

VII: CHRISTOLOGY AND SOTERIOLOGY

THESIS: (a) le azioni e il messaggio di Gesù sono all'origine della cristologia del Nuovo Testamento; spinta dall'esperienza pasquale la chiesa apostolica è cresciuta nella comprensione della salvezza in Gesù Cristo e del mistero della sua persona; (b) il Figlio unigenito del Padre si fece carne (cf. Gv. 1:14); tale mistero fu progressivamente e diversamente enunciato nella tradizione antica attraverso i vari concili cristologici; (c) Gesù fu consapevole della sua missione e filiazione divina; godeva una conoscenza umana e volontà libera autentica; pur essendo Figlio, "imparò da ciò che soffrì l'obbedienza" (Eb. 5:8); (d) nel mistero pasquale della sua morte e risurrezione ha riconciliato l'umanità con Dio (cf. Rom. 5:10-11); (e) Gesù Cristo, mediatore unico fra Dio e umanità (1 Tim. 2:5), è il centro dell'economia della salvezza, il "punto focale" e il "fine della storia umana" (GS 45).

I. Christ: God and Man: New Testament Christology

Galot: The authors of the New testament are in fundamental agreement concerning the divinity of Jesus. (Shift from understanding the present divinity of Christ to understanding his divinity as pre-existent.)

A. The testimony of Jesus concerning His identity (Implicit Christology of Jesus himself)

The Old Testament had no idea of the Incarnation; the idea is revealed by Jesus himself.

1. Schema to interpret Jesus' actions and message:

a. Incarnation of Covenant

b. Incarnation of Divine Sonship

c. Incarnation of God's Word, Actions, Presence

2. There are three indisputably authentic words spoken by Jesus as found in the Scriptures:

a. Abba: (Mk. 14:36): Testimony of Divine Sonship

b. Ego Eimi: Incarnation of Divine Presence

c. Son of Man: Jesus' self-designation

1. Jesus as the Incarnation of the Covenant.

a. The covenant:

1. Jesus identifies himself with the covenant; "This is my blood, the blood of the covenant."

2. He was fulfilling the covenant of the OT and surpassing it.

3. In his own person he embodies the two partners of covenant -- God and man.

b. The bridegroom:

1. Jesus' self-designation as the bridegroom is the fulfillment of the OT matrimonial covenant between God and his people (Hosea)

2. Since Jesus never speaks of the "bride", we can presume that he takes the place of both partners, Yahweh and his people.

2. Jesus as the Incarnation of Divine Sonship:

a. Abba: (Mk. 14:36)

While Abba only appears once in the gospels (Mark's account of Gethsemene), the early Christian community recollected that Jesus habitually used this form of address in prayer to the Father. This word, unprecedented in its use in prayer, sprang spontaneously from Jesus' deepest consciousness. **Abba signifies that Jesus' relations with God the Father are akin to any child** with his own father. Hence, Jesus places himself on the level of a divine Son. We, as adopted sons, can call Abba for Christ has extended the intimacy of his unique relationship with the Father to us (without lessening the uniqueness of being God's only begotten). Certainly its use in Gethsemene reveals Jesus consciousness that his filial identity is linked to his redemptive mission. The point is that it reveals Jesus as the true Son of God the Father.

b. "Son of Man":

(NB: McDermott's idea of Son of Man revealing the sacramental self-understanding of Jesus).

1. Jesus' self-designation: -- neither his contemporaries nor the succeeding generations use the title of Him. Jesus used the name "the Son of Man" more often than the gospel texts would indicate. These texts have replaced the term "Son of Man: either with an "I" or with a more explicit title of divine sonship, "the Son" or "Son of God." These substitutes indicate that Jesus' contemporaries understood the title to indicate Jesus' divine sonship.

2. Various Aspects to title:

a. Earthly Son of Man :

1. Jesus often said, "the Son of Man has come" indicating his awareness of his preexistence.

2. The Son of Man is the eschatological judge -but Jesus is aware that he exercised that power **now** in the forgiveness of sins.

b. Glorious Son of Man:

1. Tradition in Scripture:

a. Daniel -- "coming on the clouds of heaven."

b. Enoch: the individual and transcendent aspect

2. Son of man as universal judge:

The power to judge is a divine power, exercised at the end time "when the Son of Man comes in all his glory." The criterion of judgment will be the reactions of people to the person of Christ and to the presence of Christ in the lowly, the hungry, etc. Point: Only God can judge; only God can destroy evil; only God can require the sacrifice of self.

3. The human quality of the Son of Man:

(Galot: In Daniel 7:13, the figure of the Son of Man is a heavenly figure. Jesus changes this). Thus, Jesus uses the term not only to speak of the divine office he fulfills but also the reality of his humanness (as the title itself suggests). **The divine powers that are his are effective through his humanity**, communicated through his flesh and blood. The humanity of the Son of Man takes on the greatest universality in his self-offering: The Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve, to give His life as a ransom for the many." As Son of Man he can represent all men to the Father.

4. Conclusion:

a. Title "Son of Man" unites true God and true man.

1. True man: Jesus is truly a man, a son of Adam -- man in his integral wholeness (without sin) to inaugurate a new age.

2. True God: He is also pre-existent and showed his divine powers (i.e., judgment, forgiveness of sins, sabbath, called for faith, miracles, etc.).

b. Theological dimension: "Son of God made man"

The term suggests that the richness of the divine person lies hidden and is revealed through the human nature. In the Son of Man, he unites heaven and earth, true God and true man (He judges inasmuch as He is God and man!)

1. The ontological and the functional: Jesus does not identify himself with a function (e.g., "Messiah"); his personal reality as "Son" comes before his mission. Mission follows his identity.

2. True human sonship -- the name says that Jesus is born of a woman, born of Mary. (NB: Lambiasi and four understandings of Mary in the patristic age)

3. Jesus as the Incarnation of the Word, the Action and Presence of God.

a. The Incarnation of the Word

1. The authority of the Word:

Jesus presents his teachings as God's own teaching. (i.e. The use of "Amen" suggests these his teachings are from above which he substantiates with his own authority.)

2. Word and person:

a. Jesus heralds himself as **greater** than the spokespersons of the OT -- [greater than Solomon (wisdom) Jonah (prophet)].

b. In John's gospel the claim is more explicit -- "I am the Way, the Truth and the Light." To believe in Jesus' words and to believe in his person are one and the same thing.

b. The Incarnation of God's action:

1. Jesus places himself above the former great figures of Israel: Abraham, Moses, David.

2. The mission to establish the Kingdom:

Conscious that in him the Kingdom is present, is being actualized, particularly through his death (I shall not drink again the fruit of the vine until it all comes to pass in the Kingdom). The kingdom is established through the sacrificial love of a shepherd that realizes God's promise in OT to shepherd his people Israel.

3. The miracles: while recent theology tends to downplay the supernatural phenomenon of miracles, speaking of them as extraordinary "signs" in God's presence. Jesus asks his hearers to recognize in them the fulfillment of God's plan proclaimed by the prophets. Beyond the call to faith in Jesus, they are also manifestations of God's powerful, compassionate and liberating love, triumphant over the forces of darkness which render havoc on body and soul.

c. The Incarnation of God's Presence:

1. The temple and the House of God: In comparison with the Temple of Jerusalem, Jesus identified himself as the real temple (implying that in his person the authentic presence of God lay hidden).

2. Ego eimi:

a. The words in Greek have two translations: "I am" or "It is I". The first refers to God's self-designation in Exodus.

b. As God identifies himself by this name in the OT, Jesus used the expression many times -in answer to Caiaphas, when walking on water (where Jesus use the words spoken by Yahweh in Dt. Is. 43:1-3: "It is I, do not fear"), with the Samaritan woman, and after the resurrection. Certainly there is the level of familiar presence "It is I". But there is also the implication of divine presence (particularly in the situations in which it is used). The presence, more than just divine existence, is a pledge to be present for the sake of the other -a presence now and forever.

c. It also appears as an object of faith in Jn. 8:24.

3. The presence - a source of life. The metaphor is the vine and branches. Christ, present to us and in us, involves a permanent communication of life.

B. The first Christology in the Apostolic preaching:

The Christology of the earliest preaching is not concerned with the manner of being of the pre-paschal Jesus --rather the focus is that he reigns now as Lord and Christ. The Apostolic witness is clearly an **affirmation of Jesus' divinity** (he possessed and could send the HS, Acts 2:33-35).

1. Central content of the preaching: Salvation in Christ

The risen Christ raised up to God's right hand, pours forth his Holy Spirit. Jesus Christ is God's definitive offer of salvation; The Pentecost event is the validation of the apostolic claim.

2. Christological Titles: (Recognition of shift to Hellenistic terms)

a. "Christ":

Is more than an acknowledgement of Jesus as Messiah -- the title is re-interpreted through the Pentecost event. Christ is the one who, filled with the Spirit, is now able to pour forth that Spirit on all mankind. Christ possesses the divine power of God to communicate the Spirit.

b. "Lord": (most common in Palestinian Judaism)

Indicates a divine rank. Peter uses it in the context of Psalm 110 -- transcendence over David.

c. "Son of Man": (not understood by earliest Christians & dropped)

Stephen's speech in Acts 7; "I see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of God." - certainly the hearers understood Stephen's words to accord Jesus the mark of divinity.

d. Other titles

They are attributed to Jesus which would belong to God alone: "judge of the living and the dead" (Acts 10:42); "Savior" (Acts 4:12 -- literally, "there is no salvation through anyone else."); "author of life" (Acts 3:15)

C. In the writings of St. Paul:

1. The Son of God:

This title (along with "the son" or "is Son") appears frequently in Paul and is part of his preaching. For Paul, Christ's sonship is **not acquired or one of adoption**. Paul affirms Jesus' **preexistent Sonship** in the following from Galatians 4:4 --"But, when the fullness of time had come, God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law. . ."

a. **Col 1:15** : this hymn will later be used in the Church to signify both the pre-existence of the Son and his distinctness from the Father. "He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation. For in him were created all things in heaven and on earth . . . all things were created through him and for him. He is before all things and in him all things hold together."

b. **Phil 2:6-11**: "Who, though he was in the form of God (morphe theou). . . but God highly exalted Him and gave him the name that is above every name." The biblical significance of "name" that corresponds to mission and rank; here, the rank is one who is worshipped (every knee shall bow).

