

University of St Andrews



Full metadata for this thesis is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by original copyright

SOME ASPECTS OF THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN
SICKNESS AND SIN

THESIS
by
Chong Kah-Geh (B.Th. Singapore)

Presented to
The University of St. Andrews
In Application for the Degree of Master of Theology
July 1967

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the following Thesis is based on the results of research carried out by me, that the Thesis is my own composition, and that it has not previously been presented for a Higher Degree.

The research was carried out in St. Mary's College, the University of St. Andrews.

Chong Kah Ceh

Supervisor

**Dr. D. Calder Moir, L.R.C.P. and
S., M.B., Ch.B., B.D., S.T.M. -
Lecturer in Divinity**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| ABBREVIATIONS | VIII |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Some Primitive Views | 3 |
| Babylonian | 3 |
| Hindu | 6 |
| Egyptian | 8 |
| Greek | 9 |
| Jewish | 14 |
| II. SIN AND SICKNESS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT | 17 |
| Terminology | 17 |
| The Fall of Man | 24 |
| Sin Rooted in the Heart of Man | 26 |
| God's Power over Man's Heart | 28 |
| Sin - Inborn or Universal | 29 |
| Sin as Sickness | 31 |
| Sickness - The Visitation of God | 33 |
| Sickness - The Work of Satan | 34 |
| Sickness - The Punishment of God | 36 |
| Sickness - An Indication of Individual Sin | 37 |
| Sickness - Not Pointing Directly to Sin | 38 |
| Sickness - As Suffering Shared by Many | 41 |
| Sickness - As Cause of Death | 42 |
| Sickness - Psychical or Physical | 45 |
| Sickness and Healing | 46 |

VI

| | Page |
|---|-----------|
| III. PROVIDENCE AND SUFFERING IN THE OLD TESTAMENT | 49 |
| God's Good Creation | 49 |
| Some Suffering Figures | 53 |
| Collective Suffering | 60 |
| Disciplinary Purpose of Suffering | 62 |
| Suffering as Enrichment | 63 |
| | |
| IV. SICKNESS AND SIN IN THE NEW TESTAMENT | 66 |
| a. Sickness and Sin in the Gospels | 66 |
| b. Christ's Healing Works | 73 |
| The Wholeness of Man | 74 |
| The Healing Miracles | 77 |
| Healing - An Act of God | 79 |
| Healing - An Act of Salvation | 81 |
| Healing - An Act of the Messiah | 83 |
| Healing - An Act of Faith in Christ | 85 |
| Healing - An Act of Exorcism - to Establish the Kingdom of God | 92 |
| c. The Problem of Demon-Possession | 99 |
| d. Sin and Sickness in the Apostolic Church | 112 |
| Sickness - Its Satanic Origin and Its Educational Purpose | 112 |
| Sickness - A Punishment for Sin? | 115 |
| Concern for the Sick | 118 |
| e. Healing in the Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Age. | 120 |
| All Healing is of God | 120 |
| The Authority and the Gifts of Healing | 121 |

VII

| | Page |
|--|------|
| V. THE GENERAL BIBLICAL VIEWPOINT | 127 |
| A Summary of Previous Chapters | 127 |
| VI. SOME THEOLOGICAL CONCEPTS TODAY | 145 |
| Karl Barth | 145 |
| Emil Brunner | 171 |
| Reinhold Niebuhr | 183 |
| VII. PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS | 196 |
| Sin and Guilt | 199 |
| Some Factors of the Original Guilt-feeling . . . | 202 |
| Super-ego | 202 |
| Guilt and Fear | 205 |
| Guilt and Anxiety | 211 |
| Conscious and Unconscious Guilt | 214 |
| Psychological and Legal Guilt | 215 |
| The Value of a Sense of Guilt | 217 |
| Guilt, Morality, and Sex | 220 |
| Guilt and Responsibility | 224 |
| The Awareness of Guilt-feeling | 228 |
| The Treatment of Guilt | 234 |
| VIII. CONCLUSIONS | 242 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 257 |

ABBREVIATIONS

- I.C.C. International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1895 -- eds. Samuel Rolls Driver, et alii.
- CD Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, eds. G.W. Bromiley and T.F. Torrance. 12 Vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1936 --
- E.R.E. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. ed. James Hastings, 13 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1908-1926.
- NEB The New English Bible.
- NT The New Testament.
- OT The Old Testament.
- RSV The Revised Standard Version of the Bible.

INTRODUCTION

Zoologists and physicists agree that disease came into existence on this planet much earlier than human creatures.¹ Men were born into a world where various sicknesses were ready to seize every opportunity of attacking men's bodies. Though men have natural healing power to prevent and resist attacks from some kinds of disease, this natural power has never been sufficient to render men immune from illness.

As long as disease remains in the world, sickness and suffering will remain part of human life. Men have to face the pain and the tragic end of death caused by disease. Men are proud of this present age in which science and medicine have done noble work in the prevention and cure of disease. Sickness has been defeated and reduced, and to a great extent, men are free from harmful diseases. When a man is ill, a doctor can be called to treat his illness by his professional medical science, and the sick person will frequently recover from his illness. Although through the ages sickness has been treated by various means and seldom without success. It was only when science was able to trace cause and effect that the effective treatment of illness became a reality.

Long before medicine was used in a scientific way, primitive people had their own notions regarding the cause of illness.² Primitive men attributed sickness to two main reasons, namely, the visitation of the anger of god or gods, and the activities of demons

¹Leslie D. Weatherhead, Psychology, Religion and Healing (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1963), p. 27.

²C.G. Jung, Modern Man in Search of a Soul (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1947), pp. 144 ff.

or evil spirits.¹ The primitive man's concept of god was mainly based on the fear of natural phenomena which he believed were causing him suffering in one way or another. The storm that burst, the lightning that struck the earth with its fire, the terrible rattling thunder, the whirlwind and earthquake that brought devastations on earth, the wild animals and the poisonous snakes that suddenly attacked men, all of these were regarded as signs or powers expressing the anger of god or gods, or the evil acts of demons. Especially these things happened when gods were displeased with men. In order to win the god's favour and to calm his anger, the tribal laws were produced and strictly obeyed among the tribes; sacrifices and offering were practised. In order to cast out the demons, they employed witches, magicians, sorcerers and priest-physicians. Charms, spells, incantations and drugs were used to deal with the sick. Cases of mental sickness, insanity, epilepsy and psychosomatic cases were commonly believed among the ancient Babylonians, the Egyptians and some other orientals to be demon possessions. Three trepanned skulls uncovered at a cistern at Lachish which were dated eighth century before Christ, showed that a surgical operation was practised in dealing with a case of epilepsy.²

Primitive man normally experienced a sense of guilt when attacked by illness, thinking that he must have done something wrong against his cultic laws or rituals or against the spirits. The fear of god, fear of demons, fear of natural phenomena, fear of sickness and fear of death, caused men to feel guilty. To quote Weatherhead's words, "fear is the painful nub of guilt, and what with the legacy of pri-

¹C.G. Jung, op. cit., pp. 146 ff.

²The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick et al., (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), Vol. I, p. 847.

mitive man and of our own parents and teachers it is easy to understand the power which guilty feelings have over us."¹ Of course, not only primitive men suffered from disease, but also every man of every generation. What applied to men in primitive society also applies to modern men and the civilized society: Sickness and a sense of guilt still go hand in hand.

Some Primitive Views

Babylonian

The Babylonian's concept of sin fell mainly into two forms, namely, the religious sin and the ethical sin.

Some of the gods or deities of Babylonian tribes were worshipped as quasi-divinities or semi-gods. Religious rituals and ceremonial regulations were compulsory for the Babylonians. Shrines were erected for their gods; animals, foods and crops were offered according to their tribal laws. There were certain types of food assigned to their gods which men were not allowed to partake of. There were also certain places kept merely for the accommodation of their gods where men were prohibited to enter. It was a great offence if one should eat a forbidden food or touch a holy place, for these were taboo. The ancient Babylonian was sometimes examining himself concerning his guilt-feeling (unconscious violation of the ceremonial

¹Weatherhead, Psychology, Religion and Healing (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1963), p. 321.

From this confession we get a view of the moral concept of the ancient Babylonians.

Probably the ancient Babylonians suffered from the same disease as the present Babylonians (the inhabitants of the plains of Mesopotamia) do. According to R. Campbell Thompson's investigation, plagues like dysentery, typhoid,¹ malaria, smallpox and the like were common in ancient days. When one got sick the demon which was believed to be possessing his body, had to be expelled before the sick could be healed.² Hence, the healing act of casting out a demon could not be differentiated from magic. The situation was left to the priest and sorcerer who were called to treat the sick.

Among the priests in ancient Assyrian, a common method used to treat the sick was the rite of atonement.³ In its performance, a young pig or a hen was offered as an expiation for the demon who possessed the sick, so that the demon could transfer its possession from the sick to the substitute, i.e. the pig or hen, and the sick could then be cured.⁴

The following quotation from one of the Assyrian exorcisms could make this point clear.

¹R.C. Thompson, "Disease and Medicine (Assyro-Babylonian)", E.R.E. ed. James Hastings, et al., (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1911), Vol. IV, P. 741.

²Edward Langton, Essentials of Demonology (London: The Epworth Press, 1949), p. 22, 149.

³R. Campbell Thompson, Semitic Magic (London: Luzac & Co., 1908), p. 183.

⁴For the Assyrian, the pig is not an unclean animal. Cf. Ibid., p. 209, 212; E. Langton, op. cit., p. 25, 156.

Marduk.

• • •
 give the pig in his stead and
 let the flesh be as his flesh,
 and the blood as his blood,
 and let him hold it;
 let the heart be as his heart ...

• • •
 That the pig may be a substitute for him ...
 That the evil Spirit, the evil Demon may stand aside,
 That a kindly Spirit, a kindly Guardian be present. 1

Hindu

Although the Hindu was not a close neighbour of the Babylonians, the early history of Hindu was not without interesting thoughts concerning the relationship between sin and disease.

The ancient Hindu also believed in demon-possession as a cause of sickness. These religious outlooks later became a fixed component of the dogmas of Hinduism. When Hinduism spread through India, a great many of the inhabitants embraced these religious doctrines. One of these was the belief in Karma which is connected with the idea of transmigration which is also bound up with the problems of suffering and guilt. This doctrine, which is still believed today, states that happiness is a reward for good conduct of a previous incarnation and that suffering is due to the foolishness of a previous state of existence in one form or another. Disease and infirmity are traced to the demerits and offences committed in a previous existence. Wrong acts are sources of future punishments.

¹R.C. Thompson, Semitic Magic (London: Luzac & Co., 1908), p. 193.

A wrongdoer could be born as a leper in the next life. A murderer, a thief, a drinker and the like could be born either mad or inhuman or as a brute creature, such as a dog, pig, cat, snake, etc.¹

From this point of view, suffering is therefore considered as a retribution. An infant who is unable to distinguish good from evil still suffers from disease or pain because it was caused by a wrong committed in his previous life. It is already explained that after death, the new existence may take the form of a mere animal. Arguments could be put forward as an attempt to prove this doctrine a fallacy. One of these arguments is based on the lack of ability of man to recollect his experiences in past life or lives.²

A similar theory is found among the Kabbalist Jews and is rendered to explain why the wicked man prospers and the righteous man suffers.³ This theory stated that man suffers because the soul, which was assigned to him by God when he was in his mother's womb, could have come from an evil man. So if the righteous person suffers, his sufferings were determined by some other previous existence. Undoubtedly, not many Jews could feel at home with this theory for it lacked a religious reference and it had no root in the Old Testament. One can hardly find a parallel of this belief in any of the Jewish neighbours, namely, the Babylonians, the Egyptians, and the Greeks.

¹ Julius Jolly, "Disease and Medicine (Hindu)", E.R.E. ed. (James Hastings (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1911), Vol. IV, P. 754.

² Edmund F. Sutcliffe, Providence and Sufferings in the Old and New Testaments (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd., 1953), p. 3.

³ Ibid., p. 7.

Egyptian

Apart from the primitive view of sickness caused by the power of a spirit or a demon, the Egyptians had also other explanations concerning sickness and suffering. They believed in a fixed cosmic order since the creation. Happiness and suffering were attributed to man's fate or fortune which was bound up with the principles of creation. These cosmic principles, according to them, were unchangeable.¹ The order of the world could not be interrupted by man or thing. The heaven was under the control of the sun-god, and the earth under the hand of the god of the Nile. They believed in the stability of divine order and paid very little attention to the problem of evil. H. Frankfort says, "there are many Egyptian words to denote evil acts, but I doubt whether any should be rendered by sin, if one grants that word its proper theological connotation."² Punishment, in so far as we can speak of a connection between evil and punishment, was for the Egyptian something for the after life. Any hardship experienced in daily life, was seen as due to mere misfortune. Certainly, they would hardly admit that suffering was the result of sin.

The general primitive idea of suffering, according to what we have already surveyed, was that some regarded sickness as a product of demonic activity. However, we have to note that there were exceptions as far as some particular diseases were concerned. For instance, the wounds of soldiers obtained in a battle, complications after surgical treatment, and injuries due to accidents could not be brought under the demonic theory.³

¹Henri Frankfort, Kinship and the Gods (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), p. 149.

²H. Frankfort, Ancient Egyptian Religion (New York, 1948), p. 73.

³The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 848. Also see C.G. Jung, op. cit., p. 145.

Greek

Greek religious outlook had some things in common with that of the Egyptians. Their philosophical thoughts and religious attitudes were deeply rooted in ancient mythology. Elements of Greek religion were so rich and so incongruous that it is impossible to include all of them in a brief account. However, some fragments concerning the problem of sin and sickness might well be presented by paying some attention to a few aspects of mythology. The Olympian system of the Greek mythology included many gods. Among them Zeus was the superior god and he was widely worshipped in Greece as the god of all power. It was believed that he controlled all the natural phenomena, such as rain, wind snow, lightning, thunder, heat and cold. He was also known as the god of the sky. He was thought to punish all the wrong-doers whosoever they were, men or gods. In a myth, Prometheus, son of Iapetus, was worshipped by the Greeks as a benefactor of mankind. He stole fire from heaven and brought it to the earth for the use of man. He was then arrested by order of Zeus and was chained on a mountain, but finally he was set free by Hercules. By this myth, the punishment for the violation of the divine order was made clear. Prometheus was punished because he disobeyed the order of his king Zeus who denied men the use of fire which was the sole possession of Hephaestus and other higher gods.

This story did not influence the Greek religion to a great extent. The Greeks were maintaining that suffering was due to fate. One can hardly trace any real concept of sin in Greek philosophy. The moral idea of Greek is different from that of the Bible.¹

¹Cf. R.W. Livingstone, The Greek Genius and Its Meaning to Us (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1912), pp. 25 ff. In p. 27, Livingstone asserts, "The Greeks had no real sense of sin. They regarded their offences as shortcomings and called them ἁμαρτίαι 'bad shots'. Such things were bound to happen, and when they happened were best forgotten."

Sutcliffe agrees that "the Greeks never formed a clear conception of sin both as a violation of a divine command and therefore as an affront to divinity, and as a moral degradation of the soul."¹

One of the Greek poems of the eighth century before Christ, under the title "Theogonia", says,

They (i.e. the three personified Fates) allot to man at birth to have good and to have evil... They pursue the transgressions both of gods and of men, nor do (these) goddesses ever cease from their dread wrath till with a visitation of evil they requite whoso has sinned. 2

The poet was Hesiod, born at Ascra and flourished at about 735 B.C. His work "Theogonia" is an account of the origin of the world and the birth of the gods, and is one of the principal sources of our knowledge of Greek mythology.³ In this poem, man's destiny was decided at birth. In the seventh century before Christ, Solon, the Athenian lawgiver, reorganised the council of the Areopagus and improved the conditions of the poor. During his time the unequal possession of property was thought to have been destined to man. In this respect, Solon said, "Many are rich but wicked, good but poor, yet will we not give these in exchange wealth in place of wirtue, For this abidth ever, but riches are now of one, now of another."⁴

¹Sutcliffe, op. cit., p. 12.

²Ibid., p. 12-13.

³The New Century Cyclopedia of Names, ed. Clarence L. Barhart, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, INC., 1954), II, p. 1999.

⁴Sutcliffe, op. cit., p. 13 (Quoted by Sutcliffe).

During the Homeric age guilt was regarded as a matter of behaviour of the wrong-doer. The wrong of a certain act was for them not so much a subjective feeling of guilt but a awareness that the gods or men were deprived of what was due to them. These 'wrongs' included the following: offence against the god, offence against men, false witness, breach of laws, insulting of parents, adultery, social injustice and illtreatment of the fatherless. These things were the main reasons to cause their god's anger and a resulting punishment. Though they were convinced that the above mentioned behaviour towards god and men were wrong, they experienced little or no feeling of guilt. In this respect, it is said that "in those happy centuries they were practically free from that infectious disease, the conscious disease, the consciousness of sin."¹ As far as the connection between sin and sickness is concerned,

sickness is especially regarded as a punishment for sin, which is actually called a 'substance begetting sickness' ... Sin and guilt are here related to matters of cult and ritual, not to absolute ethical principles, and so the most important thing is the sinful act itself; the question of moral responsibility is not raised. 2

Probably influenced by the myth of Aesculapius, the Greeks became the first pioneers in medical science. Aesculapius was supposed to be the son of Apollo and Caronis. The Egyptians said he was apotheosised from the human magician Imhotep.³ It was thought

¹Gottfried Quell, Georg Bertram, Gustav Stahlin & Walter Grundmann "Sin", Bible Key Words From Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch Zum Neuen Testament, trans. & ed. J.R. Coates, (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1951), p. 54.

²Ibid., p. 62.

³Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 28.

that he used to visit patients in dreams and healed them. In the same manner, the priest-physician of the temple of Hygieia, the goddess of health, possessed some healing power and used to heal patients at night by whispering in their ears when they were sleeping.

In the fifth century B.C., Hippocrates was the great physician of Greece, and is still today called the father of medicine. His whole life was devoted to the work of medicine. Despite the current superstitions and ancient customs related to demonic theory, he believed in observation and was sure that every effect had to have some cause. He believed that the cause of a disease need not be of a supernatural origin but that it should be sought in physical and natural phenomena.¹ Some of his famous words such as "Life is short but art is long" are still noteworthy. The Heppocratic Oath is still taken by many doctors in today's medical colleges. For example, all medical graduands of the University of St. Andrews sign a declaration which includes the following words:

¹Before the time of Hippocrates the Greek mainly attributed sickness to demonic power. Cf. Edward Langton, Essentials of Demonology (London: The Epworth Press, 1949), p. 82: "The Greeks also attributed all sorts of diseases and illness to the action of 'Keres' (a Greek term generally assigned for 'Ghosts' or 'evil spirits')." Also Cf. James Hastings (ed.), Dictionary of the Bible (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963), revised by F.C. Grant & H.H. Rowley, 2nd ed., p. 382: "Homer held that a wasting sickness was caused by a demon, and the Greek dramatists generally attributed madness and religious frenzy to demonic (or divine) possession."

...Further, in the exercise of my profession I will ever have in mind the care of the sick and the well-being of the healthy and to these ends will use all my knowledge and judgment.

Lastly, I will keep silence on any matters I may see or hear in the course of my professional work which it would be improper to divulge. ¹

When Greece reached its golden age of science, ways and means of medical treatment were developed. The other peoples of the ancient world were then still bound to their own ideas concerning diseases, which left very little room for an adequate and scientific explanation of the cause of disease.

After Hippocrates had opened the way to scientific research and the classification of diseases, the belief in demonic causes was gradually replaced by a more down to earth and natural belief of cause and effect ascertained by observation and investigation. Because of his human kindness and his love for the sick, Hippocrates devoted himself to the care of those in pain. Hence, he could declare, "where the love of man is, there is also the love of the Art."²

Based on pure observation, the Hippocratic school overemphasised the physical part of healing and left the spiritual aspect untouched. Therefore they left no room for religion to partake in the Hippocratical act of healing because during that period religion was regarded as human imagination. In fact, the part of religion in the act of healing was denied. This opposition between medicine and religion was probably the result of the Greek's misunderstanding of religion and the discovery of natural laws.³

¹Declaration by Medical Graduates of the University of St. Andrews (n.d.). Copies are obtainable at College Gate, St. Andrews.

²Quoted by Phyllis L. Garlick in Health and Healing: a Christian interpretation (London: Edinburgh House Press, 1948), p. 11.

³Cf. Ibid., p.11.

Jewish

Before the knowledge of Greek medicine infiltrated into the Jewish minds, the Jews, especially the old Rabbis, were convinced that disease was sent by God as a punishment for sin and an indication of the wrath of God. Sickness was the result of God's disfavour whereas health was a sign of His favour and a reward for the righteous. Prayer and anointing were used in treating the sick. The cure of disease was regarded as a token of God's forgiveness and the assurance of peace between the patient and God. From Josephus we know that a primitive view of disease was found among the Jews.¹ Certain diseases such as leprosy, asthma and the like, were treated as the work of devils. They believed that the sorcerer possessed some capacity to cure the sick but also to bring illness. A sick person was thus thought of as a demoniac or a sinner. This belief was widely spread among the Jews and it was so strong that Rabbi Jonathan taught and said: "Disease came from seven sins, slander, shedding blood, false oaths, unchastity, arrogance, robbery and envy."² This belief remains in the Old Testament as a branch of Jewish concept concerning the problem of suffering and sin.³

It is clear that the Pharisees, the scribes and the Jews in the New Testament period were still holding this traditional dogma concerning the problem of disease and sin. On some occasions, they

¹Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 32.

²Ibid., p. 33.

³Gottfried, et al., op. cit., pp. 44-45.

tried to judge the sufferers by the calamities which they construed as proofs of sin which the sufferers must have committed.

Jesus, also born as a Jew, took a different view of the problem of suffering and made it clear, for instance in John 9:1 ff. that there need not be a direct and causal relation between sin and sickness. Thus He challenged the Pharisees' concept. He urged them to confess their sins, not to look down on sick people, and not to adopt a self-righteous attitude assuming that a healthy person is more righteous than a sick one. In the sight of Jesus, all men are sinners before God the Almighty, and all stand in need of confession, repentance and the forgiving grace of God who sent his Son to save sinners and to heal the sick. Through this redeeming task, Jesus fulfilled the will of God and the need of His children on earth. There is no other way by which a solution for sin and sickness can be found apart from the Son of man, Jesus Christ, who has authority to forgive sin and power to cure disease.

In his works of healing and exorcism, Jesus never ignored the strong link between sin and sickness of which primitive men were highly aware and to which the modern psychologists are paying considerable attention, for they realize that the recorded words and healing miracles of Jesus are a valuable source of information concerning the psychical influence on man's bodily functions and processes.

From the ancient days till the present age, men have been wrestling with suffering, sin and sickness. These are universal human problems. From a biblical point of understanding, the whole problem can be reviewed in this way: God created man in His own image. He bestowed on man freedom of choice, the capacity to respond to His call, the ability to develop a moral standard, the power to judge and to reason, the capacity to live, the desire to be loved

and the need for fellowship with one another and with God. But man is able to choose his own way, to separate himself from God, to go astray like the prodigal son who left his father and his father's love, The result of such a disobedience and alienation was a disordered life, bringing with it spiritual and physical suffering. This scriptural illustration makes it clear that man suffers because of his own choice by desiring to do his own will and not the will of God. Theologically speaking, the sinfulness of man is the main source of human sickness, physical or spiritual, though there are some exceptions like the 'innocent' Job and his disease which carries a special meaning and deserves particular attention and which will be discussed in a later chapter.¹

In order to obtain a clearer and deeper understanding of the profound relationship between sin and sickness expressed in primitive thought, one needs to investigate the Biblical concept, then proceed to the views of modern theology and psychology on this problem.

¹Infra, p. 29ff.

II

SIN AND SICKNESS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Terminology

The Old Testament employs an extensive vocabulary to indicate sin. All the words used by the Hebrew writers are not intended to form a doctrine of sin, but to state the fact of sin in various ways. All the words used in the Old Testament have both a religious and a secular meaning. However, it is clear that the Hebrew language is capable of expressing the moral and spiritual problems of men by means of a number of words indicating sin. They express the universal experience of sin in the history of human life.

According to the various connotations employed in the Old Testament for the term 'sin', the following words could be listed:

(1) חָטָא (hātā')¹

The commonest Hebrew root denoting a meaning of sin is חָטָא. It is usually employed to indicate a general 'deviation from the right way' or 'to leave what is good and true'.

Its verbal form occurs in Job 5:24 to express a meaning of 'missing something': "You shall inspect your fold and miss nothing."

¹Cf. Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, ed. Francis Brown, S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs, (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1906), p. 306, see חָטָא; Gottfried Quell, et al, "Sin" Bible Key Words From Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch Zum Neuen Testament, trans. J.R. Coates, (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1951), pp. 5 ff; Ludwig Kohler, Old Testament Theology, trans. A.S. Todd, (London: Lutterworth Press, 1957), p. 169 f; H.W. Robinson, Christian Doctrine of Man (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1911), pp. 43 ff; Walther Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament trans. J.A. Baker (London: SCM Press, 1960), Vol. I, p. 161, Vol. II, pp. 380 ff.

Thus we find that the seven hundred men among the warriors of Benjamin "could sling a stone at a hair and not miss it" (Judges 20:16). Also Prov. 8:36, "But he who misses me, injures himself," and 19:2, "he who makes haste with his feet misses his way" where the same term is employed.

The word also indicates a moral or spiritual failure, either in respect of God or men. This is clear in I Sam. 2:25, when the old Eli was annoyed by the widespread news of his sons' evil deeds, he said to them, "if a man sins against a man, God will mediate for him; but if a man sins against the Lord, who can intercede for him?" In Gen. 20:9, this word refers to an ethical relationship, and was uttered by Abimelech rebuking Abraham because the latter had not disclosed his real relationship with his wife Sarah. Abimelech asked Abraham in what way he had sinned against Abraham to deserve such treatment. These passages clearly convey the idea of a moral failure in the relationship between man and man. It is also rendered in the same way referring to international relationship: In the long argument between the king of the Amonites and Jephthah the leader of the Israelites, it is found obviously expressing a legal idea of sin: "I therefore have not sinned against you, and you do me wrong by making war on me; the Lord, the Judge, decide this day between the people of Israel and the people of Ammon."¹ Probably, an ethical idea is expressed in the words of Reuben when he spoke of a retribution of sin: "Did I not tell you not to sin against the lad? But you would not listen. So now there comes a reckoning for his blood" (Gen. 42:22). What Reuben and his brothers did to Joseph was a sin in as far as it was a breach of brotherhood relationship.

Apparently, קטף is used in the OT to convey the reality

¹Judges 11:27.

of sin in a very vivid way. It focusses an outward picture of sin without reference to the motivation of the sinner. It is also used for a secular purpose in its indication of a sin of breaking a civil law. An example of this is found in Deuteronomy 19:15-21, where a secular court is dealing with a case of false witness.

Very often the word חט assumes a pregnant meaning when it is construed in the whole context.

It is interesting to note that the term for sinner is always in plural ח'טת (hatta'im).¹ As far as sin is concerned, the whole community of Israel as well as the whole human race are sinners before God.²

It is also extended to denote a sense of guilt. It is used when Judah promised his father Jacob, that he would bring back his youngest brother Benjamin. Judah said, "I will be surety for him, of my hand you shall require him. If I do not bring him back to you, then let me bear the blame forever" (Gen. 43:9). He knew that he would be blameworthy should he fail to fulfill his promise. In other forms, it is also rendered to mean a guilt-offering.³ E.g. Lev. 6:26, "The priest who offers it for sin shall eat it; in the holy place it shall be eaten." Further more, it is used to indicate the forefathers' sin which their children might have to bear.⁴

Closely connected with חט is שגה, meaning 'to go astray'. Examples are found in Psalms 58:3, "The wicked go astray from the womb. They err from their birth," and Ezekiel 44:10, "The Levites who went far from me, going astray from me after their idols... shall bear their punishment." In the same way 'to turn away' or 'to go wandering' is expressed by the word סגה (sāgāh) (Ezek. 34:6).

¹Gottfried Quell, et al., op. cit., p. 6.

²The point of universality of sin will be discussed latter in p.28.

³E.g. the form is חטת (hatta't) meaning sin, or sin-offering.

⁴Lam. 5:7, חטת is used as a verb: our fathers sinned while it is their סגת that they might have to bear.

(2) אָשָׁם ('āsām)¹

In the Hebrew mind to make a mistake unknowingly or to defile a cultic ritual or ceremony inadvertently is also regarded as 'sin' though not in a sense of rebellion against God. The general Hebrew term used to express this sort of wrongdoing is אָשָׁם. It is commonly translated as 'guilt' or 'guilt-offering'. Any one who does wrong unwittingly against God or against man should make an atonement which is the guilt offering, in order to compensate for his own guilt. If such an offering is not brought, the offender's guilt would spread and infect or influence the whole community to which he belongs.²

A passage conveying the common meaning of אָשָׁם is found in I Sam. 6:1 ff. which tells the story of the Philistines returning the Ark of God. During the time that the Ark was in their country, it was causing them a lot of trouble. (I Sam. 5:6). Therefore they decided to return it, but were advised by their priests not to return it back empty but with a guilt offering as compensation.

In some usages אָשָׁם indicates a guilt against God, e.g. in Jeremiah 51:5, "The land of the Chaldeans is full of guilt against the Holy one of Israel." Another example is found in Lev. 5:19: "It is a guilt offering; he is guilty before the Lord."

The main derivations of אָשָׁם are rendered as 'wicked' (Prov. 14:9), 'wrongdoing' (Num. 5:7), and to commit lasting wrong 'offence' (Ez. 25:12).

Furthermore, it indicates that the guilt is blameworthy and that the guilty person deserves punishment. In Gen. 26:10, Isaac is

¹ Gottfried Quell, et.al., op. cit., p. 21 f; Walther Eichrodt, op. cit., Vol. I. p. 161; Ludwig Koehler, op. cit., p. 189. Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, op. cit., see, אָשָׁם.

² Cf. Gen. 26:10. Also see The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible ed. G.A. Buttrick, et al., (New York: Abingdon Press 1962), Vol. R-Z, see 'sin', p. 365.

blameworthy because he had not disclosed the identity of Rebekah and thus deceived Abimelech. Also in Prov. 30:10, if one slanders a servant, one would be considered guilty. In II Chr. 24:18, the idol worshippers were found guilty and the wrath of God came upon them.

(3) YWB (pesa^h)¹

The term YWB is generally regarded as expressing a profound theological concept, but it is also used to denote a rift in human relationships. Its basic meaning is 'to rebel', 'to revolt', or 'to transgress'.² The noun is rebellion, defiance or transgression.

The rebellion of Israel against God implied their human will and their voluntary act against God. It is different from the term KWN which commonly indicates a mere failure or a mistake. YWB however, refers to a wilful disobedience. It also expresses a rebellion against a nation, e.g. I Kings 12:19, "So Israel has been in rebellion against the house of David to this day." In Amos 1:3, the term is employed to denote the transgressions of Damascus. Sometime it is used to describe a sinner's character as it is illustrated in Elihu's speech: "You said, 'I am clâen, without transgression, I am pure, and there is no iniquity in me' (Job 33:9). Its corresponding noun is also found in Isa. 58:1, and Gen. 31:36; 50:17. The former passage denoted the transgression against God; the latter the transgression against man. Its religious context is found in Job 34:37, where Elihu spoke of Job: "For he addeth rebellion (YWB) to his sin (KWN)."

YWB in its primary sense as rebellions against God, is clearly expressed in Isa. 43:27, "Thy first father sinned, and thy ambassa-

¹Ludwig Koehler, op. cit., p. 170; Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, op. cit., see YWB.

²The meaning 'revolt' is found in I Kgs. 12:19 & II Kgs. 1:1, 3:5,7. The meaning 'to transgress' is used in Is. 1:28, 46:8, 53:12, Hos. 14:10; Amos 4:4; Lam. 3:42.

dors have rebelled against me", and Is. 1:2, "Sons have I brought up and reared, and they have rebelled against me."

Another word implies a similar idea of rebellion against God is קָבַח. קָבַח is found in Ezek. 2:3, in which it indicates that the people of Israel revolt against God.¹ Its occurrence in II Kgs 18:7, is connected with rebellion against a king.

(4) אָוֹן ('āwōn)²

'Guilt', in the Hebrew language is presented by אָוֹן ('āwōn). It also means crime, iniquity, punishment or perverseness. The meaning expressed by אָוֹן is quite different from that of אָשָׁם. אָשָׁם ('āšām) mainly expresses the idea of guilt resulted from wrongdoing by ignorance, but does not carry a sense of wilful rebellion against God or His commandment. It rather designates a wrongdoing without any premeditation. אָוֹן ('āwōn) does not express an act un-wittingly done (Num. 15:30). It stresses particularly the sin with an intentional motive, and the guilt-burden of a sinner. As it is written: "for my iniquities have gone over my head, they weigh like a burden too heavy for me." (Ps. 38:4).

When Cain was cursed by God after he had murdered Abel, his brother, Cain said, "My אָוֹן ('āwōn) is greater than I can bear" (Gen. 4:13). The אָוֹן involved both the hardship of life as the punishment from God and a strong guilt-feeling of man as a burden in his inner mind. The Hebrew term אָוֹן conveys both punishment and guilt. Some Hebrew writers are very good in describing the operation of guilt in human minds. The poet of Psalms 32 is one of them. In this impressive work he gives a penetrating insight in the mind and mood of a sinner:

¹In Ez. 2:5-8 קָבַח (קָבַח to be contentious refractory rebellious) rebellion.

²Ludwig Koehler, op. cit., p. 174; Gottfried Quell, et al., op. cit., p. 6; Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Op. Cit., see אָוֹן; Walter Eichrodt, op. cit., II, p. 381, p.413.

Bless^{ed} is the man to whom the Lord imputes no iniquity.

I acknowledged my sin to thee,
and I did not hide my iniquity.

I said, 'I will confess my transgressions to the Lord,'
then thou didst forgive the guilt of my sin (Ps. 32:2,5).

The theological and psychological idea of guilt in the Old Testament is brought to light by the views on atonement and retribution and the forensic or legal expression of the relationship between sinner and God. The God in the Hebrew mind is the God who judges all sins and forgives all sin.

It is interesting to note that in passages concerning the forgiveness of sins, an extensive vocabulary is used in expressing all kinds of sin which could be forgiven through a confessional prayer or a religious ritual of atonement. Examples can be drawn from Psalms 51:1 ff, in which the terms YWB, XWN, QWY are gathered together to emphasize a broken and contrite heart of a sinner confessing his sins.

On the mount of Sinai, the Lord proclaimed his forgiveness;

The Lord, the Lord, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness, keeping steadfast love for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin but who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children and the children's children, to the third and fourth generation (Ex. 34:6,7).

In this proclamation, the words iniquity QWY (awon), transgression (YWB), sin (XWN), are used. Further references are found in Lev. 16:16-21; Ps. 32: 1 ff; Prov. 6:12-14; Isa. 1:4 and Dan. 9:5.

A brief survey of some common Hebrew terms for sin is far from sufficient to bring out a full scheme of Old Testament doctrine of sin. These terms are widely spread in the text and each conveys a different meaning in a different context and does not serve only one purpose. However from our fragmentary examination of these terms, some aspects of sins are established which are important for our consideration of the relationship between sin and sickness. In particular, we have the Old testament view that sin is the breach

of relationship between man and God, and between man and man. It is these breaches of relationship that result in conflicts and unrest within man himself, and therefore must affect the health of men.

The Fall of Man¹

Already in the first chapters of the Bible, the reader is given an insight into the broken relationship between man and his God, the tense feelings between human beings and the inner conflicts of the people created by God.

The author of these chapters finds the clue to all these miseries in an act of sin, that is, an act of disobedience towards God. Where God said, "Do not!" but man willed to do just that which was forbidden. The results were disastrous. Men became alienated from God. They became aware and ashamed of themselves, they began to be obsessed with a unbearable burden of guilt. Unwilling to confess their guilt, they tried to shift the blame from the one on to the other.²

But much more. A curse was to follow, and in this curse we find a close connection between sin and its punishment and the pains and hardship of man.

The curse on the serpent (Gen. 3:14-15) symbolises the punishment on evil as far as the serpent is the symbol of evil power.³ As an animal creature, the serpent does not have any moral response. However, it is sentenced to crawling on the ground and swallows dust.

¹Cf. Walther Eichrodt, op. cit., II, pp. 400-412. Gottfried Quell, et al., op. cit., pp. 23 ff; Ludwig Koehler, op. cit., p. 188; S.H. Hooke, "Genesis", Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. M.Black & H.H. Rowley (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd., 1964), p. 180.

²Genesis 3:12-13. Cf. J.G. Flugel, Man, Morals and Society (London: Duckworth, 1948), p. 166.

³R. Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, (London: Nisbet & Son Co. Ltd., 1941), p. 192, (Vol. I); Also, S.R. Briver The Book of Genesis (London: Methuen and Co., 1904), p. 44.

And there would be unreconciliated enmity between the serpent and the woman. They would hurt each other when they meet.

The curse on the woman is pain in child bearing and subjection to her husband (Gen. 3:16). The curse, "I will greatly multiply your pain", could be rendered "I will cause you to have much suffering and pregnancy".¹

The curse on man is the heavy burden of his position as a husband and with all hardships attached. Thorns and thistles would grow on the earth where he has to plant his food. Bread to eat could only be in toil, in the sweat of his face (Gen. 3:19). The livelihood of man would be a life-long toil till the end of his life.

Finally, the expulsion from the paradise, the garden of God, indicates man's loss of the happy fellowship with God. They were once dwelling in the garden in happy companionship with God, but by their act of disobedience, their life became a life of toil and hardship.

The first chapters of Genesis do not tell us much of the problem of original sin. Some scholars even go so far to say that Genesis knows nothing of it.² It simply says that man deserves his punishment and hard life because of his disobedience.

Concerning the author and origin of sin, man must confess his ignorance. The essence of sin can not be ascertained by studying man's sinful acts, nor can sin completely be blamed on the influence of Satan's power. After the fall, sin has its roots in the depth of man's being - in the corrupt heart of man.³

¹ John Skinner, Genesis, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of Genesis (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1930), p. 75.

² Ludwig Koehler, Old Testament Theology, (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), p. 175 ff. Also Robinson Wheeler holds the same idea. See The Christian Doctrine of Man (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1911), p. 58-60.

³ Jeremiah 17:9.

Sin rooted in the Heart of Man

The Old Testament, instead of tracing the historical source of sin, finds the source very near in the heart of man.

One reason given by Genesis for the flood to destroy men and women, is that, "The Lord saw the wickedness of man was great in the earth and that every imagination of the thought of his heart was only evil continually" (Gen. 6:5). Evil is not something that suddenly falls upon one. It implies a motive that grows from the heart, and that the evil heart pushes man to do sin. Once a sin becomes a habit, it produces further sin. Sin begets more sins. Finally it goes on continually without any desire for repentance. This is probably the reason why Jeremiah says that sin comes from the evil heart.¹

It is important to note that in the time of the prophet Jeremiah, the Israelites regarded sacrifice as the main constituent of their religion.² They were keen on practising all kinds of offering which were viewed as means of communion with God. At the same time they neglected the most essential thing of their religion, namely, the obedience to the word of God.³

¹On this point, Tournier expresses, "To Jeremiah both the Bible and the modern analytical psychology reply that there is wickedness and treachery in the hearts of all men, and that none of them lives at ease." See A Doctor's Casebook in the Light of the Bible, trans. Edwin Hudson (London: SCM Press, 1963), p. 197.

²Jeremiah 7:21-22.

³Jer. 7:22-23. Also, cf. R. Davidson, The Old Testament, (London: Hodder & Stoughton 1964), p. 112-113.

To the prophet, the cult, the sacrifice and offering did not play such an important part in the religion. For him, the most essential thing in the worship of God was obedience. Thus he urged the people to listen to the voice of God and not to act as wickedly as their fathers did (Jer. 7:26). The people were so stubborn and gave no ear to God's words but went on to sin in their own ways. Jeremiah traced the stubbornness to their wicked heart and said:

They did not obey or incline their ear, but walked in their own counsels and the stubbornness of their evil hearts, and went backward and not forward. Yet they did not listen to me or incline their ear, but stiffened their neck. They did worse than their fathers (Jer. 7:24, 26).

In the early reign of Jehoiakim (c. 608-605 B.C.) Jeremiah penetrated to the root of sin and said:

The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately corrupt; who can understand it? 'I the Lord search the mind and try the heart, to give to every man according to his ways, according to the fruit of his doings' (Jer. 17:9-10).

The evil heart is the fertile soil of all sinful seeds and sinful acts. The stubborn heart shows no sign of repentance or confession but only rebellion against God. Thus the punishment of God is foreseen and foretold by the prophet Jeremiah that the nation Judah would be destroyed, the people would be killed by their enemies, the whole nation would fall into calamity, and would be captured by Babylonians (Jer. 18:17).

Also after the exile, when the Judeans were still indulging in every kind of wickedness, the prophet traced these sins to their evil will (Jer. 16:12) or stubbornness of their evil heart (Jer 23:17).

Jeremiah must have been very familiar with the saying of wisemen such as Prov. 4:23, "Keep your heart with all vigilance; for from it flows the springs of life." One can hardly find any one beside Jeremiah who could penetrate so deep down to the genesis of human sin - the deepest being of the human heart - except God himself who in Jesus Christ says,

For from within, out of the heart of man, come evil thought, fornication, theft, murder, adultery, coveting, wickedness, deceit, licentiousness, envy, slander, pride, foolishness. All these evil things come from within, and they defile a man. (Mark 7:21-23).

God's Power over Man's Heart

God not only knows every man's heart and its wickedness, but he also has power over it.

In the battle of wits between Moses and Pharaoh, the latter's heart was hardened under the design of God. The sole purpose was to let His wonders be made known through his servant Moses so that the Egyptians and the Israelites might know that Yahweh was God.¹ To say that Pharaoh's heart was hardened (Ex. 4:21) does not mean that his freedom and responsibility were denied by God. It rather indicated that God was the ruler of all things; even the stubbornness of human heart could be used by God to his own glory and for the good of his people.²

Concerning the heart-hardened people, many references are found in many places in the Old Testament, such as, I Sam. 6:6 where we read that the Philistines' hearts were hardened. According to Trito-Isaiah (63:17), the hearts of the people of God were hardened, because the people made their hearts like adamant, and listened not the words of God. The result was that the wrath of God came upon them (Zech. 7:12). The Psalmist, therefore, gave a serious warning when he said: "Harden not your heart" (Ps. 95:8).

This biblical concept of sin as a disease of the heart, progressive and destructive, is closely related to modern views of the relationship between inner stress and physical disease.

¹Ex. 7:5, 17; 8:19; 19:14, 30; 10:2.

²E.F. Sutcliffe, Providence and Suffering in the Old and New Testament (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd., 1953), p. 52 f.

Sin - Inborn or Universal

As far as human solidarity is concerned, an individual finds himself a member of and involved in a community. This close connection between individual and community is also reflected in the effects of the sins of the community on the individual and vice versa.

In the Old Testament the whole community of Israelites is regarded as sinful by the prophets. The prophet Isaiah complains that he dwells in the midst of unclean peoples (Is. 6:4). Amos condemns the nations' sinfulness (Amos 1-2) and Jeremiah and Ezekiel stress the individual's wickedness and responsibility though they never neglect to mention also the sin of the community.¹ All these prophets realized the mutual relationship between individual and community and the serious effects of sin on human life and behaviour.

Many OT passages e.g. Genesis 8:21; Psalms 51:5; Job 14:4; 25:4; Isaiah 48:8, speaking of inborn sin,² do not intend to produce a dogmatic theory of sin, nor are they offering a theory of inherited sin.³ They rather express the fact of the universality of sin and that a man is born in a sinful environment. The Psalmist is aware of his own sinfulness and realizes his share in the sinful world. Thus he declares, "Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Ps. 51:5).

When Job claims that no one "can bring a clean thing out of an unclean" (Job 14:4), he admits that he himself is involved in an unclean world, and suffers in an unclean world.

¹H.H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel (London: SCM Press, 1956), pp. 99 ff.

²H.W. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 56-60.

³Ibid.

The universality of sin is revealed in every experience of human life.¹ The OT passages just mentioned, simply state the fact of its universal character without giving any account of the process of how sin came into human heart and into the whole world. What the OT writers knew, was: "The wicked go astray from the womb, and err from their birth, speaking lies" (Ps. 58:3). By this is meant that man begins his life in a sinful world where he is able to use his own will to sin against God who knows that "the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth" (Gen. 8:21).²

Further expressions of the same kind are found in the prayers of the Psalmist: "No man living is righteous before thee" (Ps. 143:2); and in I Kings 8:46, "There is no man who does not sin."

From all this, one is justified to conclude that the writers of the Old Testament realized the universal character of sin.³

¹T.H. Robinson, "The Old Testament and the Modern World" (Epilogue) The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H.H. Rowley (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1952), p. 352-353.

²H.W. Robinson, op. cit., p. 57.

³Concerning the Old Testament view on the question of the universality of sin, Ryder Smith concludes: "Probably the right conclusion is that in all periods the ordinary or typical Hebrew believed that, both in the past and the present, there were a very few sinless men. The belief that almost all men sin sometimes is, of course, to be clearly distinguished from the belief that any man is wholly sinful." - The Bible Doctrine of Sin (London: The Epworth Press, 1953), p. 30.

Sin as Sickness

The dynamic and corruptive influence of sin is in its effects like a harmful disease that afflicts man's whole personality and which spreads out until the whole nation is infected and corrupted. Therefore sin is sometimes described as sickness. The prophet Hosea when he saw the conflict between Ephraim and Judah, he said:

Ephraim saw his sickness, and Judah his wound, then Ephraim went to Assyria, and sent to the great king. But he is not able to cure you or heal your wound. For I will be like a lion to Ephraim, and like a young lion to the house of Judah (Hos. 5:13-14).

