

**RADICAL CHRISTIAN ANTHROPOLOGY: REMEDY
FOR THE CRISIS OF CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY**

“The body-soul problem cannot be solved outside Scriptural revelation; even then one should be very careful not to interpret Scripture according to certain philosophical systems which are rooted within paganistic thinking, old or new, or — and this is perhaps worse — according to any synthesized system.

J A L Taljaard: *Polished Lenses*
(Unpublished manuscript, 1974), p 214.

x x x

It is a great pleasure to dedicate this article to Professor J A L Taljaard in celebration of his 60th birthday. I was privileged, throughout my years of study, not only to benefit from his teachings but to receive valuable stimulation and constant encouragement to an extent which was far greater than any student has the right to expect. In addition, he allowed me the special joy of being his friend as well as his student. Because the philosophy he presented was of a radical biblical approach, I was inspired to further my studies.

This volume contains contributions relating to society and societal relationships — a topic which was always very dear to Professor Taljaard's heart — and I consider, therefore, that its title is indeed appropriate. In a most significant and powerful way we have been enriched by his stimulating and valuable insights in this particular area. We can only admire the combination of spiritual zeal, intellectual clarity and integrity, as well as the humility of heart, which shine through all that he has taught and written in this field. By way of a small tribute of great appreciation I should like to congratulate Professor Taljaard by saying *Bene meritis* — “You have served well” — particularly as this was done *in lumine Tuo* (Ps 36:9b).

Taljaard's penetrating analysis of societal problems is based on a scripturally directed anthropology, which is, in turn, founded upon an ontology based on biblical in-

sights. This firm basis made his unique approach to Philosophy of Society possible. In the light of the other contributions on societal issues in this volume, I intend to focus attention on the basic constituent of society — man himself. The difficulties encountered in the area of anthropology will perforce have to be challenged because we are faced here with some of the most fundamental problems determining our views about society.

The aim of this essay is to re-affirm Taljaard's point of view that traditional Christian anthropology (call it Scholastic if you will) cannot be qualified as radically biblical.¹) I will try to prove this from a philosophical-theological point of view and it necessitates, therefore, an involvement with the research of theologians into certain anthropological concepts of the Bible. Limited space makes it impossible for me to answer certain crucial preliminary questions; such as, for instance, the problem of whether pre-scientific, naive biblical concepts (eg soul, body, spirit, flesh and heart) may be transferred into a systematic philosophical context. Furthermore, the title of this article suggests more than it actually offers. It is possible to indicate only implicitly and not explicitly exactly *how* a radical biblical anthropology is to be considered as the remedy for the crisis of contemporary society.

1. THE DANGER OF THE ONE-DIMENSIONAL MAN

We all have the tendency to make reality, including man himself, more simple than it actually is. I can mention two rather ridiculous examples to illustrate how man tried to define himself in terms of his legs.

The story is told that Plato's successors in the Academy at Athens spent much time and thought on defining the word "man". Finally they decided that it meant "featherless biped". As philosophers they were much pleased with this definition until the mischievous Diogenes plucked a chicken and threw it over the wall into the Academy. Here was a featherless biped, surely, but just as surely it was not a man! (After additional thought, the Academics added: "with broad nails"!)²)

The second example is the well-known riddle asked by the Sphinx near Thebes: "Which being has four legs in the

morning, two in the afternoon and three in the evening, and goes slower when the number of his legs increase?" It is not always easy to accept that this absurd riddle epitomises man in his stages of growth from vigorous babyhood to the slow decrepit twilight of old age.

In the case of our knowledge of man the result of oversimplification gives us a one-dimensional instead of a multi-dimensional man. Numerous examples of one-dimensional views of man can be mentioned. Man has for instance been defined as a social being (*animal sociale*), as a rational being (*animal rationale*), as a moral being, an aesthetic or symbol-making being (*animal symbolicus*) and a juridical being. Some people like to speak of man as a *homo faber*, *homo economicus*, *homo civis*, *homo theoreticus*, *homo ludens*, *homo viator*, *homo orans* and today of *L'Homme Révolte*. It is, however, clear that one does not capture the whole man in such definitions. Even if one combines them and speaks of man as an ethical-rational being, for instance, one is left merely with a two-dimensional man.

The danger of all such one-sided ideas about man in practice is that he is treated according to these distorted theoretical views. If man is regarded as a highly developed animal he is treated as an animal. When man is considered merely as an electro-chemical machine, no resistance can be offered to modern bio-chemical manipulation.

In a radical biblical anthropology we identify these one-dimensional views by means of -isms (materialism, rationalism, economism, psychologism etc.). These views about man arise when one aspect of man is lifted out from among the others and is absolutized and made the deeper source and unity of the others. One has an ism when one has too much of something, an exaggeration of what is not appropriate to the matter, or when that which is peripheral is given central importance.

An interesting part of the history of anthropology is that, where the one-sidedness of a certain ism was sufficiently felt, a change to another theory usually occurred. But usually this also proved to be one-sided. As long as fragmentary aspects are considered as representing the whole there never comes a resting point, a satisfactory end in the search for the essence of man.

How all such kinds of one-dimensional views about man contribute to the crisis of contemporary society can only be indicated briefly in the limited space of this essay. We may approach it from two different angles.

