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Editorial: The End is Near. In what sense?

In the gospels Jesus announces that 'the kingdom of God has come near' (e.g. Mk. 1:15); in the book of Revelation the heavenly Jesus promises 'I am coming soon' (Rev. 22:20). From beginning to end the NT is marked by a sense of urgency. Students. It seeks to address itself to questions being faced by theological students in their studies and to help readers to think out a clear biblical faith.

In the NT the most striking evidence is the teaching of Paul, for example in 1 Corinthians 7 where he appears to advocate celibacy on the grounds that the time before the end is short (7:29). There are other passages, especially in 1 Thessalonians, where the conclusion that the end appears very near. In 1 Thessalonians 4 the Thessalonians are described as grieving over lost loved ones, and it seems that their grief was because they had not reckoned with believers dying before the Lord's return. This expectation of a near end is something that they presumably learned from Paul, even if they misunderstood exactly what he meant (for Paul's teaching see 1 Thes. 1:10, 4:15 etc.).

What are we, who live in 1988, to make of these first-century expectations? A very widely-held opinion is that we should recognize that Jesus and the first Christians were mistaken. Many scholars take this view, and argue that the NT times had to come to terms with the 'delay of the parousia' and with the fact that its initial hopes and expectations were not fulfilled. They see this adjustment of perspective as something that is very important for an understanding of the NT, both for the history of late antiquity and for the interpretation of particular texts, such as John 21:20-23 and 2 and 3 Peter, but also more broadly; for example, they see the shift of perspective reflected in Luke's writings as a whole, since he (supposedly) thinks in terms of Jesus' history and the church's history rather than in terms of a near end, and also in John's Gospel with its emphasis on eternal life now in the Spirit rather than on eternal life in the future at the Lord's return. This evidence is often left out of account and/or ascribed to the church rather than to Jesus; but it is not obvious that this is justified, and we must beware of ignoring evidence that happens not to fit our hypothesis very easily.

As for the general sense of urgency which seems to pervade the New Testament, this is variously explained: for example, as a result of the widespread belief that the end of the world was near, or that the parousia was imminent. This may mean that the parousia was understood to be an event which was of course conditional (e.g. conditional on the teaching of the gospel) and that the conditions were not fulfilled. Another view is that the widespread belief that the parousia was imminent may have been superstitious, and that the reason for the belief was that the parousia was an event which was of course conditional (e.g. conditional on the teaching of the gospel) and that the conditions were not fulfilled. Another view is that the widespread belief that the parousia was imminent may have been superstitious, and that the reason for the belief was that the parousia was an event which was of course conditional (e.g. conditional on the teaching of the gospel) and that the conditions were not fulfilled. Another view is that the widespread belief that the parousia was imminent may have been superstitious, and that the reason for the belief was that the parousia was an event which was of course conditional (e.g. conditional on the teaching of the gospel) and that the conditions were not fulfilled. Another view is that the widespread belief that the parousia was imminent may have been superstitious, and that the reason for the belief was that the parousia was an event which was of course conditional (e.g. conditional on the teaching of the gospel) and that the conditions were not fulfilled.
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A general weakness with Allison's book, as with many other treatments of Jesus' eschatology, is that it underestimates or entirely ignores the role of eschatology in modern thinking and offering too simple an explanation of it. The ingredients that we need to reckon with include: (a) his predictions of his own death and resurrection; (b) his teaching about his going away; and (c) his teaching about his coming on the clouds of heaven and about the day of final judgment (e.g. Mk 13:24-27); (b) his warnings about judgment. The problem is that in the Gospel tradition, this being something that is to come in a generation and is apparently distinct from final judgment (e.g. Mt 23:36-39; Mk 13:14-20); (c) his sayings about Christian loving behavior toward each other. Perhaps even more accurately we should speak of Jesus' experience anticipating and also inaugurating the end-time... is active... and experience after him and with him, whether it is manifesting the kingdom in power or sharing his sufferings.

The evidence that Jesus saw his ministry as vicarious is considerable. Take Mark 10:45, for example. It is probably true that the presence of John and of the Twelve indicates that the Twelve are aware of Jesus'... and Jesus often uses the expression to describe his ministry to others and not simply to express his identity with others. Mark 10:45 illustrates the point: 'The Son of man came not to be served, but to serve and give his life as a ransom for many'. Here we have the expression 'Son of man' probably combined with the idea of the suffering servant of Isaiah 52 (another OT idea with corporate overtones); and the thought here is that Jesus' death is not simply part of the shared tribulation... the Son of man... to be judged by Jesus personally on behalf of the people of God. Jesus' death is eschatological judgment, but it is judgment taken by Jesus for the people — an idea with a strong OT background not only in Isaiah, but in other OT passages, but also in Zech 13:7-9.

The idea of Jesus' death and resurrection anticipating the final judgment and resurrection fits in with the present and future tenses of Jesus' kingdom teaching elsewhere in the Gospels. It is clear from the gospels that there are many points of... and the understanding that Jewish thinking could envision the final events — the judgment of evil and the arrival of the kingdom of God — as extending over time, and as a process or series of events that could involve the present. When Jesus announces that the kingdom of God has come and is coming, this means that the last act has begun but has not yet reached its climax; the kingdom of God is present in his activity and activity of Jesus, the kingdom of God is present... can be identified as a 'total event'... of several significant parts which together make up that whole' — and the way to interpret this 'total event' is to treat it as having already transpired' (Allison, pp. 105,106, including a quotation from Robert Kerr). Allison here recognizes that Jesus understood the kingdom to have come in his ministry in a partial way, but he does not see that it makes very clear sense to put Jesus' teaching on his death and resurrection into this context and to see them as key events in the process of the consummation of everything.

The kingdom's coming Jesus' coming... death... resur-... Pente-... Jerusalem... Gentile mission... Jesus' return

The NEW AGE OF GOD'S KINGDOM, OF HEALING, UNITY, LIFE

THE OLD AGE OF SATAN, SIN, DEATH

(For this diagram compare G. E. Ladd's Theology of the New Testament, pp. 68-69.)
A general weakness with Allison's book, as with many other treatments of Jesus' eschatology, is that it underestimates the context in which Jesus spoke. This offer- ing too simple an explanation of it. The ingredients that we need to reckon with include: (a) his predictions of his own death and resurrection; (b) his teaching about his going away; (c) his teaching about his coming in the clouds of heaven and about the day of final judgment (e.g. Mk. 13:24-27); (d) his warnings about judgment and persecution of the general church; (e) his teaching of the mission of the church, including mission to Gentiles; (f) his acknowledgment of his ignorance about the time of the end (Mt. 24:36); (g) other references of the coming and work of the Holy Spirit (e.g. in Jn. 16:14).

It is common for scholars faced with such a variety of evidence to oversimplify it, either by denying that some of the strands go back to Jesus, and/or by putting different ingredients of the 'Son of man' an assigned context which would be easy to be distinguished from each other. So just as the book helps Jesus' predictions of his death and resurrection remain, with the final judgment. Othersoversimplify in other ways for example, Marcus Borg, whose work was discussed in the last edition of Theology, plays down the relevance of Jesus' death in favour of the Son of Man. The context of the coming of Jesus is important to understand, particularly in relation to the coming of the Son of Man. Such views oversimplify the richness of Jesus' eschatological teaching. Can we better a better analysis?

Towards a solution

What an analysis such an analysis would probably be on the following lines:

1. We should agree with Allison and many other NT scholars that Jesus and his followers satisfied that the last days had come. For Jesus, the coming of the kingdom was not the proclamation of God's eternal rule or presence, but the announcement that God's promises in the OT for his people's salvation are now being fulfilled, and that through his ministry (e.g. Mt. 16:16-17, ch. 11). God's planned intervention had come; this was very interesting news.

2. However, Allison is right to say that Jesus envisaged the coming of the kingdom as a process extending over time. We are reminded of Jesus' seed parables which picture the kingdom as something small and growing. Jesus may have well have told the disciples this; but has his teaching been misunderstood? The question is, are we looking for an immediate accommodation. Another NT picture is that of a military campaign – a campaign against Satan which Jesus began and which will one day be completely won (cf. Mk. 3:22-27, I Cor. 15:24-26). During the time of growth and campaign Jesus seeks to win people over for himself, but Jesus is also concerned to identify with God's chosen people. The people of God are not now defined by race, but by faith in the Messiah of God, Jesus himself, the representative Son of man. This teaching is not simply a continuation of his earlier teaching, but differs from it in some important respects, and especially in its emphasis on the kingdom's nature and its interconnection with the church. Perhaps even more accurately we should speak of Jesus' expectation and also inaugurating the end-time events with the Son of Man teaching. This teaching does not mean the end-time events and experience after him and with him, whether it is manifesting the kingdom in power or sharing his sufferings.

The evidence that Jesus saw his ministry as vicarious is considerable. Take Mark 10:45, for example. It is probably true that the Son of Man in Mark 10:45 is spoken of as a suffering servant, but Jesus often uses the expression to describe his ministry to others and not simply to express his identity with others. Mark 10:45 illustrates the point: 'The Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve and give his life as a ransom for many'. Here we have the expression 'Son of man' probably combined with the idea of the suffering servant of Isaiah 53 (another OT idea with corporate overtones); and the thought here is that Jesus' death is not simply part of the shared tribulation of the whole of humanity but is true to God. Jesus' suffering is understood by Jesus personally on behalf of the people of God. Jesus' death is eschatological judgment, but it is judgment taken by Jesus for the people – an idea with a strong OT background not only in the Isaiah servant passages, but also in Zech. 13:7. The idea of Jesus' death and resurrection anticipating the final judgment and resurrection fits in with the present and future tenses of Jesus' kingdom teaching elsewhere in the Gospels.

A number of scholars (in particular N.T. Wright) have argued that there appear to be significant differences between the gospels in terms of corporate suffering – for himself and his community – and of general resurrection. In fact only in himself died and rose. In the light of what actually happened, the church had to re-express Jesus' expectation of the kingdom's end to the coming of his own resurrection as an anticipation of a still future general resurrection.

Allison argues that this understanding of Jesus' death and resurrection goes back to Jesus himself, but he believes that Jesus' teaching about the kingdom (in terms of corporate suffering – for himself and his community – and of general resurrection. In fact, only himself died and rose. In the light of what actually happened, the church had to re-express Jesus' expectation of the kingdom's end to the coming of his own resurrection as an anticipation of a still future general resurrection.

The kingdom's coming

The kingdom's coming is difficult to be assessed. It has many good ingredients, and its main thesis about the eschatological significance of Jesus' death and resurrection is helpful and probably correct. In going to the cross Jesus understood that the suffering and judgment of the end-time, and in his resurrection he experienced the end-time conquest of death. He is also undoubtedly correct to say that Jesus' understanding of his ministry had a strong eschatological dimension. Allison judges Jesus' 'use of the expression 'Son of man' with the 'one like a son of man' in Daniel 7 who represents the people of God. However, he oversimplifies when he concludes from these that Jesus' teaching about the kingdom is future and that the end-time conquest of death is in the future. The evidence is considerable else, but there is a considerable amount of evidence suggesting that John's understanding of Jesus' eschatological role as vicarious (i.e. on behalf of others) and as anticipating, so an alternative, and we suggest, more sensible, way of proceeding is not to see Jesus' death and resurrection as an experience of eschatological judgment and vindication which he undertook for the sake of others in order to bring about the general church's end-time experience and resurrection. Perhaps even more accurately we should speak of Jesus' expectation and also inaugurating the end-time events with the Son of Man teaching. This teaching does not mean the end-time events and experience after him and with him, whether it is manifesting the kingdom in power or sharing his sufferings.

The evidence that Jesus saw his ministry as vicarious is considerable. Take Mark 10:45, for example. It is probably true that the Son of Man in Mark 10:45 is spoken of as a suffering servant, but Jesus often uses the expression to describe his ministry to others and not simply to express his identity with others. Mark 10:45 illustrates the point: 'The Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve and give his life as a ransom for many'. Here we have the expression 'Son of man' probably combined with the idea of the suffering servant of Isaiah 53 (another OT idea with corporate overtones); and the thought here is that Jesus' death is not simply part of the shared tribulation of the whole of humanity but is true to God. Jesus' suffering is understood by Jesus personally on behalf of the people of God. Jesus' death is eschatological judgment, but it is judgment taken by Jesus for the people – an idea with a strong OT background not only in the Isaiah servant passages, but also in Zech. 13:7. The idea of Jesus' death and resurrection anticipating the final judgment and resurrection fits in with the present and future tenses of Jesus' kingdom teaching elsewhere in the Gospels.