2. "Ho Theos" vs. "Lord"

a. Ho Theos:

Paul **never** calls Christ ho theos; it is the title reserved for the Father alone. Attempt to work out Jesus' divine status while distinguishing the pre-existent one from the Father. (John

keeps the distinction between ho theos and theos.) **In Paul, the distinction is between the one God (ho theos) who is Father of our Lord (kyrios) Jesus Christ.**

b. The Lord: (222x in Pauline Literature)

The common title for Jesus in the earliest Christian communities (evident in the Aramaic prayer preserved in later Church Maranatha). In the LXX it is the title that translate Adonai, the circumlocution for Yahweh. Paul applies not only the title itself to Jesus, thus affirming his divinity, but he also applies this title to Jesus in the **same way** in which the title would have been used in the OT concerning Yahweh -- e.g., “name of the Lord” [shem Yahweh] or “fear of the Lord” or “day of the Lord” [yom Yahweh] or word of the Lord dabar Yahweh].

D. The Epistle to the Hebrews:

a. Major Themes: Jesus as High Priest, new covenant.

b. The distinction is made between Jesus and the prophets. Now Yahweh can speak by means of His Son.

c. Pre-existence: “In times past, God spoke in partial and various ways to our ancestors through the prophets; in these last days he spoke to us through a son, whom he made heir of all things and through whom he created the universe, who is the refulgence of His glory, the very imprint of his being, and who sustains all things by his mighty word.” The revelation brought by the Son is definitive and eschatological, it is creative and powerfully conserves the universe.” While the Son is imprint and refulgence of divine being, he is distinct as Son.

E. The testimony of the evangelists:

1. Synoptic Context: Theophanies of the Son

Baptism and transfiguration; in these events, common to all the synoptics, the Father presents His Son to mankind. The voice (no doubt it is God’s voice ‘from above’) designates Jesus as Son. This is a vigorous expression of Christology from above.

a. The Gospel of Mark: (Messianic Secret)

The mystery of Jesus is that He is the Son of God -- a mystery gradually revealed through the human events of the life of Jesus; but as mystery, Jesus’ divine identity is only implied, never openly proclaimed:

a. Jesus calls the twelve and made them apostles -- suggests a new creation which gives birth to the Church.

b. When asked by Caiaphas if he is the Christ: ego eimi.

c. Jesus’ death as the moment of revelation of the mystery of his filial identity (“Truly this is the Son of God.”)

b. The Gospel of Matthew: (Gospel of the Law and Kingdom)

Matthew’s consideration of the Kingdom is an affirmation of the divinity of Jesus. Only someone who is God could establish the Kingdom of God with the sovereignty of a founder and a new legislator.

a. Jesus is messianic king, fulfiller of OT expectations, but transcends those expectations. He is “Son of David” (cf. genealogy) but also is David’s Lord (interpretation of Psalm 110); he is the King who will pass judgment as Son of Man.

b. Matthew interprets the name of Jesus as “Yahweh saves” He is also Emmanuel

c. The relationship of Jesus to the Kingdom he proclaims.

1. Unlike the prophets, Jesus does not merely announce the future coming of the Kingdom, but he initiates it (miracles, forgiveness of sins);

2. He is also “supreme law giver”, speaking with exousia. He institutes the Church (gives the keys of the Kingdom). The authority that is given to him he passes on at the end, and, like Yahweh, he guarantees the new covenant through his perpetual presence (I am with you always).

c. The Gospel of Luke: (Gospel of the Lord and Spirit)

Luke’s conception of Jesus’ divine sovereignty is less external, less institutional than Matthew’s. Jesus is he who is quickened by the dynamism of the Spirit (The Spirit of the Lord is upon me). The exercise of his divine power stems from the presence of the Spirit within Him.

a. The role of the Spirit in the Incarnation: His divine sonship is linked to the intervention of the Spirit.

b. Luke shows the innermost reality of Jesus through his words of surrender on the cross.

c. The risen Christ promises the outpouring of his Spirit.

2. The Gospel of John: (The Gospel of the Word and of the Son):

In the prologue, John begins with the pre-existence of the Word from all eternity; the Word was *pros ton Theon* (**relation**) and was *theos* (**nature**); the Word was made flesh (nature) and dwelt among us (relation).

a. The gospel of the Son: For John, the title “Son of God is the essential object of faith. In 20:31, the purpose of the gospel is “that you may come to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God.”

b. The unity of the Father and Son (I and the Father are one) is brought out through Jesus doing the works of the Father, their mutual belonging, reciprocity of knowledge.

c. The gospel of the Incarnation: The Word became flesh, assuming that flesh in its totality. The very human traits of Jesus (tears, sorrow, anguish, love).

d. Thomas’ profession: My Lord and My God -- not just a profession in a belief in divinity, but personal relationship.

C. Development of Christology in the New Testament: (Dupuis)

Thesis: In the New Testament, there is an organic, homogeneous development that occurred from the primitive Christology of the Risen Christ (from below) to a Christology of the Incarnate Son (from above).

The question shifts from: **Who is Jesus for Us? to Who is Jesus?** The two fonts for NT development: proclamation of the Risen Lord in the primitive kerygma and the proclamation that the Risen Lord was the Pre-existent Son of God.

Earliest Palestinian Christology: Parousia Christology that holds tension between resurrection (already) and exultation (not yet) as one event in Christ.

First Font: Proclamation of Risen Christ in primitive kerygma:

The death and resurrection of Christ are the centers of the kerygma. The accent is on the resurrection as what God does for Jesus. It is his entrance into eschatological glory which has an effect for us: what he enjoys we will one day share in him.

a. Christology: centered on resurrection

Exultation is *God’s act, *on Jesus, *for our sake.

b. Dynamic: Continuity in that such an event forces the community to look back on person of Jesus and see his acts and message in a deeper way as revelatory of his eternal

sonship and discontinuity in that he is the agent of eschatological salvation and glory. The movement was from resurrection ---- life/message----birth-----pre-existence.

c. Characteristics: paschal, functional (has significance for us), future-oriented, soteriological and Kingdom-oriented.

Second Font: Proclamation of Risen One to Confession of Son of God

The resurrection of Jesus revealed his “divine condition.” Now the question arises as its origin. It is “extended” in two steps:

- a. reflected back to Jesus full earthly life from birth (Synoptics)
- b. pre-existence (John)

Two Phases:

a. Homogeneous development to pre-existence:

Process of retrospection was used to answer the inevitable question as to the origin of the divine condition revealed in the resurrection.

a. Step one: to whole earthly life

b. Step two: pre-existence that is independent and antecedent to birth

Result: affirmation that God became man!

1. Two-fold movement revealed as complimentary and necessary in Christology: Christology from below (primitive kerygma) leads to Christology from above (pre-existence). They are also expressed as Kenosis and Pre-existence, both of which are present in Phil 2:6-11, etc. In other words, the pre-existent Son became man, and through the paschal mystery, returns to the glory that is his.

2. Shift: “Son” become man becomes “Son of God” in resurrection

3. Functional Christology leads to ontological Christology

b. From Pre-existence to Divine Sonship:

Link with Jesus’ self-testimony: it closes the hermeneutical circle in that what Jesus understood about himself subjectively, in words and actions are later understood in their full import by this Christology of Divine Sonship.

1. Closing perspective of NT is a descending Christology but both approaches are necessary (warning for modern theology!!!).

II. Development of Christology in History:

There is a fundamental **continuity** between Jesus’ self-expression and the Christology of the New Testament in notion of divine filiation. Now we posit that despite a discontinuity of language there also exists a **continuity** between the NT Christological development and that which marks the patristic and conciliar era.

A. Doctrine in the First centuries of the Church: Preliminary considerations:

1. Ontological Focus without loss of soteriology:

The questions which dominated Christology are ontological; yet, these questions had a soteriological import. Gregory of Nazianzus was later to formulate, **Quod non assumptus, non redemptus est**. Who Christ is has implications for our understanding of what he accomplished for us.

a. “Admirabile commercium” (Marvelous exchange):

1. Personalistic sense: Son of God became man so that we could become sons of

God

2. Exchange of nature: Later understanding was that the so that we could partake of the divine nature.

2. Earliest heresies were Judeo-Christian:

a. Ebionites: (denies Christ's divinity).

Ebionites [Judaеоchristian sect] -- Christ is a man filled with the Spirit at his baptism, but denied that he was the Son begotten of the Father. Similarly, in Hellenistic circles, **Adoptionism** -- Theodotus the Elder (fl. c. 175); adoptionistic theories which see Jesus as merely a man, endowed with certain divine graces.

3. Encounter with Hellenistic Philosophy gave birth to new heresies:

a. The Question of Hellenization:

The danger of Christological reductionism arose when the Church confronted Hellenistic thought (i.e., reduce the mystery of Christ to human speculation). The truth is that (a) the Church had to clarify Greek terms that were ambiguous as Constantinople II (553) eventually defines (b) the heretics fell into the trap of hellenization. Orthodoxy actually was a "dehellenization" in content and a "hellenization" in terminology.

2. The Alexandrian vs. Antiochene Traditions as continuation of a theology from above and below that is found in the New Testament:

a. Alexandrian school: "from above"

1. Christology: Logos-sarx

a. starting point: the union in divinity between the Son of God and the Father and then affirm the true humanity he has assumed in the Incarnation.

b. concern: Unity of person

c. NT echo: Christology of pre-existence

2. Anthropology: man has a soma, psyche, pneuma (nous)

3. Heresies: Arianism (Appolinarianism) Monophysitism

b. Antiochene School:

1. Christology: Logos-anthropos (homo assumptus)

a. starting point: from Jesus' humanity or human nature to elevate him to his divinity as Son of God.

b. concern: two natures of Jesus

c. NT echo: primitive kerygmatic Christology

2. Anthropology: man is a body, soul and spirit.

3. Heresy: Nestorianism

3. Danger of Gnosticism: reducing Christ to the level of a myth:

In the second century -- great number of apocryphal writings, picturing Christ under legendary aspects; however, gnosticism placed the reality of Christ into a larger organized mythic/cosmogonic framework.