To the prophet these two countries were sinful because they both lacked love and the knowledge of God and they were equally guilty before God.¹ Their sin and wickedness which were seen as sickness and a wound, needed to be cured (Hos. 5:13). Certainly they could be healed if they came to the right 'doctor' - Yahweh, their God. They turned not to their God to seek remedy, but to Assyria who was not able to cure them. Therefore, they would be punished until they repented and turned to Yahweh (Hos. 5:12).

Though they came to confess their sin (Hos. 6:1-2) their confessions lacked the humble spirit and sincerity. It is described by Brown as "a hasty resolution which is not carried into effect."² Due to these facile confessions, they were rebuked by the prophet (Hos. 6:4 ff) because they, having forgotten their confessions, had returned to their old sins. Their love for God was just like a morning cloud and like the dew which soon disappears (Hos. 6:4). Though the prophet warned them and taught them, they would not heed to him, but remained in their evil deeds. Finally, no other remedy

¹S.L. Brown, The Book of Hosea (London: Methuen & Co., 1932), p. 52.

²Ibid., p. 56.

could cure their deep-rooted and widely extended disease. Their sickness was left to follow its own course which ended in destruction in one form or another (Hos. 9:1-9).

In connection with this point, the serious condition of the nations of Judah during the time of Isaiah, was thought to be brought about by its own sins (Is. 1:4-5).¹ The nation's sinfulness was equated to sickness by the prophet:

Ah, sinful nation,

why will you still be smitten, that you continue to rebel?

The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint.

From the sole of the foot even to the head,

There is no soundness in it, but bruises and sores ... (Is. 1:4-6).

The terms sickness and disease are occasionally used in a figurative sense to express an individual's awareness of sin which overcomes him. He feels that some severe disease attacks and troubles him.²

Sin deserves punishment and God is the Judge of all sins. His punishment of sin was made clear in the announcements of the prophets who declared the penalties of God on his nation as well as on every individual.³

To the Hebrew writer, it was true that sin brought forth sufferings and painful results (Gen. 4:13). Cain's exclamation denotes his inner conflict and the feeling of heavy guilt-burden which troubled him that he felt it difficult to bear (Gen. 4:13). Sin itself

¹G.W. Wade, The Book of the Prophet Isaiah (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1911), p. 3.

²A.R. Johnson, "The Psalms" The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H.H. Rowley (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1952), p. 170-71.

³Cf. Is. 2:10-21; 10:33-34; Jer. 25:8 ff; Ezek. 9; Hos. 13:16; Amos 3:10-11; 5:68.

is a kind of punishment and its consequence is pain and misery. This is pointed out not only by the prophets but also by the other OT writers.¹

Sickness or disease is often regarded as some kind of punishment. Although Job tried to defend his inculpability or innocence, he did not deny his involvement in a sinful world in which he shared the sufferings with so many others.² Job's friends, however, argued that Job's sickness and sufferings were the direct results of sin.³

Disease is the punishment for sin. This idea is generally in harmony with the Old Testament's concept of sickness and sin. But, there are exceptions in the OT where there is no direct connection between sickness and sin and where punishment does not indicate a sin of the sufferer. The case of Job, and the punishment of Korah and his relatives (Num. 16:29 ff) should be listed as exceptions. Though sin always brings punishment, punishment does not always indicate sin.

Sickness - the visitation of God

In the Old Testament, some disease like blindness and deafness are sometimes regarded as Divine visitations which can only be cured by God who possesses all powers including the power over all disease and the power of healing.⁴ The powerful God, the healer of Israel,

¹Dt. 28:25 ff; Lev. 16:17 ff; I Kings 8:32; Prov. 26:28; Num. 12:11; II Kings 17:6 ff.

²Cf. Job 13:26; 14:1-4.

³Job 4:1 ff; 8:1 ff; 11:1 ff.

⁴Ex. 4:11; Dt. 32:39; Job 5:18; Hos. 6:2; Ps. 16:10.

though He visited Israel with war and disease, would heal Israel if they would come to Him in repentance. His obstinate enemies, however, He punished with incurable disease (Ex. 8-9) according to his words, "I Kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal" (Dt. 32:39).¹

Sickness - the work of Satan

The sickness of Job in the form of severe sores is described as an affliction caused by Satan. The term 'sores' in Job 2:7 is from the Hebrew word י'נש (שֵׁן) which generally indicates all kinds of skin disease.²

In the OT, Satan (י'נש) generally means 'adversary'. It can be either an adversary of man or an angel of God. In a battle recorded in I Sam. 29:1ff, David became a satan of the Philistines (I Sam. 29:4). In I Kings 11:14, satan is used by God to against King Solomon. Also, in Ps. 109:6, the Psalmist prays God to send a satan to stand at the right hand of his enemy. In the incident of Balaam, an angel is acting as a satan (Num. 22:22). The meaning of satan is made plain by these passages just mentioned where satan is used without an article (י'נש).

Furthermore, satan appears with an article ה'י'נש as found in the passage of Zechariah 3:1-2 (c. 520 B.C.) where the word is ה'י'נש. (the satan) refers to the one who is standing at the right hand of Joshua and accuses him, and who is rebuked by God. The work of satan as indicated here is to charge, to accuse, and to slander.³

¹"The reference is not, of course, to the resurrection of the dead, but to Jehovah's power to rescue from mortal peril." - S.R. Driver, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1896), p. 378.

²W.A. Irwin, "Job", Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. M. Black & H.H. Rowley (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd., 1964), p. 393.

³Cf. Ludwig Koehler, Old Testament Theology (London: Lutterworth Press, 1957), p. 176.

It is notable that nowhere in Old Testament satan appears as a distinctive demonic figure; nor as an opponent to God or the one who is held responsible for all evil. It is simply an accuser, a prosecutor or an inflictor.¹

In I Chr. 21:1, satan stood up against Israel and incited David to number Israel, which was regarded as a sin (vs. 7). It is probably because of David's own pride and his lack of faith that he displeased God and got into painful distress (vs. 13). Here satan is considered as an adversary as well as an inflictor.

In the prologue of the Book of Job (Job 1-2), Satan (שָׂטָן) acts as a tempter, accuser, as well as an inflictor (Job 2:7) under the permission of God (Job 1:12). It is obvious that satan in the Old Testament is regarded as a messenger of God rather than His opponent.

As long as disease is considered as the visitation of God, satan can be seen as an inflictor sent by God to punish those who sin against Him. Therefore the writer of Job can say, "Satan went forth from the presence of the Lord, and afflicted him with loathsome sores from the soles of his feet to the crown of his head" (Job 2:7).

Saul's illness is said to be caused by an evil spirit (I Sam. 16:14 ff).² Apparently, the affliction fell quite suddenly

¹The concept that satan is morally evil is a later development of Judaism. Cf. Walther Eichrodt, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 227. The author expresses the view that "only in Judaism, under the influence of a radical change in men's feelings about the world, did a new demonological realism invade the realm of faith. It is characteristic of the period that the demons, which hitherto had been associated only with physical evil, that is to say, misfortune, are now made responsible for ethical evil, or sin."

²Henry P. Smith suggests that the verse "the evil spirit of the Lord" should be originally simply "the Spirit of the Lord." see his book, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Samuel (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1958), p. 147 ff.

upon him and it was attributed to the work of an evil spirit from the Lord. From the symptoms of Saul's sickness it was suggested that he was suffering from a mental disorder.¹ The reason for Saul's sickness is perhaps found in I Sam. 15:24 where Saul said to Samuel, "I have sinned, because I feared the people and obeyed their voice." If this was the cause, it is in harmony with the general view of the Old Testament that sin causes illness in one form or another.

Sickness - the Punishment of God

In the address of Moses to the people of Israel, he mentioned six blessings and six curses respectively for those who obey the voice of the Lord and those who disobey it.² Following the list of curses, there is an extension of the address which makes it quite plain that disease and death are the consequences of disobedience. This portion reads:

The Lord will send upon you curses, ... the Lord will make the pestilence cleave to you ... The Lord will smite you with consumption and with fever, inflammation, and fiery heat, and with drought, and with blasting, and with mildew; they shall pursue you until you perish (Dt. 28:20 ff).

Here the pestilence, disease, and hunger are the instruments to execute God's curses.

The horrible picture of the curses was a foreseen fate of the Israelites who were later captured by the Assyrians in 720 B.C. and 3 by the Babylonians in 587 B.C., which brought the curses to fulfilment.

In the incident of the ark of God, the Philistines were smitten

¹Cf. L.H. Brockington, "I & II Samuel", Peake's Commentary on the Bible, op. cit., p. 326; Henry P. Smith, op. cit., p. 148.

²Dt. 28:1-6, 16:19.

³Cf. Henry P. Smith, op. cit., p. 40.

by the hand of God because they had taken possession of the ark (I Sam. 5:1; 6:6). The disease which afflicted them is called "tumours" (טִּבּוּרִים) which was not haemorrhoids although in later Hebrew, it came to be applied only to haemorrhoids.¹ It is regarded as the agent of the Divine who punished men for their offences (I Sam. 6:9).

Another example can be found in I Kings. 12:25 ff., in connection with the dispute between the man of God from Judah and King Jeroboam when he stretched out his hand against the man of God. This act of hostility caused his hand to be paralysed (I Sam. 13:4). The penalty was extended to the altar so that it was rent and the ashes scattered (I Sam. 13:5). The hand of the king was restored after a prayer of restoration by the the prophet on request of the king (I Sam.13:6).

This man of God who appeared before Jeroboam at Bethel was a messenger of truth who demonstrated the power of God over idols and disease. The mission of this unnamed man was to punish those who sinned through idolatry though he himself was proved not a perfect man.² The punishment of Jeroboam is related not only to this single act but also to his sinful deeds listed in I Sam. 12:25-33, in which, the main sin was the worshipping of golden images. It was also held against him that he had appointed priests from those who were not Levites and that he had gone up to the altar to make sacrifice himself. Because of all these transgressions, he was punished by God through his messenger.

Sickness - an indication of Individual sin

Exodus 23:25, reads: "You shall serve the Lord your God, and I will bless your bread and your water, and I will take sickness

¹Cf. George B. Caird, "I Samuel", The Interpreter's Bible, ed. George A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1953), II, p. 904.

²I Sam. 13:2, 20 ff.

away from the midst of you."¹ Here we see that good health is a sign of God's approval and illness a sign of his disapproval, and that both the affliction and the healing of diseases are under the power of the mighty God. This thought which influenced the whole of Israel's life, is recorded in the Deuteronomic Law code (Dt. 28) as well as in the Holy code (Ex. 23; Lev. 26).²

Therefore, it is not surprising to see that the people so often attributed all forms of suffering to the visitations of God or His agents. David, the king of Israel, hearing of the death of Nabal who had insulted him, said, "Blessed be the Lord who has avenged the insult I received at the hand of Nabal, and has kept back his servant from evil; the Lord has returned the evil-doing of Nabal upon his own hand" (I Sam. 25:26 ff). The death of Nabal was apparently due to his alcoholic excesses at a evening feast and he died after ten days (I Sam. 25:26 ff). This was a case of retribution for self-indulgence.

Furthermore, the leprosy of King Uzziah is said to be the consequence of his anger towards the priest Azariah and his interruption of the priestly duties (II Chr. 26:15 ff). The incident illustrates the fact that an individual's sin brings forth sickness. From this basic point we see that in the Old Testament, the sinner suffers from his own sin.

Sickness - not pointing directly to sin

Sickness does not always point to the sufferer's own fault

¹Cf. Dt. 7:15; Ex. 15:26; Dt. 28:27, 35.

²Cf. S.R. Driver, op. cit., p. 302.

but sometimes to the wrongdoing of other person or persons. It is made plain by the event of the death of David's child born by Uriah's wife (II Sam. 12:18). Here it is asserted that the child's suffering from sickness was due to the sin of David. The whole narrative is so dramatic that it is worth taking a closer examination (II Sam. 11:12 ff).

Briefly, it tells that David, in order to have Uriah's wife, murdered him by putting him in the front ranks during a battle. After the plot, the wife of Uriah, Bathsheba, was taken by David (II Sam. 12:7 ff). Nathan the prophet came to rebuke him and foretold his punishments:

Thus says the Lord, 'Behold I will raise up evil against you out of your own house; and I will take your wives before your eyes and give them to your neighbour and he shall lie with your wives in the sight of this sun ...Because by this deed you have utterly scorned the Lord, the child that is born to you shall die (II Sam. 12:11 ff).

The whole process of punishment became evident in the frustrations and disappointments of David's later life: his infant child died from sickness; two of his sons, Absalom and Adonijah, revolted against him, and his wives were violated by Absalom. These were the evils against him coming out of his own house (II Sam. 12:13).

As a king, David sins against God through exercising his power to deprive a man of his wife and his life. Murder and the disruption is disgraceful towards his own position as a chosen king of Israel. It shows his absolute disobedience against God and a lack of love toward other children of God.

From this court history, it appears that sin has two definite result: one is the separation of the sinner from God, another is the

inevitable consequence of the evil effects of sin. The former can be reconciled through the sinner's confession and God's forgiveness. The latter remains in the world as sign that all men suffer from the effects of sin. The former is illustrated by Nathan's words: "The Lord also has put away your sin; you shall not die," the latter is seen in his further utterance: "Nevertheless, because by this deed thou have utterly scorned the Lord, the child that is born to you shall die." (II Sam. 12:14).

The sickness causing the death of the child does not directly point to the child's own sin. The suffering of the child is due to his involvement in the sinful family. In the same way, the death of Uriah the Hittite does not point to his own sin but to the sin of David. Though the effects of sin have to be endured by the sinner, it is not always the results of his sin which he has to bear. In fact, the death of the seventy thousand men of Israel was due to David's sin (I Chr. 21:24 ff).

Men suffer jointly as the tragic results of sin, for "none of us lives to himself and none of us dies to himself" (Rom. 14:1). Hence, Paul could go further and says, "If one member suffers, all suffer together" (I Cor. 12:26).

The OT as a whole, generally emphasizes a direct relationship between sickness and sin inferring that sickness is the result of sin and that sin brings forth sufferings. But it never neglects the fact of some exceptional cases, such as the case of Job, the case of David's child just mentioned, and the case of the sickness of the son of the widow Zarephath found in I Kings 17:17 ff.

Concerning the last case, it is told that the widow's son died after sickness. The widow interpreted his death as an indication of her own hidden sin. This is an expected psychological reaction of

a mother when she faces such a calamity. Certainly, a direct relationship between the child's sickness and the mother's sin, whatever it was, is not found in the story.

Sickness - as suffering shared by many

In a letter of Elijah, there is a list recording the sins of king Jehoram and the punishments to be expected (II Chr. 21:12 ff). It tells that the King had sinned in various ways: he had murdered his brothers; walked in the evil ways, led the people Israel astray, and by his example guided the whole nation to unfaithfulness. For all these sinful deeds, Elijah prophesied that the Lord would punish him by sending misfortune and disease upon his people, his children and his wives, and cause him to lose all his possessions. He himself would suffer from a severe attack of bowel diseases. These threats were finally carried out in such a way that his people were deprived of their possessions by foreigners who invaded the country and Jehoram himself died after a serious illness (vss.16).

We are reminded by Elijah's letter that an evil ruler of a nation is a source of tragedy to his nation. A nation's welfare or calamity, good or bad, happiness or suffering, depends largely on the ruler's acts. In the history of Israel it was often so that when a king was corrupt, the nation suffered, when a king was pious and obeyed the words of God, the whole nation became prosperous and lived in peace. This thought dominated many an Israelite's mind. Therefore, we often see in the OT that the people of Israel were troubled by various inflictions sent by God because of their king's wrongdoings.

Sometimes, disease is used as a warning or chastisement for the wrongdoer. King Jeroboam was warned by the sickness of his son,

Abijah (I Kings 14:1 ff). Probably, the prophet Ahijah, who brought him the message, thought that Jeroboam would take heed to turn from sin, but no sign of return was shown by the king. The death of Abijah was said to be a punishment for the sin of the king (vss.12, 17).

Sickness - as Cause of Death

We have already traced some connections between sickness and sin, now we turn to deal mainly with a close relationship between sickness and death.

Disease is usually the main factor which causes a person's death. Cases are numerous in the Old Testament.

(a) Those who died simply from their illnesses:

Prophet Elisha died shortly after his illness (II Kings 13:14). We do not know what kind of disease it was for there is no suggestion in the text. In the same way, without any clearer reference of cause, the king of Syria, Ben-hadad died not long after his sickness (I Kings 8:10 ff). However, the cause of the death of Asa is much clearer cited in II Chr. 16:12 ff. He got a disease in his feet and when the disease was growing worse he sought not the Lord, but died from his foot-disease.

(b) Child-birth often fatal.

The painful and dangerous task of child-bearing under the curse of God (Gen. 3:16) is for the first time mentioned in the Book of Genesis. To give birth sometimes caused the death of the mother. Here the death of Rachel is a case of illustration (Genesis 35:16-18). In the case, no disease is mentioned. What is made known is that she died shortly after giving birth to Benjamin.

Though her life was deprived by child-birth, she finally saw in her death, the fulfilment of her long desire which she had expressed in her cry, "Give me children, or else I die" (Gen. 30:1).¹ Unfortunately, child-birth was fatal to her.

Another case of a mother's death at child-birth is given in I Sam. 4:19 ff, telling about the death of the wife of Phinehas. The only factor that killed her was probably the sudden shock she got when she heard the tragic news of the capture of the ark of God and the death of her husband and father-in-law (I Sam. 4:17). Physically, she was already suffering from the pain of child-bearing, and the bad tidings aggravated her condition. Probably, her death was caused by both mental and physical anguish though there is no direct mention in the text of any particular disease.

If death is the natural end of human life in the world under the Divine providence, the O T writers needed not give a full account to explain the end of every individual human life. They held that life and death was in and under the will of Yahweh. Sometimes, death is regarded as a penalty for sin, in other times, death is considered as simply the will of God. For instance, Ezekiel's wife died without any visible or known cause, but only that the Lord wanted her to die (Ezek. 24:16). On the other hand, the death of all the first born of the Egyptians is clearly a penalty of God (Ex. 13).

A pathological explanation of the causes of sickness and death can hardly be expected in OT, because the OT is not a doctor's casebook. Its main purpose is to reveal the dealings of God with man in a progressive revelation and to picture the God who has power over disease, sickness and death.

¹ Gerhard Von Rad, Genesis (London: SCM Press, 1961), trans. John H. Marks, p. 335.

(c) Died but rose again

A story telling of a dead child raised by the prophet Elisha is found in II Kings 4:8-37. In the healing process, prayer and technique of some kind were used, for it is recorded as follows:

He went in and prayed to the Lord. Then he went up and lay upon the child, putting his mouth upon his mouth, his eyes upon his eyes, and his hands upon his hands; and as he stretched himself upon him, the flesh of the child became warm. Then he got up again, and walked ... (II Kings 4:34).

We do not know how far the techniques helped the child. What we know is simply that the child was raised by the man of God, and that the power of God was operating and made known through a miraculous act.

The only reason given for the child's illness is probably in II Kings 4:18-19, which says that the child went out with his father to the harvest field and suddenly cried aloud, "Oh, my head, my head!" Apparently, he died suddenly from sun-stroke.¹

A further example can be drawn from I Kings 17:17-24, where the prophet Elijah raised the widow's son. According to the scripture, he raised him through his prayer: "O Lord my God, let this child's soul come into him again." Having repeated the prayer three times the child returned to life, and was given back to his mother (vss. 22-23).

It is difficult to understand how this can happen until one realizes that nothing is impossible for God who is not restricted by natural laws. In the Old Testament, the God of Israel is the God who smites and who heals; who kills and raises the dead.

¹ James A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Kings (Edinburgh; T & T Clark, 1951), ed. Henry Snyder Gehman, p. 367.

Sickness - Psychological or Physical

The heart of Jeremiah was sick when he noticed the sin of his people and saw the destruction of his land. His grief for the people and his sympathy for those in calamity are expressed in his sorrowful song, Jeremiah 8:18-19,¹

My grief is beyond healing, my heart is sick within me.

O that my head were waters, and my eyes a fountain of tears,
that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter
of my people. 2

For the prophet, his people's sin and unrepentant attitude were severe diseases that no healing was possible. Picturing this situation, Leslie says, "It is sick - morally and spiritually ill - with a fatal disease. It breaks the prophet's heart."³

The prophet saw that in Gilead there was no physician who could cure the fatal disease which rooted in the deepest being of every sinful man.⁴ Also, there was no balm in Gilead, no physician, no remedy which could cure his sorrowful heart that suffered from the disease of depression.

¹There is no suggestion in the passage that calamity is a penalty for sin. Cf. James Philip Hyatt, "Jeremiah" (Exegesis), The Interpreter's Bible, ed. George Arthur Buttrick, et al., (New York, Abingdon Press, 1956), Vol. V, p. 886-87.

²"The slain of the daughter" is probable those who died in famine. Cf. Ibid.,

³Elmer A. Leslie, Jeremiah (New York: Abingdon Press, 1953), p.80.

⁴Gilead, a fertile region growing grapes, olives, trees, and flowers. From these facilities the 'balm of Gilead' was made (Jer. 8:22). It is a hilly country in the Jordan valley where the river Jabbok flows from east to west. Cf. The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. George Arthur Buttrick et al., (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), Vol. II, see 'Gilead'.

When the prophet says "my heart is sick within me", it is in the deepest sense, a psychical rather than physical illness. In the sinful environment he called his people to repent. But they heard not his voice and went on their own ways of sin. Here, we can understand why he was heart-sick and sorrowful.

We also see that his heartsickness was not simply a sudden shock such as that which caused Daniel to fall ill for a few days (Dan. 8:27). Nor was it bad tidings that shocked him, but it was a real psychical sickness resulting from the picture of sinfulness and disaster which he had faced for many years.

Both a "disease" of sudden shock and a longterm infliction caused by a sinful environment, could result in sickness or even death. The aged Eli was shocked unto death by the bad tidings of the capture of the ark of God (I Sam. 4:28). Jacob got a shock and his heart fainted when he heard that his beloved son Joseph was still alive in Egypt (Gen. 45:26). Amnon's 'love-sick' can also be regarded as a psychical case (II Sam. 13:2). In all these cases the importance of the influence of an environment on sickness is clearly indicated.

Sickness and Healing

In the Old Testament, examples of sickness and disease are varied. There are cases of those who had become sick and who died later, but others recovered. This is in correspondence with our time.

In the Old Testament, it is sometimes thought that illness is a sign of God's wrath and that recovery from illness is an expression of His forgiveness.

A reference to this belief, we find in the story in Num. 21:1-4. As a result of their rebellious attitude, Israelites were bitten by snakes. The only way to escape death was to turn back to God, which was symbolized by looking at a bronze serpent made by Moses.¹ Here it is illustrated that rebellion produces sickness and suffering but that repentance brings health and peace.

In the event of king Hezekiah's sickness one sees the significance of prayer in the operation of the healing act (II Kings 20:11; Is. 38:1-8; II Chr. 32:24-26). When Hezekiah became sick and was told he would die from his sickness, he immediately turned his face to the wall and prayed to God. God answered his prayer and promised him an extension of life of fifteen years. This was followed by a sign of assurance of his recovery. (II Kings 20:8-11).

The narrative in II Kings 20:11 ff. gives more details and mentions a 'cake of figs' used as a paster to cure the boil of Hezekiah (vs. 7). These detail are not found in Isaiah's version. It is commented that "a poultice of figs was well known in the ancient world as a means of softening and opening hard boils and ulcers."²

¹Bernard Martin, The Healing Ministry in the Church (London: Lutterworth Press, 1964), p. 53.

²Norman H. Smith, "II Kings (Exegesis)", The Interpreter's Bible, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 306.

In the end of Hezekiah's illness, a double treatment was applied, namely, a prayer as a spiritual treatment and the cake of figs as a medical aid. When healing is concerned, prayer and medicine are both needed for effectual treatment of the patient. Prayer played an important part in the case of Hezekiah's recovery and it was God the 'doctor' who healed him.

It is rather unusual that no suggestion of any kind of wrongdoing connected with Hezekiah's sickness is mentioned either in II Kings or Isaiah. Only in a fragmentary account in II Chronicles it says,

In those days Hezekiah became sick ... But Hezekiah did not make return according to the benefit done to him, for his heart was proud. Therefore wrath came upon him and Judah and Jerusalem, (II Chr. 32:24-25).

Both Kings and Isaiah mention that the king was faithful all the time and agree that his recovery was the result of God's mercy and forgiveness.

It is convincing that there is a close relationship between sickness and sin in the Old Testament. We have seen in our brief survey of OT incidents that men and women who had suffered from sickness whether they were obedient or stubborn, righteous or wicked, Israelites or gentiles, had either committed sin or had experienced a sense of guilt.

It is notable that punishment does not always point back to the sufferer's sin. Sickness and suffering are generally considered to be products of human sin. Since men rebelled against God, the harmony of the world was disturbed and sickness and suffering appeared as a result of men's free choice.

God is the Judge of all men, the healer of all sickness, the one who rules the world with mercy and love. Nothing can happen beyond or outside his mighty will. Under His providence and care, the world exists and men live.

III

PROVIDENCE AND SUFFERING IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

God's Good Creation

From the creation narrative in Genesis 1 ff, it becomes clear that everything in the creation of God has a meaning. The light, the firmament, the land, the plants, the creatures, the birds that fly, the beasts on the land, the fishes in the sea, the man and the woman and their offspring to fill the earth, were good in the eyes of God. As it is written: "And God saw everything that he made and behold, it was very good."¹ 'Good' in Hebrew is טוב (tob). This word has a pregnant meaning. It can be rendered to mean 'fair' or 'beautiful' (Gen. 6:2). God's word is good (Jos. 23:15). Rebekah (Gen. 24:16) and the Queen of Persian are good-looking (Esth. 1:11; 2:2). It is good for man to have a partner (Gen. 2:18). Honey and wine are good and sweet (Song. 7:9; Prov. 24:13; 25:16). It is a good thing to live a long life, a living dog is better than a dead lion (Jod. 8:32; Eccl. 4:3; 6:3; 9:4). These 'good' are related to human life. Also, in the wisdom literature God is seen as a good God, e.g. "O, give thanks to the Lord for he is good, for his steadfast love endure forever and ever" (Ps. 136). It is better to gain 'wisdom' than to possess silver and gold (Prov. 3:14; 4:2). "It is better for a man to hear the rebuke of the wise than to hear the song of fools" (Eccl. 7:5). To seek God is to seek good (Amos 5:6; 14 ff). In fact, the whole Bible is constantly referring to the 'good'. From a biblical point of view everything has a meaning. As nature has a meaning so the whole history and so the whole world. The apostle Paul says, "And in everything as we know He co-operated

¹Gen. 1:31; cf. Sutcliffe, *op. cit.*, p. 39; Walther Eichrodt, *op. cit.*, p. 349; *Infra.*, pp. 169 181 ff.

for good with those who love God and are called according to his purpose."¹

It is under God's providence that the world exists. When the Christian looks back on his life he realizes that everything has happened according to God's purpose. How often we hear people say 'Why do these terrible things happen to me?' 'Why should I suffer from this disease? I do not think I deserve it.' 'Why such and such a thing happened, I do not understand.' Apart from God, life is meaningless, things are meaningless.

In a materialistic world, many men are apt to see things purely from a rational point of view. Men are often blind to the spiritual world. For those, only the things which give immediate and visible results are of any meaning. Such people are short sighted and sometimes even spiritually blind, they see things but grasp not the meaning. Some scientists would say things are a concatenation of events. For such men a sunset is only a natural phenomenon in which radiation and physical reflections play a role. But in the same objective way even a piece of wood could be studied! The poet, however, sees the sunset in all its beauty and the Christian sees it as a part of the good work of God. The poet describes it in words and the Christian rejoices in it. Those who read the poem share the beauty of it and appreciate the wonderfulness of God's creation. Science is not the only truth in the world, the poem also reveals truth. Moreover, Jesus says, "I am the way, the truth and the life." In the deepest sense we can say that outside God every truth and every value could only be relative, and not absolute. For "with God everything takes on meaning, everything has value, either positive or negative."²

¹Romans 8:28.

²Paul Tournier, op. cit., p. 34.

The scientist and the theologian need not contradict each other. For they both look at the same object - the world and man. Scientific investigation gives a causal perception of man and of things, which is only one dimension of the whole truth. Biblical study gives us the meaning of the world and of life which is another dimension of truth. For a complete understanding of men and things both dimensions are needed. To use marriage as an example: a Christian would see the marriage in a biblical light which is related to the whole creation principle, namely that God created male and female and "it is not good that man should be alone", so that God "make him a helper fit for him."¹ This means that husband and wife were created for each other.² They recognise themselves in each other; the wife is the complement of her husband and vice versa (Cf. Gen. 2:23).

¹Cf. Gen. 1:27, & 2:18. It is clear that God made man a social being. Solitude is not according to the creation order. A helper was given to man as the embodiment and a complement. On this point, Von Rad comments, "Solitude 'is not good', man is created for sociability. God's kindness sees that it would do man good if a helping creature were given to him 'as his opposite', 'a helper fit for him' (K^enegd). Solitude is therefore defined here very realistically as helplessness (cf. Eccl. 4:9-11). The verse speaks in the first place only of an assistance, of one who is to be for man the embodiment of inner and outer encouragement." Gerhard Von Rad, Genesis, trans. John H. Marks (London: SCM Press, 2nd., 1963), p. 80.

²Cf. Genesis 2:21-24. It became clear that no creature from the animal creations could provide a fit companion for man, therefore, from his own body (rib) his life-partner was created and given to him. Actually, man and woman were originally one flesh and they completely belonged to each other, thus, they should come together again in one flesh. The aetiological purpose of the narrator is viewed in verse 24, "Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother, and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh." This text cannot be taken as conclusive evidence for the monogamic marriage, but it wants to supply an answer for the question: why does man separate from his parents and cling to his wife?

However, the whole narrative of creation, on which the Christian doctrine of man is partly based, expresses that marriage is an order of God's creation. Also concerning the question of divorce in Matthew 19:2 ff., Jesus refers to the order of creation in pointing out that the creator made male and female, and in the institution of marriage they leave their parents and become one flesh, so that what God has joined together, should not be separated by man. The possibility of receiving a 'certificate of divorce' is nevertheless confined to unfaithfulness as expressed in the sin of unchastity as mentioned in the Mosaic Laws.¹ Divorce is not the will of God (MT. 19:8), but rather it is allowed "for your hardness of heart Moses allowed you to divorce your wife, but from the beginning it was not so."² An unbeliever could not see the full function of marriage in this light. Seeking God and trusting in Him, the Christian finds life more abundant. In God, married life means more to a believer.

The Psalmist could rejoice in the works of God, saying, "The heavens are telling the glory of God; and the firmament proclaims his handiwork" (Ps. 19:1). The same truths are voiced in the hymn:

All things bright and beautiful,
 All creatures great and small,
 All things wise and wonderful:
 The Lord God made them all. 2

If under God's providence all things are good and all events have

¹The Law code of the Old Testament concerning the position of woman, marriage and divorce is found in Deuteronomy 22:28 ff., 24:7 ff.; Exodus 22:1 ff., Genesis 34:1 ff. They are not purely Hebrew thoughts but rather "infiltrations of Arabian influences which are still discernible in modern Islam." Helmut Thielicke, The Ethics of Sex, trans. John W. Doberstein, (London: James Clark & Co., Ltd., 1964), p. 105.

²Mt. 19:8.

³Cecil F. Alexander, "All things bright and beautiful", The Methodist Hymn 1 (America: The Methodist Publishing House, 1939), No. 447.

meaning, then why should men suffer? Suffer from disease, from famine, from war, from calamities, from political conflicts? Is there any meaning? Do they come from God? If not, where do they come from? Could men not avoid them? These questions have been raised from generation to generation, yet they remain unanswered. Probably they could never be solved as long as man remains in this sinful state. These questions are concerned with mankind in general as well as with the individual. The main problem is in man himself, not in the sufferings that beset men. Often there are talks about the danger of a hydrogen bomb but it is often forgotten that man is the actual danger. A hydrogen bomb could do no harm unless being made and used by man. The question is "Is it we who punish ourselves?"¹

Some Suffering Figures

Joseph

In the Bible we read about God and men. In those times, as it is today, suffering was part of ordinary life. How did they deal with the problem? Did they see suffering in the scope of God's providence? In the Book of Genesis, the history of Joseph, the son of Jacob, throws light on this problem.

When one thinks of Joseph's life as a whole, the picture of his suffering becomes clearer. At home, he suffered from his brothers' envy and hatred, he travelled to Dothan, was thrown into a pit, sold to Midianite merchants, enslaved in Potiphar's house,

¹It is we who punish ourselves', The Outlook (Official Journal of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand), September, 3rd, 1966, p. 13.

tempted by his master's wife, put into prison, faced the crimes and dreams of a court official and in all these he appeared to be always on the suffering side. Did these things occur according to God's plan? Did the events - the jealousy, sensuality and the famine - mean something to him? Without looking at the latter part of his life one is not able to know the meaning. But finally he became ruler of Egypt. Revealing himself to his brothers, he said,

And now do not be distressed, or angry with yourselves, because you sold me here; for God sent me before you to preserve life... And God sent me before you to preserve for you a remnant on earth, and to keep alive for you many survivors. So it was not you who sent me here, but God; and he has made me a father to Pharaoh, and lord of all his house and ruler over all the land of Egypt (Gen. 45:5-8).

The main reason for his success was that "the Lord was with Joseph, and he became a successful man" (Gen. 39:2). Of course, this does not always become so clear in the everyday life of suffering men and women, but as far as Joseph was concerned, his trust was always in God, and this trust enabled him to endure suffering and his firm faith in God opened his eyes to see the purpose of God in his own life.

Job

So far as the problems of sin and suffering are concerned, the Book of Job cannot be left untouched.

It is generally agreed that the Book of Job is one of the supreme pieces of work ever written in the Bible as well as in the world's literature. It is a masterpiece above all poems of the world.

It is generally accepted that the story of Job has a historical person behind it. Job, according to many scholars, was not a contem-

porary of the author, but an ancient hero whom the author used as the vehicle of his message.¹

It is unlikely that the purpose of the Book of Job is to try to solve the problem of human suffering but is intended to protest against the conception that suffering is the proof and wages of sin.² It asks attention for the problem of innocent suffering.

The speeches of the friends of Job can be considered as the traditional orthodox view, namely, that disease is the evidence of God's wrath and the proof of sin.³ Some scholars asserted that the Old Testament directly connects sin and suffering and that the author of Job was the first to oppose this view.⁴ This view, however, is disputable. Long before the time of Job there were those who believed in the innocence of the sufferer. In the Book of Genesis, Abel was murdered by his brother Cain (Gen. 4:4). No reader would say that Abel had deserved such a death. Naboth was murdered by the Queen Jezebel and he was deprived of his vineyard. Immediately Elijah came to rebuke Jezebel and Ahab. The suffering prophet, Jeremiah,

¹H. H. Rowley, From Moses to Qumran (London: Lutterworth Press, 1964), p. 159.

²Ibid., p. 170.

³Cf. Robert Davidson, The Old Testament (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1964), pp. 166-179.

⁴Cf. Ibid., p. 171. Also, I. B. Matthews, The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel, pp. 171 ff. Quoted by Rowley, The Faith of Israel (London: SCM Press, 1956), p. 114.

deserved not his suffering. It is clear that there were people as innocent as Job who suffered as severely as Job before the time of Job.¹

In the background of the Book of Job, stands the history of the Israelites of the pre-exilic period.² The Israelites were governed by monotheism which was just in its primary state and needed to grow into maturity.³ They were taught by their prophets that their God, who was active in every event, ruled human affairs so accurately and rigidly that it was always well with the righteous and ill with the wicked. The existence of sin and wickedness was a basic explanation of all suffering. The righteous man was always blessed and the wicked one was always cursed.⁴ These verses of reference are the fundamental teachings of the theory of retribution.⁵ We can simply put it in another way by saying "Man reaps what man has sown." It has something in common with the Buddhist idea of 'Karma'.

The fall and the corruption of the nation of Israel gave rise to a strong conflict between the general traditional teaching and the fate of their nation. They were defeated and captured by the heathen who were considered wicked. The righteous, the brave, the loyal and the heroic among the people of God, even the prophets

¹Rowley, From Moses to Qumran, op. cit., pp. 171.

²It is generally agreed that the Book is written some time after the exile, i.e. after 587 B.C. Cf. W.A. Irwin, "Job", Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. M. Black & H.H. Rowley (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd., 1964), p. 391. Also, W. Baumgartner, "The Wisdom Literature", The Old Testament & Modern Study, (ed. H.H. Rowley (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1953), p. 217.

³James Strahan, The Book of Job (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1913), p. 4 ff.

⁴Cf. Ex. 15:26; Dt. 7:15; 11:26-28; Ps. 1:2-3, 37:25 ff; Prov. 11.

⁵Ibid.

themselves, suffered (cf. 720 B.C. the capture of the Northern Kingdom. 587 B.C. The defeat of the Southern Kingdom.) It seemed that God had forsaken them. The wicked flourished and suffered no punishment. The faith of monotheism was severely tested.

From the eighth century B.C. onwards the history of the Israelites was a history of tragedies. Many of them doubted whether Yahweh was really their living God, the Redeemer of Israel, who had delivered them from the hand of Pharaoh. Seeing the tragic state, their prophets began to ask, "O Lord, how long shall I cry for help and thou wilt not hear? Or cry to thee 'violence!' and thou wilt not save? Why dost thou make me see wrongs and look upon trouble?" (Hab. 1:2). "Why does the way of the wicked prosper? Why do all who are treacherous thrive?" (Jer. 12:1; cf. Ps. 89:38 f). They suffered from wars, from wickedness, from injustice, and many seers one after another, arose to seek an explanation for the mystery of suffering, especially for the mystery of those who were innocent but in pain, but none could succeed. In the same way, the author of the Book of Job, attempted to throw some light on the problem.¹

The Book of Job falls into five parts:

- (1) The Prologue, Chapters 1-2.
- (2) The Dialogue, Chapters 3-31.
- (3) The speeches of Elihu, Chapters 32-37.
- (4) The Speeches of God. Chapters 38-42:6.
- (5) The Epilogue. Chapter 42:7-17.

A brief summary of the Book of Job might help to show more clearly the problem of innocent suffering in the life of Job.

The prologue gives a clear picture of who Job was. He was a pious man, righteous and just in the sight of God. He dwelt in the land of

¹James Strahan, op. cit., pp. 71.

Uz near the country of Edom. He was rich, very prosperous and was regarded as the wealthiest of all people in the land.

God was pleased with Job as He knew Job's piety and the upright and honest attitude toward Him. God told Satan that "there is none like him in all the earth ..." (Job 1:8). Satan, however, throw doubt on Job's loyalty and asked, "Doth Job fear God for nought?" (Job 1:9). Satan considered Job's piety as something he gave in return for God's blessing. Satan challenged God by suggesting that Job should be tested by depriving him of his wealth and children. This, Satan believed, would turn Job from God. Immediately the permission to try Job was granted. The first test was confined to Job's property, and soon after the permission was given to Satan, Job received word that his possessions had been stolen. The tests were carried further, news was brought to Job that his servants were murdered and his children put to death. Hearing this, Job tore his garment and prayed to God saying, "Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return hither; the Lord gave and the Lord hath taken; blessed be the name of the Lord." (Job 1:21). By these words of Job, Satan was defeated for the first time.

Having failed, Satan came to God again and asked for a second chance to test Job. God answered him,

Have you considered my servant Job that there is none like him on the earth, blameless and upright man, who fears God and turns away from evil? He still holds fast his integrity, although you moved me against him, to destroy him without cause (Job 2:3).

However, Satan argued that a good test should not be confined to the deprivation of Job's property, but Job himself should be smitten. Again God gave him permission to challenge Job, but not to take his life. Satan went and "afflicted Job with loathsome sores from the sole of his foot to the crown of his head" (Job 2:1). Seeing his

illness, his wife rebuked him; "Do you still hold fast your integrity? Curse God, and die." (Job 2:4). But Job remained faithful to God. He answered, "Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?" (Job 2:10). For a second time Satan failed. Job remained steadfast. God's victory prevailed.

Then a new factor moved in: Job's friends came to argue with him concerning his sufferings. His friends, Eliphaz, Bildad, Zophar and Elihu tried to convince him that his sickness, disaster and losses were the result of the wrath of God and the punishment for his sin. Job could hardly believe them. Suffering from sickness and losses, he cursed the day of his birth, and wished he had never been born. Yet, his friends were sure of his guilt or at least, the guilt of his children, otherwise God's wrath would not have come upon him. Moreover, God punished him less than he deserved (cf. Job 11:6; 8:4; 5:2). Job found it difficult to accept this as an explanation of his suffering. He sought no explanation but wished that God would offer him a severe death so that he could escape from his pain (Job 10:8 ff). Perhaps he even thought of committing suicide. Yet he did not, because he knew that his Redeemer was alive:

For I know my redeemer liveth, and at last he will stand upon the earth, and after my skin has been thus destroyed without my flesh, I shall see God, whom I shall see on my side and my eyes shall behold and not another (Job 19:25-27).

At last God spoke to him through the creation (Job 38:42). He came to Job not as an enemy but as a friend whom Job had regarded before as a cruel and unjust ruler. God having spoken through the whirlwind and having revealed himself through his creation, Job realized that he knew too little to understand God. He also realized that the problem of suffering was still unsolved, but he trusted in God and believed that the ways of God were right and just. Job

was comforted by his Redeemer and he was content to face the problem and stand firmly in this relationship with God. He recognized that God was far greater than man and that God's ways were not to be explained by human logic.

Collective Suffering

Believing in an all-righteous and absolutely good God, makes it more difficult for the Jewish mind to cope with the problem of the innocent who suffers. It was deeply inserted in the heart of the Jew that man's moral goodness was the way of gaining God's favour and reward, and that moral evil caused His disfavour and ultimate punishment (Prov. 22:4; 11:13; Ps. 37:2; 9). For the Jew, the retribution of goodness and evil has a reference to man's previous moral conduct (Job 5:4; 20:10). The teachings of the Mosaic law emphasize this point by instructing them to honour their parents so that their day may be long in the land (Ex. 20:12; Dt. 6:3).

As far as moral value was concerned, the nation of Israel was considered as a 'whole' as well as consisting of individuals.¹ The prophets, Hosea and Amos illustrated this view clearly by emphasizing that suffering should be considered as deserved punishment whether it concerned an individual or a community (Amos 4:6-12; Hos. 4:9). The punishment for Korah's rebellion would have come down on the whole community if Moses and Aaron had not done intercession for them. Apparently, because of the prayers of Moses and Aaron, the evil fell only on Korah, his company and their families (Num. 16:20-25).² In the same manner, Achan's dishonesty and David's pride illustrated the point (Jos. 7:20 ff; II Sam. 24:15 ff). Here the guilt of the individual affected the whole community and caused the latter to suffer with the transgressor. The prophet Isaiah rebuked the individual

¹Rowley, The Faith of Israel, op. cit., p. 118.

²Israel Gerber, The Psychology of the Suffering mind (New York: Jonathan David Co., 1951), p. 123.

wrongdoers in the community, and said, "Woe to those who are heroes at drinking wine, and valiant men in mixing strong drink, who acquit the guilty for a bribe, and deprive the innocent of his right! ..." (Is. 5:22-23). The evil deeds of those individuals affected the whole community because it is written:

Therefore, as the tongue of fire devours the stubble, and as dry grass sinks down in the flame, ... Therefore, the anger of the lord was kindled against his people, and he stretched out his hand against them and smote them, and the mountains quaked; ... For all this, his anger is not turned away and his hand is stretched out still (Is. 5:24 ff).

It is true that the community suffers for the sake of individual sin and misconduct, but it is also true that an individual often suffers because of the misdeeds of a community. This is clearly illustrated in the life of Moses. He spent half of his life in the land of Midian and another half in the wilderness. The first half was mainly spent in keeping the flock of Jethro, his father-in-law. There he lost his chance of enjoying the luxuries of life in the palace of Egypt. As a herdsman in the land of Midian he received a good training in preparation for his future work which God had in mind for him. God called him out of the burning bush. (Ex. 3:4 ff). God knew him face to face (Dt. 34:10). God established him as a great servant to deliver his people from the hand of Pharaoh. Pharaoh was defeated by God who sent the ten plagues and submerged him in the water of the Red Sea. Finally, Moses led his people out of Egypt.

However, he suffered with and for his people. Many times his people revolted against him, rebelled against God, forsook him and disobeyed God's covenant. Among his people, Moses was the one who suffered most.

In the wilderness, under mount Sinai and finally on the top of mount Nebo from where he could see the promised land, he died before he could enter (Dt. 32:50 ff).

Seeing the whole picture of his life and death, one is inclined to agree that the price of his sufferings was paid for the sins committed "in the midst of the children of Israel." Yet, Moses could sing the glory and praise and the greatness of God.¹

Disciplinary purpose of Suffering

Apart from the idea of retribution, there is 'innocent' suffering as well as suffering for the welfare of others, examples of which have already been rendered in referring to Job and Moses respectively. Some suffering however, serve a purpose of discipline. In Elihu's speeches (Job 32-37), the argument is put forward that suffering is disciplinary and necessary for man. In his book The Problem of Human Suffering, Blake points out that suffering is not always retribution. He says: "If fault is always found in the creature just because of creaturehood and if that suffering ever goes along with it, then of course suffering is not penal or retribution."² Elihu explained that suffering served a purpose to improve man's moral conduct. Suffering is for the good of man. It aims to makes man better. It sometimes expresses the love of God rather than His anger (Job. 35:15, 19 ff). "Correct me" says Jeremiah, "O Lord, but in just measure; not in thy anger, lest thou bring me to nothing" (Jer. 10:24). A similar thought is found in Leviticus, "And if in spite of this, you will not hearken to me, then I will chastise you again seven fold for your sins" (Lev. 26:18). In this quotation the stress must be put on the word 'chastise' meaning to correct or to assist in finding the correct way. Also it is found in the letter to Hebrews, "For the Lord disciplines those whom he loves" (Heb. 12:6).