On the one hand, it is obvious that certain trends in present society are the outcome of specific theories about man. We indicated above how distorted theoretical viewpoints about man result in fatal consequences in society. Man in society is treated according to pre-conceived one-dimensional ideas.

On the other hand, the opposite is also true: certain trends in society give birth to specific conceptions about man. The trends in our modern society, which is characterised by hitherto unknown welfare, a strong emphasis on the sensuous, forceful dynamics, the impressive growth of the power and abilities of man (especially through science, technology and organization), increasing secularization, a tendency towards internationalism, loss of absolute values, irrational search for refuge in various kinds of mystical experiences, permanent revolution, etc, also influence man's ideas about himself and his fellowmen. By way of illustration a few examples may suffice.

Modern technology created the picture of man as machine-constructed. The result is that man is treated as a machine and is, therefore, dehumanized.

In addition, contemporary welfare is contributing to the creation of a definite human type: the pleasure-loving man, who considers as his highest bliss the enjoyment of himself *ad infinitum*; a man who has concentrated all his energies on the production and consumption of things; a man who is exploited by others and exploits himself; the greedy, over-ambitious person, who pursues luxury symbols of status without satisfying his ever-expanding and to a large extent artificial material needs; the slave of the well-prepared advertising and propaganda of our time which forces people, by means of suggestiveness, repetition, conditioning and brainwashing, to buy commodities which invariably they do not really need; the bored individual, who neither knows what to do with himself nor what he has because prosperity does not, and cannot, satisfy all the needs of man; the weakling who may be

financially well-off, but who no longer has an ounce of defensibility or spiritual fitness; the one-sided man who is firmly in the grip of money and is unable to see any side of life other than the material.

The forceful dynamics of our time overburdens man, making him restless and tense. It created a human type which has reached a saturation point and, being unable to digest everything, has become blunt. Man is also becoming shallow because spiritual attributes cannot grow quickly and in the midst of such haste. He is left without a sense of direction so that he is drifting downstream without knowing his destination.

Much of the reaction from the side of the so-called counter-cultural movements (Hippies, New Left etc) can be explained by the fact that contemporary youth realized that man in society had lost his uniqueness, that man cannot be wholly, fully man anymore. These sub-cultural trends make us sensitive again to the fact that man cannot be happy when locked up in a one-dimensional or at most three-dimensional (mathematical-physical-biotic) prison. They became aware to a certain extent of the danger that man today, also because of the influences of contemporary society, may forget that he is man and what it really means to be human. Only if man once more becomes capable of knowing and understanding himself will he have the ability to understand and live in society with his fellowmen.

Recapulating, we may say therefore that there is a two-way interaction or rather a vicious circle: certain distorted, one-dimensional viewpoints about man are largely responsible for the crisis of contemporary culture. On the other hand, the crisis of contemporary culture creates certain ideas about man and a certain type of man which provides fertile soil for the growth of this crisis.

2. MULTI-DIMENSIONAL MAN

Man is more complicated than anything else in creation. He is an indivisible whole of extreme complexity. Although indivisible, he expresses himself in different aspects. We can distinguish at least fourteen aspects or sides of man, which are studied by the various sciences, as follows: the numerical or arithmetical and spatial

(Mathematics), the physical (Physics and Chemistry), the biological or biotic (Biology, Physiology etc) the psychical (Psychology), the analytical (Logic), the historical (History), the linguistic (Philology, Semantics, Language Studies), the social (Sociology), economic (Economics), the aesthetic (Aesthetics), the juridical (Law), the ethical (Ethics) and the pistical or faith (Theology).

Using the analogy of a diamond we can turn the human being around to catch the light of one after another facet. If we compare the human being to a prism, when we focus on it, we will find the light is broken up into different colours. Man does not gives us a black-white picture, but a coloured photograph.

As the doctrine of the different law-spheres or modalities is one of the well-known contributions of the so-called Amsterdam Philosophy initiated by Vollenhoven and Dooyeweerd, of which Taljaard is an exponent in his own original way, I will not elaborate here, but I will concentrate on another view of man which is fatal in its consequences when applied to Philosophy of Society.

3. THE DANGER OF A DUALISTIC VIEW ABOUT MAN

A well-known analogy for the human being is a house standing on two pillars consisting of one room with two windows and a door which are closed at night (the body). This house is occupied by a living being (the soul). Here again is a definition of man as a being consisting of two substances: the outer body and the inner soul.

This subject of body and soul and their relation is really a classical issue throughout the entire history of philosophy. I will not even try to enumerate the different theories about body and soul and their relation.³⁾ Dualism, one such issue, has exerted a great influence upon the entire course of the history of our knowledge of man. It embraced the problem of the relations between body and soul, matter and mind, the physiological and the mental. Dualism is a false problem because neither the soul nor the body can be investigated separately. The complex being of man is only arbitrarily divided into body and soul.⁴⁾ Scientists believe more and more in the unity of

man. Man with his brain and all his other organs thinks, invents, suffers, admires, loves and prays. I do not agree with the modern teaching that man is only body because this theory again gives us an one-dimensional man. Neither do I accept former dualistic theories.

