

and no theory so far formulated to explain evolution enjoys anything like the same certainty as the theory of evolution itself. The scientist does not know the precise manner in which the human race originated, nor does it appear that the resources of his science will ever help him to find out. Anthropologists say that man has been on earth anything from fifty thousand to one hundred and fifty thousand years and perhaps more. What a distance to travel before we come to the genesis of humanity. What chance or what means has the anthropologist of determining, in that far distant past, whether the race sprang from one or more couples? It is not something that can be verified by experiment, nor observed under a microscope. Yet this question of our origins is one that has always exercised the minds of men. In face of the necessary helplessness of science Divine Providence has deigned to provide the answer by revelation. It is not for nothing that the first book of the Bible is called Genesis.

J. O'NEILL

CHRIST JESUS WHO DIED OR RATHER
WHO HAS BEEN RAISED UP—II¹

(Rom. 8:34)

The New Testament clearly teaches that our salvation stems from the resurrection of Christ; and the Paschal liturgy, so close to the revealed sources of our faith, emphasises this same truth in an unmistakable way. Yet it must be admitted that such an emphasis on the resurrection creates a certain difficulty. The vast majority of Western Christians have been taught to regard the passion and death of our Lord as the source of their redemption, and in the prevalent theological system, with its emphasis on the atoning death of Christ, and the infinite satisfaction rendered to the Divine justice for man's infinite offence against God, the Resurrection has tended to appear as nothing more than the complement to the redemptive act of Christ, and as nothing more than the sign of God's acceptance of Christ's sacrifice.² We are all familiar with the versicle: 'By thy holy cross thou hast redeemed the world,' but we are less familiar with another one: 'We worship thy cross O Lord, and we praise and glorify thy holy Resurrection.' They are both used in the Good Friday liturgy, but the first seems to say all that is needed to sum up the mystery of our redemption.

¹ I apologise for the long delay in concluding this article, the first part of which appeared in *Scripture*, x, 1958, pp. 33-43.

² cf. M. D. Chenu, O.P., *La Théologie est-elle une science?*, Paris 1957, p. 45

Similarly we believe that Easter Sunday is the greatest feast in the Church's year, but many find it hard to give a convincing explanation of why this is so. We are astonished that there was ever a time and place where Good Friday was not solemnly commemorated.¹ And yet, for many people Easter Sunday is hardly more than a return to normal after the solemnities of Holy Week.²

The cross cannot be separated from the resurrection, and yet we are bound, because of the weakness of our intelligence, to consider them separately to some extent. This results, inevitably it would seem, in the accent being placed on the one to the practical exclusion of the other. Many influences have played their part in the elaboration of theological systems, and all such when duly approved by the Church are both legitimate and necessary for helping us to understand the unfathomable mysteries of God. It is only when the conclusions of any theological system are identified with the Divine revelation itself that there is danger. 'The word of God is not there to prove theological considerations; on the contrary, theological reflections are for penetrating and expressing the word of God in an intelligible way, after it has first been received for its own sake, in faith.'³ It is particularly important to remember this when considering the teaching of the New Testament on the death and resurrection of Christ. The fact that the scriptural message seems somewhat strange to those who are accustomed to think of the redemption as it has been systematically presented, notably by St Anselm, is no reason why it should be ignored or distorted. Neither is there any reason to fear that the emphasis placed by the New Testament upon the resurrection is as it were at the expense of the redeeming passion and death of our Lord. The death and resurrection together constitute the way whereby God saved His chosen people. The New Testament does not discuss the theoretical question of whether God could have saved us either through the death of Christ without the resurrection, or through the resurrection without his passion. The New Testament tells us how God did in fact save us: and it is this message we seek to understand and to penetrate, when, in deference to our limited intelligence, we consider separately

¹ 'Comperimus quod per nonnullas ecclesias in die sextae feriae passionis domini, clausis basilicarum foribus, nec celebratur officium, nec passio domini populis praedicatur; dum idem salvator noster apostolis suis praeceperit dicens: *Passionem et mortem et resurrectionem meam omnibus praedicate*. Ideo oportet eodem die mysterium crucis quod ipse dominus cunctis nuntiandum voluit, praedicari, atque indulgentiam criminum clara voce omnem populum postulare: ut poenitentiae compunctione mundati, venerabilem diem dominicae resurrectionis, remissis iniquitatibus suscipere mereamur; corporisque ejus, et sanguinis sacramentum mundi a peccatis sumamus.' (Fourth Council of Toledo, A.D. 633, cap. vii. cf. Mansi x, 620)

² The restoration of the Paschal Vigil is already changing this attitude.