4. Development of Christology in three great periods that reflect three reductionisms of the NT witness concerning Jesus:

Shift: Denial of either nature to denial of union-in-distinction

Answer: Affirmation of both natures (N/Cons. I) and union (Eph/Chal)

I. Period One: Docetism: (denies the human reality of Jesus):

A. It arise out of influence from Greek Philosophy. God is so above material reality, he could not possibly have taken on a human form. **In short, humanity of Jesus is only an**

appearance. Already alluded to as the proto-gnostic errors present in the Johannine community.

1. Ignatius of Antioch affirms the reality of Christ's sufferings.

2. Docetic tendencies in gnostics Marcion and Valentinus --the Son could not have been born as men are. For Basilides -- Christ did not really die -- Simon of Cyrene took his place.

Answer: Church affirmed the entrance of the Son of God in a personal mode into history and his authentic humanity. His humanity became the means of our salvation.

1. Irenaeus: Soteriological Axiom:

Fought against Ebionites and Docetists, but above all, Marcionite and Valentinian gnosticism. Affirms that Christ is true man and true God; the argument is soteriological.

a. Christ is true God because only God can efficaciously obtain salvation and restore union with us.

b. He is true man because Jesus was to recapitulate in himself all of mankind, renewing it from its origins. Against Valentinus (the body was so spiritual it merely passed through Mary) he affirms the virgin birth, receiving his flesh from her.

c. The unity of person is affirmed (against the Valentinian system where Christ descended upon Jesus).

2. Tertullian:

a. Christ had a human soul against docetism and gnosticism.

b. "una substantia, tres personae": Against the monarchianism of Praxeas (Christ is only a manifestation of the Father -- the Father became incarnate and suffered on the cross): The Word is distinct from the Father as a person. Tertullian had used the word "persona" to describe the distinctness of the Three.

c. Tertullian brought this distinction of substance and person into Christology: "We see a two-fold state, not confused, but united in a single person, Jesus, God and man." In this two-fold state, the uniqueness of each of the two substances is safeguarded."

II. Period Two: The Christological reductionism addressed to Jesus' Divinity (Arianism and Apollinarianism)

a. Arius: Denial of Jesus divinity by denying equality with Father

He was created out of nothing, and is therefore not consubstantial with the Father; later he is adopted as Son. The Son is created as an instrument for all creation; in the Incarnation, the Word assumed a body that would be his instrument, a body without a soul. For Arius: Jesus was an **intermediary** and not mediator.

To affirm equality with Father seemed to compromise biblical monotheism and the absolute

unicity of God. **Ultimately, Jesus was neither fully God or fully man!** (Not having a human soul strengthened the Arian argument; ignorance and other spiritual limitations are signs of the limitations of the created word that inhabited the human flesh of Christ.)

1. Council of Nicea (325 AD):

a. Staring point: from below: It answers: Did Jesus really become the Son of God?

b. Homoousios: The Son, consubstantial with the Father. This term was used to affirm **generic identity** of divine nature: Son is divine as Father is and equal to him in divinity.

c. Soteriological import: Jesus is true mediator. In fact, there is a strict link between soteriology and Christology. What Christ is for us and who he is in himself are linked.

b. The Apollinarian controversy:

The denial of a human soul for Christ: The enemies of Arius (Athanasius and others) did not challenge Arius' negation of the human soul in Christ. In Athanasius' word-flesh christology, the passions were attributed to the flesh, the spiritual qualities to the Word. It is not that Athanasius denied the human soul in Christ -- he never incorporated this element into his Christology.

1. The Apollinarian doctrine: "It is impossible for two spiritual and will-endowed beings to co-exist. . . consequently, the Word has not assumed a human soul." The Word became man -- but He did not assume man (very Alexandrian); **the Word takes the place of human soul (psyche) and spirit (nous).** Formula miaphysis; also spoke of single prosopon and a single hypostasis. In short, the Word became flesh without a human soul. (The first to use the term hypostasis in Christology).

2. Council of Constantinople I (381 AD): Affirmation of Christ's human soul: The Word became man to save not only bodies but also souls (soteriological move). The heresy is formally anathematized by Damasus in 375.

III. Period Three: Christological Reductionism that attacks the mysterious union in distinction realized in Christ :

a. Nestorian Controversy: (denial of Theotokos and unity in Christ): Dualism in the Antiochene school is the necessary background to understand Nestorianism. Diodorus of Tarsus after his death is

accused by Cyril of Jerusalem to be the father of Nestorianism. Diodorus did have difficulty concerning the unity of person -- "The man born of Mary is the son of God through grace whereas the Word is Son of God by reason of nature." Still not two sons. Theodore of Mopsuestia (also accused of Nestorianism by Cyril and later condemned in II Constantinople). He adopts a "Word-man" Christology; *assumptus homo*. The union of the two natures is conceived in terms of indwelling. The two natures remain distinct, but they are united in one prosopon. The difficulty is that Theodore is unclear use of prosopon (two prosopa become one prosopon after the Incarnation?)

1. Nestorius: Christotokos: Denial of unity of Christ's person: While bishop in Constantinople, some rejected *Theotokos* in favor of *anthropotokos*; Nestorius adopts the term *Christotokos*. He rejects the *communicatio idiomatum* (communion of attributes) that was part of the Church's tradition. After all, how could God have a mother? The result was that Mary was seen as only the mother of Christ's humanity.

(a). Philosophically, Nestorius failed to develop a concept of person that was distinct from nature.

physis = nature

hypostasis = concrete subsistence

prosopon = the appearance of the essence;

the concrete individuality of the nature.

He could not think of two natures except as each having its prosopon (i.e., its external aspect or form as an individual) and its hypostasis (i.e., concrete subsistence). By this he meant to convey not that each nature was an actual subsistent entity, but that it was objectively real.

He insisted that the two natures of the Incarnate Christ remained unaltered and distinct after the union; the physis of the divine hypostasis had its own prosopon. Likewise, the physis of the man assumed had its own prosopon.

(b) While he held to two prosopa in the Incarnate one, he did not hold two persons in the classical understanding of Nestorianism. The union between them was termed “conjunction” (*sunapheia*).

(c) **Nestorius ultimately denied the realism of the Incarnation because he posited two diverse subjects: The Word of God and Jesus Christ.**

2. The Council of Ephesus (431 AD):

Previous to the council, Cyril anathematized Nestorius, affirming the “single incarnate nature of the God Word.” Emperor Theodosius II convokes Ephesus; before Antiochene bishops arrive, Cyril has Nestorius deposed. The deposition is later confirmed by the legates who represent the Pope.

(a). Teaching of Council: Affirmation of Hypostatic Union

1. Staring point is from above: emphasis is on the unity between natures. It attempts to answer: In what manner did the Son of God become man in Jesus?

2. Hypostatic Union:

a. only one subject in Jesus: Divine Son

One ontological person= Son

b. the humanity of Jesus would not have existed independent of the hypostatic union.

“personality” of human Jesus is safeguarded: in psychological sense

c. KEY: The Word of God became truly human in Jesus - L’umanizzazione of God.

3. Soteriological import: without true unity, Jesus salvific mediation is lost.

4. Theotokos: The eternal Son of the Father is he who was born of the Virgin Mary; for this reason, Mary is legitimately called theotokos.

The unity of Christ’s person cannot be denied.

3. Symbol of Union: draft between Antiochene and Alex. terms (Formulary of reunion) drafted by Theodoret of Cyrus, proposed by John of Antioch and accepted by Cyril of Alexandria with a few modifications. Rejects Cyril’s one nature and speaks of two natures in union. Affirms the identity of the son of God before the Incarnation with Jesus Christ. The word for union is not Nestorius *sunapheia* but the stronger term *enosis*. (NB: Cf. Christological agreement with the Assyrian Church of the East).

b. The Monophysite controversy and the council of Chalcedon:

a. Eutyches and monophysitism:

After union, there is only the divine nature in Christ. His human nature is swallowed up by his divinity.

“I confess that our Lord has been of two natures before the union, but since the union I confess one single nature.” Leo upholds the condemnation of Eutyches made at the Synod of Constantinople. Theodorus convokes a council where Dioscorus of Alexandria refuses to read

the Tome of Leo and re-instates Eutyches . After the death of Theodorus, Marcian convokes Chalcedon.

b. The Council of Chalcedon: reaffirms unity and duality in Christ by teaching “One person with Two natures.”

1. Starting point is from below:” emphasis is on the distinction that remains between the two natures after the hypostatic union.

2. “Perfect both in his divinity and in his humanity, truly God, truly man composed of body and rational soul, that he is consubstantial with the Father in his divinity, consubstantial with us in his humanity . . . two natures **without any confusion or change or division or separation** . . . united **in** one person and one hypostasis. “

a. The distinction of natures is so radical that each nature has its own operations which are uniquely its own.

b. The union is so radical that it is not just “personal “ but “hypostatic. ‘

c. “in” suggests that the natures last.

(NB: Galot suggests that Chalcedon used ontological term (hypostasis and phenomenological term, prosopon).

2. The consequence of Chalcedon is to affirm two consciousnesses in Christ: human and divine without confusion.

c. Neo-Chalcedonians: attempt to hold on to Cyril’s idea of One nature in Christ and eventually gave birth to later controversies.

c. The monothelite controversy: (only one will in Christ)

a. Sergius of Constantinople proposed **monenergism**; after the union of natures, there was a single “energy” or operation in Christ -- the theandric operation. Pope Honorius wrote in response to Sergius that there is only one will in Christ (really, he meant a moral union of wills) . Sergius takes it literally and proposes **monothelitism** (only one will in Christ)

b. Constantinople III (681 AD) : Question of unity-in-distinction moved from level of nature to that of action/will that precede from it.

Monothelitism is condemned in Lateran I (Martin I) and in the ecumenical council **Constantinople III (681 AD) :**

a. The Council affirmed two natural wills, two natural operations (energies) without division or change, without separation or commingling.”

b. Unity is founded upon no opposition.

c. Key issue here is not the relationship between the human and divine wills in Jesus but the relationship of the divine will of the Father (only one divine will) and that of the human will of Jesus. It is the question of the relationship between the historical and transcendent.

D. Some concluding thoughts on nature and person:

a . On a fundamental level, nature answers the question “what is it” and person answers the question “who is it?” The medieval tradition spoke of the *principium quo*- the principle by which something was accomplished (namely human or divine nature) and the **principium quod**, the principle which acted, the subject of the activity (principle).

b. The Trinitarian understanding of person can help us to distinguish person and nature (and also to understand the logical affirmation of the faith that Christ does not possess a human person). Person is understood in terms of relations, subsistent relations (both an esse in, that is

an act of existence in the divine substance as well as an esse ad, that is, an act of existence over against the other Persons). To understand the Person of Jesus as the subsistent Trinitarian relation would mean to say that the Subject, when it comes to an awareness of self within the human consciousness of Christ, it will be an awareness of that which constitutes it as distinct person, namely the awareness of both oneness in and yet distinctness from the Father and the Spirit.

