

Volume X Number 1

Spring 1987

KING'S

Theological Review

The Playwright as Theologian: Peter Shaffer's <i>Amadeus</i> <i>Colin Gunton</i>	1
What is Changed in Virtue of Christ? <i>Anthony Baxter</i>	5
Ambiguity in the Marcan Narrative <i>Francis Watson</i>	11
Pentecostal, Charismatic or What's in a Name? <i>Graham Baldwin</i>	17
Theology in Anthropological Perspective? <i>Christoph Schwobel</i>	21
BOOK REVIEWS	26
FACULTY NEWS Insert	

WHAT IS CHANGED IN VIRTUE OF CHRIST?

ANTHONY BAXTER

Christians commonly speak along lines that in virtue of Jesus Christ, *change* occurs in, a difference is made to, people's situation. After and because of Christ, people are or can be in some favourable state, open to "salvation": whereas previously they were not so placed. Language of this character pervades the New Testament. And such language is prominent in subsequent presentations of Christian faith, including in utterances today.

Particular systematic accounts of Christ's function and identity tend to invoke some large-scale scheme of understanding as to what this change in people's situation comprises. By the same token, particular accounts of the Godhead in relation to our race, of being human, and of salvation or again eschaton, tend to incorporate some such scheme of ideas regarding change.

If a particular soteriological, christological, anthropological or theological account depends on a certain conception of change in people's situation which itself lacks cogency, that account is undermined.

In the first section of this article, I identify three familiar schemes of thought as to the change in people's situation which occurs in virtue of Christ; and I indicate why – in my estimation – none of these thought-patterns is satisfactory. In the second section, I sketch certain features of the outlook I myself commend.

As an aid to focusing, four further preliminary remarks are in order.

(i) We do well to be alive to the associations and the variety of usages of the word "change" in ordinary, non-theological contexts, so as to be sensitive to what is said in theology. As regards the noun "change", notions of "difference", "succession", "substitution of one thing in place of another thing", and "alteration in the state of a thing", spring readily to mind; and many further refinements in analysis are possible.

(ii) In noting common Christian speech, I have used the vague phrase "change occurs in people's situation". We must inquire of any systematic exposition, *which class* of human beings is envisaged as in the altered, favourable condition in virtue of Christ? Believing Christians (church members), and only them? Every human being living subsequent in history to Jesus? All human beings throughout world history? If the last of those replies ("all humans throughout world history") is given, we can perceive that the question here arises in markedly acute fashion, in what sense were human beings ever in an *unfavourable* condition, *from* which – because of Christ – *change* to the favourable condition occurred?

(iii) Over the last two thousand years, human beings at large and indeed church-goers have variously engaged in personal selfishness, in mass-slaughter of their fellows, and so forth – as did people in the preceding millenia. "Not too much in our world looks to have changed for

the better since Jesus was in Palestine: and throughout human history things have been pretty bleak", so the hard-headed commentator may say. For some, such a train of thought counts decisively against being a Christian at all. Now the present article does not offer an apologetic, or a theodicy. Probing here is within Christian faith. Trust that some fundamental, all-sufficing good lies open to human beings, stemming from God and attributable specifically to Christ, is indeed highly demanding. Such trust can easily waver. However, I do not accept that to seek understanding within the terms of that trust is as such a mark of glibness or inauthenticity.

Of course, where it is affirmed in faith that in virtue of Christ people are differently, favourably situated as compared with before, queries can certainly be raised of the form: Is the favourable dimension experientially discernible here and now? Or for us humans is its experienced actualization a totally future, perhaps supra-historical, reality? Or what?

(iv) Given use of locutions in the vein "through Christ, change occurs in people's situation", we constantly need to be alert to how far or in what sense one or another such locution is to be construed as an assertion about reality. Issues concerning (degrees of) obliqueness in religious discourse, knowledge, reality, adequacy in theology and so on have particular crystallizations in the area we are examining. I myself regard as the proper overall stance a form of qualified realism.

