

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY



Volume 83:3-4

July/October 2019

Table of Contents

After Canons, Councils, and Popes: The Implications of Luther's Leipzig Debate for Lutheran Ecclesiology	
Richard J. Serina Jr.	195
The Leipzig Debate and Theological Method	
Roland F. Ziegler	213
Luther and Liberalism: A Tale of Two Tales (Or, A Lutheran Showdown Worth Having)	
Korey D. Maas	229
Scripture as Philosophy in Origen's <i>Contra Celsum</i>	
Adam C. Koontz	237
Passion and Persecution in the Gospels	
Peter J. Scaer	251
Reclaiming Moral Reasoning: Wisdom as the Scriptural Conception of Natural Law	
Gifford A. Grobien	267
Anthropology: A Brief Discourse	
David P. Scaer	287

Reclaiming the Easter Vigil and Reclaiming Our Real Story	
Randy K. Asbury	325
Theological Observer	341
“What Can We Learn From Them?”	
Teaching Elementary Greek	
Using <i>Fundamental Greek Grammar</i> to Teach Greek at the Seminary	
Book Reviews	355
Books Received	371
Indices to Volume 83 (2019)	373

Editors’ Note

The year 2019 marks the 500th anniversary of the Leipzig Debate (or Leipzig Disputation). In Leipzig at the Pleissenburg Castle, Luther's colleague Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt debated John Eck from June 27 to July 3 on grace, free will, and justification. From July 4 to 8, Luther took Karlstadt's place and debated with Eck especially on the question of whether the pope was established by God as head of the Church. Our first two articles commemorate this debate. They were presented originally at the Symposium on the Lutheran Confessions at CTSFW, which was held Jan. 16–18, 2019. They remind us of what was at stake, and what we still joyfully affirm: Christ as the head of the Church, and God's Word as the sole infallible authority.

Anthropology: A Brief Discourse

David P. Scaer

The most important evidential doctrine for Christianity is the resurrection of Jesus. Without this, everything we confess in the Creed evaporates into non-sustainable speculation. Equally important is that Christ's resurrection is the certainty of our own, a theme that has to be emphasized in our preaching, especially at funerals. That being said, mourners, Christian or not, will ask the question of where the deceased are right after death, and their anxiety is not simply relieved by saying we should focus on the resurrection. Simply by pointing to the resurrection, pastors are not relieved of providing an answer of where the dead are now, especially since the Scriptures address this issue in several places.

Providing two different answers to the condition of the soul between death and the resurrection are two different schools of thought. Dualism follows traditional Christian thinking that after the death of the body the soul lives. Monism argues that in death the soul has no conscious awareness and awakes at the resurrection without an awareness of time having passed. Some non-Christians may hold that the soul is no more than an extension or function of the brain or intellect and are not bothered about where the soul is at death.¹

This essay gives a brief overview of what Christians and Lutherans have believed about man, how we originated, and how we are composed now. It does not propose to offer anything strikingly new but only to reinforce long-held beliefs. Dependent on what we believe about the relationship of the body and soul to each other is the question of what happened to Christ at his death. All four gospels and Paul speak about this burial, a fact which is essential to his being raised from the dead. But what about his soul? Separation of the soul from the body is a result of sin. In his death, Christ continues in the state of humiliation awaiting his resurrection in which, like us, body and soul will be reunited into a perfection beyond what Adam knew in Eden.

We reject John Calvin's view that in going to hell Christ continued to suffer further punishment for our sins; rather, he rested in the glory of paradise. Some

¹ A fuller discussion of these differences with a defense of the biblical view of an intermediate time period in which the soul lives with Christ is provided by John W. Cooper, *Body, Soul & Life Everlasting: Biblical Anthropology and the Monism-Dualism Debate* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1989).

David P. Scaer is the David P. Scaer Professor of Biblical and Systematic Theology at Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana. He can be contacted at david.scaer@ctsfw.edu.

readers may remember that a similar controversy over the state of the soul after death broke out at the St. Louis seminary in the late 1950s and into the 1960s, when a professor of historical theology misunderstood Oscar Cullmann's *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?*² to argue that the soul did not exist after death. For all of the differences between Plato and the New Testament on the resurrection of the body, there is, as Cullmann held, an approximation of the two beliefs that the soul continues to live on after death in what he calls "another time-consciousness."³

I. Introduction

In Christian dogmatics, the section or locus on the doctrine of man is called anthropology, a word derived from the Greek words *ἄνθρωπος* and *λόγος*, literally the study of man. Anthropology is not merely the study of individuals or peoples, but man as a collective unity. This unity focuses first on the historical Adam, in whom the entire humanity was created and from whom it has its decent. Through him, it fell into sin and under God's condemnation. Now this unity finds its focus in Jesus Christ, who replaces the first Adam as the one in whom the human race is reconstituted. The collective sense of the singular nouns "mankind" and "humankind" has theological significance. These two nouns embrace all who will ever have lived, but not in collecting them as separate individuals, but as their being derived from and included in the one man, Adam. This collective sense of mankind is foundational for the biblical doctrines of universality of sin, redemption, and justification (Rom 5:12–21).

Christian anthropology looks forward to what mankind will become in Jesus Christ, just as it looks backward to what it was in Adam. Just as in Adam no distinction is made in regard to the common possession of sin, so in Christ there is no distinction in regard to the common possession of salvation. Christian theology does not discourage non-theological secular anthropologies and does not discredit the distinctions of their findings. Mankind is a unity vis-à-vis God, sin, and redemption, but people differ from one another in many respects. Such distinctions have validity only within the realm of human experience, and the theories based on these distinctions are not final. As they are not given by revelation, their conclusions do not and cannot inform Christian anthropology; they may, however, corroborate biblical concepts and be useful in themselves.

² Oscar Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958), 56–57.

³ Cullman, *Immortality of the Soul*, 57.

In a scientific or scholarly sense, the term “anthropology” is reserved for the study of mankind’s origin, development, races, customs, and beliefs. This anthropology is not the only science devoted to the study of man. History traces the political and military rise and fall of individual men, peoples, nations, and races. Biology classifies him according to his physical components in relation to animals. Medicine is the study and cure of bodily diseases. Sociology is the study of the nature, origin, and development of human society and community life. Psychology explains man’s actions by studying his inner personal being as he is in himself. Psychiatry is the study and cure of mental diseases. Even the study of literature is basically anthropological, because in writing human beings project themselves and reflect on what and who they are. The whole science and practice of education in conveying knowledge operates with particular theories of learning and mankind. All human sciences have anthropological implications, because they are in some sense the study of man. These different approaches to man contribute to the sphere of man’s knowledge and improving his lot, even though they may not operate within biblical categories. Christians may make appropriate use of these disciplines, but only insofar as the biblical anthropology is not denied or contradicted.

Man should be studied not only as he is in himself, in regard to his world and environment, but more important in regard to the God who created him and with whom he was destined to live. By loving God and the neighbor, man begins to experience his original state and finds the real reason for his existence. Without this dimension, man is less than what God intended him to be. This relationship comes about by believing that in Jesus God has established out of the fallen human race a redeemed and restored community. While the secular anthropologies proceed with no definition of God or religion, except as they might be fixtures of culture, theological anthropology must define man in relationship to God.

Anthropology stands in antipodal relationship to the doctrine of God, that is, theology in the narrow sense, which together make up the two poles of theological discussion. The term “theology” properly suggests that the study of God is theology’s first and perhaps only goal; however, it is man who does theology to explain his relationship to God and to the world. Man is included in the definition of theology, because if God is the revealer, man is the intended and only recipient of revelation. Theology is *anthropological*, in the sense that theology is how man understands who God is and what he has done.

Theology is never the study of God in the abstract, but of God as he is the Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier of mankind. Anthropology is also the presupposition for other loci in dogmatics. The doctrine of sin as an inheritance from Adam and as part of the human existence depends upon a prior understanding

of man's origin and nature. Our anthropology shapes our Christology. In his conception by the Holy Spirit of the Virgin Mary, the Son of God became a human being. A malformed doctrine of man leads to a false understanding of Christ's person or work. Such questions concerning the justification of the sinner before God, his renewal in sanctification, the life after death, the accountability before God in a judgment, and the final resurrection are all interrelated to and dependent on anthropology.

Man by nature lives his life autonomously, as if he were dependent only on himself and his environment. In spite of this inclination to live without God, man has a built-in need for him and a penchant for creating religion. Christian anthropology must fill the vacuum present in every man by virtue of his being created by God and by his own reality that this God is no longer part of his existence.

II. The Old Testament Foundation for Anthropology

The remainder of the Old Testament is a commentary on Genesis 1–3. Fundamental anthropological principles set forth there come to reality in the rest of the biblical account. It is the history of man's plight in sin and his belief in the God who promises to extricate him from it. This belief is inextricably connected with faith in the promise of a Redeemer who will be also a man, but unlike the first man will be able not only to resist but to overcome the temptation of the serpent and thus relieve all mankind from the curse and restore it to its original condition in possession of the image of God (Gen 3:15).

From this connection between anthropology and the promise of redemption stems Israel's hope in the Messiah, and with it the New Testament understanding of Jesus as that Messiah (Christ). The Messiah will be the ideal man originally intended by God and in whom God will reconstitute mankind. The events of Genesis 4—with the birth of Cain and his murder of his brother, Abel—are important for anthropology as these represent the characteristic Old Testament dilemma of man's hope for his redemption and the reality that he remains estranged from God by sin, a reality that is confirmed to him by death. Eve brings her son Cain into the world with the hope that he will relieve her predicament. Whether Genesis 4:1 is translated "I have gotten a man with the help of the Lord,"⁴ or Luther's equally viable translation, "I have gotten a man of the Lord,"⁵ these words expressed her confidence that God had rescued her from the fall and its consequences.

⁴ All Scripture quotations are from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, copyright © 1946, 1952, and 1971 National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved worldwide.

⁵ Martin Luther, *Lectures on Genesis 1–5* (1536): vol. 1, pp. 241, in *Luther's Works, American Edition*, vols. 1–30, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955–76); vols.