³ P. Hitz, 'Théologie et catéchèse,' *Nouvelle revue théologique*, 1955, pp. 908-9, quoted by Chenu, op. cit., p. 45, fn. 2

the death of our Lord and his resurrection, and decide on the primary importance of one or the other, though in reality they cannot be separated.

A consideration of the resurrection as the source of our salvation led us to ask what was the significance of Christ's death. For the disciples the crucifixion had seemed the end of all their hopes: 'We were hoping that it was he who would deliver Israel' (Luke 24:21). The Jews had acted as they had often acted before: 'They killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets' (1 Thess. 2:15; cf. Rom. 11:1-3). All seemed over. But immediately after the resurrection and Christ's exaltation to the right hand of God, it was not surprising that this essential fact should be proclaimed with little reference to the sad events which had preceded it. The early proclamation of the gospel as we find it in Acts makes no reference to the passion and death of our Lord, except as the circumstance which made the raising from the dead possible, and as an appalling example of Jewish ignorance (cf. Acts 2:36; 4:10; 5:30; 10:39; 13:28). Yet even in those early days, when it was so important to concentrate upon the resurrection, the apostles realised that the passion and death of Jesus had been in some way according to the scriptures. If, indeed, this had not been so, Jesus would have been wholly unacceptable to the Jews as the Messiah, and faith in his resurrection would have been impossible. Hence we have passing references to this fulfilment of the Scriptures, not indeed in the first sermon (cf. Acts 2:36), in which Peter is concerned to show how the effusion of the Spirit and the raising of our Lord from the dead are in accordance with the Scriptures, but later, when Peter points out that whilst the Jews crucified our Lord through ignorance, God by their action fulfilled what had been announced beforehand by the word of all the prophets, namely that His Christ would suffer (Acts 3:17-18). In rejecting Jesus the builders had rejected the corner-stone (Acts 4:11; cf. Ps. 117:22). St Paul insists upon this at greater length: 'The inhabitants of Jerusalem and their leaders accomplished without knowing it, the words of the prophets which are read every Sabbath. . . . And when they had accomplished all that had been written of him, they took him down from the cross and put him in the tomb' (Acts 13:27-9). The fact then, that they had rejected and slain Jesus, need not be an obstacle to their belief in him as Messiah. They had never indeed imagined that the Messiah would be crucified, still less by themselves; yet if they reread the Scriptures, the source of all their belief, would they not find sufficient indication there to show that what had happened before could happen again, and indeed would happen again? The examples given there of how the chosen people could reject God's offers of salvation were too numerous to quote:

their whole history and the messages of all the prophets were full of them. When, for instance, they sang of the deliverance from Egypt, that liberation which was the foundation of all their hopes and which had given them birth as God's own people, the psalm also reminded them of how their fathers 'rebelled against the Most High at the Red Sea' (Ps. 106:7). 'They envied Moses in the camp, and Aaron the Lord's holy one. The earth opened and swallowed up Dathan, and covered Abiron's family. . . . They made the calf at Horeb. . . . They did not obey the Lord. . . . They irritated Him at Meriba, and it turned out badly for Moses because of them' (Ps. 106:16-32; cf. Ps. 78). In the same way they had 'denied the holy and the just one,' they had slain the 'giver of life' (Acts 3:14).