A number of scholars (in particular N.T. Wright) have argued that there appear to be significant differences between the gospels in terms of corporate suffering – for himself and his community – and of general resurrection. In fact, only himself died and rose. In the light of what actually happened, the church had to re-express Jesus' expectation of the kingdom's end to the coming of his own resurrection as an anticipation of a still future general resurrection.

Allison argues that this understanding of Jesus' death and resurrection goes back to Jesus himself, but he believes that Jesus' teaching about the kingdom (in terms of corporate suffering – for himself and his community – and of general resurrection. In fact, only himself died and rose. In the light of what actually happened, the church had to re-express Jesus' expectation of the kingdom's end to the coming of his own resurrection as an anticipation of a still future general resurrection.
An evangelical approach to Theological Criticism

I Howard Marshall

It is fashionable to emphasize the diversity of ideas within Scripture, and it is commonly held that Scripture contains theological contradictions. We are grateful to Professor Marshall, who has written this article, for examining some of the evidence and offers an evangelical response.

The Germans are intensely systematic in the way in which they discuss and criticize the Bible, and it is not surprising that their critiques of processes are often accompanied by German, such as 'form criticism' (Forschungsgechichte) or 'redaction criticism' (Redaktionsgeschichte). These criticisms are usually the result of a careful study of a given text. Thus the major German commentary on Mark by R. Pesch divides up its treatment of each paragraph into five clearly distinguished sections: 1. literary information and translation; 2. genre-criticism and form-criticism; 3. verse-by-verse comments; 4. tradition-criticism and redaction-criticism; and 5. recapitulation of criticism, with a view to discerning the author's intention in the section.

In the present paper I do not want to explore directly these various types of approach to the text. Instead I want to concentrate on the part that the reader can carry on alongside these other approaches and which curiously does not figure in the textbooks of biblical criticism. Like many of the issues which a German is not the professional it is of German origin, and there is no one generally accepted equivalent.

Two examples of the method
Let me begin with two areas where the process has been applied. First, we look at Acts. In his commentary on Acts 5:1-11, the story of Ananias and Sapphira, J. Roloff concludes his remarks by saying that this story reflects an experience of the early church with which it was particularly difficult to come to terms because the church thought of itself as the community of salvation directed by the Spirit; the problem was that among its members there were some who had entered it only in a nominal kind of way and for the sake of the situation, but who were no longer ready for a total, inward surrender of themselves. Then he continues:

This conclusion does not in any way reduce the sharpness of the theological problem. There are two points especially which give rise to this. First, how did it possess the church? Secondly, in what way did the church react to it? The latter is immensely important to the Paul. Woodbridge is also leaving the editorial team, having been appointed to the staff of Oak Hill College in Dunedin. This is because of the pressures of his administrative burden of Theologoi for a good many years. Our sincere thanks to both of them, as indeed to all who help in the editing and production of Theologoi.
An evangelical approach to Theological Criticism

I Howard Marshall

It is fashionable to emphasize the diversity of ideas within Scripture, and it is commonly held that Scripture contains theological contradictions. We are grateful to Professor Marshall for his recent article on this topic. If he examines some of the evidence and offers an evangelical response.

The Germans are intensely systematic in the way in which they discuss and criticize the Bible, and it is not surprising that in their critical processes they have produced critics, such as German, such as 'form criticism' (Formgeschichte) or 'redaction criticism' (Redaktionsgeschichte). These critical procedures have been described as an 'encyclopaedia' in study of a given text. Thus the major German commentary on Mark by R. Pesch divides its treatment of each paragraph into five clearly distinguished sections: 1. literary information and translation; 2. genre-criticism and form-criticism; 3. verse-by-verse comments; 4. tradition criticism and the textual tradition; 5. redaction criticism, with a view to discerning the author's intention in the section.

In the present paper I do not want to explore directly these various types of approach to the text. Instead I want to consider the claim that a certain approach which can be carried on alongside these other approaches and which curiously does not figure in the textbooks of biblical criticism. Like many of the themes of the Oxbridge or the Protestant or the Arminian, it is German origin, and there is no one generally accepted English equivalent.

Two examples of the method

Let me begin with two areas where the process has been applied. First, we look at Acts. In his commentary on Acts 5:1-11, the story of Ananias and Sapphira, J. Roloff concludes his remarks by saying that this story reflects an experience of the early church with which it was particularly difficult to come to terms because the church thought of itself as the community of salvation directed by the Spirit; the problem was that among its members there were some who had entered it only in a nominal kind of way and for the sake of the structure, but not ready for a total, inward surrender of themselves. Then he continues:

This conclusion does not in any way reduce the sharpness of the theological problem. There are two points especially which give rise to criticism. The first is that the story is scarcely reconcilable with the spirit of Jesus and which therefore finds no followers in the further development of church discipline. Even where church discipline cannot be avoided, it must not forget the love that seeks for the lost over against the concern for law. It must be protected against the idea that it must preserve a place for repentance, reconciliation and rededication. The second is that, instead of denouncing the administrative burden of Thaddeus for a good many years. Our concern thanks go to both of them, as indeed to all who help in the editing and production of Themelios.

10:13) and Matthew had the clearer theological vision: in its present existence the church cannot anticipate the perfect salvation, but it can live in the power of the Holy Spirit and hope in the future judgment of God (Mt. 13:37-43).

Here is a good example of a place where a commentator lists the content of a passage as a text and then when compared with other biblical statements, it is unacceptable and wrong. Within the Bible there are different statements, and some of them cannot be accepted.

We may consider the implications of this approach for Acts by looking at the interpretation of an example, another German scholar, G. Harbsmeier, in his discussion of 'Our Preaching in the Mirror of Acts'.
The concrete result is, however, harder to grasp because it depends on our answer to the question as to what relevance we assign to the Pastoral and its non-writings. It does not seem appropriate either simply to take over their understanding of ordination as normative or to totally rely on the grounds of a theological Schlichtnit. To take over the understanding of ordination in the Pastoral as the biblical bases and legitimation of the current-day ordination would mean overlooking the fact that this is only the witness and the testimony of one part of the NT. To reject this understanding in a brooding silence would consist of the viewpoint of an inner voice which ignores the historical context of this understanding of ordination. It seems more appropriate to take the idea of ordination in the Pastoral as a modal formed in specific historical circumstances; that means that it is not an eso-bond for today, but it is to be taken seriously as a model that must be tested for its validity for today.

Here we have the same kind of problem. What is the validity of a statement made in the NT? There is a specific use of the term Sachrückt in a way which lets us see that it is concerned with the validity of biblical teaching.

The Name of the Method

The name and definition of the method is explained by this German name, but it will be helpful to note that the possible English equivalents for it include 'content criticism', 'theological criticism', 'criterion criticism', 'methodical criticism' and 'critical study of the content' as well.

It will not surprise you in the least that among the heroes of our tale, or, if you prefer it, the villains of the piece, we must mention R. Bultmann. Here is a comment on his Theology of the New Testament by Markus Barth, who asks how a statement is a symptom of the confused state of thinking about Paul's theology that contradicts part of the source material:

\[\text{He can do so only when he feels himself called to Sachrückt on Paul, just as Luther used it, for example, on the Egoist of James.} \]

The victims of Bultmann's Sachrückt include such sources as the Pastoral statements on the Holy Spirit, the resurrection, the second Adam, original sin, the knowledge of good and evil, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit by Bultmann demythologized. In any case Bultmann is convinced that he is putting the 'real intention' of Paul over against the actual words of the text. … When Bultmann attributes the use of juridical, theological, cosmological, mystical and ideological elements in Paul's text to a 'real intention of the author in his thinking and minding', he expresses as clearly and simply as possible the criteria for his Sachrückt.

We now must be clear as to what is going on here. It is not quite the same as what it means by that word: 'I want to be free to disagree with Paul.' In that wish there is expressed a contrast between what Paul said and what I think, and if we disagree, so much the worse for Paul. That is a question of Paul's authority over against my own authority. We'll come back to that in a moment. Rather what has been said is that you can only read Paul's letters in a certain sense and another which stands in contradiction to it, or between what a writer actually says and what he really means. According to some scholars, the name and definition of the method adopted by proponents of universalism.

The proponents of universalism admit very readily that their doctrine conflicts with much biblical teaching. What they are trying to do, however, is to make a criteriological (and rejection) of one part of Scripture on the basis of another.

That is to say, critics observe or search for places where there are doctrinal contradictions in Scripture and then have to decide which passage they are to follow in preference to the other.

Clarifying the definition

Let us now clarify this with a series of comments:

1. It is primarily theological contradictions that are at issue. Facilitative differences in Paul's teaching and similar matters are not the problem here, except insofar as they form part of the theological differences. If Paul tells us that he visited Corinth only twice, others may say that he visited there three times, that is a factual contradiction and it is to be sorted out by historical and literary investigation. If, however, John date of day of Christ, and the New Testament authors were slaughtered, that could be an indication of a theological understanding of the death of Jesus which was not shared by the other Evangelists and which might stand in tension or contradiction to their understanding.

2. The contradictions may be between two statements in Scripture or between what a writer actually says and what may be presumed to be his real intention. Thus, if Paul in one place requires women to be silent in church, it could be argued, as it has been, that here he had a temporary lapse into Jewish, rabbinic ways of thinking, from which he had largely set free, and that his 'real' theology to be found in passages which emphasize the equality of men and women in Christ. This shows that the 'real intention' of a writer is not to be understood simply in terms of 'He said but he meant y,' but rather 'Although in some places he says x, the main line of his thinking was y.'

It is in fact this problem of the 'real intention' which is basically the issue. The only discussion of the problem in English known to me is that by Robert Morgan who offers this definition: Sachrückt refers to the interpreter's criticism of the formulation of the text in the light of what he thinks the subjectmatter (Gauhe) to be; criticism of what is said by what he thinks should be said.

This may be the point to mention that some critics would argue that if even a biblical writer is capable of writing with utter consistency and always getting to the root of the matter, there must be a 'real intention' of the writer behind it. He wrote his commentary on Romans he said that the commentator must get beyond the actual words of the text to what he called 'thinking as a dialectic of the matter'. This was said by Bultmann who said that it is a 'nonsensical misunderstanding that the "inner dialectic of the matter" must be adequately expressed everywhere in the Letter to the Romans,' and who maintained that we can only discern Paul's teaching by the criteria of his 'real intention'.

3. The theological contradictions may be found in three sorts of area:

a. First, they may be found between earlier and later writings. There are obvious questions about the relation between teaching in the OT and teaching in the NT. Some early Christians may have been of the opinion that Moses should keep the law of Moses, but the decision which carried the day was that these laws were not applicable to Gentiles and that it was not necessary for Jews to keep them: Jesus, for example, declared all foods 'clean'.

b. Second, they may be found within the writings of one and the same author. An example can be found in Paul's understanding of the law. It is clear that the relation of the law to the gospel is something of central importance to Paul, and that he is quite clear that one is not saved by the works of the law. But is all that Paul says about the law consistent with that central affirmation? Not all critics would agree that it is. Some would say that there is a clear and obvious rejection of the law, others more unkindly say that Paul is just inconsistent.

Similarly, there can be comparison of different or more or less contemporary writers within a group such as the NT canons to see who gets it right. We saw how Robert compared the theology of Acts with that of Jesus and Paul and opted for the latter. Thus the question may be about the contradiction between a passage in an individual writer and the 'real intention' of the NT as a whole. Such a procedure assumes that there is some norm to which writings can be assessed. It is here that we often speak of a 'cannon within the canon'. This phrase can be understood in two ways. First, it may provide a criterion for rejecting what is thought to be inconsistent or on a lower level. Second, it may provide a basis for interpretation and for assigning writings to the NT as a whole or to the total canon.

One may reject James because it appears to be inconsistent with Romans or one may say that it has a different, a lesser, but nonetheless a legitimate and necessary function alongside Romans.

c. Third, there is the assessment of what the NT says over against the interpreter's own understanding of the progress of revelation. A critic might argue that the Bible itself points us forward to certain lines of development in doctrine. For example, the idea of the Trinity was not a part of the Bible until the age of the early Church. One cannot say that the Bible fall short of expressing that ideal. In other words, the Christian faith and practice to which the Bible points has been more fully revealed now than it was then and we may not interpret the Bible's teaching on the basis of the biblical revelation now stand out more clearly, and, by measured that standard, certain parts of the Bible must be judged inadequate or out of date in their teaching.

