

CHAPTER II

R E V I E W O F LITERATURE

A. Metaphysical Understanding of Death

Every scholar knows that the view of considering man to be the most significant entity of the universe in the world of philosophy (anthropocentric), began with Socrates. He came forward when philosophical concern was "moving from the problem of nature to the problem of man."²³ At this time man began to investigate his fundamental essence and structure philosophically.

In his philosophy, Socrates came forward with his idea about the immortal soul. For him "there is an order of things behind the phenomenal world of fact to which all minds shall converge."²⁴ Mankind consists of the body and the soul. He saw the separation of the soul from the body as a metaphysical happening, and therefore, death as a metaphysical process. In this case, apparently, Socrates still held strong belief in mythical thought, which is familiar for those who follow dualistic and dichotomic thought subsequently. Socrates was the leading inspiration for other Greek philosophers concerned with the famous

²³Joseph Tong, Ph.D., Professor of Systematic and Philosophical Theology, International Theological Seminary, Syllabus and class notes on Foundation of Philosophical Theology, ITS, Los Angeles, 1988/1991/1992, p. 13.

²⁴Ibid.

dualistic and dichotomic thought. This thought is indeed a distinctive factor in Greek philosophy, meaning that the most important part of a human being is the divine and eternal soul which is immortal. Commenting on Socrates' thoughts about death, Ray S. Anderson has stated that:

The 'rehearsal of death' which characterizes the philosophy of Socrates is the process of perfecting the soul in its true knowledge of the eternal. Life and death were viewed as opposites, and because death had no power to extinguish the soul, but rather liberated it so that it might return whence it came, the life of the soul is eternal and rooted in the life of the divine.-⁵

Mircea Eliade has also quoted this idea of Socrates, that:

... the soul of man is immortal. At one time it comes to an end - that which is called death - and at another is born again, but is never finally exterminated. -⁶

Then, Plato, as a student of Socrates, was a philosopher who is famous for his concept of two worlds, that is the intelligible world and the visible world. His thoughts are formulated, in the words of Colin Brown:

the world which we see with our eyes and touch with our bodies was in reality only a world of shadows. It was a copy of the eternal world of spiritual Forms to which the pure soul could attain by philosophic contemplation. * 2 7

²⁵Anderson, "Theology ... ^ 11 p. 37.

^{2 5}Mircea Eliade, Death, Afterlife, and Eschatology: a thematic source book of the history of religions (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), p. 59.

²⁷Brown, "Philosophy . . . , " pp. 15-16.

Plato used the recollect theory²⁶ * * ²⁹ 3 to prove the pre-existence of the soul before birth. For Plato, the body or material has its existence only because the soul brings life to it. Body or material is lonesomeness (*khoora*), negative, and even evil, like a prison for the soul. Therefore, the release of the soul from the body, was of great importance for Plato, for then death need no longer be dreaded.

It is clear that the use of dualistic thought in attempting to describe the release of the soul from the body, has only been achieved through "the transcendental method, that is to say, by an investigation of the acts of consciousness in order to find out just what implications they convey."¹²⁹ In this case, Dyer reliably supports the assessment of Macguarrie who believe that,

for most of its history ... theology tended to follow the Platonic doctrine, seeing the substantiality of the soul as a guarantee of the stability and immortality of the self.³ °

Conversely, Aristotle, as a student of Plato, does not possess a clear conception of death. In fact he took a surprising departure from Socrates' and Plato's principles

^{2a}R.C. Sproul, Hai Maut Dimanakah Sengatmu?, trans. Oloria Silaen-Situmorang (Jakarta: PT BPK Gunung Mulia, 1991), p. 70.

²⁹Boros, "The Mystery . . . , " p. 11.

³⁰Harry J. Cargas and Ann White, comp., Death and Hope (New York/Cleveland: Corpus Books, 1970), p. 37.

of philosophy, especially that of dualistic thought where death is the separation of the soul from the body as a metaphysical process. He did, however, also still care about metaphysical things but only as far as "the Being and its causes (the processes by which substances come into being)."^{3x} He didn't think of dualistic man, instead he thought of man as a substance of ' *hylemorphism* ', that is, the wholeness of hyle (body) and morphe (soul) as the basic extension of man.* ³² But his philosophy of death was rather confusing. On one hand he talked about the soul as 'forms' which is more virtuous than the body, even though it can't escape from death. Conversely, he also talked about something immortal in man,³³ such as van der Weij has noted that there are ' *nus poietikos* ' which is immortal and ' *nus pathetikos* ' which is mortal, of man's soul.³⁴

The last philosopher of the Greek philosophers was Plotinus who took over the dualistic thought of Plato. He continued to perpetuate the concept that the material or

^{3x}Tong, p. 25.

