

**Sin, sickness and *han*: The intersection between
the hamartiologies of Andrew Sung Park and
Irenaeus of Lyons**

P Luu



orcid.org/0000-0003-13809-2320

Thesis accepted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy in Church and Dogma History
at the North-West University

Promoter: Prof DT Lioy

Co-promoter: Dr SP van der Walt

Graduation: May 2022

Student number: 28531345

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work that follows is the culmination of the efforts that were made fruitful only with the help of many. Writing is often a lonely endeavour, done in isolation, but it is something not done independently, but through the dialogue with and assistance of people integral to the process of making this research project a reality. This PhD thesis was completed in conjunction with Greenwich School of Theology and North-West University. Deep appreciation is owed to Tienie Buys and Peg Evans, for their strengthening encouragement, perpetual guidance, gentle tutelage, and consistent faith so that this work would be carried to completion. Prof Dan Lioy and Dr Sarel Van Der Walt, my promoters, provided invaluable feedback, critique, guidance and seemingly infinite patience throughout the whole journey of the work. It was Dr Lioy who communicated how NWU's committee saw that this topic was 'quite relevant' and this feedback was more than enough in providing motivation to press forward with the work. Dr Stuart Rochester was also instrumental in assisting to shape and narrow the research focus. All that is good with this project is credited to them.

Additional thanks to Dr Andrew Sung Park, professor at United Theological Seminary, and the initial conversations with him about his work on *han* and its theological relevance. His deep faith in the healing work of Jesus and probing theological questions were instrumental to the core of this research. Thanks also to Dr Bradley Jersak, theologian and scholar, whose scholarship into Irenaeus and the Eastern Patristic Fathers provided the initial idea to tie together what seemed to be two seemingly disparate threads of theology in a way that was beautifully connected. Another important contributor was Dr Joel B Green, Associate Dean for the Centre of Advanced Theological Studies at Fuller Seminary, whose attention to both Scripture and theology was an inspiration.

Finally, my deepest appreciation goes to the friends and family whose continual encouragement I could not be without: Kate Martin Williams; Dr Jessica Cole; Rev Tommie and Shorna Anderson; Revs Julius and Romonica Wardley; Rev Tommy Williams; Sanjiv and Sarah Manghnani; Drs Georgeann and Jesse Groh; Todd Graves; Dr Ray and Juliet Wagner; Matthew and Allison Gennote; my in-laws, Mr and Mrs. Duc and Kim Nguyen; my mother and father, Thu Tam and Le Luu. Special thanks to my wife, Paula N. Luu for her virtues of faith, hope and love, but the most enduring is love.

ABSTRACT

This thesis brings to light the intersections between the work of Andrew Sung Park and the Early Eastern Fathers, especially Irenaeus of Lyons, regarding their understandings of hamartiology, the study of sin. Theologian Andrew Sung Park is the pioneer of introducing the concept of *han* as an evaluative category to the discipline of theology in order to show how sin can be dealt with through healing of the wounded and the transformation of those who repent. This therapeutic model hails back to the work of Irenaeus of Lyons and the Early Church Fathers, where sin is described as sickness, alienation, corruption, and its effects, suffering and woundedness. Because Irenaeus' theology is by nature somatic, his images of redemption include the healing and liberation of human and the yearning of all of creation for the children of God to be restored (Rom. 8:22-23). In bringing about ancient Eastern theology and contemporary Minjung or People's theology, the hope is to form a dialogue between them so that one can expand the understanding of the other. Even with almost two millennia between them there is still much to be said and understood about how Eastern Patristic studies and contemporary contextual theology intersect, especially in their discussion of sin, which is also a discussion of human anthropology, creation, and redemption.

This research will use the primary texts of Park, especially his work regarding *han* and redemption, and the primary texts of Irenaeus, particularly *On the detection and overthrow of the so-called gnosis* (Ἐλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως) or commonly known in the Latin translated title as *Against heresies* (AH). Other Patristic theological texts will be used to compare, contrast, and expand Irenaeus' view since his influence was widespread even into the Medieval age. This thesis starts with an examination of Irenaeus and other Eastern Patristic hamartiologies and examines how ransom and recapitulation address these problems. It then moves to Minjung theology and an analysis of Park's use of *han*. This will also investigate the intersections between Park's therapeutic view of the treatment of woundedness with Irenaeus', with particular attention to somatic and historical elements, transformation, and creation. Next, the thesis deals with sin and sickness in Irenaeus' work and explores how death and the body is discussed. This is done in light of a discussion of the 'originality of sin' and responsibility of humans in the Eastern Patristic theology. The penultimate chapter discusses the Park's *Triune Atonement* and the trinitarian nature of healing for the wounded and how these connect with Irenaeus' view of the work of the Triune God in liberating and restoring humanity. Lastly, the conclusions and recommendation will deal

with restorative justice and how the hamartologies of Park and Irenaeus can provide other avenues in the discussion of sin and redemption in the world.

Keywords:

Andrew Sung Park, Atonement, Christology, Eastern Church Fathers, hamartiology, Irenaeus, nonviolence, Patristic studies, recapitulation, reconciliation, redemption, restorative justice, soteriology; Triune Atonement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	I
ABSTRACT	II
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES.....	XI
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT	9
1.3 RESEARCH QUESTION	9
1.4 RESEARCH AIM AND OBJECTIVES	10
1.5 CENTRAL THEORETICAL ARGUMENT.....	10
1.6 METHODOLOGY.....	10
1.6 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	13
CHAPTER 2: AN EXAMINATION OF DESCRIPTIONS AND THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN EVIL, SIN, AND WOUNDEDNESS IN IRENAEUS	14
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	14
2.2 THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNTS OF SIN IN COMPARISON TO THE EASTERN FATHERS' USAGE	15
2.2.1 Introduction.....	15
2.2.2 Sin as Chatta (חַטָּא)	15
2.1.1.1 Figure 2 — Primary Hebrew roots for sin and their meanings	17
2.2.3 Sin as Hamartia (ἁμαρτία)	19
2.2.4 The use of ‘Sinner’ in the Gospels.....	21

2.2.5	Correspondence between the Biblical Accounts and the Early Eastern Church Fathers	21
2.2.6	The Non-Theological Meaning for Sin (ἁμαρτία) by the Eastern Fathers	22
2.2.7	The Theological Use of Sin (ἁμαρτία) in Irenaeus and the Eastern Fathers Compared to Biblical Meanings.....	23
2.2.8	Summary of Conclusion.....	29
2.3	DESCRIPTIONS OF SIN IN IRENAEUS' AGAINST HERESIES....	31
2.3.1	Introduction	31
2.3.2	Sickness.....	32
2.3.3	Alienation.....	34
2.3.4	Corruption	36
2.3.5	Conclusion.....	40
2.4	THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVIL, SIN, AND WOUNDEDNESS IN IRENAEUS' AGAINST HERESIES	40
2.4.1	Introduction	40
2.4.2	Evil	40
2.4.3	Sin as Moral Evils	41
2.4.4	Woundedness	42
2.4.5	Sickness in Relationship to Woundedness.....	44
2.4.6	Conclusion.....	46
2.6	SOLUTIONS TO EVIL, SIN, AND WOUNDEDNESS PRESENTED IN IRENAEUS' AGAINST HERESIES	47
2.6.1	Introduction	47
2.6.2	Ransom.....	47
2.6.3	Recapitulation	49
2.6.4	Restoration to a State of Incorruption	52

2.6.5	Healing of Sickness and Woundedness.....	54
2.6.6	Conclusion.....	57
2.7	SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS.....	58
CHAPTER 3:	AN EXAMINATION OF THE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN IRENÆUS' ACCOUNTS OF SIN AND PARK'S USE OF THE CONCEPT OF <i>HAN</i> IN HIS HAMARTIOLOGY	60
3.1	INTRODUCTION.....	60
3.2	THE HISTORY OF MINJUNG THEOLOGY AND <i>HAN</i>	61
3.2.1	Introduction	61
3.2.2	Minjung and the Origins of Minjung Theology	63
3.2.3	Conclusion.....	67
3.3	PARK'S ACCOUNT OF SIN AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIN AND <i>HAN</i>.....	67
3.3.1	Introduction	67
3.3.2	Definitions of Han.....	68
3.1.1.1	Figure 3 — Table showing the various definitions of han from various descriptions of han based on the psychic/somatic relationships	72
3.3.3	Clarifying Han and Haan	73
3.3.4	Han and the Problem of Mind/Body Dualism.....	74
3.3.5	Han and Ressentiment.....	77
3.3.6	The Bible and Han	79
3.3.7	The Nature of Sin as Personal, Communal, and Systemic.....	82
3.3.8	Healing and Sin in Park's Hamartiology	84
3.3.9	Repentance and Sin in Park's Hamartiology	86
3.3.10	Conclusion.....	87

3.3	CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PARK’S HAMARTIOLOGY AND IRENAEUS’ ACCOUNTS.....	91
3.3.1	Introduction	92
3.3.2	Recapitulation and Incarnational Theology in Relationship to Liberation and Healing.....	92
3.3.3	Christian Perfection Through the Holy Spirit	94
3.3.4	The Redemption of Creation	95
3.3.5	Conclusion.....	97
3.4	SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS.....	102
CHAPTER 4:	AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIN AND SICKNESS IN IRENAEUS’ AGAINST HERESIES AND CORRESPONDENCES WITH PARK’S USE OF <i>HAN</i>	106
4.1	INTRODUCTION.....	106
4.2	SIN AND SICKNESS IN IRENAEUS’ <i>AH</i>	106
4.2.1	Adamic Wounds and Recapitulation.....	106
4.2.2	The Relationship Between Soul and Body.....	110
4.2.3	Human Woundedness and ‘the Pain of the Stroke’	112
4.2.4	Conclusion.....	113
4.3	SIN AND SICKNESS IN PARK’S HAMARTIOLOGY AND ATONEMENT THEORY	114
4.3.1	The Causal Relationship Between Sin and Han.....	114
4.3.2	The Triune Atonement	115
4.3.3	Conclusion.....	117
4.4	SICKNESS IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE IRENAEUS’ AGAINST HERESIES AND EARLY EASTERN FATHERS’ DESCRIPTION OF ‘ORIGINAL SIN’	118
4.4.1	Irenaeus and ‘Original Sin’	119

4.4.2	Athanasius and ‘Original Sin’	120
4.4.3	Tertullian and ‘Original Sin’	121
4.4.4	Conclusion.....	121
4.5	SIN, SICKNESS, DEATH, AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS	123
4.5.1	Anthropology and Ethics.....	123
4.5.2	The Relationship Between Anthropology and Ethics	124
4.5.3	Ethics in Irenaeus	125
4.5.4	Sickness and Healing	127
4.5.3	Conclusion.....	129
4.6	SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS.....	130
CHAPTER 5:	AN EXAMINATION OF THE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN IRENÆUS’ THEORIES OF ATONEMENT AND PARK’S THEORY OF TRIUNE ATONEMENT	134
5.1	INTRODUCTION.....	134
5.1.2	Atonement in Park and the Eastern Fathers	135
5.2	THE TRIUNE ATONEMENT AND THE HEALING OF THE HAN-RIDDEN	137
5.2.1	Introduction	137
5.2.2	Jesus’ Life and Work as Healing of the Han-ridden	138
5.2.3	The Cross and the Healing of the Han-ridden.....	140
5.2.4	The Resurrection and the Healing of the Han-ridden	142
5.2.5	Conclusion.....	144
5.3	RANSOM AND RECAPITULATION THEORIES AS THE LIBERATION OF HUMAN NATURE	146
5.3.1	Introduction	146

5.3.2	Recapitulation	147
5.3.3	Recapitulation of History	148
5.3.4	Recapitulation of Humanity	149
5.3.2	Recapitulation of Redemption.....	150
5.3.3	Conclusion.....	151
5.4	RESTORATIVE JUSTICE AND ATONEMENT IN PARK, IRENÆUS, AND EASTERN CHURCH FATHERS.....	153
5.4.1	Introduction	153
5.4.2	Restorative Justice in Park’s Triune Atonement	154
5.4.3	Restorative Justice in Irenæus’ Atonement Models	155
5.4.4	The ‘Two Hands of God’ and Trinity in Irenæus’ Atonement Model	157
5.4.5	Restorative Justice in the Literature of the Eastern Fathers	160
5.4.2	Conclusion.....	162
5.5	SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS.....	164
CHAPTER 6:	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	168
6.1	PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS	168
6.2	SCHOLARSHIP	169
6.2	BIBLICAL AND HERMENEUTICAL FRAMEWORK.....	174
6.3	FINDINGS	177
6.3.1	The Somatic Effects of Sin and Somatic Structure of Han	178
6.3.2	Holistic Redemption.....	180
6.3.3	Ethical Anthropology	181
6.4	STRENGTH AND WEAKNESSES	182
6.4.1	Strength and Weaknesses of Irenæus’ Hamartiology.....	182
6.4.2	Strength and Weaknesses of Park’s Hamartiology	184

6.5	LIMITATIONS OF SCHOLARSHIP.....	185
6.6	THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE INTERSECTIONS OF IRENÆUS' VIEWS OF SIN AND PARK'S VIEW OF HAN FOR THEOLOGY	186
6.6.1	Irenæus' Embodied Theology and the Effects of Sin	186
6.6.2	'Asian' Theology and Situation of Han	188
6.7.2	The Euganelion for Han	190
6.8	IMPLICATIONS FOR LITURGY AND THE CHURCH.....	192
6.9	CONTRIBUTION TO SCHOLARSHIP	195

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE 1 :	TABLE OF EASTERN FATHERS AND DESCRIPTIONS OF SIN	7
TABLE 2:	PRIMARY HEBREW ROOTS FOR SIN AND THEIR MEANINGS.....	17
TABLE 3:	TABLE SHOWING THE VARIOUS DEFINITIONS OF <i>HAN</i> FROM VARIOUS DESCRIPTIONS OF <i>HAN</i> BASED ON THE PSYCHIC/SOMATIC RELATIONSHIPS.....	72
TABLE 4:	TABLE ILLUSTRATING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SIGNIFIER AND SIGNIFIED IN <i>AH V</i> , XV, 2	108
TABLE 5:	TABLE ILLUSTRATING THE ATONEMENT MODELS DISTINGUISHED ACCORDING TO THEIR OBJECTS.....	137
TABLE 6:	ANALOGY/ACT RELATIONSHIP	160
TABLE 7:	ADDRESSING CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SINNER AND SINNED AGAINST..	191

CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

1.1 BACKGROUND

In the *Triune atonement* (2009), Andrew Sung Park has explicated the Korean notion of *han* (한) and its implications for atonement theory. Specifically, Park's writing on atonement can be seen as a natural evolution in his hamartiology (Park, 2004; Park and Nelson, 2001). The concept of *han* arose out of Korea's history of foreign invasions; however, the experience of *han* is not unique to Korean culture. While the word is almost untranslatable into English, Park (2001:47) defines *han* as the 'suffering of the innocent who are caught in the wicked situation of helplessness'. If unacknowledged or treated improperly, *han* can lead to resentment and anger, and eventually to the perpetuation of sin. Even though all people exist as an admixture of both sinner and sinned against, Park's main criticism of the study of sin, and therefore atonement theory, is the failure to distinguish the work of God toward the perpetrators (sinners) and the victims of sin (the *han*-ridden). In separating out the sin caused and the sin inflicted, and suggesting a variety of solutions and responses for each, Park shows the multi-faceted efficacy of the cross that both heals the wounded and calls sinners to repentance; a dual-directionality illustrates how redemption is the work of restoring all creation and communities, including non-rational animals and the earth (ecological redemption). *Han* is the continued groaning of all creation for this restoration (Rom. 8:22).

Because the study of *han* underscores a definition of sin tied to the relationship between the sinner and sinned-against, many theologians have begun incorporating Park's use of *han* in working out problems in theology. Of particular note is Kevin Considine's work that integrates Park's Protestant theology with the Roman Catholic inflections of Edward Schillebeeckx (2015). Here, Considine uses *han* to correct *Gaudium et spes*, Vatican II's pastoral constitution on the church in the modern world and expands the relationship between sinners (humans) and the sinned-against (God), to include the plight of humans who are sinned-against. In addition, Considine has shown that the theological use of *han* provides a language that can account for the 'breadth of

woundedness within this world’ and might be able to ‘envision God’s ongoing and relentless work of healing, liberation, redemption, and reconciliation’ (2013: 89).

More broadly, D.F. Weaver (2001) has highlighted Park’s contribution of *han* and sin to the field of ethics. What is ‘provocative’ for Weaver (2001: 487) is that Park’s description of *han* allows for moral agency for both the wounded and perpetrators of the wounds. It allows the wounded to call the perpetrators to ‘forgiving-ness’, which includes the necessary but difficult tasks of accepting repentance and working toward rectifying the wrongdoing. In this way, agency for both victims and victimizers is mediated by the cross, which both confronts sin and provides healing for the wounded. Perhaps most importantly, there have been many pastoral and practical theologians who have applied Park’s notions of *han* in the fields of Christian ministry (Lartey, 2013), recovery (Messina-Dysert, 2015; Mercadante, 1996), and multicultural dialogue (Espinosa, 2011).

However, this notion of *han* does not exist solely in contemporary theology. While *han* has its roots in Asian thought and contemporary Minjung (people’s) theology, the use of *han* is not a distant departure from the thinking of the early Church Fathers’ view of sin. The Early Fathers, particularly Irenaeus, John Chrysostom, Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Clement of Alexandria (and the Alexandrian Fathers), and Maximus the Confessor describe sin in relation to terms such as *disobedience, slavery, corruption, alienation, impatience, and sickness*. For the Church Fathers, sin is a result of systemic, communal, and personal acts of evil that are attributed to Satan and human rebellion. For Park, this can be described in terms of *han*. Sin has an effect on individuals in that it inflicts harm to others and contributes to a cycle of continued sin.

For the Church Fathers, especially of the East, ‘original sin’ is not inherited, but rather its consequences are passed on as a result of sin. Using Park as an interpretative tool, this can be expressed in terms of *han* since *han* is a symptom of the sickness of sin, the aching for healing. It is the deep groaning that emerges from being sinned against, whether from others or a system. This relationship between sin and *han* is at the centre of God’s work of redemption. *Han* either gives rise to these sins or is an effect of them. In other words, *han* is the result of sin and sin can be the cause of *han* (Park, 2001:51). This is not to say that the patristic writings have identified

the nuances within sin as clearly as Park's separation between sinned and sinned-against. However, the Church Fathers keenly perceive that sin is not merely personal acts of disobedience against God's justice, but also the corruption of the soul, and because of this, humans need not only justification, but restoration and healing. Therefore, central to the Fathers' view of atonement is the dominion over death because death is the eventual result of sickness untreated. Here, I attempt to show that Park's use of *han* seeks the same restorative justice and therapeutic results that Irenaeus and many of the Eastern Fathers sought to describe. In the same manner as one examines *han*, one can also analyse Irenaeus' notion of sickness and woundedness that is identified as both sin and the result of sin.

In Augustine's *On nature and grace*, he speaks of human nature as being 'unhealthy' (*sana non est*) and in need of a 'physician' (*medico*) (Schaff, 2002: 403; *On nature and grace*, I. 3). Because of sin, human nature, which includes 'life, senses, and the mind', has become dark and disabled with the disease of sin. This can only be remedied through 'enlightenment and healing' (*illuminatione et curatione*). For Augustine, all those who are born of Adam suffer under this condition and therefore require the aid of a healer. He specifies that this condition caused not by God, but 'from original sin' (*ex originali peccato*). This text, written around 415, was in direct response to a non-extant work by Pelagius, *Liber de natura*, which argued that human nature could possibly exist without sin and therefore negate Christ's work. Augustine's response is to show how all people fall under the 'just penalty' of God and cannot be saved but through God, because 'all have sinned whether in Adam or in themselves' (Schaff, 2002: 403; *On nature and grace*, I. 3). The two ways in which sin can infect the human being is that humans are 'born of Adam' or that we have received the penalty of guilt from Adam. Again, Augustine's contention is with the Pelagian denial of original sin that corrupts human nature. With this they also denied grace that is needed to affect salvation and continue to develop an individual's faith. The Semi-Pelagians sought a middle ground between Pelagius and Augustine and only denied the initial needed grace and affirmed the need for supervening grace. Although, Pelagius and his followers denied and affirmed several other points that are considerably different from Augustine's doctrine of free will, ideas concerning the inheritance of original sin and need for grace are the most relevant to the research.

The description of sin as sickness reveals the need for a therapeutic treatment of sin, that sin is analogous to biological sickness, that there is some kind of infection, caused by a disease, and that there is need for a cure, often outside of the body, that aids in healing of the body. This is a place of connection for Park's view of *han* as woundedness. *Han* exists as a condition that is the result of sin and also the potential cause of sin. It is an infection that if not treated, can lead to death, to physical, psychological, and spiritual dimensions, of the human and to the infection and death of others. Where Augustine and Park depart is how this sin is transmitted to others. McGonigle (2001) has shown that Augustine's reading of Romans 5:12 goes beyond merely arguing for the existence of original sin, but toward how it is transmitted seminally from Adam to his descendants. Augustine has opted for an organic explanation, rather than a juridical one, of how guilt is transmitted, by way of Adam's seed to his descendants (McGonigle, 2001: 52).

Whether or not Augustine depended on the Greek Fathers for his view of original sin or whether which view is more valid are not the aims of this research, but how the Eastern view bridge Park's hamartiology and atonement model. Eastern Fathers do not dispute that there is an 'originality' to sin, that it had its source in Adam (Blowers, 1998: 839–840). In *On the free choice of the will (OFC)*, Augustin explains, 'As a result, [Adam] was damned along with all his descendants, who sinned along with him while still wholly contained in him' (King, 2010: 209; *OFC*, 10. 28). Augustine seems to say here that when Adam sinned then all of humanity sinned because humans were somehow contained within the seed of Adam. Here is where many of the Eastern Fathers depart from Augustine's teaching. Although they believed that Adam was the source of how sin came into the world, they do not see the need to go any further than this. In the view of many of these Fathers, instead of inheriting sin, humans inherit the shame and consequences that come from sin, which ultimately is death. This shame is the cause of the bending of the human desire toward sin. For Cyril of Alexandria, sin, in this way, has penetrated humanity's 'very passions' (*On Romans*, 5.18). Because the passions govern human deliberation, there is a change in human teleology, to no longer desire and pursue God, even with the ability to do so. This metaphysics of human nature allows human freedom to act toward the good, but also does not deny that God's saving grace is needed for the transformation of the passions.

The sickness, for Augustine, is what is passed on from person to person, through biological means. For Park, the sickness comes when sin creates a cycle of woundedness, between the perpetrators and the victims of sin. This is the cycle is what Park calls *han*. For Augustine, the sickness of sin can only be cured through baptism. This was the response that Augustine gives to Flavius Marcellus in *On the merits and forgiveness of sin and on the baptism of infants* (c.411). For, the Eastern Fathers, baptism is a covenantal mark and symbol, but does not take away guilt (Quasten and Burghardt, 1963: 57; Chrysostom, *Baptismal instructions*, 3. 6). Many of the Eastern fathers, although agreeing with Augustine's interpretation of the link between the sin of Adam and the sin of humanity, depart with Augustine as to how this is transmitted. The disagreement largely falls in the interpretation of Romans 5:12. Whereas Augustine uses the Latin text and translates '*in quo omnes peccaverunt*' as 'in whom [i.e., Adam] all sinned' in the *Commentary to the Romans*, the Eastern Fathers render the ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον 'because all have sinned'. For Augustine, all have sinned in Adam and therefore receive the punishment for this guilt which is death. For the Eastern Fathers, the 'because' can refer to death itself, so that the causality is reversed; all sin because of death: 'As sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, so death spread to all men; and *because of death*, all men have sinned.' (Meyendorff, 1983: 144, emphasis Meyendorff's). For example, John Chrysostom (349–407) writes in his commentary on Romans 5:12 regarding this passage, 'But what means, 'for that all have sinned?' This; [Adam] having once fallen, even they that had not eaten of the tree did from him, all of them, become mortal' (Schaff, 2002: 641; *Homily X*, NPNF1, 11: 84.) What Adam brought into the world was the disease of death that tainted human nature, and people sin by way of that fallen nature.

Even though the Council of Carthage in 418, in which Augustine himself attended along with the Semi-Pelagians, defends Augustine's approach and condemned Semi-Pelagian and Pelagian views, there is a difference between 'Carthaginian doctrine of original sin and the Roman doctrine of a decadence caused by the sin of Adam' (Beatrice, 2013: 256). This Roman doctrine that sprang up from Enkratite teachings 'even appears to be a distinctive component of the "western" tradition"' (Pier Franco Beatrice, *Ibid*). What the Eastern Fathers interpreted and took away from Carthage was not an adherence to the Augustinian model, but an acknowledgement of the importance of infant baptism and the denunciation of Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian thought.

This is an important point of distinction because what Park seeks to do with the understanding of *han* is to show how Christ calls the perpetrators of sin to repentance and brings healings to the those infected by *han*, thereby bringing reconciliation. This model is closer to what the Eastern Fathers are describing in their analysis of human nature and teachings regarding *theosis*. Because the guilt of sin is not taken *en masse*, individuals have the responsibility to act toward their ends and make moral judgements. *Han* provides for a description in expressing the continued cycle of sin from person to person. Unlike Augustine, sin is not only, *reatus*, an inherited legal liability, but comes in the form of a sickness that needs to be dealt with in relationship between the offended and offender. The implications of this sickness are that it can be physical, social, psychological, and spiritual and does not only relate to the inherent guilt that is transmitted. The Eastern Fathers also see the ‘medicine’ to problem of sin as healing for the entire person that comes in the form of deification, which transforms the passions and the body.

In addition, Park’s view of God’s grace is in his *pneumatology*, or more specifically, his study of the Paraclete. Park highlights the work of the Paraclete, the one ‘who is called to the side’, in helping the wounded be both healed and healers themselves. Because there are ‘wounds within us too deep to detect’ the Paraclete does the sympathetic work of uncovering and binding these wounds (2009, 68). For the sinners, those who have committed the wounds, the Paraclete confronts people to repent (μετάνοια) and ‘turn to God’ (ἐπιστροφή) (2009, 81–85). This account of God’s work in the lives of both the perpetrators and the sin-stricken to end the cycle of sin. This account also shows how God works in the lives of all people in the ‘economy of salvation’. Park’s *hamartiology* encompasses the groaning of all creation (Rom. 8:22–24), and therefore has an ecological as well as cosmic element.

This is where there is a connection between Cyril of Alexandria’s view of sin as a disease and Park’s explanation of *han*. In his commentary to the Romans, Cyril explains, ‘For our nature contracted the disease of sin because of the disobedience of one man, that is, Adam, and thus many became sinners. This was not because they sinned along with Adam, because they did not then exist, but because they had the same nature as Adam, which fell under the law of sin’ (Migne, 1857–1866: 788–789; *On Romans*, 5. 18). Cyril seeks to move beyond Adam’s guilt by quoting

Deut. 24:16 regarding the punishment of the parents being separate from the punishment of the children, and to emphasize sinning in the same ‘manner’ and ‘nature’ as Adam. Adam’s sin affects, rather than being biologically transmitted to, human beings in that Adam brought the disease of death and therefore corruption into the world.

The matrix bellow illustrates the different ways sin is spoken of by various Eastern Fathers.

Table 1 : Table of Eastern Fathers and descriptions of sin

EASTERN FATHER	SIN AS	SOURCE
Irenaeus of Lyons (–102)	alienation from our proper nature, sickness, and corruption	<i>(Against Heresies)</i>
Athanasius (c.293–2 May 373)	corruption	<i>(On the Incarnation of the Word)</i>
Gregory of Nazianzus (c. 329–c.330)	sickness, darkness of the mind, bondage	<i>(Orations 38)</i>
Cyril of Alexandria (c.378–444)	sickness and corruption	<i>(Commentary on John)</i>
Maximus the Confessor (c. 580–662)	alienation from God and others	<i>(Letter 2: On Love)</i>

Even though various Eastern Fathers will be used for this research, the main focus will be on Irenaeus since he is the earliest example to give various accounts of sin in this tradition. In addition, his writings laid the seed bed for others in the Eastern tradition to develop their own ways of talking about sin and redemption. The main text will be *Adversus haereses (Against heresies)* which gives ample examples and insights into his thoughts and points of connection between him and Park. Other Fathers will be used to only show the development and refinement specific thought.

The value of Park's hamartiology is that it expands the notions of Irenaeus and Eastern Fathers, while being faithful to them. This presses the theologian to investigate the role of sin in perpetuating the plight of spiritual sickness and *han*, and helps in pinpointing how to treat the *han*-ridden. Eastern treatments of sin by way of ransom and recapitulation theories seek to explicate both liberative and restorative aspects of describing theological efficacy. The ransom theory depicts sin as bondage to Satan and alienation of human nature; in the recapitulation theory, Christ reverses the disobedience of Adam. These nuances of sin are also found in Park's emphasis on the dual-directionality of the Cross: healing the wounds of the *han*-ridden and calling perpetrators of *han* to repentance. What the patristic writings seem to point toward is what Park is attempting to tease out, and this will hopefully lead to other theological implications that are beneficial to theology and hamartiology.

Park's project is both an advancement to the field of atonement studies, and a modification of patristic thought on the notions of sin, anthropology, redemption, salvation, and human and universal/ecological restoration. As Park notes (2009: 9), ransom theory is problematic when taken literally. When understood metaphorically, however, the ideas of transformation (*theosis*) and recapitulation are incorporated into a more inclusive understanding of atonement, and patristic understanding of atonement dovetails with Park's. Because the liberation of humans has not yet been fully realized there is room to call forth a more robust view of the effects of sin and restorative aspects of the redemption, which opens up possibilities in breaking the cycle between the *han*-ridden and the perpetrators of *han*. The strength of the ransom theory is that in application it deals with systemic evil, and because this is its chief object, the systemic relationship of sin between victims and perpetrators can be carefully separated out and studied in order to find the root of 'sickness'. This research seeks to make a contribution to Patristic studies, Park studies, and restorative justice by showing how the subjects of sin, sickness, *han*, and atonement are interrelated and can be separately analysed. Park's methodology and patristic literature can be used to show where these themes intersect and how they can help interpret one another.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Connecting Andrew Sung Park's view of sin and the related idea of *han* to the writings of the Early Church Fathers and their descriptions of sin fills the lacuna around the effects of sin as described as sickness and presents solutions expressed in the atonement theories of each.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTION

Primary Research Question:

Where can commonalities, intersections, and correlations be found between Park's description of sin and use of *han* and Irenaeus' and Early Eastern Fathers' understanding of sin in order to enhance the readings of each?

Subsidiary research questions are:

1. What are the descriptions of evil, sin, and sickness in Irenaeus' *AH* and other Eastern Church resources?
2. Where are correlations between the descriptions of sin in patristic literature and Park's use of *han*?
3. In what ways can *han* be used to analyse the notion of sin as sickness in Irenaeus' *AH*?
4. In what ways does Park's description of sin and use of *han* correlate to Irenaeus' *AH* Ransom and Recapitulation theories and the aim of restorative justice?
5. What are the implications of Park's use of *han* and sin, and Irenaeus' *AH* description of sin and sickness, for the work of restorative justice in the church and contemporary world?

1.4 RESEARCH AIM AND OBJECTIVES

This research seeks to understand (a) where Park's use of *han* and notions of sin in his Triune Atonement correlates to and is a development of the work of the Irenaeus' *AH* treatment of sin and atonement and (b) how the patristic writings can be read in light of Park's views.

To achieve the aims of this research project, this study focuses on five main objectives:

1. To examine critically the descriptions and relationships of evil, sin, and woundedness in the patristic literature. [Chapter 2]
2. To examine critically the correlations between the Irenaeus' account of sin and Park's use of the concept of *han* in his hamartiology. [Chapter 3]
3. To examine critically the relationship between sin and sickness in the writings of Irenaeus and other Eastern Fathers and identify correspondences with Park's use of *han*. [Chapter 4]
4. To examine critically possible correlations between Irenaeus' theories of atonement and Park's theory of triune atonement. [Chapter 5]
5. To present possible implications of the use of *han* in a theory of atonement for the work of restorative justice in the church and contemporary world. [Chapter 6]

1.5 CENTRAL THEORETICAL ARGUMENT

Andrew Sung Park's Triune Atonement encompasses a view of sin as related to *han* that intersects with Irenaeus' descriptions of sin and sickness, and forms a basis in working toward restorative justice in offering ethical implications for the study of sin and atonement.

1.6 METHODOLOGY

Because this research centres around an analysis of theological models, emphasis will be given to primary and secondary literature reviews of Park's view of sin, his use of *han*, and where Irenaeus' *Against heresies* intersects with and provides the foundation for Park's development and further

elucidation of the work of Irenaeus and other Eastern Fathers. This will govern the analysis at the beginning and implications of this work will be proposed at the end as the ‘final outcome’ of the study (Creswell, 2014 :51). The first chapter will provide the background, problem statement, and contexts for Park’s analysis of *han* and sin and the initial argument for grounding this work in Irenaeus’ *Against heresies*. This qualitative study uses a research design based on historical theology, using archival sources based on writings of the Fathers, and using a philosophical foundation based in the Eastern Fathers, particularly Irenaeus, and contemporary Minjung theology.

Chapter two will present a literature review of Park’s understanding of sin and use of *han* and where this can be found implicitly in the Patristic literature. Because not all the Patristic Fathers can be encompassed in this work the focus will be on Irenaeus’ *Against heresies* with the work of Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Clement of Alexandria (and the Alexandrian Fathers), and Maximus the Confessor to illuminate, clarify, and/or expand these texts. The particular topics discussed will include descriptions of sin used by the Early Eastern Fathers, structural evil personified as Satan, and the relationship between sin and woundedness.

Chapter three will critically examine the correlations between Irenaeus’ and other Eastern Fathers’ accounts of sin and Park’s use of the concept of *han* in his hamartiology. In order to examine the intersection between the hamartiologies of Irenaeus and of Park it will be important to outline the history of *han* used in Minjung theology. This will be a theological analysis of the history of the use of *han* in general, how it has been used theologically, and how Park uses it in his atonement theory. Then a connection will be made between Irenaeus’ understanding of sin and Park’s handling of the relationship between *han* and sin. Because there is no research that shows the relationship between *han* with the writings of Irenaeus, and other Eastern Fathers, this research seeks to fill this lacuna and draw out texts that talk about sin in relation to suffering and systemic evils, which are at the root of what Park calls *han*, and find correspondence.

Chapter four will explore the notion of sin as described as sickness in Irenaeus’ *Against heresies* and how this correlates with Park’s use of *han*. This will lead to an exploration of the relationship of sin and sickness, described as an analogue to bodily sickness, and the usefulness of this

description in analysing sin on a structural, communal, and personal level. This study uses the tools of historical theology and Asian sociology in order to analyse the view of sin as sickness. This chapter will also use tools found in philosophical anthropology and ethics to speak about human teleology in relationship to sickness and sin. Because both Park's and Irenaeus' projects have ethical concerns that relate to human nature, it is appropriate here to explore how the corruption of human nature influences how humans achieve their ends in relation to God, the human community, and creation.

Chapter five will examine how Park's notion of *han* is expressed in ransom and recapitulation theories of Irenaeus and the aim of restorative justice. This will be both an analysis of Park's own Triune Atonement and the theories of Irenaeus and other Eastern Church Fathers regarding redemption and how they seek restoration of relationship through healing of human nature, liberation, and repentance for the perpetrators of sin. This part of the study uses tools based on historical and contemporary Minjung theology in order to analyse the notion of *han* in ransom and recapitulation theories in light of restorative justice.

The sixth and last chapter will provide implications for the work of restorative justice by way of moving from a theoretical framework into a 'transformative framework'. This new model can be seen as an alternative framework in qualitative research. This is a viable alternative because 'post-positivists impose structural laws and theories that do not fit marginalized individuals or groups and the constructivists do not go far enough in advocating action to help individuals' (Creswell, 2013: 25–26; Mertens, 2003:166–168). This is the awareness that knowledge is not 'neutral' and 'reflects the power and social relationships within society'. To research constructively aids in the improvement of society. This model seeks to provide alternative avenues to diagnose problems related to theological anthropology, most importantly how sin is defined and the teleology of persons it describes. In other words, what do these descriptions of sin and *han* contribute to knowledge of human nature and human flourishing? If there are possibilities that are helpful for marginalized peoples and communities, then an alternative theological framework can advance the conversation toward addressing existential issues related to meaning and oppression as specified in the problem section. In addition, this chapter will provide possible application for all people in

society, not only the oppressed. Helpful application of both the models of Park and Irenaeus will provide solutions to these problems.

1.6 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This study will adhere to the North West University Ethical guidelines. The study is literature research and therefore poses no risk due to the fact that it does not incorporate human participants.

CHAPTER 2:

AN EXAMINATION OF DESCRIPTIONS AND THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN EVIL, SIN, AND WOUNDEDNESS IN IRENAEUS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The first chapter sought to address the research question as to where Andrew Sung Park's work on sin as related to *han* intersect with other writings of the Eastern Fathers, especially Irenaeus' descriptions of sin and woundedness and how this is implied in their work on redemption and atonement. Here, the primary focus is on descriptions of evil, sin, and woundedness in the writings of Irenaeus and other Eastern Fathers. Because much of work around Irenaeus is centred around his greatest extant contribution, *Against heresies* (*AH*), this will be the primary text, with commentary and insights drawn from secondary sources. The writings of other Eastern Fathers will also be used to expand on the descriptions given by Irenaeus and shed light on their analysis on sin and sickness.

In the Patristic writings, there is not an attempt to develop a 'formal and normative' doctrine of sin like later developments in theology (Babcock, 1999: 1059). Moreover, the topic discussed in context links with various other doctrines such as soteriology and Christian discipleship. Although Augustine was the first in the Latin tradition to attempt to systematise a doctrine of original sin, Irenaeus' *AH* presents some of the earliest descriptions of human relationships to evil and sin for the Eastern church. Here, Irenaeus narrates the problem of evil that held humanity captive and how Jesus, 'who was made flesh for our salvation' (*AH* I.I.10), became victorious over these forces. This story also involves descriptions of how this salvation takes place, i.e., Irenaeus' own use of redemption images. Because Eastern Fathers such as Irenaeus, in *AH*, and Athanasius, especially in *The incarnation of the word of God* (*De incarnatione verbi dei*), situate their theologies within the framework of the incarnation of God, their work is particularly concerned with how sin affects the body and how God's work of redemption is also embodied, in both the glorification of Christ and of humans in the resurrection of the dead. The basic confession that Jesus Christ is 'begotten, not made' (γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα) provides the focus not only to the theology of the Eastern

Fathers, but to their anthropology (Steenberg, 2009: 2). Hence, there is a connection between how sin is described and its effects, sickness and woundedness, in relationship to the body. This chapter attempts to point out these descriptions.

2.2 THE BIBLICAL ACCOUNTS OF SIN COMPARED IN COMPARISON TO THE EASTERN FATHERS' USAGE

2.2.1 Introduction

This section explores the Biblical 'sin' words within relevant contexts in order to examine the correlations between the Irenaeus' account of sin and Park's use of the concept of *han* in their respective hamartiologies. There is an ample array of meanings and metaphors for the English word 'sin' in the biblical text. Detailed analyses on the subject have already been made by Anderson (2009) and Lam (2016). The scope of this section is not to do a thorough textual analysis of these terms, but rather use the tools of the Biblical and grammatical scholar to show how these terms have been used in their settings. What this section contributes is a survey of the words in their Hebrew and Greek context specifically to compare how Irenaeus and other Eastern Fathers used and applied these notions. Because Irenaeus himself was a unique theological figure who 'shows how both the Jewish scriptures and the emerging New Testament were read in his day and by the older generation whose teaching he remembered' his exegetical contributions are examined as a way to gain insight into contemporary and former interpreters of his time (Parvis and Foster, 2012: 3). A major contribution in the field of Patristic hermeneutics is Kannegiesser (2006) who has assembled a type of 'handbook' as a guide to navigate Patristic and ancient Christian literature. This section therefore serves as a reference when discussing Andrew Sung Park's usage of the word and its meaning and significance. In doing so, this will achieve a primary goal of seeing how these intersections between Irenaeus and Park occur in biblical contexts.

2.2.2 Sin as *Chatta* (חַטָּא)

Even though the analysing of a word such as *chatta* and how it functions in the Scriptures might be useful, the word 'sin cannot be adequately understood apart from cultural systems within which

it is located' (Lam, 2016: 2). This is an important consideration since the reification of the concept of sin is an important aspect of analysing its usage in the Biblical text, i.e., how did these phenomena come about and how was language used to describe them. Breyfogle asserts that the notion sin in the Near East started with 'the feeling associated with evil, although evil as ethical wrong and evil as misfortune were not sharply differentiated as with us; that was bad which was bad for something' (Breyfogle, 1912: 542). The distinction between the ethical and the accidental is important since it sets the context that the concept of sin does not necessarily have ethical roots, but consists of how things might happen or not happen, which is similar to Aristotle's teleological phrase 'always or for the most part', found throughout his writings. H. P. Smith starts his analysis by comparing the 'Lexical tradition' of assigning the meaning of sin חָטָא as 'he missed the mark' as in the example of Judges 20:16b, 'everyone could sling a stone at a hair, and not *miss* (חָטָא)' (NRSV; Smith, 1911: 525, emphasis Smith's). Smith however asserts that Arabic lexicographers would talk about sin as 'he did wrong' or 'he strayed from the road' which makes a point about intentionality (Smith, 1911: 525). The question is then posed whether the primary meaning still applies since 'no one misses the mark or the road intentionally' (525). This means that חָטָא cannot simply mean a state of 'missing the mark' in a passive sense, but also some kind of positive act toward another. In the above passage in Judges the word is in the hiphil or a verbal stem formation *chatta* חָטָא to denote 'causative action'. Sin here consists primarily of an act, with intent, not only a state or violation. This sense is confirmed by Cover (2008) who shows the definition of 'to miss the mark or goal' to be the fourth definition. The first sense would be 'to be mistaken' which implies a sense of ignorance (Cover, 2008: 8209). Therefore, the first use of the word is primarily not ethical.

According to the *Anchor Bible dictionary (ABD)*, 'the three most important Hebrew roots for sin (חָטָא , פָּשָׁע , $\text{וַחַל$ [wy/w]) have been studied in detail by R. Knierim (1965). Of these, the root חָטָא is by far the most frequent, occurring some 595 times in the Hebrew Bible' (Cover, 2008: 31). Akkadian and other Semitic usages provide the definition of the Hebrew חָטָא to simply be —'to be mistaken, to be found deficient or lacking, to be at fault, to miss a specified goal or mark' (Cover, 2008: 31). Similarly, the *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon (GHCL)*, translates *chatta* חָטָא primarily as the

word for ‘sinner or sinful’ and gives the meaning of ‘a miss, a misstep’ or ‘slip of the foot’ (*GHCL*: 272, 2403).

Table 2: Primary Hebrew roots for sin and their meanings

HEBREW ROOTS	TRANSLITERATION	MEANINGS
חָטָא	<i>ḥṭ, chatta</i>	‘—to be mistaken, to be found deficient or lacking, to be at fault, to miss a specified goal or mark’ (<i>ABD</i> , 8209)
פָּשָׁ	<i>pš, pasha</i>	‘wilful, knowledgeable violation of a norm or standard.’ (<i>ABD</i> , 8209)
עָוָה	<i>wn, awon</i>	‘To bend, to curve’, ‘to act perversely, to sin’ (<i>ABD</i> , 8210)

In addition, Cover shows that the ‘root *ḥṭ* frequently expresses the ‘ethical failure of one person to perform a duty or common courtesy for another, as in the failure of a vassal to pay tribute to his overlord’ examples of which are given in the texts: 2 Kings 18:14; 43:9; 44:32; Exodus 5:16; Judges 11:27 (Cover, 2008: 31-32). These senses of *chatta* all correspond to an initial reading of these biblical texts and expressed in the cultural etymology of the word. Even though one meaning might be ‘to miss the goal or mark’ the sense of either intention or ignorance is cannot be absent from this definition. These values for the word *chatta* express ethical implications, that sin can be done against another, and this could be of wilful intention or through ignorance, either way the result can turn out to be malicious. Ignorance itself can be wilful or unintentional. Both kinds of ignorance share some kind of culpability. Similarly, sin is disobedience or rebellion toward God, such as the example given in 1 Kings 8:50: and forgiving your people who have sinned against (חַטֵּאֵי-לָךְ) you and all their transgressions (וּלְכָל-פִּשְׁעֵיהֶם) which they have transgressed (פִּשְׁעֵיהֶם), but it does not necessarily need be so (Browning: 2021). Sin is often committed towards another and these sins are to be dealt with through recompense toward the injured party. Nevertheless, sin often

related to punishment and consequence. In the nominative, *chatta* חַטָּאת ‘signifies “guilt,” “punishment,” or “sin” or “guilt offering,” indicating a close relationship between the sin, its consequences (punishment), and its solution (sacrifice)’ (Horn, 2014: 280). The word *awon* ‘can designate either the sin and crime itself, or the guilt which results from the sin’ as seen in the examples, (Childs, 1993: 576): ‘And Cain said to the LORD my punishment (עוֹנִי) is greater than I can bear’ (Genesis 4:13) and ‘Moses said to the people, “Do not be afraid; for God has come only to test you and to put the fear of him upon you so that you do not sin (לֹא תֵּחַטְּאוּ)”’ (Exo 20:20). Sin is a heavy burden that needs to be extricated from the person. In the *ashre* Psalm 32:1-2, ‘[h]appy are those whose transgression (עֲוֹנוֹ) is forgiven’ and ‘[h]appy are those to whom the LORD imputes no iniquity’ (יִיָּצֵר). All these senses of the word ‘sin’ show the guilt, weight, and relief of those who experience it and ‘if sin is not acknowledged and iniquity is hidden, then the body wastes away and strength dries up’ (cf. Psalm 32:3 ff)’ (Childs, 1993: 576). Bearing the heaviness of sin affects the body to the extent that it falls into physical corruption. In order to relieve this burden some kind of remedy must be sought.

Milgrom observes to his knowledge that ‘all versions and translations, old and new, render the *hattā’t* sacrifice as “sin offering”’, but goes on to say, ‘This translation is inaccurate on all grounds: contextually, morphologically, and etymologically’ (Milgrom, 1991: 253). Rather than using the *qal*, ‘to sin, to do wrong,’ Milgrom would render it in the *piel*, as a result ‘carries no other meaning than “to cleanse, expurgate, decontaminate”’ (Milgrom, 1991: 253, Koch, 1980: 318). Therefore, the better translation *korban chattat* would be ‘purification offering.’ The relevant part of this argument for this research is the idea violating the priestly sanctuary with ‘moral and ritual sins’ and how sin is dealt with. Apparently, humans can ‘drive God out of the sanctuary and the response to *chatta* חַטָּאת would then be the purification of *chatta* חַטָּאת. In this priestly context, Milgrom claims ‘Purification is neither healing nor theurgy’ (Milgrom, 1991: 43). In other words, people are not healed or cured, but purified, and in fact, purification comes after the act of healing. However, against the translation of *chatta* חַטָּאת as ‘purification offering’ is Noland’s rendering of the word as ‘deficiency offering’ (Noland, 2015: 606). The only exception to this is the case of the day of Atonement where there is a connection of חַטָּאת to purification. In most cases the word shares the ‘sense of deficiency, of falling short of a desirable state of affairs’ (Noland, 2015: 619).

This would meet the secular usage of ‘missing the mark’, but it also hints at the notion of corruption since to be corrupt is to fail in the way that is deficient of a particular teleology. Noland goes ‘a step further’ to say, ‘there is also a shared sense that the deficiency, renders something or someone unsatisfactory for the purpose of the relevant framework’ (Noland, 2015: 619). Outside of cultic usage *chatta* חָטָא is exclusive to persons but within cultic use it is also applied to objects and cannot be entirely a word relating to guilt. This has fascinating implications to the way *chatta* חָטָא can be applied and used for non-persons and how the thought usage of the word can involve all created things.

The term ‘sinner’ in Hebrew is the related form *chata* חָטָא and, in the Hebrew scriptures, the word is often universally applied to all people, ‘a universal moral flaw, a pandemic on the human race’ (Cover, 2008: 32; Nel, 2014: 283). Admittedly, there is a tension between the designation of ‘sinners/wicked’ and ‘the righteous’ צַדִּיק in some wisdom traditions and these categories are more prominent ‘when Israel’s national security was threatened’, while in other works of Wisdom such as Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and a few Psalms) ‘reason that theodicy proves the failure of this religious categorization when applied to the individual’ (Nel: 2014). When the text came to defending God’s justice in the presence of evil, it is the corruption of these particular individuals that break the moral fabric of society. In §§ 2.2.3 and 2.2.4, the Greek use of this word will continue to show the difficulty of both its universal and particular usages.

2.2.3 Sin as Hamartia (ἁμαρτία)

In the *Anchor Bible dictionary*, Sanders indicates that ἁμαρτία and its cognates translate as ‘sin’, ‘to sin’, and ‘sinners’ ‘can refer to almost any sort of error: missing the mark in throwing a javelin, committing a procedural mistake in sacrificing, or harming or disregarding others’ (Sanders, 2008: 8222-8223). Sanders also notes that in later Greek philosophy, from Plato to the Stoics and Cynics, this notion of sin also related to the notion of ignorance (Sanders, 2008: 8223). This connection is to knowledge is clearer than the Hebrew notion or at least more directly correlated. This cognitive relationship will be also a facet of the Eastern Fathers’ view of sin.

Another correspondence is between the word sin and the concept of alienation. Sanders posits that sin usually ‘refers to an individual transgression, the noun “sinner” often (not always) indicates a worse state’ (Sanders, 2008: 8224). Rather this is a life not lived in obedience to God, but outside of closeness to God. Here, the word ἁμαρτωλοί (*hamartōloi*) and עֲשָׂרָה (*resha*) ‘the wicked’ have similar meanings. The sense is that those who are sinners are those who are in wilful opposition of the divine and therefore have separated themselves from God. ἁμαρτωλοί can roughly be equated with the Hebrew adjective עֲשָׂרָה (*rasha*) meaning wicked or unrighteous. Taken as a noun עֲשָׂרָה conveys the sense of intentionality, and therefore casts sense different from *chatta*. Psalm 1:1 is a clear example of this, where the English renders: Blessed is the person who walks not in the counsel of the wicked (*rasha*, עֲשָׂרָה), nor stands in the way of sinners (*chatta*’, עֲשָׂרָה), nor sits in the seat of scoffers (NRSV).

The other primary notions of sin in the Greek NT are παράπτωμα (*paraptōma*), παράβασις *parabasis*, and παρακοή (*parakoē*) (Sanders, 2008: 8222), which mean ‘trespass’, ‘transgression’, and ‘disobedience’, respectively. These senses of sin imply violating a boundary and/or obligation, whether legal or not. A sixth definition of sin as listed is κακία (*kakia*) and πονηρός (*ponēros*) are adjectives meaning ‘wickedness’ (Sanders, 2008: 8222). These definitions are derived from the general meaning of evil or bad (κακός). For Thomas Aquinas, evil deeds, i.e. sins are a species of the category of evil (*malum*), in general. Related to these senses of sin is φθορᾶς (*phthoras*) which can be rendered as ‘a state of moral corruption and depravity’ and ‘moral corruption’ or ‘depravity’ (Louw et al: 1987: 959, 88.267). One example of φθορᾶς is in 2 Peter 2:19: αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς (they themselves are slaves of corruption). Louw posits that in some causes the ‘immoral desires’ make those who have them ‘slaves’ (Louw et al.: 1987: 959, 88.267). However, Irenaeus’ uses of the notion of corruption is the reverse; people are slaves to the apostate one and therefore become corrupt in their natures (*AH*, V, I, 1). This theological inversion comes from the view that the origin of sin is from the rebellion of the evil one, rather than from human beings alone and inextricably tied to Irenaeus’ view of anthropology.

2.2.4 *The use of ‘Sinner’ in the Gospels*

One quandary that Sanders encountered in his analysis of the term ‘sinner’ is in the usage in the Gospels, especially in Luke. A legitimate question is, ‘Why would Jesus’ association with certain groups, such as tax collectors, be the focus of criticism’ (Matthew 11:19; Mark 2:16). One possibility that Sanders proposes would be that that ‘most Jews, or at least the Pharisees, opposed the idea of God’s grace and forgiveness’ and since Jesus provided this toward these groups the Jewish religious order became harsh opponents’ (Sanders, 2008: 8225). However, Sanders objects to this critique by describing it ‘as historical fantasy in the service of theological anti-Semitism’ (Sanders, 2008: 8225). This interpretation pits religious Jews against Jesus, who was also Jewish, but read through the lens of Christian interpreters. The only other alternative available is to acknowledge that what offended the Pharisees and Scribes was that Jesus was communicating or was perceived to be communicating ‘that even heinous sinners who followed him were acceptable to God, and that he did not require of them the standard acts of atonement which are provided for in the law’ (Sanders, 1985: 204–8). This sense of ‘sinner’ must be reconciled with Jesus’ forgiveness of sin for the purposes of healing of sickness and his admonition to ‘sin no more’ (John 5:15). Later in § 3.2.2 the analysis will show how Park offers a third option to interpret the word ‘sinner’ that Sanders and others have missed. For now, we can take ‘sinners’ in one sense to be those who are alienated from God.

2.2.5 *Correspondence between the Biblical Accounts and the Early Eastern Church Fathers*

Even though the Early Eastern Fathers would mainly use Greek and extant sources that come from Latin, the pool of meanings they would have drawn were the Hebrew sources, albeit often in the Septuagint (LXX) and a ‘linguistic immediacy’ would still be present in both New Testament and Hebrew texts (Kannegiesser, 2006: 12). Even before Origen of Alexandria (c. 184 – c. 253) proposed the three-fold interpretation of Scripture, Irenaeus would speak about the rule of faith in a way that suggest a ‘spiritual’ method of exegesis (Lienhard, 2019: 56). Irenaeus suggests that the many ‘barbarian’ nations assent to the faith in Christ ‘having salvation written in their hearts by the Spirit, without paper or ink, and, carefully preserving the ancient tradition’ (*AH*, III, IV, 2).

Therefore, the exegetical techniques of the biblical texts by the Patristic scholars will not be the same as those of contemporary exegetes. What amounts to their ‘exegesis’ of the biblical text ‘was in fact a cultural inclusion of themselves as individuals or as a group into the symbolic frame offered to them by the Bible’ (Kannegiesser, 2006: 14). This ‘cultural inclusion’ was also a reaction to the gnostic teachings that made up much of their writings, such as the works of Irenaeus. How the Patristic writers will employ these biblical terms should be analysed as much in context as the biblical terms themselves.

2.2.6 The Non-Theological Meaning for Sin (ἁμαρτία) by the Eastern Fathers

Just as the meaning of *chatta* contain non-theological meanings, ἁμαρτία similarly has a mundane meaning as ‘slip’ or ‘fall’. For example, the *PGL* provides an example in Clement’s *Paedagogus* (παιδαγωγός) which states, ‘For who, when following one in the way, and then on the former falling into a pit, would not guard against incurring equal danger, by taking care not to follow him in his slip (ἁμαρτίας)?’ (*Paed.* 3.8). The word here indicates accidental or happenstantial, unintentional action. However, what precedes the fall is the act of following and not guarding against danger of someone who has already fallen. This is the avoidance of imitating someone who has slipped into danger. Explicitly, this text is about the remedy for ignorance and sapiential in nature. Similarly, in *Paed.* 1:2, Clement distinguishes between voluntary sins and involuntary sins. Here, he speaks about Jesus as ‘The Instructor’ and demonstrates how the incarnate Word helps to deliver people from voluntary transgressions, but also prevents those who are tempted to fall into involuntary sin (ἀκούσιον ἁμαρτίαν): ‘And the Instructor, as I think, very beautifully says, through Moses: “If any one die suddenly by him, straightway the head of his consecration shall be polluted, and shall be shaved,” designating involuntary sin (ἀκούσιον ἁμαρτίαν) as sudden death’. The distinction between voluntary acts and involuntary acts is made in order to show how sin is at root ‘irrational’ or ‘contrary to reason’, and that involuntary sins are what he calls ‘sudden’ which bring back the image of falling or slipping into the pit. For Clement, all sins are irrational in nature, but involuntary sins are of the species that are not controlled by the will. Therefore, it is necessary that the Instructor should ‘take[n] charge of [humanity] in order to prevent sin’ (*Paed.* 1:2). It is clear

in these usages of the word ἁμαρτία has both non-theological meanings, but an ethical and theological analogy can be drawn between these two senses.

