

Special Study

The Biblical View of History

This statement precludes any attempt at being creative while discussing the crucial problem of the Old Testament attitude toward history. Neither of the terms - history nor philosophy, were utilized by the Hebrews.

In any adequate statement it would be imperative that we ask—"what constitutes history?" The designed task in the following pages is to point out the correlative factors of the Hebrew concept of God, Exodus, Election, Covenant, the Servant of Yehweh as the focii of Israel's theology of History."

No attempt shall be made in this statement to discuss the *supposed* variety of concepts of history involved in the motives of the early narratives, The Prophets, The Deuteronomic Historians, The Post exilic Prophets and Apocalyptic interpretation of history. (Daniel, Ezekiel, etc. - this is adequately stated in a chapter by Millar Burrows, "Ancient Israel" in a composite volume edited by Dr. Dentan - *The Idea of History in The Ancient Near East*; and in *The Old Testament Interpretation of History*, by C. R. North. The theses of these works can be answered by elimintary knowledge of the Logic of Science involved in a supposed scientific view of history.)

I shall not labor a defense of the major presupposition of this paper which is the uniqueness of "Israel's Faith." This thesis is maintained by Albright, Rowley, Wright, *et al.*, and I have basic security following scholars of their repute. But the Word of God asserted the uniqueness of Israel's Faith long before any of these internationally famous scholars were born.

No basic advance could be made in a discussion concerning a "theology of History" until we obtained common agreement as to the nature of historical knowledge and the problem of objectivity. The question is—Is *History* a Science?

The question of Historical Relativism and the quest for an absolute standard is settled in this paper by affirming the absoluteness of Israel's Faith. What is the origin and ground of perpetration of this Faith? The Old Testament unmistakably declares that the people of Israel were in possession of revelation from God! This historical revelation is the origin and them in "Events" as well as verbally (i.e., the events were interpreted in The Scriptures). The word of God (I use this phrase in a generic sense. There are several Hebrew words

for the word - but *dabar* carries this implication and means both word and event!) The Events in which Israel's salvation history rested are to be discussed in this paper. Israel was committed to Yahweh; for he was the sovereign God of the universe and His will was being worked out in spite of their freedom to rebel against Him.

The monotheism of Israel is the foundational element in their understanding of history. God manifested Himself in Nature via the great creative events. That the events occurred no one would seriously challenge but the explication of them are beyond any scientific scrutiny. In Israel's thought these were never merely datum; they were datum plus the interpretation of Faith in Yahweh as their God.

The uniqueness of Israel's understanding of God has been and still is challenged by competent scholarship.

A thorough consideration of this subject would take us far beyond the total bounds of this essay, but we shall enumerate some of the hypotheses regarding the source of Old Testament monotheism.

The various elements involved in our cursory considerations all hinge upon Israel's belief in Yahweh as sovereign of all the universe. To know (*Yadah*) God does not signify knowledge obtained via discursive reasoning, but rather an experimental knowledge.

The Wellhausen school maintains that pre-mosaic religion in Israel had been polydemonism. Archaeological investigation repudiate the affirmation that Near Eastern religions sank to such levels. They were polytheistic in character. A study of pre-history and Ethnology would be imperative in an adequate study; because the concepts of so-called primitive peoples are purer than those of their neighbors already engaged in agriculture and cattle raising.

Albrecht Alt's position is that Polytheism is the foundation of worship in ancient Canaan (his most famous pupil, Martin Noth's *History of Israel* is imperative for this school of study.) The "loca numina" were amalgamated with Yahweh in the process of time. This thesis does not consider the crucial point how was the gap bridged from Polytheism to Monotheism. (Journal of Biblical Literature, January, 1958, Part I, Volume LXXVII.)

This monotheism cannot be the result of a peculiar Semitic racial genius. Israel could not have received Monotheism from

neighboring nations simply because those nations did not have it themselves.

A consideration of the age of the documents and the stage of development of the concept of God can never eliminate monotheism from the Old Testament documents or from the "Faith of Israel." The contemporary attitude is based upon the most recent archaeological and Linguistic research and from this datum the historical aspect is reconstructed and the theological articulation is explicated.

There were many monotheistic currents in the ancient orient, but these can never explain Israel's early monotheism.

The Babylonians had many gods with Marduk at the apex after the time of Hammurabi. The thought that Marduk could be god exclusively was wholly foreign to the Babylonian manner of thinking. (For fuller treatment see *Theology of the Old Testament*, P. Heinisch, The Liturgical Press, 1950, England, translated by Heidt, p. 61-64; also *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, W. F. Albright, 1957, p. 178-9.)

The Canaanites, the Egyptians, and The Persians all show progressive deterioration in relationship to a full monotheism as seen in Israel.

