution within the secular historical framework; it must be solved from the perspective of eternity: the destiny of man involves a superhistorical goal, a superhistorical consummation of history in eternal time.

B. Reinhold Niebuhr

Berdyaev at that time was far in advance of his age. Since World War II, however, the apocalyptic view of history has become quite fashionable. When Reinhold Niebuhr wrote a new preface for his Gifford Lectures in 1963, he explained that Biblical and Hebraic faith makes the hazardous assertion of a meaningful history. This attempt to discern a pattern in the confusing crosspurposes of history sets Western culture apart and fills it with a dynamic quality, whose virtue consists of the resolute refusal to see salvation as a flight from historical responsibilities. But, he says, Western dynamism is subject to two vices: the evil of fanaticism which comes from giving ultimate significance to contingent goals; and a confused messianism which looks prematurely for an earthly kingdom of universal peace and righteousness. Niebuhr interpreted Russian Communism in this light as a secularized messianism growing out of Hebrew-Christian thought.[239] As a neo-Reformation theologian he wished to refute pseudo-messianic and Utopian hopes by reminding man of his inevitably tragic and ironic history. Niebuhr repeated from a Protestant perspective the conclusions of the Orthodox Berdyaev.

At Edinburgh, the American theologian maintained that the basic distinction between historical and non-historical religions could be succinctly defined as the difference between those which expect a Christ and those which do not. A Christ is awaited wherever history is regarded as potentially meaningful. Where a Christ is not expected, history is either reduced to nature or swallowed up in eternity.

In reminding man of his ironic past, Niebuhr recognizes that the real problem of history is not the finiteness of all human endeavor, but rather the proud pretension that seeks to obscure its finite character. This type of Utopian messianism incites all people and nations in rebellion against God on the one hand, and on the other, elevates the role of the messiah from a national to a universal level challenging the benevolent forces to operate where they never had before.

C. Jürgen Moltmann

From Tubingen, this professor is architect of a "theology of hope". Inspired equally by New Testament eschatology and the independent Marxist philosophy of Ernst Bloch, he points out that Biblical testimonies are filled with a reachable, tangible hope. Because it is eschatological, Christianity is forward looking and forward moving and thus hope should be the mainspring of theological thinking. Moltmann views the God of Exodus and Resurrection not as an "eternal presence", but rather the God of future promise; therefore Christ should be understood in terms of categories of expectation. When theology anticipates the prospects and possibilities of the future, it will become a ferment in our thinking and a truly mobilizing force in a new creation.

Understandably, Moltmann hits hard the sin of despair; weakness, timidity and weariness are considered more debilitating than the temptation to desire to be God. We are

239 R. Niebuhr, *Human Nature and Destiny,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, N.Y., 1964, vol. II, preface, viii.

construction workers and not merely interpreters of the future so the sweet decay of hopelessness, resignation, and inertia, as well as the retreat to either the golden past or the non-political realm of indifference, are intolerable for the Christian. As he put it, the world should not be viewed as a waiting room for the soul's journey to heaven but the battleground for freedom and the arena for creativity. The only reason to refer to the past is to see by analogy prefigurations of a better future. Moltmann agrees with a remark by Walter Rauschenbusch, the Baptist father of the Social Gospel: "Ascetic Christianity called the world evil and left it. Humanity is waiting for a revolutionary Christianity which will call the world evil and change it. "[240] And Moltmann himself said:

> *Christians exist, act, suffer and speak in the present, with the open Bible in their hands, as it were. Whoever closes the Bible in order to speak more effectively and contemporaneously no longer has anything new to tell his age. Whoever breaks off the conversation with the present in order to read the Bible more effectively finally merely engages in sterile monologues.[241] For Moltmann, this is the affirmation of original Christianity, and the key to overcoming the alienation of the church from the modern world as well as removing social oppression today.*[242]

D. Carl E. Braaten

Lutheran theologian Carl E. Braaten has summarized the values to be derived from the renaissance of apocalyptic thinking and imagery in contemporary theology. First, it opens up new frontiers of Biblical research. Secondly, itprovides a better historical binding between the Old Testament and the New by reporting the full ideological situation out of which Christianity stems. Thirdly, it can help us to construct a more adequate picture of the historical Jesus because the eschatological concept of the kingdom of God is the key to New Testament Christology. Fourthly, apocalyptic theology sheds new light on early Christian history by depicting the quest for the messianic kingdom rather than the consecration of the status quo which took place after Constantine made the Church the establishment faith.[243]

The above reasoning is characteristic of a major shift among Biblical critics in favor of an eschatological interpretation of the New Testament. As far back as the turn of the century J. Weiss and Albert Schweitzer had pointed in this direction. Braaten feels that the current trend of thinking will aid the Church in ridding itself of an unfortunate image as the bulwark of the establishment. Constantine thought of the Christian religion as a conservative and stabilizing force; that day is gone. On one side, Church leaders no longer want to be the arm of the powers that be, and on the other, secular leaders are well aware that the existing denominations no longer wield significant power over public opinion. As Father Andrew Greeley has pointed out, big government, big business, big labor, big military and big education are simply uninterested in organized religion.[244] Braaten therefore believes that the Church should return to its pre-Constantinian role as a committed social critic. In his mind,

240 Quoted, Moltmann, *Religion, Revolution and the Future,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, N.Y., 1969, p. 139.

241 F. Herzog, ed.. *The Future of Hope,* Herder and Herder, N.Y., 1970, p. 157.

242 Besides his major book, Moltmann has summarized his position in *The Future of Hope,* Herder & Herder, N.Y., 1970, a symposium edited by Frederick Herzog in which five American theologians subject him to rather thorough criticism. For a theology of hope based on very different philosophical grounds one can look at the later works of Henry Nelson Wieman. As an early interpreter of process theology, Wieman used Bergson and Whitehead to construct a future-oriented position.

243 C.E. Braaten, *Christ and Counter-Christ,* Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1972, preface.

244 A. Greeley, *Unsecular Man,* Schocken Books, N.Y., 1972, p. 14.

one of the advantages of apocalyptic thinking is that it looks at a society from the bottom up rather than from the top down. From there Braaten works his way to a revolutionary theology of the second advent:

> *The center of gravity lies in the future for both Marxism and Christianity. Christianity expresses this investment of hope in the future in terms of the symbol of the second coming. As Christ was a new edition of Adam, so the coming Christ will bring a new edition of humanity more glorious than his first coming in the flesh - kata sarka. Where this symbol of the second coming of Christ is completely dead, Christianity has ceased to be the religion of the New Testament. To use Kierkegaard's language, it has become the antithesis of itself. It is then just another religion - re-ligio - tied to the past and dead to the future.*[245]

THE UNIFICATION PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

Rudolph Bultmann once counseled his listeners:

> *We started our lectures with the question of meaning in history, raised by the problem of historicism. We have seen that man cannot answer this question as the question of the meaning in history. But now we can say: the meaning of history lies always in the present, and when the present is conceived as the eschatological present by Christian faith the meaning of history is realised. Man who complains: 'I cannot see meaning in history, and therefore my life, interwoven in history, is meaningless,' is to be admonished: do not look around yourself into universal history, you must look into your own personal history. Always in your present lies the meaning in history, and you cannot see it as a spectator but only in your responsible decisions. In every moment slumbers the possibility of being the eschatological moment. You must awaken it.*[246]

The celebrated scholar admonishes us: "Don't be inert; don't be despairing - but be awakened." This requires individual spiritual growth and social reconstruction. The common thread of these critics is affirmation: affirmation not based on false information but rather on a realistic foundation - that action can be taken, that we need not be frustrated onlookers, that through the Christian spirit we as well as our history have meaning.

Though Bultmann would have us relegate apocalyptic to interior realization, he by no means would have us withdraw from the world. In *the Divine Principle* view too, man is asked to search his personal history and there he will find the fruits of universal history. When one dedicates himself to God he becomes a part of the network of central spiritual figures of the past, and thus is impelled to contribute to the progress of the present - God's historical course of restoration. *Divine Principle* also would concur with Niebuhr and Braaten in recognizing the second coming as essential to the potential meaning and successful furtherance of Christianity.

However Unification theology is likewise in sympathy with the counsel of Niebuhr and Berdyaev in warning of the premature secularization of God's kingdom. One cannot help feeling that the kingdom they warn against is the one Moltmann is indirectly espousing. Be that as it may, *Divine Principle* would clarify the situation by emphasizing that the builders of Utopia should not be materialistically inspired or motivated by class vengeance but must be

245 C. Braaten, *Ibid,* p. 106.

246 Rudolf Bultmann, *History and Eschatology, the Presence of Eternity,* Harper Torchbooks, N.Y., 1957, pp. 154-155.

on fire with the vision and authority of God.

It was Leibnitz who once used all of his ingenuity to prove that we live in the best of all possible worlds. Almost no one has been able to agree with him. Proponents of the *Divine Principle* will not be the first. From this viewpoint, the society we have inherited is a corrupt and savage apostacy from the world God intended. It would be difficult to imagine how far we have fallen - yet through certain men and women at different times we glimpse a panorama of the goodness that could be. The truth they record and pass on strikes inner chords in the people of their time. The seed is nursed and the plant flowers in history.

For *Divine Principle,* goodness marches on toward its goal in spite of numerous obstacles; the past, the present, the future are full to the brim with significance. Even as it was in the Exodus, the conquest of Canaan, and the founding of the Hebrew monarchy, and even in the ministry of Jesus, so it is today. God works to transform the world according to His dispensation of restoration - prolonged by the tragedy of Golgotha but by no means ended. From the early disciples who picked up the pieces to our own times, God has been working centrally to spark a fire wherever the heart, mind and soul of man have been so inclined to receive it.