I. THREE FAMILIAR PATTERNS OF THOUGHT

Here in turn are three schemes of thought familiar, at least in outline, within theological treatments.

A. The "Restoration of Primeval Perfection" pattern

Christians have often put matters thus. Over the span of history, three stages have occurred in human-divine relations. A long time ago, at stage one, there were human beings in a flawless, perfect relationship with God. Then there was a catastrophic dislocation of things as between human beings and God, which left all members of the human race in a wretched situation. Amidst the existentially manifest bad features of this situation, its gravest and most fundamental element was that everyone was from their earliest moment cut off in some objective fashion from grace-filled, wholesome relationship with God. This wretched situation comprised stage two. In virtue of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, people are or can be restored to a position as good as, indeed even better than, the situation humans were in at stage one. This position, which in some sense is objectively already available even if it is not yet fully complete, is stage three. So, through Christ there is a radical change in the basic texture of human-divine relations from stage two to stage three, both those stages being specified in terms of a primeval stage one when human-divine fellowship was perfect.

Now it is an error, in my view, to treat assertion that there was such a primeval stage one as among the essential tenets of Christian faith. Thus it is wrong to insist that Christ effected in people's situation a change whose

definition involves assertion of such a primeval first stage. I have the impression that comparatively few serious contemporary theologians, when the matter is directly before them, express dissent from the view I here endorse. And I do not take space in the present article defending this view.¹

What does require attention is the scale of the adjustment in conceptualization needed, if no assertion is made of such a primeval stage one. It is not *simply* a question of regarding the opening of Genesis as a mythical story rather than history: and the word “Adam” in Paul as indicating humans generically rather than a specific figure. Or again, a question of depicting human life’s proper pattern as growth, through education, from childhood to maturity – with sympathy in this context for Irenaeus over Augustine. Or again, a question of seeing Christ as intrinsic to God’s “original” (eternal) purpose for humans – with sympathy here for Scotus over Aquinas. More than all those things, it is improper to hinge notions that God created human beings, and that creation is good, on the actuality long ago in the primeval mists of perfect human-divine relationship. And the whole practice of asserting Christ’s work to be at root that of restoring a *status quo ante* should be abandoned. If it is not claimed that in the past there was intimate friendship between human beings and God which then came to be radically fractured, it may not fittingly be claimed that Christ’s fundamental role lies in the *return* of such friendship: the reconciliation – in that strict sense – of human beings to God. (Allowance for specific lapses on people’s path towards full closeness with God and each other, relative to which there can indeed then – in a strict sense – be reconciliation, is a different matter.)

Often, analytical expositions have *relied* (apparently) on the assertion, the claims, just criticized; and theories of Christ’s atoning work and Christ’s person have been explanations of how or why such restoration occurred. Although today a broad array of theologians avoid explicit commitment to there having been a primeval perfect stage in human-divine relations, not as large a number, I think, squarely face the corollaries of refraining from such assertion.

A further point may be added. If in a contemporary account a theologian enlists phraseology of “restoration” and “reconciliation”, and, while somewhere remarking that such discourse is notably oblique or figurative or narrative, still leaves his or her audience with the supposition that an actual primeval perfect stage is essential, that theologian is failing, so it seems to me, in an important responsibility.

We must, indeed, take evil, sin, and the radical deficiencies in people’s current relationship with God and with each other, very seriously. As part of this, we should recognize that particular generations affect at many levels their descendants: hence there is scope for things worsening through the ages. I hold that one can, as a Christian, take evil, sin, suffering and incompleteness with all due seriousness, without structuring one’s broad theological outlook round metaphysical speculation as to how or why these sombre aspects of the human condition are as they are: around, that is, a theodicy.

Identified next is the second familiar pattern of thought as to the change in people’s situation that occurs through Christ.