¹Dt. 32:3 ff. Cf. Paul Tournier, op. cit., p. 188.

² Quoted by Israel J. Gerber, op. cit., p. 129.

Suffering as Enrichment

Suffering sometimes causes men to blame God and to argue with God and with man as Job did; but it can also draw one nearer to God and enable one to have closer fellowship with God. It is man's nature to seek God for help when he suffers from sickness and shortcomings. There is a tendency to forget God when one lives in peace, in good health and in prosperity, but in trouble one is quick to call upon Him for release from troubles and distress. For it is realised that God is near when troubles assail, for his promise is "When he calls to me, I will answer him" (Ps. 91:15). Because of the terrible pain of disease and suffering, Job imagined that God had forsaken him. On the contrary, God was suffering with Job. One can agree with Gerber, when he says, "that God suffers with the sufferer is likewise seen in the prologue of the book of Job".¹ In the same manner, God was with Joseph in his suffering by the hands of his brothers, in prison and in Potiphar's house. God was with Moses in the wilderness. God was also with Jeremiah in his suffering (Jer. 12:7-11). But in the last and final instance, the pain of suffering became cruelly visible in the Suffering Messiah suffered not for his own sake, but for a lost world. There Isaiah 53:4 ff. became manifested and there, it was shown, that God in the Suffering Servant completely identified himself with man and his suffering.

Suffering enriches prayer life because the sufferer is frequently driven out to seek God. Questioning, arguing, and seeking answers are often part and parcel of the sufferer's prayer. It happened in Moses's prayer, "Return, O Lord! How long? Have pity on thy servant!". (Ps. 90:13). "O Lord, why dost thy wrath burn hot against thy peoples, whom thou hast brought forth out of the land of Egypt with great power and with a mighty hand? Why ... (Ex. 32:11 ff).

¹Gerber, op. cit., p. 134; cf. McKenzie, Guilt: its meaning and significance (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1962), pp. 167 ff.

Personal prayer is the most helpful thing for a sufferer, for he could talk with God through his prayer, he could bring out his anguish, his distress, his sorrow and his whole heart to God. If he feels guilty he could confess his sin. Jeremiah's confessions were concerned with both his own iniquity and that of his nation. Though he reaffirm the individual's freedom, the freedom of talking to God privately, where one can open one's mind and heart before God yet he never forgot to pray for the whole nation of which he himself was a member. "We acknowledge our wickedness O Lord, and the iniquities of our fathers, for we have sinned against thee. Do not spurn us ..." (Jer. 14:20). He confessed in his prayer the guilt of his people Israel (Jer. 2:3). Job's prayer was mainly concerned with his own suffering. Immediately after he had heard the tragic news, he came to confess and to worship God (Job 1:20), but later on, even he, like the other sufferers, brought his doubt to God and raised his problems.¹

No doubt pain, sickness and disease are used as mediums to test man's religious quality. Probably the reality of one's religious faith can become known only in difficult times. Man's loyalty, his saintship his goodness can be proved real by a test of suffering. This was seen in Job's life and times. Also, the Hebrew patriarch, Abraham's faith was submitted to a test (Gen. 22 f). During his life time he experienced at least ten tests.² Not every kind of suffering serves the same purpose. When 'test' applies to a righteous man, not only his goodness is tested, but his whole body, physical and spiritual.

Of Course, the wicked cannot be tested. Illness and suffering as 'tests' and ways and means of spiritual enrichment, very seldom convey any meaning to the unbeliever, for there must be the belief that God is behind the suffering and has a purpose with suffering men.

¹ Cf. Job 10:2 ff., 13:20 ff., 14:13 ff., 40:4; 42:6; confessions are also found in Psalms 51; 42 etc.

² Gerber, op. cit., p. 131.

We have already examined in the Old Testament some references to sin and sickness and some general conclusions have been obtained resulting from this survey. We are permitted to say that some Old Testament thoughts on this subject are recurring in the New Testament, but it is also clear that some of the Old Testament thoughts are enriched and fulfilled by the progressing revelation of the New Testament. Now we turn to the New Testament to see how the problem sickness and sin is dealt with under this new dispensation.

IV
SIN AND SICKNESS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

(a) Sickness and Sin in the Gospels

The account of the healing of a paralysed man by Jesus Christ is commonly interpreted as illustrating the connection between sickness and sin.¹ Before healing the paralysed man, Jesus saw the faith of the man's friends and He said to him, "Man, your sins are forgiven." Hearing this, the audience, which included lawyers and pharisees, murmured against Him. Then he said to the paralysed man, "I say to you, stand up, take your bed and go home." And at once he rose before them, took up his bed, and went home praising God. Here we see a link between sickness and sin. The reader of this miracle would easily be inclined to say that forgiveness of sin is the precondition of healing. But it is not always seen in every kind of sickness. It is dangerous to go so far as to say that the cause of the paralytic's affliction was sin. Jesus did not mention that at all. Apparently, the main purpose of this miracle was "to convince you that the Son of man has the right on earth to forgive sins" and that "the Son of man has the power to heal the sick."²

This kind of paralysis linked to sin can find a parallel reference in the work of psychology. In the investigations of modern psychology there is a particular case telling that a soldier was paralysed because he desired to escape from the duty of fighting.³ He was afraid

¹Mt. 9:1-8; Mk. 2:1-12; Lk. 5:18-26 (NEB).

²Mt. 9:6-8.

³Weatherhead, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

Cf. J.A. Hadfield, Psychology and Mental Health (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1960), p. 211, 213.

of incurring a penalty and felt guilty because of this desire. Thus, it resulted in his paralysis. Suffering from this disease, his desire was fulfilled and his tension of guilt-feeling was reduced for he could say, "I am already paralysed, you can not ask me to fight against the enemy!" It is an interesting case, but we can not equate it to the case of the paralysed man healed by Jesus. All we can say is that there are some similar features found in both stories and nothing more than this.

Of course, sin might cause disease, but it does not necessarily follow. Adultery, for example might either cause syphilis or not cause any disease at all if the adulterer took hygienic precautions.¹

Disease is not necessarily the penalty of sin; one has to differentiate between the penalty of sin and its consequence. As far as sin is concerned, the sinner could escape its penalty but not its consequence. The consequence of sin is always separation from God and the deterioration of the personality. This is the constant result of all sinning. To quote Professor R. Siekede, "How often do we find sins without disease, and disease without sin."²

It seems that the belief of a causal relationship between sickness and sin was current in the time of Jesus. The audience of the healing miracle of the paralytic seemed to hold the current belief; even the disciples of Jesus held the same thought (Mt. 9:1-8). Whenever they saw a person suffering from disease, they were apt to think that this person must have sinned in some way or he would not be ill. But Jesus' attitude was different from theirs. When Jesus and his disciples saw a man born blind, his disciples, put the question, "Rabbi, who sinned, this man or his parents? Why was he born blind?" This question implied that the man may have sinned while he was yet in his mother's womb.

¹Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 342.

²Quoted in Paul Tournier, op. cit., p. 19.

Penetrating their minds, Jesus answered, "It is not that this man or his parents sinned; he was born blind that God's power might be displayed in curing him."¹ Here, Jesus ignores the question of inherited sin. That the man born blind was simply a fact that could provide an occasion for 'the work of God' to be made manifest.

The problem of whether a child can be said to be born sinful was argued among Rabbis. Apparently, they tended to give a positive answer. But there were some Rabbis like Rabbi Elisha Abija who once dealt with a case quoted as follows:

Elisha B. Abija (c. A.D. 120) deals with the instance of a pregnant mother who enters into an idol's temple, and smells the sacrifice. The odour penetrates her body like the poison of a snake. He rules that the unborn child did not sin. The mother is responsible for her child's later apostasy from the true faith. 2

Probably, this is a particular case found in Rabbinical teachings. However, it denotes that there were some Rabbis who tried to avoid linking up a causal relationship of sin between parents and child.

Jesus' position on this problem is made clear by noting another case found in the Gospel of St. Luke, chapter 13:1-9. Here, Jesus was talking with his disciples about a massacre of Galileans by Pilate, the Roman Governor. He said,

Do you imagine that, because these Galileans suffered this fate, they must have been greater sinners than anyone else in Galilee? I tell you they were not; but unless you repent you will all of you come to the same end. Of the eighteen people who were killed when the tower fell on them at Siloam - do you imagine they were more guilty than all the other people living in Jerusalem? I tell you they were not; but unless you repent you will all of you come to the same end. 3

Definitely, Jesus denied that these victims were greater sinners than other

¹John 9:1ff (NEB).

²Quoted by R.H. Strachan in The Fourth Gospel (London: SCM Press 1960), p. 217 (footnote).

³Lk 13:1-5.

men. He did not put a direct causal link between these victims and their sins. He brought out the fatal accident of the fall of the tower of Siloam to illustrate the question concerning the Galilean victims, to show that the problem of suffering cannot be simply taken as an isolated problem, for men suffer together. All men are equally sinful in the sight of God. Suffering is not an indication that one sufferer is more sinful than the other. "Unless you repent", urged Jesus, "you will all of you come to the same end." He asked every man to focus the attention on his own guilt and not to judge people's sin from their calamities. This is the vital point of his speech. His calls to repentance not only applied to sick people, but also to every single individual.

In the New Testament, only a small portion of the Synoptic Gospels deals with sin. Though Jesus seldom taught the nature and the consequences of sin, he was aware of its existence and its tragic end. He himself was sure that he could overcome it and was convinced that at the end of the battle against sin the victory would be his.

His attitude towards sinners and the outcast was entirely different from that of the Pharisees and the Scribes. It is made plain in the Gospels, especially in Luke 15-19, a passage which is entitled by some scholars as 'The Gospel of the Outcast.'¹ This Gospel begins with the three parables of chapter 15. At the background of it stands the love of God which is manifested in the picture in which Jesus is eating and drinking with the outcast, the tax-gatherer and the sinners. The Pharisees and the Scribes criticised him, saying, "This man receives sinners and eats with them."² Then He answered them with the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin, followed by the parable of the Prodigal Son.

¹ T.W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1964), p. 282.

² Lk 15:2.

The first two parables (Lk 15:3-10) form a pair which express the love of God, the Father towards sinful men. The parable simply says, if a man has lost one of his hundred sheep, he would leave the ninety-nine and go after the lost one till he finds it and gets it back again. Then his friends would rejoice with him over the lost one being found. The highest point of this parable is in vs. 7. It says, "Even so, I tell you there will be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents than over ninety-nine righteous persons who need not repent." The parable of the Lost Coin conveys the same meaning, that is, that Jesus came to seek and find the lost and to restore them to God the Father. The frame of references of these Parables is that the taxgatherer, the Pharisees, and the sinners belong to God as his children. God loves them and wants them back. Despite all kinds of trouble and difficulty, He seeks them till He finds them. If people would take such trouble (Lk 15:4,8) to recover their lost property, how much more trouble would God take to secure the return of His lost children.

The love of God for the unloved and the unlovable is simply a heavy blow toward the attitude of the Pharisees and the Scribes who lacked sympathy and compassion and also regarded themselves as more righteous than other people. Probably they were taught not to have any associations with the outcast. This kind of teaching was not rare in the Rabbinical rules. For instance, an old Rabbinical rule from Mekhilta on Exod. 18:1, says, "Let not a man associate with the wicked, not even to bring him nigh to the Law."¹ The strictest attitude towards sinners was more or less influenced by this sort of teaching.

The last parable in Luke 15 is the well known story of the Prodigal Son. It has something in common with the preceding two. The explanation of it can be briefly summarized as follows.

¹Quoted by T.W. Manson, op. cit., p. 283.

The father represents God; the elder brother the Jews - the Pharisees and Scribes - the younger brother the publicans and sinners, namely, the Gentiles.¹ The care and the patience of the father for his two sons indicates the love of God for sinners. The father's joy expressed on the return of his Prodigal son indicates the joy of God when He receives a repentant sinner.

From this parable, we get an idea of how Jesus understood sin and sinners and how the Father forgives them. The younger brother left his father's house, went his own way, lost touch with his father, and stayed away from his father and had all the pleasure and enjoyment. This is the clearest picture of a sinner. The second picture of the younger brother shows a repentant sinner coming back to his father. When the younger brother had spent all he had and had suffered from famine; then with a contrite heart, he returned and said, "Father, I have sinned against God and against you; I am no longer fit to be called your son; treat me as one of your paid servants."² The story leads to the highest point when the father seeing him at a distance, ran and embraced him and kissed him and received him and loved him as a son.

In the last part of the story, the elder brother could not forgive him but treated him as if he were still a sinner. This elder brother stood in the same position as those Jews and Pharisees did in keeping the commandments of their Father but showing no compassion to the outcast sinners. He called his brother 'this son of yours' which implying that he refused to have any relationship and brotherhood with such a sinner.

The contrast between the attitudes of the father and the elder brother, reflected a harsh and censorious attitude held by the self-

¹Lk 15:1. The word 'publicans' is used by T.W. Manson & other NT scholars; cf. Gottfried Quell, et al., op. cit., p. 65.

²Lk 15:19. Cf. T.W. Manson, op. cit., p. 288.

righteous toward sinners. A fundamental principle of the relationship between God and the sinner is found in this parable of Jesus. Although men are sinners, God loves them and because of this Divine love, which is manifested through Jesus the Friend of publicans and sinners, the repentance of sinners is made possible.¹

Another clear picture which the Gospel gives is Jesus, the Friend of sinners and of those who were ill. He used to have fellowship with them during a meal or through an act of healing. He came to have a meal with Matthew the tax-gatherer (Mt 9:10ff), and thus he was called 'a friend of taxgatherers and sinners' (Mt 11:9). As far as human fellowship is concerned, eating together is a genuine way of expressing a close fellowship with one another. He came to Peter's house and healed the fever of his mother-in-law. When she was healed she got up and waited on Him (Mt 8:14ff). An outcast leper came to ask for cleansing and said, "Sir, if only you will, you can cleanse me." Jesus stretched out his hand and touched him, and said, "Indeed I will; be clean again." And his leprosy was cured immediately.² He was made whole again and restored to God and to the society in which he could regain full fellowship with people and was no longer regarded as an outcast.³

The best way to express human friendship, love and care to a sick person is through the act of healing. A Sick person wants to become a friend of the doctor, wants to be healed, and wants to be treated as a human being, not simply as a case. The best gift to such a person is the restoration of health. We notice that Jesus is a physician of the sick and His healing work is meaningful and a source of joy to men. He reconciled both the sick and sinners to God through the power of healing and the authority of forgiving

¹Mt 11:19; Lk7:34.

²Mt 8:2ff.

³According to Mosaic Law, a leper is to be excluded from the community. Cf. J. Hastings (ed.), A Dictionary of the Bible (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1900), Vol. III, p. 97; cf. Lev. 13.

sin. He ended the separation from God by drawing men into fellowship with himself and leading them into the way of repentance.

Through fellowship with Him, sinners become aware of their own guilt and this awareness of sin is the precondition of repentance. Zacchaeus' awareness of his own guilt (Lk 19:1 ff), and Peter's realization of sin (Lk 5:8) are both illustrations of this point.

Healing work and forgiveness of sin went hand in hand in the mission of Jesus till finally on the cross and in his Resurrection, he gained a victory over sin, sickness and death. Not only He himself did the work but he also commanded his disciples and his Church to do the same, namely, to preach the coming of the Kingdom of God and to heal the sick.¹

(b) Christ's Healing Works

Through the insight in the Gospel, the reader becomes aware of the purpose of God revealed in the life and work of Jesus. His intense care for the hopeless, the helpless, the outcast, the unclean and all the sufferers was because of his infinite Love. The significance of his healing work and the forgiveness of sin is that it was based on love, love for sinners and for those in pain, love that asks nothing in return. His whole mission was to establish the Kingdom of God by teaching, preaching, healing and forgiving sinners. He was concerned with men in their totality, with men in their physical and spiritual needs. Those who were bodily ill needed Him as much as the sinners. They both required fellowship with Him. Sinners and those who were ill both were lacking the presence of Jesus.

As far as the Gospel is concerned, healing and the forgiving of sin are two inseparable things in the same purpose of reconciling men

¹Lk 9:1-2; 10:8; Mt. 9:35.

to God. They link up with each other in the mission of Christ and his disciples.¹

If there is a link between healing of sickness and forgiving of sin, there is also a link between human illness and human guilt, and then it follows that there is a link between sin and sickness.² It is, however, dangerous to jump from this connection to the conclusion of saying that the cause of disease is sin. Jesus did not indicate such a direct relationship when he practised his healing act and used his authority to forgive sinners. In fact, Jesus accepted sickness as a part of everyday life and made it clear that the stress should not be put on the causes of sickness and sin, but on the healing to the glory of the name of God.

The Wholeness of Man

As far as human health and healing are concerned the wholeness of self cannot be neglected. Man is an inseparable unity: body, a soul and mind cannot be separated one from another.³ The essential idea of the wholeness of man is based on the New Testament's teaching summarized in the words: the Word became flesh.

The danger of treating man as simply a mechanical or physical being as found in the teaching of Gnosticism and of Asceticism, and in the eastern religions and the western Greek traditions that 'spirit is good and flesh is evil', should be avoided. Man is a trinity in a unity of body, mind and spirit. He is not merely a physical body nor a purely mechanical being, nor is he just a spiritual creature that dwells in the body, for his is created by God in God's image.

¹Cf. Mk 2:17; Mt. 21:31 ff; 18:21 ff; Mk 1:15.

²Paul Tournier, op. cit., p. 189.

³Paul Tournier, The Healing of Persons (London: Lowe & Brydone Ltd., 1966), p. trans. Edwin Hudson, pp. 54-66; Weatherhead, op. cit., pp. 315-320; Phyllis L. Garlick, The Wholeness of Man, (London: Highway Press, 1943), pp. 62-63; 181 ff.

The wholeness of man consists of the life in full fellowship with God in whom man finds the completeness of his life - the most abundant life. "I am come that men might have life and that they might have it more abundantly."¹

Hence, the treatment for the sickness of man cannot be regarded merely as medicinal nor only as physical relief from pain. Nor can a sick person be healed by means of so called 'faith' without consulting a practitioner or physician to whom God has given skills of specialisation in his particular calling. The most valuable and effective way of treating the sick is the one in which the knowledge of all experts i.e. that of the doctor, the psychiatrist, and the minister are cooperating. We must treat the patient as a person, a man who needs complete treatment, a man who needs to be made whole, and not merely as an impersonal case.

The health of a person can be rapidly improved if science and religion join as creative partners in the task that neither could accomplish alone. As far as human health is concerned, religion can not be left out. Garlick says,

Today we are at least beginning to rediscover the therapeutic value of religion; to appreciate the fact that active faith in God is curative in its effect; that restoration to moral and spiritual health opens the way to a new inrush of vitality. 2

Also, P.E. Johnson says,

Religion develops the emotional attitudes that open the flood gates to release dammed-up energies and that provide access for tides of health to rise steadily within us. 3

Both religion and psychology play essential parts in healing and health. The influence of mind and spirit upon the physical body is great; they

¹John 10:10.

²Phyllis L. Garlick, Health and Healing (London: Edinburgh House Press, 1948), p. 65.

³P.E. Johnson, Pastoral Ministration (Digswell Place: James Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1964), p. 179.

are closely associated and interact with one another. The one is not more important than the others.¹ Both mental and spiritual powers exercise a vital influence on disease and health. No treatment for the sick which excludes religion and mental factors is a good treatment. Hence, "any treatment of the subject of mind and medicine which ignores religion, thereby loses sight of the fundamental unity of personality."²

In the Gospels we see how healing played a vital part in the work of Jesus (Mt. 4:23). We can hardly find a sick man who came to Jesus and went away disappointed. All the sick who came for help were unquestionably healed by Him (cf. Lk 4:40). Undoubtedly, the healing mission of Jesus is an essential part of His redemptive mission. He came to save sinners, He loosed those in bondage, made the blind see and the sick well again. Through His redemptive act, they were saved, and given life more abundantly. His preaching, teaching and healing were based on his love for men. He refused to perform any act of healing which might create an emotional atmosphere for the bystanders to believe in Him. He condemned the Pharisees when He was asked by them to perform a miracle.³ He healed the sick only because he loved them; He taught them because He loved them. Because he loved them he saved them. His act of healing is an expression of his redemption to bring sinners, including the sick, to reconciliation with God. Without doubt, Mark, chapter II, makes this very clear. In this narrative, the paralytic not only recovered from his palsy, but his sins were also forgiven and He was reconciled to God (Mk 2:5 ff).

¹Weatherhead, op. cit., pp. 315 ff.

²Garlick, Health and Healing (London: Edinburgh House Press, 1948), p. 66.

³Mt. 2:5 ff.

The Healing Miracles

Before healing miracles are considered, we should realize that men are limited beings. We live on a limited planet; our energies are limited, our eyesight can only reach a certain distance, our ears can hear only certain vibrations and for certain distances. There are many things, known or unknown, which we still do not understand. We do not know how they work or why they happen or how they come into being. There are many miracles which cannot be interpreted by today's so called 'science', but this does not mean that they are not true or that they do not exist. On the other hand, we find some of the miracles can be explained by today's so called natural law with which we are familiar. We should always humble ourselves to realize that we were created by the almighty God. Our knowledge is limited, our vocabulary is limited, our language and senses are all limited. Science also is limited. What we know today about our cosmos is so little in comparison with what God knows. There are thousands of things, seen or unseen which we are not able to explain, Why? Because our knowledge is not yet complete enough to find the answers. Even in our own physical bodies, we believe, there are factors, spiritual or material, which have not yet been discovered, and are not known by even the greatest physician or scientist. No one can dare to claim that he knows completely God's mighty action in the world, that he completely understands and can explain God's miracles. We should confess that our understanding is limited, though we must try our best to explain in the language and thought of today what we do know and understand about the miracles of Jesus.

We should avoid the mistake of thinking that things which cannot be analyzed by science are untrue. We are living in a scientific age, we can talk about science and think of science and its advantage for us. We see all the necessities invented by scientists. But let us

think about the men of two thousand years ago, right back to the time of Jesus and his disciples, say about 100 B.C. - A.D. 100. They lived in a world where the word 'science' was never heard. They were in a world where no such thing as science was mentioned. The writers of the Gospels could hardly use scientific vocabularies in recording the work and the life of Jesus. How can we expect all healing miracles to be explained in the knowledge of the science of today? We cannot, because some of the miracles may not belong to the plane or category of today's science or natural law.¹

Yet, this does not mean that miracles are contrary to the natural laws if they cannot be explained in a natural way. It is incredible that Jesus would do any work which was contrary to or even against the nature law of the world created by God and within God's will.²

We are today tied down to our own plane, the plane of a secular or material world. We are blind to the spiritual world. Of course, we may find that some of the miracles are on the plane where even we can explain them in detail. We know very little about the power of Jesus which operated through the healing miracles. We cannot tell how far He does possess the mighty power of healing, because God's power cannot be completely investigated by human knowledge. The only way we can know it is by faith and through faith. However, miracles are the power and compassion of God, already involved in His redemptive ministry.

Miracles manifest the love of Jesus especially in the community of his followers and the disciples. It was the power of love that brought Simon the Zealot (or the Cananaean), together with the tax

¹Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 39.

²Ibid., pp. 41 ff.

collector Matthew into the fellowship of Christ. It was this love, expressed in the miracles, which caused many to come and follow him. We can see in the Gospels that all manner of sickness was healed. Men regained their health and shared in the fellowship again.¹

However, Christ's healing work is the work of salvation which is effected by God's purpose of redemption.² It is concerned with the wholeness of man in renewing and fulfilling his entire personality. "By His death he took upon himself the guilt and the suffering of the whole human race, identified himself with men in their sin and their pain, and so was able to offer them forgiveness and peace."³

Healing, as salvation, is more than the relief of symptoms or cure of disease; it is an act of God. In order to clarify this distinction, it will be necessary to examine various aspects of this healing act.

Healing - an act of God

Jesus, the son of God, the healer of all sickness, was sent by God to fulfill God's will for all men.⁴ He fully realized that he came to do the work of his Father. He worked not according to his own will but the will of His Father.

Passages given in the Fourth Gospel clearly indicate Jesus' full recognition of the purpose of God.

To enrich the point we have to go to the Gospels and see how Jesus realized his own responsibility to perform his Father's task.

¹Mk 1:40-45; 3:1-6.

²Dorothee Hoch, Healing and Salvation: studies in ministry and worship (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1958), pp. 15 ff.

³Spiritual Healing, The Report of the Church of Scotland Commission (Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew Press, 121 George Street, 1958), p. 8.

⁴Dorothee Hoch, op. cit., p. 9, 16, 18 ff.

On his way to Galilee, beside the Jacob's well, Jesus had a dialogue with a Samaritan woman who came to fetch water. Having spoken to her about the living water, he raised the point of the will of God and said to his disciples when they offered Him something to eat, "My food is to do the will of Him who sent me, and to accomplish his work! ... " (John 4:42). Clearly, he worked in order to complete God's work and he carried on his work unceasingly to the end on the cross which was also the end of his earthly life.

After he had healed the man who was sick for thirty-eight years, Jesus was persecuted by the Jews because He did this on the Sabbath. To answer these hard-hearted Jews who were leaders of their religion, Jesus told them, "My Father is working still, and I am working" (John 5:7). No doubt, this healing work was the work of God the Father. It was the testimony of the power and authority of God who sent his only begotten son to save and to heal whenever needed. Following the incident on the same passage, Jesus bore witness to himself:

I can do nothing on my own authority ... You sent to John, and he has borne witness to the truth ... But the testimony which I have is greater than that of John; for the works which the Father has granted me to accomplish, these very works which I am doing, bear me witness that the Father has sent me. (John 5:33ff.)

The whole scripture is focused on the work of Jesus. The Father who sent Jesus, bore witness to him that he descended from heaven, preached the word of His Father, carried out the work which was granted him (cf. John 5:36). To accept this testimony is to accept the truthfulness of God and the authority of healing which was given to His son. Many of the Jews rejected this testimony, denied God's will and God's truth. Again John 6:38, conveys the same truth of Jesus' position and his work on earth. He claimed, "I have come down from heaven, not to do my will, but the will of Him who sent me."

Further passages dealing with the relationship of Christ to the Father are found in John 9:4; 5:19; 8:28-29 and 10:30, the latter cites, "I and the Father are one". Here Jesus disclosed his

Messiahship and identified himself in unity with God. Hearing this, the Jews took up stones to stone him. But Jesus defended himself, saying,

If I am not doing the works of my Father, then do not believe me, but if I do them even though you do not believe me, believe the works, that you may know and understand that the Father is in me and I am in the Father (John 10:37-38).

Also in the conversation with his disciple, Philip, who asked him to show them the Father, He said, "He who has seen me, has seen the Father." Jesus identified himself with God the Father by using a general expression of the most intimate relationship of human beings, the relationship of Father and son. Jesus' work is the Father's work; his will is absolutely in harmony with the Father's will. Other passages concerning the work of God are also found elsewhere in the Gospel. In the work of treating the blind man at Siloam (John 9:1 ff), one realizes that the work of healing fully corresponds to the will of God. It is made plain by Jesus' own words that his healing mission is willed by God and that it is also the task of those who follow him. This work is a manifestation of God's activities in history, but it is also a command for his followers to carry it on until the final victory over Satan, sin and sickness.

Healing - an act of Salvation

The healing act of Christ is not only an act of His compassion towards man but also an integrated part of the whole redemptive work of God. It is the salvation of all mankind as well as of the individual.

It is noteworthy that in a theological context the term 'Sozein' (σωζειν) is rendered 'to save'; whereas in a medical context, it is used to mean 'to make whole'.¹

¹Cf. R.A. Lambourne, Community, Church and Healing (Darton: Longman and Todd, 1963), p. 91.

To heal is to make whole. If one gets a cut on one's finger one needs a plaster to cover the injury in order to make it 'whole again.' The cut is a sign of un-wholeness or a mark of injury. If one gets hurt one needs to be healed; till the hurt or injury is fully recovered one would not feel happy and well as before. If one is suffering from depression, one is mentally or psychologically un-whole or unhealthy. One may even need to be treated by an expert in psychiatry. Spiritually anyone who is separated from God, is unwhole. Healing is an act of salvation for men, practised by Jesus and continued by His Church.

Christ is the Saviour, the Messiah whose work is concerned with the salvation of man. The Samaritan woman recognized the Messiah when she had gained the 'living water' after a conversation with Jesus. She said, "I know that the Messiah is coming (he who is called Christ); when he come he will show us all things" (John 4:7,26). This 'living water' of Christ, the Word of God, transformed her life - the truly spiritual life, the divine life - which is the beginning of eternal life.

It was the great transformation of her whole human life from a state of disintegration to integration, and this was the effect of His word. Definitely it does not mean that this was a magical and sudden change, but it rather expresses that the 'living water' which is the source of energy or dynamic power, motivated her inner life towards integration. The work of man's salvation is to be accomplished by preaching and healing which are acts to make a 'old man' new, as Paul would like to put it, and to transform 'water into wine' as Jesus did to convey the metaphysical concept of 'new birth'.¹ It is noteworthy that at the end of the story of the Samaritan woman, Jesus was called by her the 'saviour of the World'.²

¹Cf. C.H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: University Press, 1960), p. 316.

²John 4:42.

We recall the story of the healing of the blind man in John 9, verse 5 where Jesus said: "As long as I am in the world I am the light of the world." This corresponds to John 8:12, "I am the light of the world, he who follows me will not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life." Verse 5 is cited prior to the healing act. Most probably, the author not only used 'light' to denote a metaphysical meaning that the blind could surely regain his sight as one who is saved from darkness and brought into light, but also deeply denoted that by the 'light' God brings salvation to men. From this point of view Christ's healing acts are the acts of salvation - salvation in practice, salvation for man. The term 'salvation' is not found in the Fourth Gospel, but the term 'eternal life' takes its place. The idea of salvation, however, is strongly expressed in the Fourth Gospel.¹

Healing - an act of the Messiah

Matthew interpreted the healing mission of Jesus as a fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah concerning the work of the divine appointed Servant.² In an account of Jesus' healings in Peter's house, Matthew said,

That evening they brought to him many who were possessed by demons; and he cast out the spirits with a word, and healed all who were sick. This was to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet Isaiah 'He took our infirmities and bore our diseases' (Mt. 8:16-17).

According to the footnote of RSV translations of Isaiah 53:4, the term 'griefs' can also be 'sicknesses' and the word 'sorrows' can be 'pains' instead. Thus, the verse can be rendered: "Surely he has borne our sicknesses and carried our pains."

¹R.H. Strachan, The Fourth Gospel (London: SCM Press, 1960), p.72.

²Is. 53:4, 42:1-3.

The suffering Servant, the man of sorrows (Is 53:1-4) who was chosen by God, not only bore men's sins for the ~~sal~~vation of men, but also men's sicknesses and pains.¹

Healings and exorcisms, however, are directly related to the prophecy of the suffering servant, the Messiah, to whom God entrusted his divine plan of salvation. This plan was accomplished in the work of Jesus, the healer of all man.

An incident relating to Jesus' attitude to the Sabbath, described by Matthew, is the healing of a man who had a withered hand. It stresses the significant message that Jesus is the chosen servant (Mt 12:18), the Lord of the Sabbath (Mt 12:8) who has even more right than David (Sam. 21:1-6) and the priests (Lev. 24:5-9) to overrule the law of Sabbath, and to do good on the Sabbath.

To fulfill God's plan for man, Jesus worked unceasingly, even on the Sabbath; he healed the withered hand of the man (Mt 12:12). In this way Jesus again proved himself as the Messiah who came to take the pains and sicknesses on him.

The cure of all sicknesses and the casting out of all demons, are absolutely the responsibilities of the Servant Messiah whose mission was prophesied by the prophet Isaiah (Mt. 8:15-17, 12:15 ff). Isaiah's words were interpreted by Matthew, the Gospel writer, as a fulfilment of Jesus' healing mission:

And many followed him, and he healed them all and ordered them not to make him known. This was to fulfil what was spoken by the prophet Isaiah: 'Behold, my servant whom I have chosen, my beloved with whom my soul is well pleased. I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall proclaim justice to the Gentiles ...' (Mt 12:15-18).

¹Is. 42:1 ff; 42:8, 10; 11:2.

The Servant came to heal the sick and to save sinners so as to bring to pass God's plan for the salvation of man.

Although Jesus himself did not have sin, He exposed himself to common human diseases, he identified himself with a suffering and sinning world and gave himself to free men from sins and sicknesses. On the cross, he died for men's sins as well as for human sicknesses and diseases.¹

Healing - an act of Faith in Christ²

In the healing ministry Jesus often stressed the importance of faith. In some cases 'faith' was needed to guarantee the success of healing; in others, the need of faith was not mentioned.

There was the case of the woman who had a flow of blood for twelve years, and who came to touch the fringe of Jesus' garment and hoped that by that touch her disease would be cured because she had heard of the healing power of Jesus.³ According to Matthew, Jesus turned to her when he knew his garment was touched. And He said to her, "Take heart, daughter your faith has made you well." Both Mark and Luke noted that for twelve years her disease could not be healed by any one. Mark even made it clear that she had spent all that she had on her sickness and it was no better after having been treated by all physicians. Finally, she came to Jesus for she had 'faith' in Him. That was her personal faith which, to a great extent, was different from what we mean by 'Christian faith' today. Apparently

¹Cf. L.H. Brockington, "I & II Isaiah", Peake's Commentary on the Bible, eds. M. Black and H.H. Rowley (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1964), p. 527.

²Bernard Martin, The Healing Ministry in the Church (London: Lutterworth Press, 1964), pp. 42, 75-94.

³Mt 9:20-22; Mk 5:25-34; Lk 8:43-48.

it developed from the failure of all physical means of treatment. Probably it can only be shared by a minority of people who suffer from incurable disease and hope for a 'miracle' to be performed. We are here not to judge the value of her faith. But we are here to know that there were and still are people who have this so called 'faith' which is probably an equivalent of 'last try' after the failure of all medical treatment.

Concerning the case of the two blind men in Matthew 9:27-31, Jesus asked them whether they believed his ability to do it when He was begged to heal them. They answered him, "Yes, Lord." Then Jesus said, "According to your faith be it done to you." And their eyes were opened. Again, this is their personal faith. Jesus simply said that it was 'your faith' without adding any explanation of what he himself meant.

Today, if one likes to suggest a psychological explanation for such a 'faith', one might say that they were cured by means of suggestion.¹

Though such faith is far away from what we mean by christian faith in its full meaning, one thing has to be noted, that is, this sort of faith must be based on a strong will to be healed and a trust in the healer. These two requisites were found in the faith of the woman with a flow of blood (Mt. 9:20-22). Because of her belief in Him, the healing power of God worked through her faith.

Faith of the patient's friends and relatives

God's healing power works also through the faith of those who are concerned with the patient. In all healing miracles in the Gospel we clearly see that the 'faith' of some people often created a suitable

¹Cf. Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 58, 428.

atmosphere in which Jesus could more effectively work and through which the power of God was made known.

To illustrate this point, we may recall the story of the paralytic of Capernaum carried to Jesus by four men.¹ In this case, it seems that the influence of the faith of those four people - the patient's friends or relatives - carried more weight than the faith of the patient himself. When Jesus saw their faith, he forgave the paralytic his sins and somewhat later Jesus also cured him bodily. Their faith showed a complete confidence in Him that he could deal with the need they brought to him. The story mentions only that the patient's legs were paralysed. It seems that the 'forgiveness of sin' was the main curative factor. It may be that Jesus with a penetrating insight knew that the trouble of the patient was really sin or guilt. Meanwhile Jesus learnt also from the atmosphere the minds of the audience who were thinking that the paralytic must have sinned or else he would not be ill. This was in harmony with the current belief that sin was the main cause of all sickness.² We do not know what the atmosphere was which enabled Jesus to know people's minds. Perhaps, a word from Professor C.H. Dodd may help our understanding, "It appears that the authority of Jesus penetrated to the subconscious depth of personality where so many of the more mysterious disorders of mind and body have their source."³

Psychological research assures that a sense of guilt can cause

¹See supra, p. 66. Cf. Mt. 9:1-8; Mk 2:1-12; Lk 5:18-26.

²Cf. John 9:1 ff. Lk 13:1 ff.

³"Man and His Nature", p. 82; quoted by Weatherhead, op. cit., p.73.

paralysis and other kinds of illness.¹ Often a tortured and remorseful heart feels guilty and ashamed before God and before man. This burden can be relieved by a sense of forgiveness of sin which God in Christ could offer. If the paralytic was really troubled by guilt-feeling, the word "your sins are forgiven" was the cure for his sickness. The faith of the people provided a sufficient psychological atmosphere for the authority to work, and for the patient to trust in and response to it.

Further examples of this sort are found in John 4:46-54, the case of the nobleman's son; in Mark 7:24-30 the narrative of the epileptic boy. In all these cases faith carried great weight in the success of healing.

We see that in his own country of Nazareth, Jesus was rather disappointed because of the unbelief of the inhabitants for it is written: "he did not do many mighty works there, because of their unbelief."²

It seems that 'the unbelief' or 'the hard-heartedness' was the main obstacle to His healings and exorcisms.

The question can be asked whether unbelief is not 'sin' in one form or another. To a great extent, it is; but it can also be explained as 'an unwillingness to repent.' It refuses the love and the power of God. 'To believe', however, is to trust in God, to rely on God. All these terms express a willingness to accept the grace and the love of God. This is faith. So the unbelief of the inhabitants of Nazareth expressed their unwillingness to repent because the love and power of God were rejected. 'Faith' is a sign of repentance and acceptance of God's love and Grace (Lk 7:50).

¹Cf. supra, p. 66; infra, chapter VII; Weatherhead, op. cit., p.320f.

²Paul Tournier, Guilt and Grace (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965), pp. 136 ff.

²Mt 13:58.

Jesus could not do many mighty works because of the people's unbelief. It does not mean that the divine power is not strong enough to work through the unbelievers, nor does it mean that his power is restricted by men. The acts of God are not dependent on man, but God in his love and mercy give man a place and a part in his works of healing and salvation. God in Christ works by love and through love, not by force or violence. We are not expecting God to do anything which is contrary to his own nature.

For Jesus, faith is complete trust in God, trust in Him with confidence and conviction. This is what Jesus meant when he spoke of faith, faith of the patients, faith of the patients's helpers and faith in God the Father. In the same way, his own faith was a unique relationship with God the Father who was the authority and power of all healings and exorcisms.

On the one hand Jesus appreciated people's faith in God. For example, in Luke 7:9, referring to the faith of the centurion, He said, "I tell you, not even in Israel have I found such faith." Similar approval was expressed on many healing occasions as mentioned before, e.g. the faith of the woman who had suffered from haemorrhage (Mt 9:29); the faith of the Canaanite woman (Mt 15:28), and others' faith. On the other hand He was rather surprised or disappointed when He faced the obstuseness and unwillingness to count on God's goodness and power to be saved. Even his disciples were found lacking faith on several occasions. (Mt. 5:34,36).

In the Gospel, the opposite of faith is 'unbelief' which is the cause of many a discomfort and anxiety. Jesus did not do many powerful works in his own country because of the inhabitants' unbelief (Mt 13:58). In his preaching, he used as an illustration the lilies to teach his disciples something about care-free 'faith' in the daily life (Lk 12:22 ff). Probably, his disciples must have been very much concerned about food, clothes and other temporal things. He reminded

them of God's love and said, "But if God so clothes the grass which is alive in the field today and tomorrow is thrown into the oven, how much more will he clothe you, O men of little faith?" (Lk 12:28). Even his disciples sometimes disappointed him because of their lack of faith or only 'a little faith'. Another example is found in Matthew 17:14-21 concerning the epileptic boy. Jesus gave as reason lack of faith when his disciples asked him why they could not cast the demons out for he said:

Because of your little faith. For truly I say to you, if you have faith as a grain of mustard seed you will say to this mountain 'move hence to yonder place', and it will move; and nothing will be impossible to you (Mt 17:20).

It is noteworthy that in the story, Jesus was rather impatient and disappointed when he learnt about his disciples' helplessness in his absence (Mt 17:16, 17).

Mark mentioned both the faithless generation and the faithlessness of the epileptic's father (Mk 9:19, 24).

It is difficult to understand man's faithlessness when God's power is available to heal and His mercy is willing to forgive sin.

We see in Christ's healing work, the lame walk, the blind see, the dumb hear and the lepers are cleansed; these were actions of faith and by faith, through which Christ has been victorious over fear, evil, sickness and sin.

'Your faith has made you well' was a characteristic saying of Jesus. Jesus often uttered these words to the person who was healed (cf Mk 5:34; 10:52; Lk 17:19). The faith by which Jesus healed was not an equivalent of today's so called 'faith healing' practised by some Christian groups who reject any medical means in healing and claim a 'pure faith' in God. Jesus did not heal only by the power of suggestion as some of these groups do. This becomes clear when we take into consideration the various aspects of the healing ministry

of Jesus. Sometimes the act of healing was connected with the faith of the patient's relatives or friends (Mk 7:2 ff); sometimes the act of healing was performed over a distance (Mk 7:24; Mt 8:5 ff), etc. Therefore, it is impossible to find a suitable psychological explanation to cover all these healing acts of Jesus. The faith of the patients, however, pointed to a concrete trust in God's power which worked through the person Jesus. 'Faith' expresses human's willingness in accepting God's grace and makes it possible for God's power to operate against the power of Satan. 'Faith' is always active and not passive, dynamic but not satanic. It is the herald of all operations of divine power. It is actively seeking God's help. It does not reject any kind of help, whether medical or spiritual. It has nothing to do with magic or superstition and has nothing to do with any demand of believing what can not be reasoned or proved. It conveys the patient's need of help and his willingness to be helped. It is closely linked with Christ's teaching of prayer. It sometimes implies action and response, or reaction between man and God. It cannot operate from one side only. Thus, 'faith' implies man's trust and God's redemptive action which works through the incarnated person - Jesus- who does the work of salvation.

'Faith' does not discard reason or deny and scientific knowledge. It does not mean taking something for granted. It is just the opposite. It is absurd if a student does not work hard but assures himself that he will pass his examination by faith. That is not faith at all, it is selfdeception. Faith demands confidence, the use of God's gifts, the use of man's senses, ability, understanding, intelligence, knowledge, It asks the co-operation of mind and body, and requires self-discipline. From this it is to be concluded that faith is not a passive waiting for blessings from above, but it is a definite relationship between God and man, inspiring and activating man to make use of the means supplied by God.

A patient who reckons that to believe in God is to abandon all methods of medical treatment and merely put his trust in God, is neglecting God's gifts. This is not faith. He thus separates himself from God because he separates himself from the gifts of God. If he cannot first trust the gifts of God, how can he say he has faith in God? Such a person wants healing by faith, but if he cannot first trust the doctors, nurses, the psychotherapists, the pills and the drugs, and clinical treatment, his faith is no longer in God but in magic. Those who refuse to make use of medical treatment but rely on an immediate healing by God, claim that this is the 'real faith' and that the use of medicine constitutes a real lack of faith in God. Such views are based upon a sincere desire for God's glory, but they fail to recognise that all healing is God's healing act, and that the healing power of medicine is itself a gift of God.

Healing - an act of exorcism - to establish the Kingdom of God

The sole purpose of Christ's mission was to establish the kingdom of God. His healings and exorcisms served the same purpose. He desired that men should be won for God's kingdom and should come into a right relationship with God.

On some occasions, he attributed the occurrence of illness to the operation of evil power in human life.

Dealing with the woman bound by Satan for eighteen years (Lk 13:1ff), Jesus cured her on the Sabbath despite all opposition of the Pharisees. Jesus' mission was to destroy the works of Satan, demons or devils and to release men from their bondage, save them from the power of evil and restore them to God. He was concerned with men's total need. The Sermon on the mount deals with the whole human life and human problems. The victorious healing power of Christ is the sign and sure evidence of the dethronement of Satan's kingdom in order that the

kingdom of God and God's reign can be established (Lk 11:14 ff).

His authority and power is rooted in his unique relationship to God which no man ever has experienced. With his authority he fought against the power of demons and overcame them. The dawn of the kingdom of God has thus begun (Mt 12:28).

The Gospels record seven cases of demon-possession. They are, the man with an unclean spirit,¹ the Gerasene demoniac,² the Epileptic boy,³ the dumb man possessed with a devil,⁴ the blind and dumb man possessed with devil,⁵ Mary Magdalene,⁶ the daughter of the woman Canaan.⁷ Also there are other cases mentioned without giving any detail, such as Matthew 8:16, "that evening they brought to him many who were possessed with demons, and he cast out the spirits with a word, and healed all who were sick."⁸

The first three cases mentioned, give accounts of symptoms manifested by the possessed. Apparently, these symptoms were psychological as well as physical, but Christ's contemporaries construed the

¹Mt 1:21; Lk 4:31-37;

²Mt 5:28-34; Mk 5:11-20; Lk 8:26-36.

³Mt 17:14-21; Mk 9:14-29; Lk 9:37-43.

⁴Mt 9:32-34.

⁵Mt 12:22-30; Lk 11:14-26.