Modern commentators still recognize the viability of Luther's understanding that Eve saw her offspring as the Son of God and allow the translation, "I have gained a man, [who is] the Lord."⁶ Eve expressed for herself and all future generations the universal desire that sin's curse placed on mankind would be alleviated by divine intervention through a man with a special relation to God. Cain's murder of his brother, Abel, and his subsequent banishment from the community (Gen 4:2-16), which the Genesis author places immediately after Cain's birth, indicate that the promised deliverance would remain in the future. In waiting for the promise's fulfillment, Eve and all mankind would experience not only death, but death by violence. No one is immune. The last chapters of Genesis recount the deaths of Jacob (49:33) and Joseph (50:26). Man in this life will find no relief from the consequences of his rejection of God. The reign of sin and death would not be so pervasive to make it impossible for some in their fallen condition to recognize God and call upon him for deliverance.

The Old Testament is the history of those who still believe in the divine promises of man's restoration by God. This history gives special attention to such figures as Noah, Abraham, Moses, and then to the entire nation of Israel, which collectively by God's choice become his people. After the world's destruction by the flood, Noah and his wife become surrogates for Adam and Eve in God's reestablishing the human race. Abraham and Sarah with the birth of their son, Isaac, play a similar role in God's setting aside their descendants as his favored people. Through Abraham, God is again reestablishing the human race as his own people (Gen 12:3). The Israelites in their election by God, their worship of him, and their commitment to his word become a faint recollection of man in his original state of innocence and a promise of what he someday will become. Man banished from paradise looks forward to a return. Canaan, the Promised Land flowing with milk and honey, is given to Israel as their paradise in which they, like the first parents, are to listen to God and live for him. Moses stands in the line of Noah and Abraham as a type of Adam in establishing Israel as God's people and anticipates Christ, who is the new Adam. Though mortal, Moses is a reminder in his vigor of what man would have been without sin (Deut 34:7).

31-55, ed. Helmut Lehmann (Philadelphia/Minneapolis: Muhlenberg/Fortress, 1957-86); vols. 56-82, ed. Christopher Boyd Brown and Benjamin T. G. Mayes (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2009-), hereafter AE.

See also Luther's German translation of Genesis 4:1, "Ich habe den Mann, den Herrn," Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Deutsche Bibel*, 12 vols. in 15 (Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1906-), hereafter abbreviated WA DB. Note, however, that Eve is making a statement of unbelief, not belief. She is asserting her creative abilities alongside of God's as his equal, which is how things all began in Genesis 3.

⁶ Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, ed. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 1 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 101-102.

The historical books (e.g., Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles) trace this tension between the reality of sin and the promise of restoration of God's people as a whole. Though the priestly and royal leaders are representative types of the coming deliverer, the focus is on Israel as a chosen people. These books relate the few successes and many failures of Israel to accept God's promises to be his people. Again and again the promises are rejected, and God punishes the people by establishing two kingdoms, Judah in the south and Israel in the north. Kings are deposed, and foreign nations invade the land. Finally, Israel is taken into Assyrian captivity and then Judah into Babylonian captivity.

The poetic books of Job, Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, and Psalms reflect the internal turmoil of believers as individuals who are caught in a tension which cannot be resolved by themselves. Promise of future restoration is seemingly contradicted by the reign of ill fortune, sickness, and death. Job—a man who, more than his contemporaries, “was blameless and upright; one who feared God and turned away from evil” (Job 1:1)—is plagued with such unspeakable physical and spiritual evils that he succumbs to cursing the day on which he was born (Job 3:1–10). In the end, Job is vindicated, but he represents all people whose vision of a perfected humanity is beyond reality.

Ecclesiastes is the remembrances of a man who even though he has experienced everything offered by the world is brought to the edge of despair so that he toys with the idea that men are no different than animals (Eccl 3:19–21). Ecclesiastes and Job are alike in presenting a view of man in which the divine perspective of his being created in God's image is momentarily lost. For Job, non-existence would have been better than life, and thus God's creation of him is repudiated. At least for a moment, the author of Ecclesiastes considers his life apart from any awareness that God's image in him has made him distinct from the animals. There seems to be no life after death, and both men and animals face the same destiny in the grave. Both authors eventually find God as the ultimate answer to their lives. The cynical despair of the author of Ecclesiastes is finally overcome by belief that though his body returns to the earth, his soul returns to God who gave it (Eccl 12:7). Job has confidence that God will vindicate him in the resurrection (Job 19:25–27).

The value of the negative perspectives in Job and Ecclesiastes for Christian anthropology is that their perspectives present the universal predicament of all men, from which believers are not exempt. With their own resources, they are unaware that, by virtue of the image of God in them, they have a special relationship to him. They reinforce the Genesis account that God's image in man is so severely damaged, he is incapable of recognizing God as life's significant factor. Non-existence is better than existence, and man's origins are as cloudy as his destiny.

In a similar but not identical way, Proverbs addresses man within the limitations of this life. While not having the despair of Job and Ecclesiastes, Proverbs isolates that part of man's life which is directed not to God, but to his conduct in the world and lays down directives for it. The goal of Proverbs is not that in following these directives one will find a solution to the predicament of estrangement from God by redemption and restoration. Rather, one will find guidelines for life which will limit, but not exterminate, its problems and evils. Later, confessional Lutheran anthropology would develop these themes in slightly different ways. The concept of despair set forth in Job and Ecclesiastes is parallel to man's existence under the law, where he has no hope of redemption. The almost humanistic anthropology of Proverbs, with its call to discipline and prudence (Prov 1:3-4), parallels the Lutheran anthropology that man in this world is capable of outward morality with its own rewards, but this does not provide the ultimate answer to man's imprisonment in sin and death.

The Psalms speak of the predicament of man's estrangement from God and hold out the promise of God's redemption of the individual. Thus in Psalm 22, the writer who experiences God's abandonment of him at last finds God's help (v. 24) and is given a place of prominence among all men (vv. 29-31). A messianic psalm, it resembles Job and gives a vivid picture of the Christian in the world who for the moment does not experience God's creative care. Psalm 51 is the picture of a man who is confronted by sin and restored by God. Similarly, Psalm 130 connects man's personal redemption from the predicament of sin with God's restoration of Israel.

As individualistic and personal as the Psalms are in describing the plight of individuals, at the same time they see men as corporately under the reign of sin and death and who receive their corporate deliverance from God. Two psalms allude to the Genesis paradise. Psalm 1 is a picture of the ideal man. God does not speak directly to him, as he did to Adam, but he speaks to him through words of the written revelation which he believes. "His delight is in the law of the LORD [the Pentateuch], and on his law he meditates day and night" (v. 2). By listening to God, he is able to survive the judgment (vv. 4-6), since he is like the tree planted by living waters. The allusion here is to the tree of life in Eden, the paradise of the four ever-flowing rivers, a theme picked up in Revelation 21 and 22. Psalm 8 is a picture of the ideal believer reinstated into Adam's position. God, whose praise is chanted in heaven and whose glories are seen in the celestial bodies, has made man just a little lower than God himself. This man has dominion over the earth and all its creatures.

Psalms 1 and 8 were taken by Luther as references to the Messiah, but this does not detract from their informing anthropology in describing the original man Adam as he was in the original state of innocence and also the perfection of man in the person of Jesus Christ. At the same time, these psalms hold out the promise

of restoration and perfection which will become someday the possession of those who are in Christ. Since man cannot reach by himself the goal of perfection, the Old Testament describes man waiting for the future restoration, but under the reality of his bondage under the curse of Genesis 3.

While the historical books relate the successes and failures of Israel to be God's people and the poetic books reflect on that inner tension in believers, the prophetic books contain God's call to Israel to return to him with the threat of deportation should they fail. In Israel's perpetual failure to live up to God's expectations for them as the redeemed and restored people, God sends them prophets to return them to their allegiance as his people.

The prophets are caught between the glories of their own prophecies and the reality that they are ignored and not believed. Hosea forecasts the destruction of the north. Isaiah and Jeremiah promise not only the exile of Judah but their political restoration after captivity in Babylonia. Daniel and Ezekiel, written from Babylonia, also promise Judah's restoration as God's people. The promise of national survival and restoration is the occasion for these prophets to project the theme of resurrection, which alone can reverse death's threat. Isaiah reflects the Genesis 3 imagery: "But your dead will live; their bodies will rise. You who dwell in the dust wake up and shout for joy" (Isaiah 26:19).⁷ Ezekiel attaches Judah's return from Babylon with the promise of a future resurrection (37:12–14). The prophets narrow the focus from Israel as a nation to a remnant who ultimately is the promised deliverer. They also expand the promises made to include other peoples (Isa 60:1–7).

The full restoration that is promised is accomplished only when the Messiah comes, who lives up to God's expectations for the first Adam and Israel. The identification of Jesus as the new man and the new Adam is made by Paul (1 Cor 15:45) and is the message of the New Testament. In this sense, Christology informs Christian anthropology, since the person of Jesus is the picture of God's intentions for Adam and what now he intends for all men.

III. The New Testament Foundation for Anthropology

The New Testament revelation is that God's ideal man has come in his Son, Jesus Christ, who now restores mankind to its original position of fellowship with God. Such Old Testament themes as God's creation of all men in the persons of Adam and Eve and their participation and condemnation in Adam's fall (1 Tim 2:13–14) are repeated. Man's life with God after death and resurrection from the dead is heightened.

⁷ Translation my own.

The Old Testament spoke of personal survival after death as being gathered to one's fathers. Its anthropology centered rather on God's reconstituting the human race in Israel with the promise of the Messiah as the ideal man. In a similar sense, the New Testament sees man not as he is in himself, but as he stands in relation to God and his new creation of mankind in Jesus Christ. The one who recognizes Jesus as the one in whom God is restoring mankind shares in that restoration, but the one who fails in this is confirmed in his own and Adam's sin (John 11:24–26).

The New Testament presupposes the Genesis 1–3 accounts of man's creation and fall for its anthropology. All peoples, in spite of their ethnic diversities, have their origin in one person (Acts 17:26), an obvious allusion to the common descent from Adam. He is the common father, and every human being through descent from him shares in the possession of his sinful nature and its guilt. This common participation in Adam's sin is the presupposition of God's justification of all men in the person of Jesus Christ (Rom 5:12, 15). In Christ, the sin of Adam is reversed, and from God's perspective its effect is universal. "For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor 15:22). Mankind thus is not only interrelated biologically, but shares in a common condemnation by being participants in Adam's sin: "In him [Adam] they were sinning" (see Rom 5:12).⁸ For their participation in his sin and for their own, they are condemned to death.

