BOOK REVIEWS

A. S. van der Woude  The World of the Bible  (Colin J. Hemer)
Ernest W. Nicholson  God and His People, Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament  (W. A. Strange)
H. G. M. Williamson  Ezra and Nehemiah  (Derek Kidner)
Irving M. Zeitlin  Ancient Judaism -- Biblical Criticism from Max Weber to the Present  (Gerald Hegarty)
F. Watson  Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach  (John M. G. Barclay)
John Stambaugh and David Balch  The Social World of the First Christians  (Derek J. Tidball)
Boniface Ramsey  Beginning to Read The Fathers  (Frederick W. Norris)
Maurice Wiles  God's Action in the World  (Richard Sturch)
Paul K. Jewett  Election and Predestination  (Gordon Palmer)
Oliver O'Donovan  On the Thirty-Nine Articles: A Conversation with Tudor Christianity  (Gerald Bray)
Alan P. F. Sell  Theology in Turmoil. The Roots, Course and Significance of the Conservative-Liberal Debate in Modern Theology  (Trevor Hart)
William Oddie  After The Deluge: Essays Towards the Desecularization of the Church  (John S. Went)
Charles Villa-Vicencio  Between Christ and Caesar: Classic and Contemporary Texts on Church and State  (James J. Stamoolis)
Phil Parshall  Beyond the Mosque: Christians within Muslim Community  (Vivienne Stacey)
Alastair V. Campbell  A Dictionary of Pastoral Care  (Derek J. Tidball)
Roger F. Hurding  Roots and Shoots: A Guide to Counselling and Psychotherapy  (Gary R. Collins)

In this issue

Editorials: Marriage and singleness in Paul and today; Jesus in history  39
Justification: the new ecumenical debate  43
Alistair McGrath
Go therefore and make disciples . . .  48
Hans Kvalbein
The Paulinism of Acts again  53
David Wenham
Theological trends in Asia  55
Bong Rin Ro
Two review articles: Pseudonymity; Isaiah  58
Book reviews and notes  60

An international journal for theological students
75p
Vol. 13     No. 2
Editorial:
Marriage and singleness in Paul and today

One of the commonest misunderstandings around — among theologians and others — is that the apostle Paul had a negative view of marriage and sex. In fact, on that, as on so many other matters, he had a positive and balanced viewpoint, which we would do well to embrace in an age when there is so much confusion and hurt in this area. We could sum up the Pauline view and indeed the view of Scripture as a whole — under three headings:

1. Human sexuality is an important, powerful and good part of God’s creation. Paul’s description of the church as the radiant bride of Christ in Ephesians 5:23 is most obvious evidence for his positive view of marriage. He portrays the marriage relationship as something beautiful (compare Rev. 21:29), and not just as beautiful but as comparable to the intimate relationship of love between Christ and his church. And, lest anyone suppose that he has an unreal, other-worldly view of marriage (as some people do have), it should be noted that he refers specifically to marriage as something involving the bodies of husband and wife.

The Ephesians passage is not isolated in Paul’s writings: in Romans 7:4, 1 Corinthians 11:3 and 2 Corinthians 11:2 (where he speaks of presenting the Corinthians to Christ as ‘a pure bride to her husband’) he compares divine-human relationships with the relationship of husband and wife.

1 Corinthians 7 is often thought to present a negative view of marriage, but is quite different from that in Ephesians 5; this has been used as an argument against the Pauline authorship of Ephesians or seen as an indication that Paul underwent a major change of opinion. But this is to misunderstand the passage, and in particular to fail to recognize the problem Paul is dealing with in the chapter. The point is that some in Corinth were putting forward the view that it is ‘good for a man not to touch a woman’ (v. 1). What they meant, as is apparent from Paul’s comments on their views, is that those who are spiritual should not have sexual relationships, and they suggested that husbands and wives should not come together (v. 3), that the unmarried should remain unmarried (v. 8, etc.), and perhaps even that the married, certainly those married to non-Christians, should divorce their partners (vv. 10f.). So there were indeed people in the early church who were negative towards sex.

Paul, however, rejects their supposedly spiritual asceticism, and, although he does believe that there is value in singleness (a point to which we shall return), he opposes the anti-sex lobby at almost every point, arguing that husbands and wives should not deprive each other of sexual intercourse, that unmarried people, except those with the special gift of singleness, should marry, and that divorce should be discouraged not encouraged. Paul recognizes very clearly in this chapter the power of the sexual drive, and when he speaks of the dangers of immorality when people are unmarried, he is not downgrading marriage so much as attacking the dangerous foolishness of those who fail to recognize the power of sexual instincts, which should not be suppressed.

That Paul’s view of marriage even in 1 Corinthians 7 is positive is hinted at in verse 4, where he speaks in a remarkable way of the equal rights of husband and wife over the partner’s body. He probably has in mind here the thought that is explicit in Ephesians 5 about husband and wife becoming ‘one flesh’ and as a consequence surrendering the right to marry (Gen. 2:23) in 1 Corinthians 6:16, when explaining that prostitution is not to be contemplated, and he probably has in mind too in 1 Corinthians 6:18, where he says, ‘who knows who in the light of Christ’s teaching, uses both to exclude immorality and to explain the mutual responsibilities of husbands and wives.

We conclude that, although Paul does not spell out his understanding of marriage in 1 Corinthians 7 since he is not addressing the question of marriage as such in this passage, but the ascetic question), he does imply the same very high view of marital union as is found in Ephesians 5. The repeated comparison that he makes of marriage to divine-human relationships, and even to relationships within the Godhead (e.g. 1 Cor. 11:3f.), suggests that he saw marriage as modelled on and a reflection of divine relationships — the highest and most beautiful relationships of all.

If some or most of this analysis is correct, then the idea that Paul is anti-marriage and sex is very far from the mark. In fact he has about as high a view of marital union as one can imagine, far higher than the view of many modern women as the glorify sex, but who see it as little more than an animal instinct or as an evolutionary mechanism for propagating the species. The divine and Christian view has all sorts of implications: it means that sex is not something to be embarrassed about or ashamed of, but, as part of God’s good creation, is something to be thankful for and to be enjoyed. It means that sexual passion, thoughts and drives are natural and powerful; to experience them is normal, not sexual, the only thing wrong is going to be used. On the other hand, it means that the proper use of sex is vitally important. To this we will return.

2. Sex is not the most important thing in life. Paul, as we have seen, has no time for the asceticism that sees marriage and sexual union as unspiritual; he sees marriage as very good.
One of the commonest misunderstandings around — among theologians and others — is that the apostle Paul had a negative view of marriage and sex. In fact, on that, as on so many other matters, he had a positive and balanced view, which we would do well to embrace in an age when there is so much confusion and hurt in this area. We could sum up the Pauline view — and indeed the view of Scripture as a whole — under three headings:

1. Human sexuality is an important, powerful and good part of God’s creation. Paul’s description of the church as the radiant bride of Christ in Ephesians 5:23 is the most obvious evidence for his positive view of marriage. He portrays the marriage relationship as something beautiful (compare Rev. 21:29), and not just as beautiful but as comparable to the intimate relationship of love between Christ and his church. And, lest anyone suppose that he has an unreal, other-worldly view of marriage (as some people do have), it should be noted that he refers specifically to marriage as something involving the bodies of husband and wife.

The Ephesians passage is not isolated in Paul’s writings: in Romans 7:4, 1 Corinthians 11:3 and 2 Corinthians 11:2 (where he speaks of presenting the Corinthians to Christ “as a pure bride to her husband”) he describes divine-human relationships with the relationship of husband and wife.

1 Corinthians 7 is often thought to present a negative view of marriage on grounds that it is quite different from that in Ephesians 5; this has been used as an argument against the Pauline authorship of Ephesians or seen as an indication that Paul underwent a major change of opinion. But this is to misunderstand the passage, and in particular to fail to recognize the problem Paul is dealing with in the chapter. The point that is made in Corinthians was putting forward the view that “it is good for a man not to touch a woman” (v. 1). What they meant, as is apparent from Paul’s comments on their views, is that those who are spiritual should not have sexual relationships, and they suggest that husbands and wives should not come together (v. 3), that the unmarried should remain unmarried (v. 8, etc.), and that, even if one of these married, certainly those married to non-Christians should divorce their partners (vv. 10ff). So there were indeed people in the early church who were negative towards sex.

Paul, however, rejects their supposedly spiritual asceticism, and, although he does believe that there is value in singleness (a point to which we shall return), he opposes the anti-sex lobby at almost every point, arguing that husbands and wives should not deprive each other of sexual intercourse, that unmarried people, except those with the special gift of singleness, should marry, and that divorce should be discouraged not encouraged. Paul recognizes very clearly in this chapter the power of the sexual drive, and when he speaks about the dangers of immorality when people are unmarried, he is not downgrading marriage so much as attacking the dangerous foolishness of those who fail to recognize the power of sexual instincts, which should not be suppressed.

That Paul’s view of marriage even in 1 Corinthians 7 is positive is hinted at in verse 4, where he speaks in a remarkable way of the equal rights of husband and wife over the partner’s body. He probably has in mind here the thought that is explicit in Ephesians 5 about husband and wife becoming “one flesh.” He has referred to that creation principle (Gen. 2:23) in 1 Corinthians 6:16, when explaining that prostitution is not to be contemplated, and he probably has it in mind too in 1 Corinthians 6:18, where he says, “he who sins sexually sins against his own body.” It becomes clear that for Paul sexual union expressed in marriage brings husband and wife into a profound union, such that they can be thought of as a shared body: the two have become one. It is this principle which Jesus in Matthew 19:9/Mark 10 uses as an argument against divorce and which Paul, who no doubt heard it from Jesus (cf 1 Cor. 7:10, where he refers to Jesus’ teaching), uses both to exclude immorality and to explain the mutual responsibilities of husbands and wives.

We conclude that, although Paul does not spell out his understanding of marriage in 1 Corinthians 7 (since he is not addressing the question of marriage as such in this passage, but the ascetic question), he does imply the same very high view of marital union as is found in Ephesians 5. The repeated comparison that he makes of marriage to divine-human relationships, and even to relationships within the Godhead (cf. 1 Cor. 11:3f), suggests that he saw marital union as modelled on and a reflection of divine relationships — the highest and most beautiful relationships of all.

If some or most of this analysis is correct, then the idea that Paul is anti-marriage and sex is very far from the mark. In fact he has argued that as high a view of marital union as one can imagine, far higher than the views of many modern writers, of the glorified sex, but who see it as little more than an animal instinct or as an evolutionary mechanism for propagating the species. The Pauline and Christian view has all sorts of implications: it means that sex is not something to be embarrassed about or ashamed of, but, as part of God’s good creation, is something to be thankful for and to be enjoyed. It means that sexual thoughts and drives are natural and powerful; to experience them is normal, not something unspiritual or to be alarmed about. On the other hand, it means that the proper use of sex is vitally important. To this we will return.

2. Sex is not the most important thing in life. Paul, as we have seen, has no time for the asceticism that sees marriage and sexual union as unspiritual; he sees marriage as very good.
But he does not consider it the highest good or an essential of human life. Indeed he seems singlesness as an even higher good, adding that the "greatest good of the human race is the well-being of the world and the well-being of the races of men of the world" is his "superior" or "supreme" good.

We are reminded of Jesus’ teaching about living for each other, however, by his parable of the talents. In the parable, the coming of God’s wonderful and exciting kingdom and told his disciples to seek the kingdom rather than worry about the things of this world. He also taught that marriage is a gift from God and is not to be taken lightly. If you are considering marriage, you should think carefully about whether it is in your best interest.
But he does not consider it the highest good or an essential of human life. Indeed he seems singleness as an even higher good. He mentions the idea of marriage being a reflection of the coming of God's wonderful and exciting kingdom and told his disciples to seek the kingdom rather than worry about the things of this life (Matt. 6:33). Paul also explains that singleness should be encouraged (1 Cor. 7:18, 26). This also explains that marrying is a this-worldly activity, not an activity of heaven (Mt. 22:23-33). Paul reflects on the importance of marriage: he believes that the Christian, whether married or single, should be looking and living for the coming of the kingdom of God. This does not mean that he is not thinking about marriage for the single person (cf. 1 Cor. 7:34-35), but that he knows that this is a simpler life for the single person (cf. 1 Cor. 7:25-28), where there is no greater concern than the kingdom of God. This concern is reflected in the fact that he says God has given the gift of self-control, which can be used for himself or herself indirectly toward the needs of others. The single person can focus on the kingdom of God and be a part of the same mission to the world as married people. However, this does not mean that the single person is not thinking about marriage for the single person as well. It is a gift given to some to remain single, not dissimilar to other gifts such as teaching or expository preaching. God has created minister to minister in ways that those with other gifts cannot.

The importance of this teaching is considerable. Secular society tends both to romanticize and to idolize sex, and to suggest that the person who does not get sexual gratification is somehow inferior. The teaching in 1 Corinthians 7:20 is that God has given the gift of self-control, which can be used for himself or herself indirectly toward the needs of others. The single person can focus on the kingdom of God and be a part of the same mission to the world as married people. However, this does not mean that the single person is not thinking about marriage for the single person as well. It is a gift given to some to remain single, not dissimilar to other gifts such as teaching or expository preaching. God has created minister to minister in ways that those with other gifts cannot.

3. Use according to the maker's instructions. Paul's very high view of human sexuality leads him to insist on its proper use. We have already seen how Paul rules out immorality because it is in opposition to the 'one-flesh' way God designed marriage, and how for the same reasons he urges husbands to love their wives and wives to love their husbands. For the same reasons he tells couples to gratuitously give up sex to seek reconciliation rather than to avoid marriage. This is why marriage is the social institution to which the biblical teaching on marriage should be applied. Marriage is the bringing into being of a new family and household, and the model of divine relationships suggests that it is an important and ongoing social property.

3. Use according to the maker's instructions. Paul's very high view of human sexuality leads him to insist on its proper use. We have already seen how Paul rules out immorality because it is in opposition to the 'one-flesh' way God designed marriage, and how for the same reasons he urges husbands to love their wives and wives to love their husbands. For the same reasons he tells couples to gratuitously give up sex to seek reconciliation rather than to avoid marriage. This is why marriage is the social institution to which the biblical teaching on marriage should be applied. Marriage is the bringing into being of a new family and household, and the model of divine relationships suggests that it is an important and ongoing social property.

4. Use according to the maker's instructions. Paul's very high view of human sexuality leads him to insist on its proper use. We have already seen how Paul rules out immorality because it is in opposition to the 'one-flesh' way God designed marriage, and how for the same reasons he urges husbands to love their wives and wives to love their husbands. For the same reasons he tells couples to gratuitously give up sex to seek reconciliation rather than to avoid marriage. This is why marriage is the social institution to which the biblical teaching on marriage should be applied. Marriage is the bringing into being of a new family and household, and the model of divine relationships suggests that it is an important and ongoing social property.
Justification: the new ecumenical debate*

Alister McGrath

We are grateful for this article to Dr McGrath, who is a particular expert on the subject of justification, having written a major two-volume work Justitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification (CUP, 1986). He is also author of ARICII and Justification: an Evangelical Anglican Assessment (Lutterer House, Oxford, 1987) and of the new Justification by Faith: An Introduction (Zondervan/Marshall, 1988). Dr McGrath, who teaches at Wycliffe Hall in Oxford, has written several other significant works in recent years which Thematic readers should be aware of, including Luther’s Theology of the Cross (Blackwells, 1985), The Making of Modern German Christology (Blackwells, 1986) and The Enigma of the Cross (Hodder, 1987).

In recent years a number of ecumenical discussions have focused on the doctrine of justification by faith. On 30 September 1983 the US Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue group released a 24,000-word document which represented the fruit of six years of discussions on the doctrine of justification. This document, entitled Justification by Faith, is by far the most important ecumenical document to deal with the theme of justification to date, and represents a landmark in ecumenical discussions. Anyone who wishes to deal with the dialogue between Protestant and Roman Catholic theologians on justification will have to make this document his point of departure. This has been followed by the report of the Second Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARICII), entitled Salvation and the Church, published on 22 January 1987. In this article we propose to examine some difficulties in the modern discussion of justification, with particular reference to these documents.

The European Reformation of the sixteenth century saw the battles-line drawn between Roman Catholics and Protestants over the doctrine of justification by faith alone. For the Protestant Reformers, the doctrine of justification was the ‘article by which the church stands or falls’. The Roman Catholic church, in their view, had fallen over this doctrine and lost its credibility as a genuinely Christian church. For the Reformers, this was more than adequately justified breaking away from the medieval church, in order to return to the authentic teaching of Scripture. The Reformers, by reclaiming at the insights of the NT and Augustine of Hippo, were able to claim that they had recovered the biblical doctrine of justification by faith.

But what were the differences between Roman Catholic and Protestant teachings on justification in the sixteenth century? We may make an immediate distinction between two types of differences: differences which were actually nothing more than misunderstandings (where both sides were saying more or less the same thing, but misunderstand each other); and differences which were disagreements (where both sides were disagreeing precisely what the other was saying, and regarded it as unacceptable). We shall consider both these types of differences.

Sixteenth-century misunderstandings: It is obvious that both Protestants and Roman Catholics agreed on the following, although their discussion of them was confused by some difficulties which we shall note below.

1. We cannot take the initiative in beginning the Christian life— it is God who moves first. Original sin prevents our finding our way back to God unaided by grace. Popular Catholic religion in the later Middle Ages was obsessed with the doctrine of justification by works, however, pointing to a radical divergence between what theologians taught and what the common people believed!

2. The foundation of the Christian life is the work of Christ, and not anything which we ourselves can do. Once more, popular Catholic piety tended to lay considerable emphasis upon merit, and showed an obsessionist interest in the various ways in which this merit could be gained and stored, rather like funds in a bank account.