2.2.7 The Theological Use of Sin (ἁμαρτία) in Irenaeus and the Eastern Fathers Compared to Biblical meanings

For Irenaeus, Adam's fall was attributed to three factors: 1) finitude of humans 2) ignorance and 3) the influence of the Devil who exploited Adam's weak nature (*AH*, IV, XXXVIII, 1-3, Bray, 1994: 39). Irenaeus' theological anthropology is based on the limitations that God imposed on God's creatures. According to Irenaeus the limitation imposed on humans was the reason why Adam fell; the proto-human was created as immature and this lack of development was what allowed for the deception to take place. This is also the reason ignorance is a second causal factor. Like the Hebrew use of *chatta*, ignorance is a contributing factor for sin. Ignorance, whether wilful or unintentional can lead to offences. The third factor, the Devil, shows the case of outside agency as a way to defend God's goodness. For Irenaeus, God is not the creator of evil and sin and plays no part in human humans being beguiled by the Devil. It is humans who gave in to the temptation because of their ignorance, and it is the Devil who 'stealthily sow the tares' and brought about the 'transgression' (*transgressionem*, παραβασιν) (Harvey, 1857: 303) (*AH*, IV, XL, 3; Behr: 200, 24, Matt. 13: 28).

Notions of 'sinner' and 'the wicked' correspond to the idea of alienation found in the Church Fathers, especially in the form of an extrinsic source called 'the apostate one'. For Irenaeus, his interpretation of the Wisdom of Solomon (2: 23-24) led him to conclude that sin first came into creation through the angel who was jealous of humanity. Humanity was 'led astray by' this angel and made humanity 'a sinner, persuading him to disobey God's command' (*AP* 16). The alienated apostate one also was the cause of humanity becoming a 'sinner' and therefore also alienated from God. The devil was then the 'author and originator of sin' which is for Irenaeus the explanatory cause, or etiology, of how sin came into the world. Before Irenaeus, speculation about the origin of sin and evil only reached back to the intertestamental period, but the 'Israelite theologians gave little or no attention to this issue' (Nel, 2014 :281). Israel's ethical monotheism was disinterested in the origin of sin, but rather focused on human action as the source of good and evil. In

comparison, Irenaeus sought to make clear how human development and outside influences brought human nature under bondage and how the incarnation set humans free.

In *The proof for apostolic preaching (AP)*, Irenaeus invokes Psalms 1:1 to say that the description of the counsel of the ungodly as ‘the counsel of the nations who do not know God’ and because of this they do not worship the God ‘Who is, true God’ and additionally cites the revelation of God to Moses as the ‘I Am [the one] Who Is’. Here, there is a contrast between the being verb that is described by the tetragrammaton, YHWH, and those who are the ‘ungodly’, ‘sinners’ (ἁμαρτωλοί), and the ‘pestilential’ (*AP*, pre. 2). The term ‘pestilential’, used by both the Behr and Smith translations, relates to pestilence or disease. Here, the connection between sickness and ‘sin’ is made. Those who are the pestilential are those who spread sickness from their seat; ‘for the pestilential are those who pervert not only themselves, but others also, by evil and twisted teaching’ (*AP*, pre. 2). Further, Irenaeus uses an image of a chair as ‘a symbol of a school’ (διδασκειον) and this sense of ‘sinners’ takes on the contrast of ignorance versus education. Those who are wicked spread their sin by way of heresies which mis-educate others. Irenaeus’ developmental psychology is clear in this interpretation. There is a relationship between ἀγνοια (agnoia) and ἁμαρτία (hamartia) where for Irenaeus the causality is that a lack in knowledge leads to disobedience to God. The *Patristic Greek lexicon (PGL)* provides the usage of ‘ignorance and sin’ and gives the second case for ἀγνοια as ‘the cause of sin’, e.g. Clement’s *Stromata* (*STR* 7,16): ‘Though men's actions are ten thousand in number, the sources of all sin are but two, ignorance and inability’. The third case says that ἀγνοια is usually the ‘consequence of sin’ (Lampe, 1961: 21). It seems that among the Patristic theologians there is conflicting thought as to which direction the causality lies. However, it is a clear relationship between ignorance and sin, and conversely education and redemption.

This sense of alienation also appears in *AH* III, XX, 1 in the form of the metaphor of Jonah and the fish where Irenaeus compares the swallowing of Jonah with the separation that humanity experienced in their sin against God. Irenaeus reads here that humanity had a part in the culpability to sin saying that ‘God did permit [humanity] to be swallowed up by the great whale, who was the author of transgression’. However, God also prepared a ‘plan of salvation’ for humanity which

God fulfilled through the divine Word. God's way of salvation was also manifested in God's desire for the Ninevites to repent rather than perish. Alienation is therefore coupled with the economy of salvation.

The Book of Wisdom similarly describes how sin and death entered the world through the 'envy of Satan': 'for God created man for incorruption (ἀφθαρσία) and made him in the image of his own eternity, but through the Devil's envy death entered the world' (Wisdom 2.23–4; Connolly, 2002: 21). Presley (2005) has shown how Irenaeus' view of the incorruptibility of flesh is interpreted in contrast to the gnostic manuscript found in the Nag Hammadi library. In *AH* is a thorough reading of 1 Cor. 15:53-54 and how Irenaeus sought to correct the gnostic teachings of his time. In the outset of his *AH*, sets the stage by quoting 1 Cor 15:54 that 'this mortal body shall put on immortality, and this corruptible shall put on incorruption' (*mortalis haec caro induet immortalatem, et corruptibile incorruptelam*, μὴ σιωπᾶν καὶ πῶς τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο σαρκίον ἐνδύσεται ἀθανασίαν; *AH* I, X, 3; Harvey, 1857: 96). Even though Irenaeus' translation is slightly different from a contemporary Greek text such as the SBL's, the use of the term incorruptible (ἀθανασίαν) and corruptible (φθαρτὸν) is present in both the Greek and Latin texts.

In Irenaeus' reading of the Corinthians passage, the Word 'became flesh and suffered' so that salvation could be shared with the Gentiles, which was revealed at the 'last times...rather than the beginning of the world' according to the economy of God's salvation. This incarnational theology is the basis of a hermeneutic that sees the redemption of the flesh rather than the expulsion of the flesh as in the Gnostic readers, i.e., a hope of a resurrection 'which will ultimately remove the restrictive grip of the corrupt physical realm and allow them to ascend as immortal and imperishable to their heavenly home' (Presley, 1: 2005).

Later in Book V, Irenaeus would take on the use of 1 Cor. 15:50, 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God' and the flesh is 'not capable of incorruption' as a proof text to the value of the soul over the body (*AH* V, II, 2). Irenaeus' counter argument is that 'flesh and blood' are indeed important and relevant constituents of God's redemptive history, loosely quoting Paul's epistle to the Ephesians 10:30 that 'we are members of [Christ's] body, of his flesh, and of his bones' (*AH* V, II, 3). Here, Irenaeus is adamant to point out that body and flesh cannot be spiritualized. How

the corruptible flesh and blood is vivified is through the gift of the flesh and blood given through the incarnation of the Word (*AH V*, II, 3). The granting of the glorified flesh is given as an eschatological event: ‘Word of God granting them resurrection...the Father, who freely gives to this mortal immortality and to this corruptible incorruption’ (Presley, 2005). Irenaeus’ exegesis of 1 Corinthians 15:42 is used to show the contrast between the corruption of sin and the incorruptible body when raised, so that ‘it is sown in corruption, it rises in incorruption’. Unless the body dies it cannot be raised to this state of immortality. This is the deteriorating effect of death as a consequence of sin onto the body (*AH V*, VII, 1). In Irenaeus’ reading of the text, it shows that ‘[w]ithin this economy, the sequence that Paul lays out in 1 Corinthians 15 does not result...in a salvation from flesh and blood, but rather shows salvation—creation and re-creation—being worked out in and through flesh and blood, beginning with that of Christ himself’. The redemption of human nature is not separate from the working out of the materiality of humanity. Behr continues by saying, ‘Flesh and blood do not, indeed, inherit the kingdom, but nevertheless it is inherited when humans allow themselves to be worked upon by the Hands of God’ (2013: 123). This sense is confirmed by Minns who clarifies that ‘Irenaeus himself seems to have been aware of the danger of so emphasizing the inclusion of the body in the plan of salvation that the importance of the spiritual dimension in the make-up of humankind would be lost from view’ (2010: 92). Instead of taking a totally materialistic view of flesh and blood inheriting the Kingdom, Irenaeus places emphasis on how the Spirit will elevate the flesh. Minns continues by saying, ‘Our flesh will not take possession of the Spirit; rather, the Spirit will take possession of our flesh and so transform it that, without ceasing to be flesh, it will be radiant with the glory of God’ (*AH V*.9.4; 10.2; 2013: 123). It is in this crucial relationship to Spirit that makes the redemption of the flesh possible. Therefore, these ‘two hands of God’ are discussed in §§ 4.2.1. and 5.4.4 are integral to Irenaeus’ theology of redemption and trinitarian theology not only images, but also in terms of redemptive symbols.

However, this immortality should not be considered completely as a future event. The incarnation provides a gift of incorruption just as the Eucharist ‘which is the body and blood of Christ’ nourishes the body (*AH V*, VII, 1). Here on earth, the forces of sin and evil are being overcome, not completely, but still as a testament to the historical nature of the enfleshment of the Word.

Humans receive this gift presently so that they could be informed as to the presence and glory of God, by ‘learning by experience that we possess eternal duration from the excelling power of this Being’ so that ‘we may neither undervalue that glory which surrounds God as [God] is’ (*AH V*, II, 3). Unlike the gnostic exegetes, learning is not merely an intellectual exercise, but an embodied act. For Irenaeus, reversal of corruption not only begins at the resurrection, but has started because of Christ’s resurrected body. Weinandy confirms this sense saying, ‘Moreover, Jesus through his resurrection has restored, in an unforeseen manner, our likeness to God by allowing us to share in his incorruptible and immortal nature’ (2003: 31-32). However, in another sense resurrection is the affirmation of incarnation. The resurrection is of the body and the incarnation is the entry point where redemption and *theosis* take place.

The sense of corruption in relationship to sin is that the decay of the body, and the full human person, is the result of the ravages of the death, the consequence of sin coming into the world. In Greek, the word ‘corruption’ (φθορά) and ‘incorruption’ (φθείρω) have parallels to the Hebrew concept of *mishchath* (מִשְׁחָת). The Hebrew is rendered as ‘that which is corrupt, or marred, corruption’ (*GHCLOT*: 1979, 515, 4893). The other Hebrew word that encompasses the concept of ‘corruption’, ‘emptiness’, or ‘decay’ is the word *shuach* (שׁוּאָה, *GHCLOT*: 1979, 816, 7845), but this is often rendered as ‘pit’ in most English translations (ex. Psalm 102: 4). *Shuach* is also related to Sheol (שְׁאוֹל), for example in Psalm 16: 10: ‘For you will not abandon my soul to Sheol; Nor will your holy one to undergo decay (שׁוּאָה)’. These Hebrew and Greek worlds show a connection, however loose, between death and the decay of the body. Corruption that leads to the ‘pit’ or ‘grave’ is not a foreign concept, especially in a world where death and disease were concepts tied to the moral aspects of sin (Breyfogl, 1912: 544).

For example, the in the non-canonical and apocryphal book, *Acta Philipp*, there is a connection between the sin of ‘of the first man’ and the work of Jesus on the cross that ‘made alive the death of [Adam’s] transgression. Jesus is said to be the ‘type’ or form of this Adam who will heal the ‘transgression’ παράβασις. These and other similar usage of the word transgression show the idea of the sickness or woundedness of sin. Gregory of Nazianzus (c.329 – c.390) interpreted Isaiah’s suffering servant in 53:4-5 in light of 2 Cor 5:21 and Gal 3:13. According to Gregory, in the

incarnation God was made ‘passible in’ Jesus’ flesh, but ‘impassable’ in the Godhead, ‘circumscribed in the body’, but ‘uncircumscribed in the Spirit’ so that the ‘one and same person’ could make anew ‘the entire humanity fallen through sin’ (*Epistle 101*). In this way, Jesus ‘was made sin and a curse in the sense that he took them upon himself, bore them, and removed them from sinners’ (Kannegiesser: 2006, 312). In this passage, Hebrew parallelism mirrors ‘our pain’ (תַּלְגִּינוּ) and ‘our suffering’ (מַכְאִבֵּינוּ), the perception of being punished and afflicted, with ‘transgression’ (פְּשָׁעֵנוּ) and iniquities. How the Theologian interprets this passage is to show the transgression and sin is taken upon Jesus’ body as a curative, a balm for the sins of humanity. It is also in *Epistle 101*, that Gregory makes his famous statement, ‘For what is not assumed is not healed,’ tying the infusion of human flesh with the restoration of humanity. What is seen is Gregory is contrary to what later Luther would describe as *Communicatio idiomatum* or communication of attributes, i.e., what is said of one person of the Godhead can be said of another. However, Gregory sees a ‘movement’ of Christ to be a way of sanctifying ‘presence sanctifies not just physical places in the Holy Land, but all of human life’ (Hofer, 2010: 41). In Gregory’s *Or.* 37.3, the description of Jesus’ movement from place to place accompanies the healing of people: ‘if [Jesus] had not condescended to infirmity if he had remained what he was, keeping himself unapproachable and incomprehensible, a few perhaps would have followed him’. If ‘transgression’ (παράβασις) can be taken as the crossing of a boundary, Jesus’ work in the world could be seen as the crossing of the boundaries in order to heal, as Hofer says, ‘Jesus, who chose fishermen, also casts out a net and passes from place to place (*topous ek topōn*)’ (Hofer, 2010: 40).

Often, the Eastern fathers would use notions of sin to give clarification and distinction to the effects of sin on the created order since Christian Gnosticism plagued interpretation of biblical texts. For example, Marcion of Sinope’s exegesis of Romans 7:11 brought him to the conclusion that sin was brought about through both the law and the Creator Demiurge of the Old Testament who destined humanity to sin (*Adv. Marc.* IV, 9, 5) (Kannegiesser, 2006: 450-451). Marcion sought to not only create the matter/spirit divide, but also to distinguish the Old Testament god of wrath from the New Testament god of grace. The gospel then was seen as a way to liberate (*liberatus*) humans from this Jewish Demiurge. Tertullian’s *Adversus Marcionem* was produced to counter the proto-gnostic concepts of Marcion who taught that ‘the stains of sins are passed from one to another, as

by contagion, if anyone makes contact with a sinner (*peccatore*)’ (*Adv. Marc.* IV, 9, 5). This extreme view of the reification of sin in the form of actual disease misconstrues the notion of sin and its relationship to matter. Marcion’s view of the sinner being ‘victimized by the Creator-Demiurge of OT’ sets a precedent for the inability of persons to choose (Kannegiesser, 2006: 450). This perspective was extremely similar to Manichaeism which rejected the incarnation and believed that humans were destined to sin based on their reading of Romans 5:12-21. The Eastern Fathers believed that this solution to human action was untenable and proposed a more nuanced conception: ‘For this reason, not a few of the Greek Fathers defended the concept that man was free to choose between good and evil and that Paul made no denial of this truth’ (Kannegiesser, 2006: 664). This can also be seen in Irenaeus where he counters the predestination of Valentinus where some humans are by nature good and others are by nature bad (*AH* IV, IV, 3) (Behr, 2000: 42). For Maximus the Confessor, the effects of sin are not found primarily in the will of humans, but instead it is a ‘corruption in their senses’ because ‘nothing that comes from nature is impure because it is God who is the cause of its existence’ he writes in *Quaestiones ad Thalassium* (*QT* 27). For Maximus, there is a relationship between the *logoi* λόγοι which reside in all things created and the logos which is the grounding for ‘the whole universe of created realities’ (Kannegiesser, 2006: 948). Because of this relationship, the essential nature of the created order maintains its incorruptibility while its teleology bends toward corruption and death. The contention and therefore sin is not with the nature of things, but instead ‘in the war of beings among themselves, but there is no opposition at all among their logoi’ (*QT* 27).

2.2.8 Summary of Conclusion

In order to answer the subsidiary question of giving descriptions of evil, sin, and sickness in Irenaeus and other Eastern Church resources, an analysis of terms in their biblical and then Patristic contexts is crucial to understanding the lexicon employed by the Eastern Patristic writers. The purpose of this section was to provide an overview of the terms in which Eastern writers drew from in order to talk about sin and sinners. Almost two millennia separate Irenaeus and Park and how these words were employed in their settings provide ways to create a meaningful conversation across the distance of time and culture. Because meanings of words are based on how words are

used (Wittgenstein, 1958) and not absent from their semantic contexts, these sin words have various religious and non-religious usages and will inform our understanding. Outside of language theory, the words can reflect many subtleties as they move from their Semitic roots into Greek and Latin meanings. Since both the Eastern Fathers and Park are exegetes in their own rights, the nuances of these sin were explored.

The varieties of meanings for the word rendered ‘sin’ in the English make it obvious that these sin words find meaning in their contextual usage. First explored is the OT meaning of sin. Hebrew texts show that *chatta* חָטָא and other words relate to the non-religious idea of ‘to miss the mark’, but applicable in some settings and the senses where ‘deficiency offering’ is applicable *chatta* חָטָא makes the most sense in terms of its relationship to persons and objects. In these personal and non-personal uses within Hebrew ritual, *chatta* חָטָא can relate to the teleology of persons and non-persons, how they function within the Hebrew cult of the holy. This also fits into the notion of alienation and sickness, where these principles will be tied to ideas of sin as moral acts, both against God and others. Even though in the Hebrew Scriptures God does not seem to be affected by sin, except where the cultic ritual is concerned, the primary object of sin is toward God. However, the varying sapiential traditions show the effects of sin within the community of Israel and how it threatens the communal life of God’s people.

Secondly, the Greek use of ἁμαρτία is closely related to Hebrew *chatta* חָטָא, but the sense of knowledge and ignorance is made explicit through the Greek philosophical tradition. What is also added is the notion of φθορᾶς that conveys corruption. Here the Eastern Fathers mined the sense of this meaning to show the effects of sin on the human being and make contrast to the incorruptibility of the Logos. Related ἁμαρτία is the plural noun ἁμαρτωλοί (*hamartōloi*) which brings to it the meaning of those who are alienated.

Lastly, we look at how Hebrew and Greek renderings of sin words will affect ways in which they will conceive of the effects of sin and the remedy for it. If sin is punished by God or community, or if sin is commuted and forgiven is related to the intended results that the theologian wishes to convey about the cosmic implications of sin. In other words, how interpreters render ‘punishment’ and ‘sacrifice’ will be a matter of how they read the biblical text through their cultural milieu and

the philosophical and theological questions the particular exegesis wishes to resolve. However, it is important to note that the Eastern Patristic literature has shown that sin is not a central problem, but rather death is because it was the consequence of sin. The reversal of death through incarnational redemption becomes important to writers such as Irenaeus. Furthermore, for Irenaeus ‘Adam’s sin conditions the salvation to be worked by the incarnate Word but it does not call it into existence’ (Minns, 1994: 87). Even in Park, there is the ‘other side of sin’ where the effects of sin, which is *han*, have a more central place in his theological project (Park, 2001). Where sin becomes relevant in these biblical contexts is in these various ways: alienation, sickness, ignorance, and corruption. These different senses of sin are covered in the next section which review and analyse texts from Irenaeus and the Eastern Fathers.

2.3 DESCRIPTIONS OF SIN IN IRENAEUS’ AGAINST HERESIES

2.3.1 Introduction

Arguably the most important work in Christian theology after the New Testament and up to the time of Augustine’s *Confessiones*, *AH* is not only the criticism of the arguments of Valentinus and other Gnostics, but a thorough exposition of Irenaeus’ own theology in relation to the *regula fidei* or *kanon tes aletheias* of the early church (*AH*, I, X, 1; II, XXVIII, 1). It should be noted also that in *AH* II, XXVIII, 1, Irenaeus refers to the Rule of Faith to mean ‘truth itself as a rule’ (Ferguson, 1999: 1004). The work is divided into five books, the first being detailed summaries of the positions of the Gnostics and the second being a refutation of their doctrines. The other books outline Irenaeus’ own theology in reference to the teachings of the apostolic church and his reading of Scripture. The theological themes of these books are Christology, soteriology, and incarnational or what I am calling a ‘somatic’ theology, respectively. These themes are structured in counterpoint to the dualism of Irenaeus’ Gnostic interlocutors.

Irenaeus lays out a vocabulary for depicting sin that is foundational for other early Church Fathers. There are at least three ways in which Irenaeus describes sin: as sickness, as alienation from human nature, and as corruption. In *AH*, all of these descriptions are interrelated not only that they are signifiers of sin’s effects, but also, they relate to Irenaeus’ notion of anthropology that integrates

both material and spiritual. Other descriptions of sin might appear in *AH*, such as the idea of bondage or slavery (de Wet, 2010), but these three descriptions are important in that they are interconnected and provide the vocabulary for other Early Church theologians in their own descriptions of sin.

2.3.2 *Sickness*

In section 4.1, a more detailed discussion of sin and sickness will take place in order to compare it with Park's model. However, here we can sketch out how Irenaeus uses this language as it relates to alienation and corruption. In *AH*, sickness is both a synonym for sin and a way to talk about the results of sin. Sickness is also a cause of the woundedness of Christ and humans; it is the perpetuating of sin. For Irenaeus, these wounds are what Christ seeks to heal. There are parallel relationships between life and death and healing and sickness and this is made clear in Irenaeus' use of a spiritual hermeneutic. He reads Lazarus' resurrection as a symbol of what life will be like in the *parousia*. (*AH* V.XIII.1) Irenaeus writes that the binding of Lazarus was a symbol (*symbolum*, Lt) of a person who was 'bound in sins'. Therefore, the liberation of Lazarus provides freedom both of sin and of the sickness that led him to death.

Irenaeus makes a comparison between Jesus' raising of Lazarus and the resurrection at the end times. Lazarus symbolizes a person 'bound to sins' and his freeing from those bondages symbolizes 'those who were healed were made whole in those members which had in times past been afflicted'. He clarifies this by making a typological statement that the Lord was 'able to extend both healing and life' and this 'prefigures eternal things by temporal'. Lazarus' resurrection also signifies not only what Jesus does in the present, but it also speaks of 'the future resurrection' where 'the dead shall be raised'. The resurrection of Lazarus was to show the final resurrection of humanity where the ones who have done good would enter into 'the resurrection of life,' with the emphasis being on *life*, and those who have done evil would enter into the resurrection of judgment. Implied in this schema is that there is a different kind of death, a resurrected death, that is equated to judgment.

It seems in Irenaeus' schema, that life (*vita*, Lt) is more than biological life (βίος, Grk), but equivalent to quality of life or *zōē* (ζωή, Grk; Liddell and Scott, 1889: 316). We can distinguish that 'βίος i.e *life*, is not animal life (ζωή), but *a course of life, manner of living*, Lat. *vita*'. Life is the result of Jesus' work of raising and is not only a mere fact of biological existence. Therefore, the healing can be assumed to be more than the physical healing of Lazarus. This maps onto the usage and meaning of these passages, especially in John's Gospel, where there is the consistent use of ζωή where the qualifier αἰώνιος (Grk—eternal) signifies a quality of life rather than duration of life. At least in the context of the Gospel of John, ζωή αἰώνιον seems to have the connotation of life that is set in the present by the future promise of life. In the entry on ζωή, Bromiley posits, 'If future *zōē* is established by Christ's work, this work has already taken place and the resurrection of the dead is simply the consummation of the replacing of the old aeon by the new' (Bromiley, 1985: 259).

Physical sickness led to the death of Lazarus John 11:3, and in Irenaeus' reading, this sickness is symbolic of bondage to sin. It is not unimportant to note that Jesus statement in this narrative that this sickness 'does not lead to death'. Lazarus was resurrected is presumed to later die, so the death that Jesus is talking about is another kind death in contrast to his statement 'I am the resurrection and the life'. This sickness was terminal in that it led to the death of Lazarus, but not ultimately terminal because of the liberation from death that Jesus offered Lazarus and therefore humanity. So, sin is ultimately defeated and those who are in bondage to sin and death are freed. This illustrates again Irenaeus' depiction of the redemption as told in *AH* V.I.1 where the 'Almighty Word' liberates humanity's alienated nature and reiterates an often-cited verse: 'For the glory of God is a living human being; and the life of humans consists in envisioning God' (*Gloria enim Dei vivens homo, vita autem hominis visio Dei*, translation mine; *AH* IV.XXXIV.7).

In *AH* V, XVII, Irenaeus specifically talks about how God forgives sins and uses a passage from the Gospels dealing with healing to show how God forgives humans in the work of Jesus' ministry. Matthew 9:2–8 is a story about a paralytic man who was healed and the crowds who saw it were filled with awe and gave glory to God. Irenaeus shows the link of the forgiveness of sins in this passage to the healing of the man by using the paralytic man as a type for humanity. Irenaeus reads

that in this act of healing Jesus shows that ‘he is himself the voice of God, by which man received commandments, which he broke, and became a sinner; for the paralysis followed as a consequence of sins’ (AH V, XVII, 2). Irenaeus uses the story of the singular paralytic man to make a larger theological statement about the how sin is a sickness that has paralyzed and crippled humanity. Sickness is a way to speak about sin’s effects, but also is a helpful way to analyse sin itself. Irenaeus speaks about people who broke the commandments that they received and this in turn brought about sickness. We can assume that by the commandments Irenaeus means the Decalogue which contain commands both towards both God and others. Because physical sickness involves being out of harmony with one’s body, physical ailments speak of an un-syncopation with ourselves and the world. Like sin, it is about being in the right relationship. Sickness is also linked with ignorance. In AH III, V, Irenaeus shows how the doctrines of his opponents ‘bring on diseases and increasing ignorance’ and that their behaviour is not like those ‘who heal, or who give life’ (AH III, V, 2). He believes that this ignorance requires healing and that in order for a person to ‘heal the sick’ they require knowledge of their patients. For Irenaeus, ignorance of the truth leads to sin and is analogous to sickness and disease.

2.3.3 *Alienation*

Irenaeus’ view of human redemption is one of restoration of human nature from an alienated (*aliēnātus*, Lt) state to one that fulfils humanity’s calling as persons made in the image and likeness of God, deification. In a key text, AH V.I.1, Irenaeus speaks of the ‘mighty Word’ who redeems (*redemptio*, *redimens*) humanity ‘by his own blood’. The effect of this redemption was to reunite human nature to God. Irenaeus depicts humans being led into captivity by the ‘apostate one’ and Christ’s non-violent exchange of his life for theirs. Twice the language of non-violence is used, ‘*non cum vi*’ (without violent force) and ‘*non vim inferentem*’ (without inflicting violence). Also, this can be compared with a description by Maximus the Confessor in *Letter 2: On love*: ‘For since the deceitful devil at the beginning contrived by guile to attack humankind through his self-love, deceiving him through pleasure, he has separated us in our inclinations from God and from one another, and turned us away from rectitude’ (396, D) with Irenaeus’ account. Therefore, alienation is ‘contrary to nature’, which for humanity is to be, by nature, ‘property’ of God. Sin is therefore

distance and separation from being under God's ownership. It is to become foreign to God and this separation is a shift in what is the nature of humans. Alienation is the result of sin, but it is also a state of sin in which humanity was in before the redemption.

In *Nicomachean ethics* 1.7, Aristotle had defined human nature in relationship to rationality: 'the function of a human being is activity of the soul in accordance with reason or not without reason' (*EN* 1.7, 1098a1-5). This is commonly known as Aristotle's 'functional argument'. In a different take, Irenaeus seems to define human nature as relational, i.e., how one is owned by God. Human nature does not only mean how one does what one does in regard to reason, but how one is related to the divine. This is an important distinction because in Irenaeus' anthropology, humans achieve their fullest form, in relation to how they are the children and disciples of God. Since the apostate one had taken them captive, only their release could bring them back under the family of God. However, in relationships, one achieves one's true form, i.e., human nature, through friendship, kinship, and union with the divine, therefore achieving one's end.

Irenaeus also refers to the term 'enemies' (*inimici*) in which he quotes Colossians 1:21-22 to show contrast between the idea of those 'estranged and hostile' to the phrase 'friendship with God' (*amicitiam adduxit Deo*) (*AH* V, XIV, 2). Image of bondage is also invoked, but it is in reference to the 'flesh' which was kept under the 'bondage of sin.' Here, human nature is 'enfleshed' and therefore not spiritualized as something apart of the body. As we will see, this is in keeping with Irenaeus' view of an incarnational or 'somatic' redemption, one having to do with the body of Christ. Sin as alienation therefore has a holistic aspect that is both relational and embodied. This is similar to Maximus the Confessor's view of alienation when he describes alienation as both against others and also subdividing human nature: 'The self-love and cleverness of men, alienating them from each other and perverting the law, have cut our single human nature into many fragments' (*Various texts*, 46). For Irenaeus, alienation is both an aspect of sin—to sin is to alienate one from God—and the result of sin: 'that they might receive remission from the Lord when He should be present, having been converted to Him, from whom they had been alienated because of sins and transgressions' (*AH* V, X, 1). Irenaeus quotes from Ps. 58.3 to include the aspect of embodiment of sin and its effects on human nature in which the wicked are described as

being alienated ‘from the womb.’ Therefore, Irenaeus will describe redemption taking place also in the flesh.

Alienation also applies to knowledge and pedagogy. Irenaeus applies the term to being ‘alienated from the doctrine of Christ’ and therefore the ‘truth’ (AH V, XIII, 2). This is consistent to the view of human progress in terms of learning where primitive humanity is compared to children (AH IV, XXXVIII, 1). The question is posed, ‘Why man was not made perfect from the beginning?’ and Irenaeus sees the answer as an aspect of human development. Human beings are like ‘infants’ who cannot receive adult learning and therefore are not disciplined (Cf. Irenaeus, *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* (DAP), 14). Here, Irenaeus’ anthropology is a shift in language, in seeing humans not only as bound to the apostate one, but also immature. However, there is an overlap in language because humans under captivity of the apostate one also ‘rendered us its own disciples’ (AH V.I.1). He uses the passage in Colossians to show how God’s enemies are also ‘alienated, ...from God’s knowledge by evil works’ (alienati,...cogitationi ejus in operibus malis, Lt cf. ἀπηλλοτριωμένους,...τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς, Grk). In Irenaeus’ use of ‘mind’ or ‘cognition’ (διανοία, Grk or *cogitationi*, Lt) grounds the idea of alienation as the separation due to the development of one’s mental capacities.

For Irenaeus, humanity’s teleology toward maturity and therefore perfection was thwarted by the influence of satanic powers. Alienation from proper nature is a factor of not only the relationship between God and humans, but also the ability of persons to achieve their fullest potential, in both being and knowledge. Irenaeus also uses the term alienation to refer to Gnostics who are ‘alienated...from the truth’ (AH, III, XXIV, 2) and to show how the Antichrist is referred as ‘the other’ by Jesus in reference to John 5.43 (AH, V, XXV, 4). In regard to Gnostics and others who do not know the truth, alienation refers to knowledge that can lead to salvation, but in reference to the Antichrist it refers to a constant state of rebellion that leads to otherness.

2.3.4 Corruption

In Irenaeus’ anthropology, humans were prone to corruptibility at the outset because humans were not offered the gift of eternal life. Humans were however preserved by God through their

communion with God; incorruption was the intent of God for humanity. Corruption came as a result of sin and breaking of the intimate relationship with the Creator (*AP*, 15). In *De incarnatione*, Athanasius asks if Adam's repentance could correct the mistake of the fall, but answers that 'repentance gives no exemption from the consequences of nature but merely loses sins' (*DI*, 7). Repentance could not turn back the tide of corruption of human nature, which for Athanasius leads back to a state of non-being. This was the cosmic result of sin, and as Louth comments, 'corruption, and its consequence and sign, death, need to be arrested' (1996: 62). For Irenaeus, corruption is connected to both the human body and spiritual/intellectual life and therefore the solution to corruption must also contain a bodily component.

Irenaeus uses the word corruption/corruptible (*corruptiō /corruptibilis*, Lt; φθορά/φθαρτός) in contrast to the incorruption/incorruptible (*incorruptiō, incorruptibilis*, Lt; ἀφθαρσία/ἄφθαρτος Grk) or the eternal. This term is often conjoined with the term death to say that corruption leads to death. Corruption is a result of sin, but also an indicator of sin. In *AH* I, X, 3, Irenaeus speaks of the incarnation of the Word and cites 1 Cor. 15:54 (from Latin translation of the text, 'this mortal body shall put on immortality, and this corruptible shall put on incorruption') to speak of the body of Christ and the body of believers that God created and joined the Gentiles. Irenaeus applies the idea of corruption to the state in the Gentiles were in before God made them 'fellow heirs, and of the same body'. Corruption is applied in a spiritual way to the body, as in a group of people, to show how incorruption to is applied to the body of Christ, the Church. However, this application is not completely spiritualized since Irenaeus lifts the term from a text that speaks of incorruption in terms of physical transformation of the body. Corruption therefore is tied to the body in that it is the decay of it. Irenaeus will also speak of the mortality of the body in a more nuanced way in *AH* V, VII, 1, but here corruption has infected the whole human person.

In *AH* I, XXIV, Irenaeus outlines the doctrines and arguments of the Christian Gnostics, Saturninus of Antioch and Basilides, and makes a contrast between the views of corruption as applied to the body and soul. For Basilides, Christ 'appeared (*appāreō, appāruisse*, Lt)...on earth as a man' rather than taking the form as a man, i.e. the incarnation (*AH* I, XXIV, 4). Therefore, Christ did not suffer as a man and instead it was Simon who was 'transfigured' into the appearance of Christ

to act as a substitute on the cross. This Gnosticism also is directly related to the Docetism that emerged in the same philosophical soil in Antioch and Alexandria (Pearson, 1990: 203). The rejection of Christ's embodiment and suffering is tied to the view that the corruptible nature of the body is incompatible to the incorruptible nature of the divine and *nous*. Christ therefore could not embody corruption and must therefore only appear to be human. This is made clear in Irenaeus' summary of Basilides's view that 'salvation belongs to the soul alone, for the body is by nature subject to corruption' (*AH* I, XXIV, 5).

In *AH* I, XXX, 1, Irenaeus also summarizes the gnostic views Ophites and Sethians. Their creation myth starts with a 'primary light' called Bythus that is described as 'blessed, incorruptible, and infinite'. This light is called the 'Father' and 'is styled the first man' and this emanation also produced the Son and the Holy Spirit. The only talk regarding the creation of the universe is the separation of elements. There is no mention of earth and formation of man through earth, which assumes a kind of materialism. Their Christology involves Christ descending into the man of Jesus and an account of the crucifixion where Christ and Sophia depart into 'the state of an incorruptible *Æon*' (*AH* I, XXX, 13). This kind of description is invariably a derivative of the Docetic description of Christ only appearing to suffer rather than actually suffering. Irenaeus claims that Valentinus and other Gnostics derived these ideas ultimately from Plato and the Pre-Socratics (*AH*, I, XIV, 4) and that these philosophers hold fast to the idea that 'God is a slave to necessity' in that those who are contingent, and therefore corruptible beings, cannot become necessary beings and incorruptible beings. Therefore, God is so bound to these laws of nature 'that [God] cannot impart immortality to what is mortal, or bestow incorruption on what is corruptible' (*AH*, I, XIV, 4). Moreover, Irenaeus does not see this hard divide between the spiritual and material, or at least he does not see that this demarcation is for God an insurmountable obstacle to overcome.

The importance for Irenaeus in setting out these arguments at the outset of his work is to show the difference between what he perceives as Christian doctrine and those of the 'heretics'. This also sets the stage for outlining a view of sin, and therefore redemption, that not only involves the soul, but the body. But perhaps, more importantly in relationship to the idea of corruption, is that it does not apply only to the body, but also to the soul.

After Irenaeus lays out the arguments of the Gnostics and those who hold ideas contrary to what he deems Christian teachings, he then gives an account of the revelation of God (*AH* III, V, 1). Jesus' ministry reveals God's work among the Jews, 'those of the circumcision', restores freedom to humanity, and also 'bestows upon them the inheritance of incorruption' (*AH* III, V, 3). This incorruption is a gift from God and efficacious in contrast to the idolatry that the Gentiles beheld in the 'stocks and stones' in which they believed to be gods. Instead, it is 'by means of [God's] creation' that God 'did nourish, increase, strengthen, and preserve [God's people] in being' (*AH* III, V, 3). Here Irenaeus is intentional to point that that part of God's making of incorruption is related to God's created act. It is in this that God preserves the 'being' of things. Therefore, corruption is the state in which creation is not preserved. Sin has caused what was uncorrupted, i.e., God's work of creation, to be corrupted.

Contrary to Gnosticism, in *AH*, corruption is, however, not necessarily tied to the flesh or materialism. Instead, it is part and parcel of the relationship of the created order to sin. In narrating the redemption of the 'first Adam' in *AH*, III, XXIII, 1, Irenaeus shows how the first man was corrupted by the serpent and therefore lost life. Like the ideas of sickness and alienation, life is linked to the state of humans before their disobedience. This life is qualified because even though the first man lost life and was 'abandoned to death', humans continued to live, but in a state of corruption. According to Irenaeus, the serpent beguiled the first couple, causing them to sin and bringing death upon themselves as a consequence. However, the serpent also 'led man captive' even though he had 'wrought death' in the couple (*AH*, III, XXIII, 1). This contradiction can only be resolved if the death mentioned signified the state in which the humans were separated from God by sin. Corruption is therefore a state of gradual decay even though humans continue to exist biologically. However, because of the relationships between body and spirit, biological life suffers a corruption that leads to biological death. So, corruption in Irenaeus is the state decaying human nature that has been brought on because of sin and death. Humans do not relate, and therefore function, toward their proper ends.

2.3.5 Conclusion

What can be seen in the initial evaluation of sin as sickness, alienation, and corruption is that Irenaeus and the Eastern Fathers sought to show how sin affects the totality of human nature, both in soul and body. Stories about the resurrection of Lazarus and the healing of the paralytic man not only point to the eschatological hope of the resurrection, but also shows the healing power of the redemption that liberates human nature. In this way, alienated humans are brought back into union with God and the corruption of that the body faces in death is eliminated in the hope of the resurrection. Alienation also relates to pedagogy and discipleship and thus appropriately linked to the notion of perfection found in the Eastern Fathers. Corruption is an aspect of the human body as a result of sin, but Irenaeus points out the false dichotomy between the mind and body to how the soul is also corrupted and in need of redemption. Against the Gnostics who exalt soul over body, Irenaeus shows how corruption can infect human nature and bring decay onto relationships.

2.4 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVIL, SIN, AND WOUNDEDNESS IN IRENAEUS' *AGAINST HERESIES*

2.4.1 Introduction

For Irenaeus, *AH* is an exposition of both constructive theology and a polemic against the heresies against gnostic interlocutors. Integral to gnostic dogma is the reification of evil in the form of matter and the subsequent devaluing of embodied existence. In Irenaeus, the language of evil, sin, and wounded is analysed in relationship to one another in order to properly give descriptions of how sin is used.

2.4.2 Evil

Irenaeus navigates the relationship between what is described as evil and to sin and therefore the description of sickness. In *AH*, evil is presented as a personal figure in the form of Satan, the apostate one, or the serpent who is the adversary of God and seeks to deceive the primitive couple and leads them, who are the representatives of humanity, into captivity. Irenaeus uses the language

of Matthew 12:29 in describing Satan as the ‘strong man’ who is needed to be bound up and his spoils plundered. In this reading, Irenaeus says that humans were the ‘vessels’ in the strong man’s house and required liberation. In order to do this, a reversal of fortunes need to occur, where the strong man is captured and humans are freed. This is further explained in Irenaeus’ description of the redemption in *AHV*, I, 1. But first, Irenaeus starts with this description of evil to set the stage for the relationship between evil in general and acts of evil, i.e., sin, and the results, woundedness and sickness.

2.4.3 Sin as Moral Evils

For Irenaeus, attributing evil to satanic influence does not downplay human culpability. In *AH IV*, XXXVII Irenaeus devotes an entire section to speak about human free will in relationship to the capacity to do good and evil. God made humans ‘a free [agent] from the beginning’ (*liberum eum Deus fecit ab initio*, Lt., *AH IV*, XXXVII, 1) and ‘placed the power of choice’ (*posuit autem in homine potestatem electionis*, Lt). Irenaeus argues that if God had predetermined some to be bad and others to be good then ‘these latter would not be deserving of praise for being good...nor would the former be reprehensible’ (*AH IV*, XXXVII, 2). Irenaeus adheres to a classical, Greek definition of ethical action theory, going back to Homeric epics (8th century BC), in which acts are deemed moral if they are either praiseworthy or blameworthy (Eshleman, 2016). Acts must be truly voluntary in order for them to be moral.

In his refutation of ‘the doctrines of the heretics’, Irenaeus shows a highly sophisticated view of human action where not only are deeds evaluated as moral under view of the act, but also under the description of the intention. ‘Not only is the adulterer rejected, but also the man who desires to commit adultery’, says Irenaeus (*AH*, II, XXXII, 1). Even though he is taking his cue from Jesus’ teaching in the Gospels, it is in his application of these ideas into an action theory that is highly significant. Irenaeus not only sees murder as highly condemnable, but also ‘being angry at a brother without cause’. Here, his statements about moral acts are not only about the absence of doing wrong, but about the need to do good towards others. They move from not only discouraging hating of others to loving the enemies, from not swearing falsely to not speaking evil towards one’s

neighbour. This is not only a negative application of the law, proscriptive, but a positive application of moral acts and what it means to be a disciple of Christ, prescriptive.

Irenaeus sees these acts of long-suffering and kindness even toward those who do injury to Christians are for the purpose of the salvation of unbelievers. Those who are ‘in truth [Jesus’] disciples’ receive the gift to perform miracles ‘so as to promote the welfare of other [people]’ and therefore they have the ability to drive out demons, heal the sick, and even raise the dead (*AH*, II, XXXII, 4). Moral acts of good lead to miraculous acts that contribute the benefit of others. For Irenaeus, there is a close link between moral agency and participation in Jesus’ ministry in that acts are not discrete and individual in themselves, but have a greater influence in that they are to be directed toward the good of others and that they participate in the ministry that God has given the Church (*AH*, II, XXXII, 4). This puts a teleological spin on the nature of acts.

2.4.4 Woundedness

Woundedness is the connective tissue that links the work of Irenaeus and Park that are discussed in the next chapter. It is the injury or wound (*vulnus*, *volneratio*, Lt.) to a person that can perpetuate the sickness of sin. Here woundedness pertains to 1) how Christ actually felt pain and desire, contra the claims of the Docetics, and how woundedness provided compassion for others 2) how the serpent caused the woundedness of humanity and 3) how woundedness can be caused by the spread of improper teaching to others. These passages show the harm that can be caused by sin, but also the vulnerability of the body to those wounds. The wounds both speak of the effects of mortality and sin in the world.

In *AH* III, XVII, Irenaeus begins the section by refuting the Gnostics, specifically the Docetic theologians, who ‘allege that [Christ] took nothing from the Virgin [birth]’ so that they can say that he ‘cast away the inheritance of the flesh’ (*AH* III, XVII, 1). This ‘inheritance of the flesh’ brings with it all of its cravings and vulnerabilities, such as hunger that Jesus experienced during his desert fasting. In addition, Irenaeus quotes Psalm 69:27 (26), ‘They have added to the grief of my wounds’, to illustrate the added injury of persecution to someone who already was ‘wounded’ (*AH*, III, XXII, 2). Other examples of woundedness include the weeping over Lazarus’ death, his

fervent prayers at the Mount of Olives which shed drops of blood, and the piercing of his side at the crucifixion. Irenaeus calls these ‘tokens of the flesh’ and make up Christ's recapitulatory work (*AH*, III, XXII, 2). These are examples of woundedness speaks of injury that the Christ continued to endure within his lifetime that was brought on by others, not only at the event of the crucifixion. This woundedness is what brings healing upon humanity.

Woundedness is also an avenue of compassion. Irenaeus remarks that, Christ ‘both suffered, and did Himself exculpate those who had maltreated Him’ (*AH*, III, XVIII, 5). This is the root sense of the word ‘wound’ (*vulnus*), where Christ made himself vulnerable to all. For Irenaeus, the cross was the manifestation of the command to ‘Love your enemies, and pray for those that hate you’ (Matt. 5: 44) and this act of compassion was contingent on the suffering that Christ had endured. In other words, Christ turned injury into an instrumental means of forgiveness, rather than a cause for vengeance. Without this suffering that takes place in the flesh, there could not be this kind of salvific work. The Docetics believe that somehow Christ only appeared to be of the flesh, one who ‘flew away, and sustained neither injury nor insult’ (III, XVIII, 5). However, Irenaeus believes that this is based on a ‘supposition’ that somehow there is a ‘better’ Christ who does not have to endure this injury than a Christ who is willing to forgive even though he suffers from the treatment of others. Here, Irenaeus links the redemption of humanity with the wounds suffered by the Christ through immediate human agency.

In comparing the Law to belief in Christ, Irenaeus, speaks of salvation from the ‘old wound of the serpent’ (IV, II, 8). This is an intentional recalling of the story of the Bronze Serpent in Numbers 21 and also two references in John (12: 32; 3:14). Irenaeus says that there is no other way that people could be saved from this injury but by putting faith in the one who is ‘lifted up from the earth upon the tree of martyrdom’ (*AH*, IV, II, 8). The Serpent represents both evil, and the sin that was brought on by the disbelief in God as described in the story in Numbers. For Irenaeus, the Law is a custodian or ‘pedagogue’, as he quotes Paul in Galatians (3:24), that tutors one to believe in Christ and therefore find treatment for their wounds.

Related to belief and teaching, Irenaeus shows the heretics have hurt or wounded others through their ‘blasphemies’. Here, Irenaeus connects the beguiling of the Serpent with the deceptions of

those who seek to steer others away from the teachings of the Church. The Serpent, in which evil takes ‘form’, becomes the instrumental means by which the primitive couple is deceived and ‘evil is spread abroad among’ people. The one who has ‘wounded’ humanity has spread this infection among others in the world. This is where Irenaeus’ focus on education connects woundedness to alienation. Because of the evil that befell people, they continue to spread heresies and therefore continue to live in an alienated state, one separated from God and others. The intellectual life and the embodied life are most often integrated components for Irenaeus; the Spirit, and therefore the spiritual life, is what transforms and brings the flesh to the Spirit (Minns, 2010: 91; Behr 2013a: 209). Basil the Great’s *Homily in times of famine and drought* and Gregory of Nazianzus’ *On the Father’s silence, because of the plague of hail*, are examples of where these Cappadocian Fathers see the oppression of the poor and the calamity of that befalls the community as the direct result of ‘the unrighteous actions of its people’ (Ihsse, 2012: 106). These Eastern Fathers were working out the relationship between evil and sin as continual wounding of others in their practical theologies.

These cases of wounding and woundedness do not only describe human malice and its effects, but also how sin perpetually affects others, and therefore the entire cosmos. This woundedness requires treatment and can lead to the sickness that plagues humanity, the ‘wounding [people] unto death, by teaching blasphemy against God our Maker and Supporter, and derogating from the salvation of \[humanity]’ (AH, IV, pre, 4). There is a cycle of sickness that is a negative *quid pro quo* between wounding and woundedness. Therefore, woundedness is a continual condition for humanity and seeks a curative solution.

2.4.5 Sickness in Relationship to Woundedness

To revisit the reference to the passage regarding the paralytic in Matthew 9:2–8, sin can be seen as acts that not only are violations of right standing with God, but also with others and the world. Irenaeus reads that in this act of healing Jesus shows that ‘he is himself the voice of God, by which man received commandments, which he broke, and became a sinner; for the paralysis followed as a consequence of sins’ (AH V, XVII, 2). Humans received the law that taught them how to act in relationship with God, others, and the world, but they violated these laws and therefore suffer

sickness as a consequence of the transgressions. Sickness is an appropriate description since they are out of relationship and out of harmony with themselves and their environment. Sickness is the result of the wounding from sin that go untreated and God is not the only violated party, but the effects of sin reach across all aspect of human nature, and more generally the natural order. Human actions, especially moral actions, affect the entire universe (Osborn, 2001: 101-102). This is true in the case of the primitive couple's expulsion from the garden, but also true for human interactions in general.

This sickness, both spiritual and general, is caused by the actions that people commit towards one another and to God. This is not to say that sicknesses, such as physical ailments, *per se* and sin are to be correlated as one to one relationship. Correlations are often made in three ways: as the effect, as the cause, or a third relationship. For Irenaeus, sickness and sin correlate in that sin can be the cause of sickness, but in general. For example, in story of the paralytic man that Irenaeus cites (*AH* V, XVII, 2, Matthew 9:2–7) it would be inappropriate to say that somehow the paralysis that befell this man was the result of some specific sin. In *AH* V, XV, Irenaeus speaks about the resurrection of the dead and refers to the particular passage of the man born blind (John 5:14). Irenaeus again points out that 'because of the sin of disobedience, infirmities have come upon [humanity]' (*AH* V, XV, 2). He comments that when the disciples Jesus whose sin was it that caused the man to be blind, his sin or his parent's, Jesus responds 'neither'. Irenaeus then employs a spiritual hermeneutic that links Jesus' spitting on the ground, making mud, and smearing it on the eyes of the blind man to the account of the creation of humanity out of the 'dust of the ground' (Genesis 2:7). Irenaeus says that Jesus' actions point out 'the original fashioning of [humanity]' and that this particular act is a restorative process. He uses the same language that he uses in describing the redemption and liberation of humanity in this passage to show that Jesus' ministry manifests the same work of God so that people would know 'that this hand of God which formed us at the beginning, and which does form us in the womb, has in the last times sought us out who were lost, winning back His own, and taking up the lost sheep upon His shoulders, and with joy restoring it to the fold of life' (*AH* V, XV, 2). The deliberate use of 'hand of God' imagery recalls both the account of God creating in Genesis 2:7 (Minns, 2010: 116, Steenberg, 2008: 117-118) and at

justice that is enforced by YHWH in the prophets. Jesus' hands both heal and correct the damage caused by sin.

Although Irenaeus affirms the physical body of Christ in his writings, attention is not given to the post-resurrection body of Christ, particularly the wounds suffered from the crucifixion (Widdicombe, 2003: 140). However, Widdicombe observes that Gregory of Nazianzus comments as to the wounds of the ascended body of Christ. In Gregory's *Second oration on Easter* the angels had to be convinced that the same one who is ascending with the marks of the wounds is the same one who descended without them. Gregory describes the wounded body as 'made splendid by the Godhead' (*Discourse* 45.25). In Cyril of Alexandria's *Commentary on John* the wounds take on greater theological importance in that they serve a twofold purpose: 'to establish that the resurrection of the body of Christ actually took place, and thus that our bodies too will be raised; and to show that the divine economy of salvation can be known to have been effected through the whole history of the incarnation, death, resurrection and ascension of the Son' (Widdicombe, 2003: 141-42). The wounds show a continuity of God's work in the world, the wounds physically and literally marking a narrative of redemption into Christ's body.

Irenaeus shows that sin causes sickness in that it affects the relationship between God's creation in totality, not only spiritually, but also certain personal acts of sin do not cause diseases and infirmities. This is not to say that one cannot not do harm to one's self through disobedience. Irenaeus is keen to talk about ignorance and knowledge as being components to sin, hence the impetus of *AH* in general. However, for Irenaeus, to properly remedy the problem is also to properly diagnose it and this goes back to the evil, humanity's bondage to it, the actions done because of being under the 'discipleship' of evil forces, and the effects of these action in relationship with self (human nature), others, God, and the created order.

2.4.6 Conclusion

Irenaeus does not have a sophisticated categorization of sin such as Thomas Aquinas' *De Malo* and the works of other Medieval theologians, but can be seen as precursor to systematised hamartiology in its descriptions of evil as personified in Satan, moral action, and vices all

contribute to the cycle of sickness that infects the human race. The very nature of the incarnation leaves Christ vulnerable to the wounding of others, and these actions are described as how Satan and wickedness spread to others. The resurrection and Jesus' recapitulatory work show that the wounds are the subject of both healing and attest to the evil that marred the body of Christ. This wounded body is commented on by Gregory of Nazianzus and Cyril of Alexandria is an attempt to comment on both the Gospel account in John and the theological importance of sin's effects on the body, in particular the body of Christ. Later we will see this idea of woundedness will be an important point of contact to the hamartiology of Park and Minjung theology.

2.6 SOLUTIONS TO EVIL, SIN, AND WOUNDEDNESS PRESENTED IN IRENAEUS' AGAINST HERESIES

2.6.1 Introduction

Irenaeus' treatment of the problem of evil, sin, woundedness, and sickness is embedded in his view of Christ's work of redemption in ransoming those who are captive, his recapitulation of history, restoration of corruption, and his healing of the sick. Although there have been many attempts to recount these descriptions, a way to analyse them is through their object, i.e., evil. Through the work of *theosis* or the divinization of human nature, humanity is healed of the sickness of sin and therefore corruption. However, all of these solutions are interrelated as they seek the treatment of the problem of evil, sin, and therefore sickness and woundedness.

2.6.2 Ransom

For Irenaeus redemption (*redemptiō*, Lt) involves a purchase and exchange in order to deal with evil and sin. Although there might be a question as to who is paid the ransom, God or the apostate one, (lest we take the analogy too far), it is without doubt that Irenaeus sees that an exchange takes place and human liberation occurs. The point is in the act of redeeming. To revisit the text in *AHV*.I.1, Irenaeus speaks of the 'mighty Word' as the 'very man' who redeemed through his blood. As previously mentioned, the idea of blood here is closely linked to the idea of the embodiment of the Word in flesh. It does not necessarily denote a blood sacrifice, but instead an exchange of one

type of flesh for another made possible through the incarnation. As Bushur comments, ‘the recapitulation of human flesh and blood perfects humanity’s communion with God’ (Bushur, 2017: 67). Irenaeus is interested in the redemption of human nature, which includes the flesh. This is the way in which the Word of God can treat the apostasy and alienation that tyrannized humans and human nature.

The idea of ownership and dominion (*dominium*, Lt) plays an important role in Irenaeus’ view of God’s omnipotence. One of the chief criticisms of Irenaeus’ depiction of redemption is regarded as God’s power over the power of evil over humans. However, Irenaeus is consistent in invoking God’s power in several places in this paragraph in relationship to God’s justice and God’s sovereignty. First, Irenaeus sees that God’s justice means not overruling the will of people, a will which is based in human nature. The tyranny of the apostate one is described as ‘unjust’ (*injūstus*, Lt) in contrast to God’s strategy of using just and therefore non-violent means of liberating those held in captivity. Evil power cannot be overthrown by the pure force of divine power because it is using the same utilitarian means to capture God’s people. In other words, the cure cannot be in same means of the disease; i.e, force of power; the treatment has to be in a transformation of the flesh that comes in the form of the incarnation, the embodiment of the Word. Similarly, for Athanasius, the creation of humanity and God’s incarnation are intimately connected: ‘in speaking of the appearance of the Saviour amongst us, we must needs speak also of the origin of [humans]’ (*DI* §4.2). He elaborates that human beings were ‘called into being by the Presence and loving-kindness of the Word’ and being ‘bereft of the knowledge of God’ humans ‘turned back to what was’. Athanasius here holds a privative view of evil, i.e., that evil is non-being and ‘what is good’ and God is being. Hence, the remedy for corruption comes by way of both incarnation and a new creation. Second, Irenaeus says that in whatever instrumental means that redemption takes place it should not destroy God’s ‘ancient handiwork’, i.e., the creation of humanity. Somehow humanity, human nature and human bodies need to be preserved and not simply eliminated and replaced.

Christ’s incarnation becomes the solution to the problems of sin and sickness because for Irenaeus both are related to the body (2.3). Therefore, the solution to the power of evil is not directly

overcoming evil through the force of power, but the transformation of human nature and the body through the act of incarnation. In this way, Irenaeus' theology of redemption can be described as 'incarnational'. It is the substitutionary, in that the captivities are paid a ransom through Christ, but it is incarnational because the apostate one is fooled by Jesus' resurrection, which is bodily. The incarnation is the key to the problem of sickness and sin. This is why Irenaeus says, '...the Lord thus has redeemed us through His own blood, giving His soul for our souls, and His *flesh for our flesh*' (*AH* V, I, 1, emphasis mine). Power is exhibited in the self-giving of Jesus' life in full and not as an end in itself.