Unification eschatology in detailing and defining such action by God - in the past or expected in the future - steers away from two extremes. First, *Divine Principle* avoids the violently literal apocalypticism fashionable in fundamentalist circles for much the same reasons that Origen of Alexandria rejected it 1800 years ago: he, who had emphasized the perfection of divine love, could not bring himself to believe that the wrath of God was a final expression of that love. On the other hand, the demythologized existential eschaton of Bultmann recognizes but one dimension of God's revelation. In the *Divine Principle* view, Origen's conception of three levels of Biblical interpretation (spiritual, moral, historical) would apply in eschatological hermeneutics. Though Bultmann may quite uniquely emphasize the moral imperative in the summoning of the believer to a decision, eschatology also has an historical (not to be confused with literal) and a spiritual (symbolic) meaning.

According to Unification theology, if God in His wrath devastated the earth (along with a number of other supernatural cataclysmic actions) as envisioned by the chiliasts, this would either mean that God has given up His plan for the reconciliation of mankind or that He had made a bad mistake in the first place. Those who preach the literal end of the world and the fiery destruction of most of mankind claim that such a finale to world history would prove the absolute power of God. But what does that do to the faith that God is all-wise and all-loving? Could it be that a creation by God is unalterably defective and must be destroyed? A theodicy would be impossible in view of these facts and God would be confessing abject failure. Therefore, if these apocalyptic predictions are not literal, do they have more than just an existential, moral meaning?

Unification theology would see the spiritual and historical meaning of the end of the world as being the end of an epoch. As the world comes into the internal and external kingdom of God, consummated with the second advent, characterized by mature development of intuition and intelligence and spiritual power, it will be a time raging with desire for higher truth. It will unfold stage by stage. It will witness the rapid decline of old institutions and the concomitant confusion. The disclosure of new truth is to complete and explain the Old and New Testaments. It will be a time - in short - not unlike today.

CONTENTS

THE FINAL JUDGMENT

"There is a divinity that shapes our ends, Roughhew them how he will."

Hamlet

Judgment in the New Testament means the separation of good from evil. *Krisis,* the Greek word, implies a radical division of mankind into those who support God and those against Him. As a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats, so God will separate good from evil at the close of the age. In the Fourth Gospel the suggestion is made that this final judgment takes place when one decides to follow or reject the Christ. The moment of decision is not placed at the literal end of time and the full manifestation of the divine kingdom in all its glory but occurs when one is confronted by the presence of the Messiah and accepts or denies him.

An eschatological message is often mistaken for a frightening pronouncement of final doom and fiery condemnation. For Unification theology, judgment is a process which God has used throughout time to shape us into human beings filled with divine love and charity, courage and wisdom. At the end of the old epoch, God-centered consciousness and conscience, which were dethroned at the Fall of our ancestors and have remained on the defensive against evil, will at last emerge triumphant. The judgment will be intensified on an internal level as new truth, new light, is carried like electricity through the body of mankind. Thus the judgment is not a sentence but a release, just as truth brings us liberation from darkness.

According to *Divine Principle,* in our own time we are witnessing a dramatic reversal of the direction of human events. In this generation the positions of good and evil have been decisively inverted. God and goodness, if as yet surreptitiously to many, have taken the offensive. Truth is being ushered in in an unprecedented fashion: light is seeking to enter any opening in the walls of the minds of fallen men; we even now look to the horizon to view the first signs of the dawn of the messianic age.

By reconstructing the historical picture of 2000 years ago, scholars give us vision to view our own time; rooting out the myth yet preserving the spirit, we are given the standard by which we can decipher truth and measure revelation. By taking us away from a cheap escape to other worlds, theologians have encouraged us to perfect the creation we are given and to alleviate suffering within it. By making Christ more real to us, we become more real to each other.

According to Unification theology, the course of restoration will take place in two stages: through interior judgment, man's heart will be restored to its pristine estate; on the personal level man's identification with God and the ensuing bond of love formed between them will bring initial movement as goodness expands and trust increases in human relationships at all levels. Cooperation and social regeneration will be initiated more and more, but only on the foundation of man's inner realization. The long-sought goal of the true man creating a new world - the hope of Oriental and Occidental alike - is within sight. People today are being judged precisely to the extent that they are open to God's voice. The principality of Satan in this world is being overthrown and the new heaven and new earth, where religion is service and service is religion, are appearing. When all the man-made creeds for which men have so long fought with each other in vain will have fallen away, truth itself will reign, without the accumulation of debris and conventionality that have so long obscured

it.

ONE WORLD

In this world's present chaotic state, there are nevertheless many phenomena which reflect the intention of God to realize His blessings for man. The Baptist clergyman, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, who lived through the calamity of World War I and the despair of the Depression, nonetheless said that this was a great time to be alive; he could see at the end of a long dark tunnel the light of a new age. Berdyaev and the Roman Catholic thinker Maritain predicted that our world is destined for a new medievalism in which God is man's chief interest. Unification theology is no less optimistic. In the introduction to the book *The Religious Reawakening in America,* Gerald S. Snyder observes:

> *At a time when established religion has become an object of criticism, we have moved into what many consider to be one of the most religious periods in the history of the United States. Young people particularly have sparked the revival of interest in spiritual values. Unfulfilled by the offering of the traditional church and the traditional temple, they have slipped into rebellion - not against God and religious values but against the establishment of Christian, Jewish and other faiths. They are searching for new forms and ways of achieving spiritual satisfaction to offset the dulling and sterile effect of a highly materialistic and technological society.*[247]

Divine Principle views this surge of religious interest as an indication of the restoration of God's first blessing for man, growth to spiritual perfection. Because of the Fall, man lost his understanding of spiritual laws, the value of each person as a creation of God, and God's love. By constant discovery and effort, men today will not leave God without a spokesman. Understanding of the dynamics of the spiritual world and the necessity for spiritual growth have accelerated a demand for enlightened teaching. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the widespread revival of mysticism have led many to reclaim the traditions of primitive Christianity, whose adherents treasured visions, prophecy, and the direct experience of God. All of these things contribute to a new, clearer awareness of spiritual laws.

Further, the value of the individual is being restored. The legitimate liberation movements, the civil rights movements, the demand for women's rights are all part of the growing recognition that each person is a child of God and as such has a unique value. As the world comes closer and closer to entering a new age, the contradictions, imbalance and intolerance of a fallen age will become evident and be rectified.

The ability to love as God loves and the ability to see from God's viewpoint are also being restored. The range of man's love to embrace all men as brothers is a constant refrain in today's world; whereas once you were an outcast for loving those of other races and nations, now the one to be ashamed is he who does not. This breakdown of the barriers of fear and incapability to love also point to the restoration of man's first blessing.

If man had not fallen, according to *Divine Principle,* there would have been no need for separate nations and distinct religions: men would have lived as one sacred family and have been as one spiritual body, working together in a way similar to the cells of a healthy human

247 *The Religious Reawakening in America,* U.S. News and World Report Book, Washington, D.C., 1972, p. 11.

body. However, because of the Fall and the

subsequent fear and mistrust, men remained divided. Yet God worked through every culture, leading them on a course which would one day recreate the unity that should have been. The second blessing, to multiply, would have led to the original world of one family. Today we see the world moving ever closer in that direction. Toynbee has indicated that throughout history twenty-one to twenty-six cultural spheres have formed around religious teachings. As time has passed there has been a tendency for them to consolidate. Four major religious families now exist: Judeo-Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, and the Far Eastern. Each not only is experiencing a modern renaissance and reformation as it is confronted by the changes brought about by science, technology and industrialization, but more importantly, they are showing greater interest in each other than ever before.

The confidence that Christians shared at the beginning of the last century has been severely jolted, yet it is still true that Christianity retains a central position owing to its dominance in the leading nations of the free world. Without minimizing the contribution and the role of the other major religions, Unification theology sees the uniqueness of Christianity in its potential and promise to build one world family, and expects that God will use it as a base from which to establish His kingdom.

The one world created by God has been divided by man. Much of this has been brought about by wars. From the Biblical account, war began on the individual level in the fratricidal conflict between Cain and Abel, who, born to be brothers, became enemies. From this conflict between two individuals one can trace the tragedy of family feuding, clan rivalry, tribal conflict and international warfare.

Cain, though told by God to master sin, could not. Could Abel then, by his love have provided a way for unity, as Jacob did with Esau? At the turn of the century, British industry had been successful, but it soon became aware of competition; its response to the higher quality of German goods was sulky and negative. In August 1914 Cain attacked Abel. War shook Europe to its foundations. Toynbee writes:

> *It was no wonder that the German response to the British response to German competition had been resentment sharpened by contempt. This unsatisfactory British response has to be reckoned as having been one of the contributory causes of the First World War, even if one holds that the principal causes were failings on the German people's part. Germany's sensational growth in wealth, population, and power since 1871 had turned the German's heads; Prussian militarism had captivated German hearts by its success, in Bismarck's deft, but steady and cautious hands, in achieving the political unification of Germany which had opened the way for her subsequent economic advance; and, in a post-Bismarckian and un-Bismarckian mood, the German people eventually took, in 1914, the fatal step that was a moral crime as well as a gross error of political and military judgment.*[248]

Few in 1910 could believe that they were skating on such thin ice. The western world seemed so secure. The warnings of the prophets were not easily heard.