3. Although the Christian life is not begun on the basis of good works, good works are the natural result of and expression of genuine Christian faith.

4. The Christian life takes place at the communal, and not just the individual, level. By beginning the Christian life, the believer finds himself within a community of faith.

None of these points was the subject of dispute between theologians in the sixteenth century—the difficulties arose primarily in relation to how these points were expressed.

An excellent example of these difficulties is provided by the term ‘justification’ itself. Following St Augustine of Hippo, the Council of Trent defined justification in terms of ‘making righteous’. Trent’s comprehensive definition of justification makes it clear that ‘justification’ includes both the initiation and the subsequent development of the Christian life, as the believer grows in holiness and righteousness. Augustine’s interpretation of the post-classical Latin term justificare as iustus facere reveals his celebrated etymological shortcomings, although the importance of this point would not be appreciated until the sixteenth century.

On the basis of the new advances in philology associated with the Renaissance, and especially the new interest in the Hebrew text of the OT, both Lutheran and Reformed theologians recognized that the verb ‘to justify’ was forensic, meaning ‘to declare or pronounce to be righteous’, and not ‘to make righteous’. Although the Reformers had a great respect for Augustine, they had no hesitation in criticizing him when the direct study of the Hebrew and Greek texts of Scripture


---

1 New York & Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1984, 397 pp., $29.95 hardback. Textbook edition $14.95 direct from the publisher at PO Box 450, Lewiston, New York 14092, USA.
as Mark 13:24-27 as referring not to the Second Coming but to the destruction of Jerusalem, an event of truly cosmic importance described by Jesus in pictorial OT language. He doubts if Jesus spoke of himself as the future coming Son of man.

In his conclusion Borg tries to relate his understanding of Jesus’ mission to Jesus’ own understanding of himself and his work. He sees Jesus as a Jewish ‘holy man’ with a deep knowledge of God whom he experienced as merciful, and as a ‘sage’ who learned in his own experience (e.g. at his baptism) that what is needed is to die to oneself and to receive a new heart from God. In speaking of the ‘kingdom’ Jesus was referring to the reality of God that he had experienced and to which he called others to experience.

The interest of Borg’s book will, I hope, be evident from my description of it, though I have not, of course, been able to do more than describe his position in general; there is also a great deal of fresh and valuable detailed exegesis. Some parts of the book and some details are less satisfactory than others.

In particular, his last two chapters and his treatment of eschatology and Christology – significant issues to say the least – may be seriously questioned. Borg over-reacts to the views of those who have seen Jesus as an apocalyptic prophet who expected an imminent end to all things by denying that Jesus had any vision of the end of the age and the ushering-in of the perfect kingdom of God; but this is to ignore the tremendous note of excitement about the breaking-in of Christ’s new age which is present both in the gospels and in the epistles (e.g. Mt. 11:2-15, important verses not commented on by Borg). His understanding of Jesus’ person is also deficient in a similar way: the Jesus of the NT is not just a holy sage offering an alternative programme to the Pharisees, but is someone far more significant: he is the Son of man bringing salvation to God’s people (cf. Dn. 7); he is the Son of the divine owner of the vineyard (cf. Mk. 12:1-12); he is the powerful presence of God on earth (cf. Mk. 2:1-11).

But despite these significant weaknesses and other less serious details which may be questioned, Borg has undoubtedly offered us an illuminating perspective on Jesus in the social context of his day. His main argument is not, I think, seriously weakened by the deficiencies of his eschatology and Christology, but could just as well be married with more traditional views of those matters: Jesus is the divine Son who brings in the new age of God’s forgiving love and who calls his people to the path not of separation and self-preservation, but to the way of self-denial and to a ministry of mercy for the world.

Borg does not react with some of the other recent and significant works on the historical Jesus, such as A. Harvey’s Jesus and the Constraints of History and B. Meyer’s The Aims of Jesus: perhaps this is to be explained by delays in publishing a book that was originally an Oxford doctoral thesis completed in 1972. But this does not prevent his book being an important contribution to an important ongoing debate. The original hardback edition was prohibitively expensive (especially for a book printed from typescript), but the appearance of the paperback edition should make the work much more accessible. Students and scholars alike need to take the book seriously, building on those insights that are sound and seeking to improve on Borg’s treatment where it is weak.


---

Justice: the new ecumenical debate*

Alister McGrath

We are grateful for this article to Dr McGrath, who is a particular expert on the subject of justification, having written a major two-volume work Justitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification (CUP, 1986). He is also author of ARICII and Justification: an Evangelical Anglican Assessment (Lutterworth House, Oxford, 1993) and of the new Justification by Faith: An Introduction (Zondervan/Marshall, 1988). Dr McGrath, who teaches at Wycliffe Hall in Oxford, has written several other significant works in recent years which Themelios readers should be aware of, including Luther’s Theology of the Cross (Blackwells, 1985), The Making of Modern German Christology (Blackwells, 1980) and The Enigma of the Cross (Hodder, 1987).

In recent years a number of ecumenical discussions have focused on the doctrine of justification by faith. On 30 September 1983 the US Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue group released a 24,000-word document which represented the fruit of six years of discussions on the doctrine of justification. This document, entitled Justification by Faith, is by far the most important ecumenical document to deal with the theme of justification to date, and represents a landmark in ecumenical discussions. Anyone who wishes to deal with the dialogue between Protestant and Roman Catholic theologians on justification will have to make this document his point of departure. This has been followed by the report of the Second Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARICCI), entitled Salvation and the Church, published on 22 January 1987. In this article we propose to examine some difficulties in the modern discussion of justification, with particular reference to these documents.

The European Reformations of the sixteenth century saw the battle-lines drawn between Roman Catholics and Protestants over the doctrine of justification by faith alone. For the Protestant Reformers, the doctrine of justification was the ‘article by which the church stands or falls’. The Roman Catholic church, in their view, had fallen over this doctrine and had lost its credibility as a genuinely Christian Church. For the Reformers, this was far more than adequately justified breaking away from the medieval church, in order to return to the authentic teaching of Scripture. The Reformers, by questioning the insights of the NT and Augustine of Hippo, were able to claim that they had recovered the biblical doctrine of justification by faith.*

But what were the differences between Roman Catholic and Protestant teachings on justification in the sixteenth century? We may make an immediate distinction between two types of differences: differences which were actually nothing more than misunderstandings (where both sides were saying more or less the same thing, but misunderstood each other); and differences which were disagreements (where both sides were saying precisely what the other was saying, and regarded it as unacceptable). We shall consider both these types of differences.

Sixteenth-century misunderstandings

It is obvious that both Protestants and Roman Catholics agreed on the following, although their discussion of them was confused by some difficulties which we shall note below.

1. We cannot take the initiative in beginning the Christian life – it is God who moves first. Original sin prevents our finding our way back to God unaided by grace. Popular Catholic religion in the later Middle Ages was obsessed with the doctrine of justification by works, however, pointing to a radical divergence between what theologians taught and what the common people believed!

2. The foundation of the Christian life is the work of Christ, and not anything which we ourselves can do. Once more, popular Catholic piety tended to lay considerable emphasis upon merit, and showed an obsession in the various ways in which this merit could be gained and stored, rather like funds in a bank account.

3. Although the Christian life is not begun on the basis of good works, good works are the natural result of and expression of genuine Christian faith.

4. The Christian life takes place at the communal, and not just the individual, level. By beginning the Christian life, the believer finds himself within a community of faith.

None of these points was the subject of dispute between theologians in the sixteenth century – the difficulties arose primarily in relation to how these points were expressed.

An excellent example of these difficulties is provided by the term ‘justification’ itself. Following St Augustine of Hippo, the Council of Trent defined justification in terms of ‘making righteous’. Trent’s comprehensive definition of justification makes it clear that ‘justification’ included both the initiation and the subsequent development of the Christian life, as the believer grows in holiness and righteousness. Augustine’s interpretation of the post-classical Latin term justificare as justus facer claims his celebrated etymological shortcomings, although the importance of this point would not be appreciated until the sixteenth century.1

On the basis of the new advances in philology associated with the Renaissance, and especially the new interest in the Hebrew text of the OT, both Lutheran and Reformed theologians recognized that the verb ‘to justify’ was forensic, meaning ‘to declare or pronounce to be righteous’, and not ‘to make righteous’. Although the Reformers had a great respect for Augustine, they had no hesitation in criticizing him when the direct study of the Hebrew and Greek texts of Scripture

showed him to be wrong — and Augustine's definition of what justification actually was actually to be recognized as a classical case of an error arising from the use of the Latin version of Scripture, rather than Scripture in its original language.

The Reformers therefore rejected the predominantly traditional concept that justification is the "beginning of the term 'justification'" — and by doing so, added considerably to the difficulties of the sixteenth century debates on justification. For the Reformers, the fact that was that Protestant and Roman Catholics used the term 'justification' to mean rather different things. For the Protestant, 'justification' refers to the new covenantal relationship with God on the basis of the internal union of Christ and believers in the beginning of the Christian life. For the Roman Catholic — who, in this matter, continues the common teaching of the west side of the Reformation of the sixteenth century — means both the event by which the Christian life is initiated and the process by which the believer is regenerated. In other words, this is a significant difference. In protestant understands by 'justification' and 'sanctification' or 'regeneration' taken together. This semantic difference led to enormous confusion at the time, as it still does to this day.

To illustrate this point, consider the following two statements. 1. We are justified by faith alone. 2. We are justified by faith and by holiness of life.

In terms of popular polemics, the former is generally identified as the Protestant, and the latter as the Roman Catholic, position. To the Protestant, the first statement stipulates that the Christian life is begun through faith alone — which means, of course, that NT teaching on the matter. To the Roman Catholic, however, the same statement implies that the Christian life is begun through faith alone and continued in the life alone — which is obviously a travesty of the NT teaching on the matter, which makes explicit reference to the Christian life being continued in holiness, obedience and good works.

Now consider the second statement. To the Roman Catholic, this would mean that the Christian life is begun through faith and continued in holiness of life — which is obviously an excellent summary of the NT teaching on the matter. To the Protestant, however, the same statement implies that the Christian life is begun through faith and continued in the life alone — which is virtually Pelagian, and a gross distortion of the NT teaching on the matter. You can see that the first statement (understood in the Protestant sense) is a matter which is actually saying more or less the same thing — but the difference is that by the second (understood in the Roman Catholic sense) are actually saying.
showed him to be wrong — and Augustine's definition of what justification actually was came to be recognized as a classical case of an error arising from the use of the Latin version of Scripture, rather than Scripture in its original language.

The Reformers therefore rejected the predominant tradition of defining justification as the "righteousness of the term" justification — and by doing so, added considerably to the difficulties of the sixteenth-century debates on justification. For instance, the very fact that Protestant and Roman Catholics used the term 'justification' to mean rather different things. For the Protestant, 'justification' refers to the inner spiritual state of the person, the terms which are used by Christians in the beginning of the Christian life. For the Roman Catholic — who, in this matter, continues the common teaching of the whole Church — the word justification means both the event by which the Christian life is initiated and the process by which the believer is regenerated. In other words, 'justification' in Protestant understanding means the event by which the individual is declared to be righteous; in Roman Catholic understanding means both the event by which the Christian life is initiated and the process by which the believer is regenerated.

For the Reformers, the justification of righteousness (sometimes also referred to in the period 1575-1700 as the 'formula cause of justification').

1. The question of assurance (which is closely linked with the concept of justification).

We have seen only to consider the first of these two questions:

1. The nature of justifying righteousness

Luther insisted that justifying righteousness was iustitia habitus, the "righteousness of Christ" — a righteousness which was extrinsic to the believer, covering him protectively in much the same way as a mother hen might cover her chicks to keep them safe. This position was taken up by both Lutheran and Reformed theologians, who held that justifying righteousness is not a righteousness inherent to the individual, but one outside him. God effectuates our justification from outside us, prior to effecting our renewal within us. The righteousness of justification was perfect and imputed, whereas that of sanctification was imperfect and progressive.

2. The question of assurance

We are accepted on the basis of a perfect righteousness — the righteousness of Christ.

The Council of Trent, however, meeting in 1546-7 to formulate the Roman Catholic response to the Reformation controversies of justification, insisted that the simple formal cause of justification was an inherent righteousness, a righteousness within the believer. Although stressing that this was not the same as justification, it would have to be based upon a perfect righteousness — and if this righteousness was inherent to the believer, how could Trent speak of a believer growing in righteousness when he already possessed a perfect righteousness? It seemed to the Reformers that any inherent righteousness was, by its very nature, imperfect and in need of supplementation — and the imputation of the alien righteousness of Christ dealt with this difficulty.

For the Reformers, it was necessary to know that one was a Christian, but that the Christian life had indeed begun, that one had been forgiven and accepted by God — and on the basis of this conviction, the living of the Christian life, with all its aspirations to purity and progress, could begin. Being justified on the basis of the external righteousness of Christ meant that all that needed to be done for an individual's justification had been done by God — and so the believer could rest assured that he had been accepted and forgiven. The Reformers could not see how Trent ensured that the individual was accepted, despite being a sinner. For the individual who goeth this way, Trent ensured his justification, he could no longer be a sinner — and yet experience (as well as the penitential system of the Catholic church) suggested that believers continually sinned. For the Reformers, the Tridentine doctrine of justification was profoundly inadequate, in that it could not accommodate the experience of continual sinning before God while still remaining a sinner. The Reformers were convinced that Trent taught a profoundly inadequate doctrine of justification as a result. The famous phrase, due to Luther, sums up this precious insight with brilliance and verbal economy: simul iustus et peccator, 'righteous and a sinner at one and the same time.'

As the Tridentine debates on justification make clear, Trent recognized exactly what Protestant theologians were saying; what they were rejected is the number of theologians present at Trent clearly sympathized with the Protestant position, they were outnumbered and outmaneuvered. The whole issue was handled in a backhanded, but deliberate, weighted and explicit rejection of the Protestant position.

Here, then, is an area where there was genuine and apparent disagreement between the Reformers in the sixteenth century. As even the most superlative survey of Protestant and Roman Catholic polemical writings from 1530 onwards makes clear, it is in relation to the doctrine of justification that the most basic and universally the question of assurance — that the real divisions were perceived to lie. It is thus of some considerable interest to note that it was precisely these two questions (originally not on Trent's agenda, incidentally — they had to be added later, when it was obvious that they could not be avoided) which caused the most bitter and protracted of the discussions of the Council of Trent. (Indeed, at one point it seemed that Trent would not be able to say anything about the question of assurance, so difficult was it proving to reach agreement).

It will therefore be clear that any attempts to engage with the doctrine of justification in the Protestant and Reformed tradition must come to terms with these two questions, which historically were regarded as central. There is little to be gained from recapitulating what was agreed in the sixteenth century (although that agreement was, of course, obscured by polemics and terminological differences), unless it can be shown that these two issues are no longer of any importance.

But what did the Anglican theologians of the Elizabethan and Jacobean eras believe? It is very easy to assume that they have to have at our disposal an excellent study of this question from the pen of the Anglican Bishop of South Carolina, Fitz Allison. In his book The Rise of Monism, Allison shows how the Anglican tradition in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries declares that the doctrine of justification (and, more specifically, the question of the nature of the two natures of Christ) is the "central point of controversy between the Church of England and Rome. Thus for Richard Hooker, 'the grand question, which hitherto yet in controversy between us and the Church of Rome, is above all the matter of justifying righteousness'. Similarly, John Davenant's Disputatio de iustitia habitu et actu (1631) — noted, incidentally, by the writers of Salvation and the Church — represents a sustained attack upon the Roman Catholic polesmicist Robert Bellarmine's views on the nature of justifying righteousness. Both Bellarmine and Davenant agreed that the crucial question dividing Catholics and Anglicans was that of the nature of justifying righteousness.

A central disagreement which must therefore be dealt with thoroughly in any ecumenical discussion of justification is this: is justifying righteousness external (the Protestant position which Bellarmine adopted) or internal (the position adopted at the abortive Diet of Regensburg in 1541, and repudiated by both Protestants and Roman Catholics in the sixteenth century?)

So what has the recent ecumenical debate on justification actually produced? It is clear that the most recent contribution to this debate is the ARCC II document Salvation and the Church, we shall attempt to answer this question with the help of some of our commentators, and by consulting this document illustrates recent trends in this discussion, and the comments which follow will be of relevance beyond the limits of the Anglican-Roman Catholic discussion of justification.

Earlier, we noted two main types of controversy concerning justification in the sixteenth century: those which reflected simple misunderstandings (in which both sides were wrong about what the other side were saying), and those which represented genuine disagreement (where each side knew what the other was saying, and didn't agree with it). The document Justification in Reformation and Renewal (1994) is very helpful to have these misunderstandings clarified. It is shown that both churches are agreed that 'even the very first movements which lead to justification, such as repentance,
the desire for forgiveness and even faith itself, are the work of God" (24); that justification is an "unmerited" gift of God (24); that our justification leads to our recreation and hence to good works as the fruit of our new freedom in Christ (19); that it makes us the "customers" of the community of the church (25), rather than a solitary life of faith. Although none of these points was actually the subject of recent doctrinal controversy, it is possible that some readers have had abundant caricatures of both the Reformation view of justification and its Roman Catholic counterpart disfigured. For the sake of the text, I will eliminate from consideration caricatures or stereotypes of doctrines with which one disagrees (8), and it is to be hoped that this document will demonstrate that both Roman Catholic and Anglican circles concerning each other's ideological heritage. Incidentally, most of these absurdities, it must be said, date from the nineteenth century.

Personally, I regard ecumenical discussions of this type as being so important that it is inappropriate to "rock the boat" by implying that certain pressing questions have not been discussed adequately, or perhaps have been set aside to one side. This is not so. It is true that some of the questions at issue would not like to suggest that these questions imply criticism of ARCIC II, but simply a need for clarification. If these questions can be clarified satisfactorily, then no criticism need result; if, on the other hand, it is evident that no clarification is forthcoming, or that ARCIC II is taking refuge in division and non-bipartisanship to minimize theological disagreement, then criticism is both demanded and deserved. Let me identify these questions.