Whereas in Romans 5:15–16 Jesus Christ is put in the place of Adam as the man who brings justification to all men, a specific identification of Jesus *as* Adam is made in 1 Corinthians 15:45: "Thus it is written, 'The first man Adam became a living being'; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit." In both Romans and 1 Corinthians, Paul pictures a new creation of mankind in Jesus Christ, who, like the first Adam, stands at the head of the new humanity. Unlike the first Adam, who brought condemnation and death, Christ brings justification, life, and the resurrection. The old humanity is not annihilated and replaced, but renewed and restored by Christ's coming. Whereas Israel in the Old Testament was the focus of God's restored humanity, the church as it is in Christ occupies this position in the New Testament. The church is God's new humanity reconstructed in Christ. As Adam was the source of the old humanity, Christ is the source of the new. Adam had a spiritual side to his existence. Christ, on the other hand, has a life which gives spiritual existence to others (1 Cor 15:45–46). This restoration is completed at the resurrection of the dead, when the perishable becomes imperishable and the mortal becomes immortal (1 Cor 15:51–54).

⁸ Translation my own. This concept is simply not brought out in most English translations, which often render it "because all sinned."

The concept of man made in God's image, which sets him apart in Genesis from the animals, becomes a theme in Paul's description of Christ's relationship to God and then that of all Christians. Colossians 1:15 speaks of Christ as "the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation," in, through, and for whom all things were created. The first Adam is made *in* the image of God. Christ, the second Adam, *is* the image of God. Christ is assigned creative powers which never belonged to Adam. He takes Adam's place as the firstborn of all creation, the one for whom all things were created. Christ, like Adam, is the co-creator as the viceroy for God over the creation, but because of participation in God he is also the Creator. He is man raised to his highest potential.

Paul's description of the resurrected body has a more detailed discussion of God's image in man (1 Cor 15:42–50). The image of the man from heaven (i.e., Jesus Christ) is superimposed over the image of the man of dust, a reference to God's image in Adam, who was made from the ground. The ones with the new image share in the resurrection of Christ, who is the last or the second Adam, just as those who have the image through Adam share in his death.

While Christians share in the restoration of the image of God through Christ by faith, an image which is now being renewed and which will reach its perfection in the resurrection, all men still in some sense possess God's image. No human being is completely devoid of any divine resemblance. Cursing any man is an affront to God, because all men are made in God's image (Jas 3:9; see also Gen 9:6). Every person, even the one who has not recognized who Jesus is, has not lost his value to God as his creature who can still respond to the invitation to believe. Precisely because all men have the image of God, they are able to respond to God's law, as even Adam did after the fall. The preaching of the law by John the Baptist to prepare for Christ's coming presupposes that man is a sinner and is able to understand himself as such.

The Baptist's designation of his hearers as a "brood of vipers" (Matt 3:7) alludes to the Genesis account where man succumbs to the temptation of the serpent (3:1–7). Those who do not, out of sincerity, heed the call to repent are like their first parents listening to the voice of Satan (John 8:44). The picture of man apart from what he can and will become in Christ, the one given by Paul in Romans and 1 Corinthians, shows him as under Satan's control and destined only to sin against God and his fellow human beings. Man's heart is the source of all sin: "For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander" (Matt 15:19). The Jews sin against Jesus because they are of their father, the devil. Man by himself and without God is called flesh and blood, and in this condition he can never find God (Matt 16:17) or inherit his kingdom (1 Cor

15:50). When he finds God, he can still, because of this residual weakness, deny the God who rescued him (Matt 26:33–35).

In addition, man is susceptible to the allurements of the world and the direct involvement of Satan in his life. With God's help, man is capable of persevering and of overcoming the evil residue from the first Adam remaining in him. The parable of the sower describes man in sin and his inability to respond to God's activity through Christ (Matt 13:18–23). To the one who perseveres is given the crown of life, which involves the resurrection with God's image being fully restored (Rev 2:9–11). Christians as God's new humanity are made after the man of heaven. 2 Peter 1:4 adds a unique dimension in speaking not of a restoration of what was lost in the fall, but of the Christians' participation in the divine nature itself: "that through these [his great and precious promises] you may, . . . become partakers of the divine nature." Through the incarnation of God, God's participation in humanity, mankind in turn becomes a participant in the Deity. Thus the man in Christ is given not only more than Adam lost and the higher honor, which would have been his had he not sinned, but he is also made, in some sense, to share in the glories intended only for God's own experience. Humanity has been enhanced by God becoming flesh (John 1:14) so that it is raised to share in what was originally intended only for God (Eph 2:6). Humanity is exalted in Christ.

If man can share in the restoration of the new humanity in Christ, he continues sharing in the fallen heritage of Adam. Though the Christian, as he is a new image in Christ, has the assurance of final victory over Satan, sin, and death, he continues to be part of the realities of this life. Thus the disciples are susceptible to denying Jesus (Mark 14:30). Paul understands himself as the chief of sinners, a wretched man who is more plagued with his sin than impressed by his selection as an apostle by Christ (1 Tim 1:15–16). In assuming the restored image in Christ, the Christian does not totally rid himself of the corrupted image inherited from Adam. He participates in the physical life, which is concerned with this world and is still destined to death. At the same time, he participates in the spiritual life to be restored in the resurrection (1 Cor 15:42–50). Only death will resolve this internal conflict by the destruction of the corrupted image of Adam, and only the resurrection restores man to the position for which God originally intended him. Until then, he not only cannot rid himself of the threat, but he may at times be overcome by it.

The New Testament affirms Genesis 1–3 in seeing Adam as God's first creation, as the head of the primitive human community, and thus as responsible for sin's predicament. Though Eve is listed as the one who sinned first and not Adam, there is no suggestion that her failure is the cause of the world's sin (1 Tim 2:13–14). In recognizing Jesus as the man in which God establishes his church as new humanity, the New Testament focuses the image of God as it appeared first in Adam

on Christ. The relationship between the male and the female set down in the creation is not annulled, but confirmed. Such images as Christ as the new Adam and as the church's bridegroom (Matt 25:1-13; Eph 5:21-33) are based upon the prior understanding that man is created as male and female. Christ's relationship to the church is patterned after Adam's relationship to Eve as the one who gave his life and protects her. The lives of husbands and wives in the church as God's new humanity are in turn patterned after Christ's love for his church (Eph 5:28-30). The lives of husband and wife are not patterned directly after the primordial pair, but after Christ and the church.

Through Christ and the church, the original relationship between the first man and his wife is reflected in Christian marriage. The antagonism created between Adam and Eve by sin is overcome by those who are included by God in the church as the new humanity. Both male and female in Christ assume not only a posture of belief in relation to God whose voice they now hear, but their original and thus proper relationship to each other is restored. This model established in the creation (Genesis 2) and aggravated by the fall into sin (Genesis 3) not only is reinstated for husbands and wives in the church, but also lays the foundation for Paul's argument that only men and not women may assume the pastoral office (1 Tim 2:11-14). The questions of man's being created in the image of God as male and female and of who may serve as pastors are for Paul interrelated.

The New Testament is more specific than the Old Testament in addressing such questions as the condition and the survival of the soul after death and the resurrection of the body. These questions are interrelated to the one of man as consisting of body and soul. While it is true that the Old Testament sees man more as he is part of the community of Israel rather than as an individual, the concept of the individual believer as he contemplates his fate under sin and death is not missing there. As shown, Job, Psalms, and Ecclesiastes have the individual as their focus, who meditates on his creation, his place in the universe, and his fate and survival after death. In turn, the New Testament interest is in the individual; however, his fate is not seen individually, but as he is part of the church as God's redeemed people.

The church becomes the redeemed humanity in Christ, replacing the humanity which is fallen in Adam and, more important, continuing the promises associated with Israel, beginning with Abraham (Matt 3:9; Gal 3:5-9). The Old Testament speaks of death as sleeping with the fathers. David says that he will join his dead infant son in death (2 Sam 12:23). Christ raises these realities to a higher dimension. Paul, like the Old Testament, can speak of death as sleeping, but he sees this sleeping as a communion with Christ (1 Thess 4:14). At death, Jesus promises the thief a place with him in paradise, and he commends his own spirit to his Father (Luke 23:43,

46). Under the altar of God are kept those souls slain for the word of God (Rev 6:9). Paul in confronting death speaks of departing and being with Christ, which is for him a far better thing (Phil 1:23). Though the details of the afterlife are not spelled out to satisfy curiosity, the New Testament is clear in stating that after death man's spirit or soul lives on. Believers are said to be in paradise, in Abraham's bosom, under the altar of God, and most significantly, with Christ.

Paul speaks of the body as the earthly tent which must be taken off for the heavenly one (2 Cor 5:1-4). The concept of the spirit, or soul, after death focuses on the creation of man as body and soul; together, they constitute his nature. Ecclesiastes 12:7 says, "The dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit returns to God who gave it." This provides a commentary on Genesis 2 and 3, that in death man's body and soul return to their origins. This anticipates the same view of man as body and soul found throughout the New Testament. Christ's body is buried, but his soul is with God. Similarly, Stephen commends his soul to Jesus, and the faithful take his body for burial (Acts 7:59-60; 8:2). The spirit of Jairus's daughter returned to her when Jesus raised her from the dead (Luke 8:55). In both cases, the dead are said to be sleeping (Luke 8:52; Acts 7:60), a term used also by Paul to describe the intermediate state (1 Thess 4:14). The dead are described as resting (Rev 6:11). These expressions, sleeping and resting, approximate the Old Testament phrase "being gathered to the fathers." These phrases do not suggest annihilation, but an intermediate state, then raised to a higher one by the resurrection.

In the New Testament, the words "soul" ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) and "spirit" ($\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$) are used interchangeably for man's personal life which determines the character of his life on earth and which survives death. Both survive death and can refer to man *without* his body. Each word has a specific use, though both refer to the non-corporeal part of man. As man concentrates on himself in this world, the word "soul" is used. Jesus' soul is troubled to the point of death (Matt 26:38). As the saints under God's throne are concerned about their suffering brothers still on earth, they are called souls (Rev 6:9-11). As man contemplates God, he is called a "spirit." Both Jesus and Stephen give their spirits up in death to God.

In the Book of Hebrews, God is called the "Father of spirits" because he is surrounded by the cloud of believing witnesses who have overcome death (12:9). The unbelieving population at Noah's time, waiting for the final condemnation, are called spirits and not souls as they listen to Christ's proclamation of his resurrection victory (1 Pet 3:19-20). The soul, which may be used to refer to man apart from this bodily existence, may be used to refer to him as he is *both* body and spirit. Thus Noah's family, saved from the flood by the ark, are called souls. Another term for this incorporeal part of man is "heart," but it is not used as the part of man which survives, but rather as the source of sin within man (Matt 15:18) which must be

converted (Matt 22:37). Loving God with heart, soul, and mind involve not three different parts of the man's incorporeal or spiritual side, but one's entire self. The corporeal part, which disintegrates at death and is resurrected, is called body, flesh, dust, bones, and tent. Body and soul comprise one human being, but are distinguished from each other and subject to the judgment: "Do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul; rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt 10:28).