4. THE FATAL CONSEQUENCES OF DUALISTIC VIEWS ABOUT MAN

As in the case of the one-dimensional viewpoints the results of all dualistic views about man are disastrous. Actually it merely gives a two-dimensional and therefore a very poor and incomplete picture. Dualism in anthropology creates anthropological schizophrenia: on the one hand man lives bodily or physically and on the other hand he is a spiritual being. History has already proved that it is not always easy to keep the balance between the two.

At this stage one example may be sufficient. During the Middle Ages man's interest was concerned with the here-after, and not with his physical life of the *hic et nunc*, because he firmly believed that after death his "immortal soul" would at last be released from the prison of the unimportant body. In the modern world (from about the time of the Renaissance), the pendulum swung from the one extreme to the other. Only the here-and-now, the life between cradle and grave, is of real importance. The perspective of life here-after became dim and finally disappeared. Man became seized in the mighty grip of tangibles such as nourishment, clothing, sport, body and sex.⁵⁾

The outcome of a dualistic anthropology thus is often a one-dimensional man — to the one extreme or another — with the consequent unwholesome and even dangerous implications for society in general.

5. MAN AS A UNITY

Man is a unity of extreme complexity. Even to say that man is a unity⁶⁾ may still not be clear enough because one may ask: unity of what? A unity implies two or more parts forming a whole. The unity of man is not a secondary fact, i e man is not a unity only after the putting together of two or more basic parts or elements. Man is not a unity as the result of a union.

Why I prefer to give a circular definition by saying "man is man" instead of saying "man is a unity of body and soul" will become clear by means of an analysis of the most important anthropological concepts, eg soul, body, spirit, flesh and heart.

Because what I am presenting here is actually a summary of the results of various studies of the different concepts, it may give the impression of a monotonous repetition: soul, body, spirit, flesh and heart all indicate the whole man. This is so because the aim of my enquiry is not to enter into the *differences* between these anthropological concepts in the Word of God, but to draw attention to the fact that each of them does not denote something *in* man, or a part *of* man, but man as a whole from a specific viewpoint.

5.1 Man as soul⁷⁾

"Soul" is not a part of man. It is not a vague and shadowy substance. The word "soul" denotes the concrete, earthly personality for whom breathing and circulation of blood, emotional life etc are most important.

Quite simply, soul means a living being (man, animal or plant), an individual personality, a man. Often it is also used to indicate the seat of emotions, desires, and needs. That is why the Bible speaks about a soul that eats about the souls of animals, about a dead soul (and not of an immortal one), a soul of flesh (and not a spiritual one). According to the Bible the soul dies. Sometimes it may be said that the soul departs when man dies. (Gen 35:18). Similarly it may be said that the soul returns when it is revived (1 Kings 17:21-22). Such expressions do not imply that death results in the departure of the soul from the body leaving it untouched by death because it merely goes elsewhere. It simply means that *life* departs or that life returns once more.

5.2 Man as body⁸⁾

Body does not indicate a separate part of man, i.e. the lower part, according to the history of philosophy. It denotes the *whole*, concrete *man* and not a lower part of man. In some instances it has more or less the same meaning as

flesh and indicates *man* (again not a part of man) as fragile, weak and sinful.

5.3 Man as spirit⁹⁾

The spirit of man is also not a separate higher substance in man. Spirit is man himself, man himself is spirit. Spirit may also be viewed as the seat of different emotions or a constant power which causes vitality, an inner concentrated motive force. When we speak of the spirit of a person to denote the dynamic characteristics which inspire and motivate his actions, we are using the word "spirit" in a sense which closely resembles the colloquial everyday meaning of the word. Since man acts individually as well as communally, the term "spirit" takes on corresponding meaning. Thus, when a communal spirit prevails for a long period of time and fundamentally directs the course of history, we speak of the spirit of a specific age.

5.4 Flesh¹⁰⁾

This word signifies the *whole* man and all earthly creatures and characterizes man in a certain way, viz as fragile, weak, frail and perishable in contrast to God who is All-powerful and Eternal. There is no antithesis between flesh and soul. According to the Bible the soul of man is flesh and the flesh is soul. There is nothing wrong with flesh as such; flesh is not an inferior or sinful part of man.

In the Bible we sometimes find a close relationship between flesh and sin. Then flesh does not indicate a lower *part* of man as sinful, but the *whole* unregenerated sinful man. The culprit is man himself, not the flesh as such. In the same sense we will have to use the words "carnal" and its opposite, "spiritual". To be carnal means to rely only on one-self, to live in disobedience to the law of God and to hate God and our fellowman. Therefore "works of the flesh" are not only adultery and sexual sins but also hatred, wrath, strife, heresies, idolatry, witchcraft etc (Gal 6:19, 20). To be spiritual means to be guided by the Holy Spirit in everything we do — including our sexual life.

Our preliminary conclusion is that the words soul, body, spirit and flesh do not refer to man in his component *parts*. These concepts always denote the *total* man from a

certain viewpoint. They are four different facets of the diamond and four colours of the prism.

5.5 Man as heart¹¹⁾

We do not have in mind here heart in its biotic sense as the restless, beating organ in our breast. We refer to the meaning of heart as the innermost “part”, the central point, the most important constituent, the nucleus of man.