So the war came. France, England and Russia battled Germany, Austria-Hungary and Turkey with disastrous consequences for everyone involved. With aid from the United States the Allies forced the Central Powers to surrender. The Kaiser abdicated, the Hapsburgs were unseated, the power of the Ottoman Turks destroyed and the Romanovs murdered. While

248 Arnold J. Toynbee, *Experiences,* Oxford University Press, N.Y., 1969, pp. 189-190.

Lloyd George and Clemenceau gloated over their hard-won victory, Oswald Spengler predicted future uncertainty in his classic *The Decline of the West.* For *Divine Principle,* World War I had more than simply political or economic significance. Kaiser Wilhelm's scheme was a Satanic imitation of Adam's mission of perfection and dominion. Wilhelm's defeat by the Allies made a condition of indemnity upon which the formation stage of God's final dispensation could come.

World War II, according to *Divine Principle,* should also be interpreted from a messianic perspective. Secular historians are content to discuss the political and economic conditions which produced the Nazis and the Japanese militarists. Actually, the real causes of this global conflict go far deeper. Hitler dreamed of ruling the whole world and thought of the National Socialists as the vanguard of a new society which would last for a thousand years. In a hauntingly strange way, the Fuhrer basing his New Order on the pre-Christian myths of the Teutonic people was a Satanic imitation of Jesus, whose mission it had been to establish the kingdom of God. With the final victory of the Allies over the Axis powers, indemnity was paid by which the growth stage of the final dispensation could be revealed.

Some who were aghast at the actions of Hitler were silent about the crimes of Joseph Stalin. Following in the footsteps of Lenin, Stalin worked to bring the entire world under materialism. Committed to a pseudo and anti-Christian ideology, he tried to thwart the fulfillment of God's providence by opposing the world of freedom and morality to be ultimately established by God. In this sense, Stalin and his legacy symbolize the exact opposite of what God willed for His world, and according to *Divine Principle,* the third attempt of Satanic forces to use the Cain-like jealousies of modern man.

Pope Pius XI concluded, "Communism is intrinsically wrong, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever. Those who permit themselves to be deceived into lending their aid towards the triumph of communism in their country, will be the first to fall victims to their error. "[249] Since the encyclical was published, at no time has the slightest evidence been offered to refute the pope's analysis. In the light of Biblical symbology, there is now a deadly rivalry between Cain and Abel on a world-wide scale; apocalypticism would interpret this ideological warfare between Communism and Democracy as one of the innumerable signs of what Jewish thinkers have called the birthpangs of the messianic age. *Divine Principle* sees inevitable confrontation between these two irreconcilable ideologies', yet from the resolution of that conflict, the last vestiges of materialism will fall away and one world of brotherhood will emerge.

This will represent the global fulfillment of the second blessing.

In accordance with God's dispensational fulfillment of His third blessing, man's dominion over creation is being restored in a most dramatic manner. It would be difficult to overstate the significance of the scientific and technological revolution which has taken place since 1900. In seven decades, the developed nations have seen a transition from the horse and carriage to the automobile and airplane. The railroad has been largely supplanted by the jetliner. The ice box has become the refrigerator. Plastics have been invented. Modern man puts on a suit that never wrinkles and zooms to work in minutes while listening to the news from all over the world. At no other time in history could we find out almost instantaneously major events from any continent; if something happens in Japan or Zambia or Peru, we know it. And they know we know.

---

249 Anne Freemantle, *The Papal Encyclicals,* Mentor Book, N.Y., 1956, pp. 255- 262.

CONTENTS

The atomic era has dawned and the dream of space travel has become a reality. All of this is introductory and external phenomena to prepare the earth physically for God's kingdom. Yet man's inner dominion is also being expanded. Yale Professor Charles Reich observed that as a result of the explosion of information about the universe, modern man has altered his whole orientation from Consciousness I to Consciousness III.[250]

Because of the Fall, man lost his two-fold dominion: inner and outer. Through philosophy, ethics and religion God has been working to restore man's internal dominion; through science and utilization of natural law, his external dominion. Until this era, there has been a gap between science and religion, just as there has been a struggle between the spiritual and the physical. However at this unique time in history the spiritual and the physical will become one, and science and religion will meet on common ground. It was Einstein who said that science without religion is blind and that religion without science is crippled.

Increasing interdependence of men and nations is being man- ifested in cooperative groups and agencies on every level. International economic communities, Church ecumenical movements, and numerous political alliances are now functioning across former barriers. Missionaries from the East to the West are now rivaling those from West to East. The idea of world government is discussed by some and the United Nations serves as a global forum. All these things signify that the old history is approaching its consummation. The new age will see one world, one kingdom; through God's direct guidance goodness will steadily rise and evil will eventually decline, though it will fight desperately - apocalyptically. One world will develop horizontally between Occident and Orient and vertically between the physical world and the realm of spirit. Then with His inspiration, all will share a common religious philosophy and outlook. As Joachim of Fiore predicted long ago, when the kingdom comes, God and men will live together as friends.[251]

BIBLIOGRAPHY Ch. 9

Benz, Ernst, *Evolution and Christian Hope,* Anchor Book, Doubleday, New York, 1968.

Berdyaev, Nicholai, *The Meaning of History,* Meridian Book, Cleveland, 1962.

Braaten, CarlE., *Christ and Counter-Christ,* Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1972.

Bultmann, Rudolf, *History and Eschatology, the Presence of Eternity,* Harper Torchbook, New York, 1957.

Freemantle, Anne, *The Papal Encyclicals,* Mentor Book, New York, 1956.

Greeley, A., *Unsecular Man,* Schocken Books, New York, 1972.

Herzog, Frederick, ed., *The Future of Hope,* Herder and Herder, New York, 1970.

Moltmann, Jurgen, *Religion, Revolution and the Future,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1969.

Niebuhr, Reinhold, *Human Nature and Destiny,* Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1964, vol. II.

Reich, Charles, *The Greening of America,* Random House, New York, 1970.

250 C. Reich, *The Greening of America,* Random House, N.Y., 1970.

251 For further information about this remarkable Catholic abbot (1132-1202), see Ernst Benz, *Evolution and Christian Hope,* Anchor Books, Doubleday, N.Y., 1968, pp. 35-48.

CONTENTS

Snyder, Gerald S., *The Religious Reawakening in America,* U.S. News and World Report Book, Washington, D.C., 1972.

Toynbee, Arnold J., *Experiences,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1969.

CONTENTS

10. THE SECOND ADVENT

When The World Council of Churches took as its theme "Christ, the Hope of the World", the delegates at the Evanston general assembly of 1954 were forced for the first time to consider at an ecumenical conference the vexing question of the Parousia. Never before had the churches tackled a problem at this level which so seriously divided Christians from one another. Most observers anticipated a clash between the Continental apocalypticists and the Anglo-Saxon social activists. Would the ecclesiastics decide that only an eschatological interpre- tation of the human predicament was truly Christian or would they endorse a gradual evolution of the kingdom?

A very impressive committee of theologians and churchmen was assigned to prepare a report on the main theme. Among the drafters of the advisory document released in 1953 were Karl Barth and Emil Brunner, the Scottish theologian John Baillie and Indian Bishop Leslie Newbegin, the Biblical scholar C.H. Dodd and the poet T.S. Eliot, the Lebanese philosopher-statesman Charles Malik and the Czech theologian Josef L. Hromadka, Professors George Florovsky and H.S. Alivisatos representing Eastern Orthodoxy, President Henry P. Van Dusen of Union Theological Seminary and the Dutch scholar Hendrik Kraemer. Seldom before in the Christian world had such an array of talent been commissioned for a single task. Yet the result was a disheartening and uninspiring compromise. At best, all the Evanston Advisory Commission could come up with was "the guarantee of God's promise that in His good time His victory will be manifest to all, His kingdom come in glory, and He Himself be known everywhere as King." On this basis, the eminent ecumenical theologians could somehow speak of "a living hope, an ardent longing for that glorious consummation, and an eager expectation of its coming. "[252]

The timid theological consensus handed out to the World Council delegates at Evanston forcibly illustrates the quandary in which the churches have found themselves for many centuries. Although an apocalyptic understanding of human destiny has repeatedly surfaced during the long history of Christianity, its exponents have always found themselves in the position of a minority scorned and persecuted by the religious establishment. From the time of Origen of Alexandria and Bishop Augustine of Hippo, the Church as a whole has preferred a mystical union of the believer with God or an ecclesiastical identification of the kingdom with the gradual success of the existing institutional Church.

NON-APOCALYPTIC VIEWS OF THE COMING CHRIST

Since the writing of the New Testament at least, and probably even before, the Christian community has been sharply divided over the way Christ is expected to come. According to a common interpretation of scriptural scholars, Paul himself did not hold the same views on this subject throughout his life as a missionary. In his Thessalonian correspondence he clearly believes in the impending return of Christ. But in his later epistles this apocalyptic note becomes somewhat muted. That is, he moved from apocalypticism to Christ-mysticism. The expected Christ was largely replaced by the indwelling Christ.

252 *The Christian Hope and the Task of the Church,* Harper & Row, N.Y., 1954, pt. VII, p. 1.

CONTENTS

What Paul initiated, John extended, and was later carried to its logical conclusion. Since the Parousia was delayed it was natural enough to stress the abiding presence of Christ in the soul of the believer or in the worshipping congregation. If some New Testament scholars are right, the Gospels which emphasize the life and teachings of Jesus resulted from the loss of hope in his imminent return; Luke, for example, is commonly spoken of as a record of the switch from apocalyptic expectancy to what has been called early Catholicism; and the Fourth Gospel is evidence for the further waning of eschatological expectation, according to the scriptural experts.

Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy represent the institutionalization, sacramentalization and ritualization of the original eschatological fellowship of Jesus' followers. Rather scornfully, the Catholic Modernist Alfred Loisy noted that Jesus promised us the kingdom but what we got was the Church.[253] In any case, by the end of the second century, most Christians centered their lives on the sacrament of holy communion. Overt expectation of the returning Christ subsided because Christ was already present in the Church and available in the Eucharist. Professor Karl Adam of Tubingen describes this event:

> *The faithful Catholic does not merely hope that Jesus will come to him. He knows that He does. He knows that Jesus is there as really and truly as He was once present in the Upper Room or by the Sea of Galilee....Holy Communion is a living intercourse with Jesus truly present, and is therefore a perennial spring of devotion to Jesus.*[254]

And for the Russian Orthodox churchman, the experience is no different:

> *... the Eucharist is the meeting place between Jesus Christ and the believer, personal, intimate, unique. It makes the Christian a new creature by elevating him into the Divine Presence, and in that transcendental unity His individuality is eternally affirmed and reconciled with the infinite variety of the whole creation. In the Eucharist Christians possess the power that can secure their victory over all the temptations of the intellect and of the flesh; they are restored by it to unity and concord in the fullness of communion with the Holy and lifegiving Trinity.*[255]

Furthermore, the revolutionary social implications of the apocalyptic message were detrimental to efforts on the part of churchmen who longed for peace with the Roman Empire. Why raise a fuss over the kingdom to come when one could easily adjust peacefully to the existing social order? For non-theological reasons as well as theological, the Church played down the New Testament hope, reinterpreted it or consigned its fulfillment to some fardistant future.

Yet now, the future has arrived.

For evangelistic Protestants, one interpretation of Christ's coming is when he comes into the heart in the experience of conversion - often as a result of attending very emotional revivalistic meetings. For many believers, it has been an enthralling occasion; William James documents the experience of one man:

> *And then, with a breaking heart, I said, 'Dear Jesus, can you help me? ' Never with mortal tongue can I describe that moment. Although up to that moment my soul had been filled with indescribable gloom, I felt the glorious brightness of the noonday sun shine into my heart. I felt I was a free man. Oh, the precious feeling of safety, of freedom, of resting on*

253 Quoted in Rosemary Reuther, *The Church Against Itself,* Herder & Herder, N.Y., 1967, p. 51.
254 Karl Adam, *The Spirit of Catholicism,* Image Book, N.Y., 1954, p. 198.
255 N. Zernov, *Orthodox Encounter,* James Clarke & Co., London, 1961, p. 74.

Jesus! I felt that Christ with all his brightness and power had come into my life.[256]

Although belief in the second coming of Jesus is considered one of the key doctrines of fundamentalism, much emphasis is placed upon the need for individual rebirth, a conversion experience which cleanses a man of sin and makes him a temple of Christ. Also, until very recently, the Evangelical wing of Protestantism has shied away from the social application of the Christian Gospel and stressed the salvation of the individual soul.

Then there are Christians who identify the coming kingdom of God with the present reality and future triumph of the Church. Catholic thought considers the Church the actual Body of Christ or an extension of the Incarnation. At Pentecost Christ returned to dwell in His Church forever. Augustine's theology of history can be read in this fashion. Against the apocalypticists and chiliasts Augustine denies that there would be a thousand year reign of Christ at the end of history. As Paul Tillich reminds us, for Augustine the Christ rules in this present time; there is no stage of history beyond or other than the one in which we are living. We need not look beyond the present period - the kingdom of God is already manifest in the work and witness of the Church.[257]

Some liberal Protestants relegate the concept of the second advent to the first-century apocalyptic scheme later discredited by the Church; and they feel such a concept is irrelevant for the twentieth century Christian. Professor Paul Minear, then at Andover Newton Theological School, reported that Christian modernists disassociate themselves from any trace of millennialism. They openly repudiate the verbal inspiration and literal infallibility of the scriptures so are in no way bound to accept apocalyptic texts in the New Testament. Often they reject references to the return of Christ as relics of an archaic cosmology which cannot be harmonized with modern thought. They argue that believers in the coming judgment have fallen prey to moral quietism, historical pessimism, and cultural obscurantism.

Minear challenges them. He denies that the New Testament hope for the speedy return of Christ is as archaic as modernists suppose. He disagrees with the judgment that apocalypticism represents an attempt to escape from a history gladly resigned to the control of Satan. He asks, must not a Christian trust that Christ will truly redeem the whole world and vindicate God in the temporal order? In contrast to the Biblical version of Christian hope, modernists seem to hold a multiplicity of secular hopes which shift with each new change in the social scene.[258]

Many Christians believe that the Kingdom of God is gradu- ally being built on this earth as the ever-present spirit of Christ inspires us to initiate significant social reforms. Professor Kenneth Scott Latourette of Yale was one such man. He wrote that the Christian faith offers the world hope of a gradual triumph in actual human history of the values embodied in Christ. For proof the church historian mentioned the valuable work of the League of Nations, the Red Cross, the Salvation Army and the YMCA, organizations not directly related to the Church but growing out of lives made radiant through Christ. In 1954 Latourette claimed that Christ and his Church have never been more potent than in our time.

His optimism, however, did not go unchallenged. Reinhold Niebuhr replied that such a naive faith in the gradual progress of mankind under Christ's inspiration was rather fanciful in an age of atomic warfare and global conflict. According to Niebuhr, it was becoming more fantastic to believe in the modern substitute for New Testament eschatology than to expect the

256 W. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience,* Collier Book, N.Y., 1961, p. 170.
257 P. Tillich, *A History of Christian Thought,* Simon & Schuster, N.Y., 1972, p. 121.
258 P. Minear, *Christian Hope and the Second Coming,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1954, pp. 86-91.

Parousia of Christ. The New York theologian observed that "the New Testament eschatology is at once too naive for a sophisticated world and too sophisticated for the simple-minded modern man, who has become so accustomed to try to make sense out of life by measuring history in terms of some scheme of rational intelligibility."[259]

In our comments on the varied non-eschatological interpreta- tions of the coming of Christ we do not mean that the idea of the second advent has disappeared from Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox or Evangelical theologies but only that in most cases it is not an issue of paramount importance. In the Palestinian communi- ty it was the central affirmation around which all else revolved. In the later Church by and large its realization was consigned to a date unknown to even the Son of God. Yet the second advent was in no sense abandoned.

In their *Handbook of the Catholic Faith* designed to instruct potential Protestant converts, the Dutch priests Van Doornik, Jelsma and Van de Lisdonk state:

> *The Gospels are absolutely steeped in the thought of the final coming of Christ... . This second coming is to be the revelation of the goodness and justice of God; the completion of Christ's work.*[260]

CONTEMPORARY APOCALYPTICISM

Early in Christian history Montanus tried to recover the eschatological enthusiasm which characterized New Testament faith. Although he was able to win many to his cause, including the Church Father Tertullian, he was rejected by the ecclesiastical leaders of his time and his movement gradually disappeared. Montanus felt that the hope of an earthly millenium was an indispensable part of authentic Christianity. To this belief unfortunately, he attached other views which were questionable in their validity. The Church as a whole looked askance at this theology and nearly all we know of Montanus comes from his enemies who distorted his opinions. In any case, from his time on anyone who tried to revive the eschatological hope was dismissed as a Montanist heretic and schismatic.[261]

Today, however, the field is more open. Lively eschatological views abound. Dr. John Wesley White, chancellor of Richmond College in Toronto, prepared a series of sermons on the second coming which were published in 1971 and widely distributed among fundamentalists.[262]While he warns his hearers about overzealous soothsayers who deliberately disobey Jesus Christ by predicting dates for the second advent, he amasses a great pile of evidence which seems to suggest the last days are at hand. He draws countless parallels between Biblical signs of Christ's return and current events, as if to impress Christians with the probability of an approaching second coming. Such a technique shrewdly combines caution and enthusiasm. Christians can look forward to the end but not too much. This way, they will not become disillusioned if the eschatological hope fails to materialize.

White repeatedly finds modern explanations for ancient prophecies from the Old and New Testaments. On the basis of a laboratory experiment in ultrasonic sound, he explains how

259 R. Niebuhr, *Essays in Applied Christianity,* Meridian Book, N.Y., 1959, p. 329.

260 N.G.M. Van Doornik, et al, *A Handbook of the Catholic Faith,* Image Book, Garden City, N.Y., 1956, p. 467.

261 Hans Leitzmann, *A History of the Early Church,* Meridian Book, Cleveland, 1961, vol. II, pp. 193-203.

262 J.W. White, *Re-entry,* Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1971.

CONTENTS

believers at the final rapture will respond to the trumpet call without the faithless realizing what is going on. He compares astronauts out space walking to the prophecy that Christians will be caught up in the air to meet Jesus. Similarly he suggests that the prediction of the moon turning red as blood might refer to the Russians spraying the moon with red dust or that earthlings might war for possession of the moon turning it into a bloody battlefield. The melting of the elements prophesied in II Peter reminds him of thermonuclear warfare and the destruction of the universe with a great noise may be related to Fred Hoyle's hypothesis that the universe came into existence with a big bang

Much of White's book is devoted to the woeful state of the world today which he believes provides clear signs of the catastrophe to come. Drugs and divorces, famine and pestilence, juvenile delinquency and violence, Chinese Communism and sex books become evidence for him to prove the Day of the Lord is at hand. He adds to these secular maladies spelling cosmic doom the equally certain sign that the fundamentalist version of Protestantism is losing its grip on the churches.

And finally on the political level Dr. White sees contemporary events authenticating ancient prophecies. He credits Ezekiel with a prophecy that during the last days Russia and China will invade Israel; this will be marked as the prophet predicts with an air-lift of Russian soldiers into that country. The antichrist will consist of a bloc of ten nations now making up the European Common Market. An earthquake splitting the Mount of Olives will signal the final battle between Christ and his foes which will occur literally at Megiddo. The founding of Israel itself, he says, is a confirmation of prophecy, as well as the Six Day War.