The issue is succinctly stated by G. E. Wright—"the nature of deity worshipped is the basic consideration upon which all other considerations rest." (*The Old Testament against Its Environment*, G. E. Wright, Alec R. Allenson Inc., Pub. Studies in Biblical Theology, 1954, p. 16). In polytheistic theology a new god in the pantheon meant a new helper; in the theology of Israel any inclination to a different god implied apostasy from the true faith. The history of Israel from Moses till the end of the Babylonian exile, and even after the exile, is the history of monotheisms' struggle to win acceptance.

The strength of Yahweh was known by Israel because He had chosen them to be His people. At this juncture it became apparent that the three aspects of Exodus, Election, and Covenant are inseparably bound. These are independent yet, intrinsically bound together. These factors are different perspectives of the great event which made Yahweh Israel's God and Israel Yahweh's people. In these factors Israel's unique Philosophy of History becomes apparent only by "Faith." This fundamental notion could never be subjected to empirical scrutiny. Therefore, the attitude of Israel toward history must be approached with this in mind.

Israelite tradition universally connected the Exodus with the work of Moses. During this period - Israel - by faith, accepted God's call - *The Election*, *The Exodus*, and *The Covenant* became the whole fabric of their existence. (The multiple implications of these aspects of Israel's Faith are discussed in Pederson's *Israel*, p. 19ff, Wright, *Biblical Archaeology*, p. 58f, Ricciotti, *The History of Israel*, pp. 167-229, and Jacobs, *Old Testament Theology*, pp. 183-226 and Köhler, *Old Testament Theology*, pp. 59-82.)

The former sceptical attitude toward the Exodus narrative can no longer be maintained. Now it is the fundamental issue in Old Testament Theology. Yahweh became the God of Israel and the issue is not which god, but as Wright so aptly says—"The issue is not the careful weighing of the various merits of the god. It is rather, who is God? Decide on the evidence and act accordingly! What is evidence? It is the evidence of history. What God has the power to do what he wills, and to fulfill what he promises? (*Old Testament Against Its Environment*, G. E. Wright, p. 43.)

The confidence of Israel's Faith in Yahweh could have its origin only in the Exodus events themselves. (The contrast of attitudes toward the place of the Exodus in Old Testament studies can be appreciated by examining the *History of Israel*, Oesterly and Robinson, Vol. I, pp. 69-96 (now seriously dated work); Lod's *Israel*, part II, *The Hebrews Before Their Settlement in Palestine*, pp. 151-209, and Albright's, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, pp. 13-15.)

The nature of this brief statement forbids discussion of the validity of the Patriarchal narratives. (Since the work of R. de Vaux, these scriptures are accepted as historically accurate—even by negative critics. See the profound chapter, *Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age*, a lecture delivered by H. H. Rowley in 1949 in the John Rylands Library found in the volume *The Servant of the Lord* by H. H. Rowley, Lutterworth Press, 1952; and *The Journal of Semitic Studies*, Manchester University Press, Spring, 1962, J. C. L. Gibson, *Light from Mari on The Patriarchs*, pp. 44-62; C. H. Gordon, *Introduction to Old Testament Times*, Ventnor, New Jersey, chp. 8 - "The Patriarchal Age," pp. 100.) But they play a vital part in the background understanding of Election in the history of Israel. Israel became a chosen people in Abraham - if the patriarchal narratives are correct; the covenant became a reality at Sinai during the time of Moses.

The reign of God over Israel began in Election and the response of the people to the grace of the covenant.

The Election was grounded in *hesed*. The chosen people were so because of God's purpose not for priority. Wright calls Election the clue to an understanding of the Old Testament. Many of Israel's confessions were grounded in this fact (Amos 2:9-11; Micah 6:2-5; Ezekiel 20:5-7).

Israel's concept of her mission finds its origin in the purpose of God for all mankind! In the Election, God chooses Israel. Freedom is granted only in the acceptance or rejection of *The Covenant*. God's election is not like the arbitrary caprice of despot; it is always directed toward a precise end and this end is the salvation of man. The obligation of election is service, and this involves faithfulness to the covenant which shall be discussed later. Israel distorted her election by a feeling of superiority and by forgetting her mission. God's righteousness and justice demands that they comply to the stipulations of the agreement, or swift punishment will ensue (exile, etc.). It is for this reason the doctrine of the remnant appears in the prophetic literature.

