THE GREAT DIVIDE:
Dividing the Individual to Preserve the Salvation Paradox

by David P. Griffith

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, December 2020

Table of Contents

—ABSTRACT— ..... **iv**
INTRODUCTION **1**
Chapter 1. PROLEGOMENA **9**
1) The issue is ultimate salvation. **9**
2) Salvation's extent matters. **11**
3) The salvation paradox infringes commonplace logic. **16**
4) "Individual" is the lesser embarrassment. **18**
5) Models suit paradoxes. **25**
6) Scripture is the signal data. **29**
7) Understanding requires whatever it takes. **31**
Chapter 2. DECEASE, DECREASE, INCREASE **36**
1) Everyone dies, followed by more. **36**
2) The godly are separated from the perishing. **39**
a) The division 39
b) The individual's role 41
c) The binaries 44
3) The godly are completed. **46**
Chapter 3. SCRIPTURE'S SALVATION PARADOX **48**
1) Everyone is ultimately saved. **48**
a) God's Will 50
b) Reality 51
c) Rationale 53
d) The ungodly 54
2) Only some are ultimately saved. **57**
a) Descriptions 58
b) Themes 60
3) Contradictions reveal fallacies. **62**
Chapter 4. THE RESPONSES **66**
1) Universalism began strong and resurges. **66**
a) To Origen 67
b) To the Cappadocians 69
c) Before Anathema 72
d) Reformation to resurgence 76

2) Exclusivism is orthodox. 84
a) Anathematizing Universalism 84
b) Subsequent creeds 85
c) Exemplary theologians 88
3) Potentialism hedges. 89
Chapter 5. UNCONVINCING TREATMENTS 94
1) Tradition lacks consensus. 94
2) Each response is problematic. 95
a) Universalism 95
b) Exclusivism 100
c) Potentialism 102
3) The responses undervalue paradox. 104
Chapter 6. DIVISIBILITY'S COHERENCE 109
1) *Individual* takes personal identity and character. 110
2) Most any metaphysic works. 112
3) Eschatology drives anthropology. 117
4) We each live through an indivisible personal identity. 125
5) We each live as a multilateral personal character. 128
6) Personal character is divided. 131
7) Scripture reflects personal identity centering divided character. 134
8) Each individual is oriented towards and away from God. 137
9) Life forms personal character, which forms life. 145
10) Evil exists. 147
11) Dividing an individual in the afterlife is realizable. 149
12) A divided individual can be modeled. 155
Chapter 7. PRESERVING THE PARADOX 162
1) After this life, godly is divided from ungodly. 162
a) Divisible individual 163
b) Not purging 165
c) Undivided personal identity 167
2) Individual afterlife divisibility allows the salvation paradox. 171
3) The divisible individual transitions into the afterlife. 173
Chapter 8. CHRISTIANITY'S DIVISIBLE INDIVIDUAL 176
1) Scriptural hints of afterlife divisibility are ignored. 176
a) Unheeded descriptions 178
b) Separating the godly predicate 180

c) Experiencing binary outcomes 182
d) "To the extent" 183
e) Divisibility in the restoration 189
2) Theologians approach Paradoxism. 190
a) Universal purging 190
b) Orthodox catharsis 192
Chapter 9. SYSTEMIC TRUTH 196
1) Paradoxism conserves anthropology. 196
2) The good news remains God's for us. 197
3) Paradoxism handles binary problems 200
4) Proportional justice survives. 201
5) Paradoxism values grace. 203
6) Afterlife decision-making is unneeded. 204
7) The community is eternal. 206
CONCLUDINGS 208
BIBLIOGRAPHY 213

—ABSTRACT—

The Church in its first several centuries split on whether Christ saved everyone or only a few, Universalism versus Exclusivism. In the sixth century, the Church settled the issue seemingly—Universalism was heretical. Within a century, Universalism became peripheral, but never perished and today regains Christian acceptance. The history of Universalism and Exclusivism from their beginnings to the present is reviewed along with what provoked the dissonance—Scripture gives contradictory accounts of salvation's extent. That is, Scripture clearly says everyone is ultimately saved and just as clearly that everyone is not. Each side, of course, can exegete the competing account out of contention, but none has done so so convincingly that Exclusivism has been unseated from the orthodox position or that Universalism has been finished off entirely, because Scripture *is* clear in what it says if not what it means: Everyone is saved *and* not everyone is. The principle of noncontradiction, therefore, explains the dispute's persistence. A few theologians have tried to accept the truth of contradictions, but they have been as successful as those trying to accept the truth of falsehoods. Unlike Exclusivism, Universalism, or the unintelligible, the thesis takes Scripture's two accounts of salvation's extent as a paradox. The approach taken is similar to that with other Scriptural paradoxes, such as God is both three and one or Christ is both God and man. These appear contradictory too, and heresies took them that way, but the Church, to accept Scripture completely, received the contraries as paradoxical. Just as the Trinity can be *three* in *one* or the hypostatic union can be *two* in *one*, every*one* can be *two* if we rethink what we think we know about who we are—the individual, though etymologically and normally indivisible, is divisible after this life. With this understanding, an individual can be ultimately saved and unsaved, and Scripture's paradox of salvation's extent can be entirely true.

INTRODUCTION

God turned to speak to me
(Don't anybody laugh);
God found I wasn't there—
At least not over half.

—Robert Frost[1]

Salvation's extent is a Christian aporia. Christians disagree on whether Christ saves everyone or just some, but agree on the obvious: Not even Christ can do both. The disagreement emerges from their Scripture, which gives both accounts of salvation's extent and which justifies the notion, if justification were needed, that contradicting accounts cannot be totally true. So, Scriptural traditions creatively dissolve the contradiction by choosing which account to embrace and which to refrain from embracing. Exclusivist orthodoxy reconstrues the account that says everyone is saved so that Scripture never says it, and a Universalist minority, preferring that account, negates Scripture's repeated descriptions to the contrary. That is the real problem: Scripture offers a paradox that says everyone will and will not be saved, and all sides reformulate the accounts so that Scripture says only one or the other. The Church typically handles Scriptural paradoxes better. Despite the tempting nuances that heresies have offered to simplify the answers, the Church accepted such riddles as God's oneness *and* threeness and Christ's true divinity *and* true humanity. Unfortunately, by the sixth century, the Church had exhausted itself on such issues before understanding salvation's extent and, after recovering, was beyond fighting over more paradoxes. So, the Church settled for simplicity and choose Exclusivism, some were saved and some were not. The second place finisher, Universalism, was even simpler. The Church never acknowledged that somehow all of Scripture is actually true in saying everyone both will and will not be saved.

The thesis purports to do that—accept both contraries without unlearning the principle of noncontradiction—by modeling the individual's divisibility. Each person can be saved *and* each not, which leaves Scripture's salvation paradox as it should be—true. Admittedly, dividing the individual, who is practically, normally, and definitionally indivisible, is a high price, but no higher than that paid for other Scriptural paradoxes, each worth the cost of rethinking the irrefutable. The divisibility proposed is not that associated with biological death, where the vanishing cadaver leaves an afterlife remainder, typically labeled *soul*. What constitutes the remainder, which is presumably spiritual and

[1] "Ten Mills," in *Complete Poems* (New York: Holt, 1967), IX,5-8.

definitely not zoological, is left to those dealing with that topic. The thesis, rather, divides whatever the remainder is, which clearly includes how we have lived—our character. The personal character lives with roughly two paramount outlooks, directions, alignments, mindsets (*phroneite*), or, broadly termed, orientations.[2] These dueling orientations are godly and selfish, relating to God favorably or sinning, whether from pride or cowardice, and they cohabitate in each of us. This is incontrovertible for one person, is based on good authority from many, and is confidently presumed of nearly everyone else. To the observation that the character is conflicted in life, the thesis adds the novelty that it is divisible afterwards. This unconventional idea takes nine chapters to explain.

CHAPTER 1 clarifies several preparatory issues, including the meaning of the central issue—ultimate[3] salvation. Ultimate (or final) salvation requires, not just this life, but its end. Salvation is eschatological,[4] "the fulfilment of all time," Barth's phrase.[5] Salvation is obviously not merely ultimate, including every moment until then, but the ultimate is when everyone is saved or not and when the Universalist and Exclusivist answers diverge. The chapter justifies addressing this issue despite the contemporary sheepishness about paradoxes, death, and objective truth. Salvation's extent, though often deemed too contentious or speculative, must be understood because questions demand answers. If not answered intelligently, answers come otherwise. The fundamental hurdle is that salvation's extent consists of two propositions in paradox. Fortunately, neither propositions nor paradoxes intimidate Christians, who believe ideas like dying to live. The salvation paradox also suffers because it pertains to individuals, which is associated with "individualism," but this too is unavoidable because individuals, Thomas reminds, cannot be reduced to universals.[6] This is particularly true in salvation; we can be treated like cattle elsewhere, but, Kierkegaard noted, not in salvation.[7] Finally, the authority on salvation's

---

[2] Erich Fromm, *Man for Himself* (New York: Henry Holt, 1990), 57-59.

[3] "Ultimate" has qualitative and quantitative meanings. John A.T. Robinson, *In the End, God* (Eugene: Cascade, 2011), 37. Here it includes both—fulfillment of purpose and the ending.

[4] "Eschatology" is similarly inclusive. Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, trans. James W. Leitch (London: SCM, 2002), 112. It is what lasts and what comes last. Sarah Harding, *Paul's Eschatological Anthropology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 68-69, 96.

[5] *Epistle to the Romans*, trans. Edwyn C. Hoskyns, 6th ed. (Oxford Univ. Press, 1976), 498 (13:11-12).

[6] Adam Schaff, *Marxism and the Human Individual*, trans. Olgierd Wogjasiewicz (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970), 49-50, 53, 84, 107.

[7] *The Sickness Unto Death*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong (Princeton Univ. Press, 1980), 123.

extent is identified, which means tackling such issues as tradition's relationship to Scripture.[8]

CHAPTER 2 outlines the framework of ultimate salvation in which its paradox rests. While salvation's *ex*tent is paradoxical, its bewildering *con*tent is mostly settled: We live with death, die, and experience the binaries of eternal life for the godly or of perdition for the ungodly. These parameters triangulate the salvation paradox, which Jesus delivers—a sign of contradiction (ἀντιλεγόμενον) producing our division (διαμερισμόν, Luke 2:34, 12:51), bisecting us (διχάσαι, Mat. 10:34-35). Though Universalists and Exclusivists agree salvation relates to this life and at least some of us experience eternal life, they disagree whether any of us suffer its negation. This is not the only salvation dispute, but the others are left undisturbed because, no matter their resolution, the salvation paradox abides in them, preserved or not. For example, whether salvation extends to faith alone or faith plus works leaves the Christian consensus that godliness, broadly understood, relates to salvation's extent.

CHAPTER 3 sets out Scripture's paradoxical accounts of salvation's extent. Universalism is well represented. There is "one God and Father of *all* who is over *all*, through *all*, and in *all*" (Eph. 4:6), each "all" a substantive of πᾶς, meaning everyone. Because Christ "wills *all* men saved" and "gave Himself ransom exchange for *all*" (1Ti. 2:4, 6), "God's grace, saving to all men, *has appeared*" (Tit. 2:11), the aorist indicative verb actualizing Universalism. Paul explains: Christ's salvation must be as thorough as Adam's thoroughly infectious sin, reaching "all men" (Rom. 5:12-21). So, God saves "all men, most especially [μάλιστα] those believing" (1Ti. 4:10), which emphasizes that none fewer than everyone is saved. Scripture is equally expressive on Exclusivism. In the consummation, the evil are "gathered and burned in" "the fiery furnace" (Mat. 13:24-50). Christ will "separate men from each other" and the cursed will suffer "eternal castigation," a "torment[]" in "fire" (25:31-46; Luke 16:19-31). Those not abiding in Christ are "like the branch cast away to wither" (John 15:6). While "many" traverse "the way leading to the destruction," only "few" traverse "the way leading to the life" (Mat. 7:13-14). In the end, God's wrath inundates the cosmos, likened to Sodom's brimstone and Noah's flood (Luke 17:26-30//Mat. 24:37-39), "an example of suffering eternal fire's punishment" (Jude 7). Given these contradictory accounts, one must be false. So, both

[8] "Scripture" refers to the Hebrew Scriptures and the NT. *Scripture*, 4 vols., vol. IV, Baker Encyclopedia of the Bib. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988), 1915; Norman L. Geisler, *Systematic Theology*, One Vol. ed. (Minneapolis: BethanyHouse, 2011), 383-402.

Exclusivists and Universalists unwind the paradox by downgrading their opponent's Scriptural basis. Exclusivists take *all people* as *all believers* so that, wherever Scripture says everyone is saved, only believers are; and Universalists take God's wrath as a passing phase so that, wherever Scripture speaks of the damned, no one truly is. This chapter, in contrast, takes the accounts as written without anticipating the logic collision they are obviously bound for.

CHAPTER 4 presents the Church's responses to this paradox. The contesting positions have been two, and they were competitive until the sixth century, when Exclusivists prevailed and anathematized Universalism. Because Christians have abided within that resolution since then, an extended survey of Christian Universalists is given to counterbalance Exclusivism's dominance, which is primarily reflected in Christianity's creeds. In reviewing the Church's Universalism and Exclusivism, this chapter strives for even-handedness as it juggles thoroughness with brevity. The surveys find 1) Universalism began strong, convincing luminaries like Origen, Athanasius, Hilary of Poitiers, Gregory of Nyssa, John Cassian, and Maximus, and flourishes as a minority, whose modern notables include Schleiermacher, Tillich, Barclay, Moltmann, and Hart, and 2) Exclusivism has predominated, led by such greats as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil of Caesarea, Augustine, John Damascene, Thomas, Luther, Calvin, and the authors of every extant Christian confession for over a thousand years. No one has taken any but these two positions, though a twentieth-century Exclusivist subset, with worthies like Barth and Balthasar, claims Universalism is potentially, not actually, true (here designated "Potentialism").

CHAPTER 5 explains why these positions disappoint. Each response treats its preferred account as sincerely true and its opposite as facially so, all to make Scripture intelligible, though some Potentialists say Scripture is unintelligible. Exclusivists, grounded in how obviously Scripture says eternal life is not for everyone, suffer a sort of semantic anomia when encountering Scriptural words like *all* in connection with *salvation*. Universalists, like Scripture's false prophets, say all will be well despite the seriousness of the rebellion. Potentialists mostly say everyone is saved potentially, which Exclusivists espousing unlimited atonement say anyway. The chapter does not referee the theological conflict so much as find no side convinces when rejecting its opposition. Said differently, much like heresies tried with the paradoxes of the Trinity and Christ's natures, each side deflates Scripture's paradox to one proposition, while treating the other proposition as a misdirect.

CHAPTER 6, the longest, sets the table for the individual's division. It reviews the thought history and current perspectives on what we think we know about who we are in this life and who continues into the next. Addressed but found wanting are views saying the self is a fiction or an organic robot. Instead, the subject is as Wollheim, who appropriated Kierkegaard, aptly described as one who leads a life.[9] This self is often assumed to be indivisible. The body explains this sense, but it divides even in this life (*e.g.*, amputation) and always does, at least eventually and then thoroughly, in death. The terrestrial body's most pertinent limitation is that an afterlife[10] lacks one. The individual is then either discarnate[11] or transphysical. This supposed belittlement of the earthly physique sounds antiquated and is, thus, addressed repeatedly.[12] Irrespective of the body and any other ontological inventory, an individual is incurably a personal character formed in life with memories, beliefs, and preferences centered on personal identity's first-person awareness. Accordingly, an afterlife must include the personal character to be the self and must include the personal identity to be experienced. The personal character is semi-divided for the healthy (*e.g.*, internal dialogue) and pathologically so for the unhealthy (*e.g.*, dissociative identity disorder). Scripture certainly describes the character as divided: Two ways are choosable, and we each choose both. We are not two beings, but two modes of being. As Paul observed, the self is metaphorically two selves by literally living two ways (Rom. 7:19-21). So, our character forms as we lead a life, and, because it is conflicted in this life, its division afterwards is understandable, almost plausible.

CHAPTER 7 takes what prior chapters establish: Everyone is ultimately saved and not everyone is, contradictions entail falsehood, and individuals are conceptually divisible. These particulars lead to the ineluctable but unprecedented conclusion: The individual suffers divisibility in the afterlife. Rather than godly individuals being separated from ungodly ones as tradition sees it, godly can be separated from ungodly as to each

---

[9] *The Thread of Life* (Harvard Univ. Press, 1984), 1.

[10] "Afterlife" has two common meanings: every existence after this life or only the intermediate existence after this life but before the resurrection. N.T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 30-31. Here it means the former. "Heaven" is avoided as it tends to be God's dwelling, not the deads' (1Th. 4:16). Paula Gooder, *Heaven* (London: SPCK, 2011), 79-80. "Afterlife" definitely does not refer to others continuing to live after death. Samuel Scheffler, *Death and the Afterlife* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2013), 15, 64. That is just death. Ingolf U. Dalferth, *Creatures of Possibility*, trans. Jo Bennett (Grand Rapids: BakerAcademic, 2016), 143.

[11] "Discarnate" is lacking a natural body, but can include any "subtle body," a finite extent from which existence is experienced. Peter Moore, *Where Are the Dead?* (New York: Routledge, 2017), 186.

[12] Robert Song, *Covenant and Calling* (London: SCM, 2014), xv.

individual. Accordingly, one individual can have eternal life and perdition. Because Scripture says everyone is both saved and not and because the noncontradiction principle is, though ignorable, unbreakable, something must give, and that something is the individual. It splits. This differs critically from purging, which is traditional. Purging removes ungodliness from the individual and, as a result, does not address the salvation paradox—it damns no one. Dividing an individual, in contrast, results in one who is saved and one who is not. The thesis, in striving for the orthodoxy of honoring what Scripture says entirely, is thereby unorthodox in the sense of unheard of. Like Christianity generally, the thesis foolishly chooses both of Scripture's paradoxical sides to scandalously arrive at the incredible. Accordingly, Scripture's accounts of salvation's extent are not as they have been taken—poorly worded—but entirely true.

CHAPTER 8 is defensive. While the thesis builds on the paradox that Scripture presents, this chapter sets out how Scripture hints at the answer the thesis offers—individual afterlife divisibility. The exegesis is mostly original and, hence, probationary, but exploits the greater literalness the thesis allows. For instance, when Jesus says self-amputation is better than perdition entirely, might He have meant something like that—perdition partly? Jesus gives persons division (διαμερισμόν), which tradition takes as dividing persons into two groups, one of unbelievers, but Jesus says the division He brings divides a person into two (διχοτομήσει), one part (μέρος) for unbelieving (Luke 12:46, 51). The NT also frequently uses ἐάν, which combines *if* with additional contingency (ἄν), and this could mean conditional in both kind (from *if*) and degree (from ἄν), which English expresses with *to the extent*. So understood, salvation is "to the extent" godly. Certain grammar oddities, conventionally taken as unproductive, are reexamined too and found suggestive. For instance, the NT uses comparative adjectives for the saved and damned, plainly expressing degree in salvation and damnation, though traditionally understood as not really meaning that. The NT also uses neuter, not personal, nouns (*e.g.*, πᾶν and αὐτὸ) to describe *what*, not *who*, is saved and damned. In one instance, Jesus says He wants fellowship with *what* (ὃ) the Father has given Him (John 17:24). Correct grammar demands *who* (οὓς), which a few early copyists "corrected" it to, but the best manuscripts kept *what*, forcing exegetes to interpret it as *who* anyway. Individual division, however, justifies the canonical wording—personal qualities, not persons altogether, are saved. A person's divisibility might seem deranged, but, upon reflection, is sincerely so (2Co. 5:13). The chapter ends with a discourse on a few Universalists like Origen and Bulgakov and Exclusivists like Balthasar and Pannenberg, who, without dividing the individual

to account for the salvation paradox, resort to similar descriptions to account for how persons have eternal life despite endemic ungodliness.

CHAPTER 9 reviews whether individual divisibility disturbs Christian doctrines other than salvation's extent, such as anthropology, and, conveniently, no innovations are required. Dividing the individual after this life changes only those doctrines it intends to—none. The individual, who traditionally bears purging, bears divisibility, and that is all. Related to every chapter, especially this last, are the numerous doctrines the proposed model leaves undisturbed. Not developed is soteriology, whether its nature or means, or the resurrection, whether Christ's or generally, because doing so is unnecessary for the salvation paradox. Accordingly, the thesis sidesteps many issues in the same doctrinal domain, such as what constitutes, comprises, or accounts for being human, the extent to which eschatology is realized or not-yet, whether there is an intermediate state, whether perdition is torment or annihilation, or how the final judgment is administered. One paradox at a time is enough.

As this introduction manifests, the approach is conceptual. That is, while pertinent scholarship is reviewed and relied on for premises and context, the thesis is not an evaluation of what any one theologian thinks or any comparison or combination of select theologians produces. While some have more influence than others, none negotiates the salvation paradox as a paradox. On that issue, the position has been everyone will be saved, not everyone will be, or a compromise, everyone will be potentially. Each side retreats to its favored ghetto fortified by the obvious Scripture for its preferred expression and protected by the well-rehearsed exegetics for pounding the other side, but the theological shadowboxing convinces only partisans because Scripture has both accounts. No one takes the position Scripture takes: Everyone will and will not be saved. Thus, focusing on any theologian or any handful misses the point. Accordingly, the thesis cannot to manage focus (or word count) be circumscribed by isolating on specific theologians. It relies on the singularity of the salvation paradox. The thesis takes the expressed insights of various theologians (and others) for their wisdom without taking on their corpus.[13] In surveying broadly, it distills the scholarship and treats the convergence, motivated by the cultural embarrassment in how the salvation paradox has been reduced to contradiction. Even if individual divisibility is the wrong approach, the project is called for, certainly

[13] Tom Greggs, *Barth, Origen, and Universal Salvation* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2009), 13; Robert W. Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2 vols., vol. II (Oxford Univ. Press, 1999), vi; Nicholas Lash, *Easter in Ordinary* (Univ. Press of Virginia, 1988), 7.

beforehand and definitely after. As the Gregorys anticipated, "I do not wish the Word to save only half of me,"[14] even if it means I must be "at once conjoined and separated."[15]

[14] Gregory of Nazianzus, "Concerning His Own Life," in *Autobiographical Poems*, ed. Carolinne White (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996), 58-59 (ln 626).

[15] Gregory of Nyssa, "Letter 35," in *The Letters*, ed. Anna M. Silvas (Boston: Brill, 2007), ¶ 4 (p. 255).

Chapter 1. PROLEGOMENA

> *The ancients used to say: Animals are instructed by their organs. I will add: Men are too, but they have the advantage of being able to instruct their organs in their turn.*
>
> —Goethe[1]

This first chapter strives for a shared beginning by establishing agreement on several preliminary issues through convincing or concession. It defines the issue that each chapter explores, which is *salvation*; it upholds the unruly understanding that the paper's second half offers, which is *paradox*; it explains what this understanding abuses in Chapter 6, which is *individual*; it justifies what does the abusing in Chapter 7, which is *model*; and it recognizes the resources used throughout, which is, with any other truth, *Scripture*.

1) The issue is ultimate salvation.

"There is only one way," Socrates observed, "for those to begin who are to take counsel wisely about anything. One must know what the counsel is about, or it is sure to be utterly futile …. [S]ince we are to discuss the question, … let us first agree on a definition."[2] Most concur explicitly with this approach,[3] including Calvin, "I certainly am dull enough to refer everything to the definition …."[4] The finest definition of *salvation*, at least since Luke the Evangelist, is "eternal[5] life" (Luke 18:18, 30; Acts 13:46, 48).[6] This is

---

[1] 17 Mar. 1832 letter to Humboldt, translated in Barker Fairley, "Goethe's Last Letter," *Univ. of Toronto Quarterly* 27, no. 1 (1957): 1.

[2] Plato, "Phaedrus," in *Euthyphro, et al.*, ed. Chris Emlyn-Jones and William Preddy (Harvard Univ. Press, 2017), 237C-D.

[3] David L. Allen, *The Extent of Atonement* (Nashville: B&H, 2016), xxi; Epictetus, *Discourses*, trans. William A. Oldfather, 2 vols., vol. I (Harvard Univ. Press, 1956), I,xvii,12, II,xvii,5-13 (pp. 117, 339-41); John of Damascus, "Fount of Knowledge," in *St John of Damascus Writings* (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1958), I,8 (p. 26).

[4] *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2012), III,4,1 (p. 407).

[5] Αἰώνιος suffers theologically motivated translations. David Bentley Hart, *The New Testament* (Yale Univ. Press, 2017), 537-43. Using its traditional translation, *eternal*, avoids a lexical detour and, as *eschatological duration*, which it clearly means, suffices. F. Danker et al., eds., *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd [BDAG] ed. (Univ. of Chicago Press, 2000), 33; Joachim Guhrt, "Time-Aion," in *New Int'l Dict. of NT Theology*, ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 826-33; *New Int'l Dict. of NT Theology and Exegesis* 2nd ed., s.v. "aion."

The lexical detour can be sketched. Αἰώνιος originally meant something like *live much* and came to mean *unending* or *prolonged* (unlike ἀΐδιος, a metaphysics term that always meaning *endless*). To Universalists, therefore, the meaning of ἀἰωνιός is flexible enough to mean *permanent* in ἀἰωνιός life and *temporary* in ἀἰωνιός perdition. Ilaria L.E. Ramelli and David Konstan, *Terms for Eternity* (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2013), 5-70, 82, 94-95, 114-17, 237-39. However, by all accounts αἰωνιός in the NT includes *the world to come* (ibid., 19), and, because "eternal" includes that stipulatively, the traditional rendering not only suffices but avoids turning translation into exegesis, if not eisegesis.

[6] Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, ed. Robert Yarbrough and Robert H. Stein, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 463; Robert H. Stein, *Luke*, ed. David S. Dockery, NAC (Nashville: Broadman, 1992),

also the meaning that the NT gives it generally (*e.g.*, John 6:40).[7] Salvation is rightly relating to God, and eternal life is its content.[8] In Christ's spoken language, *salvation* and *life* are fittingly the same word (*chayyê*).[9] Salvation is our life with God.[10]

Salvation has two aspects—beginning and completion, justification and sanctification, or being holy and becoming holy.[11] As widely accepted, therefore, salvation requires not just this life but its end.[12] The earthly life experiences salvation fractionally in a continuum with salvation ultimately.[13] Salvation is eschatological.[14] While grounded in the present, it is largely future oriented,[15] "the fulfilment of all time," Barth formulated.[16] This is not confusing its way with its destination,[17] but the distinction is explicit: Salvation is the way to the destination (1Pe. 1:9).[18] One need not side with the mystical conclusion, "Death is the entrance to eternal life,"[19] to realize salvation, while beginning with faith in this life, is completed with promise in the next.[20]

315-16.

[7] Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the NT*, trans. Kendrick Grobel, 2 vols. (Baylor Univ. Press, 2007), II: 41.2 (p. 7).

[8] G.C. Berkouwer, *Man: Image of God*, trans. Dirk W. Jellema (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 99, 144, 243; Colin E. Gunton, *Father, Son and Holy Spirit* (New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 90.

[9] F.F. Bruce, *Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 76.

[10] Carlo Leget, "Eschatology," in *Theology of Thomas Aquinas*, ed. Rik van Nieuwenhove and Joseph Wawrykow (Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 2005), 369-70; Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, trans. Fellows of St Alban and St Sergius (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002), 135.

[11] Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics IV/2*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), § 66.1 (p. 503); Terence Nichols, *Death and Afterlife* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2010), 153, 160.

[12] Barth, *Romans*, 167 (5:12); Stanley J. Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 446-47; Christina M. Gschwandtner, "Fully Alive?," in *The Role of Death in Life*, ed. John Behr and Conor Cunningham (Eugene: Cascade, 2015), 72; Henry L. Novello, "New Life as Life out of Death," Ibid., 99, 115, 119; Gerald G. O'Collins, "Salvation," in *Anchor Bib. Dict.*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 911-12.

[13] Christiaan Mostert, *God and the Future* (New York: T&T Clark, 2002), 113; O'Collins, "Salvation," 911.

[14] David W. Congdon, *The God Who Saves* (Eugene: Cascade, 2016), 64.

[15] Brenda B. Colijn, *Images of Salvation in the NT* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2010), 125.

[16] *Romans*, 498 (13:11-12).

[17] Johannes Hoff, "The Rise and Fall of the Kantian Paradigm," in *Grandeur of Reason*, ed. Peter M. Candler, Jr. and Conor Cunningham (London: SCM, 2010), 190.

[18] Philip G. Ziegler, *Militant Grace* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2018), 10-11.

[19] Adrienne von Speyr, *Mystery of Death*, trans. Graham Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1988), 82.

[20] Martinus C. de Boer, *The Defeat of Death* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1988), 177; Soren Kierkegaard, *Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong (Princeton Univ. Press, 1990), 28-29; N.T. Wright, *Surprised by Hope* (New York: HarperOne, 2008), 197.

Salvation as eternal life, though entirely good, implies the opposite of good. This is because, while omitting anything negative,[21] it evokes the negative in that salvation is being saved from something, whether from ourselves or another force.[22] This in turn involves a process that leads to the judgment that fixes one's relation to eternal life, one's individual existence in God.[23] Thus, the alternative to eternal life, the opposite of salvation, is exclusion from it, the ultimate negation, which is variously termed perishing, perdition, annihilation, damnation, or eternal death (*e.g.*, John 3:16).[24]

2) <u>Salvation's extent matters.</u>

Avoiding the issue of salvation's extent is de rigueur in contemporary society.[25] It has become, Moltmann sensed, "'confessional witch-hunting' and banished from public life."[26] Previously, the question of who had eternal life and who did not was deadly serious.[27] As late as three centuries ago, Joseph Butler could assert, "Whether we are to live in a future state … is the most important question which can possibly be asked."[28] After a century of enlightenment, Kierkegaard detected: "eternal salvation seems to have become … a loose and idle phrase, … virtually forgotten … or indifferently set aside," "retained only because it is so quaint."[29] Then, in the thick of postmodernism, Bonhoeffer asked, "Hasn't the individualistic question about personal salvation almost completely left us all?"[30]

The apathy about salvation's extent has been partly because of the staleness in the stalemate between Universalism and Exclusivism.[31] No side has so carried the day that the also-rans had to concede the field; so, to avoid another *filioque*, Scripture's antimony

---

[21] D. Stephen Long, *The Perfectly Simple Triune God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016), 170.

[22] Colijn, *Images of Salvation*, 122, 141; Bruce Demarest, *The Cross and Salvation* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2006), 26-27; Lossky, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 135.

[23] Romano Guardini, *Freedom, Grace, and Destiny*, trans. John Murray (New York: Pantheon, 1961), 226-28.

[24] Demarest, *Cross and Salvation*, 31; Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols., vol. II (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1975), 165.

[25] Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics*, trans. John Vriend, vol. IV (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 704; Vernon White, *Life Beyond Death* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2006), 2.

[26] *Theology of Hope*, 307.

[27] Gerald L. Bray, *God Has Spoken* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2014), 494.

[28] *Analogy of Religion* (New York: Robert Carter, 1750), 298.

[29] *Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses*, 254.

[30] *Letters and Papers from Prison*, trans. Reginald Fuller, et al., Enlarged ed. (New York: Touchstone, 1997), 286.

[31] David L. Edwards, *After Death?* (New York: Cassell, 1999), 1; David Bentley Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved* (Yale Univ. Press, 2019), 4-5, 28.

on salvation's extent becomes a *mokita*, an unspoken but well-known truth.[32] If faced with the issue, honest observers concede the obvious: Each side has much in its favor. Yet, both Universalism and Exclusivism cannot be true. Therefore, Christians, when treating the issue at all, root for their chosen side based on tiebreakers, such as a perceived hegemonic hermeneutic.[33]

Whether any answer to salvation's extent is true seems evadable because of the resurgence in the doubt expressed in Pilate's "what's truth?,"[34] but the straightforward answer is: Truth is the way things are.[35] None of us actually lives to the contrary.[36] To any claim the way things are is nonexistent or unknowable, Hegel's reminder that beasts find food suffices for anyone without a death wish.[37] Truth, though basic, drives thinking,[38] and less truth is less reality.[39] For Christians, truth is apprehending reality,[40] to which Christ witnesses (John 18:37). "Truth is the measure of being and, therefore, the expression of what *is*," Balthasar summarized.[41] What truth is *not* is anything else. Truth is not what works well, though this helps.[42] Nor is truth relative,[43] what feels good,[44] or always pretty.[45] Admittedly, as Nietzsche bemoaned, truth so understood restricts freedom,[46] but reality is like that, obstinately resisting both reductionism and relativism.

---

[32] Andrew David Naselli, "Conclusion," in *Perspectives on the Extent of Atonement*, ed. Andrew David Naselli and Mark A. Snoeberger (Nashville: B&H, 2015), 222-23.

[33] Michael J. McClymond, *The Devil's Redemption*, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2018), II: 1049.

[34] Joseph Ratzinger, *Truth and Tolerance*, trans. Henry Taylor (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2004), 72.

[35] Etienne Gilson, *The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy*, trans. A.H.C. Downes (Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 2009), 267; Charles Hartshorne, *The Logic of Perfection* (Lasalle: Open Court, 1962), 165; Steven Horst, *Cognitive Pluralism* (MIT Press, 2016), 12; John Locke, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975), IV,V,2, 9.

[36] Iain McGilchrist, *The Master and His Emissary*, Expanded ed. (Yale Univ. Press, 2019), 151.

[37] Hannah Arendt, "Willing," in *The Life of the Mind*, ed. Mary McCarthy (San Diego: Harcourt, 1978), 116, 119; Charles Taylor, *Hegel* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995), 353.

[38] Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Logic*, trans. Adrian J. Walker, 3 vols., vol. I (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2000), 25-27, 35-36, 39, 208; Johann Georg Hamann, "Golgotha and Sheblimini!," in *Hamann: Writings on Philosophy and Language*, ed. Kenneth Haynes (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2009), 176-77; John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1978), 3.

[39] Plato, *The Republic*, trans. G.M.A. Grube (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1974), 585c.

[40] Elster, *Sour Grapes*, 148; Gregory of Nyssa, *The Life of Moses*, trans. Abraham J. Malherbe and Everett Ferguson (New York: Harper, 2006), Bk II (p. 38).

[41] *Theo-Logic*, I, 75.

[42] Lash, *Easter in Ordinary*, 87.

[43] Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, 271.

[44] William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (New York: Random House, 1902), 17.

[45] Walter Pater, *Marius the Epicurean* (New York: Penguin, 1985), 263.

[46] "The Genealogy of Morals," in *The Birth of Tragedy and the Genealogy of Morals* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1956), 3rd,XXIV (p. 287).

The better explanation for the silence surrounding salvation's extent lies in religion's concession to secularism: being judgmental is, with full sincerity, judged wicked.[47] "The question of our destiny is terrifying, even painful, when we have the naivete of believing in it," Blondel complained.[48] Damnation joined the Devil as either Scriptural imagery or outmoded distraction, and its extent joined the Crusades and Inquisition as a Christian evil.[49] William James discerned "the old-fashioned Christian" concerned "with the salvation of his soul" became "something sickly and reprehensible rather than admirable …."[50] Death itself became taboo.[51] So, in the Enlightenment and its progeny, salvation's extent is argued wholeheartedly only on scholarship's margins.[52] Polite non-evangelicals focus on fundamentals like ontology or Trinity and on applications like ecclesiology or ethics.[53] Salvation's extent drops between.[54] The Nietzschean error that only utility counts infects the debate.[55] Salvation's hope is escapism,[56] Marx's opium.[57] Pragmatists ask "What is its cash-value?"[58] The central question became, *Are we happier yet*?[59]

Because understanding is irresistible,[60] however, salvation's extent flares periodically, and this is one of those times, especially where doctrines are debated more than

---

47 Moore, *Where Are the Dead?*, 220, 225.

48 *Action (1893)*, trans. Oliva Blanchette (Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1984), 16 [1].

49 Henry Dwight Sedgwick, *Life of Marcus Aurelius* (Yale Univ. Press, 1922), 247.

50 *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 89.

51 Bernard N. Schumacher, *Death and Mortality in Contemporary Philosophy*, trans. Michael J. Miller (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011), 1.

52 Jerry L. Walls, ed. *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 14-15.

53 John Milbank, *The Word Made Strange* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1997), 1-4.

54 Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, trans. Graham Harrison, 5 vols., vol. V (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1998), 373.

55 Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 45; Guardini, *Freedom, Grace, and Destiny*, 37.

56 Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*, trans. James Strachey (New York: W.W. Norton, 1961), 36-38, 63, 69; Wolfhart Pannenberg, "The Task of Christian Eschatology," in *The Last Things*, ed. Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002), 1 (reporting modern view).

57 Karl Marx, "A Contribution to the Critique … Introduction," in *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, ed. Joseph O'Malley (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1982), 131.

58 James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 433.

59 Yuval Noah Harari, *Sapiens* (New York: Harper, 2015), 376-77.

60 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica, Part II-II*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1920), Q. 180, art. 7, co; Aristotle, *Metaphysics: Books 1-9*, trans. Hugh Tredennick (Harvard Univ. Press, 1989), 980a 22; Peter M. Candler, Jr. and Conor Cunningham, eds., *The Grandeur of Reason* (London: SCM, 2010), 2.

enforced.[61] This is opportune because each truth matters[62] and any vacuum fills with error, not open-mindedness.[63] "It is one of the peculiar qualities of the human mind that, when confronted with a contradiction, it cannot remain passive," Fromm saw.[64] Rosenzweig observed, "better the rashest hypothesis than … a question mark."[65] More to the point, theology explicates truth.[66] "There is nothing," Gregory of Nyssa recognized, "more saving for Christians than true theology,"[67] and salvation is no exception. It is not "God's secret will and counsel," Luther wrote, but "revealed to us in His Word."[68] Salvation is the "end of faith" (1Pe. 1:9). Hence, salvation is no McGuffin, a prop motivating the plot that is unexplained.[69] Rather, salvation asks *What happens to my relationship with God?*[70] If everyone is saved or only some, this portrays the God saving, whether His holiness or charity, His justice or mercy, His will or love.[71]

Perhaps more importantly and definitely more immediately, salvation's extent matters to living.[72] "The future determines the present," Hamann noted.[73] Only viable aspirations serve the outcome.[74] No matter how many ups and downs there are beforehand, only the end decides victory or defeat.[75] The "fundamental structure of our present life

---

61 John Sanders, "Raising Hell About Razing Hell," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 40, no. 3 (2013): 267-81.

62 Gunton, *Father, Son and Holy Spirit*, 74; William James, *Essays in Radical Empiricism*, ed. Frederick H. Burkhardt, et al., The Works (Harvard Univ. Press, 1976), 81.

63 Karl Barth, "Preface to Second Edition," in *The Epistle to the Romans* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1976), 4.

64 *Man for Himself*, 44.

65 "The Life," in *His Life and Thought*, ed. Nahum N. Glatzer (New York: Schocken Books, 1953), 8 (diary 15 Mar. 1906).

66 Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 1, 4; Ralph Martin, *Will Many Be Saved?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 172; John Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 2003), 217.

67 "Letter 34," ¶ 1 (p. 246).

68 *Commentary on Genesis*, trans. J. Theodore Mueller, 2 vols., vol. II (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1958), 19 (22:15-19).

69 Johanne Stubbe Teblgjaerg Kristensen, *Body and Hope* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 15-16.

70 Leget, "Eschatology," 373.

71 Paul Badham, *Christian Beliefs About Life after Death* (London: SPCK, 1978), 74; Congdon, *The God Who Saves*, 24; White, *Life Beyond Death*, 37.

72 Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Life out of Death*, trans. Davis Perkins (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 14-17; Neil Gillman, *The Death of Death* (Woodstock: Jewish Lights, 2006), 247; Moore, *Where Are the Dead?*, 218-19.

73 "Cloverleaf of Hellenistic Letters," 46.

74 Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory*, 173; Mostert, *God and the Future*, 23; Julia Watkin, "Kierkegaard--Dying and Eternal Life as Paradox" (PhD Diss., Univ. of Bristol, 1979), 52-55.

75 Wolfhart Pannenberg, "Constructive and Critical Functions of Christian Eschatology," *HTR* 77, no. 2 (1984): 124; *What Is Man?*, trans. Duane A. Priebe (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970), 43-44.

can only be understood on the basis of its reaching out towards the future," Rahner reasoned.[76] History fills with the lesson: Whether Apostles, medieval greats, or abolitionist Evangelicals, those doing the most good in this life think the most about the next,[77] because the most difficult path is endurable when triumph awaits.[78] Thus, individual eschatology, while implicating an individual's ending,[79] is not absorbed by this.[80] Instead, salvation's extent tells each of us, the self-absorbed, what lasts.[81] Sensing the end enables us to work towards it.[82] Otherwise human destiny is nothingness.[83] James observed, "Back of everything is the great spectre of universal death, the all-encompassing blackness …. This sadness lies at the heart of every merely … naturalistic scheme of philosophy."[84] Atheists accept, "Absolute peace prevails only in the graveyard," but "To a believer … life is always meaningful."[85] Paul agreed (1Co. 15:19).[86] Kierkegaard discerned, "the most appalling meaning is not as appalling as meaninglessness …."[87] Life, therefore, is richer when goodness is known to last.[88] "Read your own obituary notice," Joyce teased, "you live longer."[89] Accordingly, ultimate salvation exposes this life, not devalues it.[90]

---

[76] "Eschatology," in *Encyclopedia of Theology: Concise Sacramentum Mundi* (New York: Seabury, 1975), 435.

[77] Karen H. Jobes, "Remember These Things," in *Anthropology and NT Theology*, ed. Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds (New York: T&T Clark, 2019), 202; C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (New York: Collier, 1960), 104.

[78] Soren Kierkegaard, *Upbuilding Discourses in Various Spirits*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong (Princeton Univ. Press, 1993), 304; Sylvia Walsh, *Living Christianly* (Pennsylvania Univ. Press, 2005), 125.

[79] Walls, *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, 4.

[80] Carver T. Yu, *Being and Relation* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic, 1987), 171, 180.

[81] Ernest Becker, *The Denial of Death* (New York: Free Press, 1973), 2, 5; Thomas à Kempis, *The Imitation of Christ*, trans. William Benham (1888), I,XXI,5, XXIV,1, XXV,10; Scheffler, *Death and the Afterlife*, 22.

[82] Viktor E. Frankl, *Man's Search for Meaning* (Boston: Beacon, 2006), 73; Kierkegaard, *Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses*, 70, 347.

[83] Emil Brunner, *Eternal Hope*, trans. Harold Knight (London: Lutterworth, 1954), 96.

[84] *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 136-38.

[85] Schaff, *Marxism and the Human Individual*, 243, 253.

[86] Kierkegaard, *Upbuilding Discourses*, 228-29.

[87] *Stages on Life's Way*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong (Princeton Univ. Press, 1988), 359.

[88] Hans Kung, *Eternal Life?*, trans. Edward Quinn (London: SCM, 1991), 197.

[89] *Ulysses* (New York: Random House, 1961), 109.

[90] Soren Kierkegaard, *Purity of Heart Is to Will One Thing*, trans. Douglas V. Steere (New York: Harper, 1956), 120; Joseph Ratzinger, *Eschatology: Death and Eternal Life*, trans. Michael Waldstein, 2nd ed. (DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 1988), 100-101.

3) <u>The salvation paradox infringes commonplace logic.</u>

Like paradoxes generally, the paradox of salvation's extent consists of propositions, which puts off those who deny propositions express truth.[91] Propositions, however, are inescapable when seeking the truth, as anti-propositionalists themselves prove when repudiating propositions by using one and then replacing them with another. They inevitably do this every time they explain their position, such as Grenz: Propositions do "not give adequate attention to the contextual nature of theology"; instead, "the propositions of systematic theology find their source and aim in the identity and life of the community it serves."[92] Forsaking propositions is like forsaking questions, right? Propositional language is the human brain's signature achievement.[93] Propositions relate words to truth,[94] and, without them, reality becomes more hazardous (crocodiles *are* lethal).[95] So, this thesis can be no propositional safe-space.[96] "[A] man must delight in assertions or he will be no Christian," Luther concluded, "Take away assertions and you take away Christianity."[97] Propositions follow from belief (2Co. 4:13), and God speaks them to us.[98]

Even avid users of propositions can be discouraged by the proposition proposed here to preserve the salvation paradox: Individuals are divisible after this life such that each is saved to the extent godly (or righteous, faithful, justified, or whatever brands that which bears eternal life). The Church certainly does not corroborate that proposition.[99] Not even heretics do. This is no brag to justify contributing to scholarship, but a concession of profound unease.[100] That tradition has gone two millennia without employing

---

91 Etienne Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2016), 190; A.N. Williams, *Architecture of Theology* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2011), 164.

92 *Theology for the Community of God*, 5-8.

93 Jaak Panksepp, *Affective Neuroscience* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1998), 332.

94 Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (South Bend: Infomotions, 2000), I,4 (p. 12); Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophische Untersuchungen* [Philosophical Investigations], trans. G.E.M. Anscombe, et al., 4th ed. (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), ¶¶ 136, 225.

95 Noam Chomsky, *Reflections on Language* (New York: Pantheon, 1975), 184-85; Wittgenstein, *Philosophische Untersuchungen*, ¶ 241.

96 Carl F.H. Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, 6 vols., vol. I (Wheaton: Crossway, 1999), 190.

97 "De Servo Arbitrio," in *Luther and Erasmus: Free Will and Salvation* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), 105-106.

98 D.A. Carson, *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 22.

99 Roger E. Olson, *The Mosaic of Christian Belief* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002), 200, 225; Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 130; Walter F. Taylor, Jr., "Humanity, NT View," in *Anchor Bib. Dict.*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 321.

100 Edward William Fudge, *The Fire That Consumes*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2012), 5.

(or even disavowing) individual divisibility for the salvation paradox almost disallows the thesis—"almost" only because tradition stays open.[101] The etymology of *individual* (the indivisible) seemingly disqualifies the thesis too.[102] That anyone could be two is more science fiction, even comedy, than theology.[103] These all express the same objection: Theologians, users of *individual*, and anyone with a sense of self naturally expect one individual per individual.

This sensible view, however, has sensible limits. True, this body's one face and other singularities resists division, and our first-person perspective is inherently indivisible. The thesis undermines neither observation. Rather, the thesis divides who the individual is, the personal character, but even this is counterintuitive—an internal alert of oddness.[104] Oddness, fortunately, indicates falsehood unreliably, especially in paradoxes and other God disclosures.[105] Christians are to love their enemies (Mat. 5:44; Luke 6:27)[106] while celebrating God's death by drinking His blood (John 6:53-56).[107] Counterintuitive is clearly no problem for Christians.[108] To the anti-Christian, "Christianity sides with everything idiotic."[109] To Kierkegaard, "Christianity is the paradoxical truth."[110] Christians die and yet live, retaining identity without contradiction,[111] a "monstrous manner of speaking," Luther noted.[112] Christianity is in particular no stranger to strange arithmetic involving the first whole number: God is three in *one*, Christ is two in *one*,[113]

---

101 Maurice Blondel, "History and Dogma," in *Letter on Apologetics & History and Dogma* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 276; Long, *Perfectly Simple Triune God*, xi; Lossky, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 112.

102 Gilson, *Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy*, 198; Jason A. Mitchell, *Being and Participation*, 2 vols., vol. I (Rome: Ateneo Pontificio Regina Apostolorum, 2012), 379.

103 John F. Crosby, *Selfhood of the Human Person* (DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 1996), 65; Romano Guardini, *The World and the Person*, trans. Stella Lange (Chicago: Regnery, 1965), 114-15.

104 Horst, *Cognitive Pluralism*, 249.

105 H. Ray Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness* (Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 1988), 178.

106 Gregory A. Boyd, "Christus Victor View," in *The Nature of Atonement*, ed. James Beilby and Paul R. Eddy (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2006), 38.

107 Soren Kierkegaard, *Concluding Unscientific Postscript to Philosophical Fragments*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong, 2 vols., vol. I (Princeton Univ. Press, 1992), 176.

108 *Practice in Christianity*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong (Princeton Univ. Press, 1991), 79, 82.

109 Friedrich Nietzsche, "The Anti-Christ," in *The Anti-Christ and Other Writings*, ed. Aaron Ridley and Judith Norman (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2005), 52 (p. 51).

110 *Book on Adler*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong (Princeton Univ. Press, 2009), 37.

111 Alan E. Lewis, *Between Cross and Resurrection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 76.

112 *Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, trans. Erasmus Middleton and Philip S. Watson (Westwood: Revell, 1953), 169 [WA401,283 (2:20)].

113 David W. Fagerberg, "Foreword," in *Holy Eros* (Kettering: Angelico, 2014), ii.

the many faithful are *one* in Christ,[114] and a married couple is *one*.[115] Two individuals from *one*, as Chapter 6 explains, fits in nicely. For the Christian, as well as the scientist or philosopher, counter*intuitive* is no disqualifier.[116] Only counter*feit* is.[117]

Strangeness here, therefore, might be a positive. Whether from Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, Einstein, or Paul, strangeness is absurd until insightful.[118] "A man must be a little mad if he does not want to be even more stupid," Montaigne recorded.[119] The master of the absurd recognized, "there is nothing that requires as gentle a treatment as the removal of an illusion,"[120] while the master of the lucid concluded, Christian claims "about something behind the world" are "bound to be difficult—at least as difficult as modern Physics, and for the same reason."[121] Hence, paradoxes appear as madness,[122] as does Christian salvation itself, which is humorous,[123] even folly (1Co. 1:18). This is challenging, but so be it. "Although it may be beautiful," Kierkegaard conceded, "to want to help people to become Christians by making it easy, I venture according to my poor ability to take on the responsibility of making it difficult, as difficult as possible, yet without making it more difficult than it is."[124]

4) <u>"Individual" is the lesser embarrassment.</u>

The thesis, as it pertains to individual eschatology, uses "individual" because the term fits, certainly better than the alternatives, and any neologism for an everyday concept is literarily offensive. Its lexical target is familiar—who you are, I am, and others like us are.[125] The alternatives are *person*, *self*, or *human* [being].[126] *Person* and *self* do not

---

114 John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), 145-47.

115 D.C. Schindler, *The Perfection of Freedom* (Eugene: Cascade, 2012), 383.

116 Thomas Aquinas, *Faith, Reason and Theology*, trans. Armand Maurer (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1987), Q. 1, art. 4, s.c. 2 (p. 31); Hartshorne, *Logic of Perfection*, 29.

117 Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, 33; Moore, *Where Are the Dead?*, 222.

118 Bas C. van Fraassen, *The Empirical Stance* (Yale Univ. Press, 2002), 65, 111-15, 151; Maurice Wiles, *The Making of Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967), 174.

119 "Essays," in *Complete Works* (Stanford Univ. Press, 1967), III,9 (p. 761).

120 Soren Kierkegaard, *The Point of View*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong (Princeton Univ. Press, 1998), 43.

121 Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, 121.

122 Merold Westphal, *Becoming a Self* (Purdue Univ. Press, 1996), 68.

123 John R. Betz, *After Enlightenment: Post-Secular Vision of J.G. Hamann* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 69.

124 *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, I, 381.

125 Lynne Rudder Baker, *Persons and Bodies* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000), 11.

126 Olson, *Mosaic of Christian Belief*, 266; Schaff, *Marxism and the Human Individual*, 94; Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 105-106, 226.

differ much for our topic—*person* suggests *self*-awareness.[127] These alternatives are over-inclusive here, admitting such entities as Divines, angels, Martians, and corporations,[128] which the noun *individual* ordinarily excludes.[129] *Person*/*self* can also over include such entities as advanced artificial intelligences[130] and assorted animals.[131] *Person*/*self* as ordinarily understood can also be underinclusive by connoting rationality or moral responsibility,[132] which, if consistently applied independent of the human species (discussed next), excludes incompetents like infants.[133] *Individual*, in contrast, only necessitates creaturely experience.[134]

Human, when not synonymous with *person*/*self*,[135] is a specific animal, usually the rational or religious kind.[136] Yet, because our topic includes the afterlife, when none of us are likely to be mammals with large brainpans procreating fertile homo sapiens,[137] *human* unnecessarily engages those disagreeing about the concept's parameters. Even those agreeing that someone previously human continues in the afterlife debate whether a human does given its body's discontinuance.[138] *Individual*, in contrast, usefully references

---

127 Crosby, *Selfhood of the Human Person*, 1; Lloyd P. Gerson, *Knowing Persons* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2003), 14; John Perry, *Identity, Personal Identity, and the Self* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2002), 189-91.

128 Lynne Rudder Baker, "Materialism with a Human Face," in *Soul, Body, and Survival*, ed. Kevin J. Corcoran (Cornell Univ. Press, 2001), 162; Jenson, *ST*, II, 95-96; Eric Austin Lee, "Standing Accused: Analogy and Dialogue as the Personhood of Substance" (PhD Diss., Univ. of Nottingham, 2003), 90-114.

129 Baker, *Persons and Bodies*, 10 n.19.

130 Verena V. Hafner et al., "Prerequisites for an Artificial Self," *Front. Neurorobot* 14, no. 5 (2020), 1-10.

131 Joseph LeDoux, *Synaptic Self* (New York: Penguin, 2002), 27-28.

132 Baker, *Persons and Bodies*, 148-49; Boethius, "Contra Eutychen," in *The Theological Tractates and the Consolation of Philosophy* (Cambridge, MA: Loeb, 1973), III,5, 87 (pp. 84-85, 90-91); Andrew Eshleman, "Moral Responsibility," in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta (2016).

133 Timothy A. Brookins, "Greco-Roman Perspectives on Anthropology," in *Anthropology and NT Theology*, ed. Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds (New York: T&T Clark, 2019), 57-58.

134 Friedrich Schiller, "Letters on the Aesthetical Education of Man," in *Aesthetical and Philosophical Essays* (New York: Collier, 1902), 92 (Ltr XX); Miroslav Volf, *After Our Likeness* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 82.

135 Susan Grove Eastman, *Paul and the Person* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 12-14.

136 Dalferth, *Creatures of Possibility*, 9, 19; Aku Visala, "Human Cognition and the Image of God," in *Christian Doctrine of Humanity*, ed. Oliver D. Crisp and Fred Sanders (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018), 93.

137 Crosby, *Selfhood of the Human Person*, 11; Perry, *Identity, Personal Identity, and the Self*, 148; Josef Pieper, *Death and Immortality*, trans. Richard Winston and Clara Winston (South Bend: St Augustine's, 2000), 35-36.

138 Jeffrey E. Brower, *Aquinas's Ontology of the Material World* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2017), 280-87; Patrick Toner, "St Thomas Aquinas on Death and the Separated Soul," *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 91 (2010): 587-99.

the continuity without positing *human* continuation.[139] *Human* is therefore more contested because it derives from universalizing,[140] while *individual* derives from extrapolating, which is less dogmatic.[141] *Individual* is you, me, and anyone else joining the group without disputing the hard cases, but *human* universalizes the group, which requires ascertaining human nature.[142] *Individual* reserves that issue, our taxon being here inconsequential.

Combining terms, such as *human person*, is wordy and invites the components' respective problems. That said, *each human person/self* identifies the target normally, but English has a ready word for that amalgamation.[143] *Individual* bridges *human* and *person/self*.[144] Moreover, as noted, *individual* continues to work under the abnormal circumstance of the afterlife, which is not peripheral here. In short, *individual* best fits the subject. It can, nevertheless, be problematic if associated with individualism—believing the individual is the reason for existence.[145] Avoiding individual because of individualism, however, is word bigotry,[146] like avoiding science because of scientism. Christianity elevates the self and renounces selfishness.[147] Christianity rejects narcissism, not Narcissus. *Individual* is what recognizes individuals are not means.[148] Christianity's great advocate praised "self-sacrificing unselfishness,"[149] while its great detractor accepted it was "heathens"

---

139 Theodor Adorno, *Minima Moralia*, trans. E.F.N. Jephcott (London: NLB, 1974), 150 [ch 97]; Brower, *Aquinas's Ontology*, 292-300.

140 Siep Stuurman, *Invention of Humanity* (Harvard Univ. Press, 2017), 553.

141 Kierkegaard, *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, I, 490; *Two Ages*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong (Princeton Univ. Press, 1978), 82-83; *Stages*, 488-89.

142 Chomsky, *Reflections on Language*, 125-34; Perry, *Identity, Personal Identity, and the Self*, 148-51.

143 *American Heritage Dict. of the English Language* 4th ed., s.v. "individual."

144 Schumacher, *Death and Mortality*, 20-23.

145 Kenneth J. Gergen, "The Social Construction of Self," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 644; Thomas D. Williams and Jan Olof Bengtsson, "Personalism," in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta (2016).

146 Paul Pfuetze, *Self, Society, Existence* (New York: Harper, 1961), 335.

147 Barth, *Romans*, 467 (12:16); Basil the Great, "The Asketikon," in *The Asketikon of St Basil the Great*, ed. Anna M. Silvas (Oxford Univ. Press, 2007), LR 7 ¶ 1; Jason Maston, "Enlivened Slaves," in *Anthropology and NT Theology*, ed. Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds (New York: T&T Clark, 2019), 158.

148 Martin Buber, *The Way of Man* (Secaucus: Citadel, 1966), 31-32; Hartshorne, *Logic of Perfection*, 121, 145.

149 Soren Kierkegaard, *Works of Love*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong (Princeton Univ. Press, 1995), 335.

who had difficulty with *individual*.[150] Christians, therefore, safely use *individual*, knowing it as neither the be-all nor nothing at all.[151]

Some Christians, however, see *individual* as entailing an individualistic focus and dethroning *community* as the premier consideration, which leads to sinning against the other.[152] In a view traceable to Hegel,[153] they argue everything exists via relationships, even God, and individuals are relationship components, not the other way around.[154] This view, however, does not match the reality individuals everywhere have lived in for millennia.[155] The distinction between self and everything else is humanity's most basic thought.[156] This is not an ontological point, but a functional one. We experience *I am* different from *you are/it is*.[157] The first arrives as existence and the rest as knowledge.[158] Even in life's first few months, we appreciate attention given to ourselves over others and sense how to return it.[159] In infancy, we singularize inanimate solids and recognize the discontinuously moving ones as agents and, before age five, realize some agents have different beliefs from us.[160] Throughout life, individuals experience individually, even in experiencing others.[161] The conundrum of *Do others see what I see?*, such as *Is your blue the same color as mine?*, seems to be *no*.[162] "That unsharable feeling which each one of us has … of his individual destiny," James noted, "may be disparaged for its egotism, may be

---

150 Ludwig Feuerbach, *Essence of Christianity*, trans. George Eliot (New York: Harper, 1957), I,XVI (p. 151).

151 Charles Peguy, *Temporal and Eternal*, trans. Alexander Dru (London: Harvill, 1958), 117.

152 Stratford Caldecott, *The Radiance of Being* (Tacoma: Angelico, 2013), 91; William T. Cavanaugh, "Beyond Secular Parodies," in *Radical Orthodoxy*, ed. John Milbank, et al. (New York: Routledge, 1999), 184; Edward T. Oakes, *A Theology of Grace in Six Controversies* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 82-91.

153 Taylor, *Hegel*, 40.

154 Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 19, 75; Mark McInroy, *Balthasar on the Spiritual Senses* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 180; Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 17-18, 36-37, 87-88.

155 Hannah Arendt, "Karl Jaspers: Citizen of the World?," in *Men in Dark Times* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1968), 88-89; Dalferth, *Creatures of Possibility*, 169-70.

156 Wiles, *Making of Christian Doctrine*, 18.

157 Edmund Husserl, *Ideas*, trans. W.R. Boyce Gibson (New York: Collier, 1967), 80 (pp. 214-15); Mieczylaw Krapiec, *I-Man*, trans. Marie Lescoe, et al. (New Britain: Mariel, 1983), 324.

158 Kierkegaard, *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, I, 316.

159 Vasudevi Reddy, *How Infants Know Minds* (Harvard Univ. Press, 2008), 115. Newborns distinguish recordings of their own cries from those of others. Ibid., 124.

160 Horst, *Cognitive Pluralism*, 49-57, 141.

161 Morwenna Ludlow, *Universal Salvation* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2000), 149; Rowan Williams, *On Christian Theology* (Malden: Blackwell, 2000), 153.

162 Rosa Lafer-Sousa, et al., "Striking Individual Differences in Color Perception," *Current Biology* 25 (2015): R545-46.

sneered at as unscientific, but it is the one thing that fills up the measure of our concrete actuality …."[163] This sense of individuality is common to humans until lost *in extremis* like in Nazi concentration camps,[164] severe schizophrenia,[165] and perhaps certain schools. Ancient philosophy's *Know thyself* is for this reason in the singular, both to whom and about whom it speaks.[166] "A self is not a thing that may or may not exist," wrote Tillich, but "an original phenomenon."[167] "We cannot literally bring into being another person that was not there before simply by relating to the thing that is there," W.N. Clarke agreed, "Try doing this with a rock …."[168]

Individuals establish relationships, not the converse.[169] Autistic children, a practical example, have well-developed self-awareness without well-developed relationships.[170] Individuals live; relationships do so only metaphorically.[171] Accordingly, the claim, "You have to be addressed as a subject to become one,"[172] is as false as its refinement is true: You have to be addressed as a subject to realize it.[173] We are addressed as subjects because we are subjects. Our sense of self "arises from the betweenness" among us, psychiatrist McGilchrist observed, "Yet the paradox is that those feelings only arise because of … our ability to be separate, distinct individuals …."[174] The individual "possesses its act of existing," Thomas discerned, "For universals do not exist …, but only inasmuch as

---

163 *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 489.

164 Frankl, *Man's Search for Meaning*, 50.

165 McGilchrist, *The Master and His Emissary*, 332.

166 Epictetus, *Discourses*, trans. William A. Oldfather, 2 vols., vol. II (Harvard Univ. Press, 1959), III,i,25 (p. 15).

167 *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols., vol. I (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1973), 169.

168 *Person and Being* (Marquette Univ. Press, 2008), 58.

169 Gilbert Highet, *Man's Unconquerable Mind* (Columbia Univ. Press, 1954), 80; Georgi Kapriev, "Conceptual Apparatus of Maximus the Confessor and Contemporary Anthropology," in *Maximus the Confessor as a European Philosopher*, ed. Sotiris Mitralexis, et al. (Eugene: Cascade, 2017), 179; Watkin, "Kierkegaard--Dying and Eternal Life," 3.

170 Peter R. Hobson, "Autism and the Self," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 572-74, 585; Reddy, *How Infants Know Minds*, 146.

171 Crosby, *Selfhood of the Human Person*, 122-23; Hartshorne, *Logic of Perfection*, 16, 122, 212; Michel Henry, *Material Phenomenology*, trans. Scott Davidson (Fordham Univ. Press, 2008), 119-21.

172 Reddy, *How Infants Know Minds*, 32.

173 David A. Jopling, *Self Knowledge and the Self* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 166; Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Anthropology in Theological Perspective*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985), 516.

174 *The Master and His Emissary*, 303.

they are individuated."[175] The individual, even if a relations ensemble, is the baseline.[176] John Rawls, while setting out to rationalize a regime of policed social justice, accepted the individual's "inviolability …, which even the welfare of everyone else cannot override."[177]

Admittedly, *individual* requires others.[178] The more ladened concepts of *person* and *self* certainly do.[179] Even imagining a relationless individual looks impossible.[180] Those forswearing the individual's existence often confuse this organic limitation for existential dependency,[181] but individuals exist independent of actuating relationships.[182] A child whose existence depends absolutely on a mother can nonetheless exist without her, as most of us prove sooner or later. Similarly, entities who owe their existence to God can exist opposed to Him.[183] Said too often, "conceiv[ing] of an entirely isolated individual" is "impossible,"[184] but we reject solipsism after conceiving it. Relating personally requires a person.[185] Without individuals, no *one* saves any*one*. If the complaint is simply that *individual* requires another concept to understand it, no concept does better. Rather, apart from our ability to *explain* a concept, conceiving of a coherent idea like *individual* (contra *married bachelor*) is a matter of will. Even conceiving of a concept's inconceivability involves conceiving it. Those having trouble can conceive of two individuals in one relationship and subtract one individual. What remains when this happens, though it has lost many things, is still an individual.[186] No mathematics, on the other hand, yields one

---

[175] *Quaestiones De Anima* [Questions on the Soul], trans. James H. Robb (Marquette Univ. Press, 2009), Q. 1, ad. 2 (p. 49).

[176] Schaff, *Marxism and the Human Individual*, 49-50, 53, 84, 107.

[177] *A Theory of Justice*, 28.

[178] Jana M. Kreppner et al., "Normality and Impairment Following Profound Early Institutional Deprivation," *Developmental Psychology* 43, no. 4 (2007): 931-946; Edward F. Mooney, "Pseudonyms and 'Style'," in *Oxford Handbook of Kierkegaard*, ed. John Lippitt and George Pattison (Oxford Univ. Press, 2013), 201.

[179] Martin Buber, *I and Thou*, trans. Ronald Gregor Smith (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1950), 62-65; Dalferth, *Creatures of Possibility*, 30-31.

[180] Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 105.

[181] Hartshorne, *Logic of Perfection*, 136; Donald Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being* (Eugene: Cascade, 2017), 174-77.

[182] Dalferth, *Creatures of Possibility*, 6; Guardini, *The World and the Person*, 129; Pfuetze, *Self, Society, Existence*, 254, 300.

[183] Thomas Aquinas, *De Potentia* [The Power of God], trans. Richard J. Regan (Oxford Univ. Press, 2012), Q. 5, art. 1 (p. 134); M.E. Dahl, *The Resurrection of the Body* (Naperville: Allenson, 1962), 101; Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 184-85.

[184] J. Gordon McConville, *Being Human in God's World* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016), 58.

[185] Pfuetze, *Self, Society, Existence*, 334.

[186] Epictetus, *Discourses*, I, II,v,26 (p. 245).

relationship of zero individuals. Bultmann noted, "For I am I, … not as an isolable … world-phenomenon but I am I in my particular existence …."[187]

Scripture, while never using *individual* (*e.g.*, *atomos*), uses a thousand times its passé locution—*man*[188] or, for individual emphasis, *son of man*.[189] Scripture also uses countlessly the primary words every language has for individual—*you* and *I*.[190] The first command is love *your* God, and the second is love the other as *yourself*, both in the singular (Mat. 22:37-39//Mark 12:30-31//Luke 10:27). Even the beloved is loved singularly. God loves this way too,[191] reaching the self's *con-science* (συν-είδησις, 2Co. 1:12; Heb. 9:14; 1Pe. 2:19).[192] This explains Jesus' extraordinary individual attention and why He advised self-evaluation (Mat. 7:3-5//Luke 6:41-42).[193] Over the 1, not the 99, is greater joy (Mat. 18:12-14//Luke 15:4-7). "I live in faith that this Son of God loved *me* and gave Himself over for *me*" (Gal. 2:20).[194] Jesus too was an individual.[195] Balthasar recognized, "community … must begin in particularity …, for this is how Christ's path began, proceeded —and ended."[196] Bornkamm summarized, "in principle it is not proper to speak of man … in collective and general terms," "but only of him as an individual."[197] Barth similarly, "the individual is not a 'part,' but is himself the 'whole.'"[198] Christian responsibility for *individual* is, accordingly, no coincidence.[199] Salvation has this particularly, when the

---

187 *Theology of the NT*, II: epil. 1 (p. 239).

188 Gerson, *Knowing Persons*, 14; Robert H. Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976), 84, 156. The NT and Septuagint use *anthropos* 1950 times. *New Int'l Dict. of NT Theology and Exegesis* 2nd ed., s.v. "anthropos."

189 George W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, Expanded ed. (Harvard Divinity, 2006), 281, 293.

190 Cliff Goddard, "The Natural Semantic Metalanguage Approach," in *Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*, ed. Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog (Oxford Univ. Press, 2010), 462; McConville, *Being Human in God's World*, 202; John D. Zizioulas, "On Being a Person," in *Persons, Divine and Human*, ed. Christoph Schwobel and Colin E. Gunton (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 35.

191 Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics II/2*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, et al. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark 2001), § 35.1 (p. 313).

192 Hannah Arendt, "Thinking," in *The Life of the Mind*, ed. Mary McCarthy (San Diego: Harcourt, 1978), 5; Hans-Cristoph Hahn, "Conscience," in *New Int'l Dict. of NT Theology*, ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 348-51; Robert W. Wall, "Conscience," in *Anchor Bib. Dict.*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 1128.

193 Michel Henry, *Incarnation*, trans. Karl Hefty (Northwestern Univ. Press, 2015), 248; Peter Sloterdijk, *Critique of Cynical Reason*, trans. Michael Eldred (Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1987), 40.

194 Demarest, *Cross and Salvation*, 194.

195 Blondel, "History and Dogma," 244.

196 *Theo-Drama*, trans. Graham Harrison, 5 vols., vol. III (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1992), 447.

197 *Paulus*, trans. D.M.G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), 129.

198 *Romans*, 441, 443 (12:3-5).

199 Lash, *Easter in Ordinary*, 148; Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Human Nature, Election, and History* (Phila-

Christian consensus includes individuality.[200] Jesus' salvation parables highlight this (Mat. 13:47-50, 25:1-13).[201] Salvation, Kierkegaard observed, is not "distributed in bulk."[202] "In eternity you will look in vain for the crowd."[203] The "Omniscient One, even though he surely can maintain an overview better than anyone else, does not want the crowd. He wants only the single individual,"[204] "to have *I*s."[205] "People can be put to death *en masse*, … sprayed *en masse*, … flattered *en masse*—in short, … treated as cattle, but they cannot be judged as cattle …."[206]

With terminology, however, tolerance is a virtue.[207] Although *individual* best fits the topic, consistently using a well-distinguished term in this area is intractable,[208] as Locke unwittingly demonstrated.[209] Therefore, various terms, such as person, self, human, you, I/me, ego, soul, spirit, heart, or mind, will be used for the same lexical reference—the unanimously felt pocket outside of which is everything else.[210] That said, this calibrates best in English to "individual," *sit venia verbo*.

5) <u>Models suit paradoxes.</u>

If *individual* is who we each are, then dividing it might seem grotesque,[211] but this is from taking the proposed division too lightly, as if merely cleaving flesh. Divisibility of

---

delphia: Westminster, 1977), 14, 26.

200 Brunner, *Eternal Hope*, 148, 168-69; Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 581; Henri de Lubac, *Catholicism*, trans. Lancelot C. Sheppard and Elizabeth Englund (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1988), 326; Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 3 vols., vol. III (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 541-43.

201 Sergius Bulgakov, "The Lamb of God," in *A Bulgakov Anthology*, ed. James Pain and Nicolas Zernov (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), 114; Lubac, *Catholicism*, 206-207.

202 *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, I, 130.

203 *Purity of Heart*, 185, 191.

204 *Upbuilding Discourses*, 127.

205 *Journal and Papers*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong, 7 vols., vol. IV (Indiana Univ. Press, 1975), ¶ 4350.

206 *Sickness Unto Death*, 123.

207 Bas C. van Fraassen, *Scientific Representation* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2013), 86; Plato, *The Republic*, 533e.

208 John Barresi and Raymond Martin, "History as Prologue," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 33-34; Harold W. Noonan, "Personal Identity and Its Perplexities," in *Personal Identity*, ed. Georg Gassar and Matthias Stefan (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015), 89.

209 *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, II,xxvii,9.

210 Brian Gregor, *Philosophical Anthropology of the Cross* (Indiana Univ. Press, 2013), 14; Edmund Husserl, "Author's Preface to English Ed.," in *Ideas* (New York: Collier, 1967), 14; Pannenberg, *Anthropology in Theological Perspective*, 128.

211 "[G]rotesqueness is constituted by … the paradoxical …." Wolfgang Kayser, *The Grotesque in Art and Literature*, trans. Ulrich Weisstein (Columbia Univ. Press, 1957), 53.

the individual models, not what is *done* to it, but what it *is*, which is legitimately disconcerting. The dissonance, however, is not from using a model, because the proposed one just replaces the ordinary *in*divisible model. To understand the hardly understood, which *individual* is,[212] a model of some variety is unavoidable.[213] As Chapter 6 discusses, it is violating the indivisible model, which has worked so well in daily life, that makes the proposed model counterintuitive.[214]

Models are unavoidable because they bridge truth with understanding by suggesting one thing in terms of another, linking ontology and metaphor.[215] Aristotle saw that words come in three varieties: *ordinary*, to convey existing knowledge; *strange*, to simply puzzle; and *metaphoric*, to "get hold of something fresh."[216] God-related discussions need the last,[217] because they probe ultimate questions without infringing God's invisibility.[218] Words, which glance off the Absolute,[219] force Scriptural metaphors like the *begotten*,[220] *He*,[221] or the *Way*, *Word*, and *Truth*.[222] Metaphors are particularly required with paradoxes,[223] whether afterlife[224] or salvation.[225] And underlying every metaphor is a model.[226] Both are needed to explain because too much is going on to understand without them.[227]

---

212 Thomas Aquinas, *The Division and Methods of the Sciences*, trans. Armand Maurer, 3rd rev. ed. (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1963), Q. 6, art. 2, reply to opp. arg. 1 (p. 70).

213 Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1971), 285; Margaret Morrison, *Reconstructing Reality* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2015), 122-23; Janet Martin Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 60.

214 Horst, *Cognitive Pluralism*, 255-56.

215 George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Univ. of Chicago Press, 2003), 5; Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 1, 6, 15.

216 *Rhetoric*, trans. W. Rhys Roberts (South Bend: Infomotions, 2000), III.10, 1410b10-13.

217 Bray, *God Has Spoken*, 304; Eberhard Jungel, *God as the Mystery of the World*, trans. Darrell L. Guder (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 6, 281.

218 James Charlton, *Non-Dualism in Eckhart, Julian of Norwich and Traherne* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 1; Johann Georg Hamann, "Socratic Memorabilia," in *Johann Georg Hamann's Relational Metacriticism*, ed. Gwen Griffith Dickson (New York: de Gruyter, 1995), NII,64,14 (p. 382).

219 Barth, *Romans*, 530 (15:15).

220 Gunton, *Father, Son and Holy Spirit*, 61.

221 Lash, *Easter in Ordinary*, 277.

222 Milbank, *The Word Made Strange*, 149.

223 Adrian Pabst, *Metaphysics: Creation of Hierarchy* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2012), 440-41.

224 Brunner, *Eternal Hope*, 117, 139-40; Kung, *Eternal Life?*, 109.

225 Norman Russell, *Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2006), 1; Daria Spezzano, *The Glory of God's Grace* (Sapientia Press of Ave Maria Univ., 2015), 6.

226 Max Black, "More About Metaphor," in *Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1979), 31.

227 Horst, *Cognitive Pluralism*, 5, 48, 77, 83, 184-85; Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 115.

Scripture itself is a model because it communicates at one level to penetrate to another.[228] Jüngel noted Scripture is "The translation of the model of human speech to God," and its parables are like models, except parables are metaphors with plot while models are metaphors with architecture.[229]

Models come in types.[230] The thesis does not model what we know, like the helpful ones in our head used to navigate our darkened bedroom or the scientific ones depicting natural mechanisms.[231] Instead, the thesis models ineffable structural relationships.[232] Such models are "fundamental units of understanding," observed philosopher of cognition Steven Horst. "We *believe* propositions, but we *understand*" models.[233] Religious discourse necessitates them.[234] Luke Timothy Johnson explained they are "paradigm[s] within which the data appropriate to a discipline make sense," an "imaginative construal …, a structured picture …, within which the parts are seen not only to fit but also to function."[235] Models, though not themselves reality, unveil reality,[236] especially if their use persists.[237] Models that knowingly exceed reality might even be best,[238] because representation, to serve its purpose, relates imperfectly to reality.[239] Particle and wave models, for example, explain light without confusing it for corpuscular masses or liquid swells.[240] Models of *Lord* and *Father* similarly use earthly owners and sires to understand God without losing the distinction.[241]

---

228 Paul Martens, "Kierkegaard and the Bible," in *Oxford Handbook of Kierkegaard*, ed. John Lippitt and George Pattison (Oxford Univ. Press, 2013), 155.

229 *God as the Mystery of the World*, 288-89.

230 Craig Dilworth, *Metaphysics of Science*, 2nd ed. (Dordrecht: Springer, 2007), 110 & n.1.

231 Rom Harre, *Principles of Scientific Thinking* (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1970), 34-35.

232 Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 11-13; Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 3 vols., vol. II (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 421.

233 *Cognitive Pluralism*, 5.

234 Marcello Guarini et al., "Resources for Research on Analogy," *Informal Logic* 29, no. 2 (2009): 93.

235 *Writings of the NT*, Rev. ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 4.

236 Stephen Hawking and Leonard Mlodinow, *The Grand Design* (New York: Bantam, 2010), 46.

237 Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 52; Horst, *Cognitive Pluralism*, 6; Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Insight* (London: Longmans, Green, 1957), 18.

238 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 118.

239 Trevor Hart, "Redemption and Fall," in *Cambridge Companion to Christian Doctrine*, ed. Colin E. Gunton (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998), 192.

240 Horst, *Cognitive Pluralism*, 230; Kung, *Eternal Life?*, 109.

241 Kierkegaard, *Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses*, 100; Tillich, *ST*, I, 288.

Models reflect not only reality but humility, which well serves theology, especially eschatology,[242] most especially this thesis. In pursuing the inconspicuous, theology is innately provisional.[243] Theological models anticipate truth.[244] In Highet's phrasing, a model "combines the wish to know with the knowledge that all cannot be known."[245] They thereby usefully avoid subjecting the ultimate to reduction.[246] Models judiciously mix facts with surmise, maximizing truth and minimizing error, like epistemology generally.[247] They are used because "This moment, we see by a mirror darkly" what we see "thereafter face to face" (1Co. 13:12).

Model admittedly sounds scientific,[248] but, as Hamann protested, "A careful interpreter must imitate the scientists."[249] The alternatives are *myth* and the previously mentioned *metaphor* (or more broadly, *analogy*). *Myth* is inappropriate because myths have an uncertain relationship to truth,[250] especially after twentieth-century Fascists found them so helpful.[251] *Myth* is an artifact intentionally disavowing objective truth, either generally or specifically—a fairytale with a point.[252] Accordingly, outside the liberal arts *myth* is rarely countenanced. Unheard, for example, is the myth of radioactivity.[253] Using *myth* here would thus wrongly imply the afterlife is less objectively true than more accessible truths.[254] Christianity relegated them to the ideological dustbin, Balthasar recognized.[255] Paul certainly thought so (1Ti. 1:4, 4:7; 2Ti. 4:4). Theology disputes myths.[256] Of course, myths can responsibly refer to stories that expose grand truths,[257] which is how Plato

---

242 Robinson, *In the End, God*, 27, 31.

243 Westphal, *Becoming a Self*, 91; Williams, *Architecture of Theology*, 22.

244 Mostert, *God and the Future*, 117.

245 *Man's Unconquerable Mind*, 67.

246 Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols., vol. III (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1976), 422.

247 Fraassen, *The Empirical Stance*, 86-87; Vernon B. Mountcastle, "Brain Science at the Century's Ebb," *Daedalus* 127, no. 2 (1998): 29.

248 Horst, *Cognitive Pluralism*, 99.

249 "Socratic Memorabilia," NII,71,25 (p. 389).

250 Lauri Honko, "The Problem of Defining Myth," *Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis* 6 (1972): 7.

251 Ernst Cassirer, *The Myth of the State* (Yale Univ. Press, 1946), 282; Dietrich Orlow, "The Conversion of Myths into Political Power," *Am. Historical Rev.* 72, no. 3 (1967): 906-24.

252 Gillman, *Death of Death*, 27-30, 250-51.

253 Harari, *Sapiens*, 108-111, 117.

254 C.S. Lewis, "Is Theology Poetry?," in *The Weight of Glory and Other Addresses* (New York: HarperOne, 2001), 119, 136.

255 *Theo-Logic*, trans. Adrian J. Walker, 3 vols., vol. II (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2004), 262.

256 Thomas F. Torrance, *Atonement* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2009), 446.

257 Rudolf Bultmann, "NT and Mythology," in *NT and Mythology*, ed. Schubert M. Ogden (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 32, 42-43 n.5; "On the Problem of Demythologizing (1961)," 161.

used them,[258] but this is inapposite because ultimate salvation is the grand truth, not the story. *Metaphors*, the other alternative, is as noted above similar to models, which can confuse theologians, but the concepts differ; metaphors express a state of affairs to suggest another while models explain a state of affairs with another.[259] Here divisibility is not suggestive but explanatory, which befits model, not metaphor. Metaphor is inadequate for individual divisibility because it is structural, which is what models add to metaphors.[260] While they can be more vivid, metaphors are inevitably more limited in their reach; the metaphor *God is a fortress* can be pressed too far, but the model *God is a Trinity* cannot. So, *model* it is.

6) <u>Scripture is the signal data.</u>

Because models explain data,[261] another preliminary question for the model is the input—the observations, deductions, and other factual indicators.[262] The answer is both simple and complex. In the latter sense, the data is Scripture,[263] especially the NT.[264] All inquiries begin,[265] and Christians begin with Scripture.[266] It records Christianity's founding events and thus founds its theology.[267] "Christianity knows and recognizes no other shackles of faith," Hamann accepted.[268] This is true for all confessions[269] and, Roger Olson quipped, for "nearly all Christian thinkers throughout history—unless one counts

---

258 Janet E. Smith, "Plato's Use of Myth in the Education of Philosophic Man," *Phoenix* 40, no. 1 (1986), 20-34.

259 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 50-51, 55, 101.

260 Daniela M. Bailer-Jones, "Models, Metaphors and Analogies," in *Blackwell Guide to Philosophy of Science*, ed. Peter Machamer and Michael Silberstein (Cambridge: Blackwell, 2002), 123; Horst, *Cognitive Pluralism*, 207.

261 Johnson, *Writings of the NT*, 4.

262 Dilworth, *Metaphysics of Science*, 79; Antonio Lopez, *Gift and the Unity of Being* (Eugene: Cascade, 2014), 27-28.

263 Barth, *CD II/2*, § 32.2 (p. 36); Hart, "Redemption and Fall," 189; Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, I, 229, 238-39.

264 Soren Kierkegaard, *Journal and Papers*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong, 7 vols., vol. III (Indiana Univ. Press, 1975), ¶¶ 2870, 3568; Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 312-13.