³²Anton Bakker, "Badan Manusia dan Budaya," Tantangan Kemanusiaan Universal, ed. G. Mudjanto, B. Rahmanto and J. Sudarminta (Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius, 1992), p. 69.

³³M. Sastrapratedja, "Apakah Filsafat Manusia Itu?," Manusia dalam Pijar-Pijar Kekayaan Dimensi, ed. FX. Mudji Sutrisno (Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius, 1993), p. 19.

³⁴P.A. van der Weij, Filsuf-Filsuf Besar Tentang Manusia, trans. K. Bertens (Jakarta: Penerbit PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 1991), p. 38.

body is lonesomeness (*khoora*) which is merely negative or evil, yet he even thought of the material or body as nothingness (*zr/e-on*). For him, the Ultimate One is ' *To Hen* ' (The One), that is, God.³¹⁵

Plotinus, as a philosopher, attempted to distinguish the ideas of Plato from some exceptions of other philosophers such as Epicureanism, Stoicism and Skepticism.

Epicuros was rather materialist. He believed that there is an eternity of material substance composed of a tremendous number of atoms. If the body is injured at the time of death, he believed that the soul is likewise destroyed. Therefore Epicuros instructs people to spend their life with pleasure in material happiness, for there is no life after death. Because "when we are, death is not; and when death is, we are not."³⁶

Conversely, Stoa has reason to believe that man is the material link with the spirit. The spirit of man (*locjos*) is a part of divine logos, whereas the body consists of minerals as do plants and animals. Therefore the important thing in Stoicism is spiritual happiness. His motto is: "Demand not that events should happen as you wish but wish them to happen as they do happen, and you will go on well. The *que sera sera* mentality. ... fatalistic views on ³⁵

³⁵Ibid., p. 27.

³⁶David L. Bender & Richard Hagen, Death & Dying (Minnesota: Greenhaven Press, 1980), p. 23.

nature."³⁻⁷ According to Ernst Cassirer, if it were not for this fatalistic view of nature, the stoic idea would probably present no problem to theology.^{3®}

Skepticism, on the other hand, as indicated by the term 'skeptic', refers to people whose "mood is preoccupied with doubts ... the process is more enjoyable than the end. " * * * 39

In continuing the philosophy of Plato, Plotinus overemphasizes improving Plato's problem of separating body and soul. The soul will be lifted out of its individuality and unite with 'To Hen' in a state of ecstasy.

Ecstasy in unity with God can only be transient while we live our life, however, because only in death can we be one with God perfectly. When this state is reached, God will be everything and everything will be God.⁴⁰ * Or as Mohammad Hatta said: It is not God who exists in nature, but nature which is present in God.^{4x} It seems that Plotinus thinks of the material as an absolute emanation coming from 'To Hen', which fascinates man and sways him from unity with

³⁻⁷Tong, "Foundation . . .", ¹¹ p. 26.

^{3B}Ernst Cassirer, Manusia dan Kebudayaan: Sebuah Esei Tentang Manusia, ed. K. Bertens & A.A. Nugroho, trans. Alois A. Nugroho (Jakarta: Penerbit PT Gramedia, 1990), pp. 14-15.

^{t3&}Tong, p. 27.

⁴⁰van der Weij, p. 30.

■ "'Muhammad Hatta, Alam Pikiran Yunani (Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia, UI-Press, 1986), p. 168.

¹ *To Hen** . ⁴ ²

For Plotinus, if we become used to contemplating ecstasy with God during our life, when the body dies, we will enter direct unity with God. If we don't do so, however, and still look away from unity with God during our lifetime, we will come back again probably as a plant, animal, or possibly man. The principle of ecstasy, Verhaak noted is that whatever comes from '*To Hen*¹ must return to '*To Hen*', such is the divine circle. So if we run into an impasse we can deal with the problem by contemplating ecstasy and achieve momentary unity with God.⁴² ⁴³

We owe much to the Greek philosophers who established some of the important fundamental principles of man and his relation with God through their methods in which man and death were the main focus of philosophical inquiry. Some famous terminology emerged from their work, such as dialectical, transcendental, recollect methods, and dualistic or dichotomic thought. However, the metaphysical understanding of death and the belief in the immortality of the soul, constituted the main problem for theology subsequently. This was largely because the Bible has never intended death to mean the separation of the soul from the

⁴²Bakker, p. 71.