Because of this “heart” has a representative use. It is the genuine, the essential, the authentic in which something is completely represented. It represents the *whole* person. This implies a differentiation between the heart and its owner, because the representation and that which is represented can be differentiated. But it does not imply an independent existence of the heart. The representation may be *distinguished* but it cannot be *separated* from the whole man. It is the “part” of the totality in which it finds its concentration point. “Heart” does not denote the traditional “spiritual part” of man. The heart of man is not his double or “second half” and does not imply a dualism in man. “Heart” implies no reduction of man to an essence or kernel from which the covering or bark — the body — may be easily stripped off.

Because “heart” has the meaning of a concentration point or nucleus in which the whole man is represented, it has a predominantly religious significance. It is the one centre in man to which God turns, in which religious life (man’s relationship to God) is rooted. Any form of religious activity starts from the heart. The *whole* of life is religion. This implies that *all* human actions start from the heart. Man’s whole life is an outflow from his heart. The heart is responsible even for sin — and not the body as in traditional Christian Anthropology! In other words, in the heart of man the course of his life is determined. It is most important who rules it. When you possess somebody’s heart, you have gained possession of him in his totality. This is the reason why the heart should be guarded well.

It should be clear now that it is not possible to operate with sharply defined dimensions when we discuss the structure or nature of man. It is, for instance, wrong to imagine the relation between body and soul as two circles

which either do not touch at all or overlap slightly, or to speak of the inner and outer man¹²). Man is not a composition of different *parts* but an indivisible whole of extreme complexity of which we may abstract different *facets*. The difficulty is that we usually try to make independent *substances* of the *facets* we have abstracted.

This view of the structure of man is also the reason why I reject the idea of immortality which played a very important role in the whole history of Philosophy and Theology. The Bible speaks only of the resurrection of man and nowhere of an immortal soul escaping death. Immortality is used merely in connection with *man* (NB, not the soul) *after* resurrection.¹³)

6. A CRITIQUE OF THE TRADITIONAL (SCHOLASTIC) CHRISTIAN ANTHROPOLOGY

In the light of the preceding let us now consider whether most of the current Christian views about man could have solved the different problems at the three main events in the history of mankind: creation, fall and redemption.

6.1 Creation (the creation of Adam and Eve and the conception of all their successors)

According to many current Christian viewpoints the whole cosmos consists of two substances only: matter and spirit. Everything must be either matter or spirit, or matter plus spirit. God and the angels are spiritual substances. Stones are material substances. Human beings consist of matter (body) as well as spirit (soul). It is not necessary to state that reality is far more complex than a mere division into only two substances permits. It is possible to distinguish clearly between God, His creation and the laws governing creation. Furthermore, in creation I recognize four realms, viz inorganic matter, plants, animals and human beings, each of them partaking in its own way in fifteen different modal aspects.

Should we accept only matter and spirit, we will encounter many difficult problems. For instance- How is it possible for God (of spiritual substance) to control nature, which is material substance? How were angels (spiritual substances) able to remove the stone in front of the grave of Jesus, etc?

Problems connected with earthly beings will also be encountered because these beings do not exist merely in a material or spiritual way. What, for instance, is the nature of thought: spiritual or material? Any modern physicist will criticise the definition of a stone as consisting of material substance because inorganic matter contains the wealth of at least four modalities.

At this point I should like to remark that I reject the concept of "substance" because nothing in this world stands by itself. The idea of an immortal soul as substance, inviolable by the penalty of God (death), is not biblical. Everything exists only through God who keeps it in existence from moment to moment. The idea of an independent substance is a pagan one.

According to traditional Christian Scholastic ideas, God created Adam by putting a separate spiritual substance — the immortal soul — into a material clay "statue". The soul is of Divine origin because God breathed it into the "statue", hence it is spirit similar to God. However, this is not what Scripture actually reveals:

When in the story of the creation it is told that God breathed the spirit of life into man of clay he had moulded, it must not be construed in the manner that the clay is the body and the spirit of God the soul, which is seated and acts within the body.

The man of clay was a dead thing, but by the breath of God he was entirely changed and became a living soul. Soul and body are so intimately united that a distinction cannot be made between them. They are more than 'united'...¹⁴⁾

Elsewhere Pedersen says in this connection:

"The base of its (man's) essence was the fragile corporeal substance, but by the breath of God it was transformed and *became* a *nephesh*, a soul. It is not said that man was *supplied with a nephesh*, and so the relation between body and soul is quite different from what it is to us. Such as he is, man, in his total essence, is a soul . . . man as such is soul"¹⁵⁾.

The word "dust" (Hebrew *aphar*) in Gen 2:7 ("And the Lord formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul") does not denote merely one part of man. The being-dust of man denotes the whole man¹⁶). (*Nota Bene*: "The Lord formed *man* of dust . . ." and not the *body*!) Just as *basar* (or the Greek *sarx*), *aphar* indicates the total man in his fragility and weakness as previously indicated.

The scholastics regard the soul as the image of God in man. Holy Scripture, however, does not tell us that the image of God is *in* man, but that the whole man *is* the image of God. According to the scholastic view man is the *image bearer*, as if man were only the bearer of an image which could be separated from man, just as you speak of an armour bearer who bears his arms but who himself can be separated from the weapons that he carries¹⁷).