265 Taylor, *Hegel*, 139.

266 Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics I/1*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 2nd ed. (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), § 1.2 (p. 16); Michel Henry, *I Am the Truth*, trans. Susan Emanuel (Stanford Univ. Press, 2003), 1-2, 216-17.

267 Tillich, *ST*, I, 35; Williams, *Architecture of Theology*, 129.

268 "Golgotha and Sheblimini!," 185.

269 Hans J. Hillerbrand, *The Division of Christendom* (Louisville: Westminster, 2007), 386; Marsilius of Padua, *The Defensor Pacis*, trans. Alan Gewirth, 2 vols., vol. II (Columbia Univ. Press, 1956), II,XIX,2 (p. 274).

modern liberal theologians as 'Christian thinkers' …."[270] Scripture is the uniquely divine authority, which is why it cannot be "treated so scientifically that it could just as well be by anonymities," Kierkegaard reminded.[271] Scripture is God's authority[272] and is loved in proportion to its Giver.[273] Scriptural reliance obtains acutely here because reliable afterlife experiences are currently unavailable.[274] Sources such as visitations or near-death experiences, while numerous and empirical,[275] reveal the notoriously private[276] and, for this reason, are ignored here except in passing. Because afterlife experiences are beyond us for now,[277] eschatological authority depends on Scripture, not experience.[278] Accordingly, less Scripture and more experience, which some advocate,[279] is no option.[280] Instead, rededication to what Scripture teaches is required,[281] and it urges us to know (γνῶναί), even grasp (καταλαβέσθαι), the knowledge (γνώσεως) of Christ's saving love (Eph. 3:18-19). Hence, for the model, the data feed is Scripture, even when Scripture is figurative.[282]

Because it presents truths, not lists them, Scripture cannot to be properly understood by rejecting its pieces or accepted it only in pieces. The first is rejecting Scripture whenever it says what it ought not to,[283] and, given what has just been said, this is unjustified. Indeed, rejecting Scripture wholesale is preferable to piecemeal because either way

---

[270] *Mosaic of Christian Belief*, 71.

[271] *Book on Adler*, 35.

[272] Sergius Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church*, trans. Lydia Kesich (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1988), 18; Alan Richardson, *Christian Apologetics* (New York: Harper, 1947), 220.

[273] John Wycliffe, *On the Truth of Holy Scripture*, trans. Ian Christopher Levy (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, 2001), xx,129.

[274] Brunner, *Eternal Hope*, 98; Kung, *Eternal Life?*, 75.

[275] Moore, *Where Are the Dead?*, 226.

[276] John W. Cooper, *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 235; White, *Life Beyond Death*, 61-62; Carol Zaleski, "Near-Death Experiences," in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, ed. Jerry L. Walls (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 614-28.

[277] Schumacher, *Death and Mortality*, 118, 126, 129.

[278] William J. Abraham, "Eschatology and Epistemology," in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, ed. Jerry L. Walls (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 587; Pieper, *Death and Immortality*, 7-8; Paul R. Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife* (Downers Grove: Apollos, 2018), 28.

[279] Adam G. Cooper, *Holy Eros* (Kettering: Angelico, 2014), 5-6; Schaff, *Marxism and the Human Individual*, 245.

[280] Michel Henry, *Words of Christ*, trans. Christina M. Gschwandtner (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2012), 8; Marsilius, *Defensor Pacis*, II, I,IV,3, XIX,4 (pp. 13, 91-92).

[281] Ralph G. Bowles, "Does Revelation 14:11 Teach Eternal Torment?," in *Rethinking Hell*, ed. Christopher M. Date, et al. (Eugene: Cascade, 2014), 154.

[282] Henry Constable, "Divine Justice," Ibid., 203.

[283] Congdon, *The God Who Saves*, 55-57, 102; John W. Cooper, "Whose Interpretation? Which Anthropology," in *Neuroscience and the Soul*, ed. Thomas M. Crisp, et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 249.

the real authority is the chooser but rejecting it wholesale is more sincere. The second means the authority remains Scripture entirely, not its pieces.[284] Though *passages* are exegeted because that is all finite minds can handle,[285] Scripture in its entirety is the authority. While all of its expressions are not true in the literal sense, all of it nonetheless expresses truth in that sense.[286] Scripture is mistaken only when misunderstood.[287] To avoid this, more than Scripture is required, as consistently acknowledged.[288] Nothing we understand is *ex nihilo*, especially Scriptural paradoxes[289] or eschatology.[290] So, described next is the simple answer to the data used—anything true.

7) <u>Understanding requires whatever it takes.</u>

Theology, the human inquiry into God-related things, is what exalts Scripture from words carried around to words carried on.[291] Scripture, though founding theology, is misunderstood without it,[292] and, to be understood, Scripture needs philosophizing.[293] Since philosophy is love of wisdom and loving God is true wisdom, theology is true philosophy.[294] "The objects," Hegel noted, "are upon the whole the same …. In both the object is Truth …."[295] To Tertullian's "What … has Athens to do with Jerusalem?,"[296] the answer is that both are Mediterranean homes to sages and simpletons. Scripture certainly does not oppose Athens, just sophistries (Acts 17:15-34; Rom. 14:1; 1Co. 2:6; Jam

---

284 Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, III, 11; Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Life Together*, trans. John W. Doberstein (New York: HarperOne, 1954), 52; Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 23.

285 Barth, "Preface to Second Edition," 12-13.

286 Geisler, *ST*, 1320.

287 Augustine, "Letters," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Ser.*, ed. Philip Schaff (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), LXXXII,1,3; Wycliffe, *Truth of Holy Scripture*, viii,159.

288 Caldecott, *Radiance of Being*, 117; Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 283; David Bentley Hart, *The Experience of God* (Yale Univ. Press, 2013), 233; Kierkegaard, *JP*, IV, 452 (entry 4751) & 734 n.999; Franz Rosenzweig, *The Star of Redemption*, trans. Barbara E. Galli (Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 2005), 117.

289 Lubac, *Catholicism*, 165.

290 Sergius Bulgakov, *Bride of the Lamb*, trans. Boris Jakim (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002), 382.

291 Bultmann, "Theology as Science," 57-58, 65; Peter M. Candler, Jr., *Theology, Rhetoric, Manuduction* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 38; Vittorio Montemaggi, *Reading Dante's Commedia as Theology* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2016), 46.

292 Bray, *God Has Spoken*, 1225.

293 Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Signs*, trans. Richard C. McCleary (Northwestern Univ. Press, 1987), 101; Pieper, *Death and Immortality*, 1-2; Sloterdijk, *Critique of Cynical Reason*, xxxviii.

294 Gregor, *Philosophical Anthropology*, 12; John of Damascus, "Fount of Knowledge," I,3 (p. 11).

295 *Logic*, trans. William Wallace (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), I.1 (p. 3).

296 "Prescription against Heretics," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), ch VII (p. 246).

1:5, 3:17; 1Pe. 2:2).[297] Hence, Christians philosophize so long as they reflect on truth,[298] philosophizing well or wrong the only choices.[299] Until wrong, philosophy serves theology.[300] Indeed, using best practices, theology *is* philosophy, just with all the data.[301]

Theology being all-inclusive follows from the reality that hearing Scripture is interpreting it.[302] As an intelligible address to everyone, Scripture ratifies the dearness of common sense and logic—namely reason.[303] Through reasoning we understand, especially Scriptural revelation.[304] Preferring "mystery" over "proud reason" as some advocate[305] is, Hart explained, a false choice: "to believe solely because one thinks faith demands it, in []spite of all the counsels of reason, is actually a form of disbelief, of faithlessness. … Submission of that kind … would make 'true faith' and 'bad faith'—devotion to truth and betrayal of truth—one and the same thing."[306] Accordingly, added always to the text is thinking.[307] Hamann observed, "Faith needs reason just as much as reason needs faith."[308] "Reason and scripture are basically the same species: the language of God."[309] Whether it is the Augustinian "understanding completes faith"[310] or the

---

297 Augustine, *On Christian Teaching*, trans. R.P.H. Green (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), II,117-18; George H. van Kooton, *Paul's Anthropology in Context* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 264-65.

298 Blondel, *Action*, 358 [389]; Gilson, *Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy*, 419.

299 Richardson, *Christian Apologetics*, 38.

300 Wycliffe, *Truth of Holy Scripture*, ii,31-32.

301 Blondel, "Letter on Apologetics," 185; Michel Henry, *The Essence of Manifestation*, trans. Girard Etzkorn (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), 727; Justin Martyr, *First and Second Apologies*, trans. Leslie William Barnard (New York: Paulist, 1997), II,13 (p.83).

302 Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Christ the Center*, trans. John Bowden (New York: Harper, 1960), 75; Claudia Welz, *Humanity in God's Image* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2016), 106.

303 Augustine, *On Christian Teaching*, II,142; Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, I, 35; Lewis, "Why I Am Not a Pacifist," 65-66; Richardson, *Christian Apologetics*, 222.

304 Blondel, "History and Dogma," 275; Milbank, *The Word Made Strange*, 25; Wolfhart Pannenberg, "Faith and Reason," in *Basic Questions in Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 54 n.15.

305 Torrance, *Atonement*, 187.

306 *That All Shall Be Saved*, 61.

307 Pabst, *Metaphysics*, 55-57; Pannenberg, "Task of Christian Eschatology," 2; William Temple, *Nature, Man and God* (Edinburgh: R. & R. Clark, 1940), 317.

308 "Letter to Jacobi 27 Apr. 1787 (Excerpt)," in *J.G. Hamann*, ed. Ronald Gregor Smith (New York: Harper, 1960), 255.

309 W.M. Alexander, *Johann Georg Hamann: Philosophy and Faith* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966), 129.

310 Carl G. Vaught, *Access to God in Augustine's Confessions: Books X-XIII* (State Univ. of New York Press, 2005), 35.

Anselmian "faith seeking understanding,"[311] *how* faith and understanding relate can be disputed, but not *that* they do.[312]

Scripture thus invites consideration of facts it does not record. Hamann again, "Whoever studies the ancients without knowing nature is reading the notes without the text."[313] Both creation and Scripture are God-breathed (Gen. 1:3, 6, 9, 14-15, 20, 24, 2:7; 2Ti. 3:16). This demands, in John Milbank's words, "the unavoidable need for interpretative abduction"[314] or Paul Blowers' more extravagant "multidimensional participation in the polymorphous epiphany of the Word in Scripture, in the fabric of creation, and preeminently in historical flesh …."[315] "God is in the facts themselves," Bonhoeffer abstracted.[316] "Whoever says that the words of the Torah are one thing and the words of the world another," Buber concluded, "must be regarded as a man who denies God."[317] Among the essential sources of truth are life's experiences,[318] and this is particularly the case for salvation[319] and the afterlife.[320] Because experiencing involves introspection, expressing these experiences requires the grammatical first-person. Theology and philosophy probably require it generally, as truth is accessed there.[321] Regardless, the first-person reflects that understanding *self*, a central topic, derives from personal experience.[322] Because this includes relating to others, which is the second-person,[323] we combine the viewpoints, which is first-person plural. This perspective awakens, Balthasar noted, "the

---

311 Thomas P. Rausch, *Systematic Theology: Roman Catholic Approach* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 2016), 1.

312 Gregor, *Philosophical Anthropology*, 13; Adrian Pabst, "Sovereign Reason Unbound," in *Grandeur of Reason*, ed. Peter M. Candler, Jr. and Conor Cunningham (London: SCM, 2010), 137; Matthew Lewis Sutton, *Heaven Opens* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014), 240.

313 "Cloverleaf," 48.

314 *Beyond Secular Order* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 2.

315 *Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2016), 78.

316 *Letters and Papers from Prison*, 191.

317 *Ten Rungs* (New York: Citadel, 1995), 63.

318 Blondel, "History and Dogma," 286; Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 23; Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, 76.

319 Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 76.

320 Bulgakov, *Bride of the Lamb*, 349.

321 Montemaggi, *Reading Dante's Commedia*, 71, 168, 223, 247; Rosenzweig, "The New Thinking," 179 (Briefe, 597).

322 Mark Johnston, *Surviving Death* (Princeton Univ. Press, 2010), 139; William McDonald, "Kierkegaard and Romanticism," in *Oxford Handbook of Kierkegaard*, ed. John Lippitt and George Pattison (Oxford Univ. Press, 2013), 101.

323 Reddy, *How Infants Know Minds*, 26-42.

elementary insight that I am …."[324] From this *I* understanding, the universally practiced principle of the world's consistency is applied,[325] and, so, introspection's results are extrapolated.[326] "For he who knows himself," Anthony the Great saw, "knows all men."[327] Accordingly, as Chapter 6 explores, the first-person and our commonalities yield our understanding of *individual*.[328]

Most facts, especially Scriptural ones,[329] reach us through our forbearers,[330] and, because much is needed to preserve the salvation paradox, eclectic scholars contribute. If, as Barth advises, we are to "listen as unreservedly as possible to the witness of Scripture,"[331] we must shun answers that soothe, guarding against both mendacity and favoritism.[332] Thereby to provoke interpretations not our own, tradition is consulted, but not as independent authority, forgetting from where it too originated.[333] Instead, as the church fathers understood, tradition seeks truth out of, not outside of, Scripture.[334] Therefore, theologians rely on tradition.[335] They listen broadly to avoid bias and cross-examine claims to avoid falsehoods.[336] As a result, divergent experts testify[337] and, on common issues, even "infidels," because, Anselm recognized, both they and Christians "appeal to reason," "the thing sought is one and the same."[338] "He talking on his own seeks his own glory" (John 7:18).

---

[324] *Theo-Logic*, II, 255.

[325] Dilworth, *Metaphysics of Science*, 53.

[326] Francis Crick, *The Astonishing Hypothesis* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995), 107; Edmund Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations*, trans. Dorion Cairns (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1960), 110, 113; Jean-Paul Sartre, *Between Existentialism and Marxism*, trans. John Mathews (New York: William Morrow, 1976), 155.

[327] *The Letters*, trans. Derwas J. Chitty (Oxford: SLG, 1975), Ltr VI (p. 20).

[328] Henri Bergson, *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*, trans. Ashley Audra and Cloudesley Brereton (Garden City: Doubleday, 1935), 14-15; Schaff, *Marxism and the Human Individual*, 87.

[329] John Behr, *The Mystery of Christ* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2006), 64-70; Williams, *Architecture of Theology*, 222.

[330] Candler, *Theology, Rhetoric, Manuduction*, 35.

[331] *CD IV/2*, xi.

[332] Hart, "Redemption and Fall," 191; Wycliffe, *Truth of Holy Scripture*, xxiii,208.

[333] Hendrikus Berkhof, *The Christian Faith*, trans. Sierd Woudstra (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 98; Bulgakov, *Orthodox Church*, 18; Merleau-Ponty, *Signs*, 159.

[334] J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 5th ed. (New York: Continuum, 2012), 39, 42-43, 46-49; Wiles, *Making of Christian Doctrine*, 114 n.1.

[335] John R. Betz, "A Radically Orthodox Reformer: J.G. Hamann," *Modern Theology* 33, no. 4 (2017): 674; Bulgakov, *Orthodox Church*, 10-11; Geisler, *ST*, 163.

[336] Martin Heidegger, "What Calls for Thinking?," in *Basic Writings*, ed. David Farrell Krell (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), 354; Pannenberg, *ST*, II, xiii.

[337] Thomas Franklin O'Meara, *Thomas Aquinas Theologian* (Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1997), 72.

[338] *Cur Deus Homo*, trans. Sidney Norton Deane (Fort Worth: RDMc, 2005), 15 (Bk I, ch 2).

Considering anything true, Hans Hillerbrand remarked, is not merely "Protestant self-confidence … that all pursuit of truth" converges, but is fully endorsed by its sparring partner, Thomas.[339] It is "an 'abiding wonder'" at the "peaceful coexistence" of "every form of practical cognition," van Fraassen explained.[340] Theological and secular insights correspond particularly regarding *individual*,[341] and, so, insights from all quarters are gathered, including artists, whose eloquence benefit ideation.[342] On topics more explicitly reliant on special revelation,[343] Christians are the source, but they are of all sorts, not "too papistic" or "too evangelical" (or too Lutheran).[344] Such eclecticism is desirable even when their uncited insights are disagreeable.[345] Truth matters, Kierkegaard affirmed, whether from "Balaam's ass or a sniggering wag or an apostle or an angel."[346]

Accord Muhammad Al-Ghazali, "Deliverance from Error," in *Al-Ghazali's Path to Sufism* (Louisville: Fons Vitae, 2000), 39.

339 *The Division of Christendom*, 430.

340 *The Empirical Stance*, 155.

341 Jamie A. Grant, "What Is Man?," in *Anthropology and NT Theology*, ed. Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds (New York: T&T Clark, 2019), 6; Ephraim Radner, "The Mystery of Christian Anthropology," Ibid., 243-44, 257; David H. Kelsey, "Personal Bodies," in *Personal Identity in Theological Perspective*, ed. Richard Lints, et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 141.

342 Husserl, *Ideas*, 70 (pp. 183-84); C.G. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, trans. W.S. Dell and Cary F. Baynes (Orlando: Harvest, 1933), 155-56.

343 O'Meara, *Thomas Aquinas Theologian*, 72.

344 Martin Luther, *Word and Sacrament II*, Am. ed., 36 vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1959), 237.

345 Bulgakov, "By Jacob's Well," 103; Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 69.

346 *Journal and Papers*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong, 7 vols., vol. V (Indiana Univ. Press, 1978), ¶ 5646.

Chapter 2. DECEASE, DECREASE, INCREASE

Mainly [for heaven] I just think about the splendors of the world and multiply by two. I'd multiply by ten or twelve if I had the energy. But two is much more than sufficient for my purposes.
—Marilynne Robinson[1]

While the first chapter cleared out some preliminaries, including clarity on the ultimate salvation issue, a few relatively uncontested convictions about that issue need to be outlined before proceeding to its paradox, if for no other reason than establishing what is agreed-upon minimizes the risk that the resulting understanding will be maladapted to its context. To that end, this chapter presents ultimate salvation's three fixed moments: death ends this life, everyone receives their due when the godly and ungodly are separated for eternal life or perishing, and those in eternal life are completed.

1) Everyone dies, followed by more.

Human life bestrides death.[2] We live warily and then die (Gal. 2:19-20).[3] Of humans, 100% go out this way, which is corroborated Scripturally (Job 30:23; Rom. 5:12),[4] scientifically,[5] and empirically.[6] Three Scriptural exceptions have been suggested: Enoch was suddenly "not there," "snatched up" (Gen. 5:24); Elijah "was taken up to heaven in the tempest" (2Ki. 2:11); and the last generation will be "snatched in clouds into the receiving of the Lord" (1Th. 4:16-17). These aberrational ends are properly taken, however, not as exceptions to death, but as exceptional deaths, because natural life still ends.[7]

---

1 *Gilead* (New York: Picador, 2004), 147.

2 Augustine, *City of God*, trans. Henry Bettenson (London: Penguin, 2003), I,11, XIII,10 (pp. 20, 518); Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, trans. Graham Harrison, 5 vols., vol. I (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1988), 370; Barth, *Romans*, 89 (3:20).

3 Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 153, 159.

4 Grant, "What Is Man?," 21.

5 Aging science indicates death is inexorable. Paul Nelson and Joanna Masel, "Inevitability of Multicellular Aging," PNAS 114, no. 49 (2017): 12982-87.

6 About 94% of all humans that have ever lived are dead already, and the remaining 6% are just those born in the last 120 years. Carl Haub, "How Many People Have Ever Lived on Earth?," Population Reference Bureau, http://www.prb.org/Publications/ Articles/ 2002/-HowMany-PeopleHaveEverLivedonEarth.aspx (accessed 27 Jan. 2018); Gerontology Research Group, "GRG World Supercentenarian Rankings List: Validated Living Supercentenarians," http:// www.grg. org/SC/WorldSCRankingsList.html (accessed 27 Jan. 2018).

7 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica, Part III (Suppl.)*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, vol. XX (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1921), Q. 78, art. 1, co. (pp. 149-50); Charles A. Wanamaker, *Epistles to the Thessalonians*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 176; Wright, *The Resurrection*, 94-95.

Death, despite its universality, cannot be self-authenticated.[8] Consciousness cannot apprehend nonconsciousness.[9] Our personal absence after death is even a worse negation than that before birth (Ecc. 4:2-3).[10] The world beforehand invites our becoming; the world afterwards erases what we became.[11] While our own death, though unseen, happens definitely, what happens is indefinite,[12] except for two things. First, the Christian consensus is that, as Chapter 6 details, the individual continues after biological life.[13] Death, as it ends life, completes life.[14] The world tells us, "Death is the condition of your creation," Montaigne interprets, "This being of yours … is equally divided between death and life. … The constant work of your life is to build death."[15] Life, accordingly, takes a lifetime, and its accumulations are the individual.[16] So, by nearly all accounts, death retains meaning for life, reflecting the ultimate difference between life ending and life never being.[17]

Second, by dominant tradition and common experience, any individual existence after biological death outlasts the biological body.[18] "We brought nothing into the world, nor, so, can we take anything out" (1Ti. 6:7). Our treasures stay behind even when hidden in our bodies, whether in gold fillings or swallowed as nectar. It is not that an afterlife lacks a body, but that death discontinues *this* body (Ecc. 12:7). What we have here, Käsemann noted, "is always the evanescent circumstance which is shattered in death."[19]

---

[8] Krapiec, *I-Man*, 349.

[9] Douglas J. Davies, "Immortality," in *The Role of Death in Life*, ed. John Behr and Conor Cunningham (Eugene: Cascade, 2015), 34; Leo Tolstoy, *The Death of Ivan Ilyich and Other Stories*, trans. Rosemary Edmondson (London: Penguin, 1960), 137; Watkin, "Kierkegaard--Dying and Eternal Life," 80.

[10] Wollheim, *Thread of Life*, 257.

[11] Hannah Arendt, *Love and St Augustine* (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1996), 51-52, 55, 70-72.

[12] Soren Kierkegaard, *For Self-Examination*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1952), 18.

[13] Berkouwer, *Man: Image of God*, 269; Christopher Shields and Robert Pasnau, *Philosophy of Aquinas*, 2nd ed. (Oxford Univ. Press, 2016), 206.

[14] Krapiec, *I-Man*, 335, 350; Watkin, "Kierkegaard--Dying and Eternal Life," 268.

[15] "Essays," I,20 (p. 65).

[16] Kierkegaard, *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, I, 345; Westphal, *Becoming a Self*, 154.

[17] Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, trans. Graham Harrison, 5 vols., vol. IV (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1994), 490; David Bentley Hart, "Death, Final Judgment, and the Meaning of Life," in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, ed. Jerry L. Walls (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 477; Kierkegaard, *Book on Adler*, 7; Pieper, *Death and Immortality*, 78; Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife*, 28-29.

[18] Bulgakov, *Bride of the Lamb*, 357; Cooper, "Whose Interpretation? Which Anthropology," 239, 248-49; Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, 165. Christ's resurrected body is not to the contrary. See, *infra*, discussion p. 151.

[19] *Perspectives on Paul*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 25.

Even scholars who strongly identify with the terrestrial body accept this.[20] The resurrected life, which *is* corporeal, does not change the conclusion, because it involves a *new* body (1Co. 15:44-46), not revivification.[21] Given this corporeal discontinuity, some theologians struggle with whether our *identity* in this life is *identical* to that in the next, presuming identity depends on identicalness,[22] but this is disproven every time we remain us after changing our mood or haircut. Only those suffering Capgras syndrome think a changed person is a different person.[23] Identity tracks what changes, the opposite of identicalness.[24]

The understanding of the afterlife has evolved, but even the earliest Scriptural writers understood corpses were not the end.[25] The dead were, apart from interment, "gathered to" their deceased "peoples," "the way of all the earth" (Jos. 23:14; 1Ki. 2:2),[26] which is specified in nearly every Scriptural stratum.[27] This understanding matured as the faithful reflected on how death separates us from the body but not from God (Rom. 8:38-39).[28] In death, Samuel communicated with the living and foretold the future (1Sa. 28:7-19), and the departed Moses and Elijah conversed with Jesus (Mat. 17:3//Mark 9:4 //Luke 9:30). Jesus called those in hell more than dead (Mat. 10:26-28; Luke 12:1-5)[29] and argued God was of the living because the deceased patriarchs lived (Mat. 22:31-32// Mark 12:26-27//Luke 20:37-38).[30] He also assured the thief of immediate postmortem

---

[20] Adrian J. Walker, "The Lived Body as the Organ of Theology," *Communio* 33 (2006): 214.

[21] Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Logic*, trans. Graham Harrison, 3 vols., vol. III (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2005), 295; Francois Bovon, "The Soul's Comeback," *HTR* 103, no. 4 (2010): 401; Stephen Finlan, "Can We Speak of Theosis in Paul?," in *Partakers of the Divine Nature*, ed. Michael J. Christensen and Jeffrey A. Wittung (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 70-73.

[22] *E.g.*, David B. Hershenov and Rose Koch-Hershenov, "Personal Identity and Purgatory," *Religious Studies* 42 (2006): 439-51.

[23] McGilchrist, *The Master and His Emissary*, 53.

[24] Lance J. Rips, et al., "Tracing the Identity of Objects," *Psychological Rev.* 113, no. 1 (2006): 1-30; Leon Turner, *Theology, Psychology and the Plural Self* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2008), 145.

[25] John W. Cooper, "Biblical Anthropology and the Body-Soul Problem," in *Soul, Body, and Survival*, ed. Kevin J. Corcoran (New York: Cornell Univ. Press, 2001), 220; Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 89.

[26] Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology*, 128-29; P.S. Johnson, "Life, Disease and Death," in *Dict. of the OT: Pentateuch*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and David W. Baker (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003), 536; Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife*, 39-40.

[27] Gen. 25:8-9, 17, 35:29, 49:29, 33–50:2; Num. 20:24-26, 27:13, 31:2; Deu. 32:50; Jud. 2:10; 2Ki. 22:20; 2Ch. 34:28; Acts 13:36-37.

[28] Badham, *Christian Beliefs About Life after Death*, 5-7; Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife*, 22.

[29] *Death and the Afterlife*, 51-52.

[30] Gillman, *Death of Death*, 121; Wright, *The Resurrection*, 424-26.

existence (23:42-43).[31] Paul too saw afterlife existence as gain (Phi. 1:20-24), and the slaughtered martyrs reportedly remain active (Rev. 6:9-10).

Thus, we live with death and then die, and Scripture, even when figurative, refers to something afterwards. Our terrestrial body is surpassed then, but something essential continues. This well-acknowledged view sets up the salvation paradox.

2) <u>The godly are separated from the perishing.</u>

After this life's close, humanity is ultimately distinguished between the godly for eternal life and the ungodly for perishing. This moment holds the salvation paradox, requiring a lengthier discussion.

a) The division

A common Christian doctrine is that death brings the judgment of humanity based on godliness.[32] "God is nowhere and never neutral, resting in an attitude of indifference with regard to the antithesis holy-unholy, resistance to God and obedience to God," Brunner reminded. "This … is so consistently and piercingly the Biblical idea of God that we cannot be surprised that the thought of judgment penetrates unequivocally every … layer of Holy Scripture."[33] The precise predicate that serves the divine judgment can be disputed, whether *righteousness*, including rightly relating to God, or *faith*, including living for God.[34] The frequent shorthand here, *godliness*, encompasses any such concepts.[35]

The divine judgment's division of humanity begins in this life (Psa. 1:5-6). "The Lord tries the righteous and evil"—the first obtains God; the second, "fiery coals; brimstone and scorching wind" (11:5-7). The prophetic future involves separating the godly for the ungodly's destruction (Jer. 12:15-17, 36:3, 31; Amos 9:8-11; Mic. 7:18-19; Mal. 3:1-3; Zec. 5:1-4, 8:14-17). Among people, "two parts will be cut off, expire; yet the

---

[31] Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2 vols., vol. II (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 1005-13.

[32] John Behr, *Irenaeus of Lyons* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2013), 182; Brian E. Daley, *The Hope of the Early Church* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991), 219-20; Nichols, *Death and Afterlife*, 37-38; Richard G. Swinburne, "The Future of the Totally Corrupt," in *Rethinking Hell*, ed. Christopher M. Date, et al. (Eugene: Cascade, 2014), 238; Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife*, 98-99.

[33] *Eternal Hope*, 173-74.

[34] G.W. Martin, "Faith," in *New Dict. of Theology*, ed. Sinclair B. Ferguson and David F. Wright (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1988), 246-47; N.T. Wright, "Righteousness," Ibid., 590-92; Mark A. Seifrid, "Righteousness, Justice and Justification," in *New Dict. of Bib. Theology*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000), 740-45; Stephen S. Taylor, "Faith, Faithfulness," Ibid., 487-93.

[35] Fernando Q. Gouvea, "Godliness," in *Evangelical Dict. of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 508-509; Richard B. Vinson, "Godly," in *The New Interpreter's Dict. of the Bib.*, ed. Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (Nashville: Abingdon, 2007), 620-21; *Oxford English Dict.* 2nd ed., s.v. "godly."

third will remain in it. This third I will bring through the fire" (13:8-9). Separating godly from doomed has no expiry (Hab. 2:2-4). The coming Day of the Lord, which likely originated with Holy War, foreshadows God decisively intervening to protect the godly remnant as the ungodly perish (Joel 1:15, 2:2-3, 28, 32, 3:12-13, 20-21; Amos 5:18-20; Zep. 1:2-3, 14, 17, 2:2-3).[36] Those who rebel perish as the godly live in a new creation (Isa. 65–66). Ultimately, everyone is resurrected, some for eternal life, others for eternal abomination (Dan. 12:2).

The NT too separates the enduring godly from the perishing ungodly.[37] Christ's followers perdure; the rest do not (Mat. 7:24-27//Luke 6:47-49).[38] The sheep-goat parable has the righteous eternally living and the unrighteous eternally castigated (Mat. 25:31-46). Jesus brings this dividing of the godly for eternal life from the ungodly for eternal destruction: "I came not to cast peace," but "to bisect [διχάσαι]" (10:34-35). Christ is "a sign of contradiction [ἀντιλεγόμενον]," bringing "a sword" that pierces even the noblest (Luke 2:34-35). "Fire I came to cast on the earth, and would it were already kindled. … Think I came to give the earth peace? No, I tell you, but division [διαμερισμόν]" (12:49-51). Those entering through the Shepherd's door live eternally and avoid its opposite (John 10:9, 26-28). Or, "Anyone to the extent not abiding in Me is like the branch cast away to wither; they're gathered, cast into the fire, and burned" (15:2, 6). The separating is expressed non-pastorally too: "All in the tombs will … come out—those doing goods into a resurrection of life and those practicing evils into a resurrection of judgment" (5:28-29). "[W]hoever comes to Me I'll never ever cast out, … for My Father wills that all who … believe in the Son have eternal life" (6:37-40).

The Day of the Lord remains one of ungodly destruction and godly salvation (2Pe. 3:10-15).[39] Everyone is resurrected, and God judges, saving the godly from evil (Acts 24:15-16; 2Ti. 4:18; Heb. 4:9-14; 1Pe. 1:3-9). As godliness endures, ungodliness does not (2:9-10; 2Co. 9:9). In the end, the living godly are segregated from the perishing ungodly (Rev. 19:20-21, 20:6, 10, 22:11-15). Being named in the Book of Life reflects the godliness division, particularly in the end (Exo. 32:31-33; Psa. 69:28; Dan. 12:1; Luke 10:20;

---

[36] Bill T. Arnold, "OT Eschatology and the Rise of Apocalypticism," in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, ed. Jerry L. Walls (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 27.

[37] Brunner, *Eternal Hope*, 168; Kung, *Eternal Life?*, 141; Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, trans. R.A. Wilson and John Bowden (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), 174.

[38] Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, trans. James R. Payton, Jr., Irenaeus on the Christian Faith ed. (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2012), 4:4,3 (p. 88).

[39] Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife*, 98.

Phi. 4:3). The godly are listed in the Book, while the unlisted, those against God, have the second death (Rev. 3:5, 13:8, 17:8, 20:15, 21:27).

This godly-ungodly division is embraced across understandings of salvation's extent, even Universalism. Universalists say the ungodly 'perish' at an intermediate eschatological horizon in such a way that no one actually perishes, allowing everyone to be saved at the final eschatological horizon.[40] Chapters 7 and 8 further discuss this godliness division in the context of the salvation paradox.

b) The individual's role

The godliness division pertains to something about the individual. Salvation has divine *and* human dimensions, involving both God's gift *and* our receipt.[41] God draws us by grace with our reason and will.[42] While it is God who promises, empowers, and provisions, it is the individual who repents, believes, and obeys.[43] Salvation is bequeathed, not inflicted.[44] Hence, the Christian concurrence shuns both Pelagianism's self-salvation where individuals earn it and cheap-grace mechanical-salvation where God does everything.[45] Christians need not agree on our role to acknowledge Scripture gives us a role (Mat. 5:7, 6:14-24, 18:26-35).[46] It is, Nicholas Lash noted, at least "*making a difference*," whether to our community, our family, our neighbor, ourselves, something.[47]

The infamous denominational breach concerning faith plus works or faith alone, Scripture reflects.[48] On one hand, it says too frequently to be sure of completeness that our response includes deeds.[49] Actions, not faith assertions, are repaid (Mat. 21:28-31; Luke 14:13-14, 16:19-31; John 5:28-30; 1Co. 6:9-11). Salvation is worked out (Phi. 2:12-13). Forgiveness too is like for like (Mat. 6:12-15, 7:1-2, 18:23-35; Luke 6:37-38, 11:4;

---

[40] Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 103-104, 129.

[41] Demarest, *Cross and Salvation*, 43, 45, 461; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 252; Olson, *Mosaic of Christian Belief*, 267, 272-73, 286.

[42] Blondel, "Letter on Apologetics," 141.

[43] Demarest, *Cross and Salvation*, 461; Charles G. Finney, *The Memoirs*, Complete Restored ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989), 273 (MS522, JHF264); Murray J. Harris, "Salvation," in *New Dict. of Bib. Theology*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000), 765.

[44] Colijn, *Images of Salvation*, 140.

[45] Geisler, *ST*, 779; Pannenberg, *ST*, III, 444-45.

[46] Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Dare We Hope 'That All Men Be Saved'?*, trans. David Kipp and Lothar Krauth (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1988), 94-95.

[47] *Easter in Ordinary*, 284.

[48] Oakes, *Theology of Grace in Six Controversies*, 77-81; Rausch, *ST*, 155.

[49] 2Ch. 6:23; Ps. 62:12; Pro. 24:12; Jer. 17:10; Eze. 18:20; Mat. 16:27; Acts 10:35; Rom. 2:6, 14:12; 1Co. 3:12-15; 2Co. 5:10, 11:15; 2Ti. 4:14; 1Pe. 1:17; Rev. 2:23, 14:13, 18:6, 20:12-13, 22:12.

Jam. 2:13).[50] Acts are all we literally contribute.[51] On the other hand, Scripture says, "God's electing purpose" stands, "not by works" (Rom. 9:11-12), but "through our Lord Jesus' grace" (Acts 15:11). The only work is believing (16:30-31), "only believe" (*μόνον πίστευσον*, Luke 8:50), "believing in the One He sent"' (John 6:28-29). Believing is eternal life; disbelieving, dying (3:15-16, 36, 5:22-24, 8:23-24). "To the extent you confess in your mouth Jesus 'Lord' and believe in your heart God raised Him from among the dead, you will be saved, for with the heart one believes into righteousness and with the mouth one confesses into salvation" (Rom. 10:9-10).

Any addition to faith, even alone, likely undersells it (Rom. 14:23). In living, we represent God.[52] Bonhoeffer's "what is the will of God?" suffices as a slogan.[53] Scripture certainly urges holiness.[54] Jesus' parables, to begin with, reveal the ultimate importance of the individual's response (Mat. 13:24-30, 36-43, 21:28-32, 25:1-13, 31-46; 22:1-14//Luke 14:16-24; 18:9-14).[55] Even His contrasting laborers parable requires them to accept employment (Mat. 20:1-16). The sheep must follow the Shepherd (John 10:9-16). Paul too understood that transformation requires response.[56] "Continue working out your salvation with fear and trembling" (Phi. 2:12). "Be not conformed to this age, but be transformed by your mind's renewing into attesting what God wills, the good, pleasing, and complete" (Rom. 12:1-2). We are frequently exhorted to respond because responding matters (8:13-17; Eph. 4:22-32; Col. 3:1–4:6; 1Th. 4:1-12; Heb. 12:14; 2Pe. 1:5-11).[57] Otherwise, the apostles summon in vain (2Co. 5:20).[58]

Virtually every Christian knows it is *lived* faith[59] or "allegiance" that is significant.[60] "What counts before God is not simply the … deed," Bultmann noticed, "but how a

---

[50] Kierkegaard, *Works of Love*, 380.

[51] Geisler, *ST*, 822, 825; Hermut Lohr, "The Role of Eschatology in NT Moral Thought," in *Eschatology of the NT and Some Related Documents*, ed. Jan G. van der Watt (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 661.

[52] Hans Schwarz, *The Human Being* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 24.

[53] *Ethics*, trans. Reinhard Krauss, et al. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009), 47-48 [31].

[54] Preston Sprinkle, ed. *Four Views on Hell*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 203.

[55] Behr, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 97; Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Belknap Press of Harvard Univ., 2007), 646.

[56] Finlan, "Can We Speak of Theosis in Paul?," 77; Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, 115.

[57] Bornkamm, *Paulus*, 202; Erasmus, "De Libero Arbitrio," in *Luther and Erasmus: Free Will and Salvation* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), 87; Lohr, "The Role of Eschatology in NT Moral Thought," 661.

[58] Alan E. Bernstein, *Formation of Hell* (Cornell Univ. Press, 1993), 216.

[59] Geisler, *ST*, 870, 1050; Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, 114-16; Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 99-100.

[60] Matthew W. Bates, *Salvation by Allegiance Alone* (Grand Rapids: BakerAcademic, 2017), 5, 8, 92,

man is disposed …."[61] Even when salvific deeds are denied, participation is not.[62] Calvin realized "faith … alone … is not destitute of good works," "admit[ting] … a partial righteousness in works ...."[63] To God's will, we add our own.[64] We work for God, not God for us.[65] Even the most grace alone Christians—God "wholly and completely" achieves salvation—recognize this "must be received … through … a … self-surrendering response."[66] Barth summarized, "God acts in His free grace, but He also wills and expects and demands something from His covenant-partner,"[67] which is "the parallel but opposing fulfillment of two great movements," "a human action" "in participation" with Christ.[68] While atonement is God-based,[69] the individual must accept acceptance.[70] To "not destroy the grace that we have received," Cabasilas concluded, "there is need of something human,"[71] and "This alone we contribute to this life—that we submit to His gifts …."[72] Christians understand, therefore, that God does not will to save us without us.[73] Our role involves at least relinquishing our role.[74]

Any of these approaches to the relationship between who we are and our ultimate destiny is admissible here so long as it admits a relationship. What we are, whether a result, cause, or correspondence, is integral to the godliness separation, and, as discussed in Chapter 6, living changes us.[75] So, the paradox of salvation's extent arises from the

---

101, 109, 213.

61 *Theology of the NT*, I: 2.2 (p. 13).

62 Michael J. Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 80, 93, 102, 161-62.

63 *Institutes*, III,11,1, 13,2, 17,10 (pp. 475, 499, 534).

64 Betz, *After Enlightenment*, 310.

65 Peguy, *Temporal and Eternal*, 99.

66 Timothy A. McCoy, "The Gospel Truth," in *Who Will Be Saved?*, ed. Paul R. House and Gregory A. Thornbury (Wheaton: Crossway, 2000), 174-75.

67 *CD II/2*, § 32.1 (p. 11).

68 *Church Dogmatics IV/3.1*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), §§ 69.1, 69.3 (pp. 4-7, 220).

69 Long, *Perfectly Simple Triune God*, 26.

70 Tillich, *ST*, II, 170, 173, 179.

71 *The Life in Christ*, trans. Carmino J. deCatanzaro (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974), Bk VI § 1 (p. 159).

72 Ibid., Bk I § 11 (p. 63).

73 Bates, *Salvation by Allegiance Alone*, 103; Lubac, *Catholicism*, 226.

74 Robert W. Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2 vols., vol. I (Oxford Univ. Press, 1997), 167, 224-25, 232-33; Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, 150.

75 Nonna Verna Harrison, *God's Many-Splendored Image* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010), 16.

benchmark that the separation is based on something about our lives, whether done by us or to us.

c) The binaries

Another Scriptural certainty is that our destiny is binary—eternal life or perishing.[76] "Risky though it always is to speak of a consensus among theologians," Brian Daley distilled, one is that God's judgment renders "permanent and perfect happiness for the good, and permanent, all-consuming misery for the wicked."[77] The Second Temple texts clearly articulated these binaries: "multitudes sleeping in the soil's dust will wake: these to eternal life and these to shames, eternal contempt" (Dan. 12:2). This Janus-faced resurrection tied to God's final reward and condemnation matured in intertestamental Jewish literature,[78] upon which the NT then built.[79]

Believers have eternal life, but there is another outcome (John 3:16). There is saving *and* annihilating (Jam. 4:12), the saved *and* the annihilated (2Co. 2:15; 2Th. 2:10). "[T]o the one who thirsts I will give freely from the spring of life's water …., but, the cowards, unfaithful," etc., "their part is in the lake that burns fire and brimstone" (Rev. 21:6-8). The binary outcomes track the separation: "man reaps to the extent he sows. The one sowing into his flesh will from the flesh reap corruption, but the one sowing into the Spirit will from the Spirit reap eternal life" (Gal. 6:7-8).[80] The binary ultimates suffer no third outcome. Any Purgatory, for instance, is a penultimate.[81] Theologians can also decide the two outcomes have degrees,[82] but they uniformly agree that there is only two: unmitigatedly wonderful eternal life and wholly undesirable perishing.[83] This dual destiny occasions the salvation-extent dispute. Scripture demonstrates that at least some obtain the positive ultimate.[84] Passages could be catalogued (*e.g.*, Heb. 12:23; Rev.

---

[76] Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 13.

[77] *Hope of the Early Church*, 219-21 (emphasis removed).

[78] Matthias Henze, "On the Anthropology of Early Judaism," in *Anthropology and NT Theology*, ed. Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds (New York: T&T Clark, 2019), 40-42.

[79] Hans Urs von Balthasar, "Epilogue: Apokatastasis," in *Dare We Hope 'That All Men Be Saved'?* (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1988), 236.

[80] Schwarz, *The Human Being*, 19.

[81] Paul J. Griffiths, "Purgatory," in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, ed. Jerry L. Walls (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 427-29; Nichols, *Death and Afterlife*, 173.

[82] *E.g.*, Carl B. Bridges, "Degrees of Punishment and Reward in the Gospels," *Stone-Campbell J.* 14, no. 1 (2011): 81-86.

[83] Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 133.

[84] Christopher D. Marshall, "Divine and Human Punishment in the NT," in *Rethinking Hell*, ed. Christopher M. Date, et al. (Eugene: Cascade, 2014), 226.

6:9), but, because Christ undeniably atoned with effect (Rom. 5:9),[85] at least some are saved. Whether the negative ultimate is also populated is the paradox of salvation's extent, the next chapter's subject.

Two contested issues about the binaries are independent of the salvation paradox and thus of the thesis. The first is of what the negative binary consists. It is usually denominated "perish" (ἀπόληται, John 3:16) and is understood as either eternal torment or final oblivion.[86] Torment has been traditional,[87] but Scripture suggests annihilation.[88] Both are wholly negative,[89] and neither obviously worse.[90] The second independent issue is whether there is an intermediate state.[91] Tradition recognizes two afterlives—a resurrected life in a radically different body and, before then, an intermediate discarnate existence.[92] Scripture suggests these two afterlives,[93] but some, like Luther reputedly,[94] argue only the resurrected life is experienced after this one.[95] Thomism has a middle approach: The intermediate state is a diminished experience, lacking sense imagery.[96] Others see the intermediate state as undiminished.[97] The proposed model accommodates all such approaches.

---

[85] Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, 42; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 186.

[86] Caldecott, *Radiance of Being*, 245; Thomas Johnson, "A Wideness in God's Mercy," in *Universal Salvation?*, ed. Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 77-78.

[87] LeRoy E. Froom, "Conditionalism in the Early Church," in *Rethinking Hell*, ed. Christopher M. Date, et al. (Eugene: Cascade, 2014), 260-75; Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife*, 26.

[88] Fudge, *The Fire That Consumes*, *passim*; Clark H. Pinnock, "Annihilationism," in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, ed. Jerry L. Walls (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 464-66; John G. Stackhouse, Jr., "Terminal Punishment," in *Four Views on Hell*, ed. Preston Sprinkle (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 61-81.

[89] Marshall, "Divine and Human Punishment," 223.

[90] Kierkegaard, *Stages*, 260.

[91] Griffiths, "Purgatory," 431; Stephen Yates, *Between Death and Resurrection* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2017), 1-5.

[92] International Theological Commission, "Some Current Questions on Eschatology," (1992), 4.1; Nancey Murphy, *Bodies and Souls, or Spirited Bodies?* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2012), 7.

[93] Cooper, "Biblical Anthropology," 220-26; Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife*, 61-62.

[94] Philip J. Secker, "Martin Luther's Views on the State of the Dead," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 38, no. 7 (1967): 422-35.

[95] Stephen T. Davis, "Eschatology and Resurrection," in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, ed. Jerry L. Walls (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 388; Kung, *Eternal Life?*, 138; Murphy, *Bodies and Souls, or Spirited Bodies?*, 10.

[96] Antonia Fitzpatrick, *Thomas Aquinas on Bodily Identity* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2017), 155; Mary F. Rousseau, "Elements of a Thomastic Philosophy of Death," *The Thomist* 43, no. 4 (1979): 581-602; Yates, *Between Death and Resurrection*, 240.

[97] Benjamin P. Blosser, *Become Like the Angels* (Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 2012), 246 (discussing Origen); Lewis, "Transposition," 111.

* * * *

Scripture sets out binary outcomes—wonderfully good eternal life for the godly and horribly bad perishing for the ungodly.[98] No specifics about either are relevant here; the nonparadoxical given is that the ultimate outcome is binary, regardless of what the negative ultimate consists or whether an intermediate state exists. As subsequent chapters discuss, particularly 9, the binary outcomes can cause problems for how to understand salvation's extent, but the paradox itself pertains to getting to the binary outcomes, not being in them.

3) <u>The godly are completed.</u>

The final relevant Scriptural certainty on ultimate salvation is that, in addition to the unrighteous being carved out, the righteous are consummated (Rom. 9:27-28). Because we each lack in this life what God desires for us,[99] we are afterwards completed,[100] often called glorification.[101] "Simply to look at people with any degree of realism at all," Ratzinger discerned, "is to grasp the necessity of such a process."[102] Given our obvious failings, it might be the easiest Christian tenet to verify empirically.[103] So, salvation involves completion (Mat. 5:48).[104] We "are being transformed into the same icon" as "the Lord's glory," "from glory into glory, even as from Lord into Spirit" (2Co. 3:18) to "commune with divine nature" (2Pe. 1:4). What continues from this life to be transformed for the next includes the individual.[105] Only then are God's children complete like the Father (1Co. 2:6; 1Jo. 3:1-2). In addition to glorification, this can be called *theosis*, deification,[106] be gods with God,[107] or, from Greek philosophy, assimilation to God (or the gods).[108] Irrespective, the accord is that any resurrected individual will, after losing

---

98 Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 14-15, 133.

99 Thomas Talbott, "Reply to My Critics," in *Universal Salvation?*, ed. Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 252.

100 Wolfhart Pannenberg, "Modernity, History, and Eschatology," in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, ed. Jerry L. Walls (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 498.

101 Cabasilas, *Life in Christ*, Bk I § 1 (p. 43); Adam G. Cooper, *Naturally Human, Supernaturally God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014), 2; Daniel A. Keating, *Deification and Grace* (Naples: Sapientia, 2007), 39-40, 60-63, 87, 110.

102 *Eschatology*, 230-31.

103 Williams, *Architecture of Theology*, 13.

104 Spezzano, *Glory of God's Grace*, 1.

105 Pannenberg, *ST*, III, 574, 639-40; Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 187.

106 Michael J. Christensen, "The Problem, Promise, and Process of Theosis," in *Partakers of the Divine Nature*, ed. Michael J. Christensen and Jeffrey A. Wittung (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 25-27.

107 Cabasilas, *Life in Christ*, Bk I § 11 (p. 63).

108 Kooton, *Paul's Anthropology in Context*, 92, 206, 210-11, 214.

some of this life, gain what is needed for the next.[109] That is, though not all of who we are in this life makes it to the other side, whatever continues requires completing.[110]

Completion in the afterlife has significance to the position that the individual can be divisible then, which Chapter 7 considers, but the paradox of who all are ultimately saved occurs explanatorily outside this completion. Salvation's extent determines *who* is completed, not *what* happens to them when they are. This completion moment awaits Christ's day (1Co. 15:23; 1Th. 4:16-17; Phi. 1:6).[111] The moment with salvation's extent is the issue upcoming.

---

[109] J.A. McGuckin, "Strategic Adaptation of Deification in the Cappadocians," in *Partakers of the Divine Nature*, ed. Michael J. Christensen and Jeffrey A. Wittung (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 95-110; James Starr, "Does 2 Peter 1:4 Speak of Deification?," Ibid., 81-90; Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife*, 88; Donald F. Winslow, *Dynamics of Salvation* (Cambridge: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979), 193.

[110] Basil, "Asketikon," LR Pro. ¶ 4 (p. 159).

[111] Bornkamm, *Paulus*, 204; Demarest, *Cross and Salvation*, 382, 411, 467-68, 474; Harding, *Paul's Eschatological Anthropology*, 320; Amy L.B. Peeler, "The Eschatological Son," in *Anthropology and NT Theology*, ed. Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds (New York: T&T Clark, 2019), 172.

Chapter 3. SCRIPTURE'S SALVATION PARADOX

When you come to the point, it does go against the grain to kill an Archbishop, especially when you have been brought up in good Church traditions.

—T.S. Eliot[1]

Salvation's *con*tent, the last chapter showed, while hardly straightforward, is not contradictory: It is wonderful, starts in this life, and completes in the next. Salvation's *ex*tent, this chapter will show, has Scriptural accounts that seemingly contradict—one Universalist, one Exclusivist. The Universalism in Scripture can be underappreciated given, as described in the next two chapters, Exclusivism's long-running currency in the Church and, frankly, how Universalists lean on God's loving nature instead of Scripture.[2] This chapter, therefore, cannot truncate its presentation of Scripture's Universalism and, along with its presentation of Scripture's Exclusivism, leave the reader blissfully untroubled by how Scripture ostensibly contradicts itself.

1) Everyone is ultimately saved.

Before addressing Universalism's basis, a few rationales need to be identified as outside the Scriptural paradox. Universalism is sometimes called *apokatastasis*, though etymologically this is a specific kind—restoring everything to its beginning.[3] The word appears in Scripture once (Acts 3:21), and Universalists do not use this aberration to validate their position, which is no oversight. While Peter says Christ's parousia involves "restoring [ἀποκατάστασις] all" to God, he is calling for his listeners to repent so as to avoid obliteration (3:19, 23), and this call would hardly exhort if obliteration was not an option.[4] *Restoring all*, rather, includes God's wrathful judgment.[5] So, this unique *apokatastasis* verse has not shaped Universalism.

Two Universalist deductions are also excluded. The perennial question, *why would God not save everyone?,* faces Origen's answer: "If he is unwilling, then he will not be good; if he is willing but cannot, he will not be almighty."[6] Though philosophically attractive,

---

1 *Murder in the Cathedral* (San Diego: Harcourt, 1963), 79.

2 David Bentley Hart, "Christ's Rabble," *Commonweal* 143, no. 16 (2016): 18.

3 Albrecht Oepke, "Apokatastasis," in *Theological Dict. of the NT*, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 389-93; Ilaria L.E. Ramelli, "Procus and Apokatastasis," in *Proclus and His Legacy*, ed. David D. Butorac (Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2017), 95.

4 Jeffrey A. Trumbower, *Rescue for the Dead* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2001), 109.

5 Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 41 & n.90.

6 *On First Principles*, trans. G.W. Butterworth (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1936), II,5,2 (p. 102).

this Universalist favorite[7] rests on a non-Scriptural premise—God always ensures everyone's welfare.[8] God's will has self-imposed exclusions (Mat. 23:37-38//Luke 13:34).[9] We petition for His will to be done because it not always is (Mat. 6:10).[10] While God wills that His creatures not reject Him, they still do (Col. 3:23-25).[11] This is because God's unrelenting love includes not forcing salvation and His undiluted goodness includes not forgiving the impenitent.[12] Rejecting His love does not remove His love or even limit it, but it does take on His wrath.[13] God's all-powerful love, therefore, is not part of the *Scriptural* paradox, despite the argument's *ipso facto* appeal.

The second excluded Universalist argument is: The saved will empathetically suffer if anyone is damned, which means everyone must be saved if anyone is.[14] Universalists occasionally cite as support Jesus' concern for the needy (Mat. 25:40) or Paul's concern for others (Rom. 9:2-3; Phi. 2:27), but neither warrants the desired conclusion. Universalists typically take such empathy as an obvious inference from how good people feel,[15] but this too is unwarranted, at least based on Scripture. The godly crave divine vengeance (Neh. 4:4-5; Jer. 17:18), such as the Psalmist,[16] including the Psalms Jesus fulfilled (Psa. 41:9-10, 69:21, 24, 28). Jesus favorably described Abraham resting peacefully while witnessing Dives' torment (Luke 16:19-31). The thought of Divine vengeance comforted Paul too (Rom. 2:5-6, 12:19; 1Th. 4:6; 2Ti. 4:14-15), as it did the godly martyrs (Rev. 6:10, 18:20, 20:12-15). This insensitivity to the reprobate continues after Scripture, whether by Tertullian, Thomas, or Luther.[17] The saved are not so delicate as to find

---

[7] Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 635; Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 90-91; Talbott, "Pauline Interpretation of Divine Judgment," 32.

[8] Soren Kierkegaard, *Journal and Papers*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong, 7 vols., vol. II (Indiana Univ. Press, 1970), 47 (entry 1210); Daniel Strange, "Calvinist Response to Talbott's Universalism," in *Universal Salvation?*, ed. Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 156-60; Talbott, "Pauline Interpretation of Divine Judgment," 32.

[9] McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, II: 951.

[10] Stephen T. Davis, *Risen Indeed* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 157.

[11] Strange, "Calvinist Response," 164-65; Jerry L. Walls, "Philosophical Critique of Talbott's Universalism," Ibid., 122.

[12] Finney, *The Memoirs*, 549 (MS935, JHF436); Geisler, *ST*, 587; Torrance, *Atonement*, 158.

[13] Edwards, *After Death?*, 153-54; Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 74.

[14] Talbott, "Christ Victorious," 15-18; "Reply to My Critics," 266.

[15] Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 31, 78-79, 166-67.

[16] Psa. 7:6-9, 10:15, 31:17, 58:10-11, 71:13, 79:6, 10, 12, 137:7-9, 140:8-10, 143:12, 149:5-7, 9.

[17] Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 78.

unbearable living without those who are not.[18] Relating to the Savior and His community is sufficient.[19] God too proves daily His ability to endure people suffering.[20]

Universalism has broad Scriptural support nonetheless. Though Universalism was not articulated before Christ,[21] Hebrew Scripture suggested it. The first chapters establish humanity's universality (Gen. 1–11), implying a universal human destiny.[22] God then appoints Abraham and his seed to bless *all* clans on earth (12:2-3, 18:18, 22:18, 26:4, 28:14) and tells Moses that God's glory will fill *all* the earth (Num. 14:21). Later, the Psalmist sings of God's "salvation among all nations" (67:1-3), and the prophets foretell of God's "salvation to the end of the earth" (Isa. 49:6). "I will pour out My Spirit on all flesh" (Joel 2:28). The NT, however, makes universal salvation explicit.[23] To present this adequately requires addressing each passage, at least briefly, but they can be grouped by emphasis: God's will for Universalism, God's achievement of it, Universalism's rationale, and salvation's application to the ungodly.

a) God's Will

Scripture frequently says Universalism is the goal. That Christ was "sent to save the world [ὁ κόσμος]" (John 3:16-17, 12:47-50) expresses universal salvation unless Christ was a failure,[24] but Exclusivists say He saved not the world, just the believing part.[25] Understanding *world* as *world per se* supposedly does not appreciate *John*'s Exclusivist passages.[26] This common strategy is not derived from the verse's meaning, of course, but from preferring Exclusivist verses elsewhere. The main *John* epistle adds, the Father "has sent" "the world's Savior" (4:14; also John 4:42). Exclusivists cannot help notice "has sent," in the perfect tense, refers to the historical event of Christ's saving the world, but they posit its achievement is unachievable.[27] *First Timothy* confirms Christ

---

[18] Caldecott, *Radiance of Being*, 243; Gregory the Great, *Forty Gospel Homilies*, trans. Dom David Hurst (Kalamazoo: Cistercian, 1990), hom. 40 (p. 381); Kierkegaard, *Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses*, 256-57.

[19] Jobes, "Remember These Things," 198-99.

[20] Daryl Koehn, *Nature of Evil* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), 15.

[21] McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 130; Ilaria L.E. Ramelli, *Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 819.

[22] Arthur F. Glasser et al., *Announcing the Kingdom* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 29; Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, 8.

[23] Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 21; Johnson, "Wideness in God's Mercy," 94.

[24] Allen, *Extent of Atonement*, 777.

[25] Leon Morris, *Gospel According to John*, ed. Gordon D. Fee, Rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 205-206.

[26] D.A. Carson, *Gospel According to John*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 206-207.

[27] Stephen S. Smalley, *1,2,3 John*, ed. David A. Hubbard, WBC (Waco: Word Books, 1984), 253;

"entered the world to save sinners," "wills all men saved," and "gave Himself ransom exchange for all" (1:15, 2:4, 6). Most Exclusivists concede these express God's intent to save everyone in the world, but, in a frequent gambit, draw the line at God realizing that intent; the best that God can manage is saving a scattered assortment.[28] Nothing here, however, actually expresses this limitation.[29]

Interpreting *all* as *not really all* buckles under the Universalist aphorism, "God … of πάντων … is over πάντων, through πάντων, and in πᾶσιν" (Eph. 4:6). The four πᾶς substantive plurals mean "all," not "all sorts" as when used adjectively.[30] Exclusivists, nonetheless, read it as "all believers" because 1) the aphorism conflicts with Scripture's Exclusivist account and 2) Paul addressed these words to believers.[31] The first again sides with Scripture's Exclusivism. It also ignores that the *all*'s apply to who God is, not just what He does. Is God really not the God of all? Is He not over all? The second reason diminishes Scripture's authority (2Ti. 3:15). A Barth is not needed to know Scripture "veritably speaks to all men of every age,"[32] or, per Hamann, "the entire human race."[33] Scripture addresses nonbelievers like Augustine, who came to believe from its reading.[34] Besides, Scripture can limit a point to believers when intended (Acts 28:2; Rom. 4:16, 8:32; 2Co. 3:18). To that end, some *Ephesians* manuscripts add the second person plural pronoun (ὑμῖν) so that God is *in all of you*, the believers, but the certain reading excludes this addition.[35] The belated "fix" illumines the original letter's Universalism.

b) Reality

Universalism is not just God's will, but His work. In *Philippians*, God exalts "the Name above every name, *so that* [ἵνα] in Jesus' name every knee may bow … and every tongue may confess Jesus Christ 'Lord'" (2:9-11). Though *bow* and *confess* are in the

---

John R.W. Stott, *Epistles of John*, ed. R.V.G. Tasker, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 167.

[28] George W. Knight, III, *Pastoral Epistles*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 101, 119, 122; William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, WBC (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000), 84-86, 89; Philip H. Towner, *Letters to Timothy and Titus*, ed. Gordon D. Fee, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 146, 177-78.

[29] Allen, *Extent of Atonement*, 777.

[30] *BDAG*, 782-84.

[31] Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 518-21.

[32] "Preface to First Edition," 1.

[33] "Golgotha and Sheblimini!," 189.

[34] *Confessions*, trans. Henry Chadwick (Oxford Univ. Press, 1992), VIII,xii,29 (pp. 152-53). See Henry Chadwick, *Augustine of Hippo* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2010), 27.

[35] Bruce M. Metzger, *Textual Commentary on the Greek NT*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: German Bib. Soc., 2007), 536.

subjunctive, a mood suggesting uncertainty, their ἵνα clause provides the purpose-result of Christ's exaltation, "*both the intention and its sure accomplishment*," which means everyone worships and confesses Him.[36] To confine this to God's never achieved purpose, Exclusivists once more elevate the Exclusivist account in the paradox.[37] *Titus* adds, "God's grace, saving to all men, has appeared" (2:11). The aorist indicative verb relates saving everyone to Christ's historical appearance, actualizing universalistic salvation by inflection, but Exclusivists use their go-to defense: "all men" means "all sorts of men."[38] They also say "grace" is unrelated to "saving," though the words adjoin, and conclude salvation extends only to representatives from every tribe.[39] None of this, however, lessens the verse's literal Universalism.[40] *Second Peter* continues: God's patience will "accommodate all" because He does "not resolv[e]" even "some to perish" (3:9). Exclusivists take this to mean, not that God resolves to accommodate all so none perish, but that He wants to, which human freewill trumps.[41] If that does not work, Exclusivists again modify the unmodified "all" so it pertains only to the letter's addressees.[42]

Second Corinthians expands on the idea: Christ "died for all and therefore they all died, and He died for all so that the living live no more to themselves but to Him who for them died and was raised. … God in Christ was reconciling the world to Himself" (5:14-15, 19). "This," Bornkamm observes, "makes clear that God's saving act in the death of Christ embraces the whole world."[43] Exclusivists admit *all* is universal in "died for all" and "they all died," but deny *all* this meaning in the parallel phrases identifying those living in Christ. Paul Barnett, for instance, argues the *all*'s "clearly emphasize the universal and inclusive nature of Christ's death," meaning "none is excluded," but salvation "is in actuality limited." Similarly, *the world* refers just to believers around the world.[44]

---

[36] Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 473-74.

[37] I. Howard Marshall, "The NT Does Not Teach Universal Salvation," in *Universal Salvation?*, ed. Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 68-69.

[38] Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, 318-19.

[39] Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 422.

[40] Fred Sanders, "Wesleyan View," in *Five Views on the Extent of Atonement*, ed. Adam J. Johnson (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019), 156-57.

[41] Peter H. Davids, *Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, ed. D.A. Carson, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 281-82; Michael Green, *2 Peter and Jude*, ed. Leon Morris, Rev. ed., TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 148; Thomas R. Schreiner, *1,2 Peter, Jude*, ed. E. Ray Clendenen, NAC (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2003), 381-83.

[42] Richard Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter*, ed. David A. Hubbard, WBC (Waco: Word Books, 1983), 313.

[43] *Paulus*, 141.

[44] *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, ed. Gordon D. Fee, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997),

Creation's culmination in *Revelation* features Universalism. After the godly worship God, everyone else, "every creature [πᾶν κτίσμα] … in heaven, on the earth, under the earth, and in the sea," joins in (5:11-13), which, of course, is impossible if the rebels are damned. Exegetes acknowledge this expresses "universal acclamation," "universal praise in an absolute sense," "not only from God's willing subjects but also from his opponents," and this "ideal purpose" is "actually … fulfilled."[45] It is the "Universal Worship" of God[46] by "the whole created world,"[47] for which "The universality of Christ's great redemptive work calls."[48] God achieves in the end, therefore, His stated objective of bringing all to Him.

c) Rationale

Universalism is not just asserted, but Paul explains why—Adam's thoroughly infectious sin is perforce overmatched by Christ's mightier salvation: "through one man, sin entered the world, and through sin death, and thus to all men death passed, on which all have sinned," but, "if the many died by the trespass of the one, how much more God's grace and the gift by grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, abound to the many" (Rom. 5:12, 15). The "many," a Hebraism for "all,"[49] is by parallelism "all men" to whom death passed—everyone.[50] "The world," the Exclusivist Augustine accepted, refers to "the whole human race."[51] Just as Adam doomed "all men," Christ gave "eternal life" to "all men" (5:18-19, 21), literally Universalism.[52] Adam's sin-effect is inescapable and Christ's grace-effect is responsively more,[53] but Exclusivists demur: While Adam's

289-91, 307 & n.25.

45 G.K. Beale, *Book of Revelation*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 332, 365-66.

46 Grant R. Osborne, *Revelation*, ed. Moises Silva, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 264-66.

47 Gooder, *Heaven*, 67.

48 Robert H. Mounce, *Book of Revelation*, ed. Gordon D. Fee, Rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 137-38.

49 Helmer Ringgren, "Rab, Inclusive Plural," in *Theological Dict. of the OT*, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 293; Torrance, *Atonement*, 183.

50 James R. Edwards, *Gospel According to Mark*, ed. D.A. Carson, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 61 & n.34.

51 *Enchiridion on Faith, Hope and Charity*, trans. Bruce Harbert (Hyde Park: New City, 2011), 8,26 (p. 59).

52 James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, ed. David A. Hubbard, WBC (Dallas: Word Books, 1988), 280, 285, 293-94, 297; Douglas J. Moo, *Epistle to the Romans*, ed. Joel B. Green, 2nd ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2018), 349; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, ed. Moises Silva, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 286-87, 290-92.

53 C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans 1–8*, ed. J.A. Emerton and C.E.B. Cranfield, Repr. ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1985), 295; Moo, *Romans*, 362-63, 369-70; Carl R. Trueman, "Definite Atonement View," in *Perspectives on the Extent of Atonement*, ed. Andrew David Naselli and Mark A. Snoe-

sin implicates everyone, Christ's more potent grace cannot, because this just cannot be what Paul meant.[54] The *many* within the Adam-effect has its usual meaning of *all people*, but the *many* within the Christ-effect, connected by "how much more" in the same clause position 20 words later, is nonetheless fewer—*believers*.[55] That is, *all* means *all* for the Adam-effect but *all the justified* for the Christ-effect.[56] Paul's competing Exclusivist passages once again rationalize the grammatical gymnastics,[57] but the *all* condemned through Adam and the *all* justified through Christ are the same set—everyone.[58] Exclusivists, who navigate the most sublime passages elsewhere, realize this, and, so, claim an inability to disambiguate here.[59]

d) The ungodly

Universalism is to modern ears contrary to modern eyes because humanity's worst clearly refuse salvation's offer, but Christ has an answer: "I will drag all to Myself" (John 12:32). The verb means to pull to another place, such as netting uncooperative fish (21:6, 11).[60] *All* translates πάντας, which needs no comment except for how Exclusivists treat it. If modifying a noun, πάντας can mean *all kinds of*, but here it is an anarthrous substantive, so it means *all*.[61] Still, Exclusivists interpret πάντας as *all kinds of persons* because of, once more, Exclusivist passages elsewhere.[62] Nothing, however, in common-sense or the passage's wording, which is how writers normally curtail *all*, indicates πάντας is less than that.[63] Rather, the passage says Christ draws all to Him, cooperating or not.[64]

Paul speaks similarly in discussing Israel's ultimate salvation (Rom. 11:25-29). God graces "all," though "all" disobey (30-36). Notwithstanding that grace is for *all* and

---

berger (Nashville: B&H, 2015), 51.

[54] Marshall, "The NT Does Not Teach Universal Salvation," 65-66.

[55] Moo, *Romans*, 363, 369-70.

[56] Cranfield, *Romans 1–8*, 290.

[57] Trueman, "Definite Atonement View," 51.

[58] Richard H. Bell, "Rom 5.18-19 and Universal Salvation," *NTS* 48, no. 3 (2002): 417-32; Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 174-75; Hart, *The New Testament*, 298 note 2.

[59] Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 298.

[60] *BDAG*, 318.

[61] Ibid., 783-84.

[62] Carson, *John*, 443-44; Craig S. Keener, *Gospel of John: Commentary*, 2 vols., vol. II (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003), 881; Morris, *John*, 532-33.

[63] Allen, *Extent of Atonement*, 777; John S. Hammett, "Response to General Atonement View," in *Perspectives on the Extent of Atonement*, ed. Andrew David Naselli and Mark A. Snoeberger (Nashville: B&H, 2015), 138; Luther, *Galatians*, 226 [WA 401,513 (3:22)].

[64] Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 39-40; Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 98.

disobedience is by *all*,[65] Exclusivists read the first *all* as *some*, but reverse course to give the parallel *all* five words later its ordinary meaning.[66] Alternatively, Exclusivists "resolve[] the paradox" by "assum[ing]" Paul speaks "in general terms," which is code for not meaning what he said.[67] Because nothing here limits salvation's extent,[68] the best Exclusivist resort is God's "mysterious" "dark" way,[69] but that characterizes Paul's topic, not his insight.

Colossians repeats that salvation includes those opting out: Christ is "to reconcile into Him all things, whether those on the earth or in the heavens" (1:20). "To reconcile" reflects the infinitive of ἀποκαταλλάσσω, an emphatic ἀπό prefixing καταλλάσσω, "exchange hostility for a friendly relationship," such as what Christ's death achieves for us with God (Rom. 5:10).[70] What is befriended is the neuter plural τὰ πάντα, "all things." The universality of these terms plus "the earth [τῆς γῆς]" is difficult to surpass.[71] Undeterred, Exclusivists redeploy their reinterpretation of *all things* on *earth* as just the faithful widely distributed.[72] They also say the verb means pacification, not reconciliation—the unfaithful are subjugated nonsalvifically.[73] This, however, dodges the word's actual meaning of emphatically friendly.[74] The verb is contorted because otherwise it expresses that God reconciles everyone, which is ruled out as too paradoxical.[75]

Paul's treatise on resurrection has at its heart one of Universalism's strongest citations (1Co. 15:20-28):

> [S]ince by a man came death, by a man too comes the dead's resurrection. For, as in Adam, *all* die, so, in Christ, *all* will live, but each in its own corps: Christ the firstfruit, thereafter those of Christ at His presentment

---

65 Trumbower, *Rescue for the Dead*, 39-40.

66 Marshall, "The NT Does Not Teach Universal Salvation," 67-68; Moo, *Romans*, 751; Schreiner, *Romans*, 629, 631.

67 Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 689, 696-97.

68 Talbott, "Pauline Interpretation of Divine Judgment," 34.

69 C.E.B. Cranfield, *Romans 9–16*, ed. J.A. Emerton, et al., Corr. ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 587-88.

70 *BDAG*, 521.

71 Talbott, "Christ Victorious," 22.

72 Marshall, "The NT Does Not Teach Universal Salvation," 70-71.

73 F.F. Bruce, *Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, ed. Gordon D. Fee, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 75-76; Peter T. O'Brien, *Colossians, Philemon*, ed. David A. Hubbard, WBC (Waco: Word Books, 1982), 56; N.T. Wright, *Epistles of Paul to the Colossians and to Philemon*, ed. Leon Morris, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 77.

74 Paul uses elsewhere the word that actually means to subjugate. See, *infra*, p. 68, n. 26.

75 Bruce, *Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians*, 75; James D.G. Dunn, *Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 104; Wright, *Colossians and Philemon*, 77.

> —then the end, whenever He gives over the reign to the God and Father, whenever nullifying *all* rule, *all* liberty and force, for He must reign till He has put *all* His enemies under His feet. A last enemy is being nullified, the Death, for *all* He has committed under His feet …. Whenever *all* has been committed to Him, the Son Himself will be committed to Him committing *all*, so God may be *all* in *all*.

The all-ness of Christ's work is unmistakable here.[76] Everyone has the same postmortem destiny, which is life, but, to Exclusivists, Paul is only hoping for Universalism because he is not explicit enough, which is just discrediting what he writes.[77] Despite seeing that *all* dying in Adam is every human and that the Adam-Christ parallel coheres, *all* living in Christ just cannot be "all humans," because a "reference to the resurrection of non-Christians would only confuse matters."[78] The confusion stems from Paul's Exclusivist accounts.[79] Why an Exclusivist is confused is easy to appreciate, but the clarity of Paul's "all in all" is too.[80]

This passage makes another key point. Both "those of Christ" and "His enemies" attain the preferred outcome in the resurrection—"all" in the end live in Christ. The difference between the two groups is sequencing: Christ's enemies enter eschatological life *after* His followers.[81] This explicit comparison between the faithful and the rest where both eternally live is perhaps the clearest way to establish Universalism.[82] The NT does this twice more. In *First John*, Jesus "is reconciliation [ἱλασμός][83] for our sins, and not ours only but all the world's" (2:2). To Exclusivists, this "cannot mean that all people's sins are … forgiven so that all are the inheritors of eternal life, even if they do not believe," but only because it conflicts with the Exclusivist account, which leaves Exclusivists in "difficulty."[84] Their difficulty is understandable since "not ours only but all the world's" unmistakably conveys universality, and universal reconciliation implies universal

---

[76] Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 38-39; Robinson, *In the End, God*, 93-94; Talbott, "Christ Victorious," 25.

[77] Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 112, 126; Gordon D. Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 760; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 241.

[78] David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, ed. Robert Yarbrough and Robert H. Stein, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 709. Accord Anthony C. Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1224-25.

[79] Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 241.

[80] Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 193-94; Origen, *On First Principles*, III,6,3 (p. 248).

[81] Hart, *The New Testament*, 348 note ab; Talbott, "Reply to My Critics," 254.

[82] Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 113, 136, 139, 174.

[83] This term's rarity generates scholarship. Colin G. Kruse, *Letters of John*, ed. D.A. Carson, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 75-76. Two meanings compete—expiation and propitiation. *BDAG*, 474. "Reconciliation" accommodates either.

[84] Kruse, *Letters of John*, 75. Accord Stott, *Epistles of John*, 84.

salvation, particularly from the pen of someone writing before theologians had peeled apart salvation's elements.[85]

First Timothy could have the simplest expression of all-inclusive salvation: God is "the Savior of all men—most especially those believing" (4:9-10). "Most especially" translates μάλιστα, the superlative of μάλα ("very"), which the NT uses twelve times (four in the Pastorals) to mean "to an unusual degree" or "most assuredly."[86] Because μάλιστα denotes non-exclusivity, understanding "all men" as everyone is unavoidable.[87] If "believers" are saved especially, the adjacent phrase cannot be so limited.[88] Apparently, a few secular papyri use μάλιστα to mean "that is," which if applied to *First Timothy* yields the loutish but Exclusivist: The saved are "all men—that is, believers."[89] Unexplained is why any author, much less one Scripturally enshrined, would equate 100% of humanity with 0.01% of it.[90] Exclusivists unmoved by this muddle from profane sources translate creatively: Christ "is the Savior of all men [potentially], and especially [actually] of those who believe."[91] Scripture invites such Herculean exegesis, Exclusivists argue, because otherwise Scripture is in paradox.[92] Indeed.

2) <u>Only some are ultimately saved.</u>

Scripture is Universalist everywhere except where it isn't,[93] but its Exclusivism is more descriptive and thematic, rather than declarative; and, so, its presentation can be less of a catalogue. Before setting out Scripture's Exclusivist account, however, three arguments need culling. First, while Scripture often says believers are saved without

---

85 Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 101; John Owen, *The Death of Death in the Death of Christ*, ed. William Gould, The Works (Carlisle: Banner of Truth Trust, 1967), 173-74.

86 *BDAG*, 613.

87 Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 102; Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 41.

88 Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 36-38.

89 Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, 203-204.

90 Vern Sheridan Poythress, "Meaning of Malista in 2 Tim 4:13 and Related Verses," *JTS* 53 (2002): 523-32. First-century Christians numbered about 7530. Rodney Stark, *The Rise of Christianity* (Princeton Univ. Press, 1996), 6-8. The world population was then hundreds of millions. U.S. Census Bureau, "Historical Estimates of World Population," https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/international-programs/historical-est-worldpop.html (accessed 28 Aug. 2019).

91 Geisler, *ST*, 863.

92 Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, 203; Towner, *Timothy and Titus*, 311-12; Trueman, "Definite Atonement View," 35.

93 Marshall, "The NT Does Not Teach Universal Salvation," 56.

damning anyone,[94] this is irrelevant. Only exclusivity forms the paradox.[95] Taking a proposition (believers are saved) as establishing its converse (unbelievers are unsaved) is the negative inference fallacy.[96] Second, passages warning of "souls" perishing are excluded because they might concern the perishing of *natural* life using the Hebrew understanding of soul rather than of *eternal* life using Greek philosophy's enduring soul (*e.g.*, Mark 8:36, 38//Mat. 10:33, 16:26//Luke 9:25, 26, 12:9). Third, the instances where Scripture says salvation is through Christ are excluded because they express salvation's *ag*ent, not salvation's *ext*ent (*e.g.*, John 10:7-10; Acts 4:12). Who does the saving does not by itself say who is saved. Depriving Exclusivism of these points leaves plenty.

a) Descriptions

The OT vividly depicts the cosmic consummation as not saving everyone. In "the new heavens and new earth," evildoers receive "caprice" and "dread," "their worm will not die nor their fire quench" (Isa. 65:17, 66:4, 22, 24). The clearest OT reference to resurrection likewise specifies two ultimate destinies, one "to eternal life," one "to shames, eternal contempt" (Dan. 12:1-4). This anticipates the NT's two populated ultimates—"those doing goods into a resurrection of life and those practicing evils into a resurrection of judgment" (John 5:28-29). The NT elaborates on the negative ultimate.[97] A dragnet captures everyone in "Heavens' reign," but "the sons of the Evil" and the "unsound" are "burned in" "the fiery furnace, a place of weeping and gnashing" (Mat. 13:24-30, 36-43, 47-50).[98] The sheep-goats parable, among the most explicit on salvation,[99] similarly teaches exclusivity: The Son of Man will "separate men from each other" with the blessed in "eternal life" and the cursed in "eternal castigation" (25:31-46). God's judgment dispenses both eternal life and eternal destruction.[100] The Lazarus parable portrays two eternal destinies, one "tormented" "agony" in "fire" (Luke 16:19-31), which, if nothing else, describes inhabited negativity.[101] Christ's eschatological feast evicts the

---

[94] John 3:16, 6:37-40, 10:26-29, 11:26, 14:6, 17:6-10; Rom. 1:16-17, 3:21, 26, 11:5; 1Co. 1:21; Eph. 5:25-27; Tit. 2:14.

[95] Grant R. Osborne, "General Atonement View," in *Perspectives on the Extent of Atonement*, ed. Andrew David Naselli and Mark A. Snoeberger (Nashville: B&H, 2015), 89.

[96] Allen, *Extent of Atonement*, 20-21.

[97] Geisler, *ST*, 1268.

[98] Avery Dulles, "The Population of Hell," *First Things* 133 (2003): 36.

[99] Nichols, *Death and Afterlife*, 154.

[100] Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 30; Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, 238.

[101] Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 124; Stein, *Luke*, 424; Ben Witherington, III, "Equally Orthodox Christians," in *Rethinking Hell*, ed. Christopher M. Date, et al. (Eugene: Cascade, 2014), 295.

unprepared "into the outer darkness, where weeping and gnashing will be," because "many are called but few elected" (Mat. 22:1-14). Even when the point of His pericope is inclusivity, not everyone enters (Luke 14:15-24). God's call to salvation is not by itself irresistible.[102] So, Jesus parabolizes hell's fire as torturous imprisonment, and His numerous mentions reify hell (Mark 9:43-47//Mat. 18:8-9; 5:22, 25, 29-30, 10:28, 18:34, 23:33; 11:23//Luke 10:15; 12:5, 58). Anyone "not abiding in Me is like the branch cast away to wither; they're gathered, cast into the fire, and burned" (John 15:6).[103] N.T. Wright summarized, "eternal punishment" comes "most clearly and unmistakably" from "the lips of Jesus Himself."[104] Universalists counter that *eternal* means something like *special*, making the two stated ultimates really one,[105] or that Jesus engaged in a sort of pious fraud to frighten the faint-hearted into righteousness.[106]

The epistles establish the two ultimates as well. Though salvation comes to believers, its opposite comes to the unrighteous (Rom. 1:16-18). The saved are distinguished repeatedly from the perishing (1Co. 1:18; 2Co. 2:15, 4:3-4; Phi. 3:17-19; 2Ti. 2:10-13). The saved are a subset of humanity: "those loving God, those called by His purpose," "those He foreknew," "those He predestined," "those He called," "those He righted" (Rom. 8:28-30). The rest pays the eternal destruction's penalty (2Th. 1:6-10). Election discriminates (2:10).[107] Those "following the way of Balaam" are "reserved for the dark of darkness," a "day of judgment and annihilation of irreverent men" (2Pe. 2:10-17, 3:7). While believers have eternal life, those without the Son do not (1Jo. 5:11-13). To Universalists, perishing does not truly occur because the condemned are divinely rebooted before the perishing or the so-called perishing amounts to the rebooting.[108] This is never expressed, but it also reduces the two outcomes actually expressed to just the good one, despite perishing being *the* (τὸ) end for the ungodly (Phi. 3:19).[109]

Promisingly, Jesus was asked directly whether the saved were only the "few." Unfortunately, His answer was indirect: "Contest to enter the narrow door, for … many will try to enter but lack strength. Once the housemaster … shuts the door and you …

---

[102] Colijn, *Images of Salvation*, 232.

[103] Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 20-21.

[104] N.T. Wright, "Towards a Biblical View of Universalism," *Themelios* 4, no. 2 (1979): 55.

[105] Jacques Ellul, *Apocalypse*, trans. George W. Schreiner (New York: Seabury, 1977), 276.

[106] McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, II: 961-62.

[107] Ibid., II: 861; Stephen N. Williams, *The Election of Grace* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 201.

[108] Talbott, "Reply to My Critics," 251.

[109] McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, II: 953.

plead 'Lord, open to us,' He'll answer, 'I know not where you're from'" (Luke 13:23-25). If responsive, Jesus implies that "many" are not saved, certainly not everyone.[110] The *Matthew* parallel confirms "few" find "the way leading to the life," while "many are those entering" "the way leading to the destruction" (7:13-14).[111] So, "Not all … will enter the Heavens' reign," only those "doing … My Father's will" (7:21-23//Luke 13:26-27).