B. The “Enclosed Stage/Salvation Stage” pattern

Christians sometimes put matters thus. There are two stages in human-divine relations. In the first stage, before Jesus, human beings were without access – in some objective sense – to wholesome relationship with God and each other. They were enclosed within egocentricity and destructiveness. In virtue of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, a fresh stage began, in that people now have access to the mode of relationship with God and each other which God purposes: in other words, they have access to salvation. What people now have access to is expressible in terms of Kingdom and eschaton. And this reality is – in some sense objectively – already initiated and available, even if it will not be fully complete until the final climax. So, through Christ there is a radical change in the basic texture of human-divine relations from the first to the second of the thus defined stages.

An illustration of this way of putting matters may be helpful. We may refer to Walter Kasper’s book *Jesus the Christ*.²

Kasper seems disinclined strictly to maintain that human-divine relations were once perfect, and that this situation was ended in some comprehensive, metaphysically-formulable way by a specific primordial sin.³ Hence Kasper’s work is not a clear-cut instance of the Restoration of Primeval Perfection scheme of concepts, as in A above.

A prominent train of thought in the book *Jesus the Christ* runs as follows. Historical human beings are “in a perpetual vicious circle of guilt and revenge, violence and counter-violence” (56). “There is an almost ‘natural’ momentum belonging to the history of sin: it becomes increasingly enclosed within a vicious circle” (205). People cannot attain peace, freedom and life of their own unaided resources (73). Kasper goes on: “If nevertheless there is to be any salvation, it will require a new beginning, someone who will enter into this situation and break through it” (205); “liberation from the present state of alienation is possible only as a result of an underivable new beginning within history” (204). According to Kasper, Jesus Christ constitutes this new beginning within history. “Through the Incarnation of God in Jesus Christ the disastrous situation in which all men are caught up and by which they are determined in their innermost being is changed. It has broken through at one point and this new beginning from now on determines anew the situation of all men” (205). “By entering into the world in person as the Son of God [Jesus Christ] changes the situation of everyone. Every man’s living space acquires a new dimension . . . Jesus Christ is now a part of man’s ontological definition” (205). “The eschatological reality granted in Jesus changes the objective situation of all men, and makes it possible for all men to enter that new reality by faith and baptism” (156). “A completely fresh start . . . is necessary. This new element, which did not exist before . . . [and] which God alone can provide . . . is what is meant by the Kingdom of God” (73): and it is

introduced at a particular point in history by Jesus Christ.

When Christians put matters in the vein here isolated, they appear – on any ordinary construal – to be claiming that prior to two thousand years ago human beings were entirely without access to wholesome, salvific, relationship with God: whereas because of the Christ event, people living since then do have access to salvation, the Kingdom. Given a claim of that character, inquiry is needed as to whether the objectively changed situation is conceived as directly affecting every person chronologically after Christ (including for example Tibetan Buddhists themselves knowing no more about Jesus than did their Chinese predecessors in the years before Jesus' life); or whether it is conceived directly to affect only Christian believers. (We may notice that a claim of the present character has certain affinities with assertion of the historical actuality of stage two, then followed by stage three, under pattern A above.)

The Christian teacher may find it tempting to make a claim of the character just displayed. With such a claim, one is equipped to provide a simple, vivid exposition of the human condition and the person and work of Christ – an exposition into which assorted New Testament expressions, taken at face value, can seem easily to fit.

However, is it theologically responsible to make such a claim?

I myself hold, within Christian faith, that God's gracious gift of himself is present to all human beings throughout world history from their earliest moment; and that all human individuals, if they conscientiously respond to what is of value – other than their own particular selves – can be on the path of growth towards full knowledge, love and closeness with God. Put differently, the individuals can be on the path of growth towards definitive salvific communion with God and as part of that with other people. Such growth can in one way or another – and only by God's grace – be occurring, even if the persons at issue do not explicitly recognize what is going on. This tenet to which I adhere receives support from many quarters, including from Vatican II.⁴ If human-divine reality is indeed thus, then it is incorrect to assert that concretely existing human beings have ever been situated without access to salvation: and that Christ effected a change from such a situation to a situation where people do have access to salvation. Hence the above-displayed claim about a change of this sort two thousand years ago cannot stand.