The very possibility of punishment for rejecting the covenant implies the sovereign power of Yahweh. This sovereign reign of God is of vital importance in later prophetic literature for the purpose of showing God's purpose will always be done in the universe - ultimately. This doctrine is of crucial importance for the Old Testament philosophy of history. H. H. Rowley's statement strikes at the central problem of the relation of response to election—

The Servant of Yahweh is a single figure without parallel in the Old Testament. He is chosen for his service, and his response to his election is complete. Others at whom we have looked sometimes responded and sometimes did not respond to their election. But always election and response in service and loyalty belong together, and the final repudiation of the service is equally the renunciation of the election. He who responds feels that he can do no other than respond, for he feels the constraint of the Divine call. Yet they who fail to respond are the evidence that election does not really turn man into a puppet and sweep away his will. Many are called, but few are finally chosen, because few there are who finally respond to the choice. (H. H. Rowley, *The Biblical Doctrine of Election*, Lutterworth Press, London, 1952,

page 120; this is by far the most adequate statement concerning the election in English that I know anything about. Jacob Jocz's work on *The Theology of Election* is also a must. For a brief statement regarding New Testament doctrine see *Scottish Journal of Theology*, December, 1958, p. 406. The calvinistic conception of Predestination is an attempt to speak to this problem. The resurgence of the heresy of universalism is an attempt to speak to the problems involved. Neither Calvinistic exclusivism nor Universalisms inclusivism represent the Biblical doctrines involved).

This paves the way for the covenant in relation to election. These concepts are really very similar, at least historically, but in reality to keep the covenant is to acknowledge election. Rowley's fine chapter on Election without covenant points this out clearly. For this reason Israel's election is not founded on blind favoritism but conditioned by their faithfulness to the covenant. The History of Israel shows that election was not for preferential treatment but service. God's providential control of the nations manifest that election without covenant was a living reality in the history of Israel. (This distinction is met in the two words *hesed* and *hen*. The first was covenant love and the second was love outside of the covenant, cf. book of Ruth for both uses.)

The Assyrians, Babylonians and Egyptians, etc., all performed the purposes of Yahweh in punishing Israel for her apostasy. In the individual sphere there was great variety of election outside of covenant, cf. Nebuchadrezzar, Jeremiah 25:9, Cyrus, Isaiah 40:1ff, and Pharaoh, Exodus 4:21 and 9:12. These references point to a distinction of election and covenant in the nations over against Israel.

Wright affirms that Israel's election found expression in the Sinatic covenant. This pointed to the unique relationship that Israel had with Yahweh. This unique relationship was the perspective from which they viewed the purpose of God to the ends of the earth. This relation was conditioned and the prophets repeatedly claimed that the conditions were unfulfilled, therefore, the place of the remnant is vital!

The significance of the covenant idea cannot be exaggerated. Yahweh, the creator of heaven and earth had elected Israel to service and the foundation of this service was conditioned by the covenant.

Only the idea of covenant (for a popular presentation see Wright's *The Challenge of Israel's Faith*, Chicago University Press, 1944, pp. 72-81. Köhler's *Old Testament Theology*, pp. 60-74; The greatest document in English covering this idea is Pedersen's, *Israel*, pp. 263-335; Mendenhall's *Idea of Law and Covenant in the Ancient Near East*; Bright's *The Kingdom of God*, first part; Eichrodt develops three great volumes of Old Testament Theology around the concept of covenant, *Theology of the Old Testament*, German original 1933, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1961. J. Barton Payne's recent work on *The Theology of The Older Testament*, Zondervan, 1962 - builds the entire work around The Covenant Concept. Also George A. F. Knight, *A Christian Theology of The O. T.*, John Knox Press, 1959; and T. C. Vriezen, *An Outline of O. T. Theology*, Massachusetts, Charles T. Brandford Co., 1958. These will do to show the emphasis on the Covenants in contemporary theological discussions. Does it not seem strange that almost no one is aware of The Restoration Movement and its biblical emphasis on the Covenant distinction)? The Covenant concept makes it possible to understand that love of God, His righteousness, His grace, and His salvation; it alone makes comprehensible the character of sin. This explains the central place which it occupies in the Theology of the Old Testament.

Köhler's work is a mixture of both old and new wine. In his section on covenant his beginning paragraph states that the covenant was given in a polytheistic framework because Yahweh is a proper name distinguishes him from all other gods. This point cannot be established technically.

God is always responsible for this agreement. Israel is free to accept or reject the covenant but they have no part to play in determining its content.

The covenant is with "The People" and not an amalgamation of individuals. Köhler's emphasis on the collective needs the qualifications given by Wright. The individual was not completely absorbed in the collective whole. The fundamental passages dealing with covenant in Exodus and deuteronomy speak in the singular. The Decalogue is written in the singular, and if it is the basic content, that Köhler, at least, needs to rephrase his emphasis. The people is not a limited community as a quantitative community it includes the children of the promise. Every obedient individual could come under covenanted relationship with Yahweh.

This point provides entrance into the last phase of our brief study--The Servant of Yahweh. Who is the Servant of Yahweh? What place does he play in the history of the Covenanted people? How does he fit into the Old Testament Philosophy of History? What part does he play in the purpose of Yahweh?

We must pass by the eschatological factors involved in the Old Testament Philosophy of History. If space permitted we would need to explicate "The Day of Yahweh," "time and eternity in the Old Testament vocabulary," "Judgment," etc.