⁴³C. Verhaak, "Agustinus: Kebenaran Dalam Penerangan Ilahi", Para Filsuf Penentu Gerak Zaman, ed. Mudji Sutrisno & F. Budi Hardiman (Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius, 1992), pp. 29-30.

body, but rather the result of the wages of sin,

The concepts of dualism and immortality_z in reality were the source of inspiration for other terms, such as reincarnation, the divine soul, the emanation of God, the body as a prison of the soul, and salvation by philosophical contemplation and ecstasies at unity with God- It seems that those who do not believe in reincarnation, the divine soul, etc. do not believe in i m i n o r t a l i t y and do not think in dualistic thought either. Even though Sydney Shoemaker said that "someone who believes in immortality is not thereby committed, logically, to believing in dualism and in the possibility of disembodied existence,"⁴⁴ it is nevertheless clear that from Greek Philosophy that to have dualistic thought means to believe in immortality automatically. Therefore, I think it's better not to attempt to separate dualism from immortality.

But why did the idea of reincarnation catch most people's attention? In this case I agree with R.C. Sproul who assumed that it was because reincarnation can give another chance to live another life better than before; but, actually the great problem concerning reincarnation is to do with the continuity of consciousness.⁴⁵

**Hywel D. Lewis, *Person and Life After Death* (London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1978), p. 110.

⁴ ©Sproul, "Hai Maut " p. 72.

B. Death according to a combination between Greek
Philosophy and Theology of the Middle Ages

Augustine is a well-known theologian of the early Middle Ages and his thoughts dominated all Middle Ages philosophy. He took part in the philosophy of Neo-Platonism meaning that he adhered to Greek philosophy. His theological foundation was therefore based upon Greek philosophy, preserving its essence of dualistic thought and the concepts of the immortality of the soul.

Regarding the status of the soul which is more virtuous than the body, he was influenced by Plato. However, he holds a strange view about the identity of the soul. Does the soul come from God or from man's parents? Augustine has two contrary views, that of 'creationism' (created by God) and 'traduce-ism' (produced by parents). Therefore, based upon his "portrayal of man Augustine certainly makes of 'dedication to death¹ an intrinsic determining factor of human existence. Man is, in fact, dying as long as he exists."⁴⁶ It is because of sin in Augustine's view that "the essence of sin is a distortion of the order of the universe."⁴⁷

Then, Anselm, who is recognized on two accounts. One

⁴⁴ Boros, "The Mystery . . .," p. 9.

⁴⁷Wofhart Pannenberg, Perspective, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Ltd., Published by The Westminster Press, 1985), p. 96.

is his important work on the atonement, • why God become Man'; and the other is his ontological argument.⁴⁰ As with Augustine's philosophical views, he also deals with Greek philosophy. Even by means of his ontological argument which is very much akin to transcendentalism, it seems that he merely attempts to defend the metaphysical understanding of death held by Greek philosophy ontologically.

The last theologian of the Middle Ages is Thomas Aquinas. He is a theologian and reputed philosopher who based his ideas on the hylemorphism of Aristotle. He attempts to construct an anthropological philosophy and concludes along with Sastrapratedja* ⁹ who stated that, essentially, man consists of the soul and the body; the soul isn't demeaned under the body, conversely the body is demeaned under the soul; the soul is immortal.

Aquinas believes that the creation of every soul is the special act of God through which he is involved in the world.⁵⁰ Therefore he usually puts to use the term 'immittere' which means to put the soul into the material. For this reason he has a famous phrase: 'my soul is not me'.⁵¹ It is clear that for Aquinas the soul is the form

⁴⁸Brown, "Philosophy . . . , " p. 20.

⁹Sastrapratedja, "Manusia dalam . . . , " ^H p. 20.

⁵⁰van der Weij, "Fi Isuf-FiIsuf . . . , " ^M p. 41.

⁵¹Peter Vardy, Allah Para Pendahulu Kita: tahukah kita apa yang kita percaya?, trans ., Liem Sien Kie (Jakarta: PT BPK Gunung Mulia, 1992), p. 81.

of body (*anima forma corporis*).³² Or according to Schaeffer's phrase about Aquinas' thought that man's body is only a Symbol which he expresses in the dualism of grace and nature, as follows:

Grace, The Higher: God the Creator; Heaven and Heavenly Things; The Unseen and Its influence on the earth; *Man's Soul*; Unity.

Nature, The Lower: The created; earth and earthly things; the visible and nature and man do on earth; *man's body*; d i v e r s i t y.^{®3}

The mix of Aquinas and Aristotle's philosophy is called the 'Thomism¹ system of theology, which crystalized two types of theology, that is: natural theology and revealed theology.

Such a compromising attitude undoubtedly tends to generalize between philosophy and theology or reason and faith and even attempts to use the Bible as a source of theology to support Greek philosophy. The Bible, however, doesn't recognize many terms such as the evil body or nature, the irnmortality of the soul, death as the separation of the soul form the body, etc.

³²Nico Syukur Dister, "Thomas, Scotus, dan Ockham", Para Filsuf Penentu Gerak Zaman, ed . FX. Mudji Sutrisno & F. Budi Hardiman (Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius, 1992), pp. 46-47.

^{®3}Francis A, Schaeffer, Escape from Reason (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1968), pp. 9-10.