The New Testament Greek words for soul and spirit can be used in their adjectival forms to refer to kinds of people. Used in this sense, they refer not to man's constitutional nature as body and soul. The man who is concerned with the things of this life is so dominated by the "soul" [$\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$] functions of his incorporeal nature that he is called a $\psi\upsilon\chiικ\acute{o}\varsigma$ person. Difficult to translate, most versions simply use "fleshly." The "spiritual" man is the one who thinks about the things of God. The same terminology is used in describing the body, which is buried and raised in the resurrection (1 Cor 15:44). The NIV's "natural" and "spiritual" body presents the same problems as does the RSV's "physical" and "spiritual" body. These words describe man's disposition as believer and unbeliever and do not address specifically how he, as a man, is composed of body and soul (spirit). Whether a man is spiritual (dominated by the Holy Spirit) or fleshly or natural (dominated by the sinful desires of his soul), every man consists of both a body and a soul (spirit). While the New Testament teaches the soul's survival after death, it does not look upon this as man's ideal and final form. For Paul, the life after death is superior to life in this world, but man does not reach his full perfection until the resurrection, when God's image is restored in man.

IV. Anthropology: The Confessional Witness

The Ecumenical Creeds

The three ecumenical creeds with their emphasis on Christ, especially with their definition of his relationship to the Father, do not specifically address man's origin and nature. No distinction was made between the God who created the heavens and the earth and the God whose Son took on flesh in Jesus Christ to redeem the world. Marcion and the Gnostics made this distinction in dividing the Old Testament from the New by seeing the processes of creation and redemption as flowing not from different motives within God, but different gods. The God whom the Christians saw as their Redeemer was the same God who had created the earth, and in this creation they were included. The confession that he was the "almighty, maker of heaven and earth" contained the awareness that not only believers, but all men, owed their existence to him.

The Nicene Creed sets forth an embryonic anthropology in seeing man and his need for salvation as the reason for the Son of God's incarnation and death: "who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven," who for us, too, was crucified under Pontius Pilate. Though the question of man's need for God's salvation is implicit, the church which confesses the Nicene Creed presupposes man's depravity. Man's relationship to God would be more carefully defined in the sixteenth-century Lutheran Confessions. This would be their unique contribution, not developed by the early creeds with their concentration on God.

Man's constitutional nature as a body and soul, an issue over which there is more controversy in modern times, is affirmed briefly in the Athanasian Creed. Here the union of God and man in Christ is compared to the soul and body comprising one man or person. "For just as the reasonable soul and flesh are one man, so God and man are one Christ" (Athanasian Creed 35).⁹ Without a specific locus on anthropology, the creeds presuppose a specific view of man in the doctrine of the Son of God's incarnation. Since mankind needs Christ's incarnation and atonement, it is implicit that human nature is sinful and incapable of its own redemption and restoration. Man is seen as dichotomous, consisting of body and soul (spirit) and not trichotomous, consisting of body, soul, and spirit. Christ's humanity and divinity are parallel to the body and soul in a human being. In his humanity, Christ is described as a "perfect man, with reasonable soul and human flesh" (Athanasian Creed 30).

The Nicene Creed affirms that the Son of God "became man" (Latin: *homo factus est*), but it does not delineate his human nature as body and soul, though this must be presupposed. The *homo factus*, becoming man, means that he participated in everything belonging to the human nature, but always with the understanding that he was without sin. All three creeds speak of the resurrection of the body. While the creeds do not dichotomously juxtapose the body to the soul, the ancient church understood man as body and soul.

If the positive Lutheran contribution to dogmatic theology was soteriology in its articulation of the doctrine of justification by faith, the converse was a radically negative understanding of man in the condition of original sin. Unless man was pictured as completely helpless, the doctrine of God's justification of the sinner purely out of his grace would be compromised. The Lutheran Confessions are not interested in an anthropology detached from the doctrine of God, but rather addresses the doctrine of man in his present sinful relationship first with God and second with other men and the rest of the creation. This does not mean that the

⁹ Unless indicated otherwise, all references to the Lutheran Confessions are from Theodore G. Tappert, ed., *The Book of Concord* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959).

Confessions are uninterested in defining man as he was originally created as sinless. Their definition of original sin and the issue of whether human nature was in itself sinful required that they provide a definition of man in the sinless perfection from which he fell and to which he would be restored by Christ's redemption.

Augsburg Confession and the Apology

Without even touching the issue of man's creation by God or his constitution as consisting of body and soul, the Augsburg Confession affirms that all men are born in sin (AC II 1). This inborn sin is simply not the lack of faith or a proper fear of God, the medieval view classically formulated by Thomas Aquinas, but an active disposition to do evil, called concupiscence, present at conception. Thus each person comes to the world already condemned for his sin—and without God's saving activity through the Spirit and Baptism, he would be destined for eternal damnation. The Augsburg Confession identifies the Pelagians as falsely holding that man is born morally neutral and thus able to perform certain good works. "Rejected in this connection are the Pelagians and others who deny original sin is sin, for they hold that natural man is made righteous by his own powers, thus disparaging the sufferings and merit of Christ" (AC II 3 [German]). The Latin rendering sees man's fallen condition vis-à-vis the doctrine of justification. Here the Pelagians are condemned for "contending that man can be *justified* before God by his own strength or reason" (AC II 3 [Latin]).¹⁰

The scholastic theology of the Roman Catholic opponents was not a repristination of historical Pelagianism. For the Scholastics, man was not born morally neutral as Pelagius held. They however did not deny to the unconverted the ability to perform certain meritorious works. Original sin is an inclination to evil, but by itself did not bring condemnation (Ap II 3). The Formula of Concord would explicitly call the Roman Catholics "Semi-Pelagians" for their view "that man by virtue of his own powers could make a beginning of conversion, but could not complete it without the grace of the Holy Spirit" (FC Ep II 10). In contrast to the Roman position, the Lutheran understanding of man's total depravity was necessary for man's justification by God alone without any human contribution (AC IV).

The Roman Catholics in the Confutation took exception to the Augsburg Confession's assertion that the lack of faith was original guilt or sin. This response allowed Melancthon in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession to be even more forthright in setting forth Luther's doctrine that human beings are born not in a condition of moral neutrality, but in one of positive, active hatred of God. The Apology responded to the Pontifical Confutation's argument that the Lutherans had

¹⁰ Emphasis my own.

with this definition confused actual and original sin (II 1). Original sin exists not in the body, as the Roman Catholics held (Ap II 7), but in man's soul or inner being as an active force for evil. Following Augustine's definition of concupiscence, the term used in AC II (Latin) to describe man in the state of sin, the Apology says that it "is not merely a corruption of the physical constitution, but the evil inclination of man's higher capacities to carnal things" (Ap II 25).

This corresponds to Paul's "fleshly man," the one whose soul is preoccupied with worldly things. Man is described as "ignoring God, despising him, lacking fear and trust in him, hating his judgment and fleeing it, being angry with him, despairing of his grace, trusting in temporal things" (Ap II 8). Not only did he lose his "balanced physical constitution," but original sin has brought "such faults as ignorance of God, contempt of God, lack of the fear of God and of trust in him, inability to love him" (Ap II 14). Since the Apology defined man in such negative terms, it had to make brief reference to man's original righteous condition of man as one involving "perfect health and, in all respects, pure blood, unimpaired powers of the body."¹¹ The strong negative Lutheran judgment of man's abilities in relation to God did not produce a similar verdict on his abilities to participate in the ordinary affairs of this world. Luther's influential *The Bondage of the Will* with its devastating criticism of man's ability to do any good, and which found its opposing correspondent in Erasmus's *The Freedom of the Will*, did not prevent the Augsburg Confession and the Apology in attributing to man a free will in the things of this world. "Our churches teach that man's will has some liberty for the attainment of civil righteousness and for the choice of things subject to reason" (AC XVIII 1 [Latin]). This is followed up by the disclaimer that man's will and reason are unable "to accomplish anything in those things which pertain to God" (AC XVIII 4).

Thus neither *the* Augsburg Confession nor the Apology are fatalistic about man's life in this world, as if he were entirely without any choices. Quite to the contrary! The decisions about working, eating, drinking, visiting, building, marrying, activities which are common to all, are determined by the free will and not by God.¹² This does not mean that the Confessions at this point do not see God's providence involved in the ordinary lives of all men, as God is confessed as "creator and preserver of all things visible and invisible" (AC I 3–4 [German]). Man's free will in matters pertaining to this world does not suggest that God is no longer Lord of creation and that man is given free reign. Freedom in secular matters is limited

¹¹ Cf. Holsten Fagerberg, *A New Look at the Lutheran Confessions 1529–1537*, trans. Gene J. Lund (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House 1972), 129–133.

¹² Werner Elert, *The Structure of Lutheranism*, trans. Walter A. Hansen (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1962), 1:24–25.

by God's ultimate intentions for the world. The use of man's free will in secular matters pertains to man as he is a sinner and not as he is a Christian.

Thus non-Christians may make laws and govern themselves and thus attain a civil righteousness, but not a righteousness for salvation. This distinction made in man—that he is helpless before God, dependent on his righteousness, and still free in the things of this world—cannot be understood in dualistic terms, so that the Christian in effect becomes two persons. He is not divided into two separate creatures: one whose will in matters of faith and religion is controlled by the outside forces of Satan and God and other whose will in earthly matters is completely his own. The one justified by grace through faith reflects his new nature in the good that he does to others in both secular and religious matters (AC XX).

The Augsburg Confession and the Apology see the Christian with two dimensions to his life. His relationships to God and to other men are nevertheless distinct from each other. This distinction in relationships allows Christians, in spite of the acknowledgment of their own moral inadequacy, the ability “to render decisions and pass sentence according to imperial and other existing laws” (AC XVI 2 [German]) and to accept the decisions of non-Christians, who otherwise have little or no awareness of moral deficiency in matters pertaining to salvation. The one person who struggles with God over his own sinfulness and accepts Christ's righteousness is able to participate in society as a fully contributing member. Even the man who has no saving knowledge of God can with the use of his reason have an external knowledge of God and exercise his free will in making moral decisions, but in his knowledge of the true God and his ability to perform those things acceptable to God, he remains helpless.