The question of the identity of *The Suffering Servant* has received extensive treatment. (See H. H. Rowley's three chapters 1, 2, and 3, in *The Servant of The Lord*, pp. 3-88; Klausner's *The Messianic Idea in Israel*, pp. 153, 157, 162-168; Mowinckel's, *He That Cometh*, trans. Anderson, pp. 187-257; The finest statement in English is North's, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*--the entire book is a historical survey of Theories of The Servant. These negative critics refuse the inspired New Testament identification of The Servant in Acts 8:32-35. See Karl-Heinz Bernhardt, *Das Problem der alterient alischen Königs Ideologie im Alten Testament*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1961. See also publishers E. J. Brill, Leiden for the definitive work on *Sacral Kingship*.) We must face the question - Was Israel in any sense--the suffering servant? This is the apex of Hebrew thought in regard to her philosophy of history. If Israel is the servant (in any sense of the phrase), then the issues discussed in this paper fit neatly together. God elected Israel and she became a covenanted people, and Israel's part of the covenant was an obedient life or one of service. This service involved the purpose of Yahweh for all mankind. The throne of the King became the point of perspective for Israel's view point of history. Her purpose was God's purpose and God's purpose was the salvation of fallen man. God's loving kindness *Hesed* was foundation for the demand for righteousness. Righteousness made peace possible, and Yahweh became victor over the powers of darkness--not by sword or armies, but via Israel doing His will which was for the *purpose* and not *privilege*. In a profound sense Israel's entire obedience to Yahweh's will was involved in her faith that God had chosen, called and covenanted them for a universal purpose. If this be not so, then Israel's faith is inexplicable. This faith is beyond the grasp of empirical methodology and her interpretation of each phrase involved in her history--Exodus, Election, Covenant and Suffering Servant, etc.,

cannot be subjected to scientific examination. These events were actual historical phenomena, but their significance (their biblical interpretation) could have come only by Revelation!

Some Basic Problems of The New Testament View of History

The ground of correlation between the Old and New Testament datum concerning history is that one must stand within the faith (or be a non-Christian) in order to accept the Christian meaning of God's redemptive events centering in the person of Christ.

The central problem of a Christian Philosophy of History is - how can God be revealed through temporal events? How can the relative disclose the absolute? How can time be a vehicle for eternity? How can Jesus be the bringer of the reign of God? How can a process universe sustain the Christian affirmation that God did something in a divine event which is once for all? This paradoxical situation must find correlation, but where and how? Is our attitude toward history summed up in Kierkegaard's "Absolute Paradox"? We must give a categorical - No! Before and since Anselm's "*Cur Deus Homo*" men of keen insight sought an answer, but few have attained even a comprehension of the magnitude of the problems involved.

The noun history does not occur in the New Testament. The verb *historein* occurs only one time in Galatians 1:18, but here in it is used with its Hellenistic meaning - (to visit in order to get acquainted with) and does not imply what historiography signifies by the term. (For a history of Historiography see Fitzsimmons-Pundt-Nowell's, *The Development of Historiography*, The Stackpole Co., 1954. For an excellent discussion concerning the problem of historical relativism see Mandelbaum's *Problem of Historical Knowledge* and J. V. L. Casserley, *The Christian in Philosophy*, pp. 120-138-200-211,214-215.)

The form-criticism (see the works of Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*; and R. Bultmann's *Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition*; B. Easton's *The Gospel Before the Gospels*; V. Taylor's *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* are indispensable in studying "Form-Geschichte analysis." This is the leading European and American negative theory of analysis.) approach was a necessary development in the problem of the Gospel records. Historical relativism progressed to a historical scepticism. The presupposition that the faithful community

had interpreted the Christ event and that these interpretations are found in the records is a vital aspect of the general problem.

From this general attitude scholarship moved to one of denying that the historical Jesus could be ascertained. Now we can see the perspective of the contemporary "Heilsgeschichte" (see Albert Schweitzer's classic, *The Quest for the Historical Jesus*, and C. C. McCown's, *The Search for The Real Jesus*; see the recent work of Eric Rust, *Salvation History*, John Knox Press, Richmond, Virginia, 1963; his *Toward a Theological Understanding of History* is due from the Oxford University Press later this fall. Dr. Rust is a mediating Southern Baptist Scholar). method which recognizes that the records were written by those within the Faith, therefore, the records are articulations from the perspective of the faith bringing Gospel.

The Eschatological Message of the New Testament and Its Relation to a Christian Theology of History

The New Testament is unified by the affirmation that Christ is the bringer of The Kingdom of God and that He came in the fulness of time. (Gal. 4:4 - "hote de ēlthen to plērōma tou chronou exapesteilen ho theos ton huion autou genomenon ek gunaikos genomenon hupo nomon." "But when the fulness of time came, God sent forth his son, becoming of woman, becoming under law, . . ." Also for a survey of concepts of time see W. Lewis's *Time and Western Man* and Callahan's *Four Views of Time in Ancient Philosophy* Note also the unique development by all existential and process interpreters, especially P. Tillich's *Systematic Theology*, Vol. I.