⁹⁴Brown, "Philosophy . . .," p. 33.

C. Reformers¹ Worldview of Death

Martin Luther as the first pioneer of the reformation talked about death in three different rubrics:

First of all, he distinguished between the death of man and animal. Referring to the punishment of God, death for human beings he called 'the death in man' (mors in homine) not 'the death of man'; while death for animals is only as "a sort of temporal causality, ... the operation of a law of nature."⁵⁵ This difference is based on 1 Cor. 15:56, but above all it is based on his monistic theology of mankind.

Secondly, concerning the awareness of death and death's constant presence, Luther believed that:

since death is a verdict of God upon our life, it then also qualifies the entire course of life. Death is not the terminal point of Life, but a qualifying characteristic of life. Consequently I am not living in the truth unless in my awareness of death I relate my entire life to the action of God manifest in my dying.⁵⁶

Thirdly, about the illegitimacy of man's despising

^{B*}Helmut Thielicke, (Death and Life [Philadelphia : Fortress Press, 1970], p 151) in his conclusion, States that, "Human death is qualitatively different from that of animals since it is not an instance of order ... but a disorder. It is the consequence of a shattered relationship to God, a sign of man's escape from the life of God, and a threatening signal of the wrath of God. Man's death is thus more than one might suspect from its physical parallel to universal creaturely death. Behind the foreground of a biological occurrence simultaneously and essentially an event of human personhood, which makes sense only in terms of man's fateful relationship with God."

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 161.

death, Luther believed that:

On this basis contempt for death is forbidden whether it arises from defiance or ignorant security. I am not to elevate myself contemptuously above death and its author; I am attentively to acknowledge it and submit myself to it. Only in this way do I allow for the fact that there is nothing (myself included) that is greater than God, on the basis of which I might nourish the hope of overcoming his blow and his punishment. Only God himself can heal the wounds which he has inflicted; only God's love is greater than his wrath.⁵⁷

Johannes Calvin, like the other reformers had a special concept of death in his ontological analysis of man. For him the soul is a lasting substance which is also created, the noble substance of man.⁵⁸ In this case, created doesn't mean to pour the soul into the body, but rather the beginning of existence from nothingness. He talked about the soul where the image of God (*tzelem*) is present, as the essence of man takes its course. Meanwhile the likeness (*demuth*) is changeable. As such, it is the image and the likeness which expressed the characteristics of Adam totally.⁵⁹

Calvin firmly opposed the Manichaeism conception which taught that the breath of life which God breathed into

⁵⁷Ibid.

⁵⁸Johannes Calvin, *Institutio Christianae Religionis*, in the *Sumber-Sumber Sejarah Gereja nomor 1* series, ed. Dr. Th. van den End, trans. Winarsih Arifin and Th. van den End (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 1983), p. 35.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 36

man nostrils, is the transplant of the essence of God.⁶⁰

This means they taught about the emanation of soul from God .

Calvin warned Christians not to seek clarification of the soul in the mind of philosophers. He insisted that they do not know that the essence of man is broken, that man's condition before falling into sin is very different from his condition as sinner. They do not know that the wages of sin are death.

But how about the soul when man is dying? In this case, Calvin dealt with the resurrection of body. At first, he was critical of the Chiliasts, who had to place a limit on the Kingdom of Jesus of only one thousand years. The millennium kingdom in Rev. 20:4 according to Calvin is not, however, about the happiness of the church for eternity but for the rest of the church's life while it remains confronted with its struggle in the world.

Furthermore, Calvin says that people who think that the soul will be resurrected together with the body, think of man's death totally, and such a conception means that they perceive the soul only as a blowing breath, so that the body is more noble than the soul. But conversely for people who believe that the soul is immortal, after death the immortal soul will change to another new body; this means that they reject the resurrection of the natural body.⁶¹

⁶⁰Ibid., p.

Calvin believed that the soul has a longer life than the body. He based this conception on the words of Jesus in saying: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up."⁶² Because the function of the soul is to continue the enjoyment of living with God after the body has died. Thus the soul will keep its essence as the noble substance which is full of grace (in this way Calvin interpreted the words of Jesus: "Truly I say to you, today you shall be with Me in Paradise"⁶³).

It is clear that Calvin talked only about a soul that cannot die, especially in referring to the post-death condition of the believers; whereas, unbelievers have a steady eternal death including their soul. This is the separation of God as the wages of Adam's sin.⁶⁴ Therefore, Calvin also talks about the death of the soul, but it is rather the eternal death and not about the total death.

Certainly, we owe much to Luther and Calvin who established the principles of man's death as the important fundamental thought for the future Reformed theology of death. But in this case, given that the Toraja Church is one of the Calvinistic Reformed Churches, by its conception of the total death of man it seems that the Toraja Church has deviated from Calvin's view of death. For Calvin, the soul

^c=John 2:19, New American Standart Bible.