1. What sort of justifying righteousness are we talking about?

Earlier, we noted the centrality of this question to the sixteenth-century debates on justification. ARCIC II seems to treat this question as unimportant. It is not dealt with in the discussion of salvation, or the discussion of the moral law, or in the discussion of the person of Christ. Yet, the topic of justification is a key one in the debate on justification makes no reference to the importance of this question. It is simply not addressed. Certainly, ARCIC II has made very little mention of any sixteenth-century understandings of it, especially as prior to justification, is obvious. Furthermore, the sixteenth-century debates did not concern whether something was necessary for salvation and whether Pelagianism, as both sides knew. The debate, as it involved Luther and Calvin, centered on the concept of coming to God. In ARCIC II, the concept of coming to God is largely subsumed concept of merit. If the other hand, ARCIC II is unconvincing on this point. Justification is merited congruously, we may naturally ask why those who happen to disagree with this view on the Roman Catholic side apply to the Catholic Church which presumes that the sacrament of penance, Masses for special intentions, indulgences and purgatory. These questions demand more of an explanation than they have yet received in this or other dialogues.

It is a pity that ARCIC II did not seize this opportunity to pursue this study, with a view to clarifying the bearing of the doctrine of justification (or 'salvation') on these beliefs and practices. ARCIC II must elucidate the indulgence question, clarifying the relationship to the doctrine of justification, and practices. ARCIC II must elucidate the indulgence question, clarifying the relationship to the doctrine of justification, and practices. ARCIC II must elucidate the indulgence question, clarifying the relationship to the doctrine of justification, and practices. ARCIC II must elucidate the indulgence question, clarifying the relationship to the doctrine of justification, and practices. ARCIC II must elucidate the indulgence question, clarifying the relationship to the doctrine of justification, and practices. ARCIC II must elucidate the indulgence question, clarifying the relationship to the doctrine of justification, and practices.
merit in a weaker sense of the word ("congruous merit"). No medieval theologian suggested that an individual could merit his justification in the strict sense of the word—in other words, earning justification. But some theologians, especially Franciscans and that other Dominican, James of Viterbo (such as performing good works) which made it 'appropriate' for God to justify him. God was placed under a moral, rather than a formal obligation, to act justly. And if the Reformers were, as might be expected, totally opposed to the idea that one could merit justification, in either sense of the word? It is obvious that in this connection, behind, let us consider the statement of ARICC II cited above.

Does this statement mean that the Commission excludes the traditional and contemporary Franciscan teaching that it is possible to and through the merit of the Church for the grace and salvation of one's soul, so that we must raise a question about the membership of ARICC II: while fully recognizing the difficulties attending the selection of members, the history of the doctrine of justification, especially the proceedings of the Council of Trent, would indicate the need for a Franciscan theologian to be included. The Franciscans' fiercest opponents at Trent on such questions as whether justification can be merited and the possibility of assurance were, of course, the Dominicans. The Commission is fortunate to have two Dominican members—but why exclude Franciscans, when they have such a distinctive contribution to make to such a debate? Is not the Roman Catholic contingent somewhat unrepresentative as a result? While it is true that when raising the questions thought present at the Tridentine debates on justification? In the present writer's opinion, the exclusion of Franciscans from ARICC II is just as unparliamentary as the continuing omission of the Franciscan St. John of the Cross from the list of theologians who are not worth mentioning.

Let us then lay down a question which needs clarification. Is ARICC II saying that justification cannot be merited congruously? If not, it will give considerable offence to Anglicans who have always thought of the Church’s teachings on justification, especially merit prior to justification, is odious. Furthermore, the sixteenth-century debates did not concern whether something can be called "congruous" or "congruous to". Pelagianism, as both sides knew. The debate, especially as it involved Luther and Calvin, centered on the concept of congruous merit, which is the subtle concept of merit. If on the other hand, ARICC II is saying that on the basis of the doctrine of justification may in any sense be said to be representative of the Arminian camp of Church, then it is opposed to the Reformed position. But this might not be so. Perhaps ARICC II would care to clarify its position on congruous merit. I think that, until ARICC II clarifies this point, we cannot regard them as having made any contribution to this aspect of the debate on justification.

3. Indulgences

In an earlier document, the document moves on to deal with 'The Church and Salvation'. This is by far the weakest section of the document. The entire discussion of the bearing of the doctrine of justification upon the life of the church—in other words, the practical questions, which so aroused the Reformers—is abstract and unconnected. It is in this section that we have every right to look for, and find, a discussion of indulgences. After all, the historical origins of the Lutheran Revolution and the Reformation and the post-Reformation church are to be some degree of confusion within modern Catholic theology as to what the role of indulgences actually is. It is therefore fair to ask, in the wake of the fact of the enormous and therefore the magisterial pronouncement on indulgences—in other words, not just the views of some individual Roman Catholic theologian (which varies considerably), but an authoritative statement by the teaching of the Roman Catholic church as to what the function of indulgences actually is. ARICC II cannot face from history; although today I have no concern with what it was. The teaching of the Roman Catholic church, dating from 1983, is beyond a doubt. Professor B. W. North has known the case in point that there are two main problems. In the first place, it is clear that the present modern period is an inevitable part of any genuine engagement with the doctrine of justification. "Catholic inter- pretation of the Reformers' questions: was Christ's work insufficient, and do our works somehow have merit?" Paul VI may have refined Trent's test case of "properly enjoining" the church which would presupposes (purging and purgatorial penalties, for instance) remains as unacceptable to Protestants, whether Anglican or otherwise, as it has always been.

Moreover, the wisdom of Justice by Faith must be noted. Since the sixteenth-century debate on the nature of justifying righteousness, of such central importance to late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Anglican criticisms of Roman Catholicism, is studiously set to one side.

2. Merit

The document’s statements on merit require considerable clarification. The following paragraph (24) apparently explicitly excludes the possibility of meriting justification.

The language of merit and good works, therefore, when properly understood in the medieval and modern sense of "merit" (or "worth"), are able to put God in their debt. Still less does it imply that justification itself is anything but a totally unmerited gift.

This statement, however, avoids a serious difficulty dating from the sixteenth-century contemporary debate on the two types of merit. This is critical, but complicated requirements.

The medieval period saw a distinction develop between merit in the strict sense of the word ("congruous merit") and
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The great commission in Matthew 28:18-20 has a magnificent structure. It starts with a declaration of power: 'All authority... has been given to me'. It sounds like the enthronement of a king. This powerful king has an important message to his people. The message of the Great Commission is in order: 'Go therefore and make disciples...'. The second is a promise: 'And surely I will be with you, always, to the very end of the age.'

The order Jesus gives his disciples is longer and has a more complicated structure than the first and last sentence of the great commission. In the Greek text the main verb is 'make disciples'. This main verb is supported by three participles:

1. 'going', 'baptizing' and 'teaching'. The main verb describes the aim of the work of the disciples. The participles describe the means of reaching this aim. The disciples are asked to make disciples by going out, by baptizing and by teaching.

The structure of the great commission can be summarized as follows:

I. Declaration of power

All authority on heaven and earth has been given to me.

II. Commission

a) goal: to make disciples of all nations

b) means: by baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit and by teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you.

III. Promise

And surely I will be with you, always, to the very end of the age.

In this article I want to concentrate on the main verb in the great commission. What does it mean to 'make disciples' or to be a disciple? Very much has been said and written on the other parts of this basic text for the understanding of the missionary task of making disciples of Jesus. But it has been largely neglected to discuss the character of Jesus' authority as described in the NT. The command to 'go out' has been a main concern in the missiology, defining mission as crossing borders in order to proclaim the gospel for people who still have not heard it.

Lots of research has been done on the meaning of baptism and the relationship between the two actions of Christ. The promise of Jesus has been the centre of innumerable devotions and meditations to encourage believers in an age of indifference and resistance to the gospel.

I will follow with these elements of the great commission, very little has been written on the first element, the main reason that I want to discuss the meaning of the main element of this command from the risen Lord. The biblical concept of discipleship has been a part of church tradition replaced by other concepts and new words. Perhaps we might learn something about our position as Christians by considering again what it meant to be a disciple in the time of Jesus and in the early church. Jesus' call to discipleship is a challenge to modern men and women -- and to our traditional church life and Christian lifestyle.

I will put my points in the form of 13 theses with some comments added. I start with some linguistic observations.

1. 'Disciples' was the first name for the Christians

The Greek word matheîs, pl. matheîa, is used about the church, Acts 6:1, and in Ephesians, Acts 19:9. In Acts 11:26 we find a very interesting sentence: 'In Antioch the disciples were for the first time called Christians.' From this we learn that the word we use most often, 'Christian', was not the correct name for this new group. They were first simply called the 'disciples'. This makes it clear that the group consisted of the first followers of Jesus during his ministry in Galilee. In the NT, the term 'disciple' is used in the Gospels as a reference to the group regarded their relationship to the risen Lord Jesus in some way similar to the relationship of the first disciples to the earthly rabbi Jesus.

2. The verb matheîtes, 'make disciples', is seldom used in the NT and has different meanings.

The preposition 'of' in Luke 14:21 is closest to the use in the great commission: Paul and Barnabas visited Derbe, where they 'preached the gospel and made many disciples'. The preposition 'of' the gospel is here the means to make disciples, corresponding to 'baptizing' and 'teaching' in the great commission.

A striking parallel to the great commission is found in John 4:1, where 'baptizing' is the means to 'make disciples' (here not expressed by the verb matheîteis, but by the phrase eis ho kósmiōn poïei matheîa) during the earthly ministry of Jesus. We cannot discuss this passage at length here. In my opinion it shows a close connection with the following passage where the Baptist and the disciples of Jesus is somehow the key to the question of the origin of Christian baptism. The Great Commission is not in the form of an imitation of Jewish baptism as a new ritual, as it is traditionally understood in many churches. It refers to baptism as a well-known act of initiation.

In Matthew 27:37 Joseph from Arimathea is described as a person who 'had been made a disciple'. But we don't learn anything about the character or the conditions for his discipleship.

Very special is the context of the verb in Matthew 13:52: 'a scribe who is like the kingdom of Heaven'. Normally the word 'scribe' refers to opponents of Jesus. But here it is used positively of his adherents. The 'training' for the kingdom refers to some 'school' activity among Jesus and his friends. Joseph from Arimathea was a typically Christian scribe. The saying must refer to a special group of teachers in the Jesus group who had functions similar to the scribes. The children of the kingdom can be described as a 'school' with 'scribes'.

This leads us to the basic meaning of the word 'disciple' in the NT:

3. 'Disciple' (matheîs) means 'learner', 'student'. For his adherents Jesus alone is Teacher and Master. Rabbi. A Christian is always and only a student in relation to Jesus. The highest hope of a student in a rabbinic 'school' was to become a rabbi like his own teacher. The rabbi educates disciples that in their turn might become rabbis and pass the traditions on to new disciples who could become teachers for still new generations. This was the basic pattern for the Jewish, rabbinic tradition. It was a great honour to become a rabbi, and the position as a disciple of a famous master gave the possibility to advance to be a famous rabbi yourself.

The relationship of Jesus to his disciples was different. Jesus had a unique position that could not be transferred to his disciples. 'But you are not to be called "Rabbi", for you have one Teacher, the Christ' (Mt 23:8). In this text Jesus clearly pointed out the difference between the relationship between Jesus and the disciples is compared to teacher and pupils in a school. But it also very clearly pointed out the important function of the disciple to have a teaching function in the church. There are 'scribes trained for the kingdom of Heaven'. But these scribes or teachers have no special position in relation to him and are the lowest level in the hierarchy. He is always the superior teacher. Basically all members of a church or a theological seminary are fellow students in the school of Jesus. In this respect there is no difference between pastor and presbyters and student.

The name 'disciple' reminds us that the church from the beginning was the 'school' of Jesus. Therefore the teaching function must be very important in the church. But the only real teacher is Jesus himself. The church is basically a fellowship of his students.

4. A disciple learns by (a) hearing his Master, and (b) doing (or acting on) what he has heard. Our modern word 'teacher' is often associated with a person involved mainly in theoretical instruction. But it may also imply practical training. A teacher of a handicraft should have some technical skills, too. He can influence the activity of Jesus as a teacher we find his disciples both learning by hearing and learning by doing.
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The great commission in Matthew 28:18-20 has a magnificent structure. It starts with a declaration of power: 'All authority... has been given to me.' It sounds like the enthronement of a king. This powerful king has an important message to his people. This message is to be repeated in an order: 'Go therefore and make disciples...' The second is a promise: And surely I will be with you, always, to the very end of the age.

The order Jesus gives his disciples is longer and has a more complicated structure than the first and last sentence of the great commission. In the Greek text the main verb is 'make disciples.' This main verb is supported by three participles:

I. Declaration of power

a) goal

b) means

c) authority on earth.

II. Commission

a) go

b) baptizing them in the name of the Father and Son and the Holy Spirit.

c) obeying everything I have commanded you.

III. Promise

a) and surely I will be with you always, to the very end of the age.

In this article I want to concentrate on the main verb in the great commission. What does it mean to 'make disciples' or to be a disciple? Very much has been said and written on the other parts of this basic text for the understanding of the message. A new look at this verse has been given in the light of the character of Jesus as authority as described in the NT. The command to 'go out' has been main concern in the missiology, defining mission as crossing borders in order to proclaim the gospel for people who still have not heard it.

Lots of research has been done on the meaning of baptism and the Greek word bapto. The decision of Christians to promise Jesus has been the centre of innumerable devotions and meditations to encourage believers in an age of indifference and resistance to the gospel.

Jesus goes with these elements of the great commission, very little has been said on the on the menial element of this command from the risen Lord. The biblical concept of discipleship has in our church tradition been replaced by other concepts and other words. Perhaps we might learn something about our position as Christians by considering again what it meant to be a disciple in the time of Jesus and in the early church.

Jesus' call to discipleship is a challenge to modern men and women - and to our traditional church life and Christian lifestyle.

I will put my points in the form of 13 theses with some comments added. I start with some linguistic observations.

1. Disciples' was the first name for the Christians

The Greek word mathēteō, pl. mathēteûa, is used about the chosen, Acts 6:1, and in Ephesus, Acts 19:9. In Acts 11:26 we find a very interesting sentence: 'In Antioch the disciples were for the first time called Christians.' From this we learn that the word was used often, 'Christians,' was not a new term for this new group. They were first simply called the 'disciples.' This makes it clear that the group consisted of the first followers of Jesus during his ministry in Galilee. The title, however, was not immediately given to the group, regarded their relationship to the risen Lord Jesus in some way similar to the relationship of the first disciples to the earthly 'rabbi' Jesus.

2. The verb mathēteûa, 'make disciples,' is seldom used in the NT and has different meanings.

The closest NT usage is James 1:22 as close to the use in the great commission: Paul and Barnabas visited Derbe, where they 'preached the gospel and made many disciples.'

In the New Testament the word 'gospel' is here means to make disciples, corresponding to 'baptizing' and 'teaching' in the great commission.

A striking parallel to the great commission is found in John 4:1, where 'baptizing' is the means to 'make disciples' (here not expressed by the verb mathēteûa, but by the word phainetai, 'appears'). During the earthly ministry of Jesus, we cannot discuss this passage at length here. In my opinion it should be noted that it is the followers who follow the Baptist and the disciples of Jesus is somehow the key to the question of the origin of Christian baptism. The Great Commission can be used as an illustration of an historical event of baptism as a new ritual, as it is traditionally understood in many churches. It refers to baptism as a well-known act of initiation.

In Matthew 27:37 Joseph from Arimathea is described as a person who 'had been made a disciple.' But we don't learn anything about the character or the conditions for his discipleship.

Very special is the context of the verb in Matthew 13:52: 'a teaching for the kingdom of Heaven.' Normally the word 'scribe' refers to opponents of Jesus. But here it is used positively of his adherents. The 'training' for the kingdom refers to some 'school' activity among Jesus and his followers. It is here more a teaching activity than missionary activity. The promise of Jesus has been the centre of innumerable devotions and meditations to encourage believers in an age of indifference and resistance to the gospel.

This leads us to the basic meaning of the word 'disciple' in the NT: '3. Disciple' (mathēteûa) means 'learner,' 'student.' For his adherents Jesus alone is Teacher and Master, Rabbi. A Christian is always and only a student in relation to Jesus. The highest hope of a student in a rabbinic 'school' was to become a rabbi like his own teacher. The rabbi educates disciples in his turn which might become rabbis and pass the traditions on to new disciples who could become teachers for still new generations. This was the basic pattern for the Jewish, rabbinic tradition. It was a great honour to become a rabbi, and the position as a disciple of a famous teacher gave the possibility to advance to be a famous rabbi yourself.

The relationship of Jesus to his disciples was different. Jesus had a unique position that could not be transferred to his disciples. 'But you are not called "Rabbi," for you have one Teacher, the Christ' (Mt 23:8). In this text shows clearly that the relationship between Jesus and the disciples is compared to teacher and pupils in a school. But it also very clearly that the role of the teacher is to have a teaching function in the church. There are 'scribes trained for the kingdom of Heaven'. But these scribes or teachers have no special position in relation to said and written on the meaning of the word 'teacher.'

There is a chance for a young theologian or for a theological seminary are fellow students in the school of Jesus. In this respect there is no difference between pastor and people, but not in the sense of the disciple.

The name 'disciples' reminds us that the church from the beginning was the 'school' of Jesus. Therefore the teaching function must be very important in the church. But the only real teacher is Jesus himself. The church is basically a fellowship of his students.