We have quoted White's vision at length because these ideas typify the fundamentalist camp in modern Christianity. Not only is apocalypticism real to them, but also literal. With careful selection (and some would say careful omissions) the blueprint of God's ultimate extravaganza is pieced together for all to have a chance to see, and to choose.

If fundamentalists dwell on the rapture of the Church prior to the advent, their distant cousins, the Jehovah's Witnesses, concentrate on warning prospective converts of the terrible battle of Armageddon soon to be fought between the armies of God and Satan. Pastor Charles Taze Russell, who founded the Watchtower Society in 1870, was converted to the Adventist cause as a young man. Whereas the Millerites expected the physical return of Jesus in the year 1873-4, Russell preached that the appearance of Christ would be an invisible one. According to his calculations the return of Jesus would inaugurate a forty year harvest of souls which would be completed in 1914. At that time, the end of the world would come. In a book dated 1908 he asserted that some time before the end of 1914 the last member of the divinely recognized Church will be glorified with Christ. Jehovah would begin His reign on earth. Russell argued that the Great Pyramid of Egypt as well as the Bible confirmed his predictions.

Judge J.E. Rutherford, Pastor Russell's successor, dropped the Great Pyramid theory and revised the apocalyptic time schedule. According to his theology, in 1914 Satan and Jesus waged war in heaven for 1,260 days. Defeated by Christ, Satan was cast out of heaven to the vicinity of our planet. This explains World War I and other calamities experienced by mankind in that period. Rutherford also asserted that before the generation of 1914 passed away, Christ would reappear on the earth to fight the battle of Armageddon mentioned in the book of Revelation. As one of Rutherford's most popular slogans put it, "Millions now living will never die."

Armageddon will commence with a series of natural disas- ters: earthquakes, plagues, floods and a rain of fires. The earth will become littered with millions of corpses. In fact, it

will take seven months for the survivors to bury the dead and seven years for the world to be restored to its original state as the kingdom of God on earth. At Armageddon the forces of righteousness will be led by Jehovah as supreme commander and Jesus as his field marshall. Satan and his allies will suffer a crushing defeat and be completely routed. But Jehovah's Witnesses will not have to participate in this gigantic battle. They can watch what takes place from a safe distance.

Witnesses believe that only 144,000 will get to heaven. The rest of the faithful will survive the holocaust at Armageddon to be rewarded with everlasting life on a purified and perfected earth. Our world will become again the Garden of Eden. In Jehovah's theocracy on earth there will be no police, no soldiers, no bad weather, no wild animals, no sickness and no crime. No one will want for material comfort and all will experience the simple joys of an earthly Paradise forever. As for the special remnant in heaven, they will assist Jesus in governing the whole creation. The theology of the Jehovah's Witnesses revives many of the basic ideas common to apocalyptic Judaism and chiliastic Christianity - with notable additions, of course. For them, the last days are drawing nigh. Armageddon might begin next week or even tomorrow.[263]

ORTHODOX DOUBTS AND LIBERAL DENIALS

As one might expect, there has been a reaction in Christian circles to bold pronouncements of fundamentalists and Jehovah's Witnesses. When Dr. L. Berkhof, president emeritus of Calvin Theological Seminary and a longtime spokesman for the Christian Reformed Church in America, published in 1953 a brief treatise on the second coming he took pains to dampen enthusiasm among conservative Protestants in regard to any immediate return of Jesus. Besides refuting Modernists who no longer believe in a literal second advent and correcting dispensationalists for what he considered to be an un-scriptural interpretation, he warned that a premature expectation was to be carefully avoided.

The Calvinist theologian cautioned that contemplation of the future coming of Christ often has given birth to speculative, unwarranted theories and noted that the Bible leaves many of our questions unanswered. He specifically contradicts the fundamentalist claim that a proper interpretation of scripture will provide the Christian with a detailed blueprint of God's future intentions. According to Berkhof, the second coming is to a great extent a mystery about which the Bible itself gives no complete explanation.

He also reminded churchmen that serious times have often provoked considerable enthusiasm for the return of Christ. He specifically mentioned the millennarian hopes of the early Church, the fanatical sects which appeared during the Reformation, and the excitement of Christians during the worst days of the French Revolution. As examples of mistaken calculations made by apocalyptic speculators Berkhof cited the hope that Christ would come back in 1000 A.D. as was thought in the Dark Ages, at 1260 A.D. as predicted by disciples of Joachim of Fiore, during the Reformation as preached by the Anabaptists of Munster in Germany, in 1843 as the Adventist Miller prophesied, or in 1914, the crucial year emphasized by Pastor Russell. Since such predictions were not fulfilled, Berkhof claims that they prove

263 For further information on the Jehovah's Witnesses see William J. Whalen, *Armageddon Around the Corner,* John Day Co., N.Y., 1962 and Charles S. Braden, *These Also Believe,* Macmillan, N.Y., 1949, Chap. X.

CONTENTS

the utter folly of prying into the secrets of God.[264]

Professor Clarence B. Bass of Bethel Theological Seminary has published an informative, though critical study of the dispensationalism ordinarily taught by the fundamentalist. Like Berkhof, he objects to this approach on scriptural grounds. He is particularly opposed to the idea of the fulfillment of every detail of early prophetic statements concerning the old Israel. Until the nineteenth century, he contends, Israel as a separate entity was believed to have no place in the millenium to come. Thus dispensationalists, while claiming to be "the true Christians" and followers, of "old-time religion" are in reality putting their own innovations into scripture.

According to dispensationalist doctrine, at his second coming Christ will again offer an earthly kingdom to Israel. This time it will be accepted. This distinctly Jewish state will reestablish the throne of David, restore the Temple and reinstitute the Mosaic sacrificial system. Christ will have a physical throne from which to rule the nations. King"David will return to serve as his regent. The seat of world government will be at Jerusalem and all the different nations of the earth will be subservient to Israel throughout the millenium. All the Old Testament promises and prophecies will thus be fulfilled.

Bass, himself a fundamentalist, makes a clear distinction between the nation of Israel and the New Israel, which is the Church.[265] There is no basis whatsoever in the New Testament that The author traces these novel views back to Reverend J.N. Darby, an Anglican priest who later founded the Plymouth Brethren sect. C.J. Scofield adopted them from A.C. Gaebelein who admits his great indebtedness to Darby. will support the idea of an earthly kingdom going to Israel, a view which is held by Scofield Bible Christians, dispensationalists, and in part by Dr. Wesley White.

The division in the fundamentalist camp is even more acute when it comes to the idea of the "rapture". Briefly, this is the assertion supported by I Thessalonians 4:16-17 that the true Church will be removed from the earth ahead of time and will meet Christ in the air. Dr. G. Campbell Morgan, the popular British Evangelical, was once asked if he believed there was scriptural support for this. He replied that he had once held this view, but had given it up as a result of further study, claiming that it was a misreading of the Thessalonian text and thus a modern invention, without any Biblical basis whatsoever.[266]

Within the fundamentalist camp itself there is considerable criticism of the "new" style of fundamentalism typified by Dr. White and the dispensationalists. It is easily understandable that there is a widespread and unequivocal dismissal of fundamentalist tenets by Christian scholars in the mainline churches. In his book *Eternal Hope,* Emil Brunner minces no words in his utter repudiation of the notion of stars falling from heaven and Christians being raised to meet the Lord in the clouds on his return. The Zurich theologian maintains that Christian theology is wrong to suppose it can ignore the change from the archaic Judaic image of the universe to the Copernican world view of today. As such, fundamentalism leads to a ridiculous and intellectually unsound position.[267]

The thoughts of Edward John Carnell of Fuller Theological Seminary are typical of scholarly opinion:

---

264 L. Berkhof, *The Second Coming of Christ,* Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1953, pp. 9-28.
265 C.B. Bass, *Backgrounds to Dispensationalism,* Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1960.
266 *Ibid,* footnote, p. 17.
267 E. Brunner, *Eternal Hope,* Westminster, Philadelphia, 1954.

CONTENTS

Unlike the Continental Reformers and the English dissenters, the fundamentalists failed to develop an affirmative world view. They made no effort to connect their convictions with the wider problems of the general culture.... This is why fundamentalism is now a religious attitude rather than a religious movement. It is a highly ideological attitude. It is intransigent and inflexible; it expects conformity; it fears academic liberty. It makes no allowance for the inconsistent, and thus partially valid, elements in other positions.... Fundamentalism is a lonely position. It has cut itself off from the general stream of culture, philosophy and ecclesiastical tradition. This accounts, in part, for its robust pride. Since it is no longer in union with the wisdom of the ages, it has no standard by which to judge its own religious pretense. It dismisses non-fundamentalistic efforts as empty, futile or apostate. Its tests for Christian fellowship become so severe that divisions in the Church become a sign of virtue. And when there are no modernists from which to withdraw, fundamentalists compensate by withdrawing from one another.[268]

While orthodox Protestant scholars are uniformly critical of fundamentalism's faulty grasp of shades of meaning in the Gospel, they are likewise uniformly cautious in their own positions concerning the second advent. After all, the tale of unfulfilled eschatological hope goes from the apostles themselves all the way to the very top leaders of the Reformation. Luther, for example, clearly believed he was living in the last days. He found confirmation for this outlook in such diverse things as the Roman papacy, the Turkish armies threatening the city of Vienna, and the solar eclipses of 1514, 1518, 1531. But the Lord did not show up.