^{s3}Luke 23:43, New American Standart Bible.

^s"Calvin, p. 47.

is a lasting or noble substance of man, based on the twofold understanding that God created man. The CTC however, along with Luther, rejected the twofold understanding, claiming instead that the soul and the body are equal and because the image (tzelem) and the likeness (demuth) are a clear case of Hebrew paralelism indicating a single idea.

D. Death according to Rationalism and Empiricism

The Enlightenment was identified by the appearance of modern concepts about death, beginning with Rationalism and Empiricism. The thinking was more humanistic and emphasized reason, so that the authority of the traditional learning theory and doctrine of the churches, was pushed to the sidelines during this era.

The Enlightenment began with Francis Bacon, who took "the learning and Science out from theology, philosophy, and ¹ superstition¹ . . ."⁶⁵In seeking genuine knowledge, Bacon used an inductive method. Such a method indicates that Bacon did not hypothesize about 'what is death¹. He only knows that everyone is obsessed by his own death. He said that "men fear death as children fear to go in the dark; and as that natural fear in children is increased with tales, so is the other."⁶⁶ Therefore the important thing for Bacon was not

⁶⁵Tong, "Foundation . . . , ¹¹ P- 48.

⁶⁶Gladys Hunt, The Christian Way of Death (Michigan: Grand Rapids, 1971), p. 16.

to think about what death is but how to take care of our health practically and more rationally so as to prolong life.⁶⁷ Matters beyond this rational life he defined as unreasonable and therefore outwith scientific study.

Rene Descartes is one of the rationalist philosophers together with Spinoza and Leibniz. They were all committed to the deductive method of inquiry. Descartes developed a philosophy of self-consciousness. His philosophy was based on subjectivity. He said that,

our approach to knowledge must be governed by doubt: we reject everything which, when tested by pure reason, appears uncertain.⁶⁸

The famous axiom of Descartes is: 'Cogito ergo sum' (I think therefore I am).

Descartes' philosophy of body and soul has been explained by Jacques Choron as follows:

that the body belongs to the world of matter (res extensa), subject to the laws of motion and which can therefore be understood as a mechanical system, whereas the mind is unextended, thinking substance (res cogitans). There is a radical dualism between the two kinds of substance, and what gives life to the body is not the mind or soul, but "animal spirit". The mind or

⁶⁷ On page 207, Aging And The Elderly, edited by Stuart F. Spicker, et. al., published in Atlantic Highlands New Jersey by the Humanities Press, 1978, Steven R. Smith quoted Bacon as "one of several writers who thought it possible to preserve youthfulness."

⁶⁸Gerald R. Cragg, The Church and the Age of Reason 1678-1789 (England: Penguin Books, 1950), p. 38.

Kees Bertens, "Masalah 'Dunia' dalam Filsafat Manusia", Sekitar Manusia, ed. Soerjanto Poespowardoyo & K. Bertens (Jakarta: Penerbit PT Gramedia, 1983), p. 15. Bertens stated that Descartes' philosophy of subjectivity even still useful until today.

soul inhabits the body.⁶⁹

The essence of the body is extendable, therefore death only refers to the body, whereas the soul that is 'I' should not die. The only exact truth is 'I am there/exist' as the substantial truth, which is based on the premises of consciousness and unextended. In other words, the 'I', mind or soul is immortal. It inhabits the body, because what gives life to the body is animal spirit rnechanically.

Spinoza, as a rationalist philosopher, was more rational than Descartes. For Descartes, God is the Creator; but for Spinoza, God is identified by the whole universe. God and Nature is a unity. They are interchangeable. This means that Spinoza held a pantheistic belief. According to this belief, the body is God's way of existing in space; and the soul is God's way of existing in thought.

That's why Spinoza advised that we should not dread death.

A free man is one who lives under the guidance of reason, who is not led by fear, but who directly desires that which is good, who strives to act, to live, and to preserve his being on the basis of seeking his true advantage,⁷⁰

In this way we shouldn't dread death, and neither should we believe in the iinmortality of the soul, inasmuch as this is created by man's consciousness. So it follows that when

⁶⁹Jacques Choron, Death and Western Thought (New York: Collier Books, 1963), p. 112.

⁷⁰Choron, "Death . . . , " p. 121.

consciousness has gone, so has substance. Therefore there is no concept of the immortality of the soul.