Luther's two kingdom doctrine is related to the confessional anthropology of man's helplessness before God in regard to righteousness and his ability to exercise his free will in the things of this world. In the kingdom of the right hand, God deals with the proclamation of salvation. Here man understands himself as a sinner who receives God's grace in Christ apart from any merit or his reason. In the kingdom of the left hand, God also acts, but his intentions are hidden not only from the unbeliever but from the believer. Within the kingdom of the left hand, man exercises his free will as a participant in society making decisions pertaining to this world. The Lutherans saw the confusion of these two spheres at the root of the Roman Catholic misunderstanding that man could contribute to his salvation. Salvation as an act of God alone without human participation necessarily implied and required a virtually complete different anthropology from Roman Catholicism, which saw cooperation between the divine and human as both necessary and possible.

The Small and Large Catechisms

Luther's explanation of the Apostles' Creed in the Small Catechism implies a definite anthropology. The Reformer in his doctrine on God goes from the ancient church's understanding of him as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to the God who is the Christian's personal Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier: "God has created me"; "[Christ] has redeemed me"; and "the Holy Spirit has called me through the Gospel" (SC II 1, 4, 6). Luther makes the deduction that the first object of God's creative activity is the believer himself. He acknowledges that God is first *his own personal* maker and then that he is the maker of heaven and earth. The second article is even more radically personal, as the Christian sees himself alone as the object of Christ's saving activity. This is true, but less pronounced in the third article. The Christian stands in the spotlight of the Spirit's sanctifying activity, which embraces the entire Christian church. Man is seen on a continuum from his creation by God, through his redemption by Jesus, and finally to his conversion by the Spirit. His existence is derived from the God whom he knows as Father, Son, and Spirit.

Even a slightly detailed analysis of Luther's explanations reveals his fuller understanding of man. Man consists of a body and a soul, and this body will be raised up by the Spirit on the last day. All that man is and possesses as body and soul come from God. Rather than emphasizing free will in earthly matters as the Augsburg Confession and the Apology do, Luther in the Small Catechism stresses man's total dependency on God, from whom he receives all his possessions as gifts: "He provides me daily and abundantly with all the necessities of life." Man is never left alone in the world to fend for himself but is protected by God from all evil. For God's creation and preservation of his life, man is duty "bound to thank, praise, serve, and obey him" (SC II 2). The Small Catechism resembles the Augsburg Confession and the Apology in seeing man as standing lost and condemned before God and completely dependent on him for salvation and conversion (SC II 2, 3).

The intimate relationship between God and the individual, prominent in Luther's explanation of the Creed, so that he looks at God as his own, is expanded in his explanation of the Lord's Prayer to include others. Here no longer is the individual believer approaching God's throne, but the entire church comes "as beloved children approach their dear father" (SC III 2). Man who has found God to be his maker, now, through Christ, sees him as a Father within a fellowship embracing all who confess the same God. The Christian no longer sees himself as a solitary creation of God but as part of a community with other Christians. The instruction of the Small Catechism on "How Plain People Are to Be Taught to Confess" (SC V 15) shows Luther's awareness of the abiding force of sin in Christians.

In the Large Catechism, Luther expands on some points. Man is not simply one of God's creatures, but the one creature which God through the rest of the creation serves. "Besides, he makes all creation help provide the comforts and necessities of life—sun, moon, stars in the heavens; day and night" (LC II 14). In spite of his depravity, man remains at the center of God's creating and saving activities. In spite of Luther's insistence that outside of Christ no saving knowledge of God exists, he does not deny all knowledge of God. Those "who are outside the Christian church, whether heathen, Turks, Jews, or false Christians and hypocrites, even though they believe in and worship only the one, true God, nevertheless do not know what his attitude toward them is" (LC II 66).

The Smalcald Articles

Rather than giving any positive description of man, the Smalcald Articles reaffirm the Augsburg Confession and the Apology in denying man a free will in doing good and refraining from evil. By himself, man is incapable of keeping the Ten Commandments.

The Formula of Concord

The doctrine of man in the earlier Lutheran Confessions was partially shaped by Luther's controversy with Erasmus, a Renaissance humanist who emphasized the freedom of man's will. Another factor was the medieval Scholastic view that man could by his own power begin to love God. For both Erasmus and the Scholastics, man was not totally depraved and could make a contribution to his own salvation. Erasmus's views, opposed as they were to Luther's, found adherents among Luther's followers after his death. Formula of Concord I and II addressed a misunderstanding of Luther's views and the introduction of humanistic views into Lutheran anthropology.

Original sin had been the topic of Augsburg Confession II and Apology II. It was the first issue of dispute between the Roman Catholics and Lutherans, since the first article on God affirmed only what both parties already accepted as true. They were divided on the issues of anthropology and sin. The anthropological controversy was not without its implications for the doctrine of God, as the article on justification demonstrated differing views there, irrespective of his triune essence. Any suggestion that man could contribute to his salvation, the Roman position, implied that God was not the only cause of man's salvation, a position intolerable to the Lutherans. Thus the Confessions saw that their anthropology was related to their understanding of God.

A certain Matthias Flacius Illyricus, who was recognized as a staunch defender of the Lutheran faith and a scholar in his own right, had in his zealotry to maintain the sinful character of man held that the human nature was itself sinful. Whether Flacius intended such a radical verdict in virtually equating the human nature with sin is debatable, but if his position was left unanswered it would have produced dangerous consequences for the Lutheran understanding of “the chief articles of our Christian faith namely, creation, redemption, sanctification, and the resurrection of our flesh” (FC Ep I 3). Man could not be so evil that his salvation was impossible.¹³ This occasion also provided the authors of the Formula the opportunity to clarify the Lutheran position on the doctrine of man. To the writers of the Formula, it appeared that Flacius had come too close to the Manichaean error, “that original sin is strictly and without any distinction corrupted man’s substance, nature, and essence, so that no distinction should be made even in the mind, between man’s nature itself after the Fall and original sin, and that the two cannot be differentiated in the mind” (FC Ep I 19).

The Formula did not back away from Luther’s understanding of the total corruption of the human nature from conception, so “that even if no evil thought would ever arise in the heart of corrupted man, no idle word were spoken or no wicked act or deed took place, nevertheless man’s nature is corrupted through original sin” (FC Ep I 21).¹⁴ The controversy did allow the Formula of Concord to confirm the Lutheran understanding that the human nature was created good and remained God’s creature after the fall. “Even after the fall our nature is and remains a creature of God” (FC Ep I 2).

Sin did not belong to the essence (Latin: *substantia*) of man, but was an accident (*accidens*). Calling sin an accident, a term borrowed from Aristotelian philosophy, meant that man could be man without sin and still be man. This was the case with man in his creation, after the resurrection, and most surely of Christ, who was a true man and born without original sin and could not sin. Associating the human nature with sin so closely as to identify one with the other would have left only two alternatives, both of which were unacceptable: asserting God’s creation of evil, which the Formula of Concord does not allow (FC Ep I 6), or denying his role as man’s creator. To the latter, the Formula of Concord responds, “God not only created the body and soul of Adam and Eve before the Fall, but also our bodies and souls after the Fall, even though they are corrupted” (FC Ep I 4). Even more strongly, the Solid Declaration states: “Therefore the corrupted man cannot be identified

¹³ Elert, *The Structure of Lutheranism*, 29.

¹⁴ Elert, *The Structure of Lutheranism*, 29.

unqualifiedly with sin itself, for in that case God would be the creator of sin” (FC SD I 38).

A false anthropology which virtually equates sin and human nature would have grave consequences for Christology and eschatology. Such an equation would have made a real incarnation and resurrection impossible. In taking a human nature, necessarily involving participation in sin, to himself, the Son of God would have been born with sin as other human beings. This position would be intolerable for the Lutherans. The Lutheran argumentation based on Christology that the human nature could exist without sin and still be human shows how intricately their Christology and anthropology were bound to each other. In other places, the Confessions hold that Christ is made sin for us, following St. Paul, but this is God imputing sin to him, not that he was actually born with original sin. This equation would have grave consequences for the doctrine of the resurrection to the point that it would have to be denied. In the resurrection, God destroys sin and does not rehabilitate it, as Flacius’s false teaching would allow (FC Ep I 6). The framers of the Formula of Concord saw in Flacius’s teaching a form of Manichaeism which if taken to its logical conclusions would have denied God as creator of the material world and with it the resurrection.

The positive side of this controversy was the Lutheran opportunity to emphasize that man was originally created good because of his creation by the good God. The fall into sin did not annul this. Christ’s redemptive work flowed from the same good motivation which moved God to create the world. Though man’s existence was permeated thoroughly by sin, this sin was essentially an alien element in his nature, an accident, as the Formula of Concord calls it. The divine redemption was an attempt not only to give man a glory which he had never known before, but also to restore a condition to him which was his by right of his being created by God. Man would be resurrected with a body and without sin. He would not only be no less human, he would be human in the sense intended by God. In reconfirming their belief in the goodness of man’s creation by God in the face of the possibility that their position was being falsely set forth in virtually Manichaeian terms by Flacius (FC SD I 26–27), the Lutherans reiterated their position on original sin as total depravity, the issue of division with the Roman Catholics from the beginning of the Reformation.

If, on one hand, the Lutherans had to assert the goodness of the divine creation, they also had to readdress the issue that man had the capability of contributing to his own salvation and conversion. Certain humanistic ideas about man’s lack of complete sinfulness, similar to what had become the official position of the Roman Church, had found a home among the Lutheran theologians through the influence of the Renaissance.

The Renaissance and the Reformation, though contemporary to each other and sharing certain scholars, were fundamentally divided over the place of God and man in the universe. A more optimistic anthropology was introduced by associates of Melanchthon, who was as much a child of the Renaissance as he was the Reformation. In spite of the dangers associated with the overstatement of Flacius in equating man's nature with sin, the Lutherans also held that their doctrine of original sin did not allow for human cooperation.