The Greek New Testament contains two words for time, *chronos* and *kairos*, in the Galatians passage the term *chronos* appears. A problem arises from the Biblical language concerning time and eternity. This particular issue is part of the broader problem which we shall examine in this paper—that of a comprehensive doctrine of Eschatology. A thorough study of this area would provide us with the datum of a Theology of History from the Biblical perspective. (I found the most penetrating volumes to be Danielou's, *The Lord of History*, Regnary Press, Chicago, 1958; E. Rust, *The Christian Understanding of History*; and Cullmann, *The Early Church*, Westminster Press - this is not the volume mentioned previously under Eric Rust's name.)

Several New Testament words are involved in the vocabulary of a theology of History. *Hour* is a vital word in Johannine

terminology and it is set over against the infrequent use of time, *kairos*. (For a complete examination of Old and New Testament words for *time* see F. H. Brabant, *Time and Eternity in Christian Thought*, Bampton Lectures, 1937; O. Cullmann's *Christ and Time*; J. Marsh, *The Fulness of Time*; and James Barr, *A Biblical Theology Document on the Biblical Vocabulary of Time*.)

The *kairoi* falls into two basic areas. One speaks of the last (*eschatos*), and the other speaks of the end (*sunteleion*). The New Testament shows that the last time of God's decisive action began and ends in the coming again of Jesus Christ. *End* implies three basic meanings of the Christian scriptures—cessation, final period, and outcome. These all carry great significance for a Christian understanding of history. The Greek words for everlasting and eternal (*aion - aionios*) imply Christ-filled time not uncharacterized duration.

Plato taught Western Philosophy to contrast time with eternity. Such an antithesis is alien to biblical thought in so far as the contrast rests on a philosophical conception of either term. The coming of Jesus Christ into the world has marked the close of one age (for development of the concept of the two ages from Daniel forward see H. H. Rowley's *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, Lutterworth Press, 1955.) and the beginning of another. That Jesus is the event which is the center of history and its source of a significance is the point of contemporary discussion.

What is God's relation to history and how is He related to history? This is the contemporary problem of the relationship of the immanence to the transcendence of God. If the relation is perceptible only through faith, then we can see the continuity of the Old Israel's faith, and the New Israel's faith via the Lordship of God in Christ. What is involved in the reign of God which judges the past and present by the future? God's reign came in a manner which cannot develop, or be in process, or be a product of this world. The kingdom is both present and future in the same manner that the Pauline doctrine of salvation is past, present, and future.

The Kingdom of God has been interpreted in three basic ways. It has been interpreted as exclusively future, and that the sole function of Jesus was to announce its coming. In the second instance the Reign of God is exclusively present and men are invited to join it, and realize its reality in their own

Christian experience. The third position affirms that the Kingdom is already present, but hidden, and its ultimate realization is still to be consummed in a future act of God. From this basic analysis we see four vital questions. Did Jesus believe that the end of the world was imminent? (For affirmative answer and contemporary bibliography see W. Kümmel's *Verheissung und Erfüllung*; and R. H. Fuller's, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus*, particularly the first three chapters, pp. 9-77). Most scholars of the present generation would hold this view, but it is contrary to the biblical data. Did Jesus really believe that his death would usher in the end of the world? This was Schweitzer's position, but even negative critical scholars reject this today. Did the early disciple believe that in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ the Kingdom had dawned? This position finds its chief advocate in C. H. Dodd. (C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its development*; *The Parables of the Kingdom*, make use of Dodd's new edition - not 1936 edition. But note basic change concerning his "Realized Eschatological" view in his commentary on John; see also *The Festschrift to C. H. Dodd, Eschatology and Background to New Testament Thought*, Cambridge University Press, 1956.) Like most other emphasis there is a basic element which is true, but it distorts clear and textually credible passages, or precludes them from discussion altogether. Did Jesus himself believe that with his activity and his person the Kingdom had already come? Most recent New Testament scholars would admit this contention against Schweitzer.

The variety of theological methods produce differing interpretations concerning biblical eschatology. The apocalyptic interpretation separates the future hope from the past acts of God in history as recorded in scriptures. The ecclesiological-sacramental interpretation affirms that the Church is regarded as the place where time is eliminated by the sacraments.

The individualistic eschatology is extensively formed in Protestantism, and confines the "Last Things" to individual survival after death. The cosmic eschatology of the scripture is either left in background or abandoned.

The rediscovery of the biblical doctrine of The Kingdom of God aided in the movement from individualism to interest in spreading the Kingdom. Eschatology is an expressing of the urgency of missions.