III. Divine Sonship and Redemptive Mission in the consciousness of Jesus

The “act of existence” that the Son of God gives the humanity of Jesus is a real and authentic existence: it renders man in a personal, authentic manner. In a sense, it is the “humanization of God”; the Son of God enjoys, actualizes and develops a true “human personality”.

Approach: must hold together two impulses:

- a. from below: affirm the true, real & historic condition of Jesus**
- b. from above: affirm the personal identity of the Son of God.**

In this sense, we retrieve a soteriological, personal and historical dimension to the mystery of the Incarnation.

A. The self-knowledge and human consciousness of Jesus

a. Psychological Unity and self-knowledge of Jesus:

1. The Problem of unity in distinction

a. Dogma of Council of Constan. III:

1. affirmed true human nature and true human actions
2. human will “moves itself” (kinethenai-passive sense)
3. Human will is subject to divine will.

Key: Organic unity of the two wills in communion and subordination. The human acts are authentic but are human acts of Word!

b. Proper Approach: maintain tension and avoid extremes:

- a. Antiochene: to affirm Jesus’ human Ego as an autonomous subject
destroys the hypostatic union. (mistake of some: to posit nature as
autonomous center fort Jesus’ human will. That is role of person!)
- b. Alexandrian: to see the divine person as hegemonous principle that
regulates and determines the human acts of Jesus. There is no real human
ego! True human nature must determine and regulate the human acts of
Jesus!)

2. Towards a solution

Key distinction: Person is the Word: human ego in Jesus must exist

a. The divine person and the human psychological Ego

- 1. L’ego of Jesus is the prolongation, in the human self-awareness, of
the Ego of the person of the Word.**
- 2. Why?**
 - a. Self-awareness is an act of person through a nature
 - b. Jesus is personal humanization of the Word

c. Thus, Jesus' autoconsapevolezza was that of the Word (Divine Sonship) expressed in an authentic human way.

3. The ultimate center of reference for human acts of Jesus is the divine person of the Word.

b. Autonomy and Heteronomy of Jesus' human nature

1. Autonomous: in that human nature determines and specifies his actions.

2. Heteronomous: in that human nature is ontologically appropriated divine person (source of causality of acts)

c. Consapevolezza of Jesus and his Divine Sonship

NB: It must be a subjective consapevolezza of H. Union!

1. Not from Beatific Vision because:

- a. extrinsic- not subjective self-awareness
- b. does not explain Jesus' understanding of his humanity and unity with the second person of the Trinity
- c. No Scriptural testimony

2. Jesus' Subjective Consapevolezza of Divinity:

a. Seen from below:

***From consapevolezza of Hypostatic Union**

b. Seen from above:

***Consapevolezza of Jesus is the prolongation in human knowledge of the hypostatic union.**

b. The human knowledge of Jesus:

Two key principles:

a. Knowledge is that of the Son of God in real human way

b. Kenosis:

- 1. Incarnation assumed some imperfection;
- 2. perfect only in all that pertained *to his salvific mission and *in fidelity to kenosis (NB: Is there really a limiting "only"?);
- 3. no a-priori absolute principle of perfection.

1. The problem of knowledge and ignorance

a. Tradition theology supposes three different knowledges in Jesus:

- 1. Knowledge from Beautiful Vision
- 2. Infused Angelic Knowledge
- 3. Omnicomprehensive experiential knowledge

2. Towards a solution

a. Immediate knowledge of the Father:

1. Subjective Consapevolezza of Jesus as the Son

necessitat*****

human
by

d. It is omnicomprehensive (not so acc. to SS)

3. NB: Jesus' immediate Vision becomes Beatific in Resurrection.

b. Experiential knowledge: normal and ordinary

c. Infused Knowledge: Yes; due to having to have all knowledge necessary for his salvific mission

d. Ignorance in Jesus:

1. Real Ignorance is possible

2. "Day of Judgment": Ignorance of it suggests that it was not essential to salvific mission

3. Ignorance of day is not equal to error of it.

In question of human acts of Jesus, can be seen in two ways:

a. From below: man to God (act of adoration = Jesus' prayer/faith)

b. From above: God to man (Jesus' miracles as human expression of divine power)

3. The prayer and faith of Jesus

a. prayer of Jesus:

It is an act of adoration to the Father within the human expression of the inter-Trinitarian relationship of Father and Son in terms of total dependence. It is not a prayer of Jesus before Trinity.

b. Faith of Jesus

Faith is not to propositions but as an act of handing over oneself in trust to God. In this sense, Jesus expressed faith in the Father.

B. The will and human freedom of Jesus:

a. The will and human actions of Jesus:

1. Council of Constantinople III did not explain:

a. how two wills are combined

b. how human will is autonomous and truly free

2. Further Dogmas of Faith:

a. Jesus was free of all sin

b. Jesus was free of original sin

c. Jesus was free of concupiscence

d. necessary theologoumenon:

***absolute impeccability: (God cannot be author of sin in Jesus!)**

NB: He was not free from temptation or suffering!

3. Soteriological Principle:

Son of God assumed all the consequences of sin necessary for their positive valuation for man's salvation

b. Towards a True solution

1. Jesus was immune from sin: but not temptation

2. Jesus was not immune from physical or moral suffering

a. Agony:

Jesus understood his divine Sonship in self-gift through kenosis that grew in act of the agony

b. Cry at Cross:

Jesus was not truly abandoned by Father but expressed Psalm in its fullness as song of trust- in line with “dark night of soul”.

3. Acts of Jesus as expressions of divine power:

a. How can human acts be expressions of divine power?

Key Axiom: Man’s autodetermination and autonomy grew in Direct and Not Inverse proportional to union and nearness to God.

b. Miracles: as human acts of Son, Jesus performed miracles not by offering prayers to Father but by virtue of His Own Human Will.

c. Human Freedom of Jesus:

1. Issue: How do you hold together:

- a. Impeccability
- b. obedience of Jesus to Father
- c. true human and free will?

2. Towards a solution:

a. Correct Understanding of Liberty:

Liberty is not faculty of choice but the ontological perfection of the person that constitutes his dignity.

b. Corollary: More Free, the more one is determined by the Good.

***Perfection in liberty grows in direct proportion with auto-determination of will to the good.**

c. Jesus:

1. His human freedom was perfect

2. It was not determined where the will of the Father allowed a choice (modalities of mission)

3. In times of obedience to Father, Jesus did not have choice not because of outside extrinsic force by Father but because of determination that comes from authentic freedom.

II. Galot’s Material:

(Galot: The “I” of Jesus is divine; his human consciousness is true and exists, it receives light from the Father and he comes to understand that he is the divine Son at age 12! He reveals his divine identity and the sacrificial nature of his paschal mystery)

A. The consciousness of His Sonship:

1. Statement of the problem.

a. The “I” of Jesus, is his divine personhood; yet, distinct from this divine personhood is his human nature, a component of which is human consciousness.

b. The problem, therefore, is not how a man becomes conscious that he is the son of God, but rather, how does the Son of God become humanly conscious of Himself? In the Incarnation, the Son of God became the subject of human psychological activity. How was his personhood transparent to his human consciousness.?

2. Some explanations:

a. Beatific Vision: The ancient explanation was that consciousness of his divine Sonship was attributable to the presence of the beatific vision which he always possessed as

Son of God. After all, if Jesus was leading us to the beatitude of heaven, how could he have been ignorant toward that which he himself was leading people? By virtue of the beatific knowledge, the soul of Christ knows the Word. However, self-consciousness cannot be equated with vision. If the soul of Christ, in seeing God, sees the Word, is not the same as becoming conscious of one's own divine personality. As a matter of fact, it is just the opposite (for self-awareness is achieved as a reflex operation in opposition against what one sees as the "not-I").

b. Gradualist theories: The human consciousness of Jesus became aware of his Sonship at certain stages in his development: these theories attribute this awareness from any moment from his baptism to even as late as his resurrection. However, it is impossible to situate the beginning of Jesus' awareness of His divine sonship after his death. The gospels witness to his Filial consciousness during his earthly life (his claim to be the Son of God was the reason for his condemnation.)

3. The truth of the psychology of Jesus:

a. It is important not to divorce Christ's ontology from his psychology. Jesus unquestionably had to live in the psychological truth of who he was. He could not have been ignorant of his true identity or have been mistaken about it during his childhood and youth.

b. If by virtue of the Incarnation the Son of God became humanly conscious of Himself, this consciousness could have had no other object than his innermost personhood. His psychological development wasn't a transition from awareness of his human identity to the discovery of his divine identity. It had to be a gradual increase and deepening of his human consciousness that he was indeed the Son of God.

c. The psychology of Jesus is not divorced from his mission. Jesus is to proclaim not only the advent of the reign of God but that he stands in a definitive relationship to the Father as the one who will usher in that Kingdom. If Jesus was to proclaim the truth, that truth had to be grounded upon a consciousness of the truth of his own personhood.

4. The Mystical Filial contact:

a. The use of Abba (never in the OT) affirmed all that was unique and unprecedented in the "I" of Christ. The name "Abba" reveals an intimacy with the Father that is profoundly rooted in Jesus' psychology. He realized that he was a Son in the true filial sense of that word.

b. For this reason, we can speak of Jesus, in his human consciousness, having an experience of intimacy in the mystical order. Jesus' mystical contacts with the Father enabled Him to discern His own filial identity and to grasp the truth of his divine "I" through his human consciousness. (Plot believes that these contacts began quite early, as a child).

c. Through the Holy Spirit, the Father acted within the psychological makeup of Jesus in such a way as to make himself known as Father. This experience is similar to and yet profoundly different from other mystical experiences; the affirmation of Jesus is that he is equal to the Father, he is Son on that level of equality.

d. Therefore, it was by becoming aware (a gradual growth in awareness according to the laws of human psychology) that He was the Son that Jesus became aware that he was God.