The succession of human beings after Adam presents no problem with regard to the origin of their bodies because this is given them by their parents. But where did their souls originate? Some scholars (traducianists or generatianists) believe that the soul also comes from the parents. Others (creatianists) reject this because they believe that God Himself creates every new soul into the body. Both of these directions give rise to insoluble problems. The creationists, for instance, encountered the following difficulties: man becomes a human being only when God has created a soul in the more or less animal body. *When* does this happen? At conception, after a few months, or at birth? If it only happens after a few months or at birth, then abortion cannot be regarded as a sin. Further: Is this view in accordance with the doctrine of original sin because the implication is that God created sinful souls? God will then also co-operate with adulterers because He willingly supplies a soul when conception takes place. Is this view in accordance with Gen 2:2 where Scripture reveals that God *completed* his creation in six days?

What is meant by the soul being *in* the body, if the soul does not occupy any space? It is a contradiction to say that the soul is *in* the body and at the same time to assert that it cannot be shown *where* in the body. Many people identify soul with brain but usually the brain is regarded as part of the body substance.

If the soul is a part of *created* reality it must have a geometrical aspect (space). By referring to the fifteen different law-spheres distinguished by the Philosophy of the Cosmomic Idea, we find that the simplest of creatures, viz inorganic objects, appear in at least four modalities: the arithmetical, geometrical, kinematic and physical. Usually the soul is regarded as a much higher substance. But the higher beings *must* be accommodated in the lower modalities also. If souls are "creatures" they should at least be contained in the geometrical and also the physical. In other words, if souls exist they should be measurable and weighable! Thus the idea of a soul consisting of a conglomerate or union of higher functions (from the logical to the physical) which form a substance and which are not dependent on the lower functions (from the arithmetical to the psychological) is unacceptable.

The current, traditional conception of the soul in Christianity does not fit into a Biblical view of the created cosmos. It seems more like something transcending the boundary of the cosmos in the direction of God. I cannot accept something divine in the cosmos because I believe in the radical difference between Creator and creatures, including man as a whole.

According to scholastic anthropology man *has* a body. The actual or real part of man is, however, not the body because this property is not the same as the proprietor! The same criticism applies to the idea that man *has* a soul. If it is true that man has a soul and a body, the question remains: who then is man, the proprietor of this soul and body? As previously said, man *is* soul and he *is* body.

A dualistic anthropology is not a harmless theoretical idea but has fatal consequences in practical life. For instance, the higher, so-called spiritual things are deemed more important than the so-called lower bodily activities; the aim of the proclamation of the Gospel to the pagans is the salvation of souls and not of concrete human beings in their concrete everyday life; furthermore, the clergy are actually the only men who are privileged to serve God in spiritual things; the life hereafter, when the soul will be freed from the body, is stressed and not the life here on earth in which we should serve God. In the life after death and the resurrection the Scholastics mention heaven as the future home of man and forget that

the Bible stresses the fact that there will be a new earth which will again be the abode of man.

These were only a few illustrations to show that the dualistic, traditional Christian or scholastic anthropology is not in accordance with Scripture concerning its treatment of man as regards his conception and his subsequent existence on earth. This is also the case when in this view man's destiny at death is explained.

6.2 Fall into sin

The revelation of Scripture with regard to man after the fall is: the total corruption of man and (eternal) death as penalty for sin. How did the traditional Scholastic Christian Anthropology understand this?

They found the *total corruption* of man unacceptable because the only effect of sin was that man lost his supernatural faith which God gave back at redemption as a *donum superadditum* or supernatural gift. The natural functions of man were only slightly damaged but not corrupted.

The sinful part of man is more or less his body and not his spiritual side. This is not in accordance with Scripture. The whole man is sinful — sin cannot be *located*. Man cannot be divided into an important and unimportant part. Man is essentially present in *each* aspect to the same degree. Man does not have non-human parts as, for instance, his body, which is considered as the animal part and his soul as the divine part.

It is very important for Christian Anthropology to stress the fact that man as man became evil after the fall. To know what man should be we can only learn from what Scripture reveals about man before the fall and also, to a certain extent, from what Scripture reveals about man after the resurrection on the new earth. Usually the non-Christian anthropologist does not take enough notice of the fact that man, as we study him, is not the man whom God created in the beginning but man suffering from all the effects of sin.

Furthermore, with regard to the second point, *death as final penalty for sin*, the scholastic view is unsatisfac-

tory. I have already said that according to the scholastics man is only dismantled at his death. The links keeping immortal soul and mortal body together are broken; the body dies but the soul continues to exist after death. Actually they considered it to be a welcome deliverance of the soul from the prison of its body.

The death of man according to Scripture is viewed much more seriously. It is a very grave and abnormal event and should be regarded as a penalty and therefore as something most unwelcome.¹⁸⁾

The dualistic approach is also the reason for the very important role which the so-called intermediate state (period between death and resurrection) plays in scholastic anthropology. (Cf for instance purgatory in Roman Catholic thought). It is necessary in this connection to be wary because this intermediate state — if something like it exists — cannot fall within our field of scientific investigation. The only means of knowing something about man in this phase of his existence is to consult the Scriptures and this is not very easy because Scripture does not treat it in detail.