4. A disciple learns by (a) hearing his Master, and (b) doing like his Master.

Our modern word 'teacher' is often associated with a person involved mainly in theoretical instruction. But it may also imply practical training. A teacher of a craft had to have some skill in the craft himself. It can influence the activity of Jesus as a teacher we find his disciples both learning by hearing and doing by.
The sermon on the Mount describes a typical situation of Jesus as a teacher. Just as he did in the synagogue, he teaches his disciples by talking to them (Mt. 5:1-2). Their activity is listening and memorizing his words. In Luke 10:16, after Mary takes the place of a disciple listening to the teacher, Martha is rebuked for worldly worries, and not all for her activities condemned. Mary, on the other hand, seems to understand the instruction of Jesus as rabbi. Compared to his contemporaries Jesus was quite radical when he in this way included women among his disciples. Many times in the gospels we meet a woman like Martha in the synagogues and in public places, discussing with his disciples and with his adversaries in order to instruct them about the kingdom of God. The whole scene indicates that the situations the disciples are learning by listening to their Master.

Less obvious are the many references to the disciples when they are learning by doing. But the sermon on the Mount and the many stories are given also an example of how Jesus as his disciples were supervised by an instructor for the disciples to do the same as their Master: to preach the message of the kingdom and to heal the sick (Mt. 10:7-8). The total mission of the disciples is in this way put under the heading: They should do like their Master. Jesus is an example to be imitated by his disciples.

This is stated explicitly in the story about the washing of the disciples’ feet: You call me “Teacher” and “Lord”, and rightly so, for that is what I am. Now that I, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also should wash one another’s feet. I have set you an example that you should do as I have done for you” (Jn. 13:14-15). This symbolic act points to the death of Jesus. His real service for his disciples is his death for them. He is the kernel of wheat that falls to the ground and dies in order to bear a rich fruit (Jn. 12:24). As an atoning death for the many, the death of Jesus is unique and cannot be understood in any other way. It is an act of love and unlimited love has set a standard for the life of his followers. ‘Whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be your slave’ (Mt. 20:26). The Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and give his life as a ransom for many” (Mt. 20:28).

These words correspond to the way Jesus is preached as an example for his followers in the early church. The epistles now encourage the believers to imitate the action of Jesus public. But as an aspect of servant leadership, it is also an aspect of personal disposition of Jesus. The servant of Jesus is referred to as an example because of his incarnation and his death. These show his humility, love and readiness to serve others, and this is applied as a call to Christian people to tolerate and honour each other (Phil. 2:1-11), to share money with each other (2 Cor. 8:7-9), to suffer without murmur in the name of the gospel (1 Pet. 2:18-25), to help brothers in material need (1 Jn. 3:16-18). In this way Jesus is seen as a teacher not only through his words, but also through his actions and through this as a new self-understanding and a new life-style to be preserved by his followers.

To be a disciple of Christ in this way is therefore not only a matter of ‘inner’ qualities like faith and convictions. It concerns our whole life and word and deed.
The Sermon on the Mount describes a typical situation of Jesus as a teacher. Jesus, just like the teacher in the synagogue, and he teaches his disciples by talking to them (Mt. 5:1-2). Their activity is listening and memorizing his teaching. Jesus teaches in Luke 6:7-11 and in Matthew also in Luke 9:10-17. Mary Magdalene takes the position of a disciple listening to the teacher. Martha is not rebuked for worldly worries, and not for all her activities in the house. Jesus shows the distinction of thinking the instruction of Jesus as rabbi. Compared to his contemporaries Jesus was quite radical when he in this way included women among his disciples. Many times in the gospels we meet Jesus teaching in the synagogues and in public places, discussing with his disciples and with his adversaries in order to instruct them about the authenticity of their statements. Thus the situations the discip...
In Acts 2:44 and 4:32-37 many scholars have found reason to assume that the primitive church in Jerusalem abandoned private property and lived in a community of full property fellowship. But we don’t find references to such a fellowship in the Greek version of Acts, which otherwise contains 399 other references to property. It seems probable that the church should probably not be taken as general descriptions of the property conditions in the church. They generalize what occasionally happened in some particular memoirs, and not the property to relieve the need of the poorest among them. It was no sin to have property in the early church. But there are many warnings against becoming rich and to be ‘rich in good deeds, and to be generous and willing to share’ (1 Tim 6:17-19). The many exhortations to care for the poor show us that the first Christians in general were not dependent on the support of others, and that most of them had a surplus they could share with the needy. On the other hand they also show us that there were many poor people in the church. In fact, there were often more poor people in the church than there were rich people. In Jesus’ lifetime the disciples literally had to leave their property to follow Jesus. This could not have the same literal meaning in the early church. The expression ‘say farewell to everything’ in Luke 14:33 indicates the way this picture of the disciples was transferred to the early church: the call is to an inner detachment with different practical consequences. Jesus had warned against Mammon as an idol, and he encouraged practical love for neighbours in need. This encouraged a new attitude to money and property in the church.

Through these examples we see that the radical demands for the disciples in the ministry of Jesus are not simply abandoned in the early church. They are transformed for a new context. The meaning of ‘following Christ’ is no longer possible. Some scholars have looked upon this process as a sort of decline, due to relaxed eschatological expectations and the secularization or ‘Verbuergerlichung’ of the church. I think it is better to look upon this as a necessary and right development. The ‘school’ of Jesus simply had to change character when the Master was no longer present in the body only in the Spirit.

11. Life as a disciple is now ‘death and resurrection’ with Christ, inaugurated in Christian baptism.

We have noticed that the exhortations concerning family, property and fellowship presuppose the formula of ‘Death and resurrection of Christ, in Christ’. This is a reference to the new dimension of Christian life given in baptism. Romans 6 explains that in baptism the Christian is ‘laid to death’ and ‘raised again’ (Rom 6:3-4). It is the basis for Christian life. It corresponds to the way Jesus talked about ‘carrying the cross’ to follow him or to ‘take up your own cross’ (Mt 16:24-25). The disciples live under the promise that the kingdom of God belongs to them (Lk 16:22). They are chosen for this destination and are called to live and work in this context, even if this does not appear to be possible or desirable. As a disciple of Christ is a great privilege. Christ is still calling us to ‘leave everything’ and follow him.
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11. Life as a disciple is now 'death and resurrection' with Christ, inaugurated in Christian baptism.

We have noticed that the exhortations concerning family, personal conduct, and religious behavior to the formula Christ, in Christ'. This is a reference to the new dimension of Christian life given in baptism. Romans 6:3-4 explains that Christ has been raised to life and is being able to live in a new way. This involves embracing the fullness of a life dedicated to God. Thus, the basis for Christian life. It corresponds to the way Jesus talked 'carrying the cross' to follow him or serve one's own life. In Mark 8:34-37 is closely linked with Jesus' prediction of his death and resurrection. The unity of Jesus' death with the 'death' of his followers is also made clear in the context of Mark 15:26. In John 12:23-26. Death and service for others is here connected in the same way as when Jesus washed the disciples' feet.

There is a continuity between the concept of discipleship in the gospels and the baptismal exhortations and ethical teaching found in the teaching of the church. In particular, the didactic teaching in the book of James corresponds to the call to discipleship in the ministry of Jesus. Therefore it is not by accident that the Great Commission explains baptism and ethical instruction to be the means to "make disciples" of all nations. The expression "teaching them to obey everything I commanded you" is in the gospel of Matthew evidently a reference to the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew 5-7. This corresponds to the fact that the ethical instruction contained in the Sermon on the Mount was sent to preach the gospel of the kingdom for Israel, they were not asked to make disciples; but now this is included in their mission. The word "disciple" is used in the New Testament to refer to those following their Master in Galilee and Judea. All nations are invited to this new fellowship. And therefore all disciples are called to this mission.

This corresponds to the words of Paul in 2 Corinthians 5:18, when he so closely connects the gift of being reconciled with God with the ministry of reconciliation. Those who have received reconciliation are also Christ's ambassadors, urging others to be reconciled. In Ephesians 2:19-20, the church is described as the "body of Christ" and tells us to become the co-worker of Christ in his world-wide mission. He is the atoning sacrifice for our sins, and not only for our sins but also for the sins of the whole world (1 John 2:2).

13. The disciples have fellowship with Christ in life and death and are the inheritors of the kingdom of God.

A disciple is called to give up his own interests in order to obey the call of Jesus. He is also called to the world-wide, overwhelming task of making all nations disciples. Confronting this great task, he needs his own human resources, it is easy to lose, lose hope, and simply give up.

Therefore it is good to see that the Great Commission does not stop with the command, but with a promise. The risen, almighty Lord is with them — not only when they feel it or whether they have difficulties, but at the very end of the age. The disciples live under the promise that the kingdom of God belongs to them (Luke 12:32). They are chosen for this destiny: the disciples of Jesus are called and live visibly constructed, and not only as being not despair. To be a disciple of Christ is a great privilege.

Christ is still calling us to 'leave everything else and follow him.'
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The Paulinism of Acts again: two historical clues in 1 Thessalonians

David Wenham

Introduction
Few books of the NT are as important as the book of Acts for the question of the historical reliability of the NT, and few books are so controversial. Many scholars have seen Acts as offering the model of effective and concrete evidence for the historical competence of one of the evangelists; others have seen Acts as a thoroughly theological book which is of doubtful historical value.

Scholars arguing in favour of the first view have noted, among other things, the remarkable accuracy of Acts on points of historical and geographical detail, e.g. over the names of the officials of the different cities mentioned (e.g. the governor of Cyrene in Acts 13 and 17). For theissen, Acts of Thessalonica in 17:6; the 'grammateus' of Ephesus in 19:35; the 'pros' of Malta in 28:7). They have seen this as confirmation of the seriousness of Luke's claim in the prologue of his gospel to be writing an accurate account on the basis of eyewitness testimony (1:1-4) and of his implicit claim to be nags the story of Paul's career. Paul, closely in touch with eyewitness tradition (cf. Acts 16:10ff).

William Ramsay (1851-1939), who was one of the foremost experts on ancient Asia Minor, his day, was one of the best known for this. In his view, he started the earliest, sceptical opinion of Acts as a theological and historically imaginative work of late date (a view resembling that of some modern redaction critics), but he ended up concluding of Luke's stature as a historian of the first rank. A modern scholar in the same general tradition is F. B. Bruce, who concludes a major recent survey on 'The Acts of the Apostles: History or Theology.' He argues that Luke is not a historical, but a theological, author. A writer may be at one and the same time a sound historian and a capable theologian. The author of Acts was both. The quality of his history naturally varied according to the availability and trustworthiness of his sources, but being a good theologian as well as a good historian, he did not allow his theology to distort his history.

Scholars arguing in favour of the more sceptical view of Luke's writings have noted particular historical difficulties, such as the supposedly anachronistic references to Quirinius in Luke 2:1 and to Theudas in Acts 5:36. They have also drawn significant discrepancies between the account given of Paul in Acts and what we know of the apostle from his own writings. For example, it is argued that there are historical contradictions between Paul's own account of his conversion and the events following it in Galatians 1-2 and Luke's account in Acts 9-15; also that the Lukan portrait of Paul as a moderate man open to compromise, for example in Acts 21, is quite unlike the radical apostle of freedom whom we meet in, for example, Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 9:19-23 (though this is not to deny that Luke may have exaggerated some aspects of Paul's theology and ministry, the point is that he is not as exhaustive as Acts would have us believe). The difficulties are admitted, and yet, it is argued, they are much less formidable than they first appear, with the limitations of our historical knowledge, the fallibility of Josephus (who is not always in Acts at variance with Luke's) and the differing purposes of Acts and Paul's epistles are borne in mind. Also, there are satisfactory explanations of some of the difficulties; for example, if Paul's visit to Jerusalem in Galatians 2 is identified with the famine relief visit of Acts 11:27-30, not with the Jerusalem Council described in Acts 15, this eliminates one group of historical problems.

However, the purpose of this article is not to tackle the question of the Paulinism of Acts in general, but simply to make a few comments relevant to that issue. In particular, I wish to suggest also that the epistle throws some interesting light on the book of Acts.

The Areopagus speech
One of the most controversial questions about the book of Acts is the relationship of the Paulinism of Acts and the Paulinism of the apostles. It is widely accepted that the speeches are the composition of the author of Acts rather than records of what was actually said historically by the speaker referred to. Comparsion is made of Josephus and other Graeco-Roman historians who felt free to compose speeches for ariachnised to their narrative. So far as Paul's speech in particular is concerned, there is a great deal of tension here. Paul's speeches in Acts (and in the non-Pauline speeches also) are Lukan, not those of the Paul of the epistles. So, for example, the rather philosophical Paul of the Areopagus...
speech of Acts 17 is thought to be different from the Paul of the epistles who knew only Christ and him crucified.

This view of the speeches of Acts has been countered in various ways: for example, it is argued that the speeches are not polished literary pieces such as might be expected if Luke were following the travels of Paul as the authors in composing them. It is argued that Luke's regular use of sources, such as Mark, for his speeches in his gospel makes it unlikely that he would do in Acts what he did not do in Mark. It is suggested that the differences between the Paul of the Acts speeches and the Paul of the epistles may partly reflect Lukan editorial intentions and differing audiences and situations presupposed: the epistles are instruction for converted Christians, the Acts speeches are apologetic to unbelievers, with the exception of the speech in Miletus in Acts 20:17-35, which is notably more similar to Paul's epistles.

It is not the purpose of this article to elaborate or examine these general arguments, but simply to contribute to the understanding of the speeches and the piece of evidence from 1 Thessalonians that has been insufficiently noted by scholars. The evidence is that of 1 Thessalonians 1:9-10, where Paul describes his missionary visit to the Thessalonians and their response to his ministry. His response was to 'turn to God from idols, to serve a living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom God raised from the dead. Jesus rescue us from the coming wrath'.

The striking thing about this summary is its close correspondence to Paul's Arelopoeian speech described by Luke in Acts 17:16-31. Luke's account of Paul's description of his grief over the idolatry of Athens, begins with an extended discussion by Paul of the Athenians' ignorant and idolatrous religiousness as contrasted with the truth of God. He reminds them 'of all things' and 'in whom we live and move and have our being'. Paul then invokes the Athenians to repent of their 'ignorant gods' and judge the objects of their worship. He is judged by the world by a man whom he appointed, providing assurance of this to all by raising him from the dead. The similarity of the ingredients in the two passages hardly needs spelling out: in both there is an emphasis on (a) turning from idolatry to the living God, (b) coming judgment to be prepared for, (c) the resurrection of Jesus. There are four elements: (a) the godly judgment to which Paul summoned the people of Athens (as in Acts 17:16), Jesus' resurrection from the dead and his being appointed by God, and not by Paul, as the Saviour of the world (Acts 17:31). If this is the case Paul's invitation to the Thessalonians to 'respect those who labour among you and are over you in the Lord and encourage those who are weak, support the burden of the elders, and prize your life in harmony with your faith' (1 Thessalonians 5:12-13). This evidence indicates that, although Paul had a relatively short and turbulent stay in Thessalonica (as may be deduced from 1 Thessalonians as a whole), he was not allowed to leave without establishing some sort of leadership (although the actual word 'elder' is not used). If he did so in Thessalonica, it is entirely probable that he will also have appointed a leader of the church in Galatia not very long before, as Acts suggests. But then what of the evidence of 1 and 2 Corinthians? In this case it is also useful to recall the probable Pauline chronology. He is there portrayed as having arrived in Corinth, having appointed leaders in Thessalonica, and having given the evidence indicating that Paul appointed church leaders in Thessalonica, it seems intrinsically probable that he also appointed such leaders in the Corinthian church.

A comparison of 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians certainly suggests that these two churches, which were geo-politically so close, were clearly in contact with each other and which were founded at the same sort of time, had much in common. For example, they both probably had a 'charismatic problem' (cf. 1 Thes. 5:19-20 with 1 Cor. 12-14), and they had questions over the resurrection and the second coming — perhaps quite similar questions (cf. 1 Thes. 4:13-18 and 1 Cor. 15). But did they have similar structures of church leadership? The a priori probability that they will have done so is confirmed by a comparison of 1 Thessalonians 5:12-13 with 1 Corinthians 16:15-16, where Paul speaks of the diakonia of the household of Stephanas, 'the first converts in Achaea', and of other 'fellow-workers and labourers'. The language used in the two passages is quite similar (with the kappio and en: root: in common). The church of Corinth then did have recognized church leaders who described them as 'ministers of the church' (Acts 19:29) in 12:28, the latter word gatertus having very similar connotations to the word episkopos. Their lack of precision in the terminology of the church hierarchy is perhaps significant of the fact that they were a relatively ineffective and/or divided force in the Corinthian church, as well as Paul's strong conviction about the corporate nature of the church with the leaders being 'ministers of the church', Paul's description of his own ministry in this period; but it is simpler to do without the hypothesis of coincidence and to suggest that Luke had accurate information about Paul's ministry at this time. 1

The apolling of elders

Another historical reference in Acts may be illuminated by 1 Thessalonians, and that is the reference to Paul's appointment of elders in Acts 14:23. It has often been argued that this reference in Acts is probably intended as a commentary by Paul on his own activity in founding the church. The earliest Pauline church, described in the letter to the Galatians (Galatians 1:12), has no evidence of Paul's appointment of elders; on the contrary, the combined evidence of 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians tend to confirm what Acts says. 1

The two pieces of historical evidence that we have noted in 1 Thessalonians 5:12-13, and Acts 14:23, have significance for an appreciation of the historical plausibility of Acts has not been adequately recognized by the majority of scholars.


2 See, for example, Colm Hennesy's article 'Acts and Gender: Luke's portrait of Paul in Acts 17:1-16', BSac 103 (1997), which includes also his 'Luke the Historian' in BJRL 60 (1977), pp. 25-51. Before his recent article, Drews had read and kindly commented on this paper; I gratefully acknowledge his help on this and many previous occasions.