In addition, the instrumental means by which the incarnation becomes realized in humans is through the Spirit of the Father. The Spirit enables the transformation of human nature and helps bring humans a relationship with God for the purpose of *theosis*. More specifically, the Spirit attaches '[humans] to God by [God's] own incarnation' (*AH* V.I.1). Communion with God via the Spirit becomes the chief way by which human nature is transformed. Irenaeus intentionally juxtaposes eucharistic language with the language of the incarnation (Minns, 2010: 131). The communion that was enacted at the last supper is not merely a symbol of Christ's sacrifice, but the avenue by which Christ confers 'upon our flesh the capacity of salvation', as Irenaeus later explains in *AH*, V, II. There, the connection is made between the Eucharist and the act of redemption to the physicality of the body and divine union. Just as the Eucharist transforms the body, giving it the sustenance of salvation, the Spirit brings the body into unity with God.

2.6.3 Recapitulation

The notion of recapitulation (*recapitulatio*, Lt.) in *AH* is Irenaeus' reading of the Apostle Paul's idea of unity of all things in Christ (Ephesians 1:10). Jesus recapitulates or sums up (*capitu*—head, Lt) the history of the cosmos in his redemption of the first Adam in his work as the last Adam. This is a way of narrating the history of salvation through the story of the incarnation of Christ, his ministry, death, and resurrection. Recapitulation serves as a framework in discussing the way in which God works through the person of Jesus to tackle the problem of evil, sin, and death.

Related to the idea of recapitulation is the incarnation of Christ taking place through human birthing. In *AH* III, XXI, Irenaeus discusses the prophesy of Isaiah 7:14 regarding the birth of the Messiah by a young woman in light of those who dispute the virgin birth. In the last section of that chapter, Irenaeus talks about recapitulation in the context of defending the divine birth of Jesus and at the same time re-emphasizing the restoration of not only humanity, but the human body. He begins with quoting Romans 5:12 (Harvey's translation mistakenly cites this as Romans 5:19, which is a very similar verse) to show that 'by one man's disobedience death obtained [a place] through sin; so that also by the obedience of one man, righteousness having been introduced, shall cause life to fructify in those persons who in times past were dead' (*AH* III, XXI, 10, a paraphrase of Romans 5:12 as cited in Latin text of *AH*: *Quia quemadmodum per inobedientiam unius hominis introitum peccatum habuit, et peccatum mors obtinuit; sic et per obedientiam unius hominis iustitia introducta vitam fructificet his, qui olim mortui erant, hominibus*). 'Fructify' (*fructificō*, Lt) means to bear fruit and draws from the image of Christ as the first fruits of the resurrection (1 Cor 15:23), but here it demonstrates an act rather than an adjective. This is to show how the life of Christ overcomes the reach of death in the world in that it brings life into those who are dead, because of the death brought about by the first human, Adam. For Irenaeus, death is the result of Adam's disobedience, but life is the result of the obedience of the other man, the second Adam.

Schultz shows the important connection that Irenaeus makes between the 'exalted first Adam' and the 'eschatological second Adam', i.e., Christ (1978: 162-166). This takes the typology a step further than Paul's use of Adam/Christ typology, since in Schultz's thesis, Irenaeus pulls from Jewish pseudepigrapha to show that subtle distinction between the first Adam and the second Adam. For Irenaeus, God established an exalted Adam, humanity in a glorified state, and this Adam is also the one who sinned. The exalted/sinful Adam makes up the first Adam and is a narrative arc that connects the first Adam and then the second Adam. Therefore this 'theory of recapitulation is not simply a contrast of two Adams; it functions as a connection between the exalted first Adam and the eschatological second Adam who unites in history the sinful and the exalted first Adam' (Schultz, 1978: 163). The importance of this distinction shows that the intent for humanity was not in the fall, but in divine exultation and the elimination of death completes this exultation through recapitulation.

In the larger context of this argument, Irenaeus points out that Paul uses the symmetry of the Adam/Creator and Second Adam/God analogy to illustrate that Jesus' birth had to be of divine source. This not only answers the question about the virgin birth of Jesus, but it also shows how recapitulation was also about the salvation of the entire human being. He asks, 'Why, then, did not God again take dust, but wrought so that the formation should be made of Mary?' (*AH* III, XXI, 10). In other words, why did not God just make another Adam through dust just as God made Adam out of dust? This is because God wanted to 'sum up' or recapitulate the totality of Adam's history in Christ through the 'same formation' as Adam. Mary is of the same body as Adam and therefore Jesus is of the same body as Adam. In this way, Jesus is both created by God and shares the same body as Adam, but also renews Adam's body and all of humanity. Jesus tackles the problem of death and sin through bridging the history of the both the sinful Adam and exalted Adam. However, Irenaeus is particular to point out that this happens through the embodied Christ who is born of a woman.

In *AH* V, XIV, the theme of salvation of the flesh is continued. Irenaeus starts by stating the necessity of saving the flesh because God was reconciling us and the flesh to God and if this was not the case then the Word would not have taken the same substance (*substantia*, Lt) as humans. In paragraph 2, Irenaeus clarifies how the sin of alienation is dealt with by using the language of the incarnation and the idea of recapitulation. Jesus 'summed up' the history of humanity through both the 'flesh and blood' of the incarnation and bringing humanity to together with God. The incarnation and reconciliation are linked in this way. This view of the salvation of the flesh is of course in contrast to the beliefs of the Gnostics and many of those who Irenaeus disagrees with in *AH*.

Recapitulation also occurs at the eschaton with the elimination of evil (*AH* V. XXIX, 2). Here, Irenaeus uses the language of the book of Revelation to speak of the elimination of evil through the recapitulation of 'all sorts of iniquity and of every deceit' so that it can be thrown into the 'furnace of fire'. Irenaeus imagines that this is how the 'apostate power', expressed in the image of 'the beast' and having dominion over humanity is finally subjugated and destroyed. According

to Irenaeus, this power was also what brought on the evil before the great flood (Genesis 6:9-9:17) because of the ‘apostasy of the angels’.

In addition, recapitulation serves as a narrative arc that describes both ‘Protological history and eschatological expectation’ through Christ’s sacrificial offering at the cross (Steenberg, 2009: 51). Central to the theology of recapitulation is showing how humanity is made in the image of God and how Christ reveals how humans are to live in the likeness of Christ in order for humans to be restored to their true nature. Because of the nature of Irenaeus’ account of what takes place between humanity’s original state to humanity’s elevated state, some have argued whether there is a three-stage motif or two. Does Irenaeus see humans as innocent, fallen, and then returned to innocence or is it a progressive move from childlike to maturity (Fairbairn, 2003: 18–19, See note 34 for a discussion of *convalescere*, Lt., meaning ‘to recover’, and to whether *AH* IV, XXXVIII, 3 consists of a three or two-act schema). However, if humanity either progresses or is saved from a fallen state, the new state in a way must be greater than the one of the first Adam because Christ is not just an imitation of the first Adam, but Adam born and not made, to use the words of the Creed. This is an important aspect of Christ’s recapitulatory work because humanity had ‘perished’ and because what ‘had perished possessed flesh and blood’, Christ, therefore, had to restore humanity by taking on a substance that was ‘flesh and blood’ (*AH* V, XIV, 2). It was through this birthing process that Christ entered into that so he could save the entire human race.

2.6.4 Restoration to a State of Incorruption

In *AH* II, XXIX, Irenaeus argues against Valentinus and other Gnostics as to the future destiny of the soul and body. Irenaeus starts by recounting their belief that at the ‘consummation of all things’ those who believe in this system will shed their ‘animal souls’ and will become ‘intellectual spirits’. For the Gnostics, since ‘like is drawn to like’, a classic Greek principle that even Aristotle cites in *NE*, then spiritual things will be drawn to spiritual. So, the unity of their spiritual substances will be with spiritual beings, Sophia, the mother of material substances, and her consort. However, Irenaeus shows a contradiction in their beliefs since they posit that ‘acts which are deemed righteous are performed in bodies’ and this is how they will be judged to be either condemned to fire or pass into ‘the place of enjoyment’ (*AH* II, XXIX, 1). Irenaeus notices that the Gnostics have

trouble determining how actually righteousness can be judged, if not in the body since it is not per their substance, whether material or spiritual, that people are judged. For Irenaeus, as well as the Gnostics, acts of sin and virtue are evaluated in the body and necessarily have a somatic element. Their origins can be purely intellectual, but an *act* is not entirely an intent; there must be action *by* something and *on* something. Because these acts take place in a body, they are deemed righteous or unrighteous, blameworthy or praiseworthy, in relation to the body. Irenaeus shows that the Gnostics cannot entirely adhere to a doctrine that devalues the body since they themselves admit that there is no other way to evaluate virtue or vice, except by way of the body and bodily actions.

However, in this passage, Irenaeus goes further in specifying what will happen to the nature of bodies. In order to ‘render [our moral bodies] incorruptible and immortal’ God will resuscitate mortal bodies. Irenaeus revisits the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, not only to discuss it as an eschatological adjunct to history, but also to show how this works as a part of the entire history of redemption of persons. In other words, he sees an importance in discussing the restoration of the body because it is part and parcel of the elimination of sin, since sin, for Irenaeus, has a bodily component. Cosmologically, the result of sin is the corruption of the body, but on a moral level sin also perpetuates the corruption of body since it is connected to acts ‘performed in bodies’ (AH II, XXIX, 2).

Another way in which Irenaeus attempts to talk about the elimination of corruption is in his talk about God’s future restoration of things to an incorruptible state and the revelation of Jesus Christ as the Son of God. This takes place in his talk about sanctification (AH III, V, 3). Here, the priestly image of ‘making holy’ is grounded in the image of ‘those of the circumcision’, i.e., the people of Israel. Being sanctified is actualized in the flesh of God’s people. This image of sanctification is also the image of creation where God does not only create the human family, but also works to ‘nourish, increase, strengthen, and preserve them in being’. In effect, the elimination of corruption results in the restoration of ‘liberty to all [people]’. The Gentiles are turned from their idolatry in worshipping ‘stocks and stones’ to a God ‘who had had created and made all the human family, and, by means of [God’s] creation did nourish, increase, strengthen, and preserve them in being’. This turning was from the inanimate images to the God of creation and one who is flesh and blood.

Here, Irenaeus uses the term ‘apostasy’ again to make the connection between sin and spiritual knowledge. Redemption is restoration from this state of apostasy which is in one sense a corruption of right teaching or correct doctrine. The process of sanctification involves the revelation of the incarnate Christ and the liberation of these false ideas. Corruption here is closely tied to the idea of alienation as alienation is seen related to pedagogy. Nevertheless, the transformation of humans to an incorrupt state involves the transformation of the mind in order to correctly perceive the true and living God.

Lastly, in *AH* V, VII, 1, Irenaeus parses out what the ‘mortal body’ consists of in relation to the eschatological hope of the resurrection of the dead. Here he cites Romans 8:11 saying, ‘[God] that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies’. Examining the tripartite aspect of the human person, the body-soul-spirit relationship, Irenaeus eliminates the prospect that the soul or spirit could be this mortal body because ‘souls are incorporeal’ and the spirit is not by nature a substance ‘which dies and is decomposed’ and ‘is moulded’, but instead it is ‘simple and not composite’. Here, Irenaeus is using philosophical language to describe substances that resist corruption. Things that are simple do not have parts or made of parts, and therefore they do not break down into their constituent components. This can be said of that which is purely spiritual such as God and the angels. In eliminating the possibilities that the soul or the spirit can be mortal, Irenaeus suggests that it is the body that will be renewed into a ‘spiritual body’. Mortality, which is, in Irenaeus’ thought, particular to the body because of its composite state; can decompose, unlike the soul and the spirit. Although these aspects are nothing extra-biblical, since Irenaeus cites the key texts in 1 Corinthians 14:43 and 14:44 about this very issue, Irenaeus seems to be pushing the point that the corruption of the entire person will be restored including the ‘mortal body’ which will become immortal. This is to say that the influence of sin, although affecting the whole person, affects the body differently and therefore the death of the body is different than the corruption of the soul and spirit.

2.6.5 *Healing of Sickness and Woundedness*

To again use the analogy of physical health, sickness and wounds untreated can lead to death. For Irenaeus, the sickness of sin leads to spiritual death, but also death itself was the problem which

humans needed liberation from - humans ‘who had been drawn by sin into bondage, but were held by death’ (*AH*, III, XVIII, 7). As Payton describes, humans were ‘surrounded by death which became the universal inheritance of Adam’s progeny’ (Payton, 2016: 161).

In *AH*, III, V, Irenaeus asserts that Jesus and the apostles taught the truth ‘without any fraud, deception, or hypocrisy’ despite the claims of the sophists who say that Jesus and his followers accommodated their preaching to their listeners. Irenaeus describes this kind of conduct belonging ‘not to those who heal, or who give life’ but rather acts which bring ‘on diseases, and increasing ignorance’ (*AH*, III, V, 2). Here the term ‘to heal’ and related words are both used in an analogical sense and literal sense. This is made clear by the insistent use of the idea of Jesus as a physician who ‘came as the physician of the sick’ and the quotation of a related passage from Luke v. 31-32. Healing of the sick is equivalent to the teaching of right doctrine, but healing is not meant in purely analogous terms. Sin is to be attacked and treated through the aid of the great physician. Sickness is a symptom of sin in that it speaks of the corruption of both the body and the mind. The mind/body connection is reinforced when Irenaeus asks, ‘How then shall the sick be strengthened, or how shall sinners come to repentance?’ (*AH*, III, V, 2). His retort is that it is only by ‘undergoing a great change and reversal of their former mode of living’ and that people can be healed from ‘no slight amount of sickness, and many sins’ (*AH*, III, V, 2). Irenaeus describes ignorance as the ‘mother of all sins’ and that the Lord had imparted ‘knowledge to His disciples, by which also it was His practice to heal those who were suffering, and to keep back sinners from sin’ (*AH*, III, V, 2). Like alienation and corruption, sickness has a pedagogical component. Ignorance can be ‘cured’ through the help of someone who can intervene to set humans back on the right path. To use the ransom imagery, the act of redemption is a healing act that brings people from the mental and physical bondage of the apostate into the discipleship of God.

In *AH* IV, XXIII, 1, Irenaeus recounts Jesus’ preaching at the synagogue in Capernaum where he reads from the scroll of Isaiah and proclaims the year of the LORD (Luke 5:17-20). Here, he argues that patriarchs and prophets who pointed toward the advent of Christ helped to ‘fortify...the way of prosperity to the faith of Christ’ and so they who came before the apostles made the way of salvation easier for the apostles because, in a sense one had ‘sown’ and the other ‘reaped’. In other

words, the history of salvation was foretold by those who came before the apostles and therefore what takes place in Christ's life is part of the history of salvation. The import of this is that in the reading of the scroll of Isaiah from 61:1, Jesus pronounces his mission as the continuation of God's mission to the prophet. Therefore, preaching the gospel to the poor, healing the broken-hearted, preaching deliverance to the captives, and bringing sight to the blind is not tangential to God's story of redemption, but at the heart of it. For Irenaeus, this gives 'reason' for the preaching by the prophets and patriarchs, that Jesus' ministry is the continuation and culmination of what God had been doing in human history.

In *AH V*, XXXIII, Irenaeus describes one who 'confesses that one God is the author of both Testaments' and reads scripture in unity with the 'presbyters of the Church' can discern that prophets were declaring the Christ and what is expressed as 'the Liberty of the New Testament'. This liberating message as presented encompasses the incarnational life of God and therefore the healing of humanity through this life. Irenaeus again quotes Isaiah to show that part of declaring Christ's advent is to also proclaim 'the lame man shall leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall [speak] plainly, and the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall hear' (35:5–6), and that 'the hands which hang down, and the feeble knees, shall be strengthened' (35:3), and that 'the dead which are in the grave shall arise' (26:19), and that Christ 'shall take [upon Him] our weaknesses, and bear our sorrows' (53:4). These passages of Scripture for Irenaeus 'proclaimed those works of healing which were accomplished by [Christ]' (*AH V*, XXXIII, 11). In context, what concerns Irenaeus is not only to show that preaching of the message of the Gospel is a continuation of the message of the Hebrew Scriptures, but to refute Marcion's contention that the testaments are not unified in their depiction of God (Minns, 2010: 47; Lieu: 2015, 35). For Marcion the angry creator God of the Hebrew Bible was a counterpoint to the compassionate God in the Christian Testament. The importance of the unity of the two scriptural traditions speaks of both the unity of God's schema of redemption, and the importance of the unity of the human person. Marcion's thinking was a derivative of Gnostic thought in general which set a dualism of mind/body. Jesus' healing ministry is a natural affront to the belief that only the soul could be saved. Physical healing for Irenaeus was ingrained in the redemption of human nature that consisted of the complete human being. In this vein, Irenaeus says that the prophets declare 'two

advents', one in which God 'became a man subject to stripes, and knowing what it is to bear our infirmities' (Isaiah 53:3), where God comes down in order that God might deliver humanity and the second where Christ will 'come in the clouds' (Daniel 7:13) to bring judgment. In this way, life of the Christ maps unto the life of Adam in terms of the prototypical man and the future state of humanity. The incarnation of God is narrated based on a microcosm in the life of Jesus and also re-narrated on a macrocosm in the story of humanity's origin and future hope. In Steenberg's language, it is a 'recapitulative healing' that takes place where sin is vanquished through the termination of death (Steenberg, 2009: 49).

2.6.6 Conclusion

Ransom, recapitulation, restoration of corruption, healing of sickness and woundedness are all interwoven into a tapestry that makes up a more complete image of redemption of human persons. The object of these strategies is to show how evil, sin, and the consequence, death, are eliminated and how humanity can achieve *theosis*. Ransom is about the freeing of humans from their captivity to the 'Apostate One' thereby restoring human nature in terms of their relationship to God and others. Recapitulation is the summing up of the history of humanity in both precision and perfection. In both a literary and rhetorical fashion, Irenaeus uses the device of recapitulation to show how the Incarnation was the point in which the divine *Logos* entered into creation to sum up the entirety of created history (Bushur, 2017: 57). The restoration of corruption speaks to the unity of the body and spirit, but also their susceptibility to the effects of sin. To speak about acts of sin is to also talk about the body and the redemption of the body. Irenaeus sees the full restoration of the body in the eschatological hope of the resurrection of the dead, where Christ is the 'first fruits' (1Cor 13:15; *AH* III.XIII.4). Lastly, the sickness and woundedness are addressed in the specifics of Jesus' life and ministry. In order to arrest the cycle of sin in the present, while giving hope to the future fulfilment of history, Jesus' life is the act of recapitulatory history and his works attest to what has taken place in the ministry of the prophets before him and what is to come throughout and the end of history. Again, the incarnation is the substantive point in which redemption occurs and the life of Jesus illustrates encounters with sickness, sin, and his own vulnerabilities to the sin of others. In this way, his life becomes the healing 'hand of God' (*AH* V, XV, 2).

2.7 SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

In order to answer the question of correlations between Park's notion of hamartiology and the Eastern Fathers', especially Irenaeus, a map needs to be laid out using descriptions of sin as markers to indicate where the intersections take place. Because the Eastern theologians worked with the biblical texts and employed their own tools of exegesis, an analysis of the sin terms in relationship to the biblical descriptions helps give further foundation to the work of the Patristic writers. The Hebrew notion of *chatta* and related sin words and *resha* show both secular and religious meanings, and provide insights as to their possible usage. They also provide a background in relating sin to moral acts, if they are done intentionally or unintendedly, and out of ignorance. Hebrew and Greek notions of the 'sinner' or 'wicked' also distinguish who the subjects of sin are and give clues as how both Irenaeus and Park address the problem of the source of sin. Lastly, providing examples of Irenaeus' and other Patristic sources use of biblical text give ways in which they dealt with the problem of sin and even how they situate the problem in their theological work. Here Kannengiesser (2006) and a growing pool of Irenaeus scholarship (Parvis and Foster, 2012) provide helpful resources and confirm Irenaeus as a biblical theologian in his own right.

For the Irenaeus and the Eastern Fathers, sickness, corruption, and alienation are central descriptors for sin, in that they relate to the body and to the susceptibility of the body to injury. However, the human being for Irenaeus and the Eastern Fathers needs to be taken as the whole of the person, not only its spiritual nature. The concept of woundedness, explicitly in Park, is the line of connection that links the traditions of Minjung theology to that of the Eastern Fathers. Sin, when categorized in this somatic expression, shows how Jesus was susceptible to the effects of sin and that the human condition is continually prone to this. Christ's work then is to counter the effects of sin in terms of the restoration of human nature and confront this human injury to one another.

The solutions that Irenaeus gives to the problem of sin, namely the ransom, recapitulation, and restoration imagery, attest to the ways in which he shows how Christ's work deals specifically with the healing of wounds and the sickness that comes through sin. The ransom of persons to God points towards a return to human nature by way of community or family with God. Tied to this depiction of ransom is recapitulation, where Jesus recaps the history of humanity and restores into

the image of a new creation. Christ becomes the new Adam in whom is fulfilled the intent for the exalted Adam (Schultz, 1978: 163). This restoration is made explicitly through the accumulation of history through the bodily resurrection. Jesus' ministry, which includes teaching and healing becomes the basis by which humanity comes into discipleship and therefore communion with God. It is clear that Irenaeus is describing a Kingdom ethic that is both bodily and spiritual, and has no place in gnostic thought (cf. 'The kingdom is inside of you, and it is outside of you,' *Gospel of Thomas*, Saying three, 3). Within his notion of sin is a bodily component, as well as spiritual component, and therefore, for Irenaeus, the solution must also incorporate both aspects. Christ's victory over death is the also the cause of the restoration of human nature since death and corruption are linked in the body. In order for the union of humanity to God, it is therefore an uplifting of the human body to the state of the Spirit, through the work of the Spirit (Briggman, 2012: 124; Minns, 2010: 92–93). This is the process known to the Eastern Fathers as *theosis*. All these aspects of redemption are tied together through an incarnational theology. The body of Christ becomes the instrumental means in which redemption takes place.

The terms of sickness, corruption, and alienation describe how sin infects and affects the body and mind. It can be seen within both the problems of sin and death and the solutions presented by Irenaeus that there is an active cause of sin which is continued wounding and a potential cause is woundedness unresolved. Evil, in general and often described as Satan, is the primary influence on capturing humanity and deceiving it to become disciples of God. Moral agents, humans, play a part and commit acts of sin against one another, thereby acting against God and the created universe. Lastly, these acts of evil and sin, show how they contribute to continual sickness or sin by not treating the hurt and wounded.

The next step is to examine where the correlations between Irenaeus' accounts of sin and Park's use of the concept of *han* in his hamartiology. In this way we can see how *han* or woundedness is the place where these issues overlap, where both similar and different responses and solutions are proposed, and where they correspond in their theological anthropologies. In doing this we can see how the views of each can be expanded and constructive dialogue can occur.

CHAPTER 3:

AN EXAMINATION OF THE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN IRENAEUS' ACCOUNTS OF SIN AND PARK'S USE OF THE CONCEPT OF *HAN* IN HIS HAMARTIOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 2, it was shown that in Irenaeus' *AH*, the various descriptions of sin as sickness, corruption, and alienation converge on bodily existence. The solutions in which Irenaeus and other Eastern Fathers proposed was to take a holistic approach in addressing human action, injury, and death. This started with an anthropology that both addressed human responsibility and the relational aspects of sin and showed how Jesus' own activities worked toward that redemption of humanity. Recapitulation resulted in the ransom of God's creation and showed God's work of not only restoring the divine image in humans, but also bringing about divine union or *theosis*. The somatic components in examining sin and sickness as seen in chapter 2 offers a point of connection between Park's hamartiology of *han* and the Eastern Father's various description of sin. Because the primary research question is to investigate where the commonalities, intersections, and correlations be found between Park's description of sin and use of *han* and Irenaeus' and Early Eastern Fathers' understanding of sin can be found, the secondary question between descriptions of sin in patristic literature and Park's use of the term *han*, or woundedness, needs to be examined. Since chapter 2 addressed a preliminary discussion of how sin is described — the language, metaphors, and ideas used, in the Early Fathers and Irenaeus, the aim of this chapter 3 is to show how Park's descriptions of sin and how it is related to the notion of *han*, as the result of sin and the potential propagation of sin, finds commonality and correlation with the descriptions of sin in patristic literature, especially in Irenaeus' *AH*.

This chapter starts with a brief survey of Minjung theology in which Park situates himself. In order to grasp Park's overall project, it is important to show how the influence of a particularly Korean theology is used to examine the theological category of sin. Then this chapter moves into an examination Park's own explanation of relationship between sin and *han* in order to reveal an

intimate connection between Park's anthropology and hamartiology. This view of human nature and its relationship to sin and *han* is firmly rooted in Minjung theology and therefore an understanding these sources will be helpful in showing where connections can be seen. Because Minjung theology is a historical movement that begins with giving a biblical account of Jesus' ministry, it will be helpful to analyse these sources and show the hermeneutical beginnings (Byung-Mu: 2013, 49-64). Because chapter 2 draws from the somatic nature of sin in Irenaeus, it will be important to draw out aspects of Park's hamartiology that deals with healing and sin. Lastly, if the divine response to sin is ultimately grace, then the question needs to be ask as to where repentance fits in Park's hamartiology.

Because the investigation also hinges on examining patristic and Irenaeus' account, the last sections of this chapter will make correlations between Park's notions of sin, sickness, and *han* in relationship to Irenaeus' account of sin and sickness. Since sin is reified in acts of hurt and woundedness, then a strategy is to look at Irenaeus' incarnational and recapitulation theology. For Irenaeus, God's embodiment in Jesus is the starting point in which history is redeemed. Recapitulation is then the reformatting of history under the headship of Jesus rather than of Adam. This recapitulative redemption is not theoretical, but actual in that it brings about Christian perfection through the Holy Spirit. Because repentance is a pivotal component of Park's redemptive theology, looking at where Irenaeus speaks about the development of persons is key. Just as sin is not only relegated to personal actions and effects redemption cannot be only observed on personal level. Irenaeus' theology of creation and redemption should be highlighted (Steenberg: 2008; 2009, 41-54).

3.2 THE HISTORY OF MINJUNG THEOLOGY AND HAN

3.2.1 Introduction

The history of Minjung or People's Theology starts with a larger Minjung movement 'redefining social relations during the 1860-1895 Tonghak movement' in Korea (Wells, 1995: 1). Even though Minjung theology begins as not an exclusively Christian theology, a particular Christian aspect

started in the 1960s ‘as an expression of the concern of Korean Protestants with the plight of the dispossessed in South Korea’ (Clark, 1995: 87).

Minjung (People’s) theology seeks to address the needs of those from whom the political system has taken power away, the oppressed, by focusing on the need to heal *han*. An almost untranslatable term, the word “han” (한) is used to describe the deep woundedness of the Korean people. *Han* is the experience sense of intense suffering that can ultimately result in anger, hatred, and the need for revenge. In Park’s words, *han* is ‘the experience of the powerless, the marginalized, and the voiceless in the world’ (Park, 2001: 47) The history of Korea is a history of *han*. This small country has been the focus of attempted conquests from the Japanese, Chinese, and even conflict with the U.S. on more than one occasion. *Han* is a ubiquitous theme among the people of Korea that sits just below the skin of Korean culture. A related term in the Vietnamese language, *oán hận* and *hận* (恨) is rendered as hatred and animus, respectively, given a similar history with the Chinese, Japanese, French, and United States it is no surprise that this is a lexical loanword, or a case of cross-pollinated etymologies. Like *han*, *oán hận* is animus or ill feeling towards another because of some kind of offense. In any case, *han* becomes the loci from which Minjung theology takes shape and *han* is rooted in the narrative of Jesus’ ministry with the ὄχλος (Grk.) or crowds.

This branch of theology is traced back specifically to the 1970s when a group of theologians and lay leaders were dismissed from their seminaries and university posts for criticizing the South Korean government. But the notion of ‘Minjung’ draws from the oppressive history of the Yi Dynasty (1392-1910) where those who were excluded from the elite and ruling class were considered the Minjung. This longest-lived reign, planted *han* deeply within the oppressed people of Korea. This status of the oppressed returned during the Japanese Occupation (1910-1945) and those Koreans who were not Japanese collaborators assumed the title of Minjung. Park describes Minjung as ‘those people who have suffered from exploitation, poverty; socio-political oppression, and cultural repression throughout the ages. They know the pain of dehumanization’ (Park, 1984: 2). Minjung is therefore a theological dialogue between the sociological aspects of

human woundedness and the biblical witness of the suffering of God's people. To this end Park is committed to exploring the roots of *han* in his biblical exegesis and sets out to narrate implicit cases of *han*.

3.2.2 *Minjung and the Origins of Minjung Theology*

The word Minjung 민중 comes from two Chinese characters 민중 인민 (*Inmin*) often translated as 'people' or 'masses' and 대중 (Daejung), often rendered as 'public'. Communists or socialist associations are often made with the word 'people' and this translation is sometimes avoided. The idea of people comes from the *ochlos*, the crowds or masses, to whom Jesus ministered. While Minding theology (민중신학, *Minjung Sinhak*) can be appropriately translated into English as People's theology, communist connotations can be avoided if there is a clear distinction between the crowds in whom felt the weight of the oppression from religious and political injustices and the people in general. Like the *han*, *minjung* is an untranslatable term, but D. K-S. Suh describes it as the 'politically oppressed, economically exploited and culturally alienated' and adds that others would say that a person can be 'politically oppressed' without being economically oppressed (in Küster, 2010: xii). Regardless, those who are the minjung fit into this political, economic, and cultural category.

Here it is relevant to see the relationship between how Park operates within the framework of Minjung theology and how he uses and serves the tradition in order to see how Park uses the terms 'sinned against' and 'sinners'. Ahn Byung-Mu (1922–1996) is considered one of the founders of the Minjung theological movement and a prolific writer. Unfortunately, his nine hundred pieces of works which include, lectures, essays, recorded sermons, creates difficulties in scholarship because 'to read Ahn's theology effectively. We have to exercise textual criticism and need a much greater accumulation of studies on Anh's work' (Y.S. Kim & J-H Kim, 2013: 15). Doing proper work in this context is an arduous task, one beyond the framework of this paper. However, what is important is how the Minjung movement gave rise to a particular view of *han* which is the effect of sin and its remedy. For Ahn, this starts with what can be termed 'the narrative of internality'

which he came about because of the Korean War. This internality is what is used 'to represent the very self that is not captivated by the external regulations of social structure' (Y.S. Kim & J-H Kim, 2013: 16-17, fn.). So, the external events of the Korean War and its traumatizing effects on the both the physical and emotional condition of the Korean people lead to this internality. Ahn saw that while some people were troubled and tormented by what they experience, others preached a gospel of personal sins in order to find a personal claim within a capitalistic marketplace. The church strategically took the language of sin, guilt, and forgiveness and rendered it both meaningless and at the same time a tool against the hurt and pain of the Korean peoples. Ahn's soteriology became one of internal salvation for the sin against in order to find liberation from the external world. This move from the salvation of the sinners to the salvation of the sinned against marked an important shift in his theology (Y.S. Kim & J-H Kim, 2013: 17).

Two major ideas that were instrumental in developing Minjung theology are the 'narrative internality' and 'the ochlos'. These notions start with the experiences of the Korean people after a history of colonization by the Japanese and the Korean War that resulted in two to three million civilian deaths on estimate. The pain that the peoples of Korea experienced became a national pain. Ahn asserts that 'the sorrows of this nation are precisely the sorrows of minjung and vice versa' and 'the han-filled sorrows of the minjung, oppressed and robbed by the ruling class overlap with the sorrows of the nation'. For Ahn, notions of *han* and nation are 'inextricably tied' together (Ahn, 2019: 16). Ahn believes that many religious leaders capitulated to the ruling class and co-opted the language of sin in order to continue the strategy of colonization. At this point, Ahn thought is that this internalization was instilled in all the Korean peoples but is distinguished as two kinds: 'one that indulges in self-desire in the dominant system, and one that alienates persons from the external world' (Y.S. Kim & J-H Kim, 2013: 17). Ahn seems imply that what can happen when one is faced with the tragedies of the world is either to be a 'sinner' or to suffer at the hands of sinners and become one of the 'sinned against'. Because of external forces that one cannot control within a system of pain, tragedy, and loss, these experiences become internalized and this leads to ways of internalizing and coping with these experiences.

The second notion comes in the notion of the Greek term *ochlos* (ὄχλος) which can be translated ‘multitude’, ‘crowds’, ‘masses’, and even ‘mob’. Anh centred this term after an episode known as the Jeon Tae-II Event of 1972 when a worker at a garment factory set fire to himself in an act of protest against the labour practices in which he considered injustice. This event underscored the horrendous working of the sweatshops that forced garment sewers to labour in poorly ventilated conditions and therefore suffering tuberculosis, to be drugged on amphetamines in order to work longer hours, and to be poorly paid for their work. This protest brought Anh to read the Gospel of Mark in a way that brings attention to the *ochlos* who Anh saw in the faces of these factory workers. Even though Anh attributes the focus on the *ochlos* to T. Kenzo’s (田川建三) *The Gospel of Mark and liberation of the people* (原始キリスト教史の一断面：福音書文学の成立, 1968), Anh does not use the term the same way. For Kenzo the *ochlos* comprises the sick, prostitutes, tax collector, and poor, i.e., the disenfranchised. However, for Anh the *ochlos* are the crowds, all those who followed Jesus, according to Mark’s Gospel. This idea culminated in the article called ‘Minjok, Minjung, and the church’ and then fully developed into ‘Jesus and the *ochlos*’ published in 1979, using the sociological term ‘the loss of belonging’ (Y.S. Kim & J-H Kim, 2013: 19-20). The ‘masses’ did not exist as those with power nor did they exist in other places, but a liminal space that existed only in relationship to following Jesus. However, the motivation as to why people would follow Jesus was not answered until Anh’s reading of G. Theissen (Y.S. Kim & J-H Kim, 2013: 20).

For Theissen, oral transmission needs to be observed in relationship with literary transmission. Theissen’s hypothesis is that wandering charismatic prophets were the transmitters of the sayings of Jesus. Instead, Anh’s view is that the oral transmission came by way of the *ochlos* or minjung whose narratives became the Gospel of Mark. In other words, it is the Gospel of Mark that highlight the content of Jesus’ sayings and not the other way around. What is most relevant is that Anh’s view of the *ochlos* in terms of ‘deprived belongingness’ (Y.S. Kim & J-H Kim, 2013: 21). This revelation helped Anh to terminate ‘himself from the endless epistemological exploration of self-reflective subjectivity’ that plagues many traditional theological frameworks where ‘the transformation of existence is possible through the encounter with the absolute otherness’ (Y.S.

Kim & J-H Kim, 2013: 21). Rather than seeing salvation as union with the divine, which becomes a form of reflexivity, Anh sees the ‘otherness’ of the *ochlos* as the subject of salvation. Jeon Tae-Il and the tragic event of protest and resistance became the image in which Anh sees the as the ‘minjung messiah’. The pain of the masses and Jesus the same. This way Anh overcomes ‘the subject/object dichotomy (Y.S. Kim & J-H Kim, 2013: 22). Instead, masses following Jesus was a way to bring about belongingness to the *ochlos*, but at the same time, the *ochlos* became the instrumental means of transmission of what is known as ‘the Jesus event’ or Jesus’ story (Y.S. Kim & J-H Kim, 2013: 21). The masses experience both the lack of belonging, the lack of existence, and are drawn back to existential meaning through their identification Jesus. To join the minjung in their plight for salvation and liberation is also to Join Jesus in his struggle for the salvation and liberation of his people.

In comparison to Anh, while Park situates himself within the Korean theological tradition, and there are a number of differences and similarities between Park and Anh that can be noted. First, Park brings insights by seeing Minjung as the ‘sinned against’, but also showing how it can be universalized to all those who are sinned against. Park does not see the term to be specifically localized in only the suffering of the Korean peoples, but returns to T. Kenzo’s sense of the word, to where it refers to those who have been oppressed by society. Secondly, Park’s soteriology, as set within the larger framework of his notion of a ‘Triune atonement’, provides room for the oppressors. Healing is for the sinned against, while salvation is for the sinner. Thirdly, Park sees the notion of God-abandonees in the same way in which Anh sees the *ochlos* in terms of ‘loss of belonging’. Park takes Jesus’ cry of dereliction in Mark 15:34 as Jesus experiencing ‘God’s abandonment as the victims of sin did’ and that this ‘is the of the *han* of victims’ (2009: 41). Because the minjung, in Anh’s, view have had their language taken from them in their suffering, the Gospel of Mark becomes the reclaiming of their language since they are the ones transmitting this tradition. Rather, Park centralizes this loss of voice in both the preaching and exclamation: ‘Jesus’ outcry “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me” echoes every victim’s outcry’ and ‘reverberates across the valley of the shadow of death’ (2009: 45). Lastly, instead of making the crowds the subject of his theology, Jesus is still distinguished as divine other, but his life and death also show how he suffered as a person sinned against. The cross then becomes the symbol of both

the suffering of the of the *ochlos* and the results of the actual sinners, those in whom did wrong to Jesus and to the victims.

3.2.3 Conclusion

Even though the idea of the *minjung* is a sociological construct developed to describe the phenomena of the suffering of the Korean peoples, Minjung theology was created to give voice to the *han* they experienced. This became the theological traditions of those who are suffering and those who seek to join God's work in relieving the suffering of these peoples. It became an answer to a question of theodicy and a missional statement for those who became painfully aware of the shortcomings of the church in response to the crisis of pain. Rather than relieving the pain of people, the many Christians capitulated to the role of the oppressors, and thereby internalizing their sorrow in ways that continued the cycle of sin. The minjung theological movement sought to put an end to this cycle by bringing liberation to the masses. Park both situates himself within this movement, but also takes this movement outside of its post-colonial and Korean context, by showing how this theology and a focus on *han* can expand the theological category of sin to include those sinned against. As a Korean-American scholar writing and teaching in primarily in English, Park is able to bring the language of *han* to the West and set it in dialogue. In doing this, Park can show ways in which healing and salvation can occur for individuals and communities in light of the language traditionally used to within theological traditions. Moreover, by introducing the concept of *han* to a Western tradition, Park is able to set *han* and Minjung theology in relationship to ideas such as guilt, repentance, forgiveness, justification, holiness, and perfection.

3.3 PARK'S ACCOUNT OF SIN AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIN AND HAN

3.3.1 Introduction

Andrew Sung Park submits that in 'Christian theology, there is only one category used to diagnose the wrong of the world: sin' (Park & Nelson, 2001: 1). It is assumed that in order to find a solution to the wrong is to find a way to alleviate 'sin, it's guilt, death'. But Park rightly asks about the

condition of the ‘sinned-against’ (Park & Nelson, 2001: 1). How will they find healing? If the Gospel of Jesus Christ asks the victims of sin to repent of their sins in order to be saved then this good news will not be good, but instead ‘absurd’ (Park & Nelson, 2001: 1). Instead of sin, guilt, and death being the chief categories in which theology diagnoses the problem, Park suggests that the concept of *han* be used instead. In this model, *han* is the result of sin and can continue to cause sin if untreated. Untreated *han* is the instrumental means by which the sickness of sin can infect the world.

In *AH*, Irenaeus puts forth a theological practice that is an analogy from the realm of medicine, ‘For it is impossible for anyone to heal the sick, if one has no knowledge of the disease of the patients’ (IV, pre, 1). This prescription describes what Park is attempting to do in his work as a Minjung theologian and his analysis of *han* in his hamartiology. *Han* is the disease that is the result of sinful actions and also becomes the means by which sin continues in the world.

3.3.2 Definitions of Han

Han has been universally described by Minjung theologians and others as ‘untranslatable’ (Park, 1993: 15, Considine, 2014: 52; Kim, S., 2017: 268). Catholic theologian, K. P. Considine observes that ‘there is no fully adequate treatment or ‘thick description’ of *han* in the English language’ (Considine, 2014: 52). Perhaps much of this has to do with the experiences of English-speaking countries and peoples who do not face some of the same hardships as peoples elsewhere. However, those writing about the intersections of Minjung theology with Black liberation theology, including J. Cone, have keenly observed the intersection between the Black American experience and the Korean experience of the Minjung (Cone, 1983: vi). In the United States, then *han* can be equated with ‘the blues’ although the situations of slavery of African peoples and those of the oppressed Koreans are different in many respects (Padgett, 2010). Similarly, S. Kim observes that the seemingly untranslatable term is however not unique and ‘and the affect that *han* analogically indexes is one that is experienced by multiple groups around the world’ (S. Kim, 2017: 271). However, given the contextual nature of the experience of the Minjung peoples, some would interpret the resolution of the Korean sense of *han* itself as the gospel or ‘good news’: ‘Or, to be more honest, we present and communicate this religious culture as indeed the gospel, for as Asian

Christians we really have no ecclesial identity of our own' (Niles, 1981: 2). In other words, there is no indigenesness Korean 'Church' and therefore there needs to be another vessel of communication of the good news for the people of Korea. Because of its contextually, various Minjung theologians have attempted define this complex term, *han*, and an overview provides a gestalt picture of the phenomenon of *han*. Therefore, an etymology of *han* will be given through the poet Kim Chi-ha, and the theologians Suh Nam-Dong, Young-hak Hyun, and, finally, Andrew Sung Park. This will help situate Park's definition of *han* among others and show how this notion is worked into his hamartiology.

Kim Chi-Ha (b. 1941) is described as a Catholic poet, playwright, and political dissenter, but is credited by Minjung theologian Suh Nam-Dong as 'the person who has done the most to develop *han* as a theme in Christian theology' (Suh, 1981: 64). Because much of Kim's writings remain untranslated into English, the transmission of Kim's work into the English language is often seen in the translated works of Suh. Two images of *han* can be found in the poems 'Sacred place' and 'Maltuk' each have unique features in themselves. 'Sacred place' says Kim is euphemistic of a prison. A prison says Suh is a place for revolution and cites Kim saying, 'A prison is an oppression of oppressions and a contradiction of reality itself' (Suh, 1981: 60). Like the 'prison' of the wilderness in the Hebrew book of Exodus, a prison can be transformative. Kim writes that 'massive *han* shines in a tension of silence like a shadow which is waiting to explode. Its symbolic place of manifestation is the prison' (Suh, 1981: 60). Therefore, here, *han* is found in the silence and shadows, and waits for a violent transformation. In 'Maltuk', the servant-slave or 'maltuk' is a masked dancer who appears as the 'embodiment of satire, jocular and humour' (Suh, 1981: 60). Maltuk dances in protest against the yanban or ruling class. Being beaten by the yanban, maltuk gets revenge by outwitting them with 'quick wit and brave actions' through an intervention made up of amusement in song and dance rather than violence. Kim describes this as 'God's involvement in history' (Suh, 1981: 60). It can be argued that divine interaction need not be terrible, but, instead, jocular. Regarding *han*, Suh quotes Kim saying that 'accumulated *han* is inherited and transmitted, boiling in the blood of the people,' which is also is 'the emotional core of anti-regime action' (Suh, 1981: 60). Here, *han* is the result of colonial and post-colonial reaction. Like some notions of 'inherited' sin, *han* is also held in the body and passed down, however the transmission is not

purely biological. There appears to be a psychological aspect in which it has an ‘emotional core’. However, if *han* is not resolved in the way it is shown in ‘Maltuk’ then *han* can be a ‘people eating monster’, as Kim says (Suh, 1981: 60). In this way, Kim sees *han* as an extremely dark and negative aspect of the human psyche and ‘deep negativity cannot be underestimated’ (2014: 56).

Suh Nam-Dong (1918-1984), who is credited as being one of the founders of Minjung theology, defines *han* as ‘an underlying feeling of Korean people. On the one hand, it is a dominant feeling of defeat, resignation, and nothingness. On the other, it is a feeling with a tenacity of will for life, which comes to weaker beings’ (Suh, 1981: 58). Here the definition is particular to the Korean experience and is mainly displayed as emotive. For Suh, there is a two-fold facet to *han*. It can be ‘sometimes be sublimated to great artistic expressions’ and conversely, it ‘could erupt as the energy for a revolution or rebellion’ (Suh, 1981: 58). There is side that is creative, expressive, and life-giving. This is where *han* can give rise to artistic creation, which in itself can lead to the healing of *han*. The side that leads to ‘revolution or rebellion’ however need not always be negative. It can become a positive force for change and the ending of oppression and injustice for people, but when not tempered *han* can lead to violence, vengeance, and continued *han*. How can the language of sin be traditionally understood in light of the grief and suffering of the Korean people? Moltmann describes Suh’s position as, ‘Sin is language of those in power, *han* is language of the minjung’ 28 (Moltmann, 1984: 46; Volker, 2010, 84) This is the jumping off point for Park and other Minjung theologians to distinguish sin that is acted by the sinner and *han* that is received by the sinned against.

Hyun Young-hak (1921-2004) speaks of *han* as an intuition more than purely a feeling: “‘Han’ is a sense of unresolved resentment against injustices suffered, a sense of helplessness because of the overwhelming odds against, a feeling of the total abandonment (“Why hast thou forsaken me?”), ‘ adding that it is, ‘a feeling of acute pain of sorrow in one’s guts and bowels making the whole body writhe and wriggle, and an obstinate urge to take “revenge” and to right the wrong—all these combined’ (Hyun, 1985: 7). Two elements that distinguish Hyun’s description are the sense of abandonment and the ends bodily aspect that culminates in the desire for vengeance. The former is connected to both the Hebrew sense of God-forsakenness (Psalm 22) and the Christian story of

crucifixion in Matthew's Gospel (27:46). Of course, the sense of abandonment is not actual abandonment because the Psalm concludes in the praise of God's persistent presence: '[the LORD] did not hide his face from me, but heard when I cried to him' (NRSV, 22:24). This is only a 'sense' that is not yet verified, but still explored. The latter idea of retribution comes from the unresolved sense of abandonment.

Park admits that 'even in Korean, its meaning is difficult to articulate' and goes on to say that 'Han is the abysmal experience of pain' which contains 'two aspects: active and inactive' (Park, 1993: 15). The 'active part of *han* is largely emotive and is akin to aggression, while the 'inactive' aspect of *han* is 'acquiescent spirit' (Park, 1993: 15). Park goes on to both provide a definition of *han* and its 'structure'. But in the very essence, *han* is 'frustrated hope' related to the very existence of human beings. Park examines the English word 'existence' and sees the idea of 'standing out' or *ex* and *sistentia*. As humans, we 'stand out' to face forward to the world, hope being the 'window to the soul'. But thou because of oppression and injustice, hope becomes frustrated and turns inward into 'sadness, resentment, aggression, and helplessness' (Park, 1993: 15). Since hope, is embedded in ontological structure of humans it is the denial of this hope that creates *han*, and, in turn, *han* produces these 'psychosomatic states'. Here, Park's embodiment theology is clearly shown and overlaps with Irenaeus' emphasis in the incarnational and somatic nature of redemption (§2.3).

What distinguishes Park's definition of *han* from others is his emphasis on the effects of *han* on the entirety of human experience *and* the application of *han* to those who suffer unjustifiably at the hands of others, societies, and institutions. *Han* is not isolated in the lives of the Korean peoples who have suffered oppression. Rather, *han* can also 'be seen in the survivors of the Nazi holocaust, the Palestinians in the occupied lands, the hungry, the racially discriminated-against, unemployed workers, battered wives, the molested, the abused, the exploited, the despised, or the dehumanized' (2009: 39). In addition, Park acknowledges that *han* is embedded in the art and poetry of the Korean peoples going back three hundred years to the *Arirang* (아리랑), a Korean folk song. The structure of this national anthem is a verse followed by three refrains. There are about 3,600 variations of the *Arirang* attributed to sixty versions of the song. The third and last verse of the

Arirang that Park cites is translated ‘Arirang is the mountain of sorrow: the path to Arirang has no returning’ (San Kim, 1978: 4). What is highlighted by San Kim’s translation is the mountain of sorrow, a geographic, seemingly immovable mass of land, that is tied to geography and to a people. But *han* is not solely isolated to the peoples of Korea.

Even though *han* is a shamanistic word used ‘to describe the unresolved engagement of the dead, the bereft, and the down-and-out’ it was used by Minjung theologians in the 1970s to diagnose the pain and suffering of the Korean people seen in its history, literature, and arts (Park, 1996: 10-11). The theological component is seen in Minjung’s attempt at a theodicy or defence of God’s justice in the light of evil and suffering, particularly assailed upon the Korean people. However, Park pays careful attention to how *han*’s existence is understood in other Asian countries and cultures (Park, 1996:10-11). Many Asian words for *han* are derived from the Sino-Chinese character for the word. The Chinese character for *han* is *hen* (恨) meaning ‘hate’ in Chinese. In Japanese it is *kon* or *enkon* (怨恨) meaning ‘grudge. In Vietnamese *hận* is ‘resentment’ or ‘frustration’. The word *horosul* or ‘sorrowfulness’ is the equivalent word in Mongolian. It is akin to the word *korsocuka* and *akacun* for ‘grief’ and ‘sadness’ in Manchurian (Gorelova, 2002: 197). Chữ Nôm or pre-colonial ancient writing system for Vietnam uses the same symbol for *han* as the Chinese *hen* 恨. This is because the ancient Vietnamese used Chinese script before the Latinization of the language by the French colonizers. It is also important to note that the history of Vietnam parallels that of Korea with its numerous invasions, colonization from the Japanese, American war efforts, and history of civil strife. Vietnamese *hận* is also bitterness and resentment. What can be seen from the etymology of *han* is even though the origins of the word *han* can be traced to Korean shamanism, it is a notion that has been shared as both a concept and loanword for many in East Asia.

Table 3: Table showing the various definitions of *han* from various descriptions of *han* based on the psychic/somatic relationships

THEOLOGIAN/WRITER	DEFINITION
-------------------	------------

Kim Chi-Ha	‘accumulated <i>han</i> is inherited and transmitted, boiling in the blood of the people,’ which is also is ‘the emotional core of anti-regime action’ (Suh, 1981: 60)
Suh	‘ <i>han</i> is a ‘feeling of defeat, resignation, and nothingness. On the other, it is a feeling with a tenacity of will for life’ (Suh, 1981: 58)
Hyun	Han is ‘a sense of unresolved resentment against injustices suffered, a sense of helplessness because of the overwhelming odds against, a feeling of the total abandonment [sic]’ (Hyun, 1985: 7)
Park	‘ <i>Han</i> is the void of grief that the suffering innocent experiences’ (1996: 9). ‘ <i>han</i> is a deep, unhealed wound of a victim that festers in her or him. It can be social, economic, political, physical, mental, or spiritual wound, generated by political oppression, economic exploitation, social alienation, cultural contempt, injustice, poverty, or war’ (2009: 39)

3.3.3 Clarifying Han and Haan

In Korean, the terms *haan*, commonly Latinized as h-a-n (one ‘a’ and not two) is the ‘history and experience’ that ‘attest to the depth of hand suffering’ (Son, 2000:13). S-Y. Kim (1978) and C-H. Son (2000), seek to distinguish two words that are similarly spelled, but have entirely different meanings. ‘Minjung theologians all spell “han” indiscriminately in English and foster confusion particularly for English speaking readers since there are two unique concepts’ (Son, 2000: 13). These words are the *han* of Minjung theology and the *han* of philosophy. The former has a social, psychological, and physical meaning, whereas the later has a metaphysical meaning. Son suggest that *han* of Minjung theology be spelled ‘haan’ since there is a distinguishable extra ‘aay’ sound at the end of the word. In addition, Son cites a standard Korean dictionary that clearly shows ‘haan’ as (한, 恨) which is the *han* of Minjung (2000: 17, note 3). Lastly, Son notes that a ‘formidable scholar of *han* philosophy’, Sang-Yi Kim posits that ‘the *han* of *han* philosophy ought to be

pronounced as “*han*” and the physiological *haan* ought to be pronounced as “*han*”, but with the extended “a” sound like “aah” as in breathing a deep sigh of grief” (2000: 13; Kim, Sang-Yi, 1978: 103). It is interesting that Kim argues for this aspirated “a” sound, since it is a deeply physiological aspect of the word, just like the act of grieving and not only a psychological state.

This research will use the conventional Latinized spelling of the ‘haan’ of Minjung theology as *han* because this is the convention that the Korean-American theologian, A.S. Park, uses in all of his work. It is also the convention that is used by much of the literature in English about Minjung theology (ex. Volker, 2010). Han as written in Korean as 한 and in Chinese as 恨 has an etymology that can be traced back to the Sino-Korean characters 심 (心) and 간 (艮). Separately, the first word, *shim* (심, 心) has the meaning of ‘mind or heart’ and the second word, *kan* (간, 艮) has the meaning of ‘to remain still or to be calm’. Together, Son invokes the image of a tree which has its roots panted deeply, so *han* ‘is used to describe the heart of a person or people who has/have endured or is/are enduring an affliction but the pains are not always apparent or visible because they are the kind that occur deep in the essence, core being, or heart of the person’ (2000: 13). In understanding the etymology of this word, Son admits that the ‘physical manifestation’ of *han* within the heart of the people or people ‘may eventually become visible or obvious’ (2000: 13). The relationship between *han*’s psychological aspect cannot be separated from its physical aspect because often physical pains are manifestations of psychological trauma and vice versa.

3.3.4 Han and the Problem of Mind/Body Dualism

Physicians have observed the relationship between mind and body and see the inseparable ways in which persons experience hurt and pain. B. Van Der Kolk’s *The body keeps the score* (2014) cites the work of psychiatrist A. Kardiner’s work *The traumatic neuroses of war* (1941) regarding the trauma of World War I veterans. The reports from Kardiner’s book mirrored Van Der Kolk’s work where the former had observed that ‘his patients were overtaken by a sense of futility; they became withdrawn and detached, even if they had functioned well before’ (Van Der Kolk, 2014:

11). This recoiling from being functional people in society is what Kardiner calls ‘traumatic neuroses’ or what Van Der Kolk says is commonly known today as PTSD or post-traumatic stress disorder. In 2018, Complex Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (CPTSD) was added to the latest the International Classification of Diseases of the World Health Organization (WHO).

Complex post-traumatic stress disorder (CPTSD) is a disorder that may develop following exposure to an event or series of events of an extremely threatening or horrific nature, most commonly prolonged or repetitive events from which escape is difficult or impossible’ (Brewin, 2020: 145). Examples that are given include ‘torture, slavery, genocide campaigns, prolonged domestic violence, repeated childhood sexual or physical abuse’ and make up a variety of trauma a person can suffer at the hands of others, communities, institutions, and/or governments. (Brewin, 2020: 145). To replace the standard PTSD, two diagnoses were created, PTSD and CPTSD, with the later that includes PTSD, but adds, ‘evidence of disturbances in self-organisation (DSO), consisting of affect dysregulation, negative self-concept and disturbances in relationships’ (Brewin, 2020: 145). Even though these diagnoses are technical to the fields of psychology and psychiatry, they deal with psycho-social relationships that come from embodied trauma. Not all incidents of PTSD or CPTSD might not under the definition of *han*, but the element of trauma does provide an element of overlap so that application can be made with *han*. In evaluating *han* for pastoral theology provides the definition that *han* ‘refers to the long-term, often intergenerational, effects of unrelieved trauma on persons, families and communities’ (2012: 72). Because *han* is the effect of sin and can cause sin, *han* is reified in the trauma suffered by people in both PTSD and CPTSD.

Moreover, a view of *han* not only goes counter to the ancient gnostic dualism, but modern Cartesian dualism. While it is difficult to gauge the direct impact of Cartesian philosophy on theology, it can be seen that ‘[s]upporters of Cartesian ideas were found across the confessional spectrum’ (Goudriaan, 2016: 534). M. Charlesworth cites C. Taylor in saying that ‘Descartes’ view of consciousness and the body “continues today in the tremendous force that instrumental reason and engineering models have in our own social policy, medicine, psychiatry, politics and so on”’ (Taylor, 1995: 7-8; Charlesworth, 1996: 193). One Descartes’s contributions to the world of

philosophy and therefore theology is conclusion, he makes in the *Discourse on the Method* (1637). Here, Descartes submits the Cogito saying, “Je pense, donc je suis” or ‘I think, therefore I am’, or ‘I am thinking, therefore I exist’ (*DM*, Part IV).