6.3 Redemption

The resurrection is perhaps the heart of Christianity. Man will not awake from death by means of his own power, but the almighty God will awaken him in the course of the "last days". The existentialistic anthropology places too much emphasis on death because its theory considers death to be the final end of man (no resurrection). The scholastic anthropology cannot reveal the absolute wonder of the resurrection because it does not accept the seriousness of death. According to scholastic anthropology the resurrection is not a great event at all because the immortal soul continues to exist after death and is only united again with the unimportant body at the resurrection. (Just as one would assemble, for instance, a dismantled machine.)

Another unacceptable view of scholastic anthropology is that it does not fully realize that man is, and will continue to be, an earthly, temporal being.¹⁹⁾ After his resurrection, man will not inhabit heaven like the angels.

Renewed, he will live again on earth. This privilege will be granted, however, only to those children of God who believed in Him and served Him before they died.

By way of a *summa summarum*²⁰⁾ I believe firmly that God created the *whole* man and to Him the *whole* man is important. When the fall into sin took place it *radically* affected man. On the basis of Christ's work as Saviour a redemption of the *whole* man is possible. God is not interested in the winning of souls! I believe that the *whole* man will be raised from death and will be redeemed in his *entirety*.

7. FURTHER PURIFICATION OF TALJAARDS ANTHROPOLOGY?

J A L Taljaard enriched us with various brilliant, biblically founded insights in the field of philosophical anthropology of which the preceding pages gave ample evidence. Many more could be added, eg his strong emphasis on man's religious character, his analysis of man's basic features²¹⁾ and his penetrating critique of H Dooyeweerd's theory of the act structure.²²⁾ In this contribution, however, we have to limit ourselves to the problem of body and soul.

Christ is Lord and Master of the *whole* man in *everything* he does. This, I believe, was the deeply religious conviction behind Taljaard's eventful life and his keen interest in Philosophy of Society. The whole human being should be immersed in the service of the sovereign God in everything he does in all areas of life.

Furthermore, Prof Taljaard's academic motto was never to swear by the words of a human tutor. This gives me the confidence to ask a question relating to a further purification of his anthropology. He correctly dismissed not only the substantialistic but also all the functionalistic ideas which resulted in dualistic views about man. Yet I get the impression that Taljaard, just like Vollenhoven²³⁾ and (to an even greater extent) Dooyeweerd²⁴⁾, did not completely rid himself of a certain degree of dualism. I have already mentioned his distinction between "inner" and "outer" man. It is evident from his exposition that the concept "inner-outer" is not to be identified with that of "soul (heart)-body". The "inner man" is the same as the

soul/heart, but the "outer man" is considered to consist of the human functions (fifteen modalities or law-spheres) and not the body. Taljaard identifies the body with what he calls the function cloak. This function cloak covers all the activities of man during this life on earth. When the human being dies, the unity between inner and outer man is broken because the function cloak (which guarantees the "unity") is laid down.

An important argument is that death cannot imply the destruction of man: how could it then be a punishment of God? What happens then when man dies? Taljaard explains this in the light of 1 Chronicles 13:10, 11. The Lord was angry with Uzza and struck him down because he had put out his hand to the Ark.

The name David gave to this place means Outbreak of Uzza, and this outbreak can also be translated as the laceration of Uzza, indicating that he was torn apart, but not literally in the first place. And this is exactly what happens with the death of man. He is not only separated from the relation in which he was placed with the rest of creation which he had to subdue and rule, but he is also separated from himself. Death tears man in two but it cannot destroy or annihilate the relation in which man stands to God; the religious relation remains, even in death. Man is broken up in death and we bury man as body whilst man lives although he has died. That which we do not bury represents man in his totality, as a whole, but deprived of the body.²⁵⁾

It is clear that Taljaard does not deny the continued existence of the separated soul, spirit or heart after death; and that this part of man, torn from the rest which we bury, still represents man in his totality.

My question — cautious and hesitant — is whether there is any difference between a soul, heart or spirit deprived of its temporal functions (=body) and the shadowy spectre of the traditional immortal soul. Certain expressions such as "the body is put aside", "body will soon follow", and "soul and body are united again", strengthen our suspicion that Taljaard's theory is to a certain degree still haunted by the age-old pseudo-problem of soul and body.

Is it not easier to accept that man as man (and not a part of him) dies, and that man as man (and not a part of him) will be resurrected by God? Or is this viewpoint either too simple or too extreme to be in agreement with Scripture?

Perhaps this much-disputed problem will only be solved in the life hereafter so that it is appropriate for us in humility to answer with a *non liquet*. At the same time, however, we should keep in mind our high calling: *philosophia reformata semper reformanda est!*

BJ VAN DER WALT

BAREND JOHANNES VAN DER WALT, born in 1939 at Potchefstroom, studied theology and philosophy at the Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education and continued his studies in philosophy at the Free University of Amsterdam. Since July 1970 he has been Senior Lecturer in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Fort Hare and from July 1970 director of the Institute for the Advancement of Calvinism at the Potchefstroom University for C H E.