Professor G.C. Berkouwer of Amsterdam urges caution in evaluating apocalyptic' 'signs of the times ". He asks if some of the catastrophies said to indicate the approaching last days happen again and again in completely different areas, then how are we to evaluate their eschatological significance? A Calvinist theologian, he asserts that calculations about the apocalyptic time-table are not necessary, desirable or even possible. This is true because the eschatological message is always of *present* significance. It never loses its contemporaneity. For the Gospel of Luke, armies surrounding Jerusalem were a sign on the horizon of the lives of the apostles, not an end time far an the future. An eschatological light penetrates through all times and is able to attract the attention of people in every era. Therefore he maintains that the catastrophic signs have received far too much consideration: wars and famines are not the important signals. The primary concern, he feels, should be the preaching of the gospel throughout the whole world.[269]

Though Berkouwer never substantially denies the teaching of the second coming in the New Testament, another tradition stemming from the birth of Biblical criticism not only makes the date of the advent ambiguous but altogether throws it out. John Robinson and L. Harold DeWolf take this position.

Robinson, a respected Cambridge scholar and bishop of the Church of England, comes to the conclusion that Jesus himself did not teach his disciples anything about his return. That is, from his study of the Parousia texts, he feels that there is no firm foundation in the authentic words of Jesus that Christians should await the return of God's Son from heaven. All of the parables were not intended to refer to a future situation but to the present overwhelming crisis facing the nation; hence Jesus' plea was a warning for the signs of the times then before it was too late. He was trying to arouse a deluded people and their blind religious leaders to a

268 Edward John Camell, "Fundamentalism", *A Handbook of Christian Theology,* Meridian Book, N.Y., 1972 ed., pp. 142-143.

269 G.C. Berkouwer, *The Return of Christ,* Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1972, chap. VIII

realization of the awful gravity of that unique moment of visitation, which if not recognized would be a disastrous time of dispossession and rejection.

However, after Jesus was executed, the Evangelists applied the parables quite naturally to their own period and interpreted them in terms of the. awaited Parousia. Thus, Parousia parables were originally crisis parables. Jesus' warning to his contemporaries became some sort of future judgment.[270]

L. Harold DeWolf, a Methodist scholar and author of *Theology of the Living Church,* admits that he has gradually changed from an increasingly evangelical liberal to a liberal evangelical. But he still has strong reservations about the eschatological enthusiasm of many modern Protestant theologians. He sides with those New Testament critics who find it difficult to decide exactly what Jesus himself thought about the coming of the kingdom. He maintains that the Gospels upon which we are forced to rely for evidence give two conflicting interpretations. On one hand, the reign of God is to be inaugurated by a cataclysmic intervention in human affairs made by Christ who returns in a burst of overwhelming power. On the other hand, the kingdom is said to be already present and will spread gradually as the influence of the ever-abiding Christ expands. According to DeWolf (among others) no textual ground exists for dismissing either conception as a late addition.

Admitting that there are arguments for emphasizing the apocalyptic teachings, the Methodist still prefers to make the immanental conception normative. He cites five reasons. First, an apocalyptic bias on the part of Jesus' hearers must be expected and accounted for. Secondly, men are apt to remember the spectacular side of a teaching and in the process of retelling are inclined to elaborate upon it. Thirdly, Jesus' predictions of a national disaster to befall his people could easily be misunderstood and reinterpreted as prophecies of the final judgment. Fourthly, other teachings of Jesus about a blessed life after death or warnings of judgment could be distorted into apocalyptic claims. But most important, since apocalyptic hopes were not fulfilled as the early Church expected, do we really want to suggest that Jesus was mistaken about the very thing which was at the center of his thought? If the consistent eschatologists are correct, this raises serious and far-reaching questions about the authority of Jesus. An ordinary apocalyptic prophet could not release the creative power which the early Church and later Christianity clearly possess. For these reasons, DeWolf concludes that Jesus believed in a reign of God in our hearts and lives, now partial and fragmentary, but destined to grow to fulfillment.[271]

Clearly a survey of contemporary Christian thought on such an important doctrine as the second advent shows no general consensus of opinion among churchmen. Christians equally dedicated and of equal repute in the Church do not see eye to eye on this basic matter. Spokesmen for the mainline denominations almost to a man affirm that the second advent will take place in the probably distant and certainly unknown future. Or they claim that a return of Jesus is not to be expected because his spirit is always with us. Fundamentalists and some very popular sectarian movements stress that the kingdom is drawing nigh. Perhaps a reinterpretation of the nature of the second advent, like that proposed by Unification theology, will bring divergent Christians together.

---

270 J.A.T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coining,* Abingdon, N.Y., 1957.

271 H.L. DeWolf, *A Theology of the Living Church,* Harper & Row, N.Y., 1968, pp. 306-317.

CONTENTS

RESURRECTION

Literally, of course, resurrection means to rise from the dead; Pharisaic Judaism interpreted this prosaically as the resuscitation of every corpse at the time of the final judgment; some Christians have interpreted the term in a similar fashion, and the Apostles' Creed embodies a belief in the resurrection of the flesh. Modern scholars, somewhat embarrassed by such a materialistic interpretation of eternal life, either substitute for it the Greek view of the immortality of the soul or explain that the doctrine of the bodily resurrection is a symbolic way of insisting that God cares for the total human personality. The Sadducees of Jesus' day denied the resurrection of the body, because it represents an idea borrowed from the Zoroastrians and is not found in the Torah.

Divine Principle uses the Garden of Eden account to suggest a different meaning for the concept of resurrection. According to the Yahwist narrative, the Lord warned Adam and Eve that the day they ate the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil they would die. Obviously they did not. What, then, was meant by death in this connection? Did it refer to the fact that man's physical body becomes old, dies, and turns to dust *1 Divine Principle* would say no. Death of that sort is the natural fate of physical existence in accordance with natural law. No physical body is created to last forever.[272]

All of the great world religions teach that man will have a life after death, but in modern times secular-minded people cling to this physical existence believing that life ends at the grave. According to *Divine Principle,* the inevitable separation of the spirit from the body is not death in God's sight. Real death comes from the absence of give and take with Him. In this ultimate sense, death originated with man's separation from his Creator. This is a spiritual state in which man no longer has the ability to perceive God's love clearly or to respond to His presence. People born in a fallen condition must advance to the higher stages of growth and perfection. That process is resurrection, the restoration of man's original nature, and its goal is the attainment of perfection.

There is no outward change as one experiences resurrection; yet a vast spiritual transformation occurs which alters the character of one's inner life. New Testament Christianity refers to it as a virtual rebirth. It is in this way that resurrection in the apocalyptic sense should be understood.

Like judgment, resurrection has been going on since the dawn of history; and like revelation, it has a progressive nature. Man's religious ascent is from a primitive superstition and savagery. Students of the history of religion claim that mankind slowly turned from animism to polytheism to henotheism to monotheism. God could shed only as much light as man could understand and employ profitably.

Therefore, resurrection is that process which brought us from the days of Abraham, when people carried around their compact household divinities and animal sacrifices were the means to get right with God, and through the days of Moses, when the Hebrews were united in devotion to Yahweh by Law, to the days of Jesus when a great many men were liberated to

272 A common Christian interpretation of the Genesis story is that physical death is part of the curse laid upon man because of the Fall. Adam and Eve were created to live forever. By being expelled from the Garden of Eden they forfeited the chance to eat the fruit from the tree of life by which they would become immortal. Without treating the Eden story literally, many theologians nevertheless maintain that physical death is part of the price paid for man's original sin.

relate to God from an even more mature spiritual standpoint. Resurrection means facing up to God, the gradual abandonment of fear, and the narrowing of the distance between a life of external or internal slavery to a life of true freedom.

After man fell, God immediately started working to raise man to higher and higher levels of spiritual advancement, with the Ten Commandments given to the Jews marking the height of the formation stage. Jesus was to carry this further ideologically and spiritually through the growth stage to perfection. In spite of his premature death, New Testament Christianity provides an opportunity for men to be resurrected to the height of the growth stage. For this reason the newly converted Christian feels a profound change in his inner being. He experiences a resurrecting life force far beyond that common in other religious circles.

Though Christianity has been the vanguard of resurrection, God has worked in all cultures to raise the standard of worship from the primitive and fearful to the understandable and the evident. A short list of examples would include Hinduism in India, Buddhism in the Far East, Islam in the Arab world, the mystical philosophy of the Kabbalah and Hasidism, or the Reform and Reconstruction movements in Judaism. Everywhere today men call for a new faith which will harvest the fruits of all religions. The ultimate catalyst then is the expected Messiah, who comes to lead Christians as well as faithful adherents of other religious traditions to the final stage of resurrection.

Because our times are preparing for the arrival of this messianic age, we witness the appearance of many astounding psychic phenomena. Just as the intense anticipation of the immediate return of Christ produced the experience of Pentecost by the first disciples, so contemporary man's ardent longing for a Messiah has given birth to an astonishing outburst of mystical gifts and visions.

Since World War II, the western world - particularly its youth - has turned to astrology, numerology, yoga, transcendental meditation, witchcraft, satanism, mediums and visionaries. The growing popularity of the Catholic Pentecostals, over 50,000 in America who have received or seek the gift of speaking in tongues, is another clear sign of something amazing occurring in the soul of modern man. Many say that we are entering a brand new era: the age of Aquarius is about to begin, the age of Pisces (that of the fish which is a symbol of traditional Christianity) is drawing to a close.

In this century, as is recorded in a growing number of books, lectures and life experiences from one end of the world to the other, the channels of communication between the spiritual and the physical are being opened up wider than ever before. For *Divine Principle,* this is a phenomenon linked to the second advent, a new revelation of divine truth and the supreme manifestation of God's power.

New Testament Christians were familiar with the ' 'prophet"; he was that unique person in the early church (referred to in Ephesians, for example) through whom God could speak directly. By means of this basic principle of intuitive guidance, Unification theology suggests a partial explanation for today's unusual psychic phenomena. These days God is virtually pouring His spirit and power upon mankind. Widespread pentecostalist fervor and the development of highly spiritualistic sects in Asia, Europe (especially England) and America owe their inspiration to such activity.