Therefore, as Kierkegaard observed, while saving everyone is a tempting position to adopt, the NT resists that temptation and says only a few find salvation.[112] R.T. France concluded Scripture portrays "a stark choice between two totally opposed orientations and their respective outcomes," which takes for granted not everyone will "find the way to life."[113] Grenz summed up: "The New Testament writers repeatedly spoke of the fate of the unrighteous as exclusion, as eternal separation from community with God,"[114] and this negative outcome, Balthasar realized, excludes Universalism's single all-good outcome.[115]

b) Themes

Scripture, in addition to describing a real negative ultimate, has two Exclusivist themes. Scripture's meta-theme might be God's mission to all creation,[116] and this requires reaching others.[117] Paul asks, How can people believe without being taught? (Rom. 10:14). The Great Commission answers, "disciple all nations" (Mat. 28:18-20).[118] Universalism must deny evangelizing matters ultimately, but this is not what Scripture relates: "Amen, amen I tell you, except to the extent one is born above once, he can't see God's reign. … [E]xcept to the extent one is born of water and Spirit, he can't enter God's reign" (John 3:3, 5). Conversion is consistently identified as determinative, "Amen I tell you, except to the extent you turn to become as little children, you'll never

---

110 Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, ed. Moises Silva, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 1234-36; Martin, *Will Many Be Saved?*, 125-26.

111 Leon Morris, *Gospel According to Matthew*, ed. D.A. Carson, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 174-75.

112 *Attack Upon "Christendom"*, trans. Walter Lowrie (Princeton Univ. Press, 1991), 105.

113 *Gospel of Matthew*, ed. F.F. Bruce, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 288.

114 *Theology for the Community of God*, 642.

115 *Theo-Drama*, V, 191.

116 Christopher J.H. Wright, *The Mission of God* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2006).

117 Marshall, "The NT Does Not Teach Universal Salvation," 63; Williams, *Christian Theology*, 31.

118 Osborne, "General Atonement View," 118.

enter the Heavens' reign" (Mat. 18:3).[119] Missionaries grew Christianity because people were not inherently saved.[120]

The most blatant Exclusivist theme is Scripture's recurring proclamation that salvation has a real obverse, divine wrath (John 3:36; 1Th. 5:9).[121] From it only a remnant emerges.[122] Universalism hardly seems realistic after reading: "the Lord … destroys His hater," "will not consent to forgive him," and "blots out his name from under heaven" (Deu. 7:9-10, 29:20). "No pity … will keep Me from destroying them" (Jer. 13:14). As the Lord "completed His wrath," "Women's compassionate hands cooked their own children" (Lam. 4:10-11). Given this for His chosen, one can imagine how God treats the unchosen, but no imagination is required: "an avenging day for vengeance on His foes. The sword will devour … till it quenches its blood thirst, for the Lord of Forces will slaughter" (Jer. 46:10). Divine wrath fills Hebrew Scripture.[123] To which, Universalists sometimes reinterpret wrath's *remnant* as really everyone.[124]

The primary Universalist rationale for sidelining wrath is the "God of retribution" (Jer. 51:56) resigns with Christ's advent.[125] This argument, as old as Marcion,[126] ignores the NT's continuing severity, especially in the bits Marcion excised.[127] Divine wrath is expressed 36 times,[128] falls on the ungodly (Rom. 1:18), and persists into the ultimate (Eph. 2:2-3, 5:3-8; Col. 3:5-8; 1Th. 4:3-6).[129] Christ saves *from* wrath; He does not disappear it (Rom. 5:9-10; 1Th. 1:10, 5:9-10).[130] A "certain terrifying expectation of judgment

---

119 D.A. Carson, "Matthew," in *EBC*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 397; France, *Matthew*, 677-78; Morris, *Matthew*, 459.

120 Geisler, *ST*, 54; Mostert, *God and the Future*, 81; John Piper, *Let the Nations Be Glad*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: BakerAcademic, 2007), 111-54.

121 Osborne, "General Atonement View," 122.

122 Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, IV, 339; Bultmann, *Theology of the NT*, I: 32:1 (p. 288); Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 4:28,1 (p. 127).

123 Num. 31:2; Deu. 32:40-43; Psa. 94:1-2; Jer. 12:7-8, 13:13-14, 16:3-4, 19:3-6; Eze. 7:5-11, 8:17-18; Hos. 9:12, 15-16; Nah. 1:2-3; Zec. 11:6, 9, 13:7.

124 McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, II: 777-78.

125 Eric Reitan, "Human Freedom and the Impossibility of Eternal Damnation," in *Universal Salvation?*, ed. Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 127.

126 Rausch, *ST*, 55.

127 Lubac, *Catholicism*, 301.

128 Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, IV, 340; Pieter G R de Villiers, "In the Presence of God: Eschatology of 1 Thessalonians," in *Eschatology of the NT and Some Related Documents*, ed. Jan G. van der Watt (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 311.

129 Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 392.

130 Augustine, *Enchiridion*, 29,112 (p. 133); Colijn, *Images of Salvation*, 180; Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife*, 178.

and zealous fire" awaits God's opponents (Heb. 10:26-27, 29-31). And wrath excludes eternal life; "whoever disobeys the Son will not see life, for God's wrath abides on him" (John 3:36; also Rom. 11:22). The eschaton emphatically includes wrath, likened to Noah's flood and Sodom's brimstone (Luke 17:26-30//Mat. 24:37-39),[131] neither ending well for most people (Gen. 7:21-23, 19:24-25). Each is "an example of suffering eternal fire's punishment" (Jude 7), foretelling "a day of judgment and annihilation of irreverent men" (2Pe. 3:7). Then, "one will be taken and the other left" (Luke 17:27-35). The end includes God's fury, human torture, 1600 blood-filled stadiums, a blood-soaked avenging angel, vultures crying "gather for God's great supper, so you may eat … all flesh," and God casting the ungodly into the fiery lake of death (Rev. 14:9-11, 17-20, 16:5-6, 19:1-2, 11-21, 20:10-15, 21:6-8). Universalists, if taking the eschatological images seriously,[132] argue this all just represents a proper cleansing.[133] The argument satirizes itself.[134]

3) <u>Contradictions reveal fallacies.</u>

Given this record of overtly and repeatedly setting out Universalism and Exclusivism, Scripture is in contradiction seemingly or actually. A *seeming* contradiction, discussed further in Chapter 5, is a paradox.[135] Scripture is full of paradoxes,[136] which are not contradictory,[137] but even a paradox is problematic because it demands what is difficult—dynamic thinking.[138] An *actual* contradiction means Scripture is false, an unsavory result,[139] because the principle of noncontradiction says propositions that contradict actually (in the same way at the same time) cannot be true.[140] Without the principle, "it is equally possible either to affirm or deny anything of anything," Aristotle realized, "nothing truly exists."[141] The principle is what distinguishes truth and falsehood.[142] While we often

---

131 Mark B. Stephens, *Annihilation or Renewal?* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 216.

132 For Hart, *Revelation* is an "impenetrable puzzle." *That All Shall Be Saved*, 106-10.

133 Ellul, *Apocalypse*, 65, 213, 276; Talbott, "Pauline Interpretation of Divine Judgment," 42-43; "Reply to My Critics," 256-57.

134 McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, II: 963, 1048.

135 Harold Netland, "The Question of Criteria," *Calvin Theological J.* 31, no. 2 (1996): 499.

136 Kierkegaard, *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, I, 105; Lubac, *Catholicism*, 327.

137 Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, I, 233.

138 Heidegger, "Letter on Humanism," 242; Edmund J. Mazza, *The Scholastics and the Jews* (Kettering: Angelico, 2017), 2.

139 Sanders, "Response to Matthew Levering," 101.

140 Geisler, *ST*, 60; Edward N. Zalta, "In Defense of the Law of Noncontradiction," in *The Law of Noncontradiction*, ed. Graham Priest, et al. (Oxford Univ. Press, 2004), 418-36.

141 Aristotle, *Metaphysics: Books 1-9*, 1007b 19-27.

142 Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, I, 232-33; Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, xxiv.

contradict ourselves, truth cannot contradict itself.[143] Contradicting truths are unintelligible.[144] In postmodernity, the noncontradiction principle can be disputed, as if merely cognitive bookkeeping.[145] Deniers, however, are wrong, right, or neither. 1) If wrong, the principle stands. 2) If right, given the denial, the deniers are also wrong; see 1. 3) If neither, the deniers are not denying; see 1 and 2. As the master of contradiction appreciated, annulling the principle validates it because its annulling uses the principle.[146] Contradictions require, as Chesterton called out, an "ingenious defence of the indefensible," otherwise known as "lying."[147]

The principle of noncontradiction, which says an affirmation and its negation cannot be true, differs from the related principle of the excluded middle, which says either an affirmation or its negation must be true, *tertium non datur*. While the noncontradiction principle always works on actual contradictions, the principle of the excluded middle only works on the pellucid.[148] The principle of the excluded middle works in mathematics where negating the negative yields the positive, in traveling where two reversals yield the original direction, in grammar where two negatives yield the affirmative, and in the cross where Christ's death cancels death, yielding resurrected life.[149] The excluded middle's cosmic applicability, however, is unjustified because the principle fails when words find equipoise.[150] Among its best violators are paradoxes. This shortcoming of the excluded middle—either X or not-X is true—does not shake the noncontradiction principle—both X and not-X cannot be true—because the excluded middle uses logic to discover truths while the noncontradiction principle uses logic to uncover falsehoods. Logic, well

---

143 Montaigne, "Essays," III,2 (p. 611)

144 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica, Part II*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1920), Q. 1, art. 7, co; *De Potentia*, Q. 1, art. 3 (p. 11); Geisler, *ST*, 69; Eric D. Perl, *Theophany: Neoplatonic Philosophy of Dionysius the Areopagite* (State Univ. of New York Press, 2007), 50.

145 See Graham Priest, J.C. Beall, and Bradley Armour-Garb, eds., *The Law of Noncontradiction* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2004), 23-38, 197-313. Kierkegaard, despite praising reputed contradictions, did not deny the principle of noncontradiction. Richard McCombs, *The Paradoxical Rationality of Soren Kierkegaard* (Indiana Univ. Press, 2013), 13.

146 Soren Kierkegaard, *Philosophical Fragments or a Fragment of Philosophy*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong (Princeton Univ. Press, 1985), 108-109.

147 *Orthodoxy* (Cavalier Classics, 2015), 3.

148 Irving M. Copi, *Introduction to Logic*, 6th ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1982), 320.

149 Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, 30.

150 E.J. Lemmon, *Beginning Logic* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1978), 53.

suited for ferreting out falsities, is notorious at finding truth.[151] Truth is the narrower way (John 14:6; Mat. 7:14//Luke 13:24).[152] The excluded middle thus claims too much.

Humans, who can find the middle between truths, cannot long survive on contradicting truths.[153] Though this can be seen in propositions,[154] it surfaces before language.[155] Those neglecting the principle of noncontradiction, even if prelinguistic, risk extinction when such ideas as *gravity*, *friend*, or *charging tiger* are as real as their denials.[156] Faith too is subject to the noncontradiction principle.[157] To believe something is to know its meaning and truth.[158] Bonhoeffer noted, "there can be no confession without saying, 'In the light of Christ, this is true and this is false.'"[159] Because Christianity identifies truth with God, incompatible truths are disallowed.[160] Scripture, accordingly, rejects "the falsely named knowledge" of "contradictions [ἀντιθέσεις]" (1Ti. 6:20). Our words are not to contradict (2Co. 1:18). Even God honors this principle.[161] God's omnipotence, Thomas reminds, "does not extend to … caus[ing] an affirmation and a negation to be simultaneously true."[162] "You may attribute miracles to Him," C.S. Lewis adds, "but not nonsense."[163]

The noncontradiction principle's inescapability signals the crux of whether Scripture's salvation-extent accounts are actually or seemingly contradictory. If *actually* contradicting, a substantial portion of Scripture is untrue, but *seemingly* contradicting looks unavailable because the accounts appear oxymoronic. They explicitly state their simultaneity (*i.e.*, ultimately) and depend on no word's multivalency: *salvation* means the same in

---

151 Jon Elster, *Sour Grapes* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1983), 2, 16; Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Norman Kemp Smith (New York: St Martin's, 1965).

152 Jung, *Modern Man*, 46; Montaigne, "Essays," I,9 (p. 24).

153 Cornelio Fabro, *God in Exile*, trans. Arthur Gibson (Westminster: Newman, 1968), 19; Olson, *Mosaic of Christian Belief*, 68.

154 Jonathan Harrison, "The Logical Function of 'That'," *Philosophy* 79, no. 1 (2004): 67-96.

155 Geisler, *ST*, 77; Kierkegaard, *Two Ages*, 90.

156 Blondel, *Action*, 429 [472]; Erich Przywara, *Analogia Entis ... Metaphysics*, trans. John R. Betz and David Bentley Hart (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 207-208.

157 Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 59; Pabst, *Metaphysics*, 71.

158 Luther, *Galatians*, 459 [WA 402,25 (5:5)]; Bernard Williams, *Problems of the Self* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1973), 137; Williams, *Architecture of Theology*, 222.

159 *Christ the Center*, 78.

160 *Architecture of Theology*, 31-32.

161 Krapiec, *I-Man*, 112; Przywara, *Analogia Entis*, 224; Shields and Pasnau, *Philosophy of Aquinas*, 156-57.

162 *De Potentia*, Q. 1, arts. 3, 5, Q. 5, art. 2 (pp. 10, 15, 137).

163 *The Problem of Pain* (New York: Harper, 1996), 18.

both accounts, as does *all*—everyone, no exceptions. The accounts' antimony rests on one word, "not," and even young children contextually understand that.[164] This paradox, therefore, is unlike most Scriptural ones, which are typically conflicting concepts, not negating propositions. *Christ is God/man*, for instance, forms a paradox, while *Christ is God/not God* forms a contradiction. Or so the words suggest. Yet, because *man* is *not God*, the logical relationship of the proposition pairs correspond. Yet still, the salvation paradox—*everyone is saved/not saved*—affirms and negates the same idea, which is archetypically impossible.[165] Accordingly, faced with the principle of noncontradiction and what seem to be irreconcilable Scriptural accounts on salvation's extent, all Christians throughout the ages have demoted one account to only facially true so as to retain the other's actual truth. To that history, we turn.

---

[164] Ann. E. Nordmeyer and Michael C. Frank, "The Role of Context in Young Children's Comprehension of Negation," *J. of Memory and Language* 77 (2014): 25-39.

[165] Aquinas, *De Potentia*, Q. 1, art. 3 (pp. 9-10); Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 203; Plato, *The Republic*, 437a.

Chapter 4. THE RESPONSES

She said, "I would rather die."
"Oh," he said, "of course. That goes without saying. But we have to go on living."

—Graham Greene[1]

After positive headway in the first two chapters, Chapter 3 faced Scripture's contradicting accounts of salvation's extent, which unsettled the argument. This chapter describes the Church's responses to this apparent contradiction, which prolongs the unsettling. The Church saw the contradiction but knew to understand Scripture as contradicting was to misunderstand it.[2] Even when cryptic, Scripture was euharmonic.[3] Later, when Scriptural harmony became optional,[4] this potentially offered a way forward for salvation's extent. Different authors could give different answers, such as divergent Gospel biographies or *Genesis* anthropogenies, and, even if irreconcilable, this was a permissible freedom of expression.[5] Such contemporary tolerance has not, however, alleviated Scripture's salvation paradox because the same authors express both Universalism and Exclusivism.[6] Paul's seven undisputed letters, for instance, express both.[7] Therefore, from the beginning and into our forbearing age, tradition remains committed to favoring one account of salvation's extent over the other, disagreeing only over which one that is.

1) Universalism began strong and resurges.

To show that Christianity features Universalism in spite of as seen in the next section being heretical, Christian Universalists must be surveyed and mostly one by one. This, therefore, takes a bit, even with exclusions. The primary exclusion is non-Christians, such as Cabbalists and Muslims,[8] because they do not establish *Christian* Universalism.[9] The survey also largely excludes those who Nicene Christians find unreliable on

---

[1] *The Power and the Glory* (New York: Penguin, 1991), 28.

[2] Craig L. Blomberg, "The Unity and Diversity of Scripture," in *New Dict. of Bib. Theology*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000), 64.

[3] James Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible* (Harvard Univ. Press, 1998), 15-19.

[4] Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 45; Williams, *Christian Theology*, 16.

[5] John Barton, "Source Criticism (OT)," in *Anchor Bib. Dict.*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 163; Blomberg, "The Unity and Diversity of Scripture," 64-65, 69-71; Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2 vols., vol. I (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 4-5, 22-23.

[6] Robinson, *In the End, God*, 94-95.

[7] M. Eugene Boring, "Language of Universal Salvation in Paul," *JBL* 105, no. 2 (1986): 269 & n.1.

[8] McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 5, 11, 158, 176-77.

[9] Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 1.

the faith; professed Gnostics, for example, are generally omitted.[10] Despite exclusions, the Universalist survey is long for three reasons. First, the Universalism of thought leaders is often disputed to avoid them being heretics;[11] so, their Universalism must be set out to justify their inclusion. Occasionally, purported Universalists must be shown not to be. Second, the survey cannot be limited to a sample without risking the impression that Universalism's influence is less than it is. On the other hand, the survey cannot be so meticulous as to drown out its purpose of assessing the magnitude of Christianity's Universalism generally. Exhaustive studies are available (and cited), but they can be exhausting and the work commitment they require tend to attract partisans, whether Universalists or their opponents. Even so, to be readable, they must be temporally circumscribed or thematically selective. The following, in contrast, covers two millennia in a few thousand words with no incentive for tendentiousness. The third and primary reason for the survey's length is it must counterbalance the Christian meme that Exclusivism "is clear[ly] … the overwhelming consensus."[12]

a) To Origen

Though the NT's authors were Christianity's first Exclusivists,[13] they were, alas, the first Universalists.[14] So, some early post-NT Christians leaned Universalist.[15] Ignatius (-110),[16] for example, noted Christ "drew all men to Himself for their eternal salvation."[17] Clement of Alexandria (150-216) was the first indisputable Universalist and, reflecting Universalism's initial acceptability, never condemned for it.[18] He wrote, "all

---

[10] McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 1, 10, 126, 129, 155-58.

[11] Steven R. Harmon, "Subjection of All Things in Christ," in *All Shall Be Well*, ed. Gregory MacDonald (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011), 63.

[12] Jerry L. Walls, "Hell and Purgatory Response to Eternal Conscious Torment," in *Four Views on Hell*, ed. Preston Sprinkle (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 55. Accord Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 48.

[13] Martin, *Will Many Be Saved?*, 154.

[14] Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 11.

[15] Ilaria L.E. Ramelli, "Origen, Bardaisan, and the Origin of Universal Salvation," *HTR* 102, no. 2 (2009): 135-68.

[16] Most early dates are estimates.

[17] "Epistle to the Smyrnaeans," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 87.

[18] Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 63; Daley, *Hope of the Early Church*, 46-47; Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 123-24. McClymond says whether Clement gave "a full-blown teaching on universal salvation" "is not clear." *Devil's Redemption*, I: 243. *Full-blown* and *clear* proof that still survives is unrealistic for a second-century writer's position that became heretical before the printing press. McClymond nonetheless concedes Clement said divine punishment was restorative, which denotes Universalism. Ibid., I: 246, 259.

things are arranged with a view to the salvation of the universe by the Lord of the universe, both generally and particularly." God will, by "necessary corrections … and by the perfect judgment, compel egregious sinners to repent." That is, "God's punishments are saving and disciplinary, leading to conversion," "a universal movement."[19] God thus "saves all."[20] Clement's contemporary, Bardaisan of Edessa (154-223), another early Universalist,[21] argued human freewill faces "that Great and Holy Will" that is "kind and forbearing towards all beings," such that humanity's "propensity to inflict harm … shall be brought to end …. And at the establishment of that new world all evil commotions shall cease … and all deficiencies shall be filled up …."[22]

Though with antecedents like these, Origen is unquestionably the leading Universalist both because of his masterpiece *First Principles* (225)[23] and because of his posthumous anathematization for Universalism.[24] Origen occasionally said unrepentant sinners suffered everlasting damnation,[25] but Universalism (and other positions) was responsible for his infamy as the next section addresses. For Origen, because Christ *subjected all* to Himself (Phi. 3:20-21),[26] everyone receives salvation.[27] Also, because Scripture says death ends and Christ is life, eternal life outlasts eternal death.[28] "There is a resurrection of the dead, and there is a punishment, but not everlasting. For when the body is punished the soul is gradually purified …. For all wicked men, … punishment has an end, and … wicked men … shall be restored …."[29] Origen further inferred from the Word being "in

---

[19] "The Stromata," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 6,6, 7,2 (pp. 490-91, 526).

[20] "Fragments from Cassiodous," 1Jo. 2:2 (p. 575).

[21] Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 110, 113-15, 119, 800-801.

[22] "Book of the Laws of Divers Countries," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 733-34.

[23] G.W. Butterworth, "Introduction," in *Origen on First Principles* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1936), vii-viii.

[24] Schwarz, *Eschatology*, 338-41.

[25] Blosser, *Become Like the Angels*, 244-45, 256-57; Lawrence R. Hennessey, "The Place of Saints and Sinners after Death," in *Origen of Alexandria*, ed. Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen (Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1988), 311-12.

[26] The passage—God will "subject [ὑποτάξαι]" everything—is not in Universalism's Scriptural basis because the verb means "cause to be in a submissive relationship" (*BDAG*, 1042), which expresses universal *dominion*, not salvation. Moises Silva, *Philippians*, ed. Robert Yarbrough and Robert H. Stein, 2nd ed., BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 185.

[27] *On First Principles*, I,6,1 (pp. 52-53).

[28] *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans Books 1-5*, ed. Thomas P. Halton, trans. Thomas P. Scheck, Fathers of the Church (DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 2001), 5-9.

[29] *On First Principles*, II,10,8 (p. 146).

thy mouth and in thy heart" (Rom. 10:8)[30] that "Christ is in the heart of all men." In God's judgment, "diversity of conduct is taken into account and each is treated according to" one's failures, but ultimately everyone is saved. Perhaps most important was God being "all in all" (1Co. 15:28),[31] meaning He is "all things in each individual person" and "will be all things in each person … when purified" such that each "will no longer be conscious of anything besides … God …."[32] As Chapter 8 discusses, such universal purging is how Origen (and subsequent Universalists) addressed Scripture's portrayal of God's wrath—it is frontloaded such that it will peter out before the ultimate.

b) To the Cappadocians

Several Origenist positions would be criticized early on, but not Universalism.[33] Instead, Universalism grew, particularly in the East. Methodius of Olympus (250-311), though anti-Origenist, was a Universalist.[34] Gregory of Neocaesarea (213-70) wrote Christ is "the Savior of all," even "all those half-dead."[35] Anthony the Great (251-356) argued "each one of us has sold himself of his own free choice," but "the bounty of God," "the Saviour of all the world," means we cannot "bring about our own death."[36] Church historian Eusebius (263-339) recorded Christ was "the common Savior of all," "the very culmination of the salvation of us all," "sent … for the salvation of the human race"; "in the present age the promise comes to the worthy alone," but, "after the consummation," God will dwell in" "all human beings." "Thus … he will be 'all in all.'"[37] The "beneficent Savior of the universe" rescues "the souls of humanity," even the "godless," into "eternal life."[38] Trinitarian champion Athanasius (296–373) argued "the salvation of all comes to pass" through Christ[39] such that "the human race is perfectly and

---

[30] This is not in Universalism's Scriptural basis because it mandates a human response, which is not said to be universal (Rom. 10:9-10). Schreiner, *Romans*, 555-61.

[31] Ramelli, "Procus and Apokatastasis," 120.

[32] *On First Principles*, I,3,6, 6,2, II,5,2, III,6,3 (pp. 35, 54, 102, 248) (internal quotations omitted).

[33] Gregory MacDonald, "Introduction: Between Heresy and Dogma," in *All Shall Be Well* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011), 5; Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 257-73.

[34] "Banquet of the Ten Virgins," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 318-19, 337-38, 348-49, 353.

[35] "Address of Thanksgiving to Origen," in *Fathers of the Church*, ed. Thomas P. Halton (DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 1998), ch 17 (p. 200).

[36] *The Letters*, Ltrs III, V, VI (pp. 10, 16, 22).

[37] "Against Marcellus," in *Fathers of the Church* (DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 2017), 2,4,28 (p. 154); "On Ecclesiastical Theology," 1,7,2; 3,2,16, 2,21, 4,6, 16,1-2 (pp. 167, 281-82, 307, 327-28).

[38] *Commentary on Isaiah*, trans. Jonathan J. Armstrong (Downers Grove: IVP, 2013), 25:1-8 (pp. 123-26).

[39] "Against Arianism," in *Select Treatises of St Athanasius* (New York: AMS, 1978), 14,97, 17,33 (pp.

wholly delivered … from the dead."[40] God "redeemed all of us, … the whole race of men," "the common salvation of us all" to "rescue all men generally to salvation."[41] Diodore of Tarsus (-390), orthodox bishop at Constantinople I, concluded the "torment for sinners" was "not everlasting," but "in proportion to … their iniquity," resulting in everyone's "immortality" and "unending happiness."[42] Didymus the Blind (313–98), another key Universalist never condemned,[43] determined ultimate salvation occurs consecutively but entirely—Christ first, believers second, and "all the other things" third, when death is destroyed.[44]

Macrina (330–79), the eldest Cappadocian, taught Universalism to the writing Cappadocians.[45] For her, because "every knee will bow" to Jesus (Phi. 2:10), even demons will confess Christ's lordship, "expounding the agreement of the universe in the good."[46] Her younger brother Gregory (330-95) was unique—an undeniable Universalist who is widely venerated.[47] He expressed his position succinctly in his essay on *First Corinthians* 15:28 (Migne PG 44.1304-26).[48] The divine "subjection" of all is the salvation of all. Evil "will be completely destroyed" "by refinement in fire," meaning "nothing made by God is excluded from his kingdom." "God will truly be in all things …." Christ joins "all mankind … to the divinity," and, so, "the good begotten in human nature was bestowed upon every person as one entity …."[49] Gregory concluded, "the final restoration [*apokatastasis*] … is expected to take place later in the kingdom of heaven of those who

---

247, 280).

[40] "Tomus Ad Antiochenos," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Ser.*, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), ch 7 (p. 485).

[41] "Letter X," 4, 10 (pp. 528-29, 531).

[42] Solomon of Akhlat, *Book of the Bee*, trans. Ernest A. Wallis Budge (Oxford: Clarendon, 1886), 140 (quoting Diodore's lost *Book of Dispensation*).

[43] Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 63.

[44] Didymus' comments are within a ninth-tenth century manuscript at the Pantokrator Monastery (Athos), collected and translated in Alice Thompson Croft, "Didymus the Blind on 1 Corinthians 15" (Wilfrid Laurier Univ., 1987). The cited text is at pp. 8-9 (Greek, pp. 37, 39, 41).

[45] Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 372-73, 380-81; Anna M. Silvas, *The Asketikon of St Basil the Great* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2007), 148.

[46] Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Soul and Resurrection*, trans. Catharine P. Roth (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1993), chs 4, 10 (pp. 64, 106).

[47] Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 63; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 30, 82; Johannes Zachhuber, *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 201.

[48] "In Illud: Tunc Et Ipse Filius," in *Gregorii Nysseni Opera III/2*, ed. Joseph Kenneth Downing (Leiden: Brill, 1982). Its English translation is at Brother Casimir, "When (the Father) Will Subject All Things to (the Son)," *Greek Orthodox Theological Rev.* 28, no. 1 (1983): 1 n.1, 12-25.

[49] Ibid., 16-19, 22, 24 (M.1312-13, 1316, 1320, 1324).

have suffered condemnation in Gehenna."[50] The catechism he prepared included Universalism.[51]

The other Cappadocians were Exclusivists, though Basil (330–79) was predictably fond of his siblings' theology.[52] "Since the Father through the blood of His cross made peace with [all],[53] whether on earth or in heaven," "the peace from the Lord is co-extensive with the whole of eternity," and with "the cross He drew all to Himself," yielding "restoration [*apokatastasis*] of all."[54] In his "Rules" masterwork, however, Basil concluded Universalism's "end of punishment" is explicitly rejected "everywhere in the God-inspired Scripture." If perdition ended, "surely eternal life would also have an end. Now if we do not tolerate thinking like this about life, by what logic shall we assign an end to eternal punishment?"[55] Universalists argue Basil's clear Exclusivism here is interpolation or pious bluff,[56] but the best evidence is that his Rules reflect his mature theology.[57] Gregory of Nazianzus (329–89) was Exclusivist too, concluding, for example, that Arians were excluded from salvation.[58] His Universalism could have been discreet, however, meaning only mature Christians were told.[59] He argued Christ's descent into Hades was "to save everyone absolutely,"[60] "God will be all in all in the time of restitution" and "cleansed the entire world" to "the ends of the earth,"[61] and "we were all without exception created anew," "saved by the heavenly Adam."[62] According to scholarship, given his

---

50 *Life of Moses*, Bk II (p. 54).

51 "The Catechetical Oration," in *Catechetical Oration of St Gregory of Nyssa*, ed. J.H. Srawley (London: Soc. for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917), ch. 26 (p. 81).

52 Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 348-59.

53 Implied.

54 *Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah*, trans. Nikolai Lipatov (Cambridge: Edition Cicero, 2001), 8,222, 9,226 (pp. 270, 276).

55 "Asketikon," SR 267 (pp. 418-19).

56 Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 351-57.

57 Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 36; Silvas, *Asketikon of Basil*, 2-3, 17, 130, 143-45, 418 n.723.

58 "Orations," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Ser.*, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 38.14.

59 Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 63; Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 454-56.

60 *Festal Orations*, trans. Nonna Verna Harrison (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2008), Or. 45,24 (p. 185).

61 *On God and Man*, trans. Peter Gilbert (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), poems 1.1.2, lns 75-76, 2.1, lns 162-69 (pp. 42, 94-95).

62 "Orations," 30,6, 33,9 (pp. 312, 331).

Exclusivist oeuvre,[63] these sentiments indicate salvation universally available, not universally received.[64]

c) Before Anathema

With Origen's and the Nyssen's endorsement, Universalism was viable through the fifth century in the East. Even John Chrysostom (347–407), though Exclusivist,[65] proposed "the common Expiation of the world is … before us."[66] God "has given everyone the gift of immorality, everyone eternal life …."[67] Homilies that tradition attributes to him are similar: Christ's sacrifice attains "the salvation of mankind," "the salvation of the whole world," "the human race," "the whole earth."[68] Other Easterners were explicitly Universalist. Cyril of Alexandria (378–444) held Christ "is led to the slaughter for all, to drive away the sin of the world, … to abolish death by dying for all, …. rescuing the entire flock on earth …—one for all," bringing "the whole world to its fitting consummation …, that is, salvation and life for all …."[69] Christ calls "even those who will not listen and who are hardened" and "restores" "the entire race," "belief" being "an inevitable necessity."[70] Cyril resolved that Satan is left alone in hell.[71] Theodoret (393-457), though Cyril's Three Chapters opponent, agreed on Universalism: Christ too "led the whole human race back to life" and "achieves life for all people." "[T]he whole human race will follow Christ the Lord and share resurrection." "In the future life, when corruption comes to an end and immortality is conferred," "all human beings will share in the same resurrection"; "even if here and now we are not sharing in salvation, we shall not be deprived of it after departure from here." Though "unbelief is confined to this world," God imparts "in the next life" "the salvation of everyone."[72] Pseudo-Dionysius

---

[63] *E.g.*, "Orations," 2.28, 16.7, 16.9, 30.4, 30.21, 38.13, 38.18, 40.36.

[64] Winslow, *Dynamics of Salvation*, 117-19, 129, 131, 154, 157-58, 166-67.

[65] "Homilies on Matthew," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Ser.*, ed. Philip Schaff (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 36,3-4 (p. 236); Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 50.

[66] "Homilies on First Corinthians," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Ser.*, ed. Philip Schaff (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 41,8 (p. 254).

[67] "Homily 11 (on Ephesians)," in *John Chrysostom* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 214E (p. 61).

[68] "Victory over Death," in *The Paschal Mystery*, ed. Adalbert Hamman (New York: Alba House, 1969), 3-4 (pp. 101, 103).

[69] *Commentary on John*, ed. Thomas C. Oden and Gerald L. Bray, trans. David R. Maxwell, 2 vols., vol. I, Ancient Christian Texts (Downers Grove: IVP, 2013), 2 [intro., 170], 4,1 [488] (pp. 76, 217).

[70] Ibid., vol. II, 6,1 [217, 234], 9,1 [482], 11,10 [723-24], 12 [88] (pp. 60, 68, 186, 298-99, 346).

[71] "Festal Letter Seven," in *Fathers of the Church*, ed. Thomas P. Halton (DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 2009), 135-36.

[72] *Commentary on the Letters of St Paul*, trans. Robert Charles Hill, 2 vols., vol. I (Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2001), Rom. 3:4,78, 5:14-18,101-103, 1Co. 15:22-28,355-60, 2Co. 4:4,400,

the Areopagite (fifth-sixth century) determined God is the destiny of "all things," "bring-[ing] them to completion … in the one single, irrepressible, and supreme act."[73] Another pseudonymous book attributed to another Syrian, *The Book of the Holy Hierotheos* (late fifth century), advocated Universalism too.[74] Based on the critical *First Corinthians* passage, "Hells shall pass, and torments shall be done away"; so, "all is sanctified."[75]

Universalism was far less in the West.[76] The reason is unclear. It could be simply Universalism was associated with Origen and regionalism did the rest. One suggestion is dubious: After the Western church shifted to Latin in the third and fourth centuries,[77] only Easterners appreciated the NT's Greek subtleties, which Universalism apparently demands.[78] Greek proficiency, however, did not insulate the East from heresies,[79] and many Hellenics like Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Basil, the Nazianzen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Theophilus of Alexandria, and John Damascene rejected Universalism.[80] If any language attracted Universalism, it is late-to-theology and very Western English.[81] Two other explanations for Universalism's Eastern prevalence are plausible: Easterners were drawn to it because Greek philosophers were indicting Christianity for rejecting other religions, which undermined cultural solidarity,[82] and Universalism's purity appealed to the Athenian predilection for abstraction, while its singularity was too divorced from practical Roman ethics.[83]

In any event, Universalism reached the West. Hilary of Poitiers (310-65) concluded we all "have been lifted up again from the flesh to God" because Christ was "the

---

6:2,413 (pp. 60, 73-74, 227-31, 268, 274).

[73] "The Divine Names," in *The Complete Works* (New York: Paulist, 1987), 596C-597A (p. 56).

[74] McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 345.

[75] *Book of the Holy Hierotheos*, trans. Fred Shipley Marsh (Amsterdam: APA-Philo, 1979), 5.2 (p. 133).

[76] Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 607-609.

[77] Henry Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 132.

[78] Hart, *The New Testament*, 539-40.

[79] Henry Chadwick, *The Early Church* (New York: Penguin, 1977), 37-41, 144-45, 202-205; J.G. Davies, *The Early Christian Church* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 74-75, 176-81, 238-39; Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 23-28, 141-42, 226-31, 237-40, 310-17.

[80] McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 40-41.

[81] Julian of Norwich was a rare medieval Universalist, and Anglicans and their kith led Universalism during and after the Reformation (*e.g.*, *infra,* p. 76 and following).

[82] Celsus, *On the True Doctrine*, trans. R. Joseph Hoffman (Oxford Univ. Press, 1987), 70, 79, 86; Michael Simmons, *Universal Salvation in Late Antiquity* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2015), 215-16, 225-26.

[83] Sedgwick, *Life of Marcus Aurelius*, 28.

body of the whole of humanity" and "reproduced in all."[84] Hilary saw eternal life as the restoration to original perfection through evil's annihilation.[85] Ambrose (340-97), wrote "The mystery of the Incarnation … is the salvation of the whole of creation."[86] Jerome, though later an Exclusivist, was through 390 a Universalist, including Satan's salvation.[87] John Cassian (360–435), a Universalist,[88] penned "the purpose of God" for "man not to perish but to live for ever, stands immovable." God "draws men against their will to salvation."[89] Even Augustine (354–430), discussed in the next section, began as a Universalist:[90] "the goodness of God does not permit" "corruption" or other "non-existence," but "orders *all things* … till in the order of their movements they return to that from which they fell away."[91] After adopting Exclusivism, he lithely claimed he did not really mean "all things" when he wrote that.[92]

Universalism was, therefore, unquestionably common through the fifth century, although the primary proof, in the centuries before printing and surveys and before the Church had decided the issue, must be these citations to individual writers. A few facts, however, confirm Universalism's early vigor. When Origenist monks were challenging Church authority in 370-400, their Universalism was not challenged, suggesting it was then too popular to be incriminating.[93] Consistent with this, Augustine in about 420 (then an Exclusivist) deplored Universalists as *immo quam plurimi*, "indeed very many,"[94] suggesting a majority.[95] A half century earlier, Basil assessed Universalists similarly—

---

84 *Tractatus Super Psalmos I-XCI*, ed. J. Doignon (Brepols, 1997), Pss. 51:16-17, 54:9 (pp. 103-104, 146).

85 Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 241.

86 "On the Christian Faith," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Ser.*, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 5,8,104 (p. 297).

87 Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 631.

88 Ibid., 682-84.

89 "The Conferences," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Ser.*, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), XIII, chs 7, 9, 11 (pp. 425-28).

90 David Hilborn and Don Horrocks, "Universalistic Trends in the Evangelical Tradition," in *Universal Salvation?*, ed. Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 220; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 1-2; MacDonald, "Between Heresy and Dogma," 9.

91 "On the Morals of the Manichaeans," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Ser.*, ed. Philip Schaff (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 7,9 (p. 71) (emphasis added).

92 *The Retractions (Fathers of the Church, Vol. 60)*, trans. Sister Mary Inez Bogan (DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 1991), 1,7,6.

93 Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 577-98, 636-41, 823.

94 "Enchiridion Ad Laurentium," in *De Doctrina Christiana Libri Quatuor, Et Enchiridion Ad Laurentium*, ed. Carl Hermann Bruder (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1838), § 112 (p. 245); "Enchiridion," ch 112 (p. 273).

95 Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 673.

"many."[96] Regardless of exact proportions, Universalism was clearly a well-established theologoumenon in Christianity's first five centuries,[97] when those closest to the NT were interpreting it.[98] That is, Universalism was tenable when debatable.

Christian Universalism peaked, however, because, as the next section sets out, the salvation-extent question was called in the sixth century and Universalism was summarily defeated.[99] That Universalism undermined the Church's salvation monopoly did not help.[100] If "*salus extra ecclesiam*," Barth asked, "what becomes of the backbone of the Church?"[101] This might explain why Universalism was stronger in the East where the empire continued; emperor-imposed Christianity[102] was homologous with God-imposed salvation. Irrespective, as discussed below, Universalism thinned out everywhere and by the Middle Ages nearly died out[103] until the Reformation, when it resurfaced within the cracks of Rome's centralized authority.[104]

Universalism survived briefly in the East, attracting two influential seventh-century theologians—Maximus of Constantinople and Isaac of Nineveh. Maximus' Universalism was never condemned,[105] but this could be because he was discreet, treating Universalism as a Church secret especially in light of its recent anathematization.[106] He reasoned from the crucial *First Corinthians* account that "no existing thing will … be deprived of God's presence."[107] Christ will "transform the universe" "for the salvation of our souls and

---

96 "Asketikon," 419; Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 1-2. .

97 Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, V, 316-17; Daley, *Hope of the Early Church*, 222; Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 817-19, 823.

98 Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 2-3; Veli-Matti Karkkainen, *Christology: Global Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 62.

99 Oliver D. Crisp, "'I Do Teach It, but I Also Do Not Teach It': Universalism of Karl Barth," in *All Shall Be Well*, ed. Gregory MacDonald (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011), 310; Paul L. Gavrilyuk, "The Judgment of Love," Ibid., 284 n.22; Morwenna Ludlow, "Universalism in the History of Christianity," in *Universal Salvation?*, ed. Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 195.

100 *Universal Salvation*, 2.

101 *Romans*, 365 (9:30).

102 Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom*, Rev. ed. (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 149.

103 Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 23; Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 634; McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 77, 322, 390.

104 MacDonald, "Between Heresy and Dogma," 10.

105 Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 63-64.

106 Andreas Andreopoulos, "Eschatology in Maximus the Confessor," in *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor*, ed. Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil (Oxford Univ. Press, 2015), 325-33; Ramelli and Konstan, *Terms for Eternity*, 222.

107 "Ambiguum 7," in *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ* (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003), 1092C (p. 66).

bodies … inasmuch as He is the pioneer of the salvation of all ….”[108] Christ “divinized all humanity” and “accomplished the complete salvation of humanity.”[109] Isaac’s Universalism was not discreet. He argued God’s decree of Adamic death that struck everyone was “the means of transporting us to that wonderful and glorious world” of Christ’s redemption of no less equal extension. Hell involves “mercy,” not “torment,” “a result of His eternal goodness.” Claiming hell “is not full of love” is “full of blasphemy.”[110]

In the West, Universalism was fleeting, and the exception literally proves it. John Scotus Eriugena (810-77), “the greatest philosopher of the Dark Ages,”[111] was a Universalist: The Incarnation saves “the human race, without exception,” returning the “whole of humanity … to its pristine state,” obtaining “the perfection of all humanity as a whole and singly.”[112] Rome condemned him twice.[113] Universalism otherwise hardly existed among Medieval Christians,[114] except for a few women mystics imploring God to save everyone.[115] The near-death “showings” of Julian of Norwich (1342-1416), for example, convinced her of Universalism, though it contradicted the Church’s “lower” Exclusivism. When she confronted God with the conflict, Jesus replied, “alle maner of thynge shalle be wele,” even “alle that is lesse.”[116]

d) Reformation to resurgence

After effectively disappearing, Universalism reappeared during the Reformation.[117] A world where Luther died of old age was certainly more heterogeneous than one where the Church incinerated Hus,[118] if for no other reason than heterodoxies could now be

---

[108] *Ambigua*, trans. Nicholas Constas, 2 vols. (Harvard Univ. Press, 2014), II: 42 [1332D, 1333A] (pp. 154-57).

[109] Ibid., I: 4 [1044B-D] (pp. 26-27).

[110] *The Second Part*, trans. Sebastian Brock, 2 vols., vol. I (Leuven: Peeters, 1995), 39,4 & 22 (pp. 164, 172).

[111] Highet, *Man's Unconquerable Mind*, 31.

[112] *Periphyseon*, trans. Myra L. Uhlfelder (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011), Bk V, chs 23, 25, 36 (pp. 302-303, 312, 334-40).

[113] Richard Bauckham, "Universalism: Historical Survey," *Themelios* 4 (1979): 50.

[114] Ilaria L.E. Ramelli, *A Larger Hope?*, 2 vols., vol. I (Eugene: Cascade, 2019), 197; John Sanders, *No Other Name* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 81.

[115] Edward T. Oakes, "Christ's Descent into Hell," in *All Shall Be Well*, ed. Gregory MacDonald (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011), 384.

[116] *Book of Showings*, 2 vols., vol. II (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1978), 404-405, 413, 487-89, 510-12. See Maureen L. Walsh, "Re-Imagining Redemption," *Horizons* 39, no. 2 (2012): 189-207.

[117] Sanders, *No Other Name*, 81-82.

[118] Bray, *God Has Spoken*, 792; Hillerbrand, *The Division of Christendom*, 41, 58, 67-68, 89, 103, 109.

printed and distributed faster than gathered and destroyed.[119] Protestants, like Catholics, were expected, however, to identify who was and was not saved,[120] which continued to handicap Universalism, whose decrees could never be personalized. In the event, all major Reformers rejected Universalism,[121] including Luther,[122] but it resurfaced on Protestantism's fringes.[123] Hans Denck (1495-1527), unconventional even for an Anabaptist, got himself imprisoned in Switzerland for espousing Universalism.[124] A few Pietists and Brethren, an Anabaptist offshoot, were Universalists too.[125]

Off continent, Universalism obtained a foothold. This could be because medieval theology had admitted the vernacular English, broadening the discussion beyond the Latin educated, Julian being an example.[126] Then, when Church discipline slipped during the interregnum, Universalism was expressed with less risk, though still with risk.[127] Some Radical English Puritans were Universalists,[128] including two Neoplatonic Cambridge chaplains under Oliver Cromwell, Peter Sterry (1613-72) and Jeremiah White (1630–1707), but their Universalist tracts were only published anonymously or posthumously.[129] George Rust (-1670), Irish Anglican Bishop, also wrote anonymously that God's love produced afterlife punishment so intolerable that it eventually converted everyone.[130] George de Benneville (1703-93), a Huguenot turned London Pietist, had a near-death Universalist vision and was sentenced to death for proclaiming it (which was commuted).[131] James Relly (1722-78), Methodist London minister, distinguished between two salvations: one that believers had confidently and another that everyone else

---

119 Niall Ferguson, *Civilization* (New York: Penguin, 2011), 61-62.

120 Matthias Gockel, *Barth and Schleiermacher on the Doctrine of Election* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2006), 146.

121 Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 2; MacDonald, "Between Heresy and Dogma," 10; Oakes, "Christ's Descent into Hell," 384.

122 *Genesis*, II, 56, 339 (25:7-11, 47:21-26).

123 Tony Walter, *Eclipse of Eternity* (New York: St Martin's, 1996), 19.

124 Hilborn and Horrocks, "Universalistic Trends," 221.

125 Bauckham, "Universalism: Historical Survey," 50; Hilborn and Horrocks, "Universalistic Trends," 222-25.

126 Nicholas Watson, "Visions of Incusion," *J. of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 27:2 (1997): 170.

127 McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 406.

128 Bauckham, "Universalism: Historical Survey," 50.

129 Louise Hickman, "Love Is All and God Is Love," in *All Shall Be Well*, ed. Gregory MacDonald (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011), 95-113.

130 Ludlow, "Universalism in the History of Christianity," 201.

131 MacDonald, "Between Heresy and Dogma," 15.

had suspensefully.[132] The rebellious colonies were similar. Charles Chauncy (1705-87), Congregationalist pastor and Harvard College president, wrote *The Salvation of All Men*, which was published under his name only after he died.[133] The largely forgotten Baptist Boston preacher Elhanan Winchester (1751-97) authored *The Universal Restoration*.[134] His followers organized the Society of Universal Baptists,[135] and they along with other Baptists, Quakers, revivalists, and dissenting Calvinists later formed the "Universalists," which, in the nineteenth century, grew to about 140,000 members, the sixth largest US denomination.[136]

As the nineteenth century began, Universalism was still in repose,[137] but that century's spirit of inquiry encouraged freethinkers,[138] including Universalists.[139] The contemporaneous quest for human perfection also favored Universalism because humanity was perfecting itself anyway.[140] As a result, criminal justice became reformatory, and, so, hell became that too, which Universalists had been urging all along.[141] Finally, spiritualism was gaining followers, and its patrons received reassuring reports of Universalism.[142] The key theological turn was likely when Schleiermacher sanctioned Universalism at the end of his *Christian Faith* (1821).[143] He argued Scripture contradicted itself on salvation's extent, and, so, individualistic Exclusivism had to yield to Universalism; Calvinistic predestination and God's salvific will meant everyone was saved against their will.[144] Given

---

132 Wayne K. Clymer, "Union with Christ," Ibid., 137-38.

133 *The Salvation of All Men* (New Haven: A. Morse, 1784).

134 *The Universal Restoration*, 4th ed. (London 1799).

135 McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 593.

136 Ernest Cassara, ed. *Universalism in America* (Boston: Beacon, 1971), 39; Mark A. Noll, *History of Christianity in the United States and Canada* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 150-51, 220; David Robinson, *The Unitarians and the Universalists* (Westport: Greenwood, 1985), 47-50, 54, 339-40.

137 Bauckham, "Universalism: Historical Survey," 48-49.

138 Bray, *God Has Spoken*, 23.

139 Don Horrocks, "Postmortem Education," in *All Shall Be Well*, ed. Gregory MacDonald (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011), 203; MacDonald, "Between Heresy and Dogma," 14; Oakes, "Christ's Descent into Hell," 384.

140 Bulgakov, "Heroism and Otherworldliness," 52; Walls, *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, 7-8.

141 McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 84.

142 Ibid., I: 96-98.

143 Bauckham, "Universalism: Historical Survey," 50-51; Gockel, *Barth and Schleiermacher*, 98, 198; Hans Schwarz, *Eschatology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 341-42.

144 *Christian Faith*, trans. Terrence N. Tice, et al., 2 vols., vol. II (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2016), §§ 119, 162-63 (pp. 778-85, 987-98).

such developments, Universalism gained followers among the Orthodox, Anglicans, Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Congregationalists, Evangelicals, and Quakers.[145]

Universalism nearly netted Kierkegaard (1813-55), who preached, "Christ came … with the purpose of saving the world,"[146] which He will "continue to complete unto the end of the world …."[147] Though accused of saying "others were going to hell," Kierkegaard confided he did "not believe that; on the contrary, I believe that we will all be saved, I, too, and this awakens my deepest wonder …."[148] He consistently maintained, however, that everyone had to fear for their salvation because God judged individually,[149] and this justified Exclusivism.[150] Because "the terms of salvation differ for every individual," the debate "about whether God intends the salvation of all or only of some" was unproductive.[151] Admittedly, God offers "reconciliation … for the salvation of humankind,"[152] but each individual must accept it.[153] "There is … a danger … called going astray," which is ultimately "perdition."[154] Scholarship's consensus, accordingly, is that Kierkegaard was Exclusivist.[155]

Silouan of Athos (1866-1938) has been claimed as a Universalist,[156] but his expectations were more realistic: "help but a single soul to salvation." Human volition prevented more.[157] While Silouan prayed for everyone's salvation, his apostle explained this actually "rule[s] out" Universalism, because the prayer would otherwise be superfluous.

---

145 Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 634; Hilborn and Horrocks, "Universalistic Trends," 226-28; McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, II: 1005; Schwarz, *Eschatology*, 341.

146 *Practice in Christianity*, 238. Accord *Works of Love*, 8.

147 *Training in Christianity*, trans. Walter Lowrie (Princeton Univ. Press, 1967), 16, 151.

148 *Journal and Papers*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong, 7 vols., vol. VI (Indiana Univ. Press, 1978), 557 (entry 6947).

149 *JP*, III, ¶ 2551; *Upbuilding Discourses*, 260; *Christian Discourses*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong (Princeton Univ. Press, 1997), 203-205; *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, I, 275.

150 *Fear and Trembling*, trans. Walter Lowrie (Princeton Univ. Press, 1970), 66.

151 *JP*, IV, 530-31 (entries 4920, 4922).

152 *Upbuilding Discourses*, 258.

153 *JP*, IV, ¶ 4950.

154 *Upbuilding Discourses*, 13.

155 Tamara Monet Marks, "Kierkegaard's Understanding of the Afterlife," in *Kierkegaard and Death*, ed. Patrick Stokes and Adam Buben (Indiana Univ. Press, 2011), 281-82; Jack Mulder, Jr., "Must All Be Saved?," *Int'l J. for Philosophy of Religion* 59 (2006): 1-24; Julia Watkin, "Kierkegaard's View of Death," *History of European Ideas* 12, no. 1 (1990): 74-75. Ellul, a Universalist and Kierkegaardian, agreed Kierkegaard was not Universalist. Dan Clendenin, "Freedom and Universal Salvation," *Ellul Studies Bulletin*, Aug. 1988, 3.

156 Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 16.

157 "The Writings," in *Saint Silouan the Athonite*, ed. Archimandrite Sophrony (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991), 336, 341.

"There is a domain in human life … where even love is not supreme. This domain is freedom." While "Christ's love hopes to draw all men to Him," some reject it, "many or few, we do not know," though "not all will find salvation."[158]

The British continued producing Universalists in the nineteenth century[159] and with less risk, though King's College theology professor F.D. Maurice was fired in 1853 for affirming Universalism (based on eternal punishment being durationally limited).[160] Among Anglicans, Thomas Erskine argued in *Doctrine of Election* (1837) that the unsaved were subject to punitive afterlife atonement "until the righteousness of God" achieves "the final salvation of the whole human race,"[161] and Andrew Jukes wrote the Universalist *Restitution of All Things* in 1867, arguing death ushered in agelong redemption.[162] Influential Victorian writer George MacDonald (1824-1905) was a Universalist because hell destroys sin, leaving everyone in eternal life.[163] Scottish Congregational minister P.T. Forsyth (1848–1921) wrote, "The certainty of revelation and faith is that in the universal Christ the world is chosen for salvation, and is saved in principle, and shall be saved in fact."[164] Scottish theologian John Baillie (1886-1960) concluded, because Exclusivism meant that evil continued forever as it was being punished, only Universalism made sense of the ending God planned.[165]

Universalism continued to grow as the twentieth century unfolded. After the Fascist and Communist killing machines had exposed civilization as a humanistic fraud,[166] dethroning the Enlightenment's Whiggish supposition of continuous human progression,[167] Universalism filled the need that humanity was clearly failing at—its perfection. Further, with Christianity's fall from influence, much like during pre-Christendom, Universalism offered salvation for unchurched friends and family who were once again numerous without endangering a now nonexistent Church monopoly.[168] So, twentieth-

---

158 Archimandrite Sophrony, "The Staretz' Life and Teaching," Ibid., 109, 222, 226, 230.

159 Robert Wild, *Catholic Reading Guide to Universalism* (Eugene: Resource Pubs, 2015), 41.

160 Ludlow, "Universalism in the History of Christianity," 209; McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 31, 87-88.

161 *Doctrine of Election* (London: Duncan, Paternoster, 1837).

162 *Second Death and the Restitution of All Things*, 4th ed. (London: Longmans, Green, 1875).

163 *Unspoken Sermons Ser. I,II,III* (Whitehorn: Johannesen, 1997), 30-32, 512-13, 516, 605, 618.

164 *The Principle of Authority* (London: Independent Press, 1952), 357, 360.

165 *And the Life Everlasting* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1934), 245.

166 Bray, *God Has Spoken*, 1147; Erich Fromm, "Modern Man and the Future," in *On Being Human*, ed. Rainer Funk (New York: Continuum, 2005), 20-21.

167 Herbert Butterfield, *Whig Interpretation of History* (New York: Norton, 1965).

168 Pannenberg, *Anthropology in Theological Perspective*, 13-14.

century Christians began to feature prominently Universalism in their credited works and remain prominent Christians.

Universalists were often philosophic. Paul Tillich contended universal purging saved all humanity.[169] "Correlation" of the positive and the negative addressed "the demonic cleavages," "the essential unity and the existential separation of finite man from his infinity." Ultimately, "God is everything for everything," "salvation in complete unity."[170] In the "universal judgment," the good obtains eternal life without life's "ambiguous mixture."[171] John Hick's universal salvation involved each person being successively reincarnated in otherworlds until perfected.[172] Jacques Ellul based his Universalism on God's love ultimately rejecting no one.[173] Any "distance existing between God and man … will be cancelled for all mankind at the time … of the new creation." "[E]very evil work of man is rooted out of him …, but that man himself … is saved," meaning Exclusivism "is not theologically possible."[174]

Every major communion had major Universalist theologians in the twentieth century, except Catholics, though two could have been.[175] Karl Rahner purportedly said he was Universalist, but only in conversations, never in his writings.[176] Hans Urs von Balthasar was accused of Universalism, but he denied it.[177] Their published positions on salvation's extent are addressed in the third section of this chapter.

The Orthodox had Sergius Bulgakov, who reckoned God's penultimate judgment "changes man's very being,"[178] a kind of universal purgatory,[179] which Chapter 8 discusses further. Jesus "took upon Himself all humanity, … and all His works are … of universal value." With "salvation, life eternal in God," "He will raise up in the flesh all

---

169 *ST*, II, 78; *ST*, III, 400-401, 407-409, 415-18.

170 *ST*, I, 49, 61, 66, 147.

171 *ST*, III, 398-99.

172 *Evil and the God of Love* (London: Macmillan, 1966), 381; *Death and Eternal Life* (New York: Harper, 1976).

173 *What I Believe*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 189-91; *The Ethics of Freedom*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (London: Mowbrays, 1976), 79-80.

174 *Apocalypse*, 118-19, 213, 219 (internal quotations omitted).

175 McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, II: 867-935.

176 Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 143, 186.

177 Caldecott, *Radiance of Being*, 247.

178 *Bride of the Lamb*, 455, 501.

179 Gavrilyuk, "Judgment of Love," 295.

humanity."[180] "The God-man" is "universal resurrection" into eternal life for "all humanity without any exception …."[181]

The reformed faiths include Universalists. Anglican John A.T. Robinson wrote *In the End, God* in 1950.[182] "In … Christ *all* are made alive" based "solely on the unconditional love of God. Consequently, *all* will be raised; and this despite the perennial tendency of the religious to assert—both within Scripture and outside it—that there can be resurrection only for the righteous." Instead, divine free love forces the free decision for God in the next life.[183] Congregationalist Nels F.S. Ferré in *The Christian Understanding of God* (1951) suggested Scripture, notwithstanding its irreconcilable positions on ultimate destinies, has a "total message" of "God's sovereign love."[184] Presbyterian William Barclay was a "convinced Universalist" because "in the end all men" succumb to God's overpowering love.[185] Calvinist Jürgen Moltmann wrote extensively for Universalism.[186] The ultimate does not eternally condemn the unrighteous, but transforms everyone for eternal life. No one is lost.[187] God's will and power produce "universal salvation,"[188] "true Christian universalism."[189]

With Universalism's theological acceptance in the twentieth century and the decline in personal responsibility that began in its last decades,[190] the twenty-first century saw Universalism's popularity rise further, particularly among the avant-garde.[191] Christian philosopher Thomas Talbott promotes Universalism based on orthodox premises—God wills everyone saved (per Catholicism) and God is totally sovereign (per Calvinism), from which can be deduced that everyone will be saved.[192] The syllogism's usual escape—human freewill—he handles by observing that true freewill requires informed consent,

---

[180] *Orthodox Church*, 106.

[181] *Bride of the Lamb*, 429, 436, 450.

[182] Trevor Hart, "In the End, God," in *All Shall Be Well*, ed. Gregory MacDonald (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011), 355-58.

[183] *In the End, God*, 73-74, 104-16.

[184] *Christian Understanding of God* (New York: Harper, 1951), 228, 234-37, 242-49.

[185] *A Spiritual Autobiography* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 65-67.

[186] *Crucified God*, 194-95; *Theology of Hope*, 209; *The Coming of God*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 255.

[187] *Crucified God*, 176; *Coming of God*, 76, 106, 251, 271.

[188] *Coming of God*, 244-45, 250.

[189] *Crucified God*, 194.

[190] McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 18, 30.

[191] Robin A. Parry and Ilaria L.E. Ramelli, *A Larger Hope?*, 2 vols., vol. II (Eugene: Cascade, 2019), 277.

[192] *The Inescapable Love of God*, 2nd ed. (Eugene: Cascade, 2014).

and no one in their right mind rejects salvation.[193] Most denominations have those bucking Exclusivism in the twenty-first century, except Catholicism, whose maximum allowable extent of salvation appears to be hoping for Universalism,[194] a position discussed in the third section. Reformed David Congdon argues everyone is co-crucified with Christ, saving unbelievers "unconsciously."[195] Methodist Tom Greggs advocates "Particularistic Universalism," where Christ saves everyone,[196] which, he acknowledged, is Universalism.[197] The next chapter discusses the Universalism of Eastern Orthodox David Hart.

More twenty-first-century Universalists could be listed (and the citations name many), but the list, no matter how thorough when written, would be outdated when read.[198] An interdenominational organization has been ordaining Universalist since 2008.[199] As of 2011, 40% of Americans, 25% of the "born-again," align with Universalism.[200] A 1996 book on the top four primary damnation positions (hell, non-literal, purging, and annihilation) had to be updated in 2016 to credit Universalism's ascension (replacing non-literal).[201] The epithet *Universalist* in the twenty-first century has ceased to be an accusation, but become an accolade.[202] An evangelical, for instance, who thought it advisable in 2006 to publish his Universalist book pseudonymously came out in 2009.[203] Origen's reputation is being rehabilitated too—less a Christian version of Philo, more a

---

193 "Towards a Better Understanding of Universalism," 5-7.

194 Stephen Bullivant, *The Salvation of Atheists and Catholic Dogmatic Theology* (Oxford University Press, 2012), 1-12, 181-88.

195 *The God Who Saves*, 80, 90, 97-100, 215, 258-60, 268-74.

196 *Barth, Origen, and Universal Salvation*, 14, 119, 191, 195, 206.

197 "Christian Universalist View," in *Five Views on the Extent of Atonement*, ed. Adam J. Johnson (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019), 197.

198 Andrew Louth, "Eastern Orthodox Eschatology," in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, ed. Jerry L. Walls (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 246; Thomas Talbott, "Universalism," Ibid., 458 n.1; McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, II: 938-39.

199 Christian Universalist Association, "History of the CUA," https://christianuniversalist.org/about/history/, "The History of Universalism (Part Two)," https://christianuniversalist.org/resources/articles/history-of-universalism-part-2/ (accessed 5 Feb. 2019).

200 Barna Group, "What Americans Believe About Universalism and Pluralism," https://www.barna.com/research/what-americans-believe-about-universalism-and-pluralism/ (accessed 29 Apr. 2017).

201 William Crockett, ed. *Four Views on Hell* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996); Sprinkle, ed. *Four Views on Hell*, 101.

202 *Devil's Redemption*, II: 751; Roberto J. de la Noval, "Divine Drama or Divine Disclosure?," *Modern Theology* 36, no. 1 (2020): 201-10.

203 *Devil's Redemption*, II: 957.

Hellenic version of Augustine.[204] Universalism is certainly more popular now than at any time since Origen's proscription.[205]

2) <u>Exclusivism is orthodox.</u>

A corresponding resumé of Exclusivists is impractical because they are practically everyone else.[206] One compensation for the fullness of the Universalist survey is, therefore, nearly every other major figure can be counted Exclusivist *sub silentio*. Universalists acknowledge Exclusivism has been and remains the mainstream.[207] This results partly from Exclusivism's latitude. Universalism saves every human, no exceptions, while Exclusivism is any lesser extent.[208] Exclusivists can, in differing details and degrees, say God nurtures everyone, judges everyone, graces everyone, and reveals to everyone.[209] Exclusivism is merely dualistic; the righteous live forever in eternal bliss and the unrighteous forever do not, whatever their proportions.[210]

a) Anathematizing Universalism

The simplest explanation for Exclusivism's dominance is the Second Council of Constantinople in 553. The four previous ecumenical councils, binding every subsequent Christian persuasion,[211] did not address salvation's extent, which Universalists can cite for Universalism's original acceptability.[212] The relatively early Athanasian Creed (technically, *Quicumque*) declares "those who have done evil" enter "eternal fire" and "cannot be saved,"[213] but this dates to the sixth century,[214] which is when Exclusivism officially prevailed. The Jerusalem and Antioch patriarchs, who were disputing with Origenists, complained in 543 to Justinian the Great about their Universalism (among other doctrines).[215]

---

[204] Blosser, *Become Like the Angels*, 2-3.

[205] Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, V, 192; Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 634; MacDonald, "Between Heresy and Dogma," 14, 17; Martin, *Will Many Be Saved?*, 55; Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 819-20.

[206] Martin, *Will Many Be Saved?*, 14; Wild, *Catholic Reading Guide to Universalism*, 1.

[207] Greggs, "Christian Universalist View," 198; Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 4, 81.

[208] Greggs, "Christian Universalist View," 198.

[209] Lubac, *Catholicism*, 218-19.

[210] Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 30. The two main varieties of Exclusivism, *eternal torment* and *annihilation*, are not treated separately here. E. Earle Ellis, "NT Teaching on Hell," in *Rethinking Hell*, ed. Christopher M. Date, et al. (Eugene: Cascade, 2014), 117-22.

[211] Fudge, *The Fire That Consumes*, 276 & n.12.

[212] Gavrilyuk, "Judgment of Love," 283-84; MacDonald, "Between Heresy and Dogma," 9.

[213] Henry Denzinger and Karl Rahner, eds., *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, 30th ed. (St Louis: B. Herder, 1957), 16 (39-40).

[214] Chadwick, *Church in Ancient Society*, 653-54.

[215] Richard Price, "General Introduction," in *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553* (Liverpool Univ. Press, 2012), 17; "The Anti-Origenist Canons," Ibid., 274, 277.

Justinian agreed with the patriarchs: "If anyone says … the punishment of … impious human beings is temporary …, let him be anathema."[216] The Emperor was then clashing about Christ's natures, and, so, when Constantinople II convened to address the Three Chapters controversy,[217] Justinian added to the agenda Origen's Universalist "error" that "godless human beings will be with godly … men."[218] Canons specifically condemning Origenism were incorporated into the record,[219] including, "If anyone says … all human beings … will be united to God …, let him be anathema."[220] The council's list of heretics included "Origen," his "impious writings," and anyone "who … hold tenets like those of the aforesaid heretics."[221] Some Universalists say it is unclear whether the fifth ecumenical council condemned Universalism generally or Origen individually,[222] but the available evidence confirms the venerable conviction that it did.[223] Universalism's anathematization was certainly not doubted until recently,[224] including in sixth-century sources.[225] Universalists, therefore, mostly "recognize that the doctrine of universal salvation was officially condemned," albeit without proper deliberation.[226] So, with this ecumenical decision, Exclusivism became the Christian norm.[227]

b) Subsequent creeds

While Balthasar overstates that "Every Christian creed can take no other position than" Exclusivism,[228] each communion with an authorized teaching on salvation's extent has done just that, and these best reflect Exclusivism's continued dominance. The West upheld Exclusivism in the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), canon 1: The evil have "everlasting punishment," and "no one at all" "outside the Church is saved."[229] Rome's latest

---

216 "Canons of 543," Ibid., canon 9 (p. 281).

217 Price, "General Introduction," 22-23, 59.

218 "Letter of Justinian to the Holy Council," Ibid., 282-83.

219 Price, "The Eighth Session," 104; "The Anti-Origenist Canons," 271-72.

220 "Canons of 553," Ibid., canon 12 (p. 286).

221 "Proceedings," in *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*, canon 11 (pp. 123-24).

222 Daley, *Hope of the Early Church*, 190; Oakes, "Christ's Descent into Hell," 383.

223 Price, "The Anti-Origenist Canons," 270-72, 280.

224 Crisp, "'I Do Teach It, but I Also Do Not Teach It'," 310; Gavrilyuk, "Judgment of Love," 284 n.22; Ludlow, "Universalism in the History of Christianity," 195.

225 Price, "General Introduction," 100; "The Eighth Session," 105; "The Anti-Origenist Canons," 270-71.

226 Ramelli and Konstan, *Terms for Eternity*, 239.

227 Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 484.

228 *Dare We Hope*, 48.

229 Denzinger and Rahner, *Sources of Catholic Dogma*, 169 (429-30).

authorities teach the same in kinder tones. Vatican II noted individuals were lost "more often [*saepius*]" than not,[230] and the current catechism "affirms … hell and its eternity" where sinners "suffer … 'eternal fire.'"[231] "[N]othing of the dreadful reality of Hell is denied," Ratzinger explained. "The doctrine of everlasting punishment preserves its real content."[232] Protestants affirm Exclusivism in catechisms and confessions,[233] including the Lutheran's Augsburg Confession,[234] the Reformed's Heidelberg Catechism and Westminster Confession,[235] the Wesleyan's Manual of the Nazarene Church,[236] the Anabaptist /Mennonite's Dordrecht Confession,[237] the Baptist's Philadelphia Confession of Faith,[238] and the Evangelical's Basis of Faith.[239]

The East also adheres to Constantinople II,[240] as Universalists acknowledge.[241] According to John Climacus, Universalism was the "foul disease" "of the godless Origen,"[242] and ecumenical patriarch Gennadius II (George Scholarios) denounced Origen's temporary hell.[243] The Jerusalem Council of 1672 confirmed the ultimate binaries of joyful rest and "torment."[244] The Orthodox, however, mostly leave theology to liturgy,[245] and, because rituals resist authoritative interpretation, Universalists go undisciplined.[246]

---

230 Vatican Council, "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church: Lumen Gentium, Solemnly Promulgated by His Holiness, Pope Paul VI on November 21, 1964," (Boston: St Paul Eds., 1965), 16.

231 *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 1035 (p. 292).

232 *Eschatology*, 218.

233 Brian Hebblethwaite, *The Christian Hope*, Rev. ed. (Oxford Univ. Press, 2010), 84.

234 Theodore G. Tappert, ed. *Book of Concord: Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1959), 38 (ch 17).

235 "Constitution of the Presbyterian Church (USA): Book of Confessions" (Louisville: Office of the General Assembly, 2004), 4.020-22 5.057, 4.062-64, 6.177.

236 Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 391.

237 J.C. Wenger, "Dordrecht Confession of Faith," in *The Mennonite Encyclopedia*, ed. Harold S. Bender (Scottdale: Mennonite Pub'g, 1956), 93 (art. 18).

238 Timothy and Denise George, eds., *Baptist Confessions, Covenants, and Catechisms* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 92 (ch 34).

239 Hilborn and Horrocks, "Universalistic Trends," 226; Horrocks, "Postmortem Education," 199.

240 McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 119.

241 Bulgakov, *Orthodox Church*, 185.

242 *The Ladder of Divine Ascent*, trans. Colm Luibheid and Norman Russell (Mahwah: Paulist, 1982), 131 (step 5).

243 Henry Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1984), 95.

244 *Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem*, trans. J.N.W.B. Robertson (London: Thomas Baker, 1899), Ch VI, Decree XVIII (pp. 150-52).

245 Louth, "Eastern Orthodox Eschatology," 233.

246 McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 39, 44.

That said, Orthodox liturgy reflects Exclusivism: Mourning services mark the deceased's passage through an afterlife judgment ending in heaven or hell,[247] and expelling catechumens and penitents before closing the church doors symbolizes separating the elect from the damned.[248]

One major Christian denomination is unaccounted for because Anglicanism lacks clarity on anything theological except the Quadrilateral (Scripture, Nicene Creed, sacraments of baptism and communion, and episcopacy).[249] Hence, salvation's extent is not authoritatively settled.[250] The Church of England's 39 Articles, distinguishing it from Catholicism while affirming basic Christian tenets, had at one point numbered 42 so as to distinguish it also from radical Protestantism, including Universalism.[251] It was eliminated as either too obvious or too disputed.[252] Universalists generate opposition, however. When Natal's first bishop supported Universalism (and tolerated polygamy), his archbishop adjudged him a heretic and avoided excommunication at the first international Anglican bishops conference (1867) only because the Archbishop of Canterbury tabled the issue.[253] Similar stories recur of Anglicans suffering Universalists.[254]

The "Universalists" denomination made Universalism credal: "one God … will finally restore the whole family of mankind to holiness and happiness."[255] Hosea Ballou, their leading theologian, reasoned Universalism occurred without atonement and thus by a Unitarian God.[256] The slide into Unitarianism was thus inexorable, especially given humanism's rise in popularity, which had humanity saving itself.[257] In the twentieth century, the Universalists officially merged into the Unitarians, dispensing with the

---

247 Louth, "Eastern Orthodox Eschatology," 239-41.

248 Lossky, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 190.

249 Mark D. Chapman, *Anglican Theology* (London: T&T Clark, 2012), 4, 8, 70, 192-95.

250 Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922, "Doctrine in the Church of England," (London: SPCK, 1938), 25.

251 Hillerbrand, *The Division of Christendom*, 254.

252 McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 80 & n.192.

253 Chapman, *Anglican Theology*, 181-85; Ludlow, "Universalism in the History of Christianity," 210.

254 Geoffrey Rowell, *Hell and the Victorians* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1974), 116-21.

255 Robinson, *The Unitarians and the Universalists*, 56 (1803 Winchester Profession).

256 *Treatise on Atonement* (Bennington: Walbridge, 1811). See Cassara, *Universalism in America*, 17, 21-23; Robinson, *The Unitarians and the Universalists*, 61-62.

257 Cassara, *Universalism in America*, 41-42.

complication of Christ as mediator, and, so, disappeared as a Christian denomination.[258] No other before or since has adopted Universalism.[259]

c) Exemplary theologians

Given the creedal consensus, the faithful are presumptively Exclusivist, which is what makes their survey unworkable,[260] but, in addition to impersonal creeds, representative theologians can stand in for the majority who say only some are saved.[261] They include the earliest noncanonical Christians.[262] *The Didache*'s first-century tradition specifies an eschatological "test" by fire where "many" "will be utterly destroyed [ἀπολοῦνται]."[263] In the second century, Polycarp purportedly told his executioners they were "ignorant of the fire" "of eternal punishment" "reserved for the ungodly," which is not "extinguished,"[264] Justin Martyr held "everyone goes to eternal punishment or salvation in accordance with the character of his acts,"[265] and Irenaeus condemned Gnostics for saying "all souls are saved."[266] The last church father, John Damascene, summarized: While believers have "eternal salvation," the rest have "chastisement and eternal punishment." "God has done everything for a man's salvation," but His foes are "given over to absolute perdition," "the most unspeakable and extremely wicked abyss" of "everlasting fire."[267]

The three most influential systematicians of all time, Augustine, Thomas, and Calvin, were Exclusivists too.[268] Augustine saw everyone damned, *massa perditionis*, until God grace rescues some. Faith, "the universal way" to salvation, is loving Christ more than anything, including family or life.[269] Given this standard, "many more" receive "eternal

---

258 Peter Hughes, "Universalism, Universalists," in *Encyclopedia of Christianity*, ed. Erwin Fahlbusch, et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 638-41; McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 16-17, 22, 86, 572-73, II: 1001, 1004, 1017-18, 1038-40; Robinson, *The Unitarians and the Universalists*, 171-73.

259 Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 170; McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 21-22.

260 *Devil's Redemption*, I: xxi, II: 793.

261 Taylor, *Secular Age*, 122; Trumbower, *Rescue for the Dead*, 41.

262 McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 40-41.

263 Aaron Milavec, ed. *The Didache* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 2003), ix, 36-37 (16.5), 82.

264 "Martyrdom of Polycarp," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Alexander Roberts, et al. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), XI (p. 41).

265 *First and Second Apologies*, I,12, 21, 52 (pp. 29, 38, 59).

266 "Against Heresies," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Alexander Roberts, et al. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 1.25.4 (p. 351).

267 "Fount of Knowledge," III,I,3, II,29, III,29, IV,13, IV,27 (pp. 168, 262, 334, 358, 406).

268 Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 63-64.

269 *City of God*, X,32, XIII,23, XIV,1, XXI,26 (pp. 420-26, 540, 547, 1010-14).

punishment."[270] In "the universal judgment," one group "will live truly and happily in eternal life" and one "will exist unhappily in eternal death …, the condition of both will be without end."[271] Augustine faulted Universalism for contradicting "the express words of God,"[272] arguing Scripture's salvation of *all* is just *some from all races*.[273] Thomas found Christ's power sufficient to save everyone, but some reject Him.[274] So, "mankind will be cleansed … by the separation of the wicked from the good …., so that all that is ugly and vile will be cast with the wicked into hell, and all that is beautiful and noble will be taken up above for the glory of the elect …." Individuals "plunge[] into hell or soar[] to heaven" "in keeping with their reward or punishment." Universalism, therefore, "must be judged heretical" for violating the "truth … attested by the … the canonical Scriptures and the doctrine of the holy Fathers …."[275] Calvin's position is in the *Institutes*' well-titled chapter, "Of the Eternal Election, by Which God Has Predestinated Some to Salvation, and Others to Destruction." Using "grace chooses a remnant" (Rom. 11:5),[276] he concluded, "many fall away and are lost, so that often a small portion only remains. … The external invitation … holds a kind of middle place between the rejection of the human race and the election of a small number of believers." "God … determined once for all those whom it was his pleasure to admit to salvation, and those whom … to doom to destruction …."[277]

3) <u>Potentialism hedges.</u>

Because of Universalism and Exclusivism's longstanding co-existence and obvious incompatibility, some twentieth-century theologians, Rahner included, diagnosed the Church "bipolar" as bequeathed by Scripture's obfuscation.[278] Brunner explains the pathology: Scripture's salvation-extent "contradiction" is a "lack of logic" that forced the Church to "ton[e] down" half of Scripture.[279] The proposed cure is difficult to

---

[270] Ibid., XII,22-23 (pp. 502-503).

[271] *Enchiridion*, 24,97–26,102, 29,111 (pp. 119-25, 132).

[272] *City of God*, XXI,12, 17 (pp. 989, 995-96).

[273] "De Correptione Et Gratia," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Ser.*, ed. Philip Schaff (Buffalo: Christian Literature, 1887), XIV,44.

[274] O'Meara, *Thomas Aquinas Theologian*, 239-40.

[275] *ST III (Suppl.)*, XX, Q. 69, art.2, co., Q. 74, art. 9, co. (pp. 6, 116).

[276] This is not in the Exclusivist Scriptural basis because it occurs ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, which is clearly not the *ultimate*. Cranfield, *Romans 9–16*, 547-48.

[277] *Institutes*, III,21 (pp. 606, 610, 612-13).

[278] "Eschatology," 435.

[279] *Eternal Hope*, 180-81.

describe other than that it is neither actual Universalism nor abject Exclusivism.[280] This arguably new position clearly rejects Universalism, which recasts Scripture's *wrath* as *therapeutic*, yet tries to avoid Exclusivism, which recasts Scripture's *everyone* as *some*,[281] but the subtlety of this position seems to recast coherence.[282] It holds salvation's extent is *potentially* either Universalism or Exclusivism, yielding here the shorthand "Potentialism." It piously excuses Scripture from being wholly true, which offers its practitioners a satisfying exegetical sophistication.[283] Potentialists have thus evolved beyond the first disciples and church fathers, who believed "*the* Scripture [τῇ γραφῇ]" (John 2:22).[284] Instead, Potentialists take Scripture dialectically—except thesis and antithesis never meet.[285]

Because this boggle befuddles, Universalists can claim Potentialists as their own,[286] and some Exclusivists agree.[287] Yet, Potentialism is definitely not Universalism.[288] Universalism is actual universal salvation,[289] while Potentialism is its possibility, which avoids Universalism's heresy.[290] Potentialism appears to be the most optimistic Exclusivism, which has always included those desiring universal salvation.[291] So, Potentialism could encompass any hopeful Exclusivist,[292] such as Thomas.[293] Exclusivists have historically taken the position that God's twofold will includes His antecedent will to save every-

---

280 Paul D. Molnar, "Thomas F. Torrance and the Problem of Universalism," *SJT* 68, no. 2 (2015): 169-73.

281 Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 49-52, 62-64; Harmon, "Subjection of All Things in Christ," 61.

282 Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 241.

283 Bauckham, "Universalism: Historical Survey," 52; Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 252; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 10, 241, 273.

284 Candler, *Theology, Rhetoric, Manuduction*, 83; Werner Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1961), 93; Jenson, *ST*, I, 85; Wiles, *Making of Christian Doctrine*, 47.

285 Boring, "Language of Universal Salvation in Paul," 278-82, 288, 289 n.62, 291-92 & n.70; Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 66, 102-103; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 186.

286 MacDonald, "Between Heresy and Dogma," 22.

287 McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 33.

288 Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 66, 102-103.

289 Bauckham, "Universalism: Historical Survey," 49; Crisp, "'I Do Teach It, but I Also Do Not Teach It'," 306-309 & n.4; Alistair Mason, "Universalism," in *Oxford Companion to Christian Thought*, ed. Adrian Hastings (Oxford Univ. Press, 2000), 733.

290 Ludlow, "Universalism in the History of Christianity," 211; Wild, *Catholic Reading Guide to Universalism*, xiii, 2.

291 Allen, *Extent of Atonement*, 398, 784; Cabasilas, *Life in Christ*, Bk I § 10 (p. 58); Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 65, 215.

292 Examples include: Jenson, *ST*, II, 364-65; Lossky, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 235; Pannenberg, "Constructive and Critical Functions of Christian Eschatology," 136; Schwarz, *The Human Being*, 382; Wright, *Surprised by Hope*, 177.

293 Joseph G. Trabbic, "Can Aquinas Hope 'That All Men Be Saved'?," *Heythrop J.* LVII (2016): 337-58.

one.[294] In the fifth-century, a church council declared those claiming otherwise heretics.[295] Conservative evangelist Geisler recognized, "All persons are saved *potentially* …, but only some are saved *actually* …."[296] Differently expressed, Christ is sufficient for all, though efficient for the elect;[297] or salvation is objectively universal, though subjectively exclusive.[298] In Reformed traditions, "hypothetical universalism" amounts to Potentialism.[299] The Second Helvetic Confession (1561), for example, "hopes well of all," "however many will be saved …."[300] Only High Calvinists believing in predetermined limited atonement say not everyone is savable.[301] Hence, Potentialism, when its position exceeds mere uncertainty, is the hopeful end of Exclusivism and the middle of the spectrum for salvation's extent.[302]

Of those purporting to reject both Exclusivism and Universalism, the leading representatives are Barth, Balthasar, and Rahner. As with all Potentialists, Barth is seen variously as Exclusivist,[303] agnostic,[304] Universalist,[305] or confused.[306] He mostly expressed Universalism: God "is directed to the salvation of all men in intention, and sufficient for the salvation of all men in power;" "none is excluded." "[F]ellowship with God"[307] is "final and indestructible" with "all men,"[308] "the race as a whole, or the sum total of individuals." A person "cannot annul" "his election." It is "objectively

---

294 Gockel, *Barth and Schleiermacher*, 26; Martin, *Will Many Be Saved?*, 172.

295 Thomas Scott Holmes, *Origin and Development of the Christian Church in Gaul* (London: Macmillan, 1911), 404-405.

296 *ST*, 863.

297 Peter Lombard, *The Sentences: Book 3; on the Incarnation of the Word*, trans. Giuolio Silano (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2008), 86.

298 Hammett, "Multiple-Intentions View of the Atonement," 162-63.

299 Bray, *God Has Spoken*, 905-907.

300 "PCUSA Constitution: Book of Confessions," 5.048, 5.055-56, 5.077.

301 Allen, *Extent of Atonement*, xix-xx; John Calvin, *Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians*, trans. R. Mackenzie (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960), 117-18; Martin, *Will Many Be Saved?*, 172.

302 John R. Sachs, "Apocatastasis in Patristic Theology," *Theological Studies* 54 (1993): 253.

303 Joseph P. Bettis, "Was Karl Barth a Universalist," *SJT* 20 (1967): 423, 426-27.

304 Shao Kai Tseng, "Condemnation and Universal Salvation: Karl Barth's 'Reverent Agnosticism' Revisted," *SJT* 71, no. 3 (2018): 324-38.

305 Gockel, *Barth and Schleiermacher*, 207-208; McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 33, II: 863; Bruce L. McCormack, "So That He May Be Merciful to All," in *Karl Barth and American Evangelicalism*, ed. Bruce L. McCormack and Clifford B. Anderson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 227.