⁶Mt 16:9; Lk 8:2.

⁷Mt 15:21-28; Mk 7:24-30.

⁸Cf. Mt 4:24; Mk 1:32-34; Lk 4:41; Acts 10:38.

unusual appearance and behaviour of these people as demon-possession.

We now turn to the Synoptic Gospels to get biblical light on the problem of demons and how this problem should be understood.¹

The Gerasene Demoniac (Mk 5:1-20; Mt 8:28-34; Lk 8:26-39.)

Reading through these narratives of the synoptic Gospels, we get the same incidents but described in different ways. Matthew's account is rather brief and not very clear. He mentions two demoniacs instead of one as found in Luke and Mark.

Concentrating on the main issues, these three narratives are in harmony. Probably Mark's narrative is the original and it represents an eye-witness report.

We go back to the story and begin with the terrible voyage.

In the evening, Jesus and his disciples set out to sail across the lake. Jesus was tired and fell asleep on a cushion in the boat. A storm came up, the waves broke over the boat and the boat started to get filled with water. They were terrified and woke Jesus, and said, "Master, we are sinking! Do you not care?" But Jesus rebuked the wind and said to the sea, "Peace, be still."² And the wind ceased and there followed a great calm. They reached safely the shore at the eastern side of the lake, probably early the following morning.

The cemetery was near the shore where Jesus and his disciples landed. We can imagine that the extreme strain on the nerves of the disciples was not yet ceased after the frightening voyage, and when they reached the cemetery the strain was increased again for they

¹More details on the problem of demon-possession will be discussed on pp. 99.

²Some scholars suggest that these words were spoken to the disciples but it seems unlikely. Cf. Peake's Commentary on The Bible, op.cit., p. 840.

believed that the cemetery was a haunt of demons.¹

Suddenly, the noise of awful laughing accompanied by the clanking of chains was heard and a lunatic man emerged from the tombs, staring at them in anger and then he ran towards them (Mk 5:6). It was probable that the disciples cried out, "A demon! A ghost!" when they saw him. Jesus, however, was calm and steady in facing his approach and said to him, "Out, unclean spirit, come out of this man!" Hearing the word, he fell down and worshipped him. This sudden change of feeling and action is not unusual in cases of acute mania.² The sufferer had probably sensed the special qualities in Jesus, as such person often seem to have particular sensitivity of this nature. In the Gospels stories concerning demon-possessions, it is often stated that the demons could recognise Jesus.

The narrative focuses a sharp picture of the demoniac. He was exceedingly fierce and highly homicidal because of his mania. He was very strong; even the chains and fetters could not restrain him (Mk 5:4). He was also completely unable to control himself; he had lost his memory for he could not remember his own name. He used to cut himself with stones and cried aloud day and night (Lk 8:27). These are all symptoms of mania.

He was expelled by and isolated from the community because of his mania. He had to find a place for himself to settle down. A cemetery was the best place where he could feel safe, for no man would like to come to such a place to disturb and torture him. He was treated as an outcast by the community. No doubt the isolation, which was the only way the community used to treat mania, made his illness worse. It is likely that death for him was near had he not met Jesus.

¹ Infra, pp. 99 ff.

² W^F. Menzies Alexander, Demonic Possession in the New Testament (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1953), p. 74.

As far as his mission was concerned, Jesus, seeking every opportunity to seize the power of evil, took a different attitude towards this poor patient. Perhaps the patient had really been tortured by the people of the community in order to calm him down and so with this experience in mind, he begged Jesus not to torture him (Mk 5:8).

Treating the poor and wild patient suffering from serious mental derangement, Jesus said to him "Out, unclean spirit come out of this man!" If this was a psychological method of so called 'suggestion' it seemed that it did not help him at all. Then Jesus tried another way, beginning with a friendly attitude and asked his name. The man answered, "My name is Legion; for we are many." (Mk 5:9). The term 'we' indicates his divided personality with conflicting forces within him. This also was a symptom of his mania. By asking his name, Jesus established a psychological relationship to enable the patient to confide in him. The answer given by the demon-possessed person is also significant. In biblical reference a name usually expresses something of the bearer of that name. In this case, by calling himself Legion, he admitted something of his terrible state and opened the door to be treated and healed. It seems that the name Legion was the clue leading to the genesis of his mania. Perhaps, the patient was familiar with Roman troops. A legion was a large unit in the Roman army. There were six legions stationed at Syria at the time of Jesus. With his mania he really believed that a whole group of demons like legions of troops had entered into him and possessed him. Of course this might only be a product of his delusion and a result of his serious disorder.

According to the Bible narrative, the demons knew the power of Jesus and they pleaded Him not to send them to the country (Mk 5:10). A better way to treat them was to send them to the herd of pigs nearby (Mk 5:12). This was done and the pigs possessed by the demons threw themselves into the deep water.

It is difficult to understand why two thousand pigs rushed over the hill and got drowned in the lake. It is not unlikely that in his conversation with Jesus, the demoniac reached a catharsis, resulting in unexpected yells and screams, and that these frightened the pigs to such an extent that they rushed over the cliff and threw themselves into the lake.

The herdsmen fled and could find no better explanation for their great loss than to attribute it to the operation of demons and in this way it was also recorded by Mark.

One point is noteworthy, that is Jesus sought every chance to save man's life and to free man from the power of satan. Man is worth much more than animals. A high price has to be paid in order to save a life and that Jesus did, as he said himself: "You are worth more than the birds" (Mt 6:13). For the contemporaries the patient was an enemy, a dangerous man; but for Jesus he was a patient, a man worthy in the sight of God, a man who needed to be helped. In this way, Jesus differed from his contemporaries. When they saw that this maniac was healed, sitting there with Jesus and being of sound mind, and when they heard what had happened to their pigs, they begged Jesus to leave their village, so that He might not cause any more trouble which could result in further loss of their property. For them prosperity seemed more important than a man's sanity (cf Mk 5:17; Lk 8:37).

Many cases of healing and exorcisms are found involving psychological factors. Psychological explanations can be given to come to a deeper understanding of the operation of God's power working through Jesus Christ. Psychological analysis cannot deny the healing ministry of Jesus, but psychological insights can give a better appreciation of the healing work of Jesus. Modern minds might like to ascribe the healing work of Jesus to his magnetic personality and to psychological factors. Be it so, it still remains true that Jesus was sent by God to a suffering world to perform the miracles of healing and to

show forth God's mercy by proclaiming forgiveness of sin - all signs of the coming of the kingdom of God.

Jesus used every effort to perform healings and exorcisms so that God's kingdom could be established. This makes his exorcisms different from others. Every act of healing or exorcism is a new beginning of the reign of God as well as a beginning of the end of Satan's reign. Exorcisms and healings are acts of God's direct power over Satan's power. The victory of the former brings the dawning of the kingdom of God. The healings and the exorcisms are proclamations of the good news and manifestations of the good will towards men.

In a controversy about casting out devils, Jesus, knowing the minds of his opponents, said to them,

Every kingdom divided against itself, goes into ruin, and no town, no household, that is divided against itself can stand. And if it is Satan who casts out Satan, Satan is divided against himself; how then can his kingdom stand? And if it is by Beelzebub that I cast out devils, by whom do your peoples drive them out? If this is your argument, they themselves will refute you. But if it is by the spirit of God that I drive out the devils then be sure the Kingdom of God has already come upon you. (NEB. Mt 12:25-28).

Jesus puts his exorcisms into the closest context with the coming of the kingdom of God. The beginning of his ministry was the sign of the beginning of the victory of the kingdom of God, and the beginning of the dethronement of Satan. This process is still continuing today until the final victory of the heavenly kingdom and the final defeat of the Kingdom of Satan be reached in the final consummation.

The sole purpose of Jesus' work is the erection of God's kingdom. To accomplish this, the power of Satan has to be destroyed. This power is often identified with the evil force of demons or devils which to a great extent, were conceived of as corruptive,

impairing and inflicting forces causing all sorts of sufferings for man, including sickness and sin. Since, these evil powers have much to do with diseases and calamities, a close examination of their destructive nature would give a clearer comprehension of the relationship between sin and illness and all related problems.

(c) The Problem of Demon-possession

The belief that the demon was an agent of disease and accident was prevalent in the time of Christ. In the rabbinical teaching, there were certain numbers of demons, male and female, residing in various places and things.¹ The supreme one was Satan-Sammael. There were two classes of demons, one was purely spiritual and another was half-spiritual. Several representatives of the latter class were named, as Shedim, Seirim, Ruchin, Ruchoth and Lilin.² These were put under the name of Mazziqin (Tanch. Mish. 19).³

These demons commonly stayed in the desert, a cemetery, ruined houses, and other places of uncleanness. They hid under the shadow of certain trees, under the shadow of moon, the shadows of various

¹R.C. Thompson, Semitic Magic (London: Luzac & Co., 1908), pp. 57-58, 90 ff.

²W.M. Menzies Alexander, Demonic Possession in the New Testament (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902), pp 25 ff. Cf. "According to Rabbinical tradition Lilith was the first wife of Adam to whom she bore other evil spirits - Shedim, Lilin, and Ruchin." - See Edward Langton, Essentials of Demonology, (London: Epworth Press, 1948), p. 48. 'S^eirim' (שׂרִימ) were generally portrayed as goat-shaped hairy creatures. The word is mentioned in Leviticus 17:7 as 'he goats' and the same term is found in II Chronicles 11:5. In Isaiah 13:21, the 'S^eirim' were dancing among the ruins of Babylon, and in Isaiah 34:14 they were in the ruins of Edom with other wild beasts. The RSV uses 'Satyrs' for 'Seirim' in these two passages. Also cf. Walther Eichrodt, op. cit., pp.223 ff.

³Menzies Alexander, op. cit., pp. 25 ff.

other objects.¹ They rested on the surface of water, oil and other liquids. They associated themselves with certain animals, like the mad dog, fly, wasp, scorpion, serpent, ass and bull.² They easily caused demon-possession if men got close to them.

There are many evidences that Jesus to a large extent accepted the current views about demons and demon possession, yet was never subject to superstitious fear. He used to retire to the desert place for prayers, though the waste place was said to be a special haunt of demons. He was in the wilderness for forty days tempted by Satan. He asked the Samaritan woman for a draught of water although in Jewish superstition the surface of any water given by a foreigner would be the haunt of demons. His teaching concerning the providence of God over the whole creation rejected the superstitious view of the association between demons and animals. He raised the dead, he spoke about demons and cast out demons from those who were possessed. He gave this power to his disciples and commanded them to do the same. On the one hand, the current superstitions had no power over him, on the other hand, he seemed to believe that the power of demons could cause some kinds of diseases and some particular events, like the storm on the sea of Galilee in Mark 4:39.³ Mark 7:32 ff implied that deafness was caused by demons, and Luke 11:14 ff expressed it that the patient was a victim of demon possession. Apart from these references, Jesus scarcely made any allusion to devils or linked up demonpossession with the cause of disease and other events.⁴ No

¹Thompson, op. cit., pp. 90 ff.

²Edward Langton, op. cit., pp. 37 ff.

³Cf. W.M Alexander, op. cit., p. 29.

⁴Ibid., p. 95.

reference of demon possession is found in the following events: Matthew 8:1 ff, the healing of a leper; Matthew 8:14 ff, the fever of Peter's mother-in-law; Mark 2:1 ff, the healing of a paralytic man; Mark 3, the centurion's servant; Mark 5:11 ff, the daughter of Jairus and the woman suffering from haemorrhages.¹

In the time of Jesus, like all other unscientific peoples in all generation, the Jews in Palestine tended to attribute all kinds of mental disease and physical illness to demon possession. Modern man might criticize it as absurd, false and superstitious and would say that demon-possession was simply neurosis, psychosomatic or epilepsy. But for the people of two thousand years ago, demonic theory was something not so much superstitious as the best way they could find to explain the cause of human sickness. Jesus, as a historical person, living among them, had to be involved in the sharing of the traditional idea of demon-possession though he was aware of the extreme views of many of his Jewish contemporaries. Dr. Edward Langton goes so far as to say,

Discarding, as we feel we must, theories of accommodation as insufficient and invalid, we can only conclude that Jesus accepted, without serious modification, the popular belief in Satan and demons which was current in His time. Such an acceptance by Jesus does not prove that these popular beliefs correspond with reality. 2

This view can be endorsed, for as long as the acceptance of the existing views of demon-possession do not minimize the authority of the teaching of Jesus and His power of healing, one cannot see why Jesus could not accept the reality of the current belief. Jesus not merely accommodated himself to the belief common in his time but He believed in the existence and operations of demons or evil spirits. But I am inclined to differ from Dr. Langton in his view that the acceptance of these beliefs by Jesus tells us nothing about the correspondence of these views with the reality. If the belief in demons does not correspond

¹ Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 98. Also see Dictionary of the Bible ed. James Hastings, revised by F.C. Grant & H.H. Rowley (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963), p. 782-83.

² Langton, op. cit., p. 224.

to reality in some way, it is difficult to explain why He worked against the power of demons and conferred the authority on his disciples to cast out demons. His words and deeds conveyed the 'truth' of the existence of demons.

As a historical person, Jesus, the Son of Man, had some self-imposed limitations. He wept when he was sad (John 11:35), he was angry when he saw the obstinate stupidity of men (Mk 3:5), he took a rest when he was tired after work (Lk 8:23), he ate and drank with the outcast (Lk 15:1 ff), he was a man, he grew like a man (Lk 1:80, 2:52), he asked questions and gained knowledge in the same manner as men do (Lk 2:46), and he declared his ignorance of the date of the Parousia (Mt 24:26, Mk 13:32). All of these are human limitations in the life of Jesus. They accord with St. Paul's words in Philippians 2:7-8, "Bearing the human likeness, revealed in human shape, he humbled himself, and in obedience accepted even death - death on the cross" (NEB).

As long as these human limitations or self-imposed limitations did not reduce the fact of the Incarnation, there seems to be no reason to doubt that Jesus completely shared and believed the outlook of his time and place. Even the Pharisees gave some credit for his act of exorcism (Mt 12:24; 27ff; Lk 11:19ff). They said that it was by Beelzebub, prince of devil, that Jesus drove out demons. But Jesus explained that he did it by the Spirit of God. Many incidents in the life of Jesus indicated that he not merely accommodated himself to the current belief, but fully shared in the reality of it. His words and deeds corresponded to the reality of demon-possession.

It is, however, interesting to note that the activities of demons seemed to be localized. It was more common in the northern area of Palestine than in the south. The Synoptists mainly deal with Jesus'

mission in the north where the cases of possession were common. But the author of the fourth Gosple, who mainly deals with the Judaeen ministry of Jesus, mentions no demon-possession. In the present age, the actions of demons are rare in most advanced countries but common in some under-developed countries and in their mission fields.¹

Modern psychological research makes much of the influence of a strong personality on a weaker one. Many psychologists assume that the success of Jesus' exorcism was the result of the influence of his magnetic personality. The departure of the demons was due to His spiritual and personal influence on those who were possessed by them. They study of auto-suggestion on patients' minds gave rise to a hypothesis which declares that the patients believed that the power of demons could really go into their bodies and possess them. Thus this auto-suggestion acted as real demons, which disturbed the integration of personalities, and thus symptoms of lunatic disorders appeared.. If the patients also believed that the superior power of Jesus could drive out demons, the patients' demons resulting from auto-suggestion, could easily be banished by the strong personal influence of Christ exercised through 'a word' or 'a touch' of authority. Some of the modern psychologists hold this hypothesis and claim that the "exorcism presents the exact counterpart to the genesis of possession."² They conclude that demon-possession is unreal. They over-simplify the whole problem of demon-possession and their conclusion is very doubtful for there are cases of demon-possession

¹Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 101.

²Langton, op. cit., p. 162. Cf. T.K. Oesterreich, Possession, Demoniocal and Other (London: Kegan Paul, 1930), p.100.

which can hardly be explained by a psychological hypothesis.¹

Possessing some scientific knowledge, modern men are apt to explain all kinds of demon-possession in the light of medical and psychological methods, and proceed to the conclusion that there is no such thing as demon-possession but only epilepsy or hysteria; or that there is no such a thing as a demon, only disease, physical or mental. To a great extent, this way of reasoning could apply to certain cases in the New Testament involving symptoms similar to today's epilepsy, hysteria, madness or nervous disorder.² In the case of the epileptic boy mentioned in Mark 9:14-29, verse 29 is translated by the RSV as 'epileptic' but one is inclined to agree that something more than epilepsy was involved here probably some form of psychosis.³

As for the Capernaum demoniac in Mark 1:21-28 (cf Luke 4:33-37)

¹James Hastings (ed.), Dictionary of the Bible, 2nd ed. revised by F.C. Grant & H.H. Rowley (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1965), p.212. Also see Unger, Merrill Frederick, Biblical Demonology (America: Wheaton: Van Kampen Press INC., 1952), p. 99. Unger, the professor of Old Testament of Dallas Theological Seminary, concludes his study with clarity: "The truth is that the Bible, on this phase of the subject as is the case in many other fields of inquiry, without contradicting everyday experience, advances to a realm whither human science cannot follow... This action, however inexplicable it may be to the natural man, as all operation of spirit upon spirit is found to be, cannot a priori be declared impossible or improbable, and no one has a right to 'eviscerate' the virile expressions of the Scripture in order to reduce its declarations to a level with our own ignorance'."

²Langton, op. cit., p. 152, 154-155.

³Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 75. Cf. Both the RSV And NEB use 'epileptic' for σεληνιαστικός in Mt. 4:24, Mk 1:32. 'Epilepsy' or 'epileptic' is rendered from the Greek term σεληνιαστικός, literary meaning 'to be a lunatic' or 'to be moon-struck' as it appears in Mt 4:24. Its meaning is different from δαιμονιζομαι, which means 'to be possessed of a demon' or to be demonized as it appears in Mt 17:15.

the details given in the narrative by both evangelists are not enough to form a complete diagnosis. However, from the meagre materials available, it appears that the man was possessed by an unclean spirit which threw him into a convulsion and with a loud cry it left him then. The symptoms were a loud cry, a falling down and a convulsion.¹ Apparently, the story gives a picture of a man in an abnormal psychological state. The case might be some kind of insanity which has a demonic power behind it.

In Luke 13:10-17, we are told of the woman possessed by a spirit. The spirit had crippled her for eighteen years. Luke says, "there was a woman who had had a spirit of infirmity for eighteen years."² She was unable to stand straight but was bent down for eighteen years. She was regarded as a daughter of Abraham.³ She was in the Synagogue on the Sabbath day. The story shows that she was a normal woman, except for her physical trouble. There is no word indicating that she had mental disorder. Apparently, she was suffering from a spinal disease which caused her to be bent double. Concerning this point, Dr. Menzies Alexander might be wrong in saying that "we regard this therefore as an extreme instance of spinal disease in the form of 'Pott's curvature'".⁴ If it was really a surgical case, as mentioned, the difficulty is that her immediate cure was unlikely to be possible. Probably, it might be a hysterical paraplaegia.⁵ Here, again no complete detail is given

¹Lk 4:35.

²Lk 13:11 (RSV).

³Lk 13:16.

⁴Demonic Possession in the New Testament, op. cit., p. 94.

⁵Cf. Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 59.

in the story for making any definite decision which could be assigned to her illness. The treatment included both Jesus' words and hand. In other cases, the way he used to cast out demons is simply 'by a word'.¹ Here, the laying-on of a hand was practised. The imposition of a hand is also seen in other non-demonic cases, such as leprosy (Lk 5:13; Mt 8:3; Mk 1:41), blindness (Mt 9:29), fever (Mk 1:31), and some general cases in Mark 6:5, all of these are cases not attributed to demon-possessions. Probably the writers of the Gospels used to express certain kinds of disease by rendering the prevalent thought and ascribing that disease to demons.² Most likely, "a spirit of infirmity" in Luke XIII is a figure of speech applying to the woman's being physically crippled. "She was bent double", says professor J.A. Findlay, "but not demon-possessed. Jesus never laid his hands on a demoniac."³ She is 'a daughter of Abraham', These words indicated that she was appious member, a promised heir who belonged to God. All of these statements show that demon-possession is impossible to be assumed for this case.

Of course, cases like the dumb and blind demoniac in Matthew 9:32-33 and Luke 11:14, the deaf stammerer in Mark 7:32-37, and the Gerasene demoniac in Mark 5:1-20 can possibly be explained in the light of modern psychology and we may assume that they were hysterical blindness, dumbness or epileptic insanity. But this interpretation need further scientific evidence to prove its verity.

The way Jesus treated his patients with demonic or other sickness was simply by 'a word' or authority or by 'a touch' of hand' and

¹Cf. Matthew 8:16; Alexander, op. cit., p. 137.

²Cf. Lk 4:49; Mk 1:13.

³Quoted by Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 59.

thereafter the patients were immediately cured by this means of healing.¹ It was neither magical nor medical for he was not a magician nor a surgical doctor. Yet, it was so effective that it affected the patients' minds, nervous systems and bodily diseases. Probably, it was a supernatural method which belonged to such a higher plane that the present knowledge of man is still incapable of giving a sufficient explanation.²

The incidents of the activities of demons are not confined to the record of the Gospels. They are also found in other Jewish literature especially the apocryphal and apocalyptic literature, e.g. in I Enoch 1-3 and 83-90, in the Book of Jubilee and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, with which the writers of the Gospels were familiar. Also come similar but fragmentary accounts are exhibited in the Old Testament, e.g. in Psalm 106:37, and Deuteronomy 32:17, where human beings were sacrificed to demons. The Hebrew word used for 'demons' in these two passages is 'Shedim'. It is generally used for all kinds of demons whether they are good or evil, visible or invisible. In Paul's Epistles, elements of teaching on the subject of demons are in harmony with the teaching of the Gospels. Some relationship between demons and idolatry is taught in I Cor. 8:4 ff, where more emphasis is laid on the nature of idols than on the activities of demons.³ The author (Paul) tells the Ephesians that they were "once following the course of the world, following the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that is now at work in the sons of disobedience" (Eph. 2:2 RSV).

There are also many ethnic parallels of demon activities found in

¹Edward Langton, op. cit., p. 156.

²M.F. Unger, op. cit., pp.99 ff.

³Langton, op. cit., pp. 183 ff.

the East, in China, India, Africa, Babylon, Assyria,¹ and especially in the mission field.² The fact of demon-possession is widely known in the world and it became a universal phenomenon. The problem cannot be solved so easily as many modern men suppose by thinking that there are no demons existing in the world. For no one can prove their non-existence and no one knows what 'epilepsy' really meant in the time of Jesus when one tends to apply it to all demoniac.³

Some cases recorded in the Gospels or in other literature can be identified through modern psychological knowledge, but not all can be explained in the light of modern psychology and medicine.⁴ It is true that in the past era many cases of disease have been attributed to demon-possession though these were really psychological or physical diseases. Through the advancement of today's psychological research and medical investigation, past errors of attributing all diseases to demon-possession can be avoided, and more light can be thrown on the problem.

¹Alexander, op. cit., p. 41-50, pp. 144 ff. Also, according to Dr. Langton, the source of the New Testament teaching on the problem of demon-possession is traceable to the beliefs of Babylonians, Assyrians, Persians and Greeks with whom the Israelites at various times were closely connected. The Jewish belief in demons was mainly influenced by the belief of the Babylonians that the cause of all disease and sickness was due to the operations of demons. - Essentials of Demonology, op. cit., p. 22, 149.

²Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 101.

³Ibid., p. 98.

⁴Dr. Weatherhead puts all healing miracles in three classes and suggests some possible psychological and medical explanations for each case, but, concludes with the following words, "My own conclusion, from a study of our Lord's miracles in the light of modern psychology, is that while the mental mechanisms which He used can sometimes be identified through our modern psychological knowledge, the miracles certainly cannot be regarded merely as psychotherapeutic treatments ... In the miracle stories we are in a different world, Psychological theories can illumine, but cannot explain, Christ's healing work." op. cit., p. 77.

The problem with which we are dealing, is most perplexing and no satisfactory explanation or clear cut answer can be offered following our brief survey.

It is dangerous to over-simplify the problem and to conclude that there is no evil power, no demons, no Satan who could trouble men's bodies, but disease only. What the Bible says cannot be doubted or denied. Psychological or medical terms could be used to describe the cases of possession, but the satanic origin of these cases cannot be denied.

According to the Gospel of Luke, Satan was the cause of the illness of the woman who was bent double for eighteen years. (Luke 13:10-16). Jesus agreed that there was a prince of demons whom the Pharisees believed to have certain power (Mt 12:24). Jesus declared that it was the 'evil one' who shut men's hearts and ears to the Gospel (Mt. 13:19). It is false and dangerous to presume that Jesus was pretending to accept the popular thought although He knew that there were no demons within His sick people, and that he limited his divine knowledge in order to share the prevalent delusion.¹ The sincerity of the historical person, the Son of man, Jesus, cannot be doubted. To question this, would be to throw doubt on the whole christology which is based on the normal man, the Incarnation of God. This would result in the corruption of the Gospel and the undermining of faith.

From the words of Jesus as well as from the whole New Testament's teaching, we are inclined to believe in the activities of the power of Satan or evil spirits. This belief is by no means corresponding to any superstition. This belief is also entirely different from

¹A. Rendle Short, The Bible and Modern Medicine (The Paternoster Press, 1966), p. 51, 118.

the primitive view of demonology as well as from the superstitious thought of rabbinical teaching.¹ There is a similarity between the primitive view and the view of the rabbis in so far as they both pictured demons as fearful, ugly and mischievous imps or ghostss waiting in the ruins or dirty places ready to attack men. These demons could be cast out by a spell, incantation, amulet, ring, necklace and some odours or incense. But none of these things were found in use in Jesus' exorcism, and no particular figure of an imp is pictured in the Gospels. What the Gospels tell about demons is that they sometimes caused illness; that the satan tempted Jesus in the wilderness (Mt 4:3); that Satan is the 'ruler of the world' and would be cast out at the final judgment (John 12:31); and that the devil is the enemy of the Son of man (Lk 10:19); that the seven unclean spirits returned to trouble the man more seriously than before (Mt 12:43-45); that the Son of man has power over Satan (Mk 3:20; cf. Mt 12:24; Lk 11:5); and that his kingdom would be destroyed by Jesus. No doubt, the satanic power is the source of all evil and trouble.² Sin and sickness have their roots in this power.

The difficulty is that no clear line can be drawn between demon-possession and the sickness of epilepsy, insanity, mania or other similar diseases. The symptoms of demon-possession as pictured in the Bible are also found in, for example, epilepsy. One can hardly believe that in a mental derangement there would be no evil power in operation, nor can one say that in a demon-possessed person there would be no other physical or spiritual defect involved.

¹ Supra, p. 99.

² A. Rendle Short, op. cit., p. 112.

In the Gospels as well as in the whole Bible, man is treated as a complete entity. Jesus not only dealt with man's physical diseases, but also with the hidden spiritual causes. He cast out evil spirits and freed men from their bondage. He cured all kinds of diseases and restored men to the wholeness of health. He came to destroy the reign of the evil power and to establish the kingdom of God.

Demon-possession is clearly a kind of sickness and is related directly or indirectly to sin. This was the view taken by Jesus:

Christ saw in the case of every 'possessed' victim a result of sin, not necessarily through the co-operation of the victims; sin He saw embodied in 'Satan', who is identified with 'demon'; he was the personification of the principle of evil, which was manifested in men in a variety of ways. When Christ 'exorcised' a demon, He by His divine power drove the evil out and at the same time obliterated the visible results of sin. ¹

The answer for the demon-possessed people might perhaps not be found in psychology or medical science, but in the words of Him:

"My son, thy sins are forgiven" (Mk 20:5), "Sin no more that nothing worse befall you" (John 5:14), and "Your sins are forgiven" (Lk 7:48).²

Forgiveness as the clue to the exorcism of demon-possession

¹W.O.E. Oesterley, 'Demon Possession', Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, ed. James Hastings (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906), Vol. I, p. 443.

²The unnamed woman, who anointed Jesus' feet is traditionally identified with Mary, the Magdalene, from whom seven demons were driven out (Mk 8:2). Cf. Peake's Commentary on the Bible eds. M. Black & H.H. Rowley (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1964), p. 814.

is the sole authority of Jesus who practised it for the liberation of those who suffered from the inflictions caused by demonic power which very often revealed themselves in sin and sickness. Having completed his earthly task, he gave his authority to his church and those who followed him to carry out the work of God. Therefore the church, finding herself engaged in the Missio Dei should take this commission seriously and unite herself in battle against enemies, namely sin and sickness.

(d) Sin and Sickness in the Apostolic Church

Sin and sickness are life-long problems existing in human history. They are problems not to be solved by a simple formula.

In the Apostolic age the Church was challenged by the same problems, both of which originated from the same source, i.e. the satanic power. Under the commission of Christ the apostles went out to deal with these human handicaps. To sinners the good news was preached, and for the benefit of the sick healing acts were performed.

The relationship between sickness and sin is very intimate. Sometimes these two are identified with one another. This is implied in the words of Christ: "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick; I came not to call the righteous, but sinners" (Mk 2:17).

The apostle Paul devoted much of his time to the subject of sin but not so much to 'sickness'. However, from his writings, the connection between these two is apparent:

Sickness - its Satanic Origin and Its Educational Purpose

From the problem of Paul's 'thorn in the flesh', the origin and the purpose of sickness are obtained. Paul said, "And to keep me from being too elated by the abundance of revelation, a thorn was given

me in the flesh, a messenger of Satan, to harass me, to keep me from being too elated" (II Cor. 12:7). It is generally agreed that 'the thorn in the flesh' is indicating a certain kind of ailment from which Paul suffered. Actually what Paul's physical disease was, is not so clear from the text. Some conjectures are that Paul was suffering from a sharp pain,¹ or malaria,² or a serious eye trouble (cf. Gal. 4:13-14).³ For Paul, 'this thorn in the flesh' was an evil thing which came from Satan - a messenger of Satan sent to bruise him.

¹II Cor. 12:7, the New English Bible reads, "And so to keep me from being unduly elated by the magnificence of such revelation, I was given a sharp pain in my body which came as Satan's messenger to bruise me; this was to save me from being unduly elated."

²Concerning Paul's disease, D.E.H. Whiteley says, "We may therefore accept the general view that St. Paul was here referring to some physical malady; the evidence of the New Testament and the speculations of the scholars have been carefully reviewed by Allo, who points out that all the data are consistent with malaria." - The Theology of St. Paul (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964), p. 22.

³Tracing the source of Paul's disease to the event on Damascus road (Acts 23:2-5), where he lost his sight, and in his letter to the Galatians (Gal. 4:13-14), a hint of his eye trouble is given. Therefore, Professor A.R. Short concludes, "A simple explanation of all these passages is that Paul had some disease of the eyes which from time to time flared up, was repulsive to look at, and interfered with his sight. Trachoma, a chronic and intractable form of conjunctivitis exceedingly common in Palestine, would correspond exactly." The Bible and Modern Medicine, op. cit., p. 69.

Sickness is of course not a design of God. It does not come directly from God but it is a disturbance of the harmony of God's creation. Sickness is certainly not the direct will of God but it can be used by God for the good of man. Paul said that it 'was given' to him, implying a loving purpose of God behind the disease. It could not have come without God's permission. It was under the power of God and came through the hands of God. It has a particular purpose for the sufferer. As for Paul it prevented him from being too elated, keeping him from arrogance and pride. The pride of success, pride of power, the pride of self-capacity, these are forms of self-centredness which alienate man from other men and from God. Paul realized the danger of stepping into the sin of pride and he saw the educating purpose of God who chastised him by means of 'the thorn in the flesh'.¹

The messenger of Satan, the agent of disease, has his evil influence in human life. It is clearly cited in the New Testament that Satan is the enemy of God, who sows the seeds of evil in the world and prevents the coming of the Kingdom of God (Mt 13:39). He disturbs the wholeness of man by afflicting him with disease and pain (Lk 13:16; cf. Job 2:7), he is the destroyer of the human body (I Cor. 5:5; I Tim. 1:2), and the bringer of death to men (Heb 5:14). It was Satan who prevented Paul from going to Thessalonica. Possibly, it was due to an illness that he was hindered from going.²

¹Gal. 4:12-16, he mentions his illness but does not assign it to Satan.

²D.E.H. Whiteley, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-23.

Jesus was handed over to his enemies by the evil plot of Satan who entered into Judas Iscariot, and caused him to betray Jesus. The plot was carried out by the hatred and sinfulness of men. The 'bitter cup' was prepared (John 18:11) by men, but God permitted His son to drink it for the good of the same sinful men. For Jesus this cup was "the cup which the Father has given me" (John 18:11). On the cross, the blood was shed for sinners and the sick. The plot of Satan was exchanged for the victory of God.

Sickness - a punishment for sin?

Without realizing the universality of sin, a sick person tends to ask, "what have I done to deserve this disease?" The power of evil has left its marks on mankind as a whole making itself visible in the sufferings and pains in human life. Men suffer because "all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23). A sick person is a member of the universal community and he can not escape nor deny his solidarity with the rest of mankind. For better or for worse he has a share in the lot of a suffering comprehensive society until death.

For Paul the whole of mankind is sinful and human life is under a curse. This idea is apparent in the phrase: "the present age of wickedness" (Gal. 1:4). He traced the sinfulness of man to the fall of Adam and related the power of Satan to the serpent of Genesis III, for he realized the fact of the universal sinfulness of men. The Gentiles as well as the Jews are under the condemnation of sin (Rom. 1-3). Sin is so widespread that everyone is affected. Sin is collective as well as individual. It exists in the world as well as in every single man and in his will (Romans 7:15-20). The result of sin is inevitably physical death (Rom. 5:12 ff; 6:23).

A sick person has to discern between an individual sin and that of mankind as a whole, but still there is a very intimate connection. What Paul said concerning the close relationship between the members of the body of Christ, i.e. the Church (I Cor. 12:14 ff) does also apply to mankind as such. Sickness is both universal and individual sin. Of course, what one sows, one reaps, for "He (God) will render to every man according to his work" (Rom 2:6-9; cf. Ps. 62:12). Although justification is by faith judgment is, in some sense based on works. Every one is judged by what he did and by what kind of life he lived (Jas. 2:14-26; cf. Mt 25). According to scripture there is a certain kind of judgment already at work (John 3:18, 19) but the final judgment is still to come.

The question could be asked whether evil deeds receive their judgment and punishment here and now. As far as Judas was concerned, Acts 1:18 directly attributes his shameful death to his shameful deeds: "Now this man bought a field with the reward of his wickedness, and falling headlong (or swelling up) he burst open in the middle and all his bowels gushed out."¹ In the case of Judas hanging himself, according to Matthew's account, some mental disorder could be assumed; in the case of a death as described by Luke, physical illness could be assumed without excluding the further possibility of also some mental disorder.²

¹Calvin in his commentary says that Acts 1:18, is inserted by Luke - Calvin's Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, 1-13, trans. John W. Fraser and W.J. B. McDonald, eds. David W. Torrance & Thomas F. Torrance (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), p. 41.

²There were three traditions of Judas' death, one is mentioned in Acts, the others are in Matthew 27:3-10, and in the story told by Papias - The Beginning of Christianity, eds. F.J. Joakes Jackson & Kirsopp Lake (London: Macmillan & Co., 1933), V, p. 22-30.

The sudden fall of Ananias and Sapphira is obviously a penalty for their deceit (Acts 5:11). The cause of death was obviously psychological. A sudden shock derived from a strong guilt feeling influenced by Peter's strong language of rebuke is suggested to have been the cause.¹

Cases of wicked people punished by attacks of disease were not rare in the Apostolic age. The case of Elymas is another illustration. Luke tells how this man was rebuked by Paul for being a son of the devil and an enemy of all righteousness. Paul cursed him and he became blind (Acts 13:10-11). Here the disease of blindness played a role in exercising God's punishment of sin.

Paul did not hesitate to use harsh and sharp words against wicked men. He spoke directly and straightly against the power of the devil - the opponent of the Gospel (Acts 13:10). For Paul, no evil man was allowed to escape from God's judgment. He was convinced of the direct relationship between the profaning of the Lord's Supper and the weakness and illness among the members of the congregation in Corinth (I Cor. 11:27).

A traditional Old Testament idea of regarding an angel of the Lord as an usual agent of God's retribution existed in the Apostolic Church. This is made plain by Luke's record of Herod's death: "Immediately the angel of the Lord smote him because he did not give God the glory; and he was eaten by worms and died" (Acts 12:23).²

¹Theodore P. Ferris, "The Acts of the Apostles (Exposition)", The Interpreter's Bible, ed. George Arthur Buttrick et al., (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), p. 76. (Vol. IX).

²Cf. II Kings 19:35, the Army of King Sennacherib were smitten by the angels.

The inhabitants of Malta revealed the same notion regarding the relation between mishap and evil deeds when Paul was bitten by a viper. For the natives, misfortune was an indivation of the wrongdoing of the sufferer: "When the natives saw the creature (viper) hanging from his (Paul's) hand they said to one another, 'No doubt this man is a murderer, though he has escaped from the sea, justice has not allowed him to live.'" (Acts 28:6,9).¹

From this biblical narrative, one would be permitted to conclude that there is not necessarily a direct relation between mishap, calamity or sickness on the one hand and sin on the other hand. However, as indicated above and with reference to Judas, Annanias and Sapphira, Herod, etc, the Bible authors did remain convinced of a connection between sin and some punishment in this life.

Concern For the Sick

As long as illness was regarded as the work of demons or hostile spirits and as a manifestation of the deeds of the power of evil, people were prevented by fear from going near to the sick. We are reminded by Dr. L. Weatherhead that in the Apostolic age doctors were rare and the fee charged for treatment was high.² Poor people were not in a position to consult a doctor when they needed him.

¹Bitten by the viper, Paul did not fall down dead. The explanation for this is probably expressed in Luke 10:9, where Jesus says, "I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall hurt you."

²Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 78.

This was one of the reasons why the healing ministry of the apostles were fulfilled a very serious need. With the power and the love of Christ they approached the sick and healed them without any hesitation and without expecting any reward.

Although it is difficult to furnish substantial and convincing evidence concerning the first decades after Christ, it would probably be true to say that the coming of Christ and His Gospel marked a change in the relationship between the healthy person and the sick person. The Galatians accepted Paul without questioning his illness. Describing his relationship with the Galatians, Paul said: "Though my condition was a trial to you, you did not scorn or despise me, but received me as an angel of God."¹ We are not concerned here with the particular nature of Paul's disease, but what we know is that the Galatians' attitude to him was most encouraging.

One's concern for a sick person not only means much to him but also plays an important part in the whole healing process. When Timothy was in bad health, Paul advised him to take a little wine for the sake of his health.² Although Paul was a preacher, not a physician, he took care of the sick.

The apostles, sent out by Jesus, were not unaware of the intimate connection between sickness and sin and having received their commission to preach and to heal, they came to view the healing ministry as being of vital importance in obeying the command of their Master.

¹Gal 4:14.

²I Tim 5:23.

(e) Healing in the Apostolic and Post-Apostolic AgeAll Healing is of God

In the Apostolic age, the Christians as well as the pagans believed that all healings were illustrations of God's power in operation. Watching a crippled man healed by Paul, the people of Lystra said, "The gods have come down to us in the likeness of men!"¹ Although they did not know the God as Father of Jesus Christ and attributed the miracle to the work of their gods, Zeus and Hermes, they knew that the healing act was not men's work, for it was beyond the capacity of man.

In the apostolic Church all healings were done in the name of the risen Christ. The apostles and early Christians believed that every recovery from illness, every release from the bondage of demons was result of God's mercy and love. It was God who healed.

Jesus said that it was in the power of the Holy Spirit that He cast out demons. In the same way, his disciples claimed that it was by the power of God that they performed the miracles. But today, many surgeons, doctors, psychotherapists and scientists claim that healing is the result of their modern techniques and medicine. What a different view we modern men hold about the healing work!..In a materialistic world men can hardly see the spiritual meaning of healing. Often, we forget God's power and praise the ingenuity of men and their medical science. The tragic ending of taking God's glory to be one's own possession is made clear by the death of Herod.² This can be presented as a warning for modern men

¹Acts 14:11.

²Acts 12:23.

in their self-glorification. It is God who heals, not men. This truth has been formulated in this way:

The words of the celebrated physician Osler that it was God who healed, he was only the agent, are not often quoted today. Far more serious is the attitude of the Church, which having pioneered the loving care of the sick and stimulated scientific study over the centuries, has been content in countries like Britain to regard the care of the sick as the secular responsibility of the state, and has concentrated on forms of spiritual healing almost in contradistinction to scientific medicine. ¹

Men can help the sick people by means of medical science and modern techniques. A doctor is able to diagnose the illness and can prescribe all the necessary pills, drugs and treatments with a view to recovery, but the healing is from God. A doctor treats but God heals. The whole healing process is God in action and man in work of co-operation.

The Authority and the Gifts of Healing

The authority of healing is given by our Lord Jesus Christ to His disciples and to those who share in the work of proclaiming the Gospel and bearing witness to his name to all in the world. The Church is the chosen people of God, the body of Christ and He is the head of the Church; the believers are the limbs. The foundation is founded by Christ as a continuation of his own work in the world, which is to reconcile men to God. Healing of the sick is part of the work of reconciliation in which every active Christian has a share.

¹ Dr. T.F. Davey, 'Thoughts on the Tübingen Consultation', The Report of the Churches' Council of Healing, October, 1965, (London: 16, Lincoln's Inn Fields), p. 17.

² I Cor. 3:11 ff.

As far as the gifts of the holy Spirit are concerned, the varieties of gifts serve but one purpose, that is, His work of the coming of the kingdom of God. Jesus proclaimed the Gospel, received sinners and ate and drank with them and healed the sick. This He did in order to bring sinners to God. To the Church this task was given and the means provided to enable her to do it. Not only does the Holy Spirit stir up the love in the heart and activate men to go out to proclaim the Gospel, but He also provides other gifts, of which the power to heal is of no small importance.¹ But this healing work should not be seen as an activity separated from the reconciling work of Jesus, for,

All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation; that is, God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them, and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation. ³

In the Apostolic Church, no one claimed that he possessed supernatural power or any peculiar gift to enable him to carry out his healing work. It was really the other way round. When a healing miracle took place, it was acclaimed to be the work of the risen Christ, the only Person who had risen from the dead. The story in Acts III is a good example to clear up this point. At the Beautiful Gate of the temple, a crippled beggar was healed by Peter and John. After the healing all the people were amazed and gathered round them, and,

when Peter saw it he addressed them, 'Men of Israel, why do you wonder at this or why do you stare at us, as though by our power of piety we had made him walk? The God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, glorified his Servant Jesus ... whom God raised from the dead. To this we are witnesses! ³

¹I Cor. 12:4 ff.

²II Cor. 5:18-19.

³Acts 3:11 ff.

Healing miracles connected with the Apostles' missionary work frequently occurred in the Apostolic church. There are another eight cases of individual healings and seven group healings mentioned in Acts.¹ One of the latter cases can be quoted here:

And by the hands of the Apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people ... There came also a multitude out of the cities round about unto Jerusalem, bringing sick folks, and them which were vexed with unclean spirits: And they were healed every one. 2

In the post-apostolic age, the church was still performing the task of healing. We find significant, though fragmental, accounts in the works of the Apostolic Fathers like the pastor of Hermas, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and Dionysius of Alexandria.³

In the middle of the second century, Hermas wrote,⁴

I would that all men should be delivered from the inconveniences they lie under. For he that wants, and suffers inconveniences in his daily life, is in great torment and necessity. Whosoever, therefore, delivers such a soul from necessity, gets great joy unto himself ... and many upon the account of such calamities, being not able to bear them, have chosen even to destroy themselves. He, therefore, that knows the calamity of such a man, and does not free him from it, commits a great sin, and is guilty of his blood.

The Pastor of Hermas recognized the Christian duty to alleviate pain as far as possible, and he knew about the joy as fruit of the healing ministry.

¹ Acts 9:10-19, Paul regains his sight.
 Acts 9:32-35, Aeneas is healed of paralysis.
 Acts 9:36-42, Tabitha restored to life.
 Acts 14:8-10, Paul heals a cripple at Lystra.
 Acts 16:16-8, Paul exorcises a maid with a spirit of divination.
 Acts 20:7-12, Eutychus brought back to life.
 Acts 28:3-6, Paul is not poisoned by the bite of a viper.
 Acts 28:8, The fever and dysentery of Publius' father is healed.
 Acts 2:43; 5:12-16; 8:5-8; 14:3; 19:8-12 and 28:9 in which the multiple healings are mentioned.

² Acts 5:16 (NEB).

³ P.L. Garlick, Health and Healing (London: Edinburgh House Press, 1948), p. 12.

⁴ Quoted by Evelyn Frost, Christian Healing (A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1949), p. 103.

In his treatise against heretics, especially the Gnostics, Irenaeus (c. 180) mentioned that the works of healing were performed mainly by the Christians and not by others. These works were restoring sight to the blind, giving hearing to the deaf, casting out all kinds of demons, curing the weak, the lame, the paralytic and those afflicted with other diseases.¹ He also mentioned the raising of the dead on which he wrote:

The entire church in that particular locality entreating the boon with much fasting and prayer, the spirit of the dead man has returned, and he has been bestowed in answer to the prayer of the Saints. 2

Since illness was usually regarded as demon-possession or caused by sin, the healing work could be done mainly on a spiritual plane. But it seems clear that the Church was seeking other methods of healing than the spiritual method. The importance of this point can probably be seen in James' Epistle chapter 5:14 ff,

Is any among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith will save the sick man, and the Lord will raise him up; and if he has committed sin, he will be forgiven.

No doubt, anointing was introduced in the community as a method of curing the sick. It can be taken as an indication of a different method of healing than just healing by prayer, the so called 'faith' without action.