4. The result of such analysis is inevitably to force a judgment as to which texts are to be taken as expressing the real intention of a writer or the main thrust of the Scripture and how they are to be interpreted. This raises the question as to how one determines the 'real intention' or the preferable text. At least two criteria would seem to operate:

a. One is the attempt to determine the central or controlling line of teaching. Often, we find that the early writers assess all the light of this central, basic line of thinking. Thus, if Paul's central line of thought is justified by faith, we shall play down the importance of what he says on judgment by works or say that his teaching in this respect is inconsistent with this main line and drop it from our theology.

b. How do we but determine what is the 'real intention'? Thus to go back to the example of Paul on women, it could be argued that Paul's view that women were inferior to men and that if the woman was over 35 expresses the real intention of Paul, namely that within the equality of men and women in Christ the woman must nevertheless be inferior to men. Or indeed that if one text expresses the real intention and the other is a temporary aberration, or again (3) that, although Paul expresses both thoughts, the direction of his thinking, or the trajectory which he was following, leads to an unqualified statement of the equality of women to speak and minister alongside men.

c. The other criterion would seem to be the personal judgment of the reader. Not in a sense that the most determined Universalist must still decide what it is that Scripture says, and his own prejudices may well affect his interpretation. Thus one cannot help wondering whether fundamentalists defenders of slavery or apartheid who find something in Scripture that we can discover only with the utmost difficulty are not interpreting conscientiously or inconclusively in the light of their own beliefs.

5. In his essay from which I quoted a moment ago, Tom Wright goes on to say: We leave aside the application of a text to our lives [procedure of the universalists] for a doctrine of scripture itself. But we cannot leave this question aside here. It is obvious that the kind of approach which I have been outlining stands in tension, if not in contradiction, with the popular conservative evangelical understanding of the authority of the Bible. The claim of all such approaches is that the Bible is authoritative. This paper is an attempt to discuss the significance of Sachrückt from a conservative evangelical point of view in a devotional or theological manner, in a process, that is to say a kind of dialogue in which we examine the significance of Sachrückt for our doctrine of Scripture and the significance of the doctrine of Scripture for Sachrückt. It could be that there are lessons to be learned on both sides.

Evangelical presuppositions

Let us start our further examination by looking at our presuppositions. There are two important characteristics of the orthodox conservative doctrine of Scripture which are relevant here:

1. When we speak of the supreme authority of Scripture, we speak of the authority of Scripture taken as a whole rather than of isolated texts within it. This means that we assume that there is a consistent theology teaching, and therefore we can take its total message as our guide. But although this approach may appear to put all Scripture on the same plane, it is important to note that it has an important implication, namely that isolated texts taken on their own may convey a message which is at variance with that of Scripture as a whole. Thus the teaching of Scripture, as a whole, or of one part of Scripture, as a whole, or of one part of Scripture within it, rather than the meaning of the smallest parts.

2. Hence the complement of this principle is that individual texts must be understood and interpreted in their context. This is an obvious and universally accepted principle for the interpretation of Scripture, but we should not miss the fact that it is an important aspect of the principle of universalism, and so on. But it is also an essential principle with
The contradiction may be between two statements in Scripture or between what a writer actually says and what may be presumed to be his real intention. Thus, if Paul in one place requires women to be silent in church, it could be argued, as it has been, that here he had a temporary lapse into Jewish, rabbinic ways of thinking, from which he had been largely set free, and that his “real” theology is to be found in passages which emphasize the equality of men and women in Christ. This shows that the “real intention” of a writer is not to be understood simply in terms of “He said x, but he meant y,” but rather “Although in some places he says x, the main line of his thinking was y.”

It is in fact this problem of the “real intention” which is basically the issue. The only discussion of the problem in English known to me is that by Robert Morgan who offers us this definition: Sachkritik refers to the interterpreters’ criticism of the formulation of the text in the light of what (he thinks) the subjectmatter (Sache) to be; criticism of what is said is what is called ‘Sachkritik’ and what Bultmann has demystified. In any case Bultmann is convinced that he is putting the “real intention” of Paul over against the actual words of the text. . . . When Bultmann attributes the use of juridical, mythological, cosmological, mystical and idealistic elements to the formulation of Christian understanding of Christianity and mankind’, he expresses as clearly and simply as possible the criteria for his Sachkritik.

Now we must be clear as to what is going on here. It is not quite the same as in the words of the song: “I want to be free to disagree with Paul.” In that wish there is expressed a contrast between what Paul said and what I think, and if we disagree, so much the worse for Paul. That is a question of Paul’s authority over against my own authority. We’ll come back to that in a moment. Rather what has been misunderstood in Paul’s authority is the use of two things: one another and another which stands in contradiction to it, or between what a writer actually says and what he really means. According to Paul’s authority as a criterion this procedure adopted by proponents of universalism.

The proponents of universalism admit very readily that their doctrines conflict with much biblical teaching. What they are denying, however, is Sachkritik, the criticism (and rejection) of one part of Scripture on the basis of another. That is to say, critics observe or search for places where there are doctrinal contradictions in Scripture and then have to decide which passage they are to follow in preference to the other. Clarifying the definition

Let us now clarify this with a series of comments:

1. It is primarily theological contradictions that are at issue. Factually contradictory statements in the NT are not in point, for example: Paul’s teaching that the law is no longer binding while Romans 7:6-25 says that the law is binding. But both sentences can be true, a case where one passage is not contradicting the other. A more obvious example is found in Paul’s understanding of the law. It is clear that the relation of the law to the gospel is something of central importance to Paul, and that he is quite clear that one is not saved by the works of the law. But is all that Paul says about the law consistent with that central affirmation? Not all critics would agree that it is. Some would say that there is a clear contrast between the two points of view, others more unkindly say that Paul is just inconsistent.

Similarly, there can be comparison of different more or less contemporary writers within a group such as the NT canon to see who gets it right. We saw how Rolf offered the theology of Acts with that of Jesus and Paul and opted for the latter. Thus the question may be about the contradiction between a passage in an individual writer and the ‘real intention’ of the NT as a whole. Such a procedure assumes there is an ‘intention’ of the NT as a whole or some norm which all writings can be assessed. It is here that we often speak of a ‘canon within the canon’. This phrase can be understood in two ways. First, it may provide a criterion for rejecting what is thought to be inconsistent or on a lower level. Second, it may provide a basis for interpretation and for assigning writings to a place in the canon, but to the total canon. One may reject James because it appears to be inconsistent with Romans or one may say that it has a different, a lesser, but nonetheless a legitimate and necessary function alongside Romans.

c. Third, there is the assessment of what the NT says against the interpreter’s own understanding of the progress of revelation. A critic might argue that the Bible itself points us forward to certain lines of development in doctrine. For example, K. Marx Thesis is not a facet of understanding of Christian love might be thought to lead to an attitude of total non-violence. If so, we would have to judge other statements of the Bible fall short of that ideal. In one or words, the Christian faith and practice to which the Bible points has been more fully revealed now that it was then. A critic might argue that the full revelation has been revealed in the biblical revelation now stand out more clearly, and, measured by that standard, certain parts of the Bible must be judged inadequate or out of date in their teaching.

4. The result of such analysis is inevitably to force a judgment as to which texts are to be taken as expressing the real intention of a writer or the main thrust of the Scripture and how they are to be interpreted. This raises the question as to how one determines the ‘real intention’ or the preferable text. At least two criteria would seem to operate:

a. One is the attempt to determine the central or controlling thrust aspects of a passage. If we find several attempts to assess all the light of this central, basic line of thinking. Thus, if Paul’s central line of thought is justification by faith, we shall play down the importance of what he says on judgment by works or any clause that is inconsistent with this main line and drop it from our theology.

b. But how do we determine what is the ‘real intention’? Thus to go back to the example of Paul on women, it could be argued that Paul’s intention is that women should keep the law of Moses, but the decision which carried

Evangelical presuppositions

Let us start our further examination by looking at our presuppositions. There are two important characteristics of the conservative doctrine of Scripture which are relevant here:

1. When we speak of the supreme authority of Scripture, we speak of the authority of Scripture taken as a whole rather than of isolated texts within it. This means that we assume that the authority of Scripture extends to all teaching, and therefore we can take its total message as our guide. But although this approach may appear to put all Scripture on the same level, it has important implications, namely that isolated texts taken on their own can convey a message which is at variance with that of Scripture as a whole. The authority of Scripture as a whole, or of Scripture as a whole, or of text within it, rather than the meaning of the smallest parts.

2. Hence the complement of this principle is that individual texts must be understood and interpreted in their context. This is an obvious and universally accepted principle for the interpretation of a work of literature, the Bible, the chapter, and so on. But it is also an essential principle with
regard to seeing texts in the context of the Bible as a whole. Thus, to take the obvious example, the OT laws in the Pentateuch are difficult to understand if we see them in NT terms. The NT does not teach about the place of the law in the light of Christ, and therefore the laws about the offering of animal sacrifices are reckoned to be no longer valid.

It may thus appear that we do in fact practise something that looks like a kind of Sackritik. In that we assess the validity of texts in their context, and that context is both local and global. Take, for example, the letter of James. If we were to read the passage as a whole, as a Jewish gospel, I do not think that it would be a likely candidate for the honour. Its function is to correct misunderstandings of the gospel as regards ethics and to furnish ethical teaching for Christians; it presupposes the gospel, but it does not proclaim it. Teaching about the person and work of Jesus is implicit rather than explicit. Therefore, James occupies a less central position than, say, the gospels or Romans. Implicitly we assess James as falling into a particular place in the total NT revelation. We would insist that if we take the teaching of James in isolation, we should not view it as the full message of the Christian message; it is not that what James says is untrue in any way, but rather that it must be understood in the context of teaching that is found elsewhere in the NT.

It may seem, then, that what we are already doing is Sackritik. But advocates of the method argue that they are not doing this. They realise that the implication of Sackritik is 'the implications for a doctrine of scripture itself', 'once it is agreed that the biblical tradition itself is not revelation', and so on. The common denominator of their aim of theological interpretation is to correlate the theologian's understanding of the faith with what he finds in the tradition, and if it is agreed that the biblical tradition is not itself revelation [my italics], then the method is a proper one and indeed a necessary one in the theological method 'where theology is understood as the interpretation of the tradition anew in every age, in the light of life the situation and of the time in which it is done'.

Is, then, the method possible only in the assumption that the biblical tradition is not in itself revelations, in the sense that I can point to a copy of the Bible and say without equivocation, 'That book is the Word of God?' -- and, make no mistake, that is what the method implies. If so, we face two questions. First, we have to make a critical assessment of Sackritik, examining both its methods and its presuppositions. Secondly, we have to ask whether there is an acceptable form of Sackritik which is in harmony with our understanding of Scripture.
regard to seeing texts in the context of the Bible as a whole. Thus, to take the obvious example, the OT laws in the Pentateuch, though written in the context of NT teaching about the place of the law in the light of Christ, and therefore the laws about the offering of animal sacrifices are recognized to be no longer valid.

It may thus appear that we do in fact practise something that looks like a kind of Sachkritik in that we assess validity of texts in their context, and that context is both local and global. Take, for example, the letter of James. If we were to read the letter without the book of James, as a piece of gospel, I do not think that it would be a likely candidate for the honour. Its function is to correct misunderstandings of the gospel as regards ethics and to furnish ethical teaching for Christians; it presupposes the gospel, but it does not proclaim it. Teaching about the person and work of Jesus is implicit rather than explicit. Therefore, James occupies a less central position than, say, the gospels or Romans. Implicitly we assess James as falling into a particular piece in the total NT revelation. We would insist that if we take the teaching of James in isolation we should see that it is not a part of the Christian message; it is not that what James says is untrue in any way, but rather that it must be understood in the context of teaching that is found elsewhere in the NT.

It may seem, then, that what we are already doing is Sachkritik. But advocates of the method are careful to stress that it rests on presuppositions which we do not share. Consider the various phrases that have already appeared: 'showing the deeper meaning of the passage,' 'the implications for a doctrine of scripture itself,' 'once it is agreed that the biblical tradition itself is not revelation', and so on. Our common presupposition is that the aim of theological interpretation is to correlate the theologian's understanding of the faith with what he finds in the tradition, and if it is agreed that the biblical tradition is not itself revelation [my italics], then the method is a proper one and indeed a necessary one in a theological method 'where theology is understood as the interpretation of the tradition anew in every age, in the light of which the relevant prophetic scriptures are heard includes rationality'.

Is, then, the method possible only on the assumption that the biblical tradition is not in itself revelation? The seeming that I can point to a copy of the Bible and say without equivocation, 'That book is the Word of God!' is, and, make no mistake, the biblical claim is what this method presupposes. If so, we face two questions. First, why, we have to make a critical assessment of Sachkritik, examining both its methods and presuppositions in order to see if there is an acceptable form of Sachkritik which is in harmony with our understanding of Scripture.