B. Jesus' Awareness of his Redemptive Mission:

1. A theory of gradual development in Jesus' awareness of his redemptive mission.

At the beginning his public ministry, he was unaware that the message would be rejected. The opposition of his compatriots led him to the gradual understanding that his sacrifice would be the only way in which the message would be accepted.

a. If his sacrifice is the fulfillment of his mission, how could he have not understood this from the very beginning of his public ministry?

b. To justify such a radical change in his consciousness of his mission, we would need conclusive evidence from scripture, and there is none.

c. In the Temple at age 12, Jesus predicts his own death; furthermore, he submits to John's baptism of repentance, knowing his own sinlessness, yet doing so out of a consciousness of his mission to be the sinless one who would suffer for the sins of others.

2. Yet, there was an element of development in his messianic consciousness.

As hostility escalated against him, it became clearer to him the concrete way in which the drama of redemption would be carried out. As he meditated upon Scripture, Jesus came to a deeper understanding of the God's plan and the value of the ordeal to which he was destined. Jesus' Messianic consciousness continued to develop in harmony with the growth of his filial consciousness. For it was in understanding fully that he was the Son of the eternal Father that Jesus understood with even greater clarity the need for his sacrifice to be the oblation of a loving Son.

3. The interpretation that Jesus gave to his own work of redemption:

a. Jesus stressed that his death was willed by God. "The Son of Man must suffer" there is an absolute necessity that springs from a divine plan.

b. Jesus describes his death as having a sacrificial import: he sees it as a "ransom for many." In laying down his life for the sheep, Jesus stresses that it is a free act and that it is done for all.

c. The supreme interpretation which Jesus gives to his death is to be found in the Eucharist. In some respects, the eucharist can be seen as a prophetic action used to interpret the death:

1. Through the blood, a new covenant is formed, that is, a new relationship between God and Man is to be accomplished.

2. Through his death, the Kingdom is to be established definitively. "I shall not drink the fruit of the vine until I drink it anew in the Kingdom"

3. Through his death, the Church is to be established -- Do this in memory of me; the ritual re-enactment of the Eucharist is to make available the merits of his passion and death.

IV. Reconciliation of man to God in the paschal mystery.

A. The goal of reconciliation:

1. The horizontal aspect of reconciliation: Sin causes not only an enmity between man and God but hostility among men. Reconciliation has the goal of mutual reconciliation.

2. The goal of reconciliation: The **intimate union** characterized by the Incarnation is the **model** and the **means of renewal** (in his sacrifice) since the God-man effects this reconciliation precisely as standing for all men before God.

3. The abolition of barriers: foreshadowed in his public ministry .

a. Labelling the infirm or sick as "ritually impure."

b. The exclusion of "sinners"; the war against sin is not a war against sinners!

- c. The exclusion of certain “classes” of people
- d. A universalism that went beyond national boundaries

B. Scripture: The Passion and Death of Christ and Redemption:

1. New Testament witness:

a. Paul: The work of reconciliation was effected through the blood of Christ, by his death, or by the cross.

b. I Pet: “You were ransomed from your futile ways..with the precious blood of Christ. Also applies the suffering servant -- by his wounds you have been healed.

c. Pastoral Epistles: I Tim 2:5-6 : “For there is one God. there is also one mediator between God and the human race, Christ Jesus, himself human, who gave himself as a ransom for all.”

d. The Epistle to the Hebrews: The unique and definitive priestly sacrifice that is offered by Jesus. The eternal value comes not just in the blood, but in the nature of the offering itself -- “who, through the eternal spirit offered himself unblemished to God.”

e. I John: Jesus is the one sent by the Father for the “expiation for our sins and the sins of the whole world.” The blood of Jesus cleanses us from all sin.

f. Revelation: the martyrs and the blood of the lamb.

2. Two key New Testament affirmations:

a. The salvific mission of Jesus is accomplished by his death.

Galot makes a sharp distinction between the accomplishments of Jesus in his life and mission, and the supreme merit of his death. The old idea was salvation through power; in Christ, it is new.

Some theologians will refer to Jesus as:

1. The “man of fidelity” who accepts even death in order to remain faithful to his mission. It is by his life and his activities that he saved us. But, the primitive community, far from seeing death as an accident, but its supereminent value.

2. Christ’s death as a supreme example of love intended to inspire love and heroism in all. Yet, the tradition says that his sacrifice effects an inner transformation in us antecedent to any imitation on our part. Besides, exemplarism doesn’t account for the universality of salvation.

3. The passion of Christ is reduced to a protest against injustice (the just man who suffers for the just cause). Certainly Jesus died for the sake of justice -- but here we mean religious justice -- justification.

b. God’s work is accomplished in Jesus’ death.

Paradox: How can death be the work of God? Even when seen in its expiatory element (sacrifice for sin), is it not man’s action vis a vis God? The affirmation is that God was at work in the death of Jesus. The death is a divine work from several points of view:

1. The initiative of God who “sent” his Son who “gave him up” (paradidomai) for the sake of us all. It is the Father’s will.

2. It is the work of God that within it, God achieved reconciliation.

Not that God was reconciled with us (OT idea) but that God reconciled us with himself.

3. The passion of Jesus is the passion of the Son-made-man.

C. Tradition: The meaning of Passion and redemption:

1. Elements of the explanation in Patristic doctrine:

a. The victory of Christ over the devil:

Redemption is a liberation of mankind from the power of Satan. Only rarely is the blood of Christ presented as being paid to the devil as a ransom. **It is a sacrifice to the Father.** Augustine held the theory that the devil, who had a right over sinners by virtue of their sin, sought to exercise that right wrongfully over the just one, Jesus Christ, and thereby merited to lose all his captives. Another explanation entails the revenge of God whereby, just as Satan ensnared man, so does the God-man now ensnare the devil. While these images seem to give too much power to the devil, the main point emphasized is the reality of evil and sin from which we are liberated.

b. The salvific role of the Incarnation:

1. The orthodox understanding of the nature of Christ was defended in view of its implications for our salvation. Against those who would deny that Christ was fully human, the soteriological implication was cited *quod non assumptus, non redemptus est* in favor of affirming the humanity. Likewise, to those who denied the divinity of Christ, the soteriological principle that God alone could save was cited.

2. Beyond this, there is even a further connection between the Incarnation and Redemption. The physical or mystical theory of redemption (**illumination**) argue that by virtue of the hypostatic union, human beings in union with Christ can be divinized through him. The admirable commercium whereby the Word became man so that we might learn how a man can become God is present in Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Hippolytus.

3. Athanasius states that the very fact of the Incarnation brings about our **divinization**: “The Word became Man so that we might be divinized.” Of course, it is a divinization in principle -- personal cooperation and sacramental life effect this divinization in the individual person. These theories of redemption certainly are not meant to isolate the incarnation from the act of death & resurrection saying that it is by virtue of the Incarnation alone that we are saved. For these theories depend upon a Neo-platonic metaphysics that images participate in their prototype. Christ has become a prototype, the New Adam, by taking upon himself all sinful humanity (the humanity of fallen Adam) and putting it to death and vivifying it through the resurrection.

c. The doctrine of sacrifice:

The sacrifice of Christ is understood by the Fathers (as in scripture) as both similar to and different from the Judaic sacrifices. But the notion of sacrifice is not specifically analyzed in view of a theological explanation of the Redemption.

2. The Doctrine of Satisfaction:

a. The notion of satisfaction and its application to the Redemption. From Roman law, **satisfaction signified a repayment through which one fulfilled an obligation in a different manner from that originally stipulated.** While the notion was early applied to penitents, making satisfaction for their sins, it was not developed systematically by the Fathers in reference to the sacrifice of Christ. Perhaps the most developed statement in the Fathers is from Ambrose: “Christ makes satisfaction to the Father for our sins.” In all the places in which it is sporadically used, the notion of satisfaction is applied analogously to Christ’s sacrifice, because the innocent man voluntarily takes this upon himself.

b. Anselm: Fundamental elements in the doctrine of satisfaction:

1. Sin is withdrawing one's will from God; it is refusing the honor that is due to God and destroying the order in the universe he created.

2. The reparation or satisfaction cannot be a simple compensation equal to what was taken from God by sin. It must render more than what is strictly due (in normal satisfaction, we also have to make reparation for the injury that we have caused another.)

3. Since God is just, and he cannot violate his justice, all sin must either be paid for by punishment or satisfaction.

4. There is no way in which man can provide God with an adequate satisfaction, since he already owes everything to God and he can't give God something over and above what he already owes!

5. If we are supposed to prefer God to anything else, then we ought to be willing to surrender entire universes in order to love him. The slightest sin, therefore, is equal in weight to all of the possible worlds which ought not to be surrendered in exchange for loving him. How can we offer satisfaction even for the slightest of sins!

6. It looks like the only thing that awaits man is punishment (since he can't make proper satisfaction). However, that alternative isn't acceptable to God either, for that means that his creation is frustrated. God has to finish what he intended for human nature! (This does not mean that God is not free -- for, when creating us, knowing ahead of time our fall, he also freely obligated himself to save us. As Anselm writes, "Let us say, however, that it is necessary that the goodness of God, by reason of its immutability, finish what it has begun to do with man, although all the good it accomplishes is a grace.)

7. Thus, satisfaction is the only recourse, so to speak. He who provides satisfaction of God must be greater than everything that exists outside of God, in order to be able to give God something that exceeds everything that is less than God. Since God alone can make the necessary satisfaction and since it is man's duty to do this work, only the God-man can render this satisfaction to God.

8. How will the debt be satisfied on the part of the God-man. It cannot be by giving something which already belongs to God (such as obedience). But, if the just man, who does not deserve death, and the all-powerful one, who would not die by necessity, gives his life -- there is proper satisfaction, for it is something which is over and above what would be "owed" to God in justice.

c. Evaluation of the doctrine of satisfaction:

1. Necessity in God? (Fittingly?)

While Anselm preserves God's freedom as His decision to save in light of the foreknowledge of sin, still, God was in no way obligated to save them in the event of sin. Likewise, it would seem that it is not unreasonable that God could have merely pardoned the sin without demanding satisfaction. Aquinas says that if God had willed to deliver man from sin without requiring any satisfaction, he would not have acted against justice. Finally, was it necessary that satisfaction be offered by a God-man? Could it not have been a man elevated by God by a special grace who would have remained sinless? Perhaps instead of "necessity" we should substitute the word "fittingness". It was fitting for God to save the world in the manner in which he did. Fittingness does not eliminate the pure gratuitousness of the redemption.