4 See also a recent conference on the subject (Sheffield, JSOT, 1984). I did not there pose another historical question, namely the placing of Paul in any case the point remains that Paul too — or the Thessalonians — can summarize his evangelism at this time in a similar way to Luke, without specific mention of the cross.

5 C. R. Barrett, 1 Corinthians (London: Bluck, 1973), 3, speaks of the 'official' and 'unofficial' deacons, stressing the ministry of deacons and bishops (pp. 295, 296).

6 We note also the evidence of Phil. 1:17 as showing that yet another early church, at Philippi, had a journey to 'send to official and semi-official appointed leaders, bishops and deacons'. The accumulation of evidence noted makes it clear that the sort of church order presupposed in the Pastoral Epistles is not as unusually Pauline as is often suggested. On the passages in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians which discuss church order, see L. E. Ellis, Prophecy and Hesmnatery in Early Christianity (Tübingen/Grand Rapids: Mohr/Leonard, 1979), pp. 1-22.

Theological trends in Asia

Bong Rin Ho

This is the first in what we hope will be a series of introductory articles on theological trends in various parts of the world. We are grateful to Dr Bong Rin Ho, who comes from Korea but who worked in Switzerland and is now Professor of Theology at the Theological Association and Dean of the Asia Graduate School of Theology, for this contribution. It is a slightly modified version of an editorial that appeared in the Asian Theological News.
Another historical reference in Acts which may be illuminated by 1 Thessalonians is the reference to Paul's appointment of elders in Acts 14:23. It has often been argued that this appointment was a response to the criticism that Paul's early church was a "free-floating" church, without a fixed ministry. This view is not supported by the evidence from 1 Thessalonians, which shows that Paul had already appointed elders in the church at Thessalonica before he left for Corinth. Furthermore, the emphasis on the church's need for structures and order in 1 Thessalonians is consistent with the idea that Paul's appointment of elders was an important part of his ministry at Thessalonica.

The striking thing about this summary is its close correspondence to Paul's Apology speech described by Luke in Acts 17:16-31. Luke's description of Paul's defense of his gospel message in Athens is presented as a defense of his missionary work, and he points to the experience of the Thessalonians as evidence of his effectiveness. This can be seen as a way of distinguishing his work from the "idol worship" of the Athenians, and of showing that his message was not merely a matter of personal opinion, but was rooted in the truth of God.

The key figure in this defense is Paul himself, who uses the example of the Thessalonians to show that his message is not just for a select few, but is for all who will listen. He describes the experience of the Thessalonians as a model for how the message of salvation can be communicated to others. The Thessalonians, he says, are an example of how the message can bring about change in people's lives, and how it can lead to a new way of living. This is a powerful example of how the message of salvation can be communicated, and how it can bring about change in the world.

This summary also shows the importance of the Thessalonians as a model for how the message of salvation can be communicated to others. It shows how the message can bring about change in people's lives, and how it can lead to a new way of living. This is a powerful example of how the message of salvation can be communicated, and how it can bring about change in the world. The Thessalonians, he says, are an example of how the message can bring about change in people's lives, and how it can lead to a new way of living. This is a powerful example of how the message of salvation can be communicated, and how it can bring about change in the world.
West for their graduate theological education and many of those returning to Asia have introduced Western theologies at different theological schools throughout Asia.

Nevertheless, because of rising nationalism and the reassertion of traditional values in Asia since the end of World War II, Asian theologians have been seeking liberation from Western theologies in order to make the gospel more relevant to their own life situations.

The proliferation of Asian theologies Many Asian theologies have appeared in the theological arena: "Rain of God Theology" (Japan), "Holiness Theology" (Thailand), Third Eye Theology (for the Chinese), Ying Yang Theology (Chinese and Korean), Theology of Change (Taiwan), Mingjun Theology (Indonesia), and Minhajul Baha or Baha'i faith in Sri Lanka. The proliferation of Asian theologies has escalated markedly since the 1960s and will continue to multiply in the future; already these theologies have made a great impact. They have also caused conflict and confusion in theological institutions and Christian churches in Asia.

Asian theologies can be grouped into four categories:

- **Syncretism**
  Since the Programme Unit on Faith and Witness of the World Council of Churches (WCC) has sponsored a number of similar dialogues with the leaders of other living religions, the increasing tendency towards syncretism in Asian theology has created alarm in the Asian church. For example, Dr. Niranjan S. Ponnambal in his book "The Southern Cross of Hinduism" (1964), stressed that Christ already dwells in the heart of a Hindu and that the mission of the church is not to bring Christ to the Hindu but to bring Christ out of him.

- **Accommodation theology**
  Accommodation is the subtle attempt to contextualize theology in Asia. Just as a hotel or a family accommodates a guest, so theological accommodation considers prevailing customs and religious practices of other cultures and accommodates good ideas from other religions.

- **Dr. Kosune Koyama**, a former Japanese missionary professor at Thaiil Theological Seminary in Chiang Mai, in his "Wattraffico Theology" (1970), opposes syncretism for "social transformation" and advocates "accommodation instead." Dr. Koyama believes that one cannot mix Aristotelian with Buddhist in the "North Thai" or "South Thai" or "both" "kitchen." One must, therefore, emphasize good Neighbour-ology rather than mere Christology. Dr. Koyama believes that every religion has positive as well as negative points and that Thai Christians must accept the positive elements of Buddhism in Thailand in order to change their life-style.

- **Dr. Batuman Sadayang», a Malaysian Anglican priest, in his doctoral thesis at Birmingham University,(U.K.) published a book, "A Prophetic Christology for Neighbourhood" (1987), and voiced the similar concept of accommodating the Malaysian Muslim context in terms of "Neighborhood".

Yet the question of where to draw the line between syncretism and accommodation depends on whether the person is willing to accept the unique revelation of God in Jesus Christ and in the Scriptures in his accommodation. A person's answer to a question such as, "Do Buddhists and Muslims need to be converted to Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of their sins?" will reveal whether or not he believes that Jesus Christ is the only way to God.

**Situational theology**

Another form of Asian theology derives directly from a particular situation. This situational theology may not be in agreement with the biblical and historical doctrines of the Christian faith but speak to the suffering and pain who could identify with the suffering Japanese.

**The Liberation Theology of Latin America** has influenced Asian theologians and been expressed in different forms: the Mingjun Theology in Korea, and Liberation Theology in the Philippines. The Christian Conference of Asia (CCA), which represents the Asian arm of WCC, has been the chief proponent of Liberation Theology in Asia, focusing on human rights, poverty, injustice and nuclear war.

For example, it is not uncommon to read in ecumenical journals and magazines such as the CCA News, CTC (Commission on Theological Concerns) Bulletin, and East Asia Theological Association Bulletin that governments of South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, and other countries for violations of human rights. And yet, it is interesting to note that the Asian Theological Association (ATA), which held a consultation on "Contextualization: Asian Theology in Seoul, Korea, August 23-31 1982, with 85 evangelical theologians from 17 countries. The Bible and Theology in Asian Contexts (1984) was published as an outcome of this Consultation. The Third World Theologians' Consultation followed right after the ATA consultation in Seoul with 50 delegates and 33 observers from Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America to deal with the same question: "What is the Theology of the Third World?"

At the Asian theologians' consultation, The Bible and Theology in Asia Today: Declaration of the 6th Asia Theological Association Theological Consultation was adopted. This Declaration warned of the danger of syncretism and universalism in Asian theology. It encouraged Asian theologians to give careful thought concerning contextualization and Asian theology, and to circumscribe the area for evangelical theologians where they could exercise contextualization. Evangelical theologians have a set of presuppositions in their faith such as the inerrancy of the Scriptures, the uniqueness of Christ, the inerrancy of the Bible, the sovereignty of God, the inspiration of the Word of God; K. Klostermaier, Hindu and Christian in India;室友 Hang Lim in Chinese Theology in Construction; M. Ohashi in Japanese Contributions to Theology; Dong Rin Ro and Ruth Eshenour (eds), The Bible and Theology in Asian Contexts; Vinay Samuel & Chris Sugden (eds), Sharing Jesus in the Third World: S. C. Song, Third Eye Theology; Rodrigo Tano, Theology in the Philippines.

Likewise, the resurgence of the Messiah, according to Dr. Kim, also provides aspirations of the Mingjun, i.e., the resurgence movement of the mingjun and the participation of the resurrection community in the mingjun movement. Therefore, the church must initiate its witness in society to protect the poor and the weak lest she loses her historical validity.

Scores of ecumenical church people and Roman Catholic priests who have been affected by Mingjun Theology and actively participated in anti-government demonstrations were arrested.

The Korean NCC organized the Human Rights Department; and consequently, the NCC-related changes have organized the own "human rights committees" that have influenced the human rights issues by holding prayer meetings and rallies at the local church level for the 'prisoner saints' and against the use of tear gas by the riot police.

It is unfortunate that the foreign press, particularly the ecumenical denominational press in the West, overstated the religious issue in Korea as though the whole Korean church had risen against the South Korean government.

**Biblically oriented Asian theology**

There has, alongside and in response to the theologies we have described, been a continuing strong tradition of more continental Ecumenism but speaks to the theology in Asia. This is represented, for example, by the Asia Theological Association (ATA), which held a consultation on "Contextualization: Asian Theology in Seoul, Korea, August 23-31 1982, with 85 evangelical theologians from 17 countries. The Bible and Theology in Asian Contexts (1984) was published as an outcome of this Consultation. The Third World Theologians' Consultation followed right after the ATA consultation in Seoul with 50 delegates and 33 observers from Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America to deal with the same question: "What is the Theology of the Third World?"

At the Asian theologians' consultation, The Bible and Theology in Asia Today: Declaration of the 6th Asia Theological Association Theological Consultation was adopted. This Declaration warned of the danger of syncretism and universalism in Asian theology. It encouraged Asian theologians to give careful thought concerning contextualization and Asian theology, and to circumscribe the area for evangelical theologians where they could exercise contextualization. Evangelical theologians have a set of presuppositions in their faith such as the inerrancy of the Scriptures, the uniqueness of Christ, the inerrancy of the Bible, the sovereignty of God, the inspiration of the Word of God; K. Klostermaier, Hindu and Christian in India;室友 Hang Lim in Chinese Theology in Construction; M. Ohashi in Japanese Contributions to Theology; Dong Rin Ro and Ruth Eshenour (eds), The Bible and Theology in Asian Contexts; Vinay Samuel & Chris Sugden (eds), Sharing Jesus in the Third World: S. C. Song, Third Eye Theology; Rodrigo Tano, Theology in the Philippines.

Secondly, they should encourage the Asian church to adopt a holistic approach in ministry by caring for the needs of society. Evangelical churches have been often criticized by Christians as well as non-Christians for their lack of social concern.

Thirdly, they must emphasize that the priority of the church is evangelism and mission in this vast continent of Asia which has only 3% Christian population in the midst of three billion people, i.e. 60% of the world's population.

God is still at work in the Asian church, giving continuing growth even in the midst of confusion, violent demonstrations, and many unsolved problems in society and within the church.

**Bibliography**

West for their graduate theological education and many of those returning to Asia have introduced Western theologies at different theological schools throughout Asia. Nevertheless, because of rising nationalism and the rejection of traditional values in Asia since the end of World War II, Asian theologians have been seeking liberation from Western theologies in order to make the gospel more relevant to their own life situations.

The proliferation of Asian theologies

Many Asian theologies have appeared in the theological arena: "Ruin of God Theology (Judaism)," "Hinduization Theology (Thailand)," Third Eye Theology (for the Chinese), Ying Yang Theology (Chinese and Korean), Theology of Change (Taiwan), Minhing Theology (Vietnam), and Liberation Theology (Latin America) in Sri Lanka. The proliferation of Asian theologies has escalated markedly since the 1960s and will continue to multiply in the future; already these theologies have made a great impact. They have also caused conflict and confusion in theological institutions and Christian churches in Asia.

Asian theologies can be grouped into four categories:

- Syncretism
- Accommodation
- Situation
- Biblical orientation

Syncretism

Since the Programme Unit on Faith and Witness of the World Council of Churches (WCC) has sponsored a number of regional dialogues with the leaders of other living religions, the increasing tendency towards syncretism in Asian theology has created alarm in the Asian church. For example, the Lahore Christian Book, the "Anti-Hindu" Book of Hinduism (1964), stressed that Christ already dwells in the heart of the Hindu and that the mission of the church is not to bring Christ to the Hindu but to bring Christ out of him.

Accommodation

Accommodation is now a subtle attempt to contextualize theology in Asia. Just as a hotel or a family accommodates a guest, so theological accommodation considers prevailing customs and religious practices of another culture and accommodates good ideas from other religions.

Dr. Kosune Koyama, a former Japanese missionary professor at Thialand Theological Seminary in Chiang Mai, in his Waterlack Theology (1970), opposes syncretism for Eastern churches in Asia. He advocates for the importance of accommodation instead. Dr. Koyama believes that one cannot mix Aristotelian pepper with Buddhist salt in the North Thailand Christian 'kitchen.' One must, therefore, emphasize good Neighbour-olgy rather than mere Christianity. Dr. Koyama believes that every religion has positive as well as negative points. Hence, Thai Christians must accept the positive elements of Buddhism in Thailand in order to change their lifestyle.

But Batumali Sadayanya, a Malaysian Anglican priest, in his doctoral thesis at the University of the United Kingdom published a book, A Prophetic Christology for Neighbourhood (1987), and voiced the similar concept of accommodating the Malaysian Muslim context in terms of "Neighbourhood".

Yet the question of where to draw the line between syncretism and accommodation depends on whether the West is willing to accept the unique revelation of God in Jesus Christ and in the Scriptures in his accommodation. A person's answer to a question such as, 'Do Buddhis and Muslims need to be converted to Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of their sins?' will reveal whether or not he believes that Jesus Christ is the only way to God.

Situation theology

Another form of Asian theology derives directly from a particular situation. This situation theology may not be in agreement with the biblical and historical doctrines of the Christian faith but speaks to current issues in Asia. Dr. Kaokho Khaman's 'Pain of God Theology in Japan is an excellent illustration. He tried to demonstrate to the suffering people in Japan after their defeat in World War II that the suffering they were experiencing was a part of the suffering and pain who could identify with the suffering Japanese.

The Liberation Theology of Latin America has influenced Asian theologians and been expressed in different forms: the Minhing Theology in Korea, and Liberation Theology in the Philippines. The Christian Conference of Asia (CCA), which represents the Asian arm of WCC, has been the chief proponent of Liberation Theology in Asia, focusing on human rights, poverty, injustice and nuclear war.

For example, it is not uncommon to read in ecumenical journals and magazines such as the CCA News, CTC (Commission on Theological Concerns) Bulletin, and East Asian Theological Association (ATA) Bulletin, as well as in the churches of the governments of South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, and other countries for violations of human rights. And yet, it is interesting to note that the Uganda government has held prayers and meetings and rallies at the local church level for the 'prisoned saints' and against the use of tear gas by the riot police.

It is unfortunate that the foreign press, particularly the ecumenical denominational press in the West, overestimated the religious issue in Korea as though the whole Korean church had risen against the South Korean government.

Bibliically oriented Asian theology

There has, alongside, and in response to the theologies we have described, been a continuing strong tradition of more conventional theology within Asian theology. This is represented for, by the Asia Theological Association (ATA), which held a consultation on 'Contextualization: Asian Theology' in Seoul, Korea, August 23-31, 1982, with 85 evangelical theologians from 17 countries. The Bible and Theology in Asian Cultures (1984) was published as an outcome of this Consultation. The Third World Theologians' Consultation followed right after the ATA consultation in Seoul with 50 delegates and 33 observers from Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America to deal with the same questions.

At the Asian theologians' consultation, The Bible and Theology in Asia Today: Declaration of the 6th Asia Theological Association Theological Consultation was adopted. This Declaration warned of the danger of syncretism and universalism in Asian theology. It encouraged Asian theologians to give careful thought concerning contextualization and Asian theology, and, in particular, the area for evangelical theologians where they could exercise contextualization. Evangelical theologians have a set of presuppositions in their faith such as the inerrancy of the Scriptures, the uniqueness of the historical Jesus, the atonement, the personalism, and the historical-geographical and objective-theological in evidence, etc., which set a basis for making the gospel relevant in every culture.

The task of Asian theology

The West has its own theological formulations derived from its own cultural background — Calvinism, Arminianism, death of God, etc. Yet in Asia the historical and cultural background is quite different from that of the West and demands careful attention from Asian Christians to their own cultures in order to make the gospel relevant to their life situations.

Some of the issues we are facing today are Communism, poverty, overpopulation, hunger, suffering, war, demon possession, bribery, cheating, idolatry, ancestor worship, casteism, secularism, and the resurfacing of Asian religions of Buddhism, Islam and Hinduism. Asian theologians may grapple with these issues and produce Asian theology that wrestles with these problems, yet being faithful to the historic teachings of the Scriptures over the centuries.

More particularly, the task of Asian theology, and of evangelical theology in particular, is threefold: first, they must search the Scriptures and provide joint guide-lines to the grass-root churches on key controversial issues such as Christian responses to socio-political situations in Asia. For example, Christian young people are confused as to how they should express their Christian faith on socio-political issues or whether they should participate in student demonstrations against the government.

Secondly, they should encourage the Asian church to adopt a holistic approach in ministry by caring for the needs of society. Evangelical churches have been often criticized byChristians as well as non-Christians for their lack of social concern.

Thirdly, they must emphasize that the priority of the church is evangelism and mission in this vast continent of Asia which has only 3% Christian population in the midst of three billion people, i.e. 60% of the world's population.