The dialectical tension between (*telos*) and (*eschaton*) is brilliantly expounded by Niebuhr. (For Niebuhr's views see *Faith and History, Nature and Destiny of Man* and Robert E. Fitch's article on philosophy of history in R. Niebuhr, *His Religious, Social and Political Thought* ed. by Charles W. Kegley and R. W. Bretail. Niebuhr cannot correlate time and eternity because he rejects the incarnation as an historical or temporal event; see also Emil Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of The Church, Faith and the Consummation*, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1962.) Reinhold Niebuhr has contributed more than anyone else in America to a Christian understanding of the historical order. Niebuhr discusses the Biblical doctrine of history as rooted in two ideas. First, the idea of universal history over which God is sovereign and through which his purpose is attained. Secondly, history testifies to man's misuse of his freedom and his consequent denial of the Lordship of Christ by becoming a god. He repudiates all progressivism which envisages man inherent ability to irradicate all the negative factors of his environment. Niebuhr affirms one of the three general areas of eschatology already mentioned, that of the presence, yet future aspects of the kingdom of God.

The Christological eschatology is represented by Karl Barth. God has revealed his nature through a series of mighty acts, the greatest of which is Jesus Christ as the mediator of God. He repudiates all secular and philosophical attempts to understand the course of history. His concept of Revelation is vital to his teaching about history - only God can define his purpose, and this is done via the Christ event. We know God and history only when God breaks through in Christ according to Barth.

Barth accepts the New Testament Eschatology as valid for our day. This he was able to do by interpreting eschatology or eternity as the absolute transcendent which stands in radical antithesis to time. Here there is no end of history and no future advent of the Kingdom of God for the end is always equally at hand. Today Barth shows dissatisfaction with his older approach in his *Römerbrief*. Dr. West shows brilliant insight into Barth's concept of Biblical History.

The anthropological-existential exposition of eschatology comes from R. Bultmann. The eschatological message of the New Testament needs to be demythologized according to Bultmann. Bultmann utilizes Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit* as the basis

of his existential analysis of man. This anthropological position is the foundation of his hermeneutics! Bultmann's ultimate conclusion is that man is history. (See R. Bultmann's Gifford Lectures, *The Presence of Eternity or History and Eschatology* for a clear statement of his redefinition of history; also *Kerygma and Myth*, ed. Bartsch.) The real significance for Bultmann is the existential choice which decides man's destiny in the present. This decision to accept this new life is eschatological. His position is one of the approaches to the New Testament around which a great controversy now rages—the "Heilsgeschichte" and of "Existence."

Negative Scholars affirm contradictory variety of New Testament teaching, but if they would attempt correlation of the factors, as they stand, without rejecting other biblical features merely because they do not fit into their apriori-framework, then they supposed contradictory character of the data would be dissolved. (Danielou, Lord of History, Lowith, *Meaning in History*, Cullmann's *Christ and Time*, see also his *Immortality of The Soul or Resurrection of The Dead*, p. 17, where he affirms that he wrote *Christ and Time* intending to propagate *Heilsgeschichte* and instead scholars thought he wrote about time and eternity. See also F. V. Filson, *Jesus Christ the Risen Lord*; Wilder, *New Testament Faith for Today*; and Dawson's, *Dynamics of World History*, Sheed and Ward, New York.) The apriori of the New Testament framework is Faith or commitment to the Lord of History. This does not reduce history to anthropology as Bultmann does *a la* Heidegger.

The Pauline doctrine of eschatology contains most of the factors which are isolated by the various articulations mentioned. The two major points not discussed elsewhere are the two ages (I Cor. 10:11, *telē tōn aiōnōn katentēken*) and the idea that history is a battlefield between satanic powers, (see particularly the *Colossian Epistle*) and the redemptive activity of God. We shall conclude this survey by deliniating the view of history implicitly and explicitly maintained in *The Revelation*.)

The Theology of History in The Revelation

Jesus Christ has own final victory over Satandom! The Lord of Glory appeared to John "on the Lord's Day" (chp. 1:10). This was the day of His victory over sin and the grave. The entire book is intended to make the eschatological character of the

resurrected Christ stand out in all its glory. (See the excellent insights in Dr. Merrill C. Tenny's, *Interpreting Revelation*, chp 12. The Christology of Revelation, pp. 117. The Prologue: Christ Communicating (1:1-8); Christ in The Church (1:9-3:22); Christ in the Cosmos (4:1-16:21); Christ in Conquest (17:1-21:8); Christ in Consummation (21:9-22:5); The Epilogue: Christ Challenging (22:6-21).

The basic division of the book which relates "the things that thou sawest," the things which are," and the things which are about to occur" (1:19) provide us with the framework for a Christian view of history which asserts the fulfillment of the will and purpose of God for His entire creation.

The Lamb of God is the executor of the will of God. The Revelation moves from the first century (or period of Roman Persecution) to the consummation. The Slain Lamb is standing presiding over the unfolding of history. At no time, even when evil intensifies, does The Lamb of God fail to be sovereign over the entire creation (note the passive form "was given" throughout the Revelation).