In Descartes’ ‘Second meditations’ he repeats this ‘I am, I exist’, whenever it is uttered by me, or conceived in the mind, is necessarily true’ (*Med*: 25). In both cases, Descartes posits that existence is based not on the body or the physical world, but purely the mind. One can cast doubt on all things, including the reality of the extended world, but one cannot cast doubt on one’s existence if one is doubting. Therefore, existence is based solely on the autonomous thought of the individual thinker. Here is the separation of mind and body reminiscent of earlier gnostic thinkers. Just as the ethical foundations of Gnosticism waned into either hedonism or extreme asceticism, Cartesian dualism makes the subjective self as the dominant authority of ethics. C. Taylor observes that ‘the transition can be conceived as one which takes us from an ethic grounded on an order which is at work in reality, to an ethic which sees order as imposed by the will (2007: 130-131). While Cartesian dualism was making its way through some theological circles, those of Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed traditions have also ‘made theological objections against Cartesian notions such as doubt, the dualism of thinking and extension, and an indefinitely extended world’ (Goudriaan, 2016: 534). Although the relationship between Gnosticism and Cartesian thought is debatable, what is noticeable is Cartesian dualism and its influence on Modernity and Post-modernity and how it has been assimilated into culture. For theology, these notions can only be countered by an emphasis in the incarnation. Drawing on the centre of Minjung theology which is the healing of *han* there can be no separation between mind and body, spirit and the material world.

However, a critique of *han* theology has been to see it as extreme physicalism or materialism. Critics see that *han* assumes the role ‘of essentialism unique to Korea’s claims of unbroken homogeneity and ethnic singularity’ (Foley, 2021: 1) For example, S.S. Kim says that ‘[t]he insistence on the uniqueness of *han* to the Korean people has a biologicistic element to it - if one is Korean, one is born with *han* and cannot escape it’ (2017: 255). So, to posit that the people of Korea suffer from this state of resentment makes it something that is inherent and inherited. Hwa-Byung or Hwa-pyŏng (화병) is a psycho somatic disorder that has been diagnosed among some

of the peoples of Korea (Lee et al., 2014). But S.S. Kim Warner that '[t]o take ban at face value as some kind of originary [sic] Korean subjectivity is problematic from a postcolonial perspective' (2017: 257). Seeing *han* this way 'becomes the basis for ethnonationalism' (Han, 2021: 2). This perspective transforms *han* as way of only locating suffering, hurt, pain, and trauma around a particular ethnicity with the exclusion of all outsiders. S.S. Kim sees that this 'stereotype' of 'contemporary nationalist, biologicistic- oriented meaning' arose from Japanese colonialism (2017: 257). Rather than reifying *han* in this way S.S. Kim would rather describe the process in which *han* became localized within the experience of the Korean people. In short, this view came from the view of Korea as a 'nation', a term imported from the West by Japanese colonizers (S.S. Kim, 2017: 258). Rather S.S. Kim sees the manifestation of *han* as 'an example of a social construct produced in the colonial articulation of cultural difference' Kim, 2017: 258). This difference was created by Japanese cultural influencers who were trying to 'other' Korean nationals but at the same time trying to bring about peaceful assimilation into the Japanese Empire after the conquest. This social construct 'essentialized' Koreans in ways did not alleviate the pain of their oppression, but rather exasperated their plight and manifested these feelings of sorrow, grief, and resentment (S.S. Kim, 2017: 262). In terms of the relationship between sin and sickness, in this interpretation of the events that gave rise to *han* it was the Japanese who sinned against the Koreans and did not work at bringing about the healing of the wounded.

3.3.5 Han and Ressentiment

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) employs the French term *ressentiment* to describe the way in which morality is created between slaves and masters. A critique of *han* can be made given how this term has been employed by Minjung theologians and how much of it falls within this existentialist use of the term *ressentiment*. In *Beyond good and evil* (BGE, 1886) and *Genealogy of morality* (GM, 1887), Nietzsche sees that 'Christian morality is inherently structured as a form of slave morality' and uses a deep-seated sense of resentment as type of 'injured merit' (Magnus & Higgins, 49). This definition seems to imply a feeling of frustration that is made into a value. For Nietzsche, *ressentiment* is used by the slaves to evaluate the masters as 'evil' and themselves as 'good'. In the master/slave morality that he sets up, the masters see themselves as 'good' and

their slaves as ‘bad’. Morality set up in these terms are only based on the ‘value’, i.e., the consequences of actions: ‘an action’s value or lack of value was derived from its consequences; the action itself was taken as little into account as its origin’ (*BGE*, 32). However, this is what Nietzsche sees as the traditional schema of virtue ethics created by the nobles or masters. On the other hand, slaves are empowered by the use of evil to describe their masters as ‘evil’. Nietzsche characterizes the Jews as people ‘born for slavery’ and because of this ‘– their prophets melted together “rich,” “godless,” “evil,” “violent,” “sensual” and for the first time coined an insult out of the word “world”’ (*BGE*, 195). This subversion of power created an asymmetric relationship between masters and slaves. Although masters have power over slaves, the valuation of slaves is purely objective; they are only useful tools. However, the slave’s view of the master is a subjective evaluation based on *ressentiment*. For Nietzsche ‘self-assertion and self-expression’ are considered sins by this type Christian morality, yet ‘passive suffering is deemed characteristic of the blessed’ (Magnus & Higgins, 49). This is because Christians can leverage their suffering through asceticism in order for them to have existence in relationship to their masters. *Ressentiment* is the force in which the slave can achieve existential existence. Nietzsche admits that the ‘ascetic life is a self-contradiction: here rules a *ressentiment* without equal, that of an insatiable instinct and power-will that want to become master not over something in life, but over life itself’ (*GM*, III, 11). Therefore, the slaves seek to be masters themselves, but over life. Given Nietzsche’s view of *ressentiment* it within our bounds to ask as to how does this notion plays out in relationship to *han*? If *han* is an unanswered wound or pain of the victims, then is this the reworking of Nietzschean existentialism?

Indeed, Nietzsche’s claim to a slave morality is a compelling one given the French Revolution (1798-1799) that might have been the cause of *ressentiment* or even the impetus for it. However, what Nietzsche point out as a roadmap to Christian values of good and evil are not entirely validated in terms of the *han* ridden and the Christian response to it by Minjung theologians. Even though Park provides a way to think of existence as ‘standing out’ (out, ex; *sistentia*, standing; 1993: 15). He sees that when we cannot stand out as persons and become frustrated in our hope, this creates *han*. For Park, *han* is found in the theological virtue of hope and not ‘will to power.’ The experience of *han* is ‘frustrated hope, the collapse feeling of pain, letting go, resentful

bitterness, and *the wounded heart*' (1993: 31, emphasis Park's). Instead of existence based on the use of resentment, Park offers ways to relieve resentment and *han*. In addition, Nietzsche's analysis does not encompass the complexity of humans who can consist of the powerful and the sinned against at the same time. Even though Park used the sinner/sinned against distinction, he admits that humans are complex and often consist of both aspects, and that these distinctions are diagnostic tools that help bring about both the healing and salvation of the entire person. Park and Nelson see the answer to Nietzsche's *ressentiment* in a liturgy that brings about the restoration and healing of both the victims and the victimizers and imagines if Nietzsche 'were to attend such a worship service, he would realize that Christianity is not a religion of weakness, but is about the empowerment of the wounded and the repentant' (2001: 20). Lastly, some theologians have appropriated their Nietzsche's language of *ressentiment* in order to show how *han* has become a part of Korean society, thereby bringing it out from its characterization as something strictly internal to the Korean peoples. S. Han's article 'Han and/as *ressentiment* : Lessons from Minjung theology' proposes a positive view of the idea of *ressentiment* and 'suggests that this project of renewal could draw fruitfully on recent political theory on *ressentiment* and, of all places, theology, in particular minjung theology' (Han, 2021: 2). Using the work of S. H. C. Kim and J. Lie, Han attempts to show how *han* as *ressentiment* could be conceived as an epistemological tool. *Ressentiment* allows the observer to know where the hurts and sorrows of the peoples are and thereby providing 'political potential into *ressentiment* by understanding *han* as more socio-political resentment and less ontological *ressentiment*' (Han, 2021: 8). Considering this nuanced view of *ressentiment*, theologians, especially those of the Minjung tradition, can find ways to answer and appropriate Nietzsche's use of *ressentiment* as an epistemological tool in understanding the woundedness of peoples.

3.3.6 The Bible and Han

Perhaps the most formal treatment of *han* can be found in the work 'The Bible and *han*' which comes from a co-edited work called, *The other side of sin* (2001). Here, Park outlines the implicit roots of *han* in the biblical texts and sets the stage by talking about Jesus' ministry to the wounded, 'wrongdoers': 'Between the wronged and wrongdoers, Jesus was primarily concerned about the

wronged' (Park: 2001, 45). His concern is regarding a predominant theology for the sinners, but lack of a theology for the sinned against and much of *The other side of sin* seeks to address these lacunae in church doctrine and the literature of theology.

Although Park grounds his work in the ministry and teaching of Jesus, Park traces *han* throughout the Hebrew scriptures, starting with the first instance of it in the story of Cain and Abel (Genesis 4: 1-16). In this account, Cain's anger regarding the rejection of his offering was unleashed on Abel. However, the response from God to the act of violence was nowhere seen, but instead Cain is given a mark of protection and Abel's blood cried out for justification; 'The crying-out blood is the voice of *han*' (Park, 2001: 48). The next example of the sinned against is Uriah and Bathsheba (2 Sam. 11). Although, David, the one who committed these sins, repented via the confrontation of the prophet Nathan, justice is not entirely achieved since the consequence was the death of others and continued sin and abuses; 'This unresolved dimension of the consequence of sin is *han*' (Park, 2001: 49). The death of David's son, the rape of Tamar by Amnon, and the fratricide and rapes by Absalom are all continuations of the cycle of unresolved *han* and vengeance. Finally, the book of Job is perhaps the ultimate example of a wronged that is unjustified. Eventhough, Job's fortunes are restored at the end of the narrative, there was no reason given to Job as to why he suffered the way he did. The theology of Job is a disavowal of Deuteronomistic theology that accounts for a one-to-one correspondence between sin and punishment. Job's friends represent the adherents to this theology and 'their theology represents orthodox theology' (Park, 2001: 50). However, the book of Job seems to reveal the life of Job as the narration of *han*. Job repents, but there is no reason for him to repent. He has done nothing wrong and the narrative is clear of his righteousness at the beginning of the story. In addition, God does not reveal to Job that his suffering was due to the Satan's testing: 'This is the *han* of many suffering victims. They do not know why God does not make known God's hidden code' (Park, 2001: 50). The most that Job can be faulted for is his ignorance of God's nature, but Park makes the point in asking if one can repent of ignorance.

Moving into the New Testament, Park's exegesis of *han* centres around Jesus' mission in proclaiming of the year of Jubilee in Luke 4:18–19. This was to address directly those who were

the lowliest, the sinned against: 'Jesus diagnosed his time and people, and came up with the goal of his ministry, which was to release the downtrodden from their bondages' (Park, 2001: 53). These are the people who society called 'sinners', those Jesus sought to bring healing and restoration. Here, Park makes a point to address the issue of the term 'sinners' in the New Testament saying, 'Here, "sinners" are not all sinners' (Park: 53). This term is often a misnomer used to describe those who were often undesirable in society. For Park, the word 'sinner' is distinguished in two ways: 1) 'a publicly recognized criminal who violated civil laws' 2) 'a person in a lowly and socially unacceptable occupation' (Park, 2001: 53). The latter also divides into two categories, those who had occupations that were looked down at, such as prostitutes (Mt 21:32), and the sick (Mk 2:17, Lk 7:37, 39).

These categorizations of the term 'sinner' are not entirely unique to Park's analysis. D. Adams' (2008) *The sinner in Luke* surveys the argument as to how the word 'sinner' is used in the Luke's Gospel and how the word has been interpreted to mean by biblical scholars. Even though the word 'sinner' is analysed according to its usage in the synoptics, particularly in the Lukan narrative. What is unique is the way in which Park addresses these concerns are keeping with the focus of Minjung theology. Scholars who have focused on Jesus' association with 'sinners' in his time typically concentrate on trying to categorize this group, picking out who the sinners are, in the context of Jesus' ministry. Are they only the 'wicked', the *hamartólos* (ἁματωλός) (Sanders, 1985: 48) or are they also the 'common people', the *'amme ha-arets*, which Sanders denies? Another question addressed is: Is the table fellowship, the 'eating with sinners', a symposium meal, which is questioned and denied by Blomberg (2005, 86-96; 2009)? But these questions are not specifically about the treatment of 'sinners' by those who call them such and Jesus' healing ministry.

However, Blomberg points out that 'What is striking is that Jesus favours these moral outcasts with his presence, rather than becoming contaminated by them' and that this attitude and behaviour is keeping with Jesus' mission: 'he is in the process of trying spiritually to cleanse the unclean, just like a medical doctor attempts to bring physical healing to a patient' (Blomberg: 2009, 48). So, the term 'sinner' is one in whom Jesus sought to treat, contra the Pharisee's attitude that they

themselves were not sinners, but those with whom Jesus chose companionship. From a *prima facie* reading of these texts, there is no reason to doubt that the term ‘sinner’ was a derogatory word used by the religious to categorize both those of ill repute, and those who were socially unacceptable. Even though the ‘common people’ might have been able to keep the standards of purity laws (Sanders, 1985: 184), the simple theology of retributive causality, i.e., Deuteronomic penalty, accused those such as lepers, the sick, and the poor as being cursed by God (John 9:1). Moreover, it does not hold true that all the ‘common people’ are not ‘sinners’ in one way or the other as perceived by the religious authorities. Otherwise, the question, ‘Why does he eat with tax collectors and sinners?’ (Matthew 9:10-17, Mark 2:15-22, Luke 5:29-39) falls flat if it only pertains to the willingly unrepentant, i.e., the wicked. Did Jesus not associate with other undesirables and not come to bring healing to them also? It is more sensible to simply say the ‘sinners’ were those who were ‘on or beyond the borders of respectable society’ which does not mean only ‘social respectability, but religious uprightness’ (Wright, 1996: 149). Against Sanders, Blomberg cites a plethora of sources, including N.T. Wright and J.D. Crossan, who normally disagree on many biblical issues, have agreement over the historicity of the table fellowship that Jesus kept with both the wicked and the lowly of society (Blomberg, 2009: 48). It is therefore appropriate to highlight the term ‘sinner’, as Park does, in regards to those in which Jesus focused his mission.

3.3.7 The Nature of Sin as Personal, Communal, and Systemic

The relationship between evil and sin is also described by Park: ‘Evil is not an absolute concept but a relative one. Evil might be interpreted as the privation of good (Plotinus, Augustine, and Thomas Aquinas) or as the fullness of good (Lao Tzu)’ (Park, 2012: 52). These descriptions are relative based on how one looks at evil in relationship to good. As privative to good, evil is a lack of good. This approach is also teleological in that evil acts are shown to lack completeness (*On evil* Q. II, A. 1; *ST I-IIae*, Q. 71, A. 1, co.). For Lao Tzu, because evil and good are contraries, one cannot know evil unless one understands the good (*The tao te ching*, 27).

Park provides a definition of evil that ‘can be the cosmic element that gives rise to sin and *han*’ (2012: 52) and comments that some theologians might believe that sin produces evil. However,

the example of Job's suffering is contrary to this belief since the author of the work is intending to describe the righteousness of Job in the book's prose. Instead, 'evil involves the *han* that Job experiences' (Park: 2001, 52). Likewise, 'Evil in absence of sin is *han*; *han* in absence of sin is evil' (Park, 2001: 52). *Han* is suffering and woundedness unjustified. However, here Park does not factor into the equation the evil done by others that produces *han* nor the sin done to self that perpetuates *han*. Park's general analysis is only at the category of genus and not species. In order to eliminate *han*, there must be an elimination of evil. At the specific level as to how *han* is often inflicted onto others Park talks about human acts of sin.

In order to describe sin's effects on the sinned against, Park speaks about sin in terms of personal, communal, and systematic structures. (Park: 2009, 75). However, these categorizations do not mean the effects of sin are mutually exclusive. In other words, no sin is entirely personal, and in the same way, communal and systematic sins affect people on a personal level. At this personal level, sin is manifested as 'self-grandiosity, selfishness, greed, abusiveness, domination, oppression, exploitation, and lust' (Park, 2009: 76). These dimensions describe a self that is only interiorly focused, but they do encompass other positive aspects of the self, such as self-healing, that are important. What Park seeks to address is an expression of the self that is narrowly fixated, to the exclusion of how one regards and acts towards others. In addition, this dimension of wounding the 'other' is expressed in communal evils. Here the collective exhibits what is seen in the personal dimension of sin and is 'the ethos of cultural dominance, a racial superiority complex, exclusive ethnocentrism, and nationalism' (Park, 2009: 76).

Systemic or structural sins are evils that are part of a system, 'ungodly "composite personalities" that control individuals, corporations, and other organizations' (Park, 2009: 76). An example, of this might be institutionalized racism and unchallenged hierarchal structures. Although Park does not describe how the communal becomes formalised in the structural, he makes use of Baptist theologian, Walter Rauschenbusch's concept of thinking of sin and evil in terms of 'composite personalities' (Rauschenbusch, 1917: 78; 111; 114). For Rauschenbusch, these powers the 'super-personal' forces that effect persons and communities and if not acknowledged and integrated into theology, then 'theology will not deal adequately with the problem of sin and redemption'

(Rauschenbusch, 1917: 75-76). Moreover, communal and structural sins contribute to the *han* by sowing injustice and oppression on people, preventing healing and promoting hurt. To oppose these constructs is to do battle with the ‘principalities and powers’ (Eph. 6:12) of this world that have infected these structures.

3.3.8 *Healing and Sin in Park’s Hamartiology*

A key passage for Park is when Jesus responds, ‘Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick; I have come to call not the righteous but sinners’ (Mk 2:17). Here Park clarifies that those ‘sinners’ invoked are ‘not all sinners’ (76). Park sees Jesus’ use of the term ‘sinner’ in the same way the religious leaders use the term, as an indictment against those groups who could not observe the law, not only the wicked, as expressed in the above demarcations. This hereby sets the stage for Park’s project to explore a theology of the sinned against or *han*-ridden. Park’s two major works that deal with the therapeutic aspects of theology in depth are *Racial conflict and healing* (1996) and *From hurt to healing* (2001). Because sin has a social as well as personal dimension, healing has to also take on this communal aspect. In the introduction of *Racial conflict and healing*, Park sets his work in comparison to Augustine’s *De civitate Dei* (*The city of God*), where the African theologian develops a theology based on two views of the city within the context of his world and the attack of the Visigoths on the Roman Empire. In the same way, Park’s project is a contextual theology. Bevans describes contextual theology as setting a third *locus theologicus*, two other loci being Scripture and tradition, being ‘human experience’, which considers ‘culture, history, contemporary thought forms, and so forth’ (Bevans, 2002: 3-4). In addition, this theology is ‘influenced and supported by the insights of poststructuralist thinking which stresses the fluid, shifting nature of human knowledge and concepts’ and therefore bound to ‘critical investigation’ and falsifiability (Pears: 2010, 8).

Even though Park uses standard Oxford definitions for healing: ‘to make whole or sound in bodily condition’, ‘to restore to health or soundness’, ‘to free from disease or ailment’, Park sees healing from *han* taking place through ‘transformation’ and ‘transcendence’ (Park, 2004: 131). Further, ‘conscious *han*’ can be healed by ‘eradicating *han*-causing factors’ and ‘unconscious *han*’ can be dealt with by ‘working through the *han* of others, rising in turn above our own *han*’ (Park, 2004:

131). The latter, takes places through a person's work as a 'wounded healer', who helps providing for others when that person is also *han-bearing* (Park, 2004:132; Park, 2009: 68).

Admittedly, both conscious and unconscious *han* are complexly interwoven and sometimes the conscious aspects can be transcended and the unconscious aspect of *han* can be transformed. However, Park sees the work as being done through the work of the Holy Spirit (the Paraclete) and through prayer which Park sees as 'foundational in Christian life' (Park: 2004, 131). The effectiveness of the Paraclete and prayer is in the way in which the 'compressed energy' of *han* can be moved away from destruction and into constructive means. When bitterness and resentment are channelled into retribution and violence towards the perpetrators of sin, *han* becomes destructive to others and self. In contrast, when *han* is moved into a place of reconciliation with God and others. In some places, Park calls the Spirit 'the wounded healer' (Park, 2009: 68; Park, 2004: 133) and other places he calls Jesus 'the wounded healer' (Park 2004, 132). Park gives the reason that the Spirit, and more specifically, the Paraclete is called 'the wounded healer' is that Spirit was with Jesus before the crucifixion and was wounded with Jesus. In one way, Park here is using some aspects of Luther's *communicatio idiomatum*, the distribution of attributes. So, what can be applied God the Son is also applied to God the Spirit (*On the councils of the church* 41, 100-01). In another way, Park is showing how a person of the triune God also experience suffering with Jesus and therefore can understand the suffering of others. In this way, the Paraclete is the one who fully expresses *paraclesis* (παράκλησις) or consolation (Park, 2004: 133) for the victims of wounds. However, because *han* is not only personal, but structural the healing work of the Spirit must infuse the structural *han*. Here, Park uses the parable of the good Samaritan (Luke 10:29-37) to show that not only victims of the travellers must be treated, but the 'problem of robbers' must be dealt with, the problems of 'regional poverty and unemployment' (Park, 2004: 133).

Because there is a tradition of speaking about the Christian life in terms of holiness or sanctification, Park gives space to a survey of traditions that interpret what sanctification means. He starts his account by saying that 'sanctification means being set apart, made separate from the world', but moves towards a more therapeutic definition as 'being made whole.' Although he sets

in dialogue the views of Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and Roman Catholic theology, Park's view centres on 'collective holiness' where people in the community of the *ecclesia* (ἐκκλησία) are 'called out to meet together for holy or holistic missions' (Park, 2004: 140). Clearly, Park is moving from the personal dimension of *han* into the collective and uses Paul's sacrificial attitude in Rom 9:2-3 and Peter's preaching and the creation of a new community as 'they were together and held all things in common' (Acts 2:44). The aspect of 'social holiness' is a way to talk about sanctification in terms of collective wholeness and healing. These are aspects of Park's view of how *han* is relieved and on the side of the victims. The next move is to discuss how *han* is treated on the side of the perpetrators, the sinners.

3.3.9 Repentance and Sin in Park's Hamartiology

For Park, repentance is Jesus' first proclamation (Mark 1:15) and this transformative aspect is 'the essential part of his redeeming work for oppressors' (Park, 2009: 81). The cross makes up the 'challenge' to sinners and 'protest against evildoers' because the cross reveals the gravity of sin in the crucifixion of the Son of God. Moreover, for Park without repentance 'atonement theories are pointless' (Park, 2009: 81). Here, Park runs through the various atonement theories and metaphors and gives reason why repentance is a necessary and essential part of these theories. More importantly, Park concludes 'while most atonement theories are metaphorical, repentance is actual' (Park, 2009: 82). Repentance as a subjective act of individuals or groups involves work that prevents the perpetuation of sin and evil in the world. However, this labour is done with the conviction of the Paraclete and this repentance can encompass a four-step process: 1) contrition 2) confession 3) the changing of one's heart 4) transformation (Park, 2009: 81). The two Greek and biblical terms Park uses are *metanoia* (μετάνοια) and *epistrophé* (ἐπιστροφή). While *metanoia* signifies a changing of the mind or 'defection' (Lidell, 1925: 1111), *epistrophé* is the 'turning to' or 'pivoting toward' [God] (Lidell, 1925: 661). These definitions reflect both a change of perspective, as in step 3, and also a movement toward the divine and thereby a transformative move.

The relationship between *metanoia* and *epistrophé* is that they work hand in hand and for Park 'metanoia and epistrophé occur one after the other' (Park, 2009: 85). Two citations are used, Luke

3:8 and Acts 26:20, ‘to bear fruit worthy of repentance’ and ‘to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God and do deeds consistent with repentance,’ respectively. The fruit and the deeds are deemed to be the works of transformation that takes place when one changes one’s attitude and moves towards God. The work of the Paraclete is to engender and empower this work and when one is ‘in the Paraclete’ this takes place.

One of the criticisms that has been levelled at Park is regarding an anthropology that does not take everyone as a sinner, as a wrongdoer (Boehme, 2010, 206-207; Brown, 2010: 80). Much of this is addressed in *The triune atonement* (2009) which makes the distinction between sinner and sinned against. However, Park clarifies that ‘most individuals are sinners as well as well as those who have been sinned against, and therefore need both salvation and liberation’ (Park, 2009: xiii). These distinctions are helpful on the onset because they properly diagnose the problem and provide treatment and therefore a course of action for both the sinned against and the sinner. Here Irenaeus’ comment that ‘it is impossible for anyone to heal the sick, if he has no knowledge of the disease of the patients’ (AH IV, pre, 1) gives affirmation to a technique that can specifically diagnose problems in order to provide the appropriate treatment. Given what sin is, as an act of wrongdoing towards someone, then one must wonder what is provided for the *han*-ridden, the sinned against. Showing how sin can be forgiven and dealt with through the repentance of sinners and *han* ‘can be resolved by the healing of the sinned-against’ is a way to gain a proper perspective and ‘to more effectively make the fullness of Christian salvation and liberation real and concrete’ (Park, 2004: 33). Moreover, if the wounds of the sinner are not treated, then the most likely result is that the sinned against would become sinners, perpetuating sin towards others. This leads to the last section of this chapter that show the correlations between Park and Irenaeus, since both are interested in describing the healing of sin.

3.3.10 Conclusion

The study of sin in terms of *han* arises from the tradition of Minjung or the People’s theology, where the emphasis is on the oppression of the Korean people by a history of multiple foreign invaders. Park uses the particular category of *han* or woundedness to speak about the effects of sin in general and how it pertains to all those who have been hurt by the sin. For Park, this explains

the cycle of sin in the world and gives rise to his solutions which involves healing for the *han* ridden and repentance for the sinner, the ones who are the perpetrators of sin. In doing so, Park hopes to fill a lacuna in the theological work of that has by and large neglected the sinned against while providing the language of salvation and grace for the sinner. In doing this Park realizes that there are overlaps between the sinner and the sinned against, but Park makes this distinction in order to diagnose the problem of sin and provide a sufficient account of the remedy that he sees in the work of Jesus and the Paraclete. In this way, Park hopes to respond to the objection of the Jewish theologian, Martin Buber, who commented that if Jesus was truly the Messiah, then redemption would have taken place, ‘In our view, redemption occurs forever, and none of this has yet occurred’ (Park, 2009: v; Freidman, 1991: 293). Park’s project is then to show how redemption is occurring through the work of God in the lives of the wounded and those who have caused the wounds, and this work is the same work of the Messiah, Jesus.

The history of the term *han* shows how it originated from shamanistic roots in Korea and became a social, cultural, political, and theological term to describe the sorrow, pain, and grief of the Korean peoples. Different Korean theologians used the term in various ways but all root it in the sorrow derived from experiences of sin. The various ways in which the word has been used also speaks to its effect and impact. *Han* as a phenomenon can be seen in its expression in aesthetics and poetry. This is the manifestation of the internalization of the sorrow of the Korean people. Between Suh and Hyun there is a movement from *han* being only a feeling into something that is embodied. Park gives a more holistic definition of *han* that encompasses psycho-social-physical components. The anthropological understandings of each of these writers and theologians would require further research and understanding, but what can be seen in Park is a broader application of the term from its strictly Korean context to a more universalized view, where *han* can be seen in all those who have experienced oppression. This broad category of *han* also contains theological issues found in mind/body problems in the disciplines of mental health and philosophy. Because Park’s theology, like Irenaeus’, is a deeply embodied one, application for those experiencing PTSD or CPTSD can be considered, as well as bringing critique to theologies that are given to a mind/body dichotomy. Park himself is not innocuous to critiques of extreme materialism, physicalism, or even Pelagianism. It is important to see the limits of those who are suffering and

what kind of relief can be provided. If the one answer to *han* is self-denial or *dan* then the question is what kind of spiritual practices can be employed with actualizing *dan*? How does a view of Jesus' identifying with the victims of *han* work to actualize the sin against not to lash out in vengeance at the sinners? Lastly, in relationship to Nietzschean *ressentiment*, there is an appropriate use of the term which does not undermine the credibility of the Minjung movement in trying to achieve relief from pain and sorrow. To be fair to Minjung theology and its people, trauma and sorrow are as real as the effects of sin in the lives of people, and the use of *han* is a Christian response in view of their readings of Jesus' life and ministry, especially in the Gospel of Mark. On the other hand, to read Nietzsche charitably is to see how *ressentiment* can be restated to show the sociological impact of *han* in the lives of people and find the roots of their struggles and pains.

Park's project is however not without serious concerns from both a sociological and theological perspective. Because minjung emerged as reaction During the the 1960s and 1970s it is naturally 'closely tied to the achievement of human rights, democracy, social and economic justice' at the same time assimilating 'Marxist insights' it was 'opposed to the alliance, Korea, Japan, and the USA' (Thompson, 2008: 12; Delhi: 1997). These factors both expose the milieu in which minjung theology is born from and the political and cultural influences coming from the West. However, Thompson comments that the movement 'did not die when some of the political goals of democratization in Korea were achieved' rather it 'emphasized as a more universal insight affecting not only Asia but the world' (2008, 12). Moreover, the goals of minjung theology align with those of the *han*-stricken, those affected by sin (Thompson, 2008: 12; Bock, 2000: 116). The emphasis is not only particular, but also universalizable. So, all those who suffer fall into the proposed category of *han*.

In addition, Park's contributions are based on the work of the sociologist and theologian Anh Byung-Mu's (1922-1996) work in Minjung theology and the *ochlos* found in the Gospel of Mark rather than *loas* (Küster: 2010, 70; Hwang: 2013, 218). Here, Byung-Mu interprets the *ochlos* as the 'lowest class' rather than the 'crowds' or 'people', in general. In addition, he uses the term ambiguously as opposed to concretising it in order to avoid categorization (Hwang, 2013: 218). It is evident that Byung-invokes the idea of a Marxist class struggle between the haves and have

nots. Even though Park does not make this fine distinction, but focuses instead on the sinned-against, it is difficult to not see an inherent class bias. This again asks the above question about whether or not all people in one way or another are also the sinned-against or even if the *ochlos* themselves are sinners. Critics might say that Minjung theologians might overlook their sinfulness ‘—their greed, their violence, their betrayals, lies, etc.’ (Küster, 2010: xv). But Park admits that ‘most people experience both sin and han’ (1993: 70) and that sin and *han* need to be discussed together. Paul realizes that there is han not caused by sin, such as natural disasters or a ‘self-drive.’ This drive is either ‘exaggerating or denying the self’ (1993: 70). This inward focus might also be related to Luther’s concept of sin as *incurvatus in se* (Lt, ‘the self-turned inward’) found in his *Commentary on Romans*. Nevertheless, *han* and sin are interwoven at both social and personal levels.

Finally, some Korean theologians operating from the Reformed tradition have criticized Minjung theology as rejecting ‘the Bible as the fundamental and absolute source for’ as well as ‘opposing the doctrines of the Old and New Testaments and the historic church’ (Kim, 1998: 61; Se-Yoon Kim, 1987: 273). However, Park has situated his particular use of Minjung theology within the framework not of the class struggle, but within the context of the sinned-against. His anthropology encompasses more than only the Minjung people and takes into account on all who are wounded and are affected by sin. However, Kim claims that Park ‘rejects the Bible as the fundamental and absolute source for hermeneutics’ and additionally does not accept ‘virtually all the doctrines of the Old and New Testaments and the historic church’ (1998, 61). This is based on Park’s statement that the ‘basic hermeneutical task of minjung theology is not to interpret the Bible (text) in light of the Korean situation’, but rather the suffering of Koreans are interpreted ‘in the light of the Bible (text)’ (Park 1984:10). Although, Park does not use the biblical text as the starting point per se, it is difficult to see how the Bible is not utilized as some kind of authority to illuminate how Minjung theology is to be used. In addition, because hermeneutics itself is a philosophical exercise, the starting point of reading the any text is not the text itself, for what text can read itself? Readers must read texts and recognizing their own starting points and biases is a first step in honestly and faithfully approaching Scripture. Even when the claim is that the Bible is the starting point, as *sola Scriptura*, diverse conclusions will arise, which attest to the use of interpretive tool outside the

Bible (Kaiser, 2007: 166-167). In addition to the biblical witness, Park relies on the experiences of those who suffer *han* and the guidance of the Spirit of God in the form of the Paraclete (Park, 2009: 62). Because interpretation is ‘ultimately a martyrological act’ which continues to witness what is ‘heard, seen and touched in Scripture’ (1: John 1:1) and all that which Scripture cannot contain about the acts and works of Christ (John 21:25; Vanhoozer, 2006: 268).

Kim admits that Minjung theology, seen positively, offers a challenge ‘within Korean Christianity’ (1998: 62). This challenge is to move the Korean church toward social concern that gives ‘adequate attention to the needs of the poor and oppressed’ (Kim, 1998: 62). Even Calvin makes a point to highlight the needs of the poor and the role of the government to oversee their welfare in his *Commentary on Psalm 72* as well as the *Institutes* (4.20.1, 6, 9, 20; Sanchez, 2019: 268; Tuininga, 2017). Calvin comments that ‘God takes more special care of the poor than others since they are exposed to injuries and violence’ (*Commentary*, 72.4). To keep the social dimension and the spiritual dimension of Christian ministry closely attached reflects the incarnational nature of God as well as keeping with the traditions of prophetic wisdom in the Hebrew Scriptures. This application might be suitable to the Christian church as a whole such as Considine’s use of *han* for the Roman Catholic church and the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, *Gaudium et spes*.

These critiques provide helpful consideration for Minjung and Park scholars in future scholarship. Park’s and Minjung’s provisions also give helpful challenges to churches of various denominations in order to add theological depth can clarity to their own work.

3.3 CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PARK’S HAMARTIOLOGY AND IRENAEUS’ ACCOUNTS

As outlined in chapter 2, Irenaeus speaks about sin in terms of woundedness in several places in *AH* because his view of redemption encompasses a therapeutic aspect that involves the whole person, body and soul. Park’s presentation of Jesus as a physician is key in this analysis and since this chapter’s primary focus is on Park’s hamartiology, an examination will fall back on how Park has explored these aspects of anthropological as well as cosmic healing.

3.3.1 Introduction

The correlation between Park's hamartiology and Irenaeus' can be seen in how they address the problem of sin in terms of sickness and how they approach the solution to sickness, which is healing. There are definite points of connection and departure. Where Park's use the *han* to describe woundedness and Irenaeus' account of sin can be seen in the therapeutic aspects of Jesus' ministry. Both theologians work from the key text that describe Jesus as a physician (Mark 2:17) and these restorative images abound. For Irenaeus, Jesus comes as a physician to both the sick and the sinners (*AH* IV, 5, 2; III, 20, 2; Moss, 2011: 1006). Further, Irenaeus describes the treatment in pedagogical terms: 'Wherefore the Lord used to impart knowledge to His disciples, by which also it was His practice to heal those who were suffering, and to keep back sinners from sin' (*AH* IV, 5, 2). The therapeutic aspects of redemption are part and parcel of Jesus' discipleship ministry. For Park, Jesus is the Physician 'who came into the world to set free the wronged from their grief and burden' (Park, 2009: 76; Park, 2001: 45, 53; Park, 2004: 22). Jesus also came for the 'wrong doers', but his primarily mission was for the sinned against. Park goes from a general view of human woundedness, to a very particular view of the wounded themselves, the *han*-ridden. Here, the analysis will regard how Park's account of sin and its treatment connect with Irenaeus' accounts seeing the correlations between the problems and the solutions. These connections show the 'historical' and somatic nature of Park's theology in connection to the Irenaeus' recapitulative imagery. Lastly, since sin infects both the personal and cosmic dimensions, there is a discussion of Park and Irenaeus' view of healing and creation.

3.3.2 Recapitulation and Incarnational Theology in Relationship to Liberation and Healing

Park's account of *han* as defined as woundedness is at the heart of his hamartiology. *Han* is the result of sinful action done by an agent onto a subject. Therefore, the subject becomes the sinned against, the victim of the sinful actions. As we have seen, this sin is done by personal agents, communal actions, or systemic structures. The wound inflicted can result in hurt that is both conscious or unconscious and these issues are treated and transformed. Because sin involves agents and a volitional understanding of human actions Park's hamartiology involves both the

transformative act of the Paraclete and the human agents who are actively working toward reconciliation. For Irenaeus, sin described as sickness and woundedness, but this then begs the question as to what is the primary cause of the sickness or woundedness? If the initial cause is not in Adam, then it must then take the structural evil, i.e., evil in opposition to the goodness of God, in which Irenaeus calls Satan or some form of human agency. In *AH*, Irenaeus gives a narration of both instances in the describing the deception of humans with the temptation of immortality and how humans use their own agency to reject God's relational parenting.

Payton has done well in outlining how Irenaeus' theological anthropology, that actually begins with the Incarnation of Christ, is inextricably connected to Irenaeus' hamartiology (Payton, 2016: 149-163). Irenaeus was a 'biblical' theologian who crafted his refutations and discourses based on a reading of Scripture with the view that Jesus was 'the incarnate Son of God, who lived, died, and rose again to fulfil all that had been written' in the Scriptures (Payton, 2016: 151). Historically, the incarnate Word was the starting point and not the confession of Jesus Christ as the 'Son of God'; it is the 'flesh and bones Jesus of Galilee' that Irenaeus begins with (Payton, 2016: 153). Because the incarnate Jesus comes first in history, humanity is redeemed according to this order.

The other features of Irenaeus' recapitulative theology include: 1) Humanity, by nature, was created in the image of God, but was not immortal. Life was a gift and sustained only by being conformed to the likeness of God. 2) The enmity is between the woman's seed, i.e., Christ, and the Serpent, not between God and humans. 3) The punishment of sin for the first couple was expulsion to the garden, but it was not death. Death was an eventual consequence from being prevented from eating from the tree of life, which was not so much a punishment, but to prevent continued sin in humans (*AH* IV, 23, 6). This death was passed down to humanity and all humans are caught within this tension of sin and death. 4) Since the apostate one brought death in the world, Christ's recapitulation of history brings life. Recapitulation, therefore, is historical in the sense that it is about the human story, and in another sense is concerned about the events of Jesus' life in the summing up of that history. In other words, by nature, the incarnation necessitates a storied existence and recapitulation is a storied process of redemption.

Although, Park does not have an explicitly recapitulative and incarnational theology, such as Irenaeus', Park's theology is thoroughly historical. It involves Jesus' ministry as the physician to the sick, the sacrificial death of Christ, the resurrection, and the continued ministry by the Paraclete. The role of Jesus' ministry was primarily to bring liberation to those inflicted by *han* and the proclamations of the Kingdom was regarding inbreaking and a new dominion of liberation and healing. Jesus' life and ministry provides the context by which sin affects others and continues to propagate if left untreated. Using instances from Jesus' encounters, Park illustrates the difference between curing and healing, showing in Luke 17:11-19 that 'nine out of the ten lepers were cured, but not healed' (Park, 2009: 44). Park posits that the one truly healed was the Samaritan leper (v.19). Jesus' death was the confrontation of the evil that the religious leaders and political powers dealt against the '*am ha'ares* and downtrodden so that 'Jesus' life and death point to God's solidarity with the *han*-ridden' (Park, 2009: 45). More over the cross is a symbol of non-violent challenge to economic exploitation, religious authorities, and political power. In this challenge, the cross confronts active sin in the world and brings restoration to victims and salvation to the perpetrators of sin.

The Paraclete ultimately proves God's work of solidarity in being the 'wounded and resurrected Holy Spirit' who both endured the cross and embraced Jesus after the resurrection (Park, 2006: 62). Park makes a distinction between the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete, saying that they are both the same and that the Paraclete is also sent from God post-crucifixion. Park seeks to both answer the question, "Why was it necessary for God to send the Paraclete [if the Holy Spirit and God are the same]'" (Park, 2006: 62) and show how the work of Jesus continues when Jesus is not physically present. The Paraclete continues Jesus' work of healing, liberation, and salvation within communities.

3.3.3 Christian perfection through the Holy Spirit

The last component in observing the connection between Park's solution to *han* is in the transformative power of the Paraclete. For Park, one of the goals, perhaps the ultimate, is union with God (Park, 2004: 132) 'moving toward the God of Healing'. Tapping into the Wesleyan tradition of 'scriptural holiness', Park sees some sort of Christian perfection as being achievable

within earthly existence (Park, 2004: 159). Park is interested in *how* the process sanctification works out in order to make holy individual and communities. In Irenaeus' theology, this transformation is made by both the creative and sanctifying activities of the Spirit (AH III, 23, 5; Briggman, 2012: 146). A passage that has definite overlaps with Park's pneumatology is in AH V, 6, 1, where Irenaeus starts by talking about how by 'the hand of the Father, that is by the Son and the Holy Spirit, the human being, and not merely a part of the human being, was made in the likeness of God'. Park speaks about Jesus and the Paraclete being the 'twins' that engage in God's activity of healing, liberation, and salvation (Park, 2009: 60-61) in the same way Irenaeus describes the incarnate Son and the Spirit as 'the hands'. Here, the word '*perfectus*' (complete, Lt.) is used in relationship to how the Spirit joins with the entire human being, consisting of body and soul, to bring about a whole human being. Briggman highlights this passage to discuss the state of the believer when receiving the Spirit and the terminology used by Irenaeus in describing this: 'perfect', 'eternal, and 'like' [God] (Briggman, 2012: 173).

Because Irenaeus' view of *theosis*, union with God, encompasses a renewed humanity, rather than a return to Edenic existence, Christian perfection involves becoming conformed to the 'image and likeness of God' (AH V, 6, 1). This growing toward 'likeness of God' is how the human achieves perfection. Briggman additionally highlights AH V, 8, 2, where Irenaeus clarifies that 'those, then, who have the earnest of the Spirit and are not enslaved to the desires of the flesh, but are themselves subject to the Spirit and are living according to reason in all things'. For Park, the work of the Spirit and the human activity of self-denial become important work in Christian perfection (Park, 2004: 134-135). For the wounded, self-denial involves understanding one's authentic self, outside of those imposed on them by constructs created by oppressors. In this way, those whose image have been marred can begin to see themselves made in the image of God and pursue life in growing into the 'likeness of God'.

3.3.4 *The Redemption of Creation*

A last part in pairing Park's analysis of sin with Irenaeus' is in his application to creation. For Irenaeus there is no separation between his doctrine of creation and his views of redemption; 'creationism is, then, in a most direct way, his soteriology' (Steenberg, 2008: 213). On the side of

Irenaeus, Park comments that the Testaments show that ‘God’s care for the created world’ and this is a dualism that ‘regards matter as evil and spirit as good’ (Park, 2009: 94). Park’s concern is not merely ecological, but located at the heart of Hebrew and Christian narratives of God’s involvement with humanity. Citing Brueggemann (1977: 3), Park describes the centrality of land in biblical faith. In Deuteronomy, land is where blessing and fertility is bestowed. In addition, the Psalms and the Priestly writer praise YHWH’s fecundity (Ps. 50:11; 36:6; 145:15; 104; 148; 19:1; Lev. 25:23). In the New Testament, Park sees a union of two motifs, the spiritual and the ecological, as outlined by Santmire (1987). Citing the apostle Paul, Park sees that salvation includes both the individual and the universal: ‘For from him and through him and to him are all things. To him be the glory forever’ (Rom. 11:36). This doxology is one that praises God for the renewal of the entire world.

For Irenaeus, does not take lightly that human existence is tied to creation: ‘For creation is an attribute of the goodness of God but to be created is that of human nature’ (*AH* IV, 39, 2). These are serious aspects of God’s work in creating and sustaining human beings through the work of creating the cosmos. Even the narrative of Adam/Christ typology, and Eve/Mary typology (Dunning: 2009), is connected to the earth. This view of creation as sustaining and salvific is interpreted not through the lens of Genesis but through the Gospels (Steenberg: 2008, 33). The ministry of Jesus, such as healing the blind man (John 9), show the restorative connection between Jesus’ redemption and the economy of creation as a whole (Behr, 2013b: 89). In *AH* V, 15, 2, Irenaeus sees the healing of the blind as one who is healed by the ‘hand of God’ which is the hand that set forth creation. Giving sight to the blind is so that ‘the works of God should be manifest in him’ (John 9:3) and Irenaeus comments on this passage to say, ‘the work of God is fashioning the human being’ (*AH* V, 15, 2). Jesus’ restoration of sight is the same act as the bringing about of creation.

Park’s focus on creation is not merely an ecological concern as it is theologically focused, because the cosmos and all its creatures are also the objects of *han* (Park, 2009: 98). Moreover, creation yearns for the adoption of the children of God and the redemption of the body (Romans 8:18-24). This is both a point of connection and departure for Irenaeus’ treatment of creation. Creation’s

longing is an avenue of intersection because for Irenaeus the beginning is seen through the end, i.e., the activity of creation finds its culmination in the death and resurrection of the Word of God: ‘Now this is His Word, our Lord Jesus Christ, who in the last times was made a man among men, that He might join the end to the beginning, that is, man to God’ (AH IV, 20, 4). Behr describes creation as the ‘project, the work of God announced at the beginning, is completed at the end by one who is God and man: the Beginning, as Irenaeus put it, appears at the end’ (Behr, 2013b: 89). The point of departure is that for Irenaeus this ‘groaning’ is part of the fulfilment of the God’s redemption, to show that humanity as children redeemed and adopted need to grow toward their maturity in God. For Park, this cannot happen until those who continue to wound the earth and all creation repent and see themselves as intimately a part of creation and therefore a part of fulfilment of God’s purposes in creation (Park, 2009: 105). However, this difference might not be a radical departure since Irenaeus’ theology of creation, incarnation, and anthropology are interwoven. In speaking about the knowledge of redemption, Irenaeus writes ‘that we should know that He who made, and formed, and breathed in them the breath of life, nourishes us by means of the creation, establishing all things by His Word, and binding them together by His Wisdom’ (AH III, 24, 2). Perhaps, the matter is one of emphasis. Where recapitulation highlights how God’s ‘image’ or ‘handiwork’ (Grk, *πλάσμα*) is part of moulding creation into the image, first formed, and now redeemed, Park’s concern is how this formation takes place and how humans participate in making this eschatological vision a reality.

3.3.5 Conclusion

Park’s theory of sin, sickness, and woundedness connects with Irenaeus in attempting to show how Jesus is the physician of the hurting and that this healing takes place through the historical drama of Jesus’ life, ministry, crucifixion, and resurrection. Even though Park’s theology is not incarnational per se, the emphasis on the concrete wounds of the sinned against and Jesus’ own woundedness by the religious and political powers show how the hamartiology of *han* is necessarily grounded in a somatic view of human person. In other words, without seeing human persons, in light of the incarnation, as people who need physical, as well as spiritual and emotional healing, the solution for the healing of *han* could not take place. Three aspects of this healing can

be seen in connection with Irenaeus: 1) A historical and somatic emphasis 2) the aspect of Christian perfection and 3) the redemption of creation. These three points of connection show Park's therapeutic view of Jesus and the Paraclete's ministry and their involvement in the redemption of not only individuals, but also of communities and all of creation. However, these three dimensions can also be critically analysed as to how they would fit into a larger schema of constructive theology.

For both Park and Irenaeus, they both attempt to situate their theories in both the historical and enfleshed existence of Christ. For Park, this comes in the form of reifying the effects of sin as *han* in the suffering and woundedness of people, the earth, and non-human animals. How does Park make of the Davidic psalm where the cry to God is 'Against you, you alone, have I sinned' (51:4a)? Is this shift from God as the one offended by sin to others offended one of emphasis? If we see the move as not only one of importance, but a theological shift that is only made possible in terms of the incarnation of God, then we can see why this move can be made. Park's starting points, much like Irenaeus, is in the embodied Christ and the story of Jesus as one who lived among the poor and wounded (Park, 2004: 22-23; 2009: 42-43). Jesus lived among the poor as a carpenter (Mark 6:4a), contra to some who believe that Jesus was part of some kind of Galilean middle class (Meier, 1991: 278-285). In solidarity with the poor and oppressed, Jesus is the incarnation of this offended God, the one who was sinned-against. This is both an important theological nuance and also anchors Park in a biblical and theological tradition.

Similarly, Irenaeus' view of redemption is found in the narrative between evil, expressed as the 'apostate one' and humanity, rather between humanity and God. This begs the question as both God's attitude toward sin and humanity's response. At least for Anselm of Canterbury, humanity must make recompense for dishonouring God. For the bishop of Lyons, it appears that God is untouched or even disinterested in the judgement against those who sin. Further, if humans are involved in the process of redemption, then what roll do humans play in this cosmic drama?

Irenaeus' model of redemption, often described as *Christus victor* (Aulen, 1951), situates the narrative within the overarching framework of recapitulation. Jesus not only walks back the disobedience of Adam, but because of the incarnation, 'but that Adam's body is remade in Christ'

(Hollen, 2015: 93). Moreover, Jesus is not simply ‘a new and perfect man who bears no relation to Adam’, but rather God enters into Adam (Wingren, 2004: 95). In this way Adam is ‘remade by Christ’ because Christ inhabits Adam’s flesh *in rei* (Hollen, 2015: 93). Again, incarnation appears to be God’s primary response to the sin in the world. If we ask Irenaeus the question that Anselm asks as the title of his project, *Cur Deus homo*, ‘Why God became human?’ Then Irenaeus would perhaps answer, ‘So to liberate humans from sin’ (Crane, 2019: 70). The response by God is in the incarnate act of becoming human, a particular human in Jesus, and in doing so, taking on the flesh of the first human, Adam.

In terms of humanity’s response to the work of God in Christ is forgiveness and love (Osborn, 2000; Crane: 2019). There is also components of faith and repentance. Against an interpretation of redemption being merely ‘physical’, provided by Harnak and Loofs, Hart contends that belief also plays an important role in how humans are to react given the realization and revelation of redemption from sin (Hart, 1989: 152). Hart sees Irenaeus emphasizing ‘all who believe on him’ (AH II, 33, 5). Therefore, redemption cannot be only joining the incorruptible with the corruptible. However, it is important to point out that the Christ ‘confers benefits upon humans and cures’; the turn toward the disease analogy is made. This can be taken both spiritually and physically, since Irenaeus declares that the practice of Jesus ‘heal those who were suffering, and to keep back sinners from sin’ (AH, III, V, 2).

This leads into the topic of Christian perfection. Irenaeus view of human progress is firmly related to the above view of recapitulation. The developmental view of Irenaeus posits that Adam and Eve were in their infancy and had not fully grasped how to fully be the divine image-bearers. God could have given them the power, but they could not handle it in their infancy (AH IV, 38, 2). The fall of the primitive couple was due being made pre-mature. One might ask, ‘Why then did God make them this way?’ But Irenaeus avoids the temptation to answer, unlike his Gnostic contemporaries who were often given to wild speculation (Vogel, 2007: 446). It appears that Irenaeus is not only giving an account of the development of process of the early couple and reasoning as to why they fell, but an account of human anthropology in which humans being created ‘should receive growth...should be strengthen...should abound...should recover...should

be glorified...should see his Lord' (AH IV, 38, 3). The process of human growth culminates in a vision of God in nearness to God (*proximum*).

However, this answers the question of Adam and Eve's fall, but what part of this process is related to the incarnation and recapitulation of Christ? This is answered in part with what Irenaeus attributes to sin, the impatience of the first couple. For Irenaeus, Christ's incarnation is the point in which God enters into a temporal dimension in order to patiently do God's bidding and grow into the fullness of being human, and to fulfil his role of the second Adam. This is contra to Valentinus' version of Christ who seeks to escape the shackles of time, and therefore escapes being human (Vogel, 2007: 448). Because all the heretics are joined by the common bond in denying the flesh, 'But according to the opinion of no one of the heretics was the Word of God made flesh' (AH III, XI, 3), their view of Christ is one that falls into back into impatience. Their Christ is 'without flesh' and 'impassable', whereas Irenaeus' version of Christ is one who suffers because he is 'obedient even to death, death on the cross' (Philippians 2:8).

This view of sin arising from impatience is explored in greater detail by Tertullian (c. 155-c. 240 AD) in *De patientiae*, but here it is not so much a description of what sin is, but how it arises in a person. What Christ does is to undergo great suffering because he is willing to submit to God's mission and at the same time forgive those who crucified him, exhibiting the same love for the enemy as he himself preached (AH, III, XVIII, 5). This love for enemies and forgiveness is the recovery of human *imago dei*. A most striking passage in AH, consist of the ethical ramifications of human perfection that is anything, but passive growth. Irenaeus explores Matthew 5: 41 regarding radical responses to an enemy and shows how these 'precepts' preached by Jesus at the Sermon on the Mount were not 'doing away with the law, but of one fulfilling, extending, and widening it among us; just as if one should say, that the more extensive operation of liberty implies that a more complete subjection and affection towards our Liberator had been implanted within us' (AH IV, XIII, 3). As humans are made free, this freedom creates an affinity with the one who provides freedom, thereby allowing for the divine vision and proximity to God. Therefore, human progress contains ethical considerations.

The last item for critique in this chapter concerns the Irenaeus' view of the economy of creation. Since Park's view of redemption is cosmic, it must include the earth and non-human animals as also objects of *han* (2009: 98-108). This view correlate with Irenaeus' views of redemption in only the broad strokes or are there details about the economy of creation to consider? In order to show that Adam is not cursed per se because of his disobedience, Irenaeus points to the earth as the object of the curse (*AH*, III, XXIII, 3). If this is the case, then how is the earth freed from this curse? The redemption of earth and subjection of man and women in relationship are the result of the sin of the first human. In these particular earth to human and human to human relationships, Irenaeus sees that the word Word of God was to communicate with humans 'upon the earth' and should 'confer with' humans and be present with the Word's 'own creation, saving it, and becoming capable of being perceived by it, and freeing us from the hands of all that hate us' (*AH*, IV, XX, 4). The incarnation of the Word here draws allusions to back to the Genesis 2:4b creation account, where the relationship between the Edenic couple and YHWH was one of presence and fellowship. The image of garden and humanity is recast in the image of creation and Christ.

According to Dunning, the importance of earth, and specifically 'virgin earth', should not go unnoticed (2009, 72). Quoting from Genesis 2:5, Irenaeus points out that 'And as the protoplast himself Adam, had his substance from untilled and as yet virgin soil [earth, *terra*]' (*AH*, III, XXI, 10). The symmetry of the virgin earth/man relationship and virgin woman/man relationship can be mapped onto the relationship with the curses. So, in the restoration of humanity, there is also a restoration of the earth in relationship with Adam. However, putting aside Dunning's thesis that Irenaeus' vision of redemption is one of a return to childlike innocence and virginity of persons, 'without desire and without procreation' (2009: 82), another way to perceive recapitulation and terrestrial restoration is to see earth and female in restored relationship.

In *AH*, V, XXXII, 1, Irenaeus speaks of how the saints will 'receive the fruits of their labours' in the 'flesh' and that this will be done when they rise 'to behold God in this creation which is renovated' (*renovatur*). Again, Irenaeus points out that it is 'in that very creation' where they were afflicted and suffered. They will receive compensation for their patience on this renewed earth. He then quotes the passage in Romans 8:19-21 concerning the groaning of creation 'for the children

of God to be revealed'. These verses also find connection in Park's work where the earth's longing for fulfilment is the groaning of *han* (Park, 1994: 42; 2009: 99). For Park, these verses speak about the how creation was 'forced to serve human whims and has suffered pain in silence'. He interprets Paul to say that 'creation longs eagerly' for the liberation from this bondage that was set by sin. In this way, both Irenaeus and Park see the cosmic aspects of redemption, which pertain not only to humanity, but to the earth and all things within it (Park, 2009: 99).

Irenaeus' reading of the vision of the peaceable kingdom (Isaiah 11:6-9) is remarkable because he accounts for a spiritual reading of the predator and prey relationship, seeing that 'some persons endeavour to refer these words to the case of savage men, both of different nations and various habits, who come to believe, when they have believed, act in harmony with the righteous' (AH, V, XXXIII, 4) However, Irenaeus goes on to comment that 'even though this is true' in the eschatological coming of the kingdom, '[the words shall also apply] to those animals mentioned'. Although, the animals will be obedient to humans as in the former Edenic state, Irenaeus favours a renewal of relationship that is in harmony with each other. For Park, the relationships convey that both 'predators and the victims' and 'oppressors and oppressed' are in harmony with each other, playing with and enjoying each other in God's created and restored order (Park, 2009: 108).