Just now I observed that the way of putting matters isolated under B (Enclosed Stage/Salvation Stage pattern) appears, on any ordinary construal, to contain a claim that prior to two thousand years ago human beings were entirely without access to wholesome, salvific, relationship with God. However, a theologian might conceivably deploy *phraseology* of the kind under B, while regarding himself or herself as advancing not that claim, but one out of two other possible theses. In the interests of careful analysis, we should advert to these possible manoeuvres.

A thesis could be propounded that in the case of every human being in world history, during the first part of the individual's life he or she is entirely without access to

grace-filled, salvific, relationship with God, whereas in the second part of the life there is such access. The thesis, in other words, comprises an assertion that there is a historically located change in the objective situation of all human beings, somehow due to Christ. But instead of treating such change as a single occurrence two thousand years ago, the thesis rather treats the change as happening at some moment in the history of each person in turn.

If a theologian were to be advocating this thesis, it would be important that he differentiate it clearly from the claim considered above. Such a thesis does not, in any event, seem to me cogent.

The other stance a theologian might adopt is this. In so far as there is use of phraseology in the vein that at one stage human beings were without access to salvation and then at a later stage, in virtue of Christ, they have access, such locutions are not to be taken as a relatively straightforward assertion (in either of the versions noted) about human-divine reality, or ontology. The locutions are not to be taken as asserting that at one historical phase concretely existing human beings actually did not have access to God's gracious saving work, and that at a later phase the situation changed. Rather, utterances about people without access to salvation denote a *conceivable* state of human beings, a state people *would have* been in *but for* Christ, but a state which has never in fact been concretely realized. Or the theologian might put the position a bit differently, and observe that utterances containing the phraseology indicated are simply a highly indirect, figurative, perhaps story-framed, way of exposing diverse facets of our continual, ongoing, condition within history.

Where a theologian adopts a stance along these lines, the following comments may be made among others. If in a reflective setting a particular speaker intends his utterances to be taken in some such manner, he should make this abundantly evident, not leave his audience in the dark. A person who does seek so to employ the phraseology indicated has major tasks on hand showing how utterances here at issue relate to various *other* things the person is liable to say. These other things may include both what seems to fall under a rubric such as "christology", and what seems to fall under the rubrics "epistemology" or "connexions between language and reality". A question arises, for example: In the reflective, systematic context at stake, are *all* utterances to be taken as having that degree of indirectness, or only some: and if only some, how does one tell which? In my own estimation, the manoeuvre of talking reflectively for today in the vein that human beings were once without access to salvation and that Christ effected a change from that state, while intending such talk to be taken as counterfactual or as highly figurative, often leads to more obscurity than illumination.

A further word concerning Kasper may be appended. The reference to him was simply to provide one example of a certain style of putting matters. There is no further exploration in this article of how the sentences quoted from *Jesus the Christ* are to be understood and how they link up with assorted other sentences in that book. Fully to do justice to Kasper's suggestive text would take a protracted study. However, it should be noted that in the

course of *Jesus the Christ* Kasper makes a range of statements whose joint compatibility it is arguably difficult to discern, while he himself does not acknowledge – let alone resolve – such difficulties.⁵ We ought, perhaps, to be cautious about dignifying that intellectual situation as apt use of coordinate models in order partially to disclose what ultimately is ineffable mystery. It *may* be that Kasper cannot here be acquitted of theological confusion.