Leibniz was also a rationalist philosopher who combined the mechanistic nature of Descartes and Spinoza with the conception of teleological nature, or the combination of metaphysical proof and scientific proof, such as J. Tong stated:

As opposed to Descartes' Dualism and Spinoza's Monism, Leibniz proposes the Pluralistic view of reality. Though he basically agrees with Spinoza's monistic Single Substance Theory, he proposes that the universe is a constellation of monads. He uses the term monads to designate the true atoms of Nature. The Monads are force or energy. Monad has no extension, no shape, and no size. It is like a metaphysical point which relates each to the other. It is logically prior to any corporeal form or material atom. All monads behave in unity or order universe - the preestablished harmony.⁷¹

Leibniz "argues that one must avoid confounding a prolonged unconsciousness, which come from a great confusion of perception, with absolute death, in which all perception would cease."⁷² He distinguished between the rational soul which is immortal and the simple soul on the premise that no living creature perishes completely. There is only a return to perception.

Conversely, David Hume together with John Locke and George Berkeley were Empiricists, as opposed to Rationalist thinkers. Their philosophy was based not on reason but on

⁷¹Tong, p. 53.

⁷²Choron, p. 130.

experience.

Hume is famously referred to as the leading philosopher of skepticism. He was skeptical of all arguments that in reality never had more than the assumption of probability. Based upon this skepticism, Hume believed that there are no miracles.

"Our ideas reach no further than our experience", Hume left no room for the certainty of the knowledge of God. He attempts to demonstrate that the notion of the existence of God is based upon some version of causality, which in itself is not and cannot be accepted as a-priori necessity.⁷³

Therefore, for Hume there are two terms which come under attack, that is the meanings of substance and causality. Firstly, there is no 'self' as a substance that is allowed by experience. Secondly, there is only a line of phenomenon and not of causality.

For this reason Hume absolutely opposed the concepts of resurrection and the immortality of the soul because they are contrary to nature's law. For him, there is no evidence that the soul can not die.

Other philosophers and even theologians who have rejected the understanding of the immortal soul during this era have been noted by Choron, they are:

Alexander Radishchev ... considers the arguments for the mortality of the soul more convincing than those for immortality. ... he comes to the conclusion that the purely metaphysical and rationalistic arguments are inadequate and that one therefore has to include "reason of the heart."¹¹ ...

³Ibid . , pp. 58-59.

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679). .. The soul is not immortal, Hobbes maintains, but on the Day of Judgment God will raise the faithful with glorious and spiritual bodies, whereas the sinners will suffer a second and everlasting death. Of course this is a miracle, but "God, that could give life to a piece of clay, hath the same power to give life again to a dead man, and renew his inanimate, and rotten, carcass into glorious, spiritual, and immortal body." ... the French materialists of the eighteenth century, the denial of the immortality of the soul became the philosophical position par excellence. ... the accent was on life, and death was merely the unavoidable and unpleasant "natural accident," the thought of which had better be kept in the background. ... Immortality was a "priestly lie". ... D'Holbach (1723-1789). ... Fear of death is the only true enemy that has to be conquered, and that there is no after-life makes us free from the power of the priests. Condorcet (1743-1794). ... Certainly man will not become immortal; but may not the distance between the moment in which he draws his first breath, and the common term, when in the course of nature, without malady, without accident, he finds it impossible any longer to exist, be necessarily protracted?⁷⁴

Generally, Rationalist and Empiricist philosophers still believed in God (His self-existence and pre-existence), but they did not believe in the revelation of God (God is transcendent but not immanent - Deism known by nature and reason). Revelation and the immortality of the soul were the concepts left behind. Materialism dominated the philosophical framework at this time. And, whatever the kind of materialism, it must reject immortality. Or, in other words, for these thinkers immortality is an unreasonable matter and refers to spiritualism. In that case, the question is: can the definition of total death of

⁷⁴Choron, pp. 133-135.

can be classified as the concept of materialism? Or has the CTC been influenced by the enlightenment worldview?

E• Death according to the Modern/Secular Philosophy

The indication of failing interest in the authority of religion during the era of the Enlightenment is even more evident in the 19th and 20th centuries. While modern philosophers have done their best to reject theology, nevertheless, not all have lost interest. Theology "is undergoing extensive reappraisal".⁷⁵ But let me note the following 19th and 20th centuries modern/secular philosophers who also need to be reviewed.

Hegel was a philosopher of idealism, who activated a new argument of personal immortality.

Some interpreters even hold that Hegel regarded immortality as something that stands for "the infinitude of spirit and the absolute value of spiritual individuality." For him "immortality is a present quality of the spirit, not a future fact or event." ⁷⁵

Hegel worked on his new dialectic method, where the thesis and antithesis should be reconciled and not put in conflict as in the dialectic method of Greek philosophy. This is why, once he "came to formulate his philosophy of the spirit, 'everything is Spirit, and Spirit is everything', a significant change in his view of death takes * ⁷⁶

⁷⁵Ibid., p.