The coming again of Christ, the final resurrection, the judgment, the subjection of the powers, are all involved in a Christian view of history. The *pleroma* (fulness) of Christ's victory is vividly asserted in John's imperative - "come (*erchon* - present imperative form) Lord Jesus" (Rev. 22:20). Even a banned prophet (John on Patmos) knew that the victory had been already gained and he could endure the suffering knowing full well that ultimate victory was his through Jesus Christ - The Lord of History! (See the excellent, suggestive study by Stanislas Giet, *L'Apocalypse et l'histoire; e'tude historique seer l'Apocalypse johannique*. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1957).

"Come, Lord Jesus"!

Note: *History and Dialectical Materialism*

The Leading Contemporary contender with the Christian View of History is Dialectical Materialism (communism). This view maintains that man will eliminate all negative social factors when private property (the cause of *all* social evil - so asserts Marxism) becomes state or community owned.

The best single volume interpreting the Marxist view of history is still M. M. Bober, *Karl Marx's Interpretation of History*, second revised edition, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1948.

For an excellent survey of Russian views of history see, Anatole G. Mazour, *Modern Russian Historiography*, second revised, D. Von Nostrand Co., Inc. Princeton, New Jersey. Dr. Mazour discusses views of history from the 18th century through the Marxist view of History, good bibliography - p. 252.

The present author is preparing a 150 page "*Annotated Bibliography on Communism for Christian Students.*" The subject of history will receive more extensive treatment there.

For further study on the philosophy of History and the Challenge this area brings to our historically grounded Faith, see—

F. P. Gooch, *History and the Historians in the 19th Century*, Longman Green and Co., 1913. General background of the Marxian era.

Patrick Gardiner, editor, *Theories of History*, Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1959. This is a book of readings in historiography and critical studies. Excellent - raises the question which historians have pontificated about, but have produced no adequate argument. Is History a Science?

Karl Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1957. A brilliant criticism of the totalitarian doctrine of historical inevitability (*a la* Marxism, Evolutionism, etc.)

Marxist Philosophy of History stands in irreconcilable tension with the Christian view of History (specifically the view delimited in *The Revelation*).

Note: Dr. John McIntyre', *The Christian Doctrine of History*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1957. This is a fine outline study of some of the central issues for a Christian Theology of History.

Any view of History must clarify and defend its attitude toward historical *explanation, causation and fact*. This has not been done by Dr. McIntyre or anyone else committed to the unique phenomenon of Biblical history. What are the problems of the logic of historical explanation (see following notes and bibliographical data for direction in reading material).

Christians must maintain that there have been unique events which have occurred in space and time, i.e., incarnation, etc. What does the most behavioristic logician say about "unique historical phenomenon"? We can not here consider probability theories of explanation and prediction, but we can know that many things in the scientific world approach the probability of (0 based on classical probability theory the scope runs from 0 to 1), yet are actually true; therefore, no necessary and sufficient attack can be made on the biblical claims just because they are highly improbable. The contemporary rejection of the validity of *Induction* is also a must area for serious Christian Apologetics. Karl Popper's *Logic of Discovery*, and his *Conjectures and Refutation* are imperative works for advanced study in this area. The present author has just finished attending Dr. Karl Popper's seminar: *Special Problems in the Logic of Science* at Indiana University (the spring semester 1963). Since the collapse of Newtonian Physics and the falsification of the claim that water is a compound of hydrogen and oxygen (H O), the

Logic of Induction has been under the most severe criticism. Both of the above claims (Newtonian Physics and water as compound, and other similar claims) had vast inductive evidence to support their assertions, but they are now known to be false, inspite of the mass of inductive evidence. There is no known escape from this *Dilemma of Induction*. Among top flight Logicians of Science the problem of Induction is presently receiving intense scrutiny. The problem of Induction is a central problem of the Logic of historical explanation, prediction, and postdiction (and also retrodiction). The outline of Dr. McIntyre's work might be helpful in providing directions for further thought and study.

CONTENTS

| <i>Chp.</i> | | <i>Page</i> |
|-------------|---|-------------|
| | Preface | v |
| One | History and Doctrine | 1 |
| Two | History and Definition | 13 |
| Three | History and Necessity | 20 |
| | A. Time | 22 |
| | B. Geography | 25 |
| | C. Socio-economic Origin and Status | 26 |
| | D. Human Self-Interest | 29 |
| | E. Inner Dynamism | 31 |
| Four | History and Providence | 35 |
| Five | History and The Incarnation | |
| | A. The Incarnation as Fulfilment | 45 |
| Six | History and The Incarnation | |
| | A. The Incarnation as Fulfilment (contd.) | 61 |
| Seven | History and The Incarnation | |
| | B. The Incarnation as Redemptive and Recreative | 77 |
| | C. The Incarnation as Creative | 80 |
| | D. The Incarnation as Prespective | 82 |
| | E. The Incarnation as Integrative | 91 |
| Eight | History and Freedom | 94 |
| | History and Memory | 102 |
| Nine | History and Structures | 107 |
| | Short Bibliography | 116 |
| | Index of Names | 117 |
| | Index of Subjects | 119 |

Note: *The Biblical View of History and Scientific Historiography*

It is imperative that those of us committed to Biblical Christianity come to grips with the claims of so-called *Scientific-Historiography* with respect to the biblical records. This is one of the three areas of *Christian Apologetics* which call for immediate attention in *The Bible Colleges*.