Perhaps it was the instruction of Jesus and his practice of the work of healing which made the early Church carry out this task unceasingly, and which convinced the Church throughout the centuries

¹Ibid., p. 65 & 104.

²Ibid., p. 105.

that the task of taking care of the sick and establishing welfare for the whole world was its own responsibility. History tells us that the first infirmary for the sick and the first asylum for lepers were both founded by Christians. The first hospital in the western world was also established by a Christian woman.¹

Through the deep understanding of the Gospel of Love, we realize that the Church and medicine are both vital concerns for today's world. Jesus taught His disciples to continue the healing task which he had begun and he encouraged them saying:

Truly, truly, I say to you, he who believes in me will also do the work that I do, and greater Works than these will he do, because I go to the Father. Whatever you ask in my name, I will do it, that the Father may be glorified in the Son (John 14:12-13).

The task and the encouragement is still the same today.

We know that all men suffer together, none can be secure until all are made secured. There are no geographical limits as far as healing and health are concerned. Health education and social hygiene are important to prevent the spread of disease. Medical work of the Church is needed especially in developing countries, and it is far more urgently needed in villages and in the places where the poor live. Christian members of the medical profession must offer good service and should not mind working in rural areas or for meagre pay, because of their faith in Jesus Christ and compassion for people. The aim of the Church's healing work is not merely to win people for Christ, but to reflect the love of God and to bear witness for Him in combatting disease and relieving pain.

The missionary medical work in the East is no longer a part of the foreign mission endeavour, but a part of the healing ministry of the universal Church. Its work is to restore the human being in

¹Phyllis L. Garlick, op. cit., p. 32.

a culture where there are those who deny the value of human life and the wholeness of man. The Church's healing work is far more than just an auxiliary to the evangelistic work. Neither is it merely the response of the Church to the urgent need of sufferers. It is the Christian ministry of health and healing, to restore the divine image in man, and restore his wholeness.

THE GENERAL BIBLICAL VIEWPOINT

A Summary of Previous Chapters

From the ancient days till the present age, men have been assailed by illness and disease. Possessing no scientific knowledge; primitive man was frightened by and suffered from these various diseases, which they, influenced by their primitive religion, attributed to the actions of gods or evil spirits. This aspect of human suffering was treated by priests and sorcerers who were believed to be able to perform religious and magical exorcisms.

As far as sin and sickness were concerned the Jewish people held a clearer and stronger concept than their neighbour countries. The Jews regarded the source of illness as lying in men's sin - sin against God or against men. Therefore sickness was thought of as a mark illustrating the corrupt nature of man and a manifestation of God's punishment for sin. Thus a causative relation between sin and sickness grew from this thought and it was found in the minds of many Jewish people. Beside this, there was another source of illness believed by the Jews, namely, the evil spirits or demons who were thought of as enemies of men and of God. The sole purpose of the demons was to cause trouble to men, to inflict on men by various diseases and to send suffering on earth. To illustrate this point, it is necessary to investigate the Old Testament where some aspects in connection with the problem of sin and sickness can be established.

Sin, sickness, and the relationship between them in the Old Testament are expressed in various Hebrew terms and illustrated by many colourful stories. The writers' purposes were practical rather than theoretical. They stressed the facts rather than the

abstract dogma.

The meaning of sin in general is associated with the word חטא which basically denotes to miss the goal, to offend against man or god. From an ethical point of view the conflicts between man and man, and the conflicts between nations and nations were expressed by the same term. It stresses the outward actions rather than the inward motive of sin. Religiously to break a cultic law or a compulsory ritual ceremony is a sin which is designated by the term עוון. Theologically, sin is wilfully, actively and dynamically offending somebody. To revolt or to transgress against man or God is really a sin and it is clearly expressed by the word עוון which also means guilt-offering, crime and punishment. From an investigation covering a few Hebrew words for sin, some important aspects can be obtained.

The Hebrew terms as well as the first few chapters of Genesis express the conviction that it was man himself who broke the harmony of the inner self, the harmony between man and man and the harmony between man and his Creator. As a result of these breaches, the creation as a whole was no longer in complete concord and no human creature could live in perfect bliss. The health of man suffered from man's wilful choice of disobedience.

The Old Testament describes the heart as the seat of iniquity. In biblical language the heart means not only the emotional state but the will and the soul of man. For Jeremiah, the stubbornness of man's evil heart was the source from which all the troubles and sinful deeds sprang. Therefore, he painfully rebuked the heart-hardened people who refused the message of God.

Sin as described in terms of the fruit of man's evil heart, is universal as well as individual. Sinful thoughts and sinful acts prevailed from generations to generations. Hence, the prophet Isaiah complained that he was born into a sinful world, Job stressed that no clean thing could be brought forth, and the Psalmist asserted that there was no righteous man on earth (Ps. 143:12). From a biblical point of view every man is sinful, every nation is sinful, in fact the whole world is sinful. Therefore, disease and sickness are intimately related to this sinful world.

The Old Testament sometimes describes a weak and wicked nation as a sick person weakened by disease to the point of death. The sinfulness, discrimination, conflicts, famine, pain and calamities are all 'disease' of a nation. They progressively attack a nation till it is completely destroyed. In this respect, sin is a form of sickness and it needs remedy. Therefore, the repentance of the nation and the forgiveness of God are the means of healing for such a 'sick' nation.

Concerning the relationship between sin and sickness, the Old Testament holds a general view that disease is sent by God as a punishment for sin and as an expression of His wrath (cf. Ex. 4:11; Dt. 32:39). Other views in connection with this point are not rare in the Old Testament. For instance, the source of disease is ascribed in Job 2:7 to the work of Satan. In I Sam. 25:26 ff, the cause of Nabal's death was self-indulgence, and for Jeremiah, the cause of illness was traced to a deceitful heart.

Long before psychology discovered the psychological factors related to man's physical health, the Old Testament had already stressed the important influence of the spiritual or emotional functionings on man's physiological state. When a pathological cause

of sickness is to be traced, the Old Testament seldom neglects to take psychical factors into account. Obviously, the Bible does not intend to explain illness in a purely naturalistic manner, but it lays a definite emphasis on the spiritual factors as causes of sickness. The relationship between spiritual factors and physical factors are intimate for they interact with each other functionally as far as the etiology of illness is concerned. Modern views regarding disease and healing tend to emphasise the importance of the relationship of these two factors. For instance, Dr. Paul Tournier states that "every illness and every accident reveal problems, sometimes of vital importance, in which physical, psychological and spiritual factors are closely interwoven."¹

In the Old Testament, the heart is also regarded as the seat of intellect, mind and will. The importance of this realization is that the pathological cause of sickness, either mental or physical, is often traced to this recess of man. Therefore, it is not surprising that Jeremiah could assign all troubles and the illness of his people to the sinfulness and stubbornness of the heart.

Sin disturbs man's inner and outer world. Sickness illustrates that there is a disharmony or unbalance of man's physical mechanism or spiritual functionings. Every sickness has an impact upon his outer or inner world. In this respect, a disharmonious world is a sick world affecting every individual. Sickness, is a result of sin in general, but this does not necessarily mean that the sick person is more sinful than a healthy one. It is not a proof of any misdeed of the sufferer or a manifestation of his wicked personality. As far as sin and sickness are concerned, a causative relationship between them cannot always be established. In many cases of sickness

¹ A doctor's Casebook in the Light of the Bible (London: SCM Press, 1963), trans. Edwin Hudson, p. 184.

in the Old Testament, no indication of any sin of the sick people is given.

Sometimes, sickness points to sin, other time it does not. In the Old Testament, cases were reported of wicked people who got sick, but the same applied to the righteous people. If sickness is to be seen as a penalty for wickedness, the question could be put forward as to the cause and reason for the sickness of the righteous. Some light can be thrown on this problem by trying to establish the connection between God's providence and man's sufferings. In many respects, the righteous and wicked share the same lot on earth. Both are subject to the natural laws of life and death. Both are under the providential care of God. The Old Testament writer, perceiving this, declared:

Since one fate comes to all, to the righteous and the wicked, to the good and the evil, to the clean and the unclean, to him who sacrifices and to him who does not sacrifice. As is the good man, so is the sinner; and he who swears is as he who shuns an oath... (Eccl. 9:45).

This thought is further illustrated by the saying of Jesus: "Your father ... makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rains on the just and on the unjust" (Mt. 5:45). Scripture teaches that God's sovereign will concerns all men though all men have sinned, some more wickedly than others. The Hebrew thought of a righteous man does not mean that such a man is entirely free from sin.¹

¹The Hebrew word צְדִיק (tsedeq) is usually translated by 'righteous' and its naun 'righteousness.' Its common and legal usage in connection with forensic meaning, expresses that someone is proved innocent of a charge, in other words, the accusation is unjustified and therefore he is pronounced 'guiltless of a charge or charges.' The expression of a man who is upright, perfect, God fearing or eschews evil, means that he is a simple, natural and innocent man, he is naive and artless. Job is one of this kind. Job described as upright and perfect, means that he is proved guiltless and innocent of charges. Cf. Ludwig Köhler, Hebrew Man (London: SCM Press, 1956), p. 166-67.

Under God's providential care, men have a future and life acquires a meaning. God has his own purpose with and in the creation. History leads somewhere - it also has a purpose. God's providence illustrates the love and the greatness of Him. Contrary to this love and greatness stands the wickedness of sin, which is not discounted from God's providence but allowed a place in the creation.

The almighty God is also pictured as a good God (Ps. 136). Every thing created by Him was good. The heaven and the earth, the animate and inanimate things and human beings were good. From a biblical outlook, things have a meaning and are under God's care. From a scientific outlook, everything has a cause and result. The Bible is concerned with the spiritual meaning of things and science with the materialistic meaning of them. The Bible tells that God made everything; science tells how everything operates. These are two frames of reference regarding the creation and its meaning.

Sin and sickness are not meaningless. They happen under the permission of God though they do not come from God. Even the evil things could sometimes be used by the Divine for the good of his people. In the light of God's word, man is enabled to see things more positively. Joseph saw in his sufferings the good purpose of God. David saw in the illness and the death of his son born from Uriah's wife a divine punishment. Job knew that in his disease and calamities there was a test designed by God to affirm his faith. He denied that his sickness and sufferings were the proof and the wages of sin. He found no evidence that he had been more sinful than his friends, but they held that Job's illness and miseries were indications of his wrongdoings and disobedience towards God, and that the wrath of God found expression through his calamities. Job was one of many who defends his innocence and maintained that he

did not deserve to suffer. There were also other writers of the Old Testament who agreed with Job's argument. It is clear that the readers of the story of Cain and Abel would express their sympathies with a suffering and dying Abel because he did not deserve it. Possibly the same emotions would be engendered by the reading of the experience of Korah. However, the friends of Job represented the general view of the Old Testament regarding the relationship between sin and sickness, namely, that it is always well with the righteous and ill with the wicked. Though Job denied that his sickness was a result of his sin, he was not completely free from this general thought.

Looking at some biblical characters, one can hardly fail to notice the purpose and meaning expressed by their illnesses, sufferings, miseries and death. Considering this, the problem of sin and sickness becomes more transparent.

Disease is a sign of death in the days to come. It reminds man of the threat of death and vividly expresses the fact of man's mortality. Though no one really knows when the end of his earthly life will be, one has to prepare to face it. Without knowing the biblical meaning of disease very many people experience the difficulty of dealing with an unexpected sickness. Disease and death are part of man's lot. Here the words of Job are an echo of this belief:

For affliction does not come from the dust,
nor does trouble sprout from the ground;
but man is born to trouble
as the sparks fly upward (Job 5:6-7).

Sickness is meaningful if the sufferer has the correct attitude towards it, and if he is able to understand through faith that his sickness is part of the plan and providence of God.

Sickness reminds the sick person of his helplessness and his dependence on others. When in a position of disability, the sick person is on a position to appreciate more than ever his family and

friends. Then he is suddenly lifted out of his own self-contained way of life.

In God, life has a meaning and so has sickness. To seek the meanings of things is to seek God. All things reveal the messages of God. Only if one seeks him and listens to Him one would see the mercy and the love of God which is shown to him and to all other creatures. Job heard the voice of God who spoke through the whirlwind and who revealed Himself through the natural phenomena. Prophet Isaiah became aware of his own sin and knew that he was purified by God who revealed himself as the one sitting on the throne. Moses (Ex. 3,4) heard God calling him from out of the burning bush. Paul met the risen Christ on the Damascus road and felt the urge to follow Him. Jesus Christ was firmly sure that his suffering and death was the will of God His Father. These were men who were able to see the deeper meaning of events and the will of God in their illnesses and sufferings.

The thought that sickness and suffering were related to sin was prevalent in the time of Jesus. The Jews believed that all suffering was the consequence of sin. Sickness was an evil thing. It originated in sin, in man's disobedience to God and in his rebellious will that chose his own way which was not in harmony with that which God had willed for him. This principle was established from and supported by the Old Testament although there are also other passages to be found not sustaining this belief, such as in the Book of Job, the chapters on the Suffering Servant, the Gospels and the Epistles of Paul.

Jesus' own view on the problem of sin and sickness can be obtained from the Gospels. On one occasion, Jesus said to the paralysed man, "My son, your sins are forgiven" (Mk 2:5), which followed the curative words, "Rise, take up your pallet and go home" (Mk 2:12). How far the forgiveness of sin effected the recovery, the Gospels

do not make it clear. The context obviously expresses a relationship between the man's sin and his infirmity. On another occasion, Jesus said to another paralytic at Bethsaida, "See you are well! sin no more, that nothing worse befall you" (John 5:14); here a hint is given that sin was the cause of the man's disease. Further examples are widespread in the Scripture, as also in the work of modern psychology.¹

No doubt Jesus realized that there was a close connection between sin and sickness. But this interdependent relationship between sin and sickness is not an absolute law by which a sick man could be judged or pronounced guilty. The existence of this relationship does not put any man in a position to condemn those who are sick. This attitude of self-righteousness which was expressed by the friends of Job, was also seen in the remarks of the disciples of Jesus (John 9:1-5).

Jesus, aware of such an attitude, held a view different from this. Dealing with the man who was born blind (John 9:1-5) the disciples expressed their opinion that the blind man or his parents must have sinned somehow or else he would not be blind. Jesus knew that "it was not that this man sinned, or his parents, but that the work of God might be made manifested" (John 9:3). Jesus denied a causative connection between sin and the man's blindness while He ignored the question of inherited sin. Disease cannot always be taken as a proof of sin though there is a general link between them.

If there is a link between sin and sickness, there is also a link between forgiveness and healing. In some cases forgiveness of sin preceded healing. In others, no mention of sin or forgiveness is made, and both categories are demonstrative of God's power in operation. However, modern psychology agrees that the forgiveness of sin is very often a curative factor if the disease was caused by a sense of guilt.

¹Supra, p. 36. Infra, p. 210.

This current belief in the time of Jesus did not cover disease alone but all calamities were seen as having one common cause, namely sin. Jesus did not completely associated himself with this belief. Referring to Pilate's massacre of the Galilaens and those who died in the downfall of the Tower of Siloam, Jesus declared that those victims were not more wicked than other men, but that all human alike were equally sinful, none was a greater sinner than the other. He urged every man to repent of his own sin, and not to judge people's sins from their calamities.

Men in general are sinners, and are exposed to sickness and sufferings. The problem of sin and suffering might be understood much better in the light of the principle of the solidarity of mankind as a whole.

To pass a judgment on a sick person is not permissible, even if there is concrete evidence to prove that a particular disease is a direct result of a sinful act. Alcoholism could be caused by over drinking and syphilis by adultery or sensuality. But there are those who indulge themselves in alcohol and in passion without getting any disease. These moral sins have a social origin and they are collective as well as individual. Obviously, there is disease caused by sin, there is disease without sin, and there is sin without disease.

Sin, whether it causes sickness or not, does always produce two consequences; namely, a spiritual separation from God, and a progressive corruption of personality. Sinners could possibly avoid a physical penalty of sin but not its spiritual and personal consequences.

Jesus used mainly two ways to treat people in need, namely, by forgiving sin and by healing of sickness, both based on the love of God. This love became visible in the life and the work of Jesus and is recorded in the Bible.

In the Gospels specially in Luke, chapters XV, the parables of the lost sheep, of the lost coin and of the Prodigal son are told. In these parables, the merciful love of God who sent his only begotten son to seek and save sinners, to heal and to restore the sick is illustrated. Despite the opposition of his enemies, the Pharisees and the Jews, Jesus worked day and night. He preached and talked and associated himself with sinners; He sat, ate and drank with the outcasts. From His words and His works the purpose of God for the sinners and the sick is made apparent.

The acts of forgiving and healing accomplished by Jesus, served the purpose of reconciling man to God. In His healing ministry, Jesus dealt with man in his totality, with man in both his physical and spiritual need.

The healing acts of Jesus were expressive of God's love and His redeeming power and were demonstrative of His greatness and compassion. Through His healing work, diseases were destroyed, sick people healed and sins forgiven.

Healing miracles as God's great works done by Jesus, are beyond the reach of human understanding and the bounds of scientific knowledge. Man is a limited being. He is limited by time and space in which he finds himself, His knowledge, his faculties of understanding, his capabilities of achievement are all limited. In fact, his whole life is limited. Man cannot be compared with God, neither can man completely understand how God works and how his power operates in healing. Realizing the incapacities of man, it is not surprising that many healing miracles cannot be appreciated by human knowledge and that no sufficient explanation could be offered. Moreover, during the time when the Gospels were written, science as it is

advanced today was foreign to the authors thereof. It is far from surprising that no scientific theory was given in the Gospels in explaining the miracles of healing. Probably, the healing miracles of Christ belong to a higher plane and they could be accepted if viewed in a spiritual light to which the scientific world is often blind.

Healing miracles were the works of God who sent Jesus to do them. Jesus was fully aware that he was doing the work and the will of his Father. This consciousness was repeatedly expressed by Jesus' own words. To a Samaritan woman, he said, "My food is to do the will of God who sent me, and to accomplish his work" (John 4:24). To the Jews, he declared, "My father is working still, and I am working" (John 5:33). In short, healing, as the work willed by God, is an act of God for the salvation of men.

Through the healing act of Christ, men were liberated from the attack of disease and the unwhole men were restored. This act of salvation not only restored men to their complete health but also gave them a new life - the abundant life (John 10:10). Jesus is the living water (John 4: 7ff) for the thirsty, and the Saviour of the sinners and the sick (John 4:24). Every performance of healing is a step leading to the eternal life which will be the final attainment of the work of Salvation.

Healing, as an act of relieving man from disease, is also a sign of the deliverance of man from sin which is the source of all sickness. Jesus' healing task was the fulfilment of the work of the divinely appointed Servant which was prophesied by Isaiah and proclaimed by the Gospelwriter (Mt 8:16-17; cf. 12:12-18). The suffering Servant was chosen to bear men's sicknesses and pains (Is 53:4). Jesus came to heal the sick and sinners so as to accomplish God's plan and to make men participate in the Kingdom of God.

Every success of healing was accompanied by 'faith', the faith of the healer, faith of the patient and the faith of those who were concerned with the patient. 'Faith' played a decisive role in every recovery from illness. In his healing task, Jesus stressed the importance of faith in Him, faith which is a complete trust in His healing power. The woman with an issue of blood was healed by a 'touch' of faith. She came and touched the fringe of Jesus' garment, whereby her disease was cured (Mk 5:25-34). The two blind men mentioned in Matthew 9:27-31 were also healed by their faith in Christ. The modern psychologist tends to equate such 'faith' with 'suggestion'. This expression could only be taken as an illustration and not as an explanation because psychological 'suggestion' is not entirely similar to the faith which Jesus saw in his patients.

Sometimes, a healing act was performed in an atmosphere of faith, faith of a group of people which consisted of the friends and relatives of the patient. The paralysed man at Capernaum was cured under such circumstances (Mk 2:1-12).

Faith is conducive to healing, but unbelief is an obstacle. Jesus did not do many mighty works in his home country because of the unbelief of the inhabitants (Mt 13:58). The disciples could not cast out demons because of their lack of faith (Mt 17:16-17). They were unduly concerned about food and clothes because of their 'little faith' (Lk 12:22).

Faith expresses a willingness in accepting God's grace; and makes it possible for God's power to come into operation in healing and exorcism. Faith is an act of seeking and accepting God's help. It does not discard reason or deny medical knowledge, Faith expresses confidence in the use of God's gifts which include all the means of medical and spiritual treatment. Those who rejects all medical

treatments and claim that healing should be done purely by prayer, ignore the grace and some of the gifts of God. The so called 'faith healing' which contemptuously rejects the use of physical means is not faith at all, but contains perhaps in itself certain elements of superstition.

Healing, as an act of faith in God, is also an act to destroy the power of evil and to establish the kingdom of God. Sickness as a sign of man's sinful state in general, is also a visible expression of the power of evil in operation. Destroying the power of evil is a significant step in delivering man from disease. The disease of the woman who was bent double for eighteen years, was regarded as an infliction caused by Satan (Lk 13:12 ff). In this case, healing is an illustration of the destruction of the satanic power and a restoration of man to wholeness. In the Gospels, there are many cases of exorcism by Jesus demonstrating the power of God over the power of Satan. The instance of the Gerasene demoniac (mk 5:1-12) which is recorded in full detail is often quoted to represent a case which it is believed could be explained in terms of psychology. The exorcism of Jesus was an integral part of healing. In fact, there is no clear line to demarcate exorcism from healing. They could be distinguished as two, but not separated in the one purpose they serve.

Every success of healing or exorcism is a sign of the dawning of the Kingdom of God and the beginning of the dethronement of the kingdom of Satan.

It has been shown in the preceding chapter that in the New Testament, the evil power is personified as Satan, devils or demons who are responsible for all evil deeds.

In the time of Jesus, the Jewish people believed that demons were divided into classes and there were certain names given to them. These demons were associated with ruins, old houses, cemeteries and certain animals like the dogs and the cats for instance. Demons were waiting in these places to attack people who came near them.

This belief seems to have connections with superstitious notions, but it was not completely a false belief for it realized that there was an evil power preventing the work of God. Jesus accommodated himself to the current belief which, to a great extent, corresponded to the reality.

The Gospels record that Jesus rebuked demons, cast them out and that His name was known by the demons. His work was to destroy the power of demons and to liberate men from their bondages. Therefore, the belief of the existence of demons was not a delusion but a real fact.

Sickness as originated in sin, is also regarded as afflictions by demoniac power. There are numerous cases of demon-possessions, some of them showing symptoms similar to mental disorders. Psychology studies of the exorcisms of Jesus tend to the view that the success of his work was based on his personal influence and his magnetic personality. To them demon-possession was a kind of auto-suggestion or mental disorder or even epilepsy. These psychological suppositions apt to deny the reality or possibility of demon-possession, thereby, oversimplify the problem. Not all cases of exorcism recorded in the Gospels or found outside the the Gospels can be explained by modern theory. Psychological knowledge can illumine but cannot render the final answer. In fact, no boundary line can be drawn to differentiate between mental disorder and demon-possession. Probably, even advance medical science and psychology is far from being capable of understanding the problem of demon-possession. To this problem, there is hardly any better answer than offered by Jesus. To the demon-possessed patient at Garasene, he said, "Out, unclean spirit, come out of this man" (Mk 5:8). To the woman whom Satan bound, He said, "Woman you are freed from your infirmity" (Lk 13:12). To Mary, the Magdalene, from whom seven demons were driven, He said, "Your sins are

forgiven" (Lk 7:48). The answer is only to be found in Jesus through faith in him.

Demon-possession is a sign of evil power in destroying man's wholeness. Jesus used 'a word' of authority and 'a touch' of power to heal and to cast out demons and to obliterate the visible result of sin. Thereafter, men were brought back to integrity and restored to God to enjoy full fellowship with Him.

Not only did Jesus do the work of healing but he also gave his authority and power to his disciples and to those who followed him. To the twelve he said, "Preach as you go saying, 'the Kingdom of heaven is at hand'. Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse lepers, cast out demons" (Mt 10:7-8).

Under the Commission of Jesus the disciples "went out and preached that men should repent. And they cast out many demons, and anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them" (Mk 6:13). The Seventy who had been sent out, came back and said, "Lord, even the demons are subjected to us in your name!" (Lk 10:17). The disciples claimed that it was by the name and the power that they preached and healed. After the Ascension, the disciples and the followers of Jesus went out into the whole world, performing miracles and bringing men to the Kingdom of God. In the same way the the early church carried out the command of Christ. They like Jesus, declared that it was God who worked and healed for the benefit of men and for His own glory.

Modern men often claim that all healing is done only by man's medical science, whereby they failed to see that all healing is of God. In fact, it is the doctor who treats the sick, but God who heals. The process of healing is God in action and men in response.

The Church throughout the centuries realizing this important meaning of the work of God, carried out the task. As long as sickness and sin retained their evil power of destruction, healing work could never cease.

Sin and sickness is a life-long problem to be dealt by every generation, and yet, no clear cut answer can be offered. They are intimately connected to each other and deeply rooted in some or other evil source.

Scripture traces this evil source back to the actions and influences of Satan. Luke explains sickness and pain in terms of afflictions caused by Satan (Lk 13:16). Closely connected with this is Mark's assertion that Satan tries to prevent the coming of the Kingdom of God (Mk 13:30). This is what actually happened when Satan incited Judas to hand Jesus over to the enemies, but God used this plot of Satan to his own glory.

Paul was convinced of the fact that there was a deeper cause and a higher purpose behind his "thorn in the flesh". The cause he found in Satan and the purpose in God.

In the same way the Apostolic Church was faced with the same problem - so is the Church of today - recognising the close link between sickness and sin, but unable to explain it fully.

The satanic power effects the individual as well as mankind as a whole. This power is made visible in sickness and in the sinful acts of men. The incisive words of Paul, "For all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God" (Rom 3:23), is but a confession of the inability of men to do good, due to the adverse influence of a stronger power. Sin is universal as well as individual. Perceiving the universality of sin, one could understand better the meaning of disease as a sign of the sinful state in which men found themselves.

Every individual has to take responsibility for his own sin. Sin deserves punishment for "he (God) will render every man according to his work" (Rom 2:6-9). Obviously this does not mean that every sin has its corresponding sickness or other punishment. In the Bible various instances are recorded of sins having received some punishment in this life. Even today some direct relations between sin and sickness

could be traced, but in the majority of cases it is impossible. If sin is taken as an universal wickedness in the sense that mankind as a whole is estranged from God, and from each other, and granted that disease is universal even then it can be said that there is an indirect relationship between sickness and sin. If sin is taken as an individual's wrongdoing, such as moral sin or anti-social sin for which every one is responsible, then disease might be a necessary result of sin. In this respect a causal relationship between sin and sickness cannot always be established although there is an interwoven link in many cases.

So far our biblical studies have discovered a vast number of valuable basic references and original sources in both the Old and the New Testament revealing the undeniable fact of the inter-related and inter-influenced nature of character of sin and sickness. In order to enrich and widen the scope of our investigation, the further step of examination should be taken in the field of theology. To fulfil this task we choose to confine our studies to a brief survey of the thoughts of three contemporary and prominent theologians, namely, Barth, Brunner and Niebuhr.

VI
SOME THEOLOGICAL CONCEPTS TODAY

It is not intended to deal with modern theological thoughts in detail, but it may be useful to mention the particular emphases of a few of the outstanding theologians of recent years.

Karl Barth

Before we say anything about his theological thought, the words of Torrance in dealing with Barth's theology can be quoted as a precaution: "Barth is not a theologian one can criticise until one has really listened to him and grasped his work as a whole and discerned its place in the history of theology."¹

Reminded by these words, no attempt of criticism is to be made in this section of our work.

Barth's life work in theology is his Church Dogmatics, extended over twelve volumes in which his complete theology is obtainable.

In the third volume, part four, section 55, under the heading 'Freedom for Life', he fills many pages dwelling on the 'will to be healthy' which he defined as the 'strength to exist as man',

¹T.F. Torrance, Karl Barth, an Introduction to His Early Theology 1910-1931 (London: SCM Press, 1962), see Preface.

and from this, he proceeds to the problem of evil and sickness.¹ This concept is related to and based on his doctrines of creation, man, and the providence of God. God created and preserved men and all other creatures. Barth stresses that under God's providence 'to live' is a divine command and that man exists in freedom before God. However, when sickness is brought into the picture in the life of man, there is no reason for any objection to consulting a doctor; but Barth warns against confusing the task of the doctor with the priestly function. The following short quotations reflect something of Barth's mind on the problem of sickness:

"Sickness is one of the elements in the situation of man as he has fallen victim to nothingness (Nichtige) through his transgression, as he is thus referred wholly to the mercy of God."² In the same way, sickness is described as "the consequent visitation of God's judgment upon him (man)" and again as a "concrete form of weakness, of destruction of the impairing of his strength and powers of growing old and declining."³

The destructive power of sickness is apparent. Therefore, to resist sickness is in accordance with the will to be healthy and in concord with the will of God's providence. It would be hopeless to resist sickness if God does not live and work, and if this affair were not his own matter, and if He did not hold himself responsible

¹Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, Vol. III, Part 4: The Doctrine of Creation, trans. A.T. Mackay et al., eds. G.W. Bromiley & T.F. Torrance (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1961), pp. 324 ff, pp. 364 ff. (Infra abbreviated as CD). Cf. Otto Weber, Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), p. 230.

²CD, III, Part 4, pp. 372.

³Ibid., p. 372-373.

for man. The evidence given by the New Testament stresses that God is the God who acts and speaks through the work of Jesus who healed the sick and established the Kingdom of God. Therefore, it is legitimate to combat sickness for it is in harmony with God's command.

Dealing with health and disease of man, Barth defines health as "the power of the vital functions of soul and body."¹ Disease is defined as "the impairing of this power and as crippling and hampering weakness."² For Barth, health is a loan to man. It is not an eternal possession of man. Health and sickness are in contrast and conflict in human life. They are real and exist in man. Sickness is an abnormality and a destructor opposed to all normal beings which are created and willed by God. It is a negation of God. Though it is an enemy of man and of God, it can be used by God as an instrument of His judgment upon his creation.

Man's will to live and to be healthy is expressed through his act of resisting disease, through his prayer and faith expressing his need of God and his trust in Him. On the matter of retaining health and resisting sickness, man cannot do without God, for God alone has the power to forgive sin and to overcome disease which is an ugly expression of the power of evil and sin.

Since sickness and sin has much to do with man, we shall now proceed to deal briefly with Barth's anthropology.

The Real man - Jesus

Barth's anthropology is divided into four sections, namely man as God's creature, man as God's covenant partner, man as soul

¹Ibid., III, pt. 4, p. 371.

²CD, III Part 2, pp. 1 ff.

and body, and man in his time.¹ "Each section begins with statements about the man Jesus in keeping with the Christological basis of this anthropology."² Jesus as the revealing and revealed Word of God is the real man, the true natural man and the perfect man. He possessed the wholeness of man which is the key to the understanding of man as created by God. Jesus is the source of the concept of man. Barth does not begin his dogma from a general scientific or philosophical view on the phenomena of the natural man. Nor does he start from the constitution of man's being, man's nature and man's existence and from there proceeds to the man Jesus Christ. In just the opposite way, he proceeds to his doctrine of man from the very man Jesus Christ.³ Barth is interested in discovering a real man as created and willed by God. The revelation of God in Jesus Christ, the perfect man, tells that man is unable to know himself completely as to who and what he really is. Man estranged himself from his own reality because of his own sin. There is no way to be a real man apart from turning to Jesus who is without sin and from his life, work, death and resurrection, the real and the true man is recovered and humanity restored.

Barth stresses several aspects of the human nature of Jesus; namely, He lived as the man devoted to God,⁴ the man for all man,⁵

¹CD, III, Part 2, pp. 1 ff.

²Otto Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

³Karl Barth, 'Against the Stream', Shorter Post-War Writings 1946-52, ed. R. George Smith (London: SCM Press, 1954), pp. 186, 191. Cf. Karl Barth, The Knowledge of God and the Service of God According to the Teaching of Reformation, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938), p. 48; CD, III, Pt. 2, p. 325 ff.

⁴CD, III, Pt. 2, pp. 55 ff.

⁵CD, III, Pt. 2, pp. 203 ff.

the man of wholeness,¹ and the man in his time.² He is the norm of men's knowledge of a perfect man, from him this criterion is developed. Jesus lived the perfect life of the true man, in perfect fellowship with God and with men. His life reflected the real and normal man whom God willed and created.

Sinful man and the perfect man are in complete contradiction. The unwhole man is the man who separates himself from God and from his fellow men. Therefore, sinners are entirely different from the real man Jesus. Jesus is the perfect man he is also the only man without sin and sickness. Nowhere in the Gospels is there any recording of Jesus being sick or indulging in sin. On the contrary, Jesus revealed that

man is God's creature, derived from God, existing with God and thus not without Him, and wholly belonging to God, that man is willed and created by God as a being existing in fellowship both with God and with his fellow-men, in other words, that the being of man is a being in relationship, in relation namely to God and to other men. 3

The more one realizes the wholeness and perfectness of Jesus, the more one is aware of one's imperfection and sinfulness. The only way of understanding the reality of man is the way of understanding the man, Jesus.⁴

Scientific study of man certainly shows how man is, but not that he is and what he really is. Scientific studies fall outside

¹GD, III, Pt. 2, pp. 325 ff.

²Ibid., pp. 437 ff.

³Herbert Hartwell, The Theology of Barth (London: Gerald Dockworth & Co. Ltd., 1964), pp. 124-125.

⁴GD, III, Pt. 2, pp. 23ff.

the scope of this reality of man. Physiology, biology, psychology or sociology, all these disciplines are mainly concerned with the phenomena of man as he appears in the cosmos, and do not deal with man as a sinner who is unlike the man Jesus who was the healthy man, the whole man.

Man wills to be as man and to be Healthy¹

The meaning of the health of man is further defined by Barth as follows: "Health means capability, vigour and freedom. It is strength for human life. It is integration of the organs for the exercise of psycho-physical functions."²

For Barth, man has a will to live and to be healthy.³ Although health is connected with the needs of man's natural impulses and spiritual desires, it is different from the satisfaction of these needs. A healthy man is one who possesses a feeling of happiness, strength and free will to develop himself.

If a man wills to live, he should also will to be healthy. A man possessing good health is often not conscious of it and does not think of it, and he is no longer in such a position to will for it. The healthier one feels, the less one takes notice of it or knows about it.

The goal of life is more than 'to live for its health' alone. Health without a purpose is not a complete health. As one writer puts

¹CD, III, Pt. 4, pp. 334 ff.

²Ibid., pp. 356.

³Ibid.

it,

Health is not complete without asking concerning its purpose. For we do not live in order to be healthy, but we are healthy and wish to be so in order to live and work. Only in enterprise and achievement is health a blessing entrusted to us. Health is not a final end in itself; it is defined and limited by the meaning of life, and the meaning of life is nothing but preparedness for devotion and sacrifice. ¹

For ^YBarth the will to live and the will to be healthy is willed by God. These wills should be developed in obedience to this command. Health is not to search merely a particular physical and psychical object which appears valuable to man.

Man wills not only to be healthy in body and soul but to be as man - a wholeman. Every integrated element of which man consists should be willed in the quest for health. These are body, mind, and spirit, satisfaction of impulses, use of reason, faithfulness to his individuality and his fellow-men, knowledge of his limitations, capability of work and feeling, and the relationship with God his creator and his fellow-men. These are what man wills to be as man and not as an animal or a plant. Man wills to gain, practise and understand these.

However, health is not something which can be taken for granted. Man ^oloses his wholeness of health through his sin. In order to regain it, he has to fight with the enemy of health, namely, sickness.

¹Richard Siebeck, Medizin in Bewegung, Klinische Erkenntnisse und ärztliche Aufgaben (1949), p. 486; quoted by Barth, GD, III, Pt. 4, p. 356.

It is clear enough that sickness appears negative in relation to health. Sickness is a lack of strength, an incapability of exercising man's normal life. It prevents man from practising his physical and psychical functionings by threatening him and causing him pain.

For Barth, the healthy and the sick have the same nature of man, the same body-soul relationship. The difference between them is the greater or lesser strength in them.¹ From this standpoint, Barth deals with the health of man in the third dimension which is not within the sphere of physical or psychical organic functions. Barth stresses the importance of the will, both in health, as in sickness. He asserts that sickness does not diminish the power of the will to reach out to health. In illness or in good health as the conditions of health and sickness are component parts of man's life-history! Man

lives the healthy or sick life of his body together with that of his soul, and again in both cases, and in their mutual relationship, it is a matter of his life's history, his own history, and therefore himself. 2

A man can regulate his physical and psychical resources of health to oppose sickness. For Barth, the power, will and strength to be as a man - the wholeman - is the basic but vital thought leading to the real meaning of 'health'. A healthy man is not merely one whose limbs are healthy and free from disease, but like the one who answers the question in the affirmative which Jesus puts forward, "Wilt thou be made whole?" (John 5:6).

¹CD, III, Pt. 4, p. 358 ff.

²Ibid., p. 359.

Furthermore, Barth repeatedly stresses that physical and psychical health is related to the will to live and the strength to be as man. This strength is in every man; there is no problem of desiring it and keeping it. On this will to be healthy, Barth expresses himself in the following way:

The history of man must continue in the strength to be as man. What he can do for the continuation and therefore against his every restriction of his life of soul and body, he ought to will to do if he is to be healthy, if he is to live in this strength, and if his history is to proceed in the strength of his being as man. ¹

Man as a man is not to be an object of his strength but a master of it. If he wills to be healthy, he ought to be in an active position against the constriction of his psychical and physical life.

The necessary steps of preserving and protecting these functions should well be taken to follow one's will of maintaining this strength. Yet, a man might not be in complete health, even if he takes thousands of measures to maintain and protect his psychical and physical functions, if he lacks the strength to be as man and lacks the will for health.

Barth would not disagree with the opinion that human health is not merely the absence of disease and 'sin', but a state where man wills to be as man, which is willed by God. To effect this, he has to be in complete harmony with his psycho-physical functioning and exercising, which are in turn deeply dependant on physical, mental and environmental conditions. Health is dynamic and not static.

¹Ibid., III, Pt. 4, p. 359.

Dealing with social conditions, "hygiene is the foundation of every prophylactic against possible illness, as it is also the main basis of therapy where illness has already commenced."¹

As far as hygiene is concerned, God's gifts of sun, air and water are vital parts in the realm of both psychological and physical concerns. Sport also plays an important part in hygiene.

The doctor is a man who is distinguished from others by his special knowledge of psychological and physical health and sickness. He is the man who "is capable of assisting men in their necessary efforts to maintain or regain health by his advice, or orders or even, if necessary, direct intervention."² If the desire to be healthy is willed by God, there is no reason to object against consulting a doctor when needed. The doctor, his skill and treatment are gifts of God for men in need. This view is presented by Ecclesiasticus in chapter 38, verses 2-12.

A doctor possesses special knowledge and skill in treating sickness. He is a man of particular training in dealing with sickness, he is a practitioner in his own field, he has better information than ordinary man has. The patient should submit to his judgment, his advice and direction or even intervention.

Medical help through a doctor is important in resisting disease. Health, i.e. the will to live strongly as man, a doctor is not able to give, but he could exhort man to will it, and he could help in removing the obstacles to this will for complete health. Psychological and physical disease is certainly a hindrance to this will. The task

¹ Ibid., p. 360.

² Ibid.

of removing these hindrances is left to the doctor.

Health is related to social well-being. Hygiene, sport, medicine, wages, standards of living working hours, housing, etc., all these are complements of health. If one of these is in a defective condition it could cause or promote disease, for they are external complements of the will to live and be healthy. An ill state of these social conditions or living condition, says Barth, will in some way threaten them (men) in spite of the measures which they take to isolate themselves and which may be temporarily and partially successful. When one person is ill, the whole society is really ill in all its members. In the battle against sickness the final human word cannot be isolated but only fellowship. ¹

Man has strength to be as man. Man can will and expect it to be such. Therefore the corresponding measures of the will should be desired and adopted. Any treatment which has value to assist and sustain this will should not be ignored in the battle against sickness. Sickness, undermining the will to live is a shadow preventing the will from health.

Man and Mortality

For Barth the existence of man is to exist in time. To exist now, means to exist under and with God.² The time, in which man exists, is a set span of time. No doubt, a limitation is thereby predicated. Man is not God, not eternal, he is a man allowed to live in a set period of time.³ This allowance is God's free grace.

¹ Ibid., III, Pt. 4, p. 363.

² CD, III, Pt. 2, pp. 437 ff.

³ Ibid., pp. 511 ff.

The end of time is death.¹ Time goes to that place from which death comes! If the span of time is set by God as a divine favour then its termination should be seen in the same light. Paradoxically, however, it is also true that this end is a negative thing, and something evil.

On the one hand, death does not belong to man's nature created by God, but it is a sign of God's judgment upon man. In no other way could death be explained. Jesus suffered for man. Death and its power is the chief element in sinful and guilty man and the wages of sin is death. Man's dying is in some respects a death sentence. On the other hand it is also true that man's existence is finite and that man is mortal. Man's life is a loan by God. Therefore when the span of time expires, he has to give it back for it belongs to God. Man's hope is in God and on the life beyond death. Through faith he would be there with God in the 'New Jerusalem'. God is the Lord of death. He awaits men in death, for he is a gracious God. Christians should not fear death but should fear Him. Death is man's boundary.

In some respects, death is the judgment on sinful men and disease is the agent or instrument of the Judge - God.

In man's struggle against evil and its expression in the form of sin, sickness and death, God is man's comrade in the battle. God fights against 'das Nichtige'² is for the sake of his good creation in which man is one in a special position. God's victory

¹ Ibid., pp. 587 ff.

² 'Das Nichtige' is translated as 'Nothingness' which generally expresses the power of evil, sin, sickness, chaos and death. Cf. infra, p. 160; CD, III, Pt. 3, p. 389.

over 'das Nichtige' is already accomplished in Jesus Christ. Man depends on the grace of God, which would see him through the battle against the power of evil. This grace manifests itself in man's faith in Him and prayers offered to Him. In fact, it is God whose Spirit in man fights His own battle for man, and He has already won through the incarnated man, Jesus, the Son of man.

Conquering and ruling over the powers of evil, God makes them serve a positive purpose in his creation and even for the good of his own creatures. God's triumphed over 'das Nichtige' in Jesus Christ who conquered sin, evil and death through his work and miracles, his death and resurrection.¹

In order to safeguard the autonomy and the freedom of man which are elements of man's nature, God temporarily permits and endures the existence of 'das Nichtige' because God's grace is concerned with man's obedience and responsibility to His holy will. Therefore He tolerates the evil in the world and allows man to exist under the very condition under which 'das Nichtige' is permitted to extend its evil power by way of sin, sickness and death, even to such a point where, according to Barth, God runs the risk of his human creatures turning away from Him. In this respect, Barth argues from the sovereignty of God and man's duty to humble himself before God in obedience, and says,

If God is greater in the very fact that He is the God who forgives sins and saves from death, we have no right to complain but must praise Him that His will also includes a permitting of sin and death. 2

¹CD, II, pt. 2, pp. 170 ff, 291; Vol. III, pt. 3, pp. 302 ff, 354 ff; Vol. IV, pt. i, pp. 408 ff.

²CD, II, pt. i, p. 595.

Man's life as limited is a Biblical and universal truth. Man's life is a gift from God, so is the life span allotted to him. Within this longer or shorter stretch of life, man must will to be as man and to exercise his strength and power to preserve his wholeness. Referring to his strength to be as man, Barth has the following to say:

Just because it is limited, it is a kind of natural and normal confirmation of the fact that by God's free grace man may live through Him and for Him, with the commission to be as man in accordance with the measure of his strength and power, but not under the intolerable destiny of having to give sense, duration and completeness to his existence, by his own exertions and achievements, and therefore in obvious conclusion of the view that he must and may and can by his own strength and powers eternally maintain, assert and confirm himself, attaining for himself his own dignity and honour. ¹

The Psalmist penetrated man's life in its deepest meaning, and says:

Lord, let me know my end, and what is the measure of my days; let me know how fleeting my life is! behold thou hast made my day a few handbreadths, and my life time is as nothing in thy sight, Surely every man stands as a mere breath! Surely man goes about as a shadow! Surely for nought are they in turmoil; man heaps up, and knows not who will gather! And now, Lord, for what I wait? my hope is in thee. ²

Life is not man's permanent possession, it is not in the hands of man, neither is it man who created his own life, it is created and allotted by God. It is a loan by God, but only for a certain time. In the same way, the above Psalmist looks with a deepest insight at the life beyond death. The hope of man is in God, in the same way in which life is in the hand of God. Life beyond death is the hope of all Christians.

¹CD, III, pt. 4, pp. 372-373.

²Ps. 39:1-7.

Barth would agree that sickness is a forerunner and messenger of death, a sign of the power of evil and the expression of the wrath of God. But this is only one side of the truth, for sickness is also the sign of Divine benevolence in a sense that sickness, conceals a good will of God, for He has in store "the eternal life which God has allotted and promised to man who is graciously preserved and guided by Him within the confines of his time."¹ In this respect, sickness is the herald of the eternal life. This paradoxical truth is established on the ground that sickness is in the hand of God. Death appears as a sign pointing to the victory over evil power and demons which are the agents of 'das Nichtige'. This truth does not ignore the need to combat sickness, neither does it reject spiritual help to build up the strength of man to resist sickness. In the same way it does not mean a compromise with the powers of evil which takes its course in the form of disease. Above all it does not raise the question of surrender before sickness. It solely expresses that in the hand of God sickness carries a Divine purpose and reveals his good will.