306 Crisp, "'I Do Teach It, but I Also Do Not Teach It'," 305-306.

307 *CD II/2*, §§ 32.1, 33.1, 34.1, 35.3 (pp. 9, 13, 16, 19, 118, 195, 421-22).

308 *Church Dogmatics IV/1*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), § 58.2 (p. 102).

impossible."[309] The faithful are saved "de facto," and "all men" are saved "de jure,"[310] "all men and every man."[311] Barth acknowledged intellectual consistency compels Universalism, but he refused that position,[312] which explains why his interpreters struggle. He could have been avoiding heresy,[313] but his stated reservation was "we must not arrogate to ourselves that which can be given and received only as a free gift." God can "acquiesce[] in the cheerless disintegration of man's existence."[314] Barth thus rejected both Exclusivism and Universalism,[315] though the latter is a "possibility."[316]

Balthasar reached the same nonconclusion, disagreeing with Universalism and Exclusivism, in *Dare We Hope 'That All Men Be Saved'?*. Because Jesus gives no clear report on salvation's extent, he argued the Scriptural accounts cannot be understood other than as "hope for all men." While God judges each individual, Christ's salvation entails the damned too. Balthasar quoted his inspiration, von Speyr (discussed further in Chapter 8), "The truth is not simply an either-or: either somebody is in hell or nobody is. Both are partial expressions of the whole truth."[317] He explained:

> For the believer, hope remains where all speculative systems have failed: this is a hope that … "does not disappoint" (Rom 5:5). However, it has taken the whole modern movement against the dominance of the Augustinian tradition to liberate this hope with regard to our fellow men … from the restrictions and reservations that are still latent in Thomas.
>
> If we look back from this vantage point to the judgment that awaits every sinful human being, the appropriate attitude will be a hope that is not without a certain fear. … [A] man is somehow both to the right and to the left of the Judge.[318]

So, Universalism is possible.[319]

Rahner's renown on who is saved comes from his position that anonymous Christians, the unchurched, can be saved.[320] On salvation's extent itself, though his position is not as well known as that of Barth or Balthasar, Rahner heads up a different perspective

---

309 *CD II/2*, §§ 32.3, 33.2, 35.1, 35.2, 35.4, 39.2 (pp. 91-92, 149, 321, 346, 450, 757).

310 *CD IV/2*, § 66.2 (p. 511).

311 *CD IV/1*, § 61.4 (p. 631).

312 *CD IV/3.1*, § 70.3 (pp. 477-78).

313 Gockel, *Barth and Schleiermacher*, 208.

314 *CD IV/3.1*, § 70.3 (pp. 473, 477).

315 *CD II/2*, § 35.3 (pp. 415, 417-18, 421-23).

316 *CD IV/3.1*, § 70.3 (pp. 477-78).

317 *Dare We Hope*, 20-22, 29, 69, 111-13; "Short Discourse on Hell," 177, 181, 186-87.

318 *Theo-Drama*, V, 321.

319 *Dare We Hope*, 85.

320 Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 176-78.

on this middle approach. Instead of hoping for universal salvation while acknowledging the damned, Rahner just surrendered to the contradiction. He has been called a Universalist based on talks,[321] but in writing he was circumspect: "damnation is a real genuine and inevitable possibility,"[322] though "not on the same plane" as salvation.[323] Christians, therefore, have no certainty about salvation's extent because the conflicting Scriptural accounts simply cannot be reconciled.[324] According to Rahner and other Potentialists who are not just hopeful Exclusivists, this means Scripture is "not true in every respect," its paradox is not "coherent," and the Scriptural propositions are "ultimately irreducible."[325]

In sum, theologians dissatisfied with Universalism and Exclusivism have articulated in the last century a possible third response to the salvation paradox—potential Universalism.[326] Theirs is only possibly a third position because Exclusivism has always included those hoping for everyone's salvation.[327] When its position is clear and not an Exclusivist subset of hopefuls, Potentialists read Scripture as hopelessly contradictory. In short, Potentialists take Scripture as Exclusivist with a hope for Universalism or as without hope of an answer.

* * * *

The Church has treated the salvation paradox as contradiction. To resolve it, the Church mostly opts for Exclusivism because Universalism is too dependent on Scriptural snippets and on a God too purified of temperament, but some find Universalism too clearly stated and too attractive to not be preferred. Potentialists find Universalism a fine idea, but, with the majority, lack conviction in it. What remains is to evaluate these responses and begin the labor of preserving the paradox of salvation's extent.

---

321 Ibid., 143, 186.

322 "The Hermeneutics of Eschatological Assertions," in *Theological Investigations* (Baltimore: Helicon, 1960), 338-39.

323 "Eschatology," 245.

324 *Foundations of Christian Faith*, trans. William V. Dych (New York: Crossroad, 1985), 103, 443.

325 Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 246-48.

326 McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, I: 20.

327 Lubac, *Catholicism*, 218-19; Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 65, 215.

Chapter 5. UNCONVINCING TREATMENTS

We are all humiliated by the sudden discovery of a fact which has existed very comfortably and perhaps been staring at us in private while we have been making up our world entirely without it.
—George Eliot[1]

This chapter marks the discourse's turning point, because the problem that has been identified is to be worked. Though Scripture presents salvation's extent paradoxically, tradition has reformed the paradox in mutually exclusive ways.[2] Each competing position reinterprets Scripture with a three-step method as old as Tertullian: 1) quote the problematic text, 2) recite its various meanings, and 3) adopt a meaning opposite its most common.[3] *All* and *world* are pliant for Exclusivists, as is *eternal* and *wrath* for Universalists, while Potentialists read *potentially* into each Scriptural account. Problem solved. Even if the reconstructions succeed in unwinding the paradox, unanswered is why Scripture is so poorly expressed that it needs the reconstruction. More programmatically, tweaking Scripture is not what its paradoxes call for.[4]

1) Tradition lacks consensus.

Despite Exclusivism's triumph at Constantinople II, tradition has failed at consensus.[5] That it took 500 years of dispute to settle salvation's extent is dismaying because we expect those passing on God's revelations to understand the basics of what they pass on,[6] and that the resolution has grown more insecure of late adds to the dismay. The Vincentian Canon that orthodoxy is eventually taught "everywhere, always, by all"[7] helps the salvation paradox not at all. The fallback standard of ascertaining "the consentient belief" of Church "masters"[8] gives two incompatible answers.[9] Not only do the masters disagree on salvation's extent, their disagreement confirms that Scripture disagrees with itself. Potentialism verifies neither Exclusivism nor Universalism satisfies, but, when not genteel Exclusivism, it adopts Orwell's "labyrinthine world of doublethink," "to hold

---

1 *Middlemarch* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1996), 316.

2 Bulgakov, *Orthodox Church*, 185; Daley, *Hope of the Early Church*, 221.

3 Fudge, *The Fire That Consumes*, 156.

4 Stephens, *Annihilation or Renewal?*, 8.

5 Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 82.

6 Bulgakov, *Orthodox Church*, 12-13; Jerry L. Walls, *Hell: Logic of Damnation* (Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1992), 53.

7 "A Commonitory," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Ser.*, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), ch II [6] (p. 132).

8 Ibid., chs III [8], XXVII [70] (pp. 132, 152).

9 Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, V, 192, 269.

simultaneously two opinions which canceled out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both …."[10] A sage observed, "Maybe a humble agnosticism is the wisest option."[11]

2) <u>Each response is problematic.</u>

Though no controversy has generated more heat than salvation's extent,[12] theologians have not advanced its understanding after 2000 years. Only governance, not forensics, produced a resolution, and that resolution, a half millennium in coming, erodes. In debating salvation's extent, theologians have resorted to anointing one Scriptural proposition over the other, mostly choosing few are saved, often choosing everyone is saved, and occasionally giving up on the choosing.[13] The issue drifts because each disjunctive on its own is questionable. The following is intended to show, not how everyone is wrong, but how, like reading Scripture itself, everyone is right until saying everyone else is wrong. That is, error happens when Universalism rejects Exclusivism, when Exclusivism rejects Universalism, and when Potentialism, if different, rejects both.

a) Universalism

Universalism is often accused of being unbiblical.[14] The accusation, though unfair, persists because a happy ending for everyone is hardly the sense with which Scripture leaves the reader.[15] Scripture bristles with eschatological calamity.[16] So, Universalists concede Scripture's witness is too primitive for their exacting position[17] and succumb to a more civilized perspective.[18] They purify Scripture of ultimate harshness[19] and refashion its divine wrath as therapeutic.[20] In proclaiming all is well despite God's afflicting

---

[10] *1984* (New York: New Am. Library, 1961), 35.

[11] Marshall, "Divine and Human Punishment," 227.

[12] Moltmann, *Coming of God*, 237; Oakes, "Christ's Descent into Hell," 382-83.

[13] Robin A. Parry and Christopher Partridge, eds., *Universal Salvation?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), xix-xx.

[14] Timothy K. Beougher, "Are All Doomed to Be Saved?," in *Who Will Be Saved?*, ed. Paul R. House and Gregory A. Thornbury (Wheaton: Crossway, 2000), 98-100; Schwarz, *Eschatology*, 338.

[15] Louth, "Response to Tom Greggs," 218; Schwarz, *Eschatology*, 346; Mark S.M. Scott, *Journey Back to God* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2012), 163.

[16] Andrew Goddard, "The Totality of Condemnation Fell on Christ," in *All Shall Be Well*, ed. Gregory MacDonald (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011), 348-49; Hart, "In the End, God," 364.

[17] Congdon, *The God Who Saves*, 19 n.29; Philip Gulley and James Mulholland, *If Grace Is True* (New York: HarperOne, 2003), 36, 49, 51; Moltmann, *Coming of God*, 241.

[18] John Driver, *Images of the Church in Mission* (Scottdale: Herald, 1997), 22.

[19] Ellul, *What I Believe*, 188; Murray Rae, "Salvation in Community," in *All Shall Be Well*, ed. Gregory MacDonald (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011), 183; Robinson, *In the End, God*, 95, 113-15.

[20] MacDonald, "Between Heresy and Dogma," 19-20; Marshall, "The NT Does Not Teach Universal Salvation," 73.

judgment, they echo the lying prophets (Isa. 30:10; Jer. 6:13-14, 8:11, 14:13-14, 23:14-17; Eze. 13:10-16). Universalists posit that God, who risks rejection elsewhere, relents ultimately.[21] Yet, Scripture defends God's consistency (Num. 23:19; Psa. 55:18-19; Mal. 3:6; Jam. 1:17), particularly in the end (Heb. 1:12, 6:18, 13:8).[22] A loving but unfeared God, Buber recognized, is a self-serving creation.[23]

Universalism's latest apology, Hart's *That All Shall Be Saved*, showcases the Scriptural avoidance. Exclusivism is just "three or four deeply ambiguous verses that seem … to threaten eternal torments for the wicked"—namely Matthew 25:46 (*These will go away into eternal castigation*) and "a couple of verses from Revelation." "True, Jesus speaks of a final judgment, and uses many metaphors to describe the unhappy lot of the condemned," such as "the annihilation of chaff … in ovens, or the final death of body and soul." Yet, "Every good New Testament scholar" knows these are not "literal" or even "instruct[ive]," but "dissolve into evocation, atmosphere, and poetry."[24] Not that Scripture's Universalistic prose is better, but the purity of God's nature simplifies the answer—everything is saved, no exceptions.[25] Because God is all being and all good, all being is ultimately all good, though God is inexplicably accommodative of our being not all good until then.[26] God allows hells in this life and afterwards if needed, but everyone will ultimately be obliged to be the heavenly self the Father ordains.[27] This argument that God's good nature entails Universalism has been around since Origen,[28] which Hart acknowledges, but he takes it to its logical conclusion: God if Exclusivist is wicked.[29]

Universalism, in elevating God's nature to the universal answer, not only depreciates Scripture's portrayal of salvation's extent, all of Scripture's imperatives become indicatives.[30] For example, whatever the unforgivable sin is (Mat. 12:31-32//Mark 3:29//

---

[21] John Sanders, "Freewill Theist's Response to Talbott's Universalism," Ibid., 175.

[22] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica, Part I*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, vol. I (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1920), Q. 9, art. 1, co; Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics II/1*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (New York: T&T Clark, 1957), 1491; Soren Kierkegaard, *The Moment and Late Writings*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong (Princeton Univ. Press, 1998), 286-87.

[23] "Religion and Philosophy," 36-37.

[24] *That All Shall Be Saved*, 86, 93-94, 111-12, 115-20.

[25] Ibid., 13, 27-28, 61-62, 65, 93, 95-109, 133-38, 166, 208.

[26] Ibid., 47-53, 58, 69-70, 78, 81-86, 90-91, 166-67, 202-203.

[27] Ibid., 27, 44-45, 54, 62, 84-85, 103-104, 129, 168-70.

[28] Ramelli, "Procus and Apokatastasis," 101.

[29] *That All Shall Be Saved*, 4-5, 28, 43, 59-60, 62, 86-87, 90-91, 103-104, 129, 202.

[30] Bultmann, *Theology of the NT*, II: 59.1 (pp. 203-204).

Luke 12:10), despite all appearances,[31] it cannot exist. Salvation itself becomes the Omnipresent One.[32] If God's nature is the answer to salvation, this is Unitarian-style Universalism, meaning such revelations as Christ's life, death, and resurrection are as uninstructive as those of salvation's extent.[33] God shrinks as God's kingdom enlarges, Nietzsche observed.[34] Scripture's mandate for evangelism (John 5:24; Rom. 10:14-15) must also be optional because salvation occurs regardless.[35] The "conviction that salvation is in Christ alone," Ratzinger saw, "drove the great missionaries" so as to spare others damnation,[36] but with Universalism the outcome is fixed.[37] Pascal's wager[38] is, not only unconvincing,[39] but rigged. Like many others,[40] Wittgenstein complained, "all seriousness of life is done away with,"[41] contravening life's miseries and joys, whether Scripturally depicted or commonly observed.[42]

Universalism is similarly dismissive of human freewill,[43] gainsaying a Christian fundamental,[44] because we are not God's automatons.[45] Origen's exaggeration that Scripture has "ten thousand passages which with the utmost clearness prove the existence of free will"[46] is apt.[47] We *choose* (בַּחֲרוּ) to follow God or not (Jos. 24:15). What matters is our *will* (θέλῃ) to do God's *will* (θέλημα, John 7:17). Christ calls us to a *freedom* (ἐλευθερίᾳ) that has *freed* (ἠλευθέρωσεν) us (Gal. 5:1, 13). In imagery, Christ stands at the door

---

31 G. B.Caird and L. D. Hurst, "The Need of Salvation," in *NT Theology* (Oxford University Press, 1995), 116.

32 Sanders, "Response to Tom Greggs," 238.

33 Gregor, *Philosophical Anthropology*, 186-87.

34 "Anti-Christ," 17 (p. 15).

35 Lubac, *Catholicism*, 220-21; Martin, *Will Many Be Saved?*, 5, 13-14, 197.

36 *Theological Highlights of Vatican II*, trans. Henry Traub, et al. (New York: Paulist, 1966), 172.

37 Caldecott, *Radiance of Being*, 248; Olson, *Mosaic of Christian Belief*, 276.

38 *Pensees*, trans. W.F. Trotter (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1958), 233 (pp. 66-69).

39 Fraassen, *The Empirical Stance*, 95-101, 245 & n.45.

40 Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, V, 269; Beougher, "Are All Doomed to Be Saved?," 96; Gavrilyuk, "Judgment of Love," 301; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 157; McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, II: 1031.

41 M. O'C. Drury, "Conversations with Wittgenstein," in *Ludwig Wittgenstein: Personal Reflections*, ed. Rush Rhees (Totowa: Rowman & Littlefield, 1981), 175.

42 Herman Bavinck, *The Last Things*, trans. John Bolt (Grand Rapids: Baker/Paternoster, 1996), 152.

43 Lewis, *Problem of Pain*, 119; Scott, *Journey Back to God*, 163.

44 Bray, *God Has Spoken*, 510.

45 Pinnock, "Annihilationism," 472.

46 *On First Principles*, III,1,6 (p. 166).

47 Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, trans. Graham Harrison, 5 vols., vol. II (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1990), 213-15, 273; Carson, *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility*, 18-23, 206, 212.

beckoning us, not busting it down (Mat. 7:7-8//Luke 11:9-10; Mat. 11:28; Rev. 3:20).[48] To the anti-Pelagian Augustine, God gives "the power of free choice" between good or evil, God or flesh.[49] Luther, who "completely den[ied] free choice [*liberum arbitrium*]," held God's words and works "are presented to the human will so that it may apply itself to them or turn away from them."[50] God's commands are willable or wasted.[51] Indeed, all denials of freewill are squandered if we lack it.[52]

Notwithstanding denials,[53] we experience freewill.[54] Dalferth observed, "The paths of our lives evolve as a series of contingent decisions … in which only one thing is constant: not only can we choose; we must choose. And while in most cases we could have chosen differently, we could never not have chosen."[55] We are as conscious of freedom in our will as we are of its absence in our feelings.[56] Christians, like most humans, know freewill distinguishes persons.[57] It undergirds ethics and laws,[58] and without it we are mechanisms and random generators.[59] While never absolute and always frangible,[60] human freewill involves what kind of person we want to be or for whom we want to be so.[61] Buber realized, it "is the basic view that man, while created by God, was established

---

48 Sutton, *Heaven Opens*, 132.

49 *City of God*, XII,1, 3, 6-9, XIV,1, 4, 9, 13, 28, XIX,4, XX,6, XXII,1 (pp. 471, 474, 478-82, 547, 553, 566, 572, 593-94, 852, 904, 1022).

50 "De Servo Arbitrio," 172, 181, 291.

51 Augustine, "Grace and Free Will," in *Fathers of the Church*, ed. R.J. Deferrari (DC: Catholic Univ. Press, 1968), 2.4 (p. 253); Cabasilas, *Life in Christ*, Bk VI § 1 (p. 160); Origen, *On First Principles*, III,1,19 (p. 200).

52 Badham, *Christian Beliefs About Life after Death*, 129; Balthasar, *Theo-Logic*, I, 80; Guardini, *Freedom, Grace, and Destiny*, 61; Krapiec, *I-Man*, 185.

53 Patrick Haggard, "Do We Have Conscious Free Will," in *Mapping the Mind*, ed. Rita Carter (Los Angeles: Univ. of Calif. Press, 2010), 192-93; Murphy, *Bodies and Souls, or Spirited Bodies?*, 105-109; Schindler, *Perfection of Freedom*, 74-75, 90, 374.

54 Arendt, "Willing," 140; Hartshorne, *Logic of Perfection*, 162; Schwarz, *The Human Being*, 133.

55 *Creatures of Possibility*, 170-71.

56 Charles G. Finney, *Systematic Theology*, Abr. ed. (Minneapolis: Bethany House, 1976), 15, 19.

57 Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, II, 215; Harrison, *God's Many-Splendored Image*, 9-27; Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 4:37,2-5 (pp. 146-47).

58 Arendt, "Willing," 4-5.

59 Schiller, "On the Sublime," 147.

60 Kierkegaard, *JP*, III, ¶ 3281.

61 Demarest, *Cross and Salvation*, 271; Gregory of Nyssa, *Life of Moses*, Bk II (p. 51); Rahner, *Foundations of Christian Faith*, 38.

by Him in an independence which has since remained undiminished."[62] We are, Balthasar remarked, not "congealed," but "choose one's own highest value …."[63]

And some reject God.[64] If we lack freewill, we have free-won't.[65] To atheists, eternally living with the Person responsible for misery is "a perfect definition of hell," and any afterlife glorification "only intensif[ies] the nightmare."[66] Many share this view.[67] Nietzsche explained, "we certainly do not want to enter into the kingdom of heaven: we have become men, *so we want the kingdom of earth*."[68] The Nazis declared, "Heaven for sparrows and Christians, earth for us."[69] Even Universalists, Hart acknowledged, find God insufferable if He is as tradition has Him, Exclusivist.[70] All rejections of God persist after this life because those not won over by His grace here are implausibly won over by its absence in perdition or, if accessible then, more of the same.[71] Hart reasons that refusing God is unavailable because true freewill consists of pure good. Though we can fail goodness in this life and "gravitate … toward nothingness," God cannot allow anyone actually to stay this way.[72] God is too noble to allow people to actually perish from disobedience, as the serpent insinuates (Gen. 3:1-4).[73] So, God's creation is God's salvation, but on an inexplicably slow fuse. Human choices are ultimately unthreatening, which begs why God allows wrong choices if perfection is divine fiat anyway. Our life is burdened with the realization that its miseries are futilities, and our faith is burdened with a God who could have created a good world without miseries but declined.

Yet, because love is given freely or not at all, that an individual rejects God by willing to is commonly understood.[74] Bonhoeffer noted, "Force and love are opposites,"[75]

---

62 "Religion and Ethics," in *Eclipse of God* (Amherst: Humanity Books, 1996), 105.

63 *Dare We Hope*, 145.

64 Geisler, *ST*, 818.

65 McGilchrist, *The Master and His Emissary*, 198.

66 Quentin Meillassoux, "The Immanence of the World Beyond," in *Grandeur of Reason*, ed. Peter M. Candler, Jr. and Conor Cunningham (London: SCM, 2010), 454-55.

67 McCombs, *Paradoxical Rationality*, 177.

68 *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, trans. R.J. Hollingdale (New York: Penguin, 1981), Pt IV, "The ass festival", 2 (p. 325).

69 Ernst Kasemann, *Jesus Means Freedom* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 134.

70 *That All Shall Be Saved*, 208-209.

71 Geisler, *ST*, 1276.

72 *That All Shall Be Saved*, 33-43, 57-58, 79-80, 171-95.

73 Gregor, *Philosophical Anthropology*, 66.

74 Arnold B. Come, *Kierkegaard as Theologian* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1997), 140, 245.

75 *Ethics*, 240 [239].

but, for Universalists, anyone not consenting to God's overtures in this life must suffer a sort of afterlife salvation by divine rape,[76] seduced like God's Lolita: "What I had madly possessed was not she, but my own creation," "more real than Lolita; … having no will, … indeed, no life of her own."[77] Resistance is futile. Satan is "freely" compliant to the divine seduction too.[78] Universalists reinterpret freewill as good will,[79] though freewill is what allows ill will.[80] God's ontological superiority supposedly coerces freewill,[81] but coercion displaces freewill.[82] God becomes a Rousseauan forcing us to be free,[83] the afterlife becomes a reeducation camp where subversives learn to think rightly,[84] and salvation becomes a Clausewitz war "to compel the other to submit,"[85] though by Huxleyan conditioning, not kinetic brutality.[86] Morally responsible agents making meaningful choices become ultimately meaningless,[87] as Universalists admit.[88]

b) Exclusivism

Exclusivism's central vulnerability is the same as Universalism's—a shifting Scriptural exegesis. Scripture is straightforward when the faithful are saved, but the reading goes between the lines when Scripture says everyone is. The Exclusivist favorite is reinterpreting *all* as *some*, which divests the Universalist declarations of any real meaning.[89] An Exclusivist like evangelist Damarest recognizes that several places in Scripture "at

---

[76] Brian Davies, *Thomas Aquinas on God and Evil* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2011), 109-10.

[77] Vladimir Nabokov, *Lolita* (New York: Knopf, 1992), 65.

[78] Matthew Levering, "Response to Professor Greggs," in *Five Views on the Extent of Atonement*, ed. Adam J. Johnson (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019), 225.

[79] Gavrilyuk, "Judgment of Love," 300 & n.99; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 95-97, 101-102, 142; Talbott, "Universalism," 455.

[80] Cabasilas, *Life in Christ*, Bk II § 11 (p. 85); Gilson, *Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy*, 317-18; Hamann, "Philological Ideas and Doubts About an Academic Prize Essay," 115.

[81] Congdon, *The God Who Saves*, 16-17.

[82] Arendt, "Willing," 26; Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, 37; Walls, "Philosophical Critique of Talbott's Universalism," 111-17.

[83] "The Social Contract," in *Discourse on Political Economy and the Social Contract* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2009), I,vii (p. 58).

[84] Hartshorne, *Logic of Perfection*, 19; Schaff, *Marxism and the Human Individual*, 8, 36-37, 208, 213; Sutton, *Heaven Opens*, 132.

[85] *On War*, trans. J.J. Graham (London: N. Trübner, 1909), I,I,1.

[86] *Brave New World* (New York: HarperCollins, 1998), 50.

[87] Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 102, 110-11.

[88] Nik Ansell, "Annihilation of Hell and Perfection of Freedom," in *All Shall Be Well*, ed. Gregory MacDonald (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011), 424; Origen, *On First Principles*, III,5,8 (p. 244); Robinson, *In the End, God*, 104-105.

[89] Allen, *Extent of Atonement*, 718; Balthasar, "Short Discourse on Hell," 166; Michael S. Horton, "Traditional Reformed View," in *Five Views on the Extent of Atonement*, ed. Adam J. Johnson (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019), 131-32.

first blush, appear to contravene" Exclusivism by "suggesting … the salvation of all creatures," but these have to be misleading.[90] Exclusivists not only circumnavigate Scripture, but also God's love or power.[91] Either human will overcomes divine will, which diminishes God's power, or God wills whom to damn, which makes God arbitrary.[92] Balthasar summarized: When Christ says He saves all humanity, the Exclusivist responds, "Unfortunately, only half of it, despite your efforts, Lord," and, when Scripture persists, "All just pious exaggeration."[93]

Exclusivists likewise have trouble explaining why those barely damned have the same fate as those thoroughly so. The same outcome for the entire spectrum of ungodliness is, if not inequitable, bizarre.[94] The frequent recourse of easing sufferings on a sliding scale is "a groping" failure, Balthasar perceived, "an idea that links up with Scholastic speculations."[95] So, Exclusivists use two tactics to squeeze humanity into the two ultimates. The first is willful blindness, assuming counterfactually that humans spontaneously fall into the two types that correspond to the ultimates or ignoring the reality that humanity blankets the godliness spectrum.[96] The second tactic is to postulate an extrabiblical threshold.[97] Among the rabbis the eternal life threshold ranged from 100% righteousness (Shammai), 51% (Hillel), or any percent (Aqiba).[98] Exclusivists become apostates if the threshold is too strict to save anyone and become Universalists if too lenient to reject anyone. A middling threshold, therefore, is fashioned, but everyone lives between extremes,[99] meaning any threshold is autocratic, if not quirky.[100] To fashion one, Exclusivists posit an aggregating faith so that God discerns, usually at death, who is hell-

---

[90] *Cross and Salvation*, 142-43.

[91] Walls, *Hell*, 3. Most philosophical objections to Exclusivism are based on eternal torment. Marshall, "Divine and Human Punishment," 218-19. Because Exclusivism also includes oblivion instead, the torment objections are omitted, though answerable. Wilko van Holten, "Hell and the Goodness of God," *Religious Studies* 35 (1999): 37-55).

[92] Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 169.

[93] "Short Discourse on Hell," 184, 186.

[94] Crosby, *Selfhood of the Human Person*, 183-84; Nichols, *Death and Afterlife*, 188-89; Scott, *Journey Back to God*, 9.

[95] "Short Discourse on Hell," 218.

[96] Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 14; Tillich, *ST*, III, 408.

[97] Jonathan L. Kvanvig, "Hell," in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, ed. Jerry L. Walls (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 422; Marshall, "Divine and Human Punishment," 222.

[98] F.F. Bruce, *Epistle to the Galatians*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 159, 230.

[99] James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 234.

[100] Bates, *Salvation by Allegiance Alone*, 124.

bound.[101] The chosen "cannot be joined to Him in some ways, and yet be separated from Him in others," claimed Cabasilas.[102] The Scriptural warrant for saying no one is in-between is that Christ's death completes His redemptive work,[103] but this confuses Christ's decisiveness with our indefiniteness. The next chapter presents the fuller response, but, to anticipate, humans prove daily that each serves incompletely two masters.[104] Any "barcode" for identifying the saved from the rest[105] tends to reflect, not Scripture, but the human concocting it.[106] Plus, any threshold for ultimate salvation diminishes this life. If salvation is based on election, faith professions, or baptism/penance, why trouble with the rest?[107] If the moment of death or other select moments are decisive, the rest of life is ultimately vacuous.[108] If, as some Exclusivists argue, God arbitrarily spares the saved,[109] the entirety of life is that way.

c) Potentialism

As was noted, Potentialism does not seem to be separate from Exclusivism, though it is mostly treated here as a separate position because its advocates claim it is one. If not an Exclusivism subset, Potentialism's basis is inconsistent. Hart observed, it "tentatively and timidly grop[es]" for "some anxious, uncertain, fragile hope" based on "something like a dialectical oscillation" given Scripture's "indissoluble" and "irreconcilable" accounts, which "piety," "doctrine," or "prudence" "forbid[s]" choosing; so, Potentialism, while virtue signaling "tenderheartedness," suffers from "a little too much post-Hegelian dialectical disenchantment" and "a touch of disingenuous obscurantism."[110] The rationale for Potentialism, if separate from Exclusivism, can be inconsistent.[111]

---

101 Balthasar, "Short Discourse on Hell," 172-73; Hebblethwaite, *Christian Hope*, 212; Nichols, *Death and Afterlife*, 187.

102 *Life in Christ*, Bk VI § 1, Bk VII § 1 (pp. 161, 197).

103 Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Mysterium Paschale*, trans. Aidan Nichols (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1990), 13.

104 Bulgakov, *Orthodox Church*, 96. This alludes to the principle that no one can *simultaneously* serve two conflicting masters (Mat. 6:24//Luke 16:13). Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1336-67.

105 Dallas Willard, *The Divine Conspiracy* (New York: Harper, 1998), 36-37.

106 Balthasar, "Short Discourse on Hell," 191.

107 Robinson, *In the End, God*, 110.

108 Kierkegaard, *Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses*, 258.

109 Calvin, *Institutes*, II,3, III,13 (pp. 176-89, 498-501); Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, 197.

110 *That All Shall Be Saved*, 66, 102-103.

111 Peter C. Phan, "Roman Catholic Theology," in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, ed. Jerry L. Walls (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 224.

Potentialism is logically of three types based on its basis, which are "typed" for later discussion, and Potentialists use all three:

Type I: Change both Scriptural propositions. The primary Potentialist position is that Scripture's conflicting accounts of salvation's extent are each potentially true, implicitly adding "potentially" to each account. While eliminating the conflict, such Scriptural neutering is a Faustian strategy[112] rarely tolerated.[113] Even if permissible, the addition of "maybe" to *everyone is saved* and to *everyone is not* does not suspend the antinomy's middle as intended, but compromises each account.[114] Though purporting to respect both accounts, Potentialism so understood fails doubly, defying the accord that sees at least one account unadulterated.[115] It is the typical philosopher recourse for inadequate schemes—hope fusing them together works.[116] The salvation paradox, however, does not call for negating both accounts partially, but, like all paradoxes, calls for affirming both entirely.[117]

Type II: Suspend the principle of noncontradiction. Some Potentialists take the Scriptural accounts as actually contradictory but still true. Rahner, as noted, is of this type. Brunner concurs: Each Scriptural account "logically excludes the other," "juxtaposed in their harsh incompatibility," but "both" are "ultimately valid."[118] This, as Chapter 3 explained, is elegant wordsmithery but poor sense.[119] Paradoxes attenuated to contradictions are meaningless phrases, not divine wisdom.[120] This can seem pious by leaving knowledge of salvation on the altar, but it sacrifices faith's understanding.[121] Such aphasia can be justified when trying to understand God's immanence, but is inexcusable when trying to understand what we affirm.[122]

Type III: Take no position. Potentialists, when not licensing themselves to amend Scripture or to rescind the principle of noncontradiction, avoid taking a position,[123] but

---

112 Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Faust: A Tragedy*, trans. Martin Greenberg (Yale Univ. Press, 1992), lns 1250-64.

113 Martin, *Will Many Be Saved?*, 134; Robinson, *In the End, God*, 96.

114 Kierkegaard, *Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses*, 216-17.

115 Robinson, *In the End, God*, 112-13.

116 Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality* (New York: Free Press, 1969), viii.

117 Robinson, *In the End, God*, 113.

118 *Eternal Hope*, 183.

119 Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 103.

120 Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 42-43; Trueman, "Definite Atonement View," 73.

121 Pannenberg, "Task of Christian Eschatology," 3.

122 Levering, "Response to Andrew Louth," 45.

123 Gockel, *Barth and Schleiermacher*, 208.

this infringes the Principle of Sufficient Reason—every true statement has a sufficient explanation for its truth.[124] Confessing ignorance is allowable of course, but "a learned demonstration of it," Hamann noticed, reveals "a powerful resistance to the truth."[125] Kierkegaard added, "anyone who wants to end with the inexplicable" "would really do best to begin with it and say nothing else …."[126] Mysteries are fine, but unenlightening ones belong to the Beast (Rev. 17:5-7).[127] If we are to "speak of what we know," which includes salvation (John 3:11), not knowing is out,[128] and, since we know, not answering is a failure of nerve.[129] Incomprehension is untheological.[130] Christians definitely believe in definite beliefs,[131] even when paradoxical.[132] To their credit, these Potentialists leave the salvation paradox in a holding pattern, but holding patterns cannot last. Because assertions of truth have more gravity than confessions of ignorance,[133] the contradiction, if unpiloted, eventually lands in confusion.[134] Wonder is wonderful, but ignorance is not.

3) <u>The responses undervalue paradox.</u>

Scriptural paradoxes deserve better than rewrites,[135] but distinguishing the better requires distinguishing *paradox* from its kin. Paradoxes are not actual *contradictions*, but apparent ones.[136] An actual contradiction, Chapter 3 explained, has two propositions such that both cannot be true.[137] Its *raison d'être* is identifying the falsehood. Contradictions are not mere incongruities, but even those who think so still put actual ones "near the top of any list of nonsense."[138] To deflect this weaker meaning, "actual," *i.e.*, formal or logical, can preface "contradiction." A paradox is also no *dialectic*, which synthesizes two contraries to advance on truth.[139] Its *raison d'être* is this synthesis. A *paradox*, in

---

124 Hart, *Experience of God*, 146.

125 "Socratic Memorabilia," NII,73,15-20 (p. 391).

126 *Stages*, 35.

127 Rahner, "Mystery," 1000-1004.

128 John Polkinghorne, *The God of Hope and the End of the World* (Yale Univ. Press, 2002), 138.

129 Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 37; Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 102-103.

130 Tillich, *ST*, III, 396, 404.

131 Congdon, *The God Who Saves*, 2; Finney, *ST*, 47.

132 Kierkegaard, *Christian Discourses*, 244.

133 Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 148; Lonergan, *Insight*, 4.

134 Feuerbach, *Essence of Christianity*, I.II (p. 39); Hamann, "Golgotha and Shebliminil," 180.

135 Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 403.

136 Walsh, *Living Christianly*, 66.

137 *Oxford English Dict.* 2nd ed., s.v. "contradiction."

138 Westphal, *Becoming a Self*, 165-66, 182.

139 Matt F. Connell, "Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel," in *From Kant to Levi-Strauss*, ed. Jon Simons (Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2002), 35; Andrew Fuyarchuk, *Gadamer's Path to Plato* (Eugene:

contrast, consists of truths in apparent (not actual) contradiction.[140] Its *raison d'être* is conceptualizing its components' truthful relationship.

Paradoxes animate Christianity[141] and deserve one response—understanding.[142] This is not compromising opposites, but working them.[143] Regrettably, modern reasoning is "most of all unable to stomach" paradoxes, Milbank observed.[144] Paradoxes are taken as contradictions to be tidied up.[145] Postmodern thinking has the contrary bias, but nonetheless treats paradoxes as contradictions because they justify despair.[146] Irony, no longer dramatic contradiction, is how to face the cosmos.[147] Neither of these responses preserves the paradox, Auden realized: "The either-ors" "see[] only one side of the paradox," and "the mongrel halves" are "too woolly-minded to recognize a paradox when he meets one …."[148] Contemporary philosophy is often no antidote because imposed definiteness can disarm paradoxes.[149] Nietzsche explained that we no longer esteem the classically "prurient taste for whatever is … painfully paradoxical."[150]

So, paradoxes have incited these three responses. The response prevailing since *modernity* reduces paradoxes to contradictions, treating paradoxes as illusory while privileging one proposition.[151] The contradiction is actualized, and the exercise becomes determining which proposition is actually true and which facially so. The response *postmodernism* prefers reduces paradoxes to contradictions too, but it privileges the contradiction's impenetrability. The paradox is suspended as nonsense, violating what is officially the principle of noncontradiction but is really thinking.[152] The response that has thrived

---

Wipf & Stock, 2010), 126.

[140] *Oxford English Dict.* 2nd ed., s.v. "paradox." Its other definitions rendering it a fine synonym are avoided—euphemism for "absurdity," gloss for "mystery," or grandiloquence for "surprise." The last is what *paradoxa* means in the NT. Peter Doble, *The Paradox of Salvation* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996), 31, 33, 238-40.

[141] Kierkegaard, *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, I, 105; Lubac, *Catholicism*, 327.

[142] Scott, *Journey Back to God*, 5.

[143] McCombs, *Paradoxical Rationality*, 64.

[144] *Beyond Secular Order*, 5.

[145] James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 423.

[146] John McGowan, *Postmodernism and Its Critics* (Cornell Univ. Press, 1992), 49-50.

[147] Charles Glicksberg, *Ironic Vision in Modern Literature* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969), 11.

[148] W.H. Auden, *The Double Man* (New York: Random House, 1941), 115 (note to ln 821).

[149] Husserl, "Author's Preface," 20.

[150] "Genealogy of Morals," 1st,I (p. 158).

[151] Kierkegaard, *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, I, 218-19.

[152] Wilhelm Dilthey, *Introduction to the Human Sciences*, trans. Ramon J. Betanzos (Wayne State Univ. Press, 1988), 312 (II.4.4); Geisler, *ST*, 69.

since before modernity preserves the paradox. This *classical* response accepts that the truths seemingly contradict, but only seemingly. This is unlike the first response where the paradox is illusory. A contradiction (an illusory paradox) has a proposition not actually true, while an apparent contradiction (a paradox) has true propositions not actually contradicting. In sum, the modern response changes the paradox into one true proposition; the postmodern response changes nothing, leaving the inexplicable; and the classical response, in retaining the paradox's dynamic truths, changes the listener.[153]

A simple paradox illustrates: I have won every chess game *and* lost 50 of them. Without more, both cannot be true. The modern converts the least favored proposition into what it 'really' means: I must have lost 50 games, and, since losses instruct, they count as 'wins'; or I must have played poorly in 50 wins, and they count as 'losses.' The postmodern does nothing because the contradiction wonderfully exposes winning as a human construct. The classical response, taking both propositions as true, concludes I won and lost 50 games by playing myself. Such riddles are, of course, unlike real paradoxes,[154] but they exercise the skill genuine paradoxes require—thinking more than one thought at once.[155]

Christianity's definitive paradoxes expose the real-world difference in responses.[156] When Scripture yielded the apparent contradiction that God is one and three, heresies demoted a truth, but the Church refused, producing the Trinity.[157] The key, de Lubac described, was "to set oneself free from those habits of thought that contemplation of material things develops."[158] Scripture similarly yielded the apparent contradiction that the Son, while not *two* Persons, is a divine *one* and a human *one*. A human's divinity and the God's humanity, Bonhoeffer concluded, had "to be held together at the risk of destroying the rationality of the exposition."[159] As heresies jettisoned a proposition, the Church preserved the paradox with the hypostatic union,[160] facing two complete entities

---

153 John Milbank, "The Double Glory," in *The Monstrosity of Christ*, ed. Creston Davis (MIT Press, 2009), 116.

154 Tillich, *ST*, I, 109.

155 Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, 28.

156 The paragraph grossly summarizes Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2009); Chadwick, *Church in Ancient Society*; Davies, *The Early Christian Church*; Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 83-162, 223-343.

157 Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 60; Lossky, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 46, 50-66.

158 *Catholicism*, 329.

159 *Christ the Center*, 88.

160 Behr, *Mystery of Christ*, 38; Cooper, *Naturally Human, Supernaturally God*, 41, 44, 48; Aaron Rich-

as a unity.[161] In each of these classic disputes, heretics took the first paradox response. Not even heretics dared the second; certainly none argued God is *potentially* one or Christ is *potentially* divine. Orthodoxy took the third response—embrace both halves by modeling the contradiction as apparent.[162]

Application to the salvation paradox is plain. Exclusivism and Universalism take the first response and favor one Scriptural account. Potentialism, if different, purports to accept Scripture as contradictory, the second response. The third response is untried, which is excusable because the salvation paradox affirms and negates the same idea; the salvation of *everyone* and *not everyone* shouts contradiction. By the mid-fifth century, the Church, having grasped who the Son was and what He had done, had not settled on His efficacy.[163] Then, as the Church's environment tipped from pagan to Christian, Universalism was no longer needed to save those outside the Church and in fact disincentivized the holdouts. So, Exclusivism ascended. J.N.D. Kelly assessed this post-Chalcedon era: "so far as the central stream of Christendom was concerned, the brilliant upsurge of fresh ideas which had distinguished the earlier centuries had spent itself."[164] The fatigued Church feared traversing additional nebulous doctrinal frontlines,[165] leaving the disputants to the same centuries-old arguments in the same centuries-old standoff.[166] With Universalism and Exclusivism to choose from and obliged to choose, the Church chose Exclusivism, but the debate continues. Perhaps today ancient insights can be revitalized for lost answers.[167]

* * * *

Preserving a Scriptural paradox is orthodox, at least if the Church's first doctrinal decisions are indicative. Though Scripture says salvation's extent is paradoxical, the Church in this case says different. Its response has thus far been to adopt the usual conceit of heresies: Treat the paradox as contradiction and, to avoid the resulting disaster of partial falsehood, compromise part of Scripture. Regardless of the side taken, each says the other's Scriptural account is a matter of surface appearance or figures of speech or

---

es, *Ecce Homo* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 38-41.

161 Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 296.

162 Williams, *Architecture of Theology*, 24-25, 27.

163 Bray, *God Has Spoken*, 399.

164 *Early Christian Doctrines*, 3.

165 Chadwick, *Church in Ancient Society*, 437.

166 Hick, *Death and Eternal Life*, 242.

167 Simon Oliver, "Radical Orthodoxy," in *Cambridge Dict. of Christian Theology*, ed. Ian A. McFarland (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011), 428-29.

must yield to some other authority. Not yet taken is retaining the import and truthfulness of both Scriptural accounts. We are almost there. To explain the model that preserves the salvation paradox, the *individual* and its divisibility must be understood, the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 6. DIVISIBILITY'S COHERENCE

Both one and many; in the brown baked features
The eyes of a familiar compound ghost
Both intimate and unidentifiable.
So I assumed a double part ….

—T.S. Eliot[1]

Christianity has a problem. In spite of a consensus on several features about salvation (Chapter 2), Christians lack one on the seminal issue of its extent (Chapters 3-4). This is partly because the only alternatives have philosophical troubles, but mostly because they each simplify what Scripture says (Chapter 5). No position accepts Scripture's paradox as a paradox. Rather, each side, justified by one account and its confliction with the other, depletes the other with extraordinary exegesis or thematic absorption. While philosophical reasoning prefers one account over the other, Scripture prefers both. This chapter seeks an opening into the paradox without rewriting or relegating a Scriptural account, and the proposal is a model of *individual* that deviates from the one we use reflexively (Chapter 1).

Individual, from all viewpoints recognizing it, is profound, multilateral, and transformable,[2] a chameleon worked out contextually.[3] "In the dark night of thought dwells a glimmering of Being," says a phenomenologist,[4] and this we barely detect.[5] Wilde knew, "to recognize that the soul of a man is unknowable is the ultimate achievement of Wisdom. The final mystery is oneself."[6] While *I* is incomprehensible, *you* is more so.[7] "[I]n broad daylight my neighbor is dark and impenetrable, separated from me by his apparent resemblances," Sartre says,[8] "not because the alter ego is an alter," Michel Henry clarified, but "because the other is an ego."[9] And such is the inscrutability of *individual* in this

---

[1] *Four Quartets* (San Diego: Harcourt, 1971), Little Gidding,II,94-97 (p. 53).

[2] Harrison, *God's Many-Splendored Image*, 194; Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia, "Unity of the Human Person According to the Greek Fathers," in *Philosophical Theology and the Christian Tradition*, ed. David Bradshaw (DC: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 2012), 67-76.

[3] Lee, "Standing Accused," 11; McConville, *Being Human in God's World*, 61, 79; Ziegler, *Militant Grace*, 188.

[4] Merleau-Ponty, *Signs*, 15.

[5] Highet, *Man's Unconquerable Mind*, 35.

[6] *De Profundis* (New York: Modern Library, 2000), 87.

[7] Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 84; Marcel Proust, *In Search of Lost Time*, trans. C.K. Scott Moncrieff, et al., 6 vols. (London: Folio Society, 2001), III: 57.

[8] *Between Existentialism and Marxism*, 155.

[9] *Material Phenomenology*, 112-13.

life, which only rarefies afterwards.[10] Fortunately, while incomprehensible practically, *individual* is lived practically.[11]

Though the next chapter advances the thesis, this one presents its critical element, individual divisibility. Such divisibility galls Westerners, who bind identity and person.[12] Bodies encourage this view. A functional body's immune response, for instance, differentiates the self from any other at the biochemical level,[13] but using this body to establish this life's unity is inadequate. The typical individual has had several—embryo, fetus, newborn, infant, toddler, etc.[14] And medical science frequently demonstrates corporeal divisibility by amputating, transplanting, and transfusing,[15] and occasionally by bifurcating conjoined twins.[16] Eventually, each body divides wholly in "time's gullet," Tertullian's expression.[17] "[O]ne after another, … all peoples and times," Walter Pater observed, are "dissolved again into their dust."[18]

While the earthly body discontinues with death, the individual's first-person awareness continues, at least in Christianity, but this is not the individual because awareness alone is vacant; no memories, no beliefs, no preferences is no one. Instead, if the self is to continue, it must include a core suite of personality features, which is called the character. This character is inexorably lived divided in life, which can be stark in the unhealthy (*e.g.*, multiple personalities), but even the healthy debate themselves, struggle with themselves, and dislike themselves for liking themselves too much. So, a truly divided individual, though never encountered in this life, is conceivable in the next because we are nearly that now. This is what this chapter strives to show.

1) *Individual* takes personal identity and character.

While the individual manifestly correlates to a natural body,[19] we must be more than an "ingenious machine for turning … Shiraz into urine," Karen Blixen remarked.[20]

---

[10] Berkouwer, *Man: Image of God*, 264.

[11] Balthasar, *Theo-Logic*, I, 249.

[12] Jenson, *ST*, I, 120.

[13] Gordon G. Gallup, Jr., James R. Anderson, and Steven M. Platek, "Self-Recognition," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 81.

[14] Trenton Merricks, "The Resurrection of the Dead and the Life Everlasting," in *Reason for the Hope Within*, ed. Michael Murray (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 267.

[15] Ian Hacking, "Our Neo-Cartesian Bodies in Parts," *Critical Inquiry* 34, no. 1 (2007): 78-105.

[16] L. Spitz, "Conjoined Twins," *British J. of Surgery* 83 (1996): 1028-30.

[17] "On the Resurrection of the Flesh," ch IV (p. 548, trans. modified).

[18] *Marius the Epicurean*, 149.

[19] Moore, *Where Are the Dead?*, 7, 21, 34, 49.

[20] Isak Dinesen, "The Dreamers," in *Seven Gothic Tales* (New York: Modern Library, 1994), 344.

"Is not the soul more than meat?" Wilde asks.[21] "I," Whitman answers, "am not contain'd between my hat and boots …."[22] If we experience anything after death, we are more than our bodies as they themselves attest when they disintegrate.[23] What best specifies Sartre's "the adventure that I am"[24] is not the body, but Wollheim's gloss on Kierkegaard, *the life that is led*.[25] This is what we sense without positing anthropological substances. An individual, Barth recognized, "does not exist abstractly but concretely, *i.e.*, in experiences, in determinations of his existence by objects, by things outside him and distinct from him."[26] The led life is not mere living, like plankton, but distinguishes who we are.[27] It might be ontological,[28] but is certainly revelatory.[29] Life, "the principle of every thing," Henry saw, "always founds what we call 'being' …."[30] From leading life, we understand life,[31] which, in turn, forms the individual who develops beliefs, values, attitudes, preferences, emotions, thoughts.[32] "Personal character" labels these features, particularly the enduring ones,[33] and "personal identity" labels experiencing them.[34] That is, personal character is the self itself, the concentric individual, and personal identity is the self's self, the individual's center.[35] In short, personal character is the life led, and personal identity is its awareness.[36]

---

[21] *De Profundis*, 83 (rendering Mat. 6:25c).

[22] "Song of Myself," in *Leaves of Grass* (New York: Modern Library, 2001), 7 (p. 41).

[23] Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body* (Columbia Univ. Press, 1995), 8; Fitzpatrick, *Aquinas on Bodily Identity*, 62, 145.

[24] *Between Existentialism and Marxism*, 166.

[25] *Thread of Life*, 1-2.

[26] *CD I/1*, § 6.3 (p. 198).

[27] Hamann, "Philological Ideas," 114; Luc Jaeger, "A Biochemical Perspective," in *The Role of Death in Life*, ed. John Behr and Conor Cunningham (Eugene: Cascade), 27; Wollheim, *Thread of Life*, 1, 31.

[28] Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 16-17.

[29] Henry, *Essence of Manifestation*, 285, 443.

[30] *Material Phenomenology*, 3.

[31] Dalferth, *Creatures of Possibility*, 169; Dilthey, *Introduction to the Human Sciences*, 169 (II.2.1); Hamann, "Cloverleaf," 53.

[32] Henry, *Incarnation*, 19; Marya Schechtman, *Staying Alive* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 111, 118; Kathleen V. Wilkes, *Real People* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1988), 163.

[33] See synonyms note at *American Heritage Dict. of the English Language* 4th ed., s.v. "disposition."

[34] Cooper, *Naturally Human, Supernaturally God*, 47; Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000), 49.

[35] Arthur J. Deikman, "'I' = Awareness," in *Models of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher and Jonathan Shear (Thorverton: Imprint, 1999), 424.

[36] E.J. Lowe, *Subjects of Experience* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996), 182; Richard Sorabji, *Self: Ancient and Modern Insights* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2006), 21.

2) <u>Most any metaphysic works.</u>

"We can no more think than we can will, without being conscious of our self," Hamann realized.[37] Kierkegaard concurred, "The inner being announces itself and craves an explanation."[38] Theology, science, philosophy, almost every discipline, has quested for the self,[39] because *who am I?* or, simplified, *what am I?* is the quintessential human question.[40] Kant, though identifying the question and feeling competent to handle the most profound, never tried this one.[41] Nor need we, much. Novelists know, "you can assert the existence of … Being" without "the slightest notion of what it is,"[42] as do philosophers, "we can never entirely reduce to ideas what is given in the totality of our being."[43] This is expedient because, as Highet found, "The cave we inhabit is our own mind; and consciousness is like a tiny torch, … which can at best show us only a few outlines …."[44]

The thesis relies on not an explicit metaphysic, but on factual experiences,[45] and among our first is *individual*.[46] "It has no name but I," a neuroscientist recognized.[47] We naturally equate our *seeming* to think, will, and act with our *really* doing so.[48] As a result, "our knowledge of the human world is better than that of the natural world," Milbank observed.[49] "There is one thing," Lewis explained, "in the whole universe which we know more about than we could learn from external observation. That one thing is Man. … [W]e have, so to speak, inside information …."[50] Because we understand *individual* through our sense, affectivity, and desire, we search there for who lives.[51] In brief,

---

37 "Fragments," I (p. 162).

38 *Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses*, 87.

39 Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 10; Heidegger, "Being and Time: Introduction," 59-60.

40 Bonhoeffer, *Christ the Center*, 30; Jobes, "Remember These Things," 189; Zizioulas, "On Being a Person," 44.

41 Martin Buber, *Between Man and Man*, trans. Ronald Gregor Smith (London: Kegan Paul, 1927), 118-21.

42 Robinson, *Gilead*, 178.

43 Dilthey, *Introduction to the Human Sciences*, 315 (II.4.4).

44 *Man's Unconquerable Mind*, 36.

45 Fraassen, *The Empirical Stance*, 3-4; Pater, *Marius the Epicurean*, 61, 115.

46 Guardini, *Freedom, Grace, and Destiny*, 17, 63.

47 Giulio Tononi, *Phi* (New York: Pantheon, 2012), 8.

48 Blondel, "Letter on Apologetics," 156-57.

49 *Theology and Social Theory*, 272.

50 *Mere Christianity*, 18-19.

51 Cooper, *Holy Eros*, 10.

individual is understood through the observations, intuitions, and conclusions of individuals.[52] Briefer still, we look to our life to understand our life.[53]

Whether we constitute bodies, souls, or their like or their combinations or emergents or whether any sufficiently identify us is unanswered, therefore, because staying at the experiential skirts the ongoing battles over of what individuals consist or what brings them into existence.[54] Wittgenstein noted "a great variety of criteria for the '*identity*' of a person," but "which of them leads me to say *I* am in pain? None."[55] In agreement, the thesis takes no ontological position, just a stance,[56] which is that phenomena reflects truth.[57] This is *not* phenomenology, which is what allows phenomena.[58] "The object of phenomenology," Henry distinguished, "is not the things but their how," not what appears but "appearing itself."[59] Phenomenology "move[s] in the field of pure phenomena," Husserl explained, and "existence" "has no bearing on the matter."[60] In contrast, the thesis depends on *the things*, not their how, *what appears*, not appearing itself, and *existence*, not pure phenomena.[61] What is discerned is actuality, not essence,[62] satisfied with the demonstrable, not the *Dasein*.[63] As Guardini reminds, "we are not concerned with the astronomical but with the existential world, whose center is always the person who inquires about it."[64] We need here only what keeps us from bumping into walls.[65]

---

[52] McConville, *Being Human in God's World*, 4; Tillich, *ST*, I, 110-11.

[53] Richardson, *Christian Apologetics*, 50, 94.

[54] Lynne Rudder Baker, "Persons and the Metaphysics of Resurrection," *Religious Studies* 43, no. 3 (2007): 333; Andrei A. Buckareff and Joel S. Van Wagenen, "Surviving Resurrection," *Int'l J. for Philosophy of Religion* 67 (2010): 126; James T. Turner, Jr., "No Explanation of Persons," Ibid. 76 (2014): 298; Georg Gassar and Matthias Stefan, eds., *Personal Identity* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015), 2-17.

[55] *Philosophische Untersuchungen*, ¶ 404.

[56] Fraassen, *The Empirical Stance*, 47.

[57] Krapiec, *I-Man*, 129, 143; Proust, *In Search of Lost Time*, IV: 188; Shields and Pasnau, *Philosophy of Aquinas*, 101.

[58] Michel Henry, "Phenomenology of Life," in *Transcendence and Phenomenology*, ed. Conor Cunningham and Peter M. Candler, Jr. (London: SCM, 2007), 241-42.

[59] *Material Phenomenology*, 64-65.

[60] *The Idea of Phenomenology*, trans. Lee Hardy (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1999), 36, 50.

[61] Milbank, *The Word Made Strange*, 125.

[62] Rosenzweig, "The New Thinking," 190-92.

[63] Heidegger, "The End of Philosophy and the Task of Thinking," 391.

[64] *The World and the Person*, 55.

[65] Kierkegaard, *Stages*, 476; Locke, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, IV,XI,10, XIV,1.

Modeling phenomena has the advantage of circumventing the riddle of reality's connection to appearance.[66] The empiricist-realist battle can wage on.[67] Accentuating the fathomable stops short of ontology or ontology-replacing reductions,[68] satiating ourselves on the existing before the existential,[69] staying this side of Lucretius' "tight-barred gates of Nature" without his (and his successors') unsubstantiated supposition of nothing beyond.[70] The discourse takes appearances as what they appear to be,[71] which helps because *individual* is the "sort of thing," Socrates appreciated, whose "lengthy explanation" is "beyond human power" whereas "what it is *like*" "is within human capability, and briefer."[72] Like Paul's downright *individual* (more below),[73] we stay in Kierkegaard's subjective, where the individual faces the universal.[74] Lacking "virtuosity in playing with categories," we grasp life's meaning as best we can.[75] I "must be content with existing" "because I am only a poor existing human being who neither eternally nor divinely nor theocentrically is able to observe the eternal."[76] Following this lead, the thesis leaves undetermined what carries the individual's essence,[77] but uses what every functional person lives: You are, I am, and others like us are each a unique package of personal stuff experienced through an irreducible awareness, whether ontological or delusional.[78]

The context could alone justify this limitation. Because the topic concerns the afterlife, a purely material individual is a non sequitur. Epictetus' "little soul, carrying around a corpse"[79] can be denied, but, if we are only material, we cease with dying,[80] if

---

66 Fraassen, *Scientific Representation*, 168, 270.

67 Dilworth, *Metaphysics of Science*, 9, 19-20, 49.

68 Krapiec, *I-Man*, 331; Lee, "Standing Accused," 86.

69 Charles Guignon, "Heidegger and Kierkegaard on Death," in *Kierkegaard and Death*, ed. Patrick Stokes and Adam Buben (Indiana Univ. Press, 2011), 186-88, 200-201.

70 *On the Nature of Things*, trans. Anthony M. Esolen (John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1995), I,71-73, 445-46.

71 Balthasar, *Theo-Logic*, II, 249.

72 Plato, "Phaedrus," in *Symposium and Phaedrus* (New York: Knopf, 2000), 246a.

73 Arendt, "Willing," 57.

74 *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, I, 129-32, 207-51. See McCombs, *Paradoxical Rationality*, 38-44; Walsh, *Living Christianly*, 8.

75 *Either/Or*, trans. David F. Swenson and Lillian Marvin Swenson, Rev. ed., 2 vols., vol. II (Garden City: Doubleday, 1959), 190.

76 *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, I, 212.

77 Stewart Goetz, "Substance Dualism," in *In Search of the Soul*, ed. Joel B. Green (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2010), 37.

78 Baker, *Persons and Bodies*, 146; Wilkes, *Real People*, 157.

79 Epictetus, "Fragments," in *Discourses* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959), 26 (p. 471).

80 Trenton Merricks, "How to Live Forever without Saving Your Soul," in *Soul, Body, and Survival*,

not a lifetime before.[81] As cultures throughout history testify to, afterlives oppose pure materialism and entail continuing consciousness.[82] Christians need not decide what survives to know something does,[83] and they commonly hold that whatever happens after this life necessitates individual continuity if salvation means anything.[84] As the corpse unravels, something continues,[85] something like spirit,[86] and, to understand this, we need not know *what* the individual's continuity is, only *that* it is.[87] A led life intersects body *and* consciousness.[88] Since something continues and something discontinues, this entails a qualitative dual*ity*, not necessarily a substantive dual*ism*.[89]

Dividing an individual obviously challenges the body's wholeness. Our nervous system's singularity gives a clear sense of undivided existence,[90] but death dichotomizes any unity the earthly body provides[91] and ends its role as our interface with the world.[92] Secularists and Christians assess this similarly by erasing the corpse through intent or default.[93] Corpses that persist rarely do so because of importance; the hundreds perfectly conserved in Mount Everest's permafrost are classed as garbage.[94] Even in this life, corporeal indicators lose out to the autobiographical self, such as when an identical twin

---

ed. Kevin J. Corcoran (Cornell Univ. Press, 2001), 183-84.

[81] Conor Cunningham, "Is There Life before Death?," in *The Role of Death in Life*, ed. John Behr and Conor Cunningham (Eugene: Cascade, 2015), 120-51.

[82] Moore, *Where Are the Dead?*, 30; Pieper, *Death and Immortality*, 94; Jacob Holsinger Sherman, *Partakers of the Divine* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014), 20-21.

[83] Jenson, *ST*, II, 104; Murphy, *Bodies and Souls, or Spirited Bodies?*, 3, 21-22, 37-39.

[84] Berkouwer, *Man: Image of God*, 251-53; Cooper, *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting*, 3, 9, 59, 75, 171; David Rankin, *The Early Church and the Afterlife* (New York: Routledge, 2018), 1.

[85] Bray, *God Has Spoken*, 81; Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology*, 159; Harding, *Paul's Eschatological Anthropology*, 334-35.

[86] Stephen T. Davis, "Physicalism and Resurrection," in *Soul, Body, and Survival*, ed. Kevin J. Corcoran (Cornell Univ. Press, 2001), 238; Eric T. Olson, "A Compound of Two Substances," Ibid., 81; Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 267.

[87] Dilthey, *Introduction to the Human Sciences*, 298 (II.4.2).

[88] Edith Stein, *Potency and Act*, trans. Walter Redmond (DC: ICS, 2009), 102, 118, 124-26, 223.

[89] Berkouwer, *Man: Image of God*, 213-14; Cooper, "Biblical Anthropology," 228; Yates, *Between Death and Resurrection*, 35-37, 58-59.

[90] Dilthey, *Introduction to the Human Sciences*, 85 (I.3).

[91] Cooper, *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting*, 214; Leget, "Eschatology," 367; Schumacher, *Death and Mortality*, 48.

[92] Arendt, *Love and Augustine*, 78; Krapiec, *I-Man*, 351; Fernando Vidal, "Brains, Bodies, Selves, and Science," *Critical Inquiry* 28, no. 4 (2002): 938.

[93] Lidija Novakovic, *Resurrection* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2016), 164-65; Walter, *Eclipse of Eternity*, 91-116.

[94] Elizabeth Mazzolini, "Food, Waste, and Judgment on Mount Everest," *Cultural Critique* 76 (2010): 2, 14.

corrects a misidentification, and the next life, to be us, needs the same.[95] This full self consists of thinking, consciousness, and other personhood affairs,[96] forming the personal drama of the inner, indispensable *I*.[97] For Christians, the earthly body cannot be the self that is saved and continues.[98] What continues is a discarnate essence in any intermediate state, which has a new body in the resurrection.[99]

Recognizing that an individual is more than an earthly body means disallowing anthropological nihilism.[100] The thesis safely accepts we are more than Dennett's "organic robots"[101] or Hollywood's electrified Frankenstein cadavers.[102] Naturalism might not require this, but Christianity does,[103] whether the something more is spirit, God's memories,[104] or software. Hence, irrelevancies here include whether reality is as perceived or being is predicate[105] and the mind-body problem.[106] Relevant, rather, is the presence of Anthony's "invisible substance which does not pass away with the body."[107] This "strange, enigmatic, personal essence," in Pater's words,[108] can, for the model, transcend matter or be mental substance, ectoplasm, or photons.[109] It is traditionally termed *soul*, *spirit*, or *form*,[110] but, to acknowledge here that the self's ontology is left unanswered,

---

95 Moore, *Where Are the Dead?*, 200.

96 Fraassen, *The Empirical Stance*, 191; Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 596; Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, 36.

97 Blondel, "Letter on Apologetics," 161-62.

98 Badham, *Christian Beliefs About Life after Death*, 64, 86-87; Bovon, "The Soul's Comeback," 406; Bynum, *Resurrection of the Body*, 9; Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 586-87; Hebblethwaite, *Christian Hope*, 174; International Theological Commission, "Some Current Questions on Eschatology," 5.4; Johnston, *Surviving Death*, 125; Novakovic, *Resurrection*, 68, 71; Pannenberg, "Task of Christian Eschatology," 7-8.

99 Cooper, *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting*, 117, 176, 179, 181-82, 189, 209; Dahl, *Resurrection of the Body*, 18, 37-39, 46, 94; Yates, *Between Death and Resurrection*, 7.

100 Jenson, *ST*, II, 57-58.

101 *Elbow Room*, New ed. (MIT Press, 2015), 186.

102 Mary Shelley had the good sense to leave unsaid life's source. *Frankenstein* (New York: Norton, 1996), I,3, III,7 (pp. 31, 146).

103 Geisler, *ST*, 721.

104 Miguel de Unamuno, *Tragic Sense of Life*, trans. J.E. Crawford Flitch (New York: Dover, 1954), 149.

105 Milbank, *Beyond Secular Order*, 53-55.

106 Barbara Montero, "Post-Physicalism," *J. of Consciousness Studies* 8, no. 2 (2001): 61-80.

107 *The Letters*, Ltr VI (p. 21).

108 *Marius the Epicurean*, 107.

109 Fraassen, *The Empirical Stance*, 190-92.

110 Cooper, "Whose Interpretation? Which Anthropology," 241; Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 146-49, 154-55.

terms specifying attributes are applied: *personal identity* is the individual's perspective on existence, and *personal character* is the set of features formed as the individual life is led.[111]

3) <u>Eschatology drives anthropology.</u>

Because there is thinking and because thinking without a thinker is unthinkable,[112] the thinker is more overt than God.[113] It is ineliminable,[114] involuntarily primordial.[115] It exists unmistakably because only what exists can be mistaken[116] and must be real because only thinking judges what is real.[117] "Through acts of immediate intuition we intuit a 'self,'" Husserl reminded.[118] If its existence is doubted, "no reason or reply" answers but Hamann's "Bah!"[119] Everything observed carries this sense of *I*.[120] As anyone who has dreamed vividly or seen something not there can verify, the sights inside the head are closer than the rest.[121]

Our self-awareness is chronic, perhaps arriving when humanity first willfully walked upright.[122] Reason, though coming later,[123] quickly found the self, certainly before the Common Era, when Eurasians from end to end were recording consciousness of consciousness.[124] In the West, Socrates' borrowed "Know thyself" propelled the understanding.[125] "Socrates' infinite merit," Kierkegaard reminded, "is precisely that of being an *existing* thinker, not a speculative thinker who forgets what it means to exist,"[126] and

---

111 Pannenberg, *Anthropology in Theological Perspective*, 61, 65.

112 John Foster, "Brief Defense of the Cartesian View," in *Soul, Body, and Survival*, ed. Kevin J. Corcoran (Cornell Univ. Press, 2001), 17; Husserl, *Ideas*, 46 (p. 130).

113 Locke, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, IV,IX,3; Rosenzweig, *Star of Redemption*, 49.

114 Baker, *Persons and Bodies*, 67.

115 Balthasar, *Theo-Logic*, I, 166; Taylor, *Hegel*, 141.

116 Augustine, *City of God*, XI,26 (pp. 459-60); Henry, *Material Phenomenology*, 130.

117 Husserl, *Ideas*, 135 (p. 348).

118 Ibid., 43 (p. 123).

119 Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi, *Werke Vol. 4, Pt. 3* (Leipzig: Fleischer, 1819), 34 (Hamann 22 Jan. 1785 letter).

120 Henry, *Incarnation*, 172.

121 *Essence of Manifestation*, 465-66, 682-83; Gerald L. Schroeder, *The Hidden Face of God* (New York: Touchstone, 2002), 5, 9.

122 Michael S. Burdett, "Transcendence and Human Enhancement," in *Transhumanism and Transcendence*, ed. Ronald Cole-Turner (DC: Georgetown Univ. Press, 2011), 26.

123 Betz, *After Enlightenment*, 326.

124 Arendt, "Karl Jaspers," 88-89; Pannenberg, *Anthropology in Theological Perspective*, 166.

125 Bergson, *Two Sources of Morality and Religion*, 61; Kevin Vanhoozer, "Human Being, Individual and Social," in *Cambridge Companion to Christian Doctrine*, ed. Colin E. Gunton (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998), 158.

126 *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, I, 172.

Socrates taught that *individual* is like two horses, one good, one bad, driven by one charioteer.[127] His successors agreed.[128] Plato's *individual* was a unitizing soul of competing interior parts,[129] living as one who is two.[130] Aristotle's *individual* was matter of the same essence distinctively formed; the body materialized the soul, and the soul actualized the body.[131] Plotinus' *individual* was a unified soul dominating what was divisible;[132] consciousness held together the double inner self.[133] These views lasted. The Chalcedon Creed describes Christ's humanity Platonically as "rational soul and body."[134] Aristotle's embodied subjectivity evolved through such thinkers as Hegel.[135] Christian theologians like Augustine and Thomas deepened ensoulment and embodiment,[136] culminating in the Thomist fusion of Platonic duality and Aristotelian holism,[137] such that the body is the soul's matter and the soul is the body's form.[138] The soul fits the body, not like hand in glove, but like life in hand.[139]

With modernity, the trajectory of *individual* inverted from its Socratic path.[140] Moderns, in freeing themselves generally, freed themselves from themselves. "Know thyself" looked like ego-driven emptiness.[141] Science figured out how to trigger physiologically our senses of love, morality, spirit, and transcendence, and, when isolated by

---

127 Plato, "Phaedrus," 246a-b, 253c-e.

128 Barresi and Martin, "History as Prologue," 34-35.

129 *The Republic*, 431a, 435c, 436a-b, 437c, 439d-440a, 440e-442b, 443d, 444b, 486b-e, 495e, 505d, 544e, 590c, 609d-612c. See generally Gerson, *Knowing Persons*.

130 Charles Stang, *Our Divine Double* (Harvard Univ. Press, 2016), 22.

131 Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*, 42-50, 74; Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (Yale Univ. Press, 1995), 7-8; Pabst, *Metaphysics*, 21. See particularly Aristotle, *De Anima* [On the Soul], trans. R.D. Hicks (New York: Cosimo, 2008), 412a-415a.

132 "Ennead," in *Plotinus* (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1952), IV.2.1-2 (p. 140).

133 Stang, *Our Divine Double*, 187, 196-201.

134 Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 339.

135 Taylor, *Hegel*, 87, 332, 570-71.

136 Clarke, *Person and Being*, 27-53; Pabst, *Metaphysics*, 90-91, 95-103, 202-208, 246-51, 266-67; Vaught, *Access to God*, 43-44.

137 Aquinas, *Quaestiones De Anima*, Q. 6, ad. 13, Q. 14, ad. 11, Q. 15, s.c. (pp. 98, 179, 185-86); *Summa Theologiae, 1a*, trans. Timothy Suttor, vol. XI (New York: Blackfriars with McGraw-Hill, 1970), Q. 75, arts. 3-4 (pp. 13-21). See Cooper, *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting*, 80; Pannenberg, *ST*, II, 184.

138 Bynum, *Resurrection of the Body*, 257; Mary T. Clark, "An Inquiry into Personhood," *Rev. of Metaphysics* 46, no. 1 (1992): 23; Fitzpatrick, *Aquinas on Bodily Identity*, 27-30, 42, 49-51, 80, 96-97.

139 Brian Leftow, "Souls Dipped in Dust," in *Soul, Body, and Survival*, ed. Kevin J. Corcoran (Cornell Univ. Press, 2001), 120-38; Leget, "Eschatology," 366; Pieper, *Death and Immortality*, 30.

140 Turner, *Theology, Psychology and the Plural Self*, 2.

141 Sloterdijk, *Critique of Cynical Reason*, 537.

skepticism, figured our inner life is only physiological,[142] without troubling to realize science can trigger our sense of heat too. Through skepticism and science, materialism became dogma,[143] and persons became pure physicalities.[144] So, we suffer an identity crisis.[145] Berdyaev recaps: "We are witnessing the process of dehumanization in all phases of culture and social life. … Man has … ceased to have any value at all."[146] Various Romantic existentialisms combed through the facts science had left over for a substitute *individual* to somehow affirm human life, such as we are "nothing but" something blatant like gene-reproducing atoms.[147] Philosophers, among the last holdouts, succumbed too,[148] directing "a radical critique against the philosophy of the subject and the ego-subject," Henry reported, producing "its own self-destructing."[149]

Abridging in this way the history of *individual* from before modernity to now omits the crosscurrents that got us here, but it also avoids the scholarly fray of who is responsible. Proposals for patient zero include Plotinus through Hegel for abstracting away existential layers,[150] Thomas for basing Christian revelation on speculative reason,[151] Descartes for banking on subjectivity,[152] Darwin for leaving us mere animals, or Freud for assigning our innermost sensibilities to myth.[153] Being agnostic on the issue, this discourse willingly suffers from Nietzsche's "democratic prejudice" against genealogies.[154] The genetic fallacy is to suppose an idea's descent indicates its truth.[155] Genealogies matter to rationality, not truth (Tit. 3:9).[156] Regardless of heritage, the idea that *individual* is

---

142 Rita Carter and Christopher Frith, *Mapping the Mind*, Rev. ed. (Los Angeles: Univ. of Calif. Press, 2010), 13.

143 Brower, *Aquinas's Ontology*, 265.

144 Christoph Schwobel, "Introduction," in *Persons, Divine and Human*, ed. Christoph Schwobel and Colin E. Gunton (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 4.

145 Vanhoozer, "Human Being, Individual and Social," 158.

146 *The Fate of Man in the Modern World*, trans. D.A. Lowrie (Univ. of Michigan Press, 1961), 25.

147 Lee, "Standing Accused," 10.

148 David Bourget and David Chalmers, "What Do Philosophers Believe?" *Philosophical Studies* 170, no. 3 (2014): 476, 496.

149 *Material Phenomenology*, 123.

150 Conor Cunningham, *Genealogy of Nihilism* (London: Routledge, 2002), 3-125.

151 Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 143; Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, I, 36-37, 185, 203.

152 Krapiec, *I-Man*, 24.

153 Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, I, 152.

154 "Genealogy of Morals," I:4 (p. 162).

155 S. Morris Engel and Angelika Soldan, *The Study of Philosophy*, 6th ed. (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2008), 141-42.

156 Elster, *Sour Grapes*, 140.

essentially a fiction has taken root. Terminology changed first. *Soul* became *mind* with Descartes' cogito,[157] which became *self* with Hume's empiricism.[158] When the jargon could retreat no further, skeptics turned to science, whose microscopes found only the microscopic.[159] Superstition supposedly gave way to theology, which gave way to metaphysics, which gave way to science,[160] which gives way to nothing, literally. Science, which had been the endless appreciation of truth,[161] became, Henry realized, "systematized information gained by the observational method."[162] Science went from "a collection of true facts about the world," a biologist concluded, to what "scientists say about the world."[163] This was about when those who had been "natural philosophers" stopped being philosophers[164] and became "scientists" instead (coined 1833).[165]

Though the genealogy of the *individual*'s demise can be passed over without risking the conclusion, the role of science cannot be because of how it rightfully earns our appreciation elsewhere.[166] Pondering science awakens our interiority,[167] but scientism excludes it.[168] So, objective science finds that the led life lacks meaning.[169] Science submits to the "fateful presumption," Montaigne remarked, of disdaining what is not comprehended.[170] The world fills with singular judgments—John is hungry, Jane is upset—but science dismisses them as unobjective.[171] Science impersonalizes, again literally.[172] Its

---

157 Moore, *Where Are the Dead?*, 183.

158 Krapiec, *I-Man*, 71.

159 Barresi and Martin, "History as Prologue," 51, 55; Robert Hooke, *Micrographia* (Project Gutenberg eBook, 2005), 19-22 (pref.); Jenson, *ST*, I, 120-21.

160 Bulgakov, "Vladimir Solovyov: Scholar and Seer," 42-43; David Farrell Krell, "General Introduction: Question of Being," in *Martin Heidegger Basic Writings*, ed. J. Glenn Gray (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), 6.

161 Hartshorne, *Logic of Perfection*, 129.

162 *God, Revelation and Authority*, I, 202.

163 R.C. Lewontin, *Biology as Ideology* (New York: HarperPerennial, 1991), 103.

164 Heidegger, "Modern Science, Metaphysics, and Mathematics," 247.

165 Laura J. Snyder, "William Whewell," in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta (Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford Univ., 2019).

166 Heidegger, "Modern Science, Metaphysics, and Mathematics," 3, 12-13.

167 Taylor, *Hegel*, 82.

168 Edwards, *After Death?*, 57; Pfuetze, *Self, Society, Existence*, 149; Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, 62.

169 Harari, *Sapiens*, 391.

170 "Essays," I,27 (p. 134).

171 Henry, *Incarnation*, 74.

172 Highet, *Man's Unconquerable Mind*, 34-35.

trademark of isolating the repeatable, therefore, obscures individualities.[173] Except in lifeless facsimiles or cadavers,[174] no self sits still for the controlled experiment.[175] Van Fraassen discerned, "no objectifying inquiry can reveal what persons are … among things in the world."[176] Because science is made for humans, not humans for science, the led life is beyond it.[177]

Science tried biology, psychology, and sociology,[178] but "Biologists no longer study life," only structures,[179] "Modern psychology is psychology without the *psyche*,"[180] and sociology involves, not *self* and *identity,* but things like *self-image* and *sexual identity*.[181] They confront a subject who knows it lives even before the physical.[182] Certainly no *you* or *me* is found among the quarks[183] nor any that enjoy good music.[184] Likewise, the science of science, when not nihilistic,[185] honors its founder's admonition to "beware of the wish to be edifying."[186] Dalferth noted, "Where once we saw a 'child of God,' we now see an animal, without the quotation marks."[187] Thus, *you* and *I* are no longer obvious to every-

---

173 Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory*, 259.

174 Arendt, "Thinking," 40, 56; Jeffrey P. Bishop, "On Medical Corpses," in *The Role of Death in Life*, ed. John Behr and Conor Cunningham (Eugene: Cascade, 2015), 166; Carter and Frith, *Mapping the Mind*, 26-27.

175 Bultmann, "Theology as Science," 46; Richardson, *Christian Apologetics*, 34, 40.

176 *The Empirical Stance*, 191.

177 Dilworth, *Metaphysics of Science*, 265-67; Lewontin, *Biology as Ideology*, 12-13.

178 Barresi and Martin, "History as Prologue," 49.

179 Francois Jacob, *The Logic of Life*, trans. Betty Spillman (New York: Pantheon, 1973), 299.

180 Tillich, *ST*, III, 24.

181 Barresi and Martin, "History as Prologue," 51.

182 Henry, *I Am the Truth*, 38; Edmund Husserl, *The Crisis of European Sciences*, trans. David Carr (Northwestern Univ. Press, 1970), 6; Philippe Rochat, "What Is It Like to Be a Newborn?," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 57.

183 Goetz, "Substance Dualism," 48-50; Michael Lockwood, "Consciousness and the Quantum World," in *Consciousness*, ed. Quentin Smith and Aleksandar Jokic (Oxford: Clarendon, 2003), 447; Thomas Metzinger, "The No-Self Alternative," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 279, 285.

184 William Hasker, "Do My Quarks Enjoy Beethoven," in *Neuroscience and the Soul*, ed. Thomas M. Crisp, et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 13-40.

185 Cunningham, *Genealogy of Nihilism*, 3-179, 238-60.

186 Georg W.F. Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A.V. Miller (Oxford Univ. Press, 1981), Preface 9 (p. 6). Marx concurred, "Philosophy is to investigation of the real world what masturbation is to sexual love." Schaff, *Marxism and the Human Individual*, 77.

187 *Creatures of Possibility*, 178.

one,[188] and *our* protests are necessarily unheard, just folk-metaphysics.[189] The deconstruction eviscerating God eviscerates the self.[190]

Because scientism denies any meta- to physic,[191] within its limits, we are bodies or brains.[192] "'You,' your joys and your sorrows, … your ambitions, your sense of personal identity and free will," are according to a Nobel-laureate physiologist, "nothing but a pack of neurons."[193] The corporeal is philosophy's dominant view too,[194] making it, in Milbank's words, also "radically incompetent with relation to reality."[195] The body's matter offers space-time coordinates,[196] but cannot sustain the individual's continuity.[197] Self is beyond particles.[198] Science is thus mostly noncontributing to who leads this life and continues afterwards.[199] The "mysterious reality, contradicting all rationalist explanation and yet impossible to gainsay," Guardini recognized, is that "man, though he is part of the general pattern of Nature, represents in addition a genuine starting point …."[200]

The scientific fixation on the body is explicable because ethereals like the mind resist fixation.[201] Basing the unmeasured on what has been measured bakes in error because science course-corrects every few generations—recall pre-Copernican, pre-Galilean, pre-Newtonian, pre-Einsteinian, pre-Copenhagen.[202] Further, science cannot

---

188 Shaun Gallagher, "Introduction: Diversity of Selves," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 27.

189 Metzinger, "The No-Self Alternative," 279.

190 Barresi and Martin, "History as Prologue," 43; Fromm, "Modern Man and the Future," 27; Laurence Paul Hemming, "Heidegger and the Grounds of Redemption," in *Radical Orthodoxy*, ed. John Milbank, et al. (New York: Routledge, 1999), 99.

191 Ernst Haeckel, *The Riddle of the Universe*, trans. Josephy McCabe (New York: Harper, 1900), 182; John Milbank, "The Mystery of Reason," in *Grandeur of Reason*, ed. Peter M. Candler, Jr. and Conor Cunningham (London: SCM, 2010), 72.

192 Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 588; LeDoux, *Synaptic Self*, 13; McGilchrist, *The Master and His Emissary*, 135.

193 Crick, *The Astonishing Hypothesis*, 3, 7, 203. Accord LeDoux, *Synaptic Self*, 2, 324.

194 Dalferth, *Creatures of Possibility*, 20-21; Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 70, 85, 93; Hud Hudson, "The Morphing Block and Diachronic Personal Identity," in *Personal Identity*, ed. Georg Gassar and Matthias Stefan (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015), 237; Williams, *Problems of the Self*, 10.

195 *Theology and Social Theory*, 211.

196 Davies, *Aquinas on God and Evil*, 48-49; Mitchell, *Being and Participation*, I, 379.

197 Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 158.

198 Hartshorne, *Logic of Perfection*, 168; Kung, *Eternal Life?*, 111; Song, *Covenant and Calling*, 56.

199 Henry, *Incarnation*, 3, 18, 86, 108; Kung, *Eternal Life?*, 18-19; Lowe, *Subjects of Experience*, 43.

200 *Freedom, Grace, and Destiny*, 28.

201 Dilworth, *Metaphysics of Science*, 187.

202 Arendt, "Thinking," 54; Balthasar, *Theo-Logic*, I, 84; Fraassen, *The Empirical Stance*, 78-82.

differentiate between magical and spiritual[203] or identify the proof it needs for the self.[204] Science resorts to subhuman nature for the human despite consciousness' certainty.[205] Instruments certainly cannot detect inner life.[206] Scientific cluelessness is, accordingly, no gap to close.[207] Method and problem pass each other by,[208] because the perceiver cannot be perceived and remain perceiver.[209] "All science is a science of experience," Dilthey explained, "but all experience" occurs in "our consciousness," making it "logically … impossib[le]" to go "beyond these conditions," "like seeing without an eye …."[210] Besides, science has human prejudices,[211] including the desire to neutralize the fear of death, which a life limited to the body does.[212] If *self* is nothing, death is unfrightening, just matter reorganized.[213] Nietzsche argued, "Let us beware of saying that death is opposed to life. The living is only a form of what is dead …."[214]

Thus, pure science sees consciousness as pure illusion,[215] in spite of its commonsense givenness.[216] As one mind philosopher found, identity's ontology "has by and large been abandoned … by most empirical researchers …."[217] Metzinger reports, "no such things as selves exist in the world: Nobody ever *was* or *had* a self."[218] Rather, *self* is a

---

[203] Dilworth, *Metaphysics of Science*, 267.