In the meantime, the established Christian churches, in seeking on the one hand to become knit together and on the other to knit the world together, actually reflect a union that

is sought for above, in the view of Unification theology. In spite of some defects, the ecumenical movement and the social gospel movement (now called liberation theology) represent positive responses to the clear challenge of God for our day.

With each passing year the crescendo of spiritual activity mounts. For *Divine Principle*, this is like a symphony tuning up before the grand performance. If one now hears only discordant notes and strange noises, the time is not remote when all will realize their roles as parts of a whole in the universal and long-sought final resurrection.

ANTICHRIST

In an age filled with messianic expectancy, the term antichrist may again be heard. Ecclesiastics have always had a certain penchant for vitriolic language and this particular epithet has enjoyed a place of special privilege. In order to use the term correctly a brief historical explanation may be useful. Probably the oldest usage of the word goes back to a period prior to the writing of the New Testament. It is highly likely that Jesus himself was accused of being the antichrist by the Pharisees, Sadducees, Zealots and Essenes. That is, because of his work and the awe in which he was held by his disciples, he could easily be denounced as a pseudo-Messiah, the Hebrew expression for which antichrist is a Greek equivalent. Down through her history Judaism has been cursed with the appearance of charismatic figures, religious or military, who have claimed to be the long-awaited Messiah. Theudas the Galilean (Acts 5:36) is one such messianic pretender, but there were many. In the light of its later usage by Christians, it is important to remember that the abusive term was originally employed against Jesus himself.

Within the New Testament the word seems to have been used in two very different ways, both referring to the ultimate incarnation of evil. In the little apocalypse of Mark (chap. 13), "the abomination of desolation" was connected to a political enemy of God, either someone like the Hellenistic ruler Antiochus Epiphanes who polluted the Holy of Holies in Jerusalem by sacrificing a pig on the high altar, or the insane Roman emperor Caligula who ordered that a statue of himself be placed in the Jewish Temple. In both cases the antichrist was a secular antagonist of God and the true faith. A later New Testament writing, the book of Revelation, likewise identifies an enemy of the Most High as a pseudo-savior like the profligate emperor Nero or the notorious imperial persecutor of Christians, Domitian.

This political explanation of the antichrist has never been completely abandoned. Hitler, for example, was denounced as the antichrist by some Christians inside and outside of Germany. Lenin and Stalin were likewise condemned because of their inhuman totalitarianism in general and their ruthless persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church in particular. In this sense, the antichrist is a secular ruler who challenges the rightful prerogatives of God.

A second usage is also grounded in the New Testament. In one of the Johannine epistles, the antichrists are those who deny that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh (I Jn. 4:2-3). Quite clearly the objects of the New Testament author's wrath are not Jews who deny that Jesus is the Messiah but Christians who deny that he came in the flesh. As most commentators agree, I John is attacking either the Gnostics who felt that matter is evil and thus Christ's appearance was spiritual or the Docetic Christians who believed that Jesus was completely divine so only looked like a man. In both cases, we find an identification of the antichrist with the heretic; that is, a Christian who holds doctrinal views contrary to the majority in the Church is

considered an enemy of the Messiah.[273]

Eccelesiastical history is replete with examples of this. It has been used by Eastern Orthodox against Roman Catholics, Roman Catholics against Protestants, Lutherans against Anglicans, Quakers against Congre-gationalists, New Light Presbyterians against Old Light Presbyterians, etc., ad infinitum. Differences in doctrine, polity or custom have led one group of believers to confront another with a charge of being the antichrist. Not until comparatively recent times have Christians who differ in theology, forms of church government or liturgical practice been able to meet and work together without wild accusations of heresy and schism.

The use of the term antichrist, as well as other epithets, has meant that in the past no figure of ability or position could feel safe from attacks by the mean-spirited. Among the heretics and schis- matics of church history were Stephen and Paul, Origen, Pope Honorius I, Patriarchs Nestorius and Cyril Lucar, Erasmus, Luther, George Fox, Theodore Parker, Lyman Beecher and Horace Bushnell. Since 1900 heresy charges have been levelled at Bishop Barnes of Birmingham, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Teilhard de Chardin and Rudolf Bultmann, all of them eminent scholars. Fortunately latitudinarian views have accompanied the birth of the ecumenical movement in almost all branches of the Christian Church and heresy hunting has been increasingly confined to the ignorant, the bigoted and the backward remnant of the clergy. By and large the motto for mainline Christianity has become: "In essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things, charity." What else would be appropriate for a religion whose founder was accused of being an antichrist, an immoralist and a blasphemer?

THE SPIRITUAL APOCALYPSE

According to Unification theology, all religions have arisen through the providence of God and each has contributed to the spiritual enlightenment of mankind. Within Christianity too, all denominations in varying degrees are part of one vast flock through which God has encouraged progress and brought abundant benefit to this world. All have helped to lay the foundation for the final dispensation of the second advent. Even some of the so-called heresies in history have been well-intentioned efforts to recover aspects of Christian thought overlooked or disregarded by the established churches.[274] Many of the arguments and opinions put forth heretofore, coming from the classic tradition in Christian thought, in some manner support the view of the second advent of Unification theology, while others are no doubt in opposition.

The argument of Berkouwer that wars and famines are not necessarily the signs of the last days would be in agreement; the notion that an intended earthly fulfillment was not in the plan of God would be in opposition. The idea of the Dutch Catholic scholars that Christ must come to finish his work would find strong sympathy in *Divine Principle;* the theory that some figure will come on a physical cloud with a supersonic voice would not. The conviction of the various New Age groups, assorted mystics and spiritualists, fundamentalists, pentecostals, Jehovah's Witnesses that these are the days of the Messiah's coming find a common The title speaks for itself; the Quaker theologian has only one regret; that there are too many heretics for one small book. base, but the notion that supernatural phenomena will surround it would

273 Otto Piper, "Antichrist", *A Handbook of Christian Theology,* Meridian Book, N.Y., 1972 edition, pp. 13-17.

274 Rufus M. Jones, *The Church's Debt to Heretics,* George H. Doran Co., N.Y., 1924.

be in profound disagreement.

Because the new Christ is coming in a way similar to the appearance of Jesus 2000 years ago, there will again be a tremendous dichotomy between the literal apocalyptic expectation and the actuality of his person. Yet, he will come in a way that can reconcile those viewing the kingdom as already having begun and those viewing it as yet to be consummated. In one sense - a very basic one - the emotional expectancy in modern charismatic movements is similar to the attraction of the ancient fishermen to the Messiah. From a different perspective, the scholarly peeling away of non-essential myth prepares us to accept the Messiah when he comes - to respond in a realistic way to a realistic move of God. Thus, though some on emotional levels may have partial revelation of his coming, they but see it in highly exaggerated, fantastic, clouded terms - much as did people 2000 years go. The goal of historical research is to put events in their rightful perspective. Apocalypticism serves its purpose by arousing anticipation and inspiring preparation.

In Jewish messianism, the return of Elijah the prophet to herald the arrival of the Son of Man played an important role. Much of the spiritual phenomena of the past 100 years is itself the Elijah for the messianic age to come, in the view of *Divine Principle.*

If there is such a thing as a spiritual apocalypse which is not supernatural, if there is such a thing as demythologizing without dematerializing, if there is such a thing as a second coming theology without either spiritualizing it out of existence or eschatologizing it into the absurd, then that terminology, that ideology would somewhat apply to Unification theology. If not, then perhaps a new term - qualified eschatology? - may be coined. Every culture has begun with a powerful, inspired religious figure; any hope for world peace and unity depends on the unity of religion: from that

point unity of people, and thus the unity - though not uniformity - of culture can be realized. In the four major cultural spheres today, there is an awareness that their religions are not quite fulfilled and some kind of judgment day or time of fulfillment is expected. If each is realized through a different messenger, then there will still be religious barriers and thus cultural barriers, and world peace and unity will be impossible. If on the other hand, God inspires a man and a people with a truth that can be the fulfillment of historic religions, then through that man and that truth, world harmony will be within grasp, and the prince of peace will have come.

In a striking way, for *Divine Principle,* the stage js set today. The characters and their roles are not all that different from 2000 years ago - yet the script we have and the cast to be included have been expanded. One can hope and believe that we will use the lessons of history today to correct the mistakes of the past.

BIBLIOGRAPHY Ch. 10

Adam, Karl, *The Spirit of Catholicism,* Image Book, New York, 1954.

Bass, C.B.,*Backgrounds toDispensationalism,* Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1960.

Berkhof, L., *The Second Coming of Christ,* Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1953.

Berkouwer, G.C., *The Return of Christ,* Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1972.

Braden, Charles S., *These Also Believe,* Macmillan Co., New York, 1949.

CONTENTS

Brunner, Emil, *Eternal Hope,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1954.

Carnell, Edward John, "Fundamentalism", *A Handbook of Christian Theology,* Meridian Book, New York, 1972 ed.

DeWolf, H.L., *A Theology of the Living Church,* Harper & Row, New York, 1968.

Evanston Assembly, *The Christian Hope and the Task of the Church,* Harper & Row, New York, 1954.

James, William, *Varieties of Religious Experience,* Collier Book, New York, 1961.

Jones, Rufus, *The Church's Debt to Heretics,* George H. Doran Co., New York, 1924.

Leitzmann, Hans, *A History of the Early Church,* Meridian Book, Cleveland, 1961, vol. II.

Minear, P., *Christian Hope and the Second Coming,* Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1954.

Niebuhr, Reinhold, *Essays in Applied Christianity,* Meridian Book, New York, 1959.