2. Satisfaction as juridical or quantitative act?

For Anselm, satisfaction for sin explains both the Incarnation and the death of Christ. But sin cannot measure and justify the entire achievement of Christ -- it makes his coming entirely juridical and quantitative. However, in defense of Anselm, it could be said that Anselm does go beyond the simply juridical by stressing that what is owed to God must be over and above what was taken from him. This supererogatory aspect of Christ's work points to the fact that what was done was done not just to even the scales -- it was done in love and obedience.

d. The Medieval Tradition after Anselm:

Many scholastic theologians took up Anselm's ideas of satisfaction with little modification. Aquinas himself adopted satisfaction as one way of understanding the work of redemption. Thomas, in his usual synthetic style, brings together four "ways" in which the death of Christ brought us salvation:

- a. the mode of merit (treated below),
- b. the mode of satisfaction (Anselm's theory -- with the idea of "necessity" replaced with "fittingness"),
- c. the mode of sacrifice (biblical reflection)
- d. the mode of redemption (Patristic theories of ransom).

3. The Doctrine of Merit:

a. Development of the Doctrine:

Merit has its roots in scripture and the Patristic tradition. Strictly speaking, **merit is defined as a "right to a reward" by virtue of a virtuous act performed.** Certainly, the exaltation of the Suffering servant (because of his sufferings, my servant shall justify many) or the exaltation clause of the Philippians hymn: Therefore God has highly exalted him.. Hilary will use this text of Paul to speak of the "merit of humility" or the "merit of obedience" which gained the reward of exaltation. As Augustine writes, "humility is the merit of glory; glory is the reward of humility."

b. Individual Positions:

1. Peter Lombard saw merit under a twofold aspect: Christ merited for us both liberation from sin and the opening up of the Kingdom, and he merited for himself the glorification of his body and the impassibility of his soul.

2. Thomas develops merit similarly: Christ merited for himself his resurrection and all that relates to his glorification; but, since grace was given him not just as an individual but as head of the Church, he merited salvation for all his members.

3. Scotus tends to reduce Christ's merit to a merit of fittingness, that is, the value and the merit of the work of Christ do not derive from the work itself but from its acceptance by God who gives that work its infinite value (a kind of voluntarism?). There is great truth in this position -- after all, the glorification of Christ is the sign of God's acceptance of His work.] In contrast to this opinion, the Thomists insisted upon a "condign" merit, that is, there is a proportionality between the work accomplished by Christ and the result obtained.

4. Other interpretations of the redemption:

a. Abelard: Abelard, challenging the theory of the devil's right, denies the doctrine of a ransom. Isn't it cruel of God to demand a price for our ransom? Isn't the death of the innocent Christ a graver sin than the original sin? How could we have been made righteous by that kind of a death? **Abelard envisions the Passion of Christ as a demonstration of God's love.** The

supreme love of Christ brings us a liberation, wins for us the freedom of the children of God who act out of love and not fear. This exemplarist doctrine is condemned by the council of Sens.

b. Socinus: Socinus has a similar reaction against the notion of “price”. Christ should be viewed as a person who, in order to liberate his friends from an enemy, is mortally wounded by the enemy in the process. That is how Christ shed his blood in liberating us from the evil one. In itself, Christ death has no efficacy. Christ’s entrance into heaven is how eternal liberation is achieved for us, for now the glorious and risen Lord intercedes for us. In this framework, there is no “healing” of wounded mortal nature through the redemption.

c. The theories of liberal protestantism:

1. Schleiermacher situates the efficacy of the redemption in the subjective domain of consciousness and sentiment. Christ is the supreme example of God-consciousness. In his suffering, we see the possibility of the unfolding of divine consciousness in all of us if we, like him, can surrender our lives to God.

2. Ritschl: The redemption is the revelation of God the Father. In revealing this divine love, Christ inspires us to trust, to love, to generosity.

3. Reville in France: the effect of sin is to beget in us a sense of the rigorous justice of God and inspire moral despair. The Redeemer revives faith, helping us to believe that goodness is possible; he communicates an energy to destroy the power of sin in our lives.

4. Rashdall in England: the effect of Christ’s death is not the remission of sins but to assist us morally in our own act of repentance whereby God forgives our sins.

5. Critique of these interpretations:

a. Particularism: While admitting that the redemption is a reflection of the love of God, and also admitting the psychological effect that this visible demonstration of love has for us, the effects of redemption, when limited to these, do not touch all people.

b. Potency: Furthermore, does an attractive example have the power to transform lives? The sinner is in a radical impotence, incapable of freeing himself by his own efforts from his slavery to his own sin.

c. Limit to God’s love: To reduce God’s love to the analogy of human examples puts limits on that love. God’s love is endowed with an efficacy greater than all human models of love, that is, models of love exerting a psychological influence on others.

D. The meaning of suffering in the Event of the Cross

1. Statement of the problem:

a. Distinguish the problem of suffering and the problem of evil: By the problem of evil we mean the moral issue whereby man’s freedom has brought about a state of alienation. The problem of suffering, on the other hand, is the experience of pain that ought not be. (The issue of the experience of pain that is disproportionate to what we believe God’s plan is).

b. While there is a tradition of linking suffering as a punishment for sin in the OT, Jesus clearly refuses to attribute misfortune as a punishment for sinfulness. If suffering is not a punishment for sin, then why does God allow people to suffer?

2. The solution provided by Christ:

a. Jesus' personal involvement: Jesus bears the right interpretation of the meaning of suffering in his very own flesh. There was nothing lacking to the solidarity of the Son of God with mankind in the area of suffering. Beside the physical pain of the cross, there is the mental sense of abandonment, the pain of failure when his message was not accepted, the moral pain of the innocent wrongfully accused! Yet, his desire to be in solidarity with mankind did not mean that he did not try to alleviate suffering in others when he encountered it.

b. Suffering transformed into a redemptive act.

1. Christ, who was without sin, freely bore the consequences of sin (rejection, suffering and death). However in freely accepting the will of the Father, his suffering and death repairs the damage of sin (God-alienation) and now makes God-union (atone-ment) possible for all.

2. We cannot interpret the sufferings of Christ as Christ receiving the punishment we all deserved for sin, as if Christ, in some way, received the wrath of the Father in our place. Christ is the innocent man; by his own suffering, he wanted to make it clear that earthly sufferings are not to be interpreted as divine punishment.

3. What about the person who suffers an injustice? The misfortune ought not to be considered as a punishment for sin; rather, the misfortune can be borne as a free act of reparation, as the act of a forgiven sinner who freely unites himself to the Savior's oblation for the salvation of the world. (Cf. *Salvifici Doloris*).

3. The suffering of the Divine Person of the Son:

a. What do we mean when we say "Christ suffered and died for us?" One interpretation (exemplarist): Christ provided an example for all humanity, showing us how to transform human pain and suffering into a free act of loving obediential surrender to the Father. While that is partially true, it limits the universal effect of what Christ did to those who would later come to know of his example.

b. Once again, we are brought into the heart of the mystery of the words "for us." How can one human being do something that is effective for all of mankind (both past and future)? The actions of Jesus in some way have to be considered as **transhistorical**. This happens in virtue of the Incarnation. His actions have an infinite value because they are the actions of the eternal Son of God. What he does, he does once and for all.

c. Therefore, Jesus as the Son is represented mankind its universal dimensions. The suffering love that constituted his sacrifice was a human love infused with a divine love; the Incarnate Son of God suffered in his human nature.

4. The suffering of the Father:

a. The Biblical testimony:

Romans 8: "God who did not spare his own Son" and John 3: "God so loved the world that he gave his only Son." The passion is a work that the Father has granted Jesus to accomplish. Theological import:

a. It is the Father who takes the initiative in the sacrifice, not only by deciding that his Son is to suffer for the redemption of the world but by giving him in sacrifice and being the first to suffer by reason of this "handing over."

b. The Father's participation in the sufferings of his son. It is hard to imagine that the Father would remain impassive to the sufferings of His Son.

b. Divine Impassibility and the Analogical sense of the Father's suffering:

The suffering of the Father must be understood analogically. His nature as divine is impassible. However, in freedom, God has decided to establish personal relations with men. In doing so, the Father laid himself open to the pain of being rejected and decided to become personally involved in suffering through the plan of his redemption. His love is a suffering that is freely chosen and does not change him in nature.

c. The Father's involvement in human suffering:

The Father willed a redemptive suffering for mankind and he was the first to assume this suffering by giving his own Son.

a. God "willed" a redemptive suffering. Revelation is clear that Jesus, in his suffering, is doing what God wants and wills. But doesn't this make God cruel or impotent? No since God takes human freedom seriously. When men freely decided to accept the path of suffering and death as the consequence of sin, God respected the consequences of their free action but assumed the burden of these consequences.

b. God willed the suffering involved in the Redemption --but he was the first to bear it.

d. The Meaning and value of suffering:

What does it mean to say that the Father sends suffering into human existence? The two aspects of the Father's initiative and compassion in the suffering of Christ can be seen in our own suffering. The Father compassionately suffers with us in our suffering.

1. In itself, pain possesses no moral value; as a matter of fact, pain can lead to negative values of egoism and self-pity. Through the grace of Christ, when self-pity is transformed to self-gift, the self-gift is all the more intense because of the "cost". In the plan of redemption, suffering is meant to promote love, and the value of pain and suffering come from love.

2. Likewise, in itself, pain does not lead to union with God. As a matter of fact, it can set the stage for revolt. However, pain born in obedience to the God who wills it is the more supreme sacrifice of obedience.

3. Obedience is never willed by the Father for its own sake --but for a higher value, namely fruitfulness and joy. In obedience and in love, we find ourselves, not slaves but sons of the Father. In that is our joy now and the promise of eternal joy forever.

E. Redemption through the glorification of Christ:

By glorification, we mean not only the resurrection, but the entire process of Resurrection-Ascension and Pentecost.

1. The relation of glorification to redemption:

a. The Glorification of Christ is the sovereign work of the Father; God definitively acts in history

b. It is the acceptance of the oblation of the sacrifice --the sign that the work of reparation of sin has achieved its purpose.

c. The sealing of the covenant between God and man; restores man to God's friendship and communicates to him divine life.

d. Human nature, through its union with the divine nature, is transformed. That transformation is now ours in principle. The principle of salvation means that in Christ is already realized the divinization of human nature which has yet to be accomplished in other men and women.