⁷⁶Ibid., p.

place.^{1,77}

About what constitutes man and death according to Hegel thinking, Choron has quoted Alexandre Kojève's reading of Hegel, who points out that,

"the man Hegel analyses is not what the Greeks and subsequent philosophy believed to have perceived - a purely natural being - but man as he appears in the pre-philosophical judeo-christian tradition ... the free historical individual (•person¹)." ... to describe man as the free historical individual is to describe him as finite on the ontological plane, as "worldly," or spatial and temporal on the metaphysical, and as "mortal" on the phenomenological planes. On this latter plane man appears as a being always conscious of his death, who often accepts it freely and sometimes even inflicts it upon himself voluntarily.^{7a}

In many respects Nietzsche "belongs to that group of thinkers who fit into the loose designation of 'philosophers of life,'¹ whose common bond is their revolt against Cartesian rationalism and their attempts to explain all reality in terms of life. Their answers to death, however, and their concern with it, vary greatly.¹¹⁷⁹

For Nietzsche, there is no God now. The old God is dead. What Nietzsche believes is that there's nothing new in this world. Everything is in the eternal circle. Everything fades away and everything exists again; everything is dead and everything is born again; everything breaks into pieces and everything is pieced together. The present happening has

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 153.

⁷⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., p. 209.

happened in the past and will happen in the future. The eternal way is circling.^{a0} Death is precisely that. The same goes for birth. Man is born to be there/exist (esistere sulla terra) and essentially should exist again because of the eternal circle.

Scheler is a contemporary philosopher who uses the phenomenological method. He attempts to prove that something continues to live after man's death. Choron stated:

Scheler, in short but characteristically penetrating study of the problem, 'Death and Survival'¹, cites two more: the endeavour to demonstrate empirically the existence and activity of the souls of the dead - Spiritism (or Spiritualism) - and one that consists of making more or less daring analogies in which the basic conditions of our experience are extended to the sphere of being that lies outside of experience. Scheler has in mind here Fechner's «inductive metaphysics," where death is assumed to be a second birth.^{a1}

For Scheler, everything that we see in this world is uncertainty. Therefore we need to look for the certain things in 'Erlebnisse' (experience of consciousness) . There we meet with 'I' which makes up man's spiritual substance. Man and animals are equals, with the exception of man's ability to think. In addition to thought, man also has 'love' as the core of his phenomenon. In other words, if a person has no love, it means that he is equal to an animal. That's why "Scheler scorns the 'metaphysical frivolity' of philosophers who do not want to deal with ultimate

^{a0}Louis Leahy, Aliran-Aliran Besar Ateisme
Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius, 1985), pp. 20-21.

questions, and the problem of death in particular."⁸²

Love is pure and the ultimate of love is God . Therefore what is really survival after death?

Scheler does not ask how immortality can be proved, for it cannot be proved. "To be immortal" is a negative "fact" (sachverhalt), and as such is incapable of proof. Therefore, he speaks of the "survival of the person," not of its so-called immortality. But if we had empirical evidence of survival, then we could with some justification infer the possibility of what is usually called immortality.⁸³

Finally, Heidegger is a secular Existentialist philosopher, who based his work on the main principle of existentialism that 'man is really human nature if he is really free, and he is really free if he is an atheist'.⁸⁴ Thus Heidegger was also an atheist philosopher. His philosophy was based on 'being there'. He said that everyone has the experience of death from birth. Man is 'stranded' (geworfen) in this world 'towards death' (zum tode) in such a way, so that the existence ("existenz", "dasein") of man is the same with "being there towards death" (sein-zum-tode).⁸⁵ Man is 'being there' only if he is seen as a totality. The totality is visible in an experience called 'angst' which shows how man run away from himself. 'Angst'

⁸²Ibid., pp. 270-271.

⁸³Ibid., p. 213.

⁸⁴Leahy, "Aliran-Aliran", p. 58.

⁸⁵Christ Verhaak, "Kematian dan Harapan", Manusia dalam Pijar-Pijar Kekayaan Dimensi, ed. FX. Mudji Sutrisno (Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius, 1993), p. 152.

disputed principles can be reconciled, such as Hegel did with his dialectic method. It is unfortunate that Hegel thought of death only as a reconciliation of the spirit with his self. The same goes for Nietzsche who believes that death essentially prevails eternally. Such are the various conceptions among other contemporary philosophers who commonly tend to say that it is not necessary to be confused over death issues. They commonly emphasise practical matters, so that they become more ethical than dogmatical. They tend to skip away from difficult doctrinal questions about eternal life.

G. Many more Western Viewpoints of death in the last 20th Century

For the time being, I will end this chapter (which is dominated by Western philosophical and theological viewpoints of death) with the following viewpoints.

James Scully has stated that for many Christians, death is precisely that (based on Stephen's words: "Lord Jesus receive my spirit", Acts 7:59), handing his spirit, his soul, his inner being over to Jesus. Therefore, death can no longer be a thing to dread.⁹⁰ It seems that such an idea is equal to the metaphysical understanding of death, that is, death is the separation of the soul from the body.