[204] Lowe, *Subjects of Experience*, 43.

[205] Robert Spaemann, *Essays in Anthropology*, trans. Guido de Graaff and James Mumford (Eugene: Cascade, 2010), 23; John Cook Wilson, *Statement and Inference and Other Philosophical Papers*, 2 vols., vol. II (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), 857; Yu, *Being and Relation*, 53.

[206] Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, 38, 95; Wittgenstein, *Philosophische Untersuchungen*, ¶ 430.

[207] Blondel, *Action*, 77, 89, 92 [68, 82, 85]; Tillich, *ST*, I, 6.

[208] Crick, *The Astonishing Hypothesis*, 259; Ludwig Wittgenstein, "Philosophie Der Psychologie - Ein Fragment," in *Philosophische Untersuchungen*, ed. P.M.S. Hacker and Joachim Schulte (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), ¶ 371.

[209] Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, I, 483; Jacques Maritain, *Existence and the Existent*, trans. Lewis Galantiere and Gerald B. Phelan (New York: Pantheon, 1948), 69-72.

[210] *Introduction to the Human Sciences*, 72-73 (Pref.).

[211] Lewontin, *Biology as Ideology*, 41.

[212] Krapiec, *I-Man*, 343; Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 70-71.

[213] Epicurus, "Letter to Menoeceus," in *Philosophy of Epicurus*, ed. George K. Stodach (Northwestern Univ. Press, 1963), 180; Matthew Levering, *Proofs of God* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016), 209; Moore, *Where Are the Dead?*, 139.

[214] *The Gay Science*, trans. Josefine Nauckhoff (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001), 109 (p. 110).

[215] Crick, *The Astonishing Hypothesis*, 33.

[216] Milbank, *Beyond Secular Order*, 93.

[217] Dan Zahavi, "Unity of Consciousness and the Problem of Self," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 324-25.

[218] *Being No One* (MIT Press, 2003), 1. Accord Johnston, *Surviving Death*, 306.

culturally created fiction[219] derived from mistaking reflexive pronouns for reality[220] and presumably from mistaking actual reflections this way too. The emperor not only has on no clothes, but, underneath, there is no person. Hans Christian's fellow Dane anticipated this: With "breathless busyness or worldly desire or abstract thinking or whatever the distraction might be," a person now ignores "his own *I* and the pulse beat … of his own self."[221] The "existing individual," who had directed "all his attention to his existing," has taken the only other option: "do everything he can to forget that he is existing and thereby manage to become comic."[222] Blondel summarized, "How far removed we are now from the simplicity of conscience …. It is … the decomposition of death in life itself. Isn't that what we wanted: … a complete liquidation, a huge burst of laughter, a mournful joke, … a hoax, nothing, that is what a man and his destiny have become."[223]

However, "To think that the individual is being liquidated without trace is overoptimistic," Adorno observed.[224] What is left, Nietzsche saw, was a "falsity towards oneself," whether called "nature," "Darwinism," or "fatalism," and, these vestiges, "we owe Christianity."[225] Christianity is the conservative.[226] Despite methodological detours, it returns to actuality.[227] And the self is actuality. "The first part … of Christianity is," Luther recognized, "the knowledge of ourselves."[228] Zizioulas agreed, "historically as well as existentially the concept of the person is indissolubly bound up with theology,"[229] as did Niebuhr, "The only word in our vocabulary which does justice to the knowledge of persons or selves is 'revelation.'"[230] So, theologians not gripped by contemporary

---

[219] Barresi and Martin, "History as Prologue," 51; Henry, *I Am the Truth*, 262-63.

[220] Anthony Kenny, *The Legacy of Wittgenstein* (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1987), 81.

[221] Kierkegaard, *Book on Adler*, 103.

[222] *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, I, 120 [VII 99].

[223] *Action*, 24 [10].

[224] *Minima Moralia*, 135 [ch 88].

[225] *Writings from the Late Notebooks*, trans. Kate Sturge (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2003), 174 (NB 10, entry 7); *The Will to Power*, trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage, 1968), 268-70, 285-86, 294.

[226] Bultmann, "NT and Mythology," 25; Dalferth, *Creatures of Possibility*, 158; Henry, *I Am the Truth*, 35.

[227] Franz Rosenzweig, "The New Thinking," in *Philosophical and Theological Writings*, ed. Paul W. Franks and Michael L. Morgan (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2000), 130.

[228] *Galatians*, 131 [WA 401,221 (2:16)].

[229] *Being as Communion*, 27.

[230] *The Meaning of Revelation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 76.

notions hostile to *I*[231] understand it is as beyond material as death is beyond biology.[232] "To be spirit," Kierkegaard concluded, "is the human being's invisible glory."[233] Theologians can privilege the earthly body,[234] but this is often from over-exegeting Paul,[235] de-Hellenizing him,[236] or ignoring how Christianity upset the ancient physiognomy, which had the corporeal imply the intrinsic, such as disfigurement reflecting depravity.[237] Regardless, the Christian debate about the earthly body is irrelevant to ultimate salvation because that body discontinues.[238] Being "flesh and blood," van Fraassen saw, is how "we persons manifest ourselves *in the first instance*," but the "crucial point" is "what counts as conscious counts as a person …."[239] Afterlife continuity has to be something like spirit (Jam. 2:26) or, in inclusive and non-substantive vocabulary, identity and character.[240] What continues, Stephen T. Davis lists, is "experiences, beliefs, wishes, knowledge, memory, inner (rather than bodily) feelings, thoughts, language …."[241]

4) <u>We each live through an indivisible personal identity.</u>

Individual is, therefore, more than what objective science or its philosophy offers.[242] This is tolerable because the finest authorities on *individual* are not professionals fashioning theories, but ordinary people, including professionals, experiencing life.[243] As science examines such things as molecules, neurotransmitters, and amino acids, the individual bears things like suffering and joy, desires and choices, hopes and fetishes.[244] While

---

231 Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 166-67.

232 Cooper, *Holy Eros*, 20; Olson, *Mosaic of Christian Belief*, 201; Schwarz, *The Human Being*, 171.

233 *Upbuilding Discourses*, 193.

234 Behr, *Mystery of Christ*, 146-58; White, *Life Beyond Death*, 49.

235 *E.g.*, Harding, *Paul's Eschatological Anthropology*, 171: Paul's "I punish my body" becomes in the hands of the exegete, "I, who am one interrelated aspect of the indivisible entity called the σῶμα, recognize my identity with this totality—it is an aspect of me, and I am an aspect of it."

236 George H. van Kooten, "St Paul on Soul, Spirit and the Inner Man," in *The Afterlife of the Platonic Soul*, ed. Maha Elkaisy-Friemuth and John M. Dillon (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 25-44.

237 Mikeal C. Parsons, *Body and Character in Luke and Acts* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006), 15-17, 64-65, 144-45.

238 Davis, *Risen Indeed*, 90.

239 *The Empirical Stance*, 191-92 (emphasis added).

240 Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 152; Charles Taliaferro, "Human Nature, Personal Identity, and Eschatology," in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, ed. Jerry L. Walls (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 534; Miroslav Volf, *The End of Memory* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 24, 192.

241 *Risen Indeed*, 90-91.

242 Hart, *Experience of God*, 161, 181, 204, 210, 213-15, 227; William Hasker, "Persons as Emergent Substances," in *Soul, Body, and Survival*, ed. Kevin J. Corcoran (Cornell Univ. Press, 2001), 114; McCombs, *Paradoxical Rationality*, 128, 134-36.

243 Reddy, *How Infants Know Minds*, 5; Wollheim, *Thread of Life*, 30.

244 Gschwandtner, "Fully Alive?," 59-60; Merleau-Ponty, *Signs*, 71.

those experiencing this life do so through a body, it is the experiencing that is life. Hamann observed, "Between an idea in our soul and a sound produced by the lips lies the distance between spirit and body;"[245] so, "our philosophy must begin from heaven and not … the dissection of a cadaver."[246] Apart from "the visible" "body," Henry noted, we are "the invisible" "human being itself," "his or her true reality."[247] Though the self works through the body,[248] this derives from the body's servantship (1Co. 9:27).[249] The eye does not see; *we* see using it.[250] Hamann again: "The veiled figure of the body" is "the visible schema in which we move along; yet in truth" is "nothing but a finger pointing to the hidden man within us."[251] A committed materialist like Lynne Baker recognizes "bodily continuity seems neither sufficient nor necessary for personal identity."[252] Thus, the body is not all the individual is,[253] and, with death, it discontinues.[254] The individual, Conor Cunningham recapped, is "only contingently related to this body."[255] *Individual* is an eschatological specialty, when earthly bodies are dispensable.[256]

Unlike our body, our interiority is unsharable.[257] Not only is your awareness outside mine, my awareness is outside mine—it *is* my awareness. Balthasar wrote, "we can never get it within our sights, for it itself holds the rifle."[258] We nonetheless sense our experiences converging,[259] an immediate access to the *I*.[260] It is hard reality.[261] It is not

---

245 "Letter to Lindner 9 Aug. 1759 (Excerpt)," 67.

246 James C. O'Flaherty, *Unity and Language* (Univ. of North Carolina, 1952), 89.

247 *Words of Christ*, 17.

248 Timothy Mooney, "On the Critiques of Pairing and Appresentation by Merleau-Ponty and Levinas," in *Transcendence and Phenomenology*, ed. Conor Cunningham and Peter M. Candler, Jr. (London: SCM, 2007), 453.

249 Goetz, "Substance Dualism," 39; Henry, *Incarnation*, 4; Pannenberg, *ST*, II, 181.

250 McGilchrist, *The Master and His Emissary*, 372-73.

251 "Aesthetica in Nuce," 64.

252 *Persons and Bodies*, 119.

253 Rankin, *The Early Church and the Afterlife*, 52-53.

254 Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 645-46.

255 "Is There Life before Death?," 130.

256 Colin E. Gunton, "Trinity, Ontology and Anthropology," in *Persons, Divine and Human*, ed. Christoph Schwobel and Colin E. Gunton (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 60; Harding, *Paul's Eschatological Anthropology*, 6.

257 Caldecott, *Radiance of Being*, 104; Henry, *Words of Christ*, 107.

258 *Theo-Drama*, I, 484.

259 Guardini, *Freedom, Grace, and Destiny*, 42.

260 Crosby, *Selfhood of the Human Person*, 87; Husserl, "Author's Preface," 11; Krapiec, *I-Man*, 95.

261 Goetz, "Substance Dualist Response to Nonreductive Physicalism," 140-41; Henry, *I Am the Truth*, 39; *Barbarism*, trans. Scott Davidson (London: Continuum Impacts, 2012), 10.

volitional,[262] but primal like the principle of noncontradiction.[263] Just as nothing makes anything identical,[264] the personal identity just is.[265] Although personal identity, which involves personhood,[266] is not a subset of thinghood identity,[267] it is like any other identity, entirely passive.[268] Without doing anything, personal identity is there.[269] This internal observer is known, not by observing it, but by it observing.[270] "Even in those moments when we are most disinterested spectators," Proust mused, "every impression is double and the one half which is sheathed in the object is prolonged in ourselves by another half which we alone can know …."[271]

This discrete first-person identity is unqualifiedly singular and indivisible.[272] Every awareness, including awareness of awareness, attaches to it.[273] It is unified consciousness.[274] Even schizophrenics sense this enough to realize they are thinking the thoughts not theirs.[275] Likewise, those with surgically disconnected autonomous cerebral hemispheres experience life as a unity.[276] Our interiority intuits its distinctiveness,[277] even in infancy.[278] Though disorders degrade its appreciation,[279] the psyche regulates a life-

---

262 Josef Parnas and Louis A. Sass, "Structure of Self-Consciousness in Schizophrenia," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 529.

263 Przywara, *Analogia Entis*, 199.

264 Harold W. Noonan, *Personal Identity*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2003), 87; Perry, *Identity, Personal Identity, and the Self*, 68; Schindler, *Perfection of Freedom*, 210.

265 Merricks, "How to Live Forever," 191-92.

266 John Macquarrie, *Principles of Christian Theology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), 65-66.

267 Baker, *Persons and Bodies*, 40-41; Cunningham, *Genealogy of Nihilism*, 226; Henry, *Essence of Manifestation*, 25, 33-42, 45.

268 Henry, *Incarnation*, 168-71; *Words of Christ*, 73, 95; *Essence of Manifestation*, 474.

269 Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, II, 58; Henry, *Words of Christ*, 96.

270 Deikman, "'I' = Awareness," 426; Henry, *I Am the Truth*, 107.

271 *In Search of Lost Time*, VI: 470.

272 Gallagher, "Diversity of Selves," 20; Hart, *Experience of God*, 156, 171, 197; Sorabji, *Self*, 260-61.

273 Henry, *Words of Christ*, 12; Kai Vogeley and Shaun Gallagher, "Self in the Brain," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 118-19, 129.

274 Barresi and Martin, "History as Prologue," 34-47; Nancey Murphy, "Nonreductive Physicalist Response to Substance Dualism," in *In Search of the Soul*, ed. Joel B. Green (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2010), 67.

275 John Perry, "On Knowing One's Self," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 388.

276 Panksepp, *Affective Neuroscience*, 307.

277 Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, II, 285-86; Vogeley and Gallagher, "Self in the Brain," 125.

278 Rochat, "What Is It Like to Be a Newborn?," 69-71; Daniel N. Stern, *The Interpersonal World of the Infant* (New York: Basic Books, 1985), 10.

279 Parnas and Sass, "Structure of Self-Consciousness in Schizophrenia," 532-40.

sustaining equilibrium.[280] The personal identity's unity thus resists actual disruption.[281]

Personal identity normally correlates to a body.[282] "The human body," Wittgenstein saw, "is the best picture of the human soul."[283] The body unifies[284] and seals individuality,[285] but death breaks the seal (1Co. 15:50). A dead body is nobody. The intermediate state lacks an operative body entirely,[286] and the resurrection has a revolutionary body,[287] which is from God's intervention, not salvaging a chassis.[288] The "soul-based" "corruptible" body "will be changed out"[289] for the "spirit-based" "incorruptible" body (15:42-53), becoming in Thomastic terms, "supernatural,"[290] entirely different prime matter,[291] or, in modern terms, "transphysical."[292] The terrestrial body and the resurrected body, no matter how similar, are thus discontinuous, separated by the eon and glories.[293] Käsemann concluded, death does not "change" the body but "breach[es] … the old and the new. Only miracle can bridge the two."[294] The terrestrial body, to the extent a unifying package in this life,[295] thus cannot preclude division in the next. Only the personal identity does that.

5) <u>We each live as a multilateral personal character.</u>

The personal identity is not us.[296] It experiences who is living, but is not who is

---

[280] Jung, *Modern Man*, 17

[281] Hart, *Experience of God*, 198-200; William Hasker, *The Emergent Self* (Cornell Univ. Press, 2001), 128; Galen Strawson, "The Minimal Subject," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 253-55.

[282] Henry, *I Am the Truth*, 123; John F. Wippel, *Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas* (DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 2000), 367-75.

[283] "Philosophie Der Psychologie - Ein Fragment," ¶ 25.

[284] Barth, *Romans*, 199 (6:6); Dorothee Legrand, "Phenomenological Dimensions of Bodily Self-Consciousness," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 217.

[285] Henry, *Incarnation*, 179.

[286] Nichols, *Death and Afterlife*, 46-75.

[287] Demarest, *Cross and Salvation*, 475-76; Yates, *Between Death and Resurrection*, 209-10.

[288] Caroline Walker Bynum, "Material Continuity, Personal Survival, and the Resurrection of the Body," *History of Religions* 30, no. 1 (1990): 51-85; Dalferth, *Creatures of Possibility*, xviii.

[289] The verb (ἀλλαγησόμεθα), from the adjective *another* (ἄλλος), means changing form without changing identity. *BDAG*, 45-47; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1295 & n.187.

[290] Dahl, *Resurrection of the Body*, 49.

[291] Brower, *Aquinas's Ontology*, 202-203.

[292] Wright, *The Resurrection*, 477.

[293] Harding, *Paul's Eschatological Anthropology*, 405; Kooton, *Paul's Anthropology in Context*, 305.

[294] Kasemann, *Perspectives on Paul*, 8-9.

[295] Fitzpatrick, *Aquinas on Bodily Identity*, 124.

[296] Parnas and Sass, "Structure of Self-Consciousness in Schizophrenia," 528; Rosenzweig, *Star of*

living.[297] It underlies, but is not, the inner life.[298] As psychiatry bears witness, identity lacks form.[299] It centers the psychological contents but is not the contents,[300] without which we are bare stare.[301] Rather, who lives and is formed in life is the personal character.[302] Each individual's life is this character.[303] "Character is the fixed individual form of a human," Jung perceived.[304] Character is our bundle of self-things, what matters to us, what drives us.[305] The "self worth wanting," Kathy Wilkes observed, is "something with a character; where emotions, decisions, actions, and reactions spring from a reasonably coherent cluster of beliefs and values."[306] Charles Taylor concurred, "What I am as a self … is essentially defined by the way things have significance for me."[307]

Humanity has repeatedly found personal character centered on personal identity under different terminologies.[308] Like *soul* but without its contested substantiality,[309] *personal character* is individual essence.[310] Jennifer Radden terms it "characterization identity," "the attributes comprising individuals' own unique self-concepts," the "beliefs, values, desires, and other psychological features."[311] Rahner describes the "categorical experience" built on the "irreducible datum of existence."[312] The Hegelian *I* is "individual personality" with "its self-identity."[313] The "I," Hegel noted, is "a *content* which it *differentiates*

Redemption, 76-79; Taylor, *Sources of the Self*, 27.

297 Baker, *Persons and Bodies*, 59, 69, 92; Gillman, *Death of Death*, 266; Pannenberg, *ST*, III, 561-62.

298 Hart, *Experience of God*, 198-99.

299 Deikman, "'I' = Awareness," 422.

300 Tillich, *ST*, III, 27-28.

301 Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 194.

302 Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, I, 485; Cooper, *Holy Eros*, 12.

303 Guardini, *The World and the Person*, 112-13, 119.

304 *Modern Man*, 74.

305 Henry, *Material Phenomenology*, 6, 132; Highet, *Man's Unconquerable Mind*, 8; Perry, *Identity, Personal Identity, and the Self*, 234.

306 "Know Thyself," in *Models of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher and Jonathan Shear (Thorverton: Imprint, 1999), 29.

307 *Sources of the Self*, 74.

308 Horst, *Cognitive Pluralism*, 324; Johnston, *Surviving Death*, 261-63, 316-17; Krapiec, *I-Man*, 90-91.

309 Veli-Matti Karkkainen, "Multidimensional Monism," in *Neuroscience and the Soul*, ed. Thomas M. Crisp, et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 219.

310 Edwards, *After Death?*, 81-82; Michael O'Laughlin, "Anthropology of Evagrius Ponticus and Its Sources," in *Origen of Alexandria*, ed. Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen (Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1988), 359.

311 "Multiple Selves," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 550-51.

312 *Foundations of Christian Faith*, 26-35.

313 Taylor, *Hegel*, 298.

from itself; for it is … the bifurcation of itself."[314] Other terms have been used. Personal character and identity can be the narrative self, constituting our experiences and dispositions, built upon the subjective person.[315] Or each of us is self-as-object and self-as-subject.[316] The word combinations are unending. One reviewer decided, "Contemporary human identity has become a cauldron of conflicting and relativised ego-expressions jostling for a safe anchor amidst the chaos of pluriformity."[317] The name game vindicates in other contexts the philosophical serviceability of numerical identity and qualitative identity;[318] the former has one instance like personal identity, and the latter tracks its changes like personal character.[319] Despite the many labels, once the mysteries of existence, awareness, and substance are conceded,[320] the various formulations see *individual* as a package of inner features centered on the unitary identity.[321] This, fortuitously, is also the everyday sense of *individual*.[322]

This exploration concentrates on the *essential* self, not the Christian Neo-Platonist idea of essentially *relating* to Creator and creations,[323] because the elemental *I* is the more common understanding[324] and, given the personal identity's unity, more sensible. The essential *I* also taxes the thesis more by implying indivisibility, because, if the individual existed only in relation to God,[325] nothing precludes division. God can relate to a bifurcation as easily as a unity. If God is the one constant, then indivisibility is not a constant.[326] Francis knew, "what a man is in the sight of God, so much he is, and no more."[327]

---

314 *Phenomenology of Spirit*, 486.

315 Parnas and Sass, "Structure of Self-Consciousness in Schizophrenia," 525; Vogeley and Gallagher, "Self in the Brain," 118-19, 129.

316 Legrand, "Phenomenological Dimensions of Bodily Self-Consciousness," 205.

317 Graham McFarlane, "Strange News from Another Star," in *Persons, Divine and Human*, ed. Christoph Schwobel and Colin E. Gunton (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 110.

318 Derek Parfit, *Reasons and Persons* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1986), 201-202.

319 Gallagher, "Diversity of Selves," 15-16.

320 Lopez, *Gift and the Unity of Being*, 1.

321 Kierkegaard, *Two Ages*, 73.

322 Galen Strawson, "The Self," in *Models of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher and Jonathan Shear (Thorverton: Imprint, 1999), 3.

323 Pabst, *Metaphysics*, 248-51, 270, 286, 300, 383, 442.

324 Baker, *Persons and Bodies*, 125; Yu, *Being and Relation*, 61, 67.

325 Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, III, 204-207; Guardini, *The World and the Person*, 21, 31, 141; Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 182.

326 Adrienne von Speyr, *Gates of Eternal Life*, trans. Corona Sharp (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1983), 17.

327 "Words of Admonition," in *The Writings of St Francis of Assisi* (Philadelphia: Dolphin, 1905), 20.

Indeed, if the individual is composed of relationships, it divides eventually.[328] That is what composites do.[329] A relationship-based individual, a proponent observed, has "no essential, stable, autonomous self." Instead, it "is continuously reconstituted by the complex interactions." "Insofar as the self is always a self-in-relationship, when it is embedded in a new relational matrix it becomes a new self."[330] So, if relationship-based, the individual is unavoidably divisible as multiple relationships come and go.[331] In contrast, the essential *I* resists division. In any event, the in-itself individual can co-exist with the relational model if that is desired, but limiting the examination to the plainest model is less presumptive about to what extent the relational model contributes. So, the *I* can be anything else, but, at a minimum, is the inherently unifying first-person perspective, called personal identity, and the accretion of a life led, called personal character.

6) <u>Personal character is divided.</u>

Despite the earthly body's singularity and the personal identity's unifying, *individual* is widely known as a multiplicity.[332] Misunderstanding this misunderstands this life.[333] "Every man lives in the twofold *I*," resolved Buber.[334] Poets know this, whether Auden's "Double Man," whose "bones cannot help reassembling themselves,"[335] Dickinson's "cleavage in my mind" unable to "make them fit,"[336] Whitman's "I contradict myself," "I contain multitudes,"[337] Wordsworth's "often do I seem / Two consciousnesses,"[338] Goethe's "Two souls live in me, alas, / Forever warring with each other,"[339] or Pope's "This light and darkness in our chaos join'd, / What shall divide? The God within the mind."[340] Before the Common Era, Catullus elegized, "I love, I hate. / You ask why do

---

328 Kierkegaard, *Sickness Unto Death*, 13; Reddy, *How Infants Know Minds*, 122.

329 Gregory of Nyssa, *Life of Moses*, Bk II (p. 101); John of Damascus, "Fount of Knowledge," III,I,8 (p. 185); Amy Mullin, "Selves, Diverse and Divided," *Hypatia* 10, no. 4 (1995): 6-8.

330 Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 146, 160, 167.

331 William James, *Principles of Psychology*, 2 vols., vol. I (New York: Henry Holt, 1890), 294; Turner, *Theology, Psychology and the Plural Self*, 46, 52-53, 82-83.

332 Gerson, *Knowing Persons*, 277; James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 168; Krapiec, *I-Man*, 100, 107, 198, 202; Leonard Lawlor, "The Postmodern Self," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 705; Lowe, *Subjects of Experience*, 30-31.

333 Kierkegaard, *Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses*, 99.

334 *I and Thou*, 65.

335 *The Double Man*, 12 (prol.).

336 "Life," in *Collected Poems* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1993), CVI (p. 57).

337 "Song of Myself," 51 (p. 113).

338 *The Prelude* … (New York: Rinehart, 1954), II,31-33.

339 *Faust*, lns 1136-41.

340 "Essay on Man," in *The Works* (Ware: Wordsworth Eds., 1995), 204-205 (II,IV, VI).

this. / I know not, yet feel this. / And it can excruciate."[341] The subjective sciences too accept we are complex characters on unified platforms.[342] Psychologists, for instance, treat patients as singular identities anchoring empirical pluralities.[343] Jung saw, "What drives people to war with themselves is the intuition or the knowledge that they consist of two persons in opposition to one another."[344] A person's life has Dilthey's "double aspect."[345] Therefore, Wordsworth's "the crowded solitude"[346] is our shared experience[347] and why aloneness is not always loneliness.[348] Wakefulness posits two *I*'s,[349] and each human heart is two hearts.[350] "With their mixed minds," Radden observed, "normal people are far from simple unities" "and rarely entirely 'single-minded' in its goals and attributes"; "variations among normal people in respect to self-unity" are "a valuable part of human nature."[351] James perceived we are not "ideal abstractions," but "concrete human beings" of "intermediate varieties and mixtures."[352] The individual moves between opposing voices as if separate characters in a single story,[353] Arendt's one mind "willing and nilling."[354] Wherever *is* and *ought* are, bifurcation is.[355] The singular individual is legion.[356] Plato, for this reason, analogized a self to a city of multiple residents.[357] The individual consists of competing personalities of divine and beast.[358] In short, "different

---

341 *Odi et amo. Quare id faciam fortasse requiris. Nescio, sed fieri sentio et excrucior.* "Poem 85," in *Carmina* (Perseus Project, accessed 1 Aug. 2020).

342 Henry, *I Am the Truth*, 150.

343 James, *Principles of Psychology*, I, 224-25, 338, 344-46, 371-73, 400-401; Turner, *Theology, Psychology and the Plural Self*, 76, 119-20, 180-81.

344 *Modern Man*, 236-37.

345 *Introduction to the Human Sciences*, 160 (II.1.3).

346 *The Prelude* …, IX,29.

347 Gallagher, "Diversity of Selves," 21; Kung, *Eternal Life?*, 137-38; Wilkes, *Real People*, 102, 130.

348 Arendt, "Thinking," 185; Kierkegaard, *Stages*, 333-34; Montaigne, "Essays," I,39 (p. 177).

349 Soren Kierkegaard, *The Concept of Anxiety*, trans. Reidar Thomte (Princeton Univ. Press, 1980), 313.

350 Blondel, *Action*, 115, 167 [110, 169].

351 "Multiple Selves," 547, 561.

352 *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 164.

353 Hubert J.M. Hermans, "Dialogical Self," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 660.

354 "Willing," 94, 109.

355 Mark C. Taylor, *Journeys to Selfhood* (Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1980), 48.

356 Hart, *Experience of God*, 201; Mooney, "Pseudonyms and 'Style'," 198.

357 *The Republic*, 368e-369b, 435b-c.

358 John M. Rist, "Plato Says That We Have Tripartite Souls," in *Man, Soul and Body* (Brookfield: Variorum, 1996), 103-104, 116.

persons," Proust realized, "compose our personality."[359]

Extreme cases highlight this particularly, such as multiple personalities (nka dissociative identity disorder),[360] where memory buffers become pathological.[361] Personalities become problematic not when plural, which is normal, but when their plurality becomes unworkable.[362] Professionals treat alternate personalities, but we all have subpersonalities.[363] Another odd case is commissurotomy patients whose brain halves act independently; one person both senses and does not sense the same object and both registers and does not register the same idea.[364] Such abnormals do more than illustrate the individual as divisible, but magnify normal selfhood's divisibility. Each of us has two cerebral hemispheres with autonomously different orientations—the right half perceives and intuits holistically and the left half analyzes and knows sequentially.[365]

Though the personal *character* is divided as in conflicted, it is as a rule not divided as in separated. This is because the personal *identity* unifies experience for self-preservation.[366] The identity centers the *I*'s of our desires and activities.[367] First-person experience singularizes the divisible life.[368] As the centering *I* resists division, however, the lived *I*, the personal character, constantly divides with denial, dissociation, self-deception, and repression.[369] Each self, therefore, is a unity in either harmony or disharmony, and both imply multiples because even harmony takes two.[370] Kierkegaard summarizes, "there is not one single living human … who does not secretly harbor … an inner strife

---

359 *In Search of Lost Time*, V: 4.

360 The DSM-5 defines it as "two or more distinct personality states" of "marked discontinuity in sense of self" with "[r]ecurrent gaps in the recall … inconsistent with ordinary forgetting" that "cause clinically significant distress or impairment in … functioning."

361 Carter and Frith, *Mapping the Mind*, 175-76; Radden, "Multiple Selves," 552-60, 564-67.

362 Hermans, "Dialogical Self," 662; Williams, *Problems of the Self*, 17.

363 Turner, *Theology, Psychology and the Plural Self*, 90, 101, 179.

364 Wilkes, *Real People*, 141.

365 McGilchrist, *The Master and His Emissary*, 1-3, 11, 19, 27-28, 40-44, 52, 220, 226, 330, 352-53, 428.

366 Harry Frankfurt, "Freedom of the Will and the Concept of a Person," *J. of Philosophy* 68 (1971): 18; James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 167; Wilkes, *Real People*, 142-43.

367 Deikman, "'I' = Awareness," 421.

368 Strawson, "The Self," 13.

369 Marcia Cavell, "The Self: Growth, Integrity, and Coming Apart," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 601.

370 Arendt, "Thinking," 183, 186; "Willing," 64; McGilchrist, *The Master and His Emissary*, 128.

…."[371] Hegel agreed: "I am not one of these two taking part in the strife, but I am both the combatants, and am the strife itself."[372]

Individual has had this one constant as individuals reflect—each of us is one and many. According to the ancient parable, we each are two warring dogs dominated by the one that the individual choses to feed.[373] In Judaism, each of us is two opposing impulses.[374] The *Rule of the Community*, as an example, explains that we each have a spirit of darkness and a spirit of light until the dark spirit is ripped out on judgment day.[375] The church fathers believed each of us has a personal angel and personal demon from which we are choosing constantly.[376] Such concretizations of our two inner orientations in the one person have been recorded since antiquity.[377] Even those believing the self consists of billions of neurons explain that our competing personalities are the neurons coalescing like a republic's citizens into parties.[378] No matter the approach, after differences in idioms are shelved and nihilism is flushed out, the scholarly consensus follows the common observation that personal character (centered on personal identity) is divided.[379] In this life, we each are two selves[380] or, as persons are normally counted, a divided self.[381] "[W]e are, I know not how," Montaigne saw, "double in ourselves."[382] Socrates was right: An individual is at least two inner selves.[383]

7) <u>Scripture reflects personal identity centering divided character.</u>

The divided character with unified identity is reflected in Christian anthropology too, partly because Scripture is realistic, not theoretical.[384] It lacks philosopher terms like

---

371 *Sickness Unto Death*, 136.

372 *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion*, trans. E.B. Spiers and J.B. Sanderson, 3 vols., vol. I (New York: Humanities, 1968), 64.

373 Billy Graham, *The Holy Spirit* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1988), 89-90.

374 John G. Gammie, "Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature," *JBL* 93, no. 3 (1974): 357-58.

375 Kooton, *Paul's Anthropology in Context*, 18-20, 24, 92.

376 Gregory of Nyssa, *Life of Moses*, Bk II (p. 43).

377 Balthasar, *Theo-Logic*, III, 387-88.

378 Douglas Hofstadter, *Metamagical Themas* (New York: Basic Books, 1985), 782-90.

379 Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 181; McGilchrist, *The Master and His Emissary*, 243, 461-62.

380 Koehn, *Nature of Evil*, 239; Montaigne, "Essays," II,16 (p. 469).

381 James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 498-99.

382 *Complete Works*, trans. Charles Cotton (Philadelphia: William T. Amies, 1879), 315.

383 Plato, *The Republic*, 439b-e, 443d-e, 580d, 603c-d, 604b.

384 Berkouwer, *Man: Image of God*, 30 n.37, 194-95; Richardson, *Christian Apologetics*, 224.

ipseity, form, or Me*,[385] but uses lyricist ones like soul, spirit, or heart.[386] It also uses definite descriptions or indexicals, such as Jesus' declaration "I Am" (Mat. 14:27//Mark 6:50//John 6:20). Scripture's principal designations, however, are those from real life—names.[387] Names define, separate, and signal being,[388] such as Father, Son, and Spirit[389] or the Tetragrammaton (Exo. 3:13-15),[390] which is emphatically in the first-person singular. Knowing God's name is knowing God (Isa. 52:6). Salvation is in no other name (Acts 4:12). Names designate even in tough cases like the raised dead. Lazarus is Lazarus before and after death (John 11:17-44), as are all the revivified.[391] Names identify eternal destiny (Rev. 13:8). Scripture's personal designations entail unified identities, even postmortem. Neither the spirit-mistress of Endor nor Saul nor Samuel had difficulty with Samuel's identity in death (1Sa. 28:3-15).[392] When the transfigured Jesus met the deceased Moses and Elijah, the names identified (Luke 9:30, 33//Mat. 17:3//Mark 9:4). Identities in the Lazarus parable were likewise seamless into death (Luke 16:19-31). The resurrected Jesus too had full identity with the crucified Jesus.[393]

Unlike personal designations, personal integrity is elastic in Scripture.[394] Identities blur, for instance, when the Son comes from God, the Spirit comes from the Father, the Son and Father are of one, and the Father is in the Son and vice-versa (John 8:42, 10:30, 38, 14:11, 15:26). The Church took each Divine as a personal identity (*hypostasis*), and God was not a fourth.[395] Another Scriptural identity challenge is God making "accommodation within" each beloved, the Father abiding within us through the Spirit, we being in Christ and He in us, each in God's image (Gen. 1:26-27, 5:1-3; John 14:16-20, 23-24,

---

385 This is Galen Strawson's terminology. "The Self," 16.

386 Colin Brown, "Spirit," in *New Int'l Dict. of NT Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 689-708; Gunther Harder, "Soul," Ibid., 676-86; Theo Sorg, "Heart," Ibid., 180-84.

387 Jorge J.E. Gracia, *Individuality* (State Univ. of New York Press, 1988), 201-202; Pannenberg, *Anthropology in Theological Perspective*, 294.

388 Montaigne, "Essays," II,16 (p. 468).

389 Basil the Great, "Letters," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Ser.*, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 210.4 (p. 250).

390 Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 295; Zizioulas, "On Being a Person," 33.

391 1Ki. 17:17-23; 2Ki. 4:20-35, 13:21; Mat. 9:23-25//Mark 5:35-42//Luke 8:49-55; 7:12-15; Acts 9:37-41, 20:9-12.

392 Cooper, *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting*, 65.

393 Jenson, *ST*, I, 174, 198-200; Karkkainen, *Christology*, 151; Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, 187.

394 Jenson, *ST*, I, 119.

395 Lewis Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2010), 108, 325-26; Jenson, *ST*, I, 118-19, 152; Monk of the West, *Christianity and the Doctrine of Non-Dualism*, trans. Alvin Moore, Jr. and Marie M. Hansen (Hillsdale: Sophia Perennis, 2004), 20.

17:20-24; 1Jo. 2:6, 24, 3:23-24, 4:12-16).[396] This unbounded relation between God and believer does not endanger the latter's existence,[397] but exposes unity without lost identity.[398] Identity does not cease although you are "not your own" (1Co. 6:19),[399] but the individual, when uniting with the other, retains identity.[400] Salvation involves participating individually in God's personal existence[401] and includes identifying with Christ.[402]

In Scripture, the earthly body, the substrate for the single psychophysical entity,[403] is not the personal whole, but the personal physicality.[404] That is, the person, while a spirit-body,[405] is spirit-based (1Co. 12:12-16, 24-26; 2Co. 5:1-2).[406] At death, the unity of the spirit-body undeniably breaks;[407] "the body without spirit is death" (Jam. 2:26). At home in the body is exiled from the Lord (2Co. 5:6-8).[408] The individual's inner spirit is often conceptualized as *conflicted soul* (Psa. 42:5, 11, 43:5), *heart and heart* (12:2), or *core* in Hebrew (51:5-6, 64:6)[409] or *belly* in Greek (John 7:38).[410] This inner life, unlike the earthly body, can live eternally[411] and includes, as science philosopher Nancey Murphy lists, "memory, moral character, interpersonal relations, and, especially, relationship with God."[412] Scripture reveals this inner duality.[413] Otherwise, "Let your left hand not know

---

396 Demarest, *Cross and Salvation*, 330-33.

397 Guardini, *The World and the Person*, 145; Kruse, *Letters of John*, 81, 143, 165.

398 I. Howard Marshall, *Epistles of John*, ed. Gordon D. Fee, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 202; Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 187.

399 Christensen, "The Problem, Promise, and Process of Theosis," 28-29; Cyril, *John*, II, Bk 11, ch 11 [734] (p. 303).

400 Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority*, I, 73; Lubac, *Catholicism*, 330; *Theological Fragments*, trans. R.H. Balinski (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1984), 60-61.

401 Cooper, *Naturally Human, Supernaturally God*, 41; Williams, *Architecture of Theology*, 219; Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 49-50.

402 Charlton, *Non-Dualism*, 15.

403 Murphy, *Bodies and Souls, or Spirited Bodies?*, 22, 141.

404 Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology*, 79, 84, 112-13, 154-55, 212.

405 Philip E. Hughes, "Is the Soul Immortal?," in *Rethinking Hell*, ed. Christopher M. Date, et al. (Eugene: Cascade, 2014), 188.

406 Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology*, 175.

407 Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 555.

408 Harding, *Paul's Eschatological Anthropology*, 356.

409 "Midst [קֶרֶב]" in the construct to *person* means the "inward part of man," as in "seat" "of thought and emotion." Francis Brown, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon [BDB]* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2012), 899.

410 Bultmann, *Theology of the NT*, I: 20.1 (pp. 221-22); Cooper, "Biblical Anthropology," 219-20, 227; Geisler, *ST*, 721-22.

411 Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 159.

412 *Bodies and Souls, or Spirited Bodies?*, 132, 138.

413 Blosser, *Become Like the Angels*, 36.

what your right does" (Mat. 6:3) is literally nonsense.[414] Scripture shows, Bornkamm found, "Man's discord is part of his human nature. He himself is the contradiction. This is the 'I' of [Paul's] cry 'Wretched man that I am!'"[415] This understanding of the individual's divisibility is, however, best recognized in Scripture's portrayal of our two orientations, the next topic.

8) <u>Each individual is oriented towards and away from God.</u>

Though pagan anthropology uses dualisms of substances, like body and soul,[416] Christian anthropology uses a duality of lifeways, understood chiefly as for and against God,[417] but also Spirit and Sin,[418] morality and immorality,[419] faith and unfaith,[420] towards eternity and towards death,[421] or Augustine's *caritas* and *cupiditas* (love oriented outwardly and inwardly).[422] Early Christian training was in the Ways of Life and Death.[423] The designations mostly used here for such concepts are the encompassing ones of godly and ungodly. The NT "laid the foundations of the structure," Guardini discerned, "a division," "a separation of two 'worlds.'"[424] The NT life, independent of "ontological structure," Bultmann wrote, "offers the possibility of choosing one's goal, of deciding for good or evil, for or against God."[425] In primordial sinfulness, God's image, namely us,[426] chooses between God and us.[427] Which orientation is natural need not be decided; we each are both, jostling positive and negative.[428] The individual is thus split, Augustine

---

414 R.C.H. Lenski, *Interpretation of St Matthew's Gospel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1964), 257-58; John Nolland, *Gospel of Matthew*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 276.

415 *Paulus*, 127.

416 Brookins, "Greco-Roman Perspectives on Anthropology," 44-45.

417 Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 158-59; Gunton, *Father, Son and Holy Spirit*, 161; Jenson, *ST*, II, 137; Pannenberg, *Anthropology in Theological Perspective*, 21; Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 63-64, 156; Taylor, *Secular Age*, 276.

418 Harding, *Paul's Eschatological Anthropology*, 4, 87.

419 Kierkegaard, *Two Ages*, 73.

420 Dalferth, *Creatures of Possibility*, 26-27, 197-98.

421 White, *Life Beyond Death*, 26.

422 Arendt, *Love and Augustine*, 17-19, 23, 27, 30, 34, 77-78, 90-91, 94-95.

423 Milavec, *The Didache*, 3 (1:1), 44.

424 *The World and the Person*, 93.

425 *Theology of the NT*, I: 18.4 (p. 209).

426 Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics III §43-44*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, et al., Study ed. (New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 43.2 (pp. 26, 43 [029, 047]); Pannenberg, *Human Nature*, 13.

427 Guardini, *The World and the Person*, 42-43; Watkin, "Kierkegaard--Dying and Eternal Life," 106-107.

428 Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, IV, 188; Guardini, *Freedom, Grace, and Destiny*, 34; Kempis, *Imitation of Christ*, II,IX,7.

realized.[429] On the split pivots ethical life,[430] worshipping God or self.[431] "[W]hatever is done or devised among men is," Luther saw, "either righteousness or sin before God."[432] Even if postlapsarian humans are in essence totally depraved, they are in reality dually oriented,[433] God's child and God's enemy.[434] We are godly in essence and ungodly in practice,[435] or, in postmodern terms, essentially good and existentially estranged.[436] Regardless of what labels the dualistic sides, each of us is both.[437]

Temptation entails clash.[438] We each choose Adam's assertion of self and Jesus' obedience of divine.[439] Balthasar speaks for those who are to glorify God wholly:[440] "the powers of evil are not simply alien and external," but "a shaft … that reaches down to the deepest abysses. Thus, he stands in a baffling solidarity with the … superior forces of negativity …, while at the same time he is fighting off these same powers as far as he can."[441] While no one opts for evil entirely because something longs for God,[442] "For the most part, men are by nature," the humanist prince accepted, "prone to unbelief, inclined to evil …."[443] "All have sinned" (Rom. 3:23). Christ, therefore, addresses everyone, "you being evil" (Luke 11:13//Mat. 7:11).[444] We cannot occupy the other extreme either, perfection being boundless.[445] Only One lacks division[446] and, therefore, is entirely good (Mat. 19:17//Mark 10:18//Luke 18:19). Everyone else is not wholly holy,[447] though the

---

[429] *Confessions*, VIII,v,11, ix,21-23 (pp. 140, 147-49).

[430] C. Stephen Evans and Robert C. Roberts, "Ethics," in *Oxford Handbook of Kierkegaard*, ed. John Lippitt and George Pattison (Oxford Univ. Press, 2013), 224-25, 228.

[431] Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 188.

[432] "De Servo Arbitrio," 308.

[433] Berkouwer, *Man: Image of God*, 38, 65, 140-41, 146-55.

[434] Greggs, *Barth, Origen, and Universal Salvation*, 207; Luther, *Galatians*, 226 [WA 401,367 (3:6)].

[435] Olson, *Mosaic of Christian Belief*, 204, 208.

[436] Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 160.

[437] Freud, *Future of an Illusion*, VII.F (p. 659).

[438] Baker, *Persons and Bodies*, 157; Kempis, *Imitation of Christ*, I,XIII,3.

[439] Brian S. Rosner, "Son of God at the Centre," in *Anthropology and NT Theology*, ed. Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds (New York: T&T Clark, 2019), 234.

[440] Gunton, *Father, Son and Holy Spirit*, 9.

[441] *Theo-Drama*, IV, 137.

[442] Thomas Aquinas, *Compendium of Theology*, trans. Richard J. Regan (Oxford Univ. Press, 2009), § 174 (p. 135); Perl, *Theophany*, 55-56; Tillich, *ST*, II, 167.

[443] Erasmus, "De Libero Arbitrio," 41.

[444] Henry, *Words of Christ*, 22.

[445] Gregory of Nyssa, *Life of Moses*, Bk I,Prol. (pp. 4-5).

[446] Gilson, *Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy*, 92.

[447] Balthasar, "Epilogue: Apokatastasis," 242-43; Barth, *CD II/2*, § 39.2 (p. 746); Cabasilas, *Life in*

healthy live life whole, leaning good or evil each moment.[448] Each of us is oriented godly and ungodly[449] or, in superficially secular terms, good and evil.[450] Taking life as either-or, Kierkegaard understood, is "tragic proof of" a "flabby … soul."[451] No one "is so lowly that he can do no wrong," nor is anyone "too lowly to carry the image of God."[452] We are both an "Edenic echo" with a "side of deep depravity."[453] God's image is certainly godly but also more or less godless.[454] While the extraordinary could theoretically be entirely consumed with hatred or utterly permeated by God, neither is realistic.[455]

Scripture emphasizes these dueling personal orientations.[456] "You're from the below; I am from the above. You're of this world; of this world I am not" (John 8:23).[457] We are toward or against God (8:44, 47).[458] Humanity began this way. Although partaking of knowing good and evil meant God's condemnation, to God's image endowed with godly wisdom and love,[459] partaking offered godlikeness (Gen. 2:9, 17, 3:5-6, 22). We each are His image to a degree, even the unbelieving, even if infinitesimally.[460] The pedigree is indestructible.[461] Humanity's "divine likeness," de Lubac noted, "may be dimmed, veiled, disfigured, but it is always there."[462] The image is unequally distributed among us —the best heroically holy, the worst not wholly lacking.[463] God's image connects us to God,[464] but, even when unspoiled, was torn between God's glory and God-like glory and,

---

Christ, Bk II § 7 (p. 77).

448 Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory*, 415.

449 Charlton, *Non-Dualism*, 53.

450 Fromm, "Modern Man and the Future," 27.

451 *Either/Or*, II, 145.

452 *Upbuilding Discourses*, 210.

453 *Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses*, 126-27; *For Self-Examination*, 20.

454 "[T]he human race [*Slægt*] is certainly related [*i Slægt*] to the divine, but it is also more or less degenerate [*vanslægtet*]." *Upbuilding Discourses*, 231.

455 Benedict XVI, *Spe Salvi. Encyclical Letter of 30 Nov. 2007* (Boston: Pauline, 2007), 45-46; Dalferth, *Creatures of Possibility*, 78; Marsilius, *Defensor Pacis*, II, I,XI,6 (p. 42).

456 Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, IV, 184; Richardson, *Christian Apologetics*, 131.

457 Schwarz, *The Human Being*, 19.

458 Taylor, "Humanity," 321-23.

459 Harrison, *God's Many-Splendored Image*, 15.

460 Geisler, *ST*, 57; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 45; Rae, "Salvation in Community," 190.

461 Lossky, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 124.

462 *Catholicism*, 283.

463 Harrison, *God's Many-Splendored Image*, 35; Spaemann, *Essays in Anthropology*, 60-61.

464 Harrison, *God's Many-Splendored Image*, 187.

choosing disobediently, achieved separation from God.[465] On this primordial anthropology, Christianity builds (Gen. 9:6; 1Co. 11:7; 2Co. 3:18).[466]

God presents to His people "blessing and curse," "life and good, death and evil, for I command you today to love the Lord your God, walk in His ways, …, so you may live …, but, if your heart turns and you disobey, … you will perish in perishing" (Deu. 11:26, 30:15-20). We choose both ways (Jer. 21:8; Jam. 3:5-12),[467] and, to the extent we choose against God, we are to *turn back* (שׁוּב) or *change* our *mind* (μετανοέω)—that is, orient away from wrath and toward life (*e.g.*, Acts 26:17-18; 2Co. 3:16, 12:21; 1Th. 1:9; Jam. 5:20; 1Pe. 2:25).[468] But we don't, not always. "To each by his deeds He will give: eternal life to those who … endur[e] in doing good, … but wrath and fury to those partisans who, while disobeying the truth, obey unrighteousness" (Rom. 2:6-8).[469]

The NT often expresses for-self and for-God as two forces—the flesh of *I* and the Spirit in *me*.[470] The flesh's downside is not living in it, which is this life, but its orienting this life, which is death.[471] The problem is not the carnal, but carnality. "Love not the world nor things in the world …, the flesh's craving …. The world with its cravings is passing, but anyone doing God's will abides into the age" (1Jo. 2:15-17). "The flesh's mindset is death, but the spirit's mindset is life and peace, for the flesh's mindset is hostile to God"; "while the body is death through sin, the spirit is life through righteousness" (Rom. 8:6-7, 10-11). We live out these opposing mindsets[472] and choose between them: "While I live no more, in me lives Christ. As now I live in flesh, I live in faith" (Gal. 2:20). But we resist the call: "the flesh craves against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh" (5:17). Among less certain points, the call is for a "transformed identity," Susan Eastman noted, but the struggle "suggest[s] two contrasting yet concurrent

---

465 Mostert, *God and the Future*, 206.

466 Berkouwer, *Man: Image of God*, 44; McConville, *Being Human in God's World*, 28, 43; Schwobel, "Human Being as Relational Being," 149.

467 Luther, "De Servo Arbitrio," 316; Martin, *Will Many Be Saved?*, 91.

468 Demarest, *Cross and Salvation*, 250-51.

469 Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 154.

470 Cooper, *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting*, 109-10; Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, 232-34; Watkin, "Kierkegaard--Dying and Eternal Life," 105.

471 Bultmann, *Theology of the NT*, I: 23.1 (pp. 239-40); Richard J. Mouw, "The Relevance of Biblical Eschatology," in *Christian Doctrine of Humanity*, ed. Oliver D. Crisp and Fred Sanders (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018), 65.

472 Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 91.

realms of existence in which 'I live.' The first is characterized as 'the flesh' and the second is characterized as 'the faith.'"[473]

The source of the orientations is outside the thesis, which is intentional because the source of ungodliness is controversial. It is sufficient here to know we are earth-spirit composites (Gen. 2:7, 3:17-19; Psa. 104:29-30),[474] infirm and willing (Mat. 26:41//Mark 14:38; 14:33).[475] The foolishly best explanation of humanity's fall need not be endorsed.[476] "To want to give a logical explanation of the coming of sin into the world is a stupidity that can occur only to people who are comically worried about finding an explanation," Kierkegaard disapproved.[477] Only the blatant must be acknowledged—each mere human, or nearly all of them, mixes both orientations.[478] So, both are true: "To the extent we say 'we have no sin,' we mislead ourselves," and "All abiding in Him are not sinning" (1Jo. 1:8, 3:6). In close order the same author says believers necessarily sin and necessarily do not, and the text hardly bears the traditional escape: The first statement uses the noun "sin" and present indicative "have" for *occasional* sinning, and the second uses the verb "sin" itself in the present indicative for *habitual* sinning.[479] Rather than straining at grammatic distinctions for sinning frequencies, the orientations are the paradox. When sinning, we refuse God, and, when godly, we do not. Each individual is demonic and divine.[480]

Faith, especially if understood as believing or not, might seem to be an exception and be either-or, but here too we resist extremes.[481] Scripture repeatedly states the obvious: Individuals can have *great* faith, *much* faith, or *little* faith (Mat. 8:26, 14:31, 15:28, 16:8, 17:20; 8:10//Luke 7:9; Mat. 6:30//Luke 12:28). The apostles sought more faith and were thankful when it increased (17:5; 2Co. 10:15; 1Th. 3:10; 2Th. 1:3). We are to love God with our *whole* being (Deu. 6:5; Mat. 22:37//Mark 12:30//Luke 10:27; 1Th. 5:23), recognizing that partial is the norm.[482] Even in worshiping the risen Christ the

---

[473] Ibid., 156.

[474] Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 65.

[475] Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, I, 199-200; Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology*, 110-11.

[476] Dahl, *Resurrection of the Body*, 69, 82; Pascal, *Pensees*, 445 (p. 124).

[477] *Concept of Anxiety*, 320-22.

[478] Come, *Kierkegaard as Theologian*, 132-33; Torrance, *Atonement*, 314. Christ as no *mere* human is no exception. Guardini, *Freedom, Grace, and Destiny*, 195-96.

[479] Kruse, *Letters of John*, 126-32.

[480] Tillich, *ST*, III, 231.

[481] Barth, *CD II/2*, § 35.2 (p. 348).

[482] Dahl, *Resurrection of the Body*, 59; France, *Matthew*, 846; Hartshorne, *Logic of Perfection*, 40.

disciples were *two-minded* (ἐδίστασαν,[483] Mat. 28:17). To describe divided orientations, *James* coined *dual-souled* (δίψυχος, 1:8, 4:8), blending *two* and *soul*,[484] which likely reflects the Platonic divided self.[485] The neologism resurfaced in *The Shepherd of Hermas* where multiple uses (x55) confirm it is a person divided between two spirits, good and evil.[486] We all this way unless the innermost being wills only the good.[487] Although doubt displaces faith,[488] both go together in us,[489] which is no contradiction but again coexisting orientations.[490] Each of us has "as God has distributed faith's measure" (Rom. 12:3), which varies until "complet[ed] … into the measure of Christ's fullness" (Eph. 4:7, 11-16). Some scholars are not "prepared" to accept that this says faith varies,[491] but prepared scholars recognize faith comes by degrees.[492] Understood is the cry, "I believe; help my unbelief" (Mark 9:24).[493]

Paul analogized a person's two orientations to two persons: "disrobe[] the old man with its practices and put on the new, the renewing into true knowledge after his Creator's icon" (Col. 3:9-10).[494] "Walk no more as the nations walk, … alienated from God's life …. [P]ut aside from your former living the worn-out man, corrupted by its wily cravings, … renewing your mind's spirit, and … put on the new man created by God in truth's righteousness" (Eph. 4:17-24). Andrew Lincoln perceived, "the old person is in a process of moral corruption" "under the dominion of this present age," and

---

483 This blends δίς, adverb for "two," and στάσις, "place," to mean "being uncertain" about which place or position to take on an issue. *BDAG*, 252.

484 Peter H. Davids, *Epistle of James*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque Ibid. (1982), 74-75; Luke Timothy Johnson, *Letter of James*, ed. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 287.

485 George H. van Kooten, "'Two Inclinations' and James' Anthropological Designation of Humankind as 'Double-Minded'," in *Origins of Evil in Early Judaism and Christianity*, ed. H.M. Patmore, et al. (Cambridge Univ. Press, Forthcoming 2020).

486 Carolyn Osiek, *Shepherd of Hermas*, ed. Helmut Koester, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 20, 30.

487 Kierkegaard, *Upbuilding Discourses*, 25, 30, 67.

488 *Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses*, 27; *Book on Adler*, 184.

489 Calvin, *Institutes*, III,2,37 (p. 379); Demarest, *Cross and Salvation*, 273-75.

490 Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 187.

491 Moo, *Romans*, 778-80.

492 Aquinas, *Compendium*, § 215 (p. 169); Basil, "De Spiritu Sancto," 9.22; Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 721-22; Origen, *On First Principles*, I,3,4, 3,6, IV,4,2 (pp. 32, 34-35, 316); Schreiner, *Romans*, 652-53.

493 R.T. France, *Gospel of Mark*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 368.

494 Demarest, *Cross and Salvation*, 410.

the "new person … is in a process of renewal" in God-like righteousness.[495] Synonymously,[496] Paul describes the orientations as the worldly "outer man" and the godly "inner one" (2Co. 4:16).[497] Because "inner man" generally refers to a literal second person, such as a man occupying a citadel, Paul is adopting the image of two persons in each person.[498] Exegetes can interpret the two persons sequentially, not synchronically,[499] but the orientations remain viable. Hamann discerned, "The mystery of the marriage between natures so opposed as the outer and the inner man … is great," but the cohabiting oppositions comprise "a comprehensive concept of the fullness within the unity of our human essence …."[500] The two persons are obviously *not* two distinct beings, but are as obviously two distinct ways of being.[501]

Paul expresses this famously in *Romans*:

> I know not what I am working out, for I am doing not what I am willing for, but doing what I hate. … I know nothing good lives … in my flesh, for the willing reclines beside me, but the working out the noble, never. For I am not doing the good I am willing for, but am doing the evil I am not willing for. If what I am not willing for I am doing, no more am I the one working it out but sin alive in me. The law I then find in me: the one willing to do the noble reclines beside the evil, for, in the inner man, I subscribe to God's law, but I see another law in my appendages, warring against my mind's law and imprisoning me in sin's law …. I, wretched man! (7:15, 18-24)

Paul's 35 first-person singular words in 8 verses is explicitly autobiographical.[502] Some interpreters disagree, but cannot agree on whether he describes Christians or degenerates.[503] If this is not "a dualistic way of looking at things," Käsemann asks, "What else can an understanding of existence be called if it sees man as being in conflict with himself?"[504] Paul's *I*'s and *me*'s (and present tense verbs) answer: The universal human

---

495 *Ephesians*, ed. David A. Hubbard, WBC (Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 286-88.

496 Kooton, *Paul's Anthropology in Context*, 358.

497 Barnett, *Second Corinthians*, 250-51; David E. Garland, *2 Corinthians*, ed. E. Ray Clendenen, NAC (Nashville: B&H, 1999), 240; Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, ed. David A. Hubbard, WBC (Waco: Word Books, 1986), 91-92.

498 Kooton, *Paul's Anthropology in Context*, 358-59.

499 Bruce, *Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians*, 146-48, 358-59; Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 598-613; Wright, *Colossians and Philemon*, 138-39.

500 "Philological Ideas," 118.

501 Murray J. Harris, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 360.

502 Augustine, *Retractions*, 1.22.2 (p. 97); Bray, *God Has Spoken*, 974; Schreiner, *Romans*, 371, 379.

503 Moo, *Romans*, 480-89.

504 *Perspectives on Paul*, 16.

condition is that each of us is two of us.[505] "Paul's discovery," according to a more recent popularizer of the human condition, is the individual is "two-in-one" with characters "in constant struggle with each other."[506]

Other self-reflective writers share Paul's self-discovery.[507] Augustine confessed, "I turned from unity in" God "to be lost in multiplicity." "Who can untie this extremely twisted and tangled knot"?[508] His *civitas dei* and *civitas terrena* also reflect the will's opposing orientations.[509] "I have become a question [*quaestio*] to myself."[510] Luther too noted, "we have against us even the one half of ourselves," "a double life. The first is mine, which is natural …; the second is the life of another, … the life of Christ in me."[511] Kierkegaard's introspections resemble Paul's:

> A person in despair despairingly wills to be himself. But if he despairingly wills to be himself, he certainly does not want to be rid of himself. Well, so it seems, but upon closer examination it is clear that the contradiction is the same. The self that he despairingly wants to be is a self that he is not …, that is, he wants to tear his self away from the power that established it. In spite of all his despair, however, he cannot manage to do it; … that power is the stronger and forces him to be the self he does not want to be. But this is his way of willing to get rid of himself, to rid himself of the self that he is in order to be the self that he has dreamed up.[512]
>
> Whether he, the weak one, despairs over not being able to tear himself loose from the evil or he, the presumptuous one, despairs over not being able to tear himself completely loose from the good—they are both double-minded, they both have two wills ….[513]

Bonhoeffer concluded: "Man's 'I' is no longer what was named by God …." "I am separated from the 'I' that I should be by a boundary which I am unable to cross. This boundary lies between me and myself, between the old 'I' and the new 'I'."[514]

---

505 Cranfield, *Romans 1–8*, 341-47; Guardini, *Freedom, Grace, and Destiny*, 66; Oakes, *Theology of Grace in Six Controversies*, 60; Origen, "Dialogue with Heraclides," in *Treatise on the Passover and Dialogue with Heraclides* (New York: Paulist, 1992), 11,28–12,7, 16,13 (pp. 66, 70).

506 Arendt, "Willing," 64.

507 "Thinking," 214; Buber, "Religion and Philosophy," 44; "God and the Spirit of Man," 127; Graham, *Holy Spirit*, 90, 95, 131; Mother Teresa, *Come Be My Light* (New York: Doubleday, 2007), 169, 210.

508 *Confessions*, I,v,5, II,i,1, x,18, IV,iv,9 (pp. 5, 24, 34, 57).

509 Pannenberg, *Anthropology in Theological Perspective*, 89 n.22.

510 *Confessions*, X,xxx,50 (p. 208, translation modified).

511 *Galatians*, 76, 171 [WA 401,128, 287 (1:11, 2:20)].

512 *Sickness Unto Death*, 20.

513 *Upbuilding Discourses*, 139.

514 *Christ the Center*, 54, 61.

9) <u>Life forms personal character, which forms life.</u>

"The present moment is the sepulchre of all that went before it," Schilling composed.[515] So, leading a life shapes character,[516] for and against God.[517] The individual's "eternal dignity," Kierkegaard observed, "lies precisely in this, that he can gain a history."[518] Decisive acts form character.[519] Plato and his predecessors knew this.[520] As do those since then. "The soul," John Climacus concluded, "is molded by the doings of the body, conforming to and taking shape from what it does."[521] Wilde recognized, "every little action of the common day makes or unmakes character."[522] Individuals in this life, Kathryn Tanner saw, "cultivate or discourage … natural drives and tendencies" "from the uses to which they put themselves," and this "adds to the plastic, shape-shifting character of human nature."[523] We become what our actions intend,[524] which is particularly true of Christian life.[525] Acts broadly defined influence character broadly defined.[526] So, as God invests in us,[527] we are invented. Loving God grows godliness,[528] while sin both infects us and arises in us.[529] "[T]he totality of those acts" of a "personal life process," Tillich discerned, "never comes to an end."[530]

---

515 Schiller, "Philosophical Letters," 384 (Ltr II).

516 Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics I/2*, trans. G.T. Thomson and Harold Knight (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1956), § 15.3 (p. 195); Basil, "Asketikon," LR 6 ¶ 1 (p. 178); Swinburne, "Future of the Totally Corrupt," 236.

517 Harrison, *God's Many-Splendored Image*, 186; Lewis, *Problem of Pain*, 106-107; Russell, *Doctrine of Deification*, 318.

518 *Either/Or*, II, 224.

519 Krapiec, *I-Man*, 98-99, 185, 203, 221; Schindler, *Perfection of Freedom*, 290-93; Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, 194.

520 Heraclitus, *Fragments*, trans. Brooks Haxton (New York: Viking, 2001), 82-83, 97 (Fragment 121); Plato, *The Republic*, 444c-d; Gregory Shaw, *Theurgy and the Soul*, 2nd ed. (Kettering: Angelico, 2014), 6.

521 *The Ladder*, 227 (step 25).

522 *De Profundis*, 58.

523 *Christ the Key* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2010), 44-47.

524 Joakim Garff, "Formation and the Critique of Culture," in *Oxford Handbook of Kierkegaard*, ed. John Lippitt and George Pattison (Oxford Univ. Press, 2013), 253; Nicholas J. Healy, *Eschatology of Hans Urs von Balthasar* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2007), 121; Kierkegaard, *Concept of Anxiety*, 48.

525 Cooper, *Holy Eros*, 20-22; Henry, *I Am the Truth*, 171; Speyr, *Gates of Eternal Life*, 15.

526 Guardini, *Freedom, Grace, and Destiny*, 157.

527 Lubac, *Catholicism*, 266.

528 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae, 1a*, trans. Timothy Suttor, vol. XIII (New York: Blackfriars with McGraw-Hill, 1964), Q. 93, art. 4 (pp. 59-61).

529 Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 184-85; Ziegler, *Militant Grace*, 59.

530 *ST*, III, 38.

Scripture reflects that how we live changes us.[531] "[A]ffliction works out endurance; endurance, attestation; attestation, hope; and hope will not shame" (Rom. 5:3-4). Also, "underwrite in the faith your virtue; in the virtue, the knowledge; in the knowledge, the self-control; in the self-control, the endurance; in the endurance, the reverence; in the reverence, the brotherliness; and in the brotherliness, the love" (2Pe. 1:5-7). Wrongdoing makes us wrong, justifying "the ancient parable, 'From the evil comes evil'" (1Sa. 24:13). "[E]ach is tried by his own craving, hooked and baited. The craving conceived then births sin, while the matured sin births death" (Jam. 1:14-16). "Know you not, when you present yourselves as slaves into obedience, you are slaves to what you obey, whether sin into death, or obedience into righteousness?" (Rom. 6:16).[532] This relationship between who we are and what we do sustains punishment.[533] Sins produce sinners, and sinners produce sins.[534] God "disciplines His beloved and punishes every son He receives. Into discipline persevere," which "yields the peaceful fruit of righteousness for those it trained" (Heb. 12:6-7, 11).

Science confirms that what we do affects who we are and vice-versa,[535] attesting to the intuition that earlier properties lead to later ones.[536] Our actions, to illustrate, anatomically alter our brains, which, of course, alter our actions.[537] Even before birth, we are experiencing, learning, and changing as we interact with our world,[538] not only the one outside the womb but the chemical world inside it.[539] Ever onward, experiences change the brain and conversely.[540] Psychoanalysis understands that each incident

---

531 McConville, *Being Human in God's World*, 201.

532 Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 170-72.

533 G.A. Cole, "Justice: Retributive or Reformative," *Reformed Theological Rev.* 45, no. 1 (1986): 5-12.

534 Pannenberg, *Anthropology in Theological Perspective*, 119-20.

535 Gallagher, "Diversity of Selves," 17, 22; Elisabeth Pacherie, "Self-Agency," Ibid., 442; Schroeder, *Hidden Face of God*, 182.

536 John Campbell, "Personal Identity," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 340.

537 Pascual-Leone Alvaro et al., "The Plastic Human Brain Cortex," *Annual Rev. of Neuroscience* 28, no. 1 (2005): 377-401; Carter and Frith, *Mapping the Mind*, 19; Kevin J. Corcoran and Kevin Sharpe, "Neuroscience and the Human Person," in *Neuroscience and the Soul*, ed. Thomas M. Crisp, et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 127.

538 Rochat, "What Is It Like to Be a Newborn?," 62-63.

539 LeDoux, *Synaptic Self*, 66-67, 92.

540 Ibid., 8-9; Mountcastle, "Brain Science at the Century's Ebb," 7.

imprints us, even if subconsciously.[541] Even our memories, which form us, are in turn formed by us.[542] We are how we have lived.[543]

So, life is a feedback loop, usually a positive one, of experience and character.[544] We live as we have done and do as we have lived, because what is once done stays done.[545] Faith and conduct form character, which forms faith and conduct.[546] Like the tree and its fruit, so the individual and its life (Mat. 7:16-20, 15:17-20; 12:33-37//Luke 6:43-45). We each are God's "workmanship … for good works" (Eph. 2:10). Our experiences deliver what endures in us, "an eternal weight of glory" (2Co. 4:17). Our decisions shape us, define us, feed our divided orientations, and reflect our eternal destiny.[547] This life is Rosenzweig's "road to our personality"[548] or Frost's "trial by existence."[549] We live not in a vale of tears, but in Keats' "vale of Soul-making,"[550] and this yields the personal character, which enters the next life for transformation.[551]

10) <u>Evil exists.</u>

Because the proposed model uses both character orientations, including the ungodly, this can suggest two problems. The easiest to address is the concern the model, like Manichaeism, supposes two souls for each individual.[552] It does not because the model supposes nothing about substances at all. It says individuals have two orientations or, said differently, conflicted characters (or wills), not two souls (or identities).[553] Hence, the model is not like Christ's special case, one united individual of two persons.[554] The recognition that this is a model and one that employs the individual's singularity must be

---

541 Brian L. Horne, "Person as Confession," in *Persons, Divine and Human*, ed. Christoph Schwobel and Colin E. Gunton (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 70.

542 Volf, *End of Memory*, 25, 52.

543 Blondel, *Action*, 215, 277 [223, 296]; Brunner, *Eternal Hope*, 48; Welz, *Humanity in God's Image*, 73.

544 Graham, *Holy Spirit*, 258; Henry, *Essence of Manifestation*, 459; McCombs, *Paradoxical Rationality*, 105-108, 192-93.

545 Balthasar, *Theo-Logic*, I, 198; Welz, *Humanity in God's Image*, 98; Wollheim, *Thread of Life*, 31.

546 Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory*, 139; Welz, *Humanity in God's Image*, 132.

547 Tillich, *ST*, III, 413.

548 "The Life," 81 (18 Aug. 1918 letter).

549 "The Trial by Existence," 19.

550 *Selected Letters* (Harvard Univ. Press, 2005), 109.

551 Taylor, *Journeys to Selfhood*, 138.

552 Blosser, *Become Like the Angels*, 62.

553 John M. Connolly, *Living without Why* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 42-85.

554 Blowers, *Maximus the Confessor*, 135-65.

retained in Chapter 7 when the character is divided in the afterlife as the identity remains whole.

The second pitfall is that modeling ungodliness can seemingly transgress theologians who via Aristotle[555] say evil (or ungodliness) is nonbeing.[556] They say evil is good's absence like physicists say cold is heat's absence. While physicists are persuasive until I grab ice, theologians are less so as I listen to myself, who is as substantive as anything.[557] Evil feels not like a void, but like a demon, or me. "I am no philosopher," the philosopher Montaigne confessed, "Evils crush me according to their weight …."[558] Many, such as Barth, Lossky, Kierkegaard, and Luther, agree evil is negativity, not negation.[559] Hans Schwarz explained: Evil is no "deficiency of being." "When something is good and a little evil is added to it, say 5 percent, one could not for this reason reduce its existence to 95 percent."[560] Henry concurred, "Evil is no less real than Good …."[561] According to the ancient wisdom, therefore, evil is not nil, but attacks.[562] Evil is less an absence like darkness and more a presence like cancer. Buber even claims evil must exist for good to exist.[563] Lewis perceived that "real Christianity" is not a pantheism of being equals God, but nearly a "Dualism" of a civil war between God and "a Dark Power," with us "in a part of the universe occupied by the rebel."[564]

Scripture describes evil as being or anti-being, not nonbeing.[565] God actuated the distinction between primordially known good and evil.[566] God *creates* and *forms* evil (Isa. 45:7; Jer. 18:11).[567] Evil also comes from our inner nature and defiles us (Mark 7:20-23// Mat. 15:18-20). Evil spoils and corrupts, which God destroys (Gen. 6:12; Exo. 32:7-8;

---

555 Bray, *God Has Spoken*, 998.

556 Davies, *Aquinas on God and Evil*, 32-36, 71; Perl, *Theophany*, 53, 60; Hans Schwarz, *Evil: Historical and Theological Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 163-68.

557 Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, V, 314; Bulgakov, *Bride of the Lamb*, 153; W.T. Purkiser, Richard S. Taylor, and William H. Taylor, *God, Man, and Salvation* (Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 1977), 120.

558 "Essays," III,9 (p. 725).

559 Barth, *Romans*, 199 (6:6); Kierkegaard, *Sickness Unto Death*, 96; Lossky, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 128; Luther, "De Servo Arbitrio," 232.

560 *The Human Being*, 146.

561 *Essence of Manifestation*, 451.

562 Koehn, *Nature of Evil*, 31.

563 *Ten Rungs*, 89-90.

564 *Mere Christianity*, 36.

565 Bray, *God Has Spoken*, 86.

566 Theodoret, *Commentary on Letters of Paul*, I, Rom. 47 (p. 43).

567 Hamann, "Fragments," IV (p. 167). The first verb (בָּרָא) always refers to divine creation, and the second (יָצַר) describes what a potter does to clay. *BDB*, 135, 427.

Psa. 145:20). Quasi-autonomous sin reigns and enslaves, seduces and kills (Rom. 6:12, 16, 7:11).[568] We are to loathe evil, which can overcome us and from which we need rescue (12:9, 21; 2Ti. 4:18). Evil makes demands, which we are to fight (Gen. 4:7; Rom. 6:14; Eph. 6:12). Jesus thus portrayed evil as, not an absence, but a person (Mat. 6:13; Luke 22:53; John 17:15). Only in *Revelation*'s final scene does the dualism of good and evil cease.[569]

The proposed divisibility model works, nonetheless, for Aristotelians, because evil's essentialness is inessential to the model; it uses evil things, not evil as a thing.[570] So, if Aristotle is correct that evil is merely good's absence, the model continues to function because evil need not be being, just in being. Predicates are unquestionably part of experience.[571] Evil, if not noun or nature, is adjective and condition.[572] Hamann saw, "everything is divine, and the question of the origin of evil amounts in the end to word-play and scholastic prattle."[573] Regardless of whether the negative orientation is good's perversion or anti-good, the individual is both,[574] distancing us from God and pleasing Him.[575] The model uses this—evil's separability, not its substantiality.

11) <u>Dividing an individual in the afterlife is realizable.</u>

The individual's dividedness in this life plainly differs from its actual divisibility afterwards,[576] but forearmed with the former we should be able to mentally transition to the latter. It is similar to how we understand a conflicted country is one country until a civil war divides it.[577] The individual that experiences life as a psychophysical unity divides what reflects from what is reflected upon,[578] and this reflected self has divisive orientations,[579] allowing, perhaps too easily, its modeling as divisible.[580] Even a water molecule's thoroughly united hydrogen and oxygen, once its elements are called out,

---

568 Boyd, "Christus Victor View," 29.

569 Gooder, *Heaven*, 67; Stephens, *Annihilation or Renewal?*, 233-34.

570 Krapiec, *I-Man*, 235-36.

571 Feuerbach, *Essence of Christianity*, I.2 (p. 14).

572 Koehn, *Nature of Evil*, 5, 240; Lossky, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 128.

573 "The Last Will and Testament of the Knight of the Rose-Cross," 99.

574 Balthasar, *Theo-Logic*, II, 350; *Theo-Drama*, III, 482-86; IV, 369, 479.

575 Crosby, *Selfhood of the Human Person*, 228-29; Lewis, "The Weight of Glory," 36-37.

576 Gilbert K. Chesterton, *St Thomas Aquinas* (New York: Angelico, 2011), 17-18.

577 Wippel, *Metaphysical Thought of Aquinas*, 356.

578 Henry, *Essence of Manifestation*, 690-91.

579 Lowe, *Subjects of Experience*, 36, 40.

580 David Hume, *Treatise of Human Nature* (Mineola: Dover, 2014), I.I.3 (p. 7); Krapiec, *I-Man*, 347-49; Schiller, "Letters on the Aesthetical Education of Man," 115 (Ltr XXVI).

imply their divisibility under the right extreme conditions.[581] The individual's two orientations in this life, having been called out, likewise suggest divisibility. Some individuals have pathologically, not just metaphorically, divided minds, and everyone else experiences themselves as not yet divided.[582] A person "ordinarily experiences the dimension of self-awareness in unity," Tillich recognized. "The psychological and the personal self are united in him. Only in such special situations as dream, intoxication, half-sleep, and so on, does a partial separation occur, and this separation is never so complete that a sharply distinct description of the psychological is possible."[583] Kierkegaard understood, "The view which sees life's doubleness or duality is higher and deeper than that which seeks unity."[584]

Husserl found, "*all real unities* are '*unities of meaning*.'"[585] Only the dimensionless point seems indivisible and that definitionally.[586] Even the invariant, such as a line, can be divided, as can prime numbers notwithstanding the results' fractional messes.[587] A perforated life should split as easily as abstractions.[588] Personal orientations and identity are admittedly not parts,[589] nor does the proposed division require they be. Individual divisibility is as Benjamin Blosser described Origen's anthropology, "not from an ontological partition into distinct metaphysical units, but rather from a moral crisis."[590] Modeling the orientations' divisibility does not materialize them, but re-models what has been modeled as indivisible.[591] The individual has "two natures in his created hypostasis," Lossky observed, "on the one side there is the … deifying will …; on the other side there is the

---

581 Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife*, 36.

582 Horst, *Cognitive Pluralism*, 322; Jennifer Radden, "Pathologically Divided Minds," in *Models of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher and Jonathan Shear (Thorverton: Imprint, 1999), 356.

583 *ST*, III, 37.

584 *Journal and Papers*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong, 7 vols., vol. I (Indiana Univ. Press, 1967), ¶ 704.

585 *Ideas*, 55 (p. 152).

586 Euclid, *Elements*, 3rd ed. (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, 1885), I.1 (p. 2).

587 Brower, *Aquinas's Ontology*, 118; Lowe, *Subjects of Experience*, 36; Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 77.

588 Luther, *Galatians*, 472 [WA 402,45 (5:9)].

589 Karol Wojtyla, *The Acting Person*, trans. Andrezej Potocki (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1976), 189-219.

590 *Become Like the Angels*, 18.

591 Spaemann, *Essays in Anthropology*, 38.

human will …."[592] Though disturbing to the ego, each individual is a confluence, and only God's gift—or, in common terms, this life—coheres the individual.[593]

This life's corporeal cohesiveness does not foreclose divisibility afterwards. The model recognizes that the natural body enables character and anchors identity, but, even in this life, matter by itself is a weak identifier, fluxing like river water through an individual, whose form changes as much as a river's throughout its history.[594] More significantly, the terrestrial body disintegrates in death, which denies it this unifying function altogether.[595] Ignatius prayed for his corpse to be entirely consumed, and this was to fulfill, not contravene, his resurrection.[596] Similarly, the Roman Empire, according to the epistle from Lyons in 177, failed to deter martyrs by having their remains eaten by dogs, burned to ash, and thrown in the Rhone river, which flushes out to sea.[597] The incorporeal find eternity.[598] Even if the corpse was to persist as an identifier in death, it becomes divisible then particularly, as Christians (and others) prove whenever they divide it for dispersed relic veneration.[599]

Christ's body is no counterexample. His terrestrial body differed from His resurrected body too.[600] Resurrected, it recurrently appears and vanishes, for instance.[601] Regardless, Christ's resurrection is not our timing (1Co. 15:20-23)[602] and, thus, not our continuity. His corpse was resurrected on the third day and suffered no decay (Acts 2:27, 31-32),[603] which has happened exactly once.[604] Finally, even His naturally unifying body

---

592 *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 126-27.

593 Richard H. Bell, "The Corrupt Mind and the Renewed Mind," in *Grandeur of Reason*, ed. Peter M. Candler, Jr. and Conor Cunningham (London: SCM, 2010), 215; Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology*, 201-202.

594 Bynum, *Resurrection of the Body*, 112; Cooper, *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting*, 189; Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, 156. The analogy is ancient. Heraclitus, *Fragments*, 81 (pp. 50-51).

595 Krapiec, *I-Man*, 358.

596 "Epistle to the Romans," ch IV (p. 75).

597 Herbert Musurillo, *Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972), xx-xxii, 80-83.

598 Augustine, *City of God*, I,12 (pp. 21-22); John Behr, "Life and Death in the Age of Martyrdom," in *The Role of Death in Life*, ed. John Behr and Conor Cunningham (Eugene: Cascade, 2015), 82; Bynum, *Resurrection of the Body*, 49.

599 Moore, *Where Are the Dead?*, 148.

600 Graham Ward, "The Displaced Body of Jesus Christ," in *Radical Orthodoxy*, ed. John Milbank, et al. (New York: Routledge, 1999), 173.

601 Davis, *Risen Indeed*, 57; Wright, *The Resurrection*, 478.

602 Yates, *Between Death and Resurrection*, 22.

603 Bock, *Acts*, 124-25, 129; Novakovic, *Resurrection*, 172.

604 Riches, *Ecce Homo*, 194-95, 206-207.

did not unify Him in death, because, after He yielded His spirit to the Father (Mat. 27:50 //Luke 23:46//John 19:30), His body was in the tomb as He experienced Paradise (Luke 23:42-43). So, even the united Son was divided in death,[605] which makes sense because the body's cessation is what death is even where there is more to experience.[606]

Thus, no individual is mere body, but includes thoughts, experiences, feelings, beliefs.[607] This thick self, which this life forms and which eternal life requires, is the character that transitions to the next life[608] and on what the proposed model works. Though personal identity is unitary by necessity, personal character, normally lived as conflicted, can be divisible because nothing about the afterlife requires that the orientations remain together or any personal identity experience both. The argument now is not that divisibility occurs in the afterlife because that derives from the paradox of salvation's extent. Instead, this chapter's burden is to show that dividing an individual is coherent. This coherency in spite of the everyday experience of indivisibility is paralleled in theology's other crucial paradoxes—Trinity and hypostatic union. The Triune God is three identities of one nature, and Christ is two natures of one identity.[609] These paradoxes, Gregory of Nyssa saw, involve being "at once conjoined and separated," offering "a new and strange kind of conjoined separation and separated conjunction."[610] His confederate added that the Persons "are divided without division" and "united in division."[611] These notions, so divergent from everyday reality where each healthy person has one identity and one nature, were accepted only because of Scriptural paradoxes. That too is what justifies dividing the individual after this life.

To the extent individual divisibility seems absurd, it is because of the venerable

---

605 Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1857; Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, II, 1010; Riches, *Ecce Homo*, 197-208.

606 Cooper, *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting*, 214; Leget, "Eschatology," 367; Schumacher, *Death and Mortality*, 48.

607 Welz, *Humanity in God's Image*, 126.

608 Harrison, *God's Many-Splendored Image*, 49.

609 Riches, *Ecce Homo*, 82-83, 97; Elena Vishnevskaya, "Divinization as Perichoretic Embrace in Maximus the Confessor," in *Partakers of the Divine Nature*, ed. Michael J. Christensen and Jeffrey A. Wittung (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 132.

610 "Letter 35," ¶ 4 (p. 255). Tradition preserved this as Basil's Letter No. 38 ("Letters," 139), but it is Gregory's. Dario Benedetto, et al., "The Puzzle of Basil's Epistula 38," *J. of Quantitative Linguistics* 20, no. 4 (2013): 267-87; Anna M. Silvas, *Gregory of Nyssa: The Letters* (Boston: Brill, 2007), 247.

611 "Orations," 39.11.

idea of the essential *I*,[612] which Descartes educed.[613] Most everyone is effectively an anthropological Cartesian, including those who pre-date him and those who explicitly deny a dualism, because, in recognizing a self in life, if not in theory, we recognize an elemental *I*.[614] It is simply recognizing the obvious: There is awareness, which means something is aware. By convention at least, this something is called the *I*. The unanimous reality is, therefore, the Descartes formula modified, *ego sum, ergo sum*.[615] Without the essential *I*, the individual is an incongruous dipolar mass easily disunited,[616] where selfhood naturally ruptures between towards self and towards God.[617] So, divisibility would only become easier if the essential *I* were ever dropped.