His D Phil dissertation is entitled: *Die Natuurlike Teologie met besondere aandag aan die visie daarop by Thomas van Aquino, Johannes Calvyn en die "Synopsis Purioris Theologiae" — 'n Wysgerige ondersoek* (1974).

He has written articles in *Philosophia Reformata* and several South African journals.

PRESENT ADDRESS: Du Plessisstraat 15, Baillie Park, Potchefstroom 2520, Republic of South Africa.

NOTES

1. Cf the following publications of Taljaard: Lewe, dood en onsterflikheid in die Wysbegeerte. *Koers*, 27 (10): 449-459, April 1961; 'n *Skrifmatige Antropologie en Samelewingsleer* (Mimeograph Class Notes, P U for C H E, 1974); and his to be published "magnum opus" *Polished Lenses. A philosophy that proclaims the sovereignty of God over creation and also over every aspect of human activity*, chapter 4. (p 172 and following of the 1974 manuscript).
2. According to Copi, I M: *Introduction to Logic* (1969), p 116.
3. For a classification according to the Consistent Problem-Historic Method, cf my article "Historiography of Philosophy", *Tydskrif vir Christelike Wetenskap*, 9: 163-184, 1973. The anthropological application of this method is illustrated in my essay, "Man, the tension-ridden bridge between the transcendent and non-transcendent world in the thought of Bonaventure of Bagnorea," *Philosophia Reformata*, 39:156-169, 1974. A great variety of viewpoints amongst Christians is covered in my bibliography on Anthropology in *Perspektief*, 11 (1):54-72, March 1972.
4. Cf Taljaard- "Lewe, dood en onsterflikheid in die Wysbegeerte". *Koers*, 27:453-454, April 1961; and *Polished Lenses*, p 174: "What surprises one is that there are still, in the second half of the twentieth century, Christians who believe that a separate substance, called soul, enters the body . . . when the child starts to breathe
"
5. The latest tendencies in the contemporary world is to return again to all kinds of mystical experiences. We witness today different kinds of "spiritualism" old and new ranging from the more or less "Christian" types to pagan witchcraft and Satanism. Man is trying to escape from the one-, two- or three-dimensional prison (in which the mathematical, physical and biotic aspects of life is overemphasized) of the ruling philosophies of life. This is clear evidence that man, created by God as a multi-dimensional being, cannot be free and happy in such narrow-minded views about himself.
6. In his article "Lewe, dood en onsterflikheid in die Wysbegeerte," *Koers*, 29 (10) : 454, 1961, Taljaard still uses the expression "unity" but in *Polished Lenses* (1974), p 213 he says: "Actually the word 'unity' should be avoided in an indication of the wholeness of man, being a mathematical concept. The same applies to the word 'totality' because it presupposes the existence of parts. I prefer to speak, just plainly, about man, the living creature God created from the dust of the earth in his image and likeness . . . placed in covenantal relation with the rest of the earthly creation to God."
7. Cf Becker, J H *Het begrip nefesi in het Oude Testament* (1942) and his contribution, "Ziel. Bijbelsche gegevens," in *Christelijke Encyclopedie*, vol VI (1961), p693-695. See also the following works of Janse, A: *Om "de levende ziel"* (nd), *De mensch als "levende ziel"* (1936), *Van idolen en schepselen* (1938); Von Meyenfeldt, F H: *The meaning of ethos* (1964), p 54-56; and Ridderbos, H: *Paulus. Ontwerp van zijn Theologie* (1966), p 127, 128.
 Taljaard, in the above-mentioned *Koers* article, correctly stressed the fact that the word "soul" is mostly used in the Bible simply as a synonym for "human being". Cf p 453. We are also in agreement

with his rejection of the false problems regarding the relationship between soul and body and the question of the origin of the soul and at what stage it is united to the body of every human being. (Cf footnote 4 supra.)