C. The “Uniformity in Basic Texture” pattern

Partly in reaction against perceived deficiencies of thought-patterns A and B, theologians sometimes incline to putting matters thus. The basic texture of human-divine relations has been uniform, constant, throughout history. God has invariably been present and active within human beings, seeking to elicit response from them. (Phrases used by the writers at issue to characterize such invariable divine presence and activity severally include divine “grace”, “Spirit”, “word”, “self-communication”.) In so far as people do respond positively, relationship between themselves and God develops, and they are en route to the fullness of salvation. In the life of Jesus, such human-divine relationship was at the highest level of development that occurs or indeed could occur within history: and that peak level within history *only* occurs in the case of Jesus. People subsequent in history who attend in faith to Jesus – that is, Christians – can learn, gain knowledge. They can learn about God’s style and purposes, in that these are reflected in Jesus without the sinful, obstructing elements which clog the rest of us. And they can learn what a total human response to God and peak historical relationship with God consists in, and can proceed to emulate this example. These people’s motivation to respond positively is thus enhanced. In the upshot, their relationship with God within history is liable to flourish more than it otherwise would. (Various utterances about Jesus’ resurrection and about the eschaton are prone to be accommodated within this general mode of expressing matters.)

Given this way of putting matters, how is the question “What is changed in virtue of Christ?” to be handled? The basic texture of human divine relations is homogeneous, constant, through history: it undergoes no change in virtue of Christ from anything it has ever been. The changes bearing upon the last two thousand years as compared with what went before can be summed up as just twofold. (i) There has actually existed a human being whose relationship with God was at the highest pitch possible within history. (ii) People who attend in faith to this human being, Jesus, have the opportunity of going through an intellectual or psychological process which is richer or deeper, at least in practice and relatively speaking, than is otherwise available. Hence they have the opportunity of more flourishing in relationship with God than otherwise within history is at hand. (Some thinkers, of course, take a “lower” outlook again, and regard Jesus as merely one among a number of world religious leaders: and likewise, Christianity.)

It can be tempting to settle for this thought-pattern (C), with its apparent simplicity, manageability, and allowance for assorted modern views. Such a thought-pattern can prove discernible behind a variety of theological labels – “Hegelian”, “liberal”, “process”, “transcendental”, and so forth.

However in my judgment thought-pattern C, taken on its own, signally fails to do justice to the relevant theological sources and indeed to reality. Some of the considerations prompting this judgment are adduced in material I have written elsewhere.⁶ If the series of points sketched in the ensuing section of the present article is accepted, the rationale against settling for thought-pattern C comes into focus.

One other remark may be added. It was said above, when thought-pattern C was introduced, that theologians sometimes *incline* to put matters thus. That formulation leaves room for the fact that one or another concrete theological treatment, while approximating to the type identified under C, may also contain traces of further elements.

We have surveyed three conceptual schemes concerning what is, or again is not, changed through Christ. Various influential accounts of Jesus’ person and work, of being human, and of the Godhead, have been couched – broadly at any rate – in terms of one or other of these schemes. If – as I judge – none of these schemes can appropriately be employed today (at least in so far as any relatively strong correlation between concepts and reality is posited), the problems to be faced as regards the basic structuring of christological and related thought are large. A sense that clear-sighted perception of the state of the issues here is not widespread provides my reason for devoting so much space in this article to highlighting these issues.

II. SOME POINTS TO BE AFFIRMED

I now indicate, under five headings, some of the positive points which in my view should be affirmed in the area at stake. In the present article there can only be bald, summary expression of what are in fact constituents of a complex, wide-ranging outlook. Steadily believing all these things to be so is liable to stretch a person to the utmost limits of faith and trust.

1. Single economy of salvation: yet unfolding in different phases

On the one hand, fundamentally there has only been one single economy of salvation, which God purposed from the outset for the human race: an economy centred in Christ. There was not some original preferred plan which was comprehensively dislocated, such that Christ – as agent in a second-best remedial plan – radically alters the direction of divine-human relations back to a course they were once on. Hence at this fundamental level, the answer to the question “What is changed in virtue of Christ?” is “Nothing”. (That is to say, at this level no change occurs from an *actual* contrasting, prior situation. Those who wish can try to speculate on a query “What difference does Christ make to what *would* have been the case had God *not* provided a single saving economy centred in Christ?”. However, I am not myself convinced of the fruitfulness of such speculative endeavours.)