3.4 SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

Since chapter two explored the descriptions of sin found in the Eastern Fathers, especially in Irenaeus, chapter three is an exploration the secondary question: how these descriptions fit into the picture of Park's analysis of sin and *han*, as categories and ties to Irenaeus' own work. Once this is established connections can be drawn back to Irenaeus to show how his theological work can shed light on Park's and vice versa. The category of *han* provides the tool for Park's analysis of sin and its effects on a personal, communal, and systemic level. Both Park and Irenaeus see Jesus as the healer of results of sin on the human person.

This chapter begins by showing the context for Park's theological project being situated in Minjung theology. This provides a basis for the social and experiential sources of *han*, the origin of the word and its meaning in both historical and contemporary settings. Park acknowledges that

these sources, but also draws from a wealth of biblical literature to show where the effects of sin manifest *han*. Where sin is found there is also *han*, unless there is an arbitrary definition of sin that does not encompass ethical actions toward God, creature, or created. The sinner's wounding of another is the basis of *han*, but not all *han* is the result of sin. What is important here is how Park's hamartiology takes into consideration personal, communal, and systemic components (2009, 75). In order to adequately account for the healing of *han*, there needs to be a view of sin that brings sin's reach to bear.

This leads to what Park sees as Jesus' primary mission, to heal the *han*-stricken and proclaim liberation for those taken captive from the effects of sin. In delineating those who suffer from *han* and those who cause *han*, Park attempts to isolate the causes, therefore seeking to properly diagnose the problem of sin's continued existence. Breaking the cycle of *han* becomes the object, which is a subcategory of dealing with the effects of evil. Even though Park wishes to set himself apart from Christus victor and Ransom models of atonement (Park, 2009: 3-14) he finds himself working within these categories. What is unique about Park's formulation is not the way in which he expresses the 'Triune atonement' since most theories are not exclusive of a trinitarian component, but the way in which he attempts to deal with the existence of sin and treatment of it given the claim that evil and sin have been dealt with by God's work in Christ.

For Park, to deal with sin, the starting point must be in the healing of *han*, wounds which if gone untreated might spawn sin. For, treatment for *han* comes in the form of both transformation and transcendence. For those who caused the sin, salvation involves repentance. Because reconciliation is a key component, the interrelationship between the sinner and sin-against needs to be developed. Park's major works *Racial conflict and healing* (1996) and *From hurt to healing* (2001) offers outlines to move forward in the three dimensions of sin and woundedness as described above.

In addition, critiques of both Park's theology and Minjung theology show both the limitations of these systems and their challenges to other Christian perspectives. Perhaps in taking the components of sinner and sin-against separately, in the end there can be an overreaching and all-encompassing prescription since most people live within the matrixes of both. But the advantage of taking them separately is to see the causes of the continued suffering and wrongdoing that comes

from sin. This strategy is the continuing exposition of Jesus' sermons within the milieu of the modern world.

The second part of chapter two returns to a comparison between the Park's project and Irenaeus' project around their doctrines of sin, the first tie comes in the form of the incarnation of the Word of God, which is the historical starting point for Irenaeus. Through this enfleshment of the God, there is the recapitulative process which restores human nature that was under the influence of evil. The connection between where Park situates the healing of *han* and the incarnation of the Word is within the parameters of history. It is within this temporal state that historical recapitulation can take place and healing can occur. Fittingly, Gregory Nanzianzen's famous statement, 'What has not been assumed has not been healed' (*Ep.* 101, 32: SC 208, 50) applies here not only to the 'rational mind,' contra Apollinaris, but also to the whole of human limitations found within history. Because Christ could enter into time, he can also heal the wounds related to time, wounds made because the sin of haste or otherwise.

The second aspect of connection is within the framework of Christian perfection. Instead of speaking about human transformation in terms of sanctification, Irenaeus uses the language of deification in terms of proximity and sight. Human nature is restored under the pedagogy of God by the work of Spirit through the work of the incarnation: 'The Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ...did, through his transcendent love, become what we are, that he might bring us to be even what he is himself' (*AH*, V, Pre, 1). To highlight, this is not a return to some prelapsarian state, but to the state of Christlikeness.

For both Park and Irenaeus, this requires the help of the Spirit of God. However, there are differences in how this perfection is achieved. Whereas Park sees treatment in the wounds, Irenaeus shows treatment in the restoration of the body from the ravishes of death. This restoration comes through the recapitulative work of the incarnate Word who restores the whole human being with the same act of God's creation of the cosmos. However, this restoration is not entirely passive since humans require transformative acts in order to conform to the likeness of God. This change can be described as union with God, or *theosis*. It is the transformation of the whole person by the Spirit of God. Similarly, Park's view of God's healing of *han* show that his atonement imagery is

both historically based and somatic in nature. Like Irenaeus's incarnational redemption, Park's is rooted in the healing of the entire person that is represented by Jesus' ministry, death, and resurrection. In addition, Park and Irenaeus find creation to also be the object of God's redemptive act. For Park creation is also the *han* ridden and in need of ecological restoration. Humans need to repent of their misdeeds to the land and the animals, of which both are intimately tied to human fertility and flourishing.

Lastly, the third point of comparison is in the treatment of creation in respect to sin. For Irenaeus, the groaning of creation is awaiting a rebirth for the children of God to come to true fruition. This creation was fashioned 'for the benefit of that human nature which is saved' (AH V, XXIX, 1) because of the work of the redemption of the incarnate Word, which was born through that creation, there is an interwoven relationship between the creation and restoration of humanity (Steenberg, 2008: 149). The cures and the curses between Adam and earth are linked by a single history and destiny. Similarly, Park's view of redemption of creation includes both the individual and the cosmos.

If the 'economy of salvation' is discussed in Irenaeus (AH, III, XXIII, 1) then it is important to point out that for Park there is an 'economy' of healing and liberation for all of creation. This becomes the goal of human history. Recapitulation history takes into account both the groanings of humanity and creation for redemption (Romans 8: 22-23).

Because *han* holds these multivalent aspects of woundedness in persons, communities, and systems, *han*, can therefore be used to analyse Irenaeus' view of sin and woundedness. The task of chapter four is to understand how the 'disease of sin' is treated and death is conquered (AH, I, VI, 2) in the application of the category of *han*.

CHAPTER 4:

AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIN AND SICKNESS IN IRENAEUS' *AGAINST HERESIES* AND CORRESPONDENCES WITH PARK'S USE OF *HAN*

4.1 INTRODUCTION

As outlined in Chapter 2 Irenaeus and the Early Church Fathers proposed descriptions of sin as sickness, corruption, and alienation and showed how sin affected persons as woundedness. Chapter 3 outlines Park's use of *han* as it emerges from the milieu of Minjung theology and correlations were made with Irenaeus' hamartiology. This chapter seeks to analyse the relationship between sin and sickness in the writings of Irenaeus and other Eastern Fathers and identify correspondences with Park's use of *han*. How does the Patristic literature make sense of healing of woundedness if sin is involved with the body? This chapter will explore the somatic nature of Irenaeus' anthropology and how the healing of wounds is achieved through the re-narrating of Adam's life through Christ's life.

4.2 SIN AND SICKNESS IN IRENAEUS' *AH*

In order to examine the relationship between sin and sickness in the writings of Irenaeus and other Eastern Fathers, it will be important to understand the place of sin in relationship to what Irenaeus sees as the condition of humanity. This section will begin with what Irenaeus sees as the wounds suffered by Adam and therefore all of humanity in what is called the 'pain of stroke' (*AH* V, XXXIV, 2) and will move to an understanding of Irenaeus' anthropology, that is both somatic and communal. This is an attempt to make sense of Irenaeus' connection between incarnation theology and his theology of recapitulation in order to remedy the sickness in the nature of humanity.

4.2.1 *Adamic Wounds and Recapitulation*

As seen in chapter 2, because sin encompasses a somatic nature in Irenaeus, the solution presented by Irenaeus is also somatic in nature, i.e., which starts with the incarnation of God. Recapitulation

is rooted in God's taking upon God's self the flesh of humanity, the flesh that God created and breathed life into, in order to heal the sickness of sin. Gregory of Nazianzus' maxim 'what is unassumed is unhealed' (*Ep.* 101.7, 'To Cledonius') also 'has a forebearer in Irenaeus' (Steenberg, 2009:66). For Irenaeus, the assumption of the flesh is the instrumental means in which restoration can take place. In order to heal the wounds of Adam, and therefore all of humanity, this enfleshment must reach back historically to the primeval beginnings of Adam.

The incarnation is the primary way in which restoration of human nature takes place. As expressed in the last chapter, incarnation is a historical act and therefore healing takes place within a historical and storied narrative. This narrative reaches back into earth's creative past, as seen in Irenaeus' interpretations of the healing of the man born blind (*AH* V, XV, 2) in Irenaeus' exegesis of John 9:1-11. For Irenaeus, this is not only an act of particular healing, but also one that goes back to creation of humans from *adama* in Genesis 2:7 (Steenberg, 2008: 111; 2009: 24). What is of interest is not only the spiritual hermeneutic which Irenaeus employs, but the question the biblical text raises in relation to sin and how it is answered. 'Who sinned, this man or his parents, that he is born blind?', asks the disciples. Those who asked this question have been handed down a simple way to look at Deuteronomistic causality; it is either the act of sin from the man or it is the acts of sin from the parents in whom the man inherited the punishment. Irenaeus uses the phrase 'now the work of God' (John 9:3b) as the hermeneutic bridge that ties this passage to Genesis 2:7: 'the fashioning of man'. For Irenaeus, the issue of blindness was not the sin per se, but the restoration of the blindness in the forming of the body of humans. In other words, because the incarnation takes place within a particular time, and the healing of the man born blind takes place in a particular time, the dressing of the man's wounds can reach back in time to the work of God at the beginning. The hands that created humans from dust are the same hands that restore sight to the blind man. This healing event is the particular-ness of the incarnational act and recapitulative process taking place in the same time and within the same act.

The blindness of the man can be taken as a defect of human nature, a signifier of the woundedness of humanity. The wounds that are seen in the man born blind were wounds that bridge an expanse of time going back to Adam. Jesus' hands are the 'hands of God' that formed humans at creation,

and restored the sight of the blind man. Irenaeus sees the blindness as something ‘omitted’ (*praetermissus*, Lt) by the Word, the ‘artificer’, who did not ‘form in the womb [viz., the blind man’s eyes]’. Here there are two questions that arise from this reading: 1) Whether Irenaeus is attempting to draft a theodicy of God’s involvement in sin and suffering in the world, i.e., that evil and suffering are somehow omissions from a good God or 2) that this assertion alludes to Irenaeus’ view of human development as indicted in the prior phrase ‘He made [humans] by a kind of process’. *Praetermissus* has the sensed of ‘permitted’, ‘neglected’ or ‘overlooked’. If we eliminate the last two as options of meaning because of the negative connotations when applied to an all-knowing God that is consistent to Irenaeus’ theology, then ‘permitted’ might be the best option in translation. If it is the latter then the argument can be outlined as a kind of parallelism in the chart below:

Table 4: Table illustrating the difference between the signifier and signified in AH V, XV, 2

Particular narrative of Jesus’ healing (Signifier)	General act of God’s creation (Signified)
Healing with hands	Forming with hands
Restoration of what is omitted from the womb	Forming in the womb
Healed in public	Made in secret
The healing ‘indicating the whole as distinct from part’	Making the ‘whole of humans’

One way to distinguish the particular acts of healing found in the Gospel narratives is to see them in this semiotic analysis between the signifier and signified. This is not to say that these acts were interpreted at that moment as these things they signified, but in terms of a spiritual and historical hermeneutic. This type of semiotic reading is not unheard of and can bring about fascinating analogies between the creation narratives (Korsak, 1998: 131-144). For Irenaeus, these ways of

reading show what these acts of healing mean and how they reach across time to restore the human person. In addition, this way of reading the text provides a synchronic, simultaneous, rather than merely diachronic, linear, account that can be achieved outside of strict historical or literary criticism of the text (Vogel, 2007:145-146). However, in other places Irenaeus gives a diachronic account that shows the ‘unfolding of the economy and the growth of human beings in time’ (Behr, 2013a: 184). Irenaeus speaks ‘that one and the same God has made some things temporal and some eternal, some heavenly and others earthly; and understand for what reason God, though invisible, manifested Himself’ (*AH* I,10, 3). It is God who acts within time and outside of time to bring forth redemption for particular people in their particular situations.

However, this is not to say that salvation and healing are only particular to persons. Again, it is not only the individual acts of sin that are healed here (the ‘part’), but also the woundedness of the Adamic body as a ‘whole’. As touched upon in chapter 2, sin has a somatic component that is related to the body. Augustine tried to achieve this articulation in his theory of inherited sin also but limited his conception to the transmission of sin in terms of sex and seed. However, taken as the corruption of the entire human nature, then sin affects both body and soul, and therefore healing must encompass the whole of human nature. This reading is evident in the end of this section where Irenaeus returns to the ransom imagery and adds a shepherding metaphor where God who formed humans ‘at the beginning...has in the last times sought us out who were lost, winning back [God’s] own, and taking up the lost sheep upon [God’s] shoulders, and with joy restoring it to the fold of life’. This is a reference to his description of freedom from the Apostate one and the restoration of human nature at the beginning of book V (*AH* V, I, 1).

Here is where the somatic understanding of the human person follows on the notion that soul and body are bound in a way that expresses human persons. This anthropological view of humans is certainly pre-Cartesian, but cannot be easily dismissed as naive. It is both anti-materialist and anti-reductionistic. There is a balanced emphasis on both body and soul that harks back to Aristotle’s hylomorphism. In this, Irenaeus sought to provide some continuity between a Hebraic and a Greek anthropology. However, what is unique to Irenaeus’ anthropology, and Christian anthropology as a whole, ‘is the affirmation that this life is also the life of God’ (Behr, 2000: 223). Irenaeus’

anthropology has to be essentially one grounded in the theological tradition, whether it is described as theological or philosophical.

4.2.2 *The Relationship Between Soul and Body*

Irenaeus' formulation about the corporeality of the soul is not patently stated, however, Hochban argues that this view is assumed through several passages in *AH* (1946, 527). For Irenaeus, the soul has the 'form' or 'figurant' of the body. The example used is that the soul is fitted to the body just as water fills a vessel. Hochban cites Irenaeus to show that in the parable of Dives (the rich man) and Lazarus (*AH* II, XXXIV, that 'that souls not only continue to exist, not by passing from body to body, but that they preserve the same form [in their separate state] as the body had to which they were adapted' (1946, 528; *AH* II, XXXIV, 1). Irenaeus goes on to clarify how it is that a soul can retain memories when these memories are experienced through the body: 'it is plainly declared that souls continue to exist that they do not pass from body to body, that they possess the form of a [human] (*hominisfigurant*), so that they may be recognised, and retain the memory of things in this world; (1946, 528; *AH* II, XXXIV, 1). All of this is not only to provide some kind of relationship between the soul and body, but also to affirm the importance of the bodily resurrection, of both Jesus and the resurrection of the dead.

For the Gnostics, the resurrected body of Jesus and the resurrection was purely a spiritual and not material because 'material is the product of corruption and bound in corruption' (Steenberg, 2009: 39). Irenaeus sought to counter this argument by making distinctions between the 'mortal body' and the 'soul', in which he identifies with the 'breath of life' as given in Genesis 2:7. (*AH* V, VII, 1). Irenaeus likens the body to the 'instrument' or 'tool' and the soul as 'the reason of an artist' (*AH* II, XXXIII, IV). The soul controls the body, but without the body, a person would be incomplete, a disembodied self. This completeness of self is also what reveals God's self to the world. Steenberg presents this as Irenaeus' 'second great anthropological supposition' — 'that the fashioned creature is necessarily economic, and in its economy of growth further reveals the unchanging attributes of the God into whose image it grows' (Steenberg, 2009: 38).

For Irenaeus, ‘the first two component parts’ of the self are the body and soul (Steenberg, 2009: 38). This begs the question as to what other ‘components’ make up human person? Is the human person made in a state that is naturally incorruptible and immortal? Steenberg points out that this is not the case with Irenaeus (2009: 38). Since the human person is not ‘naturally immortal’ (AH V, I, 3) there must be something else that is added or given to the person if redemption is to return them to the state of immortality they once possessed through Adam. In the same text in AH, Irenaeus attempts to answer this question in terms of the Spirit of God who animates the first person, Adam, and giving him life. Again, the two ‘hands of God,’ which are the Spirit and the Word, provide the animating and eternal principles for human beings. Humans, therefore, do not possess their own aseity, but are dependent on God. Irenaeus, against Classical Greek philosophy, does not hold to the idea of the immortality of the soul, but a view based on the creative acts of a biblically revealed God and a God who redeems creation. Sin brings the body and soul back into the state of corruption because of death entering the world, but God’s redemption through the recapitulative work of Jesus, brings the body and soul back into a state of incorruptibility (AH V, XIII, 3).

Irenaeus’ emphasis on the body has given risen to a ‘physicalist’ critique. This history is well documented in D. S. Kim’s dissertation (1969) and Behr (2000), but often this reading is discouraged by them. Robinson reads Irenaeus to show that the body is the ‘image of God’ and that the spirit of a person is assigned to the ‘likeness of God’. Brunner sees that Irenaeus while being critical of the Gnostic position was also incorporating Philo and Stoicism. While Irenaeus was moved by Greek philosophy and Gnosticism to distinguish the faculty reason in the *imago dei*, his Christian perspective and biblical reading moved him to connect the creation account in Genesis 1:26 to the relationship between mind and body (Brunner, 1939: 504-505). D. S. Kim’s evaluation is in keeping with ‘those who equate the image of God with the body and soul in man and the spirit with the likeness of God’. However, the spirit in humans ‘is not something added to human nature’ (1968, 95-96). This spirit is what moves humans into the goal of unity with God and cannot be extricated from the body. The emphasis is that the whole person is renewed through the Spirit of God, unlike Gnostic renderings of pneumatic salvation.

In addition, the soul is connected not only to the individual body, but to the Adamic body as a whole. This is where Irenaeus does not only speak of body and redemption individually, but collectively. In order for Christ to redeem humanity as a whole, his body, in both the incarnation and the Eucharist where humanity ‘participates in the saving cup’ (*Participare compendii poculo*, Lt; AH III, XVI, 7), is linked to the first body and soul. In this way, the body of Christ, as incarnate in eucharistic element, is what brings salvation to the human race. However, this directs focus on one aspect of Jesus’s life, his birth, and not the totality as we will ask in a later section. For, Irenaeus, the physical body is at least the starting point because this is where the damage to Adam begins.

4.2.3 Human Woundedness and ‘the Pain of the Stroke’

As indicated in Chapter 3, the phrase ‘pain of the stroke’ (Lt. *dolorem plagae*) is related to Irenaeus’s theory of corporate sin in Adam, since it is clear that the ‘strokes’ visited on Adam for his sin are also inflicted on all humanity (Schultz, 1978: 164). This is partially drawn from Isaiah 30:25-26 that states, ‘the Lord binds up the hurt of His people, and heals the wounds inflicted by His blow’. Even though Irenaeus does not thoroughly explain the passage in a systematic and exegetical manner, he explores its meaning and application by describing the therapeutic role of God in binding up the pain of humanity. In this particular instance, Irenaeus does not make a connection with the ‘pain of the stroke’ with Adam, Eve, sin, and death. However, Schultz shows that in the pseudepigraphic literature from which Irenaeus draws from, *Vita Adae et Evae* and the *Apocalypse of Moses*, definite connections are made (1978, 165-166). Here the words ‘pains’ (Lt. *dolor*), in AH, is connected to strokes (*plagae*), in pseudepigraphic sources, and the phrase ‘his (Adam’s) soul shall go off his body’ (*non custodisti ecce inducam in corpu*), in *Vita*, is connected to Irenaeus’ use of ‘death’ (*mors*) (Schultz, 1978: 166). In these comparisons to the pseudepigraphal literature, what can be seen is that the injuries suffered by humanity are linked with disobedience and its eventual consequence, death.

Adam is described as the one who receives the wound, who becomes sick and suffers the ‘disease of sin’ (AH IV, XXXVIII, 3). The healing on the other hand comes from the bodily resurrection of those who are given ‘the inheritance of the fathers. This image is in reference to ‘the earth as

the inheritance of those who are resurrected from the dead' (Isaiah 58:14, Presley, 2015: 229-230). Presley takes this to mean that the pain of death is healed by means of the bodily resurrection initiated by the bodily resurrection of Jesus (2015, 230).

However, this begs the question as to what causes the disease? It must be something that lies within Adam, the representative, human. For Irenaeus, it is connected to his anthropology of person and developmental theory that will be explored in § 4.5. However, here, Irenaeus traces the wound to the proto-human who suffers pain and eventually death, and therefore humanity is 'plagued' with these wounds. Going back to this the text from Isaiah shows the importance of the binding up of these wounds. It is not unimportant here to describe these 'wounds' as bodily and not merely metaphorical. Ignatius of Antioch, among one of the earliest Apostolic fathers (c.35–c.107), would comment on the real, bodily suffering saying, 'For he suffered all these things for our sake, that we might be saved; and he truly suffered, just as he also truly raised himself' (*The epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrnaeans*, 2). Here the emphasis is on the bodily wounds and not anything imaginary or illusory as the Gnostics or Docetists might believe. In the same way, Irenaeus would describe the 'pain of the stroke' as both leading to death and synonymous to death.

4.2.4 Conclusion

Irenaeus' trichotomy, the body, soul, and spirit, is interconnected and interrelated. However, the body and soul are tied to the 'image of God' where the spirit is connected to the 'likeness of God'. Drawn from these relationships Irenaeus' anthropology can be described as both somatic and communal. The human body is historically related to the adamic body, both as a recipient of Adam's flesh and also made in the image of God, just as Adam was created. In this way the incarnation of Word capitulates a communal history through the physical acts of Jesus, such as his obedience to God through baptism and his ministry.

The image of 'the pain of the stroke' ties the embodied wounds of Adam symbolizing Adam's death to the crucifixion of Jesus. It is through this bodily death that bodily life occurs, thereby healing the penalty of death inflicted on both Adam and his progeny. The descriptions of humans

as being an integrated, tripartite person are consistent with the wounds inflicted on the person because of sin. This wound is both bodily and spiritual in nature.

4.3 SIN AND SICKNESS IN PARK'S HAMARTIOLOGY AND ATONEMENT THEORY

In the previous chapter an investigation of Park's use of *han* in his hermeneutic (§ 3.2) and theological framework provided the reasoning behind how *han* can be used as heuristic category. For Park, the idea was to distinguish between the sinner and the sinned against in order to properly diagnose the problem of sin, and therefore provide a solution consistent with the biblical witnesses. However, what has not been fully explored are the ways in which healing can occur. This section outlines Park's atonement theory that involves care for the wounds and salvation for sinners in order to compare to Irenaeus' images and metaphors of atonement. It explores the relationship between sin and *han* and shows the work of dealing with both sin and *han* in what Park calls the 'triune atonement.'

4.3.1 *The Causal Relationship Between Sin and Han*

Park's view of sin is that it is the chief cause of *han* against others, which includes all aspects of creation. Not all *han* is the result of sin, but all sin produces *han* in others (Park, 1993: 13). In addition, physical sickness can be caused by what Park calls a 'sin consciousness' as seen in his examination of Jesus healing a paralytic man (Mk 2:1–12, Park: 2001, 55). Park attempt here to take in account the Deuteronomistic causal connection between sin and physical sickness and suffering. Park suggests that the 'term sin should be recast' and that instead we see the plight of the paralytic man as having a 'sin-consciousness' (Park, 2001: 56). This is critiqued in comparison to John 8:11 where Jesus tells the adulteress to 'go and sin no more' whereas Jesus does not give the paralytic a similar command. Although this argument is one based on the absence of the statement, Park makes the point that 'sin and human suffering are not necessarily interlocked in the cycle of cause and effect' (2001: 56). Even though the paralytic's sin was not the direct cause of his paralysis, the belief that this was the case kept him from receiving the healing to walk.

Therefore, the treatment was in the receiving of forgiveness. Park is consistent to interpret Jesus' mission as the 'healing of Han'.

4.3.2 *The Triune Atonement*

As explored in Chapter 3, Park distinguishes between those who cause the sin and those who suffer from the sin, i.e., the sinned against or the *han*-ridden. Although Park's theological treatment in his book, *The triune atonement*, is not systematic, one can see where he speaks about the work of Jesus the Son and the Paraclete as the 'twins' in doing the work of liberation and healing (2009, 60). This is parallel to Irenaeus' use of the 'two hands' of God metaphor of Jesus and the Spirit (AH III, XVII, 4). For Park, the work of Jesus is in his ministry in solidarity with the victims, those who suffer *han*, and his death was 'a symbol of challenge' to the powers that killed Jesus (Park, 2009: 45). The Paraclete is the continuation of the work of Jesus as in terms of liberation, healing, and salvation. From an analysis of the work of Jesus and the Paraclete emerges the work of the Father to complete the portrait of the 'triune atonement'.

Jesus stands in solidarity with the those who are the downtrodden of his time. Park points out that Jesus' ministry was to the poor and those who suffered from religious and political persecution. By 'sharing a common goal together', Jesus' mission was to provide liberation as he preached from Isaiah in the synagogue (Luke 4:18-21). The second way he did this was to identify with the downtrodden. This is shown in the parable of the last Judgment (Matt. 25:31-46) and his status as a *tekton* (Grk., τέκτων) often translated as 'carpenter' or even 'construction worker' which signified a working class background. Kim paints a picture of 'manual worker using wood or stone', which puts him among the *ha'aretz* (2015, 52). Kim goes even further to say 'Matthew finds it embarrassing to accept Jesus as *tekton*' (2015, 34). This reading takes into account Mark 6:3 and the question 'Is not this the carpenter, the Son of Mary...?' and the parallel question: 'Is this not the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary?' In Matthew 13:55. However, Hengel provides an alternative perspective and says that 'Jesus himself did not come from the proletariat of day-laborers and landless tenants', but instead renders the word *tekton* to mean 'mason, carpenter, cartwright, and joiner all rolled up into one' (1974, 26-27). In this view, neither Jesus nor many of his disciples fell into the same category as the proletariat. However, when speaking

about terms such as class, are modern views imposed on the history and the texts of the first century? Destro and Pesce argue that the ‘Gospel texts employ generic categories’ by showing the sparse use of ‘rich’ in Luke and the other synoptics and the lack of use of the term in John (2012, 263). Instead, the synoptics use ‘the rich’ (πλούσιος, pl. πλούσιοι) and ‘the poor’ (πτωχός, pl. πτωχοί) to show the broad categories of those people whom Jesus interacted with, many of his followers being of the latter description despite their relative wealth. Most often than not ‘the rich’ are the ones who had the most difficult time following Jesus (Mark 10:22; cf. Matt 19:22; Destro & Pesce, 2012: 264). Whether or not these ‘rich’ people were the focus of Jesus’ mission is what is being questioned and not what types of economic classes exist in Jesus’ time and if Jesus was part of that class.

More important for Park is if Jesus stood in ‘solidarity’ with the poor rather than if he was one of the poor. Park’s use of the phrase ‘solidarity’ can be seen as both as a sociological and theological term. The original French word *solidarité* means ‘unity in feeling and action’ and derives from the *solidum*, meaning ‘whole sum’. In one sense what Park sees Jesus doing is identifying with those of the minjung in society (Kim, 2007: 271), but in the other sense there is a participatory role where Jesus enters into the lives of the people in whom he ministered. Although perhaps unintentional, Park’s use of this summative nature of unity recalls Irenaeus’ notion of recapitulation of humanity in a summing up of the history of Adam. Behr suggests that the use of the word *plasma* or handiwork ‘indicates the solidarity of the whole human race “in Adam”’ through the creative process of God (2000, 38). In turn, Christ’s summative work is standing in solidarity with the human race, in a way, becoming the new Adam (Romans 5:14). Therefore, this solidarity that Christ represents is mirrored in the solidarity of the human race as seen in Adam.

A criticism of Park’s ‘triune atonement’ is that there is a lack of thorough treatment of the work of the Father in the salvific role in the relation to both the Son and the Spirit (Brown, 2010: 80). This oversight misses the opportunity to explore how the Father participates in how sin is treated, either by bringing healing to the sinned against, or bringing sinners to repentance. In addition, if Jesus’ work was to do the will of the Father, then how does it relate to the work of solidarity with the oppressed seen in the biblical stories the Old Testament? Is there a through line in the narrative

of the people of Israel that illustrates the suffering of the sinned against and the forgiveness of the sinner? In Irenaeus, there is at least the use of the Jonah story to illustrate the oppression of the Southern Kingdom from the Babylonians, the threatened destruction of Nineveh, and the repentance of both Jonah and the Ninevites (*AH* III, XX, 1). However, Park's triune atonement glosses over God, 'the Father almighty, the creator of heaven and earth', as expressed in the Creed, and how God's work of creation and redemption are related. Perhaps these issues will be addressed at a later time by Park and other Minjung theologians.

4.3.3 Conclusion

When Park says that the 'cross is a symbol of challenge', one question to ask is in what way is Park using the word 'symbol' and how could this symbol be efficacious for both the healing of *han* and the salvation of sinners? Unlike Irenaeus' ransom and recapitulation theories, what happens through the crucifixion does not have a direct effect either historically or ontologically. Rather, some have critiqued Park as privileging a 'moral influence view' of atonement (Brown, 2010: 80). Setting aside the argument as to whether Park's view is some sort of moral influence theory in the tradition of Abelard, Park's idea is that Jesus' death did not serve as a propitiation of sin nor an expiation of sin, but rather as a way to counter the effects of sin through ethical acts.

The purpose of a symbol is 'its intrinsic ability to convey' a 'transcendent reality' (Akala, 2014: 41). What is the transcendent reality that this might point toward? How does the cross show the effects of sin for both the victims and the victimizers? Urban distinguishes signs from symbols saying that, 'all symbols, may we say, are signs, but not all signs symbols' and explains that '[t]he Cross is a significant sign and its expressive character lies in the idea' (2013: 407). Urban limits the nature of a sign in that it 'cannot express or signify except attention is given to the sign itself' (2013: 407). This then begs the question as to what the idea of the cross is and what attention are we to give to the sign? For Park the attention is given to the solidarity of Jesus to the suffering of those who have been sinned against. Because Jesus stands with and for those who are victims of political and religious oppression, the cross points to the oppression that has taken place against the son of God and also represents the acts of violence of wounding others.

Not only is the crucifixion a symbol of the opposition of God's Kingdom, but also central to Park's view atonement is the blood of Jesus which 'symbolizes' forgiveness (2012: 89). Park argues that the blood of Jesus is an image taken from the priestly tradition of blood sacrifice (2012: 87-88). However, this sacrifice was transformed into a final sacrifice as spoken about in the letter to the Hebrews (9:22). Park clarifies that the power in the blood is not in the literal, biological blood of the man Jesus, but in the meaning of the blood. Here, perhaps we can use Urban's description of symbol in that the '*genuinely* symbolic is bound up with the intuitive and cannot be separated from it' (2013, 408-409). Symbolic resemblance can occur on two levels, 'logical' and spiritual or 'intuitive'. On a logical level the blood might be particularly salvific if transferred medically to another person requiring a transfusion, but cannot be efficacious universally. However, if the blood of Jesus symbolizes forgiveness toward repentant humans, then it is the 'divine' act of caring for all of creation (Park, 2012: 89).

4.4 SICKNESS IN RELATIONSHIP TO IRENAEUS' AGAINST HERESIES AND EARLY EASTERN FATHERS' DESCRIPTION OF 'ORIGINAL SIN'

This section will explore Irenaeus' account of sickness and how it fits into the Eastern notion of the originality of sin or original guilt as explained in (§ 1.1). In understanding this relationship, we might begin to have a comprehensive picture of how human nature is conceived. It is generally agreed in the literature that although not all of the Early Church Fathers understood the notion of original sin in the same way Augustine interpreted and read the creation accounts, the idea that sin originated with the first couple was universally accepted by both Eastern and Western Fathers. What this meant, was of course a matter of interpretation. In this section, the task is not so much to defend or even explain the various approaches, which have been done thoroughly elsewhere (González, 1971; Wiley, 2002; McFarland, 2010). Rather, this survey is to show the relationships, if present, between the Eastern Father's concept of the 'original sin' and sickness. Irenaeus' *AH* will be paired with Athanasius of Alexandria's *Contra Arianos* (*CA, Against the Arians*) and *De incarnatione* (*DI, Concerning the incarnation*). Tertullian will be juxtaposed with the two in order to show a bridge and development in the West that led to Augustine's view of inherited sin.

4.4.1 Irenaeus and ‘Original Sin’

A paraphrase of Romans 5:12 & 19 is cited in Latin text of *AH III, XI, 10*: ‘For as by one man’s disobedience sin entered, and death obtained [a place] through sin; so also by the obedience of one man, righteousness having been introduced, shall cause life to fructify in those persons who in times past were dead’ (*Quia quemadmodum per inobedientiam unius hominis introitum peccatum habuit, et peccatum mors obtinuit; sic et per obedientiam unius hominis iustitia introducta vitam fructificet his, qui olim mortui erent, hominibus*). This can be compared to the Vulgate: ‘For as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners: so also by the obedience of one, many shall be made just’ (*The Douay-Rheims Bible* translation of *propterea sicut per unum hominem in hunc mundum peccatum intravit et per peccatum mors et ita in omnes homines mors pertransiit in quo omnes peccaverunt*). Here the ‘in quo’ translates ‘in whom’ so this reads in English’, and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned’, which in this text Irenaeus omits. As discussed in the introduction (§ 1.1), this is a much different reading from how Augustine would interpret the origin of sin as a result of Adam’s sin in *On the free choice of the will*. Irenaeus’ omission of this phrase does not deny Augustine’s reading, but it does reveal Irenaeus’ emphasis that death was brought to all people because of the sin of Adam, whether or not Adam was the transmitter of sin. Irenaeus sees there is an originality to sin, but also finds the problem as based in death. This is why he makes the parallel between ‘one man’s disobedience’ and ‘death’ to ‘one man’s obedience’ and ‘life’.

Augustine interpreted ‘original sin’ in two different ways (Wiley, 2002: 5). The first is through the term *peccatum originale originans*, i.e., ‘original sin as originating’ *peccatum originale originatum* ‘original sin as originated’ (Wiley, 2002: 5). The first relates the Adam and Eve and the actual, historical, event of their sinning, and the second relates to how sin is transmitted to the progeny of Adam and Eve, how the sin of humanity came to be. We can describe the first as undisputed by all of the Church Fathers, and the second the point of departure.

While perhaps Irenaeus was to make Romans 5:12 ‘central to his anthropology’, he seeks to not give a ‘metaphysical’ explanation, but one grounded in the incarnation (Osborn: 2001, 218). It is only in the enfleshment of God in a human that there could be a curative remedy to the problem

of death. As Osborn points out, humanity is ‘all sick, suffering from the bite of the serpent with a disorder between our soul and our body; to heal this sickness God endured all things on our behalf’ (2001, 218). The goal of incarnation was also to participate in the suffering of humanity, both in a substitutionary role and participatory role.

4.4.2 Athanasius and ‘Original Sin’

Athanasius of Alexandria (293-373) describes sin not in terms of sickness, but corruption as seen in §2.2.4. In *DI* 5.2, Athanasius says that ‘corruption ran riot among [people] and held sway over them to an even more than natural degree, because it was the penalty of which God had forewarned them for transgressing the commandment’. Here, the word nature (Lt. *natura*) is the translation of the word Greek word φύσις which denotes a movement toward something or teleology (Anatolios, 2004: 32). The impulse of humanity after Adam was toward corruption or even ‘de-creation’ (Anatolios, 1998: 37; 2004: 39); it is a movement toward non-existence. This is the perpetual course of the sickness, from being created to being non-created or even, in a sense, toward non-being. ‘Indeed, in their sinning they had surpassed all limits’ (*DI* 5.2), Athanasius continues. These acts of sin are in the very sense transgressions, but the limits are the boundaries in which humanity was created to exist within.

For Athanasius, sin was woven in the ‘flesh’ because it was a part of the economy of creation and salvation. Here the blame for sin is not on the soul, which he follows Origen to say it was pre-existent and immortal. Instead, for Athanasius because the human was constituted from clay, ‘Athanasius blamed it on the inherently corruptible clay out of which Adam's flesh had been made’ (Bray, 1994: 39). This is because, for Athanasius, the result of Adam’s sin was death or corruption, but this death is what Christ sought to cure and not sin *per se*. Sin is only expressed in terms of corruption of both the body and the soul and bound within this description is the view of human development. The incarnation is the Word entering into sinful humanity so that ‘sin might perfectly be expelled from the flesh, and we might have a free mind’ (*CA*: 2.56; 1.43; 1.59–60). For Athanasius the ethical meaning of sin is not in its inherent nature, but in relationship to how it is expressed in the relationship to the progress one makes toward being more like God. The history of interpreting *how* this progress is made, either by way of ‘willed obedience’ or ‘through

attachment to an immutable God-man' is left to be argued (Weinandy & Keating, 2017: 113). However, here it is universally accepted that for Athanasius, progress comes by way of this the incarnational act of joining humanity whereby sin is removed.

4.4.3 Tertullian and 'Original Sin'

Likewise, in the West, Tertullian would develop this further to show an intimate relationship between soul and body, even going as far as suggesting some kind of 'non-material corporeality to the soul' (Steenberg, 2009: 75). In Tertullian's *De testimonio animae* (V, *On the witness of the soul*), he states that the soul 'sympathizes with the body and shares in its pain' and conversely, the body 'suffers with the soul and is united with it'. This connection is also found in *De oratione* XXIX (*On prayer*) where Tertullian talks about the power of prayer 'to recall the souls of the departed from the very path of death, to transform the weak, to restore the sick, to purge the possessed, to open prison-bars, to loosen the bonds of the innocent'. The link between the health of the soul and the health and liberation of the person is seen in a person made whole. These relationships between the soul and body find their way in the developmental anthropology of humans, i.e., like Irenaeus' anthropology, humanity is to develop in a certain way to mature both physically and spiritually. The sin of impatience is what short-circuits this development, bypassing humanity's potential. However, unlike Irenaeus Tertullian introduces the notion of 'inherited sinfulness into his anthropological framework' (Steenberg, 2009: 81). Here, human sinfulness is not an 'ontological' notion, but one grounded in the economy of human development. In other words, Tertullian sees humans as being in and endowed with the same 'nature' as Adam. Although Tertullian sees an intimate relationship between body and soul in his view of redemption of persons, he still insists that 'sin is transmitted, along with the soul, from one generation to the next' through sexual intercourse (Bray, 1994: 42).

4.4.4 Conclusion

Surveying the eastern patristic literature shows that a break that took place between the concept of original sin that started in Tertullian and break correlates to human nature. The import of this brief account was to show how sin was thought of in relation to its origins. If sin is the 1) result of death

(Irenaeus) or 2) the corruption of the person (Athanasius) or 3) as the same nature as Adamic sin (Tertullian), the treatment of sin then corresponds to the root causes. For Irenaeus, and other Eastern Fathers, the sickness is that death has infected the human and the remedy is in treating the cause, which is death. The restorative efficacy of the incarnation makes this possible. However, one needs to ask, then what is the role of the cross and the resurrection if for Irenaeus, and Athanasius for that matter, that the incarnation is central (Weinandy & Keating: 2017, 114). For Irenaeus the cross becomes the way in which human nature becomes restored to humanity, but the cross only becomes viable through the incarnation and resurrection. Against the gnostic interpreters, only in the incarnation could the Christ truly die, and only in the resurrection could God prove victory over death (*AP* 48; Osborn, 2001: 118-119).

There are two ways one can analyse this relationship 1) by way of what can be described as historical parallelism (Minns, 2010: 110) and 2) through the particularity of the incarnation itself (Steenburg, 2009: 2). Irenaeus shows that there is a correlation between the creation account and the death of Jesus. Recapitulation is not only about Adam's obedience but also situated in the particular events of both Adam's life and Jesus' life. Irenaeus describes the how Jesus's death on the cross recaps the death that entered the world through Adam's disobedience. According to Irenaeus, this death entered on the fifth day and in parallel form Jesus' death was also on the fifth day: 'For by summing up in Himself the whole human race from the beginning to the end, He has also summed up its death' (*AH* V, 23, 2). Secondly, the death of Jesus depends on the fleshly life of Jesus: 'One does not begin with the eternal Word, later to take flesh.' Instead, 'One begins with the flesh and bones of Jesus of Galilee, and sees in him the eternity of the divine Son' (Steenburg, 2009: 2).

4.5 SIN, SICKNESS, DEATH AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS

4.5.1 *Anthropology and Ethics*

Philosophical anthropology and ethics can be used by the theologian to speak about human teleology, i.e., human purpose and thriving. Philosophical anthropology observes ‘man’ or ‘humans’, in order to grasp ‘the fundamental principles’ of humanity’s existence and behaviour in the world (Lombo & Russo, 2007: 18). It is asking the ‘why’ and ‘how’, of humanity rather than the ‘what’ that empirical sciences ask. In this respect philosophical anthropology can be used to talk about human achievement in relationship to sickness and sin in Irenaeus’ work. This kind of use is seen in the writings of many of the medieval masters, such as Thomas Aquinas, who drew from the well of Aristotelian ethics, but for Irenaeus, unlike his Christian predecessors his philosophical anthropology is entrenched in his theological anthropology (Meeks, 1986: 3). Irenaeus’ ethics is often described within the bounds of what has been come to be known as ‘Irenaeus theodicy’ by the writings of John Hick (1966) via Schleiermacher (1800, 1830). Taking Irenaeus outside of this characterization, we can see that the core of Irenaeus’ views is grounded in Genesis 1:27 where God created humanity in God’s own ‘image’ and ‘likeness’. As the starting point, Irenaeus sees human progress toward the likeness of God to be the goal of humans and their flourishing (Osborn, 2001: 108). This is Irenaeus’ view of human nature and because both Park’s and Irenaeus’ project have ethical concerns that relate to human nature, it is appropriate here to explore how the corruption of human nature influences how humans achieve their ends in relation to God, the human community, and creation.

In both Irenaeus and Park the term ‘sickness’ is 1) used as an analogous term 2) to show Jesus’ therapeutic mission 3) as a synonymous term to the concept of corruption, one that Athanasius later develops. First, sickness is used as an analogous term, i.e., to compare one thing to another. Sickness leads to death; redemption leads to life. The two hands of God, ‘the Word of the Father and the Spirit of God, having become united with the ancient substance of Adam’s formation, rendered man living and perfect, receptive of the perfect Father, in order that as in the natural

[Adam] we all were dead, so in the spiritual we may all be made alive' (AH V.I.3). Sickness finds its cure in the healing of death. These 'two hands' not only provide a cure to death, but also sustain life to 'nourish and preserve humanity' (AH V, XIX, 2). Secondly, sickness is used to show Jesus's mission—be a physician. Irenaeus describes 'the Lord came as the physician of the sick' (AH III, V, 2) and quotes Luke 5:31-32 about how a physician comes for the sick and not the healthy. This is also a key passage of Park's. Thirdly, as presented in section (2.2.4) and in Athanasius (§4.4.3). Sickness is used synonymously with the term 'corruption.'

4.5.2 The Relationship Between Anthropology and Ethics

Philosophical, as well as theological anthropology, both ask metaphysical questions and have metaphysical beginnings. Philosophical anthropology starts with being qua being as a basis to speak about human existence. In the same way, theological anthropology starts with the first act of being made possible by God and alive by the Spirit, and this was 'found solely in a Jewish-Christian tradition' (Gen. 2:7; Weinandy, 2003: 17). Even though there is no evidence of the purely licentious and anti-nominal lifestyle among the gnostic sects, Gnosticism tended to move to the logical extremes of declaring the body and the material world was either toward asceticism or hedonism (van Kooten, 2010: 20). However, the goal for the Gnostic is for the 'spiritual element' within the trapped human to eventually return to the 'spiritual realm', therefore leading a moral life is not a condition for this return, which will happen by necessity of nature' (Minns, 2010: 21).

Even though discussions about ethics do not occur primarily for Irenaeus, nevertheless there are discussions of behaviours and attitudes as they relate to the redeemed and transformed life. God in humanity, becoming a human being 'accomplishes the economy' of salvation (Behr, 2000: 63). For Irenaeus, the incarnation, the event of God becoming human, is the basis for the restoration of human nature. It is this human nature that moves humanity toward the goal of flourishing (Aristotle) which is complete communion with God (Aquinas), but for Irenaeus this comes through a transformation of the whole body into the likeness of God. The ethical implication of this restorative process is that the '(r)espect for our bodies and the bodies of others is an essential element of Christian Gospel' (Weinandy, 2003: 32). *Theosis* should lead to respect of the divine likeness in others as it is an essential part of worship of God.

Another ethical concern is seen in the virtue of patience as a spiritual and ethical virtue. In the Aristotelian tradition of virtue ethics, crucial to consider are acts that are considered in respect to their extremes. Vogel (2007) provides an analysis of sin as impatience, but admittedly links it with alienation. One can see impatience in relation to ‘time’ and alienation in relation to ‘proximity’ in order to make this connection. Doing things according to a right time, right place, right situation becomes important in fulfilling the goal of being in the likeness of God. If sin is a sickness, then impatience is what makes humans sick (Vogel, J., 2007). Impatience can be both sin and the cause of other sin. Later church Father, Tertullian, develops this notion of impatience or ‘discontent’ (Lt. *impatientia*) as being at the root of sin in *De patientia* (*On patience*). Here in Irenaeus, impatience is what leads humanity to usurp the creator’s goal for them to grow up in their own time, but instead seek to find their own knowledge in the ‘tree of the knowledge of good and evil’.

4.5.3 Ethics in Irenaeus

For Irenaeus, the fullest revelation is expressed in the connection between God’s creation and how humans live out their being: ‘the glory of humans [is] God, but [Humanity’s] works [are the glory] of God; and the receptacle of all [God’s] wisdom and power [is] humanity. Just as the physician is proved by his patients, so is God also revealed through humans’ (AH III, XX, 2). Irenaeus uses the analogy of the physician intentionally here to show the restorative process of health is likened to the revelation of power and wisdom in human beings. The proof of a doctor’s ability to cure is in the health of the patients, and the evidence of God’s existence is revealed in the creation, i.e., humans. This revelation is manifested in humanity’s works (Lt. *operationes*). This glorification can be seen in the human cognitive faculties of intelligence and wisdom, and also the ability to galvanize these operations into action.

For Irenaeus, ethical action means living life out to the fullest. Irenaeus later says, ‘For the glory of God is a living [human being]; and the life of [a human] consists in beholding God. For if the manifestation of God which is made by means of the creation, affords life to all living in the earth, much more does that revelation of the Father which comes through the Word, give life to those who see God’ (AH IV, XX, 7). Here the emphasis is in the living, breathing human being who is restored to life. The first part of the good life is living life well. Actions done in harmony to this

kind of life are right actions. Conversely, actions done out of sync to this life of fruition are wrong actions.

One must ask whether these acts negate the redemptive work of Christ? For Irenaeus the deification of humanity is the process of ‘perfecting man after the image and likeness of God’ (AH V, XXI, 2). One can also describe ethics in terms of Irenaeus’s descriptions of ‘sonship’ and the analogies he makes with these descriptions. The first is a natural sonship that ‘is the relationship between a son and the father who begets him’ (Minns: 2010 ,128). Here Irenaeus sees that humans are created by God and, in a way, have sonship with God. However, this sonship is also tempered by how obedient they are to God. One could always leave one’s family and not act like a son. Therefore, the second analogy is between a student and a master. Here the student becomes obedient unto the teacher’s tutelage and this discipleship falls under the description of another metaphor for relationship, i.e., ‘adoption’. ‘Sonship’ then becomes something that is restorative through discipleship and adoption, but this is not so much something achieved through discipleship, but rather reflective of discipleship (Minns, 2010: 129). For Irenaeus adoption is a gift: ‘for in the end of times he has opened the covenant (testament) of adoption’ (*Dem 8*).

Even though Minns does not read the adoption to be restorative, Irenaeus himself uses this image in the text saying that by God’s ‘tender mercy’ who had ‘compassion on God’s own handiwork, and gave to it salvation, restoring it by salvation, restoring it by means of the Word’ (AH V, XXI, 3). The last part of this text however does affirm the graciousness of God: ‘in order that [humans] might learn by actual proof that he receives incorruptibility not of himself, but by the free gift of God’ (AH V, XXI, 3). What can be concluded is that in Irenaeus, the account of human progress is intimately tied to the account of redemption. Irenaeus says that this development is in a way ‘necessary’ in ‘that man should in the first instance be created; and having been created, should receive growth; and having received growth, should be strengthened; and having been strengthened, should abound; and having abounded, should recover [from the disease of sin]; and having recovered, should be glorified; and being glorified, should see his Lord’ (AH IV, XXXVIII, 3).

4.5.4 *Sickness and Healing*

For Irenaeus the remedy to the sickness of sin is in the therapeutic work of Jesus. Here, the language of physician and healing is important because they are seen as methods by which redemption is achieved. The question is how this language is used by Irenaeus and the early church. Irenaeus shows that the apostle Paul speaks about Jesus as a someone who saves humanity from ‘human infirmity’ and that this malady is within Paul himself: ‘For I know that there dwelleth in my flesh no good thing’ (Rom. 7: 18, *AH III*, XX, 3). In addition, Paul expressed a constant ‘thorn in the flesh’ that was either physical, psychological, or metaphorical (2 Corinthians 12:7-9). In addition, Irenaeus uses a key passage from Luke 5:31-32 that shows Jesus as a self-prescribed physician to the sick. Jesus’ interlocutors, the Pharisees, often criticized Jesus for being with so called ‘sinners’, those who were accused of as being sick according to legal standards, ceremonial decorum, and the Deuteronomistic code. ‘But for what reason do the Pharisees blame the Saviour for eating with sinners?’ Cyril of Alexander asks and answers that Jesus shows the ‘sinners’ that he ‘is present now, not as a judge, but as a physician; and performs the proper duty of the physician's office, in being in the company of those in need of healing’ (*Cyril on Luke 5*).

Dörnemann shows that Jesus’ role of a doctor (*Arzt*) is a metaphor for his ability to bring wholeness in his redemptive work (2013, 102–124). Here, the sacraments of baptism, penance, and the eucharist act as the salve to restore sinful persons. Christianity, at heart, is a ‘therapeutic religion’ (*therapeutische Religion*) argues Dörnemann following Biser (1998). This can be seen in Jesus’ title as physician or doctor even though Jesus ‘did not see himself as a physician or therapist’ in the strictest sense. For Dörnemann the ‘healings are signs of a more complete healing (physical and spiritual healing and remission of sins). Jesus wants to convey holistic salvation’ (2013, 104).

However, this metaphorical approach has its disadvantages. First, it does not express the nature of the disease, i.e., something that infects and affects human nature. It is curious that Dörnemann cites Clement of Alexandria (c. 150 – c. 215), saying, ‘But everything has the goal of healing and permanent health’ (πάντα εἰς σωτηρίαν καὶ ἰδίον ὑγείαν διατείνει, *Stromata* 1,178,1 (GCS 15, 109,19-29). However, he does not take this to mean that sin is related to health in that health is a sign of healing of the effects of sin.

Second, he does not move beyond the Deuteronomistic and pharisaical notion that sickness is a result of sin. In many ways, Love (2003) is more thorough and takes the curative metaphor a step further in his historical approach. Here, Jesus' acts of mental and physical healing can be seen as acts of 'divine goodness coupled with forgiveness of sin', but in doing so 'seeks to introduce a change in spiritual outlook in the individual, while at the same time creating an evolution in the social norms toward the treatment of those beset by illness or disease' (Love, 2003: 231). Love sees the established views of sickness in Jesus' time as being adversarial to those who were sick with physical and mental maladies. Being near, much less touching, a diseased person was ritually prohibited (Leviticus 13 & 14), so the act of being close to and even physically touching sick people was scandalous. Therefore, Jesus shows that sickness is not something that results from sin *per se*, but counters the idea with the statement, 'Your sins are forgiven' in order to show that there is no direct correlation and free the sick from their 'sin-consciousness' (Park: 2012, 55). In other words, even though Dörnemann takes Irenaeus to describe, 'The saving action of God is like the action of a doctor' (2013, 110), he does not go far enough to describe how Jesus changes the view of what the salvation of a physician was in the first century.

In order to see how Park's concept of *han* can be applied, it would be helpful to revisit a key text in Irenaeus, *AH* III, V, 2. First Irenaeus cites Luke 5:31-32 where Jesus describes his mission to come to heal those who are sick and not those who are well. This statement is of course a tongue in cheek criticism of the Pharisees who do not consider themselves sick. Instead, Jesus said he came for the so called 'sick' in order to heal them of their diseases and suffering. Here, Irenaeus asks, 'How then shall the sick be strengthened, or how shall sinners come to repentance?' The 'or' (Lt. *et*) can be either providing an alternative (as in a disjunctive operator in logic, $\vee$), or as a synonym, sometimes explaining the previous statement. If taken the former, the sick and the sinners are the same. They need to both be strengthened and come to repentance. However, if taken in the latter sense then we can read Irenaeus as acknowledging the two types of groups: those who suffer because of sin and those who need to turn away from sin in repentance. Irenaeus sees that neither of these people can become healthier if they pursue 'the same courses' yet they must 'undergo a great change and reverse their former mode of living. Love observes that Jesus 'employs different methods of healing as he encounters differing situations (2003, 230). First there

is the interview, where Jesus is what the person needs. Then there is a diagnosis where Jesus assesses the problem. This is followed by the actual practice when the healing occurs. Lastly, there is a prognosis or treatment plan. Even though this does not map out exactly in Park's sinned against/sinner scheme, it is helpful to see the treatment for sin is particular to the problem of the patient in both Park's and Irenaeus' schemas.

4.5.3 Conclusion

Since both Park's and the Eastern Fathers' framing of sin is therapeutic, resemblances occur: 1) Both make sense of sin in terms of bodily woundedness 2) both see therapeutic remedies for the treatment of sin since it is related to the body 3) both use the images of Jesus as the physician who not only heals the wounds, but also re-interprets the causes of the maladies associated with sickness. 4) Both show the work of God's Spirit as being operational in restoring human woundedness and therefore human nature.

However, where the two depart is also notable. For Park, there is a delineation between the sinned against and the sinner in order to treat the problem of woundedness, even though in the end he admits that persons are a mix of both. Using the physician analogy, the analysis is to find the appropriate treatment plan for the patient and provide the remedy. Sin is taken separately as an ethical violation of the sinner. The 'trine atonement' acts to help bring healing for the sinned against and repentance for the sinner in order to effectively stop the cycle of sin and therefore bringing redemption to the cosmos. This is done through the work of Jesus' ministry and the continual work of the Spirit of God. For Irenaeus, the healing of the Adamic wounds comes by way of recapitulating history and thereby liberating humans from evil and allowing them the freedom to progress in the likeness of God. This restoration of human nature is tied in Irenaeus' philosophical and theological anthropology, where he sees the goal of humans is to become more God-like and thereby setting the stage for other Eastern Fathers to develop a more robust anthropology of *theosis*. Whereas Park takes the wounds separately between the wounded and the perpetrators, Irenaeus takes it *en masse* because of humanity's solidarity in Adam, even though this solidarity was not in Adam's sin, but in his death and redemption.

4.6 SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

This chapter sought to give an account of the relationship between sin and sickness in the writings of Irenaeus and other Eastern Fathers and to show where Park's use of *han* correlates especially in their atonement projects of recapitulation and the 'triune atonement', respectively. This aspect is crucial in seeing how answers provided by theologians correspond to how questions are framed and assumptions are made, specifically about the nature of sin.

This account begins by showing how anthropological concerns are established by Irenaeus. Most Patristic writers observe that sin is both an avoidable and inextricable aspect of a discussion of human nature. Irenaeus' hamartiology is described as sickness and pain. Therefore, the restoration of human nature is through a redemptive act that is therapeutic. The prescription for healing the 'pain of the stroke' is both recapitulative and developmental. Adam's disobedience is the cause of the pain, but his disobedience is rooted in being created as a primitive person. Adam is like a child who did not know better and therefore suffered from his own ignorance. This leads us to question how humanity is to grow out of their childlike innocence and ignorance, and find escape from the sickness and death that Adam introduced into the world.