8. Cf Ridderbos, H, op cit, p 123, and Kuitert, H M: "Mens en lichaam in de Heilige Schrift." *Vox Theologica*, 34 (2): 37-50, 1963.
9. Cf in this connection Crump, F J: *Pneuma in the Gospels* (1954); Scheepers, J H: *Die Gees van God en die gees van die mens in die Ou Testament* (1960) and Waaning, N A: *Onderzoek naar het gebruik van "pneuma" bij Paulus* (1939).
10. Cf Lindijer, *Het begrip sarx bij Paulus* (1952).
11. Cf the following studies: Becker, J H: "Het begrip 'hart' in het Oude Testament". *Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 50: 10-16, 1950; Von Meyenfeldt, F H: *Het hart (leb, lebab) in het Oude Testament* (1950) and his contribution entitled "Enige algemene beschouwingen gegrond op de betekenis van het hart in het Oude Testament", in: *Wetenschappelijke bijdragen door leerlingen van Vollenhoven* (1951), p 52-67. Cf also his above-mentioned work *The meaning of ethos* (1964) p 49-54, and Ridderbos, H: op cit, p 126, 127.
We cannot agree with Taljaard who uses the concepts of heart, spirit and soul as synonyms. Cf Koers article, p 457, and *Polished Lenses*, p 186 and also p 214. "Only after death the heart, soul or spirit exists on its own . . ."
12. Cf Koers, 27 (10): 455, 456, Apr 1961.
13. Cf ibid, p 457 and 458 for a very clear exposition on this problem. From *Polished Lenses*, p 187 the following: "Only those who are not delivered to the second death receive immortality and they are the people belonging to Jesus Christ, given to him by the Father, his brothers and sisters. It is evident that one can only speak about immortality after the resurrection of the body. Only after the day of Judgement it is given to the children of God."
Cf also Snyman, W J: "Lewe, dood en onsterflikheid in die Nuwe Testament". *Koers* 28 (10): 417-430, April 1961.
14. Pedersen, J *Israel. Its life and culture*, I & II. (1959), p 171.
15. Ibid, p 99 Italics of "became" and "supplied with" added.
16. Cf Kuitert, H M, op cit, p 39.
17. For the Biblical meaning of man as the image of God cf Berkouwer, G C: *De mens het beeld Gods* (1957), which has also been translated in English, *Man: The image of God* (1962); and Schrotenboer, P G: "Man in God's World". *International Reformed Bulletin*, 10 (31): 11-30, Oct 1967. For Taljaard's viewpoint — to my mind a brilliant, new and Scripturally founded approach — cf *Polished Lenses*, p 177 et seq. A detailed discussion of the biblical meaning of the expression, "man created in the image and likeness of God," together with a criticism of the traditional ideas in this connection, is offered in my dissertation *Die Natuurlike Teologie met besondere aandag aan die visie daarop by Thomas van Aquino, Johannes Calvyn en die "Synopsis Purioris Theologiae"* - 'n *Wysgerige Ondersoek* (1974) chapter VI. p 678-704.
18. Taljaard correctly emphasizes the fact that death is a penalty and a horror. Cf *Polished Lenses*, p 185 et seq.
19. According to Taljaard man is an everlasting, indestructable, but not eternal being. Man is characterized by his timeliness (Afrikaans: "tydsheid") — not to be confused with "timelessness"! Cf ibid, p 184.

20. We have learned much from the works of K J Popma to reach a genuine radical biblical view about man. A penetrating critique of traditional Christian anthropology can be found at various places in the seven volumes of his major work *Levensbeschouwing* (1958-1965). Valuable reading material is also offered in the different essays in the mimeograph (98 pages) publication of the Institute for Christian Studies, Toronto entitled *Anthropology and Psychology in Christian Perspective. Some readings and propositions.*
21. Cf *Polished Lenses*, p 194 et seq.
22. Cf *ibid*, p 206 et seq.
23. Cf the following: Vollenhoven, D H T and Schilder, K: *Van "Oorzaken en Redenen". Minderheidsnota inzake Algemene genade, Genadeverbond, De onsterfelijkheid der ziel, Pluriformiteit der kerk, Vereniging der twee naturen van Christus en Zelfonderzoek* (Stencil) Kampen/Amsterdam, 1939; Vollenhoven D H T *Inleiding in de wijsgerige anthropologie (vroeger genaamd: Theoretische Psychologie I). College-dictaat, cursus 1957-1958*; *Ibid: Het Calvinisme en de reformatie van de Wijsbegeerte* (1933), part I, Chapter 2, especially p 43-45; *Ibid: Isagoge Philosophiae* (1967).
24. H Dooyeweerd gives an exposition of his Anthropology in his work *In the twilight of Western thought* (1960, reprint 1968), Chapter 8. Also available is a mimeograph "Theory of man — thirty-two propositions," which is a translation of "De leer van de mens in de 'Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee': 32 Stellingen," published in *Sola Fide*, 2 Febr 1954, p 8-18, and in *Correspondentiebladen van de Vereniging voor Calvinistische Wijsbegeerte*, 6 (5): 134-143, Dec 1942. (Reprint in Dutch available from the Filosofisch Instituut, Centrale Interfaculteit, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam.)
For a discussion of Dooyeweerd's Anthropology cf Kock, F A: *Die betekenis en plek van die hart in die Wysbegeerte van die Wetsidee* (MA Thesis 1954); Berkouwer, G C: *op cit*, p 284-293; Seerveld, C: "'Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee' — Characteristics of Prof Vollenhove and Dooyeweerd," *Correspondentiebladen van de Vereniging voor Calvinistische Wijsbegeerte*, 24: 8-10, April 1960; Spier, J M: *Tijd en Eeuwigheid* (1953), p 141-181; Wiskerke, J R: "De anthropologie van dr A Kuyper en die hartkwaal van de Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee," *Lucerna*, 4:26-39, 1963; Young, W "The nature of man in the Amsterdam Philosophy", *The Westminster Theological Journal*, 22: 1-12, 1959/60.
25. Taljaard *Polished Lenses*, p 186, 187. Cf also p 188, 189: "What one buries can be compared with a cloak, and what remains alive can be called heart or soul or spirit. During life they are in an intra-individual relation to each other, but during the first death they are torn apart. Now the relation, if any, between them could be indicated as inter-individual. With the resurrection of the body, the cloak is again taken up, the tear is mended and the intra-individual relation is restored, man is placed again upon the earth, a new man on a new earth because Christ makes everything new."