God is still at work in the Asian church, giving continuing growth even in the midst of confusion, violent demonstrations, and many unsolved problems in society and within the church.
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New Testament Pseudepigrapha? A review

Donald G Guthrie

It is commonly held among critical scholars that many of the NT books are pseudepigrapha; for example, Peter, it is said, did not write 2 Peter; Paul did not write the Pastoral Epistles or Ephesians; even Colossians and 2 Thessalonians may not be genuine. There seems to be a strong case for this point of view: pseudepigraphal scholars have argued in favour of pseudepigraph, not seeing this as in conflict with an evangelical understanding of Scripture. This latest work, Richard Bauckham, in a magisterial commentary on 2 Peter, and now David G. Meade in a significant thesis produced under the supervision of Professor James Dunn at Nottingham, provides an overview of the Pseudepigraphic New Testament and (Cathb: T.C. B. Mohr, 1986). In this review Dr Donald Guthrie, who is author of the Tyndale commentary on the Pastoral Epistles and who has made a particular study of pseudepigrapha for evangelical purposes, New Testament Introduction, responds to Dr Meade's thesis.

This book is not a discussion of the possibility or probability of pseudepigraph in the New Testament. It takes canonical pseudepigraph for granted and is an attempt to explain the practice from a theological point of view. It is therefore a study from a very definite standpoint. Moreover, Meade defines pseudepigraph in so broad a manner as to exclude any suggestion of a mere literary device. Indeed he regards a pseudepigraphic situation as being one in which it is not possible to determine of literary parallels can be found to be of minor importance. By this means Meade leaves the way clear for the thesis that literary affinities must be regarded primarily of the conviction of an authorial tradition, and not of literary origins (p. 157).

This study appeals to three groups of OT and Jewish writings in which there is a typological or allegorical relationship (Vergewegung) of tradition which nevertheless is attributed to the same source as the originating of the tradition which has been used. The first group consists of the prophetic writings, from which he selects as an example the Isaiahic literature. The second group consists of those Jewish works which were written in their concluding or eschatological tradition, from which he selects the books of Daniel and Enoch. He concludes that literal affinities in the New Testament is an assumption of continuity, rather than a deviation, and in a way which supports the idea of pseudepigraph.

The reference to the exigence of the OT clause, the character of the tradition, the purpose of the epistle, and the recognition of the technique (or for Meade, assumed NT pseudepigraph), I am assuming that Meade defines this notion of pseudepigraph that he is clearly searching for some better explanation for the practice than has to be attributed to the canonical writers. The need for this study, in spite of its detailed technical and theoretical examination, does not escape the danger of special pleading.

It is not until the end of his study that Meade turns his attention to the NT literature itself. He is forced to admit that pseudepigraph 'in the biblical mode' i.e. his own qualification, 'is not always an aspect of the growth of Christian literature. But this is valid, in view of the differences in literary genre further, Meade's methodology may be considered in the context of canonical pseudepigraph as he is clearly searching for some better explanation for the practice than has to be attributed to the canonical writers. The need for this study, in spite of its detailed technical and theoretical examination, does not escape the danger of special pleading.

It is not until the end of his study that Meade turns his attention to the NT literature itself. He is forced to admit that pseudepigraph 'in the biblical mode' i.e. his own qualification, 'is not always an aspect of the growth of Christian literature. But this is valid, in view of the differences in literary genre further, Meade's methodology may be considered in the context of canonical pseudepigraph as he is clearly searching for some better explanation for the practice than has to be attributed to the canonical writers. The need for this study, in spite of its detailed technical and theoretical examination, does not escape the danger of special pleading.

It is not until the end of his study that Meade turns his attention to the NT literature itself. He is forced to admit that pseudepigraph 'in the biblical mode' i.e. his own qualification, 'is not always an aspect of the growth of Christian literature. But this is valid, in view of the differences in literary genre further, Meade's methodology may be considered in the context of canonical pseudepigraph as he is clearly searching for some better explanation for the practice than has to be attributed to the canonical writers. The need for this study, in spite of its detailed technical and theoretical examination, does not escape the danger of special pleading.

It is not until the end of his study that Meade turns his attention to the NT literature itself. He is forced to admit that pseudepigraph 'in the biblical mode' i.e. his own qualification, 'is not always an aspect of the growth of Christian literature. But this is valid, in view of the differences in literary genre further, Meade's methodology may be considered in the context of canonical pseudepigraph as he is clearly searching for some better explanation for the practice than has to be attributed to the canonical writers. The need for this study, in spite of its detailed technical and theoretical examination, does not escape the danger of special pleading.

It is not until the end of his study that Meade turns his attention to the NT literature itself. He is forced to admit that pseudepigraph 'in the biblical mode' i.e. his own qualification, 'is not always an aspect of the growth of Christian literature. But this is valid, in view of the differences in literary genre further, Meade's methodology may be considered in the context of canonical pseudepigraph as he is clearly searching for some better explanation for the practice than has to be attributed to the canonical writers. The need for this study, in spite of its detailed technical and theoretical examination, does not escape the danger of special pleading.

It is not until the end of his study that Meade turns his attention to the NT literature itself. He is forced to admit that pseudepigraph 'in the biblical mode' i.e. his own qualification, 'is not always an aspect of the growth of Christian literature. But this is valid, in view of the differences in literary genre further, Meade's methodology may be considered in the context of canonical pseudepigraph as he is clearly searching for some better explanation for the practice than has to be attributed to the canonical writers. The need for this study, in spite of its detailed technical and theoretical examination, does not escape the danger of special pleading.

It is not until the end of his study that Meade turns his attention to the NT literature itself. He is forced to admit that pseudepigraph 'in the biblical mode' i.e. his own qualification, 'is not always an aspect of the growth of Christian literature. But this is valid, in view of the differences in literary genre further, Meade's methodology may be considered in the context of canonical pseudepigraph as he is clearly searching for some better explanation for the practice than has to be attributed to the canonical writers. The need for this study, in spite of its detailed technical and theoretical examination, does not escape the danger of special pleading.
New Testament Pseudepigraphy: A review

Donald G Guthrie

It is commonly held among critical scholars that many of the NT books are pseudepigraphic. For example, Peter, it is said, did not write 2 Peter. Paul did not write the Pastoral Epistles or Ephesians; even Colossians and 2 Thessalonians may not be entirely Pauline. Clearly, many of the pseudepigraphical scholars have urged in favour of pseudepigraphly, not seeing this as in conflict with an evangelical understanding of Scripture. The work of Richard Bauckham, in magisterial commentary on 2 Peter, and now David G. Meade in a significant thesis produced under the supervision of Professor James Dunn at Newcastle, demonstrates the continuing vitality of the pseudonymous hypothesis. The latter must necessarily be sufficiently Pauline to be regarded as valid enough and it must be sufficiently un-Pauline to be written by Paul himself. If the unknown writer could get as close as this to adapting Paul’s teaching to a new situation, it is difficult to see how he could be regarded as a pseudonymous author. The age-old dilemma is not resolved by appealing to the nature of the authorial personae of the Pastoral Epistles. It could be demonstrated within the undisputed Pauline epistles. Paul was successfully regarding his teaching to the needs of his readers.

We need to examine carefully Meade’s main contention that pseudonymity (in the biblical mode) is not an illusion of literary form, but of authoritative Pauline tradition. The hypothesis that is for the Pauline tradition it is necessary to disprove that whether literary parallels can be found to be of minor importance. By this means Meade leaves the way clear for the thesis that literary authentication of the pseudo Pauline Introduction, responds to Dr Meade’s thesis.

This book is not a discussion of the possibility or probability of pseudonymity in the biblical era. It takes canonical pseudonymity for granted and is an attempt to explain the practice from a theologically oriented point of view. It is therefore a study from a very definite standpoint. However, Meade defines pseudonymity in too broad a manner as to exclude any suggestion of a mere literary device. Indeed he regards a pseudonymous authorship as necessary, i.e., it is necessary to disprove that whether literary parallels can be found to be of minor importance. Thereby means Meade leaves the way clear for Dr Meade’s thesis. The literary authentication of the pseudo Pauline Introduction, responds to Dr Meade’s thesis.

This study appeals to three groups of OT and Jewish writings in which the idea of literary composition (Versglervangung) of tradition which nevertheless is attributed to the same source as the originator of the tradition which has been used. The first group consists of the prophetic writings, from which he selects as an example the Isaiahic literature. The second group consists of the Peshitta or Targumic version of the OT. The third group consists of the Talmud, from which he selects the books of Daniel and Enoch. He concludes that while the NT can rely on literary parallels to demonstrate an awareness of the existence of the ancient tradition texts, the NT avoids the confusion of identification with the ancient tradition texts, the NT avoids the confusion of anachronistic identification with a way that supports the idea of pseudonymity.

Whatever the value of his suggestions with regard to the OT, the criterion of embarrassment is one of his chief tools in explaining the alleged (or for Meade) NT pseudonymity. Paul seems that if such a criterion is to be applied, it must be shown that there is no evidence of the growth of Christian literature. But this is valid, in view of the differences in literary genre? Further, Meade’s methodology may be challenged on another ground: is it not the case that, in the study of literature remotely parallel to the NT writings, and to resort to the ancient tradition texts is no different from what he is being accused of being concerned about the problem of pseudonymity and the canon.

Since Meade has explained his NT examples of pseudonymity as being merely a device to replace the original, there is no possibility of the process of the interpretation of tradition by claiming that the rise of heroism demanded a more fixed approach to tradition, donc the doctrine of the creation of a tradition in which the New Testament is based, if the church began to realize that its flexible approach to pseudonymity approached a point of crisis. Paul’s pseudonymity can be explained also without reference to Paul’s original intentions. Paul’s pseudonymity can be explained also without reference to Paul’s original intentions. Given a criterion that is faced with a dilemma, which is not likely to be lessened by a study of this nature. It is not unreasonable to expect that some adequate parallels would be furnished and that some probable link between these and any possible NT pseudographs should be established. It simply will not do to dismiss such a demand as superficial, as Meade in fact does. The weakness of his approach can be demonstrated by selecting the examen 148.

Even before setting out his thesis on the Pastoral Epistles, Meade speaks of the "explicitly pseudonymous epis tology of the Pastoralists" (p. 122). It is a difficult task to tum the bear on the tooth of the inevitably polemical prejudice against the authenticity of the Pastoralists, which offends his own claim to be an advocate of a more historically based approach. The Pastoralists take up many elements from Paul’s writings and "actualize this material for their own generation" (p. 139). But there is too fine a line here between the "tradition of the Pastoralists" and the "original tradition of Paul". The latter must necessarily be sufficiently Pauline to be regarded as valid enough and it must be sufficiently un-Pauline to be written by Paul himself. If the unknown writer could get as close as this to adapting Paul’s teaching to a new situation, it is difficult to see how he could be regarded as a pseudonymous author. The age-old dilemma is not resolved by appealing to the nature of the authorial personae of the Pastoral Epistles. It could be demonstrated within the undisputed Pauline epistles. Paul was successfully regarding his teaching to the needs of his readers.

Meade’s contribution follows the regular format of the Word series, with each section of the commentary being divided into six sections: enabling the reader to concentrate on his own preferences. Although one appreciates the resoluting behind this approach, it does make for a more disjointed reading. But perhaps one cannot have it both ways? An advantage of the traditional approach is that the text commentary content certainly does not do so. Watts, who has written commentaries on several of the prophetic books and who now writes this Southern Baptist Seminary in Louisville, describes Isaiah as a visionary. This book, based of course on the first word of the book of the Hebrew text, is understood as a literary term referring to the whole book. The treatment is not the same. The book is an interpretative work divided into twelve acts, which is written in a very different style. For example, C. T. Edwards’ commentary, which is a commentary, is a commentary that is based on the latest historical setting in the book, the final text is then developed on Acts 1:1-6, and the final text does not appear in the Greek text. The final text is then developed on Acts 1:1-6, and the final text does not appear in the Greek text.

It is quite impossible within the short compass of this review to discuss adequately the distinctive features of Watts’ work. There is undoubtedly much here that is not only stimulating, particularly in the treatment of the historical composition of the text, which emphasizes the book as essentially divine revelation. Some other important topics are covered more briefly than was perhaps necessary. But the artistic quality of the book is a challenge to the readers. At this point, it is perhaps only fair to add that the final work in the commentary section is the one that is most accessible to the reader. Watts’ treatment is divided into twelve acts, which is written in a very different style. For example, C. T. Edwards’ commentary, which is a commentary, is a commentary that is based on the latest historical setting in the book, the final text is then developed on Acts 1:1-6, and the final text does not appear in the Greek text. The final text is then developed on Acts 1:1-6, and the final text does not appear in the Greek text.
emergence of Tiglath-pileser III, God abandoned his plan of political rule through the Davidic kings and instead carried them out through a succession of world empires. Throughout this entire period, Israel was made aware, however painfully, that her role as God’s servant community, a spiritual gathering without political ambitions. With the end of the Temple and the destruction of Jerusalem, a new foundation was needed, a fundamental law if, as is argued, it was understood by Ahaz and Manasseh but not by Hezekiah and Josiah.

Despite their divergent approaches, certain similarities in the two works are worth noting. Both are based on common themes and common features, but both are fundamentally the study of the law of God. The first is the interest in Isaiacian ism. It is remarkable that for both authors the meaning of the Davidic covenant comes closest by insisting on "the guiding hand of a single master" within the individual on the one hand, and on the other hand, understands unity in literary terms, as evidenced by the book’s structure, plot, characterization, style and motifs. It is clear, even from this extremely brief resume, that after a rather sleepy beginning, the story takes off in its second half. One can see a conclusion that servanthood is the central feature of Isaiah’s message is especially interesting. It would be unfair to compare the separate, purely literary, and political parts of these two chapters, or of the appearance of the second volume, but one looks forward with anticipation to the future direction of the interpretation of Isaiah.

No doubt every reader, like this reviewer, will have their own personal opinions, using these volumes to approach the topic of Amos. For some, they will prove more rewarding than others. The treatment of the ‘Hope at the End’ (9:11-15) is particularly weak – only three-quarters of a page on these verses and their relationship to the rest of the book. As the reader is led to understand that the overall message and theology of the book, regardless of whether one regards it as prophecy or commentary, sees them as ‘post-exilic mitigation’ (p. 83) of the foregoing message, thorough study may help to spell out his own position clearly on this, or on various other issues.

My major criticism of this OT Guide is that it tackles too much in too little space – a criticism which also applies to the first volume. One loses sight of the overall message and theological contribution of the book in the attempt to analyze each section. Some critical issues also seem somewhat uneven. Compare, for example, the two brief discussions of 9:11-15 with the lengthy treatment of 7:1-16 and 7:9-12 in the latter two volumes of the series. The authentic words of Amos may suggest that evangelical students will find this OT Guide unacceptable. To be fair, however, Auld’s treatment of the story of the two books is probably the best in the series. Auld’s treatment of the story of the two books is probably the best in the series.

In spite of his claim that ‘this book is fundamentally different in character’ from the PC, these two books are, in fact, the same in some of their characteristics. For this reason, the OT Guide to Amos, cannot be found in the PC, but apart from this chapter and the first one of the PC, the two books closely resemble each other. This is the case even when one looks at the second book, which appears in Story is either repetition or expansion of the PC on Matthew, Ch. 2-4 are basically an expansion of two sections of the 7th century BC. The first two chapters of the PC, Ch. 5 is an enlarged version of the section on the Son of Man. Ch. 6 is the same as Ch. 4 of the PC. They seem to overlap even to the extent of confusing the reader. That the OT Guide to Amos is so short and to the point could well invalidate the method as such, but the failure is probably due to the author’s application and understanding of the method. In this respect, the OT Guide to Amos (Fortress Press, 1985) by R. A. Edwards, which is overlooked in this review, gives a broader and more balanced treatment of the two books.

For this reason, the OT Guide to Amos is in its extremely useful sections on 'Further Reading'. At the end of each chapter. Books and articles are named which may be useful for further study.
emergence of Tiglath-pileser III, God abandoned his plan of political rule through the Davidic kings and instead carried them out through a succession of world empires. Throughout this entire period, Israel was made aware, however painfully, that her role as God's servant community, a spiritual gathering without political ambitions. While this was true, the concept of prophecy needed a fundamental shift if, as is argued, it was understood by Ahaz and Manasseh but not by Hezekiah and Josiah.

Despite their divergent approaches, certain similarities in the two works are apparent. They both use the same common features, but both are fundamental to the study of the OT. The first is the interest in Isaiianic units. It is remarkable that for both authors, the core of their study, comes closest by insisting on 'the guiding hand of a single master within the field of prophecy' (p. 9). This is clear in the two sources (in the fifth century is dissimilar). Isaiah's thought-structure is the key for Osawalt, and the essence of the book's unity is theological, Watts, on the other hand, understands unity in literary terms, as evidenced by the book's structure, plot, characterization, style and motifs. Is is clear, even from this extremely brief resume, that after a rather sleepy beginning, the book begins to have real interest in the second half of the book.

After the first two chapters, the oracles against Israel's neighbours, culminating in Amos's indictment of Israel herself. A range of scholarly opinions on the authenticity of individual oracles, and the nature of Amos's theology, is documented. Literary considerations are of the appearance of the second volume, and one looks forward with anticipation to the future direction of the interpretation of Isaiah.

No doubt every reader, like this reviewer, will have their own particular, perhaps idiosyncratic, solution to the various questions of Amos's vision. It offers no blanket solution to all the complex problems. However, I am encouraged to believe that, like Professor Ortlund, the author has produced a book that is capable of being a useful tool for reading Amos and perhaps even the remainder of the OT. The reviewer's description of the book to readers with previous biblical training.

As for his approach to the text, Gordon works on the basis that a text cannot be chopped up for the sake of localizing sources without taking into account the rules of the poetics of biblical narrative which structure the text as a single entity. The reviewer finds this approach to be a necessary tool for understanding the process of inspiration. Gordon's position is that the question of inspiration cannot be isolated from the literary form of the text.