2. The spiritual glorification of Christ in death

That is, the time between Christ's death and resurrection: I Peter 3:18-19 -- "put to death in the flesh, he was brought to life in the Spirit. In it, he also went to preach to the spirits in prison." At the moment of death, he carries out a mission among the deceased by virtue of sharing a common destiny with them. This was Jesus' first glorification -- at the moment of his death, he received a new spiritual life. He was glorified in his soul.

a. The descent into hell:

The descent into hell is our guarantee that Christ really experienced death -- the extreme moment of his humiliation. Through the centuries, there has been speculation concerning the effect that Christ's death had on the hypostatic union. If Christ's soul left its body, did the Godhead leave? Most theologians said that the Godhead remained with the soul and the body. (Galot suggests that it was an experience of Sheol)

b. Christ, "made alive in the spirit."

His spirit does not mean his divinity (as if only his divinity went down to preach to the spirits in prison). His spirit is the spiritual reality of his human person, now in a new state, a state of divine life. In short, he was glorified in his soul three days before he was glorified in his body.

c. The preaching to those in prison:

There has been much dispute both over who these spirits are and what this preaching is all about. The central message is this: **The redemption has a universal and retroactive effect.** How did Christ save those who had already died? How does his grace extend backwards in time? If salvation is through Christ and Christ alone, then that process of salvation did begin before the Incarnation (Augustine); Christ was present as Word in a hidden way. At the moment of his death, the Savior completed in the souls of those who did respond to his offer of salvation (the souls who did respond to his grace) the work he had begun long before. He gave these souls access to the happiness of heaven.

3. The Resurrection of Christ: Mystery of New Life

Its soteriological value (the resurrection is not just a proof of Christ's divinity, nor the happy ending after the gruesome tale of the Passion. It has a soteriological value which we now need to explore):

a. The connection of Christ's death and resurrection in the drama of salvation: The resurrection, with its salvific effect, is the goal of Christ's death, the final reason for his death. Both Christ's death and resurrection are efficacious in producing salvation in its totality. Yet, their figurative value remains distinct by virtue of the fact that his death symbolizes death to sin, whereas the resurrection signifies the granting of new life (of course, these two effects constitute one single reality seen from two perspectives). **Christ's death and resurrection are each the cause of the whole of salvation** (his death is its meritorious cause, his resurrection is its direct efficient cause).

b. The soteriological efficacy of the resurrection: Resurrection is a new birth of Christ to His divine Sonship. By virtue of his resurrection, Christ possesses in his corporeal humanity the full splendor of his divinity. His entire human nature is now the bearer of divine glory and an expression of his divine Sonship.

c. The resurrection of Christ is the source of new life for mankind. As risen Lord, he now can live in us, or, scripturally expressed, we can live in Christ.

d. The resurrection of Christ is the foundation of the corporeal resurrection of all human beings. Paul makes this connection in I Cor 15. If Christ did not rise from the dead then we are still dead in our sins.

4. The Ascension: Mystery of Power and the inauguration of the Kingdom of God

a. Both a phenomenon and a mystery. Christ ended his physical presence among his disciples. He entered into another mode of existence that enabled him to exert a greater influence on the world, and to diffuse His sovereign presence within it. Christ is seated at the right hand of the Father, definitively possessing Messianic power and exercising it on our behalf.

b. The divine power which Christ possesses by virtue of the ascension. Power of intercession and a power of dominion over the Church as Head.

c. The ascension completes what the resurrection begun. As the resurrection was the irruption of the new, spiritual or divine life within the body of Jesus, so the ascension is the attribution of a new, spiritual or divine power possessed by both body and soul of Jesus (signified by the words, “seated at the right hand of God). He is established as Mediator, as High Priest, etc.

5. Pentecost:

a. Consummation of the covenant: The glorious Christ consummates the union between mankind and God by implanting His Spirit into the heart of his community. Pentecost is the supreme gift of love. through the Holy Spirit, God gives himself to Man in his innermost being.

b. A missionary event: The salvation brought by Christ through the Holy Spirit is a communitarian salvation, destined to be communicated to the whole world. The Spirit accomplishes within us the work of liberation, and therefore extends the work of the earthly Christ. Through that liberation, we enjoy an adoptive sonship.

c. The liberation obtained by Christ and offered by Him to the world. This liberation consists in the remission of sins (Jn 20) and the acquisition of divine sonship. In addition, it is a liberation that involves sacrifice as a condition of the human destiny. And it is a liberation of love which seeks to overcome all the particularistic conflicts of nations and classes.

V. Jesus as Universal Savior

A. Scriptural witness:

1. Acts 4:22: Peter claims that Jesus is the author of life and the only savior. He is the universal fount of salvation and there is no other.

2. Mk. 10:45: Jesus claims that the Son of Man has come to give his life for the ransom of many:

a. Principle of discontinuity: The Son of Man originally was understood to come to be served.

b. The word “many” has the Semitic understanding of “all”

c. “Life in exchange for many”: is for all. Jesus is the only savior of humanity (Is. 53:10).

B. Theological Understanding of Galot:

1. Galot's main point is that Jesus is the only mediator of salvation because he alone is God.

2. Glorification of Christ: from the point of his descent into hell and reveals **the universal efficacy of Christ** in two ways:

a. Effect of grace: In glory, Jesus communicates his grace to all men of the past in "vita terrena". It is in their earthly life because they need to accept it.

b. Effect of glory: Jesus introduces all the dead into the Beautiful Vision immediately after his death.

3. Point: Jesus is the principle of Divine Filiation for all men. All receive the redemptive grace of Christ.

C. Dupuis' Analysis:

1. Jesus Christ in history and in the world:

Thesis: Unicity and universality of salvation in Jesus Christ:

1. unicity: God's revelation in decisive way (w/o repetition) pt: cosmic significance

2. universality: final revelation: for all men at all times. pt: religious pluralism

Key Question: how can an historical event have universal significance?

a. Jesus Christ at the center of Faith:

New Testament and apostolic tradition give clear testimony that Christianity is based upon the message and person of Jesus. Both saw the Incarnation as univocal event of salvation for all men. Vatican II, by speaking about the Church as universal sac. of salvation affirms Christ as primordial sacrament of encounter with God (Church is decentralized).

b. Sense of Christ in divine plan: (Unicity)

1. Motive for Incarnation: Why such unicity in the face of the scandal of the cross?

Traditional answers:

a. Anselm: "satisfaction"- infinite offense requires "infinite reparation". Salvation is seen as a juridic thing.

b. Thomas: "Convenience"- Incarnation was not necessary for salvation but convenient that Son satisfy justice.

Good: Incarnation is free

Bad: Incarnation is an after-thought.

c. Scotist: Incarnation was from the start the goal, end and image of creation. Even without sin, the Incarnation would have occurred.

Bad: Still two moments in divine plan.

2. Solution:

a. Premise: No division of divine plan into two moments. Rather, there is **only one divine plan that is a-prior gratuitous** (both in creation and redemption).

b. Starting Point: Structure of Man vis-a-vis **God's total and most immanent auto-donation. That is, God is most immanent when inserted into human history in Incarnation.**

c. Objections:

1. Time: Irrepeatability rests with nature of Incarnation itself and link it is between God and man.

a. Intrusion? No, respect for man

b. Late? No, why so early?

2. Space: Why only one historic religion is definitive revelation?

a. must see cosmic dimension of Incarnation and unity between creation and recreation in evol. terms.

c. The Christ-event, center of salvation-history (universal)

Christ-event as center of salvation history is rooted in

Christian view of history (vs. circular or spiral versions).

a. Christian history is positive, linear and optimistic with one direction: towards the Kingdom of God. Jesus establishes dialogue with God and final goal in HIm.

b. Other views of history? See them in Rahner's terms of **universal history = salvation history, in which God's dialogue with men begins with creation to end. Christ is center not in a chronological sense but a Theological sense.**

c. Christian terms: Eschatological waiting is in two terms. In resurrection "already" of salvation has come. It remains in tension with "not yet" of parousia.

2. Jesus Christ and world religions:

a. The centrality of Christ in theology of religions

1. Two approaches:

a. vertical (Christocentric): religions in relationship to mystery of Christ

b. horizontal (ecclesial): religions in relation to Church.

2. Vatican II: speaks in both senses (when refers to an individual, it does so in Christocentric terms; groups are seen in ecclesial terms).

3. Dupuis' Thesis: Christocentric, vertical terms are most fruitful.

b. Debate in Religious Pluralism:

1. Two key principles:

a. Universal salvific divine will

b. necessary mediation of Christ

2. Current debate is divided into three camps:

a. Ecclesiocentric: (exclusive or implicit terms)

Dupuis: both are flawed bec. Church is relative in terms of Christ

b. Christocentric: (exclusive or inclusive terms)

c. Theocentric: (pluralism; no definitive salvation in Jesus Christ).

Dupuis: This is flawed because it does not hold two principles together.

3. Only inclusive Christocentricism respects both principles.

A. The Mystery of the Person Jesus Christ (M. Hunt)

"He said to them, 'But who do you say that I am?'" Matt. 16:15

I. Preparation

1. The *Protoevangelium* of hope and of promise
2. The images of the *Suffering Servant* (Isaiah) and the notion of redemptive suffering and new covenant (Jeremiah)

II. Mystery of the Incarnation

A. Scriptural Testimony

1. Jesus fully human and fully divine

B. Conciliar Teaching

1. Nicaea (325) - in condemning the teachings of Arius, Nicaea taught that the Son is of the same substance as the Father, *ὁμοούσιος*
2. Constantinople (381) in condemning, among others, the teachings of Apollinaris and Eunomius, re-affirmed the teaching of Nicaea
3. Ephesus (431) in condemning the teachings of Nestorius, taught that Mary is “Mother of God” (Theotokos) and that Jesus is “one and the same divine person.”
4. Chalcedon (451) in condemning the teachings of Eutyches, Chalcedon taught “the one and the same Christ, Son, Lord and Only begotten” was made known in these two natures which, without detriment to their full qualities, continue to exist without confusion or change, and without division or separation while belonging to only one person and not two.”

III. The Public Ministry

A. Titles of Jesus

Son of Man, Son of God, Suffering Servant, Holy One of God, Messiah, Teacher, Christ, and Lord.