Though Melanchthon was associated with a type of synergistic position condemned by the Formula of Concord II, the Apology he authored is cited approvingly at length (FC SD II 8–14). Formula of Concord II sets forth the Lutheran anthropology under the title of the "Free Will," and it is directed against the humanistic anthropology introduced by Melanchthon's influence. Man's will is seen from four different perspectives: "(1) before the Fall, (2) after the Fall, (3) after regeneration, and (4) after the resurrection of the flesh" (FC Ep II 1). These divisions are significant. Rather than seeing anthropology in a single dimension, the Formula views it in four differing relationships to God. Man can never be defined apart from this relationship, as the Scholastics had done.¹⁵ In the first state, before the fall, man can resist sin. In the second state, after the fall, he cannot do anything but sin and displease God. The third state was not as important an issue, since the will converted by the Holy Spirit can perform the works God desires. It became an issue to the extent that some held that man's conversion was so complete that he could refrain from sin and live a perfect life. The fourth state, coming after the resurrection, is not problematic, since all would agree that those resurrected in Christ are incapable of sinning. The real problem is whether in the second state, in which man stands helpless before God, he can make a contribution to his conversion.

This article on the free will is a converse of the one on original sin. While the article on original sin (FC I) insists that sin and the human nature cannot be equated, the one on free will (FC II) holds that no prior activity in man can contribute to his conversion. Much of the argumentation of the inability of the free will to prepare itself for conversion was set forth in the articles on original sin in the Augsburg Confession, Apology, and Formula of Concord I. Man's non-resisting will, along with the Spirit and the Word, was a cause of man's salvation, a position attributed rightly or wrongly to Melanchthon. Condemned was the position which held that man's will is "able by its own natural powers to add something (though it be little and feeble) to help, to cooperate, to prepare itself for grace, to dispose itself, to apprehend and accept it, and to believe the Gospel" (FC Ep II 11). Stated in this

¹⁵ Elert, *The Structure of Lutheranism*, 132.

way, the condemned position was similar to the scholastic view which did not see man as totally depraved. The Formula of Concord's position was that the human will is capable of conversion by the word of God and the Holy Spirit, but it cannot be regarded as an instrument in its own conversion (FC Ep II 17–19). Though this article is addressed to the condition of man's will prior to conversion, it also denied to man by himself the ability to keep the law after his conversion (FC Ep II 12). At the same time, the Formula of Concord, citing Luther, could say that man has a free will over the things subject to him.¹⁶

The condition of man's total depravity and his need for God's grace is a characteristic doctrine of the Lutheran Confessions, as is the one on justification. Though the Confessions do not discuss the doctrine of man isolated from the questions of his sinfulness and need for justification, a number of points about man can be excised. Namely, man's origin is found in God's creation of Adam and Eve. The Confessions throughout presuppose the veracity of the Genesis account with the creation of Adam and Eve and the fall (FC Ep I 1, 3).

While the Confessions do not offer a Platonic view of man in which the soul is exalted at the expense of the body, they see the soul as the real seat of man's personality. Sin originates not in the body, but in the soul. The Lutherans and the Roman Catholics agreed that man consisted of body and soul, though they differed on the degree to which the soul was corrupted. For Lutherans, this was a thorough corruption; for the Roman Catholics following Aquinas, it was the absence of righteousness and the lack of submission of the soul's lower powers to the higher ones, a view taken over from ancient Greek philosophy. The Confessions do not address, specifically, man's constitutional nature as body and soul, but they presuppose it. That man consists of body and soul is fundamental for Lutheran–Roman Catholic dispute on man's fallen nature. The Roman Catholic view, that the soul by itself before conversion is capable of higher religious activities, presupposes the body and soul dichotomy as much as does the Lutheran position. This dichotomous anthropology is reinforced by the discussion of Christ's descent into hell and whether it happened according to the soul alone or the body and soul (FC IX). Without this necessary and prior distinction, the discussion is without value. Most telling is that in Luther's explanation of the first article of the Creed, the Christian confesses that God has given him both body and soul. Even after the fall, the body and soul are said to be created by God (FC Ep I 2).

The issue of sexuality and the existence of man as male and female became a Reformation issue because of the celibacy laws of the Roman Catholic Church, which forbade marriage to priests, nuns, and monks who had taken vows. Not only

¹⁶ Elert, *The Structure of Lutheranism*, 24.

do the Confessions protest these monastic requirements, but they set forth the relation of the sexes to each other in a positive way. In the Small Catechism, Luther distinguishes between the duties of husbands and wives (SC IX 6–7). The issue of sexuality surfaced prominently in the Augsburg Confession in the matter of the marriage of the priests (AC XXII) and then in the matter of whether monastic vows required lifelong celibacy (AC XXVII). While not deprecating the importance of vows, the vow of celibacy had no force since it contradicted God's law given in creation (AC XXVII 22–23). Marriage cannot be abrogated by celibacy, since as a natural ordinance, it belongs to man by natural right (Ap XXIII 9). The desire of one sex for the other is seen as natural and proper, having been ordained by God. Not only are God's laws in nature contravened, where men and women are not permitted to marry, but unnatural and sinful behavior between the sexes arises.

The fundamental Lutheran distinction between the law and the gospel as the proper proclamation of God's word (FC VI and VII) presupposes a certain understanding of man as a creature of God who is able to respond to the law. The law's first use, directed to man in sin, is to be used not only on unbelievers, but believers also. The sinful nature, which the Formula of Concord calls the old Adam, inheres in the intellect, will, and all human powers in such a way that the law must be preached to keep the sinful nature in bounds (FC Ep VII 4). Man is unable to respond to the gospel by himself, but all men are able to understand the threats of the law and to adjust their behavior in such a way to fulfill its external demands. The Confessional understanding of man does not address the question of man as he is in body and soul to the extent that a contemporary dogmatics would require. Their interest is in man as a sinner now justified freely by God's grace through faith. In this, they reflect and develop the biblical concepts of man's creation in God's image, the fall, and the restoration.

V. A Historical Survey of Anthropology

The biblical view of man as created in God's image differed from the views of the Egyptians and the Babylonians, who saw people as subservient to kings as the gods' representatives. In the Babylonian creation epic, man is created from the blood of a slain god, so the gods would not have to serve themselves. Individual worth depended on relation to the ruling class as the gods' representatives.

In the Greco-Roman world of the New Testament, the body and soul were seen as separate entities, a view developed from Plato, though his was not the only view. The soul [$\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$], the center of man's existence, was divided into three ontological parts: reason, passion, and desire. Man must work to ensure that reason remained dominant over the soul's lower parts. This division of the soul into powers or parts

made early inroads into Christian anthropology and later the scholasticism which Luther rejected. For Plato, the soul, especially as it is reason, belongs to the transcendental world, and thus it is preexistent to the body and survives it. The soul's immortality stands in contrast to the body, with which the soul is in temporary union. Death was seen as an escape from the body.¹⁷ Paul's emphasis on the bodily resurrection, taken over from the Old Testament and connected with Christ's, was presented as a defense against this commonly held philosophical view of immortality of the soul, which did not allow for a resurrection (Acts 17:32; 1 Cor 15). This sharp, dualistic division of body from soul starkly differed from the biblical view of the union of man as a dichotomy of body and soul. Scriptures, like Platonic philosophy, knew of the soul's existence outside of the body (1 Cor 5:3–5), but the ideal man is a unity of body and soul. The body envelops the soul, just as the soul envelops the body. This Greek philosophical view, contrasting the body as man's inferior part and the soul as his superior part, was developed in Gnosticism and Neo-Platonism and was prominent in the post-apostolic period. The church's anthropological definitions could not escape these influences. Gnosticism, which may have been as early as the New Testament, saw the material creation as evil and assigned a lower deity as its cause. A Christian form of Gnosticism viewed itself as the true religion. The dualism of man as body and soul was seen as a reflection of a greater cosmic dualism between opposing deities, with the evil one assigned to the creation of matter and the good one to the creation of the spiritual world. "Yet within Gr.-speaking Gnosticism the terminology of the popular philosophical doctrine for the soul is used in anthropology, so that the pairs light/darkness, good/evil, spirit/matter and soul/body correspond to one another."¹⁸

With Gnosticism's denial of Christ's incarnation and resurrection, man's real life was seen in the soul. Death released man to a happier destiny with no promise of bodily resurrection. Gnosticism had three categories to which all people were assigned. At the lower level were sinners, who were completely fleshly, without hope of reclamation. In the middle were the common people who strenuously had to combat bodily evils by refraining from fleshly sins. The enlightened, the highest level, were sufficiently freed from the body to make it insignificant and to allow them freedom to satisfy their carnal desires without damage to their spiritual lives. Gnosticism developed a modified form of trichotomy for the enlightened. The ordinary people had only a body and soul. The higher class of men were given a

¹⁷ Albert Dihle, "A. ψυχή in the Greek World" in "ψυχή, ψυχικός, etc." in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, vol. 9 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964–1976), 612–614.

¹⁸ Dihle, "E. Gnosticism," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 656–658.

spirit.¹⁹ The Valentinian form of Gnosticism virtually ascribed to man two souls, a *ψυχή* which had value only in relationship to the *πνεῦμα*.

The distinction between male and female was of no theological significance, and God was referred to in both masculine and feminine terms. Though the church successfully resisted Gnosticism's blatant dualism, Neo-Platonism, which had similar origins, influenced post-apostolic Christian thought. Origen of Alexandria in the third century followed Plato in teaching not only the soul's immortality, but also its preexistence. The importance of Greek philosophical influence can be seen in the title of Tertullian's *De Anima (On the Soul)*, written in the third century and considered the church's first anthropology. Here Tertullian set forth biblical themes with Stoic terms. Like Irenaeus of Lyon before him, he saw the soul as an ethereal substance.

The high place given the soul in the anthropology of these early church fathers did not mean they considered man's bodily existence worthless or inferior. They did not adopt the dualistic worldview of Neo-Platonism, Gnosticism, or Manichaeism, which saw the spiritual, non-corporeal world as good and the material as evil. Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, in placing high value on the soul, opposed the Gnostic devaluation of the body as dualism and taught the dichotomous view of man as body and soul. This became standard for traditional Christianity.

The church fathers' definition of the image of God would also set the boundaries for later dogmatical study on anthropology. Clement, Origen, Tertullian, and Lactantius saw the image of God as seated in the soul in which the body participated. At this time, a distinction, important up through the Scholastic period and the Reformation, was made between the "image" and "likeness" of God in man. The language of the distinction between image and likeness was taken from Genesis 1:27, but the distinction itself was an adaptation of Plato's division of the soul into a nobler part in which reason was operative and a lower part for emotions and desires.