Two obvious weaknesses of the method
First, the method could be argued to work where there are in fact weaknesses in the method as it is practised.

1. The first is that it is inconsistent in its attitude to the Bible. The question that arises is whether and in what sense the tradition is revelation. Here Morgan offers some interesting comparisons with the context and with the traditions of Liberalism and Liberalism which both rejected parts of the tradition out of hand. Sachkritik, he says, 'allows the tradition to remain intact; it gets round obnoxious pieces of tradition by reinterpretation, instead of removing them.' He then compares the tradition is revelation in this way with the methods of tradition and attempting to persuade an opponent of the superior cogency of his own position by marshalling the traditions that confirm his position and ignoring or omitting some pieces. But two features emerge. First, after the game, all the pieces are put back on the board for the next game; the interpretation is not cut off from theological generation to generation. Second, one can find a way to interpret the same passage in such a way which pieces may need to be sacrificed. The really interesting point here is the insistence that each time the game is finished and the pieces back on the board for the next one it is that says, some players recognize the existence of the canon and remain tied to it - although of course there are NT scholars who do not see the NT as a coherent or unified recognition, at least by some scholars, that in some sense the NT is a locus of revelation and possesses authority of some kind. It is not surprising, then, that F. Bovon explicitly charges Sachkritik of incompleteness in that despite his attack on Luke-Acts he does not reject it from the canon.

Second, there is the problem of subjectivity, to which Morgan has again drawn attention. The problem is determining the criterion for judgment, which is supposed to be the revelation itself, namely the Christ who is heard and apprehended in faith. But here the method becomes subjective in its presuppositions, and collaboration is the only way to which is said and yet what means is what is said by what is meant. Bultmann, however, claims to avoid subjectivity in that he finds 'what is meant' through the historicity and purpose for which the text was written, whereas Sachkritik is a necessary part of the historical interpretation of the NT. In other words, he is asking not just what Paul meant, but as much as we of the New Testament, 'What was it that Luke does not offer the total and the perfect theology of the New Testament; he must be heard in connection with the other authoritative sources, namely the development theology and be criticized and augmented from them.

Two points emerge here. First, that is well in Sachkritik the admission of possible doctrinal contradictions in the NT, but also that he believes that when one applies Sachkritik to the specific case of Luke and Paul Luke can be shown to be on the side of the New Testament. This is at variance with the harmonizing act and thereby demonstrates that in principle harmonization is a legitimate procedure. The second point is that he admits that Luke, like any other NT writer, is not always in harmony with what he does contradict must be taken if real scholarly is to be possible.

Here again Sachkritik is open to criticism, and once again the criticism comes from outside the evangelical camp. F. Bovon, for example, in two levels, first attacks other writers in effect the method which is being applied. He makes the claim that he is criticizing Luke in the light of the Chris is praeascens, that is to say from how he sees Jesus Christ as the centre of our faith. But Bovon argues that, despite his disclaimers, his attack really arises more from the theologus praeascens than from the Chris is praeascens. In other words, Bovon does part of the criticism of Luke.

Second, according to Bovon the centre of Luke's message, the revelation of Christ as Saviour, is completely neglected by Sachkritik in favour of themes which Luke considered secondary or which he was not even able to treat as such. That is to say the method is to some extent out of step with the reality of the situation caused him to have a kind of tunnel vision in which he sees only certain parts of Luke's theology; the result is that he both misses out on what is central and also misjudges the parts which do see because he does not see them in their proper context.

Numerous exegeses would agree with Bovon at this point. In particular, I refer to W. G. Kümmel, in his essay on 'Carroll's two Logical Arguments Against a Gospel for Jesus' the defence against the idea that Luke saw the history of Jesus as an eschatological event - and he argues that he did. This is essentially the same point as Bovon was making, but in the matter of the relationship between the two things. If we are neither revealing to give up the conception of the canon nor able to deny the presence of fundamental contradictions in the New Testament, as the present method of Hermeneutics clearly faces, then to say that the statement of the central message of the New Testament, by which the statements of the individual writings are to be assessed.

Working by this principle, Kümmel is prepared to defend Luke as being in harmony with the central message of the NT, as it is found in the agreement of Jesus, John and Paul. He says:

By further developing the basic theological viewpoints which has been the subject of discussion to solve the problems of the close of the period of earliest Christianity, and in that he remains, in the main lines of his theology, in agreement with the central proclamation of the New Testament.

Nevertheless, he continues:

That of course does not rule out the possibility that legitimate criticisms may be levelled against the Lucan theology or that individual passages might not be in agreement, for example theologically. But that is not to say that Luke's New Testament authorship can be denied. Even the New Testament, Luke does not offer the total and the perfect theology of the New Testament; he must be heard in connection with the other authoritative sources, namely the development theology and be criticized and augmented from them.

Two points emerge here. First, that is well in Sachkritik the admission of possible doctrinal contradictions in the NT, but also that he believes that when one applies Sachkritik to the specific case of Luke and Paul Luke can be shown to be on the side of the New Testament. This is at variance with the harmonizing act and thereby demonstrates that in principle harmonization is a legitimate procedure. The second point is that he admits that Luke, like any other NT writer, is not always in harmony with what he does contradict must be taken if real scholarly is to be possible.

But in coming to this conclusion we are engaging in a typ of evaluation which we had to do in order to see if there is an acceptable form of Sachkritik which is in harmony with our understanding of Scripture.

The problem of development
If we adopt an evangelical attitude to the Bible, we shall agree that there are differences between earlier and later writers, but that our principle of harmony suggests that these are differences in harmonious development rather than irreconcilable contradictions. Hence the equivalent of Sachkritik for us is a kind of historical procedural method, which we shall call the developmental plan. Clearly this means that some parts of Scripture are superseded by others or are not to be taken literally.

There is the fact that some parts of the OT are no longer directly applicable within the NT church. I have already mentioned the OT sacrificial system. Its literal application is no longer required, and this is grounded in NT teaching which teaches that since Christ has offered the perfect sacrifice. Another development is of course the clear example of later teaching superseding earlier teaching. Yet the earlier teaching is not totally rejected. It is not isolated as a matter of theology, but as a shadow of the good things to come, as being a kind of prophetic pointer or symbol to the spiritual reality. Broadly this is true, but it must be added that in this particular detail in Leviticus, which one provided the practical guidance Jewish religion, is now obsolete and cannot be used as a basis for practical, biblical exposition in the way in which we might expand a passage from the NT.

The same will apply within the NT itself to those passages where Jesus addresses his disciples in terms of their or timing practice of the OT cult (Mt. 5.23ff; ch. 6.16-18). We learn this is true, but it must be added, that in this particular detail, the particular audience at a particular time (e.g. specific instructions by prophets) and (b) to a particular people in particular context (e.g. members of the Jewish cult). But both cases we recognize that behind the instructions that will be principles which can be reapplied.

We also note that some teaching has a limited horizon. For example, in the OT there are some fairly horrific examples c. genocide and of racial discrimination. In most, if not in all cases, the horizon of the command or the narrative is the idolatry and immorality of the peoples concerned, and the danger of turning them against the Lord and polluting the people. In NT teaching, Christians are commanded to love their neighbours and their enemies and to seek to lead them to salvation, but these are not to accept the faith the disciples of Jesus should call down upon them, as Elijah did in OT times (Lk. 9.54ff). We can see in the OT, the same problem, a valid point in its own horizon, namely that God's people should seek to avoid being corrupted by idolatrous and immoral people, but the method followed, namely the annihilation of the temple and the destruction of the nation, things that we could not see as being primitive and now superseded by later material, but we do recognize that we are to listen to it in a different way from the original writers. Thus, though we have long tradition of interpretation sees the Christian counterpoint to the enemies of Israel in the evil principalities and power against which Christians must fight with all their might.
to combine different views to form one total picture. Does such a synthesis always remain satisfactorily consistent? Is it possible to agree or disagree with a passage in a way which is not immediately apparent from the text, and still not renounce a deep-seated element of truth?

We began our discussion by citing two examples of this problem: Acts and the Pastoral. Let us go back over the problem.

With regard to Acts there were two specific problems: (a) the general relation of Acts to Paul, and (b) the sub-Christian implications of Acts 5:1-11.

In the case of (a) the problem is so frequent by exegesis: is it possible for Acts really to have given a different theological understanding from that of Paul and one which is theologically inferior? We have already commented on this problem, and our conclusion is that we feel that Harbouer's case is not established exegetically.

(b) In the case of Acts 5:1-11 it is unacceptable to say that Luke is merely reporting historical what happened, and that this is not necessarily therefore an example to be followed by later Christians. The difficulties are that Peter is presented as an exemplary leader, and that what Luke is actually depicting is the natural conclusion of the situation in which Peter acted, and that any form of it is the final and definitive one. Nor can the different systems be harmonized into one. What we can do is to see in each case what were the principles, the situation and the money that led to the specific type of order, and then work through what we see in the text in order to see if we can account for our situation.

We have to deal with the problem of the Pastoral. Here the question is whether the validity of the church order presented there when compared with teaching on NT. Lips was right when he said that we do not reject this teaching outright on grounds of Sachkrit: indeed it would be hard to find grounds for doing so. He is also right that we do not simply take it over as it stands. For the fact is that there are several types of church order and organization in the NT, and we seem to be forbidden in some respects where now we seem to be permitted. Nor can we do justice to the context and the message unless we take into account the evidence, or see in the light of the central message, and this will manifest that disjunction; the question is the context of the situation.

But these points do not get to the heart of the matter, which is basically whether the picture of God here and of the way in which the church should act is inconsistent with the gospel. Lips was mistaken in thinking that we would tend on the whole to accept it and see no contradiction.

A better approach is to see that the horizon of the narrative is limited; its purpose is solely to emphasize the heinousness of sin and the need for repentance. The narrative is concerned simply to stress these things: the question of an opportunity for repentance is not raised here, although it is taught elsewhere and must be taken into account in the church today. This is essentially the same approach as we took with regard to the stern judgments on idolatry and sin in the OT. The practical result is that we retain the passage as one which emphasizes the heinousness of sin and the reality of divine judgment upon it, but that we insist that the passage must not be taken on its own as a guide to church practice. It is the presence of a church order in the Pastoral, namely the refusal to allow women to teach. How do we tackle this for today? My own understanding of it is that this is a local, situation-bound restriction. But I say this on the grounds (a) that what seems to me to be a central part of the concern of the NT, namely the question of whether the biblical Christ is present in the church, the more practical in the church and the NT must be regarded as local rather than universal. There may well be situations today when it ought to be taken literally, but these will be the exception. Again, we shall not treat the passage as Scripture if we do not ask what principles of universal validity lie behind it and led the author to express himself for his local situation in the way he did. But we do not reject the literal teaching of the passage simply because we do not like it. Rather we have to ask whether the teaching of the NT itself is clear enough to emerge out of our fundamental loyalty to the message of the NT.

I have used the example of a passage which I do not believe applies universally today because it is of local application in the NT. But I must mention a different example. If the world today tolerates homosexual practices and refuses to regard them as sinful, then we do not go along with this attitude, unless we can be convinced that the biblical attitude to homosexual acts is local and situation-bound, or perhaps even culture-bound. We are not at liberty to judge the teaching of Scripture by the standards of the contemporary world, but on the contrary we have to recognize that the Bible must be free to speak its prophetic and critical word to the practices and beliefs of our world.

However, there may be another criterion of judgment. It is proper for us to assess biblical teaching not so much by the central concern of the Bible itself as by a theological position which, while developed from the Bible, claims to have reached a point beyond all possibility of modification. The NT writers in the church must take into account the evidence, or see in the light of the central message, and this will manifest that disjunction; the question is the context of the situation.

Barth saw the danger of a 'method which is all too likely to do violence to a historical text in making it correspond to the interpreter's own view'. It sounds suspiciously like the Christus præsens of some of the scholars we have been discussing, and the suggestion is that the Bible contributes to revealing Christ, but is only one contributor out of many. But there is not only the risk, alluded to earlier, that the scholar may put into the text too much of his own Christus præsens. There is also the more fundamental objection which says that the Christus præsens must be identical with the biblical Christ and not the Christus præsens. The Christus præsens is revealed in the NT, and to assert that we can criticize and reject these on the basis of a position which is based on the context of the NT, is fundamentally at variance with the biblical understanding of man. But it is another thing to question the doctrine of the Christus præsens, which is based on the historical situation and culture-bound teaching of the NT and to assert that we can criticize and reject these on the basis of a position which is based on the context of the NT. It would be a case of revealing Christ in one NT, and to assert that we can criticize and reject these on the basis of a position which is based on the context of the NT.