Piper, Otto, "Antichrist", *A Handbook of Christian Theology,* Meridian Book, New York, 1972 ed.

Reuther, Rosemary, *The Church Against Itself,* Herder & Herder, New York, 1967.

Robinson, J.A.T., *Jesus and His Coming,* Abingdon, New York, 1957.

Tillich, Paul, *A History of Christian Thought,* Simon & Schuster, New York, 1972.

Van Doornik, et al., *A Handbook of the Catholic Faith,* Image Book, Garden City, N.Y., 1956.

Whalen, William J., *Armageddon Around the Corner,* John Day Co., New York, 1962.

White, J.W., *Re-Entry,* Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1971.

Zernov, N., *Orthodox Encounter,* James Clarke & Co., London, 1961.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For permission to reprint excerpts in this volume, grateful acknowledgment is made to the following:

Abingdon Press for excerpts from *Kyrios Christos* by WilhelmBousset, copyright 1970; for excerpts from *The Finality of Christ* ed., Dow Kirkpatrick, copyright 1966; for excerpts from *World Christianity* by Henry Van Dusen, copyright 1958.

Harry N. Abrams, Inc. for excerpts from *The Meaning of History* by N. Berdyaev, copyright 1962 by Meridian Books; for excerpts from "Fundamentalism" (by Edward John Carnell) *A Handbook of Christian Theology,* copyright 1972 by Meridian Books; for excerpts from *The Writings of Martin Buber,* by W. Herberg, ed., copyright 1956 by Meridian Books; for excerpts from/I *History of the Early Church,* vol. II by Hans Leitzmann, copyright 1961 by Meridian Books; for excerpts from *Essays in Applied Christianity* by Reinhold Niebuhr, copyright 1959 by Meridian Books; for excerpts from *The Mind and Heart of Love* by M.C. D'Arcy, copyright 1967 by the World Publishing Co.; for excerpts from *A Handbook of Christian Theology* by the Dutch bishops, copyright 1958 by The World Publishing Co.

George Allen & Unwin Ltd. for excerpts from *The Life of Jesus* by Maurice Goguel, copyright 1952.

Alec R. Allenson, Inc. for excerpts from *God Who Acts* by G. Ernest Wright, copyright 1952.

Basil Blackwell & Mott Ltd. for excerpt from *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* by J. Lindbom, copyright 1963.

Cambridge University Press for excerpt from *The Servant-Messiah* by T.W. Manson, copyright 1953.

James Clarke Co., Ltd. for excerpt from *Orthodox Encounter,* by N. Zernov, copyright 1961.

Cornell University Press, for excerpt from *Ancient Israel* by Harry M. Orlinsky, copyright 1954 by Cornell University.

Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd. for excerpt from/4 *Concise History of Israel* by Ernst Ehrlich, copyright 1962.

Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. for excerpt from *Systematic Theology* by Charles Hodge, copyright 1970.

The Epworth Press Publishers for excerpt from *Essentials of De- monology* by Edward Langton, copyright 1949.

Fortress Press for excerpt from *Christ and Counter-Christ* by Carl E. Braaten, copyright 1972; for excerpt from *Jesus* by H. Conzelmann, copyright 1973; for excerpt from *John the Baptist* by Charles H.H. Scobie, copyright 1964

Harper and Row Publishers, Inc. for excerpts from *The Humanity of God, by* John Wright Buckham, copyright 1928; for excerpts from *Christian Belief in God* by'A.E. Garvie, copyright 1932; for excerpts from *Theism and the Scientific Spirit,* by Walter Marshall Horton, copyright 1933; for excerpts from *Concise History of Israel* by M.A. Beek, copyright 1963; for excerpts from *The Christian Hope and the Task of the Church* by the Evanston Advisory Commission, copyright 1954; for excerpts from *Know Your Faith* by Nels F.S. Ferre^ copyright 1959; for excerpts from *Christianity through the Ages* by K.S. Latourette, copyright 1965; for excerpts from *A History of Christian Thought* by Paul Tillich, copyright

1968; for excerpts from *The Recovery of Family Life* by E. and P. Trueblood, copyright 1953; for excerpts from *The Destiny of Man* by Nicolas Berdyaev, copyright 1960 by Harper Torchbook; for excerpts from *History and Eschatology, the Presence of Eternity* by Rudolf Bultmann, copyright 1957 by Harper Torchbook; for excerpts from *Kerygma and Myth* by Rudolf Bultmann, copyright 1961 by Harper Torchbook; for excerpts from *What is Christianity* by Adolf Harnack, copyright 1957 by Harper Torchbook; for excerpts from *The Carolingian Empire* by Heinrich Fichtenau, copyright 1964 by Harper Torchbook.

Hawthorn Books, Inc. for excerpts from *What is an Angel?* by Pie-Raymond Regamey, Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholi- cism, vol. XLVII, copyright 1960.

Helicon Press for excerpts from *In the Beginning* by Jean Danielou, copyright 1965.

Houghton Mifflin for excerpts from *Ultimate Conceptions of Faith* by George A. Gordon, copyright 1903; for excerpts from *How Much is Left of the Old Doctrine?* by Washington Gladden, copyright 1899 by Columbus School of Girls.

Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. for excerpts from *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation-The Science of Freedom,* vol. I, by Peter Gay, copyright 1967.

Longman Group Limited for excerpts from *The Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin* by N.P. Williams, copyright 1927 by Mrs. Williams.

The Macmillan Co. for excerpts from *The Spirit of Catholicism* by Karl Adam, copyright 1954 by Image Publishing Co.; for excerpts from *Nature, Man and God* by William Temple, copyright 1949 by Macmillan Services Ltd.; for exceipts from *Varieties of Religious Experience* by William James, copyright 1961 by Paul R. Reynolds, Inc.; for excerpts from *The Gospel of the Kingdom* by F.C. Grant, copyright 1940, renewed 1968 by F.C. Grant; for excerpts from *Collected Poems and Plays* by R. Tagore, copyright 1958; for excerpts from *Jesus of Nazareth* by Joseph Klausner, translated by Herbert Danby, copyright 1925, renewed 1953 by Herbert Danby; for excerpts from *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God,* by Albert Schweitzer, copyright 1950; for excerpts from *Quest of the Historical Jesus* by Albert Schweitzer, copyright 1948.

The Magnes Press for excerpts from *Commentary on the Book of Exodus* by Umberto Cassuto, copyright 1967.

Mentor Book for excerpts from *The Papal Encyclicals* by Anne Freemantle, copyright 1956.

Newman Press for excerpts from *Church History,* vol. Ill, by K. Bihlmeyer and H. Tuchle, copyright 1966.

Oxford University Press, Inc. for excerpts from *The Man for Others* by Erik Routley, copyright 1964; for excerpts from *Experiences* by Arnold J. Toynbee, copyright 1968; for excerpts from *Surviving the Future* by Arnold J. Toynbee, copyright 1971.

Penguin Books Ltd. for excerpts from *Judaism* by Isidore Epstein, copyright 1959; for excerpts from *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* by G. Vermes, copyright 1962.

Prentice-Hall, Inc. for excerpts from Bernard W. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament,* second ed., 1966; for excerpts from C. Manschreck, *A History of Christianity in the World,* 1974.

Random House, Inc. for excerpts from *The Sense of Beauty* by George Santayana, copyright 1955 by The Modern Library.

Schocken Books, Inc. for excerpts from *The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and Original*

Sin by F.R. Tennant, copyright 1968.

SCM Press, Ltd. for excerpts from *The Trial of Jesus* by Ernst Bammel, ed., copyright 1970, Alec R. Allenson, U.S.A., distributors.

Chas. Scribner's Sons for excerpts from/4 *History of the Christian Church* by W. Walker, copyright 1959, revision; for excerpts from *On the Philosophy of History* by Jacques Maritain, copyright 1957; for excerpts from *Man's Quest for God* by A. Heschel, copyright 1954; for excerpts from *Human Nature and Destiny* by Reinhold Niebuhr, copyright 1964; for excerpts from *Our Faith* by Emil Brunner, copyright 1935.

Seabury Press for excerpts from *The Biblical Doctrine of Original Sin* by Andre-Marie Dubarle, copyright 1964 by Herder and Herder; for excerpts from *The Future of Hope,* by Frederick Herzog, ed., copyright 1970 by Herder and Herder.

Sheed and Ward, Inc. for excerpts from *The Confessions of St. Augustine,* Book X, by F.J. Sheed, copyright 1943.

University of Chicago Press for excerpts from *The Religion of Israel* by Yehezkel Kaufmann, copyright 1959.

Books by U.S. News and World Report for excerpts from *The Religi- ous Reawakening in America* by Gerald S. Snyder, ed., copyright 1972.

Westminster Press for excerpts from *God and the World* by John B. Cobb, Jr., copyright 1969; for excerpts from *A Compend of the Institutes of the Christian Religion* by Hugh T. Kerr, copyright 1964; for excerpts from *Jesus-God and Man* by Wolfhart Pannenberg, copyright 1968; for excerpts from *Honest to God* by John A.T. Robinson, published in the U.S.A. by Westminster Press, 1963, copyright, SCM Press, Ltd., 1963; for excerpts from *New Directions in Theology Today,* vol. *VI, Man, The New Humanism* by Roger L. Shinn, copyright 1968; for excerpts from *The Religion of Ancient Israel* by T. C. Vriezen, published in the U.S.A. by The Westminster Press, copyright 1963, W. De Haan N.V., Zeist and Van Loghum Slaterus N.V., Arnheim, Netherlands, English translation 1967, Lutterworth Press, London.

Yale University Press for excerpts from *The Problem of God* by J.C. Murray, copyright 1964.

CONTENTS