On the other hand, it may fittingly be conceived that God puts his single overall plan of salvation into effect in

various phases, such that with a particular phase, there can be a genuinely *new* element or set of elements in history from what was before. In that sense, there can be change. (For what is new in the historical phase subsequent to Jesus, see under headings 3, 4 and 5 below.) Along with that, the notion of God doing specific acts within history should be retained. In these ways, the texture of human-divine relations is not uniform through history.

2. From radical shortfall to the destination God purposes

In the case of all human beings in history, at the start of their lives they fall radically short of what God ultimately purposes, destines, for them. They are enmeshed in disharmony, evil and sin. They oppose, in states of blindness or perversity, the divine will. The impact of these tendencies in one generation can then make things worse for later generations, down through the ages. At the same time, all human beings are from their earliest moment the locus of God's self-giving presence and activity. Provided people respond positively to God, they are transformed – by divine grace – such that, in relationship with God and each other, they become what God purposes them to be. This is how God freely, lovingly, deals with his human creatures. Jesus Christ is *central in this process, and in different respects causative of whatever transformation emerges*. The climax of this transformation, the fullness of salvation, lies beyond the grave. In varying ways and degrees there can be *some* “advance” transformation within history – even though it is here never more than fragmentary.

Thus from this angle, the question “What is changed in virtue of Christ?” is to be answered in the terms, “All the positive transformation, change, which occurs in people's lives throughout history is, in one respect or another, in virtue of Christ”.

3. Jesus the optimal case: attention to him yields knowledge

We fittingly employ, I think, three key, complementary and irreducible ways of portraying Christ's role and identity. One of these is as follows.

The life of Jesus of Nazareth comprised, uniquely, the highest case possible within history of the kind of human-divine relationship God ultimately purposes for all. Moreover Jesus was drawn by God through death to the definitive fullness, completion, of human-divine relationship – the first human being to be so drawn.

These things being so, people who attend in faith to Jesus can obtain knowledge, or revelatory disclosure, concerning God's dealings and what they themselves are called to; they can be stimulated to respond, treating Jesus as a model; and they can thereupon by God's grace grow in relationship with God. Such opportunities amount to more, at least in practice and speaking relatively, than is otherwise available.

This mode of portrayal throws some light on how the position within history from the time of Jesus onwards is changed, compared with what it was before: and how

those who attend in faith to Christ are better placed than they otherwise would be.

(The points just set down under this heading, *if* they were taken by themselves, would resemble certain points in thought-pattern C above, “Uniformity in Basic Texture”.)

4. Explicit sharing in Christ's life: a distinctive, fresh reality

Another of the three key ways of portraying Christ's role and identity is this. Jesus' journey through history to the point of crucifixion, and then through death to risen life with the divine Father, is such that other people can in some real fashion share in, be caught up into, this journey: share in Christ. They can share in his suffering and death, and thereby share in his risen life in relation to the Father. To say that is of itself to ascribe to Jesus Christ a “more than individual”, “inclusive”, personality. This participation in, incorporation into, Christ occurs in a distinctive personalized form only in so far as people consciously attend in faith to Christ, take after Jesus in practical orientation, and enter into the life of the church community. Putting this point in other words: human beings who attend in faith to Christ and seek to follow him (as under heading 3 immediately above) do not simply undergo a certain intellectual or psychological process, focused on a figure “Christ”. They are actually involved, in an ongoing, transcendent and personal manner, with the totality of Christ's existence – in his relationship with the Father. To be thus involved with Christ is *as such* – by God's power – to be transformed in a distinctive way or degree in the direction of the definitive fullness of salvation God purposes. It is to be created anew: or again, to be sanctified. This explicit, personalized form of involvement with Christ, and the associated transformation, is a notable – albeit in practice only fragmentary – anticipation within history of the final climax, the fully realized Kingdom. The involvement and transformation are a reality to which the words “objective” or “ontological” apply.