After the Cartesian Enlightenment, we underappreciate the challenge the Church faced in retaining Christ's unity despite the difference in His two natures. The Church, worried division followed,[618] had to positively deny difference meant division,[619] because it knew individuals could divide[620] and knew Christ could too,[621] although He was singly oriented.[622] Like splitting the proto-individual, when God took the androgyne's "side"[623] for "flesh of my flesh" (Gen. 2:7, 15-25), the Church had no trouble with one individual divided.[624] This was typical in antiquity.[625] Plato, for instance, tells of humanity's legendary origin where each person had eight limbs and two faces until Zeus split them into male and female.[626] Dividing Christ was an attraction the Church had to affirmatively

---

612 Feuerbach, *Essence of Christianity*, I.II (p. 42); Heidegger, "Modern Science, Metaphysics, and Mathematics," 274, 280-81; Olson, "A Compound of Two Substances," 84.

613 Riches, *Ecce Homo*, 11, 63.

614 McGilchrist, *The Master and His Emissary*, 20; Reddy, *How Infants Know Minds*, 11, 23, 29-30; Giulio Tononi and Christof Koch, "Consciousness: Here, There, and Everywhere?," *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 370: 201440167 (2015), 2, 5; Turner, *Theology, Psychology and the Plural Self*, 35.

615 Panksepp, *Affective Neuroscience*, 311-12, 420, n.34.

616 Westphal, *Becoming a Self*, 180.

617 Garff, "Formation and the Critique of Culture," 264.

618 Riches, *Ecce Homo*, 30-33.

619 Blowers, *Maximus the Confessor*, 176.

620 John of Damascus, "Fount of Knowledge," I,11, 43 (pp. 41, 68).

621 Maximus, "Opusculum 6," PG 91:65C-68D (pp. 174-76); Charles Stang, "The Two 'I's of Christ," *Anglican Theological Rev.* 94, no. 3 (2012): 529-47; Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, 92 & n.87.

622 Lossky, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 146-47.

623 *BDB*, 854; Heinz-Josef Fabry, "Sela," in *Theological Dict. of the OT*, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 400-402.

624 Kierkegaard, *Concept of Anxiety*, 317-18.

625 Wendy Doniger, *Splitting the Difference* (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1999), 1.

626 "Symposium," 189d-193a.

resist,[627] particularly because two different natures intimate division.[628] So, the natures were resolved to be "without division," "not parted or divided into two *prosopa* [persons]."[629] Only personhood unified.[630] The need for the credal contention thus implies generally the potential for individual divisibility.[631]

Unlike the early Church, those after Descartes have difficulty disuniting the individual, but just as the divine and human can be two persons (the Father and me) or one person (Christ),[632] an individual's godliness and godlessness can be separated under the right extreme circumstances. Cartesianesque anthropology in fact conceals how real dividing an individual is already: Bodies are bisected (*e.g.*, conjoined twins), personalities are split (*e.g.*, dissociative identity disorder), and brains are halved (*e.g.*, commissurotomy patients). The Cartesian difficulty comes, not from dividing an individual, but from dividing a unitary one. "There is nothing comic in half an apple," Kierkegaard mocked, "the comic would become apparent only if a whole apple were half an apple."[633] Dividing a water molecule, returning to that metaphor, does *not* yield two water molecules, but two very unwatery elements. Solomon's gambit depended on people knowing that splitting the baby meant, not two babies, but zero babies. This is unlike the civil war metaphor where one country becomes two countries. We find the water molecule more applicable to the individual even though scholarship never uses the water metaphor to explain the self but often uses the country metaphor. A statue, however, is a common metaphor for identity, and division destroys it, but dividing an individual is not similarly destructive even to a Cartesian for two reasons. First, as explained, the *I*, regardless of substance, entails personal identity *and* character, and the *I* that the model divides is the dually oriented character, the led life. The essential *I*, however, retains its indivisibility with the identity. Second, as Chapter 2 noted, the afterlife includes culling and completion. So, adding division to the process is unlike dividing a typical statue. If a bronze statue is

---

627 Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 739-41.

628 Sebastian Mateiescu, "Counting Natures and Hypostases," in *Studia Patristica LXXXIX*, ed. Markus Vinzent and Sotiris Mitralexis (Leuven: Peeters, 2017), 64-65, 76.

629 Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 339-40.

630 Joseph Ratzinger, *Behold the Pierced One*, trans. Graham Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1986), 39.

631 Olson, *Mosaic of Christian Belief*, 226-27.

632 Riches, *Ecce Homo*, 4, 176; Kevin Vanhoozer, "The Origin of Paul's Soteriology," in *Reconsidering the Relationship between Bib. and Systematic Theology*, ed. Benjamin E. Reynolds, et al. (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 198.

633 *Stages*, 43.

being thoroughly remade of unoxidizable gold anyway, dividing it is just more remaking. Metamorphosis plus division is more metamorphosis.[634] The best metaphor, therefore, for the individual in the afterlife might be sunlight, which is as the Nyssen appreciated one color until it becomes a rainbow,[635] and we have known since Newton that a prism without any color divides a ray of indivisibly white light into seven darker ones.[636]

12) <u>A divided individual can be modeled.</u>

Even our divided character has to imagine how an individual can actually be divided.[637] Fictionalized characters can help with this.[638] Dr. Jekyll, who had a "deeper trench than the majority of men," "sever[ing] … those provinces of good and ill" that "divide and compound man's dual nature," concluded that each of us "is not truly one, but truly two."[639] Composite autobiographical characters can reveal the author's split,[640] as do pseudonymous writings.[641] Kierkegaard, for instance, has his pseudonymous publisher ponder whether his two pseudonymous authors might be one person.[642] "[W]ithout my knowing it," he complained, "I really have been used."[643] Each littérateur is in fact a plus one: "It would be an exaggeration to say that our relationship is hostile," Borges wrote, "I allow myself to live, so that Borges can spin out his literature."[644] Like Dostoevsky, we each know "the trouble is that I have two tales, and only one life story."[645]

The less artistic must use thought experiments to expose individual divisibility, but such experiments depend on intuitions in imagined scenarios to expose features of reality that we have not realized.[646] Because this reverses the time-tested process of reality

---

634 Moses Maimonides, *The Guide for the Perplexed*, trans. Michael Friedländer (BN, 2007), Pt II, prop. VII (p. 146).

635 "Letter 35," ¶ 5 (pp. 255-57).

636 Ahmo Colic and Hrustem Smailhodzic, "The Study of Light" (presented at AIP Conference Proceedings 899, 2007), 849.

637 Norbert Wiener, *The Human Use of Human Beings*, Rev. ed. (New York: Da Capo, 1954), 95.

638 Doniger, *Splitting the Difference*, 79-87; Soren Kierkegaard, "Repetition," in *Repetition and Philosophical Crumbs*, ed. Edward F. Mooney (Oxford Univ. Press, 2009), [30].

639 Robert Louis Stevenson, *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (New York: Dover, 1991), 42-43.

640 Hermans, "Dialogical Self," 59.

641 Charles Stang, *Apophasis and Pseudonymity in Dionysius the Areopagite* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2012), 204-205.

642 *Either/Or*, trans. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong, 2 vols., vol. I (Princeton Univ. Press, 1987), 13.

643 *JP*, VI, 231-32 (entry 6505).

644 "Borges and I," in *Collected Fictions* (New York: Penguin, 1998), 324.

645 *The Brothers Karamazov*, trans. Constance Garnett (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1995), 2.

646 Ryan Wasserman, "Personal Identity, Indeterminacy and Obligation," in *Personal Identity*, ed.

informing intuitions, thought experiments evoke truths unreliably.[647] Word pictures are similar in that they are less creative than literature, but, unlike thought experiments, word pictures do not purport to discover what is unknown, just what is coherent.[648] In the event, a word picture can portray individual division as a coherent idea.[649] Individual division resulting in two identical individuals is common in selfhood scholarship,[650] and it is often through teletransportation, where an identical individual is materialized elsewhere as the original is extirpated, though sometimes the original remains, usually to create selfhood mischief.[651] The word picture here is similar.[652] Physically doubling a person leaves the original,[653] and this accommodates our natural bias for the substantive.[654]

Suppose, therefore, the ultimate 3D printer, like a typical transporter, duplicates an individual in every way imaginable, down to its most micro level.[655] If an obvious original must be avoided, the device can, in addition to subatomically duplicating the original, equally redistribute the original's particles between the two persons. The duplicates then each have equal right to the original, but this subatomic dissolution of the original hazards its continuity (like in teletransportation).[656] Either version pictures individual division by duplication. Suppose also the device can exclude an undesired virus from one of the duplicates, and suppose *you* secretly submit to duplication because you have an incurable noncontagious lethal virus. After duplication, you wake next to someone indistinguishable from you. You feel like an original, but realize the other duplicate must be feeling that too. Your memories—what is recalled, forgotten, and falsely remembered—are identical.[657] You both, therefore, remember having the virus and choosing to be duplicated so as to be virus-free. You both feel like you have lived the span of your

---

Georg Gassar and Matthias Stefan (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015), 64.

[647] Tamar Szabo Gendler, "Exceptional Persons," in *Models of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher and Jonathan Shear (Thorverton: Imprint, 1999), 459; Wilkes, *Real People*, 1-48.

[648] Morrison, *Reconstructing Reality*, 92; Volf, *End of Memory*, 142 n.34.

[649] Gallagher, "Diversity of Selves," 5.

[650] Barresi and Martin, "History as Prologue," 41.

[651] Derek Parfit, "The Unimportance of Identity," in *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 419.

[652] Kierkegaard, *Attack Upon "Christendom"*, 162.

[653] Sloterdijk, *Critique of Cynical Reason*, 199.

[654] Gregor, *Philosophical Anthropology*, 54.

[655] Hick, *Death and Eternal Life*, 280-94.

[656] Jonathan Edwards, *The Works*, 2 vols., vol. I (London: Westley, 1834), cclxiv; Merricks, "How to Live Forever," 193.

[657] Volf, *End of Memory*, 194-95, 197.

remembered life, yet know only one of you has done so. You both feel original but want to be virus-free. You two are by all accounts identical except for the virus and for being in slightly different places.[658] You are as identical as two things can be.[659]

Interrelating with the other you, who is independent of you but otherwise is you, disorients.[660] You share everything—appearances, mannerisms, memories, attitudes. When asked for a new password, you separately give the same one; in buffets, you take the same foods in the same quantities; and, in your first sleep, you dream identically, among the most personal activities.[661] You do not literally think the other's thoughts, but correctly surmise them because you are thinking them too.[662] Apart from testing differently for the virus, nothing distinguishes you two; even you cannot tell the difference except you are the one seeing the other you.[663] Differences emerge, however. The initially synchronized blinking, breathing, and heart rates cease to be after a while. Eventually, the small differentials grow, but none indicates who is original.

The duplication need never be technologically achievable. It is probably not in spite of teletransportation's popularity because it depends on us being just physical bits, which is, as has been explained, inadequate.[664] Besides, duplicating subatomic particles means copying their position and momentum, which the Heisenberg principle seemingly disallows.[665] Irrespective of feasibility, the scenario is obviously possible metaphysically.[666] Similar thought experiments have been offered in selfhood scholarship,[667] and literature offers full-length treatments.[668] The real world even has psychotics who suffer autoscopic delusion or subjective doubles syndrome (imagining an actual double exists or another person is one's double), and we understand their reality as we deny it.[669] We

---

658 Badham, *Christian Beliefs About Life after Death*, 72-73.

659 Hick, *Death and Eternal Life*, 282-85; Claire Ortiz Hill, *Rethinking Identity and Metaphysics* (Yale Univ. Press, 1997), 43-45.

660 Mooney, "On the Critiques of Pairing and Appresentation," 491.

661 Freud, *Future of an Illusion*, I.B, VII.B, E, F (pp. 54, 578, 630, 647, 652); Jung, *Modern Man*, 16.

662 Merleau-Ponty, *Signs*, 170-72.

663 Hart, *Experience of God*, 158-59.

664 Henry, *I Am the Truth*, 103-104; *Words of Christ*, 84.

665 Lowe, *Subjects of Experience*, 46 n.49.

666 Baker, *Persons and Bodies*, 127.

667 Kevin J. Corcoran, "Persons and Bodies," *Faith and Philosophy* 15, no. 3 (1998): 335; Dean W. Zimmerman, "Compatibility of Materialism and Survival," Ibid. 16, no. 2 (1999): 205-207.

668 *E.g.*, Christopher Priest, *The Prestige* (New York: St Martin's, 1996).

669 Carter and Frith, *Mapping the Mind*, 127-28; Carolina A. Klein and Soniya Hirachan, "The Masks of Identities," *J. of the Am. Academy of Psychiatry and the Law* 42 (2014): 370.

sometimes nearly do this to ourselves when finding a heartfelt note we composed but forgot and confront this author as if a separate person.[670] Regardless, the word picture can be visualized: Two you's exist, one with your personal identity.[671] No one knows who is original without testing for the virus because the personal characters are the same. Division has doubled life.[672] Worth repeating is that you feel like the original, but, until tested for the virus, you have no way of knowing whether you are, because everything pre-duplication has been duplicated. All that you can discern is two qualitatively identical individuals live in the first moment and you are one of them.[673]

Even though nothing is literally identical with anything else in that they are exactly the same thing, things can be identical with each other in that one has exactly everything the other has and nothing else. This identicality is the word picture, except for the virus and the first-person perspective. Even with these two differences, one intentional and one inherent, a person can identify with a different person, and this is a cognitive act.[674] In the word picture, you identify with the other you.[675] Before duplication, you were *you*, who was sick, and, after duplication, you are *you-sick* and *you-healthy*.[676] A thought experiment's point is typically how you regard your other,[677] but not the word picture's. Naturally, you-sick wants you-healthy to live on, and you-healthy wants you-sick to make the best of things.[678] Even when identity is not a given, identifying is mostly experienced, not chosen, because identity and identification correspond, not just grammatically, but meaningfully.[679] Stories, for instance, can toy with this reality. Two conflicting sympathetic characters—*e.g.*, a suave jewel thief and a police detective—create identification

---

[670] Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*, trans. Eric A. Blackall and Victor Lange (New York: Suhrkamp, 1989), 44 (II,2).

[671] Wiener, *Human Use of Human Beings*, 96, 102. The duplication is exact for those like Parfit who say personal identity is literally nothing but a concept that we use as a stand-in for our judgment about the sufficiency of the scalable discrimination in personal characteristics. Parfit, *Reasons and Persons*, 253, 264, 271; Dean W. Zimmerman, "Materialism, Dualism, and 'Simple' Theories of Personal Identity," in *Personal Identity*, ed. Georg Gassar and Matthias Stefan (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015), 206. The Parfitian position is based on, not a revelation, but answers to rhetorical questions implied from thought experiments. Baker, *Persons and Bodies*, 134 n.28.

[672] Parfit, *Reasons and Persons*, 253, 262.

[673] Davis, *Risen Indeed*, 137.

[674] E.J. Lowe, "The Probable Simplicity of Personal Identity," in *Personal Identity*, ed. Georg Gassar and Matthias Stefan (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015), 139.

[675] Baker, *Persons and Bodies*, 136-37, 141.

[676] Perry, *Identity, Personal Identity, and the Self*, 42-61, 82, 131-32, 160-61.

[677] Parfit, "The Unimportance of Identity," 421.

[678] *Reasons and Persons*, 264.

[679] Perry, *Identity, Personal Identity, and the Self*, 153-56.

tension. I choicelessly identify with the detective. In WWII stories, I identify with the Allies no matter how sympathetic the Axis characters. I, a Southerner, root in Civil War stories for the South, though losers in two senses. Identifying, like identity itself, is a product or part of life, not a choice. So, in the word picture, unless suffering from self-hatred so perverse as to be literally self-destructive, the you who experiences through your personal identity naturally also identifies with the you who does not.[680]

None of this changes which you it is through which you experience. Identity is fact.[681] Moving around your personal identity based on personal preference is thus unavailable; subjectivity is inalienable.[682] One has one's perceptions and no one else's with no other explanation.[683] While you prefer to be virus-free, it is irrelevant to whether you are. Henry concluded, "Life, thrown into itself, has always already thrown us into ourselves, … that at no moment ever chose to be this Self that he is …."[684] Nor is personal identity duplicated in the word picture or ever,[685] because it inherently integrates.[686] Your personal identity in two bodies is conceivable if you somehow controlled and received inputs from both, but you would in time integrate the two corporeal experiences just as we do with our two eyes, two hands, and two cerebrums.[687] This would be two bodies (of one individual), not two individuals. Because your personal identity can never be doubled, the other you's personal identity is an open issue. You do not know if the other has one, though it is presumed just as it is for every other person you meet. The other's personal character can be detected through observation and interrogation of course, but the other's identity cannot be. Obviously, the other seems to have one because the other seems to be aware just like you are, but only the other is aware of its awareness. If the other's personal identity does exist as presumed, the reason for its existence is entirely unknown, as it always is. It is possible the duplicator added it, the duplicated brain

---

680 Welz, *Humanity in God's Image*, 54.

681 Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 140; Amy Kind, *Persons and Personal Identity* (Cambridge: Polity, 2015), 103.

682 Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, 164.

683 Henry, *Incarnation*, 36.

684 *I Am the Truth*, 227-28.

685 Baker, *Persons and Bodies*, 108, 133; Jungel, *God as the Mystery of the World*, 182.

686 Strawson, "The Self," 12; Richard G. Swinburne, "How to Determine Which Is the True Theory of Personal Identity," in *Personal Identity*, ed. Georg Gassar and Matthias Stefan (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015), 108; Wippel, *Metaphysical Thought of Aquinas*, 363.

687 Zahavi, "Unity of Consciousness and the Problem of Self," 316.

naturally included it, the Creator gave a special assist, or some other possibility. The personal identity just is (or is not).

While the imperceptible personal identity necessarily distinguishes the two you's, this is not what makes you you. If the you with your personal identity had emerged without your memories, feelings, beliefs, and preferences, it would not be you.[688] If lacking your memories, not to say the rest, the duplicator failed definitionally,[689] and, most importantly, you have ceased. Memories form love, happiness,[690] faith,[691] and thankfulness,[692] meaning all of these of yours are gone. Not only would your history obviously be gone too, but your expectations need memories,[693] so they would be gone as would such joys as your humor. Indeed, all thinking involves connecting one thought to another, which requires a first thought to be applied to a second;[694] so, your way of thinking is no more. One need not be Lockean—your memories are sufficient to be you—to realize your memories are necessary to be you.[695] The worst actual memory deprivation (from a hippocampus virus) involved losing every few minutes all explicit memories (while retaining implicit ones like language), and this was to its sufferer "like being dead."[696] Memory, Augustine realized, wards off "disintegration."[697] No wonder Scripture demands remembrances.[698] Proust aptly asks what is "the meaning of that immortality of the soul" if "The being that I shall be after death has no … reason to remember the man I have been since my birth."[699] The "resurrection of the soul after death," he answers, is

---

688 Barresi and Martin, "History as Prologue," 42; Carter and Frith, *Mapping the Mind*, 169; Sydney Shoemaker, "On What We Are," in *Oxford Handbook on the Self*, ed. Shaun Gallagher (Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 359, 362.

689 Moore, *Where Are the Dead?*, 202.

690 Candler, *Theology, Rhetoric, Manuduction*, 62; Cavell, "The Self," 604-605.

691 Volf, *End of Memory*, 97.

692 Dalferth, *Creatures of Possibility*, 104.

693 Arendt, *Love and Augustine*, 56.

694 "Thinking," 78; "Willing," 37; McGilchrist, *The Master and His Emissary*, 164.

695 Augustine, *Confessions*, X,xvii,26 (p. 194); Carter and Frith, *Mapping the Mind*, 177; Volf, *End of Memory*, 24, 147.

696 Corcoran and Sharpe, "Neuroscience and the Human Person," 123-25 & n.4.

697 Augustine, *Confessions*, II,i,1 (p. 24).

698 Jobes, "Remember These Things," 192-93.

699 *In Search of Lost Time*, IV: 365.

"a phenomenon of memory."[700] Without your character, Kierkegaard knew, you are no one.[701] Characterless identity is blank stare,[702] an empty clone.[703]

* * * *

A divided individual is understandable, because this life's divided character is divisible, not in the world we know, at least not utterly, but conceptually. If, however, it were to happen that an individual were divided actually and recompleted, we would know what has happened. The reason for demonstrating divisibility's coherency is that in the afterlife it preserves the paradox of salvation's extent, the next chapter's topic.

---

[700] Ibid., III: 77.

[701] *Either/Or*, II, 168.

[702] Henry, *Material Phenomenology*, 45-48, 51, 66, 72; McCombs, *Paradoxical Rationality*, 151; Perry, *Identity, Personal Identity, and the Self*, 161.

[703] Horne, "Person as Confession," 71; Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 283.

Chapter 7. PRESERVING THE PARADOX

I have no other way out. One of us is stupid. Well, and you know one can never say that about oneself.

—Tolstoy[1]

The thesis can be considered now that prior chapters have examined the prerequisites. Scripture expresses about as well as it can both that everyone is ultimately saved and that not everyone is. Confirming Scripture is clear on both accounts, the Church's greats have found each of them through the centuries, but, to avoid contradiction, have devalued one account in advocating for the other. The thesis, so as not to depreciate Scripture and yet to retain its sense, proposes a model that joins the salvation paradox to a divisible individual. This allows both Scriptural accounts to stay true, and, after the last chapter, this model should appear, if not easy, at least not insane.

Christians can be in denial about a Scriptural problem by assuming tradition handles it.[2] For the paradox of salvation's extent, tradition has not. The problem is not Scripture, however, but the handling. "May I," Hamann asks, "venture a conjecture that strikes me as at least ingenious?"[3] Rather than subjecting the salvation paradox to Scriptural reinterpretation,[4] what is offered is preserving the Scriptural paradox, full stop. The proposed divisibility is outwardly similar to tradition's afterlife purging, but purging does nothing for the paradox of salvation's extent. Universalists purge everyone so no one is damned, and Exclusivists purge the saved so they enjoy eternal life. Individual divisibility, in contrast, is applicable to everyone and results in the saved *and* the damned.

1) After this life, godly is divided from ungodly.

If the proposal pans out, *individual* would not be the first word to defy its etymology. "Atom," the Greek variant of the Latin *individual*, also means non-splittable, and it was until it wasn't.[5] Whether *individual* suffers divisibility depends on whether it addresses the salvation paradox, which has been addressed throughout, and it depends on the coherency of individual divisibility, which Chapter 6 addressed. Finally, it depends on the meaning of individual divisibility in the context of the salvation paradox, which is this

---

[1] *Anna Karenina*, trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (New York: Penguin, 2000), 136.

[2] Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 203.

[3] "Aesthetica in Nuce," 65.

[4] Robin A. Parry, "Universalist View," in *Four Views on Hell*, ed. Preston Sprinkle (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 103.

[5] Fromm, "Modern Man and the Future," 21.

chapter's burden. The exploration of what afterlife divisibility of an individual means begins with its minimalist but manifest conception charted in the last chapter:

- An individual, independent of constitutional elements, lives as terrestrial body, personal identity, and personal character.
- The personal character has in this life divided orientations, godly and ungodly.
- The personal identity and character must, if there is an afterlife, be in it.

With this understanding, again regardless of what substantively carries these personal features, the proposal is: After this life, the personal character is divisible between godly and ungodly with the godly saved and the ungodly not, and the personal identity is with whom the person identifies.

a) Divisible individual

The thesis takes no position on anthropological dualism—*e.g.*, body and soul—or any mediating hierarchy of essence.[6] Paul was likely a trichotomist of body, soul, and spirit (1Th. 5:23),[7] as were most coeval theorists, such as Plato, Philo, Justin, Plutarch, Aurelius, Clement of Alexandria, Plotinus, and Didymus.[8] The model can be agnostic on this ancient dispute because division does not require knowing the substance of what is divided, only how to distinguish what is divided. The internal life has "different and distinguishable aspects," "not … separable bits," Wollheim noted.[9] Darnel from wheat is differentiated and then divided this way irrespective of substance, and, by analogy, godliness and its negation are similarly differentiated and then divided (Mat. 13:26, 38).[10]

The model, while forgoing dual*isms*, uses dual*ities*, but only the two that have been explained and that tradition supplies. The first is the discontinuity and continuity from this life to the next. For the next life to not be this one, there must be discontinuity, and, for it to be us in the next life, there must be continuity.[11] The division that is traditional, spirit from body,[12] is not the proposed divisibility. The model takes whatever continues, whether understood substantively as soul, mind, or blueprint, and recognizes that it entails at least personal identity and character. The thesis is that the latter is divisible, and it

---

[6] Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 15.

[7] Kooton, *Paul's Anthropology in Context*, 294, 296.

[8] O'Laughlin, "Anthropology of Evagrius Ponticus," 363.

[9] *Thread of Life*, 71.

[10] Nolland, *Matthew*, 545.

[11] Aquinas, *De Potentia*, Q.3, art. 2 (pp. 39-40); Polkinghorne, *The God of Hope and the End of the World*, xxiii, 77, 149; Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife*, 87.

[12] Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, IV, 223; Brunner, *Eternal Hope*, 94; Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 73-75, 104-105.

results from the second duality—our orientations.[13] That is, the second duality is applied to the first duality's continuity. Kevin Vanhoozer describes felicitously the "fault-line that threatens to rip a human being apart"—"not that of body and soul, … but rather the tension between what men and women were originally created and destined to be, on the one hand, and what they have actually become, on the other."[14] Recognizing that *individual* is divisible in this way preserves the salvation paradox—everyone is and is not saved.

As a result and for the reasons Chapter 6 gave, the model rejects, not only nihilistic anthropologies, like we are organic robots, but also those of revival perfectionist Charles Finney: Godliness and ungodliness "cannot …, by any possibility, co-exist in the same mind."[15] Cabasilas as noted above argued similarly, and Luther takes the same position: "if God is in us, Satan is absent, and only a good will is present; if God is absent, Satan is present, and only an evil will is in us."[16] As exhortations, these usefully approximate and are even true if taken to mean "*to the extent* God is in us, Satan is absent" or if applied concurrently—Satan displaces God in any given moment. The literal implication, however, that we in this life can be pure godly would be wonderful, but life and Scripture disabuse us of this fantasy, at least for most of us.[17] Even the truism that we cannot be godly and ungodly in the same way at the same time still has us live both, and, no matter how much one predominates, the other is potent.[18] Removing evil means removing the cause behind it.[19] In Luther's terms, both God and Satan are in each of us, and, while God could prevail, that entails removing us.[20] Removing my evil means removing me. This, fortunately, is not His promised manner. God makes all things new, not all new things (2Co. 5:17; Rev. 21:5).[21] The proposed divisibility, therefore, matches the distinctive of Christ reconciling an individual to God without destroying the individual.[22] He insists on each of us from each of us.[23] In becoming godly, we join God, not become

---

[13] Cooper, *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting*, 49-50, 77, 101.

[14] "Human Being, Individual and Social," 162.

[15] *ST*, 38, 50.

[16] "De Servo Arbitrio," 180.

[17] Come, *Kierkegaard as Theologian*, 133.

[18] Harding, *Paul's Eschatological Anthropology*, 214, 218, 274.

[19] Geisler, *ST*, 790.

[20] Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, ed. Helmut Koester, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 272; Come, *Kierkegaard as Theologian*, 271; Guardini, *The World and the Person*, 95.

[21] Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife*, 181.

[22] Pannenberg, *Human Nature*, 13.

[23] Milbank, *Beyond Secular Order*, 127.

God, and, when God faces us, He draws us in, away from what has charmed us.[24] If we face away, we face torment or oblivion.[25] We become the self that God intends or spiral into our selfish center,[26] the difference between confronting our ungodliness and abiding in it.[27] "The light shines in the darkness, and no darkness grasped it," and those "doing evil" avoid the light, "but whoever does the truth comes toward the light" (John 1:5, 3:20-21). We might not identify with both light and darkness, but we live both.[28]

In summary, apart from the unifying terrestrial body (discussed repeatedly) and the personal identity (discussed further below), the next life's continuity includes the personal character, and its previously discussed dividedness in this life is divisible in the next.

b) Not purging

In the afterlife, divisibility is similar to purging in that both address how ungodliness discontinues while the saved continue, but the concepts differ essentially. Within tradition, purging never applies to the damned, but is exclusively applied to individuals on the eternal life trajectory.[29] For Exclusivists, purging prepares the chosen for eternal life, and, for Universalists, purging conveys everyone, particularly the laggards, into eternal life. That is, Exclusivist purging saves no one because purging is for the saved, and Universalist purging damns no one because purging is what avoids damnation. Therefore, regardless of which answer is given to salvation's extent, purging has no effect on salvation's paradox, whereas divisibility models that paradox.

Tradition does not apply purging to the damned because the concept is inapplicable. Purging's perspective is that of the preferred component. Purging silver means removing impurities, but, from the impurities' perspective, silver is removed. From the ore's perspective, on the other hand, silver and non-silver are separated from each other —the ore is *divided*. Unlike purging, the perspective inherent in divisibility, like the ore's, is holistic. This is God's perspective; He sees all of all, both godly and ungodly, though the relationships differ.[30] As Barth understood, while we cannot literally "adopt the point of view of God," "we are exhorted" to "bear it in mind, consider it from all sides,

---

[24] Henry, *Words of Christ*, 31; Krapiec, *I-Man*, 356.

[25] Balthasar, *Dare We Hope*, 129; Lewis, "Weight of Glory," 38; Pannenberg, *Anthropology in Theological Perspective*, 89.

[26] Welz, *Humanity in God's Image*, 265.

[27] Gregor, *Philosophical Anthropology*, 97; Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, 137-39, 161, 173-75.

[28] Gregory of Nyssa, *Life of Moses*, Bk II (p. 53).

[29] Schwarz, *Eschatology*, 337.

[30] Bultmann, "Theology as Science," 50; Jobes, "Remember These Things," 202.

and then live within its gravity."[31] Adam Cooper recognized theology should "embrace all things with a sensitivity and judgement shaped by the perspective of eternity."[32] So, divisibility treats both godliness and ungodliness as the individual, while purging removes ungodliness from the presumably godly individual. Thomas demonstrated this in describing the process both generally and for humans. For the world, "there will be a separation [*separatio*] of the elements," dividing desired from undesired, while, for humans, "it behooves … those things to be removed [*removeri*] which are opposed to glory," a purging of undesired so as to leave the desired.[33]

This difference in perspective matters to that undergoing the process. Purging targets what is alien; division targets what is allied. In the context of the individual, unlike divisibility and contrary to fact, purging takes *self*ishness as foreign to *self*.[34] I am not who God wants me to be plus something apart from me, despite purging's implication; rather, I am both who God desires for me and who God does not. I want to be God's object *me*, but the subject *I* is too lazy and too attached to self-gratifying. As Barth encapsulated, "the pronoun 'I' spells judgement."[35] Saying "I" certainly correlates to being *I* as we acquire speech around the same age as our sense of self.[36] "The word 'I' remains the shibboleth of mankind," Buber noted.[37] If God has chosen me for eternal life, even if I have done whatever I should, my glorification involves more than removing impurities, but saying farewell to the me I know. I have not died to myself in this life, not entirely, though I will to, mainly. On how rotten I am, I can be off and still be attached to all of me, because I remain my fallen universe's center. As Montemaggi discerns, I am unable "to live in total, loving surrender of self." It "has to do with … pride. … I hope the reader will … forgive this, and … the impression of false modesty …."[38] Removing the selfish me is not purging what is *not* me, but is dividing what *is* me.[39] Evil is of course

---

[31] *Romans*, 516 (14:13).

[32] *Holy Eros*, 3.

[33] *ST III (Suppl.)*, XX, Q. 74, art. 1, co. (p. 95); *Summa Theologica, Part III (Suppl.)*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, vol. XXI (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1922), Q. 97, art. 1, co. (p. 169); *Tertia Pars Summae Theologiae a Quaestione 60-90*, Opera Omnia, Iussu Impensaque Leonis XIII. P.M. Edita (Romae Typographia Polyglotta, 1882).

[34] Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology*, 213; Kierkegaard, *For Self-Examination*, 90.

[35] *Romans*, 85 (3:9).

[36] Carter and Frith, *Mapping the Mind*, 156.

[37] *I and Thou*, 69.

[38] *Reading Dante's Commedia*, 39.

[39] Gracia, *Individuality*, 30.

alien to God, but He is not the one purged. To a biped, on the other hand, leg amputation is not purging.

Afterlife purging is therefore very different from divisibility, notwithstanding that both understand humans as conflicted in this life and in need of change afterwards. Because purging and divisibility are both applied in the afterlife to deal with what is ungodly, the proposed divisibility can even relieve the extent of purging traditionally needed, and this issue is taken up in Chapter 9. The issue at hand is the contrast between purging and divisibility. Purging removes from the saved what is unworthy for eternal life, but divisibility is regardless of destiny and does not presume what is desired or ignore that what is removed is us—not the us we should be, but the us we are nonetheless. Consequently, purging, unlike divisibility, does nothing for Scripture's paradox of salvation's extent.

c) Undivided personal identity

The proposed model does not specify what constitutes you, nor is this specificity required. Regardless of ontology, being you before and after death requires your personal character, which differentiates you not only from others but from the potential you's that you have not lived to be.[40] If you lose all your actual memories (real or imagined), feelings, and dispositions, you have lost the actual you. Experiencing the loss, though, is your personal identity.[41] No matter how radical the changes to your character, they are your changes, and, if the change is total, you have been replaced. So long as they occur to *you*, however, your personal identity remains, which, Proust described, "is the persevering and unalterable servant of our successive personalities; hidden away in the shadow, … with no thought for the variability of the self …. It is as invariable as the intelligence and the sensibility are fickle, but since it is silent, gives no account of its actions, it seems almost non-existent …."[42] This bare personal identity, Stratford Caldecott learned, shapes the person's ultimate destiny.[43] Being possessed by God is decisive.[44] The more immersed in sin, the more sin is missed and the more painful the attraction to God.[45] Our orientations naturally appeal to us or we would not have them, and we

---

[40] Bernard Williams, *Moral Luck* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993), 15.

[41] Ian A. McFarland, "The Upward Call," in *Christian Doctrine of Humanity*, ed. Oliver D. Crisp and Fred Sanders (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018), 226, 228.

[42] *In Search of Lost Time*, II: 425-26.

[43] *Radiance of Being*, 243. Accord Welz, *Humanity in God's Image*, 153.

[44] Adrienne von Speyr, *The Word*, trans. Alexander Dru (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2019), 112.

[45] Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 379.

thereby identify with them. My godliness is drawn to God, and my ungodliness is drawn away; yet, if I identify with the ungodly, that is my identity, and vice-versa.[46]

Personal identity, so understood, highlights three features of the proposed model. First, it is ambiguous about whether identity is entirely given or partially chosen, and this reflects the two conceptions of identity previously described—the identi*ty* that is given and the identi*fying* that is partly chosen. The purely given personal identity is based on our experienced perspective, which is just there, and the partly chosen personal identifying is something we do but that is nonetheless strongly constrained, such as identifying with characters in a story. This more active identifying is admittedly beyond mere awareness, but is willed, a sort of empathy, which requires at least a trace of character; yet, this is not a problem because personal identity accompanies personal character in any event. As Fromm saw, identifying "is nothing but the expression of … character."[47] More theologically, this means the model is agnostic on atonement's extent and the predestination and freewill debate. The model can manage five-point Calvinism, where God chooses a person's identity as godly, or Wesleyanism, Arminianism, and Molinism, where a person chooses to identify as godly, as well as any of the more common intermediate combinations of divine grace and human response.[48] That is, the modeled identity can be any Christian blend of given and formed.

Second, as Chapter 6 explained, personal identity can never be divided or doubled and remain the same identity. A divided or doubled personal identity is like a four-sided triangle. Two awarenesses (sic) are either two persons or one person with some sort of stereo awareness, like the way are brain hemispheres have different perspectives. The personal identity's inherent unity, therefore, raises the question of what happens postmortem to identity when the personal character is divided postmortem. The model gives no answer, just as it does not say what happens postmortem generally. The model accepts our life has a personal identity and the saved has eternal life, which means the *pre*mortem personal identity continues *post*mortem, but, because each person can suffer the two ultimates and because no identity can be divided or doubled, how the postmortem transformation handles the personal identity is left open. That is, while one of two personal characters is experienced postmortem through the premortem personal identity,

---

[46] Clarke, *Person and Being*, 98-99; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 60.

[47] *Man for Himself*, 233.

[48] Adam J. Johnson, ed. *Five Views on the Extent of Atonement* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019).

the model says nothing about the existence, nature, or source of the personal identity, if any, for the other personal character.

While the thesis does not model it, answers are available for what happens postmortem regarding the personal identity. If the negative binary is annihilation, not torment,[49] the personal identity of the damned is ultimately a non-issue. What is annihilated has no experiences. Another mitigation would be, if the saved continued to be purged as tradition says, they would not require division too. After purging, nothing is left to be divided. Regardless of these extenuations, the personal identity question remains, and the answer turns on whether or not the personal character once divided requires another personal identity. If each divided personal character requires a personal identity, any postmortem transformation must add an identity to match the two characters. This presumably is what occurred in Chapter 6's word picture, though even in that scenario where the two you's confront each other, the other's personal identity was as foreign to you as anyone else's. An added personal identity also presumably manifests with each (fictional) teletransportation. On the other hand, if a personal identity is *not* required for each postmortem personal character even without the extenuations, which seems more likely, then no personal identity needs to be added. While every personal character *in this life* has a personal identity, nothing but that familiarity precludes its absence later. Some theorists of the self, such as Parfit, hold that, counter to what we commonly experience, no one has a personal identity beyond the personal character, which hypothesis Chapter 6 repudiated.[50] The Parfitian holding entails, however, the more limited and more commonsensical point that a personal character does not *need* a personal identity. Their main point depends on thought experiments convincing us of a reality we do not recognize, but their more limited point takes the experiments as word pictures, which are taken as merely conveying what is possible. Christian theorists reject the main Parfit holding because they know there is identity,[51] but they can agree with the more limited Parfitian point because they know identity is largely a matter of God's will.[52] So, if personal character can lack a personal identity, each character in the afterlife need not have one. Regardless, whether a personal identity is added or not, its indivisibility is not a hurdle for the model. Either one is mysteriously added in the same way one is mysteriously present

---

[49] Fudge, *The Fire That Consumes*, 33-252; Pinnock, "Annihilationism," 464-66; Stackhouse, "Terminal Punishment," 61-81.

[50] See n. 671, *supra*, at p. 158.

[51] Baker, *Persons and Bodies*, 134 n.28.

[52] Davis, *Risen Indeed*, 116-22 & .3.

now or an added one is unneeded. The issue is uncertain because the postmortem experience is not modeled other than what happens to the *pre*mortem personal identity and character. True, the issue of requiring an added personal identity validates the initial reaction that individual divisibility is strange, but this is to be expected from modeling paradoxes. Modeling a man as God means He has a mother and two wills.[53] Strange. Modeling life as eternal means that to die is to live.[54] Strange too.

Third, the modeled personal identity unmistakably distinguishes the proposal from Universalism. While recognizing we each can be saved and damned, our personal identity, which cannot be both, is in play. The two "ways of life meet not only in the personal form for which he is responsible before God," von Speyr explained, but the individual "has himself become a point of convergence"; "whatever in our offer of ourselves may seem to have a … relative character," but "we can always live at the center, the axis, of God's choice."[55] If we knew only God, Universalism makes perfect sense, but we know ourselves too. History is a prime indicator of this reality.[56] Marx's "The more man puts into God, the less he retains in himself"[57] can be felt despite its fallaciousness. Therefore, my personal identity's destiny, which follows from with whom I identify, is not unquestionably the God-oriented me. Desiring one orientation does not eliminate the other.[58] My self-oriented me draws me away.[59] God "is waiting and watching" for what "even He cannot produce," Lewis remarked, but is what each of us "freely give Him or freely refuse Him."[60] We identify with the character oriented toward Him or we do not, but our personal identity is one or the other. Said another way, our personal character is to an extent Universalist, but our personal identity is to its only extent Exclusivist.

* * * *

The thesis is that whatever the individual is and continues from this life into the next is divisible. That which continues, as noted, is manifestly not the earthly body,

---

[53] Justo L. Gonzalez, *The Story of Christianity*, Rev. ed. (New York: HarperOne, 2010), 299-302, 304-305; Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 343, 498.

[54] Colijn, *Images of Salvation*, 87.

[55] *The Christian State of Life*, trans. Mary Frances McCarthy (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1986), 93, 109.

[56] Pannenberg, *Anthropology in Theological Perspective*, 485.

[57] "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts," in *Karl Marx Selected Writings*, ed. David McLellan (Oxford Univ. Press, 1978), 79.

[58] Wollheim, *Thread of Life*, 183.

[59] Lubac, *Catholicism*, 342.

[60] *Mere Christianity*, 164-65.

which in death suffers its own thoroughly disassembling division. Rather, what continues beyond this life, however it subsists and whatever it becomes, includes the personal identity and character that have lived. Of the two, identity, your awareness, is intrinsically indivisible, but the character, the lived you, is nearly divided normally and, therefore, can be divided actually. The next section revisits the justification for dividing the personal character after this life.

2) <u>Individual afterlife divisibility allows the salvation paradox.</u>

Though Scripture says both everyone is saved and not everyone is, no interpreter has tolerated that position. An Exclusivist majority says Scripture only *seems* to declare everyone saved; a Universalist dissent says Scripture only *seems* to declare not everyone is; and Potentialists, when not hopeful Exclusivists, say Scripture only *seems* lucid in declaring both. Taking either Scriptural account as not meaning what it says rings false, and taking Scripture as unmeaningful rings not at all. As an alternative, the thesis deploys the model of an individual who is divisible after this life. The proposal thereby tolerates both Scriptural propositions, keeping the accounts paradoxical. Incorporating all the data is the measure of a theory's worth.[61]

To make this plain, the responses to the salvation paradox can be compared in tabular form based on their fidelity to the Scriptural accounts and their sufferance of the principle of noncontradiction. The table separately treats Potentialism's two positions identified previously (Type III being no position) and gives the thesis a handle like the other responses, which is "Paradoxism":

	Universalism	Exclusivism	Potentialism		Paradoxism
			I	II	
Everyone is ultimately saved	True	*False*	*Maybe*	True	True
Not everyone is ultimately saved	*False*	True	*Maybe*	True	True
Truths cannot (actually) contradict	True	True	True	*False*	True

Universalism is true in that everyone is saved; Exclusivism is true in that only some are; and Potentialism, when not optimistic Exclusivism, is right in that both are true. Each position is *untrue* (italicized) only when negating the truth agreed on by the others. Universalism denies Scripture says not everyone is ultimately saved, when it patently does at times. Exclusivism denies Scripture says everyone is ultimately saved, when it patently does at times. Potentialism denies (I) both accounts by adding *potentially* every time or

[61] Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, 52.

(II) reality by believing an actual contradiction. Each position, true in the positive, strays in the denial. When embracing Scripture, each position is true; when refraining, each is deficient. "For it is … by negation rather than positively," adopting Pater's words, "that such theories fail to satisfy us permanently, and what they really need for their correction, is the complementary influence … in which they may find their due place."[62] Paradoxism, in contrast, takes the Scriptural accounts as-is and the principle of noncontradiction as indispensable. Universalism is true, Exclusivism is true, and Potentialism is right, but only Paradoxism treats the salvation paradox as truths in apparent contradiction. The paradox thus exposes the resilience of "one" as expressed in words like "every*one*" and implied in words like "all," and Paradoxism exploits this resiliency. In terms of the noncontradiction principle, the Scriptural accounts are modeled so as to not contradict *in the same way*.

Scriptural necessity, therefore, divides the individual, and, if *necessity can break iron*,[63] necessity can break the individual. Paradoxism, however, seemingly violates a different maxim, *a part cannot exceed its whole*,[64] because dividing one individual results in two individuals. Yet, this maxim is frequently disproven. Identical doubles occur when the first two cells of a fertilized sea-urchin egg are separated or whenever flatworms are split,[65] and division doubles each time cells reproduce via mitosis.[66] In this life at least, division plus energy can equal doubling. Hesiod knew, "fools, they do not know how much more the half is than the whole …."[67] Eternal life should be no less. With such an understanding of divisible life, the salvation paradox rejoins other Christian paradoxes.[68] Just as the Trinity models how God can be one and three, the divisible individual models how one person can be both saved and unsaved. Scripture's "most unvarying fate," Luther pointed out, is "to have the world in a state of tumult …."[69] Instead of Scriptural cul-de-sacs for salvation's extent, one Universalist, one Exclusivist, formed by an

---

62 *Marius the Epicurean*, 183.

63 Feuerbach, *Essence of Christianity*, I,XV (p .146).

64 Marsilius, *Defensor Pacis*, II, I,XIII,2 (p. 51).

65 Crick, *The Astonishing Hypothesis*, 6; Moran Neuhof, Michael Levin, and Oded Rechavi, "Vertically- and Horizontally-Transmitted Memories," *Biology Open* 5 (2016): 1177-88.

66 J.R. McIntosh and M.P. Koonce, "Mitosis," *Science* 246, no. 4930 (1989): 622.

67 "Works and Days," in *Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*, ed. Glenn W. Most (Harvard Univ. Press, 2010), 41 (pp. 88-91).

68 Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, 28-29.

69 "De Servo Arbitrio," 129.

inviolate individual, Paradoxism reconnects both Scriptural accounts through the divisible individual.

3) <u>The divisible individual transitions into the afterlife.</u>

The proposed model can now be exercised within the nonparadoxical features of ultimate salvation that Chapter 2 identified, which involved roughly three explanatory moments:

- Death: This life ends.
- Separation: The godly is separated from the ungodly for eternal life.
- Completion: The eternally living are completed.

Death ushers in the moments of separation and completion. While death is temporally before the other two, this subsequent pair need not be sequential with respect to each other. Because their accomplishments are different, their occurrence can be understood separately, but their order and distinctiveness are neither required nor established. Paradoxism applies after the first moment as part of the second. Rahner observed, "the reality of man … is not abolished in death, but rather is transposed into another mode of existence," "mark[ing] an end for the whole person."[70] This transposition is untouched by and well timed for Paradoxism. As to the moment of completion, it too is transforming[71] and untouched by Paradoxism because whatever completion occurs in the afterlife still occurs.[72] Paradoxism, as part of the separation moment, enables the completion moment. That which bears no fruit is cut off, and all that bears fruit is cut clean to be completed (John 15:2).[73] The proposed model need not change even the separation moment other than to separate the godly and ungodly *as to* each individual rather than *between* godly and ungodly individuals. It remains true the godly have eternal life, the ungodly do not, and individuals have both; and eternity still somehow conserves and completes this life.[74]

Paradoxism, accordingly, is at home in ultimate salvation's broad understanding. Each of us is godly and selfish, the first because that was the design and the second because, as Lewis observed, "The moment you have a self at all, there is a possibility of

---

[70] *Foundations of Christian Faith*, 437-38.

[71] Behr, *Mystery of Christ*, 105, 143; Blowers, *Maximus the Confessor*, 229, 236, 247.

[72] Jonathan Edwards, "The Miscellanies," in *Works Of*, ed. Paul Ramsey (Yale Univ. Press, 1957), 1099; Rahner, *Foundations of Christian Faith*, 441.

[73] Keener, *John*, II, 993-98.

[74] White, *Life Beyond Death*, 68.

putting yourself first—wanting to be the centre—wanting to be God, in fact."[75] The doomed worship self, and death gives them their ambition,[76] vindicating the Hasidic aphorism, "There is no room for God in him who is full of himself."[77] Both those seeking God and those seeking anything else as god obtain their desire.[78] Individuals who are unprepared to live with God abandon existence, usually by claiming godhood.[79] Ratzinger explained, "man wishes to be God. … Yet man pursues it in the style of a Prometheus, … equality with God …. But man is not God. By making himself like unto God he sets himself over against truth, and so the adventure ends in that nothingness where truth is not."[80] Because identity and identification are coupled,[81] if we identify *with* God, we are with Him, and, if we identify *as* God, we are not. In God's realm, we live glorified; in any other, we live nowhere, or worse.[82] Paradoxism highlights all this. Despite its radicality, people still experience eternal life and perishing, including resurrection, judgment, and completion, and these still relate to Father-glorifying, Son-following, and Spirit-filling. The only change individual divisibility offers is preservation of the salvation paradox.

* * * *

Prior chapters established two seemingly disconnected points: The Church has not preserved the Scriptural paradox of salvation's extent, and the individual is notionally divisible. This chapter has taken the by-now fully anticipated step of connecting these two observations—preserving the paradox by dividing the individual. The issue has not been what are salvation's binary ultimates, but the extent to which non-binary individuals have them. With division, an individual has the ultimates to an extent. That which is godly has eternal life; that which is ungodly has perishing. While the Church has thus far preferred to destroy the paradox and preserve the individual, purged or not, Paradoxism prefers the paradox even if to hell with the individual. Though perhaps ironic given the focus on the individual, whatever distress the individual suffers confirms the intuition that only by attending to something can it be transformed.

---

[75] *Mere Christianity*, 38.

[76] Lewis, *Problem of Pain*, 124-25.

[77] Buber, *Ten Rungs*, 102.

[78] C.S. Lewis, *The Great Divorce* (New York: HarperOne, 1973), 75.

[79] Guardini, *Freedom, Grace, and Destiny*, 80.

[80] *Eschatology*, 64-65.

[81] Williams, *Problems of the Self*, 41.

[82] Henry, *Words of Christ*, 83; Kempis, *Imitation of Christ*, III,IX,1; Pieper, *Death and Immortality*, 59.

If dividing the individual to preserve the Scriptural paradox seems too costly, the following chapters might help. The next chapter detects substantiation for individual afterlife division within Scripture and its theological tradition, and the ensuing chapter deals with how Paradoxism can otherwise suit Christian doctrine.

Chapter 8. CHRISTIANITY'S DIVISIBLE INDIVIDUAL

> *[If] nothing lay ahead but … death and eternal oblivion, … he had either to explain his life so that it did not look like the wicked mockery of some devil, or shoot himself.*
>
> —Tolstoy[1]

Scripture has seeded the discourse throughout and formed the paradox from which the individual's afterlife divisibility emerged, but it has to this point been unexamined for what it says about the individual's afterlife divisibility outside the paradox and *individual* generally. Scripture, no surprise to anyone familiar with it, never says the individual is actually divisible, but what is surprising is that, once Paradoxism is allowable, Scriptural oddities taken at face value point in that direction. The second half considers those working with Scripture who, without preserving the salvation paradox, approach Paradoxism's strangest feature. Theologians have explained the incongruity of nonbinary individuals entering the binary of eternal life with such graphic descriptions of afterlife purging that they substantiate Paradoxism's claim that the individual can endure division.

1) Scriptural hints of afterlife divisibility are ignored.

Scripture could theoretically repudiate afterlife divisibility, but does not. It says little of course about the individual in the next life, as Paul exemplifies with his account of his heavenly trip "in or out of the body, I know not, God knows" (2Co. 12:2-3).[2] Even if Scripture was not the authority on the next life despite Chapter 1's pledge, other afterlife data would not help because non-Scriptural data is subjective—each reported experience is unavoidably individualized.[3] This absence of evidence is obviously not evidence of absence, but *is* evidential when weighed because the affirmative evidence, which is offered below, necessarily preponderates. Further, evidentiary silence, like Sherlock's unbarking dog, can be evidence if affirmative evidence should exist but does not.[4] Scripture, as has been noted, employs frequently the concepts of *individual* and relies acutely on its orientations to answer the question of *who we are*.[5] "The Bible focuses relentlessly on the human

---

[1] *Anna Karenina*, 796.

[2] Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 128; Christopher Rowland, "Eschatology of the NT Church," in *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, ed. Jerry L. Walls (Oxford Univ. Press, 2008), 59.

[3] Nichols, *Death and Afterlife*, 91-112; White, *Life Beyond Death*, 61-62; Zaleski, "Near-Death Experiences," 614-28.

[4] Stanley Brice Frost, "Death of Josiah," *JBL* 87, no. 4 (1968): 369; John Lange, "The Argument from Silence," *History and Theory* 5, no. 3 (1966): 288-301.

[5] Oliver D. Crisp and Fred Sanders, eds., *Christian Doctrine of Humanity* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018), 15; Pannenberg, *Anthropology in Theological Perspective*, 395; Rosner, "Son of God at the Centre," 224.

being," Gordon McConville summarized, and "the nature of humanity … belong[s] centrally to the subject matter of biblical portrayal …."[6] Scripture, despite its extended treatment of *individual*, never once indicates its indivisibility.[7] This contrasts with the intimations about divisibility discussed next.

Scriptural meaning is inexhaustible.[8] "There is something to be gained from the obscurity of the inspired discourses of Scripture," Augustine understood.[9] Such sources tend to answer only the questions put to them,[10] requiring the proper questions be put. If asked non-presumptively, Scripture hints at individual divisibility. It advances afterlife descriptions that are so violent that they are written off as gratuitous, but, if read plainly, suggest individual divisibility. Scripture also often says eternal life pertains to *what*, not *who*, experiences it and these grammatical anomalies fit ultimate salvation pertaining to individual predicates, not individuals *in toto*. Scripture at times adds that eternal life and perishing can be experienced to an extent, which are taken as nonliteral given the binaries, but divisibility accounts for these expressions. Moreover, to relate how binary outcomes are scalably experienced, the NT extensively uses a small Greek word that contributes contingency to the already contingent "if," whose combination could mean "to the extent," an otherwise unexpressed relationship in the NT. Finally, Scripture describes everyone in the eschaton experiencing *eternal life*, including those who *perish*, which is taken as muddled, but describes each person experiencing both ultimates, for which a divided person allows.

These readings run exegetically upstream, but follow to a fault what is written. These passages ordinarily suffer the exegetical stratagem Exclusivists and Universalists launch at antagonists: Scripture is figurative when it says what is unexpected. The readings here are almost Kierkegaardian: "Would it ever occur to a lover to read a letter from his beloved with a commentary!" After translation, "Every commentary detracts."[11] "What is needed above all is to get the huge libraries and scribblings and the eighteen hundred years out of the way in order to gain the view."[12] The offered readings are novel and hence precarious, but this is not a problem because they do *not* establish

---

[6] *Being Human in God's World*, 7, 9.
[7] Berkouwer, *Man: Image of God*, 264.
[8] Blowers, *Maximus the Confessor*, 137.
[9] *City of God*, XI,19 (p. 450).
[10] Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 215.
[11] *JP*, I, 85 (entry 210).
[12] *Book on Adler*, 43.

Paradoxism. Its model derives entirely from Scripture's paradox of salvation's extent. The exegesis is not even secondary support. That honor belongs to the Scriptural insistence that the outcomes are binary while humanity is not, which Paradoxism, like purging, explains. Instead, finding Paradoxism within Scripture follows the approach that found Trinitarianism. The Church did not first see the Trinity in Scripture, but, seeing Scripture in paradox, arrived at the Trinity and then found Scripture expressing it.[13] This became the scientific method: Develop a model to explain the unintelligible and *then* proceed to the facts for validation or not.[14]

a) Unheeded descriptions

Scripture frequently portrays the individual as conflicted in this life as has been seen, but it occasionally suggests more—division afterwards. Scripture is not read this way because of the innocent assumption that the individual is *in*divisible, but, when the assumption is suspended, statements credited to Jesus suggest afterlife divisibility. In a series of parables about God's coming judgment, Jesus warns He has come to give earth *division* (διαμερισμόν, Luke 12:5, 36-38, 45-46, 51//Mat. 10:28, 34, 24:51). Tradition takes this as people being eschatologically divided into two groups, one saved, one not, but Jesus forestalls this reading when He says the God-figure *will cut in two* (διχοτομήσει) the unworthy servant and assign *part* (μέρος) with unbelievers. Assuming Jesus could say nothing so grisly, some exegetes blame a mistranslation of His unrecorded Aramaic, which would naturally be less savage,[15] but this is pure conjecture.[16] Usually, His phrasing is excused as a flashy image of a severe beating,[17] but no exemplars support this hypothesis either, which leaves διχοτομήσει's literal meaning of *cut in two*.[18] Josephus, for example, uses the term for the key article of Solomon's split-the-baby decision.[19] The

---

[13] Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 177; Wiles, *Making of Christian Doctrine*, 53; Joseph Wolinski, "Trinity: Theological History," in *Encyclopedia of Christian Theology*, ed. Jean-Yves Lacoste (New York: Routledge, 2005), 1606-607.

[14] Al-Ghazali, "Deliverance from Error," 25; Immanuel Kant, "Preface to Second Edition," in *Critique of Pure Reason* (New York: St Martin's, 1965), 20 (B xiii); F.S.C. Northrop, "Introduction," in *Werner Heisenberg's Physics and Philosophy* (Amherst: Prometheus, 1999), 3-4.

[15] Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, ed. David A. Hubbard, WBC (Dallas: Word Books, 1995), 724-25.

[16] John Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, Ibid., (1993), 704.

[17] Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1182; Carson, "Matthew," 511; Morris, *Matthew*, 617-18.

[18] *BDAG*, 253; Alfred Plummer, *Gospel According to S. Luke*, ed. S.R. Driver, et al., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1981), 332-33.

[19] Ceslas Spicq, "Dichotomeo," in *Theological Lexicon of the NT*, ed. James D. Ernest (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 351.

parable, therefore, refers to an individual's division in the afterlife based on faith.[20] Endorsing this literal "cut in two" meaning is that διχοτομήσει is used with μέρος, which denotes "part, in contrast to the whole" or derivatively "body parts."[21] Parts are obviously what result from splitting something.[22] The parable has outcome variability clearly in view given that Jesus also refers to a range of individualized floggings in the coming judgment (Luke 12:47-48).[23] Why a parable of a person's bisection based on faith? The pericope could be an inexplicable anomaly, but it is one that both the *Luke* and *Matthew* authors, each with a demonstrated willingness to edit,[24] separately retained. If intentional, it reflects what it says—the individual is divisible in the afterlife.[25]

This cut-in-two parable is not even Jesus' most gruesome depiction. He twice commends to a pre-anesthetics world self-amputation to avoid hell. "If your right eye scandalizes you, extract it and cast it away, for one appendage perishing, and not your whole body cast into hell, secures you," and, in case that were unclear, He repeats the point for the right hand (Mat. 5:29-30). When Christ revisits the subject, He is ebullient:

> To the extent your hand scandalizes you, cut it off; you're better off entering life maimed than having two hands entering hell, the unquenchable fire. To the extent your foot scandalizes you, cut it off; you're better off entering life lame than having two feet cast into hell. To the extent your eye scandalizes you, cast it out; you're better off entering God's reign one eyed than having two eyes cast into hell, where their worm dies not and the fire quenches not …. (Mark 9:43-49//Mat. 18:8-9)

These otherwise insane passages (apotemnophilia) are interpreted as figurative for how seriously sin should be treated,[26] but this neutralizes Christ's vivid images.[27] The "shocking" words say take sin seriously, but, as "exaggerations," not as seriously as all that.[28]

---

[20] Francois Bovon, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51–19:27*, ed. Helmut Koester, trans. Donald S. Deer, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013), 240.

[21] *BDAG*, 633-34; Gottfried Nebe, "Μέρος," in *Exegetical Dict. of the NT*, ed. Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 409-10.

[22] Stein, *Luke*, 362.

[23] Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1184-86.

[24] Carson, "Matthew," 16-17; Stein, *Luke*, 59.

[25] Origen, *On First Principles*, II,10,7 (pp. 144-45).

[26] Craig L. Blomberg, *Matthew*, ed. David S. Dockery, NAC (Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 109, 275; Carson, "Matthew," 151; Edwards, *Mark*, 293-96; William L. Lane, *Gospel According to Mark*, ed. Gordon D. Fee, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 347-50.

[27] Istvan Czachesz, "Why Body Matters in the Afterlife," in *The Human Body in Death and Resurrection*, ed. Tobias Nicklas, et al. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 406; Morris, *Matthew*, 119; Robert H. Stein, *Mark*, ed. Robert Yarbrough and Robert H. Stein, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 449.

[28] France, *Matthew*, 205, 683.

These expressions truly shock, however, if the individual is, no exaggeration, divisible.[29] Jesus and the first audiences knew, as we do, that the binary ultimates do not correspond to nonbinary humanity,[30] and, so, when He says eternal life is better partly than not at all and parting with a damned part is better than damnation entirely, only exegetical predispositions make them hyperbole.[31] Paradoxism, on the other hand, takes His images not as wildly exaggerated, but wildly true. Salvation is not, Lewis reminded, "like the development from seed to flower," but "Our Lord speaks of eyes being plucked out and hands lopped off—a frankly Procrustean method of adaptation."[32]

b) Separating the godly predicate

Binary ultimates plus parsimony imply binary groups, and Scripture reinforces the inference. In the Lazarus parable, no one of middling character, only a chasm, is between Lazarus, who is comforted by the angels and Abraham, and Dives, who is tormented in Hades' flames (Luke 16:19-31). The sheep and goats parable likewise has no mongrels of mixed righteousness, only the purely righteous sheep on the right and the purely unrighteous goats on the left (Mat. 25:31-46).[33] Despite only the two extremes in the parables, the audience could, in applying them, be expected to recall that humanity is not binary.[34] Universalists do. Macrina understood Lazarus and Dives as orientations in each of us,[35] and Bulgakov took the sheep-goats parable similarly: "the separation into sheep and goat is accomplished (of course to different degrees) within every individual …. Thus, the judgment … introduce[s] into the life of every person an antinomic separation that consists in participating in glory … and, at the same time, in burning in the fire of divine rejection. The difference between the two states can here be only a quantitative one."[36]

The human condition might justify such interpretations, but elsewhere Scripture's irregular wording does the justifying. John's gospel, for instance, uses neuter nouns, not personal ones, to distinguish the saved: "All [Πᾶν] the Father gives Me will come to Me; whoever comes to Me I'll never ever cast out, … and this is My sender's will: I may

---

[29] Gavrilyuk, "Judgment of Love," 296.

[30] Bulgakov, *Bride of the Lamb*, 465.

[31] Berkouwer, *Man: Image of God*, 245; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, ed. David A. Hubbard, WBC (Dallas: Word Books, 1993), 121.

[32] "Membership," 174.

[33] France, *Matthew*, 961 n.86; Morris, *Matthew*, 633-35.

[34] Nichols, *Death and Afterlife*, 164.

[35] Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Soul and Resurrection*, ch 6 (pp. 75-76).

[36] *Bride of the Lamb*, 462.

annihilate none of all [πᾶν] He has given Me, but raise it [αὐτὸ] up on the last day, for My Father wills that all [πᾶς] who … believe in the Son have eternal life, and Me, I'll raise him [αὐτὸν] up on the last day" (6:37-40). Though His topic is people, Jesus uses neuter nouns (πᾶν and αὐτὸ) for the saved, which, unlike masculine ones, stress qualities, not persons.[37] Exegetes nonetheless take these singular neuters as plural persons, and the usual assumption that persons come in two groups necessitates this move.[38] If an individual were divisible, however, the reference expresses what its grammar suggests—the salvation division is within, not between, individuals.

John offers further examples: The Son was "granted liberty over all flesh so He might give all [πᾶν] that You've given Him eternal life" (17:2). While Christ has authority over the grammatically feminine "all flesh," the neuter "all" has eternal life.[39] The expected feminine or masculine *all* for flesh or people would have referred to humanity, but the unexpected neuter *all* emphasizes a human quality; yet, convention still takes it as humanity.[40] While personifying is an understandable strategy for explaining concepts to persons,[41] de-personifying, which is what this is, is an affectation in search of a purpose. If, however, *John*'s author deserves his reputation for craftsmanship,[42] his choice of neuter is informative—the quality of godliness has eternal life. *John*'s third usage is, "Father, My will is that what [ὃ] You've given Me be where I am and be with Me" (17:24). The first word (in Greek) after the vocative *Father* is the neuter *what*, emphasizing it is not the expected masculine *who*,[43] which highlights that the division is not between followers and non-followers. Presumably because this emphasized the division's what-ness, some manuscripts "corrected" *John*'s neuter to the masculine οὓς to express the traditional group

---

[37] F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *Greek Grammar of the NT and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. Robert W. Funk (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1962), § 138 (p. 76); Edward W. Klink, III, *John*, ed. Clinton E. Arnold, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 332; Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek NT*, 2nd ed., Bib. Languages: Greek (1996), 101; Nigel Turner, *Grammar of NT Greek: J.H. Moulton*, 4 vols., vol. III (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 21.

[38] Carson, *John*, 290; Andreas J. Kostenberger, *John*, ed. Robert Yarbrough and Robert H. Stein, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 211 n.61; Morris, *John*, 325.

[39] Keener, *John*, II, 1053.

[40] Carson, *John*, 555; Morris, *John*, 636-37 n.9.

[41] Carson, "Matthew," 326.

[42] Kostenberger, *John*, 1.

[43] Morris, *John*, 651 n.75.

division,[44] with which later scribes (like modern exegetes) are more comfortable.[45] The attempted fix thus draws out *John*'s original point—a quality, not persons, is with Christ.

The NT also uses adjectives and participles instead of nouns for the saved and doomed. "Both righteousness [δικαίων] and unrighteousness [ἀδίκων] are next to be resurrected" (Acts 24:15). "The Lord knows how to rescue reverence [εὐσεβεῖς] from trial and to reserve unrighteousness [ἀδίκους] for punishing into a day of judgment" (2Pe. 2:9-10). Such substantive adjectives linguistically stress qualities, not persons.[46] The adjectives are also abnormally anarthrous, further stressing qualities.[47] So, given the grammar, qualities, not people, are literally saved and doomed. Participles reflect this too: "He not being [ὢν] with Me is against Me, and he not gathering [συνάγων] to Me scatters" (Mat. 12:30// Luke 11:23). The usual understanding is this "divides humanity simply into two groups; there is no middle ground,"[48] because an individual must be "heaven bound or hell bound," "pro-Jesus or con-Jesus," "righteous or unrighteous."[49] Even if this fit Scripturally described and commonly observed humanity notwithstanding Chapter 6, the participles undermine this reading by denoting qualities in motion, not actors.[50]

In short, Scripture often expresses salvation of a personal quality, not a person altogether, which fits as expressed if individuals are ultimately divided, not one from another, but as to their qualities. To avoid this conclusion, Scripture must in several places be taken as grammatically wayward.

c) Experiencing binary outcomes

The NT sometimes applies to humanity the eschatological binaries such that they are experienced in nonbinary ways. That is, eternal life and perishing, despite being binaries, are experienced on a scale. The positive binary is experienced variously in the mina parable—different performances receive different eschatological rewards (Luke 19:11-27).[51] Likewise, the rich *hardly* (δυσκόλως) enter God's reign (Mat. 19:23//Mark 10:23//Luke 18:24), where the adverb means *degree* of difficulty.[52] The negative binary is

---

[44] Carson, *John*, 571.

[45] Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 214.

[46] Turner, *Grammar*, III, 13; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 233.

[47] Porter, *Idioms*, 105; A.T. Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek NT* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934), 794; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 294.

[48] France, *Matthew*, 481.

[49] Stein, *Luke*, 332.

[50] Robertson, *Grammar*, 1100; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 613, 616.

[51] Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1536-37, 1540-43.

[52] Horst Balz, "Δυσκόλως," in *Exegetical Dict. of the NT*, ed. Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider

likewise experienced diversely. Some people are *twice* as hellish[53] as others (Mat. 23:15), damnation is *more bearable*[54] for some than others (10:15, 11:22, 24; Luke 10:12, 14), and some are condemned *more*[55] than others (Mark 12:40//Luke 20:47). These rare comparative adjectives plainly express "degree, not kind."[56] Similarly, eschatological destiny in the faithful servant parable involves flaying some *much* and others *little*,[57] depending on the degree of unfaithfulness (12:47-48). Finally, tormentors get *as much*[58] torment in their eschatological destiny as they gave in life (Rev. 18:6-7). Though these could be hyperbolic,[59] only a resolve that the binaries be experienced either-or requires that the expressed variability in the afterlife be figurative.

None of this changes the Scriptural insistence *that* the outcomes are binary, but all of it challenges the typical understanding of *how* the binaries are experienced. Without some other element, these descriptions lack literal meaning because someone cannot have eternal life, wonderful at the extreme, and someone else have more, nor can someone have absolute negation, God-less eternity, and someone else have less.[60] But variously experiencing these either-or outcomes describes individual divisibility.

d) "To the extent"

English typically expresses binary conditions with "if." Greek does so with εἰ. When such conditions are applied in nonbinary ways, English uses "to the extent (that)." Applied to salvation's extent, eternal life is *to the extent* godly. Though common in English, NT Greek supposedly uses no such fully scalable conditional in any context. Instead, given what contemporary grammarians finagle from NT conditionals, Greek conditionals express only their odds, ranging from likely to hypothetical,[61] adhering to the formula, "Given certain conditions, certain results follow."[62] As a result, the NT authors

---

(Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 361; France, *Mark*, 404; Morris, *Matthew*, 492-93.

[53] Διπλότερον is comparative of διπλοῦς, "double." *BDAG*, 251-52.

[54] Ανεκτότερον is comparative of ἀνεκτός, "bearable, endurable." Ibid., 76.

[55] Περισσότερον as a comparative of περισσός, "abundant," means "even more." Ibid., 805-806.

[56] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 296-98.

[57] These are plurals of πολύς, "much," and ὀλίγος, "little." *BDAG*, 702-703, 847-50.

[58] Τοσοῦτον is the correlative demonstrative pronoun "so much." Ibid., 1012.

[59] Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 669.

[60] Wilko van Holten, "Can the Traditional View of Hell Be Defended?," *Anglican Theological Rev.* 85, no. 3 (2003): 475; Wright, *Surprised by Hope*, 179.

[61] Robertson, *Grammar*, 1004-27.

[62] C.F.D. Moule, *Idiom Book of NT Greek*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990), 148.

can apparently never state what English speakers state effortlessly, "*To the extent* of certain conditions, certain results follow."

Two Greek terms almost express "to the extent." From classical Greek, καθότι nearly does the job by blending *according to* (κατά), *what* (ὅ), and *thing* (τι) to mean "to the degree,"[63] but this says the condition has obtained to *an* extent, unlike "to *the* extent," which retains the conditionality of "if." In Hellenistic Greek, however, καθότι is entirely unhelpful. In its six NT uses, all by *Luke* (1:7, 19:9; Acts 2:24, 45, 4:35, 17:31), καθότι is not a conditional but a variant of ὅτι (because).[64] So, it never expresses "to the extent." A second word, ὅσος (*insofar*, *inasmuch*), is used over 100 times in the NT to express correlation or comparison.[65] It too can be confused for a fully scalable conditional like *to the extent* because it indicates a condition that obtains partly like *to an extent* or that obtains enormously like *to such an extent*.[66] The NASB, for instance, twice renders ἐφ' ὅσον as *to the extent* (Mat. 25:40, 45) despite precisely rendering the phrase elsewhere (9:15; Rom. 11:13).[67] Regardless of translation, however, ὅσον by definition and every NT usage expresses a condition that definitely obtains (albeit variously) unlike *to the extent*.[68]

Admittedly, any NT "to the extent" lacuna is manageable, because other strategies can compensate, such as puzzles (*e.g.*, "I believe; help my unbelief") or odd grammar (*e.g.*, neuter nouns for people). The lacuna is partly the result of Scripture's lack of interest in fine distinctions between characters, often using positive adjectives when the comparative (or superlative) is meant.[69] Though it occasionally makes explicit the absolute (1Th. 5:23), it mostly avoids character gradations even in non-conditionals.[70] Noah, Job, Lot, and the Josephs are "blameless" or "righteous" without being absolutely so because the terms approximate (Gen. 6:9; Job 1:1, 8; Mat. 1:19; Luke 23:50; 2Pe. 2:7-8).[71] Even if

---

[63] I. Howard Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Paternoster, 1995), 53; Plummer, *Luke*, 10.

[64] *Luke*, 10; Porter, *Idioms*, 237.

[65] Horst Balz, "Ὅσος," in *Exegetical Dict. of the NT*, ed. Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 537; *BDAG*, 729; Henry George Liddell et al., "Ὅσος," in *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 1262; Franco Montanari, "Ὅσος," in *The Brill Dict. of Ancient Greek*, ed. Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroder (Boston: Brill, 2015), 1494; Joseph H. Thayer, "Ὅσος," in *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the NT* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 457.

[66] These idiomatic distinctions are described in Merriam-Webster's Learner's Dictionary, "extent," http://learnersdictionary.com/definition/extent (accessed 3 Oct. 2018).

[67] Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 655; Nolland, *Matthew*, 40.

[68] *Matthew*, 1031; Robertson, *Grammar*, 733.

[69] Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 296-97.

[70] David J.A. Clines, *Job 1–20*, ed. David A. Hubbard, WBC (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 12.

[71] Blomberg, *Matthew*, 58; Demarest, *Cross and Salvation*, 416-19; Kenneth A. Mathews, *Genesis 1–*

gradations were desirable, *to the extent*'s precision can sound clinical, and its prolixity contrasts with *if*'s bite. Still, these workarounds and excuses fail to explain why the NT talents omit entirely nonbinary conditionals, which English speakers manage easily.[72]

While admittedly not apparent from its translation or exegesis, a Greek word in the NT could, in conjunction with "if," express "to the extent." The particle ἄν adds a usually unrenderable contingency to what it modifies.[73] Translators can reflect its presence by adding "would" when modifying main verbs or "ever" when modifying particles,[74] but its added contingency is lost when ἄν modifies the already contingent "if [εἰ]" in their blend ἐάν, which also means "if."[75] In its 351 NT appearances, ἐάν when paired with a subjunctive verb conventionally indicates a third-class condition—one that ranges from likely to possible to hypothetical,[76] which is what the subjunctive means anyway.[77] So, ἐάν, in suggesting opaquely and redundantly a condition's odds, defies literary criticism's insight that each bit counts.[78] Though no jot should fail (Luke 16:17),[79] ἐάν seems to be an exception—"if" plus ἄν equals "if."

It need not be that way. Ἐάν could express a conditional in both kind (from "if") and degree (from ἄν) and thereby accomplish what "to the extent" accomplishes in English. *Galatians* has an archetypal disputed use: *Works do not justify except/unless through faith* (2:16), where *except/unless* represents ἐάν with *not* (μὴ). The phrase has doctrinal implications because "except" means justification is from faith, *not* works, and "unless" means justification is from faith *with* works.[80] Both traditions, however, employ only the "if" of ἐάν. If ἄν were restored, faith's necessity and work's value is apparent either way:

11:26, ed. E. Ray Clendenen, NAC (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996), 358-59.

[72] The Learner's Dictionary (see, *supra*, n. 66) reports "to the extent that" is "often used" to describe conceptual relationships.

[73] Carson, "Matthew," 397; *BDAG*, 56; James Hope Moulton, *Grammar of NT Greek*, 3rd ed., 4 vols., vol. I (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978), 165.

[74] *BDAG*, 56.

[75] Robertson, *Grammar*, 1007.

[76] Horst Balz, "Ἐάν," in *Exegetical Dict. of the NT*, ed. Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 367. Technically, the apodosis must not be in the present indicative; if it is, it is a fifth class condition—present general condition (simple if-then). Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 470.

[77] *Greek Grammar*, 461-63.

[78] Bruce K. Waltke, *Genesis: Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 33.

[79] Jerome, "Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians," in *Commentaries of Origen and Jerome on St Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, ed. Ronald E. Heine (Oxford Univ. Press, 2002), Bk II, 591 (3:5-7, p. 147); Luther, *Galatians*, 480 [WA 402,57 (5:12)].

[80] Debbie Hunn, "Ἐὰν Μή in Galatians 2:16," *Novum Testamentum* 49, no. 3 (2007): 281-82; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, ed. David A. Hubbard, WBC (Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 83-84.

No works justify *except to the extent* / *unless to the extent* through faith

Ἐὰν's import is implicated especially in Scriptural passages addressing Paradoxism. This can be shown in mostly canonical order with ἐάν rendered as *to the extent* or, in the negative, *except to the extent*. The NT's first book says humans respond on a godliness spectrum: "*To the extent* you release others their trespasses, your heavenly Father will release you too, but, *to the extent* you release no others, your Father won't release your trespasses" (Mat. 6:14-15). "In wrath, his lord gave him over to the torturers till he paid all he owed. So will My heavenly Father do to you, *except to the extent* you release your brother from your heart" (18:34-35). The typical "if" distorts the conditions by stating forgiving is one and done rather than what it is, ongoing and rarely complete,[81] which "to the extent" expresses. Similarly, "*except to the extent* you turn to become as little children, you'll never enter the Heavens' reign" (18:3) reflects that an adult's childlikeness varies, unlike the usual "if" formulation.[82]

Luke makes the same connection with repentance: "*Except to the extent* you repent, all will perish" (13:3, 5). With ἐάν's conventional meaning, the condition is third class (repentance might not happen),[83] which leaves the extent of repentance unsaid, but repentance is not either-or but has amplitude. *Luke*'s sequel expresses the positive side: "All *to the extent* calling on the Lord's name will be saved" (Acts 2:21). The conditional phrase is literally "all who ἐάν call," which is commonly taken as leaving unspecified who calls,[84] but the subjunctive phrase, "all who … call," does that without ἐάν. Proficient authors add words to add meaning, and ἐάν as "to the extent" does that.

John often uses ἐάν to relate godliness to salvation. "*Except to the extent* one is born above once, he can't see God's reign," and, "*except to the extent* one is born of water and Spirit, he can't enter God's reign" (3:3, 5). Although literal birth is binary, only by ignoring ἄν's added contingency is God's reign "bipolar."[85] Retaining ἄν's contribution recognizes God's reign runs through us, not necessarily throughout us (Luke 17:21).[86] This salvation continuum recurs in *John*:

> No one can come to Me *except to the extent* the Father … drags him, and I'll raise him on the last day. … I Am the living bread that descended

---

[81] France, *Matthew*, 252.

[82] Ibid., 678.

[83] Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53*, 1206.

[84] *Acts*, 119.

[85] Carson, *John*, 439.

[86] Ziegler, *Militant Grace*, 92-94.

> from heaven. Anyone *to the extent* eating of this bread will live into the age. … *[E]xcept to the extent* you eat the Son of Man's flesh and drink His blood, you've no life in you. … By this I told you no one can come to Me *except to the extent* given by the Father. (6:44, 51, 53-54, 65)
>
> *[T]o the extent* you believe not that I Am, you die in your sins. … *[T]o the extent* the Son frees you, you'll be truly free. … My Word *to the extent* anyone keeps, death he'll never ever note. (8:24, 36, 51)
>
> Through Me anyone *to the extent* entering will be saved. (10:9)
>
> *[T]o the extent* you believe, you'll see God's glory …. (11:40)
>
> *[E]xcept to the extent* the wheat kernel falling to the ground dies, it remains alone, but, *to the extent* it dies, it bears much fruit. He loving his soul annihilates it, while he hating his soul in this world will keep it into eternal life. Anyone *to the extent* serving Me must follow Me …. *To the extent* anyone serves Me, My Father will honor him. (12:24-26)

Given its full meaning, ἐάν appreciates that individuals are not exclusively godly, which finding continues in the Farewell Discourse:

> *To the extent* you love Me, keep My commands. … *To the extent* anyone loves Me, he'll keep My Word, My Father will love him, and We'll come to him to make accommodation within him. (14:15, 23)
>
> As the branch itself can bear no fruit—it must abide in the vine—neither can you bear fruit except *to the extent* you abide in Me.… Anyone *to the extent* not abiding in Me is … gathered, cast into the fire, and burned. … *To the extent* you keep My commands, you'll abide in My love, as I've kept My Father's commands and abide in His love. (15:4, 6, 10)

The traditional understanding of these conditions as either-or fails literally because no one entirely keeps God's commands or entirely abides in His love. Thus, exegetes must assume the conditions are not as absolute as an "if" condition states,[87] but this resort is unnecessary when ἄν contributes its meaning.

The Pauline corpus has similar expressions: "*To the extent* you confess in your mouth Jesus 'Lord' and believe in your heart God raised Him from among the dead, you will be saved" (Rom. 10:9-10). Confessing and believing are scalable in intensity and frequency, which "to the extent," not "if," expresses. *Galatians* adds, "*to the extent* man reaps, that also he sows" (6:7). The condition "ὃ … ἐάν" is often translated "whatever" because it establishes a "direct correlation between a person's sowing and reaping,"[88] but this is literally false. One can sow and another reap, for instance (Mat. 25:26//Luke 19:22), and, regardless, sowing *seed* reaps momentously different *fruit* (Mark 4:3-9//Mat. 13:3-9//Luke 8:5-8; 1Co. 15:36-38). The listener obviously intuits the proverb's point,

---

[87] Carson, *John*, 520-21.

[88] Longenecker, *Galatians*, 280.

but this is what validates that ἐάν means "to the extent." Finally, *Ephesians* relates goodness to divine justice: "*To the extent* anyone … does good, this the Lord will repay [κομίσεται, middle voice *provide for*]" (6:8). A person is not repaid regardless of whether good is done entirely or once; repayment is to the extent of the balance.

The general epistles productively use ἐάν too. *James* makes a staggering claim: "Anyone *to the extent* resolving to befriend the world is appointed God's hater" (4:4). The normal *if* takes this as "the dualism of Qumran" with "no middle point"; "one must be '100 percent'" "either God's friend or his enemy."[89] Because such a monochrome view is unreal as Chapter 6 showed, exegetes must treat the statement as amounting to a more nuanced relationship,[90] but giving effect to ἄν allows *James* himself to express it. *John*'s main epistle, like the gospel of that name, also frequently applies ἐάν to godliness' extent:

> *To the extent* we say "we have community with Him" yet walk in the darkness, we falsify … the truth, but, *to the extent* we walk in the light …, His Son Jesus' blood purifies us from all sin. *To the extent* we say "we have no sin," … the truth is not in us. *To the extent* we confess our sins, He … releases our sins and purifies us from all unrighteousness. *To the extent* we say "we have not sinned," we make Him a liar and His Word is not in us. (1:6-10)
>
> In this we know we have known Him: *To the extent* we obey His commands. … *To the extent* anyone loves the world, the Father's love is not in him. … *To the extent* what you heard since beginning abides in you, … this is the promise He promised us—eternal life. (2:3, 15, 24-25)
>
> *[T]o the extent* we love others, God abides in us and His love is being completed in us. … *To the extent* anyone confessed that Jesus is the Son of God, God abides in him and he in God. (4:12-13, 15-16)

These ἐάν's are typically taken as expressing uncertainty about *who* is referenced,[91] but the ἐάν's modify verbs, not unwritten Greek subjects. Moreover, uncertainty about the subject gives ἄν no meaning at all because *if* alone creates that uncertainty. Without ἄν, the exegesis must again come to the rescue, as Stephen Smalley exemplifies: "John is not saying that the Christian must be perfectly obedient before he can in any way know God …. Obedience is not the *condition* for knowing God; but 'obeying orders' should *characterize* that knowledge (normally, if not without exception) …."[92] Ἐάν's full contingency, however, obviates the need to salvage what was canonized. The ἐάν's the Elder actually

---

[89] Davids, *James*, 161.