Taken over into Christian anthropology, there was a shift of terms, but vestiges of at least a bipartite division in the soul remained. In the fall, the likeness or similarity to God, a gift of grace, is lost, but not the image in which reason resides. Reason may malfunction, but as part of God's image in man it cannot be eradicated, and thus it is immortal. This distinction of likeness from image is traceable to Irenaeus and Augustine and was standardized for traditional Roman Catholic theology through Aquinas. Man retains the image in a damaged condition with its use of reason and will, but loses the divine likeness given to him by grace and

¹⁹ Eduard Schweizer, "D. Development to the Pneumatic Self in Gnosticism" in "*πνεῦμα, πνευματικός*" in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, vol. 6 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968), 392–396.

assuring him of immortality. This division between man's still-present lower powers and the lost higher powers, restorable through sacramental grace, allows for Roman Catholicism to have both natural and revealed theologies. It is basic for their view that some with an extra endowment of grace and the right use of their natural powers can become saints. Since the fall of man was not so complete that he lost the image or damaged it beyond self-repair, he can with the use of reason perform works acceptable to God. Man using his natural moral capacities can even earn salvation. For the Scholastics following Aquinas, it was not so much that man by sin had broken a relationship with God, but that the soul's powers were no longer operating harmoniously with each other.²⁰ Thus Roman Catholic anthropology, with its retention of God's image with the use of reason and the free will in divine matters, sharply contrasted with Luther's anthropology of total depravity.²¹

There was no disagreement among early Christian fathers that man's body was taken from the ground, but Plato's view that the soul was preexistent provided the opportunity for Christians to ask about the origin of the soul. Three answers were provided. Origen, showing a strong Neo-Platonic influence, held to the preexistence of the souls before the act of conception, a view with few adherents. Tertullian's view of traducianism saw the soul as transmitted from the parents by procreation to the child, a view later favored by the majority of Lutherans. A position known as creationism (not to be confused with the creation of the world from nothing) offered by Clement held that God created an individual soul for each body. This view gained the ascendancy until the Reformation and is still favored by Roman Catholics and the Reformed.²² Creationism distinguished between sensual and rational movements within the soul.

This distinction, derived from Plato, would later lead a few to see man as trichotomous: body, soul, and spirit. With trichotomy, the soul is seen as man's lower powers and the spirit as that part of man dwelling on divine and spiritual matters. This view was a variation of Gnosticism which attributed the spirit only to the enlightened. These differing views were important in understanding not only man but also original sin and its transmission.

Creationism has an almost insurmountable difficulty in explaining original sin's transmission, as God participates in creating sinless souls to enter sinful bodies.²³ Traducianism sees sin inherent in the soul and is passed on from the parents to the offspring by procreation. In Origen's view of preexistence, the soul

²⁰ Fagerberg, *A New Look at the Lutheran Confessions*, 129–131.

²¹ Elert, *The Structure of Lutheranism*, 1:29–35.

²² See L. Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 4th and enlarged ed. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1941), 201.

²³ L. Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 199–200.

becomes sinful by its entering a body contaminated by sin. After each soul's creation, God must attribute to it Adam's sin. These questions about the origins of the soul and sin in the individual have strangely surfaced in the matter of abortion in determining the beginning of human life. While traducianism sees the soul present at conception, creationism can allow for its introduction into the body at any time. Determining this time decides when the unborn can be seen as fully human. All three views—traducianism, creationism, and preexistence—saw man as body and soul. Their emphasis on the soul did not cause them to devalue the body or deny its resurrection. At the Fourth Council of Constantinople (869–870), the dichotomous view prevailed, but not to the exclusion of trichotomy, which was often favored by mysticism.

St. Augustine of Hippo in his debate with the British monk Pelagius in the fourth and fifth centuries was a significant factor in the development of anthropology by attaching its discussion to that of sin. In response to Pelagius, who held that man was born into the world with no moral tendencies and was free to choose between good or evil, Augustine provided the dogmatic definition for original sin as inherited from the parents. Sin had its origins in the fall and destroyed the harmonies both between the body and the soul and between God and man. Man was bereft of righteousness and enjoyment of divine blessedness. He could only sin. As the soul could not obey God, the body was no longer subservient to the soul. Concupiscence, defined as desire, including but not limited to sexual drives, remained as sin.

Through a special bestowal of grace (*gratia infusa*), which was freely given (*gratia gratuita, gratia gratis*) in the sacraments, man can overcome this deficiency. Augustine could not decide between traducianism and creationism, but in the end gravitated toward the latter. Though a modified form of Augustine's theology was endorsed by the Council of Orange and he was honored as a doctor of the church, a synthesis between Pelagianism and Augustinianism emerged in which nature (Pelagius) and grace (Augustine) defined anthropology until the Reformation. By nature, man could perform certain philosophical virtues, as set forth by Aristotle. These served as a foundation for theological virtues, which could only be given through sacramental grace. Man's reason could successfully strive against his lower inclinations and perform virtuous acts. During this period, the creationist theory of the soul's origin was prominent. This view allowed the soul to be infected but not totally corrupted by sin. Aquinas, with the distinction of earlier church fathers between the image and likeness, held that man in losing the image had lost God's grace given in paradise, but still had his image. With his reason and will, man could find God and perform acts acceptable to him.

If Luther's Reformation was characterized by his doctrine of justification freely by grace without works, it was at the same time a repudiation of any anthropology which saw any virtue in man. Original sin was not simply the absence of righteousness which could be repaired with the right use of reason, as held by the Scholastics, but an active, positive force in despising the things of God.²⁴ On one hand, Luther adopted a radical Augustinianism view in seeing man as totally bereft of God's righteousness, but distanced himself from the Augustinian view that grace was a substance (*gratia infusa*) given man through the sacraments. Grace was God's gracious attitude by which he declares the sinner righteous for Christ's sake. The unstated premise of the Augsburg Confession was that the Roman Catholic views of man and salvation by works border on Pelagianism, though they never held with Pelagius that man comes into the world as morally neutral. Original sin for Roman Catholicism is not sufficiently damning to merit hell until an actual sin has been committed. Their *limbo infantium*, the place in the afterlife reserved for the unbaptized children, results directly from their view of original sin as the absence of righteousness rather than active force. Luther had no use for philosophical Scholastic anthropology and relied only on the Bible for his. This was made clear in his *Bondage of the Will* and especially his *Disputation on Man*: "Philosophers and Aristotle are not able to understand or to define what the theological man is, but by the grace of God we are able to do it, because we have the Bible."²⁵ His doctrine of justification allowed for no autonomous virtue in man, free will, and intrinsic virtue in the soul pointing to its own immortality. Unlike the Scholastics, Luther returned to the biblical view in making no distinction between the image and likeness. His view that man had completely lost God's image was derived from his dislike for the Scholastic division between the image and the likeness which allowed man to retain the image with its damaged, but not irretrievable, abilities to do good works. He also saw man in relation to God and not as he is in himself. Original sin completely destroyed this relationship, and thus man was completely devoid of God's image.

Later Lutheran theologians followed Luther in seeing that this relationship was completely destroyed by sin, but recognized that this relationship did not exhaust the biblical meaning of the image. Later Lutheran theologians are more likely to speak of man's retention of God's image, but in such a shattered form with no possibility of self-restoration. Melancthon and Calvin held to original sin, but allowed for philosophical humanism in their anthropologies. This influence can be

²⁴ See Elert, *The Structure of Lutheranism*, 30. "For Luther the concept of sin was constantly oriented toward God – not toward an impersonal law that is transgressed. It is oriented toward this law only insofar as this law is felt directly as God's will."

²⁵ Luther, *Disputation on Man* (1536), AE 34:142.

more clearly seen in Zwingli, who held original sin brought guilt but was not sin in itself. Melanchthon, by making the free will a factor in conversion, showed that he had come under Platonic and Scholastic influences in seeing one part of the soul as morally superior to another. Thus he leaned in the direction of Pelagianism in seeing man as a contributory factor in conversion.

In response to what was seen as Melanchthon's synergism, Flacius adopted a virtual Manichaeism in identifying the human nature as sin. Both positions were condemned by the Formula of Concord I (5, 27). In seeing sin as the soul's original condition, Lutherans favored traducianism. The Reformed, as the Roman Catholics, adopted creationism, but neither in refuting the other's position have found it heretical.

Reformed theology, by seeing the Christian's personal experience rather than word and sacraments as the guarantee of salvation, prepared the way for Pietism with its anthropocentric theology. Inner certainty and not the outward word was the assurance of salvation. With its concentration on personal awareness of salvation, Pietism permeated both Lutheran and Reformed thought in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It followed the Reformation in placing itself under the Bible for its authority and adhering to original sin; but by putting the emphasis on man's spiritual development and awareness, it offered an essentially different anthropology. In practice, man's personal awareness of salvation and the possibility of freedom from sin in his life introduced an anthropology foreign to the Lutheran emphasis on human depravity through original sin. Pietism, by shifting the emphasis to the individual, prepared the way for the Rationalism of the age of Enlightenment. The Enlightenment did not have Pietism's commitment to the Bible as authority or its understanding of original sin. Man was not burdened with inborn sin and had no need of God's special revelation.

Freedom was the key concept for anthropology.²⁶ Man was not only at the center of his world, but in control of it. Enlightened by the proper use of reason, he was capable by himself of the thoughts about God previously given through the apostles and prophets. He was morally self-sufficient.

The highly optimistic assessment of man in the Enlightenment was brought to an end by Immanuel Kant at the end of the eighteenth century. In his *Critique of the Pure Reason* and *Critique of the Practical Reason*, he first challenged Rationalism's view that man could live in harmony with nature and use it for his purposes in constructing a natural religion. Kant saw man as the source of his own

²⁶ Elert, *The Structure of Lutheranism*, 34: "It is only logical when in the writings of the rationalistic dogmatists like Semler and Wegscheider the association of sin with the doctrine of freedom leads to a furious attack on the doctrine of original sin as maintained by the Reformation."

knowledge of God and morality, apart from any involvement in nature. The moral imperative, a key term for Kant, was built into each person. Both Rationalism and Kant had no need for a special divine revelation and saw man as religiously autonomous, though for the former these conclusions came from his use of reason in analyzing his world and for the latter out of an internal sense of morality and religion. The extreme subjectivism of Kant combined with the experience theology of late Pietism provided the basis for Friedrich Schleiermacher, whose influence stretched through the nineteenth century into the twentieth. His “theology of consciousness” (*Bewusstseinstheologie*) derived from the Pietism of his father, a Reformed minister who was rooted in the experience theology of the Reformed. Schleiermacher held that everyone had the inherent ability to develop his own religious sense about God out of his “feeling” (*Gefühl*). Man’s consciousness of God had to predominate over all other knowledge and action.²⁷ Rationalism, or the Enlightenment, with its concept of the undamaged reason, Kant with his view of the internal moral imperative within man, and Schleiermacher’s internalization of religion in the feeling and consciousness all have a strong correlation to Plato. For him, the preexistent soul has certain intellectual and moral capacities because of its participation in prior divine reality.