This mode of portrayal throws further light on how, subsequent in history to Jesus and because of him, there is a distinctive, new phase in the passage of God's saving economy towards its culmination: a phase in which only authentic Christians directly take part. The arrival of this phase, with its overt openness to the absolute future, is a change within history relative to what went before. And for particular individuals generation by generation, joining in can be a striking change from their previous experience.

It will be appreciated that the outlook I am expounding combines both various universal elements, and certain elements which can seem to attribute a “scandalously” high, particular, status to Christianity.

5. Jesus, distinctive embodiment of God's movement towards human beings

The other key way of portraying Christ's role and identity is this. Jesus distinctively embodies and manifests a gracious initiative, movement, from God to human beings in history. While we must avoid suggesting that God, loving and personal as he is, was objec-

tively absent from human lives in the millenia before Jesus' birth, nonetheless we should affirm that the divine movement towards our race was distinctively enfleshed and shown forth in the life of Christ.

This movement embodied in Christ is in a crucial sense *prior* to the divinely-fostered movement *from* human beings *to* God which stands more prominent under my headings 3 and 4.

On account of this divine presence in Christ, people who attend in faith to Christ can obtain distinctive knowledge, or revelatory disclosure, regarding God and God's character; they can be prompted to respond; and they can thereupon come towards God in a fashion not otherwise available.

This mode of portrayal throws yet further light on how the position within history from the life of Jesus onwards differs from what went before; and how those who attend in faith to Christ are better placed than they otherwise would be.

While the specific focus of the points respectively under headings 3, 4 and 5 varies, the reality at stake is unified: a reality comprising newness in history after Jesus from what was before. There are, I would argue, some intimations of matters under these three headings in what we may reconstruct as Jesus of Nazareth's own teaching, style and consciousness.

Amplification of the points I have sketched in the

second section of this article brings in certain far-reaching understandings about knowledge, language and salvific advance. It brings in also ideas regarding God, time and history. Moreover, to enlarge on the points sketched is as such to elaborate notions about the Godhead in relation to human history which warrant the term "trinitarian".

Precisely how the points assembled under headings 1 to 5 all cohere together may perhaps not be as straightforwardly discernible as one would wish. But in any event, one should in faith trust that reality itself is integrated. And one should hold on firmly to each of these points concerning what is, and again what is not, changed in virtue of Christ.

FOOTNOTES:

- This article was originally a paper presented to the Heythrop-King's Systematic Theology Discussion Group in May 1986.
1. One writer who elaborates well certain aspects of the viewpoint endorsed in the text is G. Daly, in "Theological Models in the Doctrine of Original Sin", *The Heythrop Journal*, 13 (1972), pp. 121-142.
 2. *Jesus the Christ* (London: Burns and Oates 1977).
 3. Such disinclination emerges amidst remarks on p. 204.
 4. E.g. *Lumen Gentium*, art 16; *Gaudium et Spes*, art 22.
 5. For instance, compare the utterances at pp. 156 and 204B of *Jesus the Christ* quoted in my text with utterances at pp. 255 and 266-268 about the Spirit at work everywhere and associated salvation.
 6. See "The term 'archetype', and its application to Jesus Christ", *The Heythrop Journal*, 25 (1984), pp. 19-38; and "How is Christ's risen life relevant to other people's salvation?", *The Heythrop Journal*, 28 (1987), pp. 144-164.

CAMBRIDGE

Medicine, Miracle and Magic in New Testament Times

HOWARD CLARK KEE

This book sketches and illustrates in detail the range of understandings of the human condition and remedies for ills that prevailed when Jesus and the apostles – as well as their successors – were spreading the Christian message and launching Christian communities in the Graeco-Roman world.

168 pp. 0 521 32309 6 £19.50 net

Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 55

Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles

A Sociological Approach

FRANCIS WATSON

In this book Francis Watson questions the adequacy of interpreting Paul from the perspective of the Reformation, arguing that if his texts are understood sociologically rather than theologically, many long-standing problems are resolved.

258 pp. 0 521 32573 0 £22.50 net

Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 56

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 2RU