So it is with Elisabeth Kubler-Ross who, basing her

⁹⁰Bender 5 Hagen

"Death . p. 19.

is different from 'furcht', because 'angst' causes man to forget his 'being there'. Therefore, the last possibility of 'angst' is to show itself, namely, dying. Consequently 'angst' is the 'fear to die'.^{as} "Death, in the widest sense, is a phenomenon of life, which Heidegger designates 'dying' (Sterben) in contrast to the act of 'demi se' (Ableben). ... Every man is constitutionally thrust toward his death. He appropriates it and relates himself to it in every moment of life."^{a7}

For Heidegger, "death ... is indeed 'the finality of life'; it is also, 'the finality in life', or (better) 'life in its finality'."^{as} In the other words, "life towards death",^{86 * * 89 * *} which means everyone should attempt to activate his own consciousness of life as a person.

It can be concluded that entering the 19th century, contemporary philosophers have varying and individual critiques from previous philosophers. In such a way, dualism and immortality seem to be left behind but it's unlikely that their methods can be ignored; nevertheless,

⁸⁶Ibid., pp. 152-154.

^{a7}Helmut Thielicke, "Death . . . " , p. 79.

^{sa}Norman Pittenger, After Death: Life in God (new York: The Seabury Press, 1980), p. 6.

^{B9}Ibid.

See also A Hand Book of Christian Theology (Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1958), p. 71. "Heidegger read off the deepest meaning of our life as an 'existence-unto-death'."

ideas on psychiatric aspects of terminal illness, spelled out five emotional stages dying patients experience - denial, anger, bargaining, depression, and acceptance - saying that,

death is the final stage of growth in this life. There is no total death. Only the body dies. The self or spirit, or what ever you may wish to label it, is eternal.^{9 x}

Conversely, Robert M. Herhold says:

If life after death could be empirically verified beyond a shadow of a doubt, then there would seem to be little need for faith. It would be the thanatologist rather than the believer who would inherit the kingdom of heaven.⁹²

This means that both Kubler-Ross and Christian who believes in the immortality of the soul seem do not need Easter, because immortality replaces the resurrection.

Whereas, Herbert Spencer Jennings representing a biological view of life after death States that,

if we are to found our outlook of the world on what we discover in the scientific study of life, we are compelled to break with the notion that personality, individual identity, continues after death.⁹³

Biological Science has no support for a doctrine which convinces individuals that the same individuals continue to live after the event that we call death.

Paul Tillich says that in thinking about death and whether there is life after death, we should think about

^{9x}p. 33.

^{9*}p.

⁹³p.

cannot be definitely proved.**

Secondly, there is no question of man's fundamental problem is his apparent termination of existence at death and it is unlikely that the problem will ever be resolved

Thirdly, it seems that it is only Kubler-Ross who firmly states that only the body dies. Her view seems to be an accurate and logical solution to the problem of death, especially for many modern Christians who do not want to be confused by the dogmatic conceptual controversy of resurrection.

Fourthly, immortality and eternal life seem to be the two overlapping terms that make the conception of the total death of man unthinkable.

H. Summary and Implications for Present Study.

Throughout this chapter, it has been demonstrated that the philosophical and theological conception of death is very much defined by the dominant worldview of the particular era, depending on the system of thought such as metaphysical question of whether there is a relationship between 'Human Being/the World/Nature/the Secular' with ¹ God/Supernature/the Sacred world'. If there is a relationship between man and God ontologically, it seems that death means a metaphysical process emphasizing the

⁹⁶Bender & Hagen, p. 108.

immortality of the soul; but if not, death means a finality of life.

In a review of selected literature and previous conceptions, it was suggested that in addition to whether there is a relationship between man and God or not, is the different conception of 'man's existence and substance' especially regarding the status of the body and the soul. It is hypothesized that the stronger one's belief in man as a whole body and soul (totally), the more likely one is to acknowledge *the total death of man*; conversely, the stronger one's belief in the soul as a noble or divine substance (immortal), the more likely one is to see death as a metaphysical process in which only the body dies. It is apparent that both philosophy and science tend to diminish the sovereignty of God in dealing with man's death, but it is a wonder that they tend to agree with the idea of the total death of man.

Apparently, James Barr is right to conclude that it is unlikely that philosophy and theology will ever be separated.⁹⁷ It will be helpful, as Dr. Tong suggested in his class lecture on *Foundation of Philosophical Theology* that it is impossible for modern theology to avoid the philosophical system of thoughts, but rather to use its questions in theological method of inquiries functionally.

⁹⁷James Barr, *Alkitab Di Dunia Modern* trans T 7 Cairns (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 1989) p jng * * '