Irenaeus' account of 'pain of the stroke' demonstrates the somatic aspect of sin, how it affects the body. This underlines how sin is involved in the whole person and all of humanity. This wound is made through the consequence of the death that was introduced into the world. Quite differently from Augustine, Irenaeus sees the curses being toward the ground and the serpent, but not toward the primitive humans. The enmity that was to be directed toward humans was instead turned toward the apostate one: God 'turned the enmity by which [the devil] had designed to make [humans] the enemy of God, against the author of it, by removing His own anger from humans, turning it in another direction, and sending it instead upon the serpent' (AH IV, XL, 3). Therefore, it was not death that was a punishment and sin that was passed down, but instead death and humans were its inheritors.

The result of death (*mors*) and pain (*dolor*) is explicit in Irenaeus' pseudepigraphal literature, namely *Vita* (Schultz, 1978: 166). This connection demonstrates a consistency of thought in

Irenaeus' insistence that redemption is about the healing of human nature's primary woundedness, which is injury to the human person. The brief survey of other Patristic sources illustrates a connective line between sin in terms of woundedness, corruption, and inherited sinfulness. What this shows is that how sin effects human nature is holistic, although the various theologians will parse how and what is inherited in particular.

Because the Adamic wound requires redemption, Irenaeus offers a therapeutic model. This however does not negate speaking about the law. However, Irenaeus describes how 'Moses set forth dispensation of the law' that points the way to the incarnation (AH III, XI, 7). In the same way, Athanasius speaks of God having 'pity on our race, and was merciful to our infirmity, and submitted to our corruption, and did not endure the dominion of death' (DI 8, 15). He continues and proclaims, that in God's 'loving kindness' did this 'in order that, as all die in him, the law (νόμος) concerning corruption in men might be abolished—since its power was concluded in the Lord's body and it would never again have influence over [humans] (DI 8, 30-55). In order to heal woundedness, death needs to be dealt with. Ransom (§ 2.4.1) and recapitulation (§ 2.4.2) models of redemption fit into the therapeutic aspects of Irenaeus' treatment because both maintain a restorative aspect. The incarnation of God can be seen as an ethical act which brings goodness into the world. With the ransom imagery, it is the restoration of human nature and the recapitulation

Park in a similar way, uses a phenomenological approach in finding the locus of sin primarily in evil acts done towards others which include all of creation. Considine has observed in the Roman Catholic tradition in the 'Pastoral Constitution' of *Gaudium et spes* that 'a basic Christian anthropology of the human person as sinner and God as Sinned-Against' (2013b, 30). This might be the common account for many traditions since Anselm of Canterbury's formulation, but Park finds this approach incomplete. In order to grasp a fuller picture of sin, ethical actions towards others and the entire creation is to be observed. In other words, if ethical acts were the basis of human sin and an anthropology derived from these acts, then the question as to the object of these actions needs to be asked. Sin can have effects both on others, creation, and reflexively toward the sinner themselves. In using the distinction of sinner/sinned against, Park is able to diagnose the problem in terms of *han* and the potential perpetuation of sin if *han* is not properly treated.

What follows is setting the relationship between anthropology and ethics in Irenaeus and Park. The study of human teleology is inextricably bound to concerns about the human good. Outside of the discipline of theology, the study of anthropology has taken a turn back to the study of ethical considerations (Laidlaw: 2017, 1). However, the pursuit of the flourishing is a vital aspect of both Irenaeus' and Park's anthropology. For Irenaeus, *theosis* or growing into the likeness of God is connected to redemption. The liberation of humans meant the restoration of human nature; those, who were once under the bondage of the apostate one, are now under the discipleship of God. As Irenaeus turns the prism of Jesus' redemptive work, another facet is the healing of the Adamic wound, the consequence of his disobedience toward God. This is expressed in the term 'pain of the stroke' and finds healing the recapitulative work of the incarnation, life, death, and resurrection of the Christ. For Park, this ethical consideration comes through the work of the sinner, the one who inflicts the wound, to stop the unethical acts. On the side of the sinned against, those wounded by sin are to find healing through the work of the Spirit.

In Irenaeus, ethics or the pursuit of the good is deeply developmental. People who are created in the *imago dei* are to find the fullest fruition in unity with the divine. The 'glory of God' is found in the works of God done through the ethical actions of humanity. Irenaeus uses Paul's description of 'the fruit of the Spirit' (Gal. 5: 22-23) as way to show the work of the Spirit in an analogous way in contrast to 'the work of flesh' (AH V, XI, 1). Irenaeus avoids gnostic dualism by comparing the flesh to 'the image of him who is of the earth' i.e., Adam (AH V, XI, 2). In reading 1 Cor. 15: 49-ff., he takes Paul to mean that the flesh is the image of God as imprinted into the proto human. This is not sufficient for inheriting the Kingdom of God. Rather, one must be 'washed' in the name of the 'our Lord Jesus Christ' and the 'Spirit of our God', citing Paul. Irenaeus' view of the development is pneumatological in the sense that the Spirit washes the works of the flesh. In other words, the frustration of the works of the flesh are given liberation by the maturation provided by the Spirit. Even though the image of God in humans is also the image of the divine Son (Behr, 2000: 89), true liberation is the image being restored through growing into the likeness of God. Even though Irenaeus' model is sometimes considered 'restitution' or the restoration to a prior state (Payton, 2016: 163) in actuality, the fuller picture is a movement toward Christlikeness. Irenaeus states, 'what we had lost in Adam – namely, the image and likeness of God – we recovered

in Christ Jesus' (AH III, XVIII, 1). The connection between the ethics, anthropology, and *theosis* is quite clear in this account.

The last section of this chapter focuses on the treatment of woundedness in Irenaeus and Park. It is not surprising that both use biblical texts from Mark 2:15-17 and Luke 5:31-32 that show Jesus bringing healing to those sick. Whereas Irenaeus sees the sick as all those who need to be healed from their sins (AH IV, 5, 2; III, 20, 2), Park views this as a backhanded way of speaking of those who are wounded by sin and need healing, as opposed to the those who caused the wounds, i.e., those who do not need a physician. The image of physician is crucial in both respects because it provides a basis as to how the restorative process is to be perceived. For Irenaeus, human nature is perceived to be wounded and in need for liberation in order for it to reach the fullest maturity in the likeness of God. For, Park, the wounds run through of all aspects of a person's being, physical, psychological, and spiritual. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and prayer, there can be healing of 'psychosomatic ills and social evil' (2004: 131). This also does not negate the process of sanctification in which Park sees both as personal and collective, expressing that until 'we achieve community holiness, individual holiness will remain abstract' (2004; 140). Here is where the implications of Park's hamartiology take roots in the *ecclesia* and the community, which will be discussed in the last chapter.

CHAPTER 5:

AN EXAMINATION OF THE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN IRENAEUS' THEORIES OF ATONEMENT AND PARK'S THEORY OF TRIUNE ATONEMENT

5.1 INTRODUCTION

As examined in chapter 4, provided accounts of theological anthropology of Irenaeus and Park and show correspondence. These conceptions are intimately connected to their respective theories of atonement and to show how these atonement theories work in tandem is to show how they each approaches the problem of sin. In order to do this, the Latin word, atonement, or 'to make one' will be used interchangeably with the word 'redemption' since nowhere in *AH* does Irenaeus use the Latin adverbial *atonen*. However, he regularly employs the term *redimō* meaning 'to redeem' or 'buy back' (*AH* V, II, 1).

This chapter explores possible correspondences between Irenaeus' atonement theory, namely recapitulation and ransom, with Park's 'triune atonement'. First, this chapter examines Park's largest project to date, the attempt to create a comprehensive work around the healing of *han* and showing how Jesus' ministry was an attempt to heal both the wounded and bring salvation to the perpetrators of *han*, i.e., the actual sinners. Section 4.5 introduced Parks' triune theory in terms of the anthropological concerns, how it showed Jesus' solidarity with the sinned against and how this led to the healing of the wounded. However, the other side of the work is with those who are sinners, the perpetrators of the sin. How does Park address the criticism that most atonement theories have to do with the sinners and not only with the sinned against (Park: 2009, 37)? In § 3.2.3, this question was touched upon, but here explores the question in terms of the notion of justice in general and the idea of restorative justice in particular.

Second, the recapitulative narrative outlined in Irenaeus encompasses more than redoing of Adam's disobedience, but vanquishing death itself. In this sense the person can be made a 'living human being', but this also involves the healing of the Adamic wound, i.e., 'the pain of the stroke'. This section demonstrates that Irenaeus' description is the fulness of humans through the humanity of God. These notions connect Park and Irenaeus and serve to show the intersection between how

their theories of atonement serve to answer the problems arising from how they understand their respective hamartologies.

Lastly, chapter five examines how Park's notion of *han* is expressed in ransom and recapitulation theories of Irenaeus and the aim of restorative justice. This is an analysis of Park's own *Triune atonement* (2009) and the theories of Irenaeus and other Eastern Church Fathers regarding redemption and how they seek restoration of relationship through healing of human nature, liberation, and repentance for the perpetrators of sin. This part of the study uses tools based on historical and contemporary Minjung theology in order to analyse the notion of *han* in ransom and recapitulation theories in light of moving humanity toward God's righteousness. On the side of Irenaeus, key texts from *AH* outline the general narrative of redemption (*AH* IV, II, 1; V, I, 1; V, II, 1-3; V, XVIII, 7). J. Vogel (2007) examines redemption from the point of view of a 'waiting on the economy of salvation' so that human completion is a reversal of what he calls the 'sin of haste'. Another way to view the redemption is through the narrative of recapitulation history (O'Keefe & Reno, 2005). These are various attempts to look at redemption as both liberative and restorative. These lenses allow a further insight into what redemption can look like in terms of the movement of history toward the peaceable kingdom.

Overall, this chapter develops the thesis by showing where Park's use of *han* and notions of sin in his 'Triune atonement' correlates to and is a development of the work of Irenaeus' *AH* treatment of sin and atonement, thus making a connection between the redemption theories of Irenaeus and Park, and thereby offering a theological bridge between their works.

5.1.2 Atonement in Park and the Eastern Fathers

Although the authoritative translator of Irenaeus into English, Harvey states that readers can observe Irenaeus making 'the clear statement of the doctrine of atonement, whereby alone sin is done away' (448, FN), the phrase 'doctrine of atonement' is anachronistic, since it is a Latin term for a Greek writer, and implies at least two interpretative moves 1) that what God did in Christ did somehow correlate to the Jewish feast of כיפור יום (*Yom Kippur*) and 2) that this particular act of 'making one' is correlated to other views of atonement. Nowhere does the word appear in the text

of Irenaeus' *AH*, but instead the word 'reconciliation' (καταλλαγῆς, Grk; *reconciliatio*, Lt) is used. Even though Reardon (2015) acknowledges that this usage is problematic, he yet attempts to use it as a word to give meaning to the descriptions of atonement in both Anselm and the Eastern Fathers. Moreover, he attempts to reclaim the term 'atonement' and roots it in Paul's usage of 'reconciliation' in 2 Cor. 5:18-19 and Rom. 3:24. Here, it is fitting to couch Irenaeus language in 'atonement' imagery and metaphors, instead of treating it as a 'doctrine of atonement' per se. In addition, words like 'reconciliation' and 'redemption' are being used as they are drawing from Irenaeus' own work.

Another way in which atonement models can be analysed is in respect to their objects, i.e., what is sought to remedy. It is clear that in both Ransom and recapitulation imagery, the object is the elimination of evil. Christ ransoms humanity from the apostate one in his act of self-sacrifice. Secondly, this model deals with the problem of death which was a consequence of the actions of the Edenic couple's actions. Recapitulation is the reworking of history and therefore the undoing of the disobedience of Adam and Eve. Since the primitive couple brought death into the world by consequence, Christ's recapitulative act brings life, ridding the world of Satan's final victory over humanity (*AH* V, XXI, 1).

For Park, it is more difficult to tease out the object of his model. The notion of *han* is at the root of the work of Jesus' ministry and yet at the same time sin is at stake and his project is the stopping of the cycle of sin. This chapter is to show how the objects of Park, Irenaeus, and the Eastern Fathers intersect and overlap. In doing so, it becomes clear how theology works to generate a language and grammar in describing God's work through Jesus.

Table 5: Table illustrating the atonement models distinguished according to their objects

ATONEMENT MODEL	OBJECT	STRATEGY
Ransom (Irenaeus)	the liberation of humans from evil	The self-sacrifice of Jesus to trick the devil
Recapitulation (Irenaeus)	the restoration of humanity	The re-working of history through Christ's obedience
Triune atonement (Park)	healing the wounds of <i>han</i>	For the sinners, repentance through the turning of sinners from hurting others to healing of <i>han</i> For the sinned against living a life of forgiveness and forgiveness. To cut off from the pain of <i>han</i> as expressed in the notion of <i>dan</i> .

5.2 THE TRIUNE ATONEMENT AND THE HEALING OF THE HAN-RIDDEN

5.2.1 Introduction

Park's work clearly comes through a development of a theory of healing of hurt that starts with the sociological notion of *han*. He describes *han* as a 'wounded state of mind' which is tied to an Asian idea that rises from a Korean context (Park, 2001: 46). Crucial to the elimination of sin and therefore the victory over evil is healing of *han*. Because *han* is the direct result of sin, the healing of wounds is both a continuation of Jesus' ministry and a demonstration that Jesus is victorious over evil, its consequence, death. Furthermore, treating the wounds of sin prevents other sins from possibly arising. Woundedness can lead to anger, bitterness, violence, vengeance, and perpetuation of *han*.

Although Park is not the first to explore the implications of *han* in Christian theology, Park explores several aspects of the healing of *han* through an expansive theological project that deals with *han* and its relationship to sin, and how Jesus' work was mainly centered around the treatment of *han*. Therefore, Park's project is to show this takes place and God's work through Jesus' life, ministry, the crucifixion, and resurrection. This section explores how this *han* is actually dealt with. How does a particular hermeneutic give rise to both a philosophical and pastoral approach? In addition, the healing of *han* cannot be handled by human alone but needs the work of the Spirit as a continuation of the work of Jesus. Park's Christology is deeply integrated with his pneumatology. Because the mission of God was not completed, the continuation of this work comes through the efficacy of the Spirit's movement in the lives of both the sinner and the sin against.

5.2.2 *Jesus' Life and Work as Healing of the Han-ridden*

Han is woundedness that requires justification and healing. Even though the notion of and the word itself *han* arose from Korean culture and used by Minjung theology, the experience of a *han* is broadly Asian, and found in many cultures. The original symbol for *han* is distinctively Chinese (恨). Korean *han* is a loanword from the Chinese and is also related to the Vietnamese words hận and oán hận, which can be translated as "hatred" and "animus," respectively.

Han can be also examined by several aspects: 1) as a psychological state: whereas it is 'the experience of the powerless, the marginalized, and the voiceless in the world can be summed up as *han*.' (Park, 2001: 47). 2) as a corporate phenomenon, whereas it is 'victim's cumulative and corporate feeling' (Chung, 2009: 188). 3) as an experience set within a historical context. In this aspect, the history of *han* has been critiqued by historian Suh Nam-Dong, as a type of 'identity re/construction' that 'traces the history of suffering and resistance back to the mythical beginnings of Korean history' (Küster, 2010: 84). However, in the same way that Suh particularizes *han* in the context of history, he 'denies "suffering" as an adequate translation for the specific Korean experience of *han*' (Küster, 2010: 84).

In addition, *han* ‘is a critical wound of the heart generated by psychosomatic, social, political, economic, and cultural repression, as well as by social, political, economic, and cultural oppression’ (Park, 1993: 10). Here Park describes *han* 4) as a physical wound to *han*. The intersection between physical and psychological *han* can be seen in Jesus’ healings where he mends both physical infirmities and as well as alleviating the psychological trauma of stigmatization and shame for being declared a ‘sinner’ by society (Park, 1993: 10). *Han* is also expressed 5) as a political and 6) economic phenomenon. Therefore, *han* is seen in the particular instances of the Korean people as multi-faceted, to be given many interpretive aspects.

Han is ‘essentially untranslatable’, (Kim, 2007: 125; Park, 1993: 20). Park defines it as ‘wounded heart’ which takes on the psycho-somatic aspects of the effects of sin (Park, 1993: 20). If a physical wound is defined as a ‘a separation of living tissues from a body’ then analogously a psychosomatic wound be ‘the tissue of the heart caused by abuse, exploitation and violence’ (Kim, 2007: 125). However difficult this word is to understand in both English and Korean, *han* finds expression in two ways: 1) in the aesthetic and cultural expression that ‘results from a sense of hopelessness and defeat’ and 2) because of the ‘tenacious desire to live’ *han* ‘can sometimes erupt into revolution or rebellion (Lee, 2012: 57). It is within these twofold expressions of *han* that the practices of healing exist and where Christian theology of healing finds a particular form in the healing of *han*.

The multivalent aspects of *han* in one way move the focal point of the theological discussion away from sin to the object of sin, the sinned against. In another way, it requires different definitions on sin. Sin is at one hand ‘sickness’ and on another hand the cause of sickness. In Park’s anthology of articles, *The other side of sin*, theologians examine the literature that speaks of both aspects, from the effects and from the causes, the victimizers and the victims, in order to deconstruct the universalization of sin that has been the marker of the Modern theological project à la Reinhold Niebuhr and Anders Nygren (Park, 2001: 11-13). The emphasis on *han*, however, cannot be extricated from the larger project of Minjung (People’s) theology to seek liberation for the downtrodden.

However, there are critiques of the use of *han* and Minjung theology. Historically, Minjung theology finds a historical root in Shamanism, considered ‘the most ancient religion in Korea’ (Lee, 2012: 62). Shamanism, *Mukyo* in Korean, was the folk religion in Korea and can be found in some way in the major religions of Confucianism, Buddhism, and Christianity. Since it existed before these ‘institutional’ religions, it was never totally abolished or replaced by the other religions, but simply incorporated in one form or another. Küster sees that in ‘turning to the national cultural heritage, the minjung movement also discovered Shamanism for its purposes’ (Küster, 2010: 37). Through this perspective ‘the shaman (mudang) is the priestess of *han*, who cures the suffering of the people through the *kut*’ (꺆) (Küster, 2010: 37). *Kut* is the shamanistic ritual in Korea involved in healing (Kim, D., 1999: 127). The shaman is the ‘dancer for God’ who calls upon god with the ritual dance and takes away sickness (Lee, 2012: 62; Yoo, 1985: 25f.).

Is Jesus’ healing of *han* the same as the shaman’s use of *kut*? Whereas Jesus healed physical as well as psychological wounds, the shamans ‘do not take seriously the vicious structures which generate the *han*’. Rather their primary interests are the healing of ‘the wounded hearts’ (Park, 1993: 45; Kim, D., 1999: 128). Park outlines the structural roots of *han* finding three that ‘have regularly generated *han* in the world: ‘the capitalistic global economy, patriarchy, and racial and cultural discrimination’ (Park, 1993: 45-67) Jesus, as portrayed in the Gospels, brings about both individual and systemic healing of both bodily wounds and psychological oppression. Jesus does this by confronting the cult of religious scapegoating that regarded the wounded as the ‘sinners’ of society. These so called ‘sinners’ were effected by economic structures, the poor and the peasant class; patriarchal structures, women; and cultural discrimination, Samaritans and other demonized people groups. Jesus’ ministry was to all those who suffered because of these systems.

5.2.3 The Cross and the Healing of the Han-ridden

For Park, the cross is a symbol of the suffering of the sinned against and God’s standing with them: It is ‘great advocacy for the victims of abuse, violence, and unjust oppression, opposing abusive power unto death. The victims would be healed in his solidarity woundedness with them and would be vindicated by the power of the cross that demands offenders to repent of their sins.’ (Park, 2001:

57) The cross therefore was both an act of violence toward victims, symbolizing the effects of sin on the sinned against, and the presence of God in the death of the suffering son of God. The meaning of these two aspects is analysed in what Park describes as substantial and relational. Most models of atonement seek to deal with the sinner and for Park this is ‘the fundamental problem in the Christian way of thinking about sin’ (Park, 1993: 72).

For the sinner, the solution has been based on relieving the ‘pain of guilt, fear, and death’ (Park, 1993: 102). However, this fixation of the perpetrators of pain does not prevent the further continuation of sin, but rather it often perpetuates sin because the wounded do not have an outlet for recourse. They are left to deal with their own hurts in ways that often produce shame, anger, and suffering. Additionally, if before the sinned against also become the sinners, their healing could bring salvation on themselves and those of actual sinners. In messaging that the cross was the result inflicted harm by sinners, those who are perpetrators of sin can also be called upon to repent.

For Park, if sinners find salvation through their belief in the Christ and the embracing of the forgiving work of the cross through repentance, this cannot be the only aspect in which atonement may work. In other words, because sin has an object in both people, the earth, and all the inhabitants of earth, then the sinned against are an integral part of the salvation process. Moreover, because salvation is ‘not something one can hold nor some place one can enter’ salvation is not ‘substantial’ (Park, 1993: 103). This claim might be taken as a critique in some Christian circles where salvation is brought about through a sacramental sign of grace, thereby taken as substantial in that regard. However, Park sees it as ‘reasonable’ if one sees it that, but then questions if salvation achieves what it sets out to do (Park, 1993: 102). If the purpose of salvation is to rescue one from, sin, wrath, guilt, and/or death, then is it not relational in so far as those elements affect others? If sin is both separation and transgression, it has to do with the other person. Similarly, if wrath is upon the sinner, then the reason for that wrath is not only because of a violation against God, but that this is also a violation against other people. The sinner can suffer guilt, but this guilt is a product of what happens to the sinned against. Finally, death is the final spiritual, existential, and physical separation from community.

5.2.4 *The Resurrection and the Healing of the Han-ridden*

What the resurrection of the son of God means is a defeat of the powers of evil, and therefore limiting the violence that can be done to the victims, even in death. Chung sees the resurrection as this continuing covenant to work at healing the victims of *han*. It is Jesus' promise that 'I am going to Galilee ahead of you' (Mk 16:7) and 'becomes an *ochlos*-based reading of the Gospel of Mark'. This is what Ahn Byung-Mu, considered the father of Minjung theology, calls 'theology of outcry'. Therefore, the 'risen Christ works constantly with his people in Galilee until the end' (Chung, 2009: 190). For Byung-Mu, Galilee represents the region of outcry, where the first disciples, the sinned against, and the crowds (*ochlos*) were treated by Jesus. Galilee was the area from where the disciples were called and awaiting the visitation of the risen Christ.

Lyew sees that there are both passive and active strategies for the treatment of *han*. The passive ways in which *han* has been treated leads to people who 'swallow and dissolve their *han* as a blend of excruciating pain, longing for something unattainable, waiting, autogenous sadness and resignation within themselves,' (Lyew, 286). The artistic results of woundedness provide beauty to the experience of *han*, but does not extinguish the lingering effects. This is akin to the poetic sections of the book of Job without a grounding in the prose narrative. The positive corollary to *han* is *dan* as the 'Transcendental Solution to Han' (Lyew, 285) Dan (단) 'dan as cutting off the link of the evil cycle of vengeance between *han*-sufferers and *han*-providers' (Lyew, 286). *Dan*, like *han*, is a term borrowed from the Chinese (斷) which means 'a cutting off' and 'represents the attempt to destroy the greed which is at the centre of the oppressor-oppressed cycle' (Moon, 1985: 54-55).

Actively, within the history of Korea, 'whenever their *han* as deploration was maximised under the circumstances of politico-social uncertainties, however, minjung transformed it into *han* as rancour.' This is seen in the many examples of the 'minjung revolts' where expression of *han* is active engagement to transform systems of oppression (Lyew, 2007: 281). Moreover, the resurrection points to the possibility of continued relationships. Where Jesus enjoins humanity to teach, disciple, and engage, the healing of *han* is about the transformation of society: 'For genuine

reconciliation between oppressors and the oppressed, we need to think of the possibility of rebuilding a society filled with justice and peace.’ This vision seeks to stir the Christian imagination toward a new ‘village’ where reconciliation can take place between perpetrators and victims of *han*.

In the resurrected life of Jesus, there exist both the reiteration of the covenant of God in God’s commitment to God’s people (Hebrews 13:5) and the defeat of death and therefore sin. The resurrection demonstrates *dan* because it is the ‘cutting off’ of the violence toward the oppressed and vindication of their life. Indeed, the orientation of Jesus’ continual healing ‘rests upon the historicity of Jesus’ resurrection.’ (Lyew, 2007: 289). Following Karl Barth’s emphasis on the resurrected life of Jesus as the way God re-enters into the communion with ‘Mitmenschlichkeit’ humanity, Lyew cites Barth saying that ‘[i]t is impossible to erase the bodily character of the resurrection of Jesus and His existence as the Resurrected’ (Barth, 1936-1975: Vol II/2, 448; Lyew, 2007: 45).

Park’s inroad into this discussion is his exploration of the ‘resurrected Spirit’ as both the Spirit who brought forth Jesus, who was crucified with Jesus, and continues the work of Jesus after Jesus was risen (Park, 2009: 61). Here Park also distinguishes the Paraclete from the Spirit in that the Paraclete is the advocate who is sent after Jesus’ ascension to help the disciples. The Greek word Paraclete (παράκλητος) derives from the words ‘with, from, beside’ (παρά) and ‘to call’ (καλέω). Kittel defines the use of the term in the New Testament text as ‘advocate’ (Kittel, 1964: 703). Here, the instances of the word are telling and it confirms much of Park’s sense that the Paraclete is a “twin” to Jesus: 1) Jesus ‘bears witness’ to the Spirit even in leaving the disciples (Jn. 14:3). 2) Between the two ‘comings however, the Paraclete comes, or Christ himself comes by the Paraclete in a pneumatic rather than a personal coming (Jn. 15:26; 14:28)’ 3) ‘The Paraclete enables people to come to Jesus even though they cannot come where he now is (Jn. 7:34; 8:21-22; 13:33)’. These senses of the coming of Christ and the Paraclete is confirms a Christology that is pneumatological.

5.2.5 Conclusion

Salvation necessarily has a therapeutic element not only for the sinner, also for the sinned against. It is important to note that the word 'salvation' itself (σωτήριος) is related to the word for 'healing' (θεραπεία), the former with a meaning that can pertain to deliverance from illness. When Park speaks about salvation for the sinner and healing of *han* for the sinned against, it is important to note that there is an admixture of woundedness in the sinner. If Park is consistent with his anthropology, then the sinner also requires some kind of healing for their own wounds, or else only the wounds on the side of sinned against are addressed. However, Park does charge the sinners with the work of repentance from their acts of sin (Park, 1993: 87-89; 2004: 73-79; 2009: 81-85). The accounts in the Gospels that Jesus refers to himself as a 'physician' seems to leave open the possibility for the healing of the sinner even though his admonishment is that they would not receive it (Mk 2:17; Mtt 9:12; Lk 5:31).

Park's atonement project demonstrates how *han* can be treated and this happens through a historical narration of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. In this sense it is not unlike J. Denny Weaver's non-violent narrative Christus Victor which Park also critiques (Weaver, 2011; Park, 2009: 31-34). The main problems Park has with this theory is the explanation as to why evil still exists even though Jesus proclaims victory over evil. Between now and the eschaton there is an existential gap. Christ has triumphed over evil, but evil still exists. Park asserts, 'Unless Weaver explains more fully why Jesus' rule is limited, the theory seems equivocal' (Park, 2009: 34). Another related critique is the continued work of the resurrected Christ in the role of the Paraclete. It is apparent that Park seeks not only to fill the lacunae in atonement theories, but also move the practical concerns forward to explanations as to how transformation can take place.

However, central to the problem of *han* is the justification of its use. Moon ponders the use of *han* in pastoral theology and states that '[t]o argue that *han* forms the core of Korean spirituality is to internalize the beliefs of what the colonizers have said about Koreans: "the beauty of sorrow" due to their unfortunate geopolitical situation' (Moon, 2014: 419). Accordingly, Moon sees that 'the concept of *han* has been a discursively colonized concept—one that has been controlled by a theology imbricated with nationalism' (Moon, 2014: 420). Because *han* has been so embroidered

with colonialism and nationalism, the question is raised if it is a valuable means to bring about the healing of the victims.

Moreover, Moon's intent is to 'argue against the existing paradigm of *han* as a theological concept that is unique to Korean culture and that is considered to be a national characteristic of the Korean people'. Instead, Moon proposes 'that *han* is a concept that is transcultural, intercultural, and extant in all human communities' (Moon, 2014: 420). What is sought after is a universalizing of *han* from the particular colonized stigmatization into describing it as 'the multi-faceted dimensions of suffering that are pervasive in all cultures and histories because of the human vulnerability to suffering' (Moon, 2014: 420).

Moon sees the concept of *han* in the writings of Yun Chi'i-ho, an activist and philosopher who fought for the independence of Korea, but also saw the benefits of Korea being under Western influence, including Christianity and argues, citing Robinson (2007: 78), that 'the modern theological constructs of *han* and *chŏng (jeong)* arose out of this environment of cultural modernity and the juxtaposition of the modern and the traditional' (Moon, 2014: 426). Secondly, Moon observes that 'the modern Korean theological concept of *han*, as it was developed in Minjung liberation theology, was also shared by the Japanese during the period of Japan's colonization of Korea' (Moon, 426). In particular, Yanagi Muneyoshi (1889–1961) an art patron and religious thinker is credited with coining the adage 'the beauty of sorrow' to describe *han*. It is this interconnectedness 'with Korean national identity' that Moon seeks to depart from (Moon, 2014: 428). To what extent then is this sorrow a reification of a concept and perhaps an incorrect reification?

Additionally, there is a particularity with *han* in that it is 'intimately connected with Korean national identity' (Moon, 2014: 428). It is in this identity that perhaps creates artificial 'distinctions and divides between colonizer/colonized, as well as the resulting cultural products, are artificially constructed' (Moon, 2014: 432). The final recommendation of Moon is for pastoral theologians 'to have a more complex theory of *han* and suffering that does not essentialize and further victimize Korean wo/men' (Moon, 2014: 432).

Park notes that even though the word *han* emerges from a Korean context, the idea itself is a loan word from the Chinese (恨) and shares similarities with the Vietnamese hận and oán hận which means ‘hatred’ and ‘animus’ in their respected forms. Han can also be seen as American ‘blues’ that emerges from slavery, segregation, and Jim Crow in the United States. Even though there is not the use of “wounded” as a theological concept in Hindi, such as using the word for wound “ghayal” (घायल), Dalit theologians have addressed the ‘wounded psyche’ to describe the mental state brought on by the caste system and colonialism (Rajkumar, 2010: 138). By looking at the biblical narratives such as Cain and Abel, Park has constructed a theology that calls forth the concept of *han* as an experience for all those who suffer violence and seek justification for the injury. What Park does as an Asian-American theologian is provide a greater context and interest than Minjung theology’s emphasis on the Korean experience. At least in his latest work, *The triune atonement*, the project encompasses healing for the wounded, the salvation of sinners, and restoration for all of creation.

5.3 RANSOM AND RECAPITULATION THEORIES AS THE LIBERATION OF HUMAN NATURE

5.3.1 Introduction

We have seen that Irenaeus’ anthropology centres around a particular view of human nature as progress toward a particular goal, becoming more divine. This developmental theology is included in an overall view of God’s economy (*economia*). Osborn asserts that ‘economy (the coherent history of salvation) is the concept which depends on recapitulation for its coherence and which defines the place of the central event’ (Osborn, 2000: 13). Assuming that ransom belongs within the framework of recapitulation, we can see that human nature being liberated both by the particular work of God in the cross, and the work of God in the life and work of Jesus. The task of this section is to show how restored human nature is part of this work of recapitulation and ransom.

5.3.2 *Recapitulation*

Recapitulation begins with the statement from Ephesians 1:10 (ἀνακεφαλαίωσις). The Latin, *recirculatio*, contains the sense of circling around. Kittel's *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* describes *anakephalaióomai* - as 'a rare term means —to bring to a *kephalḗ* '(or head) (Kittel, 1964: 380). However, another nuance of the definition is 'to bring to a conclusion' and in the passage this 'suggests that there is a definitive, comprehensive, and recapitulatory summation of the totality of things as the church receives it head' (Kittel, 1964: 380; Schlier, 1985: 673-82).

The Greek term *anakephalaiosis* (ἀνακαίνωσις) expresses 'the idea of being brought to a head as a unifying principle and of somehow resuming all things' and this 'begins with the Incarnation and will be completed with the glorification of the body' (Unger, 1992: 185-186). This is based on the pre-existent Word in creation which recapitulates all creation through the incarnation of the Word. This is that act whereby Jesus 'summarizes' within Jesus' self 'all creation and unites all people and angels too to himself as under one Head, and in so doing he duplicates, or resumes, the acts of Adam either by similarity or by opposition' (Unger, 1992: 185-186). In other words, in ways in which Adam was obedient to God, the Word expresses this unity, and the ways Adam was disobedient to God, the Word untangles the misdeeds and thus brings about the unity.

Additionally, recapitulation conveys the sense of 'final repetition, summing up, drawing to conclusion'. Literarily, recapitulation is 'a term in rhetoric, it refers to the end of a speech, when the speaker drives home the point with a summary of the strongest arguments.' (O'Keefe & Reno, 2005: 39). In Latin, the term *caput* refers to the head or the chapter of a book, so the idea of recapitulation is that Jesus summed up the life of Adam through his own life (O'Keefe & Reno, 2005: 39). Jesus is the 'second Adam' who fulfilled a life of intimacy with God, whereas Adam rejected this kind of relationship with God and instead sought the power of the knowledge of the tree of good and evil.

Even though the Patristic Fathers do not use the term recapitulation as extensively as they use the term 'economy' (Latin, *economia*; Greek, οἰκονομία) 'the underlying concept is always present in the Fathers' exegesis' (O'Keefe & Reno: 2005, 39).

In *AH* III, XVI, 6, recapitulation is spoken about in terms of the incarnation the following respects:

1. Jesus] is ‘man, the formation of God’.
2. Jesus] ‘took up humanity into himself, the invisible becoming visible, the incomprehensible being made comprehensible, the impassable’.
3. Jesus summed ‘up all things into himself so that ‘he might draw all things to himself at the proper time.’

In the incarnation, the Word of God is supreme, and related to the ‘heading up’ Jesus makes himself the ‘Head of the church’. Here the celestial and the ecclesiastical meet in the history of recapitulation. As Jesus gathers those called to be the body, Jesus also brings together the cosmic forces of the universe into correct unity.

Accordingly, there are three ways in which recapitulation can be discussed, in terms of 1) recapitulation of history 2) recapitulation of humanity 3) recapitulation of redemption. All these ways signal what God’s work within the creation of the world and summarizing these events again through the incarnation.

5.3.3 *Recapitulation of History*

For Irenaeus, even though the theological course of history might not have been clear before the advent of Christ, the incarnation clarified what was to come. Jesus’ recapitulative act was to provide hermeneutical clarity as to what the law and prophets were pointed toward. In this sense Irenaeus uses the term ‘recapitulation’ in an innovative way, adding ‘layers of historical and ontological meaning’ (O’Keefe & Reno, 2005: 39). In *AH* V, XI, 1, there is a certain confluence of revelation and the economy of salvation. Irenaeus rhetorically asks: ‘And how do the Scriptures testify of [Jesus]?’ and answers, ‘unless all things had ever been revealed and shown to believers by one and the same God through the Word’. Since all things came to be through the Word, the economy of God is about how God reveals God’s self throughout history and how it is in this history that God shows God’s redemption (*AH* III, XXI, 1).

In *AH V*, XXIII, 2, Irenaeus both points to the details of both creation and salvation history in order to undermine the beliefs of the Gnostics (Przyszychowska, 2018: 13). Irenaeus compares the day of disobedience of Adam to the day of Christ's death. Irenaeus interprets that Adam in a way died when he ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Irenaeus quotes Gen 2:17, 'for in the day that ye shall eat of it, ye shall die by death' to depict Adam's death taking place on the same day as Christ's death. This is to say that Adam did not physically die, but brought death into the world as a consequence of his disobedience and therefore introduced it to all of humanity. What Christ did for Adam was 'thus granting him a second creation by means of [Christ's] passion, which is that [creation] out of death'. In making this typological connection, Irenaeus erases the dichotomy between the Old Testament deity and New Testament deity showing that what was vaguely foreshadowed by the Hebrew Scriptures were clearly fulfilled by the incarnation of Christ.

5.3.4 *Recapitulation of Humanity*

Secondly, the recapitulation of humanity occurs in a two-fold fashion. In *AH III*, XVIII, 1, Irenaeus speaks of the redemption of Adam: 'Jesus 'commenced afresh (Lt, "in seipso recapitulavit) the long line of human beings, and furnished us, in a brief, comprehensive manner, with salvation; so that what we had lost in Adam—namely, to be according to the image and likeness of God—that we might recover in Christ Jesus.' However, in another sense Jesus 'exhibited a new sort of generation' (*AH V*, I, 3). Jesus is not the old Adam reborn, but became the New Adam (Florovsky, 1976: 178). In this way, humanity is related to history. This movement is not backward at a restoration of Eden, but a restoration of the cosmos in the New Jerusalem (*AH V*, XXXV, 2). For Irenaeus, the earth represents the tabernacle, an image (Latin) of one that is to come. In contrast, the New Jerusalem is the place 'when all things are made new' and people will 'dwell in the city of God.'

For Irenaeus, it is only in the incarnation that history finds completion and humanity is restored: 'when the foe was conquered in [Adam's] turn, Adam received new life; and the last enemy, death, is destroyed' (*AH V*, XXXV, 2). Again, Jesus 'gathered up in himself all nations, dispersed as they were even from Adam' (*AH III*, XXII, 3). This speaks of the unitive economy of Christ that brings

both humans and human nature together'. Like in Park, the wounds that separate tissue, find healing completion, but here in the recapitulative work of Christ.

For Irenaeus recapitulation is part and parcel to the work of liberation from death which is the effect of sin. Irenaeus uses the image of how humans were 'drawn by sin into bondage' and this imprisonment was 'held by death' (*AH* IV, XVIII, 7). Only through the incarnation of God as fully human can sin 'be destroyed by [a human], and [humans] should go forth from death. In the next chapter of *AH*, Irenaeus quotes from John 8:36, saying, 'If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed' (*AH* IV, XIX, 1). Recapitulation is also related to the bestowing of incorruption. Those people who are 'ignorant' of the one who is 'God with us' (Emmanuel) remain 'debtors to death', not able to 'obtain the antidote of life' (*AH* IV, XIX, 1). Irenaeus holds to the idea that humans are not by nature incorruptible and immortal. Rather, they are given immortality from God as the source of life. Recapitulation then shows Christ's life as one who lived dependent upon God for the source of life, even though Jesus was both God and human. Irenaeus is deeply Trinitarian in his theology and this is reflected in how he argues that humans are to participate in the economy of God's life just as the persons of the Trinity draw from each other's life. When God expelled the primeval couple from the garden, it was to remove them from the source of eternal life (Lashier, 2014: 86). It was God who 'effected the incarnation of this [union of God and human]' and 'showed forth a new [kind of] generation; that as by the former generation we inherited death, so by this new generation we might inherit life' (*AH* V, I, 3).

5.3.2 *Recapitulation of Redemption*

In a way, recapitulation is in itself a redemptive act, but in another way, Jesus' work can also be described as a summation of the redemptive process that have been used by God in the history of creation, revelation, and present restoration. The ransom described by Irenaeus in *AH* V, I, 1, describes how those enslaved are released and human nature is restored. This act was present throughout the biblical narratives and then re-narrated by Irenaeus in the above passage. The pedagogical point is made that 'for in no other way could we have learned the things of God unless our Master, existing as the Word, had become [a human being]' (*AH* I, I, 5). The incarnation is the

connecting point for both the earthly and heavenly, that Christ, ‘has come to lead humanity back home and with mankind all the cosmos’ (1 Cor 15:47) (Carroll, 2003: 952).

A key passage in *AH* that brings both the sense of recapitulation and ransom together is Irenaeus’ defence of the pre-existence of Christ and what is accomplished in the incarnation: ‘but when He became incarnate, and was made man, He commenced afresh the long line of human beings, and furnished us, in a brief, comprehensive manner (*in seipso recapitulavit*), with salvation; so that what we had lost in Adam—namely, to be according to the image and likeness of God—that we might recover in Christ Jesus’ (*AH* III, XVIII, 1). Here the image of God that was ‘lost in Adam’ is restored in Christ. This image is what liberates human nature that was captive by the apostate one. Unless this unity between human nature liberated and divine nature restored is established, salvation cannot be achieved (Clemons, 2011: 14): ‘How could we have been united to imperishability and immortality unless imperishability and immortality had first been made what we are, so that what was perishable might be absorbed by imperishability and what was mortal by immortality?’ (*AH* III, XIX, 1). In order for humanity to be restored, ‘Christ had to become our very substance’ (Clemons, 2011: 14). There is conditional necessity in the salvation of humanity. Whether or not humanity necessitated saving, in order for salvation to be complete, humanity was to be made complete through the joining of human and divine, in the flesh.

5.3.3 Conclusion

Irenaeus’ views connect recapitulation and the liberation of humans for the restoration of their ultimate aims. However, there are three considerations to take into account that have to do with Irenaeus’ description in general and how liberation works in particular.

First, in historical recapitulation, ‘Christ gains salvation for all [humanity] (ἐν συντόμῳ)’ in restoring the timeline of Adam to Jesus (Carroll: 2003, 952). That which could not be entirely forecast but alluded to by the prophets was filled in, and fulfilled, by the events of Christ’s life. Recapitulation of humanity and of redemption grounded by this historical setting. It solves the problem of ahistoricity critiqued by J. Denny Weaver of ‘abstract formulas of traditional atonement’ (2011, 189). What Irenaeus’ particular take on recapitulation is, is to both give a story

of God's ransom of humanity and draw from the biblical narratives. Historical recapitulation does not exclude either the conception of liberation and restoration, nor does it leave out biblical narratives, but makes room for them by providing the conceptual framework, like Park's use of *han* as a tool for analysing sin.

Second, because this model of recapitulation falls within what can generally and achronistically be considered as 'Christus victor' the tendency is to reduce the treatment of atonement into 'a simple classification scheme with three major families of atonement doctrine: Satisfaction, Christus Victor, and Moral Influence' (Crane, 2019: 55). In order to move beyond this simplification Crane argues 'that a faithful atonement theology must make interpretive sense of the sheer volume of New Testament texts that resonate with the imagery of sacrifice and substitution' (Crane, 2019: 63). To look at the expansive New Testament texts, the history of interpretation of these texts, and how words are used pastorally and doctrinally should move the theological discipline toward a new 'grammar' for theology.

Third, Park's own critique of ransom theory in light of recapitulation rightly separates it from Christus Victor. According to Park, even though Ransom is similar to Christus Victor in that both portray a 'dualistic struggle'. However, while Ransom sees 'Satan as a legitimate opponent of negotiation, while the idea of Christ as victor views Satan as the enemy to be defeated' (Park, 2014: 13). Even though Park's reading does not situate ransom within recapitulation, his evaluation of ransom reveals much about how he attempts to construct a theology that is distinct.

For Park, the strengths of ransom are 1) it is supported by textual evidence which contain ransom imagery (Mark 10:45; Matt 20:28; 1 Cor. 6:20; 7:23; 1 Tim. 2:6; 2 Pet. 2:1) 2) it 'addresses the reality of the power of evil' over humanity 3) it integrates Jesus' death and his resurrection (Park, 2014: 7). However, Park finds fault in the way that ransom has been used: 1) it has been taken too literally 2) it sees Satan as a 'naïve, unintelligent being', a tricker who was tricked 3) if Jesus liberated from Satan, then humans should be free. However, human beings are far from free (Park, 2014: 8). There is still a continued struggle with sin, evil, and death in the world; the reality of this must still be accounted for given the theological claims of Jesus' victory.

To answer Park's valid critiques, one can use Crane's concept of 'apocalyptic soteriology' (Crane, 2019: 70). Here, Irenaeus' account of Jesus' divine and human nature (*AH* III. XVIII, 7) is interpreted to show that '[b]ecause Jesus Christ is human, he can break the chain of sin and death from within human history. Because he is divine, what he does has universal significance as God's invasion and deliverance of the cosmos in bondage' (Crane, 2019: 70). However, this does not become realized in the life of humans unless humans take part in this eschatological hope of liberation (Crane, 2019: 71). The key to understanding recapitulation in a non-passive way is to see how human history finds its fulfilment in the actualization of the recapitulation of history. Where Christus Victor declares triumph over the powers of evil, recapitulation works in conjunction with the history of human action to fulfil the work of Christ in the world. This sense of active participation is what Park seeks to do in his own project in order to undo the effects of death and sin in the world. 'Apocalyptic soteriology' is therefore the way in which humans can enter into Christ's life and be co-laborers in the 'already/not yet' narrative history of God's kingdom.

5.4 RESTORATIVE JUSTICE AND ATONEMENT IN PARK, IRENAEUS, AND EASTERN CHURCH FATHERS

5.4.1 Introduction

In the work of Park, Irenaeus, and the Eastern Church Fathers, in general, a clear line of restorative justice can be seen. This particular type of justice is aimed at bringing about a renewal of humanity and life lived in relationship between God, humanity, and all of creation. Moore describes it as 'the restoration of full life potential for every person and community, fostered through equitable social structures and conditions that foster well-being and flourishing' in addition Moore adds that 'reconciliation is the restoration of good relations between God and humanity, and among people; it is a coming together in right relationship. Both are a gift from God—a holy trust that cannot be forced'.

Within these two definitions is the aspect of restoration. In adjectival form, restorative justice is then an emphasis in justice that brings about a renewal of all aspects in the world and not only setting things right. The Hebrew and Greek words for justice are *tsedaqah* (תְּצַדִּיק) *dikaioné* (δικαιοσύνη) respectively, and in themselves do not signify this sense of renewal, but instead point toward right actions in order to pursue a common good. However, pursuing these deeds requires strategies and actions to accomplish these goals. For both Park, Irenaeus, and the Eastern Fathers these instrumental means take the form of the restoration of humans and human nature, to heal their wounds and restore divine nature. This section explores how restorative justice is demonstrated in each of their projects.

5.4.2 *Restorative justice in Park's Triune Atonement*

Restorative justice in Park starts with a discussion of what retributive justice looks like. This critique is not so much a denunciation of retributive justice, but instead a re-evaluation of the method. For Park, *lex talionis* is rooted in the limitation of vengeance and there is a difference between retribution and vengeance. 'This law of *lex talionis* sounds pitiless and malicious, but in reality, it is grounded in mercy,' says Park (2004: 112). Since those who are wounded 'have a tendency to retaliate more than they were hurt, the law sets a limit on retribution' (Park, 2004: 112). The law of retribution was intended to prevent *han* from continuing to affect others unjustly. However, where this law has been used unjustly is in the misappropriation of the law. The main criticism that Park has to making this type of justice normative for Christian theology is that by placing emphasis on the perpetrators of sin, how they should or should not be punished for their actions, it neglects the true victims. The main question then is how does retribution get at what the victims are seeking? If the victims are only seeking that the perpetrators hurt as much as the victims hurt then this is simply retaliation and not retribution. Then what comes back into play is the cycle of hurt and sin does not prevent sin, but rather continues sin.

Restorative justice for Park functions in three ways 1) it brings attention back to the victims 2) it seeks 'to identify responsibilities, meet needs, and promote healing' (Zehr, 1999: 134) 3) it involves all parties: 'victims, offenders, and communities' (Park, 2004: 112). For Park, the purpose of restorative justice is to end the cycle of sin through the healing of *han*. Related to restorative

justice is Park's concept of 'justification by love' rather than only 'justification by faith' as expressed by the Reformers.

For Park, justification by faith is a 'most important doctrine of Christianity (or at least for Protestantism)' that 'delineates how the wrongdoer can be saved, but omits how the wronged can be saved' (Park, 1993: 95). Here is where Park pivots to the 'justification by faith informed by love', because it seems that justification alone does not bring with it justice for the sinned against (Park, 1993: 96). In other words, when sinner and God are justified it is between the two parties rather than to those in whom the sinner has wounded. The Catholic doctrine is more inclusive of the victims. Still, its 'orientation' is centred upon the oppressors. What Park proposes is to redirect the direction of justification toward those who are wounded, and not only the sinners.

'What is critical in Park's distinction in describing justification by love is that it is not only a change in 'status', but a 'state of our nature (Park, 1993: 98). Here, Park's use of state of nature is insightful. The Aristotelian view of a natural teleology of all things come into play, i.e., the intrinsic movement toward a goal. If the purpose of justice is to move all things to a final good that which is unity with God, then it must also of necessity be a unity with all of creation. This would be the right state of being, a change not only from unrighteous to righteous, but a realigning of our intrinsic teleology or human nature. True redeemed nature requires not only a right relationship with God, but also a reconciliation with those who were hurt by sin. Justification by love seeks to restore others' wholeness by bringing healing to *han*.

5.4.3 Restorative Justice in Irenaeus' Atonement Models

In Irenaeus, liberation is akin to restoration. In the Ransom even though it rejects God's use of violence in redeeming humans, is in a way 'violent' in how it 'liberates from bondage and breaks the spell which mesmerizes those who had capitulated to oppressive powers' that 'only violent imagery and metaphors are capable of giving adequate expression to its impact' (Crane 2019: 57). In *AH*, Irenaeus attempts to contrast how the apostate one obtains his goals, by 'persuasion' rather by coercion. Irenaeus contrasts the strategies of the Kingdom to the methods done by those who take it by force (*AH* IV, XXXVII, 7). Here, he uses Matthew 11:12, 'From the days of John the

Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven has been subjected to violence, and violent people have been raiding it,' to drive home the point about God's non-violent means as opposed to what some might find as a way to bring about the reign of a kingdom. As with the prophets before Jesus and even during the time of Jesus, the truth of God has often been met with violent reactions. So, the clash between God's love and justice often means an eruptive reaction. However, ultimately, what brings restoration is the liberate act of Christ's sacrificial giving on the cross, therefore bringing restorative redemption to humanity. If recapitulation is a tool of rhetoric, then the finality to an argument is the resolution of the summations. Liberative and restorative redemption thus can be seen as the resolution of the recapitulative process: 'Christ came to restore what we had lost in Adam' (*id est secundum imaginem et similitudinem esse Dei*) (Hochban: 1946, 528; *AH* III, XVIII, 1).

Irenaeus moves from the abstract redemptive image to the image of the strong man used by Jesus in the Gospels. Here, Irenaeus uses the same Ransom imagery, but with the language from the synoptic Gospels (Matt 12: 29, Mark 3: 27, and Luke 11: 21–22), to say that Jesus binds the strong man, i.e., Satan, 'in order that man, being set free, [humanity] might return to his Lord, leaving to him (Satan) those bonds by which he himself had been fettered, that is, sin' (*AH* V, XXI, 3). Irenaeus speaks both of sin as a 'transgression of the Law' which is both love of God and neighbour (*AH* IV, XII, 2) Of course, the captivity of Satan is a metaphor for the conquering of sin and death. But this is a type of justice that because Jesus reversed the injustice that led people into 'bondage' and 'who had been led captive in times past, was rescued from the grasp of his possessor, according to the tender mercy of God the Father' (*AH* V, XXI, 3). This justice is connected to the work of God who had 'compassion on [God's] own handiwork, and gave to it salvation, restoring it by means of the Word—that is, by Christ—in order that man might learn by actual proof that he receives incorruptibility not of himself, but by the free gift of God' (*AH* V, XXI, 3). Justice is coupled with restoration. It is not only a declaration the wrong doings of the evil one, but also the righting of the wrongs in order to restore the 'handiwork' of God, i.e., creation.

Related to the restoration of human nature is the moral core that helps achieve fulfilment and reconciliation of creation. Recapitulation contains an ethical component ('perfect goodness') that

intersects with an ontological aspect ('being, life, incorruption, glory'), i.e., the love of enemies and the salvation of humanity in the forgiveness of those who crucified the Christ (Osborn, 2000: 16). Irenaeus reminds his readers 'to be long-suffering, and to show kindness towards those [that injured them], and to pray for them, that by means of repentance they might be saved—so that we should in no respect imitate the arrogance, lust, and pride of others' (AH XXXII, I). Here it is not merely piety that Irenaeus seeks to instil in his readers, but rather he urges people to live in imitation of their Lord, unlike the heretics that believe in an arbitrary ethic. Recapitulation necessitates the brining together of both redemption and perfection (Osborn, 2000: 12).

At the same time, restoration necessitates the redemption in relationship to incarnation. Irenaeus asks, '[H]ow can they (human beings) be saved unless it was God who wrought out their salvation upon earth? Or how shall man pass into God, unless God has [first] passed into man?' (AH IV, XXXIII, 4). Restoration is both the image and the likeness: 'Only if it is truly the Son who is man can he restore our likeness to himself, but, equally, only if the Son is truly one of us, can our image be restored by him' (Weinandy, 2003: 27). God's incarnation in Jesus enables the restoration of both image and likeness, but the likeness is not only to the likeness of God, but also to the likeness of the son. Humans are truly human in the likeness of the one who was fully human. This Christological move makes the deification not only described as moving toward God's likeness, but also one that moves people toward the image of Jesus.

5.4.4 *The 'Two Hands of God' and Trinity in Irenaeus' Atonement Model*

Irenaeus can be described as a trinitarian theologian not only because he mentions the triune God, but also makes meaningful contributions to Trinitarian theology and integrates his views into his overall theological project, including how atonement takes place through the persons of the trinity. Like Park's 'Triune Atonement' Irenaeus sees the relationships between the persons of God and how recapitulation is articulated. Lashier speaks of this relationship in terms of 'divine transcendence' and points out how this is relevant in speaking about the divine persons, especially of the Son and the Spirit (2014). There are two aspects of 'divine transcendence' that Lashier speaks about: 1) as 'defined by quality rather than spatial distance' and 2) as 'of God as the Fullness of all things, maintained through an absolute transcendence, allows him to posit nothing between

God and his creation' (2014: 85-86). God is transcendent not in terms of separate in proximity from God's creation but is distinguished by how creation participates in God's fullness for its subsistence (*AH IV, XIX, 2*).

In a polemic that resembles a doxology, Irenaeus proclaims the greatness of God, but also God's imminence. Irenaeus says this to counter a Gnostic notion that claims that 'God is the image of another Father' and to speculate on these things misses the how to conceive of God. Irenaeus starts by asserting that it is true that 'the gifts, oblations, and all the sacrifices' that were shown to Moses were 'types of the celestial' (*AH IV, XIX, 1*). Here, he uses similar language to the writer of the letter to the Hebrews to claim that those objects and rituals on earth point to spiritual forms or realities (Hebrews 8:1-7; 9:1-5). However, the gnostic difficulty is seeing the material world as a reflection of the spiritual world and thereby missing the presence of God in creation. They would rather seek images and reflections of another spiritual reality. So, they think that they are conceiving of the correct God in overlooking the material realities, but instead are actually missing the image of God seen in the incarnation. Irenaeus comments by citing Jeremiah 23:23 and says, '[God] it is who fills the heavens, and views the abysses, who is also present with every one of us. For he says, "Am I a God at hand, and not a God afar off? If any man is hid in secret places, shall I not see him?"' (*AH IV, XIX, 2*). Here, the notion of being "at hand" is used both to signify divine transcendence, i.e., as one who fills the heavens and also the intimate nature of God presence.

In chapter XIX of book IV, the word 'hand' (*manus, manubus* Lt.) is used at least ten times. Lawson suggests that the 'hand', 'arm' or 'finger' of God was 'a regular Old Testament metaphor' and it was 'descriptive of some special and wonderful divine act or intervention, particularly in creation, in protection of God's People or the vindication of the right, in revelation, or prophetic inspiration' (Lawson, 2006: 123). These appendages reach outward by a divinely 'other' person, but also connect in a real and physical way to creation. Lashier posits that even though 'God contains material creation, his absolute transcendence keeps him from mixing with material' (2014: 85). The incarnation can be expressed as not so much a mixing, but of God being fully human in the person of Jesus. However, in *AP 11*, Irenaeus speaks of the formation of humans by God as a type of 'mixing' saying that with humans God 'formed with His own hands, taking from

the earth that which was purest and finest, and mingling in measure [God's] own power with the earth'. Irenaeus continues to use the hand image to illustrate that God traced [God's] own form on the formation that which should be seen should be of divine form: for (as) the image of God was man formed and set on the earth'. Dunning comments, 'In this way, human flesh and blood is formed from a mixture of God's power and rarefied dirt' (2009: 69). The mixing that God does is in creation, but after this creation there is no need for this type of formation.