This is the methodology of the New Testament Church. However, this is not the methodology of the New Testament Church. We do not have to accept the passage as Scripture if we do not ask what principles of universal validity lie behind it and led the author to express himself for his local situation in determining its presuppositions and methods. We must admit the existence of the problems that led to the development of the doctrine, but it is not our job to work with them, we shall do so by a method that looks for the underlying harmony and truth of the Word of God in Scripture, and not in the context of the NT. But this must be a method that looks for the underlying harmony and truth of the Word of God in Scripture, but that insists that at the end of the day it is God's Word that judges us and not we that judge God's Word. It is unfortunate that the English equivalents of the term may convey this false impression that the reader can stand as critic over the theology of the Bible, and a less tendentious name for the process would be helpful. At the end of the day what we have to do is to compare Scripture with Scripture, to discover what is the message of a given passage when seen within the total context of the biblical revelation. Perhaps a more positive term like 'theological evaluation' comes nearer to the intention of the method.
to combine different views to form one total picture. Does such an approach mean that our faith is just a matter of religious positions? Not really. Our faith is a way of life that is lived out daily in our actions and relationships.

We began our discussion by citing two examples of this principle: Acts and the Pastoral. Let us go back over the problems.

With regard to Acts there were two specific problems: (a) the general relation of Acts to Paul; and (b) the sub-Christian implications of Acts 5:1-11.

In the case of the problem of the relation of the first book to Paul's works, we shall find a strong argument for opposing the view that Acts represents the works of Paul. We shall try to show that there is no basis for assuming that Acts was written, or even that Paul knew of it, and that it is not necessary to assume that this was the case.

(b) In the case of Acts 5:1-11 it is unacceptable to say that Luke is merely reporting historically what happened, and that this is not necessarily therefore an example to be followed by later Christians. The difficulties are that Peter is presented as an exemplary leader, and that what Luke is actually depicting is a situation of gross political action. Supposing that any one form is the final and definitive one. Nor can the different systems be harmonized into one. What we can do is to ask in each case what were the principles, the situation, and the kind of move that led to the specific type of order, and then work backwards to see how we could retain the principles but be appropriate for our situation.

This again is Sachkritia in that it goes beyond the surface teaching to ask what is the real underlying concern in a particular instance, and what is the meaning of the teaching, but it does recognize that the particular form in which the principles appear is situation-bound, and that we must not put a system on something that is a context-dependent situation.

A better approach is to say that the horizon of the narrative is limited; its purpose is solely to emphasize the uniqueness of sin and the need for salvation. The narrative is concerned simply to stress these things: the question of an opportunity for repentance is not raised here, although it is taught elsewhere and must be taken into account in the church today. This is essentially the same approach as we took with regard to the stern judgments on idolatry and sin in the OT. The practical result is that we retain the passage as a warning, and interpret its specific aspect of the church order in the Pastoral, namely the refusal to allow women to teach. How do we tackle that for today? My own understanding of it is that this is a local, situation-bound, restriction. But I say this on the grounds (a) that what seems to me to be a central part of the concern of the NT, namely the question of the role of women in the church, is addressed here. We do actually see women fully engaged in ministry in the NT itself. In other words, there is a contradiction within the NT message itself, as this passage is judged to be normative for all time, including NT times.

Now this means that a passage which on other grounds seems to be out of date for today is regarded as no longer literally binding not simply because it is unacceptable but because when placed in the context of the NT itself it is seen to be local rather than universal. There may be well be situations today that ought to be tackled by women, but these will be the exception. Again, we shall not treat the passage as Scripture if we do not ask what principles of universal validity tie it behind and led the author to express himself for his local situation in the way he did. But we do not reject the literal teaching of the passage simply because we do not like it. Rather we have to ask what principles of universal validity are behind this teaching and whether they have been carried out in the context of the NT.

I have used the example of a passage which I do not believe applies universally today because it is of local application in the NT. But I must mention a different example. If the world today tolerates homosexual practices and refuses to regard them as sinful, then we do not go along with this attitude, unless we can be convinced that the biblical attitude to homosexual acts is local and situation-bound, or perhaps even culture-bound. We are not at liberty to judge the teaching of Scripture by the standards of the contemporary world, but on the contrary we have to recognize that the Bible must be free to speak its prophetic and critical word to the practices and beliefs of our world.

However, there may be another criterion of judgment. Is it proper for us to assess biblical teaching not so much by the central concern of the Bible itself as by a theological position which, while developed from the Bible, claims to have reached a point beyond which we can go no further than is self - better than the biblical writers did? To be sure, there are many cases where we have to go beyond biblical teaching expressed in a specific cultural setting, for example in recognizing that slavery, while accepted in the NT, is fundamentally at variance with the biblical understanding of man. But it is another thing to question the doctrine of revelation, which is the basis of the situation- and culture-bound teaching of the NT and to assert that we can criticize and reject these on the basis of a position which is explicit in the teaching of the Bible.

Barth saw the danger of a 'method which is all too likely to do violence to a historical text in making it correspond to the interpreter's own view'. It sounds suspiciously like the Christus praevenit of some of the scholars we have been discussing, and the suggestion is that the Bible contributes to revealing Christ, but is only one contributor out of many. But there is not only the risk, alluded to earlier, that the scholar may be tempted by his own prophetic praevenit to regard Christus praevenit. There is also the more fundamental objection which says that the Christus praevenit must be identical with the Christus revelatus. We are to see the biblical Christ who is and remains our authority. It is the Word of God, Christ himself, revealed in the Scripture, who is the final authority, and the claim of any extrabiblical religion that Scripture can reveal a harmonious revelation of this Christ. The assumption may be wrong, but this is our faith, and this is where we stand.

Conclusion

The evangelical doctrine of Scripture sets firm limits to the practice of Sachkritia by showing that it is possible to distinguish between its presuppositions and methods. We must admit the existence of the problems that led to the development of Sachkritia, and accept the notion that such practices are legitimate. But we shall do so by a method that looks for the underlying harmony and truth of the Word of God in Scripture, and not for a detached and extrabiblical interpretation, but that insists that at the end of the day it is God's Word that judges us and not we that judge God's Word. It is unfortunate that the English equivalents of the term may convey this false impression that the reader can stand as critic over the theology of the Bible, and a less tendentious name for the process would have been helpful. At the end of the day what we have to do is to compare Scripture with Scripture, to discover what is the message of a given passage when seen within the total context of the biblical revelation. Perhaps a more positive term like 'theological evaluation' comes nearer to the intention of the method.

1 R. Pesch, Das Markus-evangelium (Freiburg, 1976), I, p. 68.
5 H. von Lius, Glaube - Gemeinde - Ame (Göttingen, 1975), p. 284
14 E. Cremer, op. cit.
17 Yet it cannot be denied that the method has its attractions. Thos. Williams, 'The Irresistible Praying Prophet: Galatians 3:28, not rules and an expanded interpretation of the text, but Poulter said Wilton: Adam was but human - this explains it all. He did not want the apple for the apple's sake, he wanted it only because he was quite prepared to suffer for it and not for nothing, for not for the serpent; then he would have eaten the serpent.'
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We welcome this article by the Professor of Theology at the United Theological College in Abersneath in Wales, in which he describes and responds to an important new book on ethics.

1. Resurrection and Moral Order

Most of us probably insist that theology and ethics should go together. One has to do with reflection that is barren without the other, and the other without reflection. Yet if we compare the phrases 'evangelical theology' and 'evangelical ethics', the first sounds a lot more familiar than the second, though 'evangelical social ethics' is coming increasingly into popular currency. Recently, however, a work has appeared titled Resurrection and Moral Order (hereafter R&M) by a Professor of Theological Ethics whose name has had a very high acclaim and even been tipped for classical status.1 Its author (Professor Oliver O'Donovan) commands our gratitude and its substance commands our attention. So we will look in this article at some of the central theses of the book. Yet we need to be critical as well as appreciative.

2. Christ's resurrection

We shall argue for the theological proposition that Christian ethics (and much more) is not just about what Jesus did but died (p. 13). Why? Because resurrection tells us of God's vindication of his creation and so of our created life (ibid.). Resurrection is God's affirmation of humanity for it reverses Adam's decision to die; it affirms the order in which mankind is placed at the same time for it points creation to its fulfiment in the eschaton. The resurrection announces the end of the gap between the creation and the eschatological destiny will do more than just restore the created order, but it will not abolish it either. Resurrection is a transformation power. We are not adrift in this world (for the humanity created by God is vindicated in history) nor lost in the next (for the humanity vindicated in history is destined for full redemption). Creation shares the fate of mankind. On this axis of God's creative and redemptive activity we are solidly established in our humanity within an objective realm.

3. The will submitted to the understanding

What will this mean for Christian ethics? Over the centuries there have been different ways of looking at morality. But often schemes of thinking have not been hotbeds of life. These are not just idle words. Our thinking. Creation-resurrection-eschaton gives us the objective framework for moral endeavour. But how does that help us as we try to translate the ethics of issues, as opposed to just theoretically contemplating ethics? Moral issues as we face them can frighten us in one of two ways. Either they seem completely detached from the life of faith associated with them or they seem incorrigibly perplexing (witness our efforts at times to figure out the obligations of friendship). Now O'Donovan is constantly anxious to avoid an easy route tied up to the moral perplexities. But he insists that they confront us within a divinely given order. Morality is not some chaotic cross-country course where we finally abandon the attempt to make sense of the current situation embedded in our freedom and does not the presence of a God presiding over the moral order guarantee that what we has to say now becomes the law of our existence (p. 33).

O'Donovan's thesis at this point is fairly straightforward. Human freedom is freedom to be human, not to be something else; it is thus freedom to indwell an order that cannot otherwise be seen. We are not therefore free to make an order sui generis. Nor is the Spirit's agency a threat to freedom; on the contrary, only through God the Spirit is a free response possible. Freedom real is, but it is easy by existentialism to make a false duality. Scripture tell us that roles were developed by the author in relation to authority, especially the authority of Christ, and in relation to the church thought of not as a monarchical authority, primarily within which we enquire about our freedom but as itself a servant summoned to freedom.

6. Love: the bond of deeds and character

We are confronted by a moral order which has many features and is tied to various other elements in our life. What unifies our outward deeds and inward character? The answer is love. This is what shapes the moral life. There is ultimately no tension between the requirements of love of God and love of neighbor. The primary reason is that there is a loving order whose author is God, whose inhabitants are alike in their kind (equal in humanity) and one in destiny (we are meant to be in the model of Jesus, who can be understood if there is a disposition or (not quite the same) character to be formed in an integrated way too and this again is the domain of historical and cultural situation, destined to flower for a season in this world with no further consequences. The ultimate reward of love is the fulfillment of life in eternity and transformation beyond the world when by justifying grace the fragments of the life of love are gathered together in intelligible unity. So the incentive to love which the author provides is not more than incentive to preserve and enhance life's only actuality, its majestic order framing time and destined to redeem it.

B. Towards a response

When O'Donovan says what I wish to question certain aspects of this analysis, it is appropriate to mention first three major strengths of the book. First, our outline completely veils the fact that O'Donovan's work is executed with an extraordinary fecundity and a whole range of richness. The book features a historical assessment, philosophical analysis. Taste and see. One accumulates enormous debts to the author on a host of issues in the course of the book and although some of these discussions seem at first sight to take a life of their own in the second and final parts of the book, independent of the main body of the argument, the discussions themselves like the book as a whole (quite same) has played a particularly important part in moral thought since at least Immanuel Kant at the end of the eighteenth century. Kant himself could associate freedom, and moral agency with belief in God. But his whole way of throwing weight on the moral agent induced some later thinkers to follow a path to a different kind of freedom. Could it be concluded that you can account for moral agency without reference to God, but you could even think that, or rather the idea of God, actually threatens moral agency. Failure to know that God's care is embedded in our freedom and does not the presence of a God presiding over the moral order guarantee that what he has to say now becomes the law of our existence (p. 33).

Kierkegaard, in a piece to which O'Donovan refers, closes a chapter with the words: "The reward of the good man is to be allowed to worship in truth." When we remember that Scriptwaterea in Romans 12:1 can appear as 'service' as well as 'worship' in an English rendering then we get a hint of the ethical potential of this imagery. In fact, the substantial contention that man and creation form an interlocking order affirmed by God in the gospel, open to our participation in the form of the most authentic kind of worship, appears very correct in its principle. If we now focus on difficulties it must be framed by these considerations. I shall focus on two, the
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Stephen N Williams

We welcome this article by the Professor of Theology at the United Theological College in Aberystwyth in Wales, in which he describes and responds to an important new book on ethics.