Holding fast to this paradoxical truth, one would realize that when one encounters sickness, or even death, one does not yield before the devil but surrenders in the presence of the merciful God who permits these things to happen for one's own good. The purpose of God in sickness is difficult to grasp because it always hides behind the sickness itself. Though illness is sometime unbearable its Divine meaning cannot be ignored.

¹CD, III, pt. 4, p. 373.

God's Creation and the Power of Evil

Since disease and sin sprouted from the same evil source - das Nichtige - they are enemies of man and of God because of their destructive power. It is necessary to deal with Barth's thought on evil and good in order to understand better the subject of sin and sickness.

The teaching of Barth on the subject of good and evil is related to his doctrine of creation and is based on the major premise that Jesus Christ is the key to the understanding of man, creation, and the Creator. God created everything good. All creatures brought into being by Him, possessed nothing of evil. To this good creation God repeatedly says 'Yes'. This Yes should be made apparent and should be understood. The opponent to His 'Yes' is His definite 'No'.¹ This 'No' must be pronounced on everything which is evil and this was in fact declared by and in Christ's death on the cross. This 'No' as opposed to God's 'Yes' to His good creation is spoken for the sake of His 'Yes', i.e. for the sake of the preservation and continuation of His good creation. These 'Yes' and 'No' must be considered together because none of them can completely be understood without the other. Undoubtedly, God would say 'No' to sin and sickness because they are both in contrast to God's 'Yes'. Sin and disease are both manifestations of 'das Nichtige'.² They

¹ CD, II, pt. 2, p. 13; Vol. III, pt. i, pp. 257 ff; Vol. III, pt. 4, pp. 367 ff.

² 'Das Nichtige' translated as 'the Nothingness' is found in the English translation, Church Dogmatics, trans. G.W. Bromiley & R.J. Ehrlich, eds. G.W. Bromiley & T.F. Torrance, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1961), Vol. III, pt. 3. The term is also translated as 'the Nihil' by A.C. Cochrane in his English translation of Otto Weber's Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics, in note 1, page 287.

both are evil and of destructive nature. The sick man and the sinful man are the same in the sense that they are attacked by the same power of evil. According to the interpretation of Scripture, Jesus Christ proves himself the Victor over 'das Nichtige.' On the cross through His death and resurrection He overcame sin, sickness and death, and thereby rendered the forces of evil powerless.¹

God's good creation is under his own blessing. This is affirmed in Jesus Christ.² Through his creation God reveals to man his own glory. Man on his part must will to be as man through serving and working as a witness to the glory of God because man's life is a precious gift from God.

Things harmful to God's creation and to his purpose with it, are contrary to God's will. Thus they must be excluded from God's creation on account of their evil character. This God does by his 'No'. Things confronted with God's 'No' have no part in His good creation, but they exist within the bounds of the wrath and the judgment of God. From this standpoint, sin and sickness are not willed by God nor are they created by Him.

Barth does not deny the existence of the power of evil. What he denies is the independent existence of this power in confrontation with God as if it were a sort of 'anti-god' who existed with God from the beginning. What he further denies is the teaching of dualistic doctrine on the work of creation and on the permanent existence of 'das Nichtige'. His position of anti-dualism is made apparent in his criticism of Marcion's teaching on the creation.³ In his doctrine

¹CD, III, 3, pp. 311f., 354 ff., 362 ff; Vol VI, pt. i, pp. 408.

²CD, II, 2, pp. 122 ff; Vol. III, pt. 1, pp. 331 ff; 377ff.

³CD, III, 1, pp. 334 ff; 337 ff.

of creation as a divine blessing, Barth, does not reject the existence of evil power which is closely linked up with the nature of 'das Nichtige'. He rejects, however the optimistic world-view of Leibniz,¹ and the pessimistic world-view of Schopenhauer.² It can be added that, for Barth, the existence of the power of evil is under the permission of God, and it is ruled and controlled by Him. Therefore its existence could be used by God for the good of His creation. Keeping this in mind, one could not easily agree with the critical view of Gustaf Wingren, when he asserts as follows:

There is in Barth's theology no active power of sin, no tyrannical demonic power that subjects man to slavery and which God destroys in his work of redemption. There is no devil in Barth's theology. This is a constant feature in his theological production. 3

To characterize the true nature of 'das Nichtige', Barth uses uncommon terminology, e.g. 'non-real' and 'the impossible possibility'. On the one hand, 'das Nichtige' is non-real because God only willed and created what is in concord with his own nature, namely what is real and good. This means that God is the source of all reality. Nothing can be real if it is not in conformity with God's own reality. In this respect, 'das Nichtige' cannot be regarded as real for it is the antithesis of God's good creation and the opposite of God's reality.⁴ On the other hand 'das Nichtige' does exist.⁵ But it exists

¹Ibid., pp. 380ff, 406ff.

²Ibid., pp. 344ff. 377ff.

³Theology in Conflict (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1958), p. 25; cf. p. 109.

⁴CD, II, Pt. 1, p. 532.

⁵CD, III, Pt. 3, pp. 349ff; Vol IV, Pt. 3, pp. 176ff. Also, Karl Barth's Table Talk (recorded and edited by J.D. Bodsey, Scottish Journal of Theology, occasional papers, No. 10, 1963), p. 17.

only on account of God's negation and rejection, i.e. under the control and the permission of God. God uses 'das Nichtige' in the witness of Scripture. "Darkness and chaos have a place in this witness", says, a scholar on Barth, "but only as scorned and rejected realities."¹ In such a peculiar manner it exists in a terrifying and impairing way, but God in Jesus faced it in his crucifixion and death.²

God as the source of all reality is also the source of every genuine possibility. Things which are contrary to His reality and revolt against His standards of reality are 'impossible possibilities'. Things which try to equate themselves with God and not to serve Him are, in Barth's view, unreal and yet they are regarded as satanic realities. Their negative characters and capacities are 'impossible possibilities'.³ These negatives like sin, disease, chaos and death are signs or expressions of 'das Nichtige' and are 'impossible possibilities' which do not carry any meaning of existential impossibility. Cochrane makes the following remarks on this point:

Although the Nichtige exists, it does not exist as the Creator and the creature do; it exists as that which has been negated and abrogated by God... As Barth himself explains in a letter, "'Nichtige' contains not only a negative but a distinctly qualifying note. That which is 'Nichtige' is not only ineffectual, insignificant, and trifling but is downright abominable-yes, accursed. Strictly speaking, the word may only be used in the way I have done: to denote the Chaos, sin, the devil, and the demons. Used in any other way it is too strong, too sharp." 4

¹ G.C. Berhouwer, The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth (London: Paternoster Press, 1956), p. 60.

² CD, II, Pt. 1, pp. 553ff; Vol, III, Pt. 3, p. 332; cf. H. Hartwell, op. cit., p. 120.

³ CD, II, Pt. 1, p. 532.

⁴ Otto Weber, Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics, trans. A.C. Cochrane (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), p. 187, translator's note 1.

Sin, Sickness and Death

Barth reaffirms that it is a fact that man has the strength to be as man and that man can will and affirm it as such.¹ By doing so he can will and adopt the necessary measures of this will in order to preserve the functions of soul and body. Disease as a weakness is opposed to strength. It is not willed by the Divine but it is in contrast to the will to live. Holding this view, Barth proceeds to criticise the teaching of Christian Science on this subject.

Sickness, whether psychical or physical, are human problems due to lack of strength to be as man. In his dispute with Christian Science on sin, sickness, evil and death, Barth holds that sickness is not illusion. The founder of Christian Science, Mary Baker Edgy and her adherents hold as their basic view on the subject of sickness that God is the only reality, and that He is spirit and his whole creation is a reflection of his spiritual essence. Apart from God, there is no reality but only powers and thoughts. Matter is only appearance representing powers such as sickness, sin, evil and death. Man as the image of God, is perfect. Things in opposition to this perfection are false realities of imagination and misunderstandings and sprung from man's alienation from God. All fears emerge from this illusion. All illness is based on this fear and even fear itself is illness. Illness is a picture created by fear and it falls on the body of man. For instance ulcer is an appearance of pain, and in itself it is not painful! It is merely as an appearance of matter without mind. When fear is taken away the soil on which sickness grows

¹CD, III, Pt. 4, p. 363.

is also removed. Even evil is not real. Death, according to Christian Science is a disappearance of man from his level of Consciousness. Men are freed by Jesus who is the embodiment of truth and who breaks through the false appearances, namely, sickness, sin, evil and death etc ... Through the power of prayer, all evil is bound to disappear to Nothingness. Therefore, prayer is the only means of treating the false appearance, the illness and the fear. All members of Christian Science are healers. Other measures medical or psycho-therapeutical, are regarded as unbiblical as being in contrast with the first commandment of God. To use them would be to trust another god or gods.

This view is far from the teaching of the Bible and is a false view. The unquestioning trust on the power of prayer is to be commended. But ignoring and denying all other gifts or means of healing is tantamount to a rejection of all free grace and the capabilities given by God. Prayer is not the only means in treatment, but God is the only reality. All things created by Him are real though they are not of the same reality as God is.¹ Sickness is a fact and not only an illusion. What is created and under the providence of God is not only reflections of thoughts and powers. Certainly, the Bible does not agree that sin, evil, sickness and death are only illusions. Therefore from this must be concluded that the standpoint of Christian Science and its adherents is contrary to the Scriptures.

From here Barth in his refutation of the views of Christian Science argues that sickness is an encroachment on human life. To prove that sickness is real and not imagination, Barth concludes from

¹ Ibid., p. 366.

the fact of the change, physical or psychical, from health to sickness; the health strength that resists illness; and the treatment given by the doctor to fight against disease but which sometimes still retains its evil effects despite all medical treatment. For Barth, these are real events, historical events. Again, Barth says:

The will to live as the will for health is a serious act of obedience to a serious command of God. Because man is not dealing with a false or imaginary opponent but with an enemy which is in some sense real. 2

Sickness, Death and Judgment

Sickness and death are unnatural and disorderly. Sickness is a work and manifestation of devil and demons who are in rebellion against God and his creation. On the origin and nature of sickness, Barth expresses himself as follow:

It (sickness) is neither good nor is it willed and created by God, at all, but is real, effective, powerful and menacing only as part of that which He has negated, of His Kingdom on the left hand, and therefore with its nullity. But in accordance with the will of God and under His reign it is necessarily dangerous - as the forerunner and messenger of death, the executor of God's final sentence - to man who has fallen from God and become His enemy. 2

Barth agrees that disease originated and exists in relation to the sin of man. Furthermore, it is a definite sign of physical death which is to come, but it is also a sign of spiritual death which already exists in man. Both the Old and the New Testaments express

¹Ibid., III, Pt. 4, p. 366.

²Ibid., p. 366.

that illness is an enemy of God and of his creation. It prevents the erection of the Kingdom of God. It is the agent of the devil and demons which are identified with Satan, the head of all evil and the producer of all calamities.

In his work, Jesus resisted sickness for he was aware of its wicked nature and destructive power. His work represented the will of God and the demonstration of God's power over the power of disease. The miracles, healings, exorcisms and the resurrection of Jesus are all indications of the Kingdom of God in which He and his followers are glorified.

Sickness as a sign of death is also an illustration of God's wrath and judgment, and it is rooted in, related to and corresponds to the corruption of man. Apart from the love of God, there is no other way of deliverance from this judgment of sin which raises its ugly head in the form of illness.

Healing is willed by God and demonstrated by Jesus Christ who submitted himself to the judgment of death but He changed the victory of the power of sin and sickness into defeat as revealed in His resurrection which is a declaration of the will of God for the liberation of man and the termination of evil power.¹

For Barth, the will to be healthy raises no question at all if sickness and health are seen from the above theological point of view. On the question how to face sickness and its threat of death, Barth puts forward his view that it is the command of God that man "must will to live and not die, to be healthy and not to be sick, and to exercise and not neglect his strength to be as man and the remaining psycho-physical forces which he has for this purpose, and thus to maintain himself."² This view of Barth

¹Cf. Ibid., p. 367.

²Ibid.

should be seen in the closest connection with God's command: "thou shalt not kill" and is in fact a further exposition thereof. No one is permitted to overlook or neglect this command as far as good health and good will of man is concerned. Keeping these words in mind, one would be bold enough to face sickness and death, concludes Barth.

From this theological point of view, Barth raises the further question concerning the way man should act in facing illness and death. He stresses the vital importance of man's obedience to this command of God. This he sees as the first requirement. Secondly, one should realize that although the power of evil and death serves as an instrument of God's righteous judgment by afflicting man with illness, it is also a power opposed to God's good will. The existence and working of this power is not permanent but exists only under God's permission. To surrender before the power of disease and death and to allow it to take its course is obviously an act of disobedience towards God. Therefore to be in harmony with the will of God, one should will to live and thereby will to resist sickness. Thirdly, though God is the righteous Judge, He is also the merciful, gracious and patient God. God in Christ has already marched through the realm of death and triumphed over its force. In short, when facing power of the realm of death, men must will what God has willed for men, namely that which is fulfilled by the work of Jesus concerning sickness and the Kingdom of God. Barth summarizes this view with the following words:

A little resolution, will and action in face of that realm and therefore against sickness is better than a whole ocean of pretended Christian humility which is really perhaps the mistaken and perverted humility of the devil and demons. 1

¹ Ibid., p. 368.

All resistance to sickness is in accordance with God's will and plan. This task is willed by God and is already accomplished by him through Jesus Christ. God is the God who lives, speaks, work and is responsible for man. Under God's providence, man has a place in his plan and what man does in resisting disease is not in vain seeing that he cooperates with God to execute His plan for creation. The destroyer, the Satan, the one who reveals himself in the form of sickness also occupies a place in His creation. But this wicked destroyer cannot escape from the judgment of God. In resisting him God is always victorious.

To resist disease is the work of God as well as the task of man. In combatting sickness, prayer to God and faith in Him play an very important role. These two are the sources from which man obtain his power which stimulates the will and builds up resistance to illness. They cannot be replaced by any other means of treatment, whether, physical, psychological, or medical. All means of treatment must serve the plan of God where God and man work together in destroying the power and effect of disease.

Dealing with disease and sin, Barth quotes a great number of Old Testament references. He is aware of the fact that Exodus 15:26 is often quoted as the standpoint of the Old Testament on sickness and all related problems. For Barth unquestionable obedience to the command of God is the clue to health. On the contrary, disobedience is the door through which the power of evil, that takes the form of illness, invades the wholeness of man. In a different manner, Jeremiah and the Palmist declared the same truth.¹

Weakened by sin, the way is open for the invasion by a power of destruction which manifests itself in the form of sickness.

¹Jer. 33:6; Ps. 107:11 f.

There is no other way to resist this power apart from God who mercifully hears the prayer of men. Examples illustrating this point are found in Ps. 30:2 ff., and in II Kings 20:1 ff., describing respectively the praise of a man who was rescued from the realm of death and the King Hezekiah whose prayer was heard and whose disease was cured by God. In these case the prayers offered to God could perhaps be taken as man's share in the combined action of God and man against sickness and death.

In the New Testament, the Epistle of James, chapter 5:14 f, urges that prayer to God and anointing the sick with oil should join together in combatting illness. Speaking about the gifts and the grace of God, one could refer to those mentioned in I Cor. 12:9 ff, but at the same time one should not forget the gifts of modern medical science as it finds expression in medicine, psychotherapy, well equipped hospitals and clinics, scientifically trained doctors, psychologists and nurses, all gracious gifts and means in a battle against the power of devil and disease. Finally, concerning sickness, Barth says that

it is an element and sign of the power of the chaos threatening creation on the one hand, and on the other an element and sign of God's righteous wrath and judgment, in short, an element and sign of the objective corruption which is related and corresponds to human sin and from which there is no deliverance apart from the mercy of God in Jesus Christ. ¹

From this and from the short survey which we have given on this subject, it is clear that Barth recognizes the very close relationship between sin and sickness and that he emphasizes the importance of this link.

¹CD, III, Pt. 4, p. 366-367.

Emil Brunner

The Providence of God

Brunner opposes the pessimistic and cynical view of creation that the universe is meaningless and things only happen 'by accident'. He strongly maintains that such a view is in contrast to the Biblical teaching of providence which holds that all that happen is within the knowledge of God and included in his divine plan, and nothing occurs by chance or without any order.¹

Life is under the preserving grace of God. The grace of preservation is expressed in the words of Jesus: "Even the hairs of your head are all numbered"², and "look at the birds of the air they neither sow nor reap or gather into barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not of more value than they?"³ Preservation of the creation is an activity of divine grace.⁴ The divine grace of preservation is related to His redeeming grace. Apart from the latter, no one can have any knowledge of the divine activity.

God wills to save sinners and deliver them. Therefore He preserves them and spares their lives.⁵ If it was not for his grace one could hardly know the meaning and the value of life which is worth preserving. All sinners are under the judgment of God, yet He preserves them till the final judgment.⁶ In the light of his

¹Brunner, Dogmatics, Vol. II: The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, trans. Olive Wyon (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952), p. 155.

²Mt. 10:30.

³Mt. 6:25.

⁴Brunner, op. cit., p. 154; cf. Mt. 5:45.

⁵Brunner, op. cit., p. 154 f.

⁶Romans 9:22.

preserving grace, one can understand the meaning of 'sickness not unto death' which is due to this grace and the medical help of Him through men which is also an expression of God's grace. There is no reason to oppose medical treatment if one realizes that preserving life is the will and the grace of God. Any means or measure used to treat sickness and thereby preserve life is not without the will of God, for God wills man to live to be as man and to be healthy, as Barth would put it.¹ Brunner, sees it somewhat differently. For him man's present life is a life under grace leading to the eternallife.² As far as God's redeeming will is concerned, life ought to be preserved by using any possible means. On this point Brunner expresses himself as follow:

Certainly, the world is real, and it is ordered, because God 'preserves' it. Without the preserving will of God the world falls into nothingness in a flash. The world is not so solid and indestructible as it looks ... In any case this Biblical view seems to be in greater harmony with the present aspect of scientific knowledge (in the sphere of Natural science) than with the view put forward a hundred years ago, following in the steps of physicist Laplace, of the causal world, in its independence, understood in a fully deistic sense as an absolute.³

The Old Testament's view on the providence of God is that it is well with the righteous and ill with the wicked, that sickness and disaster fall upon those who do not trust God, and those who rely on Him escape the calamities.⁴ Brunner sees the purpose and meaning of such an Old Testament teaching in the emphasis on a real and complete trust in God. It does not mean to say that in the world, children of God will not have to face any sickness and calamity, nor

¹Dogmatics, III, Pt. 4, pp. 347 ff.

²Brunner, op. cit., p. 159.

³Ibid., p. 153.

⁴Supra, p. 14.

does it mean that all suffering and illness would be removed and everything turned into good for those who follow Him. God does not will an easy-going life. He allows his sheep to go through the "shadow of death"¹ and permits afflictions to fall on the righteous.² Yet, God in Christ shared the affliction and disasters of men. On the cross, He was crucified an execution which was in itself the most unjust act in the history of the world. On the cross the meaning of providence becomes clear. Providence does not guarantee against suffering. Owing to man's sin, men suffer and God suffers with them and for them.

Brunner agrees that sin and sickness are signs of the power of darkness or the force of chaos, to use the term of Barth. They occupy a place in the creation. They are not created by God because God cannot create what is evil in nature. They are deeply correlated to man's rebellious will. Man sins against God and therefore throws himself into troubles and miseries of which sickness and death, either physical or spiritual, are often the grave results.

Sin, Disease and Mortality of Man

From a biblical point of view all creatures on earth are limited by time and space, they are all temporal and transient and involved in some kind of suffering.³ However, this does not provide any reason to deny that all things are created by God.⁴

¹Ps. 23:4.

²Ps. 34:19.

³II. Cor. 4:6 ff.

⁴Emil Brunner, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 129.

The Biblical ground for Brunner's view on the relationship between sin and death is found in the Epistle to the Romans: "The wages of sin is death,"¹ and further, "through one man sin entered into the world and death through sin."² Paul traced human sin and death to the rebellious Adam. It seems as if Paul understands by 'death' in this context, not so much bodily death, as spiritual separation. Brunner describes human death as being "in fear and agony, with the anxious uncertainty about that which lies on the other side of death, with a bad conscience, and the fear of possible punishment."³ This is true in general, but there is the death of the Christian who dies without fear because he is eager to depart to the promised place prepared by Jesus Christ. He is sure where he is going.

The effect of sin is destructive and disintegrating. It is a poison contaminating the body, mind and spirit. Its effect reaches into the psychical sphere of man, into the unconscious and touches the physical functionings and reveals itself in psychological phenomena. Psychologist and physicians realize the essential connection between the feeling of guilt and bodily disease, and the disorders derived from the lack of inward peace. Sin is the source of destruction, conflict, disintegration, and corruption in both individual and community.

¹Rom. 6:23.

²Rom. 5:12.

³Brunner, op.cit., II, p. 129.

It is difficult to grasp the meaning of suffering if man is without sin and is absolutely obedient to God. Brunner, realizing the relation between sickness and sin, expresses himself in the following way:

We only know the suffering that affects sinful man, and sinful humanity, the experience with which humanity has to deal, that is the suffering which cannot be separated from sin. 1

Clearly, if sickness is included in suffering, it also cannot be isolated from sin. Sin is not an inherited evil coming down to men through the ages. The story of Adam's fall has nothing to do with a fallen world,² for it does not carry the sense of inherited sin. Sin is in every man, in his will and mind, in his conscience it dwells in him and with him. He is responsible for his own sin, he cannot evade this responsibility by holding that sin is an out-stander or inherited element. Furthermore, Brunner says,

The doctrine of the Fall is not a theory, which is intended to explain the existence of evil, on the contrary, it is the idea in which the inexplicable character of evil finds its clearest expression. 3

Sin is "resistance to the will of the Creator and Lord"⁴ and not a historical event as such. In the same way, one cannot speak about the Fall as history. If it were history, it should be "primal history" or "super-history".⁵

¹Brunner, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 131.

²Ibid., p. 128ff. Where Brunner argues that the Bible knows nothing of a fallen world though Romans 8:20 refers to it, its meaning is obscured.

³Brunner, The Mediator, trans. Olive Wyon (London: Lutterworth Press, 1934), p. 144.

⁴Ibid., p. 142.

⁵Ibid., p. 391.

With Brunner as well as with Barth, sin stands for the concept of extremely abstract possibility. This is seen in Brunner's expression: "Sin is something which we cannot explain, something which will not fit into any reasonable scheme at all."¹ What he stresses in this context is that there is nowhere a solution for the problem of evil; though there are schemes and theories by which the ideas of sin and evil can be explained, they cannot be solved. Sin is something that exists, it is the conditioning power of human nature. It was not Adam's own possession. It is an aspect of growing personality, "for 'person' means precisely that which we cannot have but must be."²

A sinner is not a human being who has sinned a certain number of times; he is a human being who sins whatever he is doing. No long as this is not perceived the gravity of sin is ignored, non-recognition of my own will by the divine will in the existence of my fellow men. 3

Man is not a puppet but is created by God. Man has his freedom granted by God. He belongs to God. His existence is determined by his free relationship with God. The relationship between man and God is based on freedom. God and his love is interested in man's free responsibility, i.e. to respond to His grace and love, to live for Him, to follow his will and to have fellowship with Him. This freedom or free will of man is granted not without running the risk that man will fall away from God by using his free will adversely. This freedom is not an incorruptible freedom, it is not necessarily used in giving the right response to God though it ought to be so. It is a free grace granted for man who has every

¹ Brunner, The Mediator, trans, Olive Wyon (London: Lutterworth Press, 1934), p. 144.

² Ibid., p. 319.

³ Ibid., p. 142-143.

right to use it as he wills. Things which are in contrast to God are outside the will of God. God cannot do anything contradictory to his own unchangable will. God would never deprive man of his own freedom which He has already granted to man for he is not a God in contrast with himself. Therefore, man can turn his back on God, revolt against Him, alienate himself from Him, and throw himself into sin by using his freedom. In other words, in sin, man loses his freedom. "Everyone that committed sin is the bond-servant of sin."¹ Clearly, it is not God, but sin which deprives man of his freedom, and thus he becomes subjected to sin:

Through sin man has lost his original freedom. He is no longer free to realize his divine destiny, and to be good, as God would like him to be. Evil has taken possession of us; it is radical evil, from which we cannot be freed by any mere 'revolution in the disposition' (Kant). 2

For Brunner the evidence of sin and the result of it can be seen in man's inner conflict.

Even as sinner man does not cease to be destined for God, sin manifests itself as a perpetual state of conflict, in which man oscillates between the desire to escape from God, and the longing for Him; between an atheistic denial of God's existence, and a superstitious fear of God; between impiety, and pseudo-peity, between secularism and religiosity. 3

The evil effect of sin extends to man's psycho-physical function and causes him to find himself in a state of conflict. Sin not only estranges him from his destiny which God willed for him, it also disintegrates the wholeness of self. Thus he becomes a

¹John 8:34.

²Brunner, Dogmatics, Vol. II: The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, trans. Olive Wyon (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), p. 122. (Infra, abbreviated as Dogmatics II).

³Ibid., p. 125.

man of divided self, a sick soul as William James puts it.¹ This self-contradiction of man is expressed by Paul in a phrase of clarity:

I do not do the good I want but the evil I do not want is what I do. No if I do what I do not want, it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells within me. So I find it to be a law that when I want to do right, evil lies close at hand. 2

What Paul says about himself can also apply to every man's inner state, no matter if he is conscious of it or admits it or not.

The consequence of sin as seen in the self-conflict of man is also demonstrated in man's self-centredness or self-deification. Instead of loving God, man lives the pleasure which the world offers. This craving causes egoism and a deification of the world. The direction of his whole life is reversed and perverted. Man's heart is deformed and his will is distorted because of sin. He is no longer a man in wholeness. He turns away from God, from the way which God has willed for him. He himself is his own God, his own pleasure and his own religion. God finds no place in his life.

Though man could turn from the will of God and follow his own will he could never avoid the perpetual conflict of his inner-self which is a 'chronic disease' or 'a sickness unto death' as Kierkegaard phrases it.³ The most important symptom of this conflict

¹William James, The Varieties of Religious Experience (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1902), pp. 127 ff.

²Romans 7:19-21.

³S. Kierkegaard in his book Sickness unto Death, trans. Walter Lowrie (Princeton: University Press, 1946), p. 32 ff., he examines with clarity the psychological phenomena of the conflict of man's inner-self and has thrown light on christian understanding on the psychical consequence of sin.

in despair.¹

This inner conflict and despair is an experience of the Psalmist:

Why are you cast down, O my soul,²
and why are you disquieted within me?
Hope in God; for I shall again praise him,
my help and my God. 3

This expression is no less than describing his soul, his life. His self is not in peace. This conflict which was experienced by a sinful man, expresses that his heart is not at ease, not at the right place which it ought to be. He is longing for rest and seeking God for this rest.

The sinner's heart is restless. His mind is in tension arising from his feeling of guilt. Man in sin falls into a state of anxiety before God. Adam and Eve in great anxiety hid themselves because of the act of disobedience.⁴ Every human life bears the marks of anxiety, insecurity and fear. Not many people want to admit that they are in a state of anxiety though they are really tormented by their bad conscience. Some might really not feel it, because it is repressed or suppressed into the unconscious.⁵

¹ Ibid.

² 'my soul', can also be 'my life', 'my person', 'my spirit', 'my mind'. In the Chinese Bible it is translated as 'my heart'. See Kuoyu Bible (Hongkong: Hongkong Bible House, 1957), p. 575.

³ Ps. 42:5.

⁴ Gen. 3:8.

⁵ Cf. Brunner, Dogmatics, II, p. 119.

The same thought is expressed by Paul in Romans 7:24, "Wretched man that I am! who will deliver me from this body of death?" The higher will to do good is incapable because of the evil desire that prevents and weakens it. These two are not in conformity. Thus conflict arises. In this respects, Paul describes man from a legal point of view. Referring to the law, he finds man could not thoroughly keep and fulfil/ it. What is more, man is under the curse of the law. With the law, Paul could not feel at peace. This is a clear illumination of the state of sinful man. Every man has his own anxiety. The greater position a man has, the more the anxiety. "The more intellectual a man is, the greater is his 'anxiety'; it cannot be banished by any system of life insurance"¹ Relief from anxiety is found only in God with Jesus Christ who is the grace and the peace of all men for he says, "In me you may have peace. In the world you have tribulation."²

The more one realizes that he is a sinner before God, the more he can grasp the meaning of death. Sin is the wilful rebellion of man against God, his Creator. As a dependent creature man breaks the bounds set for the sake of his own good, namely, for him to be as man of God and with God; man thinks that he can win for himself more 'freedom' by breaking the relationship between himself and his Creator, but the result is not so. On the contrary, he loses his image of God, he loses his freedom and falls as a slave, or more truly, as a victim of sin just because he alienated himself from God.

¹Brunner, Dogmatics, II, p. 128.

²John 16:33.

This truth is reflected by the 'myth' of the Fall which describes the rebellious man, Adam and Eve, who were drive out from paradise and the way of return barred by the flaming sword and the angels. It signifies that no return is possible unless God himself removes the obstacle. As slave or 'victim' of sin, man's life is under the power of sin and not of God. In other words, sin deprives man of his life - the life in full fellowship with God - therefore, he is dead. In this respect death is not something coming at the end of the life time, it has already begun in the life without God. It begins with man who separates himself from God who is the source of all life.¹ This death leads to the final end of the psycho-physical death, the complete ending of sinful man, which is a full expression of the power of evil through man's sin, and also on the other hand, a sign of God's judgment of sin.²

Death as the wages of sin is also the demonstration of the wrath of God. The Psalmist realizes it and says, "We are consumed by thy anger, by thy wrath we are overwhelmed."³ It is the reaction of God towards sin and evil. Death is not an element of God's creation, nor is it created or willed by Him. On the contrary it is an enemy of God; as Paul puts it "the last enemy to be destroyed."⁴ Barth would agree with Brunner on the matter of death, that the power of God conquering the power of evil or chaos is made manifest.

¹John 4:6.

²Brunner, Eternal Hope (London: Lutterworth Press, 1954), p. 102.

³Ps. 90:7.

⁴I Cor. 15:26.

To explain the question of how death could be the demonstration of the power of evil on the one hand, and the wrath of God on the other, one has to understand it in this way: although, death is an extreme sign of evil force, it is under the power of God who could use it as an instrument of his judgment on sin, thus, the Judge is God, not the evil. Through this judgment, one sees the declaration of God's righteousness, his wrath, and his mighty power as victory over sin and evil.

Confronted by Christ and His death, one begins to grasp the meaning of death. Through Him, the meaning of death is exposed and reflected to all believers; and they are urged to take death seriously.¹

Scripture affirms that man was created in the image of God and destined to eternal life. But men have built a great wall of sin on the way to the eternity and have thrown themselves as prey to death. This is the reality of every man's state. Men, by themselves, are unable to break this wall but by God's love and grace, a door is opened in the wall. Through Christ and with Him and in Him men go through this door to eternity, and their original destiny is restored.

¹Brunner, Eternal Hope (London: Lutterworth Press, 1954), p. 104.

Reinhold Niebuhr

It is not the intention to undertake a full exposition of Niebuhr's thought on sickness and sin but only to stress a few important points he makes in this respect.

For Niebuhr as for Barth, God's creation is good.¹ This is supported by the Old and the New Testaments which describe God as the good God who created all things in which there was no evil. This Biblical view stressing the contrast between the insufficient and dependent character of creatures and the self-sufficiency and independence of the Creator is extremely important for the understanding of the limitation of man. Although the contrast between good and evil becomes evident in this world, Niebuhr maintains that,

this contrast never means that the created world is evil by reason of the particularization and individualization of its various types of existence. It is never a corruption ... nor is it evil because of the desire and pain which characterize all the insufficient and dependent life, as in Buddhism. 2

The conviction that the world is good in origin is based on the simple phrase "God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good,"³ which is the dictum that prevents the Christian faith from yielding to a dualistic world-view which was threatening the Church and her belief from her earliest years. The Church did not fail to express her faith in God in saying with Niebuhr that

the world is not evil because it is temporal, that the body is not the source of sin in man, the individuality as separate and particular existence is not evil by reason of being distinguished from indifferential totality, and that death is no evil though it is an occasion for evil, namely, the fear of death. 4

¹ Reinhold Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man (London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1941), Vol. I, p. 181.

² Ibid.

³ Gen. 1:31.

⁴ Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 79.

The dependence and mortality of man and the Brevity of his life are facts which are presented in the scripture as facts in accordance with the Divine will with the creation. It is only God who is immortal. The Psalmist realizes this paradox and says,

Before the mountains were brought forth,
 or ever thou hadst formed the world,
 from everlasting to everlasting thou art God.
 Thou dost sweep men away,
 they are like dream,
 like grass which is renewed in the morning;
 in the morning it flourishes and is renewed,
 in the evening it fades and withers. 1

Man, although mortal, is not evil in origin. Niebuhr argues that the fragmentary character of human life is not regarded as evil in Biblical faith because it is seen from the perspective of a centre of life and meaning in which each fragment is related to the plan of the whole, to the will of God. The evil arises when the fragment seeks by its own wisdom to comprehend the whole or attempts by its own power to realize it.²

Here the insufficiency of man is seen from another angle; that he is unable to grasp some particular divine will and wisdom revealed above the comprehension and the judgment of man.

This finiteness was shown in the life of Job. With his own understanding and according to his own standard of judgment, Job argued with God and challenged Him because he could not understand why God permitted such painful disease and calamity to fall upon him. He was fully aware that he was certainly not more sinful than other men. He doubted whether God was still the righteous God. He tried to penetrate God's justice by his own criterion, but he failed. Finally he yielded to God who revealed

¹Ps. 90:2-6.

²Reinhold Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 179.

himself through the mysteries and the greatness of his own creations which were beyond the comprehension of man. His revelation to Job was put in a series of challenging questions:¹

"Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth?
Tell me if you have understanding."²

Inevitably, Job found himself unable to compare his knowledge with that of God. He could only answer:

Behold, I am of small account:
What shall I answer thee?
I lay my hand on my mouth.

Therefore I have uttered what I did not understand,
things too wonderful for me, which I did not know.
I had heard of thee by the hearing of ear,
but now my eye sees thee;
therefore I despise myself,
and repent in dust and ashes. 3

Job confessed his insufficiency by recognising and admitting his own lack of understanding.

As an individual, Job was not more sinful than other men. An individual is not originally evil, for he was created by God and belongs to Him. This paradoxical truth support the view that sickness as an evil factor in man, was not originally planned for the individual. It is an outsider that invaded God's good creation and affected man. The self or personality or ego as an 'agent' of every individual in awareness of his own existence, thoughts and actions, is still the finite self.

¹Cf. Job 38:42.

²Job 38:4.

³Job 40:4; 42:3, 5, 6.

Despite its deepest self-consciousness, its awareness of its own continuing identity and its observation of the whole world, the self remains as an dependent entity.

Although the Christian view on the doctrine of Creation is never absorbed by the Hellenistic view, it has not been consistently kept without taint by the latter. From the very beginning this biblical insight was distorted by some elements of dualism and later, Platonism, which conceived of the creation as completely corrupt and essentially evil. Under the influence of this thought, some church fathers like Origen interpreted the doctrine of man in connection with the story of the Fall which he regarded as a pre-existent defection of man.¹ He also equated the original sin to the sin of Adam's fall. Other church fathers, like Justin Martyr, Gregory of Nyssa, Irenaeus, in the same manner, identified sin and evil with temporal man and the mutability of the temporal world.² Certainly this is not in total harmony with the Biblical view that man is created as a good creature though he is a mortal and limited being.

Furthermore, Niebuhr argues that the mortality of man is not the consequence of sin. He agrees with Brunner that Paul's teaching in Romans 5:12, Ephesians 2:11; I Cor. 15:56, can hardly be interpreted as a dictum pointing to the physical death of man. What is emphasized in Paul's teaching is the spiritual death in particular.³

¹In his book, Christian Realism and Political Problems (London: Faber & Faber, n.d.), p. 11, Niebuhr says that "most of the christian theories before and after Augustine committed grievous errors in their analyses of the human situation and in resulting political calculation, and that Augustine himself must be subjected to criticism on various accounts."

²Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man (London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1941), Vol. I, p. 184.

³Ibid., p. 185 ff; Vol. II, chs. 9 & 10.

For Paul, death is the consequence of sin. This is different from the Hellenistic teaching on the same subject where the latter stresses that sin is the consequence of death. This differentiation is made very clear by Augustine.¹ Paul traces human sin to the sin of Adam and says that death is wrought from the very beginning by Adam's sin: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin."² Paul's teaching on 'death through sin' is not particularly related to the physical death. More often, in his thought, he stresses the concept of death symbolically to indicate spiritual death.

Niebuhr also comments on the self-centricity of man when he says:

The law of his nature is love, a harmonious relation of life to life in obedience to the divine centre and source of his life. This law is violated when man seeks to make himself the centre and source of his own life. 3

From this standpoint, the sin of man is the spiritual alienation from God who is the genesis of life. The infection of this alienation spreads from the spiritual level to the body, and thus the harmony of man is disturbed.⁴ This alienation is the result of rebellion against God, in so far as man refuses to admit his limitations and pretends to be more than he is.⁵

¹ Anti-Pelagian Works, Vol. I, 150. Quoted by Niebuhr, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 185.

² Romans 5:12.

³ Niebuhr, op. cit., p. 17. (Vol. I).

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

Man is not created as an evil being, but he sins through using his free will which is a merciful grace granted from God as part of man's nature. The essence of man is his free will, his self-determination. His sin is the wrong use of the will and its consequent corruption. The biblical view of man, is that his sin is not in his finiteness or limitation but in his will. This evil character of sin, not regarded as an inevitable result of his finiteness, is also not the fruit of his insecurity or a necessity of his nature.¹ Sin is caused by the fact that man denies that he is merely a limited being. Evil is not created, but arises from man's effort to transgress the bounds set for his life, to stretch his power beyond its limits. From this it becomes clear that temptation lies between his situation of finiteness and freedom.

For Niebuhr, the ultimate problem of man does not exist in his finiteness but in his self-contradiction.² The totality of man is based on his freedom and capacity for self-transcendence.

Sin is reflected in the self-contradiction, the conflict between the 'true-self' and the 'false-self' caused by a wrong use of his freedom. This contradiction is felt by the individual as an uneasy conscience.

Not only the psychologist but also the theologian sees the deepest effect of the spiritual function influencing man's physical condition.³ Sin, regarded as an alienation between man and God,

¹Ibid., I, pp. 190 ff.

²Ibid., I, p. 17, 307, 311, 317-18.

³Cf. Ibid., I, p. 17.

is therefore essentially spiritual and not carnal. Body as the physical factor of man, though finite, is not originally evil, but it is an agent of the spiritual rebellion. It transforms the spiritual sin into action. This point is perceivable when one realizes the deep effect of spiritual factors upon the physical condition of man. The apostle realized this when he wrote: "Desire when it has conceived give birth to sin",¹ and it can be added, that when sin is conceived, it brings forth corruption, deterioration and evil deeds. Spiritual sin extends its influence, like a harmful disease, from the spirit to the body of man, and disturbed the harmony.²

Barth as well as Niebuhr maintain that man wants to be as man, wills to be as man and although he is a finiteness, yet he is a free man. On the one hand, he is tied by his nature and history, on the other hand, he is free to look backward to examine his past and look forward to project his future. He is created as God's man, he belongs to God, yet, he possesses all his will to reject and deny his Creator. Man is in an ambiguous and contradictory position and senses his self-contradiction because he wants to cross the boundaries set for him. In such a self-contradictory state, he experiences within himself 'two men' dwelling in him, one craving for God while the other one goes his own way which is contrary to God's will. This is the tension between finiteness and freedom.

¹James 1:13-15.

²Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, I, p. 294. Here he uses a symbolic expression in interpreting the perfection before the Fall of man. The perfection is assumed as the locus of health in a particular disease organism: "Obviously the seat of infection may be in one particular organ of the organism, so that the other parts are comparatively healthy. Yet disease in any part of the organism effects the whole. The whole organism is thus diseased. Yet there is some health as long as there is life."

In such a conflict and ambiguous state, man finds himself in a situation of anxiety and insecurity for he senses that he is not in unity with himself.¹ Aware of such insecurity, he tries to overcome it by using his radical free will to thrust beyond its limitations and thus he cannot avoid hurting others.² In this way the harmony of creation is disturbed and the relationship between himself and other men, as well as the relationship between man and God destroyed.³

The insecurity is rooted in man's deepest being and related to his position in creation. Sin must be considered not merely as a transgression of known laws or as a failure in performing a compulsory duty, but also as something deeply related to man's insecurity and anxiety. Niebuhr puts it this way:

In short, man, being free and bound, both limited and limitless, is anxious. Anxiety is the inevitable concomitant of the paradox of freedom and finiteness in which man is involved. Anxiety is an precondition of sin. It is the inevitable spiritual state of man, standing in the paradoxical situation of freedom and finiteness. 4

For Hadfield, anxiety is a spiritual disease;⁵ for Weatherhead,

¹Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 190ff; 17ff, 274, 293ff.

²Niebuhr, Christian Realism and Political Problems (London: Faber & Faber, n.d.), p. 16ff.

³Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man (London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1941), I, pp. 216-220, pp. 200-210, 250-51.

⁴Ibid., pp. 194-95.

⁵J.A. Hadfield, Psychology and Moral (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1930), p. 46ff.

it is a form of mental disorder or neurosis;¹ for Niebuhr it is a precondition of sin, yet, not the actuality of sin.² Sin is man's own responsibility in the human situation governed by the freedom of choice. This freedom is the source of all creativity as well as of temptation, and consists of both creative and destructive elements. Between them, no frontier line can be drawn.³ Anxiety is the description of the inner state of man, the centre of both his dignity and misery. Niebuhr elucidates this statement in the following way:

It is the condition of the sailor, climbing the mast (to use a simile), with the abyss of the waves beneath him and the "crow's nest" above him. He is anxious about both the end toward which he strives and the abyss of nothingness into which he may fall. 4

Man is anxious because of the limitation of his life and his dependent character. Parents are anxious for their children's future and well-being. The statesman is anxious about the order and security of the nation. All human beings are anxious for perfection and security. The challenging words of Jesus convey the same truth: "which of you by being anxious can add one cubit to his span of life?"⁵ It expresses a general human situation that because of man's finiteness, they are anxious of their needs

¹Weatherhead, op. cit., pp. 500ff.

²Niebuhr, op. cit., I, pp. 190ff. Cf. J.G. McKenzie stresses that anxiety is very near to guilt, and it precedes criminal action. See his book, Guilt, its Meaning and Significance (London: Allen & Unwin, 1965), p. 29 f.

³Niebuhr, op. cit., I, pp. 195ff, 266ff.

⁴Ibid., p. 198.

⁵Mt. 6:27.

of everyday life even though they are aware of God's providence. This is a spiritual sickness of man in general. This anxiety, for Niebuhr, is a source from which sin and evil spring. "It is not his finiteness, dependence and weakness but his anxiety about it which tempts him to sin."¹

Man as a free man is anxious to realize the unlimited possibilities of his freedom which he could exercise to overcome his state of anxiety, insecurity and contingency. This is not so easily done because man is bound by his impotent and contingent character which he either conceals or conquers by practising his free will.

Realizing the radical or dynamic thrust of the freedom of man, one can understand the depth of sin which takes place in the depths of man's free will.² Though sin is a deviation, a deliberate action of revolt or rebellion, it is more than that, for it has its root in the nature of the power of freedom and man's misuse of this power. This understanding of sin of man is supported by the essential biblical outlook on demonology. According to Niebuhr,

the importance of Biblical Satanology lies in the two facts that: (1) the devil is not thought of as having been created evil. Rather his evil arises from his effort to transgress the bounds set for his life, an effort which places him in rebellion against God. (2) The devil fell before man fell, which is to say that man's rebellion against God is not an act of sheer perversity, nor does it follow inevitably from the situation in which he stand ... It is suggested to man by a force of evil which precedes his own sin. Perhaps the best description or definition of this mystery is the statement that sin posits itself ... 3

¹ Niebuhr, op. cit., I, p. 180.

² Ibid., pp. 173-78, 190-198.

³ Ibid., pp. 192-193.

Here an element of sin is implied in the temptation that leads to sin. Kierkegaard is not far from the truth on this point when he says, "Anxiety is the psychological condition which precedes sin. It is so near, so fearfully near to sin, and yet it is not the explanation of sin."¹ Man cannot will himself out of being a sinner. Sin is inevitable but not necessary as far as the finiteness and the freedom of man are concerned.²

Seeking the basis of security in himself, man tries to overcome the anxiety of his contradictory and ambiguous position; thus, he throws himself into a state of pride. Niebuhr explains this in this way:

When anxiety has conceived it brings forth pride and sensuality. Man falls into pride when he seeks to raise his contingent existence to unconditional significance; he falls into sensuality, when he seeks to escape from his unlimited possibilities of freedom ...³

The sin of pride is precisely the very basic sin of man. Every individual has his own priority. There are the pride of power, pride of knowledge, and the pride of virtue.⁴ In the pride and self-love of man, there is a sinful factor involved, namely, the sin of deceit. Every self is afraid of being discovered because of its sin, the self seeks to defend itself. By doing so it must deceive itself first before it goes to deceive others. Through self-deception, the self could successfully defend itself. Furthermore, there is pride in theegotism of the individual,

¹Der Begriff der Angst, p. 89; quoted by Niebuhr, op. cit., I, p. 195.

²Niebuhr, op. cit., I, pp. 257ff.

³Ibid., p. 198.