[90] Douglas J. Moo, *Letter of James*, ed. D.A. Carson, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 187.

[91] Karen H. Jobes, *1,2&3 John*, ed. Clinton E. Arnold, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), 67-68; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 698-99.

[92] *1,2,3 John*, 45.

wrote avoid by themselves what Ian Howard Marshall noted were otherwise "surely … unreasonable" "absolute … conditions."[93]

* * * *

NT Greek might not, after all, have had a lacuna of "to the extent." Using ἐάν many NT writers might have managed to express salvation as a continuum.

e) Divisibility in the restoration

Of several Scriptural depictions of the universal consummation,[94] among the first is *Isaiah*'s concluding apocalypse (chs. 65–66).[95] It gives for the binaries the by-now time-worn phrases—*the new heaven and earth* for the positive outcome and *the undying worm and unquenchable fire* for the negative (65:17, 66:22, 24). *Mark*'s Jesus explicitly uses this Isaian framework (9:43-48).[96] Those in *Isaiah* who experience the now standardized *two* eschatological outcomes fall discordantly into *three* categories:

1. the faith*ful* endure into the positive eschatological outcome (66:22),
2. the faith*less* perish in the negative eschatological outcome (65:2, 12, 66:4, 16, 24), and
3. "all flesh" worship God and see the second category perish in the negative eschatological outcome (66:23-24).

The portrayal is thus paradoxical because the second and third categories are incongruent —the faithless perish but everyone abides worshipfully.[97] Walter Brueggemann calls this "a profound tension between magnanimous *inclusiveness* and intensely felt *exclusiveness*."[98] Tradition, represented by John Oswalt, resolves the tension by recognizing "only two categories of people," "those who fall down before him in worship, and those who foolishly rebel against him,"[99] but this interpretation, while tension-free, effaces *Isaiah*'s third category, the "all flesh" who live on to see the perishing and to worship God.[100] Like communicators generally, for *Isaiah*, "all flesh" is everyone.[101] Therefore, like the

---

93 *Epistles of John*, 123.

94 Bulgakov, *Orthodox Church*, 176.

95 Paul D. Hanson, *OT Apocalyptic* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1987), 35-38.

96 Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife*, 136.

97 Jacob Stromberg, "Inner-Isaianic Reading of Isaiah 61:1-3," in *Interpreting Isaiah*, ed. David G. Firth and H.G.M. Williamson (Downers Grove: IVP, 2009), 271.

98 *Isaiah 40–66*, ed. Patrick D. Miller and David L. Bartlett, WeBC (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 260.

99 *Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40–66*, ed. Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 691.

100 J. Alec Motyer, *Isaiah*, ed. Donald J. Wiseman, TOTC (Downers Grove: IVP, 2009), 460-61.

101 George A.F. Knight, *The New Israel: Commentary on the Book of Isaiah 56–66* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 119; Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–66*, 313 n.93; Richard L. Schultz, "Nationalism and Uni-

paradox of salvation's extent, this says some perish and everyone lives, which, if not a paradox, requires exegetical repair. Paradoxism's divisible individual, however, allows *Isaiah*'s three categories to fit the two outcomes.

John the Baptist echoed *Isaiah*'s observation, "All flesh will see God's salvation" (Luke 3:6). "All flesh" again refers to everyone, and "will see" translates the future tense of ὁράω, which in the transitive here means *perceive* or *experience*.[102] That is, in spite of the Baptist's acute stress on God's destructive wrath in the end (3:7-9), he implies everyone will also experience salvation.[103] Destruction and living on is intelligible if the individual is divisible after this life. All flesh experiences God's salvation, but, to the extent ungodly, also experiences the perishing of His wrath.

2) <u>Theologians approach Paradoxism.</u>

Not only does Scripture suggest afterlife individual divisibility, theologians can offer descriptions that almost do. While many theologians, particularly Potentialists, agree with Paradoxism's *premise* that no traditional position adequately handles Scripture's salvation paradox, Paradoxism's *answer* of afterlife individual divisibility is the innovation, and, on that, no one has yet ventured. Various theologians have, however, nearly given that answer such that it is not as alien to orthodoxy as its novelty suggests. Without endorsing Paradoxism's model, theologians have portrayed afterlife purging so vividly that the individual nearly divides. Extended quotes can be required to make this point.

a) Universal purging

All salvation-extent positions find purging explanatory of how nonbinary individuals fit the binary outcomes, but Universalism to achieve its inexorable universality requires purging—evil*ness* must end for evil *people* not to end.[104] Athanasius, for instance, argued, "evil should be entirely consumed in all men" so "that the soul [is] purified."[105] Origen elaborated: In "the day of judgment," "the good will be separated from the evil and the righteous from the unrighteous and every individual soul will by the judgment of God be allotted to that place of which his merits have rendered him worthy …." God destroys "evil thoughts of the mind, shameful deeds and longings after sin" such that

---

versalism in Isaiah," in *Interpreting Isaiah*, ed. David G. Firth and H.G.M. Williamson (Downers Grove: IVP, 2009), 130, 137.

[102] *BDAG*, 719-20.

[103] Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 1–9:50*, ed. Moises Silva, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 295; Leon Morris, *Luke*, Rev. ed., TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 105.

[104] Ramelli, *Apokatastasis*, 252.

[105] "Letter III," 4 (p. 514).

everyone "advances and comes to higher degrees of perfection" until "all stains" are "purged."[106] Subsequent Universalists continued to offer afterlife purging as a way to account for evil discontinuing without evil people discontinuing, such as Gregory of Nyssa,[107] Cassian,[108] John Scotus,[109] Tillich,[110] and Moltmann.[111]

The Universalist most nearly describing individual divisibility is Bulgakov, who saw the individual's "mixture of good and evil" sifted in afterlife judgment.[112]

> Every human being sees himself in Christ and measures the extent of his difference from this proto-image. … Love is the Holy Spirit, …. [b]ut this love … is also the judgment of the individual upon himself, his vision of himself … in conflict with himself, that is, outside Christ ….
>
> [T]his ontological condemnation … is … the metaphysical annihilation of what is condemned …[,] not to personal being …, but to his mortal … content, which is consumed by the divine fire. The inner division of every human being, his separation into mortal and immortal parts, … is … the judgment of God. … Everything that is not in conformity with this image falls into the outer darkness, into nonbeing …. *The spiritual sword cuts a human being asunder to his very depths.*
>
> This partial nonbeing … is experienced as fire …. Every human being experiences this … in conformity with his wrong state and to the degree it is wrong. … But … 'Annihilation' … does not extend to the entire being of a person. *It is a separation or a spiritual amputation, so to speak* ….[113]

Bulgakov's Universalism discussed in Chapter 4 governs ultimately, but, until then:

> *We must … conclude that the very separation into heaven and hell … is internal and relative.* Every human being bears within himself the principle of the one and the other, depending upon the measure of his personal righteousness.
>
> [T]he very distinction between heaven and hell exists only for our limited earthly condition. But since every human sins, the two states inevitably coexist in one the same person. … The *mixture* of good and evil that is proper to the overwhelming majority of human beings compels us to postulate not a simple but a complex sum total of God's judgment, which unites blessing and condemnation.
>
> [T]he fundamental antinomic postulate of eschatology is that eternal life … can coexist with … perdition. Both, to different degrees, are included in being. When it is conceived statically, this antinomy becomes a direct

---

[106] *On First Principles*, I,1,2, 2,4, 3,8, II,10,5, 9,8 III,6,3 (pp. 7, 17, 38-39, 136, 143, 248).

[107] Zachhuber, *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa*, 1-2, 188, 191-92, 210, 241-42.

[108] "The Conferences," XIII, chs 7, 9, 11 (pp. 425-28).

[109] *Periphyseon*, Bk V, chs 36, 38 (pp. 334-40, 352).

[110] *ST*, III, 397-401.

[111] *Coming of God*, 76, 97, 255.

[112] *Bride of the Lamb*, 359-60, 457, 497, 504.

[113] Ibid., 459, 463 (emphasis added).

> contradiction. When it is conceived dynamically, it can be grasped livingly.[114]

Bulgakov thus depicts purging similar to divisibility, but, like Universalists generally, no one is damned. Through vividly described penultimate scrubbing, the individual in Universalism is ultimately *unified* rather than divided.[115] Since everyone is saved and no one doomed, this leaves the Scriptural expression of Exclusivism unaddressed. In contrast, Paradoxism's divisibility retains both Scriptural salvation accounts. While purging picks *out* what is *foreign* to the person to save the person, division picks *apart* what *is* the person to save the paradox.

b) Orthodox catharsis

Mainstream theologians can nearly divide an individual after this life too, but this is to fit saved individuals into the positive binary. Ratzinger, certainly mainstream (aka Pope Benedict XVI), sees confliction in degrees based on conflicting personal orientations: "The borderline between Sheol and life runs through our very midst, and those who are in Christ are situated on the side of life, and that everlastingly." "Christ inflicts pure perdition on no one," "but comes to be wherever a person distances himself from Christ." "Christ's word … then lays bare the fact that the person who is lost has himself drawn the dividing line and separated himself from salvation." "One is in heaven when, *and to the degree*, that one is in Christ."[116]

Balthasar, as part of his Potentialism (Chapter 4), has the individual "torn into two opposite values," part "receptive to salvation" and "part that is not." This is brought about by the Son, who "both grounds and surpasses all we mean by separation," the "bifurcation" in each of us.[117] Balthasar once explained this bifurcation consistent with individual divisibility:

> Ambrose came up with the daring statement: '*Idem homo et salvatur ex parte, et condemnatur ex parte*' [Every sinner will hear both "Begone into eternal fire" and "Come ye blessed of my Father"],[118] man is somehow both to the right and to the left of the Judge. Accordingly, … it takes the entire courage of Christian hope for a man to … trust that … *what is damnable in*

---

[114] Ibid., 465, 476-77 (emphasis added except "mixture").

[115] Blosser, *Become Like the Angels*, 31.

[116] *Eschatology*, 94, 117, 205-206, 234-36 (emphasis added).

[117] *Theo-Drama*, IV, 223-24, 325.

[118] Ambrose's statement (literally translated, "the same human, both partly saved and partly condemned") addresses the unworthy works of the saved (1Co. 3:15). "Expositio in Psalmum CXVIII," in *Sancti Ambrosii Mediolanensis Episcopi Opera Omnia* (Paris: Migne, 1887), 1238 ¶ 58 (col. 1580).

> *him has been separated* from him and thrown out with the unusable residue that is incinerated outside the gates of the Holy City.[119]

Later in expositing von Speyr's visions of Holy Saturday, Balthasar said Christ "experiences … the whole ambiguity of his human nature," including "dispositions" to good and evil "like every man," and goes "in two opposite directions: … toward paradise and … into deep hell," encountering in the latter "effigies," which "consist of what a man has given from his own substance to the sin he has committed." The sinner "'is copied, in negative,'" and "his dead copy in hell regains a sort of life ….'"[120] These remarks, despite appearances, do not reflect a split individual or address the salvation paradox.[121] Rather, Balthasar is applying von Speyr's mystically experienced annual crucifixions where the subjective *sinner* splits from her objectified *sins*.[122] Like von Speyr,[123] Balthasar sees the individual, not as both godly and ungodly, but as one or the other: "the particular direction taken depends on the individual's personal and primary direction for or against Jesus, which means that he chooses either the path toward God or the path toward chaos."[124]

For Protestants too, individuals can be saved in degrees. Barth realized, "Man is … on the way to eternal life to the degree that he lives *by* the grace of God …."[125] The person's inner "frontier" reflects "the degree": One side is for God and the other opposes, and this two-sided person is judged "divisive[ly]" such that the anti-God side "tears away." The judgment "locks up the one in order to … free him from his identification with the first man and his wrong," a division "between the man of sin and man himself." "It is this man … that He condemns and … causes … to perish as such, … aiming thereby to separate him completely from this unfaithful man …. *This separation has to take place in him*." In spite of the separation, "God's sentence on him pronounces

---

119 *Theo-Drama*, V, 321 & n.27.

120 *Theo-Logic*, II, 285, 351, 355-57.

121 Joshua R. Brotherton, "The Possibility of Universal Conversion in Death," *Modern Theology* 32, no. 3 (2016): 319.

122 Lois M. Miles, "Obedience of a Corpse: The Key to the Holy Saturday Writings of Adrienne von Speyr" (PhD Diss., Univ. of Aberdeen, 2013), 180-81; Sutton, *Heaven Opens*, 15-16, 25, 172-73, 178, 184-85. See Adrienne von Speyr, *The Farewell Discourses*, trans. E.A. Nelson (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1987), 81, 208, 237, 269; *The Word*, 31; *Gates of Eternal Life*, 60, 112.

123 *Confession*, trans. Douglas W. Stott (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1985), 55, 58; *The Farewell Discourses*, 164; *The Passion from Within*, trans. Lucia Wiedenhover (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1998), 157.

124 *Theo-Drama*, IV, 433-34.

125 *CD II/2*, 576.

all this as an indivisible whole,"[126] which is why, as seen in Chapter 4, everyone can be potentially saved entirely.

Pannenberg sees the eschatological judgment of a dually oriented individual similar to divisibility: "confrontation with eternity means judgment *only insofar* as" people make "themselves autonomous in relation to God, separated themselves from him," "and our existence as sinners makes shipwreck on this *inner contradiction* …." "At issue already in this life is identity, … integration of the moments of life into the unity of life as a whole." "In the sphere of the eternal present, … all things that make up the content of life sound forth together …." "The word of Christ as the offer of salvation will then make clear that the lost drew the line themselves and separated themselves from salvation."[127] What follows is extreme purging:

> Holding fast to his purpose in creation implies that [God] will not let his creatures make shipwreck on the dissonances of their existence as these are disclosed in the sphere of the eternal present. … It is the fire that purges out everything in the life of the creature that is incompatible with the eternal God ….[128]

> The separation between good and evil remains, since such a separation is the essence of judgment. But it is a separation that applies to each one of us. Each person is to be purified from everything that is incompatible with God's eternal life, though the extent of such purification may be different in each individual case.[129]

This purging mitigates Exclusivism without being Universalism:

> How the life of an individual may emerge from the contradiction that fills it … to stand as a whole before God's eyes is something that no one can know. However, even if our life is not destroyed in the contradiction between selfhood and openness to the world, it is only beyond death that we can hope for the life in which the ego itself lives out of God instead of living in tension with him ….[130]

Notwithstanding these comments, Pannenberg's position is that the individual is unqualifiedly unitary, the opposite of divisible.[131]

In summary, as promised, no orthodox theologian offers Paradoxism, but many draw near to its most disturbing feature, individual divisibility. They use ultra-purging to account for how each conflicted individual eternally lives with God, which explains how

---

[126] *CD IV/1*, §§ 58.1, 61.3 (pp. 82, 568-69, 574, 593) (emphasis added).

[127] *ST*, III, 610-11, 614 (emphasis added).

[128] Ibid., 637-38.

[129] "Task of Christian Eschatology," 9-10.

[130] *What Is Man?*, 67.

[131] Turner, *Theology, Psychology and the Plural Self*, 151-61.

mixed creatures end up in bliss, but does not explain, nor does it try to, how Scripture's salvation paradox is unreservedly true. Regardless, these theologians understand the force of purging as similar to dividing.

* * * *

The immoderate recourse of remodeling the individual as divisible to preserve the paradox of salvation's extent is not as foreign to Christianity as it seems. Scripture hints at afterlife divisibility, and many theologians come close to dividing the individual with afterlife purging. With Paradoxism justified, explained, and defended, it remains to be applied in light of other Christian doctrines.

Chapter 9. SYSTEMIC TRUTH

> *I can't believe that, when we have all been changed and put on the incorruptibility, we will forget our fantastic condition of mortality … that meant the whole world to us.*
>
> —Marilynne Robinson[1]

Through Chapter 5, the need Paradoxism addresses was detailed, and the chapters afterwards gave its basis and rationale. One defense remains. Paradoxism, if true, should accommodate other truths and, if false, contravene them (1Jo. 2:21).[2] This premise powers systematic theology,[3] if not reasoning.[4] So, doctrines that Paradoxism likely implicates, such as anthropology, theistic atonement, infant salvation, and divine justice and grace, are considered, and what is found is that dividing the individual imperils only its target, the individual. Though possibly unexpected, this follows from Paradoxism modeling the data unfiltered and avoiding selectivity's collateral damage. "What at first seems totally new, even disruptive," von Speyr spotted, will, if true, "find the place reserved for it in tradition and … integrate itself organically into the age-old teachings."[5]

1) Paradoxism conserves anthropology.

Individual divisibility might seem to undermine traditional Christian anthropology, but, as often with paradoxes, what seems misleads. Christian anthropology deals primarily with this earthly life,[6] which any divisibility afterwards affects not at all. So, no matter how unified we are in *this* life, division afterwards does not conflict.[7] Paradoxism also leaves intact Christian *afterlife* anthropology because nothing about it requires *in*divisibility. This life has continuity with the next because the individual does not end with biological death, at least as Christianity understands it,[8] and whatever a person's afterlife continuity is, whether spirit or something else, remains the case with Paradoxism. Whoever we are without Paradoxism is who we are with it. If God can pull off our living after dying, division is hardly a greater wonder.[9] In tradition, regardless of division, we

---

[1] *Gilead*, 57.

[2] Balthasar, *Theo-Logic*, I, 39, 127; Hume, *Treatise of Human Nature*, I.III.9 (p. 77); Wiles, *Making of Christian Doctrine*, 141-42.

[3] Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 39.

[4] Elster, *Sour Grapes*, 1.

[5] *Gates of Eternal Life*, 64.

[6] Gooder, *Heaven*, 81; White, *Life Beyond Death*, 65-66.

[7] Lowe, *Subjects of Experience*, 36.

[8] Polkinghorne, *The God of Hope and the End of the World*, xxiii, 77, 149; Speyr, *Mystery of Death*, 65.

[9] Balthasar, *Life out of Death*, 38; Davis, "Physicalism and Resurrection," 239.

are clearly malleable particularly in the afterlife, where the individual experiences both purging and glorification. Because the same individual who endures them can endure division, Paradoxism does not change anthropology except for what is anticipated from the process: Eschatological division divides an individual between godly and ungodly, not between those who are godly (wholly, mostly, amply, or minimally) and those who are ungodly to the obverse degree. Apart from this intra-individual division, any change in the individual is not modeled.

2) <u>The good news remains God's for us.</u>

The discourse has not imposed much on the doctrine of God, because the topic has been who is saved, not who saves,[10] or, in grammatical constituents, salvation's direct object, not its subject.[11] Besides, humans writing to humans about humans naturally feature humans.[12] Creeds and catechisms, for instance, are apt to be in the first person.[13] That said, we find God in seeking self[14] and see Christ in others.[15] Humans seeking truth secretly prioritize Christology, Hamann understood,[16] and see life from their perspective, Paul understood.[17] "Amidst the shreds of my talents I began to search for my self, amidst the manifold for the One," Rosenzweig noted.[18] The doctrine of God has here been sidelined partly because salvation results from something and, if treated causally, can crash the inquiry.[19] Von Speyr, for example, says salvation is the "Power to compel God"—that is, "demand eternal life."[20] Salvation, for Universalists, follows from being created and, for Exclusivists, follows from distinctives like baptism/atonement, election,

---

[10] Graham Ward, "Hegel and the Grandeur of Reason," in *Grandeur of Reason*, ed. Peter M. Candler, Jr. and Conor Cunningham (London: SCM, 2010), 262; Wiles, *Making of Christian Doctrine*, 106.

[11] Robinson, *In the End, God*, 72.

[12] Berkouwer, *Man: Image of God*, 10, 356-57; McCombs, *Paradoxical Rationality*, 56.

[13] Davies, *The Early Christian Church*, 198-99; Thomas F. Torrance, ed. *The School of Faith* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1996), xlvii-viii.

[14] Calvin, *Institutes*, I,1 (p. 4); Conor Cunningham, "Suspending the Natural Attitude," in *Transcendence and Phenomenology*, ed. Conor Cunningham and Peter M. Candler, Jr. (London: SCM, 2007), 281.

[15] Montemaggi, *Reading Dante's Commedia*, 26.

[16] John Milbank, "Theological Critique of Philosophy in Hamann and Jacobi," in *Radical Orthodoxy*, ed. John Milbank, et al. (New York: Routledge, 1999), 29-30.

[17] Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 179.

[18] "The Life," 95 (30 Aug. 1920 letter to Meinecke).

[19] Bonhoeffer, *Christ the Center*, 44.

[20] *The Word*, 119.

or faith.[21] If God were a mechanism, such causality computes, but, since He is not, it does not.

Paradoxism, happily, does not suffer especially from this mechanistic urge. Counting everything in life is not only personal and realistic, but dovetails with the doctrine of God, which in Trinitarian salvation is *with the Father through the Son in the Spirit*.[22] This understanding suits Paradoxism. Irenaeus explained, "The Spirit prepares humanity in the Son of God, and the Son leads humanity to the Father, while the Father confers incorruption for eternal life, which comes to all those who see God."[23] Salvation is Son and Spirit reestablishing godly relations.[24] It is Christ's victory,[25] transforming us for a restored life.[26] "God Himself," Cabasilas noted, joined "human nature," "thus removing the separation between Godhead and manhood." Christ "slays the evil life" while giving goodness,[27] drawing us towards reconciliation and away from resistance,[28] uniting life's brokenness,[29] gathering our annihilation and being.[30] The Spirit's role correlates.[31] To the extent Spirit-filled, the individual's will bends from ungodly to godly[32] and has eternal life.[33] The Spirit's "multiple densities," Tom Greggs observed, "avoid[s] the binaries of saved-damned or heaven-hell while still creating room for … the importance of the decision of faith."[34]

Paradoxism does not treat the issue of *how* God achieves salvation. The ecumenically unresolved theory of atonement, from Irenaeus to Tertullian, Cyprian, Athanasius, Augustine, Anselm, Abelard, Luther, and Calvin, and into modernity to now, has tended to cluster around three foci: 1) Christ changes our enslaver, such as the ransom model where Christ's sacrifice redeems humanity or the Christus Victor model where He overcomes Satan, 2) Christ changes our relationship with the Father, such as the satisfaction

---

[21] Marshall, "Divine and Human Punishment," 225.
[22] Balthasar, *Theo-Logic*, III; Cyril, *John*, I, Bk IV, ch 1 [500] (p. 223).
[23] *Against Heresies*, 4:20,5 (p. 115).
[24] Gunton, *Father, Son and Holy Spirit*, 90.
[25] Schwarz, *The Human Being*, 175.
[26] Henry, *Words of Christ*, 110.
[27] *Life in Christ*, Bk II § 7, Bk III § 2, Bk IV §§ 16-17 (pp. 78, 105, 140-41).
[28] Guardini, *The World and the Person*, 154, 157; Lossky, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 153.
[29] Behr, *Mystery of Christ*, 92.
[30] Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 65.
[31] Spezzano, *Glory of God's Grace*, 4.
[32] Berkouwer, *Man: Image of God*, 163.
[33] Pannenberg, *ST*, III, 622.
[34] *Barth, Origen, and Universal Salvation*, 14-15.

model where Christ satisfies humanity's debt or the penal substitution model where Christ suffers for humanity, or 3) Christ changes us, such as the union, imputation, therapeutic, or influence models, where Christ restores humanity.[35] All theories recognize Christ atoned with effect, and each can be and has been used by both Universalism and Exclusivism. Perhaps obviously, when Universalism and Exclusivism can handle a theory, Paradoxism can handle it too. Each atonement theory has Christ achieve salvation at least to an extent, which occurs under Paradoxism as well.

Paradoxism's acceptance of Scripture's Exclusivism raises an issue Exclusivism does not share because Paradoxism also accepts Scripture's Universalism. Accepting both accounts means everyone can be damned to an extent, which seemingly conflicts with Christ atoning with effect. That Paradoxism damns everyone is untrue, however. No saved personal identity is damned under the model; so, everyone damned in that sense is misleading. Even for the personal character, damning everyone to an extent is *not* part of the model. Anyone who is sinlessly faithful like Catholicism or Orthodoxy envision Mary[36] need no division, just as they need no purging. The same is true for the fully penitent or any otherwise unconflicted character. A divided character is clearly not what is desired (Deu. 6:5; Psa. 119:113; Mat 22:37//Mark 12:30//Luke 10:27; 1Th. 5:23; Jam. 1:8, 4:8). As noted in Chapter 7, theologians like Cabasilas, Luther, and Finney argue undividedness is not even possible for the faithful. Unconflicted persons would not suffer damnation to any extent. Even the conflicted saved could, as tradition has it, be purged of any ungodliness and, once purged, division becomes unnecessary for them as well. The division of the saved is, therefore, not part of the model, because the salvation paradox does not require it. According to Scripture, everyone is saved, not everyone damned. Thus, only the damned must suffer division under the model.

Even if none of this were true and the model damned everyone to an extent, Christ still atones with effect. He still redeems us, restores us, prevails over Satan, satisfies our divine debt, and takes our place for our transgressions. That the model also damns to an extent is no less troubling than that humanity is damned to an extent as orthodoxy has it already. That salvation is less than 100% undermines no atonement theory just as no atonement theory undermines Exclusivism. Paradoxism's difference is that salvation's extent is among *each* individual, not individual *groups*. The gospel, as

---

[35] Paul R. Eddy and James Beilby, "The Atonement," in *The Nature of Atonement* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2006), 9-20; Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 340-53.

[36] Lossky, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 141, 193; Wallenfang, *Human and Divine Being*, 147.

always, divides between godly and ungodly.[37] So, the news is good entirely, but its reception, not so much.

3) <u>Paradoxism handles binary problems.</u>

Eternity's inferno wears tolerably on those actively responsible for it, but "insurmountable doubt" obtains, Bulgakov pointed out, "for the overwhelming majority," such as "children who die at an early age," "pagans and members of other religions," "the mentally retarded, severely handicapped, idiots, and all those whose life is marked by the 'karma' of heredity and lack of consciousness."[38] A classic case since Augustine ruthlessly applied baptism's obvious significance has been unbaptized infants.[39] Condemning them to perdition repulses, but salvation regardless means infanticide assures salvation. This puts Exclusivism to the test because salvation from merely living is Universalism.[40] Automatic salvation ignores the call to faith, which infants have not answered, diminishes the promise of hope, which infants have not lived, and disregards the command to love, which infants have not heeded.[41] Christians lack consensus.[42] Exclusivism, in addition to damning the seemingly undamnable, gives the persistently godly the same destiny as those briefly so, such as the deathbed converted.[43] Avoiding these sorts of predicaments is part of Universalism's appeal, but Universalism just eliminates the second ultimate altogether, which creates the opposite problem: Instead of those with unclear lives suffering supposed injustice, this life matters ultimately not at all. No matter how horrible life is lived, God shakes His Etch-a-Sketch, restoring everyone to His conformist image. Being regenerate is all that is ultimately relevant for Exclusivism, and for Universalism it is just being generated.

In contrast, the entirety of divine grace and the human response informs Paradoxism. To the extent godly, the individual has eternal life; to the extent not, perishing. Nothing is irrelevant. Infants, returning to that quandary, are like everyone else, God-oriented and self-oriented, and thus saved and not saved. Their ultimate distinctive is

---

[37] Colijn, *Images of Salvation*, 74, 77.

[38] *Bride of the Lamb*, 369-70.

[39] "On Merit and the Forgiveness of Sins, and the Baptism of Infants," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Ser.*, ed. Philip Schaff (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1887), 15-43 (Bk I). See Geisler, *ST*, 984, 999.

[40] Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 145.

[41] Kevin Timpe, "An Argument for Limbo," *J. of Ethics* 19 (2015): 286.

[42] Sanders, *No Other Name*, 305.

[43] Nichols, *Death and Afterlife*, 188-89.

only in what distinguishes them—life's primary character-building chapters are lost.[44] Paradoxism similarly nuances other doctrines dealing with salvation's determinants, which tend to be binary given the ultimates. Instead of identifying either-or indicators of eternal life, whether rebirth for Exclusivism or mere aborning for Universalism, everything in this life ultimately matters.[45] Paradoxism, therefore, does deserve to be condemned for blurring any absolute demarcation between godly and ungodly that tradition has compartmentalized. Jesus deserved it.[46]

4) <u>Proportional justice survives.</u>

Another salvation vexation is that an eschatological menu whose only options are eternal life and perdition seems far too short for the Infinite One. Two ultimates, and extreme ones, for all of humanity challenges Exclusivism's justice. The Universalist menu is even shorter. Human variety, even when aggregated into categories, calls for more than one or two outcomes. Plato, apparently the first to write clearly on afterlife judgment, had enough fecundity for four outcomes.[47] God should be as adept, especially since His justice entails proportion, even reflexivity.[48] One of His first principles is "Whoever sheds man's blood, by man his blood will be shed" (Gen. 9:6), and proportionality in justice later broadened to all corporeal harm (Exo. 21:12, 23-25; Lev. 24:17-20). Because God prefers proportion in human justice, His justice should reflect this—and does.[49] God gives what is due to each individual (Psa. 28:4-5, 62:12; Pro. 24:12; Isa. 3:10-11; Jer. 17:9-10, 32:19; Eze. 14:12-14, 20). God judges impartially (Deu. 1:17, 11:26-28; Ecc. 12:14; Jer. 18:20) and equitably (בְּמֵישָׁרִים,[50] Psa. 75:2, 96:10), both for His chosen and to the ends of the earth (Amos 3:2; Oba. 1:15; Eze. 18:30, 39:24). "I will judge each as befits his ways" (33:20). When His justice was challenged as too individualized, God defended it as proportionate, "adjusted to the standard [יִתָּכֵן]"[51] (18:5-29; 33:8-20).

---

[44] Carter and Frith, *Mapping the Mind*, 19-22; Come, *Kierkegaard as Theologian*, 164-66, 173.

[45] Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 15-16.

[46] Bornkamm, *Paulus*, 235.

[47] *Phaedo*, trans. R.S. Bluck (New York: Routledge, 2014), 113d-114c. See Bernstein, *Formation of Hell*, 55, 61.

[48] *Formation of Hell*, 237; Kvanvig, "Hell," 419; Pinnock, "Annihilationism," 471.

[49] Basil, "Asketikon," LR Pro. ¶ 4 (p. 158); Nigel G. Wright, "A Kinder, Gentler Damnation?," in *Rethinking Hell*, ed. Christopher M. Date, et al. (Eugene: Cascade, 2014), 232.

[50] The always plural noun (מֵישָׁרִים) for the verb "smooth [יָשַׁר]" literally means "evenness." *BDB*, 449.

[51] Ibid., 1067.

God also applies proportionate justice. When humanity spoiled the earth, God spoiled humanity (Gen. 6:11-13). Those blessing Abram are blessed; those cursing him, cursed (Gen. 12:2-3). When the people sought meat and turned their nose up to God, He gave the people meat until it came out their nose (Num. 11:19-20). When the 40-day patrol reported the Promised Land's deadliness, they had to patrol 40 years outside the Promised Land until dead (14:28-34). When the people faced away from God, He hid His face (Deu. 31:18). When they violated the ban, He banned them (Jos. 7:12). Those glorifying God are glorified; those disdaining Him, disdained (1Sa. 2:30). The righteous are righted; the condemnable, condemned (1Ki. 8:23; 2Ch. 6:23). Those pillaging God's people, God pillaged (Jer. 30:16, 50:15; Eze. 39:10; Joel 3:4-8; Hab. 2:8). When the people rejected God, God rejected the people; "They sow the wind and reap the whirlwind" (Hos. 4:6, 8:7).

Thus far only Hebrew Scripture has been cited, but not because the NT weakens God's proportionality.[52] "Your standard's measure will measure you" (Luke 6:38//Mat. 7:2; also Mark 4:24). Afflicters are afflicted (2Th. 1:5-9), and "Anyone corrupting God's sanctuary, God will corrupt" (1Co. 3:17). The NT particularly stresses proportionality in the end, ultimate salvation's fulcrum. This is not merely in *Revelation*, where God punishes proportionately, blood for blood (2:23, 14:13, 16:6), but the minas parable has proportional eschatological judgment (Luke 19:11 -27), as does the contrasting talents parable: Though the Master expresses equal pleasure for various achievements, better achievers still finish better (Mat. 25:14-30). God's justice, even when asymmetrical, is proportionate, whether sevenfold (Gen. 4:15; Lev. 26:18) or double (Isa. 40:2; Jer. 16:18; Rev. 18:6).

Unlike Universalism, where merely having a life determines ultimate salvation, and unlike Exclusivism, where a certain threshold in life does, God's judgment reflects all of life, not just its special moments or its first.[53] Universalism prioritizes a person's first moment when salvation becomes guaranteed, and Exclusivism prioritizes the last moment when whatever is decisive can occur. But every moment has ultimate priority. God "will light up the secrets in darkness and expose the hearts' resolves. Each will then receive his recognition from God" (1Co. 4:5; also 1Ti. 5:24-25). For the ungodly, "the end will correspond to their works" (2Co. 11:15), and the saved are not exempt (1Co. 3:12-15; 2Ti. 4:8). God, "the impartial judge of each man's work" (1Pe. 1:17), judges

---

[52] Thomas R. Schreiner, "Penal Substitution View," in *The Nature of Atonement*, ed. James Beilby and Paul R. Eddy (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2006), 79.

[53] Lewis, "Weight of Glory," 28.

individually (Rom. 14:10-12; 2Co. 5:10). Jesus' eschatological judgment repays for an entire life (Mat. 16:27). The unrighteous have God's wrath; the rest, eternal life (Rom. 1:29-31, 2:2, 5-10). We have in the next life what we cultivate in this one.[54]

While eternal life and perishing are the only outcomes, those obtaining them fail to categorize so neatly.[55] Universalism's solution eliminates proportion altogether in ultimate judgment, one for all, and Exclusivism, with two outcomes, is but one better. Universalists argue the ultimate lacks proportion because God's nature lacks proportion,[56] but God's nature has existed all along with evil all around. Exclusivists rationalize binary justice for non-binary humanity with two apologies. One is that God's election is inexplicable, but this implies arbitrariness.[57] While no deal breaker, it does not comport with God's concern for proportion. The second is that eternal life is always gratuitous because perdition is always deserved.[58] This too, while coherent, leaves the ultimates outside God's bias for proportion. Both rationalizations based on divine entropy deplete the ultimate of meaning as effectively as motile definitions deplete words of meaning.[59]

Paradoxism, on the other hand, allows proportion without repudiating the binary outcomes or the ultimate meaning of all of life. Everything godly lives ultimately, and anything ungodly perishes ultimately. Eternity's judgment is not so much a retribution for what one has done but a recognition of what one has become.[60] Christian eschatology, therefore, is no refuge. Henry described "the reproach: the invention of a fantastic … other world, a place of imaginary satisfaction of … all the aspirations that a person cannot realize here below." "The problem was not its ideals but that by projecting them into an empty heaven it reduced them to pious wishes instead of bringing them into daily life …." This myth is not Christian, whose "decisive thesis …. is that there exists only one reality," "nothing other than life."[61] With Paradoxism, all in this life matters after all.

5) <u>Paradoxism values grace.</u>

Bonhoeffer famously villainized cheap salvation, where "grace alone does everything" so "everything can stay in its old ways," "the mortal enemy of the church." In

---

54 Gregory of Nyssa, *Life of Moses*, Bk II (pp. 73-74).

55 Harrison, *God's Many-Splendored Image*, 18; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 14.

56 Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 47, 53, 58, 69-70, 78, 202-203.

57 James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 323; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 14.

58 Calvin, *Institutes*, III,11-13 (pp. 473-501).

59 Pannenberg, *Anthropology in Theological Perspective*, 333.

60 Bultmann, *Theology of the NT*, I: 2.2 (p. 15).

61 *I Am the Truth*, 234-35, 238.

contrast, worthy grace costs a life of discipleship, "a genuine, simple obedience in faith in the righteousness of Christ."[62] Any understanding of an afterlife can cheapen grace,[63] because it tends to pale compared to this life.[64] To the extent this life does not affect the ultimate, it is cost-free ultimately; yet, Kierkegaard noted, faith is "a task for a whole lifetime,"[65] practicing "the earnest thought of death."[66] Universalism cheapens grace because nothing from this life matters ultimately other than that there was one, and Exclusivism is similar in that nothing matters ultimately beyond whatever splits humanity into saved and damned. If, however, the individual is ultimately divisible between godly and ungodly, nothing is cheap.[67] Bonhoeffer knew, "One takes from life what it offers, not all or nothing, but good things and bad …." "Christian life is … choosing something relatively better over something relatively worse," "a concrete ethic" encompassing "all of life."[68]

6) <u>Afterlife decision-making is unneeded.</u>

Both Exclusivists and Universalists, to alleviate a theological problem with their position, hypothesize that those betraying this life can about-face afterwards. Exclusivists, so no one is judged too hastily, postulate we have further chances after this life to decide rightly, whether in a Purgatory or not.[69] Universalists, in recognition of the fact that loving requires freewill, postulate that the afterlife consists of God outlasting naysayers until inducing the proper mindset,[70] a sort of divine water-drip torture.[71] Brian Hebblethwaite asks us to "free ourselves from the old idea that opportunities to repent and respond to God's love are restricted to a single life span on earth."[72] Like Kantian immortality, Philip Ziegler perceived, "we are not so much saved by the bell as saved by the

---

62 *Discipleship*, trans. Barbara Green and Reinhard Krauss (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 43 [29], 45 [31], 120 [121], 144 [148].

63 Feuerbach, *Essence of Christianity*, I,XVII (p. 161).

64 Brunner, *Eternal Hope*, 91.

65 *Fear and Trembling*, 23.

66 "At a Graveside," in *Three Discourses on Imagined Questions*, ed. Howard V. and Edna H. Hong (Princeton Univ. Press, 2009), 77.

67 Cabasilas, *Life in Christ*, Bk I § 1 (p. 44).

68 *Ethics*, 92 [79], 98-100 [86-88], 159 [151], 261 [260], 378 [381].

69 Griffiths, "Purgatory," 427.

70 Bulgakov, *Bride of the Lamb*, 363; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 106; Talbott, "Universalism," 451-52.

71 McClymond, *Devil's Redemption*, II: 956.

72 *Christian Hope*, 215.

fact that the bell never rings."[73] Nothing but niceness, however, affirms afterlife do-overs.[74] God invites in *this* life, which explains its criticality and why every Christian branch recognizes death's salvation finality.[75] The parables of the bridesmaids, talents, and minas all reflect that it is this life that matters to the ultimate (Mat. 25:1-30; Luke 19:11-27). The Lazarus parable has this point particularly: Dives begs for mercy after he dies, which is denied because his life was sufficient (16:19-31).[76] What we do in *this* body judges us (2Co. 5:10), and judgment "into salvation" occurs after "dying once" (Heb. 4:1, 6-7, 9-11, 9:27-28). History and Scripture show the time for deciding for or against God runs out.[77] A *dead*line exists.[78] An individual, Kierkegaard discerned, cannot try out another identity in eternity to see if it fits.[79] "What God does for us, He does in us," Lewis reminds, in "the daily and hourly repeated exercises of my own will …."[80]

Christians nonetheless acknowledge that, to live in God's presence, we must lose the unsuitable. Catholics hold this happens over time, and this matured into the doctrine of Purgatory.[81] Catholics acknowledge Scripture hardly justifies the doctrine, but base it principally on praying for the dead: If the dead are instantaneously in God's presence, the prayers are tardy; so, given their efficacy, purging must be durational.[82] Other Christians reject this doctrine as Scripturally foreign, but still have afterlife purging, only non-temporally.[83] Instantaneous purging, however, devalues the God-given duration of this life; if characters can exist instantaneously, life*times* are superfluous, if not ridiculous.[84] This is not the case, of course.[85] Paradoxism, in contrast, uses neither chronological[86]

---

[73] *Militant Grace*, 98.

[74] Daley, *Hope of the Early Church*, 95, 108; Martin, *Will Many Be Saved?*, 154; Schwarz, *Eschatology*, 346-47; Williamson, *Death and the Afterlife*, 191-92; Yates, *Between Death and Resurrection*, 225.

[75] Bulgakov, *Bride of the Lamb*, 362; Ludlow, *Universal Salvation*, 163; Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 216-17.

[76] Bernstein, *Formation of Hell*, 241.

[77] Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, I, 22; V, 413.

[78] Caldecott, *Radiance of Being*, 243.

[79] *Upbuilding Discourses*, 66; "At a Graveside," 84.

[80] "A Slip of the Tongue," 191-92.

[81] Jacques Le Goff, *Birth of Purgatory*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1986), 41, 271.

[82] Nichols, *Death and Afterlife*, 171-76; Ratzinger, *Eschatology*, 218-33; Rausch, *ST*, 283-84.

[83] Calvin, *Institutes*, III,2,28, 4,31, 5,2 (pp. 373, 427, 436); Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 591-92.

[84] Nichols, *Death and Afterlife*, 175; Stackhouse, "Terminal Punishment Response to Hell and Purgatory," 181.

[85] Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, 51.

[86] Purgatory does not require chronological duration. Benedict XVI, *Spe Salvi*, 47.

Purgatory, which is not from Scripture, nor instantaneous character development, which is not from living. With Paradoxism, any division and even purging exists to preserve the import of this life in the next, not nullify its import.

7) <u>The community is eternal.</u>

Individuality only thrives in relationality,[87] which Christianity has known since Augustine[88] and modernity has known since Hegel.[89] Accordingly, an individual's web of relations—the community—is indispensable, and this should be no less true in the eschaton.[90] A Universalist advantage, therefore, is the entire community perdures in the end, but its downside is the ungodly are press-ganged into Stepford membership.[91] Exclusivism necessarily eliminates engagement with those outside salvation. So, through Universalist compulsion or Exclusivist expulsion, some life-giving communal relations go missing in the ultimate. Paradoxism, however, retains the entire web of relations in eternal life unlike Exclusivism, and everyone is there by identification unlike Universalism. Paradoxism's focus on the individual might have seemed hostile to community, but the opposite is true. *Every* individual is subject to division and, therefore, always remains in community, the open issue being the extent. Individual divisibility allows the eternal to include everyone without their abolition.

* * * *

Paradoxism, while adversely affecting no doctrine, unsettles humanity's ultimate. Antonio Lopez describes the "excruciating" concept that "requires the ungrateful person to let go of his own idea of perfection and of the predilection for his own coherence …."[92] Paradoxism is like its ascendant, Christianity, Kierkegaard's "turbulent thing,"[93] which fundamentally alters the individual.[94] *Who* brings salvation is not paradoxical, but, whatever certitude attaches to *what* yields ultimate salvation, Paradoxism defies. Just being a creature, sufficient for Universalism, is no longer sufficient. Whatever threshold Exclusivism finds sufficient, whether conversion, election, or deeds, is no longer. Everything is necessary; nothing, sufficient.[95] Barth wrote, "to Christianity," "no problem of

---

87 Barresi and Martin, "History as Prologue," 54.

88 *Confessions*, 1,6,10 (p. 8).

89 *Phenomenology of Spirit*, ch IV, 166-99 (pp. 104-19).

90 Buber, *I and Thou*, 63; Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God*, 603, 611.

91 Hart, *That All Shall Be Saved*, 150-58.

92 *Gift and the Unity of Being*, 295.

93 *For Self-Examination*, 14.

94 Ziegler, *Militant Grace*, 167.

95 Barth, *Romans*, 361 (9:24-29); Hoff, "Rise and Fall of the Kantian Paradigm," 185; Kierkegaard,

life, be it great or small, is trivial or irrelevant,"[96] but at the center is whether the person identifies with God, who is, Lewis noted, "an acquired taste."[97]

The Moment and Late Writings, 290.

[96] R*omans*, 463 (12:16).

[97] *Problem of Pain*, 55.

CONCLUDINGS

> *The thought of the life beyond the grave distracts me … to terror. …. And now I am so bold as to ask you. Oh, God! What will you think of me now?*
>
> —Dostoevsky[1]

Chapters 1 and 2 framed Chapter 3's challenge: Scripture is in paradox on salvation's extent, imparting Exclusivist and Universalist accounts. Chapter 4 documented the Church's response: Scripture is in contradiction, and, so, one account is honored as the other is hollowed out. After centuries of debate, the Church decided on Exclusivism, including Potentialism, but many have favored Universalism. Chapter 5 found the positions inadequate because each side, to brevet one Scriptural account to doctrine, cashiers the other to confusing nuance. Universalism seems Pollyanna, Exclusivism seems savage, and Potentialism seems disingenuous or desperate. This unsatisfactory state of affairs led to Chapter 6's disquisition that the individual is divisible, which, Chapter 7 explained, allows Scripture's portrayal of salvation's extent to remain paradoxical. Chapters 8 and 9 offered additional reasons for this understanding. The stances argued with conviction throughout were mostly to suggest the viability of preserving the salvation paradox. Those so inclined can jettison certain stances—such as who we are, any Scriptural exegesis, and the doctrinal influences—without undermining the primary thesis. At the end here, the gist can be singled out from the obiter dicta.

The thesis began with what cannot be fairly disputed: Scripture says everyone will be saved and not everyone will be. If the Scriptural text did not clearly establish this, the many first-rate defenders of each salvation-extent account do. Denying either account is effectively unavailable until one is exegeted with extreme prejudice—the favored account justifies reinterpreting the other so just the favorite survives. The only alternative has been to claim actual contradictions are true, but this view does not survive contact with reality except possibly under dictatorial doublethink. In contrast to such 'solutions,' the primary thesis is that Scripture's portrayal of salvation's extent is as it appears, a paradox. The argument here has been mostly to show *how* this can be, and the proposal is a divisible individual. Though *individual* has been around for nearly as long as cogitation, Descartes famously highlighted its indivisibility. Those disputing Cartesian anthropology have largely challenged its dualism, but the competitors, before and after Descartes, still model the individual as indivisible thanks to this life's naturally unitary corporeality and

[1] *The Brothers Karamazov*, 48.

the first-person's inherently unitary perspective. The thesis uses this understanding because it has been the most common since antiquity, is the most reasonable given our unitary perspective, and imposes the most stress on Paradoxism's divisibility. Others with less Cartesian views can, if so inclined, consider alternatives for *individual* (or *self* or *human*) and have an easier time with the paradox. Regardless, the issue remains whether dividing the individual, whatever it is, risks less than enfeebling one Scriptural account. If dividing the individual does not display the salvation paradox, some other model should.

Scripture's adherents have struggled for millennia with its paradoxes. The Church typically imbibes Scripture entirely, marginalizing as heresy sublations dressed up as sublimations, and, to preserve Scripture's paradoxes, models theological insights. An interminable exception has been the paradox of salvation's extent. Instead of accepting that everyone is both ultimately saved and not, Christians have accepted the half deemed best. The dominant Exclusivist position is based on Scripture describing two actual, populated ultimate destinies, including perdition. The competing Universalist position is based on Scripture saying God, through and in everyone, reconciles and saves everyone, dragging everyone to Himself, even the ungodly. Given the inescapable principle of noncontradiction, whether reasoned out or intuitively lived, the Church felt obliged to pick one. No insight required, just a Scriptural cleanup. In its first centuries, the Church tentatively split on which account to prefer. In deciding more vital issues, it had preserved Scriptural paradoxes, but had not done so for the salvation paradox. A "coating of dust" had fallen, Bornkamm described, "on the holy writings like a pall."[2] By the sixth century, the Church lacked the appetite for more incongruities and opted for Exclusivism, though Universalism remains. Both sides, in reaching opposite conclusions, agreed the salvation paradox is a contradiction in need of reform. In contrast, Paradoxism sees the Scriptural accounts of salvation's extent as paradoxical, not unartful; everyone is ultimately saved *and* is not. If both are true, they cannot contradict, which is what invites the individual's divisibility. It can be admitted at the end that this is as to be expected. Absolute truth claims, such as those Scripture makes about eternal life, are bound to be particularistic *and* universalistic because they distinguish without exception.[3]

Paradoxism, to the extent elegant, however, is no anodyne for the salvation paradox because, to preserve it, the model exposes the individual as divisible into two, not merely purged into purity. How can this be, a divisible individual? The model relies on

---

[2] *Paulus*, xxv.

[3] Stuurman, *Invention of Humanity*, 113.

what we are sure of about *individual*. Much of what we think we know is unhelpful given our context, and what substance continues from this life to the next is unspecified. That said, the Christian consensus delivers, and the model employs, two relevant unavoidable axioms. First, corpses prove relentlessly that bodies suffer erasure as thorough as words wiped from a chalkboard. Second, two personal aspects perdure in the afterlife: Our personal identity continues because any afterlife to be our life must be experienced by us, and our personal character continues because any afterlife to be ours must be us. While identity is awareness and thus unitary, character is what a led life renders and is thus conflicted, godly and ungodly. From this, Paradoxism's understanding of the salvation paradox follows: The individual is ultimately saved to the extent godly and doomed to the extent ungodly, and our personal identity experiences the personal character with which it identifies.

Because no one is ultimately nothing, everyone in God's mercy is ultimately remade while remaining oneself, reunifying God and the singular, but anyone opposing God's mercy deserts the self.[4] In the paradox of salvation's extent, as in other Christian paradoxes, identity and difference, singular and plural, coincide.[5] Contrary to expectation, divisibility unifies because everything in this life matters for the next, notwithstanding that the next life, by general agreement, radically differs.[6] The next is not merely this life plus extras, just as the eternal is not dying plus overtime. Rather, Christ unifies this life's unity with the next,[7] and, while everything now will matter to the next, not everything now will be in the next.[8]

The "sustaining thought" in Wordworth's words[9] is "God is love," which is not our love for Him, but His for us, namely His love revealed in us (1Jo. 4:8-10, 16). "[T]he glory of God," Irenaeus noted, "is a living man; and the life of man consists in beholding God."[10] Cabasilas advanced the idea, "It is those in whom this noble passion is nourished who truly live, just as all things are dead for those in whom it is absent."[11] No one entirely escapes this passion, just as no mere mortal nourishes it thoroughly. The

---

4 Lopez, *Gift and the Unity of Being*, 290, 293, 302.

5 Stang, *Our Divine Double*, 253.

6 Lopez, *Gift and the Unity of Being*, 303.

7 Gregor, *Philosophical Anthropology*, 124.

8 Speyr, *Mystery of Death*, 74, 108.

9 *The Prelude* …, XIV,204-205

10 "Against Heresies," 4:20,7 (p. 490).

11 *Life in Christ*, Bk VII § 15 (p. 228).

"dangerous condition of being human," McConville reminds, involves "the perpetual tension between flourishing and degradation."[12] "In redemption, as in creation," Käsemann knew, "everything is differentiated …. God does not want stereotypes."[13] Yet too, "Nothing differentiates" (Rom. 3:22).[14]

This began as an effort to understand what Scripture means by everyone is saved and is not. Paradoxism accepts both as true, but this is reckless, even threatening, because neither salvation proposition gets domesticated. It means we continue to face the lifelong choice for Barabbas or for Christ, the sinfully earthy or the earthly divine.[15] "The man under grace is engaged unconditionally in a conflict," Barth saw, "a war of life and death, a war in which there can be no … peace." "Upon the threshold of my existence there appears … the new man in Christ Jesus, … endowed with attributes which are not mine …. This new man is … no … second person …; he claims to be me myself," but then "an abyss is disclosed between myself and – myself."[16] Standing before the abyss, the question is with whom do we identify. Hamann answered, "Unbelief in the most essential … sense of the word is thus the only sin against the spirit of the true religion …. As a result, there is no mediating concept left … except to believe with all their heart, with all their soul, with all their mind: For God so loved the world—This faith is the victory that overcomes the world."[17]

When all is done, I want to be "counted worthy of God's reign" (2Th. 1:5). I do not know if I can try more—I certainly can—or how much that counts—I question that—but I will try more, for "nothing entering man from outside can defile," only "what comes out of man" (Mark 7:18, 20//Mat. 15:17-18). "I do not wish the Word to save only half of me," Gregory of Nazianzus foresaw,[18] as did Kierkegaard: I alone am guilty, which brings the joy that the fault lies in me alone and that my task alone remains.[19] "God will call to account the pursuit" (Ecc. 3:15). Therefore, even when assured of salvation,[20] I doubt the extent I abide in it.[21] Though the good news is God's grace to

---

[12] *Being Human in God's World*, 192.

[13] *Perspectives on Paul*, 4.

[14] Barth, *Romans*, 99-102.

[15] Speyr, *The Passion from Within*, 136-37.

[16] *Romans*, 225, 229, 262.

[17] "Golgotha and Shebliminil," 194-95.

[18] "Concerning His Own Life," 58-59 (ln 626).

[19] *Upbuilding Discourses*, 275, 277, 280.

[20] Luther, *Galatians*, 364-65, 370 [WA 401, 577-78, 586 (4:6)].

[21] Demarest, *Cross and Salvation*, 379.

humanity, I live the paradox of an alienating response.[22] I am, therefore, sure and unsure of salvation. I hear distinctly Yes and No, the voices sounding different. Sure, God loves *me entirely*, but if only *I entirely* returned the favor. Kierkegaard again writes for *me*: "now, for the first time, I understand and can see the whole of it—but then of course I cannot say 'I'."[23] "What is this mystery in me?" the original Climacus asked. "Speak to me, my yoke-fellow, my nature! I cannot ask anyone else about you," he insisted. "How can I escape the danger of my own nature? I have made a promise to Christ that I will fight you, yet how can I defeat your tyranny?"[24] I—no, we—should fight, not because we want to live eternally, but because we want to be there when we do.

[22] Schwobel, "Human Being as Relational Being," 161.

[23] *JP*, VI, 287 (NB13.21).

[24] *The Ladder*, 186 (step 15).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abraham, William J. "Eschatology and Epistemology." In *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 581-95. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.

Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem. Translated by J.N.W.B. Robertson. London: Thomas Baker, 1899.

Adorno, Theodor. *Minima Moralia*. Translated by E.F.N. Jephcott. London: NLB, 1974.

Al-Ghazali, Muhammad. "Deliverance from Error." Translated by R.J. McCarthy. In *Al-Ghazali's Path to Sufism*, 17-80. Louisville: Fons Vitae, 2000.

Alexander, W.M. *Johann Georg Hamann: Philosophy and Faith*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966.

Allen, David L. *The Extent of Atonement*. Nashville: B&H, 2016.

Alvaro, Pascual-Leone, Amedi Amir, Fregni Felipe, and B. Merabet Lotfi. "The Plastic Human Brain Cortex." *Annual Rev. of Neuroscience* 28, no. 1 (2005): 377-401.

Ambrose. "Expositio in Psalmum CXVIII." In *Sancti Ambrosii Mediolanensis Episcopi Opera Omnia*, 971-1238 (cols. 1261-1580). Paris: Migne, 1887.

———. "On the Christian Faith." In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Ser.*, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, 199-314. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.

Andreopoulos, Andreas. "Eschatology in Maximus the Confessor." In *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor*, edited by Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil, 322-40: Oxford Univ. Press, 2015.

Ansell, Nik. "Annihilation of Hell and Perfection of Freedom." In *All Shall Be Well*, edited by Gregory MacDonald, 417-39. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011.

Anselm. *Cur Deus Homo*. Translated by Sidney Norton Deane. Fort Worth: RDMc, 2005.

Anthony the Great. *The Letters*. Translated by Derwas J. Chitty. Oxford: SLG, 1975.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Compendium of Theology*. Translated by Richard J. Regan. Oxford Univ. Press, 2009.

———. *De Potentia* [The Power of God]. Translated by Richard J. Regan. Oxford Univ. Press, 2012.

———. *The Division and Methods of the Sciences*. Translated by Armand Maurer. 3rd rev. ed. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1963.

———. *Faith, Reason and Theology*. Translated by Armand Maurer. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1987.

———. *Quaestiones De Anima* [Questions on the Soul]. Translated by James H. Robb. Marquette Univ. Press, 2009.

———. *Summa Theologiae, 1a*. Translated by Timothy Suttor. Vols. XI, XIII, New York: Blackfriars with McGraw-Hill, 1970, 1964.

———. *Summa Theologica, Parts I, II, II-II*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1920.

———. *Summa Theologica, Part III (Suppl.)*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Vols. XX, XXI, London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1921, 1922.

———. *Tertia Pars Summae Theologiae a Quaestione 60-90*. Opera Omnia, Iussu Impensaque Leonis XIII. P.M. Edita. Romae Typographia Polyglotta, 1882.

Arendt, Hannah. "Karl Jaspers: Citizen of the World?". In *Men in Dark Times*, 81-94. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1968.

———. *Love and St Augustine*. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1996.

———. "Thinking" and "Willing." In *The Life of the Mind*, edited by Mary McCarthy. San Diego: Harcourt, 1978.

Aristotle. *De Anima* [On the Soul]. Translated by R.D. Hicks. New York: Cosimo, 2008.

———. *Metaphysics: Books 1-9*. Translated by Hugh Tredennick. Harvard Univ. Press, 1989.

———. *Rhetoric*. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. South Bend: Infomotions, 2000.
Arnold, Bill T. "OT Eschatology and the Rise of Apocalypticism." In *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 23-39. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
Athanasius. "Against Arianism." Translated by John Henry Newman. In *Select Treatises of St Athanasius*, 155-428. New York: AMS, 1978.
———. "Tomus Ad Antiochenos," "Letter III" and "Letter X," In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Ser.*, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, 481-86, 512-15, 527-32. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
Auden, W.H. *The Double Man*. New York: Random House, 1941.
Augustine. *City of God*. Translated by Henry Bettenson. London: Penguin, 2003.
———. *Confessions*. Translated by Henry Chadwick. Oxford Univ. Press, 1992.
———. "De Correptione Et Gratia." Translated by Peter Holmes, et al. In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Ser.*, edited by Philip Schaff. Buffalo: Christian Literature, 1887.
———. "On the Morals of the Manichaeans" and "Enchiridion." In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Ser.*, edited by Philip Schaff, 95-107, 237-76. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
———. "Enchiridion Ad Laurentium." In *De Doctrina Christiana Libri Quatuor, Et Enchiridion Ad Laurentium*, edited by Carl Hermann Bruder, 166-252. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1838.
———. *Enchiridion on Faith, Hope and Charity*. Translated by Bruce Harbert. Hyde Park: New City, 2011.
———. "Grace and Free Will." Translated by Robert P. Russell. In *Fathers of the Church*, edited by R.J. Deferrari. DC: Catholic Univ. Press, 1968.
———. "Letters." In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Ser.*, edited by Philip Schaff. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
———. *On Christian Teaching*. Translated by R.P.H. Green. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
———. "On Merit and the Forgiveness of Sins, and the Baptism of Infants." Translated by Peter Holmes, et al. In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Ser.*, edited by Philip Schaff. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1887.
———. *The Retractions (Fathers of the Church, Vol. 60)*. Translated by Sister Mary Inez Bogan. DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 1991.
Ayres, Lewis. *Augustine and the Trinity*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2010.
———. *Nicaea and Its Legacy*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2009.
Badham, Paul. *Christian Beliefs About Life after Death*. London: SPCK, 1978.
Bailer-Jones, Daniela M. "Models, Metaphors and Analogies." In *Blackwell Guide to Philosophy of Science*, edited by Peter Machamer and Michael Silberstein, 108-27. Cambridge: Blackwell, 2002.
Baillie, John. *And the Life Everlasting*. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1934.
Baker, Lynne Rudder. "Materialism with a Human Face." In *Soul, Body, and Survival*, edited by Kevin J. Corcoran, 159-80: Cornell Univ. Press, 2001.
———. *Persons and Bodies*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000.
———. "Persons and the Metaphysics of Resurrection." *Religious Studies* 43, no. 3 (2007): 333-48.
Ballou, Hosea. *Treatise on Atonement*. Bennington: Walbridge, 1811.
Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *Dare We Hope 'That All Men Be Saved'?*, including "Short Discourse on Hell," "Epilogue: Apokatastasis," Translated by David Kipp and Lothar Krauth. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1988.
———. *Life out of Death*. Translated by Davis Perkins. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
———. *Mysterium Paschale*. Translated by Aidan Nichols. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1990.

———. *Theo-Drama*. Translated by Graham Harrison. 5 vols. Vols. I-V, San Francisco: Ignatius, 1988-98.
———. *Theo-Logic*. Translated by Adrian J. Walker. 3 vols. Vols. I-III, San Francisco: Ignatius, 2000-2005.
Balz, Horst. "Δυσκόλως," "Ἐάν" and Ὅσος." In *Exegetical Dict. of the NT*, edited by Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider, 361, 367, 537. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
Barclay, William. *A Spiritual Autobiography*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
Bardesan. "Book of the Laws of Divers Countries." In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 723-34. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
Barnett, Paul. *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Edited by Gordon D. Fee. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
Barresi, John, and Raymond Martin. "History as Prologue." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 33-56: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics I/1*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 2nd ed. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.
———. *Church Dogmatics I/2*. Translated by G.T. Thomson and Harold Knight. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1956.
———. *Church Dogmatics II/1*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. New York: T&T Clark, 1957.
———. *Church Dogmatics II/2*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, et al. Edinburgh: T&T Clark 2001.
———. *Church Dogmatics III §43-44*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, et al. Study ed. New York: T&T Clark, 2010.
———. *Church Dogmatics IV/1-3.1*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
———. *Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. 6th ed. Oxford Univ. Press, 1976.
Barton, John. "Source Criticism (OT)." In *Anchor Bib. Dict.*, edited by David Noel Freedman, 162-65. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
Basil the Great. "The Asketikon." Translated by Anna M. Silvas. In *The Asketikon of St Basil the Great*, edited by Anna M. Silvas, 151-451: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007.
———. *Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah*. Translated by Nikolai Lipatov. Cambridge: Edition Cicero, 2001.
———. "De Spiritu Sancto" and "Letters." In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Ser.*, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, 1-50, 109-327. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
Bates, Matthew W. *Salvation by Allegiance Alone*. Grand Rapids: BakerAcademic, 2017.
Bauckham, Richard. *Jude, 2 Peter*. WBC. Edited by David A. Hubbard. Waco: Word Books, 1983.
———. "Universalism: Historical Survey." *Themelios* 4 (1979): 48-54.
Bavinck, Herman. *The Last Things*. Translated by John Bolt. Grand Rapids: Baker/Paternoster, 1996.
———. *Reformed Dogmatics*. Translated by John Vriend. Vol. IV, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
Beale, G.K. *Book of Revelation*. NIGTC. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.
Becker, Ernest. *The Denial of Death*. New York: Free Press, 1973.
Behr, John. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.
———. "Life and Death in the Age of Martyrdom." In *The Role of Death in Life*, edited by John Behr and Conor Cunningham, 79-95. Eugene: Cascade, 2015.
———. *The Mystery of Christ*. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2006.

Bell, Richard H. "The Corrupt Mind and the Renewed Mind." In *Grandeur of Reason*, edited by Peter M. Candler, Jr. and Conor Cunningham, 197-217. London: SCM, 2010.
———. "Rom 5.18-19 and Universal Salvation." *NTS* 48, no. 3 (2002): 417-32.
Benedetto, Dario, et al. "The Puzzle of Basil's Epistula 38." *J. of Quantitative Linguistics* 20, no. 4 (2013): 267-87.
Benedict XVI. *Spe Salvi. Encyclical Letter of 30 Nov. 2007*. Boston: Pauline, 2007.
Beougher, Timothy K. "Are All Doomed to Be Saved?". In *Who Will Be Saved?*, edited by Paul R. House and Gregory A. Thornbury, 83-110. Wheaton: Crossway, 2000.
Berdyaev, Nicolas. *The Fate of Man in the Modern World*. Translated by D.A. Lowrie. Univ. of Michigan Press, 1961.
Bergson, Henri. *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*. Translated by Ashley Audra and Cloudesley Brereton. Garden City: Doubleday, 1935.
Berkhof, Hendrikus. *The Christian Faith*. Translated by Sierd Woudstra. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
Berkouwer, G.C. *Man: Image of God*. Translated by Dirk W. Jellema. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
Bernstein, Alan E. *Formation of Hell*. Cornell Univ. Press, 1993.
Bettis, Joseph P. "Was Karl Barth a Universalist." *SJT* 20 (1967): 423-36.
Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians*. Hermeneia. Edited by Helmut Koester. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
Betz, John R. *After Enlightenment: Post-Secular Vision of J.G. Hamann*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
———. "A Radically Orthodox Reformer: J.G. Hamann." *Modern Theology* 33, no. 4 (2017): 640-77.
Bishop, Jeffrey P. "On Medical Corpses." In *The Role of Death in Life*, edited by John Behr and Conor Cunningham, 164-778. Eugene: Cascade, 2015.
Black, Max. "More About Metaphor." In *Metaphor and Thought*, edited by Andrew Ortony. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1979.
Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. *Greek Grammar of the NT and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by Robert W. Funk. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1962.
Blomberg, Craig L. *Matthew*. NAC. Edited by David S. Dockery. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.
———. "The Unity and Diversity of Scripture." In *New Dict. of Bib. Theology*, edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner, 64-72. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.
Blondel, Maurice. *Letter on Apologetics & History and Dogma*, 125-208, 219-87. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
———. *Action (1893)*. Translated by Oliva Blanchette. Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1984.
Blosser, Benjamin P. *Become Like the Angels*. Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 2012.
Blowers, Paul M. *Maximus the Confessor*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2016.
Bock, Darrell L. *Acts*. BECNT. Edited by Robert Yarbrough and Robert H. Stein. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
———. *Luke 1–9:50, Luke 9:51–24:53*. BECNT. Edited by Moises Silva. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 1996.
Boer, Martinus C. de. *The Defeat of Death*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1988.
Boethius. "Contra Eutychen." Translated by H.F. Stewart, et al. In *The Theological Tractates and the Consolation of Philosophy*, 73-129. Cambridge, MA: Loeb, 1973.
Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Discipleship*. Translated by Barbara Green and Reinhard Krauss. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

———. *Christ the Center*. Translated by John Bowden. New York: Harper, 1960.
———. *Ethics*. Translated by Reinhard Krauss, et al. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009.
———. *Letters and Papers from Prison*. Translated by Reginald Fuller, et al. Enlarged ed. New York: Touchstone, 1997.
———. *Life Together*. Translated by John W. Doberstein. New York: HarperOne, 1954.
Borges, Jorge Luis. "Borges and I." Translated by Andrew Hurley. In *Collected Fictions*, 324. New York: Penguin, 1998.
Boring, M. Eugene. "Language of Universal Salvation in Paul." *JBL* 105, no. 2 (1986): 269-292.
Bornkamm, Gunther. *Paulus*. Translated by D.M.G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
Bourget, David and David Chalmers, "What Do Philosophers Believe?" *Philosophical Studies* 170, no. 3 (2014): 465-500.
Bovon, Francois. *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51–19:27*. Translated by Donald S. Deer. Hermeneia. Edited by Helmut Koester. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013.
———. "The Soul's Comeback." *HTR* 103, no. 4 (2010): 387-406.
Bowles, Ralph G. "Does Revelation 14:11 Teach Eternal Torment?". In *Rethinking Hell*, edited by Christopher M. Date, et al., 138-54. Eugene: Cascade, 2014.
Boyd, Gregory A. "Christus Victor View." In *The Nature of Atonement*, edited by James Beilby and Paul R. Eddy, 23-49. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2006.
Bray, Gerald L. *God Has Spoken*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2014.
Bridges, Carl B. "Degrees of Punishment and Reward in the Gospels." *Stone-Campbell J.* 14, no. 1 (2011): 81-86.
Brookins, Timothy A. "Greco-Roman Perspectives on Anthropology." In *Anthropology and NT Theology*, edited by Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds, 43-63. New York: T&T Clark, 2019.
Brotherton, Joshua R. "The Possibility of Universal Conversion in Death." *Modern Theology* 32, no. 3 (2016): 307-24.
Brower, Jeffrey E. *Aquinas's Ontology of the Material World*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2017.
Brown, Colin. "Spirit." In *New Int'l Dict. of NT Theology*, 689-708. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon [BDB]*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2012.
Brown, Peter. *The Rise of Western Christendom*. Rev. ed. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.
Brown, Raymond E. *The Death of the Messiah*. 2 vols. Vols. I-II, New York: Doubleday, 1994, 1998.
Bruce, F.F. *Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985.
———. *Epistle to the Galatians*. NIGTC. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
———. *Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*. NICNT. Edited by Gordon D. Fee. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
Brueggemann, Walter. *Isaiah 40–66*. WeBC. Edited by Patrick D. Miller and David L. Bartlett. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.
Brunner, Emil. *Eternal Hope*. Translated by Harold Knight. London: Lutterworth, 1954.
Buber, Martin. *Between Man and Man*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. London: Kegan Paul, 1927.
———. "Religion and Philosophy" and "God and the Spirit of Man." Translated by Maurice S. Friedman. "Religion and Ethics." Translated by Eugene Kamenka and Maurice S. Friedman. In *Eclipse of God*, 25-46, 93-111, 121-29. Amherst: Humanity Books, 1996.
———. *I and Thou*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1950.

———. *Ten Rungs*. New York: Citadel, 1995.
———. *The Way of Man*. Secaucus: Citadel, 1966.
Buckareff, Andrei A., and Joel S. Van Wagenen. "Surviving Resurrection." *Int'l J. for Philosophy of Religion* 67 (2010): 123-39.
Bulgakov, Sergius. *Bride of the Lamb*. Translated by Boris Jakim. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002. Neviesta Agntsa.
———. "Vladimir Solovyov: Scholar and Seer," "Heroism and Otherworldliness," "By Jacob's Well" and "The Lamb of God." Translated by Natalie Duddington and James Pain. In *A Bulgakov Anthology*, edited by James Pain and Nicolas Zernov, 42-48, 51-53, 100-18. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.
———. *The Orthodox Church*. Translated by Lydia Kesich. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1988.
Bullivant, Stephen. *The Salvation of Atheists and Catholic Dogmatic Theology*. Oxford University Press, 2012.
Bultmann, Rudolf. *NT and Mythology*, including "Theology as Science," "On the Problem of Demythologizing (1961)," edited by Schubert M. Ogden, 1-43, 45-67, 155-63. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.
———. *Theology of the NT*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols.: Baylor Univ. Press, 2007.
Burdett, Michael S. "Transcendence and Human Enhancement." In *Transhumanism and Transcendence*, edited by Ronald Cole-Turner, 19-35. DC: Georgetown Univ. Press, 2011.
Butler, Joseph. *Analogy of Religion*. New York: Robert Carter, 1750.
Butterfield, Herbert. *Whig Interpretation of History*. New York: Norton, 1965.
Butterworth, G.W. "Introduction." In *Origen on First Principles*, i-xxxix. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1936.
Bynum, Caroline Walker. "Material Continuity, Personal Survival, and the Resurrection of the Body." *History of Religions* 30, no. 1 (1990): 51-85.
———. *The Resurrection of the Body*. Columbia Univ. Press, 1995.
Cabasilas, Nicholas. *The Life in Christ*. Translated by Carmino J. deCatanzaro. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974.
Caird, G. B., and L. D. Hurst. "The Need of Salvation." In *NT Theology*. Oxford University Press, 1995.
Caldecott, Stratford. *The Radiance of Being*. Tacoma: Angelico, 2013.
Calvin, John. *Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians*. Translated by R. Mackenzie. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960.
———. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2012.
Campbell, John. "Personal Identity." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 339-51: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Candler, Peter M., Jr. *Theology, Rhetoric, Manuduction*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
Candler, Peter M., Jr., and Conor Cunningham, eds. *The Grandeur of Reason*. London: SCM, 2010.
"Canons of 543" and "Canons of 553." Translated by Richard Price. In *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*, 281, 284-86: Liverpool Univ. Press, 2012.
Carson, D.A. *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
———. *Gospel According to John*. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
———. "Matthew." In *EBC*, edited by Frank E. Gaebelein, 2-599. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
Carter, Rita, and Christopher Frith. *Mapping the Mind*. Rev. ed. Los Angeles: Univ. of Calif. Press, 2010.

Casimir, Brother. "When (the Father) Will Subject All Things to (the Son)." *Greek Orthodox Theological Rev.* 28, no. 1 (1983): 1-25.
Cassara, Ernest, ed. *Universalism in America*. Boston: Beacon, 1971.
Cassian, John. "The Conferences." In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Ser.*, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, 291-545. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
Cassirer, Ernst. *The Myth of the State*. Yale Univ. Press, 1946.
Catholic Church. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
Catullus, Valerius. "Poem 85". *Carmina*. Perseus Project, accessed 1 Aug. 2020.
Cavanaugh, William T. "Beyond Secular Parodies." In *Radical Orthodoxy*, edited by John Milbank, et al., 182-200. New York: Routledge, 1999.
Cavell, Marcia. "The Self: Growth, Integrity, and Coming Apart." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 592-605: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Celsus. *On the True Doctrine*. Translated by R. Joseph Hoffman. Oxford Univ. Press, 1987.
Chadwick, Henry. *Augustine of Hippo*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2010.
———. *The Church in Ancient Society*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
———. *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition*. Oxford Univ. Press, 1984.
———. *The Early Church*. New York: Penguin, 1977.
Chapman, Mark D. *Anglican Theology*. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
Charlton, James. *Non-Dualism in Eckhart, Julian of Norwich and Traherne*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
Chauncy, Charles. *The Salvation of All Men*. New Haven: A. Morse, 1784.
Chesterton, Gilbert K. *Orthodoxy*. Cavalier Classics, 2015.
———. *St Thomas Aquinas*. New York: Angelico, 2011.
Chomsky, Noam. *Reflections on Language*. New York: Pantheon, 1975.
Christensen, Michael J. "The Problem, Promise, and Process of Theosis." In *Partakers of the Divine Nature*, edited by Michael J. Christensen and Jeffrey A. Wittung, 23-31. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
Clark, Mary T. "An Inquiry into Personhood." *Rev. of Metaphysics* 46, no. 1 (1992): 3-28.
Clarke, W. Norris. *Person and Being*. Marquette Univ. Press, 2008.
Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War*. Translated by J.J. Graham. London: N. Trübner, 1909.
Clement of Alexandria. "The Stromata" and "Fragments from Cassiodous." In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 299-568, 571-77. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
Clendenin, Dan. "Freedom and Universal Salvation." *Ellul Studies Bulletin*, Aug. 1988, 3.
Clines, David J.A. *Job 1–20*. WBC. Edited by David A. Hubbard. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
Clymer, Wayne K. "Union with Christ." In *All Shall Be Well*, edited by Gregory MacDonald, 116-40. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011.
Cole, G.A. "Justice: Retributive or Reformative." *Reformed Theological Rev.* 45, no. 1 (1986): 5-12.
Colic, Ahmo, and Hrustem Smailhodzic. "The Study of Light." Paper presented at the AIP Conference Proceedings 899, 2007.
Colijn, Brenda B. *Images of Salvation in the NT*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2010.
Come, Arnold B. *Kierkegaard as Theologian*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1997.
Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922. "Doctrine in the Church of England." London: SPCK, 1938.
Congdon, David W. *The God Who Saves*. Eugene: Cascade, 2016.
Connell, Matt F. "Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel." In *From Kant to Levi-Strauss*, edited by Jon Simons, 33-49: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2002.
Connolly, John M. *Living without Why*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.

Constable, Henry. "Divine Justice." In *Rethinking Hell*, edited by Christopher M. Date, et al., 198-206. Eugene: Cascade, 2014.
Cooper, Adam G. *Holy Eros*. Kettering: Angelico, 2014.
———. *Naturally Human, Supernaturally God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.
Cooper, John W. "Biblical Anthropology and the Body-Soul Problem." In *Soul, Body, and Survival*, edited by Kevin J. Corcoran, 218-28. New York: Cornell Univ. Press, 2001.
———. *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
———. "Whose Interpretation? Which Anthropology." In *Neuroscience and the Soul*, edited by Thomas M. Crisp, et al., 238-57. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
Copi, Irving M. *Introduction to Logic*. 6th ed. New York: Macmillan, 1982.
Corcoran, Kevin J. "Persons and Bodies." *Faith and Philosophy* 15, no. 3 (1998): 324-40.
Corcoran, Kevin J., and Kevin Sharpe. "Neuroscience and the Human Person." In *Neuroscience and the Soul*, edited by Thomas M. Crisp, et al., 121-36. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
Cranfield, C.E.B. *Romans 1–8, Romans 9–16*. ICC. Edited by J.A. Emerton and C.E.B. Cranfield. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1985 (Repr. ed.), 1994 (Corr. ed.).
Crick, Francis. *The Astonishing Hypothesis*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995.
Crisp, Oliver D. "'I Do Teach It, but I Also Do Not Teach It': Universalism of Karl Barth." In *All Shall Be Well*, edited by Gregory MacDonald, 305-24. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011.
Crisp, Oliver D., and Fred Sanders, eds. *Christian Doctrine of Humanity*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018.
Crockett, William, ed. *Four Views on Hell*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
Croft, Alice Thompson. "Didymus the Blind on 1 Corinthians 15." Wilfrid Laurier Univ., 1987.
Crosby, John F. *Selfhood of the Human Person*. DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 1996.
Cunningham, Conor. *Genealogy of Nihilism*. London: Routledge, 2002.
———. "Is There Life before Death?". In *The Role of Death in Life*, edited by John Behr and Conor Cunningham, 120-51. Eugene: Cascade, 2015.
———. "Suspending the Natural Attitude." In *Transcendence and Phenomenology*, edited by Conor Cunningham and Peter M. Candler, Jr., 260-87. London: SCM, 2007.
Cyril of Alexandria. *Commentary on John*. Translated by David R. Maxwell. Ancient Christian Texts. Edited by Thomas C. Oden and Gerald L. Bray. 2 vols. Vol. I-II, Downers Grove: IVP, 2013, 2015.
———. "Festal Letter Seven." Translated by Philip R. Adimon. In *Fathers of the Church*, edited by Thomas P. Halton, 125-36. DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 2009.
Czachesz, Istvan. "Why Body Matters in the Afterlife." In *The Human Body in Death and Resurrection*, edited by Tobias Nicklas, et al., 391-411. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.
Dahl, M.E. *The Resurrection of the Body*. Naperville: Allenson, 1962.
Daley, Brian E. *The Hope of the Early Church*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991.
Dalferth, Ingolf U. *Creatures of Possibility*. Translated by Jo Bennett. Grand Rapids: Baker-Academic, 2016.
Danker, F., Walter B., William F., and Wilbur G., eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd [BDAG] ed: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2000.
Davids, Peter H. *Epistle of James*. NIGTC. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
———. *Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*. PNTC. Edited by D.A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
Davies, Brian. *Thomas Aquinas on God and Evil*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2011.

Davies, Douglas J. "Immortality." In *The Role of Death in Life*, edited by John Behr and Conor Cunningham, 31-41. Eugene: Cascade, 2015.
Davies, J.G. *The Early Christian Church*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987.
Davis, Stephen T. "Eschatology and Resurrection." In *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 384-98. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
———. "Physicalism and Resurrection." In *Soul, Body, and Survival*, edited by Kevin J. Corcoran, 229-48: Cornell Univ. Press, 2001.
———. *Risen Indeed*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
Deikman, Arthur J. "'I' = Awareness." In *Models of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher and Jonathan Shear, 421-27. Thorverton: Imprint, 1999.
Demarest, Bruce. *The Cross and Salvation*. Wheaton: Crossway, 2006.
Dennett, Daniel C. *Elbow Room*. New ed.: MIT Press, 2015.
Denzinger, Henry, and Karl Rahner, eds. *The Sources of Catholic Dogma*. 30th ed. St Louis: B. Herder, 1957.
Dickinson, Emily. "Life." In *Collected Poems*, 3-72. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1993.
Dilthey, Wilhelm. *Introduction to the Human Sciences*. Translated by Ramon J. Betanzos. Wayne State Univ. Press, 1988.
Dilworth, Craig. *Metaphysics of Science*. 2nd ed. Dordrecht: Springer, 2007.
Dinesen, Isak. "The Dreamers." In *Seven Gothic Tales*, 337-442. New York: Modern Library, 1994.
Doble, Peter. *The Paradox of Salvation*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996.
Doniger, Wendy. *Splitting the Difference*. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1999.
Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *The Brothers Karamazov*. Translated by Constance Garnett. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1995.
Driver, John. *Images of the Church in Mission*. Scottdale: Herald, 1997.
Drury, M. O'C. "Conversations with Wittgenstein." In *Ludwig Wittgenstein: Personal Reflections*, edited by Rush Rhees. Totowa: Rowman & Littlefield, 1981.
Dulles, Avery. "The Population of Hell." *First Things* 133 (May 2003): 36-41.
Dunn, James D.G. *Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*. NIGTC. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
———. *Romans 1–8, Romans 9–16*. WBC. Edited by David A. Hubbard. Dallas: Word Books, 1988.
Dunning, H. Ray. *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*. Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 1988.
Eastman, Susan Grove. *Paul and the Person*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.
Eddy, Paul R., and James Beilby. "The Atonement." In *The Nature of Atonement*, 9-21. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2006.
Edwards, David L. *After Death?* New York: Cassell, 1999.
Edwards, James R. *Gospel According to Mark*. PNTC. Edited by D.A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
Edwards, Jonathan. "The Miscellanies." In *Works Of*, edited by Paul Ramsey, 833-1152: Yale Univ. Press, 1957.
———. *The Works*. 2 vols. Vol. I, London: Westley, 1834.
Eliot, George. *Middlemarch*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1996.
Eliot, T.S. *Four Quartets*. San Diego: Harcourt, 1971.
———. *Murder in the Cathedral*. San Diego: Harcourt, 1963.
Ellis, E. Earle. "NT Teaching on Hell." In *Rethinking Hell*, edited by Christopher M. Date, et al., 116-37. Eugene: Cascade, 2014.
Ellul, Jacques. *Apocalypse*. Translated by George W. Schreiner. New York: Seabury, 1977.
———. *The Ethics of Freedom*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. London: Mowbrays, 1976.