A. Resurrection and Moral Order

Most of us probably insist that theology and ethics should go together. One has to do with reflection that is barren if it is done abstractly, the other that is barren if it is done without reflection. Yet if we compare the phrases 'evangelical theology' and 'evangelical ethics', the first sounds a lot more familiar than the second, though 'evangelical social ethics' is increasingly coming into popular currency. Recently, however, a work has appeared titled Resurrection and Moral Order and the title suggests an attempt at the full-bloodedness of Evangelical Ethics that has had a very high acclaim and even been tipped for classical status.1 Its author (Professor Oliver O'Donovan) commands our gratitude and its substance commands our attention. So we will look in this article at some of the central theses of the book. Yet we need to be critical as well as appreciative.

Two preliminary warnings are in order. (1) This work is an outline for an outline of evangelical ethics. If it were an outline of evangelical ethics, we might expect to find a treatment of such standard themes as government, labour and marriage. But we do not get this. This outline for ethics sets out for us the theological shape our thinking might take, we approach anything in ethics. Theological principles, not ethical particulars, are the focus. (2) What we have is an outline. Professor O'Donovan is not introducing beginners to the field but giving a survey of the field to those digging away in it. Karl Barth admitted that one of the most pressing tasks of the church in the massive Church Dogmatics by skipping the small print! The same might be possible with this work, yet I suspect it would be hard for those without some background in moral theology and philosophy. Let us set out its concerns in six main theses.

1. Christian realism

It was back in 1929 that Lippmann back in 1929 who spread talk of 'scientific realism' - a project designed to encourage science and morality to shrug off the shackles of religion.1 What has fallen science and morality in a culture more progressively dispensing with religion, as it seems? In practice, very often, people have ended up by imposing on the world a coherent structure for life and thought, but such a structure does not reflect inherently in the world - our science and morality do not conform to the way the world really is. Perhaps the natural order cannot be known to us and perhaps that is what science and morality do. Professor O'Donovan wants to combat this latter view. 'Realism' can mean a lot of different things, but here it means believing that the structures within which God has placed us, within which we think and act, including the structure of our being as humans, are given and objective; through the gospel we get an intellectual grip on reality. And what O'Donovan does for realism in the moral order may be compared with Professor Thomas Torrance's parallel enterprise with regard to the natural, scientific order.2

2. Christ's resurrection

'We shall argue for the theological proposition that Christian ethics is not only non-human but non-human with the presence of Christ, and that such an ethically significant presence is an objective something to understand - an ontological basis for morality (ontology pertains to that which we know). When we ask about the nature of this presence, we are led back to the epistemological question (epistemology pertains to that which we know or believe). And here O'Donovan emphasis that the presence of Christ is not our reason for trust but divine revelation in Christ. The gospel is our source and the author's engagement with this question explicitly invites comparison with the work of Tom Torrance. What we know from him, and through Jesus Christ and through the Spirit, the Spirit, the Spirit conforms us to that reality vindicated in Christ. If the will must be shaped by understanding it is only as the understanding is shaped by the gospel of Christ.

3. Free in Christ

Now that we have talked of an objective order encompassing us, we are directed to us, and a Spirit presence empowers us, are we on course for a life of moral freedom? The author devotes much space to the question of freedom in the book, and indeed much of the discussion here is linked with O'Donovan's particular discussion. The concept of freedom has fallen on hard times in much recent philosophy, particularly the area known as 'philosophy of mind'. But the concept of freedom is still relevant to pursue here this largely secular debate about the relation of freedom and determination. On the other hand, the notion that to be a moral agent is to be free (the autonomy thesis) also has a certain appeal (although this is a bit paradoxical when one comes down to it). Part of the reason is the same: one has played a particularly important part in the moral thought since at least Immanuel Kant at the end of the eighteenth century. Kant himself could associate freedom and moral agency with belief in God. But his whole way of throwing weight on the moral agent induced some later thinkers to follow a path to a different conclusion. Could it be concluded that you can account for moral agency without reference to God, but you could even think that God, or rather the idea of God, actually threatens moral agency. Failing to account for moral agency is the same as losing the possibility of freedom. And does the presence of a God presiding over the moral order guarantee that what he has to say now becomes the law of our actions?3

O'Donovan's thesis at this point is fairly straightforward. Human freedom is freedom to be human, not to be something else; it is thus freedom to indwell an order that cannot otherwise be the order within which we live.4 Nor is it the agency that threatens freedom; on the contrary, only through God the Spirit is a free response possible. Freedom is real, but that reality is established within the order of God. Or to put it in a way that is not gestalt: freedom is an order that is free. St Paul's discussion is developed by the author in relation to authority, especially the authority of Christ, and in relation to the church thought of not as an authority, primarily within which we enquire about our freedom but as itself an agent summoned to freedom.

6. Love: the bond of deeds and character

We are confronted by a moral order which has many features and many possibilities in order to live within it. What unifies our outward deeds and inward character? The answer is love. This is what shapes the moral life. There is ultimately no tension between the requirements of love of God and the requirements of love of our neighbour, though there is a reason why one order whose author is God, whose inhabitants are alike in their kind (equal in humanity) and one in destiny (we are meant to be translated into a condition that can be understood by others). There is a reason why one order has isolation, destined to flower for a season in this world with no further consequences. The ultimate reward of love is the fulfillment of life in eternity and transformation beyond the world when by justifying grace the fragments of the life of love are gathered together in intelligible unity. So the incentive to love which the author provides is no mere incentive to preserving what is noblest in us, but the foundation of its majestic order framing time and destined to redeem it.
first with seemingly small beginnings, the second compounded an implicitly difficult suggested by the first.

1. Difficulties with 'transformation' of natural structures in 1 Peter and the NT

The great key texts and theological principles taken by the author of 1 Peter to elucidate the nature and boundary between resurrection and ethics are understandably Pauline ones. But much interest attaches to two significant references to the first Petrine epistle. Part One of 1 Peter 1:24 is crucial. Here is the announcement that resurrection is theologically central for ethics since it 'tells us of God's vindication of his creation, and our duty to him in respect of it'. Indeed, this most consistently theologian New Testament treatise on ethics, begin by proclaiming the reality of the new life upon which the possibility of ethics depends: "By his great mercy we have been born anew to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (1:3) (p. 13). The second brings its claim to the conclusion that 'Christian ethics, like the resurrection, looks both backwards and forwards, to the origin and to the end of the created order. It respects the natural structures of life in the world, while looking forward to their transformation' (p. 38). This is instanced in 1 Peter 2:12 which opens with a declaration of hope and moves on to talk about natural structures in a fashion that one cannot regard as natural structures we implant into god, towhich the human will is aversely addressed. In other words, new and open-mindedness, I start with this second claim and move on to the first.

It is surely wrong to say that Peter's letter exemplifies a hope which envisions the transformation of natural structures, and the consequences of this for O'Donovan's thesis are by no means trivial. The idea here is a passage of two words: 'hope' and 'transformation'. 'Hope' (elpis) is a word commonly used in the NT in the sense typical of our ordinary discourse, where it expresses a wish which stands in need of fulfilment. 'Transformation' (metamorphosis) is a word with a distinctively theological sense, member of the triune, fulfilled, faith, hope and love, whose object is what is promised or secure. In other words, it may be possible to have correspondingly confident disposition. The question is then whether that kind of hope encompasses the transformation of natural structures or reality.

So what of 'transformation'? O'Donovan introduces this idea when he is concerned with divine redemption for the whole of creation. Creation as a whole must fulfill a God-given purpose, a purpose which we are to acquire by the power of our own love of God, the only goal of this teaching. And 'this fulfillment is what is implied when we speak of the "transformation" of the created order that will occur in the end of the world. We must understand "creation" not merely as the raw material out of which we as we know it is composed, but as the order and coherence in which it is composed" (p. 31). 'Creation is the given totality of order which forms the presupposition of historical existence. "Creation" is not the same as "creation". For the first this is the order or structure, the second the ingenuity of art can overthrow" (p. 61). The ramifications of this are central in the book, of course, and the question is whether we remain on track. The possibility of this is explored in particular in chapter 3. Now the natural structures of life in this world are explicitly part of the created order that will be transformed - that is why one comments on 1 Peter 1:24. This is not the place to say much about the author's exposition. And later we have a more specific allusion to the transformation of marriage (p. 70f), one of the themes that the author's hope is often taken from in our age.

However, there is surely no sign that this epistle exhibits any hope for the transformation of natural structures. It is true that Christian hope, embodied in the heart and governs our actions in such a way that it is in conduct that could transform these structures.8 But neither hope nor resurrection carries implications of eschatological transformation. 'Transformation' for O'Donovan stands as the alternative to, e.g., abolition. Supposing one asked on the basis of this epistle whether natural structures or institutions are being transformed, it would be theologically fallacious to suggest a logical abolition. Even after investigating the Jewish background of the epistle to find out whether Petrine hope is real or otherwise as it sounds, it would appear difficult to establish a definite answer. The fact is that nothing at all in Petrine ethics hangs on whether natural institutions are to be abolished or transformed and nothing in resurrection hope is anything like epistemologically justified in such a way. But let us enquire more generally about abolition and transformation and thus work our way out of a narrow consideration which is partly mentioned above. For instance, the abolition of structures in the way indicated and taking the line that what the NT says about the fulfilling transformation of the whole actually has little obvious bearing on our attitudes to natural institutions.11 If this is so, the relation of the kind of outline of ethics proffered in this book to concrete ethics is put into question. But if, indeed, we must say that the shape of the question of natural institutions is that it is not in transformation that embraces institutions, then Christian ethics is surely on what will turn out to be a rather detailed discussion of the question of whether or not it is acceptable to use a principle which may be an end of such influence on ethics. In sum, then, it is not clear that Peter or the NT generally12 envisages the transformation of natural structures as an end in itself; it matters, not how transformation of a whole bears on this.

While accusations of unclearly often be rather cheap, I think it is fair to raise the question here simply because it brings in the relation of the principles outlined in this book for Christianity ethics and the various constructions we struggle for within natural structures. And in a very different way, this question arises too from the second point I wish to make, the one that takes us back to O'Donovan's second general reference to 1 Peter 2:12, then we now turn.

2. Crucifixion-resurrection instead of creation-resurrection

It will be recalled that the author described in 1 Peter as the most comprehensive are free from evil, nothing is accomplished by force. While it is enabled by an emphasis on suffering. Not everything talked about as suffering is of the same kind, but various sufferings are connected. In one sense, suffering is a contingency a commonality of the whole. In another sense, the for work of labour (of the three singled out by O'Donovan) suffering explicitly mentioned. But it is also true that suffering is the path to glory is through suffering essentially the same road to glory as the Christian who took such a path: the resurrection of Christ was the resurrection of the one who trod it and is viewed in Peter's epistle as a model for the Christian. O'Donovan from the start makes clear that cross and resurrection cannot be detached from each other more that from suffering and glory. Still, the explicit and underlying connection of the resurrection with ethics in Peter's letter compels a different set of questions those offered by O'Donovan because however one comes at it, the integration of hope and suffering, born of life under the risen Lordship of crucified, is starkly central. The meaning of the resurrection here for ethics is as much to do with bearing the cross as with vindicating creation. Now what do we imply by this?

In contemporary theology, Moltmann has been especially conspicuous in pursuing a path of reflection which made was the crucial dimension of the so-called new theologians foundational for Christian ethics. The most consistent ethical point of all his work is the call to align with the disadvantage and oppressed. Resurrection cannot underlie gender ethics except in systematic connection with the cross, as well as eschaton and Moltmann seeks to base this on Paul more than on any NT author. Now one might agree or disagree with Moltmann's own presentation of why he wishes to shape Christian ethics differently (though not necessarily incompatibly at all) in Peter, Moltmann and O'Donovan. And it may be that the work of reflecting on this closely (and, summarily, I am afraid) about O'Donovan's broad endeavor in this work.

In this work, is the author answering the question: who does the resurrection mean for Christian ethics? Or is it rather a more general question: what does it mean for our understanding of the world and its role in the world. If so, it is open to the rejoinder that the meaning of the resurrection for Christian ethics lies as much in its connection with the cross suffering of primordial importance to eschaton and its connection with the vocation of created order. But he really answering the second question, in which case there is clearly an overlap because he is the author of this book. But the importance of the link between resurrection and created order is one established by the particular perspective with which he approaches the discipline of Christian ethics may be shaped by this. But there is something explicit or implicit in biblical theology and ethics that must make the vocation of theologians. And in this case, the vocation of creation is how we understand the world and its role of this. But the outline for such an ethics would look very different.