⁴Ibid.

a family pride, a group pride and pride of one's nation. To quote Niebuhr:

No nation is free of the sin of pride, just as no individual is free from it ... All modern nations, indeed all nations of history, have been involved in the sin of pride. One must realize - in this as in other sinfulness - that it is just as important to recognize the differences in the degree of pride and self will expressed by men and nations, as it is known that all man and nations are sinful before God. ¹

This pride indicates that all man are sinners in revolt against God and estranged from Him. Sin is originated in their human free will bestowed by God. Human will seeks the things of the self and for the self and for its own glory, thereby widening the gulf or separation between the self and the true self which is willed by God. This condition of wilful alienation finds no way of restoration apart from that which is through Jesus Christ's reconciling work which restores man to God.

On the cross, God in Christ takes the sin of man and the evil burden of man's self-contradiction and conquers it. The love of the crucified Christ is the criterion for the self and the law of man's freedom.² The dreadful misery of man is made apparent in the contrast between the love of God and the evil of self-corrupted man.

To concluded this chapter it remains to be pointed out that these three theologians are mainly concerned with spiritual sickness - namely sin. It is not surprising that they, as theologians, do not say much about the physical side of illness, nor do they deal with the psychological disorders. They have rightly chosen to

¹Ibid., I, pp. 232-233.

²Ibid., pp. 302-309.

confine themselves to their own theological categories and to abstain from crossing the boundaries of psychology and medical science, which should be left to the respective experts.

In our day of specialization in all branches of science, there is also an ever increasing inter-dependence of the various disciplines in the whole field of science. Even theology and psychology feel their dependence on each other. It is no longer sufficient for theology to go its own way without taking psychology into account as far as the problem of sin and sickness is concerned. Psychology could throw light on the problem by using its techniques in the investigation of human behaviour and motives which have a close relationship with sin and sickness. A co-operation between psychology and theology, especially in defining and treating sickness with a 'sin'-cause, could prove valuable.

VII

PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The psychologist, physician and theologian all agree that man's mental conditions can actively influence his physiological functions.¹ Medical students would not now be content with discoveries in biology and the progress of physics, chemistry and pathological conditions. In recent years more attention had been paid to psychological research concerning guilt and neurosis, both of which had been entirely lacking in the history of medicine for centuries. In many respects, man's psychical condition carries a great weight in the matter of human health and disease. Physical, psychical and spiritual factors constitute human existence. Man is a unity of body, mind, and soul. These factors are interrelated and they inter-influence each other in works, functions, and also in health and illness. When a man is sick, the cause of his disease could be either physical, psychical or spiritual. If one of these component 'parts' is attacked by a disease, the others are also adversely affected.

¹Paul Tournier, Guilt and Grace (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965), pp. 9ff., pp. 128ff.; Weatherhead, op. cit., pp. 313ff; Reinhold Niebuhr, op. cit., I, p. 293; J.A. Hadfield, Psychology and Morals (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1930), p. 46. J.G. McKenzie, Guilt, Its Meaning and Significance (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1962), p. 14.

Many physical diseases like paralysis, blindness, asthma, gastric or duodenal ulcer, and some skin diseases are psychogenic in origin.¹ These diseases are sometimes caused by aberration, emotional change or disturbances which affect the physiological functioning of the body. That this is possible can be experienced in everyday life. The circulation and the speed of bodily functions can easily be increased by a stimulation of hope. One's appetite can be increased by the sight of good food. The sexual instinct can be stimulated by what is perceived by the eyes. The power of mind over body is generally accepted by psychologists as well as by medical men. The curative power of the mind in cases of bodily diseases is also not to be doubted. Hence, we often find that the forgiveness of sin has a curative effect on some diseases, especially those caused by a sense of guilt.

On the other hand, many mental diseases are believed to have some physical cause.² For instance, a slight damage of the brain could bring forth a mental derangement, neurosis or insanity, and lack of proper functioning of the mind. Therefore, in treatment of psychological disorders, psychotherapy is often combined with physical methods of treatment. It can also be noted that it was recently discovered that a disorder of the chromosomes causes mental and physical disabilities or defects.

A group of disorders like alcoholism, irritability, bad temper, cynicism, aggressiveness, despondency, and some sexual perversations may be originally engendered by repressed complexes or sentiments. These are functional nervous diseases revealing physical symptoms

¹Cf. L. Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 318.

²Ibid., p. 373.

but the origin is often found in the unconscious conflicts of the mind. These functional nervous diseases are often reflections of disharmony in man's psychical state. Some of these disorders result from wilful choice and therefore they are sins from a biblical point of view, but others derive from natural factors which sometimes are beyond the control of the will and therefore they can be termed diseases or sicknesses.

Diseases such as blindness, deafness, paralysis, etc., have physical symptoms, but sometimes are not organic in origin but functional. There could even be both organic and functional factors. To differentiate between organic and functional disease, one may say that the organic disease effects a change in the bodily structure and causes damage to it, but the functional disease shows no change of the structure apart from its improper functioning. An examination of the organs and limbs of a functional paralytic reveals no organic or bodily deficiency or defect. The cause of the lack of proper functioning of the organ and limb of the patient is located elsewhere; perhaps in his will or his mind, in his mental or spiritual state which directs the exercise of the functions of the flesh and body. It could be noted here that many paralytics healed by Jesus appeared to have had functional rather than organic diseases. If they were organic, healing seems from a scientific point of view, to be highly improbable, but of course the deeds of Jesus could not be scientifically limited or explained.

Diseases are not only physical and mental, but also spiritual. These diseases of the soul, are pride, jealousy, hatred, malice, bad temper, anxiety, worry, resentment and so on. For a theologian, they are wilful sins, but for a psychologist they are mental disorders or moral defects.

Theology traces sickness to human sin, whether individual or universal. Psychology sees sin as an uneasy and disharmonious state

of man's inner world, and expresses the relationship between sickness and sin in terms of the relationship between disorder and guilt. Biblical concepts mainly deal with and regard sin as the source from which illness and all calamities sprout. Psychology is duly aware of the fact that a sense of guilt is a causal factor of many kinds of disorder or disease, and it further realizes that guilt-feeling could destroy the health of man.

Guilt and Sin.

Guilt is a universal problem. Every man and woman has experienced guilt-feeling; whether conscious or unconscious, it is there in the minds. Guilt-feeling plays an essential part in psychosomatic disorders. The psychotherapist has to deal with it, especially in treating neurosis.¹ It could very well be the main factor of malady or neurosis. Most of the psychologists and psychotherapists of whom Freud could be called the herald, placed a strong emphasis on the factor of original guilt-feeling.

In the Gospels there are examples where people recovered from sickness or disease through the removal of a sense of guilt. In particular did this occur in the miracles of Christ Jesus.² There sin was closely connected with guilt. It is true that to be a sinner is to be guilty, but it is promised that the burden of guilt can be taken away by means of forgiveness. Yet, what does one mean by forgiveness, repentance, reconciliation and salvation? For these problems, theology might need psychology as supplement to enrich, or even to complete the interpretation of some of these

¹R.S. Lee, Your Growing Child and Religion (Britain: Penguin Books, 1965), p. 112.

²Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 320; supra, pp. 66ff.

terms. On the problem of guilt, psychology provides great help by analysing the internal and mental disorders of the sinner. As long as man is a sinner, guilt remains a part of his existence. No one can escape from it; even a small child experiences it. Its universal corruptive attributes are well known. Therefore we might say that this is a guilt-ridden age where redemption is sorely needed.¹

For the psychologist, guilt is a sense of feeling. But it is more, it is a feeling as well as a fact. When one does something which is prohibited or fails to do something required, one feels a sense of guilt. Sin is regarded as a mental disease. Psychologists like Freud and Jung have said very little about sin in its objective meaning. Probably, they have chosen to confine their interpretations to their own understanding of science by dealing merely with the subjective side of the sense of guilt. Not many psychologists or psychotherapists would readily offer an absolute and comprehensive definition for the term guilt. However, Hadfield says,

Sin is due to wrong sentiments, moral disease is due to morbid complexes giving rise to uncontrollable impulses. The full and efficient cause of sin is a deliberate and conscious choice of the will moved by a false or wrong ideal. The sinner and the morally diseased both see the ideal: but whereas the former does not, the latter cannot, under ordinary circumstances, respond to it. 2

To such a brief comparison of sin and moral disease one can readily agree.

¹J.G. McKenzie, op. cit., p. 13.

²J.A. Hadfield, op. cit., p. 48.

Another psychologist defines guilt as a "sense of wrongdoing, as an emotional attitude, generally involving emotional conflict, arising out of real or imagined contravention of moral or social standards, in act or thought."¹ Guilt is related to wrongdoing, crime, blameworthiness and the punishment of conduct resulting from breaking a law. These offences are connected with ethics and laws. Guilt, however, is certainly more than evil actions and conduct. The feeling of guilt which implies a state of mind is also guilt in a real sense.

Psychology as well as sociology emphasize guilt-feeling because it often precedes a criminal action rather than merely follows it. Morbid guilt should be regarded as an emotional disorder or mental disease, and not necessarily as a crime or sin. Guilt-feeling, although it may not express itself in any disorder or conduct, is already 'guilt'.

When one revolts against one's internal authority - one's super-ego - an uneasy feeling emerges resulting in a guilt-feeling. Such a feeling denotes a disharmonious state of one's inner authority or super-ego, or in other words, an effort to reject one's moral standards. Thus the idea of his own self, namely, the ego, is in opposition with his ego-ideal. When super-ego demands obedience, a sense of guilt is indicative of disobedience to this demand. This conflict in man's inward state is the chief source of various neuroses or mental derangements which are mainly dealt by the psychologist, psychotherapist and psychiatrist. The super-

¹James Drever, A Dictionary of Psychology (London: Penguin Books, 1966), p. 113.

ego not merely demands obedience, but also a penalty for the breach of its command. Guilt demands penalty, therefore it is quite possible that one could have a sense of guilt while at the same time one is longing for punishment.¹

Some Factors of the Original Guilt-feeling

Super-ego

A sense of guilt generates from the super-ego. For instance, a child is usually taught by the parents not to say or do something. As a consequence of this negative teaching or demand, the child knows he must not do or say certain things because he knows what would happen if he disobeys the demands of prohibitions. He usually obeys these not so much because he does not like to do the things prohibited, but because he fears the consequences which could imply punishment in one way or another. The parents' demands and prohibitions internalize so deep in the child's mind and remain active as if the parents were always with him to guide his will and to examine his behaviour-tendencies. Hence, the child's parents become his super-ego. A sense of guilt is felt whenever such a child wishes to do something which encroaches on his super-ego.

The parents want to see their children following their advice, doing what is permitted, speaking what is allowed and behaving as is expected. Anything that is forbidden according to the parents' moral standard, their children would not be allowed to do. If such a child does do otherwise, a sense of guilt emerges because he realizes what the reaction of his parents would be.

¹J.C. Flugel, Man Moral and Society (London: Duckworth, 1948), pp. 142-145.

The hope of the parents is concentrated on their childrens' success. They are anxious to see a bright future for their children. Therefore, many parents give them a strict training believing that it will produce the expected results. Hence, they pay full attention to their childrens' behaviour, character, education and discipline. Very often such parents are not aware of the psychical sufferings inflicted by such rigid training. A strict up-bringing accompanied by scolding, warning, correcting, criticising by words or by hints, directly or indirectly, is a fertile soil for guilt-feeling. Although it is true that a successful future life depends largely on a good and strict up-bringing by the parents, it is also not devoid of truth to say that many parents are to be blamed for a morbid guilt-feeling experienced by their children as a by-product of their up-bringing.

Well-educated parents seldom use a negative or dictatorial way in training their children; instead, they guide them in a more positive way by encouraging words instead of scolding, advising them to do good instead of warning them to shun evil, praising them whenever they show their ideas, thoughts and characters instead of despising and ridiculing their way of behaving. With this positive approach parents feel proud if a child reveals what he thinks and what he knows, and what is expected of him. All these are not a complete safeguard against guilt-feeling, for although the parents would still continue to encourage the child, a sense of guilt would be experienced when the child senses his parents' discontent. If a child sees his parents praising their neighbour's child who can perform what he himself cannot achieve, a sense of guilt emerges through a feeling of inferiority. From this, one may safely conclude that guilt-feeling is a by-product of up-bringing no matter how thorough the efforts of the parents in the process of up-bringing.

Not many parents are aware that they could be the cause of their childrens' guilt-feelings. Often one hears a parent saying to a child: "Are you not ashamed of doing such a thing?" or "How dare you do it," or "If you do this you will be punished," or "You should not ask such a question?" An attitude expressed in such words might well be the cause of a guilt-feeling arising out of fear or an inferiority feeling of the child. Even kind advice from parents such as, "If I were you, I would do otherwise," often suggests the same thing because it means that what 'you' do is not desirable or perhaps even wrong.

A child might sense his parents dislike of certain kinds of enjoyment, even though they do not openly oppose these particular enjoyments. It goes without saying that a child follows his parents' behaviour and has a tendency to adhere to their moral standards or to imitate them, to like what they like, and to behave as they behave.¹

Some ascetic or austere parents reject everything that gives pleasure, and lead a life of severe self-discipline. Children brought up by them usually do not and often cannot enjoy any kind of pleasure. Instead, they feel a sense of guilt whenever they take part in something that should be enjoyable. In a strict family, children are told not to desire what is disapproved, not to like what their parent hate; in other words, a kind of militant training is given to their children, and a burden of guilt is unavoidable when the child does not comply with the rules and regulations.

Lack of confidence in the parents is also conducive to guilt-feeling. Such a lack of confidence is very often connected with a too rigid up-bringing which does not enable the child to feel free and act freely. Often a child would not tell his parents

¹Cf. J.C. Flugel, Op. cit., pp. 52ff.

that he got a good scolding from his teacher, nor would he let them know that he has read an exciting magazine over night. These secrets of a child are liable to cause a guilt-ridden personality if there is no outlet for them.

Obviously, the feeling of guilt is not confined to childhood, but, every adult person experiences the same thing in everyday life. Many incidents in daily life could create a sense of guilt. A refusal of a cordial invitation, a failure to fulfil a promise, a fervent exchange of words between friends or members of the family, and many more, all these could produce a sense of guilt. It is true that this feeling of guilt is universal and is part of the routine of life.

Guilt and Fear

Guilt-feeling emanates from the super-ego, and as we have mentioned already, a child's super-ego is derived from his parents or teacher who act as his internal authority.

Guilt-feeling is also related to religion, whether such a religion is 'primitive' or 'modern' does not change the fact that it very often is a factor in the causing of a feeling of guilt. For primitive men, the natural phenomena, such as, thunder, storm, rain, lightning, earthquake and whirlwind are expressions of the anger of the god or gods whom they fear. Experiencing the anger of the gods in such a way, a guilt-feeling is likely to arise. This is very much more the case when these natural phenomena cause destruction in some way or another, for then the question inevitable arises in the mind of the primitive man as to what he has done wrong to deserve such a punishment from the gods. In primitive religion together with the fear of God, the fears of taboos are important factors in causing guilt-feeling. In such a case the gods

are acting as super-ego.

The first chapters of Genesis tell about Adam and Eve who disobeyed the command of God and partook of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The result of that rebellion was not only the expulsion from the garden of Eden, but also a burden of guilt which followed that act of rebellion. Their guilt appeared when they were called by God (Gen. 2:9). The words of God internalized as the source of their guilt-feelings as well as the basic authority of their conscience of good and evil.¹

For Sigmund Freud, religion originated from fear.² He maintains that man creates his own idea of God before whom he feels himself a sinner and therefore he fears and worships Him. Freud asserts that guilt-feeling generates from fear of God and fear of taboo, but his views on religion are far from biblical. One could not agree with him when he says that "devout believers are safeguarded in a high degree against the risk of certain neurotic illness; their acceptances of the universal neurosis (i.e. religion) spares them the task of constructing a personal one."³ For him religion is a neurosis because it is based on fear from which guilt derives.⁴

¹C.H. Waddington, The Ethical Animal (London: Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1960), p. 164.

²Cf. Westermarck's words "The Old saying that religion was born of fear seems to hold true in despite of recent assertions to the contrary." Quoted by Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 401.

³S. Freud, The Future of an Illusion, trans. W.D. Robson-Scott, (London: The Hogarth Press, 1962), p. 40.

⁴Ibid., p. 13 & 20. Freud regards religion as an illusion as well as a neurosis and holds that every man creates his own picture of God and a portrait of his father in order to fulfil his desire of longing for a father. Cf. Ibid., pp. 13-15, 18-20, 38-45.

Furthermore, guilt and an Oedipus complex are clearly linked.¹ During the Oedipus period, the conflict in a child's inner world is clearly seen in its ambivalence, namely his desire to love and hate a particular object at the same time. In the case of an Oedipus complex of a male child, the object is his own father who is thought of as a competitor for the love of his mother. In such a child, there is an obscure sexual desire beginning to develop towards his mother. In this state, a desire for murdering his father comes into his mind, but at the same time he loves him because he is aware that the competitor is his father, his authority and super-ego. This complex of love and hatred is the genesis of fear and a feeling of guilt from which mental disorder or neurosis is likely to emerge.²

It is important to note that guilt feeling springs from the conflict between the super-ego and the ego. A sense of guilt is felt whenever the ego tends to do something to gratify its primitive impulses which betrays the prohibition of its super-ego. In this state the will of the ego is in conflict with its super-ego. The self is in a state of unbalance because it fails to reconcile the different behaviour-tendencies between the super-ego and the ego, namely, the demands of the former and the will-design of the latter.³ Unless a compromise between the two can be made, the

¹S. Freud, The Ego and the Id (London: The Hogarth Press, 1949), trans. Joan Riviere, pp. 40ff.

²Freud, Totem and Taboo, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965), trans. James Strachey, pp. 125ff., 18-69, 143.

³Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 321.

conflict is going to be repressed into the unconscious and guilt feeling and neurosis could result from this. This point may be illustrated by the following example: A friend wished that his father would die so that he could inherit his property. This wish occupied his mind so strongly that he dreamed one night that his father was dead. From then on a sense of guilt made itself felt accompanied by anxiety and fear. He knew that he should not have such 'a wish' because he loved his father. Here the disunity is seen between his wish and the demand of his super-ego. In other words, the super-ego resists, opposes or even cuts off the unconscious impulse, and conflict is unavoidable.

In everyday life, men experience feeling of fear in various forms. The fear of disease, fear of mental disorder, fear of dying young, fear of having an abnormal child, fear of an operation, fear of loneliness, fear of losing parents, husband or child, fear of being misunderstood: these are only some of the fears which one meets in life.¹ Life is tormented by fear. Man does not only fear to die but also fear to live, i.e. to face life in all its trials and tribulations. The fear of failure could at the same time be the fear of success. The fear of sex could at the same time be the desire for it.² Some of these fears which are not directed to any particular external object threatening one's life, can be called abnormal fear. They are rather pathological in character because they are attached to objects which are not dangerous in themselves. Fears even arise from the imagination, having no connection with any visible or real object at all. These are morbid fears or phobias, and to a great extent they are really anxieties rather than fears. Fear in its plainest connotation is attached to objects which are dangerous to life. Such real fear prepares the body and the mind to meet the danger. However, fear is the basic ground of guilt-feeling

¹ Paul Tournier, The Strong and the Weak (London: SCM Press, 1963), pp. 66-99.

² Ibid., pp. 70ff.

and anxiety.¹

Many cases of depressive guilt-feeling are connected with sex. Some people feel that it is a shameful thing to talk about sex or even to know about it. Not every couple could enjoy their married life just because of the taboo of sex. Some even regard the sexual relationship as sinful while others conceive of it as something animal.² This abnormal fear of sex is more or less influenced by pulpit teaching.³ The taboo of sex is not only exaggerated but many people condemn it as an evil thing, especially cynical and sceptical persons. Even the most common habit of masturbation is sometimes thought of as wicked or a great sin.⁴ This kind of exaggeration makes those who indulge in such habits feel a heavy burden of guilt and gives rise to fear of some dreadful result. Often this guilt is repressed into the unconscious to become a hidden source of neurosis.

Fear plays an important role in sexual perversion. Fear of the impulse of sex, fear of marriage, fear of not enjoying the married life, all these fears are not unlikely to cause psychosexual troubles. The fear of a sexual pervert brings forth a guilt-feeling, hence, he is not able to enjoy a normal married life. He feels guilty not necessarily because he is conscious of sin but rather because he is aware of his fear. Many a neurotic loses appetite, loses weight, loses health just because of this

¹S. Freud, Totem and Taboo, trans. James Strachey (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965), p. 68-69.

²Helmut Thielicke, The Ethics of Sex, trans. John W. Doberstein (London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd., 1964), p. 71.

³Paul Tournier, The Strong and The Weak (London: SCM Press, 1964), p. 75f. He stresses that the Church should admit the accusation of exaggerating the fear of sex. This is true only to some extent. In recent years this kind of exaggeration has gradually declined. In many churches in the East, the strong emphasis on the relationship between sex and sin still occupies a prominent place.

⁴Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 324.

fear.¹

The fear of sex impulses is a result of over-exaggeration of the wickedness of sex. Sex itself is not evil. It is a factor within God's creation. He created male and female. He granted them natural instincts and affections which direct to fellowship, love, and marriage. In the very first chapter of the Bible it is written that "God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them."² Then God blessed them and gave them the command to "be fruitful and multiply."³ Sex is a gift of God; it should be accepted with gratitude and without guilt, and should be hallowed and directed according to the Divine purpose. To avoid falling into sexual sin and guilt, the Church's view of chastity and abstinence before marriage, and faithfulness within marriage, should not be undermined or minimized.

Guilt originated from a moral misdeed committed in the past, but repressed into the unconscious and thus forgotten, could reappear when a suitable situation presents itself. Such a situation may recall the unconscious guilt and result in anxiety feelings or physical symptoms. Weatherhead tells of a married young woman whose guilt-feeling was recalled and it appeared with a physical symptom - a rash on her chest - whenever she saw a certain type of motor car. The reason was that she had committed a moral offence in such a car while her own husband was away. There was no ointment and drug which could cure her rash. Having confessed her guilt, and her husband having forgiven her, the rash cleared up instantly. In this case the forgiveness of sin was the remedy.⁴

¹Cf. J.A. Hadfield, op. cit., p. 27, 157.

²Gen. 1:27-28.

³Ibid.

⁴Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 326-327.

In short, one may conclude with Sherrill who maintains, "Guilt implies that one has done something forbidden or failed to do something required. The "something" may be action or it may be feeling. The source of the prohibition or requirement may be religious, or legal, or social, or familial, or personal; and may exist in written form, or as unwritten law. 1

Guilt and Anxiety

Anxiety is a universal experience and covers all ages.

Winnicott stresses that

in ego-id terms the sense of guilt is very little more than anxiety with a special quality, anxiety (is) felt because of the conflict between love and hate. Guilt-sense implies tolerance of ambivalence. 2

Guilt-feeling begins at infancy. A child is able to show himself pleased or sad before he is able to express himself by speech. Evidence of this can be seen in a infant's crying or screaming which expresses a feeling of discomfort, anger, or aggressiveness. This happens long before an infant can formulate his ideas.

The infant's world is his own feelings and sensations. Before he can discern between himself and the outside world he already experiences his own world - the world of comfort or discomfort. These feelings are related to his natural instincts. When he is hungry, thirsty, lonely or cold, he senses a displeasure in his own world. He feels a need of something which can put him back into

¹ Lewis Joseph Sherrill, Guilt and Redemption (America: John Knox Press, 1957), p. 62.

² D.W. Winnicott, The Maturation Processes and the Facilitating Environment, ed. John D. Sutherland (London: The Hogarth Press 1965), p. 16. Here he follows the thoughts of Freud on the sense of guilt.

his comfortable world. If these instincts are not satisfied, anger and aggression arise in the form of suffocating screaming which denotes that he is tormented by his desires, and in need of fulfilment. His screams signify his dependence. His mother is the object of his dependence. At his mother's breast he experiences pleasure, his hunger is stilled and his world becomes a world of comfort. He is not aware of any other existence, perhaps not even of his mother. He merely feels that his mother's breast is a part of himself, and a part of his own world.

In the process of passing from a comfortable world to an uncomfortable world, a baby passes into a state of anxiety. Anxiety arises from a threat to his dependence, from separation from the object on which he depends. He senses his need when he lacks the desired object. In other words, what he experiences is a loss of love in a sense of a need, and this is not far from the experience of anxiety.

To a baby, anxiety arises from a situation of ambivalent feeling. A baby experiences pleasure in sucking his mother's breast. Occasionally, when he finds that the milk is not flowing out smoothly and quickly, he gets angry and bites the nipple at that moment. He might get in return an unpleasant slap or a sudden draw-back of the nipple from his lips. Such reactions are conducive to aggressiveness followed by a feeling of fear of losing the loved object, and anxiety arises. This anxiety is very near to guilt-feeling. At the moment when he bites the nipple there are conflicting feelings, on the one hand, he hates it because the milk does not come out easily, on the other hand, he loves it on account of what he has experienced before. This is the origin of the baby's ambivalence. The ambivalence develops gradually according to the process of the baby's growth. It

develops and becomes more complex when the baby reaches the stage of childhood and begins to know that his mother is not his sole monopoly and that he has to face the threat of a 'rival'—his father—who shares his mother's love and affection. Furthermore, if his mother has a new-born baby, this feeling of ambivalence can easily shift to the newcomer. He hates the newcomer because the latter deprives him of part of his mother's love and attention, but he is told to love the new brother or sister. In such a position, the feeling of fear, anxiety, and guilt derived from a love-hate complex.¹ Due to this mixed feeling of hate and love, a sense of anxiety starts to grow, resulting in a feeling of guilt. This again can lead to the stage of an Oedipus complex.²

Anxiety is not only confined to a child's feeling, but it is the experience of every man and woman. Man is not completely independent, nor does he completely feel secure in the world. His anxiety originates from his dependent and finite nature. He is anxious because he fears to lose the objects on which he depends. He is anxious because he fears to lose the necessities by which he lives; in fact, he fears severe competition. This undeniable truth is strongly stressed by Niebuhr that man is in a state of insecurity and anxiety.³ A child is anxious to monopolize the love of his mother, a student is anxious about the results of his examinations, a teacher is anxious about the failure of his teaching, a sick person is anxious about his health, parents are anxious for the future and the success

¹D.W. Winnicott, op. cit., p. 17.

²Supra, p. 206.

³Supra, pp. 190 ff. Cf. Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man (London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1941), I, Pp. 195-98, 205-206, 166-268.

of their children, policemen are anxious for the security of society and human life, a government is anxious for her people's well-being and her nation's progress, a nation is anxious about the conflict and disharmony of the international relationship, and the world is anxious for its existence. The feeling of anxiety is so common and universal that no one can ignore or deny its existence.

Conscious and Unconscious Guilt

When one is aware of guilt-feeling one is conscious of it. If being repressed, it moves away from the memory to sink into the unconscious and, therefore, one is unaware of it though it is still there in one's unconsciousness.

A sense of guilt can be conscious or unconscious. It can become a latent factor between the state of consciousness and unconsciousness. It could be conscious at a certain moment but no longer so a moment later, though it is capable of becoming conscious again if stimulated by a particular environment and an appropriate external or internal stimulation.¹ In other words, when guilt is repressed, it becomes latent guilt. This latency of guilt can reveal itself in many kinds of mental or physical diseases if the latency continues for a long period. The process from guilt-feeling to mental or physical disease is not yet known or clear.

A sense of guilt repressed to become an unconscious feeling can be due to certain opposing or preventing forces. The power of fear; fear of super-ego, fear of painful consequence, fear of punishment, fear of shame and embarrassment, fear of discovery

¹Cf. Supra, p. 209.

of self-secrecies, all these and more are forces supporting the ego to suppress a sense of guilt. At the same time these forces are also the sources from which guilt-feelings spring. Encircled by these forces, guilt-feelings remain unconscious because they put up a barrier preventing the feeling of guilt from becoming conscious again.

The repressed guilt and other repressed complexes and sentiments so accumulated are likely to become hindrances to the developing processes of a child's mental life, and obstacles to health and to an intergrated personality of man. The results of such unbalanced personalities are very often functional diseases, such as hysterical deafness, blindness, dumbness, functional paralysis, sexual perversions and criminality. All these could be due to unconscious guilt and the expression of heaped up guilt-feelings and other complexes.

Psychological and Legal guilt

Psychoanalysis is mainly based on the difference between what is conscious and what is unconscious as far as the understanding of themmental processes and the feeling of guilt are concerned. Consciousness is only an element in man's mental life. It can be entirely absent or can exist together with other mental elements.

It seems difficult for the lawyer or moralist to accept mental but unconscious factors such as an unconscious guilt-feeling. They could argue that things which are mental cannot be unconscious. However, the unconscious elements in man's mental life manifest themselves occasionally in dreams, phantasy, hypnosis and certain other behaviours. This is affirmed by psychoanalysis. Against such a lawyer, the psychoanalyst can assert that many criminal acts

are based on an unconscious motive or intention which cannot rank equally with premeditated and wilful criminal acts.

While the psychologist stresses the subjective side of guilt, the lawyer and jury emphasize the objective side of it, and therefore every sentence pronounced upon a criminal is based on the criminal acts and the motives thereof. Concerning the motivation, a psychoanalyst is able to discern between conscious intention and the unconscious motive which might not be considered by the lawyer and the judge. A serious breach of law resulting from an unconscious motive is entirely different from a premeditated act. For a psychoanalyst the former is a crime, the latter is not, but a sickness, an abnormal behaviour which may be due to certain repressed complexes, guilt or emotional disturbances.¹

Psychoanalysis has shown that the unconscious plays an important role in many crimes and anti-social actions. The sociologist would agree that a vast number of cases of suicide are due to unconscious motives. To the understanding of this factor in man's mental life, a great contribution was made by the psychoanalyst, Sigmund Freud, who can be regarded as a pioneer in this field.² To illustrate the activity of the unconscious intention, the following can serve as an example:

A man who threw his two children into a well and injured his wife with a knife, was arrested before he had time to kill her. Under the law, it was undoubtedly a case of murder. Yet psychoanalysis revealed that the man's intention not to spare his family to prevent them from suffering, was repressed into his unconscious mind for a long period and it became an unconscious latent motive which led to

¹ McKenzie, op.cit., p. 68.

² Cf. S. Freud, Ego and Id., op. cit., pp. 9ff.
Totem and Taboo (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965), p. 70-71.

such an abnormal behaviour. He was completely unaware that what he had done, was a criminal offence. The psychologist is not unaware that such a deed is a culpable offence and that such a man is, according to the law, guilty, blameworthy and has to be punished. What is held by the psychoanalyst is that though this man's act is a crime, his motive or intention was not to commit a crime. As far as his unconscious is concerned he is not a criminal, but he is mentally ill and in need of treatment rather than punishment, sympathy rather than blame. Psychological evidence of the mental state of the accused should be taken seriously in any case of crime. Nevertheless, the psychologist should not minimize the responsibility of any criminal. No matter what kind of abnormal behaviour such a person exhibits, he cannot shirk his responsibility.

The Value of a Sense of Guilt

A sense of guilt is not entirely harmful, impairing and destructive. On the contrary, it carries some values in man's life. Indeed, a sense of guilt may be very close to a sense of responsibility and duty.

It would be absurd to say that all guilt-feelings need treatment. Winnicott, referring to Klein's work on a sense of guilt in the growth of a child, expresses his own view as follows:

The work of Klein has enabled psycho-analytic theory to begin to include the idea of an individual's value, whereas in early psycho-analysis the statement was in terms of health and capacity for guilt-feeling. ¹

¹ D.W. Winnicott, op. cit., p. 25.

A child has a sense of guilt when he has done something wrong. This is not a morbid guilt-feeling because it reminds him that he was not right. In fact, it can be regarded as healthy for it warns him that he was not behaving as he ought to behave. Stimulated by this guilt-feeling, he urges himself to do good, to aim at what is right because he knows that his parents love him and expects him to be and do good. Such a guilt arising from the will to do good but followed by failure, is far from morbid although it carries a possibility of becoming a morbid feeling if it is repressed.

A sense of guilt has some value in a child's moral development. Before a child is mature enough to discern between right and wrong or, in other words, to distinguish what has moral value to him and what has not, he needs a sense of guilt to urge or press him to grow in a right moral orientation. Parents are obliged to teach a child moral principles but not moral judgments. They are obliged to lead a child to a mature state in mental and moral life. Under responsible parents, a child is allowed to develop his own moral criterions and judgment. A sense of guilt is not a moral agent but an incentive which urges or stimulates moral development.¹ Although parents, in some respects, are the super-ego of a child, it does not necessarily follow that the ego is following the super-ego as far as the moral criterion is concerned. In fact, in his moral growth, the child should develop a capacity to experience a sense of guilt, to face it and to accept it because "accepting guilt is a mark of growing maturity."² The same writer elaborating on this, says: "To accept guilt-feeling, and moral responsibility is to accept moral values, not merely the authority of the father or admired teachers. There must be a degree of moral insight."³

¹ Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 333.

² J.G. McKenzie, op. cit., p. 48.

³ Ibid.

For a child as well as for every adult, guilt-feeling is a warning sign indicating that something has gone wrong, provided that the guilt-feeling follows a wrongful act or behaviour. Kept alert by this sign, one can try to avoid committing the same wrongdoing or criminal act again. Therefore it is a valuable sign for every individual as far as morals are concerned. According to Freudian psychology,¹ guilt is conceived of as a mental element or feeling preceding an actual crime and not following it. In this case it is a sign of danger pointing to a wrong future act. If this is so, every man being aware of his own guilt, knows what wrong is going to follow, and granted that his super-ego is strong enough to prevent the evil intention to become a real act, antisocial behaviour would be rapidly reduced. How a conscious intention can be alarmed or prevented by a sense of guilt and not let it express itself in crime, but at the same time not to be repressed into the unconscious, is left to the psychologist and his knowledge of the growth and value of guilt-feeling.

A lack of guilt-feeling could easily be the cause of habitual crime. Someone who repeatedly commits the same crime, is unable to understand or feel the moral evil of his deeds. This kind of antisocial conduct cannot be remedied by punishment, but what is needed is the development of a healthy sense of guilt. In many respects, a healthy guilt-feeling has some value in preventing a crime from happening or from being repeated. Concerning the relationship

¹Winnicott, op. cit., p. 16.

²Ibid., p. 25.

between the absence of guilt-feeling and antisocial behaviour, one scholar says:

In the most serious and rare antisocial episodes it is precisely the capacity for guilt-feeling that is lost. Here we find the most ugly crimes. We see the criminal engaged in a desperate attempt to feel guilty. It is unlikely that he ever succeeds. 1

It is apparent that the absence of a sense of guilt can cause a great deal of loss of moral value in the development of man's mental life.

Guilt, Morality and Sex

Dealing with the problem of guilt the moral responsibility cannot be neglected. Any statement on the standard of human morality should include guilt of sin and moral responsibility. If not, a general moral standard for people of all classes can hardly be established and accepted.

The recent report of the British Council of Churches on sex and morality,² mentions nothing about sin and guilt, but confuses the issue and makes it much more complicated for those who face the problem.

The Working Party of the Report abandoned the original terms of reference, and involved themselves in the perplexing questions of what morality is and who the authority of moral judgment is.³

¹Winnicott, op. cit., p. 27.

²Sex and Morality, a report presented to the British Council of Churches, October, 1966 (London: SCM Press).

³The original task was "to prepare a Statement of the Christian case for abstinence from sexual intercourse before marriage and faithfulness within marriage, taking full account of responsible criticisms, and to suggest means whereby the Christian position may be effectively presented to the various sections of the community." Sex and Morality, op. cit., p. 5.

They suggested that the question of whether or not to have sexual relations before marriage and outside marriage should be left to the individuals to decide, for said they, "no rule can cover all the varied and complex situations in which men and women find themselves."¹ The Report does not suggest any particular instance in which extra-marital relations are to be commended, yet, as a whole it appears to be in great conflict with the traditional position concerning morals, chastity, faith and guilt. Certainly, most church authorities do not consent to the whole of it, and many are disturbed by many of the assertions of the Report.

Of course, not all sex relations are wrong and sinful. Sex relation within marriage is blessed by the divine Authority and it is right not to have a sense of shame or abnormal guilt-feeling in this relationship. As far as the problem of sex is concerned, the value of chastity should not be depreciated. Moral laws and rules are necessities for human life and for social order. They could at least assist men and women in keeping themselves from falling into sexual licentiousness.²

It is known how a strong sense of guilt was evoked when people of hundred years ago talked about sex and faced the matter of sex. It is only in recent years, that the taboo of sex has gradually been done away with. This is due to a better understanding of the problem of sex. The view that sex is essentially sinful and

¹ Ibid., p. 63.

² According to Niebuhr, sex licentiousness is another form of self-love and 'self-escape.' He says, "the real situation is that man, granted his 'fallen' nature, sins in his sex life but not because sex is essentially sinful ... Thus sex reveals sensuality to be first another and final form of self-love, secondly an effort to escape self-love by the deification of another, and finally an escape from the futilities of both forms of idolatry by a plunge into unconsciousness." See The Nature and Destiny of Man (London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1941) I, p. 254.

shameful is rooted in an ancient dualistic concept of man and found its followers in asceticism and puritanism. Origen was one of the early theologians who identified sex and sin.¹ This view should be abandoned from the Christian idea of sex, but the biblical truth as well as the Church's position which is the "abstinence from sexual intercourse before marriage and faithfulness within marriage"² should not be undermined nor misinterpreted, or else the family discipline, social stability and moral order would be impaired.

It is undeniable that psychology discovered the importance influence of sex impulse on personal behaviour and personality. Psychology is also an aid to help people in overcoming the taboo of sex and the unhealthy guilt-feeling. The danger of repressed sexuality is made apparent by psychoanalysis. Considering all this, one must admit that psychology has shed light on the problem of sex, but there is a real danger of overemphasizing the role and importance of sex. In this respect there is often much said about sex instinct, physiological and glandular drive of sex and the sexual needs of men and women, but just as often the problems of morality, sin, and responsibility are completely left out of the total picture.

Apart from the questions of morality, adultery, sin, and guilt there are other problems connected with free sexual intercourse; for instance, the possible increase of abortions, the serious position created by an unwanted child, and over-population, just to mention a few. Even the advanced contraceptives which are available today are not flawless, and it is doubtful whether the partners always would use them when urged for sexual relations. Hence, there

¹Niebuhr, op. cit., I, p. 243.

²Sex and Morality, op. cit., p. 5.

are certain dangers to be expected when premarital intercourse becomes a general accepted social activity.

The Report proved itself a failure of seen in the light of the original assignment. The British Council of Churches, however, regretted the Report's ambiguous conclusion and reaffirmed the position of the Church in accordance with the rule that sexual intercourse should be confined within marriage. Probably, the Council found it difficult to repudiate the Report publicly for it was the result of the Working Party appointed by the Council. The Council's attitude was however expressed in this manner:

The Council, while convinced that Christians must always show compassion to those who fall below the highest standards, and neither condemn nor condone, affirms as Christian the rule that sexual intercourse should be confined within the married state. It believes that the maintenance of this rule is in accordance with the will and purpose of God and that God's grace and strength are available to help all who seek to reach that demanding and rewarding standard.

In the light of this and while regretting that the Working Party did not proceed to state unambiguously these conclusions, the Council receives the Report, Sex and Morality which has much to contribute of value to the contemporary discussion of moral questions by both Christians and non-Christians. 1

Clearly, the Report stands on its own moral philosophy in which a reference to the problem of guilt or sin is entirely lacking. In this respect, the words of Lewis criticising some moral philosophers are relevant:

Moral philosophers do not seem to have had a great deal to say about guilt; and it would be easy to compile an impressive list of ethical treatises in which the subject is not mentioned at all. In recent ethics especially it has suffered much neglect. In theology, on the one hand, the problem of guilt has always been to the fore, and of late it has also elicited the very lively interest of the psychologist. 2

¹Quoted by John R. Gray, "Sex and Morality", The Expository Times, January, 1967 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark), Vol. LXXV:III, No. 4, p. 105.

²Quoted by JoG. McKenzie, op. cit., p. 16.

Although no rule or law can cover the whole complex situation of sex in human life in which every man and woman plays a part, and although every individual has the right to choose his own moral criterion as far as sex and morality is concerned, and although the philosopher can stress that "morality is absolute and autonomous",¹ and the psychologist can emphasize the importance of the unconscious motive of moral vice, the most important point should by no means be ignored, namely, the responsibility and guilt-feeling attached to sex and all related problems and behaviour. Every man is and ought to be responsible for his own deeds and the consequence thereof, otherwise, the stability of a society will suffer harm.

Guilt and Responsibility

When responsibility is surveyed, the problem of guilt should not be left in obscurity. A sense of responsibility is related to the feeling of guilt.² Every man is responsible for his own behaviour, for keeping the law, even for his thoughts and emotions as far as the relation between guilt and responsibility is concerned.

Responsibility implies a sense of obligation which closely links up with a sense of guilt.³ Every man who has a sense of obligation, experiences a sense of shame when he shirks his obligation and when he loses control of his temper, impulses or tongue. He is ashamed because his neglect is to him an expression of the fact

¹John Laird, A Study in Moral Theory (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1926), p. 316.

²D.W. Winnicott, op. cit., p. 102.

³McKenzie, op. cit., pp. 50ff; 66ff; 95ff.

that he is falling below the required moral standard. He knows that he is responsible for his behaviour and acts because he could have done otherwise if he wanted to. He is aware of the fact that it was not because he was unable to do otherwise, but that he was not prepared to do what was right. He feels blameworthy because he did not act in another way. This is the basis of his guilt-feeling. His conscience suffers by means of self-blame or regret related to a sense of responsibility.

Conscience is the component system of moral principles and moral ideas. Like a policeman watching the well-being of a society and its inhabitants, conscience is watching over every behaviour of the self and checking every feeling, desire and motive of the self. It is the nucleus of the personality containing the very being of man. It is a mirror of the self in which the self sees the misconducts which violate a required moral criterion. Also, it is the super-ego of the ego, to use an expression of Freud who employs the term in the explanation of the origin, growth, nature and the functioning of the conscience.¹ Unless one's conscience is working, or in other words, unless one possesses a conscience, there is no sense of responding to various criteria. Therefore, the self is responsible for its conduct, character, behaviour, for the expressions of all its desires, feelings, and impulses. If the expressions are not in accordance with the demand of the conscience, the self feels guilty.

¹See his work, The Ego and The Id (London: The Hogarth Press, 1949), pp. 9ff.

Self-punishment or self-blame is another form of expressing responsibility. This happens when the self offends the conscience and becomes a guilty-self which feels a need for punishment in order to get rid of the guilt-burden. In this respect punishment serves as a kind of atonement which the self employs to expiate its guilt.

The conscience is the inner authority of the self. From this authority or dictate, the self receives a sense of 'ought' which prescribes what ought and what ought not. A guilt-feeling arises immediately if the 'ought' is violated. The conscience gives authority to control impulses, desires and sentiments of the self. Where the freedom of the self is limited by this authority, the opportunity is created for responsibility in conduct and behaviour. In fact, the self is responsible for the expressions of its impulses and not merely for the impulses themselves.

If every impulse is controllable by the self, many perversions and antisocial behaviour would rapidly be reduced. There are however, uncontrollable impulses. One often hears someone saying "I could not control myself!" The following will serve as an illustration: A pick-pocket who deprived a woman of her purse in a busy market place, was caught and when questioned how he had come to steal in the presence of a multitude of bystanders, he answered, "I saw only the purse and not the people!" The impulse of stealing was stirred up by a particular object, namely, the purse. He acted on the sight of the purse without considering the inappropriate situation.

The impulse as a natural or instinctive tendency arises and expresses itself in the presence of a suitable object or in suitable circumstances which discharge adequate stimulations or excitements to the self. An impulse is not only an impulsion but also impulsive

and can become uncontrollable.

Psychology emphasizes that many perversions such as those of sex perverts, exhibitionists, alcoholics, kleptomaniacs, are moral diseases which are basically uncontrollable.¹ They do not originate from clear intentions or motives. They are mainly due to irresistible impulses which can no longer be controlled or repressed and which have to be expressed in action or actions. Hence, the pervert can hardly be held responsible for his perversion but should be cleared from all blame, as many psychologists insist.² One should, however, be on guard not to allow the pervert to shirk his responsibility as far as the stability of society is concerned. He should be held responsible for any perverted conduct which can adversely affect other people. In the first place, although he cannot control his impulses, it does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that he cannot also control the expression of these impulses in outward behaviour. Many homosexuals and exhibitionists, apart from those mentally defective, have not allowed themselves to indulge in sexual vice.³ In the second place, no psychologist or psychiatrist can prove an uncontrollable impulse though they are aware of such a factor. There is no scientific method to distinguish which impulse is controllable and which is not. Therefore, if a pervert is also a criminal, he is blameworthy. In the third place, there is no adequate reason to defend a pervert who allows his impulse to get

¹J.A. Hadfield, op. cit., pp. 49ff.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

into a situation or condition which is uncontrollable. He could choose otherwise and seek the way of cure before his impulses urge him to some criminal behaviour. In all this, he remains responsible for any misbehaviour.

On the other hand society should also share the responsibility in failing to prevent certain moral diseases to spring up and spread. The sexual vice or perversion of an exhibitionist does not merely stem from an impulsion but also from an influence evoked under suitable circumstances which already exist in society and which suggest or produce stimulations for the impulse of the pervert. In such a way, irresistible conditions for the pervert might be created. Stimuli such as posters, cinemas, picture-magazines, literature, advertisements, loose conversation, entertainment and erotic surroundings, are external supporters or social suggestions for an uncontrollable impulse to take its course. These should be taken into account as far as sexual perversions are concerned. Therefore, society should not be allowed to avoid its responsibility and obligation for the situation offered to the pervert. Society owes it to itself to create and encourage a healthy environment for the benefit of the strong and the weak, whether physically, economically or morally.¹ To achieve this, every member of the society is responsible, jointly as well as severally.