B. Images of Jesus

powerful Suffering Servant, healer, liberator, friend of the poor, reconciler, herald of discipleship

C. Message

1. Jesus knew the purpose of his mission as One sent by the Father for the salvation of the world (ITC, Christology)
2. Proclamation of the **Kingdom of God**
 - a. not confined to a spatial or temporal reality
 - b. God’s manner of ruling, in the style of a loving Father
 - c. entropic and diabolic forces of chaos and evil are radically transformed through the creative Passion, Death and Resurrection of Jesus
 - d. ongoing transformation flowing from the Paschal Mystery in the person of the Holy Spirit
 - i. convoking of Church
3. Parables
 - a. proclaim the Kingdom of God as a reality

- i. already present (in the person of Jesus)
 - ii. but-not-yet fully present (transformation of the created order)
- b. a call to conversion and the decision for Jesus
 - i. moral code
 - ii. teaches with authority (ejxousiva) [Mark 1:27]

D. Actions of Jesus

1. Table fellowship
 - a. tax collectors and sinners
 - b. image of the eschatological banquet
 - c. actions that interpret a message of mercy without measure and love without limits
2. Miracles
 - a. concrete ways of proclaiming and effecting God's power over chaos and evil
 - b. point to a description of the fullness of the Kingdom of God
 - c. casual or 'pseudo sophisticated' manners of dismissing miracles essentially limit what God, who has historically entered the fabric of humanity, can and can not do
3. Jesus the "pray-er"
 - a. Union with the Father
 - b. "spent the night in prayer" (Luke 6:12)
 - c. the significance of ABBA in the prayer of Jesus
 - d. the life of Jesus gives evidence of a conscious perception of his filial relation to the Father.

IV. Bibliography

A. Sources

Council of Nicaea (325), Council of Constantinople (381), Council of Ephesus (431), and Council of Chalcedon (451). Chapters in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Volume 1 (Nicaea - Lateran V)*. Edited by Norman P. Tanner, SJ. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1990.

Commissio Theologica Internationalis, "La conscience que Jésus avait de lui-même et de sa mission." *Gregorianum*, 67, 3 (1986), pages 413-428.

B. Literature

Davis, Leo Donald, SJ. *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils 325-787*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987.

- Galvin, John P. "Jesus Christ" Chapter in *Systematic Theology - Roman Catholic Perspectives, Volume I*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Grillmeier, Aloys, SJ. *Christ in Christian Tradition, Volume I*. Translated by John Bowden. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.
- Kasper, Walter. *Jesus the Christ*. New York: Paulist Press, 1976
- _____. *The God of Jesus Christ*. New York: Crossroads, 1984.
- Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Doctrines, Fifth Edition*. London: A & C Black, 1989.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Prayers of Jesus [Studies in Biblical Theology • Second Series, Number 6]*. Translated by John Bowden, Dr. Christoph Burchard, and John Reumann. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1967.
- Meier, John. "Jesus." Chapter in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, SS, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, SJ and Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.
- Rahner, Karl, SJ. *Foundations of Christian Faith*. New York: Seabury Press, 1978.
- Young, Frances. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

B. The Soteriological Value of the Cross (M. Hunt)

"... Before He was given up to death, a death He freely accepted..."
Eucharistic Prayer II

The death of Jesus Christ stands as an historical event within human existence. Yet St. Paul writes,

For since, in the wisdom of God, the world did not know God through wisdom, God decided, through the foolishness of our proclamation, to save those who believe. For Jews demand signs and Greeks desire wisdom, but we proclaim Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles, but to those who are the called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. For God's foolishness is wiser than human wisdom, and God's weakness is stronger than human strength. (I Cor. 1: 21-25)

What His death means and the affect that His death has had and continues to have on the entire created order are subjects of countless theological volumes.

I. Freedom

A. Public Ministry

1. the death of Jesus can be seen as flowing from his public activity of preaching of the Kingdom of God
2. Consistency of Jesus' proclamation to the end. Jesus accepted the consequences of his message

Jesus' consciousness

1. predicts the passion
2. interprets death as salvific

II. Sacrifice**1. hilasterion**

- a. "that which expiates sin."
- b. Action by God alone

2. ransom

- a. Mt. 20:28, "to serve and give life as a ransom."
- b. to do for others what they can not do for themselves

3. for

- a. "for the benefit of"
- b. "in place of"

4. Last Supper

- a. body - given up for sins
- b. blood - for the forgiveness of sins

III. Images**Death of a Prophet Martyr**

- a. prophets in OT encountered rejection
- b. genuine prophets, then, encounter rejection
- c. prophetic sign left for others to interpret

Death of the Righteous Sufferer

- a. psalms and wisdom literature
- b. God provides the triumph and victory

Atoning, Redemptive Death

- a. salvific effect attributed to suffering
- b. IV Suffering Servant Song
- c. I Cor 15: 3 - His death was for our sins

IV. Effects**A. Hebrews**

1. The Cross is fulfillment
 - a. salvation has come
 - b. forgiveness is guaranteed
2. ratification of the new covenant is effected in blood
3. cleansing of conscience

B. Johannine Literature

1. abundant use of the lamb imagery
2. a sacrifice that is both
 - a. universal
 - b. replete with the love of God

V. Conclusion

1. Mystery

- a. I Cor 2: 1-2, God's mystery is Jesus Christ crucified.
- b. during Lent - we pray to grow in a deeper understanding of the Passion and Death of Jesus Christ.

2. Transformative - Paul

- a. Messianic Expectations
 - i. came to understand the Cross in terms of salvation following the Damascus experience
 - ii. transformation of the image of the curse (Deut. 21:23)
 - iii. Paul came to realize that the Messiah had come and that the Cross (and Resurrection) inaugurated an entirely new age.

VI. Bibliography

- Brown, Raymond E., SS. "Aspects of New Testament Thought." Chapter in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, SS, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, SJ and Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.
- Büchsel, F. "hilasterion" in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. page 362. eds. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich (One Volume editor, Geoffrey W. Bromiley) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985.
- _____. "lytron" in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. page 543. eds. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich (One Volume editor, Geoffrey W. Bromiley) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985.
- Galvin, John P. "Jesus Christ" Chapter in *Systematic Theology - Roman Catholic Perspectives, Volume I*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- International Theological Commission. "Select Questions on Christology." Chapter in *International Theological Commission: Text and Documents, 1969-1985*. Edited by Michael Sharkey. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989.
- Kasper, Walter. *Jesus the Christ*. New York: Paulist Press, 1976

Meier, John. "Jesus." Chapter in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, SS, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, SJ and Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Rahner, Karl, SJ. *Foundations of Christian Faith*. New York: Seabury Press, 1978.

Schmaus, Michael. *Dogma 3 - God and his Christ*. Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, Inc., 1984.

C. The Resurrection of Jesus Christ (M. Hunt)

“... Jesus Christ, our Lord, rose from the dead in His human body...”

Special form *Easter Communicantes*

Eucharistic Prayer I (The Roman Canon)

I. Traditions

A. Empty Tomb

1. not a ‘proof’ in itself for the Resurrection of Jesus
2. continuity between the earthly Jesus and the Risen Jesus

B. Appearances

1. ‘different form’
2. initially, Jesus is unrecognizable
 - a. I Cor 15: 36-44

II. Proclamation of the Resurrection

A. Old Testament time imagery

1. Third Day
 - a. used in 42 verses throughout the Scriptures
 - b. eg. - Exodus 19: 16-25
 - c. used often in reference to something new in the sense of deliverance and a better reality to come
2. First Day
 - a. used in 46 verses throughout the Scriptures
 - b. eg. - Exodus 40
 - c. used often in reference to divine action that touches deeply humanity at its core
3. Eighth Day
 - a. used in 24 verses throughout the Scriptures
 - b. eg. Lev. 14: 10-20
 - c. used often in reference to dedication or consecration to God

B. New Testament imagery

1. Resurrection
 - a. distinction between resurrection and resuscitation
 - b. eg. Lazarus
2. Raised up / Risen
 - a. “Raised up”
 - i. often in Paul, God/Father is the subject (active principle) of the Resurrection.
 - ii. eg - Romans 6

- b. “Risen”
 - i. often in John, Jesus rose by his own power
 - ii. eg. John 10
- c. conclusion of ‘raised up’ / ‘risen’
 - i. the humanity of Jesus was raised by the power of God.
 - ii. this power of God is shared by the Father and the Son, since both are of the same substance.
 - iii. a matter of emphasis either on the Father (as glorifying the Son) or on Jesus (manifestation of His divine power)

III. Ascension

A. 40 days

- 1. used in 24 verses throughout the Scriptures
- 2. eg. - Genesis 8
- 3. used often in reference to an event or to a period of time that is in preparation for a event or time of fulfillment that *necessarily* follows.

B. Enthronement/Exultation

- 1. completion of the ascent
 - a. lifted up (Cross)
 - b. raised up (Resurrection)
 - c. ascended (Ascension)
- 2. Hebrews
 - a. intercessor

IV. Easter Faith

A. “Peace to you”

- 1. often the greeting of the Risen Jesus to the disciples
- 2. the eschatological gift of salvation in the sense of being ‘at peace with God.’
- 3. parallel with eternal life (zwh;)

B. History

- 1. Resurrection as continuous with Jesus of Nazareth
- 2. an event, though, that transcends the boundaries of time and space

V. Bibliography

A. Sources

The Roman Missal - The Sacramentary. Translation prepared by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy. New York: Catholic Book Publishing, Co., 1985.

B. Literature

- Brown, Raymond E., SS. "Aspects of New Testament Thought." Chapter in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, SS, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, SJ and Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.
- Foerster, W. "eiréne" in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. page 207. eds. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich (One Volume editor, Geoffrey W. Bromiley) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985.
- Galvin, John P. "Jesus Christ" Chapter in *Systematic Theology - Roman Catholic Perspectives, Volume I*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Kasper, Walter. *Jesus the Christ*. New York: Paulist Press, 1976
- Meier, John. "Jesus." Chapter in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, SS, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, SJ and Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.
- O'Collins, Gerald. *Jesus Risen*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1987.
- Rahner, Karl, SJ. *Foundations of Christian Faith*. New York: Seabury Press, 1978.
- Schmaus, Michael. *Dogma 3 - God and his Christ*. Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, Inc., 1984.