The sufferings and the death of the just man had always been a disturbing problem. Suffering and death are evils and must be considered in relation to sin. If Jesus were the Messiah then he must be sinless; why then did he suffer death? The same question had been asked of the just many times before, but it became particularly insistent now that it concerned the saviour. St Paul, therefore, in the years which followed the first proclamation of the gospel, considered more deeply the significance of Christ's death. He never indeed allowed this consideration to overshadow the primary importance of the resurrection in the message of salvation, and that is why he never separates our Lord's death from his resurrection. But he did realise that the death of Christ was not to be explained simply as the necessary condition for his being raised from the dead, nor simply as the result of Jewish ignorance. A pressing problem, at once practical and personal, led him to this consideration, and it is important for us to realise this. In spite of God's having raised and exalted Jesus to make him the Christ, the Lord and the judge of the living and the dead, those who believed still suffered and died. Tribulation and persecution were still their lot; in fact their sufferings had increased by the very fact that they had believed that God had raised up a saviour. They eagerly awaited the coming of the Lord, but the longer that coming, and with it the glorious consummation of God's act of salvation was delayed, the more pressing became the problem of the sufferings of those who through Christ had been saved. The first proclamation of our Lord's *death* precisely as part of the good news, is to be found in the context of grief for the death of some of the Christians of Thessalonica (1 Thess. 4:14), and it is in the atmosphere of waiting, suffering, persecution and death that Paul meditates upon the part played by our Lord's death in the events whereby God saved us. His consideration of this mystery is firmly rooted in historical circumstances. His sufferings as an apostle can be summed up by saying:

'Always carrying in the body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our bodies' (2 Cor 4:10), and in defending the integrity of his ministry against the accusations of certain members of the Corinthian church who have caused him much suffering, he is led to assert: 'One man died for all; therefore all died. And he died for all in order that the living might no longer live for themselves but for him who died and rose for them' (2 Cor. 5:14). It is Christ's death which changes the nature of the Christian's sufferings and death completely. By virtue of Christ's death, the sufferings and the death of the Christian are no longer the destructive effects of sin but the first stage of his salvation.

What is the precise significance of the statement that Christ died for us? This is indeed a difficult question to answer, and it must be clearly understood that we are seeking to reach the limits of human understanding of what will always remain in the end a divine mystery. But the text we have just quoted may show us the way. When the one died for all, then all died. It is inadequate therefore to speak of Christ dying *in place of* all, and to think of him merely as a substitute for mankind. If the word 'for' meant no more than 'as a substitute,' or 'in place of,' then the rest would not have died. Moreover, as we have already seen,¹ it is certainly not Paul's intention to speak of Christ's resurrection as a substitute for ours, when he goes on to say that Christ both died and rose for all.² Christ's sufferings played a part in our salvation insofar as we were all incorporated into Christ not only at the resurrection but also upon the cross: here there is the same solidarity between Christ and us, as there is between Adam and unregenerate mankind. No-one will deny that this notion of corporate solidarity between the one and the many is mysterious and difficult to realise—the widespread denial of original sin is sufficient proof of this. But it is upon this notion that the Biblical doctrine of salvation through Christ rests. It is the lack of consciousness of any real solidarity among men at the present day which makes the expression 'vicarious suffering' no longer adequate, for 'vicarious' signifies nothing more than 'substituted,' and the one for whom the substitute acts or suffers is considered to be thereby excluded from any real action or suffering. The Biblical notion of corporate personality puts the emphasis upon the group rather than upon the individual who represented the group, and Christ saved mankind because he was mankind personified. According to the mind of Paul, every Christian has in a mysterious but real way died in the person of Christ, and died the particular kind

¹ cf. *Scripture*, x, 1958, p. 40

² The words 'for them' probably belong to both participles. cf. A. Plummer, *II Corinthians*, 1915, p. 175

of death that Christ died. As J. A. T. Robinson points out, Paul expresses the relation between Christian and Christ by a variety of prepositional phrases, but they all 'depend for their understanding on a single assumption and mean nothing without it. It is the assumption that *Christians have died in, with and through the crucified body of the Lord* (have a share, that is, in the actual death that He died unto sin historically), "once for all" (Rom. 6:10, R.V.M.) *because, and only because, they are now in and of His body in the "life that he liveth unto God," viz., the body of the Church.*'¹ This is why the sufferings of Christians have been made essentially different. They are no longer a defeat suffered at the hands of sin, but a victory over sin. In virtue of the death of Christ they can now cry: 'O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?' (I Cor. 15:55). Paul has not solved the mystery of suffering. The Christian is still tempted to object that if in Christ he has really died, then he ought not to experience suffering and death. But faced with the obvious fact that Christians do suffer and die, he has shown us how those sufferings have been radically changed by the sufferings and death of our Lord, and, in doing this, he has told us why the death of Christ is joined to his resurrection as the means of our salvation. The death in Christ which all died upon the cross is manifested throughout time in each individual Christian. Because he is already dead to sin through Christ, then his sufferings and his death are the manifest defeat of sin. Sin is as it were put in the position of the torturer, who in his unsuccessful effort to extract a secret goes on torturing his victim even after he has died. Such action would only emphasise the torturer's defeat. So, too, the sufferings and death of the Christian are manifestations of the defeat of sin, for the Christian has already died to sin in Christ.