We are edging here towards the concerns of liberation theologians. One need not take up a position with regard...
first with seemingly small beginnings, the second compounded an implicit difficulty suggested by the first.

1. Difficulties with 'transformation of natural structures in 1 Peter and the NT'
The great key texts and theological principles taken by the author are that the differences between natural creation and ethics are understandably Pauline ones. But much interest attaches to two significant references to the first Petrine epistle. Part One sets out the argument that the announcement that resurrection is theologically central for ethics since it 'tells us of God's vindication of his creation, and his intention to renew it'. The latter is most consistently theological New Testament treatise on ethics, begin by proclaiming the reality of the new life upon which the possibility of death depends: "By his great mercy we have been born anew to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (1:3) (p. 13). The second brings to its claim that 'Christian ethics, like the resurrection, looks both backwards and forwards, to the origin and to the end of the created order. It respects the natural structures of life in the world, while looking forward to their transfiguration' (p. 38). This is instanced in 1 Peter which opens with a declaration of hope and moves on to such things as ethics of government, labour and marriage. O'Donnovan avers that 'a hope which envisions the transformation of existing natural structures cannot consistently attack or repudiate those structures', though the institutions need reformation. I start with this second claim and move on to the first.

It is surely wrong to say that Peter's letter exemplifies a hope which envisions the transformation of natural structures, and the consequences of this for O'Donnovan's thesis are by no means trivial. The use here to pass over two words: 'hope' and 'transformation'. 'Hope' (elpis) is a word thoroughly at home in this epistle; it crops up in some form in 39 of its 66 verses. The word is used in the context of Christian life in contrast to Pauline 'faith' and the epistle has been said to show 'more compellingly than any other New Testament text the interrelatedness of Christian ethics'.10 If one may hope to continue. Now 'elpis' can be used in the NT in the sense typical of our ordinary discourse, where it expresses a wish which stands outside of the present, a desire for a future destination, hoped to visit Timothy (1 Tim 3:14) and Felix, not knowing his mind, hoped that Paul would offer him a bâle (Acts 24:26). But this is not the triumphant hope anticipated in the preceding verse. A distinctly theological sense, member of the triumvirate 'faith, hope and love', whose object is what is promised or sought, can be found in a corresponding confidence.11 The question is then whether that kind of hope encompasses the transformation of natural structures or rather a whole.

So what of 'transformation'? O'Donnovan introduces this idea when he is concerned with divine redemption for the whole of creation. Creation as a whole must fulfil a God-given purpose and not exist for the sake of the 'ego' or the only locus of this teaching. And this 'fulfilment is what is implied when we speak of the 'transformation' of the created order. We must understand 'creation' not merely as the raw material out of which the word as we know it is composed, but as the order and coherence in which it is composed' (p. 31). 'Creation is given the totality of order which forms the presupposition of historical existence. "Created" is not a static notion, but a dynamic one, a process of becoming in which the tendency or the ingenuity of art can overthrow' (p. 61). The ramifications of this are central to what in 1 Peter 3:18ff the author is exploring in particular in chapter 3. Now the natural structures of life in the world are explicitly part of that created order that will be transformed - that is why these statements on 1 Peter 3:18ff are critical in understanding the relationship of the author's exposition. And later we have a more specific allusion to the transformation of marriage (p. 70f.), one of the three types of personal relationships (the other two being life and political) that God's people are to conduct in conduct that could transform these structures.12 But neither hope nor resurrection carries implications of eschatological transformation. 'Transformation' for O'Donnovan stands as the alternative to, e.g., abolition. Supposing one asked on this basis of the epistle whether natural structures or institutions are to be altered by some theologically sanctioned form of political abolition. Even after investigating the Jewish background of the epistle to find out whether Petrine hope is really as otherworldly as it sounds, it would appear difficult to establish a definite answer. The fact is that nothing at all in Petrine ethics hangs on whether natural institutions are to be abolished or transformed and nothing in its resurrection hope involves anything more than even implied "abortion", and one that holds what one holds about structures or institutions makes little difference here. That is, one might love in the way and for the ends that one desires. The argument that the abolition of structures in the way indicated and taking the line that what the NT says about the fulfilling transformation of the whole actually has little obvious bearing on our attitudes to natural institutions.13 If this is so, the relation of the kind of outline of ethics proffered in this book to concrete ethical doctrines needs to be put to the test. If, indeed, we must say that the share of Christian ethics hangs on a transformation that embraces institutions, then Christian ethics is surely hostages to fortune. But what will turn out to be a rather detailed discussion of eschatology that surely does not merit a role of such influence on ethics. In sum, then, it is not clear that Peter or the NT generally envisages the transformation of natural structures. In one sense it matters; not clear how transformation of a whole bears on this.

While objections of uncertainty can often be rather cheap, I think it is fair to raise the question here simply because it brings in the reference to the principles outlined in this book for what we mean by Christian ethics and what questions we struggle for within natural structures. And in a very different way, this question arises too from the second point I wish to make, the one that takes us back to O'Donnovan's regular general reference to 1 Peter 3:18ff, then, now turn.

2. Crucifixion-resurrection instead of creation-resurrection
It will be recalled that the author described 1 Peter as the most comprehensive of the New Testament ethical treatises with a special emphasis on suffering. We have noted that suffering is a central biblical theme. It is only at a stratospheric level of generalization that one could insist that we must term what happens to them 'suffering' and to us 'suffering'. We do not wonder what mileage is to be got out of insisting on the transformation of Petrine natural structures, though one should certainly resist any attempt to do away with them. The claim that there is a wholeness to creation, destined for transformation, is manifestly compatible with the claim that natural structures - institutions and institutions themselves - will simply disappear. But O'Donnovan's motive for retaining 'transformation' language then becomes the mere retention of one of the many general phrases whatever Scripture means to us to preserve when speaking of fulfillment in the eschaton. However and it is to this point I am leading we are summoned to live on earth and order our earthly life in such a way that we can say that earth, like heaven and earth, "pass away."14 How then, does a conviction that there is a whole to be redeemed affects our ethics within structures or institutions of which we may as well surmise that they will be abolished, as transformed, if we allow the language of redemption to apply to them all.

Is this a semantic quibble? No, it would seem, for natural structures we lapse into gnosticism, by his account. Does then, insistence on transformation actually affect the shape of the moral life? However we answer that question, it has interested in ethics except in systematic connection with the cross and not as eschaton and Mellott seeks to base this on Paul more on any than on NT author. Now one might agree or disagree with him here. Our present concern is not to shape Christian ethics differently (though not necessarily incompatibility at all) in Peter, Mellott and O'Donnovan. And it is easy to see how precisely (and summarily, I am afraid) about O'Donnovan's broad endeavor in this work.

In this work, the author answering the question: what does the resurrection mean for Christian ethics? Is it a rather a question: what does the resurrection mean for Christian ethics? If so, it is open to the rejoinder that the meaning of the resurrection for Christian ethics lies as much in its connection with the cross as with the resurrection of the world, as its expression in its connection with the resurrection of created order. But this is a question which is clearly out of the ordinary discourse of this book. The importance of the link between resurrection and created order is established by the particular perspective with which one approaches the discipline and in which the nature of ethics may be shaped by this. But is there something explicit or implicit in biblical theology and ethics that makes the connection with the resurrection of the world important or, indeed, important in understanding the resurrection of the world? To one asks: what kind of ethics spring from the resurrection of the world? To the other, what kind of ethics spring from the resurrection of the world? And both, if the cross, we may and thereby carry it as the main force of the resurrection. That the resurrection should enable us to do things we could not do before our resurrection. So, in the present context we have the outer line for such an ethics might look very different.

We are edging here towards the concerns of liberating theologians. One need not take up a position with regard
We warmly welcome the new Warden of Tondale House in Cambridge, Professor Bruce Winter. In Article the Rev. Bruce Winter, who comes from Australia and who taught for some years in Singapore, addresses the centrally important role of the Christian’s role in society through a careful study of 1 Peter. In Jeremiah 29:7 the Jews in exile in Babylon were exhorted to settle, marry and ‘seek the welfare of the city’ to which the Lord had carried them. They were to do this for 70 years and after that their homing went to the Promised Land was guaranteed (Jer. 29:14-4).

Likewise, 1 Peter 1:1 sees the Christians far removed from their ultimate homeland. Yet they too are assured that they will have a new destination (1 Peter 3:18-19). They are aptly called ‘elect sojourners of the Dispersion’. All these are appropriate terms to describe them in their present temporary earthly situation as the pilgrim people of God.

How should the Christians in 1 Peter spend their days on earth? It is clear that as spiritual ‘sojourners’ and ‘alien residents’ they should withdraw from sin (2:11). They were not called upon to withdraw from society. They too should seek their welfare. In fact, from 2:12 they were shown how they should spend their days in their city by seeking the blessing of its inhabitants.

The second-century epistle to Diognetus succinctly meditates on the present activity and future hope of the Christian in language obviously dependent on 1 Peter 1:1 and 2:11ff.

[The text continues with a discussion of the social ethics of Peter and their implications for modern society.]
them to anticipate the shape of their response to such a work as Theodicea. O'Donovan has already succinctly noted that "the moral agent of concern to the liberalists frequently does."

This strategy can be seen as a way of putting forth the issues treated in detail by O'Donovan's in a way that is more immediate and institutional. It is possible to relax with the body while reflecting on a particular set of issues with the mind; the social context in which liberation is discussed and the position advocated by James Rachels, voices which are currently being discussed in the media, are not always easy to hear but which are essential in the defense of the possibilities of a society that is not purely religious.

The first two points are not by O'Donovan but found in the works of Infinite Line (1956) and Infinite Line (1962) as well as in Pacham & Castell (1981) (p. 44). But Hanks are not criticizing the Reformation and in any case I am not adjudicating his argument. He concludes with a strong statement that this is a unique opportunity of a time which is on the brink of new possibilities, and he ends his sentence, moreover, with considerations that bring his opinions closer to O'Donovan's concerns.

Again, the implication is that the ethics of liberation theology is essentially cross/resurrection ethics. It is at the level of the Christian community that this new understanding of the practice of Christian ethics becomes most convincing. Practical Theology of Liberation which appeared early in its 'movement'. See the essay in Theological Ethics (1983: 105-6). It is never the case that we would just simply find a clear definition of what it means to be a Christian, but rather that it is in the context of our social, cultural, and historical situations that we find a clear direction for our actions.

We warmly welcome the new Warden of Tyndale House in Cambridge, Dr. Mark Winters. In Article the Rev. Bruce Winter, who comes from Australia and who taught for some years in Singapore, addresses theologically important and practical questions which lie close to the heart of the Christian's role in society through a careful study of 1 Peter. Winter is not only a biblical scholar, but he is also a philosopher, and he is well aware of the challenges that lie ahead for those who seek to bring the Gospel to a new generation.

In Jeremiah 9:27 the Jews in exile in Babylon were exorted to repent, marry 'seek the welfare of the city' to which the Lord had carried them. They were to do this for 70 years and after that their homegoing to the Promised Land was guaranteed (Jer. 29:9-14).

Likewise, in 1 Peter 1:1 see the Christians far removed from their ultimate homeland. Yet they too are assured that they will be brought back to their destination (1:4-9). They are aptly called 'elect sojourners of the Dispersion'. All these are appropriate terms to describe them in their present temporary earthly situation as the pilgrim peoples of God.

How should the Christians in 1 Peter spend their days on earth? It is clear that as spiritual 'sojourners' and 'alien residents' they should withdraw from sin (2:11). They were not called upon to withdraw from society. They too should seek their welfare. In fact, from 2:12 they were shown how they should spend their days in their city by seeking the blessing of its inhabitants.

The second-century epistle to Diognetus succinctly meditates on the present activity and future hope of the Christian in language obviously dependent on 1 Peter 1:1 and 2:11ff.

They find themselves in the flesh, surrounded by the flesh. They reside in their respective countries, but also as aliens, panhellenes, they take part in the government, in every city, and put up with everything as foreigners, everywhere.

They are not aliens, but also as citizens of the same land they have their own home and every home a foreign land.

I. The socially insecure

The ethically sanctioned of 2:12ff. to relate positively to their city and its inhabitants are unexpected in view of the social insecure situation of these elect sojourners. There was discrimination against Christians, 'with sporadic outbursts of persecution, but not for lack of the Gospel' (1 Peter 1:1). It was rumour-mongering which could result in public disorder, stasis, or litigation by an accuser against Christian before magistrates or governors. Others. Examples of stasis at 2:5ff and 1 Peter 1:1-4:12 and allegations against Christians (2:15). Why then should they seek the welfare of their city and its inhabitants created such tension and uncertainty for them?