———. *What I Believe*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
Elster, Jon. *Sour Grapes*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1983.
Elwell, Walter A., ed. *Scripture*. 4 vols. Vol. IV, Baker Encyclopedia of the Bib. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988.
Engel, S. Morris, and Angelika Soldan. *The Study of Philosophy*. 6th ed. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2008.
Epictetus. *Discourses*. Translated by William A. Oldfather. 2 vols. Vol. I-II: Harvard Univ. Press, 1956, 1959.
———. "Fragments." Translated by William A. Oldfather. In *Discourses*, 439-73. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959.
Epicurus. "Letter to Menoeceus." Translated by George K. Stodach. In *Philosophy of Epicurus*, edited by George K. Stodach: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1963.
Erasmus. "De Libero Arbitrio." Translated by E. Gordon Rupp and A.N. Marlow. In *Luther and Erasmus: Free Will and Salvation*, 35-97. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.
Erickson, Millard J. *Christian Theology*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.
Erskine, Thomas. *Doctrine of Election*. London: Duncan, Paternoster, 1837.
Eshleman, Andrew. "Moral Responsibility." In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, 2016.
Euclid. *Elements*. 3rd ed. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, 1885.
Eusebius of Caesarea. "Against Marcellus" and "On Ecclesiastical Theology." Translated by Kelley McCarthy Spoerl and Markus Vinzent. In *Fathers of the Church*, 75-155, 159-337. DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 2017.
———. *Commentary on Isaiah*. Translated by Jonathan J. Armstrong. Downers Grove: IVP, 2013.
Evans, C. Stephen, and Robert C. Roberts. "Ethics." In *Oxford Handbook of Kierkegaard*, edited by John Lippitt and George Pattison, 211-29: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.
Fabro, Cornelio. *God in Exile*. Translated by Arthur Gibson. Westminster: Newman, 1968.
Fabry, Heinz-Josef. "Sela." In *Theological Dict. of the OT*, edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, et al., 400-405. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
Fagerberg, David W. "Foreword." In *Holy Eros*. Kettering: Angelico, 2014.
Fairley, Barker. "Goethe's Last Letter." *Univ. of Toronto Quarterly* 27, no. 1 (1957): 1-9.
Fee, Gordon D. *First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
Ferguson, Niall. *Civilization*. New York: Penguin, 2011.
Ferre, Nels F.S. *Christian Understanding of God*. New York: Harper, 1951.
Feuerbach, Ludwig. *Essence of Christianity*. Translated by George Eliot. New York: Harper, 1957.
Finlan, Stephen. "Can We Speak of Theosis in Paul?". In *Partakers of the Divine Nature*, edited by Michael J. Christensen and Jeffrey A. Wittung, 68-80. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
Finney, Charles G. *Systematic Theology*. Abr. ed. Minneapolis: Bethany House, 1976.
———. *The Memoirs*. Complete Restored ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989.
Fitzpatrick, Antonia. *Thomas Aquinas on Bodily Identity*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2017.
Forsyth, Peter Taylor. *The Principle of Authority*. London: Independent Press, 1952.
Foster, John. "Brief Defense of the Cartesian View." In *Soul, Body, and Survival*, edited by Kevin J. Corcoran, 15-29: Cornell Univ. Press, 2001.
Fraassen, Bas C. van. *The Empirical Stance*. Yale Univ. Press, 2002.
———. *Scientific Representation*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2013.
France, R.T. *Gospel of Mark*. NIGTC. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

———. *Gospel of Matthew*. NICNT. Edited by F.F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
Francis of Assisi. "Words of Admonition." Translated by Paschal Robinson. In *The Writings of St Francis of Assisi*, 3-19. Philadelphia: Dolphin, 1905.
Frankfurt, Harry. "Freedom of the Will and the Concept of a Person." *J. of Philosophy* 68 (1971): 5-20.
Frankl, Viktor E. *Man's Search for Meaning*. Boston: Beacon, 2006.
Freud, Sigmund. *The Future of an Illusion*. Translated by James Strachey. New York: W.W. Norton, 1961.
Fromm, Erich. *Man for Himself*. New York: Henry Holt, 1990.
———. "Modern Man and the Future." Translated by Lance W. Garmer. In *On Being Human*, edited by Rainer Funk, 15-31. New York: Continuum, 2005.
Froom, LeRoy E. "Conditionalism in the Early Church." In *Rethinking Hell*, edited by Christopher M. Date, et al., 260-275. Eugene: Cascade, 2014.
Frost, Robert. "The Trial by Existence," "Ten Mills." In *Complete Poems*, 19-20, 405-407. New York: Holt, 1967.
Frost, Stanley Brice. "Death of Josiah." *JBL* 87, no. 4 (1968): 369-82.
Fudge, Edward William. *The Fire That Consumes*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2012.
Fuyarchuk, Andrew. *Gadamer's Path to Plato*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
Gallagher, Shaun. "Introduction: Diversity of Selves." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, 1-29: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Gallup, Gordon G., Jr., James R. Anderson, and Steven M. Platek. "Self-Recognition." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 80-110: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Gammie, John G. "Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature." *JBL* 93, no. 3 (1974): 356-85.
Garff, Joakim. "Formation and the Critique of Culture." Translated by George Pattison. In *Oxford Handbook of Kierkegaard*, edited by John Lippitt and George Pattison, 252-72: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.
Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. BECNT. Edited by Robert Yarbrough and Robert H. Stein. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003.
———. *2 Corinthians*. NAC. Edited by E. Ray Clendenen. Nashville: B&H, 1999.
Gassar, Georg, and Matthias Stefan, eds. *Personal Identity*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015.
Gavrilyuk, Paul L. "The Judgment of Love." In *All Shall Be Well*, edited by Gregory MacDonald, 280-304. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011.
Geisler, Norman L. *Systematic Theology*. One Vol. ed. Minneapolis: BethanyHouse, 2011.
Gendler, Tamar Szabo. "Exceptional Persons." In *Models of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher and Jonathan Shear, 447-65. Thorverton: Imprint, 1999.
George, Timothy and Denise, eds. *Baptist Confessions, Covenants, and Catechisms*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999.
Gergen, Kenneth J. "The Social Construction of Self." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 633-53: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Gerson, Lloyd P. *Knowing Persons*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2003.
Gillman, Neil. *The Death of Death*. Woodstock: Jewish Lights, 2006.
Gilson, Etienne. *Being and Some Philosophers*. 2nd ed. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2016.
———. *The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy*. Translated by A.H.C. Downes. Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 2009.
Glasser, Arthur F., Charles E. Van Engen, Dean S. Gilliland, and Shawn B. Redford. *Announcing the Kingdom*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003.

Glicksberg, Charles I. *Ironic Vision in Modern Literature*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969.
Gockel, Matthias. *Barth and Schleiermacher on the Doctrine of Election*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2006.
Goddard, Andrew. "The Totality of Condemnation Fell on Christ." In *All Shall Be Well*, edited by Gregory MacDonald, 325-54. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011.
Goddard, Cliff. "The Natural Semantic Metalanguage Approach." In *Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*, edited by Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog, 459-84: Oxford Univ. Press, 2010.
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Faust: A Tragedy*. Translated by Martin Greenberg. Yale Univ. Press, 1992.
———. *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*. Translated by Eric A. Blackall and Victor Lange. New York: Suhrkamp, 1989.
Goetz, Stewart. "Substance Dualism" and "Substance Dualist Response to Nonreductive Physicalism." In *In Search of the Soul*, edited by Joel B. Green, 33-60, 139-42. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
Gonzalez, Justo L. *The Story of Christianity*. Rev. ed. New York: HarperOne, 2010.
Gooder, Paula. *Heaven*. London: SPCK, 2011.
Gorman, Michael J. *Inhabiting the Cruciform God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
Gouvea, Fernando Q. "Godliness." In *Evangelical Dict. of Theology*, edited by Walter A. Elwell, 508-509. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
Gracia, Jorge J.E. *Individuality*. State Univ. of New York Press, 1988.
Graham, Billy. *The Holy Spirit*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1988.
Grant, Jamie A. "What Is Man?". In *Anthropology and NT Theology*, edited by Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds, 5-25. New York: T&T Clark, 2019.
Green, Michael. *2 Peter and Jude*. TNTC. Edited by Leon Morris. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
Greene, Graham. *The Power and the Glory*. New York: Penguin, 1991.
Greggs, Tom. *Barth, Origen, and Universal Salvation*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2009.
———. "Christian Universalist View." In *Five Views on the Extent of Atonement*, edited by Adam J. Johnson, 197-217. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019.
Gregor, Brian. *Philosophical Anthropology of the Cross*. Indiana Univ. Press, 2013.
Gregory of Nazianzus. *Festal Orations*. Translated by Nonna Verna Harrison. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2008.
———. *On God and Man*. Translated by Peter Gilbert. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.
———. "Orations." In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Ser.*, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, 203-434. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
———. "Concerning His Own Life." Translated by Carolinne White. In *Autobiographical Poems*, edited by Carolinne White, 11-154. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996.
Gregory of Nyssa. "The Catechetical Oration." Translated by J.H. Srawley. In *Catechetical Oration of St Gregory of Nyssa*, edited by J.H. Srawley, 23-120. London: Soc. for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917.
———. "In Illud: Tunc Et Ipse Filius." In *Gregorii Nysseni Opera III/2*, edited by Joseph Kenneth Downing, 44-50. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
———. "Letter 34" and "Letter 35." Translated by Anna M. Silvas. In *The Letters*, edited by Anna M. Silvas, 246-47, 249-59. Boston: Brill, 2007.
———. *The Life of Moses*. Translated by Abraham J. Malherbe and Everett Ferguson. New York: Harper, 2006.
———. *On the Soul and Resurrection*. Translated by Catharine P. Roth. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1993.

Gregory Thaumaturgus. "Address of Thanksgiving to Origen." Translated by Michael Slusser. In *Fathers of the Church*, edited by Thomas P. Halton, 91-126. DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 1998.
Gregory the Great. *Forty Gospel Homilies*. Translated by Dom David Hurst. Kalamazoo: Cistercian, 1990.
Grenz, Stanley J. *Theology for the Community of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
Griffiths, Paul J. "Purgatory." In *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 427-45. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
Gschwandtner, Christina M. "Fully Alive?". In *The Role of Death in Life*, edited by John Behr and Conor Cunningham, 56-75. Eugene: Cascade, 2015.
Guardini, Romano. *Freedom, Grace, and Destiny*. Translated by John Murray. New York: Pantheon, 1961.
———. *The World and the Person*. Translated by Stella Lange. Chicago: Regnery, 1965.
Guarini, Marcello, Amy Butchart, Paul Simard Smith, and Andrei Moldovan. "Resources for Research on Analogy." *Informal Logic* 29, no. 2 (2009): 84-197.
Guhrt, Joachim. "Time-Aion." In *New Int'l Dict. of NT Theology*, edited by Colin Brown, 826-33. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
Guignon, Charles. "Heidegger and Kierkegaard on Death." In *Kierkegaard and Death*, edited by Patrick Stokes and Adam Buben, 184-203: Indiana Univ. Press, 2011.
Gulley, Philip, and James Mulholland. *If Grace Is True*. New York: HarperOne, 2003.
Gundry, Robert H. *Soma in Biblical Theology*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976.
Gunton, Colin E. *Father, Son and Holy Spirit*. New York: T&T Clark, 2003.
———. "Trinity, Ontology and Anthropology." In *Persons, Divine and Human*, edited by Christoph Schwobel and Colin E. Gunton, 47-61. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
Hacking, Ian. "Our Neo-Cartesian Bodies in Parts." *Critical Inquiry* 34, no. 1 (2007): 78-105.
Haeckel, Ernst. *The Riddle of the Universe*. Translated by Josephy McCabe. New York: Harper, 1900.
Hafner, Verena V., Pontus Loviken, Antonio Pico Villalpando, and Guido Schillaci. "Prerequisites for an Artificial Self." *Front. Neurorobot* 14, no. 5 (2020): 1-10.
Haggard, Patrick. "Do We Have Conscious Free Will." In *Mapping the Mind*, edited by Rita Carter, 192-93. Los Angeles: Univ. of Calif. Press, 2010.
Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew 1–13, Matthew 14–28*. WBC. Edited by David A. Hubbard. Dallas: Word Books, 1993, 1995.
Hahn, Hans-Cristoph. "Conscience." In *New Int'l Dict. of NT Theology*, edited by Colin Brown, 348-51. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
Hamann, Johann Georg. "Cloverleaf of Hellenistic Letters," "Aesthetica in Nuce," "The Last Will and Testament of the Knight of the Rose-Cross," "Philological Ideas and Doubts About an Academic Prize Essay" and "Golgotha and Sheblimini!" Translated by Kenneth Haynes. In *Hamann: Writings on Philosophy and Language*, edited by Kenneth Haynes, 33-136, 164-204. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2009.
———. "Letter to Lindner 9 Aug. 1759 (Excerpt)," "Fragments" and "Letter to Jacobi 27 Apr. 1787 (Excerpt)." Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. In *J.G. Hamann*, edited by Ronald Gregor Smith, 67, 160-73, 255-56. New York: Harper, 1960.
———. "Socratic Memorabilia." Translated by Gwen Griffith Dickson. In *Johann Georg Hamann's Relational Metacriticism*, edited by Gwen Griffith Dickson, 375-407. New York: de Gruyter, 1995.
Hammett, John S. "Response to General Atonement View" and "Multiple-Intentions View of the Atonement." In *Perspectives on the Extent of Atonement*, edited by Andrew David Naselli and Mark A. Snoeberger, 134-41, 143-94. Nashville: B&H, 2015.

Hanson, Paul D. *OT Apocalyptic*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1987.
Harari, Yuval Noah. *Sapiens*. New York: Harper, 2015.
Harder, Gunther. "Soul." In *New Int'l Dict. of NT Theology*, edited by Colin Brown, 676-86. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
Harding, Sarah. *Paul's Eschatological Anthropology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.
Harmon, Steven R. "Subjection of All Things in Christ." In *All Shall Be Well*, edited by Gregory MacDonald, 47-65. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011.
Harre, Rom. *Principles of Scientific Thinking*. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1970.
Harris, Murray J. "Salvation." In *New Dict. of Bib. Theology*, edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner, 762-67. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.
———. *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. NIGTC. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
Harrison, Jonathan. "The Logical Function of 'That'." *Philosophy* 79, no. 1 (2004): 67-96.
Harrison, Nonna Verna. *God's Many-Splendored Image*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010.
Hart, David Bentley. "Christ's Rabble." *Commonweal* 143, no. 16 (Oct. 7 2016): 18-21.
———. "Death, Final Judgment, and the Meaning of Life." In *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 476-89. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
———. *The Experience of God*. Yale Univ. Press, 2013.
———. *The New Testament*. Yale Univ. Press, 2017.
———. *That All Shall Be Saved*. Yale Univ. Press, 2019.
Hart, Trevor. "In the End, God." In *All Shall Be Well*, edited by Gregory MacDonald, 355-81. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011.
———. "Redemption and Fall." In *Cambridge Companion to Christian Doctrine*, edited by Colin E. Gunton, 189-206: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998.
Hartshorne, Charles. *The Logic of Perfection*. Lasalle: Open Court, 1962.
Hasker, William. "Do My Quarks Enjoy Beethoven." In *Neuroscience and the Soul*, edited by Thomas M. Crisp, et al., 13-40. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
———. *The Emergent Self*. Cornell Univ. Press, 2001.
———. "Persons as Emergent Substances." In *Soul, Body, and Survival*, edited by Kevin J. Corcoran, 107-19: Cornell Univ. Press, 2001.
Hawking, Stephen, and Leonard Mlodinow. *The Grand Design*. New York: Bantam, 2010.
Healy, Nicholas J. *Eschatology of Hans Urs von Balthasar*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2007.
Hebblethwaite, Brian. *The Christian Hope*. Rev. ed.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2010.
Hegel, Georg W.F. *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion*. Translated by E.B. Spiers and J.B. Sanderson. 3 vols. Vol. I, New York: Humanities, 1968.
———. *Logic*. Translated by William Wallace. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.
———. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by A.V. Miller. Oxford Univ. Press, 1981.
Heidegger, Martin. "Being and Time: Introduction" and "The End of Philosophy and the Task of Thinking." Translated by Joan Stambaugh. "Letter on Humanism." Translated by Frank A. Capuzzi. "Modern Science, Metaphysics, and Mathematics." Translated by W.B. Barton, Jr. and Vera Deutsch. "What Calls for Thinking?" Translated by Fred D. Wieck and J. Glenn Gray. In *Basic Writings*, edited by David Farrell Krell, 41-89, 193-242, 247-86, 345-67, 373-92. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
Hemming, Laurence Paul. "Heidegger and the Grounds of Redemption." In *Radical Orthodoxy*, edited by John Milbank, et al., 91-108. New York: Routledge, 1999.
Hennessey, Lawrence R. "The Place of Saints and Sinners after Death." In *Origen of Alexandria*, edited by Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen, 295-312: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1988.
Henry, Carl F.H. *God, Revelation and Authority*. 6 vols. Vol. I, Wheaton: Crossway, 1999.

Henry, Michel. *Barbarism*. Translated by Scott Davidson. London: Continuum Impacts, 2012.
———. *The Essence of Manifestation*. Translated by Girard Etzkorn. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.
———. *I Am the Truth*. Translated by Susan Emanuel. Stanford Univ. Press, 2003.
———. *Incarnation*. Translated by Karl Hefty. Northwestern Univ. Press, 2015.
———. *Material Phenomenology*. Translated by Scott Davidson. Fordham Univ. Press, 2008.
———. "Phenomenology of Life." Translated by Nick Hanlon. In *Transcendence and Phenomenology*, edited by Conor Cunningham and Peter M. Candler, Jr., 241-59. London: SCM, 2007.
———. *Words of Christ*. Translated by Christina M. Gschwandtner. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2012.
Henze, Matthias. "On the Anthropology of Early Judaism." In *Anthropology and NT Theology*, edited by Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds, 27-42. New York: T&T Clark, 2019.
Heraclitus. *Fragments*. Translated by Brooks Haxton. New York: Viking, 2001.
Hermans, Hubert J.M. "Dialogical Self." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 654-80: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Hershenov, David B., and Rose Koch-Hershenov. "Personal Identity and Purgatory." *Religious Studies* 42 (2006): 439-51.
Hesiod. "Works and Days." In *Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*, edited by Glenn W. Most, 86-153: Harvard Univ. Press, 2010.
Hick, John. *Death and Eternal Life*. New York: Harper, 1976.
———. *Evil and the God of Love*. London: Macmillan, 1966.
Hickman, Louise. "Love Is All and God Is Love." In *All Shall Be Well*, edited by Gregory MacDonald, 95-115. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011.
Highet, Gilbert. *Man's Unconquerable Mind*. Columbia Univ. Press, 1954.
Hilary of Poitiers. *Tractatus Super Psalmos I-XCI*. Edited by J. Doignon. Brepols, 1997.
Hilborn, David, and Don Horrocks. "Universalistic Trends in the Evangelical Tradition." In *Universal Salvation?*, edited by Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge, 219-44. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
Hill, Claire Ortiz. *Rethinking Identity and Metaphysics*. Yale Univ. Press, 1997.
Hillerbrand, Hans J. *The Division of Christendom*. Louisville: Westminster, 2007.
Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. South Bend: Infomotions, 2000.
Hobson, Peter R. "Autism and the Self." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 571-91: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Hoehner, Harold W. *Ephesians: Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.
Hoff, Johannes. "The Rise and Fall of the Kantian Paradigm." In *Grandeur of Reason*, edited by Peter M. Candler, Jr. and Conor Cunningham, 167-96. London: SCM, 2010.
Hofstadter, Douglas. *Metamagical Themas*. New York: Basic Books, 1985.
Holmes, Thomas Scott. *Origin and Development of the Christian Church*. London: Macmillan, 1911.
Holten, Wilko van. "Can the Traditional View of Hell Be Defended?". *Anglican Theological Rev.* 85, no. 3 (2003): 457-76.
———. "Hell and the Goodness of God." *Religious Studies* 35 (1999): 37-55.
Honko, Lauri. "The Problem of Defining Myth." *Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis* 6 (Jan. 1, 1972 1972): 7-19.
Hooke, Robert. *Micrographia*. Project Gutenberg eBook, 2005. 1664.

Horne, Brian L. "Person as Confession." In *Persons, Divine and Human*, edited by Christoph Schwobel and Colin E. Gunton, 65-73. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
Horrocks, Don. "Postmortem Education." In *All Shall Be Well*, edited by Gregory MacDonald, 198-218. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011.
Horst, Steven. *Cognitive Pluralism*. MIT Press, 2016.
Horton, Michael S. "Traditional Reformed View." In *Five Views on the Extent of Atonement*, edited by Adam J. Johnson, 112-33. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019.
Hudson, Hud. "The Morphing Block and Diachronic Personal Identity." In *Personal Identity*, edited by Georg Gassar and Matthias Stefan, 236-48: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015.
Hughes, Peter. "Universalism, Universalists." In *Encyclopedia of Christianity*, edited by Erwin Fahlbusch, et al., 638-42. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
Hughes, Philip E. "Is the Soul Immortal?". In *Rethinking Hell*, edited by Christopher M. Date, et al., 185-97. Eugene: Cascade, 2014.
Hume, David. *Treatise of Human Nature*. Mineola: Dover, 2014.
Hunn, Debbie. "Ἐὰν Μή in Galatians 2:16." *Novum Testamentum* 49, no. 3 (2007): 281-90.
Husserl, Edmund. "Author's Preface to English Ed." In *Ideas*, 5-22. New York: Collier, 1967.
———. *Cartesian Meditations*. Translated by Dorion Cairns. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1960.
———. *The Crisis of European Sciences*. Translated by David Carr. Northwestern Univ. Press, 1970.
———. *The Idea of Phenomenology*. Translated by Lee Hardy. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1999.
———. *Ideas*. Translated by W.R. Boyce Gibson. New York: Collier, 1967.
Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. New York: HarperCollins, 1998.
Ignatius. "Epistle to the Romans" and "Epistle to the Smyrnaeans." In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 73-78, 86-92. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
International Theological Commission. "Some Current Questions on Eschatology." 1992.
Irenaeus. *Against Heresies*. Translated by James R. Payton, Jr. Irenaeus on the Christian Faith ed. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2012.
———. "Against Heresies." Translated by Alexander Roberts and William Rambaut. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Alexander Roberts, et al., 309-567. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
Isaac of Nineveh. *The Second Part*. Translated by Sebastian Brock. 2 vols. Vol. I, Leuven: Peeters, 1995.
Jacob, Francois. *The Logic of Life*. Translated by Betty Spillman. New York: Pantheon, 1973.
Jacobi, Friedrich Heinrich. *Werke Vol. 4, Pt. 3*. Leipzig: Fleischer, 1819.
Jaeger, Luc. "A Biochemical Perspective." In *The Role of Death in Life*, edited by John Behr and Conor Cunningham, 14-28. Eugene: Cascade, 2015.
Jaeger, Werner. *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1961.
James, William. *Essays in Radical Empiricism*. The Works. Edited by Frederick H. Burkhardt, et al. Harvard Univ. Press, 1976.
———. *Principles of Psychology*. 2 vols. Vol. I, New York: Henry Holt, 1890.
———. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. New York: Random House, 1902.
Jenson, Robert W. *Systematic Theology*. 2 vols. Vol. I-II, Oxford Univ. Press, 1997, 1999.
Jerome. "Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians." Translated by Ronald E. Heine. In *Commentaries of Origen and Jerome on St Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, edited by Ronald E. Heine, 75-272. Oxford Univ. Press, 2002.

Jobes, Karen H. *1,2&3 John*. ZECNT. Edited by Clinton E. Arnold. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.
———. "Remember These Things." In *Anthropology and NT Theology*, edited by Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds, 189-203. New York: T&T Clark, 2019.
John Chrysostom. "Homilies on First Corinthians" and "Homilies on Matthew." In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Ser.*, edited by Philip Schaff, 3-269. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
———. "Homily 11 (on Ephesians)." Translated by Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen. In *John Chrysostom*, 60-72 (Field 214-27). New York: Routledge, 2000.
———. "Victory over Death." Translated by Thomas P. Halton. In *The Paschal Mystery*, edited by Adalbert Hamman, 98-106 [PG 46, 65-681]. New York: Alba House, 1969.
John Climacus. *The Ladder of Divine Ascent*. Translated by Colm Luibheid and Norman Russell. Mahwah: Paulist, 1982.
John of Damascus. "Fount of Knowledge." Translated by Frederic H. Chase, Jr. In *St John of Damascus Writings*, 3-406. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1958.
John the Scot. *Periphyseon*. Translated by Myra L. Uhlfelder. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011.
Johnson, Adam J., ed. *Five Views on the Extent of Atonement*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019.
Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Letter of James*. AB. Edited by William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
———. *Writings of the NT*. Rev. ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.
Johnson, P.S. "Life, Disease and Death." In *Dict. of the OT: Pentateuch*, edited by T. Desmond Alexander and David W. Baker, 532-36. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003.
Johnson, Thomas. "A Wideness in God's Mercy." In *Universal Salvation?*, edited by Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge, 77-102. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
Johnston, Mark. *Surviving Death*. Princeton Univ. Press, 2010.
Jopling, David A. *Self Knowledge and the Self*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. New York: Random House, 1961.
Jukes, Andrew. *Second Death and the Restitution of All Things*. 4th ed. London: Longmans, Green, 1875.
Julian of Norwich. *Book of Showings*. 2 vols. Vol. II, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1978.
Jung, C.G. *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*. Translated by W.S. Dell and Cary F. Baynes. Orlando: Harvest, 1933.
Jungel, Eberhard. *God as the Mystery of the World*. Translated by Darrell L. Guder. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
Kallistos (Ware) of Diokleia. "Unity of the Human Person According to the Greek Fathers." In *Philosophical Theology and the Christian Tradition*, edited by David Bradshaw, 67-76. DC: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 2012.
Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Norman Kemp Smith. New York: St Martin's, 1965.
Kapriev, Georgi. "Conceptual Apparatus of Maximus the Confessor and Contemporary Anthropology." Translated by Stoyan Tanev. In *Maximus the Confessor as a European Philosopher*, edited by Sotiris Mitralexis, et al., 166-92. Eugene: Cascade, 2017.
Karkkainen, Veli-Matti. *Christology: Global Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003.
———. "Multidimensional Monism." In *Neuroscience and the Soul*, edited by Thomas M. Crisp, et al., 201-27. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
Kasemann, Ernst. *Jesus Means Freedom*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.
———. *Perspectives on Paul*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.

Kayser, Wolfgang. *The Grotesque in Art and Literature*. Translated by Ulrich Weisstein. Columbia Univ. Press, 1957.
Keating, Daniel A. *Deification and Grace*. Naples: Sapientia, 2007.
Keats, John. *Selected Letters*. Harvard Univ. Press, 2005.
Keener, Craig S. *Gospel of John: Commentary*. 2 vols. Vol. II, Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003.
Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. 5th ed. New York: Continuum, 2012.
Kelsey, David H. "Personal Bodies." In *Personal Identity in Theological Perspective*, edited by Richard Lints, et al., 139-58. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
Kempis, Thomas à. *The Imitation of Christ*. Translated by William Benham. 1888.
Kenny, Anthony. *The Legacy of Wittgenstein*. New York: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
Kierkegaard, Soren. "At a Graveside." Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. In *Three Discourses on Imagined Questions*, edited by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong: Princeton Univ. Press, 2009.
———. *Attack Upon "Christendom"*. Translated by Walter Lowrie. Princeton Univ. Press, 1991.
———. *Book on Adler*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. Princeton Univ. Press, 2009.
———. *Christian Discourses*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. Princeton Univ. Press, 1997.
———. *The Concept of Anxiety*. Translated by Reidar Thomte. Princeton Univ. Press, 1980.
———. *Concluding Unscientific Postscript to Philosophical Fragments*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. 2 vols. Vol. I: Princeton Univ. Press, 1992.
———. *Eighteen Upbuilding Discourses*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. Princeton Univ. Press, 1990.
———. *Either/Or*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. 2 vols. Vol. I: Princeton Univ. Press, 1987.
———. *Either/Or*. Translated by David F. Swenson and Lillian Marvin Swenson. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Vol. II, Garden City: Doubleday, 1959.
———. *Fear and Trembling*. Translated by Walter Lowrie. Princeton Univ. Press, 1970.
———. *For Self-Examination*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1952.
———. *Journal and Papers*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. 7 vols. Vols. I-VI: Indiana Univ. Press, 1967-78.
———. *The Moment and Late Writings*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. Princeton Univ. Press, 1998.
———. *Philosophical Fragments or a Fragment of Philosophy*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. Princeton Univ. Press, 1985.
———. *The Point of View*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. Princeton Univ. Press, 1998.
———. *Practice in Christianity*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. Princeton Univ. Press, 1991.
———. *Purity of Heart Is to Will One Thing*. Translated by Douglas V. Steere. New York: Harper, 1956.
———. "Repetition." Translated by M.G. Piety. In *Repetition and Philosophical Crumbs*, edited by Edward F. Mooney: Oxford Univ. Press, 2009.
———. *The Sickness Unto Death*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. Princeton Univ. Press, 1980.
———. *Stages on Life's Way*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. Princeton Univ. Press, 1988.
———. *Training in Christianity*. Translated by Walter Lowrie. Princeton Univ. Press, 1967.

———. *Two Ages*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. Princeton Univ. Press, 1978.
———. *Upbuilding Discourses in Various Spirits*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. Princeton Univ. Press, 1993.
———. *Works of Love*. Translated by Howard V. and Edna H. Hong. Princeton Univ. Press, 1995.
Kind, Amy. *Persons and Personal Identity*. Cambridge: Polity, 2015.
Klein, Carolina A., and Soniya Hirachan. "The Masks of Identities." *J. of the Am. Academy of Psychiatry and the Law* 42 (2014): 369-78.
Klink, Edward W., III. *John*. ZECNT. Edited by Clinton E. Arnold. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016.
Knight, George A.F. *The New Israel: Commentary on the Book of Isaiah 56–66* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985.
Knight, George W., III. *Pastoral Epistles*. NIGTC. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
Koehn, Daryl. *Nature of Evil*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.
Kooton, George H. van. *Paul's Anthropology in Context*. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
———. "St Paul on Soul, Spirit and the Inner Man." In *The Afterlife of the Platonic Soul*, edited by Maha Elkaisy-Friemuth and John M. Dillon, 25-44. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
———. "'Two Inclinations' and James' Anthropological Designation of Humankind as 'Double-Minded'." In *Origins of Evil in Early Judaism and Christianity*, edited by H.M. Patmore, et al.: Cambridge Univ. Press, Forthcoming 2020.
Kostenberger, Andreas J. *John*. BECNT. Edited by Robert Yarbrough and Robert H. Stein. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.
Krapiec, Mieczylaw. *I-Man*. Translated by Marie Lescoe, et al. New Britain: Mariel, 1983.
Krell, David Farrell. "General Introduction: Question of Being." In *Martin Heidegger Basic Writings*, edited by J. Glenn Gray, 3-35. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
Kreppner, Jana M., Michael Rutter, Celia Beckett, Jenny Castle, Emma Colvert, Christine Groothues, Amanda Hawkins. "Normality and Impairment Following Profound Early Institutional Deprivation." *Developmental Psychology* 43, no. 4 (2007): 931-946.
Kristensen, Johanne Stubbe Teblgjaerg. *Body and Hope*. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
Kruse, Colin G. *Letters of John*. PNTC. Edited by D.A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
Kugel, James. *Traditions of the Bible*. Harvard Univ. Press, 1998.
Kung, Hans. *Eternal Life?* Translated by Edward Quinn. London: SCM, 1991.
Kvanvig, Jonathan L. "Hell." In *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 413-26. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
Lafer-Sousa, et al. "Striking Individual Differences in Color Perception." *Current Biology* 25 (2015): R545-46.
Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Univ. of Chicago Press, 2003.
Lane, William L. *Gospel According to Mark*. NICNT. Edited by Gordon D. Fee. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
Lange, John. "The Argument from Silence." *History and Theory* 5, no. 3 (1966): 288-301.
Lash, Nicholas. *Easter in Ordinary*. Univ. Press of Virginia, 1988.
Lawlor, Leonard. "The Postmodern Self." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 696-714: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Le Goff, Jacques. *Birth of Purgatory*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1986.
LeDoux, Joseph. *Synaptic Self* . New York: Penguin, 2002.
Lee, Eric Austin. "Standing Accused: Analogy and Dialogue as the Personhood of Substance." PhD Diss., Univ. of Nottingham, 2003.

Leftow, Brian. "Souls Dipped in Dust." In *Soul, Body, and Survival*, edited by Kevin J. Corcoran, 120-38: Cornell Univ. Press, 2001.
Leget, Carlo. "Eschatology." In *Theology of Thomas Aquinas*, edited by Rik van Nieuwenhove and Joseph Wawrykow, 365-85: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 2005.
Legrand, Dorothee. "Phenomenological Dimensions of Bodily Self-Consciousness." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 204-27: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Lemmon, E.J. *Beginning Logic*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1978.
Lenski, R.C.H. *Interpretation of St Matthew's Gospel*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1964.
"Letter of Justinian to the Holy Council." Translated by Richard Price. In *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*, 282-84: Liverpool Univ. Press, 2012.
Levering, Matthew. *Proofs of God*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016.
———. "Response to Andrew Louth" and "Response to Professor Greggs." In *Five Views on the Extent of Atonement*, edited by Adam J. Johnson, 44-49, 223-26. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019.
Lewis, Alan E. *Between Cross and Resurrection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
Lewis, C.S. *The Great Divorce*. New York: HarperOne, 1973.
———. *The Weight of Glory and Other Addresses*. New York: HarperOne, 2001.
———. *Mere Christianity*. New York: Collier, 1960.
———. *The Problem of Pain*. New York: Harper, 1996.
———. *The Weight of Glory and Other Addresses*. New York: HarperOne, 2001.
Lewontin, R.C. *Biology as Ideology*. New York: HarperPerennial, 1991.
Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. "Ὅσος." In *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 1261-62. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. WBC. Edited by David A. Hubbard. Dallas: Word Books, 1990.
Locke, John. *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1975.
Lockwood, Michael. "Consciousness and the Quantum World." In *Consciousness*, edited by Quentin Smith and Aleksandar Jokic, 447-67. Oxford: Clarendon, 2003.
Lohr, Hermut. "The Role of Eschatology in NT Moral Thought." In *Eschatology of the NT and Some Related Documents*, edited by Jan G. van der Watt, 644-65. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
Lombard, Peter. *The Sentences: Book 3; on the Incarnation of the Word*. Translated by Giuolio Silano. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2008.
Lonergan, Bernard J.F. *Insight*. London: Longmans, Green, 1957.
———. *Method in Theology*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1971.
Long, D. Stephen. *The Perfectly Simple Triune God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016.
Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. WBC. Edited by David A. Hubbard. Dallas: Word Books, 1990.
Lopez, Antonio. *Gift and the Unity of Being*. Eugene: Cascade, 2014.
Lossky, Vladimir. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Translated by Fellows of St Alban and St Sergius. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002.
Louth, Andrew. "Eastern Orthodox Eschatology." In *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 233-47. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
———. "Response to Tom Greggs." In *Five Views on the Extent of Atonement*, edited by Adam J. Johnson, 218-22. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019.
Lowe, E.J. "The Probable Simplicity of Personal Identity." In *Personal Identity*, edited by Georg Gassar and Matthias Stefan, 137-55: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015.
———. *Subjects of Experience*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996.
Lubac, Henri de. *Catholicism*. Translated by Lancelot C. Sheppard and Elizabeth Englund. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1988.

———. *Theological Fragments*. Translated by R.H. Balinski. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1984.
Lucretius. *On the Nature of Things*. Translated by Anthony M. Esolen. John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1995.
Ludlow, Morwenna. *Universal Salvation*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2000.
———. "Universalism in the History of Christianity." In *Universal Salvation?*, edited by Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge, 191-218. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
Luther, Martin. *Commentary on Genesis*. Translated by J. Theodore Mueller. 2 vols. Vol. II, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1958.
———. *Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. Translated by Erasmus Middleton and Philip S. Watson. Westwood: Revell, 1953.
———. "De Servo Arbitrio." Translated by Philip S. Watson and B. Drewery. In *Luther and Erasmus: Free Will and Salvation*, 101-334. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.
———. *Word and Sacrament II*. Am. ed. 36 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1959.
MacDonald, George. *Unspoken Sermons Ser. I,II,III*. Whitehorn: Johannesen, 1997.
MacDonald, Gregory. "Introduction: Between Heresy and Dogma." In *All Shall Be Well*, 1-25. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011.
Macquarrie, John. *Principles of Christian Theology*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.
Maimonides, Moses. *The Guide for the Perplexed*. Translated by Michael Friedländer. BN, 2007.
Maritain, Jacques. *Existence and the Existent*. Translated by Lewis Galantiere and Gerald B. Phelan. New York: Pantheon, 1948.
Marks, Tamara Monet. "Kierkegaard's Understanding of the Afterlife." In *Kierkegaard and Death*, edited by Patrick Stokes and Adam Buben, 274-97: Indiana Univ. Press, 2011.
Marshall, Christopher D. "Divine and Human Punishment in the NT." In *Rethinking Hell*, edited by Christopher M. Date, et al., 207-27. Eugene: Cascade, 2014.
Marshall, I. Howard. *Epistles of John*. NICNT. Edited by Gordon D. Fee. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
———. *Gospel of Luke*. NIGTC. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque. Grand Rapids: Paternoster, 1995.
———. "The NT Does Not Teach Universal Salvation." In *Universal Salvation?*, edited by Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge, 55-76. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
Marsilius of Padua. *The Defensor Pacis*. Translated by Alan Gewirth. 2 vols. Vol. II: Columbia Univ. Press, 1956.
Martens, Paul. "Kierkegaard and the Bible." In *Oxford Handbook of Kierkegaard*, edited by John Lippitt and George Pattison, 150-65: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.
Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. Yale Univ. Press, 1995.
Martin, G.W. "Faith." In *New Dict. of Theology*, edited by Sinclair B. Ferguson and David F. Wright, 246-47. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1988.
Martin, Ralph. *Will Many Be Saved?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
Martin, Ralph P. *2 Corinthians*. WBC. Edited by David A. Hubbard. Waco: Word Books, 1986.
Martyr, Justin. *First and Second Apologies*. Translated by Leslie William Barnard. New York: Paulist, 1997.
Marx, Karl. "A Contribution to the Critique … Introduction." Translated by Annette Jolin and Joseph O'Malley. In *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, edited by Joseph O'Malley, 129-142. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1982.
———. "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts." In *Karl Marx Selected Writings*, edited by David McLellan, 75-112: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978.

Mason, Alistair. "Universalism." In *Oxford Companion to Christian Thought*, edited by Adrian Hastings, 733. Oxford Univ. Press, 2000.
Maston, Jason. "Enlivened Slaves." In *Anthropology and NT Theology*, edited by Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds, 141-59. New York: T&T Clark, 2019.
Mateiescu, Sebastian. "Counting Natures and Hypostases." In *Studia Patristica LXXXIX*, edited by Markus Vinzent and Sotiris Mitralexis, 63-78. Leuven: Peeters, 2017.
Mathews, Kenneth A. *Genesis 1–11:26*. NAC. Edited by E. Ray Clendenen. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996.
Maximus the Confessor. *Ambigua*. Translated by Nicholas Constas. 2 vols.: Harvard Univ. Press, 2014.
———. "Ambiguum 7" and "Opusculum 6." Translated by Paul M. Blowers and Robert Louis Wilken. In *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ*, 45-74, 173-76. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003.
Mazza, Edmund J. *The Scholastics and the Jews*. Kettering: Angelico, 2017.
Mazzolini, Elizabeth. "Food, Waste, and Judgment on Mount Everest." *Cultural Critique* 76 (Fall 2010): 1-27.
McClymond, Michael J. *The Devil's Redemption*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2018.
McCombs, Richard. *The Paradoxical Rationality of Soren Kierkegaard*. Indiana Univ. Press, 2013.
McConville, J. Gordon. *Being Human in God's World*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016.
McCormack, Bruce L. "So That He May Be Merciful to All." In *Karl Barth and American Evangelicalism*, edited by Bruce L. McCormack and Clifford B. Anderson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
McCoy, Timothy A. "The Gospel Truth." In *Who Will Be Saved?*, edited by Paul R. House and Gregory A. Thornbury, 167-77. Wheaton: Crossway, 2000.
McDonald, William. "Kierkegaard and Romanticism." In *Oxford Handbook of Kierkegaard*, edited by John Lippitt and George Pattison, 94-111: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.
McFarland, Ian A. "The Upward Call." In *Christian Doctrine of Humanity*, edited by Oliver D. Crisp and Fred Sanders, 217-36. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018.
McFarlane, Graham. "Strange News from Another Star." In *Persons, Divine and Human*, edited by Christoph Schwobel and Colin E. Gunton, 98-119. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
McGilchrist, Iain. *The Master and His Emissary*, Expanded ed.: Yale Univ. Press, 2019.
McGowan, John. *Postmodernism and Its Critics*. Cornell Univ. Press, 1992.
McGuckin, J.A. "Strategic Adaptation of Deification in the Cappadocians." In *Partakers of the Divine Nature*, edited by Michael J. Christensen and Jeffrey A. Wittung, 95-114. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
McInroy, Mark. *Balthasar on the Spiritual Senses*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
McIntosh, J.R., and M.P. Koonce. "Mitosis." *Science* 246, no. 4930 (1989): 622-28.
Meillassoux, Quentin. "The Immanence of the World Beyond." Translated by Peter M. Candler, Jr., et al. In *Grandeur of Reason*, edited by Peter M. Candler, Jr. and Conor Cunningham, 444-78. London: SCM, 2010.
Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Signs*. Translated by Richard C. McCleary. Northwestern Univ. Press, 1987.
Merricks, Trenton. "How to Live Forever without Saving Your Soul." In *Soul, Body, and Survival*, edited by Kevin J. Corcoran, 183-200: Cornell Univ. Press, 2001.
———. "The Resurrection of the Dead and the Life Everlasting." In *Reason for the Hope Within*, edited by Michael Murray, 261-86. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
Methodius. "Banquet of the Ten Virgins." In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 309-55. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.

Metzger, Bruce M. *Textual Commentary on the Greek NT*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: German Bib. Soc., 2007.
Metzinger, Thomas. *Being No One*. MIT Press, 2003.
———. "The No-Self Alternative." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 279-96: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Milavec, Aaron, ed. *The Didache*. Collegeville: Liturgical, 2003.
Milbank, John. *Beyond Secular Order*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.
———. "The Double Glory." In *The Monstrosity of Christ*, edited by Creston Davis, 110-233: MIT Press, 2009.
———. "The Mystery of Reason." In *Grandeur of Reason*, edited by Peter M. Candler, Jr. and Conor Cunningham, 68-117. London: SCM, 2010.
———. "Theological Critique of Philosophy in Hamann and Jacobi." In *Radical Orthodoxy*, edited by John Milbank, et al., 21-37. New York: Routledge, 1999.
———. *Theology and Social Theory*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 2003.
———. *The Word Made Strange*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1997.
Miles, Lois M. "Obedience of a Corpse: The Key to the Holy Saturday Writings of Adrienne von Speyr." PhD Diss., Univ. of Aberdeen, 2013.
Mitchell, Jason A. *Being and Participation*. 2 vols. Vol. I, Rome: Ateneo Pontificio Regina Apostolorum, 2012.
Molnar, Paul D. "Thomas F. Torrance and the Problem of Universalism." *SJT* 68, no. 2 (2015): 164-86.
Moltmann, Jürgen. *The Coming of God*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.
———. *The Crucified God*. Translated by R.A. Wilson and John Bowden. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
———. *Theology of Hope*. Translated by James W. Leitch. London: SCM, 2002.
Monk of the West. *Christianity and the Doctrine of Non-Dualism*. Translated by Alvin Moore, Jr. and Marie M. Hansen. Hillsdale: Sophia Perennis, 2004.
Montaigne, Michel de. *Complete Works*. Translated by Charles Cotton. Philadelphia: William T. Amies, 1879.
———. "Essays." Translated by Donald M. Frame. In *Complete Works*, 1-857: Stanford Univ. Press, 1967.
Montanari, Franco. "Ὅσος." In *The Brill Dict. of Ancient Greek*, edited by Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroder, 1493-94. Boston: Brill, 2015.
Montemaggi, Vittorio. *Reading Dante's Commedia as Theology*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2016.
Montero, Barbara. "Post-Physicalism." *J. of Consciousness Studies* 8, no. 2 (2001): 61-80.
Moo, Douglas J. *Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Edited by Joel B. Green. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2018.
———. *Letter of James*. PNTC. Edited by D.A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
Mooney, Edward F. "Pseudonyms and 'Style'." In *Oxford Handbook of Kierkegaard*, edited by John Lippitt and George Pattison, 191-210: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.
Mooney, Timothy. "On the Critiques of Pairing and Appresentation by Merleau-Ponty and Levinas." In *Transcendence and Phenomenology*, edited by Conor Cunningham and Peter M. Candler, Jr., 448-94. London: SCM, 2007.
Moore, Peter. *Where Are the Dead?* New York: Routledge, 2017.
Morris, Leon. *Gospel According to John*. NICNT. Edited by Gordon D. Fee. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
———. *Gospel According to Matthew*. PNTC. Edited by D.A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
———. *Luke*. TNTC. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
Morrison, Margaret. *Reconstructing Reality*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2015.

Mostert, Christiaan. *God and the Future*. New York: T&T Clark, 2002.
Mother Teresa. *Come Be My Light*. New York: Doubleday, 2007.
Motyer, J. Alec. *Isaiah*. TOTC. Edited by Donald J. Wiseman. Downers Grove: IVP, 2009.
Moule, C.F.D. *Idiom Book of NT Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990.
Moulton, James Hope. *Grammar of NT Greek*. 3rd ed. 4 vols. Vol. I, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978.
Mounce, Robert H. *Book of Revelation*. NICNT. Edited by Gordon D. Fee. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
Mounce, William D. *Pastoral Epistles*. WBC. Edited by Bruce M. Metzger. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000.
Mountcastle, Vernon B. "Brain Science at the Century's Ebb." *Daedalus* 127, no. 2 (Spring 1998): 1-36.
Mouw, Richard J. "The Relevance of Biblical Eschatology." In *Christian Doctrine of Humanity*, edited by Oliver D. Crisp and Fred Sanders, 61-69. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018.
Mulder, Jack, Jr. "Must All Be Saved?". *Int'l J. for Philosophy of Religion* 59 (2006): 1-24.
Mullin, Amy. "Selves, Diverse and Divided." *Hypatia* 10, no. 4 (1995): 1-31.
Murphy, Nancey. *Bodies and Souls, or Spirited Bodies?* Cambridge Univ. Press, 2012.
———. "Nonreductive Physicalist Response to Substance Dualism." In *In Search of the Soul*, edited by Joel B. Green, 65-68. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
Musurillo, Herbert. *Acts of the Christian Martyrs*. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972.
Nabokov, Vladimir. *Lolita*. New York: Knopf, 1992.
Naselli, Andrew David. "Conclusion." In *Perspectives on the Extent of Atonement*, edited by Andrew David Naselli and Mark A. Snoeberger, 213-27. Nashville: B&H, 2015.
Nebe, Gottfried. "Μέρος." In *Exegetical Dict. of the NT*, edited by Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider, 409-10. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
Nelson, Paul, and Joanna Masel. "Inevitability of Multicellular Aging." *PNAS* 114, no. 49 (2017): 12982-87.
Netland, Harold. "The Question of Criteria." *Calvin Theological J.* 31, no. 2 (1996): 495-503.
Neuhof, Moran, Michael Levin, and Oded Rechavi. "Vertically- and Horizontally-Transmitted Memories." *Biology Open* 5 (2016): 1177-88.
Nichols, Terence. *Death and Afterlife*. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2010.
Nickelsburg, George W.E. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*. Expanded ed.: Harvard Divinity, 2006.
Niebuhr, Helmut Richard. *The Meaning of Revelation*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
Nietzsche, Friedrich. "The Anti-Christ." Translated by Judith Norman. In *The Anti-Christ and Other Writings*, edited by Aaron Ridley and Judith Norman, 1-67. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2005.
———. *The Gay Science*. Translated by Josefine Nauckhoff. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001.
———. *The Birth of Tragedy and the Genealogy of Morals*. Translated by Francis Golffing. Garden City: Doubleday, 1956.
———. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Translated by R.J. Hollingdale. New York: Penguin, 1981.
———. *The Will to Power*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage, 1968.
———. *Writings from the Late Notebooks*. Translated by Kate Sturge. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2003.
Noll, Mark A. *History of Christianity in the United States and Canada*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Nolland, John. *Gospel of Matthew*. NIGTC. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
———. *Luke 9:21–18:34*. WBC. Edited by David A. Hubbard. Dallas: Word Books, 1993.
Noonan, Harold W. *Personal Identity*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2003.
———. "Personal Identity and Its Perplexities." In *Personal Identity*, edited by Georg Gassar and Matthias Stefan, 82-101: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015.
Nordmeyer, Ann. E., and Michael C. Frank. "The Role of Context in Young Children's Comprehension of Negation." *J. of Memory and Language* 77 (Nov. 2014): 25-39.
Northrop, F.S.C. "Introduction." In *Werner Heisenberg's Physics and Philosophy*, 1-26. Amherst: Prometheus, 1999.
Novakovic, Lidija. *Resurrection*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2016.
de la Noval, Roberto J. "Divine Drama or Divine Disclosure?". *Modern Theology* 36, no. 1 (2020): 201-10.
Novello, Henry L. "New Life as Life out of Death." In *The Role of Death in Life*, edited by John Behr and Conor Cunningham, 96-119. Eugene: Cascade, 2015.
O'Brien, Peter T. *Colossians, Philemon*. WBC. Edited by David A. Hubbard. Waco: Word Books, 1982.
O'Collins, Gerald G. "Salvation." In *Anchor Bib. Dict.*, edited by David Noel Freedman, 907-14. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
O'Flaherty, James C. *Unity and Language*. Univ. of North Carolina, 1952.
O'Meara, Thomas Franklin. *Thomas Aquinas Theologian*. Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1997.
O'Laughlin, Michael. "Anthropology of Evagrius Ponticus and Its Sources." In *Origen of Alexandria*, edited by Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen, 357-73: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1988.
Oakes, Edward T. "Christ's Descent into Hell." In *All Shall Be Well*, edited by Gregory MacDonald, 382-99. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011.
———. *A Theology of Grace in Six Controversies*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
Oepke, Albrecht. "Apokatastasis." In *Theological Dict. of the NT*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, 389-93. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
Oliver, Simon. "Radical Orthodoxy." In *Cambridge Dict. of Christian Theology*, edited by Ian A. McFarland, 428-29: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011.
Olson, Eric T. "A Compound of Two Substances." In *Soul, Body, and Survival*, edited by Kevin J. Corcoran, 73-88: Cornell Univ. Press, 2001.
Olson, Roger E. *The Mosaic of Christian Belief*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002.
Origen. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans Books 1-5*. Translated by Thomas P. Scheck. Fathers of the Church. Edited by Thomas P. Halton. DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 2001.
———. "Dialogue with Heraclides." Translated by Robert J. Daly. In *Treatise on the Passover and Dialogue with Heraclides*, 57-78. New York: Paulist, 1992.
———. *On First Principles*. Translated by G.W. Butterworth. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1936.
Orlow, Dietrich. "The Conversion of Myths into Political Power." *Am. Historical Rev.* 72, no. 3 (1967): 906-24.
Orwell, George. *1984*. New York: New Am. Library, 1961.
Osborne, Grant R. "General Atonement View." In *Perspectives on the Extent of Atonement*, edited by Andrew David Naselli and Mark A. Snoeberger, 81-127. Nashville: B&H, 2015.
———. *Revelation*. BECNT. Edited by Moises Silva. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.

Osiek, Carolyn. *Shepherd of Hermas*. Hermeneia. Edited by Helmut Koester. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.
Oswalt, John N. *Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40–66*. NICOT. Edited by Robert L. Hubbard, Jr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
Owen, John. *The Death of Death in the Death of Christ*. The Works. Edited by William Gould. Carlisle: Banner of Truth Trust, 1967.
Pabst, Adrian. *Metaphysics: Creation of Hierarchy*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2012.
———. "Sovereign Reason Unbound." In *Grandeur of Reason*, edited by Peter M. Candler, Jr. and Conor Cunningham, 135-66. London: SCM, 2010.
Pacherie, Elisabeth. "Self-Agency." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 442-64: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Panksepp, Jaak. *Affective Neuroscience*. Oxford Univ. Press, 1998.
Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Anthropology in Theological Perspective*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985.
———. "Constructive and Critical Functions of Christian Eschatology." *HTR* 77, no. 2 (1984): 119-39.
———. "Faith and Reason." Translated by George H. Kehm. In *Basic Questions in Theology*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
———. *Human Nature, Election, and History*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977.
———. "Modernity, History, and Eschatology." In *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 493-99. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
———. *Systematic Theology*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 3 vols. Vols. II-III, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994, 1998.
———. "The Task of Christian Eschatology." In *The Last Things*, edited by Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson, 1-13. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002.
———. *What Is Man?* Translated by Duane A. Priebe. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970.
Parfit, Derek. *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford Univ. Press, 1986.
———. "The Unimportance of Identity." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 419-41: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Parnas, Josef, and Louis A. Sass. "Structure of Self-Consciousness in Schizophrenia." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 521-46: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Parry, Robin A. "Universalist View." In *Four Views on Hell*, edited by Preston Sprinkle, 101-27. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016.
Parry, Robin A., and Christopher Partridge, eds. *Universal Salvation?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
Parry, Robin A., and Ilaria L.E. Ramelli. *A Larger Hope?* 2 vols. Vol. II, Eugene: Cascade, 2019.
Parsons, Mikeal C. *Body and Character in Luke and Acts*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.
Pascal, Blaise. *Pensees*. Translated by W.F. Trotter. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1958.
Pater, Walter. *Marius the Epicurean*. New York: Penguin, 1985.
Peeler, Amy L.B. "The Eschatological Son." In *Anthropology and NT Theology*, edited by Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds, 162-75. New York: T&T Clark, 2019.
Peguy, Charles. *Temporal and Eternal*. Translated by Alexander Dru. London: Harvill, 1958.
Perl, Eric D. *Theophany: Neoplatonic Philosophy of Dionysius the Areopagite*. State Univ. of New York Press, 2007.
Perry, John. *Identity, Personal Identity, and the Self*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2002.
———. "On Knowing One's Self." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 372-93: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Pfuetze, Paul. *Self, Society, Existence*. New York: Harper, 1961.

Phan, Peter C. "Roman Catholic Theology." In *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 215-32. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
Pieper, Josef. *Death and Immortality*. Translated by Richard Winston and Clara Winston. South Bend: St Augustine's, 2000.
Pinnock, Clark H. "Annihilationism." In *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 462-75. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
Piper, John. *Let the Nations Be Glad*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: BakerAcademic, 2007.
Plato. *Phaedo*. Translated by R.S. Bluck. New York: Routledge, 2014.
———. "Phaedrus." Translated by Tom Griffith. In *Symposium and Phaedrus*, 89-180. New York: Knopf, 2000.
———. "Phaedrus." Translated by Chris Emlyn-Jones and William Preddy. In *Euthyphro, et al.*, edited by Chris Emlyn-Jones and William Preddy, 412-579: Harvard Univ. Press, 2017.
———. *The Republic*. Translated by G.M.A. Grube. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1974.
———. "Symposium." Translated by Tom Griffith. In *Symposium and Phaedrus*, 5-85. New York: Knopf, 2000.
Plotinus. "Ennead." Translated by Stephen MacKenna and B.S. Page. In *Plotinus*. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1952.
Plummer, Alfred. *Gospel According to S. Luke*. ICC. Edited by S.R. Driver, et al. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1981.
Polkinghorne, John. *The God of Hope and the End of the World*. Yale Univ. Press, 2002.
Polycarp. "Martyrdom of Polycarp." Translated by Alexander Roberts and William Rambaut. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Alexander Roberts, et al., 39-44. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
Pope, Alexander. "Essay on Man." In *The Works*, 190-228. Ware: Wordsworth Eds., 1995.
Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of the Greek NT*. Bib. Languages: Greek. 2nd ed. 1996.
Poythress, Vern Sheridan. "Meaning of Malista in 2 Tim 4:13 and Related Verses." *JTS* 53 (2002): 523-32.
Presbyterian Church (USA). "Constitution of the Presbyterian Church (USA): Book of Confessions." Louisville: Office of the General Assembly, 2004.
Price, Richard. *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*. Liverpool Univ. Press, 2012.
Priest, Christopher. *The Prestige*. New York: St Martin's, 1996.
Priest, Graham, J.C. Beall, and Bradley Armour-Garb, eds. *The Law of Noncontradiction*: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004.
"Proceedings." Translated by Richard Price. In *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*, 106-39: Liverpool Univ. Press, 2012.
Proust, Marcel. *In Search of Lost Time*. Translated by C.K. Scott Moncrieff, et al. 6 vols. London: Folio Society, 2001.
Przywara, Erich. *Analogia Entis ... Metaphysics*. Translated by John R. Betz and David Bentley Hart. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. "The Divine Names." Translated by Colm Luibheid. In *The Complete Works*, 47-131. New York: Paulist, 1987.
Purkiser, W.T., Richard S. Taylor, and William H. Taylor. *God, Man, and Salvation*. Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 1977.
Radden, Jennifer. "Multiple Selves." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 547-70: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
———. "Pathologically Divided Minds." In *Models of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher and Jonathan Shear, 343-58. Thorverton: Imprint, 1999.

Radner, Ephraim. "The Mystery of Christian Anthropology." In *Anthropology and NT Theology*, edited by Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds, 243-62. New York: T&T Clark, 2019.
Rae, Murray. "Salvation in Community." In *All Shall Be Well*, edited by Gregory MacDonald, 171-97. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2011.
Rahner, Karl. "Eschatology" and "Mystery." In *Encyclopedia of Theology: Concise Sacramentum Mundi*, 434-39, 1000-1004. New York: Seabury, 1975.
———. *Foundations of Christian Faith*. Translated by William V. Dych. New York: Crossroad, 1985.
———. "The Hermeneutics of Eschatological Assertions." Translated by Kevin Smith. In *Theological Investigations*, 401-28. Baltimore: Helicon, 1960.
Ramelli, Ilaria L.E. *Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
———. "Procus and Apokatastasis." In *Proclus and His Legacy*, edited by David D. Butorac, 95-122. Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2017.
———. *A Larger Hope?* 2 vols. Vol. I, Eugene: Cascade, 2019.
———. "Origen, Bardaisan, and the Origin of Universal Salvation." *HTR* 102, no. 2 (2009): 135-68.
Ramelli, Ilaria L.E., and David Konstan. *Terms for Eternity*. Piscataway: Gorgias, 2013.
Rankin, David. *The Early Church and the Afterlife*. New York: Routledge, 2018.
Ratzinger, Joseph. *Behold the Pierced One*. Translated by Graham Harrison. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1986.
———. *Eschatology: Death and Eternal Life*. Translated by Michael Waldstein. 2nd ed. DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 1988.
———. *Theological Highlights of Vatican II*. Translated by Henry Traub, Gerard C. Thormann and Werner Barzel. New York: Paulist, 1966.
———. *Truth and Tolerance*. Translated by Henry Taylor. San Francisco: Ignatius, 2004.
Rausch, Thomas P. *Systematic Theology: Roman Catholic Approach*. Collegeville: Liturgical, 2016.
Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1978.
Reddy, Vasudevi. *How Infants Know Minds*. Harvard Univ. Press, 2008.
Reitan, Eric. "Human Freedom and the Impossibility of Eternal Damnation." In *Universal Salvation?*, edited by Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge, 125-42. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
Richardson, Alan. *Christian Apologetics*. New York: Harper, 1947.
Riches, Aaron. *Ecce Homo*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
Ringgren, Helmer. "Rab, Inclusive Plural." In *Theological Dict. of the OT*, edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, et al., 293. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
Rips, Lance J., et al. "Tracing the Identity of Objects." *Psychological Rev.* 113, no. 1 (2006): 1-30.
Rist, John M. "Plato Says That We Have Tripartite Souls." Chap. I In *Man, Soul and Body*. Brookfield: Variorum, 1996.
Robertson, A.T. *Grammar of the Greek NT*. Nashville: Broadman, 1934.
Robinson, David. *The Unitarians and the Universalists*. Westport: Greenwood, 1985.
Robinson, John A.T. *In the End, God*. Eugene: Cascade, 2011.
Robinson, Marilynne. *Gilead*. New York: Picador, 2004.
Rochat, Philippe. "What Is It Like to Be a Newborn?". In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 57-79: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Rosenzweig, Franz. *His Life and Thought*, edited by Nahum N. Glatzer. New York: Schocken Books, 1953.

———. "The New Thinking." Translated by Paul W. Franks and Michael L. Morgan. In *Philosophical and Theological Writings*, edited by Paul W. Franks and Michael L. Morgan, 109-39. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2000.
———. *The Star of Redemption*. Translated by Barbara E. Galli. Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 2005.
Rosner, Brian S. "Son of God at the Centre." In *Anthropology and NT Theology*, edited by Jason Maston and Benjamin E. Reynolds, 225-41. New York: T&T Clark, 2019.
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. "The Social Contract." Translated by Christopher Betts. In *Discourse on Political Economy and the Social Contract*, 43-168: Oxford Univ. Press, 2009.
Rousseau, Mary F. "Elements of a Thomastic Philosophy of Death." *The Thomist* 43, no. 4 (1979): 581-602.
Rowell, Geoffrey. *Hell and the Victorians*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1974.
Rowland, Christopher. "Eschatology of the NT Church." In *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 56-72. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
Russell, Norman. *Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2006.
Sachs, John R. "Apocatastasis in Patristic Theology." *Theological Studies* 54 (1993): 617-40.
Sanders, Fred. "Response to Matthew Levering," "Wesleyan View" and "Response to Tom Greggs." In *Five Views on the Extent of Atonement*, edited by Adam J. Johnson, 101-105, 156-76, 235-39. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019.
Sanders, John. "Freewill Theist's Response to Talbott's Universalism." In *Universal Salvation?*, edited by Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge, 169-87. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
———. *No Other Name*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
———. "Raising Hell About Razing Hell." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 40, no. 3 (2013): 267-81.
Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Between Existentialism and Marxism*. Translated by John Mathews. New York: William Morrow, 1976.
Schaff, Adam. *Marxism and the Human Individual*. Translated by Olgierd Wogjasiewicz. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
Schechtman, Marya. *Staying Alive*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Scheffler, Samuel. *Death and the Afterlife*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.
Schiller, Friedrich. "Letters on the Aesthetical Education of Man," "On the Sublime" and "Philosophical Letters." Translated by Nathan Haskell Dole. In *Aesthetical and Philosophical Essays*, 33-125, 135-49, 379-441. New York: Collier, 1902.
Schindler, D.C. *The Perfection of Freedom*. Eugene: Cascade, 2012.
Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *Christian Faith*. Translated by Terrence N. Tice, et al. 2 vols. Vol. II, Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2016.
Schreiner, Thomas R. *1,2 Peter, Jude*. NAC. Edited by E. Ray Clendenen. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2003.
———. *Romans*. BECNT. Edited by Moises Silva. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003.
———. "Penal Substitution View." In *The Nature of Atonement*, edited by James Beilby and Paul R. Eddy, 67-98. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2006.
Schroeder, Gerald L. *The Hidden Face of God*. New York: Touchstone, 2002.
Schultz, Richard L. "Nationalism and Universalism in Isaiah." In *Interpreting Isaiah*, edited by David G. Firth and H.G.M. Williamson, 122-44. Downers Grove: IVP, 2009.
Schumacher, Bernard N. *Death and Mortality in Contemporary Philosophy*. Translated by Michael J. Miller. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011.
Schwarz, Hans. *Eschatology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
———. *Evil: Historical and Theological Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
———. *The Human Being*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.

Schwobel, Christoph. "Introduction" and "Human Being as Relational Being." In *Persons, Divine and Human*, edited by Christoph Schwobel and Colin E. Gunton, 1-29, 141-65. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
Scott, Mark S.M. *Journey Back to God.* Oxford Univ. Press, 2012.
Secker, Philip J. "Martin Luther's Views on the State of the Dead." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 38, no. 7 (1967): 422-35.
Sedgwick, Henry Dwight. *Life of Marcus Aurelius*. Yale Univ. Press, 1922.
Seifrid, Mark A. "Righteousness, Justice and Justification." In *New Dict. of Bib. Theology*, edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner, 740-45. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.
Shaw, Gregory. *Theurgy and the Soul.* 2nd ed. Kettering: Angelico, 2014.
Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein.* New York: Norton, 1996.
Sherman, Jacob Holsinger. *Partakers of the Divine.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.
Shields, Christopher, and Robert Pasnau. *Philosophy of Aquinas*. 2nd ed.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2016.
Shoemaker, Sydney. "On What We Are." In *Oxford Handbook on the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 352-71: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Silouan, Staretz. "The Writings." Translated by Rosemary Edmonds. In *Saint Silouan the Athonite*, edited by Archimandrite Sophrony, 269-504. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991.
Silva, Moises. *Philippians*. BECNT. Edited by Robert Yarbrough and Robert H. Stein. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005.
Silvas, Anna M. *The Asketikon of St Basil the Great*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2007.
———. *Gregory of Nyssa: The Letters.* Boston: Brill, 2007.
Simmons, Michael. *Universal Salvation in Late Antiquity*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2015.
Sloterdijk, Peter. *Critique of Cynical Reason*. Translated by Michael Eldred. Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1987.
Smalley, Stephen S. *1,2,3 John*. WBC. Edited by David A. Hubbard. Waco: Word Books, 1984.
Smith, Janet E. "Plato's Use of Myth in the Education of Philosophic Man." *Phoenix* 40, no. 1 (1986): 20-34.
Snyder, Laura J. "William Whewell." In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta: Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford Univ., 2019.
Solomon of Akhlat. *Book of the Bee*. Translated by Ernest A. Wallis Budge. Oxford: Clarendon, 1886.
Song, Robert. *Covenant and Calling.* London: SCM, 2014.
Sophrony, Archimandrite. "The Staretz' Life and Teaching." Translated by Rosemary Edmonds. In *Saint Silouan the Athonite*, 9-259. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991.
Sorabji, Richard. *Self: Ancient and Modern Insights.* Oxford: Clarendon, 2006.
Sorg, Theo. "Heart." In *New Int'l Dict. of NT Theology*, edited by Colin Brown, 180-84. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.
Soskice, Janet Martin. *Metaphor and Religious Language.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
Spaemann, Robert. *Essays in Anthropology*. Translated by Guido de Graaff and James Mumford. Eugene: Cascade, 2010.
Speyr, Adrienne von. *The Christian State of Life*. Translated by Mary Frances McCarthy. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1986.
———. *Confession*. Translated by Douglas W. Stott. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1985.
———. *The Farewell Discourses*. Translated by E.A. Nelson. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1987.
———. *Gates of Eternal Life*. Translated by Corona Sharp. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1983.

———. *Mystery of Death*. Translated by Graham Harrison. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1988.
———. *The Passion from Within*. Translated by Lucia Wiedenhover. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1998.
———. *The Word*. Translated by Alexander Dru. San Francisco: Ignatius, 2019.
Spezzano, Daria. *The Glory of God's Grace*. Sapientia Press of Ave Maria Univ., 2015.
Spicq, Ceslas. "Dichotomeo." In *Theological Lexicon of the NT*, edited by James D. Ernest, 350-52. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
Spitz, L. "Conjoined Twins." *British J. of Surgery* 83 (1996): 1028-30.
Sprinkle, Preston, ed. *Four Views on Hell*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016.
Stackhouse, John G., Jr. "Terminal Punishment" and "Terminal Punishment Response to Hell and Purgatory." In *Four Views on Hell*, edited by Preston Sprinkle, 61-81, 179-89. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016.
Stang, Charles. *Apophasis and Pseudonymity in Dionysius the Areopagite*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2012.
———. *Our Divine Double*. Harvard Univ. Press, 2016.
———. "The Two 'I's of Christ." *Anglican Theological Rev.* 94, no. 3 (2012): 529-47.
Stark, Rodney. *The Rise of Christianity*. Princeton Univ. Press, 1996.
Starr, James. "Does 2 Peter 1:4 Speak of Deification?". In *Partakers of the Divine Nature*, edited by Michael J. Christensen and Jeffrey A. Wittung, 81-92. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
Stein, Edith. *Potency and Act*. Translated by Walter Redmond. DC: ICS, 2009.
Stein, Robert H. *Luke*. NAC. Edited by David S. Dockery. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.
———. *Mark*. BECNT. Edited by Robert Yarbrough and Robert H. Stein. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
Stephens, Mark B. *Annihilation or Renewal?* Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
Stern, Daniel N. *The Interpersonal World of the Infant*. New York: Basic Books, 1985.
Stevenson, Robert Louis. *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. New York: Dover, 1991.
Stott, John R.W. *Epistles of John*. TNTC. Edited by R.V.G. Tasker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
Strange, Daniel. "Calvinist Response to Talbott's Universalism." In *Universal Salvation?*, edited by Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge, 145-68. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
Strawson, Galen. "The Minimal Subject." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 253-78: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
———. "The Self." In *Models of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher and Jonathan Shear, 1-24. Thorverton: Imprint, 1999.
Stromberg, Jacob. "Inner-Isaianic Reading of Isaiah 61:1-3." In *Interpreting Isaiah*, edited by David G. Firth and H.G.M. Williamson, 261-72. Downers Grove: IVP, 2009.
Stuurman, Siep. *Invention of Humanity*. Harvard Univ. Press, 2017.
Sudhaile, Stephanus Bar. *Book of the Holy Hierotheos*. Translated by Fred Shipley Marsh. Amsterdam: APA-Philo, 1979.
Sutton, Matthew Lewis. *Heaven Opens*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.
Swinburne, Richard G. "The Future of the Totally Corrupt." In *Rethinking Hell*, edited by Christopher M. Date, et al., 234-40. Eugene: Cascade, 2014.
———. "How to Determine Which Is the True Theory of Personal Identity." In *Personal Identity*, edited by Georg Gassar and Matthias Stefan, 105-22: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015.
Talbott, Thomas. "Towards a Better Understanding of Universalism," "Christ Victorious," "Pauline Interpretation of Divine Judgment" and "Reply to My Critics." In

Universal Salvation?, edited by Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge, 3-52, 247-73. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
———. *The Inescapable Love of God*. 2nd ed. Eugene: Cascade, 2014.
———. "Universalism." In *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 446-61. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
Taliaferro, Charles. "Human Nature, Personal Identity, and Eschatology." In *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 534-47. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
Tanner, Kathryn. *Christ the Key*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2010.
Tappert, Theodore G., ed. *Book of Concord: Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1959.
Taylor, Charles. *Hegel*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995.
———. *A Secular Age*. Belknap Press of Harvard Univ., 2007.
———. *Sources of the Self*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000.
Taylor, Mark C. *Journeys to Selfhood*. Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1980.
Taylor, Stephen S. "Faith, Faithfulness." In *New Dict. of Bib. Theology*, edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner, 487-93. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.
Taylor, Walter F., Jr. "Humanity, NT View." In *Anchor Bib. Dict.*, edited by David Noel Freedman, 321-25. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
Temple, William. *Nature, Man and God*. Edinburgh: R. & R. Clark, 1940.
Tertullian. "Prescription against Heretics" and "On the Resurrection of the Flesh." In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 243-68, 545-94. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
Thayer, Joseph H. "Ὅσος." In *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*, 456-57. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
Theodoret of Cyrus. *Commentary on the Letters of St Paul*. Translated by Robert Charles Hill. 2 vols. Vol. I, Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox, 2001.
Thiselton, Anthony C. *First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NIGTC. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
Tillich, Paul. *Systematic Theology*. 3 vols. Vols. I-III, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1973-76.
Timpe, Kevin. "An Argument for Limbo." *J. of Ethics* 19 (2015): 277-92.
Tolstoy, Leo. *Anna Karenina*. Translated by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky. New York: Penguin, 2000.
———. *The Death of Ivan Ilyich and Other Stories*. Translated by Rosemary Edmondson. London: Penguin, 1960.
Toner, Patrick. "St Thomas Aquinas on Death and the Separated Soul." *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 91 (2010): 587-99.
Tononi, Giulio. *Phi*. New York: Pantheon, 2012.
Tononi, Giulio, and Christof Koch. "Consciousness: Here, There, and Everywhere?". *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 370: 201440167 (2015).
Torrance, Thomas F. *Atonement*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2009.
———, ed. *The School of Faith*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1996.
Towner, Philip H. *Letters to Timothy and Titus*. NICNT. Edited by Gordon D. Fee. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
Trabbic, Joseph G. "Can Aquinas Hope 'That All Men Be Saved'?". *Heythrop J.* LVII (2016): 337-58.
Trueman, Carl R. "Definite Atonement View." In *Perspectives on the Extent of Atonement*, edited by Andrew David Naselli and Mark A. Snoeberger, 19-61. Nashville: B&H, 2015.
Trumbower, Jeffrey A. *Rescue for the Dead*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2001.

Tseng, Shao Kai. "Condemnation and Universal Salvation: Karl Barth's 'Reverent Agnosticism' Revisted." *SJT* 71, no. 3 (2018): 324-38.
Turner, James T., Jr. "No Explanation of Persons." *Int'l J. for Philosophy of Religion* 76 (2014): 297-317.
Turner, Leon. *Theology, Psychology and the Plural Self*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2008.
Turner, Nigel. *Grammar of NT Greek: J.H. Moulton*. 4 vols. Vol. III, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
Unamuno, Miguel de. *Tragic Sense of Life*. Translated by J.E. Crawford Flitch. New York: Dover, 1954.
Vanhoozer, Kevin. "Human Being, Individual and Social." In *Cambridge Companion to Christian Doctrine*, edited by Colin E. Gunton, 158-88: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998.
———. "The Origin of Paul's Soteriology." In *Reconsidering the Relationship between Bib. and Systematic Theology*, edited by Benjamin E. Reynolds, et al., 177-212. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
Vatican Council. "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church: Lumen Gentium, Solemnly Promulgated by His Holiness, Pope Paul VI on November 21, 1964." Boston: St Paul Eds., 1965.
Vaught, Carl G. *Access to God in Augustine's Confessions: Books X-XIII*. State Univ. of New York Press, 2005.
Vidal, Fernando. "Brains, Bodies, Selves, and Science." *Critical Inquiry* 28, no. 4 (2002): 930-74.
Villiers, Pieter G R de. "In the Presence of God: Eschatology of 1 Thessalonians." In *Eschatology of the NT and Some Related Documents*, edited by Jan G. van der Watt, 302-32. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
Vincent of Lerins. "A Commonitory." In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Ser.*, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, 131-59. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
Vinson, Richard B. "Godly." In *The New Interpreter's Dict. of the Bib.*, edited by Katharine Doob Sakenfeld, 620-21. Nashville: Abingdon, 2007.
Visala, Aku. "Human Cognition and the Image of God." In *Christian Doctrine of Humanity*, edited by Oliver D. Crisp and Fred Sanders, 91-109. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018.
Vishnevskaya, Elena. "Divinization as Perichoretic Embrace in Maximus the Confessor." In *Partakers of the Divine Nature*, edited by Michael J. Christensen and Jeffrey A. Wittung, 132-45. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
Vogeley, Kai, and Shaun Gallagher. "Self in the Brain." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 111-36: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Volf, Miroslav. *After Our Likeness*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
———. *The End of Memory*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
Walker, Adrian J. "The Lived Body as the Organ of Theology." *Communio* 33 (2006): 203-14.
Wall, Robert W. "Conscience." In *Anchor Bib. Dict.*, edited by David Noel Freedman, 1128-30. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
Wallenfang, Donald. *Human and Divine Being*. Eugene: Cascade, 2017.
Walls, Jerry L. "Hell and Purgatory Response to Eternal Conscious Torment." In *Four Views on Hell*, edited by Preston Sprinkle, 55-59. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016.
———. *Hell: Logic of Damnation*. Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1992.
———, ed. *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.

———. "Philosophical Critique of Talbott's Universalism." In *Universal Salvation?*, edited by Robin A. Parry and Christopher H. Partridge, 105-24. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
Walsh, Maureen L. "Re-Imagining Redemption." *Horizons* 39, no. 2 (2012): 189-207.
Walsh, Sylvia. *Living Christianly*. Pennsylvania Univ. Press, 2005.
Walter, Tony. *Eclipse of Eternity*. New York: St Martin's, 1996.
Waltke, Bruce K. *Genesis: Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.
Wanamaker, Charles A. *Epistles to the Thessalonians*. NIGTC. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and W. Ward Gasque. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
Ward, Graham. "The Displaced Body of Jesus Christ." In *Radical Orthodoxy*, edited by John Milbank, et al., 163-81. New York: Routledge, 1999.
———. "Hegel and the Grandeur of Reason." In *Grandeur of Reason*, edited by Peter M. Candler, Jr. and Conor Cunningham, 232-63. London: SCM, 2010.
Wasserman, Ryan. "Personal Identity, Indeterminacy and Obligation." In *Personal Identity*, edited by Georg Gassar and Matthias Stefan, 63-81: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015.
Watkin, Julia. "Kierkegaard--Dying and Eternal Life as Paradox." PhD Diss., Univ. of Bristol, 1979.
———. "Kierkegaard's View of Death." *History of European Ideas* 12, no. 1 (1990): 65-78.
Watson, Nicholas. "Visions of Incusion." *J. of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 27:2 (1997): 145-87.
Welz, Claudia. *Humanity in God's Image*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2016.
Wenger, J.C. "Dordrecht Confession of Faith." In *The Mennonite Encyclopedia*, edited by Harold S. Bender, 92-93. Scottdale: Mennonite Pub'g, 1956.
Westphal, Merold. *Becoming a Self*. Purdue Univ. Press, 1996.
White, Vernon. *Life Beyond Death*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2006.
Whitehead, Alfred North. *Process and Reality*. New York: Free Press, 1969.
Whitman, Walt. "Song of Myself." In *Leaves of Grass*, 33-115. New York: Modern Library, 2001.
Wiener, Norbert. *The Human Use of Human Beings*. Rev. ed. New York: Da Capo, 1954.
Wild, Robert. *Catholic Reading Guide to Universalism*. Eugene: Resource Pubs, 2015.
Wilde, Oscar. *De Profundis*. New York: Modern Library, 2000.
Wiles, Maurice. *The Making of Christian Doctrine*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967.
Wilkes, Kathleen V. "Know Thyself." In *Models of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher and Jonathan Shear, 25-38. Thorverton: Imprint, 1999.
———. *Real People*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988.
Willard, Dallas. *The Divine Conspiracy*. New York: Harper, 1998.
Williams, A.N. *Architecture of Theology*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2011.
Williams, Bernard. *Problems of the Self*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1973.
———. *Moral Luck*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993.
Williams, Rowan. *On Christian Theology*. Malden: Blackwell, 2000.
Williams, Stephen N. *The Election of Grace*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
Williams, Thomas D., and Jan Olof Bengtsson. "Personalism." In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, 2016.
Williamson, Paul R. *Death and the Afterlife*. Downers Grove: Apollos, 2018.
Wilson, John Cook. *Statement and Inference and Other Philosophical Papers*. 2 vols. Vol. II, Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.
Winchester, Elhanan. *The Universal Restoration*. 4th ed. London 1799.
Winslow, Donald F. *Dynamics of Salvation*. Cambridge: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979.

Wippel, John F. *Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas*. DC: Catholic Univ. of Am. Press, 2000.
Witherington, Ben, III. "Equally Orthodox Christians." In *Rethinking Hell*, edited by Christopher M. Date, et al., 292-303. Eugene: Cascade, 2014.
Wittgenstein, Ludwig. "Philosophie Der Psychologie - Ein Fragment." Translated by G.E.M. Anscombe, et al. In *Philosophische Untersuchungen*, edited by P.M.S. Hacker and Joachim Schulte, 182-243. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
———. *Philosophische Untersuchungen* [Philosophical Investigations]. Translated by G.E.M. Anscombe, et al. 4th ed. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
Wojtyla, Karol. *The Acting Person*. Translated by Andrezej Potocki. Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1976.
Wolinski, Joseph. "Trinity: Theological History." In *Encyclopedia of Christian Theology*, edited by Jean-Yves Lacoste, 1606-16. New York: Routledge, 2005.
Wollheim, Richard. *The Thread of Life*. Harvard Univ. Press, 1984.
Wordsworth, William. *The Prelude* …. New York: Rinehart, 1954.
Wright, Christopher J.H. *The Mission of God*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2006.
Wright, N.T. *Epistles of Paul to the Colossians and to Philemon*. TNTC. Edited by Leon Morris. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
———. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
———. "Righteousness." In *New Dict. of Theology*, edited by Sinclair B. Ferguson and David F. Wright, 590-92. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1988.
———. *Surprised by Hope*. New York: HarperOne, 2008.
———. "Towards a Biblical View of Universalism." *Themelios* 4, no. 2 (1979): 54-58.
Wright, Nigel G. "A Kinder, Gentler Damnation?". In *Rethinking Hell*, edited by Christopher M. Date, et al., 228-33. Eugene: Cascade, 2014.
Wycliffe, John. *On the Truth of Holy Scripture*. Translated by Ian Christopher Levy. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, 2001.
Yates, Stephen. *Between Death and Resurrection*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2017.
Yu, Carver T. *Being and Relation*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic, 1987.
Zachhuber, Johannes. *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
Zahavi, Dan. "Unity of Consciousness and the Problem of Self." In *Oxford Handbook of the Self*, edited by Shaun Gallagher, 316-35: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014.
Zaleski, Carol. "Near-Death Experiences." In *Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 614-28. Oxford Univ. Press, 2008.
Zalta, Edward N. "In Defense of the Law of Noncontradiction." In *The Law of Noncontradiction*, edited by Graham Priest, et al., 418-436: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004.
Ziegler, Philip G. *Militant Grace*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2018.
Zimmerman, Dean W. "Compatibility of Materialism and Survival." *Faith and Philosophy* 16, no. 2 (1999): 194-212.
———. "Materialism, Dualism, and 'Simple' Theories of Personal Identity." In *Personal Identity*, edited by Georg Gassar and Matthias Stefan, 206-35: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015.
Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion*. Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.
———. "On Being a Person." In *Persons, Divine and Human*, edited by Christoph Schwobel and Colin E. Gunton, 33-46. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.