Watts understands the literary form of the text as a single entity and as such is capable of being the means by which the text was inspired. Watts also notes that the literary form of the text is capable of being the means by which the text was inspired. Watts also notes that the literary form of the text is capable of being the means by which the text was inspired. Watts also notes that the literary form of the text is capable of being the means by which the text was inspired.

Gordon's approach to the text is in line with the reviewer's understanding of the text as a single entity. This understanding is based on the literary form of the text and is capable of being the means by which the text was inspired. Watts also notes that the literary form of the text is capable of being the means by which the text was inspired. Watts also notes that the literary form of the text is capable of being the means by which the text was inspired. Watts also notes that the literary form of the text is capable of being the means by which the text was inspired. Watts also notes that the literary form of the text is capable of being the means by which the text was inspired. Watts also notes that the literary form of the text is capable of being the means by which the text was inspired. Watts also notes that the literary form of the text is capable of being the means by which the text was inspired. Watts also notes that the literary form of the text is capable of being the means by which the text was inspired.

The introductory section of the commentary provides a careful survey of previous work, including a brief discussion of the question of Deuteronomistic history. A large part of the introduction is taken up by an overview of 1 and 2 Samuel in Gentile contexts. The reviewer finds these two books to be important for the study of the OT and notes that the study of these books is crucial for understanding the theological development of the OT.

This commentary is the latest in a series of detailed works on 1 and 2 Samuel, which have recently inundated the world of biblical studies. It can deal with the same author as the previous commentaries, and the same author, Professor Ortlund, was involved in the earlier commentaries. The reviewer finds this commentary to be a useful tool for understanding the text and believes that it will be of great value to those who are interested in the study of 1 and 2 Samuel.
would like to question the validity of applying a method used in the study of modern literature to the study of history, considering the differences in literary genre. In addition, Kinghary dates Matthew 1.21 as late as the 5th century AD, which is unlike the apostle, but the reviewer would like to challenge his view in spite of the scholarly consensus (cf. J. A. T. Robinson, The Priority of Matthew, 1969 and D. A. Carson’s commentary on Matthew). A recent edition of PC on Matthew is valuable introduction to the Matthean studies, but there are major questions about studies and Kinghary’s application of literary history to his method.

Akio Itō, Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.


This book is amazing. If you thought that German academics were incapable of writing interesting material for the ordinary Christian, just try this book. The reviewer gives two reasons why: the first is 10 pages from Jesus’ teaching on love since Jesus’ teaching; and 2) that fact in 10 pages. If you tell me that it is an attempt to help the non-specialist to a fuller understanding of the historical Jesus, I do not believe that the specialist. The knowledge of the history of the first century is not necessary to understand the book.

I will examine the first of this review is a topic in this book, discussing some of the topics raised in the original book from a different perspective. Students will really get to know a standard reference work.

The book falls into four parts. After a brief introduction Georgi surveys the history of New Testament studies of Paul’s colleagues and Hellenistic Jewish culture. He concludes his book by discussing the effectiveness of the viewpoint in the Galilean context. This book is valuable for students, especially those who are interested in the development of early Christianity. The book is well written, clear, and easy to understand. The reviewer recommends it for all libraries, especially those with an interest in New Testament studies.


When a Jamaican Seventh-Day Adventist presents what we suspect is his doctoral thesis, it is time to review over seeing Caribbean scholars joining in scholarly dialogue. Furthermore, a study of the economy of James is a good one. The book is well written and thought-provoking, and the reader will find the book to be a valuable addition to the literature on James.

Maynard-Reid argues that James is to be set in the period before AD 50, thus re-writing the entire economy of James. He argues that Jews and Gentile Christians were more in Jesus’ teachings than just between Jewish and Gentile. In the light of this, the larger and the general attitudes towards rich and poor in the first century, he argues, are not consistent with what he argues in the text. He notes that there are some who have been known as rich and poor.

Wright circumvents this last criticism by arguing that Colossians is political in content.

... Paul is warning the readers not to be taken in by the claims of Judaism, which would try (as in Acts 15:3) to persuade converts to Christianity that their present position was unacceptable. On the contrary, they were to be encouraged to remain Jews, and that act as an organ of divine power. George then looks at early Christianity and concludes that the majority of early Christians were similar to the Hellenistic-Jewish pneumatic apologists, seeing Jesus as a ‘divine man’ (cf. Mark’s view of Jesus). The author then moves on to examine what he calls the ‘political context’, which he sees as well as 10–13, for his view that Paul’s opponents found in Jesus a ‘divine man’ and a political identity. The author suggests that the political context is significant, and that this is suggested by Paul’s words. George correctly argues that the issue between Paul and his opponents is not merely socio-political, but also religious and theological. The author then gives an example of the Jamesian with their ‘spiritual relativity’, a political and the Pastoral Epistles (i.e., so-called ‘early church’). The author then moves on to examine the Epistle to the Hebrews, and concludes that this is a political document.

In other words, Wright thinks Paul is doing in Colossians what he did in Gal. 4:11; only in Galatians Paul is facing Judaism that has already begun, while in Colossians it is treated as a real danger, but only potentially so. This thesis starts with the advantage of a measure of a priori probability (i.e., the situation envisaged must have been one particular case). The author then moves on to examine the Pauline Christology, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and concludes that this is a political document.

The whole picture George paints of Jewish and Gentile missionaries is a cause of many, as it is a political document. The author then moves on to examine the Epistle to the Hebrews, and concludes that this is a political document. The author then moves on to examine the Epistle to the Hebrews, and concludes that this is a political document. The author then moves on to examine the Epistle to the Hebrews, and concludes that this is a political document. The author then moves on to examine the Epistle to the Hebrews, and concludes that this is a political document. The author then moves on to examine the Epistle to the Hebrews, and concludes that this is a political document.

it is always clear what he thinks Paul is saying, and how it relates to the rest of the letter. He has a good eye for irony: see for example the light thrown on the notoriously difficult sentence in 2:15 by his argument.

These powers, angry at his challenge to their sovereignty, stripped him naked, held him up to public contempt, and celebrated a triumph over him as the king of the world—"the prince of the power of the air". Thus, the paradox of the cross, and one moreover which shows in what profound way the death of Christ is perceived as the beginning of the new age. The author then moves on to examine the Epistle to the Hebrews, and concludes that this is a political document. The author then moves on to examine the Epistle to the Hebrews, and concludes that this is a political document. The author then moves on to examine the Epistle to the Hebrews, and concludes that this is a political document. The author then moves on to examine the Epistle to the Hebrews, and concludes that this is a political document. The author then moves on to examine the Epistle to the Hebrews, and concludes that this is a political document. The author then moves on to examine the Epistle to the Hebrews, and concludes that this is a political document.

The Fundy New Testament Commentaries are being revised to serve a new generation, and Tom Wright has contributed to this model. It is both admirably untechnical and lucid, while yet being firm and confident. The reviewer believes that the model offers a great contribution to the understanding of the letters, particularly of Colossians.

Colossians, like most (if not all) of Paul’s letters, was written to particular historical circumstances, and how one understands the situation one is arguing from is very little. However, it is not the whole story: the emphasis in the epistle on Christ’s superiority to the powers (1:16; 2:20), on the importance of ‘growth’ as a metaphor for spiritual development, and on Paul’s participation in Christ’s death and resurrection (2:11-12, 18) hold that the false teaching was the early stage of a movement, not just an isolated incident.

The most significant difference between the two approaches is that the reviewer’s model offers a more complete understanding of the historical context of Paul’s letter. The reviewer believes that Paul’s letter was written to warn against false teaching, and to encourage the Colossians to hold to the truth. The reviewer concludes that Paul’s letter was written to warn against false teaching, and to encourage the Colossians to hold to the truth.

The reviewer concludes that Paul’s letter was written to warn against false teaching, and to encourage the Colossians to hold to the truth.

The reviewer concludes that Paul’s letter was written to warn against false teaching, and to encourage the Colossians to hold to the truth.

The reviewer concludes that Paul’s letter was written to warn against false teaching, and to encourage the Colossians to hold to the truth.
With respect to the question of who Paul's opponents were, there are three categories of scholars who argue for one or another of the hypotheses: (i) Geoghegan, (ii) the school of Geoghegan, or (iii) something like Geoghegan’s suggestion. The value of Geoghegan's work lies in his capacity to sharpen the debate and to make us aware of important factual reasons for believing that Paul's opponents were “different” from his opponents in 1 Cor., and (ii) Hartill's review is one of the best I have come across in this field. Hartill has very lucidly and Hellenistic syncretism. This book represents the English translation of a 1958 doctoral dissertation, revised and published in Germany in 1964. The published version has become the standard work on the subject. More than a translation, however, from p. 330 to 370, it is also a commentary, and the discussion of passages implies a critique of the traditional interpretation. 

The plot is pure fiction, the background solidly substantiated fact. It is an historical novel, about a totally imaginary Andreas, from Syria, who becomes the friend and confidant of Paul. The book leads the reader ever closer to the mysterious figure of the prophet Jesus. Faced with the realities of Jerusalem life, and the life of the church through his, ‘shadow’ broods over the book, even though Andreas never in fact meets him face to face. The effect is thus to reconstruct the life of Jesus in the Jerusalem community and to highlight major and political tensions, and to allow Jesus to gradually take shape within that wider scene, as an emissary who might have been known to his followers. Such a project could easily have turned embarrassingly wooden and unbelievable, like so many of the ‘novels’ of modern Jewish novels. That it succeeds brilliantly is due in part to the author’s impeccable scholarship, but much more to the fact that he has thrown himself into the creative task with verve and skill. Andreas and his friends (who include Arabba) are characters with whom one is eager to identify. His novelistic approach means that the reader is drawn into the world of the early Christians, the setting is vivid, and the skill and imagination in combining perceptive character study with historical accuracy is remarkable. Although the novel is set in the time of Jesus, and the whole story is given the air of historical authenticity, pictures the life of the church in the great cities of the ancient Mediterranean world. They saw themselves as ‘divine men’, and painted Moses in this light. A thesis which has been advocated for some time is that the early Christians were regarded as the ‘divine men’ (as Mark’s account of Jesus). The most striking example of this is the fact that Jesus as a divine being, as well as to 10, for his view that Paul’s opponents were found in a Jesus who was more than a mere prophet. Geoghegan correctly argues that the issue between Paul and his opponents is not merely socio-political, but also theological. Paul’s opponents were “Jews with their spiritual relatives”, and the Epistle to the Galatians was written to counteract this, according to the author. Fourth, in the Epilogue Geoghegan wanders through the various topics and issues which his previous dissertation touched upon. These include source criticism of 2 Cor., Hellenistic Jewish Apologetics, and the divine man motif. The central theme of the Epilogue is the problem of interpreting Paul’s thought, and he provides a useful and stimulating account of the issues during this period. This is used as a stick to beat Geoghegan’s opponents. The book is clearly written, and Geoghegan’s arguments are supported by a wealth of Hellenistic-Jewish opponents of Paul. The whole picture George paints of Jewish missionary activities is based on a very solid foundation, and is presented in a clear and logical manner. However, I was not entirely satisfied with his method of synthesis. For instance, I think one should think of Paul’s opponents as Jews who were not followers of Christ. The book ends with a comprehensive bibliography, a helpful index and a list of abbreviations.
take up the cause of the oppressed’. Again, Maynard-Reid may be able to establish this conclusion as being implied in James (as he well establishes James’ interest in the poor and his viewing the rich as obstacles to social justice) without necessarily having to present them as so. Short, this is a good book, but it is not a beginning. It is, however, a conclusion, but helpful for further study. It goes somewhat beyond the Register. He presents two test cases: first-century Romans, where he wants others to understand and build on this foundation and extend the arguments it begins.

Peter H. Davids, Coquitlam BC, Canada.


This book has won me over. My first impression was of yet another ‘Introduction to the New Testament’, expanded by the addition of some material on the historical, cultural and religious setting of the early church. As such I expected it to be worthy but unremarkable, and the introduction fed my fears, as the author talked, as I think most of us do, of new and new and new and new. The need for a new approach by way of an ‘experience-interrogation model’, seeing the growth of the NT within the ‘symbolic world’ which seemed to mean simply ‘culture’ or ‘first-century Judaism’. A glance at the table of contents, with its apparently traditional book-by-book account of the NT writings, suggested to me that all this was just pretentious verbiage, and that nothing had really been gained.

I wish to apologize to the author for jumping to such unjustified conclusions. Digging a little deeper into the introduction, they should first read the author’s ‘ten theses on the canon’ (pp. 344-547). There you will find an approach to the study of Scripture which will probably be new to a great many readers. This study of the canon of the NT, unlike other historical studies, keeps it firmly in its place. The Bible is the church’s book, for the church, not as a detached academic pursuit. There are strong echoes here of Trendal’s ‘canonical’ approach to Scripture. It brings an air of something more than an historical investigation of the order in which the books were written and learn from it rather than to ‘explain’ it. The whole is bathed in healthy Christian spirituality. This is a further elaboration of the way biblical scholarship is moving away from arid analysis of source-criticism and canon criticism towards a desire to let the text speak for itself, then we have a lot to look forward to.

Before turning to the books themselves, Parts One and Two introduce the historical and cultural setting of the NT and ‘The Christian Experience’. These cover roughly what we have been calling the ‘background’. Although traditional; the latter more impressive in its attempt to do justice to how and why the Christian movement ever got off the ground in the first place. While it is more concerned with the essential foundations of Christian faith, not just as an idea, but as something rooted in the particularities of the social, cultural and religious traditions towards the writing of the NT books is then discussed in a way reminiscent of Moule’s Birth of the New Testament, i.e. one which treats the NT as a product of the historical, social and cultural conditions in real world, not as mechanical manipulators of fragmentary sources. Consequently, a number of standard critical methods have to be set aside.


Christopher Tuckett, Lecturer in NT Studies at Manchester, has undertaken the ambitious study of analysing a great mass of parallels between the Nag Hammadi Gospels, the related Bodmer Codices (5267), and the related Berlin Codex (5820). He excludes from his study The Gospel of Thomas and The Gospel of Philip as these are clearly in a different class. In his view, the text does have a number of subjects of discussions.

The original stimulus for the project came from the contention of J. M. Robinson and H. Koester that the Gospel of Thomas contains a number of traditions similar to the hypothetical Q which we have seen in the Synoptic Gospels. Some time ago, Tuckett noted in the context of the ‘Mood of the New Testament’ (as he calls it) that ‘some passion’ was apparent in the synoptic Gospels and the Synoptic Gospels were even more so. This led to the hypothesis that the Synoptic Parallelism was not simply due to one’s scholarly interests but to a common passion that was present in the Synoptic Matrix.

Tuckett has concluded that the Synoptic Gospels (I, 2, 5) betray knowledge of the gospels of Matthew and Luke (p. 97). The text does contain a number of interesting independent sayings on such a parable of dates, which the author does not consider ‘necessarily domineering’ (p. 89). On the other hand C. W. Hedrick, ‘Dominion Sayings in the Synoptic Gospels’ (Journal of the American Academy of Religion, NT 29 (1983), pp. 146-9) has argued that this saying, along with others, fits the criteria for determining authentic sayings of Jesus.

Synoptic allusions in The Gospel of Thomas (I, 3 and X, 2) can be explained first—date dependence on Matthew (pp. 58-60), as it is in the case with The Apocalypse of John (II, 1; III, 1; IV, 1; BG 850, 2) (p. 5). The author is confident that the Synoptic allusions can be traced to Matthew except for the reference to the Good Samaritan, which he says is clear. The Synoptic allusion to John was exactly this way of Jesus Christ’s: John 13:31-35 (= BG 206) and similarly dependent upon Matthew and Luke (p. 35).

R. S. Edwards shows three traditions in The Gospel of John (1, 12; 6, 18) which are similar: the same synoptic allusions as does also a Valentinian Exposition (XI, 2) (p. 83). The Interpretation of Knowledge (XI, 1) depends on Matthew (p. 145). The Gospel of Mark (BG 850, 4) also relies on Matthew (p. 38).

The common-sense for pre-synoptic sources in the Nag Hammadi tractates turned out to be so fine, as he discovered that allusions to synoptic materials were dependent upon the gospels in their present state. The gospels in their present state are primarily on Matthew is consistent with the popularity of the first gospel for all the early church (p. 150). Tuckett concludes:

One important, albeit negative, result of the analysis undertaken here is that there appears to be no evidence for the use of pre-synoptic materials that can be dated with any accuracy. The synoptic reflex at tradition all, the texts examined here appear to point to a common source in the pre-Q gospels of Matthew, Mark or Luke...there is also no evidence for the continuing survival and transmission in the Q source (or any other pre-Q-reductional synoptic source) by Gnostic communities (p. 149).

Dick France, London Bible College.

D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (eds), Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon (Leicester: IVP, 1986), vi + 468 pp., £9.95.

This book is a companion to the earlier volume, Scripture and Truth (IVP 1985), which argues that the Bible is the Word of God and is its basic text in is again presented here, i.e. the evangelical view of the phenomenon of Scripture, in contrast to the critical method. This book is particularly important because the contributors belong to a new breed of evangelical scholars and have written many books and articles on several topics. The nine essays are on three specific areas, as the title indicates, though not evenly distributed.

First of all comes an introduction by Carson, the wide scope of which covers the entire book, particularly the first part. Although the author, makes it an excellent way into the debate. Kevin Vanhoozer writes an important essay which contains the revelation that allows for a due appreciation of the varied literary forms in the Bible. Moises Silva addresses the question of Historical Reconstruction. He presents two test cases: first-century Pharisees and Christianity. Silva pinpoints some well-established prejudices and leads the reader to the understanding that the ideas that the Pharisees were 'too strict' in their observance of the Law, and that Jesus was not-in fact, not—against the Law, but is consistent with it. Paul Wright recognizes the 'relaxation of God's standards' (p. 119). Craig Blomberg deals with the problem of harmonization. His thesis is that 'active' harmonization is impossible except by the addition of material. A true and genuine harmonization in conjunction with Redaction Criticism, can be legitimately employed to bring together apparent discrepancies in the text.