For the best single *introductory volume* in the English Language - see Ernest Nagel, of Columbia University, *The Structure of Science: Problems in the Logic of Scientific Explanation*, Harcourt, Brace, and World, New York, Inc., 1961, chp. 15 - *Problems in the Logic of Historical Inquiry*, pp. 547.

William Dray, *Laws and Explanation in History*, New York, 1957 - excellent, indispensable! Editor M. F. Ashley Montague, *Tonybee and History*, Boston, 1956. This work is made up of critical studies of Tonybee's attempt to establish Laws of History.

An understanding of the problems of historical causation, historical fact, historical explanation (necessary and sufficient condition as vital issue in the logic of history), the genetic fallacy (i.e., if one knows the origin of a concept, then one can therefore explain it.) This particular problem needs examination in view of the negative critical attitudes toward the biblical records. The issues of history and the biblical records can by no means be reduced to the fact that liberal theologians reject many biblical claims, and that conservative theologians accept the Bible as the very word of God. The Bible makes claims that are either true or false. If the Biblical claims are in harmony with the actual state of affairs, then actually they are true, if not they are false. (We are not here implying that the Bible contains false assertions). We cannot permit ourselves to side step the ultimate problem by taking up the escape position of *Heilsgesichte-geschichte*. The biblical records are either right or wrong! An understanding of *The Logic of Historical Inquiry* is imperative, if those of us how love the Word of God, as life itself, wish to give defensible answers to the negative critical reconstructions of Old and New Testament Literature by von Rad, Bright, Albright, Martin Noth, *et al.*, and the New Testament by Bultmann, *et al.*

We are vitally concerned with the problem of History and The Revelation! Does the apocalyptic form of this work preclude it from historical accuracy, and valid assertions about the culmination of human history? We thank God that we can give a categorical - No! to this question.

Note: *Handel's Use of Texts from The Revelation in The Messiah*

G. F. Handel's oratorio was composed in 1741 in 24 days (from August 22 - September 14). It was first performed in Dublin, Ireland, April 13, 1741.

Handel's *Messiah* was written on the basis of the *prophecy, promise and presence* of the Messiah. The first part covers *The Advent* on Christmas season; the second part covers *The Passion* or the

accomplishment of salvation through the redemptive sacrifice of Christ; the third part instructs us in the most moving manner about the Resurrection. Handel employs four pages from *The Revelation* - Chorus 44 - Revelation 19:6; 11:15; 19:16; Chorus 53 - Revelation 5:12-13. The beautiful Hallelujah (this word is composed of two Hebrew terms meaning praise Yahweh) Chorus contains phrases and message from chapter 19:6 and 16, and 11:15.

See number 44 Chorus page 193 in Schirmer, Inc., New York edition of G. F. Handel's *The Messiah* for use of the following passages from *The Revelation*.

Rev. 19:6 - "Halleluia because our Lord God the almighty reigned (*ebasileusen* - 1st aor. indicative)."

Rev. 19:16 - "King of Kings and Lord of lords."

Rev. 11:15 - "The kingdom of the World became the kingdom (not in Greek text but implied) of our Lord and of his Christ and he shall reign unto the ages of the ages."

Rev. 5:12 - "Worthy is the Lamb having been slain to receive the power, and riches and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory; and blessing."

Rev. 5:13 - "the blessing and the honor, and the glory, and the might unto the ages of the ages."

Special Study

The Theme of Conflict and Victory in *The Revelation* and The Dead Sea Scrolls

The best single source which examines the theme of *Conflict and Victory in The New Testament* is Ragnar Leivestad, *Christ The Conqueror*, Macmillan Co., New York, 1954. This excellent study is controlled by the Scandanavian hermeneutical principle of "Motif Research," and therefore must be used with care by the uninitiated in technical theological issues. For the critical and discerning mind it will open up vistas of New Testament research which will produce great preaching materials.

One of the key theological words in *The Revelation* is *nikaō* - victory. The term is used twenty-seven times in the entire New Testament, and seventeen times it appears in *The Revelation* (Moulton-Geden - *Greek Concordance of New Testament*, pp. 665-666). The victory attained by The Lamb of God is available to all obedient, faithful followers. The Bible can, of course, speak of victory and conflict without using either term directly. The victory of Christ stands in irreconcilable contrast with the