The awareness of Guilt-feeling

A healthy sense of guilt is an important factor concerning a sense of responsibility. Such a healthy sense of guilt which urges man to act in a sense of obligation, to feel a need for a

¹Cf. Paul Tournier, The Strong & the Weak (SCM Press, 1963), pp. 30ff.

lost object,¹ and give a man a sense of oughtness - he feels he ought to put things right² - is certainly different from a sense of morbid guilt which leads to an opposite result and often cause certain kinds of disease.³ Morbid guilt is due to a repression, therefore, guilt-feeling should not be repressed. In order to avoid creating an unbearable guilt-burden, the guilt factor should not be exaggerated.⁴ Repressed guilt needs to be brought out or discharged into consciousness, in other words, guilt-feeling needs to be awakened so that one can consciously feel it and face it. The awakening of a sense of guilt is necessary before any solution of the problem of guilt can be offered. The only true solution of guilt, says Tournier, is "the acceptance of our responsibilities, genuine recognition of our guilt, and repentance and the receiving of God's forgiveness in response to this repentance."⁵

Projection of guilt upon other cannot help to get rid of a sense of guilt or to forget the feeling of guilt. For instance, a father coming back from gambling scolded his children without any obvious reason. Investigation revealed that this father had lost money in the gambling. This created a sense of guilt accompanied by anxiety and irritability. In order to find an outlet for these 'mental diseases', he directed them on to his children.

¹Weatherhead, op. cit., pp. 348.

²Cf. McKenzie, op.cit., pp. 49ff, 89, 113ff.

³Supra, p. 214.

⁴Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 333.

⁵Paul Tournier, Guilt and Grace, (trans. Anthur W. Heathcote (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965), p. 142.

This did not give relief; on the contrary, it doubled his burden of guilt and made him more intolerable. In fact, there generated in his mind a vicious circle of guilt and anger, a sequence of mental processes created from the period from the act of gambling to the act of scolding.¹ Having lost money he became annoyed and he blamed himself. This produced a sense of guilt. His guilt produced anger which led to more rebellion, wrongdoing and an intensified guilt-feeling. Through the act of scolding, he released his anger, but not his guilt. On the contrary, he felt the burden of guilt much heavier than ever before and it drove him into despair. This was not only the punishment for sin but the real price he paid for it.² Unless, he became aware of his guilt and sought God for forgiveness, no remedy could be offered.

The story of Cain (Gen. 4:1-6) expresses the same truth. Cain was angry with God because his offering was not appreciated (Gen. 4:5). The reason why God regarded the offering of Abel more favourably than Cain's is not given. What is known, is that the anger of Cain motivated him to commit murder. His anger found a way of escape in the murderous deed, but his guilt remained active in his mind and it generated further guilt and even further sin which is expressed in his deceitful words: "I do not know, am I, my brother's keeper?" When he was asked by God where Abel was

¹Paul Tournier, op.cit., pp. 146.

²Cf. H.W. Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1911), pp. 311ff.

In order to veil his sinful act, he lied to God. This reveals the very nature of sinful man. Sin begets more sin and guilt produces more guilt. Cain became aware of his guilt. It was God who awoke the guilt of Cain, discharged his guilt into consciousness, and pressed him to accept it and face it. This is clearly expressed in the dialogue between God and Cain (Gen. 4:6-13). A series of challenging question is an effective stimilus in the awakening of guilt. Further God rebuked him, saying, "you are cursed from the ground... you shall be a fugitive and a wanderer on earth" (Gen. 4:10-12). Hearing the words, Cain felt guilty and insecure and he expressed himself as follows:

My punishment is greater than I can bear. Behold, thou hast driven me this day away from the ground; and from thy face I shall be hidden; and I shall be a fugitive and a wanderer on the earth and whoever finds me will slay me (Gen. 4:13-14).

The awareness of guilt is not only the sign of the punishment of sin but it is also a first step to the confession and the forgiveness of guilt. From Cain's own words, one can penetrate his remorse, his bitter and sorrowful heart which illustrates his desire for the grace of God. The forgiveness of his guilt is shown in the promising words: "If anyone slays Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold." (Gen. 4:15). A mark was put on Cain to prevent anyone killing him (Gen. 5:5), and by these words and acts of God forgiveness was signified.

God is not merely the God who sends diseases (II Kgs. 5:27), who punishes people (Job 31:23) and judges sinners (Mk 9:43), but also the God who preserves, who loves and forgives. The wrath and the love of God are actually one attribute of God though we can conceive of them as distinct. They are not contradictory to

each other.¹ The wrath of God is his reaction to sin and evil. The authors of the Bible cannot but use anthropomorphic expressions in describing the nature of God who is active, dynamic, alive and who loves and punishes. Of course, God is more than the God who can be described in human words. While God cannot but feel revulsion at sin, his wrath carries a factor of love. Even the anger of the worldly parents with their children contains an element of love and mercy. The wrath of God cannot be equated to the anger of man because the latter contains a certain amount of vengeance and evil. God's wrath is good. It is another side of his love. One is reminded of this truth in the letter to the Hebrews: "The Lord disciplines him whom he loves, and chastises every son whom he receives" (Heb. 12:6).

The ultimate aim of the wrath of God is not only to punish the arrogant sinner, but also to arouse his feeling of guilt, to urge him to humble himself and accept his own guilt, whereby he might be led to the way of confession and forgiveness.

Self-righteousness is a great enemy of man and of God. It is a great hindrance which prevents man from receiving the grace of God. God's wrath as an expression of his love opposes this enemy in order to remove it and to open the way for sinners to His grace. This truth is stressed by James in his letter, "God opposes the proud, but gives grace to the humble" (Jas. 4:6). Unless a sinner in a process of introspection becomes aware of his own guilt and accepts it, no repentance is possible.

¹Cf. DDM. Baillie, God was in Christ (London: Faber & Faber Ltd., n.d.), p. 186. He says, "Throughout the whole of this New Testament material there is no trace of any contrast between the wrath of God and the love of Christ, or of the idea that God's attitude to sinners had to be changed by the sacrifice of Christ from wrath and justice to love and mercy."

Many psychotherapists tend to blame the morbid guilt of their patients on religious teaching or pulpit sermons. On the one hand, this accusation carries an element of truth because there are patients whose abnormal guilt was caused by the influence of pulpit teaching. The preacher's words can stir up either healthy or morbid guilt. In order to awake a sense of guilt to strengthen a healthy conscience and to lead men to gain access to grace, a preacher can hardly avoid emphasizing both the love and the wrath of God. One is not surprised to find an abnormal guilt-feeling as a by-product of preaching. The awakening of guilt is an important step leading to repentance, and the way by which one can proceed to confession and to the receiving of forgiveness. This awakening of guilt, however, carries a possible danger of reopening old wounds. On the other hand, the accusation is far from just as far as motive is concerned. It is true that no preacher has any intention of imposing a morbid guilt on his audience, nor has he any premeditated idea to cause mental disease through his sermons. He preaches in order to show men the grace, and in that process he often arouses a sense of guilt which urges men to seek and obtain grace. Further still, "true religion would increase moral sensitiveness without increasing morbid guilt."¹ Therefore, one should not lay the blame for the morbid guilt-feeling on religion and the preacher. Religion is not blameworthy but praiseworthy because it

¹Weatherhead, loc.cit., p. 333.

is not only a stimulus in the awakening of guilt but also a most important instrument in treating a sense of guilt.

The Treatment of Guilt

If a sense of guilt is successfully repressed, it becomes unconscious and creates various latent diseases in man's mental or physical system. Even if it is not repressed, severe conscious guilt-feelings could drive a man into depression or despair. It then acts like a whip in the hand of the super-ego, painfully lashing the self so that the latter is urged to repent or even to seek for punishment or other remedy. These effects could turn man to God when he consciously realizes that he has not been true to God and to himself.¹

Apparently, a psychoanalyst could analyse the sources, the causes, and the effects of a sense of guilt and direct man to realize his ego-centricity and his need of repentance. The psychotherapist, however, could hardly offer complete treatment to those who are suffering from morbid guilt-feeling unless religion is brought into operation.² It would be of no avail to ask a person suffering from an excess guilt-feeling not to take it too seriously because of the universality of guilt. Religious treatment does take it seriously by offering forgiveness. If the patient really believes that God forgives sin, the burden of guilt could be lifted.³

¹R.S. Lee, op. cit., p. 112-113.

²Cf. Weatherhead, op. cit., p. 332.

³J.G. McKenzie, op. cit., p. 154.

Psychoanalysis plays a vital part in the treatment of guilt.¹ It proves itself valuable in the investigation of an unhealthy sense of guilt. Through a careful and attentive examination of the phenomena of a patient suffering from guilt-feeling, a psychotherapist is able to trace the source and the cause of the disease, but it is doubtful whether he could offer an effective technique by which a sense of morbid guilt can be removed. The psychotherapist is mainly concerned with symptoms of disorders derived from guilt, but not with moral values or moral evil. He is not dealing with a wilful sinner but with a mentally sick man. In other words, it is the psychopathological cause and result which concern him and not the spiritual or moral factors in the patient's life. The psychopathologist is able to investigate the mental functions and processes of a patient brought about by the patient's mental disorder resulting from guilt. He is able to trace the cause and to prepare the patient for treatment. Therefore, the psychological observation is the first step from which one proceeds to the treatment of guilt.

Before any treatment can be offered to a patient, one needs to know what the cause of the patient's feeling of guilt is.² Its origin can be either a super-ego, a fear, or an anxiety, which is related to prohibitions demanded by various authorities, whether personal, familial, social, legal, or religious. If the cause is known, then one has to decide whether a sense of guilt of the patient is healthy or morbid, active or repressed, conscious or unconscious. Psychoanalysis is very helpful in this examination by recalling past memories of the patient. It can recharge a repression and

¹Hadfield (J.H.), Psychology and Mental Health (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1960), p. 393.

²Ibid.

bring it into consciousness. If guilt-feeling is related to impulses or instincts, the patient and his expressions of impulses have to be redirected to a suitable orientation. To do this, the necessary moral and religious ideals of a patient have to be taken as relevant factors though a psychotherapist usually does not pay much attention to these factors.

If a sense of guilt which is created from an sinful incident is repressed, complexes are set up and guilt becomes a mental disease. In such a case psychological treatment can be of the greatest value in tracing the guilt-causing incident or incidents. Usually, this mental disease reveals symptoms such as, phobia, insomnia and anxiety. Although psychotherapy can be very helpful in such cases, there will be no complete cure if the patient does not desire it, and if religion and moral factors are not taken into consideration. Unless religion is brought to deal with it, to offer him the grace of God and his forgiveness, to arouse or create within himself a desire for a complete recovery or remedy, the patient's sickness will grow worse. Therefore, psychology and religion need each other as a supplement in treating patients suffering from guilt-feeling.¹

Religious confession is another means of dealing with guilt-feeling. Every religion, in one way or another, believes in the value of confession. Man needs confession in order to release his burden of guilt tormenting him from the very beginning of human sin. Man may conceal his sinful acts from God and from other men, and repress his guilt from consciousness, but although guilt can be repressed and forgotten, it remains in the unconscious mind. It may become conscious and active again at any time when an appropriate stimulation is presented; thereby again causing torment to the sinner. The sinner is able to conceal his sinful deeds but not his guilt

¹Cf. J.A. Hadfield, Psychology and Mental Health (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1960), p. 362.

burden, therefore confession is needed.

Examples of people recognizing their guilt and confessing their sin are not rare in the Bible. King David was aware of his guilt after the rebuke of Nathan.¹ Realizing his sin of adultery and murder, David, the king, confessed, "I have sinned against the Lord" (II Sam. 12:4). Then Nathan said to him, "the Lord also has put away your sin" (II Sam. 12:4). His confession gained him an assurance of forgiveness. In other words, the confession was the way to the grace of God who alone has authority to forgive sin. It is important to note that forgiveness is not a concession to an easy-going life where one light-heartedly believes that the more one sins, the more grace and forgiveness can be obtained.

Another story tells that the sin of pride of king Hezekiah was forgiven when he "humbled himself for the pride of his heart."² Followed the forgiveness, his sickness was cured and his life prolonged.³ The same absolution was experienced by the psalmist who praised God, saying,

Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven,
whose sin is covered.

When I declared not my sin my body wasted away
through my groaning all day long.

I acknowledged my sin to thee,

Then thou didst forgive the guilt of my sin.⁴

Clearly, the burden of guilt is heavy and the forgiveness of it brings peace to the heart of man. This truth is reaffirmed in Psalms LI that God would not despise a broken and contrite heart.⁵

¹ II Sam. 12:14; Supra, p. 39.

² II Chr. 32:26.

³ Supra, pp. 47f.

⁴ Ps. 32:1-5.

⁵ Ps. 51:17.

The New Testament teaches that the work of Jesus is a work of grace and forgiveness. Examples illustrating this point are scattered in the Gospels. The narrative telling of the woman taken in adultery can be given as an example. Her sin was forgiven, her guilt was lifted and she was commanded, "Go and do not sin again."¹ While her feeling of guilt was relieved, the guilt of her accusers was awakened at the same time, and the mask of their self-righteousness was completely pulled down. Their real attitude was revealed and they went away with hardened hearts.²

This stubbornness is a great barrier to confession. It is an obstacle in the relationship between God and man. Unless it is removed there can be no real confession.

If sin becomes mental disease, confession is a way of healing. The Apostle James stresses this point and says "Confess your sins to one another, and pray for one another that you may be healed. The prayer of a righteous man has great power in its effects."³

Since in a vast number of cases of mental and physical disease are related to the feeling of guilt,⁴ it is not surprising to find that confession often relieves a sense of guilt, fear, and anxiety, and thereby helps to clear up certain diseases.

The Roman Catholic confession places a high value on the need for treatment of guilt. Roman Catholics go regularly to confess their sins and thereby gain relief of the guilt-burden. This regular confession could be very effective but the problem is that not every one confesses the real guilt, but by means of rationalization substitutes another false guilt for the real one. In this

¹John 8:11.

²Cf. John 8:9.

³James 5:16.

⁴Cf. Supra, p. 215.

respect, the relation between the penitent and the confessor is very important. The penitent has to be very sure that the confessor would never repeat a word of what he was told. If the former has not enough confidence in the latter, there can hardly be real confession. Whether the penitent is Catholic, Orthodox or Protestant who confesses his guilt to his priest or pastor and receive absolution in communion or public worship, in the very first place he needs a full trust in the confessor before any secrecy can be disclosed. The catharsis of a guilt-patient taking place in a consulting room needs the same confidence.

Another stumbling-block on the way of confession is an acute sense of shame. A penitent may desire to speak out all his sin and guilt but because of shame and fear that people would despise or ridicule him if his deeds become known, he hesitates or declines to confess. Unless the penitent is determined and is strong enough to overcome this obstacle, he is not able to do any confession, especially in the presence of others. It could be suggested that such a person should confess privately or in a closed room. Even here some problems arise. It is doubtful whether he will really get the result or effect of confession if no human being can hear him. There is the possibility that he might doubt whether God could really hear and answer him in the same way as Jesus did when he said "Your sins are forgiven" (Mt 9:2). If no response from God can be felt, he might even confess the same guilt over and over again.

In confession there is a danger of confusing moral disease and wilful sin. For a psychologist there is a distinctive difference. The former has nothing to do with confession for it only needs treatment as most psychologists apt to insist. Hadfield illustrates this by drawing a distinction between a drunkard and

an alcoholic:¹ The drunkard maintains that every man possesses a freedom to indulge in excessive drinking if he wants to; and he really does so. An alcoholic, on the contrary, does not want to get overwhelmed by alcohol but he is compelled by an uncontrollable force and cannot refrain from drinking. The drunkard could give up drinking if he wanted to, but not the alcoholic. The former willfully desires to get drunk, therefore it is a sin; the latter is driven by an undesirable impulse which he finds his will entirely impotent to resist, therefore it is a moral disease. The former needs confession, the latter remedy, psychological or medical. For the psychologists sin is based on the will and directed by the will but not so with moral disease. One can hardly agree that in a moral disease the will is completely absent because it is almost impossible to separate an impulse from the will, because very often the impulse is approved by the will. The moral disease has at least an indirect link with the will of the patient, for, to revert to the example of drinking, there must have been a period in which the alcoholic could stop drinking before the undesirable impulse took over and made resisting alcohol impossible. However, there is no distinct demarcation between a drunkard and the alcoholic and no one can prove an uncontrollable inner force.² With this it is concluded that if there is no distinction in principle between moral disease and sin, both should be included in the confession, and the confessor should treat them in conjugation with each other. From a religious point of view, confession is needed for every man who is sinful as well as guilty. Nevertheless, it is obvious that

¹Hadfield, op. cit., p. 48.

²Supra, p. 227.

a patient can only confess what he is conscious of at that moment because confession is not a technique whereby unconscious memories can be recalled.

In short, if religious confession is to be effective, the pastors, priests, ministers, doctors and psychiatrists should train themselves to be trustworthy persons in order to win the full confidence of those in need.

CONCLUSIONS

Before drawing a few conclusions, it is deemed necessary to give a short review of what has been said on the subject of sickness and sin.

Primitive people traced their sickness and calamities to their wrongdoings and to the anger of their god or gods although they did not worship the God whom Jesus revealed. Some of these primitive people were neighbours of the Jews who were convinced that disease was, on the one hand, the punishment of God for sin, and on the other hand, the expression of the activities of demons. This significant relationship between sin and illness assumes a deeper dimension in the study of biblical references. Some Hebrew terms for sin such as חַטָּא, פְּשָׁע, עֲוֹן, signify that the Old Testament places considerable emphasis on human sin resulting in separation from God and from men. Many Hebrew prophets who felt the call of God, stood up and rebuked their corrupt fellowmen and urged them to repent. Jeremiah, for instance, realized that the seat of all evil was in the heart of man, and that the sinful heart disturbed the harmony of man's inner world. In the prophet's eyes the whole world was in a state of corruption from the lowest rank to the highest, from the individual to the whole nation. The effect of sin is like a harmful, destructive, and impairing disease. Therefore, a sinful nation is a sick nation ^{which} urgently needs a remedy of which repentance is the condition.

Sin weakens the perfect health of man and destroys the power of a nation when such a nation indulges in evil deeds. Examples illustrating this plight of a nation are not rare in the Old Testament. In fact, the Old Testament was fully aware of the immense influence of man's mental and spiritual activities upon bodily functioning. Although there is an intimate relationship between sin and sickness, it does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that a sick person is essentially more sinful than a healthy man. Job who could not see a direct link between his sickness and sin argued that his disease was hardly a consequence of any objective misdeed. Sickness reminded him that the righteous and the wicked often shared the same lot in the sinful world where disease and evil occupied a place.

The world and men exist under the providential love of God. In his providence, sickness and suffering carry a purpose of God - a purpose of enrichment, chastisement, purification or punishment of God.

The general thought of the Old Testament that disease is sent by God as punishment for transgressions expressing his wrath, and that it was well with the righteous and ill with the wicked, is found ^{again} back in the New Testament (e.g. John 9:2ff). Jesus was highly aware of the close relationship between sin and sickness (cf. Mk 2:5ff; John 5:14ff). On some occasions Jesus regarded illness as inseparably linked with human sin, in other cases he did not imply any connection at all. He warned against the practice of condemning or condoning sick persons, arising from the belief

that those who suffered were more wicked than those who escaped inflictions.

The consequences of sin can be viewed from two different angles: one is the inevitable estrangement from God, the other the progressive deterioration of the personality.

The attitude of Jesus towards sinners and the sick was one of love and mercy. The way of treating them was by means of his forgiveness and atonement. These he expressed in his work of healing and his authority of absolution.

The healing mission of Jesus indicated the power of God and the manifestation of his glory. It was the fulfilment of his Father's will for men and with men. Through his healing mission men were liberated from the fetters of disease and from the chains of Satan. It was in healing that men experienced physical and spiritual liberation.

Faith in its widest sense is a factor conducive to healing but unbelief is an impairing hindrance; unless removed, no healing is possible. Healing faith means the full confidence to make use of all the gifts of God including all possible measures, whether medical, psychological, mechanical or spiritual. If sickness is a sign of evil power, healing is the act to suppress and destroy it. The inseparable partner of healing is exorcism. These two are one serving the same purpose of God. Exorcism is one of the means by which the evil forces are checked and by which men are delivered from their influence. If sickness is an expression of this evil power, the removal of these adverse powers should lead to the recovery and wholeness of man.

Some cases of demon-possession in or outside the Gospels are explainable in psychological terms. The patients were possibly suffering from auto-suggestion, epilepsy, hysteria, or some other mental disorder or neurosis. These disorders could be basically psychogenic or functional arising from inner conflicts, repressions or fears. But there are many other cases where psychology is unable to offer any explanation. Psychology is not in a position to prove the existential reality or unreality of demon-possession. Jesus' attitude, his words and his works pointed to the possible existence and activities of demons. He gave his authority and power to his church and followers to resist this evil power. He saved sinners, cast out demons, healed the sick and reconciled men with God. The church should follow in his footsteps because these works are the conditions and signs of the coming of the kingdom of God.

As long as sin and sickness, as expressions of the evil powers, remain active in the world, men cannot evade their influence. Sin is individual as well as universal. The whole human race is affected. This is the fertile soil for disease, physical or spiritual, to take its course. Sin is a sign of spiritual illness; disease is an indication of the destructive power of the cooperation between sin and sickness. This relationship could be remote or intimate and in the majority of cases indirect. Men remain unwhole as long as sin and sickness maintain their power over men.

Theology asserts that health is not merely the absence of disease. Physical health alone is not perfect health. The perfect health is the wholeness of man. It needs a complete harmony between every component of body, mind and spirit in its functioning, its processes and its growth. The body should be in harmony with its outward world, the mind in harmony with its thoughts, and the spirit in harmony with God. In other words, these three inseparable dimensions of man need to be entirely in unison and expressed in harmonious psycho-physical and spiritual functioning. God's will for man is perfect health. It is far from his will that man's psycho-physical constitution should function in an imperfect manner. From both a biblical and theological point of view, there can be no complete health if life has no purpose, no hope, no love, no God, and if man has no will to be as man. Barth rightly observed that the essence of health is to be as man. Man ought to will to live and to be healthy. The will as the motive power of man is the health force. Health is not merely the proper functioning of man's physiological and psychological faculties, nor does it merely consist in the satisfaction of man's impulses. If the will and the strength are lacking, there can be nor real health. But even this is not enough; men has to be in concord with God, with other men and with himself, that is, no conflict between the self, super-ego, ego, and Id, before he can achieve wholeness.

In theology the problem of sin and sickness is seen in the context of the doctrine of God, man, and the world.

Under God's preserving grace, the evil is temporarily allowed to exist in the creation. In order to safeguard freedom, God permits suffering caused by evil powers expressed in the form of illness, sin, chaos and death. This permissive will of God contains an inscrutable purpose of God.

Sickness and sin are signs of the power of darkness, originated from 'das Nichtige', to use Barth's expression, and they are deeply related to man's rebellious free will.

Man is granted freedom by God. With this free will, man can turn his back on God, reject and deny Him although freedom was not originally assigned to be used for that purpose. Every sin reveals a wrong use of freedom. God would not deprive man of his free will because He is a God who is free and who allows freedom.

Sin is like a disease carrying its destructive and corruptive effect to every dimension of man. Sin is the cause of all troubles, disturbances, conflicts, disintegrations, sufferings and other human problems.

The result as well as the evidence of sin is also revealed in man's sinner conflict and anxiety. Its effects spread from the spiritual and mental level to the psycho-physical functioning. The Bible says that a sinner's heart is restless and in despair. The narrator of The Fall describes this unrest and fear in Genesis 3:8, the Psalmist expresses the same view in Psalms 42:5, likewise Paul in Romans 7:24. For those who are restless, the peace of God is sorely needed (cf. John 16:33).

Man estranges himself from God and becomes a victim of sin. His life is no longer in fellowship with his Creator but under the

evil power of sin. Sin deprives man of a full spiritual life. Life without God is dead in some respects and leads to the final psycho-physical and spiritual termination of man.

Sickness is the forerunner of death. On the one hand, it is a sign of the wrath of God, and on the other hand, a form of expression of evil. Sin and sickness came from the same source, namely 'das Nichtige'. Sin and sickness are not created nor willed by God who is the Creator of all good. But under His power these evil things can be used for a good purpose. Sin and sickness are agents of evil, and enemies of men and the Kingdom of God. They are impossible possibilities which exist under God's negation, rejection, wrath and judgment, but also under God's providence and ruling power they are allowed to occupy some place.

Under God's providence the world exists and men live. The mere existence of man is expressive of the grace of God. But providence does not mean that in the world everything turns into good and that children of God have no need to resist sickness and temptations. God allowed his Son to suffer and die on the Cross for men, and those who follow Him should not expect to lead an easy-going life, free from sickness and sufferings.

Man is not immortal, he is permitted to live ⁱⁿ a set span of time. At the end of time, death brings the judgment of God for some, and eternal life for others.

God wills man to live and not to die as a victim of sin and sickness. In the same way, man should will to live and to be

healthy. Disease is a hindrance to this will and prevents the normal functioning of man's psycho-physical and spiritual life. Unless it is removed, there can be no way to the wholeness of man. In this task of combatting disease, doctors, nurses, and medical science are indispensable.

Healing which is God's will was illustrated by the work of Jesus. To resist illness is the command of God. From this it follows that surrendering before sickness and sin is an act of disobedience. In the battle against sin and sickness God is always on his creature's side but faith in Him and prayer to Him are necessary equipments, without which men could never win the war. Because Jesus had conquered sin, sickness and death, victory belongs to God and not to the evil power.

Psychology mainly deals with man's mental life and describes the interwoven relationship between sin and sickness in terms of excessive guilt and other disorders. Psychology affirms that the physical, psychical and spiritual factors of a man are inter-related and inter-reacting in the functions and in matters of health and sickness. It is true that man's spiritual life strongly influences his mental and physical life, and vice versa. The power of mind over body is undeniable. In the same way, a sound body is conducive to an active and alert mind. This interaction is an indisputable fact.

Guilt is a mental and spiritual disposition which could cause mental disorders if repressed. Guilt indicates an incompleteness of man's health. It is a mental disease as many psychologists assert. If any one of the three component parts of man, body, mind and spirit, is ill, the whole man is affected. Guilt is a mental sickness

disintegrating the wholeness of man.

Guilt-feeling emerges whenever one revolts against one's inner authority - the super-ego or one's conscience. A sense of guilt does not merely come from the command of the super-ego but it also arises from a sense of fear. This fear could be fear of God or gods, fear of taboo, and fear of punishment, or many others. Guilt linked up with fear could cause neurosis.

Guilt-feeling is closely related to a sense of anxiety which is the state of the inner world of every sinful man. Anxiety causes unrest and tension. Sometimes it indicates a threat to a person or object on which the anxious man depends in one way or another. Anxiety also originates from the conflict between a sense of love and a sense of hate, namely, from a state of ambivalence.

When guilt is repressed it becomes unconscious but still remains active in the unconsciousness when a barrier is set up to prevent it from coming back to consciousness. The barrier could be fear or shame. This unconscious guilt is not unlikely to become a latent disease revealing itself in dreams, under hypnosis, in phantasy, and in certain kinds of perversive behaviour. It may also result in neurosis, mental disorder, insomnia, phobia, paralysis, hysterical deafness or dumbness and certain functional or organic diseases.

A large number of cases of anti-social behaviour, criminal acts, Homicide and suicide are due to unconscious motives which are more or less associated with a sense of guilt which either precedes or follows a crime. Dealing with social problems, the sense of guilt aspect cannot be neglected.

On the one hand, guilt acts as a hindrance to the processes of development of the mental and moral life of man. In other words, it is a stumbling block in the way of the wholeness of man. On the other hand, it is valuable in human life. It behaves as a stimulus which urges to do good, to avoid evil, and to choose a right moral direction. When guilt is the result of a wrongdoing, it acts as a sign of warning that something has gone wrong. It also acts preventative to evil deeds when it warns man against the wrong which he contemplates to do. In the former case it urges one not to repeat the same wrongdoing, in the latter case it urges one to refrain from the wrongdoing. An incapability to experience a sense of guilt is the cause of repeated crimes and a sign of an immaturity in man's moral development.

In some respects, guilt is closely linked up with a sense of duty and responsibility. As far ^{as} morality is concerned, guilt, sin, and responsibility cannot be ignored or minimized. The understanding of the intimate association of sin, guilt, sex and morality is indispensable if one wants to grasp the nature, functions, and value of these. These three factors - sin, guilt and sex - play an equal important role in man's moral life. Our brief discussion on Sex and Morality revealed the same truth.

For the sake of the stability of a society, for the peace of the whole human family, and for the good of every individual, no man should be allowed to shirk his responsibility. Responsibility is closely related to a sense of guilt because the latter could stimulate responsibility. Responsibility is also connected with the conscience which is very important in human life. Man should be held responsible for his behaviour, thoughts, emotions, and actions.

Since, many mental and physical diseases are related to sin and guilt, treatment of them should not be given without taking these two factors into consideration. Psychology shows that the awareness of guilt is the initial step leading to the cure of these diseases. Psychology alone seems powerless to dissipate a sense of guilt. Here religion should be brought into the treatment of guilt because the offering of forgiveness could prove effective. If a guilty patient believes that God really forgives his sin, the guilt cause might be removed, immediately or gradually. Many examples are found in the Gospels. For sinners and guilty men forgiveness through confession and repentance is the way leading to the wholeness of man.

Our threefold study, namely the biblical, theological and psychological elucidation of the problem of sin and sickness which is in turn closely connected with life and death, helps to establish a better comprehension of the meaning of health and the wholeness of man.

Sin and sickness, individual and universal, is a very basic problem of man. Sin is the source of sickness and of all human sufferings. The international and national conflicts, racial problems, political struggles, the craving for power, the alarming increasing of the population, famine and hunger, the nuclear power race, war - cold or hot - all these are problems related directly or indirectly to sin. These problems would not have arisen if man was without sin and free from diseases, mental, physical or spiritual. Dealing with these problems, psychology and theology could help to find the deepest roots and to assist men to realize their sin and bring them to the awareness of guilt. The awakening of guilt is

the precondition to the grace of God from whom man separated himself; but God forgives and accepts those who are willing to come. The doctrine of the incarnation, salvation and resurrection find their prominent meaning in the belief that Jesus came to reconcile man to God and to restore him in wholeness of health.

The conscience keeps awake the sense of guilt and it could direct the expression of impulses in resisting temptations and avoiding anti-social behaviour. The increase of crime and mental illness are human problems of today. These problems have much to do with a lack of responsibility which in turn is connected with an inactive conscience. The weaker the conscience, the higher the increase in crime. The lesser the sense of responsibility the wider the spread of mental disease. Man's conscience can be strengthened and his responsibility deepened when religion is brought into his life.

The perpetual human problem of sin and sickness shows that no man is whole and perfect. In dealing with these problems, various ways and means could be employed but the inter-influence and inter-action between body, mind and soul, and that between sin and sickness should never be overlooked. Psychology reveals these various influences and throws light on the problems in a scientific way. Psychology and theology need to work together in the investigation and the treatment of guilt and disorders. The denial of the love of God and of the existence of evil and of the operation of man's inner and mental processes, could never lead to a clear understanding of the relationship between sin and sickness.

Large amounts of money and energy have been utilized in many fields of scientific research, but not much attention has been paid to the investigation of the spiritual dimension of man as one of the interrelated aspects of man as body, mind and spirit. Here is still a vast area for science to conquer.

Psychology mainly treats sin as a phenomenon of mental disorder which is due to faulty sentiments and complexes, and it neglects to bring into account the moral valuation of man and the evil of sin. Hence, the psychological treatment of a sinner is incomplete because of the neglect of the relevance of moral and religious factors. As far as sin and forgiveness are concerned, both psychologism and theologism should be avoided.

The psychologist and the theologian need not contradict or oppose each other. While the theologian emphasizes the wickedness and the corruptive nature of sin as man's experience as well as man's problem, the psychoanalyst could analyse these experiences and guilt feelings. The theologian's conception of sin and forgiveness is based on the biblical revelation concerning the relationship between God and man, and between man and man. Factors governing these relationships are the nature of God, the nature of man, and the nature of sin. The psychologist could analyse the various factors in the relationship of man with man, and of man with God, and could try to trace the sources of guilt, and then proceed to create the conditions of reconciliation. The cooperation of these two specialists, the psychologist and theologian, could throw light on human problems, especially the problem of sin and sickness, and could jointly attempt to find a way out of the labyrinth of these problems.

Psychology needs to search for a more adequate and effective technique for recalling all unconscious materials into consciousness. The present psychotherapy, such as interviews, consulting, hypnosis, etc., takes a long time to finish its course. The recalling of past memories is a necessary step in treating repressed guilt and the guilt-causing defect. Here an effective technique is required. If psychology could advance to a stage where the unconscious can be recalled immediately, the treatment would be easier and more effective.

Religion could prove itself invaluable when called in to assist in psychotherapeutic treatment. If a latent guilt is brought into consciousness, the patient could find health in forgiveness. The assurance of forgiveness has to be offered to the patient suffering from guilt feeling. Unless this patient desires it, no absolution can be experienced and no healing is possible.

Theology asserts that God heals. Those who dedicate themselves in the battle against disease should cooperate with God in treating the sick. Man should prepare himself to allow the power of God to operate.

Although spiritual healing is not the usual means of healing all diseases, the fact of spiritual healing is proved sufficiently by the work of Christ and that of the early church. This power can not be replaced by psychotherapy which is not a substitute for the spiritual power of the healing church. The difference is that Christ's healing power effected an immediate cure but psychotherapy acts and heals gradually and slowly.

Church fellowship which consists of and expresses itself in an atmosphere of faith, hope, and love has a high therapeutic value for sinners and the sick, especially when the illness is caused

by repression or lack of love. As sin is a self-deprivation of the love of God, these patients need to be accepted and loved in the fellowship of Christ.

Man is a complete entity and all treatment should be directed to man-as-a-whole. If any one of man's inseparable factors, namely body, mind, and soul is sick or incomplete, man is not in perfect health. Health is not only the absence of disease. Physical health is only one dimension of health which needs to be completed by spiritual and psychical health. The universality of guilt reflects that all men are not in perfect health. Forgiveness and redemption as means of treatment are urgently needed because through these men can be restored to God and be led to the way of wholeness and complete health. In other words, every man needs God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Alexander, W. Menzies. Demonic Possession in the New Testament. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902.
- Baillie, D.M. God was in Christ. London: Faber & Faber Ltd., 1947.
- Barnhart, Clarence, L. (ed.) The New Century Cyclopaedia of Names. Vol. II. New York : Appleton-Century-Crofts, INC., 1954.
- Barth, Karl. Church Dogmatics. Vol. III. Part Two: The Doctrine of Creation. eds. G.W. Bromiley & T.F. Torrance. Trans. Harold Knight; G.W. Bromiley; J.D.S. Reid; R.H. Fuller; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1961.
- _____ Church Dogmatics. Vol. III. Part Three: The Doctrine of Creation. Translated by G.W. Bromiley & R.J. Ehrlich. Edited by G.W. Bromiley & T.F. Torrance. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1961.
- _____ Church Dogmatics. Vol. III. Part Four: The Doctrine of Creation. eds. G.W. Bromiley & T.F. Torrance. Trans. A.T. Mackay; T.H.L. Parker; Harold Knight; Henry A. Kennedy & John Marks. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1961.
- _____ Church Dogmatics. Vol. IV. Part Three: Second Half: The Doctrine of Reconciliation. eds. G.W. Bromiley & T.F. Torrance. Translated by G.W. Bromiley. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1962.
- _____ Against the Stream, Shorter Post-War writings 1946-52 Edited by Gregor Smith. London: SCM Press, 1954.
- _____ The Knowledge of God and the Service of God According to the Teaching of Reformation Recalling the Scottish Confession of 1560. Translated by J.L.M Haire & Ian Henderson. London: Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., 1938.
- Berkouwer, G.C. The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth. Translated by Harry R. Boer. London: The Paternoster Press, 1956.

- Black, Matthew & Rowley, H.H. (eds). Peake's Commentary of the Bible. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd., 1964.
- Blake, Buchanan. The Meaning of Suffering in human Life. Paisley: Alexander Gardner, 1922.
- Brown, Francis; Driver, S.R. & Briggs, C.A. (eds.) Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1906.
- Brown, S.L. The Book of Hosea. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1932.
- Brunner, Emil. Dogmatics. Vol. II: The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption. Translated by Olive Wyon. London: Lutterworth Press, 1956.
- _____ Eternal Hope. trans. Harold Knight. London: Lutterworth Press, 1954.
- _____ The Divine Imperative. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.
- _____ The Mediator. London: The Lutterworth Press, 1934.
- Buttrick, George A. et alii. (eds). The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Four Vols. New York: Abingdon Press. 1962.
- _____ The Interpreter's Bible. Twelve Vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1952-57.
- Calvin, John. Calvin's Commentary on the Acts of Apostles 1-13, 14-28. Translated, by J.W. Fraser & W.J.B. McDonald, Edited by David W. Torrance & Thomas F. Torrance. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1965.
- Drever, James. A Dictionary of Psychology. London: Penguin Books. 1966.
- Davidson, Robert. The Old Testament. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1964.
- Dodd, C.H. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1960.
- Driver, S.R. A Critical & Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy. Edinburgh: T & T Clard, 1896.

- Eichrodt, Walther. Theology of The Old Testament. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Farmer, H.H. The World of God. London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1935.
- Farrer, Austin. A Study in St. Mark. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1951.
- Flugel, J.C. Man, Morals and Society: a psychoanalytical study. London: Duckworth, 1948.
- Frankfort, Hanri. Kingship and the Gods. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Freud, Sigmund. The Ego and Id. Translated by Joan Rivier. London: The Hogarth Press, 1949.
- _____ The Future of an Illusion. Translated by W.D. Robson Scott. London: The Hogarth Press, 1962.
- _____ Totem and Taboo. Translated by James Strachey. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.
- Fromm, Erich. Psychoanalysis and Religion. London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1951.
- Frost, Evelyn. Christian Healing: a consideration of the place of spiritual healing in the church of to-day in the light of the doctrine and practice of Ante-Nicene church. London: A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1954.
- Fuller, R.H. Interpreting the Miracles. London: SCM Press, 1964.
- Garlick, Phyllis L. The Wholeness of Man: A study in the history of healing. London: Highway Press, 1943.
- _____ Health and Healing. London: Edinburgh House Press, 1948.
- Gerber, Israel J. The Psychology of the Suffering Mind. New York: The Jonathan David Co., 1951.
- Grensted, L.W. Psychology and God. London: Longmans, 1931.

- Hadfield, J.A. Psychology and Morals. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1932.
- _____ Psychology and Mental Health: a contribution to developmental Psychology. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1960.
- Hartwell, Herbert.. The Theology of Karl Barth. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1960.
- Hastings, James. (ed.) The Dictionary of the Bible. 2nd ed. Revised by C.F. Grant & H.H. Rowley. T & T Clark, 1963.
- _____ Dictionary of the Christ and the Gospels. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906.
- Hendlam, Arthur C. The Miracles of the New Testament. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1914.
- Hoch, Dorothee. Healing and Salvation. London: SCM Press, 1965.
- James, William. The Varieties of Religious Experience: a study in Human Nature. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1902.
- Johnson, Paul E. Pastoral Ministration. London: James Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1964.
- Jolly, Julius. "Disease and Medicine (Hindu)", E.R.E. Vol. IV. ed. James Hastings. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. 1911.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. Psychology and Religion. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1938.
- _____ Modern Man in Search of A Soul. trans. W.S. Dell & C.F. Baynes. London: Kegan Paul. 1938.
- _____ The Integration of the Personality. Translated by S.M. Dell. London: 1940.
- Kierkegaard, S. The Sickness Unto Death. Translated with an introduction by Walter Lowrie, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946.

- Koehler, Ludwig. Old Testament Theology. trans..A.S..Todd. London: Lutterworth Press. 1957.
- _____ Hebrew Man. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Laird, John. A Study in Moral Theory. London: George Allen & Unwin 1926.
- Lambourne, R.A. Community, Church and Healing. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1963.
- Langdon, Stephen Herbert. "Sin (Babylonian)", E.R.E. 13 Vols. Ed. James Hastings. Edinburgh, T & T Clark. 1920.
- Langton, Edward. Essentials of Demonology. London: The Epworth Press, 1949.
- Lee, R.S. Your Growing Child. Britian: Penguin Books. 1965.
- Leslie, Elmer A. Jeremiah. New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.
- Livingstone, R.W. The Greek Genius and Its Meaning to us. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1912.
- McKenzie, John G. Nervous Disorder and Religion. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1947.
- _____ Nervous Disorder and Character. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1946.
- _____ Guilt, its meaning and significance. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1962.
- Manson, T.W. The Sayings of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1963.
- Martin, Bernard. The Healing Ministry in the Church. London: Lutterworth Press, 1964.
- Mitton, C. Lestie. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: The Epworth Press, 1957.
- Montgomery, James A. A Critical & Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Kings. ed. Henry Snyder Gehman. T & T Clark. 1951.

- Moule, C.F. Miracles. London: A.R. Mowbray, 1965.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. The Nature and Destiny of Man: a Christian Interpretation. Two Vols. London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1941.
- _____ Christian Realism and Political Problems. London: Faber & Faber. n.d.
- Oesterreich, T.K. Possession Demoniacal and Other. London: Kegan & Paul. 1941.
- Otto, Weber. Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics: an introductory report on volume I:1- III:4. Translated by Arthur C. Cochrane. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.
- Peake, Arthur S. The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament. London: Robert Bryant. 1904.
- Quell, Gottfried; Bertram, Beorg; Stanhlin, Gastav; & Grundmann, Walter. Sin: Bible Key Words From Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Worterbuch Zum Neuen Testament. Translated by F.R. Coates. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1951.
- Rad Von, Gerhard. Genesis. London: SCM Press, 1963.
- Richardson, Alan. The Miracle Stories of the Gospels. London: SCM Press, 1941.
- Roberts, David E. Psychotherapy and A Christian View of Man. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.
- Robinson, H.Wheeler. The Christian Doctrine of Man. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1911.
- Rowley, H.H. The Faith of Israel. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- _____ From Moses To Qumran. London: Lutterworth Press, 1964.
- _____ (ed.) The Old Testament and Modern Study: a generation of discovery and research. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1952.

- Short, A. Rendle. The Bible and Modern Medicine. The Paternoster Press, 1966.
- Smith, Charles Raimer. The Physician Examines the Bible. New York: Philosophical Library INC., 1950. Hallmark-Hebner Press.
- Smith, Henry P. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Samuel. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1958.
- Smith, Ryder. Bible Doctrine of Sin. London: The Epworth Press, 1953.
- Sterrell, Lewis Joseph. Guilt and Redemption. John Knox Press, 1957.
- Skinner, John. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1930.
- Strahan, James. The Book of Job. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1931.
- Strachan, R.H. (ed.) The Fourth Gospel. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Streeter, B.H. (ed.) The Spirit. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1951.
- Sutcliffe, Edmund F. Providence and Suffering in the New Testament. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1951.
- Thielicke, Helmut. The Ethics of Sex. trans. John W. Doberstein. London: James Clark & Co. Ltd., 1964.
- Thompson, R. Campbell. "Disease and Medicine (Assyro-Babylonian)", E.R.E. Vol. IV. ed. James Hastings. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1911.
- _____ Semitic Magic: its origins and development. London: Luzzac & Co., 1908.
- Torrance, T.F. Karl Barth: an introduction to his early theology 1910-1931. London: SCM Press, 1962.
- Tournier, Paul. A Doctor's Casebook in the Light of the Bible. London: SCM Press, 1954.
- _____ Guilt and Grace. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1962.

- Tournier, Paul. Healing of Persons. Translated by Edwin Hudson. London: Lowe & Brydone (Printers) Ltd., 1965.
- _____ The Strong and the Weak. London: SCM Press, 1963.
- Unger, Merrill Frederick. Biblical Demonology: a study of the spiritual forces behind the present world unrest. America: Van Kampen Press, INC., 1952.
- Waddington, C.H. The Ethical Animal. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1960.
- Wade, G.W. The Book of the Prophet Isaiah. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1911.
- Weatherhead, Leslie D. Psychology, Religion and Healing. London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1952.
- Whiteley, D.E.H. The Theology of St. Paul. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.
- Wilson, Michael. The Church is Healing. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- Wingren, Gustaf. Theology in Conflict. trans. Eric H. Wahlstrom. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1958.
- Winnicott, D.W. The Maturation Processes and the Facilitating Environment. London: The Hogarth Press, 1965.
- _____ The Family and Individual Development. London: Tavistock Publications Ltd., 1965.

Other Sources

Sex and Morality: A Report Presented to the British Council of Churches, October, 1966. London: SCM Press, 1966. (A Pamphlet.)

The Expository Time, January, 1967. Vol. LXXVIII. No. 4.
Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1967.

Spiritual Healing: The Report of the Church of Scotland Commission.
Edinburgh: The Saint Andrews Press, 121 George Street, 1958.

The Healing Church: The Tübingen Consultation, 1964 (World Council Studies No. 3). World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1965.
Edited by the Division of World Mission and Evangelism,
World Council of Churches, 150 route de Ferney, 1211 Geneva,
Switzerland.

Thoughts on the Tübingen Consultation: The Report of the Churches' Council of Healing, October, 1965. By T.F. Davey.
London: 16, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

The Ministry of Healing in the Church: A Handbook of Principles and Practice with Contributions from Doctors and Ministers.
Issued by the Presbyterian Church of England Sub-Committee on the Church's Ministry of Healing and the Congregational Healing and Psychology Fellowship. London: Independent Press, 1963.