Douglas Moo discusses the problem of senus peletur ("full sense"). He believes that a better alternative can be found in a 'canonical approach' to the text and that the author of the text is not the canons as witness to salvation-history (p. 209). John Frame concentrates on the work of the Spirit in revelation, inspiration and internal testimony. He challenges the Barthian school on its assumption that the orthodox view of biblical authority denies God’s (the Spirit’s) role in the production of Scripture. He argues that the relationship between the message and the form of Scripture: ‘Believing Scripture is believing that message [God], and believing the messenger believing the book’ (p. 228).

John Woodbridge contradicts the widespread idea that modern evangelical emphasis on inerrancy originated as a reaction to the rationalistic outlook of the Enlightenment. He makes a strong case for the idea that the inerrancy debate is prompted by modern evangelicals. G. Bromley surveys Barth’s position regarding inerrancy. He argues that Barth lacks any commitment to the idea of being witnesses to but not revelation themselves, and Barth’s dismissal of inerrancy. But Bromley sees merits too in Barth’s view, not the least of which is that it clarifies the authentic authority of God himself.

Tuckett contributes the only (but lengthy) essay dealing with the canon of the Scriptures. In the discussion of the canon of the NT he agrees with Ridderso’s approach to canon history, viewing it on the part of the apostles, not as a creation of the church. He concludes that the canon comprises the only (but lengthy) essay dealing with the canon of the Scriptures. In the discussion of the canon of the NT he agrees with Ridderso’s approach to canon history, viewing it on the part of the apostles, not as a creation of the church. He concludes that the canon comprises the


Elsie K. Kosters, Edinburgh.

Alan S. Duttie, Bible Translations and how to choose between them (Exeter: Paternoster, 1985), 127 pp., £3.50.


There is a wealth of choice of versions lying before the reader of the Bible in English. Riches indeed—but the very variety may be
take up the cause of the oppressed’. Again, Manyard-Roi dust may be able to establish this conclusion as being implied in James (as he well establishes James’ interest in the poor and his view of the rich as obstacles), but the evidence adduced to back up this theory is not present in the text.

In short, this is a good book, but it is not a beginning. It is not a conclusion, but a helpful basis for further study. It goes somewhat beyond the two previous works, notably the Reformation. It presents two test cases: first, the ‘excommunication’ of the Arians and, secondly, the attempt to focus on themes and characteristics of the book. The differing character of the witness of the two is a good indication of the need for responsibility and stimulating attempt to let the reader listen with deeper appreciation to what the book wants to say. The book really is, then, a contribution to the study of the history of Christian doctrine and the ‘relaxation of God’s standards’ (p. 119). Craig Blomberg deals with the problem of harmonization. His thesis is that ‘additive’ harmonizations do not offer a solution to the problem. In conjunction with Reduction Criticism, can be legitimately employed to make sense of this text.

Douglas Moo discusses the problem of serenam pietas (‘full sense’). He believes that a better alternative can be found in a ‘canonical’ approach, which is based on the understanding of the canon as witness to salvation-history (p. 209). John Frame concentrates on the work of the Spirit in revelation, inspiration and internal testimony. He challenges the Barthian school on its assumption that the orthodox view of biblical authority denies God’s (the Spirit’s) inspiration and the possibility of a certificate of inspiration, primarily on Matthew is consistent with the popularity of the first gospel at the time of the early churches (p. 150).

Tuckett concludes:

One important, albeit negative, result of the analysis undertaken here is that there are apparently no evidence for the use of prescriptives or imperatives in the Gospels. This is not surprising. The canonical tradition of the whole New Testament is far too stylized to reflect any tradition of standard, which as often to be explained as a reflection of the culture of the New Testament... Orcas (p. 117). Tuckett concludes with a discussion of the ‘The Gospel of Matthew’ (pp. 213-215).

Dick France, London Bible College.


Christopher Tuckett, Lecturer in NT Studies at Manchester, has undertaken the ambitious study of analyzing a great mass of parallels between the Gospels. This is a difficult task, and the result is a book which is well worth the effort. The book is divided into two parts: the first part is a general introduction to the Gospels, and the second part is a detailed analysis of the parallels between the Gospels. The book is well written, and the author is clearly a master of the subject. The only downside of the book is that it is quite expensive, and may not be accessible to everyone.

The book is divided into two parts: the first part is a general introduction to the Gospels, and the second part is a detailed analysis of the parallels between the Gospels. The book is well written, and the author is clearly a master of the subject. The only downside of the book is that it is quite expensive, and may not be accessible to everyone.
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The purpose and method of the New International Version

In fact in many ways the short title is more accurate than the fuller one: most of the principles which the book describes and advocates are common in all major English versions of the Bible since the mid-sixteenth century. This book is really a collection of discussions of some points in 20th-century English translation that have never before been clearly articulated. The NIV is, in effect, a collection of 14 separate papers, varying widely in approach from the rather diffuse generalities of Colin Brown's 'realization' or 'recontextual' approach to the very specific translation problems that the rendering of sh 'ol (Richard Harris—ch. 5) or bichal (Ralph Earle—ch. 4) texts. The topics may be roughly divided into three groups: those dealing with technical problems, those dealing with difficult conceptual problems, and those dealing with questions of exegesis which present themselves to the translator as 'translating' friend or foe of the original. The first group requires an understanding of Jewish law, the evangelists on the primary datum, he can do no more than say that notoriously the evangelists do not agree about secondary details. Ch. 7 is a survey of the Trinity; Ch. 8 ('The definition of Jesus') shows how all the great doctrines radiate from the central doctrine. Ch. 9 is a survey of the Greek NT; Ch. 10 is a survey of the NRSV; Ch. 11 is a survey of the NIV. The editor has the final word on how the questions were answered and what the conclusions are.

The main discussion is of principles, with illustrative examples drawn from the four specific English versions in a list of about 40 whole Bibles and 60 NTV's. Each of these translations is cited in exemplification of both desirable and regrettable characteristics common to all four. Other books about Bible translations tend to tackle the field version by version. This is true of histories of the English Bible such as Bruce (The English Bible, Lutterworth, 1961), which also tends to have much fuller discussion of the earlier history than of the 20th-century versions. (This book is a fully updated and expanded edition of The History of the Bible in English, 1967.) It is also the case that the history of translation for any particular language is a single, unbroken story from the New Testament through to the present. In both cases it is safe to assume that in this field of scholarship the Symposium is the book to read. It is a very useful book to have around, and it is a book which any student who is interested in this field would do well to possess.

The advantage of this approach is that when further versions or major revisions appear in the future, users can consult the principles discussed in this book and re-read the relevant sections of these new translations.

This book is an excellent job of producing the book with a nicely distinguished bold face, italic and small capitals used to give emphasis and to distinguish different types of version cited. There are no errors that are of any significance. The book is well done. It is a valuable contribution to the field of the study of translation difficulties. I would wholeheartedly recommend this book for everyone who is interested in the history of English Bible versions in a large number of very short chapters, presumably a reflection of the original publication of the material in 14 magazine articles in Theology. This is a useful book to have around, and in this presentation separates out sub-topics may well make the book more useful, particularly as the reviewer may then want to go back to the original text for more information. It is to be noted that the reviewer may make the point that the reviewer may have a cluster of footnotes: these are, to my mind, overserved. Neither honestly nor humility requires that every point one makes be referred to something else. I would like to see this reviewer be more self-sufficient in this regard.

The general criticisms of the present version are set out in a large number of very short chapters, presumably a reflection of the original publication of the material in 14 magazine articles in Theology. This is a useful book to have around, and in this presentation separates out sub-topics may well make the book more useful, particularly as the reviewer may then want to go back to the original text for more information. It is to be noted that the reviewer may have a cluster of footnotes: these are, to my mind, overserved. Neither honestly nor humility requires that every point one makes be referred to something else. I would like to see this reviewer be more self-sufficient in this regard.

Of the general topics, Linton writes about the importance of literary style, and one could wish that it were more developed in the original. I would heartily agree, but am not convinced that this is widely put into practice in the NIV—more revealing is Seek's 'speaking' of the NIV, which is also, I believe, a fresh approach to the task. A note should also be added to the discussion of alliteration, where, in the passage from John 1:14, the original NIV has a cluster of footnotes: these are, to my mind, overserved. Neither honestly nor humility requires that every point one makes be referred to something else. I would like to see this reviewer be more self-sufficient in this regard.

Of the general topics, Linton writes about the importance of literary style, and one could wish that it were more developed in the original. I would heartily agree, but am not convinced that this is widely put into practice in the NIV—more revealing is Seek's 'speaking' of the NIV, which is also, I believe, a fresh approach to the task. A note should also be added to the discussion of alliteration, where, in the passage from John 1:14, the original NIV has a cluster of footnotes: these are, to my mind, overserved. Neither honestly nor humility requires that every point one makes be referred to something else. I would like to see this reviewer be more self-sufficient in this regard.

In spite of its sub-title, 'The Use and Abuse of the Bible in the Debate about Women in the Church', Mary Hayter actually limits herself to the NT and the ordination of women within the Church of England. Readers not concerned with that particular debate are likely to find the book, which inevitably makes assumptions about the nature of early women's ordination, of little use. However, within that context it has a very useful contribution to make.

Part I, on the roles of the women, the audience; the essay which names the movement of the ordination of women within the Church of England. Readers not concerned with that particular debate are likely to find the book, which inevitably makes assumptions about the nature of early women's ordination, of little use. However, within that context it has a very useful contribution to make.
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Duthie approaches the question from a detailed understanding of linguistics and translation theory as well as biblical studies and a Christian perspective. He feels that the translation process is considered, from the identity of the translators, to the literary style, to the context and purpose of the translation. He is very critical of the New International Version (NIV).

The main discussion is of principles, with illustrative examples drawn from a variety of English versions in a list of about 40 whole Bibles of 60 NTs. Each of these translations is cited in exemplification of both desirable and regrettable characteristics common to English translations. Another book about Bible translations tend to tackle the method by version. This is true of histories of the English Bible such as Bruce (The English Bible, Lutterworth, 1961), which also tend to have much fuller discussion of the earlier history than the 20th-century versions. Another book is a brief of the English Bible (The History of the English Bible, 1979). It is also the first English version of Duthie's thoughts on English Bible translation. It is a revised edition (The History of the English Bible in English, 1979). It is also the only book by Duthie that can be read without previous knowledge of his work. The book is divided into nine parts: a part on each version or type of translation for all the castigated features, while illustrating the "proper" way to translate from the author's own thoughts. The first edition was published in 1979. It is revised in 1997, and again in 1998.

The book is divided into nine parts: a part on each version or type of translation for all the castigated features, while illustrating the "proper" way to translate from the author's own thoughts. It is revised in 1997, and again in 1998.

The book is divided into nine parts: a part on each version or type of translation for all the castigated features, while illustrating the "proper" way to translate from the author's own thoughts. It is revised in 1997, and again in 1998.

The book is divided into nine parts: a part on each version or type of translation for all the castigated features, while illustrating the "proper" way to translate from the author's own thoughts. It is revised in 1997, and again in 1998.

The book is divided into nine parts: a part on each version or type of translation for all the castigated features, while illustrating the "proper" way to translate from the author's own thoughts. It is revised in 1997, and again in 1998.

The book is divided into nine parts: a part on each version or type of translation for all the castigated features, while illustrating the "proper" way to translate from the author's own thoughts. It is revised in 1997, and again in 1998.

The book is divided into nine parts: a part on each version or type of translation for all the castigated features, while illustrating the "proper" way to translate from the author's own thoughts. It is revised in 1997, and again in 1998.

The book is divided into nine parts: a part on each version or type of translation for all the castigated features, while illustrating the "proper" way to translate from the author's own thoughts. It is revised in 1997, and again in 1998.

The book is divided into nine parts: a part on each version or type of translation for all the castigated features, while illustrating the "proper" way to translate from the author's own thoughts. It is revised in 1997, and again in 1998.
America and England is perhaps indicated by the difficulties the author of this work had in finding a publisher willing to accept it. Bultmann is unquestionably one of the most important theologians of our time. It is of great importance for the present NT study and systematic theology. In the last two decades, however, there has been a growing reaction against Bultmann's views in many circles. This is not surprising. The rise of modern Catholic and Protestant (associated with Kierkegaard and Brunner), and the new interest in the NT and its interpretation, has led to a new evaluation of Bultmann's work and a growing dissatisfaction with Bultmann's approach to both the NT and history. Although Bultmann is no longer the theological force which he once was, he still has a considerable influence in certain circles.

This book provides a helpful guide to a selection of such works by Bultmann.

Dr. Painter (who is head of the Division of Religious Studies at La Verne College) offers an excellent guide to Bultmann's approach to the history of Jesus. He provides a careful study of Bultmann's understanding of the theological relevance of existential and ethical questions, and the role of the NT in contemporary society. Bultmann's emphasis on the significance of Jesus' death and resurrection is emphasized, and the role of the NT in contemporary society is considered.


Peter Hocken is an English Roman Catholic priest who is now a professor of church history at The Catholic University of America in Washington, DC. This book is the result of a doctoral thesis under Prof. Walter Hollenweger at Birmingham University and reflects the particular interest of the Church in the charismatic movement, for which that centre is becoming known. Hocken's theme is fasci-

ating both for Roman Catholics and for Protestants, and for his purposes his sources - conversations, diaries, prayer letters, popular publications and the like. It contains something of a surprise, that through Bultmann's work and a growing dissatisfaction with Bultmann's approach to both the NT and history. Although Bultmann is no longer the theological force which he once was, he still has a considerable influence in certain circles.
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William Zuidema, Godiva's Partner: An Encounter with Judaism (London: SCM, 1987; from 2nd ed. of Dutch original, Onverwacht met het jodendom), 217 pp. + notes, £8.50

This book, by the then Study Secretary for Jewish-Christian relations for the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands, shows the appreciations of the book and the bibliography to students in their first year of theological study. John Bowen's characteristic is clear and concise. The notes and bibliography are very good and representative of their areas of study. But one major criticism must be made at the outset, namely, that the book only deals with orthodox Jewish life, thereby neglecting the full range of world Jewry today. However, this reviewer would endorse that students should be made aware of some of the differences between Ashkenazi, Sephardi, and Oriental Jewry, and that the question of Judaism is a highly complex one.

Zuidema has built this book up from years of teaching seminars to Christian groups, and suggests that the book could be used profitably in this way by Christians today. This reviewer would endorse that suggestion. It is a very worthwhile book to read and have in your library.

Walter Riegas, All Nations Christian College, Ware.

Peter Hocken, Streams of Renewal: The Origins and Early Development of the Charismatic Movement in Great Britain (Exeter: Paternoster, 1986), 288 pp., £7.50

Peter Hocken is an English Roman Catholic priest who is now a member of the staff of the University of Maryland, USA. This book represents the conclusions of his doctoral research under Prof. Walter Hollenweger at Birmingham University and reflects the pastoral interest of the charismatic movement, for which that centre is becoming known. Hocken's theme is fasci- cinating both for its relationship to a range of its sources - conversations, diaries, prayer letters, popular publications and the like. It contains something of a surprise that events through which some of the leaders of the movement were engaged, such as the charismatic renewal, the fact that all this can be researched by a Roman Catholic priest is itself a reflection of his own position of responsibility.

Hocken sets out to chart the origins of charismatic renewal up to the end of 1963. His first intention is to uncover the facts of what actually happened and this is done by listening to the witnesses of those events. The emerging pattern roots the origin of the charismatic movement in the influence of certain independent figures who were initially involved in the 20th century German charismatic renewal, in particular the group surrounding Pentecostal, Cecil Cousen, David Lillie, Arthur Troun, Camille Hogg and the early days of the Church of God at Wigan. From these individuals the renewal began to spread to the denominations and at this point Hocken gives great weight to the protestant tradition. The book is well written and well researched (associated with Kissmann and Bornkamm), and the new interest in the theology of the charismatic revival is readily apparent. But there is no evidence of the growing dissatisfaction with Burkitt's approach to both the NT and history. Although Burkitt is no longer the theological force which he once was, he is still highly regarded for his work of reference. This book provides a helpful guide to a selection of such resources.

Dr Painter (who is head of the Division of Religious Studies at La Trobe University) provides a helpful guide to Burkitt's approach to the history of Jesus. He provides a careful study of Burkitt's understanding of the theological relevance of existentialism and his position on the theories of the historical Jesus in terms of Heggdett; his hermeneutical presuppositions underlying his NT exegesis; his account of the resurrection of Jesus; his understanding of the significance of Jesus Christ; and his views on the relation of faith and understanding. In every area we find a workman- like approach to the literature, with helpful references to the secondary literature. Painter is an unqualified admirer of Burkitt, and has little hesitation in pointing out some of the obvious weaknesses of his approach (for example, his strong subjective understanding of the resurrection).

This book is not suitable as an introduction to Burkitt. It is likely to be of interest to the reader who is already familiar with Burkitt's position, who is interested in the debates surrounding the invention of the historical Jesus and who is interested in the historical Jesus as a religious phenomenon in terms of Hegdett; his hermeneutical presuppositions underlying his NT exegesis; his account of the resurrection of Jesus; his understanding of the significance of Jesus Christ, and his views on the relation of faith and understanding. In every area we find a workmanlike approach to the literature, with helpful references to the secondary literature. Painter is an unqualified admirer of Burkitt, and has little hesitation in pointing out some of the obvious weaknesses of his approach (for example, his strong subjective understanding of the resurrection).
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