Throughout the Old Testament God's acts of salvation had always been considered as events which really affected every generation of Israelites, in virtue of their corporate solidarity with those who had gone before. It was not considered strange, for instance, to say to the Israelite who lived five hundred years after the Exodus: 'Yahweh has taken you and made you come forth from the crucible of fire, Egypt, in order that you might become the people of His heritage, as you are, even today' (Deut. 4:20; cf. 5:3; 10:15; 6:7-8, 20-5). No difficulty was felt in telling them that they had suffered the slavery of Egypt, though five hundred years had elapsed since the historical event. The salvation which the Israelites enjoyed by virtue of their solidarity with the small group who had been led out of Egypt to form God's chosen people was continually renewed through such sacramental rites

¹ J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body*, London 1952, pp. 46-7

as the Pasch and the Redemption of the first-born. This latter rite, in origin doubtless far older than Israel, and originally an acknowledgment of God's sovereignty over all creatures, had been adopted as a sign of the deliverance from Egypt (Exod. 13:14-16; Num. 3:13; 8:17). Since God abhorred human sacrifices, the rite consisted in the buying back of the child from God by payment of a sum of money. The child was as it were rescued from the exclusive possession of God by *redemption*, by being bought back at a price, and this rite and the event for which it served as a memorial shared the same terminology: God *redeemed* the Israelites from Egypt, but without money (cf. Is. 52:3). In fact God had brought them out by the strength of His mighty arm, and far from being paid a price to hand them over the Pharaoh had not been able to prevent their going. When the Israelite was asked the meaning of the rite of redeeming the first-born, he was to reply: 'By strength of hand the Lord brought us out of Egypt, from the house of bondage. For when Pharaoh stubbornly refused to let us go, the Lord slew all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both the first-born of man and the first-born of cattle. Therefore I sacrifice to the Lord all the males that first open the womb; but all the first-born of my sons I redeem' (Exod. 13:14-15).

Just as God's rescue of His chosen people from Egypt was spoken of as a redemption, so God's final and perfect rescue of His people from all evil, of which the captivity in Egypt was only a small part, is spoken of as the redemption through Christ. Those who had just received Baptism¹ are thus admonished: 'Realise that not with corruptible things, silver and gold, were you redeemed from your vain conduct, inherited from your fathers, but with precious blood, as of an unblemished and unstained lamb, Christ, who was known indeed before the foundation of the world, but made manifest at the end of time for our sakes. Through him we believe in God who raised him from the dead, and gave him glory, so that your faith and hope might be in God' (1 Pet. 1:18). The mention of redemption through silver and gold is perhaps a reminiscence of the rite of redemption of the first-born. But the real parallel between this rite and Baptism lies in the fact that they are both memorials of God's saving His people. As the parallel to the silver and gold, within this baptismal context, Peter mentions the precious blood of the lamb, for the shedding of that blood marks one of the stages in the Divine act of salvation through Christ, as our Lord himself had asserted: 'The Son of Man also came not to be served but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many' (Mark 10:45). The blood of the lamb had played a part in God's first

¹ cf. M.-E. Boismard, 'Une liturgie baptismale dans la *Prima Petri*,' *Revue biblique*, 1956, pp. 182-208

rescue of His people, for the Israelites had smeared their door-posts with it and thereby escaped the avenging angel sent to slay the first-born of Egypt. The Christian at Baptism is sprinkled with the blood of Jesus Christ (cf. 1 Pet. 1:2) and redeemed with precious blood, in a rite which is the effective memorial of God's final redemption of Israel through His Son, the first-born of all creation (Col. 1:15).