Here, Irenaeus uses the 'hand of God' image to talk about humans being fashioned by the 'virgin soil' of the earth by the Word of God (AH III, XXI, 10). The birth of Jesus the Christ is seen as the act of recapitulation through the virgin woman so that the Christ could take on human flesh, not to be fashioned again, but to recapitulate the history of humanity. Irenaeus uses the term 'preserving the similitude' or 'analogy (*similitudinem*, Lt.; ὁμοιότης, Grk) in the above text to show a parallelism, but not duplication of what God had done in history. Rather, God's hand did something new and unique in the history of humanity. In this way, Irenaeus anticipates the creedal formula 'begotten, not made'. Adam was made through the soil by 'mixing' with God's hand; Jesus was born of a woman, who himself was the Word in which made the soil that gave substance to Adam.

The hand of God is this incarnate intervention into humanity to sum up Adam's history and make Christ the head. As Behr points out that 'the manner of Christ's incarnation preserved the manner of Adam's formation is due both to the fact that Adam was a type of Christ and to the need for Christ's flesh to be that of Adam' (Behr, 2000: 63). Since the virgin Mary herself was a descendant of Adam, the formation by the hand of God needs not be duplicated in Jesus' birth. This relationship can be seen as an analogy/act relationship that Irenaeus is setting up between the hands of God, the virgin image of soil/woman, and the acts of God in history.

Table 6: Analogy/Act relationship

Analogy	Act
God's hands: Adam is born of virgin soil ::	Creation
God's hands (the Word): Christ is born of virgin woman	Redemption

The two hands of God are ways to speak of God's recapitulative work in the world. It is a way to speak about how God restores creation within the framework of history. It is the continuing work of Jesus and the Spirit who does this and although Irenaeus' formulation is quite intricate, it also speaks of how clearly thought out this theological discourse is presented. Steenberg remarks that this image is 'intended to provide for the conceptualization of such direct activity as it is meant to be a commentary on the relationship of the Father, Son and Spirit one to another' (Steenberg, 2009: 26). The direct work of the Father speaks about the relationship between the Son and the Spirit to the Father in the perichoretic connection of the Trinity. In addition, this connection between the ways in which Park speaks about Jesus and the Paraclete as 'twins' (Park, 2009: 60-61) helps to further ground a contemporary constructive theology in the foundations of the past.

5.4.5 Restorative Justice in the Literature of the Eastern Fathers

The themes of restoration are shown in the various Eastern Fathers and display the link between redemption and healing, specifically in Gregory of Nazianzus (329–389) and Maximus the Confessor (c. 580-662). Hofer shows that Gregory of Nazianzus's poem *De rebus suis* reflects how the prayers to Christ serve as an example for how a life in prayer brings healing. This 'deeply Christomorphic autobiography heals others' lives in their reading and imitating the prayerful life described in the text' (Hofer: 2013, 9) This reading of Gregory is indeed informed by the belief that 'Christ heals [Gregory's] life through the process of poetic narration' (Beeley: 2014). Here, there is a resemblance with the use of art in order to create the healing of *han* in Korean Minjung theology.

In Gregory what we have is the restoration of the fallen image of humanity through the incarnation. However, the tone is taken from the Philippian hymn and Gregory adds the poverty of Christ: ‘This is the intent of God who, for our sake, was made human and became poor, in order to raise our flesh and restore his image and remake the human, that we might all become one in Christ, who perfectly became, in all of us, all that he is himself.’ (Or. 7.23, SC 405.240; Hofer, 2013: 110). The restoration comes not only in the divine image, but in a sociological order. Christ humbled himself as a servant to God and identified himself with impoverished humanity.

The ethical teachings span into comments from Maximus the Confessor who speaks about the relationship between ethics and redemption in his *On the Lord’s prayer* (LP), that forgiveness by God is contingent on forgiving others their debts: ‘if we really wish to be delivered from evil and not to enter into temptation, we should trust in God and forgive our debtors their debts’. The power of forgiveness is in the redemption of the world, specifically the triumph over evil: ‘For Christ, who has overcome the world (cf. John I 6: 33), is our leader’ (LP [V2] 303). For Maximus, it seems impossible to separate ethical commitments from the narrative of redemption. Ethical actions enable restorative justice in the world and not exclusive of God’s redemption.

Maximus goes further and shows the connection between the ‘daily bread’ and Jesus as the ‘Bread of Life’ who ‘enables us to participate in divine life by making himself our food’ (LP[V2] 289). In doing so, Jesus ‘transmutes with divinity those who eat it, bringing about their deification, since he is the bread of life and of power in both name and reality’ and by feeding humanity this way, Christ ‘restores human nature to itself’ (LP[V2] 289). After this Maximus outlines how this restoration took place through 1) the incarnation that ‘chose death for [the sake of those who crucified him] instead of life’ and 2) through voluntarily taking the record of humanity’s sins on the cross, Jesus ‘abolished the enmity which led nature to wage an implacable war against itself’ and made peace with ‘the enmity that led nature to wage an implacable war against itself’. This also resulted in the reconciliation between those who were both outside of the Law, the Gentiles, and those inside the Law, the Jews and ‘formed the two into one new man, making peace and reconciling us through himself to the Father and to one another (cf. Eph. 2:14-16)’.

In Maximus' *Ambiguum* 7 (A7), deification is the complete restoration where humanity is united with God through ascending 'to the Logos by whom [humanity] was created and in whom all things will ultimately be restored' (A7, 1080C). Here Maximus speaks about the intrinsic nature of humans, their metaphysical teleology, in terms of restoration. Blowers and Wilken notes that the 'Greek term is ἀποκατάστασις refers to the restoration of all things to their original condition' and that the notion 'gained currency through the writings of Origen and was used by Gregory of Nyssa' (2003, 56). Maximus concludes that 'this movement toward the divine reaches its end only when one reaches God', that restoration takes place alongside deification which reaches an apex (A7, 1080C).

5.4.2 Conclusion

It can be clearly seen and has been shown that the Eastern Fathers' therapeutic views correspond to the therapeutic strategies of Minjung theology and Park in particular. When incarnational theology is at the root of Patristic theology, it is difficult to extricate bodily redemption from spiritual redemption. For Irenaeus, the wounds that Jesus heals are a foretaste and foreshadowing of eschatological redemption of human nature. Human goals are thwarted by sin and require healing, restoring people to proper purpose and state of nature.

There are two main criticisms with Park and the Eastern literature on these accounts of restorative justice, that is regarding Semi-Pelagian (semi-Augustinianism) orientation and universalism, respectively. For Park, the question is proposed: 'Whence comes the power to transform social structures, such that forgiveness for their past sinfulness could be granted? Either it is not possible for sinful persons to change the structures, in which case forgiveness would never come, or sinful people would change the structures by themselves, in which case God and by extension, God's forgiveness would be superfluous' (D. Nelson; 2009, 176). Although this raises valid concerns, it also shows a misreading of Park's project, which is first the liberation and healing of the *han-ridden* and then the salvation of the sinners. Park, throughout the literature, makes it clear the wounds of the sinned against cannot be healed themselves, or else *han* would not be an issue. Moreover, in order for this recognition to occur there needs to be some kind of awareness of how oppressors wound others and how the wounded need to be spotlighted. Here Park cites Matthew

5:23-25 where in order for one to worship one has to reconcile to a person who has been offended by one's actions (Park, 1993: 96). For Park, what has been left out in the doctrine of justification by faith is the relationship between the sinner and the sinned against, which leaves the process of reconciliation out of the picture. Park alludes to Rahner's idea that 'since God is the source of human freedom, the more we depend on God the freer we become' and extrapolates that 'since God is the source of our human effort, the more we depend on God the more we change the *han*-ful situation of the world' (Park, 1993: 97). Therefore, at the core of our efforts to deal with *han* is a reliance on God's efforts.

Regarding the Eastern Father's use of restoration, a concern with ἀποκατάστασις is that it has been used by Gnostics to express the particular doctrine of universalism and in Maximus' usage, which follows from Origen 'the mystical doctrine would be honoured with silence would be that of universal salvation in the sense of universal salvation', but Maximus does not openly profess it because of 'pastoral concerns' (Ramelli, 2013: 742). First, Origen is wise enough to notice that ἀποκατάστασις cannot be extricated from the importance of ethical actions to choose between right and wrong, good and evil, and the consequences of those actions. If humans maintain that there are no consequences to one's actions then there are no motive for moral actions. It is not that ethical actions need the justification of the possibility of punishment or reward, but moral action must be free actions that are seen to affect others.

Secondly, although '[t]he doctrine of recapitulation, in later years, became a basis of salvific universalism' Irenaeus does not follow this path, but makes clear that the recapitulation of history ends in both reconciliation and judgement (Tiessen, 1993: 21). In *AH* I, X,1, Irenaeus cites Phil 2:11, that every tongue should confess but also that God 'should execute just judgment towards all' and send 'spiritual wickednesses [sic], and the angels who transgressed and became apostates, together with the ungodly, and unrighteous, and wicked, and profane among [people], into everlasting fire'. It is quite clear that from this text that Irenaeus does not believe in a view of universal salvation, but that perhaps he has been misread. The focus of recapitulation is the restoration of human nature through the liberation from and the elimination of evil.

For Park, Irenaeus, and the Eastern Fathers' restorative justice is the utilitarian means by which the objects of atonement are achieved. For Park it is the healing of the wounds of the *han*-ridden. For, Irenaeus and other Eastern Fathers, it is the end of evil, and therefore death, shame, and sin. The theological strategy and method were to show how humanity could be restored by deification if victory over these powers is declared and pastorally describe the way in which both Christian doctrine and worship are to be articulated given this defeat of the forces of evil.

5.5 SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this chapter was to show how Park's description of sin and use of *han* correlate to Irenaeus' *AH* Ransom and Recapitulation theories and the aim of restorative justice. It achieves this goal by demonstrating how the atonement theories of Park, Irenaeus, and the Eastern Fathers have similar objects, which overlap in the elimination of sin and evil in the world. What differentiate their models is their starting points, descriptions, and strategies. What is of vital importance in looking at these various models is not looking at how they work in exclusion of each other and other atonement models, but what sense are they communicating the Biblical narratives and how they are situated in the history of theology overall.

The first evaluation was of Park's project in the *Triune* atonement and his work leading up to this treatise, which involves the intersection Minjung theology and use of *han*. What was seen is that Park situates his project closely within the work of Jesus and his ministry toward the crowds (ὁ ὄχλος) to start with the wounds of those injured by religious and political oppression. However, the purpose is not simply to heal the *han*-ridden and depict Jesus as a proletariat leader, but also involve the salvation of the sinners, and all of creation. Therefore, in many ways Park builds on the projects of the Minjung theologians in Korea to a more global framework.

In laying out how Park does this, it is apparent that Park leaves out much in his *Triune atonement* and the lacunae need to be filled by his work or subsequent responses. First, in narrating the work of God in Jesus, Park does not speak much about the power, symbol, and consequence of the resurrection only in the continued work of the Paraclete. In Christian doctrine, the event of the risen Christ is the ultimate proof of the victory over death, evil, and sin in the world. If for Park,

the cross is the symbol of God's solidarity with the wounded, then the resurrection should be the symbol of God's vindication of the sinned-against. Their wounds are not a sign of defeat but will be ultimately overcome and even in death, there is life. Second, as indicated in the previous chapter, the role of the Father is not explicit in the healing of *han* or the salvation of sinners. This is where it might be important for Park to paint a picture of creation and the healing and restoration of *han*. If the solution to *han* is ultimately restorative then the work of the Father should be integral to Park's project. Third, given the above in the formulation of the *Triune atonement* would benefit from looking at the relationship of the trinity through the Eastern model of perichoresis, this notion of mutual indwelling, can help bring together the notion of a Triune atonement such as in the work of John of Damascus as explored by Twombly (2015).

What Park does in full is to answer Moon's critique of *han* and Minjung theology in arguing 'against the existing paradigm of *han* as a theological concept that is unique to Korean culture and that is considered to be a national characteristic of the Korean people'. Moon proposes instead 'that *han* is a concept that is transcultural, intercultural, and extant in all human communities. Indeed, *han* describes the multi-faceted dimensions of suffering that are pervasive in all cultures and histories because of the human vulnerability to suffering' (Moon, 2014: 420). Park in much of his work has addressed this important acknowledgment of the need to move the locus of *han* from a strictly contextual concept within Korean culture to a more global context.

The second evaluation was of ransom and recapitulation, as well as a theology of economy, which permeates Irenaeus' theology as well the literature of the Eastern Fathers. The object of the recapitulation of history, humanity, and redemption is to liberate humans from evil. This work takes place by various descriptions, but recapitulation and ransom demonstrate how the economic governance takes place. Here Irenaeus starts with the incarnation and proceeds to show how the 'summing up' takes place through the divine/human nature of Jesus. Two elements of recapitulation stand out 1) its historical aspect and 2) its related eschatological nature. The first, answers the criticism of the ahistoricity of some atonement models. Even though Irenaeus lays out his theory in a 'quasi-mythological form' (Crane: 2019: 59), there is a definite theological history that he draws from. The summing up of Christ takes place not apart from his ministry, but through

Christ's obedience to God even in the face of death on the cross (Phil 2:7-8). The eschatological component to historical recapitulation brings together both doctrinal and pastoral elements of theology. Even though the forces of evil and sin are vanquished by the resurrection, the actualization of this reality is done through a participatory role in an eschatological soteriology.

This leads to the discussion of restorative justice in the penultimate section of this chapter, one of restorative justice. For Park, this way of expressing justice encompasses the goal of God's work in restoring the whole of creation. Because retributive justice aims at only limiting vengeance, restorative justice is a way to bring about healing of *han* that was inflicted in the first place. Restorative justice then is concerned not only with limiting retribution, but limiting sin by focusing on the victims. This is the same approach to 'justification by love'. Here, Irenaeus seeks to reframe the discussion of justification by faith to include the sinned against and not only the sinner. Justification by love is restorative in that it seeks to bring reconciliation not only between the sinner and sinned against, but with all parties.

Irenaeus sees restoration as Christ's work by undoing what Adam did through disobedience. Because restoration is preceded by liberation and finds final culmination in deification, restoration is essential in achieving the ends of human nature. In relation to justice, the work of recapitulation puts things right with the universe both historically and anthropologically. Human destiny is put right by the restoring work of God, as well as human nature. For, Irenaeus the image of the 'hands of God' illustrate how God is involved in both creation and redemption through the recapitulative process through the Adam who was created from virgin soil and the second Adam who was birth through human flesh. It is these two hands image that also paints the picture of the act of restoring humanity into the divine likeness. These images show that Irenaeus integrates Trinitarian theology into his project as much as Park attempts to do so, perhaps even to a more robust extent. Given the trajectory of human restoration, how does Irenaeus account for passivity? Irenaeus is clear that the judgment of the righteous and unrighteous will take place. Whether this judgment will be one that sets up a place of eternal punishment for the damned or their annihilation is not the purview of this research. Regardless, Irenaeus' polemic is to activate those to be involve in spiritual formation since spiritual formation to become more God-like is a continual course for all humans.

The final evaluation was of how the Eastern Fathers have reiterated the restorative process. Two Fathers, Gregory of Nazianzus and Maximus the Confessor, in particular are used to show how restorative justice works. For Gregory it is articulated in terms of ‘poetic narration’ which brings healing through a life of prayer and to others through a life of imitation of this life. For Maximus, the Lord’s Prayer from Jesus’ teaching in Matt. 6, is the framework in which to talk about human restoration. Involved in this restoration is both an ethical admonition to forgive and the idea of reconciliation. In the midst of this work is the question of universalism. In what ways does Maximus fall into the trap of preaching salvation for all? Readers of Maximus show that the pastoral concerns of the Confessor exceed the need go down this path. Moreover, what is important for Maximus is ethical action that is the fruit of restoration.

For both Maximus and Gregory restoration achieves the ends in ways that retribution does not achieve and therefore replaces retribution, even though the accounts might start with retribution (Flood, 2010: 151). In other words, the Eastern Fathers, as well as the Western, took seriously the consequence of sin, which was death and the justice that needed to be taken to reverse this course. However, for many of the Eastern Fathers, such as Irenaeus, Maximus, and Gregory, they saw that the course taken was one of restoration of humans to their natures so that humanity might find ultimate unity together and with God. This holistic process overlaps with Park’s project despite the differences in approach and emphasis, but it shows how the history of theology has developed in dialogue with sources, which Park admittedly draws from, and some of which he does not.

If then restorative justice is central to the endeavours of Irenaeus, the Eastern Fathers, and Park then the implications be of Park’s use of *han* and sin, and Irenaeus’ *AH* description of sin and sickness, for the work of restorative justice in the church and contemporary world? The last chapter explores what the shift to a liturgy of restoration and liberation means when the scope of redemption is focused on the relieving of *han* and thereby the lessening of the actuality of sin in the world.

CHAPTER 6:

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

The purpose of this research was to find the intersections between the hamartiologies of Eastern Patristic theologian Irenaeus, and other Eastern Fathers, and the of contemporary theologian, Andrew Sung Park. First, this research asks about the descriptions of evil, sin, and sickness in Irenaeus' *AH* and other Eastern Church writings. Second, this research asked about what correlations exist between the descriptions of sin in patristic literature and Park's use of *han*. Third, this research sought ways that *han* could be used to analyse the notion of sin as sickness in Irenaeus' *AH*. Lastly, this research ask in what ways does Park's description of sin and use of *han* correlate to Irenaeus' *AH* ransom and recapitulation theories for the aim of restorative justice. The overall purpose of this research was to investigate if contemporary theologians like Park were moving in a direction different from the intentions of the earliest Church literature after the canonization of biblical texts. Although, it was heavily noted that the theology of Park, and other Minjung theologians, and the theology of Irenaeus, and other Eastern Fathers, obviously differ in contexts, many of the ways in which they described sin and its effects were similar.

Chapter 1 noted that the idea of sin as sickness can be seen in the work of Augustine of Hippo's *On nature and grace* where there is talk about human nature as being 'unhealthy.' The solution for Augustine was to propose the idea of 'original sin'. In *City of God (de civitate Dei, CG)*, Augustine talks about the outcome of the sickness of the soul being its death saying that 'for souls, too, have their own sort of death in ungodliness and sin' (*CG, XX, 6*). Augustine's route was to take Adam's death as the causal relationship for all of humanity's death and thereby the sin of Adam is also all of humanity's sin. He then concludes that all people are, 'without a single exception, were dead through sin, original sin or intentional sin' (*Omnes itaque mortui sunt in peccatis, nemine prorsus excepto, siue originalibus siue etiam voluntate additis*). However, there is a distinction between Augustine's view of original sin and the view that Adam's fall was an original sin, but separated from other human sin, as some would see as the view of the Eastern

Patristic writers. Nevertheless, understanding the connection between the view of sin and the solution given to sin provides ways to articulate various ethical approaches. In other words, some analysts such as Couenhoven would argue that understanding Augustine's view of sin as sickness 'aids us in understanding the nature of our own agency and the expectations we have for ourselves and other persons' (2013: 9). If this is the case, then the same can be said about the understandings of sin from the Eastern Patristic and Minjung theologians, particularly Irenaeus and Park, respectively.

Throughout this research it was shown that Irenaeus and other Eastern Patristic theologians held this similar view that sin was a kind of sickness, analogous to maladies of the body, and that salvation was in turn therapeutic and not only forensic. However, their solutions, language, and articulations differed from Augustine. Principal in understanding how they differ from Augustine is in answering the question, "If sin is sickness, then what makes the person sick?" For Augustine, this was in the original sin of Adam. Then the cure is in the new Adam who acts as the 'Christus medicus figure' (Arbesmann, 1954: 2). Christ's grace is the curative for the sickness of Adam. Even though Augustine 'easily holds the first place among those Patristic writers of the West who made use of' the description of Christ the Physician, the application of this image can only be seen in his homilies as an exhortatory tool (Arbesmann, 1954: 2). Augustine speaks of the pride of the primeval couple as the sickness and God's humility in Christ as the balm (Arbesmann, 1954: 9). Rather, Irenaeus and Park both integrate the concept of therapeutic nature of Christ's work in their overall theological projects. Therefore, the purpose of this research was to show how the descriptions of sin, sickness, and *han* in the hamartologies of Irenaeus and Park show how the descriptions of sin overlap, intersect, and differ and ways in which these descriptions give rise to theological and ethical considerations.

6.2 SCHOLARSHIP

Because much of theology can be divided into either Patristic, Medieval, Reformed, and Contemporary studies, outside of the *Ressourcement* theology (*Nouvelle théologie*) of the mid-20th century, there has not been extensive work done to bring Patristic texts in dialogue with

contemporary theology. Therefore, the literature review attempted to look at how the intersection of these theologies can take place. Areas of intersection can be found the following three ways. First, the connection can be found in the description of sin in Irenaeus' *AH* as woundedness, particularly in discussion of the wound of Adam, and the Minjung idea of *han*. Second, the solutions found in each of the hamartiologies in the healing of woundedness are related, specifically the physician metaphor in Irenaeus and Park's therapeutic emphasis in the healing of *han* starting in his work *The wounded heart of God* (1993), developing it in *From hurt to healing* (2004), and presenting his fullest development to date in *The Triune atonement* (2009). Finally, in terms of restorative justice, both theologians show how their solutions provide ways in which humans can achieve healing from their wounded natures. Irenaeus' and the Eastern Father's views of sin as sickness appear in the way they express their theological anthropology as both wounded and corrupted.

In AH III, XVII, Irenaeus counters the Gnostic theologians, by connecting the virgin birth of Jesus with the incarnation being in the flesh. This incarnational theology provides the possibility of Jesus' own woundedness, in the flesh, and the healing that takes place which is recapitulative ministry. In this connection, Park and other Minjung theologians show the woundedness caused because of sin and the results of unhealed woundedness, a continued perpetuation of sin, if *han* is not healed. Minjung theologians such as Kim, Hyun, Suh, and Park have expressed *han* in terms as 'pain', 'resentment', and 'bitterness'. For Kim it is rooted particularly in the Korean experience, but for Park and others it can be generalized to all who have experienced injustice and oppression. These are termed the 'sinned-against' by Park. For Irenaeus, the wound that humanity suffers is the wound given to all of humanity because of the Adamic wound, which is death. Of course, the term wound is an analogous term used to describe how the properties of sin are like a disease. For Irenaeus, and other Eastern Fathers, death is the result of the wound that in it is the outcome of the disease of sin, but it can also be the cause of the disease sin in that death creates the environment for disease and sin to fester.

The solutions that Irenaeus and Park present as ways around the problem of sin are also interrelated. For Irenaeus, the solution was in how Jesus recapitulated history to undo the work of

human sickness or woundedness. Irenaeus posits that that it ‘behooved [God] to who was to destroy sin, and redeem [humanity] under the power of death, that He should Himself be made that very same thing which he was, that is, man; who had been drawn by sin into bondage, but was held by death, so that sin should be destroyed by man, and man should go forth from death’ (AH III, XVIII, 7). Here the proposition is that God’s redemption was in liberating humans from the ‘bondage’ of sin through destroying death, defeating death through the reframing of history. Crane shows that Irenaeus answers Anselm question, ‘Cur Deus homo?’, by saying that ‘[b]ecause Jesus Christ is human, he can break the chain of sin and death from within human history’ (Crane, 2016: 70). Crane goes on to specify that Jesus as the God/man does something of ‘universal significance’ in acting out ‘God’s invasion and deliverance of the cosmos in bondage’ (Crane, 2016: 70). In Irenaeus’ own terms ‘God recapitulated in [God’s self] the ancient formation of man, that [God] might kill sin, deprive death of its power, and vivify [humans]’ (AH, III, XVIII, 7). Similarly, what Park attempts to do is show how Jesus own ministry is to heal the wounds of individuals and communities by healing the wounded and therefore ending the cycle of sin. ‘In his hometown, Nazareth, Jesus declared the purpose of his mission: to bring good news to the poor, to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, and to proclaim the year of God’s favour (Luke 4:18-19)’, Park comments (2004: 22; 2009: 41). However, for Park, Jesus’ life is a gift both for the victims of sin and the sinners. There are two ‘paths’ that Park outlines: ‘Sinners need salvation: sin → guilt → repentance → forgiveness → justification by faith → sanctification → entire sanctification (a salvation journey)’. On the other hand, ‘[v]ictims need liberation: wounds → shame → challenge → forgiving → justice by faith → healing → jubilee (a liberation journey)’ (Park, 2009: xii).

The last way in which Irenaeus and Park converge is in the way in which they describe the healing from the wounded natures as a type of restorative justice. For Irenaeus restoration was liberation from the clutches of the apostate one and healing of human nature in order to achieve the fullest of a person’s *imago Dei*. In citing AH V, XVII, 1, Steenberg interprets Jesus’ work as the ‘unifying act of healing and restoration: in offering himself in obedience, the incarnate Son “cancels (*consolatus*) our disobedience with his obedience”’ (Steenberg, 2009: 49). In the recapitulative salvation God does not only undoes the history set by Adam, but also restores human nature so

that it receives the ‘gift of communion’ in order to be with the divine nature (AH V, XVII, 1). For Park, restorative justice is not only the work of God in the past, but also the continued work of the Paraclete for ‘the past two thousand years’ (Park, 2009: 62). Citing Brown (1970: 1142-43; 1979: 139), Park sees that the work of the Paraclete not only continues the works of Jesus, but also the arrival of the Paraclete for the early apostles ‘explained the delay in the Parousia’ and validates the return of Jesus (Park, 2009: 65). Lastly, Park talks about how ‘Jesus’ restorative work purifies and detoxifies the polluted and toxic ground by reducing the effect of the poison of infectious human sins’ (Park, 2009: 106). Jesus’ blood counteracts the effects of the blood spilled into the ground by Cain (Gen. 4:10) and the severed relationship between Adam and the soil (Gen. 3:17). The work of the Paraclete is work in the restoration of not only the *han* inflicted on humans, but on all creation. The importance of restorative justice is that without it the goals of God cannot be achieved in this world. M. Moore shows the relationship between justice, restoration, and reconciliation: ‘*Justice is the restoration of full life potential for every person and community, fostered through equitable social structures and conditions that foster well-being and flourishing. Reconciliation is the restoration of good relations between God and humanity, and among people; it is a coming together in right relationship*’ (2001:155, emphasis Moore’s). Restorative justice is a kind of righteousness that brings about the fulfilment of humanity’s flourishing and fullest potential as people created in the image of the divine. Areas of correspondence between Irenaeus’ hamartiology and Park’s hamartiology are not incidental, but interrelated given the emphasis that each theologian has placed on several concomitant factors of each person’s theology: the emphasis on history, the relevance of the incarnation, and the view of redemption as therapeutic. For Irenaeus, recapitulation is a historical act in which Christ takes up the history of Adam, unravelling and restoring it (AH III, XIX, 1). For Park, the ministry of Jesus serves as indications of what God is doing in the world through the continued work of the Paraclete.

Major criticisms against Irenaeus’ treatment of sin and redemption are that it borders on Christian Universalism and it leaves individuals passive. However, there have been sufficient texts to show that Irenaeus believes in supreme judgment and punishment for sins; his treatment of Gnosticism as a whole and condemnation of their errors should be enough to show that he finds Christian dogma and orthodoxy of utmost importance. The second objection is also one used by Park to

critique Irenaeus saying that even though Irenaeus' ransom theory, 'addresses the reality of the power of evil over us' there are several weaknesses including the difference between described liberation and actual liberation (Park: 2009: 7-8). What Irenaeus offers in terms of his descriptions of ransom and recapitulation are visions of Christian history. However, scholars such as Osborn have pointed to that crucial to Irenaeus' ethics is the concept of deification even though these might be 'disparate elements' in Irenaeus' thought (2001: 243-245). Further, ethics in Irenaeus is related to the creation of humans and their flourishing (Osborn, 2001: 108). For Irenaeus, the 'glory of humans' is God, but the 'glory of God' in turn is creation revealed in the works of humans (AH III, XX, 2). Human capacities and abilities demonstrate God's revelation just as the health of a patient demonstrate the efficacy of a doctor. Irenaeus use of this example shows his intentionality in describing the restorative process of *theosis* in the treatment of sin.

Major criticisms against Park's hamartiology centre around the distinction that he makes between the sinned and the sinned against. The question is posed: 'Most atonement theories teach that all human beings are sinners – not just those who cause *han*– and that Christ suffered and died to pay for the sins of everyone – perpetrators and victims alike' and that is weaknesses unclear that 'whether all are sinful or whether only the perpetrators of acts which produce *han* are sinners' (Boehme, 2010: 207). Like the Eastern Fathers, Park does not subscribe the notion of inherited sin as Augustine does therefore there is not a notion that a person is a sinner from birth. Park's view is that sin is immoral acts done against others, God, and the created order. Park submits that 'most individuals are sinners as well as those who have been sinned against, and therefore need both salvation and liberation' (Park, 2009: xiii). For Park's project overall is to lessen sin and its impact in the world. His major work on hamartiology, *The wounded heart of God* (1993), attempts to outline a detailed explanation of how *han* works in relationship with sin. A second critique against Park is if his theological framework borders on Pelagianism. Park sees the discussion within both Protestant and Catholic circles is to separate two types of sin: actual and original, among Protestants, and, similarly, *reatus* (guilt) and *vitium* (imperfection) among Catholics (1993: 78). However, what Park is attempting to take the conversation in a different direction since he states that even though many theologians, such as W. Rauschenbusch, Reinhold Niebuhr, and P. Tillich, view sin as 'selfishness or self-centeredness', 'but it is the doctrine of sin itself that is self-centred'.

This is because most attempts to talk about sin have focused ‘almost exclusively on the sinner/ oppressor’ (1993: 73). For Park, the potential cause of sin is the unhealed *han* of the oppressed. Attempts to talk about sin in a general way, such as in the doctrine of original sin, universalize guilt and do not deal with the treatment of the problem. Jesus’ work and the Paraclete’s continued work is to confront these problems and thereby dealing directly with sin that spreads among God’s creation. The Pelagian critique is overstated since it is the work of God that is at work in restoring humanity. In this way, Park is closely aligned with the Eastern Fathers’ in the rejection of universal guilt. Lastly, a final critique that is faced by Park, especially in the Triune atonement, is that it is evident that the Son and the Spirit or Paraclete play a role in the restoration of humanity, but the Father’s role is not spoken much about. Here is another place in which Park differs from Irenaeus in that for Irenaeus, the Creator plays a large role in the redemption of creation and the ways in which Irenaeus describes the Father’s role is explicit (ex. *AH* I, IX, 3). This last critique of Park has not been answered by him and should be the basis for further research.

6.2 BIBLICAL AND HERMENEUTICAL FRAMEWORK

Chapter two attempted to set up ways in which the Eastern theologians described sin. This was done through a comparison with how sin is described in both a Hebrew and Christian context using linguistic data. Then Irenaeus and others are discussed in the light of the biblical descriptions of sin. Recently, there have been a wealth of resources written about Patristic exegesis and Irenaeus’ exegetical approach (ex. Hoh, 1919; Lawson, 1948; Wingren, 1959; Holsinger Friesen, 2009). Irenaeus situates his work in Scripture and ‘has a central concern for the right use of scripture’ (Osborn: 2001, 162). Scripture is described as the various trees in the Garden of Eden that God gave people to ‘eat’, but the ‘heretics’ chose not ‘be nourished with the Lord’s Scripture’ (*AH* V, XX, 2). Moreover, Irenaeus’ hermeneutic is grounded in the *regula fidei* (*AH* I, X, 1; *AP* pre, 3) which for him is a synonymous with and ‘an outline of’ the *Dei verbum* or Scripture (Behr, 1997: 102). Irenaeus’ references to sin and woundedness frequently references New Testament passages (ex. *AH* III, XVII, 3; Luke 10:35). Similarly, in comparison to Irenaeus’ accounts of sin, Chapter three explored ways in which Park’s account of sin and *han* is also narrated in the Scriptures.

Chapter two outlined ways in which sin is described by Irenaeus and other Eastern Fathers as sickness, alienation, and corruption. The purpose of this chapter was to survey ways in which Irenaeus and the Eastern Patristic writers used images of sin to talk about God's redemptive work. The effect of this overview revealed how Irenaeus attempted to show how sin affected the totality of human nature, both in soul and body, and that redemption for Irenaeus consisted in the restoration of the entirety of the person. These descriptions were grounded in Irenaeus's biblical exegesis and the theological framework of the incarnation of the logos in which Irenaeus reads in Scripture.

For example, Irenaeus alludes to the resurrection of Lazarus to illustrate both how sin is bondage to a sick and dead body, but also how the resurrection is embodied new life. Irenaeus draws the conclusion regarding this account: 'therefore, those who were healed were made whole in those members which had in times past been afflicted; and the dead rose in the identical bodies, their limbs and bodies receiving health, and that life which was granted by the Lord' (AH V, XIII, I). Alienation, is the result of the distancing of a person from God and self because of sin. Alienation is related to human nature and therefore connected to the body (AH V, XIV, 2). Humans, who were once 'in friendship with God' are now 'estranged and hostile'. In using Colossians 1: 21-22, Irenaeus shows how the flesh is also under 'the bondage of sin'. Similarly, corruption is the affect that sin has on both the body and the soul of the person. Irenaeus clarifies this against the gnostic writers, such as Basilides (117-138 AD), who say that 'Salvation belongs to the soul alone, for the body is by nature subject to corruption' (AH 1, XXIV, 5). In all of these descriptions, Irenaeus seeks to clarify how the whole person, both body and soul/spirit, is affected by sin and also redeemed through the recapitulative process.

In correspondence, Park's use of *han* and his views of sin are based in the Gospel accounts of Jesus' ministry to the ὄχλος or people and their woundedness. In this way, Park's hamartiology is biblical theology, but also developed from a psychological and sociological understanding of peoples. A key passage for both Park and Irenaeus is Mark 2:17 (Park, 2004: 23; 2009: 76; 2012: 45; AH III, V, 2), where Jesus is described as a 'physician' of the sick and those who consider themselves as healthy. Those who are 'sick' are those who suffer the wounds of sin or *han*. Those

who do not consider themselves as sick, the religious teachers in whom Jesus was speaking, were those who caused many of the wounds. These are the people who labelled those who could not keep the Levitical laws, the 'sinners'. Pivotal to the discussion is Park's chapter entitled, 'the Bible and *han*' in *The other side of sin* (2012) and a treatment of *han* and the Bible in *From hurt to healing* (2004: 16-32) *Triune atonement* (2009: 94-98). Using examples from both the Hebrew Bible and Christian Scriptures, Park makes a case that since the Bible 'the major subject of the Bible was to care for the afflicted, particularly the unjustly oppressed' it is therefore 'necessary for Christians to read the Bible chiefly from the viewpoint of the downtrodden' (2012, 45). Park is keenly aware that the theologies of the Hebrew Bible are not one sided, but there are theologies that uphold the status quo 'that legitimates the structure of the society' and other theologies that work to liberate people from the former types of theologies (2012: 45). Moreover, Park attempts to show how *han* is found in the Hebrew Bible starting with the story of Cain and Abel and concluding with the story of Job. In the New Testament, Park alludes to the life of Jesus and comments that '[to] locate *han* in the New Testament, it is necessary for us to walk with Jesus in Palestine (2012, 52). Jesus' own life as a carpenter's son and an itinerant preacher demonstrates how he lived among those who were sinned against. Park then parses between the two types of 'sinners' of Jewish society: 1) the 'publicly recognized criminal who violated civil laws' and 2) the 'person in a lowly and socially unacceptable occupation'. The second class can also be divided further into 1) one being 'the sinner of dishonourable occupation' and the 'other is the sinner of low status such as the sick or the poor' (Park, 2012: 53). Jesus is seen in the New Testament as dealing with so-called sinners who fell into these classes. These were the 'publicans and sinners (Mk 2: 16), prostitutes (Mt 21: 32), or the sick' in other words, 'they were simply called "sinners" (Mk 2:17 Lk 7:37, 39)' (Park, 2012: 53). These evaluations are generally confirmed by the biblical scholarship and uses of the term 'sinners' however, there is some debate as whether these 'sinners' were the *amme ha-arets*, the people of the earth, or were they the morally corrupt (Sanders, 1985: 48) and what kind of fellowship meal Jesus was actually eating with them Blomberg (2005: 86-96; 2009). However, it is easy to read that Jesus did associate with these people and this was one of the criticisms that was levelled against him by the religious orders of the Pharisees and Scribes. Lastly, Park sees the execution of Jesus as the accumulation of what it means to be sinned against.

In many ways, the cross goes against the theology that sin causes suffering for the victim of sin, rather it showed God's own *han* as a result of human sin: 'Jesus did not know sin, yet knew *han* thorough and thorough. Jesus' last cry was a victim's outcry in *han*: "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" (Mk 15:34)' (Park, 2012: 57). For Park, the cross 'is a symbol of God's *han*' (Park, 2009: 45-46; 2012: 57). Like Park, Irenaeus would talk about the incarnate life of Jesus as God being made vulnerable to the sorrows and pains of the world: 'They have added to the grief of my wounds' (Psalm 69:26; *AH* III, XXII, 2). However, for Irenaeus this is an outcropping of his incarnational theology and not a core tenant, as with Park's theology of *han*.

Irenaeus and Park have demonstrated how biblical scholarship and Scripture are central to their theologies, albeit for different reasons. For, Irenaeus it is a *regula fidei* or standard of faith in which to maintain orthodoxy and fight the heresies of Gnosticism. For Park, Scripture is a testament to the history of how *han* existed in the biblical narratives and is a result of sin, not only against God, but also toward others and even the created order. Park's philosophical or anthropological theology is not exclusive of his biblical theology, rather it works in tandem with these insights. The relevance of these biblical frameworks is that they allow both Irenaeus and Park to be in dialogue with other Christian traditions that value the scriptural tradition. Even though various Christian traditions differ as to how these passages are interpreted, still conversation can be had between other traditions, such as Considine's use of Park and Minjung theology in the Catholic tradition.

6.3 FINDINGS

The purpose of this research was to examine the areas of correspondence between Irenaeus' and Park's hamartologies, examining where the Eastern Fathers and contemporary Minjung theologians intersect. After a survey of Irenaeus' and other Eastern writers' descriptions of sin, an examination was made in Chapter 3 as to Irenaeus' account of sin and Park's use of the Korean concept of *han*. In Chapter 4 this investigation went further into sin as described as sickness and Park's description of *han* and sickness. The important correspondences show how a therapeutic view to the treatment of sin because of a similar view of how sin affects the whole person. These findings capture the intersections between Irenaeus' and Park's hamartologies.

Several major strands of theology crucial to both Irenaeus and Park's hamartiology are their theological anthropologies, in chapter 4, and theories of atonement, seen in chapter 5. Irenaeus' incarnational theology is inextricably related to his view of the redemption of the totality of human nature. The woundedness of Adam is what is healed and therefore all of humanity is united in this restoration of their persons. Park's view of persons is sin is manifested in its effects, and its effect is in the wounding of others and even the created order. This is rooted in the scriptural framework as demonstrated above. *Han* is manifested both individually and collectively because sin is both acted out on an individual and corporate level. Park's anthropology is not only individual, but is related to how persons are involved in their societies, communities, and social systems. *Han* is generated through what Park perceives to be at least three root causes: 'the capitalist global economy, patriarchy, and racial and cultural discrimination' (1993 :45). These factors are the 'vortex of *han*' and are 'the principalities', 'the powers', 'the world rulers of this present darkness', and 'the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places' of 'which Christians should contend' (Ephesians. 6:12; 1993: 66). God's work in the concept of the 'triune atonement' is to bring healing to what these systems have manifested. Irenaeus' and Park's view of humans and their views of atonement have similar aspects in that they are connected by a somatic view of sin and therefore redemption that also involves the healing of humans in their entirety.

6.3.1 *The Somatic Effects of Sin and Somatic Structure of Han*

Irenaeus' theological anthropology and hamartiology are interconnected with Park's theological anthropology and hamartiology in that they use the language of sickness and wounds because they are similar views of a somatic structure to sin. Unlike Augustine who viewed sin as being biologically transmitted and inherited and therefore guilt as inherited, it is questionable that Irenaeus sees the relationship between sin, the body, and guilt the same way. At most he is unclear (Osborn, 2001: 216), but the majority of Patristic scholars see that the Eastern 'Fathers were almost unanimous in repudiating what would later become the Augustinian position' of inherited sin (Bray, 1994: 42-43; Wiley, 2002: 41). What is clear is that all people inherit death, which is the consequence of the primeval couple's sin. Likewise, Park sees the body as a part of human nature, which, like the soul, can be subjected to sin and therefore need restoration, but not the vessel of

sin's transmission. Moreover, Park's view of *han* is that it is somatic and psycho-social. For, Irenaeus, death was the crucial factor that continued to provide the effects of sin on human nature. Against the Gnostics, who believed that the material world was created in 'death, corruption, error, and such like', Irenaeus instead contends that by Christ's suffering, he 'destroyed death, and dispersed error, and put an end to corruption, and destroyed ignorance, while He manifested life and revealed truth, and bestowed the gift of incorruption' (AH II, XX, 3). Because the eventual consequence of sickness is death, then to remove death was also to remove the corruption and sickness. As Osborn states it, 'For Irenaeus the incarnation was physically necessary to save humanity from death and corruption. Sin had to be killed, death had to be deprived of power and replaced by life' (2001, 101). Park attempts to correctly diagnose the problem that plagues humanity, the problem of sin, since '[i]n Christian theology, sin is the only category we have to diagnose the wrong of the world' (2004: 9). Because the treatment for sin does not reside solely in the forgiveness of sinners, but rather the healing of the sinned against, the focus then must be on those who have suffered from sin. Sin is reified only in the wounds of the *han* ridden. Wounded persons have the ability to embrace the healing that Jesus and the Paraclete offers a sinners have the opportunity to repent and seek salvation through the grace that God offers.

Park poses several different understandings of *han*: rational, intuitive, and incarnational (1993: 145). The rational understanding accesses the 'conscious level of *han*' while the intuitive understanding 'perceives the unconscious level of *han*'. However, it is the incarnational understanding that brings these two together and implements them into practical living for persons: 'Rational and intuitive understandings are limited in their ability to dissolve *han*. Incarnational understanding will fully enhance us to complete the task of the dissolution of *han* (1993: 145). In order to have 'incarnational understanding' one has to participate in reality with an 'attitude of compassion and humility'. God's incarnation in Jesus was an act of humility (Phil. 2: 6-11) and his surrounding to the cross showed his compassion (Luke 23:34). The resurrection and ascension entrusted the church to further carry out this incarnational understanding.

6.3.2 *Holistic Redemption*

This leads to the solutions presented by Irenaeus and Park through their atonement projects. Irenaeus' ransom and recapitulation views work hand in hand in order to bring restoration to human nature. The Christian language of redemption is owed greatly to Irenaeus' the concept of ransom (Lt. *redemptio*). The ransom view can be seen as a subset of recapitulation, but emphasized the liberation of humans from evil and the restoration of human nature. In this way it can be characterized as restorative justice, where God brings about God's righteousness in setting all things to their rightful place. This involves the restoration of human nature so that they can begin the process of deification or *theosis*. Recapitulation involves the summation and reworking of history through Jesus' obedience. This process not only involves the restoration of human nature, but also the changing of history, through the birth, life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. In this way, the recapitulation is deeply connected to history. The link between enfleshment theology and recapitulation can be seen in the virgin earth/ virgin birth motif that Irenaeus uniquely uses (Dunning, 2009: 57-88; Minns, 2010: 103). The summation of history starts with the Logos being birthed through the womb of Mary which mirrors the image of Adam being created from the ground. In effect, the womb of Mary becomes the 'virgin earth' in which all creation will have a second chance at achieving perfection. As R. Williams aptly states regarding Irenaeus, 'The only history to be taken seriously is bodily history, and so the redemption of humanity must be located in bodily history' (1979: 37).

Similarly, Park's Triune atonement enfleshment theology comes in the form of redemption of all creation and not only for humans. Park speaks of Wesley's notion of 'collective perfection' in the same way that Irenaeus speaks of unity with God, in that 'perfection is relational and social' and 'solitary perfection is an oxymoron' (2004: 161). Healing, as wholeness, and holiness, as sanctification, work hand in hand in order to achieve the goals of redemption. For Park, healing is 'an ongoing process, transpiring gradually under the guidance of the Holy Spirit' (2004: 131), similar to the process of *theosis*. More importantly, healing is of the whole person and for all of creation, against the dualism that pits the spiritual over the material world (Park, 2009: 94). Citing Rom. 8: 19-23, Park observes that creation has been subjected 'to human exploitation' and 'has

been groaning in labour pains until now' (2009: 99). The work of Jesus and the Paraclete is to liberate all of creation from *han*. In the *Triune atonement*, Park seeks to offer a way to understand God's work so that Christians and communities can participate in the work of relieving *han* and therefore preventing further sin.

6.3.3 Ethical Anthropology

Lastly, the theological anthropologies of both Irenaeus and Park have ethical components. Irenaeus offers the majestic saying, 'For the glory of God is a living [human being]; and the life of [a human] consists in beholding God' (AH IV, XX, 7). This 'living human being' is the person who comes into relationship with God through the process of being more like God. This deification is not only spiritual, but ethical. It is about being in relationships of righteousness or justice with others. Restorative justice implies ethical actions that are consistent with the restorative process of recapitulation. Jesus' obedience to God was not just done for God alone, but done as acts of righteousness toward others. This is declared against the Gnostics who believe that it is only the spiritual soul that will be saved: 'spiritual things to spiritual, while material things continue among those that are material' (AH II, XXIX, 1). Irenaeus says that these Gnostics contradict themselves because they still maintain that those who are righteous would pass into the 'place of abode', 'place of rest', or 'place of enjoyment', but 'those of the impious continue in the fire'. If this was the case then how can the Gnostics maintain what is righteous or unrighteous? Irenaeus declares 'For it is manifest that those acts which are deemed righteous are performed in bodies' (AH II, XXIX, 1). This is a tenet of Irenaeus that seems patently simply, but crucial to his ethics. Humans perform acts of righteousness in the body and this body must also be redeemed if humans are to be more God like in the process of *theosis*. As Wingren asserts, 'Recapitulation is through Christ, but it is also achieved through men' (1959: xiv-xv). If the incarnation is necessary to the recapitulative process, then it is incumbent on the humans to be participants in this process.

Park's anthropology and atonement model are deeply ethical since it seeks to bring healing to *han* and salvation for the sinners. For the sinned against, Jesus provides healing through the being a symbol of the God forsakenness of the cross, where God demonstrates that God joins those *han* ridden in solidarity. The continuing work of the Paraclete in healing 'our diseases as well as our

illnesses' (Park, 2009, 96). Here, Park uses Kleinman's distinction to say that '*Disease* refers to malfunctioning of biological and/or psychological processes, while the term *illness* refers to the psychosocial experience and meaning of perceived disease' (Kleinman in Park, 2009: 96). The healing that is needed is both the effects of the disease and what one suffers from the disease itself. Park is aware that people suffer from the sins of others and this also has the impact of sustained trauma. Just as no sin can be purely individual, no sickness can be purely isolated. Both disease and illness must be treated or else the sickness will spread to others. For Park, Christian ethics involves the healing of wounds that are physical, psychological, social, and spiritual. This is accomplished by the shift in focus from the sinners to the sinned against. These components are all related to humans as agents who can both sin and be sinned against.

6.4 STRENGTH AND WEAKNESSES

Both of Irenaeus' and Park's hamartiologies have their strengths and weaknesses. In observing these advantages and disadvantages, one can see what these theologies have to offer and where the research needs to be advanced.

6.4.1 *Strength and Weaknesses of Irenaeus' Hamartiology*

Irenaeus' view of sin is faithful to both scriptural and theological tradition. The incarnation is a crucial part of the biblical text, not only in the New Testament, but also in the Old Testament. Since the incarnation is the physical manifestation of God, God who can be seen and heard, Irenaeus sees even in the theophanies of the Old Testament are aspects of the incarnation (Minns: 2010, 55; *AH* IV, XX, 9; cf. Mt. 17.1- 4). Irenaeus is insistent to draw upon this biblical and theological tradition in order to combat the false teachings of the Gnostic writers. The incarnational theology that propels Irenaeus' work also grounds him in a tradition that seeks to describe the totality of God's work beginning in creation and continuing through the life and work of Jesus, even into the bodily resurrection of the dead and final judgment. This theology also combats other philosophical tendencies such as Cartesian dualism. As Irenaeus observes that the threat posed to the Church by the gnostic doctrines, these dualistic tendencies also threaten the Church today. Further, Irenaeus notices that with Gnosticism, there is no tradition where the disciples of their

teachers hand down knowledge to other disciples: ‘For, prior to Valentinus, those who follow Valentinus had no existence; nor did those from Marcion exist before Marcion; nor, in short, had any of those malignant-minded people’ (*AH* III, IV, 3). For Irenaeus, tradition is the link to the past, to the preaching of Apostles and to Jesus.

More recently, recapitulation has seen new light. For example, the work of H. Boersma (2006) has come to value recapitulation and Irenaeus’ work in discussing the problems of sin and redemption. However, he says that ‘Redemption is more, however, than recapitulation or reconstitution’ and that ‘God’s redemptive move of hospitality can only have the desired effect of homecoming if and when human beings look to Christ as their example’ (2006: 126). What is required is not only an objective component, but ‘a positive human response’. This positive human response is Park’s critique of Irenaeus’ description of atonement. It leaves persons passive. ‘Recapitulation of Adamic existence—creation, temptation, and death—is indeed the means by which Christ gains the victory’ but he goes on to exhort ‘But this decisive victory of Christ requires implementation in the lives of Christians’ (Boersma, 2006: 131). Even though there are ethical components to Irenaeus’ anthropology, as noted in Chapter 4, §5.3, a possible weakness in Irenaeus’ theology is how people work out ethics so that sin is limited and people are restored.

Specifically related to hamartiology is Irenaeus’ view of sin as woundedness or sickness. It is an inevitable consequence of an emphasis in incarnational theology that it is a theological anthropology that encompasses the totality of the human person. In both Irenaeus and Clement there is ‘the insistence on the resurrection of the body, and the possibility that the flesh itself may be sanctified’ (Behr, 2000: 21). The body and spirit are both part of the redemptive process because sin affects the totality of the human person. Just as the body undergoes decay and eventual death, the body would also be redeemed at the resurrection of the dead. Irenaeus can be seen as the ‘first Christian theologian’ after the Apostolic age to have a ‘positive valuation of the body as part of the totality of humanity in God’s “image”’ (Steenberg, 2009: 17). Unlike the Gnostics who would either ‘ontologize evil or sin and give it material stature’, Irenaeus understood sin and evil in ‘economic terms’ (Steenberg, 2009: 37). Sin and evil are linked to creation and the history of God, and therefore ‘renewal and rapprochement’ also works in this economical way (Steenberg, 2009:

37-38). In order to deal with sin, a process needs to take place that involves the whole of creation and history, not only disparate elements of sin and evil. Here, Irenaeus' holistic approach goes a long way in achieving the goal.

Lastly, another weakness brought up is the possibility of Irenaeus being interpreted in a universalist reading and thereby making light of sin and evil. In other words, if sin and evil are dealt with through the second Adam's recapitulation of history, then is there need to do anything about it? What is the ethical challenge for the church? Where is the call to Christian discipleship? For Irenaeus, the antidote to alienation from God is pedagogical discipline. The Gnostics are alienated from the truth of Christ (AH V, XIII, 2). In addition, fall of humans came from humanity's creation as those created immature, as 'infants' (AH IV, XXXVIII, 1). Deification then is the process of making humans as God is, just as God became who humans are (AH V, pref.) and this is through obedient discipleship as a follower of Jesus (AH IV, XIV, 1). An analysis of sin that takes into account the physicality of persons has roots in the total economy of salvation and not only a particular aspect. For, Irenaeus creation and re-creation, history, and deification are all intricately and inextricably related.

6.4.2 *Strength and Weaknesses of Park's Hamartiology*

Park's hamartiology starts with an evaluation of the place of the category of sin in Western Christian theology and seeks to find a way to speak about a Christian theology that seeks to correctly diagnose the problems caused by sin: 'personal, social, and global problems as child abuse, family, sexual, and racial violence, labour exploitation, drug abuse, human rights violations, crimes of corporations, animal cruelty, and environmental crises' in addition to problems that are 'caught in a vicious cycle of escalated violence' between groups of people because of racial and religious conflict (1993: 9). Park asks, 'Is the Doctrine of sin capable of responsibly diagnosing and constructively dealing with these kinds of issues? Has Christianity grappled with them with a serious commitment to the establishment of God's reign on earth? (1993: 10). The move to present *han* and refocus the conversation toward the healing of *han* is an attempt to focus on the core of Jesus' mission and address the practical problems of sin. What Park offers in his hamartiology is to find a way to prevent further harm and end the cycle of retribution by healing the wounds caused

by sin, the wounds of *han*. This becomes a useful tool in understanding how sin fully operates in the lives of individuals and communities.

One of the weaknesses of using *han* as a tool of analysis is that in a post-Colonial world there is a difficulty in application. How can the gospel of the *han* ridden be applied to all peoples if there is division between those who are sinned against and those who are sinners? What can be observed is that throughout Park's oeuvre that the language of 'salvation' begins to be differentiated between the wounded and the sinners after *The wounded heart of God* (1993). J. McIntyre analyses various theological models for atonement and notices that given the numerous different permutations that can be made all of these soteriological models 'will be founded upon these twin facts—the historicity and particularity of the death of Christ and the integral relationship between Christ's death and the forgiveness of our sins' (2000: 22). However, in Park's 'triune atonement' the forgiveness of sins and the healing of the wounded are given different aspects.

In later works, *From hurt to healing* (2004) and *Triune atonement* (2009) (those who are sinners are given the invitation to repent, and participate in the restoration of others and the world. In many ways, Park's distinction is a theoretical one, but in other ways it is practical. Children who are abused and mistreated cannot be 'sinners' in the actual sense of the word, unless this sense is applied in an ontological way. Perhaps in this sense, Park's usage will have a difficult time reaching some traditions, such as the Roman Catholic tradition that teaches inherited sin. However, there still can be a distinction where the Roman Catechism differentiates that 'original sin is called 'sin' only in an analogical sense: it is a sin 'contracted' and not 'committed'—a state and not an act' (CCC 404). So, in a sense, Park's distinctions might make sense between the actual and what is 'contracted' or 'inherited'. However, further work needs to be done by theologians of other Christian traditions in order to nuance Park's work.

6.5 LIMITATIONS OF SCHOLARSHIP

This research limited itself to the correspondences and intersections between the hamartiologies of Irenaeus and Park. A few of the other Eastern Fathers, such as Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Alexandria, Maximus the Confessor were examined to show how they

described sin and Irenaeus' place in the tradition. Likewise, a survey of Minjung theology and the concept of *han* was explored outside of Park's usage. Because of a wealth of Irenaeus studies and his re-emergence as a unique influence on theology, more work could be done with Irenaeus' theological anthropology and its relationship to deification, Irenaeus' Christology and its relationship to the Trinity, and the redemption models of the other Eastern Fathers in relationship to recapitulation. Not all atonement models were considered nor were they within the bounds of this research. Likewise, because Park studies have been limited to a few emerging scholars, further work could have been done in the areas of Pneumatology, the relevance of Minjung theology to the contemporary Korean Church, and the intersections between Minjung and other liberative theologies. Minjung theology and the Korean notion of *han* are also expansive topics that this research was not an exhaustive source of either.

6.6 THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE INTERSECTIONS OF IRENAEUS' VIEWS OF SIN AND PARK'S VIEW HAN FOR THEOLOGY

This section explores the implications of Irenaeus' and Park's hamartologies for theology given the findings of this research. First, since Irenaeus is one of the earliest post canonical Christian theologians who wrote extensively on theology, his views on sin and redemption can be used to explore the understanding of early Christianity before Constantine and the Roman Empire. This in turn may have important implications for the understanding of how theology is done in the twenty-first century. Secondly, Park's understanding and use of *han* can be seen to be applied and be contextualized to answer the appropriate situations including cultural, socio/economic, ethnic and racial, and political situations. This section analyses the implications of both Irenaeus' views of sin and redemption and Park's use of *han* on the discipline and science of theology. In other words, how can the idea of *han* help bring about a new understanding regarding how Christian theology can be articulated for the twenty-first century and beyond?