Schleiermacher’s theology was immediately influential. Its adherents at Erlangen attempted to revive classical Lutheranism, but they made “the regenerate ‘I,’” an idea adopted from Schleiermacher, as the ultimate source of Christian truth. It was also influential on the German philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel with his dialectal theology of the immanent spirit and on the Danish philosopher and theologian Soren Kierkegaard, regarded as the father of existentialism. Kierkegaard adopted the Reformation doctrine of justification, but without accepting its dogmatic presuppositions. Man is estranged from himself as a sinner with the sickness unto death. Only by living his life under a contradiction can he receive his authentic existence through Christianity, when he is willing to make the decision to be a Christian. While protesting Rationalism, he put man in the center. His views influenced the theologies of Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, and Rudolf Bultmann through the philosopher Martin Heidegger. Barth, who began his career opposing Schleiermacher’s theology of consciousness, was dependent on the same philosophical roots in the Reformed theology of experience.

In spite of his explicit protest against the optimistic view of man held by the nineteenth-century liberal theology under Schleiermacher’s influence, Barth’s encounter theology placed man in the center of the revelatory process. Unless man

²⁷ For an analysis and outline of the development of theological anthropology, see Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Jesus—God and Man*, trans. Lewis L. Wilkins and Duane A. Priebe (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968), 39–49.

participated as a receiver in the divinely given revelation, it was not valid. Though he claimed theology came from without, in the reality of the encounter with Christ, and not from within, as Schleiermacher and classical nineteenth-century liberalism after him held, Barth placed man in the center as the one who must have an existential encounter with God. Knowledge of God was relative, and man, able to make a decision, stood at the center of his universe. Since he finally came to hold to universalism, original sin which he saw as estrangement from God was not determinative for his anthropology.

Charles Darwin, not a philosopher or theologian, had a great impact on all scholarly disciplines including theology with his theory of evolution in *The Origin of Species* (1859). Since Darwin argued in *The Descent of Man* (1871) that man was not a special creation of God but a result of long evolutionary processes, such questions as to the nature of God's image in man and his constitutional nature as body and soul became moot. In the field of psychology, Sigmund Freud saw man not as a creature of God but as a collection of internal, undeveloped forces in his unconscious self and external ones in his environment from which the "self" emerged. In the unconscious or preconscious resides the conscience, shaped by such persons in authority as parents and teachers and the subject of psychoanalysis. Religion is only a projection of man's own internal situation, and thus any understanding of man being created by God or in his image is impossible.

Karl Marx's view of history, which promised man a glorious destiny in a classless society, influenced not only political and national leaders but also philosophers and theologians. Marx understood man economically as being exploited by capitalistic forces for their own good. Individuals must be subordinated to the group's welfare.

The views of Darwin, Freud, and Marx came to influence theological anthropologies of the modern world. The biblical categories of the image of God in man and his constitutional nature as body and soul had to be redefined. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, a Roman Catholic theologian, offered evolutionistic anthropology in theological terms in *The Phenomenon of Man* (written in 1937 but published only posthumously in 1955).²⁸ Mankind as a whole was evolving to perfection. In this evolution, Christ stands as a symbol of that destiny.

It may be too simplistic to attribute the failure of much contemporary biblical theology to understand man as body and soul to any one source, but the influence of Darwin and Freud cannot be discounted. Contemporary critics of a dichotomous view of man are more likely to attribute this belief to a foreign intrusion of Platonic philosophy into theology than an original understanding of the Scriptures.

²⁸ For further information about Teilhard, see Robert North, *Teilhard and the Creation of the Soul* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1967).

As much as Christian anthropology must distance itself from the Platonic dualism between the body and soul, the similarity between Christianity and Platonism in at least distinguishing the body and the soul cannot be ignored.²⁹

The German philosopher Ernst Bloch, influenced by Marx and Hegel, saw all of society moving together toward a glorious destiny. Jürgen Moltmann set forth Bloch's views in the biblical language of eschatology. No longer is the individual important, but humanity as a totality is in a state of becoming. Salvation for the individual comes in associating himself with the unfolding of history. This happens when man associates himself with the forsaken and the downtrodden in the world. Jesus in his suffering and death represents the true humanity. Man can realize the image of God within himself by transcending the present life and anticipating the future. What the future will bring takes the place of the traditional concepts of what God has already done in Jesus. The theology of hope itself evolved into the theology of liberation in which mankind, through sometimes violent means, brings about his glorious destiny.

The New Testament view that the church is God's newly established humanity in Christ has been replaced with the view that all of humanity is pushing forward to a glorious future within the dimensions of this earth. This view has adherents among South American Roman Catholic clerics, and its political goals are recognized as similar to those of Marxism. Part of the same milieu has arisen in the theology of Wolfhart Pannenberg, with whom the term "theology of history" is connected. Man is defined not by theology but by biology, sociology, history, and psychology. Man in union with Jesus Christ is able to shape his environment and in a sense control his destiny as he presses on to his goal in God. This is consummated in the resurrection of the dead. The otherworldly dimension of the New Testament, early church, and Reformation hope is missing here.

VI. Practical Implications

Even without a consciously defined anthropology, each person understands himself and his relationship to others in a certain way. Christian anthropology sees man not only as God's creature, but as the one resembling him. Though man's communion with God is disrupted by sin, it has been reinstated in God's redemption of man in Christ.

This perspective is important for Christians, and it has particular significance for pastors. Our relationships with other people determine our views about them. Within a family, people are viewed as parents, children, or siblings. In the world,

²⁹ See *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, articles on πνεῦμα and ψυχή (vv. 6 and 9), where such thinking is prevalent.

they are viewed as sellers, buyers, employers, or employees. There is the division between the teacher and the students, between those governing and the governed. All these relationships are temporary (Gen 2:24). Since Christian anthropology is shaped by the redemption, the Christian looks at man not within these earthly relationships, but from the perspective of God (2 Cor 5:16). The Christian, especially the pastor, looks at others not from the perspective of what they can do for others, for the church, or even for God. He sees them as persons in whom God, because of his creation and redemption, has an investment. Sin as the intervening factor in man's existence can no longer be the solitary factor in assessing a person's worth. The redemption of mankind is a universal factor involving every human being, even though he or she may be ignorant of it or may have rejected it (2 Cor 5:19). Human nature's depravity is visible. Faith is required to believe in spite of what is seen and experienced. The individual has value not only to God but to others.

Thus the Christian following Christ's example embraces sinners in his fellowship. Jesus saw all men, regardless of their rejection of him, from the perspective of his atonement. He prays to God to forgive his tormentors, because he sees all men as already forgiven by his cross. He must affirm the very purpose of his redemptive death. Through God's revelation in Christ through the Scriptures, the Christian shares Jesus' view of others. This determines his behavior to others, even to those who are not of the household of faith. This anthropological perspective determines the character of Christian preaching.

The preacher understands his audience as those who have been created in God's image and lost it and have now been redeemed in Christ. The law and the gospel are directed to man in this contradictory relationship to God, wherein man is fully accountable for his sin but at the same time completely redeemed in Christ. Preaching makes man aware he is a sinner and God's redeemed child in whom his image is being restored. The contradiction in man does not lie in his being body and soul, but it lies in his nature as a sinner and a saint. As a sinner, man is without origin and destiny. His future is shrouded in hopelessness and anxiety over death. In Christ, he becomes aware of his divine creation and is destined to live with God forever.

Even though the Christian view of man with its doctrine of original sin is pessimistic about the potential of human nature, it is optimistic about what man can become in Christ and in a certain sense has already become. The incarnation demonstrates that the fallen human nature is not beyond redemption and can be put into a permanent relationship with God. The incarnation is the promise of what mankind can and does become in Christ. Just as the entire human race was present in Adam, so it is also present in Christ and thus accepted by God. This is objective justification.

According to human ethical standards, people can be judged to be morally good or evil, and this judgment can be made in degrees. In Christ, God accepts all and the categories of good and evil in *this* perspective are no longer valid. This does not mean that the Christian is amoral as he operates in this world, failing to distinguish between right and wrong. It does mean that God has solved man's basic sinfulness. In Christ, he has restored mankind.

Thus the Christian looks upon his fellow human beings as embraced by God's redemptive love in Christ and not only as sinners. Like Christ, he becomes *indiscriminate* in regard to race, ethnic background, language, religion, customs, and laws, but he also does not see some as being more sinful than others. All are sinners, but all are redeemed in Christ. The Good Samaritan becomes the model for Christian behavior because he makes no distinction in regard to race or religion in helping the stricken traveler. The priest and Levite make a distinction and show they understand neither God nor man, who is created in his image.

Secular anthropologies which have permeated modern thinking in the twentieth century have, in removing God as a factor in understanding human nature, necessarily avoided the question of the afterlife. This unanswered question has resulted in an inordinate interest in human health and prolonging human life through extraordinary means, to the point of extreme pain and discomfort of the sick and dying. Some find evidence for the afterlife in the experiences of those who have been revived after near death.

The validity of these experiences is uncertain and inconclusive. The ancient Greek philosophy in placing all of human existence in the soul may have downplayed the human tragedy of death, but it did emphasize correctly that life in this world was not ultimate. Christianity can never revert to the exalting of the soul, but in an age of materialism it does have an obligation to emphasize that man does have a life which continues after death and the body's decomposition. This life with God and Christ is superior to what can be experienced on earth. The biblical concept of man's life as a pilgrimage to a higher form of existence has a place in the center of Christian thought. As man looks forward to a higher life, first at death and finally at the resurrection, he is not relieved of his responsibilities on earth. These responsibilities do not come to him as a command of the law, but from his acquired self-understanding that the image of God, once lost, is now being restored in him to care for the created universe. The world, which is under the curse brought by man's sin, will also share in his redemption (Rom 8:19–24). Now man can live

and work in this world in the confidence that God will include him and the entire creation in the final consummation.³⁰

³⁰ Readers may want to note that this essay was submitted to replace another one that was rejected, and was accepted by the editors of *Confessing the Gospel*. It was then rejected. For an account of how these things happened, see my *Surviving the Storms* (Fort Wayne: Luther Academy, 2018), 189.