The blood of lambs and of other animals had been a constant feature in God's plan for the salvation of His people, for it was by means of sacrifices that they had made expiation for their sins. In particular, on the day of atonement, expiation had been made with particular solemnity by the pouring of blood on the covering of the Ark, and because of this action it was known as the instrument of expiation. But the Christian no longer needs a material instrument of expiation. Just as Christ is the spiritual temple from which flow the waters of life, so also he is the spiritual instrument of expiation given to us by God: 'Whom God set before (us) as an instrument of expiation, if we believe, in his blood' (Rom. 3:25). Although Christ has died to sin, and we in him, once for all, yet that dying to sin must be manifested throughout time, in the life of each individual Christian, and there is need, therefore, for the constant sacramental renewal of the whole drama of salvation. And the risen Christ is the constant means of making expiation. It is God Himself who provides us with this means, and it is the risen Christ, for he is the object of our faith (cf. Rom. 4:24-5). But it is possible to speak of the risen Christ as the instrument of expiation for sin because he is at the same time the crucified Christ, the Lamb that was slain, and therefore in him the blood of expiation is eternally poured out.

The paschal lamb also served as a memorial and efficacious sign of the deliverance from Egypt (Exod. 12:25-7; Deut. 16:1, 6; Exod. 12:14), together with the unleavened bread, the Azymes (Exod. 13:3, 8-10; Deut. 16:3; Exod. 12:17). In the remembrance of God's final act of deliverance Christ himself is the paschal lamb, giving his own body and blood to be eaten and drunk in efficacious memory of the salvation God has wrought through him. It is noticeable how in the memorials of both deliverances the signs are linked more obviously with the need for deliverance than with the triumphant achievement of it. Thus the paschal lamb and the rite of the first-born were linked directly with the need for protection against the avenging angel when the Israelites had not yet been liberated from Egypt; and the unleavened bread was the 'bread of affliction' which the Israelites ate in Egypt (Deut. 16:3). The signs used were reminders of the need for deliverance, but the rites as a whole were reminders of the accomplishing of deliverance. So, too, the Christian rites of Baptism, as a redemption through the

blood of Christ, and of the Eucharist as the sharing of the body and blood of Christ sacrificed for us, remind us directly of the crucified Christ; but the rites are at the same time efficacious signs of the triumphant deliverance of Christ at the Resurrection. Peter speaks of the recipient of Baptism both as 'sprinkled with his blood' and as regenerated 'by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead' (1 Pet. 1:2-3). Similarly the Holy Eucharist according to St Paul 'proclaims the death of the Lord' (1 Cor. 11:26), and yet it is a sharing of 'the table of the Lord' (1 Cor. 10:21), the joyous banquet of which only those partake who are raised up with him and are come into God's kingdom.

T. WORDEN

*Upholland College
Wigan*

QUESTION AND ANSWER

The publishers of the New World Translation of the Christian Greek Scriptures claim that it is the most accurate translation yet produced. Is this so?

This version, published by the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, sets out to provide a translation into modern English of the Greek New Testament, and contains a foreword, a translation based principally on the Westcott and Hort text, and an appendix in which there are longer comments on certain verses. The foreword is principally devoted to the surprising thesis that the writers of the New Testament wrote the sacred tetragrammaton (YHWH or less accurately JHVH¹) in the majority of cases where all our existing manuscripts read *kurios* (Lord) or *theos* (God). The first argument to support this thesis lies in the claim that this was the practice in Greek translations of the Old Testament. There is evidence of this in certain manuscripts of the Septuagint and of the versions of Aquila and Symmachus,² but the practice was by no means universal, and on this point the distinguished Cambridge scholar H. B. Swete wrote: 'there is no reason to suppose that any copyists of the Alexandrian version hesitated to write $\alpha\bar{\kappa}\varsigma$ or $\bar{\kappa}\epsilon$ for *yhw̄h*.'³ In a footnote he adds that 'With the exception of

¹ Vocalised Jehovah: this inaccurate representation was known as early as the thirteenth century.

² cf. G. Lambert, 'Que signifie le nom divin YHWH?', *Nouvelle revue théologique*, 1952, p. 900

³ *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge 1914, p. 39