6.6.1 *Irenaeus' Embodied Theology and the Effects of Sin*

Gregory Nazianzen's famous and mysterious phrase, 'What has not been assumed has not been healed' can be used to analyse Irenaeus' purposes in describing sin and its solution. Sin described

as sickness is not only used metaphorically, but to speak of its effects. Even though Irenaeus does not parse sin in the same terms as Park, between sinners and the sinned against, Irenaeus' approach in describing sin and his solutions given show that theologians as early as the Eastern Fathers have acknowledged the complexity of this theological concept. Sin is not simply privation, in which Augustine would later describe as *non est* or *privatio boni*; it is a privation of *something*. In Augustine's *Enchiridion*, he would use the analogy of health and sickness to describe sin, saying 'the wound or disease is not a substance', rather 'the flesh itself being a substance' (*Enc* 11). However, sin is a parasite that requires a host and since the host is what is corrupted, then it is the entire person that is affected. Of course, these effects also make others 'sick'. What begs the questions, is 'What is the cause of sickness in the first place?' An understanding of this is what Irenaeus is attempting, at least in part, to describe. This shows that Patristic studies can give rise to nuanced understandings of sin and atonement, and therefore wider application.

By centralizing the incarnation, Irenaeus shows that sin is described in an embodied way. The natural consequence of this theology is to use the rhetorical device of recapitulation to illustrate the summing up of history. In the same way, his theological anthropology lends its way to talk about the holistic redemption of persons. Deification is akin to the language of Wesleyan perfection, addressed in Park as 'collective holiness' (2004: 138-139), but also speaks about the divine/human union reflected in the incarnation. For Irenaeus, *theosis* then must be grounded in the ethical action in order for the reconciliation between creation to be achieved.

What this implies for theology is that a wide range of study can be made through this embodied lens. For soteriology, considerations can be made as to how salvation encompasses the person in their entireties, including psychological and social aspects. For missiology, considerations can be made about how enculturation, language, and location affects theological language. For Christology, consideration can be made as to the messianic perspectives in the Hebrew Bible and Jesus' and Paul's perspectives of these notions. As it was seen in this research, far-reaching implications and connections can be made with the Eastern Patristic emphasis on incarnation, which have affected many theologians outside of Eastern Orthodoxy.

6.6.2 ‘Asian’ Theology and Situation of Han

It has been almost a half a century since *Water buffalo theology* was published under the name *Waterbuffalo theology* by Kosuke Koyama in 1974 (notice the spelling of the two titles). This marks a nascent, particularly Asian Christian theology into the world. What Koyama attempted to do was not unlike what Irenaeus was doing with *AH* during his time as a way to speak to the gnosticism that threatened Christianity. *AH* and other works by Irenaeus were to interpret the revelation of scripture for a particular context. *Water buffalo theology* spoke to the milieu which was the globalization of Christianity into Asia and how it became rooted in the cultures of various Asian communities. Much like, Irenaeus, an ‘incarnational’ tone was used in Koyama’s work to help him establish the relationship as to how theology should situate itself. This section shows the progression of this type of theology as a voice in the community of theological voices and how *han* helps give language to the study of theology. Minjung theology and the use of *han* is itself a progression of this particular ethnic and contextual theology, contributing to both Pan-Asian theology and theology as a whole.

Waterbuffalo theology (1974) and the twenty-fifth anniversary edition, *Water buffalo theology* (1999, revised and expanded) is Koyama’s pivotal work and greatest contribution to the study of East Asian, Christian theology, in that it places the locus of God’s revelation not only in the texts of Scripture and the knowledge of Jesus through the scripture, but in the ‘faces of the people’ (1999, x; note: I will be using the most recently addition to the book. Koyama notes the spelling of the current addition to be ‘Water buffalo’ in two words and not one). Koyama explains that Water Buffalo theology does not lay out a methodology, but a movement ‘from country to country’ (1999: 3). However, there is an approach, despite Koyama’s denial; it is to first narrate the historical, sociological, and political contexts and Southeast Asia, and to provide space to suggest implications for a contextual theology. “‘Third World Theology’ begins by raising issues not by digesting Augustine, Barth, Rahner,” asserts Koyama (1999: 3). In this sense, Koyama provides a deeply dialectal theology.

His section entitled ‘From country to country’ provides an open dialogue of the context, an investigative *sitzen leben*, that explores various countries: Singapore, Thailand, China, Hong

Kong, the Philippines, Indonesia, Burma, Vietnam, Japan, and Taiwan. What Koyama is missing in this ground-breaking work is the social, historical, and theological context of South Korea. However, Koyama makes proposals that directly connect to the Minjung theology of Korea. For example, for Singapore, Koyama suggests that theology move '[t]oward a slower and more human "erets-logy"' This sense of *erets* mirrors the senses of the people of the land, or the so called 'sinners' (§2.2.4; 1999: 3).

Koyama first casts the people of Singapore as people who live in a constant 85 ° Fahrenheit climate, but who are 'worker ants' who resist the consistency of this environment (1999: 4). In relationship to 'being efficient' (fast) and 'being slow' (human), Koyama proposes his theology of the 'people of the earth' from the biblical use of *erets* (אֶרֶץ) meaning earth or land (Gen. 1:1). Koyama makes several suggestions by providing a contrast between the biblical God as being 'slow' and 'inefficient' and citing the wilderness wandering as being how God expresses God's love in this pace (1999: 4). Koyama also explains how the 'image of the crucified Christ' — 'nailed down' is the ultimate symbol of immobility' (1999: 4). The theologian connects the slowness of the of the wilderness wandering to the staggered pace of the cross by saying that the crucifixion was the 'intensification of the forty years in the wilderness' (1999: 4).

Even though both Koyama and Park focus their theology as a reflection of the *imago Dei* in the lives of people, the difference between their approaches to contextual theology is at Park's theology is rooted in the suffering of the sinned against and the repentance of the sinner through the analysis of *han*, while Koyama wishes to avoid a syncretism. In a section entitled 'Proclamation, accommodation, and syncretism' Koyama raises a series of valid questions: 'In the proclamation of the gospel, at what point does accommodation become syncretism and at what point does proclamation become iconclasticism of the cherished cultural values of Asia? Are our churches structures the best possible structures in our historical-cultural contexts?' (1999: 78). This begs the question as to what the *euangelion* is since throughout the scriptures the term 'gospel' is used in a variety of contexts and interpreted in a multitude of ways by the New Testament writers. However, the point regarding syncretism and accommodation is a valid question since Park and other Minjung theologians have been criticized by using the ideas of

shamanism in their theologies (Kim, E., 1998; Choi, 2013). In addition, the last question about the structures of the church is engaged in this chapter in order to evaluate Irenaeus' and Park's for the church.

6.7.2 *The Euganelion for Han*

The word *eugangelion* (εὐαγγέλιον) is often translated as 'gospel' in the New Testament texts, but used in a wide range of ways. Outside of the usage to refer to the 'Emperor cult' and his birth, *euganelion* is found in the NT in these instances: 'Mark has the noun eight times, Matthew four, and Luke (preferring the verb) none at all. There are two instances in Acts, sixty in Pauline works, and one each in 1 Peter and Revelation' (Friedrich and Kittel, 1985: 236-237). Within the Gospels, the *euangelion* 'implies disclosure of the messianic secret' to Jesus' disciples (Friedrich & Kittel, 1985: 237). Even though the word, *euangelion* is used by writers of the Gospels, Mason, a historian says, 'that the evidence is better explained if [euangelion] was understood to be a proprietary term of Paul's gentile mission (it was truly his Announcement).' Mason asserts that this accounts for 'Mark's embrace of the term' while the other evangelist hesitated to do so (Mason 2009: 3). For Paul, the 'gospel' was then his formulation of the good news of Jesus to the world, but this still leaves the question of Jesus' usage and can be still used.

In the Gospels, Jesus' message was about the realization of the kingdom: "The time has come," he said. "The kingdom of God has come near. Repent and believe the good news!" (Mark 1:15). Whether Jesus' use of the word is in keeping with the original usage is not at issue if one adopts Wittgenstein's notion that words are dependent on their usage (Wittgenstein, 1958). If in this case, then 'Jesus both proclaims the gospel and is and actualizes it' (Friedrich & Kittel, 1985: 237). Other writers such as Paul of Tarsus would use the word to both express the act of sharing about Jesus as the Christ (2 Cor. 8:18; Phil. 4:3, 15) and the content of *tó euangélion* (Friedrich & Kittel, 1985: 237). The importance of the proclamation is that it is an articulation of how God was working in the world. For Jesus, this was the manifestation of God's reign through the work of casting out demons, healing the sick, and preaching of this gospel. For Paul of Tarsus and other canonical writers, it was about God's work through Jesus himself as inaugurating the eschatological event of the kingdom.

For Park the gospel consists of the good news for both the sinner and the sinned against: “to bring the good news to the poor and the downtrodden, we need to develop a proper analysis of the problems of the whole world viewed from the perspective of both the sinner and the victim’ (1993: 13). This is not unlike Jesus’ homily in the synagogue when he preached from Isaiah 61 (Luke 4:14-30) only that instead of the differentiation that Jesus makes between those people who are part of Israel and those who are not part of Israel, the difference is between the sinners and the sinned against. This does not introduce an entirely new category to the theological discourse, because given the nature of sin there must be an object to sin (one does not sin against nothing), yet it poses the questions as to what might be the remedy to sin. Moreover, Park addresses other doctrines through his analysis of sin— ‘repentance, justification, and salvation’ (Park 1993: 13).

Table 7: Addressing Christian Doctrines and the Relationship Between Sinner and Sinned Against

Christian Doctrine	Relationships addressed
Repentance/Forgiveness	
Repentance	sinner
Forgiveness	victim
Justification/Justice	
Justification	oppressor
Justice	oppressed
Salvation/Healing	
Salvation	the salvation of the sinner
Healing	resolution of <i>han</i> for the victims of sin

All of these relationships are clearly laid out in *The wounded heart of God*, except for ‘the salvation of the sinner’ which is explored in the later work, *The Triune atonement*. In one sense, the sinned against receive salvation in that the Latin/Greek means of the word designate health and healing (*salus*, Lt, σωτηρία, Grk.). In certain NT text, *sótéria* has the sense of ‘both a present reference as

finding and a future reference as entering the kingdom' Friedrich & Kittel, 1985: 1028-1029) In another sense, those who commit sins against others receive salvation in the form of 'challenging the offenders' and convicting them 'of their sins and wrongs' on all 'levels—the personal, the collective, and the structural—' (Park, 2009: 75-76). The gospel for the sinner is that they have a chance to realize the impending hope of the kingdom through healing relationships.

6.8 IMPLICATIONS FOR LITURGY AND THE CHURCH

Liturgy can be defined as the 'work of the people' (Grk. *lēitos*, λειτος 'public' + *ergos*, ἔργος 'working'), but takes its form in language which provides for doxology for the church. Irenaeus and Park both provide a way to talk about God's work in the world and the relationship this has to the church or the called people of God (ἐκκλησία). The language of sin, sickness, alienation (otherness), corruption (decay, disease), and woundedness offer ways in which the church can speak of redemption, repentance, reconciliation, and restoration. These descriptions of sin and *han* can provide ways in which the church can enter into community in order to alleviate the wounds of people and prevent further harm. The following are three implications for liturgy and the church 1) worship should draw attention to God's holistic work in redeeming all of creation 2) ministry should bring about the healings of victims of harm rather than perpetuating the wounds and sin by easily absolving the guilt of the sinner 3) reconciliation should start with *dan* rather than first attempting to bring victims and perpetrators together.

Irenaeus' and Park's anthropologies and theories of redemption focus on the entire person, in all their intellectual, psychological, social, and physical aspects. Both the Apostles and Nicene Creeds begins with 'in God the Father almighty, Maker of heaven and earth'. This joins the creative act of God in both the spiritual and material realms. It is about the entirety of God's work and echoes the Genesis account of creation, God saw everything that he had made, and indeed, it was very good' (1:31a, NRSV). The תָּבָרָא מְאֹד (tō-wb̄ mē- 'ōd; very good), although not treated explicitly by Irenaeus, expresses the entirety of the created order in relationship to all that was created before this final day of creation. Irenaeus clarifies, 'Now the soul and the spirit are certainly a part of the man, but certainly not the man; for the perfect man consists in the commingling and the union of

the soul receiving the spirit of the Father, and the admixture of that fleshly nature which was moulded after the image of God' (AH, V, VI, 1). By 'perfect man', Irenaeus means not only the prototypical human, but also the fully constituted human being, that is being completed in the likeness of the divine. Because Park sees *han* as being constitutive of psycho, somatic, and social factors, the treatment of the whole person becomes the focus of Christian life and ethics. By restoring creation to its correct relationship with God, God can truly be shown in God's full glory. When the church can become the means to declare this goodness in God's full creative act, then God will be glorified. As Irenaeus declares, 'For by means of the creation itself, the Word reveals God the Creator' (AH IV, VI, 6).

Sexual and other abuses within Catholic and Protestant denominations are ubiquitous, but often not brought to light. In order to prevent further harm to others, the focus of the work of the church should be to listen, acknowledge, and investigate the testimonies of the victims. Because Irenaeus' ransom model of redemption focuses on liberating humans from the clutches of evil and sin, the church's objective mission should be about these liberative practices. However, in order to set these victims free (Luke 4:18) persons who were hurt, injured, and/or traumatized require tending to. The church should not only work to provide liturgies of forgiveness and freedom of guilt for sinners, but work to develop liturgies for the sinned against. R. Duck has observed, 'If confession is the cry of the sinner, then lament is the cry of the victim' (2001: 168). Citing Henderson (1994: 54–56), Duck says that '[a]s many as fifty-nine of the one hundred fifty Psalms are psalms of lament' (2001: 168). If more than a third of the Psalms are ones of grieving victims, those who are sinned against, then the Psalter should be focused on as much on those suffering than those who have caused the suffering. Instead of being the source of hurt and pain for some people, the church and its liturgy can be the source of healing and restoration. The church's ministry of reconciliation is a reflection of God's reconciliation with people (2 Cor. 5:16-21). Irenaeus makes it clear that in this bringing together of parties requires the body of Christ, 'And in every Epistle the apostle plainly testifies, that through the flesh of our Lord, and through His blood, we have been saved' (AH III, XIV, 3). Reconciliation must contain a bodily element that is realized in order for the parties to come together. However, reconciliation that takes place between humans cannot too easily bring parties together if one party still retains enmity and can continue to cause harm to the

sinned against. In order to prevent further sin, Park suggests the practice of *dan* (단) or self-denial. *Dan* prevents bitterness, hatred, resentment, retribution, vengeance, and violence. *Dan* prevents subjective enmity and in order to be truly reconciled, victims of *han* should engage in practices that embody *dan*. When victims can learn to practice *dan*, they participate in the ministry of forgiveness that Park uses in order to talk about ‘the forgiveness the offenders receive’ (2004: 81).

One of the implications that Park draws for the church in distinguishing sin and *han* is the problem of racism in the context of the American church. Park observes that in ‘treating the problem of sin as traditional churches have done does not fully address certain issues that our society is facing’ (1996: 3). To fully treat sin in society, the roots of sin must be taken in account and to ‘distinguish sin from *han* and provide some relevant prescriptions for their dissolution’ (Park, 1996: 3). In this light, Park observes that Korean-Americans ‘suffer more from *han* than sin’ (1996: 3). For example, in the United States, there is an asymmetric relationship between those ethnic groups who commit crimes and those who commit crimes upon these groups. For example, Pew Research Centre report shows the incarceration rate for Black men to be twice as high as Hispanics, at the rate of 797 per 100,000 persons, and five times more than their white counterparts, at the rate of 268 per 100,000 persons (Gramlich, 2020). even though Black men commit proportionately at the same rates as white men. While Blacks in the United States make up nearly 12% of the American population, they make up 33% of the prison population while whites make up 63% of the American population, they make up only 30% of said prison population (Gramlich, 2020). This is even during falling incarceration rates for Black men since 2006. Ida B. Wells, an African-American journalist, wrote in a pamphlet entitled ‘Southern horrors: Lynch law in all its phases’ (1892) in response to the lynching of three Black men in Memphis, TN in the same year. Thomas Moss, the owner of the *People’s grocery store* and his co-workers, Calvin McDowell and Henry Stewart, were engaged in a conflict with white deputies who were hired to destroy Moss’ store. A white competitor saw Moss as a direct rival because Moss provided services for Moss’ own community, drawing business away from the white owner’s store. Moss’ men did not realize that deputies were sent, and a conflict ensued. Moss, his co-workers, and a hundred other black people were arrested and jailed. A violent masked mob came to take Moss and his two co-workers shot them to death

and destroyed their bodies beyond recognition. Wells published the pamphlet because the men who lynched Moss and his friends were not arrested even though they were well known in the community to have committed the crime. Wells writes about her calling to seek justice for the death of her friends: ‘Somebody must show that the Afro-American race is more sinned against than sinning, and it seems to have fallen upon me to do so’ (Wells, 1892). This is the first incident in the literature of the use of the phrase ‘sinned against’ in relationship to sin. If the contemporary church is to continue to pursue its mission to engage in the work of God in the world, then the question has to be answered as to how sins such as racism, sexual abuses, massive economic disparity, environmental destruction, and seemingly endless wars are to be dealt with through theological discourse. Both Park and Irenaeus provide their own attempts at to answer the issues of sin for their own time, places, and cultural climates.

6.9 CONTRIBUTION TO SCHOLARSHIP

This research contributes both to Irenaeus and Park studies by pointing out the correspondence between two theological traditions that looked to be dissimilar. Contemporary interests in Patristic studies, for example *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus* (Beeley, 2012) and *God visible: Patristic Christology reconsidered* (Daley, 2018), testifies to its importance in the field of theology. In addition, the expansion of Christianity in areas outside of Europe and the Americas testify to how Christian theological traditions have adapted and developed. Because it is difficult, if not impossible, to separate culture from Christian theology (Ward, 2005: 2), it is important then to see how Christianity also developed from other Christian traditions in order to have a better perspective as to what has been developed in other continents such as Asia and Africa. The purpose of this research was to investigate the places of overlap in two seemingly disparate traditions, Eastern Patristic theology and Minjung theology of South Korea, particularly in Irenaeus of Lyons and Andrew Sung Park, in the area of hamartiology. Because various fields of Christian theology overlap and are naturally interrelated, the consequence of this investigation also looked into theological anthropology, ethics, and atonement models, but only insofar as it related to the hamartiological findings in each figure. This research into the correspondence between Park and

Irenaeus fills a lacuna in the research since as far as the literature review shows, there has been no research that investigates these intersections.

The importance of this work is that it also shows how Minjung theologians and theologies can find ways to ground their work in earlier traditions. Even though Park finds limitations in ransom and recapitulation views in advancing his own atonement model, his own model finds many semblances to the therapeutic models of the Eastern Patristic tradition. Patristic scholars will also find encouragement to look at various contexts and hermeneutical approaches in studying Patristic scholars, such as the rhetoric they used and how they framed their attacks toward their interlocutors. Here, we saw various Gnostic writers as being important contexts for the situatedness of Irenaeus' writings. Just as important was the context of Minjung theology and the Korean history of colonization and conquest of their country that gave rise to the notion of *han*. Lastly, since *han* is felt and manifested both in body and psycho-social aspects of a person the notion can provide a broad application to theologies that emphasize incarnational approaches. Because the incarnation is fundamental to the New Testament, particularly the Gospels, this research opens a way for Christian theologians to investigate the problem of sin's effect on the whole person and ways in which theologies can answer these questions. Most recently, Roman Catholic (Considine, 2013) and Lutheran (Nelson, 2009) theologians have found applications with Park's hamartiology. With this research, the way is made for other traditions to find application for Park's work.

Both Irenaeus and Park provide a venue of theological engagement with scholars who have feet in both Patristic studies as well as contemporary theology. For example, the contemporary theologian Jürgen Moltmann or the late theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer can be put in conversation about the nature of sin, its effects, and the healing of the victims. Since these two theologians were both prisoners during the holocaust, their theologies and perspectives can be brought to bear in relationship to incarnational and Minjung theologies. These intersections regarding sin, recapitulation, ransom, and ethics could also be discussed in with other liberative theologies such as the Black American theology of James Cone or the Liberation theology of Fr. Gustavo Gutiérrez Merino of Peru. If these latter theologies are truly liberative, then they could be analysed with a Patristic lens to observe their correspondence to an older tradition.

As it was shown Park and Irenaeus situate the effects of sin as woundedness and sickness. This therapeutic approach should open avenues for sociology and psychology, as well as other disciplines to be used to inform theology. S. Rambo's *Spirit and trauma: A theology of remaining* (2010) and *Resurrecting wounds: Living in the afterlife of trauma* (2018) speak to the current interdisciplinary work that cross theology and trauma. Still much work is left to be done on this front if theological work can converse with other disciplines in a way that it can tangibly affect a world which God created.

The purpose of this study was to bring to Patristic studies into dialogue with contemporary Minjung theology to both ground Minjung theology and to bring to light new ways in which Patristic scholars can be read and applied. In the early 20th century, criticisms of Irenaeus' originality and importance have been criticized starting with A. Van Hartack (1907), Bousset (1915), and F. Loofs (1930), but others more recently cited in this research have validated Irenaeus' prominence as an extraordinary scholar and biblical exegete. Likewise, there has been criticism of Park's corpus of work that it is debatable 'to whether the traditional Christian view of sin and its salvation really ignored the victims or persons of 'han'' (Kang, 1994: 392–392; Ngien, 1996: 668). To tackle this criticism is beyond the scope of this research, but it was shown that Patristic anthropology has an ethical component that focused on the effects of sin to persons. What is admitted by a critic is that Park's 'ideas, which he gains from eastern and western religious traditions, enable him to develop a "contextual" program that effectively addresses cross-cultural, missiological, and global theological issues' (Ngien, 1996: 668). Park consistently garners this favourable critique and this is why Park studies are relevant to the discipline and science of theology. It is indeed crucial to re-visit the masters of the past to garner insights as much as explore the contemporary scholars working in unique contexts to explore fully the wide range of theological topics and studies.

REFERENCES

- Adams, D.H. 2008. *The Sinner in Luke*. Eugene: Pickwick Publishers.
- Akala, A.J. 2014. *The Son-Father relationship and Christological symbolism in the Gospel of John*. London: Bloomsbury, T&T Clark.
- Anatolios, K. 1998. *Athanasius: The coherence of his thought*. London: Routledge.
- Anatolios, K. 2004. *Athanasius*. London: Routledge.
- Anh, B-M. 2019. *Stories of Minjung theology: The theological journey of Ahn Byung-Mu in his own words*. Atlanta: SBL.
- Anderson, G.A. 2009. *Sin a history*. New Haven: Yale.
- Anon. Arirang, Lyrical folk song in the Republic of Korea. 2012, Intangible cultural heritage: Unesco, viewed 14 August 2021,
<<https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/arirang-lyrical-folk-song-in-the-republic-of-korea-00445>>
- Aquinas, Thomas. 2003. *On evil*. Regan, R. *trans.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aquinas, Thomas. 2006 *Summa theologiae*. Latin text, English translation. O'Neill, C.E. *trans.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arbesmann, R. 1954. The concept of 'Christus medicus' in St. Augustine. *Traditio*. 10: 1-28.
- Aristotle. 2014. *Nicomachean ethics*. Reeve, C.D.C. *trans.* Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Augustine. 1877. *de civitate Dei*. Dombart, B. *ed.* Lipsiae: Aedibus B.G. Teubneri
https://openlibrary.org/works/OL137835W/De_civitate_Dei Date accessed: 5 July, 2021.
- Augustine. 2002. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers series 1, volume 5: St. Augustine: Anti-Pelagian writings*. Schaff, P. *ed.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

- Augustine. 2010. *On free choice of the will, On grace and free choice, and other writings*. King, P. *ed.* Cambridge: Cambridge.
- Aulen, G. 1951. *Christus victor: An historical study of the three main types of the idea of Atonement*. New York: Macmillan.
- Augustine. 1954. *City of God: Books XVII-XXII*. Vol 8. Walsh G. G & Honan, D. J. *trans.* (*In The Fathers of the church: A new translation*). Washington: The Catholic University of America.
- Augustine. 1961. *The enchiridion on faith, hope, and love*. Paolucci, H. *ed*, Shaw, J. F. *trans.* Chicago: H. Regnery.
- Augustine. 2002b. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers series 1, volume 11: Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Romans*. Schaff, P. *ed.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Athanasius. 1971. *Contra gentes and de incarnatione*. Thomson, R. W. *ed & trans.* Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Athanasius, *Four Discourses Against the Arians*. NPNF (V2-04). Archibald Robertson *trans.* Philip Schaff *ed.* Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark.
- Babcock, W.S. 1999. *Sin* (*In Encyclopedia of Early Christianity* (second ed.)). Ferguson, E. *ed.* New York: Routledge.
- Barth, K. 1936-1975. *Church Dogmatics*, Vol 111/2. Bromiley, G. W. and Torrance, T. F. *eds.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Beatrice, P.F. & Kamesar, A. 2013. *The transmission of sin: Augustine and the pre-Augustinian sources*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beeley, C.A. 2012. *Re-Reading Gregory of Nazianzus*. Washington: Catholic University of America.

- Beeley, C. A. 2013. A review of Christ in the Life and Teaching of Gregory of Nazianzus. *Oxford early Christian studies*. 10 (53), <https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2014/2014.10.53/>. Date accessed: 10 January 2019.
- Bevans, S.B. 2002. Models of contextual theology (revised and expanded ed). Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- Behr, J. 2000. Anthropology and asceticism in Irenaeus and Clement. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Behr, J. 2013a. Irenaeus of Lyons: identifying Christianity. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Behr, J. 2013b. Nature, wounded and healed in Early Patristic thought. *Toronto journal of theology*, v. 29 (1): 85–100.
- Biser, V. E. 1998. Die heilkraft des glaubens. *Concilium*, 34: 534-544.
- Blomberg, C. L. 2005. Contagious holiness: Jesus' meals with sinners. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.
- Blomberg, C. L. 2009. Jesus, sinners, and table fellowship. *Bulletin for biblical research*, 19 (1): 35-62.
- Blowers, P. M. 1998. Original sin. (In *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. Ferguson, E., Norris, F. W., & McHugh, M. P. eds. New York: Garland. p. 839-940).
- Bock, K. Y. ed. 1981. Minjung theology: People as the subjects of history. Toa Payoh: The Commission on Theological Concern, The Christian Conference of Asia Singapore.
- Boda, M. J. 2009. A severe mercy: Sin and its remedy in the Old Testament. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Boersma, H. 2004. Violence, hospitality, and the cross: Reappropriating the atonement tradition. Grand Rapids: Baker.

- Bousset, W. 1915. Jüdische-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom: Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenäus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Bray, G. 1994. Original sin in Patristic thought. *Churchman*, 108: 37-47.
- Brewin, C. R. August 2019. Complex post-traumatic stress disorder: A new diagnosis in ICD-11. *BJPsych Advances*, 26 (3): 145-152,
<https://doi.org/10.1192/bja.2019.48> Date accessed: 10 August 2021.
- Breyfogle, C. M. 1912. The Hebrew sense of sin in the Pre-Exilic period. (Dissertation – PhD). Published by: *The American journal of theology*. The University of Chicago Press. 16 (4): 542-560.
- Briggman, A. 2012. Irenaeus of Lyons and the theology of the Holy Spirit. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bromiley, G. trans. 1985. Theological dictionary of the New Testament. Kittel, G. & Friedrich, G. eds. Grand Rapids: The Paternoster.
- Brown, R. 1970. Gospel according to John (XIII-XXI). *Anchor Bible*. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Brown, R. 1979. The community of the beloved disciple. New York, NY: Paulist.
- Brown, S. A. 2010. Review of Triune atonement: Christ's healing for sinners, victims, and the whole creation. *Theology today*, 67 (1): 78-80.
- Browning, W. R. F. ed. Sin (*In A dictionary of the Bible*. Oxford Biblical Studies Online)
<http://www.oxfordbiblicalstudies.com/article/opr/t94/e1773> Date accessed: 12 Feb. 2021.
- Brueggemann, W. 1977. The land: Place as gift, promise, and challenge in biblical faith. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

- Buschart, W. D., & Eilers, K. 2015. *Theology as retrieval: Receiving the past, renewing the church*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.
- Bushur, J.G. 2017. *Irenaeus of Lyons and the mosaic of Christ: Preaching Scripture in the era of Martyrdom*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Byung-Mu, A. 2019. *Stories of Minjung theology the theological journey of Ahn Byung-Mu in his own words*. In, H. *trans.* Wongi Park, W. *ed.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Carroll, E. R. 2003. Recapitulation in Christ. (*In New Catholic Encyclopedia*. Carson, T. & Cerrito, J. *eds.* Detroit: Gale.
<https://www.encyclopedia.com/religion/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/recapitulation-christ> Date accessed 16 August 2021.
- Charlesworth, M.1996. Postmodernism and theology. *The way*, 36 (3), July: 188-202.
- Childs, B. S. 1993. *Biblical theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological reflection on the Christian Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Choi, G. 2013. The influence of Shamanism in the Korean Adventist Church, *Journal of Adventist mission studies*, Vol. 9, No. 2, Art. 3: 21-38.
- Chung P.S. 2009. Constructing irregular theology: Bamboo and minjung in East Asian perspective, *Studies in systematic theology*, vol 1. Leiden: Brill.
- Clark, D. N. 1995. Growth and limitations of minjung Christianity in South Korea (*In South Korea's minjung movement: The culture and politics of dissidence*. Wells, K.M, *ed.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, p. 87-104.
- Clement of Alexandria.1885. *The stromata*. Wilson, W. *trans.* (*In Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 2. by Roberts, A., Donaldson, J., & Coxe, A.C. (eds). Buffalo: Christian Literature Publishing Co).

- Clems, S. D. 2011. Christ the archetype: second Adam typology and interpretive method in Irenaeus's Against heresies. *The Living Church*: 12-16, 14 Aug.
- Considine, K. P. 2013a. Theology at the cutting edge: *Han* (恨) and salvation for the sinned-against. *New theology review*, 26 (1): 87-89.
- Considine, K. P. 2013b. Towards a Roman Catholic soteriology for the sinned-against creature: An intercultural dialogue between the soteriology of Edward Schillebeeckx and Korean-American theologies of "han". Chicago: Loyola (Dissertation – PhD).
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/510 Date accessed 10 Aug, 2021
- Considine, K. P. 2014. Kim Chi-Ha's *han* anthropology and its challenge to Catholic thought. *Horizons*, 41 (1): 49-73.
- Considine, K. P. 2015. Salvation for the sinned-against: *Han* and Schillebeeckx in intercultural dialogue. Eugene: Pickwick.
- Connolly, H. 2002. Sin (New Century Theology). London: Continuum.
- Couenhoven, J. 2013. Stricken by sin, cured by Christ: Agency, necessity, and culpability in Augustinian theology. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cover, R. C. 2008. Sin, sinners (Old Testament) (*In The Anchor Bible Dictionary* vol 6. Freedman, D. N. ed. Yale University Press. pp. 34-40.
- Crane, R.D. 2019, Rethinking the grammar of the atonement: Forgiveness, judgment, and apocalyptic recapitulation. *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 46 (1): 55-77.
- Creswell, J. 2014. Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. 1st ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Creswell, J. 2013. Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Croasmun, M. 2017. *The emergence of sin: The Cosmic tyrant in Romans*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cyril of Alexandria. 1857-1886. *Patrologia cursus completus. Series Graeca*. Migne, J.P. *ed.* Paris: Migne.
- Daley, B.E. 2018. *God visible: Patristic Christology reconsidered*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- de Wet, C. 2010. Sin as slavery and/or slavery as sin? On the relationship between slavery and Christian hamartiology in Late Ancient Christianity. *Religion & theology*, 17: 26–39.
- Descartes, R. 2008. *Meditations on first philosophy with selections from the objections and replies*. Moriarty, M. *trans.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Destro, A. & Pesce, M. 2012. *Encounters with Jesus: A man in his place and time*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Devasahayam, V. *ed.* 1997. *Frontiers of Dalit theology*, Delhi: ISPCK.
- Dörnemann M. 2013. Einer ist arzt, Christus medizinales verständnis von erlösung in der theologie der griechischen kirchenväter des zweiten bis vierten jahrhunderts. *De Gruyter*; 17(1): 102–124
- Duck R. C., Hospitality to victims: A Challenge for Christian worship in the other side of sin (*In The other side of sin: Woundedness from the perspective of the sinned-against*, Park, A. & Nelson, S. *eds.* Albany: State University of New York. p.143-164.
- Dunning, B. H. 2009. Virgin earth, virgin birth: Creation, sexual difference, and recapitulation in Irenaeus of Lyons. *Journal of religion*, 89 (1): 57-88
- Eshleman, A. 2016. Moral responsibility. (*In The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Zalta, E. N. *ed.*

<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/moral-responsibility/> Date accessed: 10 December 2019.

- Espinosa, G. 2011. 'Salvation and transformation': Latino Evangelical political activism and the struggle over comprehensive immigration reform. (*In Wading through many voices: Toward a theology of public conversation*. Recinos, H. *ed*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, p. 133–151
- Evans, E. *ed and trans*. 1972. Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fairbairn, D. 2003. Grace and Christology in the early Church. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ferguson, E. 1999. Rule of faith. (*In Ferguson, E. ed, Encyclopedia of early Christianity*. New York: Routledge, p. 1003-1004).
- Flood, D. 2010. Substitutionary atonement and the Church Fathers: A reply to the authors of *Pierced for our transgressions*. *Evangelical Quarterly*, 82 (2):142-159.
- Florovsky G. 1976. Creation and redemption: volume three in the Collected Works of Georges Florovsky. Belmont: Nordland.
- Freidman, M. 1991. Encounter on a narrow ridge: A life of Martin Buber. New York: Paragon House.
- Gesenius H.W.F. 1979. Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee lexicon to the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- González, J. L. 1971. A history of Christian thought Volume II: From Augustine to the eve of the Reformation. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.
- Gorelova, L. M. *ed*. 2002. Manchu Grammar: Handbook of oriental studies: handbuch der orientalistik, Section eight, Central Asia. Leiden: Brill.

- Goudriaan, A. 2016. Descartes, Cartesianism, and Early Modern theology (*In The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern theology, 1600-1800*, Lehner U.L. , Muller R. A. , and Roeber A. G. eds. New York: Oxford, p. 533-549).
- Gregory Nazianzen. 1819-1893. To Cledonius the priest against Apollinarius. Browne, C. G. & Swallow, J. E. *trans.* (*In Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen: Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series II, vol. 7.* Schaff, P. *ed.* Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library).
- Gregory Nazianzen & Saint Ambrose. 1953. Funeral orations by Gregory Nazianzen and Saint Ambrose, *Fathers of the Church*, vol. 22. New York: The Catholic University of America.
- Gramlich, J. 2020. Black imprisonment rate in the U.S. has fallen by a third since 2006. Pew Research Centre.
|<https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/05/06/share-of-black-white-hispanic-americans-in-prison-2018-vs-2006/> Date of access: 15 Aug. 2021.
- Hart, T. A. 1989. Irenaeus recapitulation and physical redemption (*In Christ in our place: The humanity of God in Christ for the reconciliation of the world: Essays presented to James Torrance.* Hart T.A. & Thimell, D. eds, Allison Park: Pickwick. p. 152-181.
- Han, S-E. 1999. A response to Dongsoo Kim. *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, 15: 141-143.
- Harvey, W. W. 1857. *Santi Irenæi: episcopi Lugdunensis Libros quinque adversos haereses. Cantabrigiæ: Typis adamicus* (Cambridge University).
- Henderson, J. F. 1994. *Liturgies of lament*. Chicago: Liturgy Training.
- Hengel, M. 1974. Property and riches in the Early Church: Aspects of a social history of Early Christianity. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.
- Hick, J. 1966. *Evil and the God of love*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hochban, J. I. 1946. St. Irenaeus on the atonement. *Theological Studies*, 7(4): 525-557.

- Hofer, A. 2013. Christ in the life and teaching of Gregory of Nazianzus: Oxford Early Christian studies. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hoh, J. 1919. Die Lehre des hl. Irenäus über das Neue Testament. Münster: Aschendorffschen.
- Holland, M. 2015. Irenaeus of Lyons: A defense of recapitulation. (Thesis-MA).
- Holsinger Friesen, T. 2009. Irenaeus and Genesis: A study of competition in Early Christian hermeneutics. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Hwang, Y-Y, 2013. The person attacked by the robbers is Christ. (*In Reading Minjung theology in the twenty-first Century: Selected writings by Anh Byung-Mu and modern critical responses*. Kim, Y.S. & Kim, J-H eds, Eugene: Wipf & Stock.
- Ihsse, B.L. 2012. They who give from evil: the response of the Eastern Church to moneylending in the Early Christian Era. Cambridge, UK: James Clark & Co.
- Irenaeus. 1920. The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching. Robinson, A., ed. New York: The Macmillan Co.
- Irenaeus. 1997. On the Apostolic preaching: St Irenaeus of Lyons. Behr, J. *trans*. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary.
- Irenaeus. 2001. The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus: volume 01. Harvey, W. W. *trans*, Roberts, A. & Donaldson, J. eds. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- Ireneaus, 1857. Libros quique adversus haereses. Harvey, W. W. ed. Cantabrigiae: Typis academicis.
- James, M. R. *trans*. 1924. Acts of Philip in The Apocryphal New Testament. Oxford, UK: Clarendon.
- John Chrysostom. 1963. Baptismal Instructions. Quasten, J. & Burghardt W. M. eds. Mahwah: Paulist.

- Kang, W. J. 1994. Book review: *The wounded heart of God: The Asian concept of han and the Christian doctrine of sin*. *Missiology*. 22(3): 392–392.
- Kaiser, W. C. 2007. Must we go “beyond” the Bible? The theological use of the Bible. (*In* Introduction to biblical hermeneutics: The search for meaning (revised and expanded ed). Kaiser, W. C. & Silva, M. eds. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Kannegiesser, C. 2006. Handbook of patristic exegesis. The Bible in ancient Christianity vol 1. D. Jeffry Bingham ed. Leiden: Brill.
- Kim, D. 1999. The healing of *han* in Korean Pentecostalism. *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*. 15: 123-139
- Kim, D. S. 1938. *The doctrine of man in Irenaeus of Lyons*. Boston University (Dissertation – PhD).
- Kim, E., 1998. Minjung theology in Korea: A critique from a Reformed theological perspective. *Japan Christian review*. 64: 53-65.
- Kim, S. tans. 1978. Arirang. (*In* Suffering and hope: An anthology of Asian writings. O’Grady, R. & Jin L. S. eds, Singapore: Christian Conference of Asia.
- Kim, S-Y. 1987. Is minjung theology a Christian theology? *Calvin theological journal*. 22. Nov: 251-74.
- Kim, Sang-Yi. 1984. *Han* and *han*: Theological interpretation of *hanism*. (*In* Hanism as Korean mind: Interpretation of Han Philosophy. Kim, S-I & Ro, Y-C eds. Ann Arbor: Eastern Academy of Human Sciences).
- Kim, S-So H-C. 2017. Korean *han* and the postcolonial afterlives of “the beauty of sorrow”. *Korean studies*, 41: 253-279.
- Kim, Y-B. 1992. Messiah and minjung: Christ’s solidarity with the people for new life. Kowloon: Christian Conference of Asia-Urban Rural Mission.

- Kim, Y. S. 2015. *Resurrecting Jesus: The renewal of New Testament theology*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.
- Kim, Y. S. 2016. *Messiah in weakness: A portrait of Jesus from the perspective of the dispossessed*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.
- Kim, Y-S & Kim J-H, eds. 2013. *Reading minjung theology in the twenty-first century: Selected writings by Ahn Byung-Mu and modern critical responses*. Eugene: Pickwick Publications.
- Koch, K. 1980. Chaeta; chet; chet'ah; chata ah; chatta ah; chatta' th; chatta. (*In The theological dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated from Tueologisches wörterbuch zum Alten Testament, vol. IV. Botterwek, G. J. & Ringgren, H. eds. W. Germany: William B. Eerdmans).
- Korsak, M.P. 1998. 'A fresh look at the garden of Eden', *Semia 81: Thinking in signs: Semiotics and biblical studies...thirty years after*. Patte, D. ed, 81: 3-37.
- Koyama, K. 1974. *Waterbuffalo theology*. London, UK: SCM.
- Koyama, K. 1999. *Water Buffalo theology* (25th anniversary ed, revised & expanded). Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- Küster, V. 2010. *A Protestant theology of passion: Korean Minjung theology revisited*, vol. 4. Leiden: Brill.
- Laidlaw, J. 2017. Ethics/morality (*In The Cambridge encyclopedia of anthropology*. Stein, F., Lazar, C., Candea, S. M., Diemberger, H., Robbins, J., Sanchez, A., & Stasch, R. eds. <http://doi.org/10.29164/17ethics> Date accessed: 10 Nov. 2019).
- Lam, J. 2016. *Patterns of sin in the Hebrew Bible: Metaphor, culture, and the making of a religious concept*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lampe, G. W. H. 1961. *A Patristic Greek lexicon*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Lartey, E. 2013. Pastoral theology in an intercultural world. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.
- Lashier, J. 2014. Irenaeus on the Trinity. Leiden: Brill.
- Lawson, J. 1948. The biblical theology of Saint Irenaeus. London: Epworth (reprinted ed. 2006. Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers).
- Lee, J., Wachholtz, A., & Choi, K.-H. 2014. A Review of the Korean cultural syndrome hwa-byung: Suggestions for theory and intervention. *Asia T'aep'yongyang Sangdam Yon'gu*, 4: 49. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4232959/> Date accessed 10 August, 2021.
- Lee, S.T. 2012. Religion and social formation (*In Korea: Minjung and millenarianism*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter).
- Liddell, H. G. & Scott, R. 1889. A Greek-English lexicon. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lienhard, J. K. 2019. Canons and rule of faith (*In The Oxford handbook of Early Christian biblical interpretation*. Blowers, P. M. & Martens, P. W. eds, Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 55-70).
- Lieu, J.M. 2015. Marcion and the making of a heretic: God and Scripture in the second century. New York: University of Cambridge Press.
- Lombo, J.A. & Francesco, R. 2007. Philosophical anthropology: An introduction. Downers Grove: Midwest Theological Forum.
- Loofs, F. 1930. Theophilus von Antiochien Adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
- Louth, A. 1996. Maximus the Confessor. London: Routledge.
- Love, J. 2008. The concept of medicine in the Early Church. *The Linacre quarterly*, 75 (3): 225-238.

- Luther, M. 1955- 86. On the councils of the church, 41, 100-01 (*In Luther's works: American edition*, Pelikan, J.J. & Lehmann H.T., gen. eds, 55 vols., St. Louis: Concordia; Philadelphia: Fortress).
- Lyew, S. N. 2007. *Han*, resurrection, and the question of meaning: Exploring the question of meaning through the *han* of the Korean minjung and Christian faith in resurrection. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit. (Dissertation – PhD).
- Magnus, B. & Higgins, K. M. 1996. Nietzsche's works and their themes (*In The Cambridge companion to Nietzsche*. Magnus, B. & Higgins, K. eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 21-70).
- Mason, S. 2009. Josephus, Judea, and Christian origins: Methods and categories. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Maximos the Confessor. 1990. First Century of Various Texts (*In Philokalia*, volume two. Palmer, G.E.H., Sherrard, P., & Ware, K. trans. London: Faber & Faber.
- McFarland, I. A. 2010. In Adam's fall: A meditation on the Christian doctrine of original sin. Oxford: Blackwell.
- McGonigle, Herbert. 2001. Augustine v Pelagius on original sin. *European explorations in Christian holiness*, (2): 41-54.
- McIntyre, J. 2000. The Shape of soteriology: Studies in the doctrine of the death of Christ (new ed). Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark.
- Meeks, W.A. 1986. Understanding Early Christian ethics. *Journal of Biblical literature*, 105 (1): 3-11.
- Meier, J.P. 1991. A marginal Jew: Rethinking the historical Jesus, vol. 1. New York: Doubleday.
- Mercadante, L.A. 1996. Victims and sinners: Spiritual roots of addiction and recovery. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

- Mertens, D. 2009. Transformative research and evaluation. 1st ed. New York: Guildford.
- Messina-Dysert, G. 2015. Rape culture and spiritual violence. Oxon: Routledge.
- Meyendorff, J. 1983. Byzantine theology: historical trends and doctrinal themes. Rev. 2nd ed. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Milbank, J. 2006. Theology and social theory. 2nd ed. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Milgrom J. The Anchor Bible dictionary: Leviticus 1-16, a new translation with introduction and commentary. New York: Doubleday.
- Minns, D, 1994. Irenaeus. London: Geoffrey Chapman.
- Minns, D. 2010. Irenaeus: an introduction. New York: T&T Clark.
- Moltmann, J. (ed). 1984. Minjung. Theologie des Volkes Gottes in Südkorea. Neukirche: Neukirchner.
- Moon, C. 1985. A Korean minjung theology: An Old Testament perspective. Maryknoll: Orbis.
- Moon, H. 2014. Genealogy of the modern theological understanding of *han* 한. *Pastoral Psychology*, 63 (4): 419–435
- Moore, M. 2001. Teaching Justice and Reconciliation in a Wounding World. (In *The other side of sin: Woundedness from the perspective of the sinned-against*, Park, A. & Nelson, S. eds. Albany: State University of New York. p.143-164).
- Moss, C.R. 2011. Heavenly healing: Eschatological cleansing and the resurrection of the dead in the early church. *Journal of the American academy of religion*, 79 (4): 991-1017.
- Nam-Dong, S. 1983. Towards a theology of *han*. (In *Minjung theology: People as the subjects of history*. rev. ed. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books. p. 55-69).

- Nel, M. 2014. Sin: Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. (In *The Oxford encyclopaedia of the Bible and ethics*. Brawely, R. L. *ed.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 279-284).
- Nelson, D. R. 2009. What's wrong with sin: Sin in individual and social perspective from Schleiermacher to theologies of liberation. London: T&T Clark.
- Ngien, D. 1996. Review of *The wounded heart of God: The Asian concept of han and the Chastain Doctrine of Sin*. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 64 (3): 667-668.
- Nietzsche F., 2002. Beyond good and evil: Prelude to a philosophy of the future. Norman, J. *trans.* Horstmann, R. *ed.* Berlin: Humboldt-University.
- Niles, D.P. & Thomas, T.K. *eds.* 1980. Varieties of Witness, Asia focus series. Singapore: Christian Conference of Asia.
- Nolland, J. 2015. Sin, purity and the $\pi\alpha\rho\iota\tau\eta$ offering. (In *Vetus Testamentum* 65. Leiden: Brill, p. 606-620).
- O'Keefe, J. & Reno R. R. 2005. Sanctified vision: An introduction to Early Christian interpretation of the Bible. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.
- Osborn, E. 2000, Love of Enemies and Recapitulation. *Vigiliae Christianae*. 54 (1): 12-31.
- Osborn, E. 2001. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Padgett, K. W. 2010. Sufferation, *han*, and the blues: Collective oppression in artistic and theological expression. Columbus: University of Ohio. (Thesis – MFA).
- Park, A. 1984. Minjung theology: a Korean contextual theology. *Indian journal of theology*, 33 (4): 1-11.
- Park, A. 1985. Minjung theology: a Korean contextual theology. *Pacific Theological Review*, 18:2, pp. 17–29.

- Park, A. 1993. The wounded heart of God: The Asian doctrine of *han* and the Christian doctrine of sin. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Park, A. 1996. Racial conflict and healing: An Asian-American theological perspective. Maryknoll: Orbis Books (reprinted ed. 2009. Eugene: Wipf & Stock).
- Park, A. 2001. A theology of the Way (Tao). *Interpretation: a journal of Bible and theology*, 55 (4): 389-399.
- Park, A. 2004. From hurt to healing: A theology of the wounded. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Park, A. 2009. Triune atonement: Christ's healing for sinners, victims, and the whole creation. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Park, A. 2011. Response to Espinosa, G. (*In Wading through many voices: Toward a theology of public conversation*. Recinos, H. ed. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, p.152–154).
- Park, A. and Nelson, S. 2001. The other side of sin: Woundedness from the perspective of the sinned-against. Albany: State University of New York.
- Parvis, S. and Foster, P. 2012. Introduction: Irenaeus and his traditions (*In Irenaeus: Life, scripture, legacy*. Parvis, S. and Foster, P. eds, Fortress: Minneapolis. p. 1-12).
- Payton, J. R. 2016. Irenaeus. (*In T&T Clark companion to the doctrine of sin*. Johnson, K. L & David, L. eds. London: Bloomsbury).
- Pears, A. 2010. Doing contextual theology. London: Routledge.
- Pearson, B. 1990. Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.
- Poulsom, M. G., van Erp, S., & Boeve, L. eds. 2017. Grace, governance and globalization. London: Bloomsbury.

- Presley, S. O. 2005. Irenaeus and the Gnostics on 1 Corinthians 15:53-54. *The Biblical Studies Foundation*.
https://bible.org/article/irenaeus-and-gnostics-1-corinthians-1553-54#P58_17843 Date accessed: 5 October, 2019
- Presley, S. O. 2015. The intertextual reception of Genesis 1-3 in Irenaeus of Lyons. Leiden: Brill.
- Przyszychowska, M. 2018. We were all in Adam: The unity of mankind in Adam in the teaching of the Church Fathers. Puławska E. *trans.* Warsaw: De Gruyter.
- P'yochun Kuko Taesachon Selol Ilchungtang*, 1978. Seoul, Ilchungtang, p. 1394.
- Rajkumar, P. 2010. Dalit theology and Dalit liberation: Problems, paradigms, and possibilities. England: Ashgate.
- Ramelli, I. 2013. The Christian doctrine of *apokatastasis*: A critical assessment from the New Testament to Eriugena. Leiden: Brill.
- Rauschenbusch, W. 1917. A theology for the social gospel. New York: Macmillan Company.
- Reardon, P. H. 2015. Reclaiming the atonement, Volume 1: The incarnate Word. Chesterton: Ancient Faith.
- Robinson, M. E. 2007. Korea's twentieth-century odyssey: A short history. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i.
- Sanchez, M. C. 2019. Calvin and the Resignification of the World: Creation, Incarnation, and the Problem of Political Theology in the 1559 Institutes. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.
- Sanders, E. P. 1985. Jesus and Judaism. Philadelphia: Fortress.

- Sanders, E. P. 2008. Sin, Sinners (New Testament) (*In The Anchor Bible dictionary*, vol VI. Freedman, D. N. ed. New York: Yale University Press, p 40-47).
- Schultz, D.R. 1978. The origin of sin in Irenaeus and Jewish pseudepi-graphical literature. *Vigiliae Christianae*, 32: 161–190.
- Schlier, H. 1985. Kephale (*In Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, abridged in one vol. Kittel G., Friedrich, G., and Bromily, G.W. eds. Grand Rapids: Eardmans. p. 673-82).
- Schleiermacher, F., 1800. On religion: Speeches to its cultured despisers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schleiermacher, F., 1830. The Christian faith, Sections 1-19. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- Sesboüé, B. 2000. Tout récapituler dans le Christ: christologie et sotériologie d'Irénée de Lyon. Paris: Desclée de Brower.
- Smith, H. P. 1911. The Hebrew view of sin. *The American journal of theology*, 15 (4): 525-545.
- Son, C-H, 2000. *Haan* (한, 恨) of Minjung theology and *han* (한, 韓) of *han* philosophy: In the paradigm of process philosophy and metaphysics of relatedness. Lanham: Oxford: University Press.
- Steenberg, M.C. 2009. Of God and man: Theology as anthropology from Irenaeus to Athanasius. New York: T&T Clark.
- Steenberg, M.C. 2008. Irenaeus on creation: the cosmic Christ, and the saga of redemption. Supplements to *vigiliae Christianae* texts and studies of Early Christian life and language. Leiden: Brill.
- Stegemann, E., & Wolfgang, S. 2001. *The Jesus Movement*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press. 1997. Translated from, *Urchristliche Sozialgeschichte*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

- Suh, N. D. 1981. Towards a theology of *han* (*In Minjung theology: People as the subject of history*. Kim, Y. B. *ed*, Singapore: A CTC-CCA Publication, p. 55-69).
- Taylor, C. 2007. *A Secular Age*. Cambridge: Belknap.
- Taylor, C. 1995. Overcoming epistemology. (*In Philosophical arguments*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p. 7-8).
- Tertullian. De patientiae. 1885. Thelwall, S. *trans.* (in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Ed. Roberts, A., Donaldson, J., and Coxe, A. C. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co).
- Thompson, D.M. 2008. Introduction: mapping Asian Christianity in the context of world Christianity. (*In Christian theology in Asia*. Kim, S.C.H., *ed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tiessen, T. L. 1993. Irenaeus on the salvation of the unevangelized. Ann Arbor, MI: Scarecrow.
- Tuininga, M. 2017. Calvin's political theology and the public engagement of the church: Christ's two kingdoms. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Twombly, C. C., 2015. Perichoresis and personhood: God, Christ, and salvation in John of Damascus. Eugene: Pickwick.
- Unger, D. J. 1992. St. Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies. New York: Paulist.
- Urban, W. M. 2013. Language and reality: The philosophy of language and the principles of symbolism. New York: Routledge.
- Valsamis, G. *ed*. 2018. Septuagint Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Wisdom, Sirach: The Greek Old Testament. Athens: Elpenor.

- Vanhoozer, K. 2006. Four theological faces in biblical interpretation. (*In Reading scripture with the church: Toward a hermeneutic for theological interpretation. Adam, A. K. M ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.*)
- van Kooten, G. H. 2010. Christianity in the Graeco-Roman world: socio-political, philosophical, and religious interactions up to the Edict of Milan (CE 313) (*In The Routledge companion to early Christian thought. Bingham, D. J. ed. Abingdon: Routledge, p. 3-37*).
- Vogel, J. 2007. The haste of sin, the slowness of salvation: An interpretation of Irenaeus on the fall and redemption. *Anglican theological review*, 89 (3): 443-459.
- Ward, G. 2005. Christ and culture. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Weaver, D.F. 2001. How sin works: A review essay. *Journal of religious ethics*, 29 (3): 473–501.
- Weaver, J.D. 2011. The nonviolent atonement. 2nd edition. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- Weinandy, T. G. & Keating, D. A. 2017. Athanasius and his legacy: Trinitarian-incarnational soteriology and its reception. Minneapolis: MN: Fortress.
- Wells, I. B. 1892. Southern horrors: Lynch law in all its phases.
<https://www.gutenberg.org/files/14975/14975-h/14975-h.htm> Date of access: 15 Aug. 2021.
- Wells K.M. 1995. South Korea's minjung movement: The culture and politics of dissidence.
Wells, K.M., ed. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i.
- Widdicombe, P. 2003. The wounds and the ascended body: The marks of crucifixion in the glorified Christ from Justin Martyr to John Calvin. *Laval théologique et philosophique*, 59 (1): 137-154.
- Wiley, T. 2002. Original sin: Origins, developments, contemporary meanings. Mahwah: Paulist.

- Williams, R. 1979. *The wound of knowledge: Christian spirituality from the New Testament to St. John of the Cross*. Cambridge, MA: Cowley (second revised ed. 1990. London, UK: Darton, Longman & Todd).
- Wingren, G. 1959. *Man and the incarnation: A Study in the biblical theology of Irenaeus* (reprinted ed. 2004. Eugene: Wipf & Stock).
- Wittgenstein, L. 1958. *Philosophical investigations*. Anscombe, G.E.M., *trans.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Wright, N.T., 1996. *Jesus and the victory of God (Christian Origins and the Question of God 2)*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Yoo, T. S. 1985, *Hankuk mukyo ui yoksa wa kujo* (The history and Structure of Korean shamanism). 5th ed. Seoul: Yonsei University.
- Younghak, Hyun. 1985. Three talks on Minjung theology. *Inter-religio*, 7: 2-40.
- Zehr, H. 1999. Restoring justice. (*In God and the victim: Theological reflections on evil, victimization, justice, and forgiveness*. Lampman, L. B. *ed.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. p. 146-159).