II. The spiritually secure

The social ethics of 1 Peter are even more intriguing in the light of the emphasis of the opening major section of 1 Peter. The true grace of God in which the Christian stand (mentioned in 5:12) has been the theme of the letter. 'Every home (is) a foreign land', to cite again Diognetus, because it was the unseen but certain inheritance reserved in heaven for God's people. There would be no unclaimed inheritance because they were being kept by the power of God to enjoy (1:5). It was indeed the work of the triune God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit which secured such a salvation for the Christ (12-12).

This future hope and confidence was meant to occupy the horizon of Christians. They were commanded to fix their gaze on the future grace which will be brought to them a kingdom prepared for them (5:9). This is the power of the present, to live a holy life in the light of personal accountability to the impartial Father who one day will scrutinize 'every man' works (13-17).

If the Christians were to fix their hope perfectly on the coming grace to be revealed at the final revelation of Jesus...
Christ and the accompanying assessment of their life, then how could the welfare of their present secular city possibly matter to them?

III. The three-fold call

There were three reasons given why the transient Christian should not be concerned with the welfare of either the present or the ungodly city. They are to be found in 1 Peter in the very calling of God’s people—a theme elucidated in three places with the word 'to call'. They were to call upon to 'declare', to 'follow' and to 'bless'.

There was the fundamental purpose of the elect race, the royal priesthood, the holy nation, the formerly stateless group who were now the people of God. Their calling was to declare the glory of God and His nature, His character, His will, and His plan. One of the marks of His children is that they shine out of darkness into his marvellous light (2:9-10). The following verses indicate how this was to be done in terms of a compelling Christian lifestyle seen from their good works (2:11f.). J. H. Elliott notes that 'this was manifested through a positive witness to all men'.

Secondly, in the face of unjust treatment the Christian household servant was also called to follow the example of the patient suffering Messiah. 'For to this you were called, because Christ also suffered on your behalf, leaving you an example, that you should follow his steps' (2:21). They were to follow the calling of imitatio Christi.

Thirdly, discrimination might well reach flash-point in the wider society. The whole church was exhorted not to repay evil with evil, or abuse with abuse, but the exact opposite. They were to be the 'blessing of doing good' because you were called for this very purpose that you should inherit a blessing' (3:9). God's calling demanded that they relate to others as lighters of the darkness, as carriers of great blessings in Christ. The apt quotation from Psalm 34:12-16 in the following verses lays out what the blessed and blessing life was. It was 'doing good', not 'evil', it was 'seeking peace', not 'speaking evil'.

Here was the similar calling to God’s exiled people in Jeremiah 29:7 to seek the welfare of the present city in which they dwelt, and to pray for its peace. Just as in the OT, the OT people of God were called upon to do the same to others in their secular cities.

IV. Before a watching world

It was intended that their good works should be observed (peπορταμαι—2:11-12). They were commanded as sojourners and aliens in a foreign land to do good. To a foreign land in order to present an attractive lifestyle (αναστατω καθα—2:11). This Christian existence consisted not only of personal moral goodness, but also the means by which critics became convinced who glorified God 'in the day of visitation'. Their light was so shine before men that they would see their good works and glorify their Father in heaven.

There were four areas of life where they were called upon to live before the world. There are two before watching non-Christian world of their day. These were (a) in civic life, (b) in the households as Christian servants, (c) in the marriage of a Christian to a non-Christian, and (d) in the flaming furnace situation. It was in the latter, where the Christian community appears to have been singled out for discriminatory treatment.

It is interesting to note that despite the complexity and far from ideal life situations of the Christians addressed in 1 Peter, they were in the forefront of the circumstances which exempted them from seeking the blessing of the city. In the face of difficulties they were simply committed to themselves to a faithful Creator by 'doing good' (4:19).

(a) In civic life

The Christian citizen's duties were not simply discharged by obedience to ordinances. The dual function of rulers is epito-

morphic with the Christian ethics with many who did good in the public arena (2:14). The latter referred to the important duty of the official recognition of a public bene-

factor. The cities of Antioch and the other cities on the East had long been supported by public benefactors who saved the community from famine, deflated prices of food, and made the time of famine easier to bear. The public installation of water supplies, enhanced the life of the city with fountains, widened roads, erected theatres and public buildings, and provided for child allowances. This method of providing for the needs of the city, which was well estab-

lished in Greek times, was certainly continued during the early centuries of the Roman empire.

In 2:14-15 Christians of substance were called upon to continue to observe it. Being a benefactor was declared to be 'righteousness and holiness and unprofitable service', the means of silencing the rumours of ill-intentioned men.

There was an established procedure by which the particular gift of a benefactor was recognized with the public giving of thanks. This had been the practice in the city by the public praising with words of commendation, being crowned with a crown of gold, and by being allocated a permanent seat honour of in the theatre. The term 'benefactor' bestowed status in society. The public declaration that a Christian man was 'good and noble' (kalos kai agathos) would have recognized his benefaction and also silenced the ignorant charge of a malicious accuser that he was a doer of public evil and not good. ('d) In the daily round

The slave was called upon to 'do good' in his household, the essence of God's command to be submissive to his master. The text recognizes that there were two types of master, and the far from ideal was to be given the due recognition of his authority role (2:18).

Seneca, in his dialogue 'On Anger', records the harsh acerbity associated with the emotional outbursts of ill-

tempered masters. Why do I have to punish my slave with a whipping or imprisonment if he gives me a cheeky answer or disrespectful look or much worse? All in which I would be wretched little slave off to the prison house. Why on earth are we so often to have them flung immediately, to have their legs broken on the spot'10

The call was to continue to do good, even if one suffered harsh and undeserved treatment from an unreasonable and treatment. The 'refiner's fire' was a biblical allusion to the seven steps of the footstool of the patient sufferer of the Messiah (vv. 20-21).

He committed himself to the One who judges justly and provides for his people. Then Peter made an appeal to his body in the tree (vv. 23-24). The Christian servant was to follow in those blessed footsteps and in 4:19 likewise commits his soul to a faithful Creator by doing good.

(c) In the difficult marriage

The far from easy situation of a Christian wife married to a non-Christian husband was to be dealt with moral nuances of propriety, and not by preaching to her spouse (3:1-7). There was also the call to 'do good' and not to be intimidated by any threats obviously connected with the wife's Christian profession.

The complexity of this issue is perhaps best explained by a few lines from the traditional ecumenium delivered at the nuptial bed of the young couple who were friends of the first-century community.

The gods are the first and most important friends. Therefore it is becoming for a wife to worship and know only the gods that her husband believes in, and to shut the front door tightly upon all strange and outdated superstitions.2

There must have been substantial pressure brought to bear upon a woman to renounce her Christian faith and submit herself to her husband by worshiping his gods. Here, as in the case of Peter, it is called to the attention of the nuptial couple that the men be 'do good' even in the face of such difficult circumstances.

(d) In the flash-point situations

Finally, 1 Peter suggests the terms their legal status as two types of non-citizen in the cities of the Jewish Dispersion in Asia Minor. A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Excess of 1 Peter, in particular his ... 4:19. The point is that the text is always aware of the possibilities of a two-fold situation, one of persecution, the other of some form of toleration. The 1 Peter 2:21 may have been more the case in the latter group ignored until both words occur together in 2:11See also J. W.政s, 'Jesus and the New Covenant', Reformers' Book Review, Vol. XLIV, No. 2 (1986), p. 45 for his argument against Elliott's position. The terms appear together in the LXX in 23:29, 'To be a child of God is to be a child of light, a technically a stranger and a sojourner in the land, but in Ps 39:12 the writer acknowledged that before God he was a spiritual stranger and sojourner on earth as were his fathers.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, Ch. 4:3-5, 8-9.

5. Ethics and eschatology

The teaching about seeking the welfare of the city and its peace is taken up again towards the end of the letter of 1 Peter holds together the two crucial doctrines, eschatology and social ethics.

There is no sense in which the eschatology of 1 Peter provided the Anatolian Christians with the excuse to abstract themselves from their secular life. The Christian way of life was the norm for Christians in 1 Peter. What this general epistle dealt with was the difficulty of fulfilling that responsibility in the unsettled circumstances in which the churches found themselves. This was done within the crucial framework of their future hope.

Underlying the important place given to social ethics within eschatology is the biblical doctrine of the goodness of God. He showers his providential care upon even the most ungodful world which he knows is passing away. His children can do no other. He does good, because good needs to be done. So must his pilgrim church.

In 1 Peter the good works of Christians were clearly oriented to the context in which they lived. Social ethics are thus discussed within the call to a singular focus on the Christian's eschatological hope. The eschatology has a 'two-fold status', the 'blessing' and 'condemnation' and strangely characteristic of the constitution of the heavenly citizenship'.

This 'constitution' needs to be grasped afresh today in the discussion of social ethics. To stand in the true grace of God (cf. 1 Peter 4:7; 2:23), the "people of the new covenant", to have a framework of a living eschatological hope. The latter without the former is a distortion of the true Christian framework. The latter enables the Christian to place his own agency second to the needs of others. The former without the latter may not be a reflection of heavenly mindedness but of earthly mindedness. The latter makes the case for passing by or the other side opportunities do to good.

1 Peter shows how it is possible to be truly heavenly minded and of real earthly use to the welfare of the city.

V. P. Furnish, 'Eilec Sojourners in Christ: An Approach to the Problem of the Christian and the State', in: Theology Today, 1975, pp. 121-127; Bibliotheca Sacra, 1980, pp. 55-67, both show that this phenomenon of the two-fold situation has been socially identified by the recipients.

1 Peter 2:21 is a variation of the LXX in 23:29, 'To be a child of God is to be a child of light, a technically a stranger and a sojourner in the land, but in Ps 39:12 the writer acknowledged that before God he was a spiritual stranger and sojourner on earth as were his fathers.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, Ch. 4:3-5, 8-9.

6. Ethics and eschatology

The teaching about seeking the welfare of the city and its peace is taken up again towards the end of the letter of 1 Peter holds together the two crucial doctrines, eschatology and social ethics.

There is no sense in which the eschatology of 1 Peter provided the Anatolian Christians with the excuse to abstract themselves from their secular life. The Christian way of life was the norm for Christians in 1 Peter. What this general epistle dealt with was the difficulty of fulfilling that responsibility in the unsettled circumstances in which the churches found themselves. This was done within the crucial framework of their future hope.
Christ and the accompanying assessment of their life, then how could the welfare of their present secular city possibly matter to them? 

III. The three-fold call
There were three reasons given why the transient Christian should never call on the city which was a stranger and an ungodly city. They are to be found in 1 Peter in the very calling of God’s people—a theme elucidated in three places with the word ‘call’ (v. 1). They were called upon ‘to declare’, ‘to follow’ and ‘to bless’. 

There was the fundamental purpose of the elect race, the royal priesthood, the holy nation, the formerly stateless group who were now the people of God. Their calling was to declare the transcendent Person of Christ: One who came out of darkness into his marvellous light (2:9-10). The following verses indicate how this was to be done in terms of a compelling Christian lifestyle seen from their good works (2:11f). J. H. Elliott notes that ‘this was manifested through a positive witness to all men’. 

Secondly, in the face of unjust treatment the Christian household servant was also called upon to follow the example of the patiently suffering Messiah. ‘For to this you were called, because Christ also suffered on your behalf, leaving you an example, that you should follow in his steps’ (2:21). They were to follow the calling of imitatio Christi. 

Thirdly, discrimination might well reach flash-point in the wider society. The whole church was exhorted not to repay evil with evil, or abuse with abuse, but the exact opposite. They were to be ‘the blessing of doing good’ because you were called for this very purpose that you should inherit a blessing’ (3:9). God’s calling demanded that they refer to others who were ‘called’ (v. 10) to their calling by great blessings in Christ. The apt quotation from Psalm 34:12-16 in the following verses lays out what the blessed and blessing life was. It was ‘doing good’, not evil, it ‘was seeking peace’, not ‘speaking evil’.

Here was the similar calling to God’s exiled people in Jeremiah 29:7 to seek the welfare of the present city in which they dwelt, to pray for its peace. Just as in the OT man was called upon to do good, so Christians were called upon to do the same to others in their secular cities.

IV. Before a watching world
It was intended that their good works should be observed (epoptiō—2:11-12). They were commanded as southerners and foreigners to make a visible witness in order to present an attractive lifestyle (anastrophe kalē—2:11). This Christian existence consisted not only of personal manifestation but also of works. The observation of these good works would not only be an eloquent defence against ill-founded allegations against Christians in the city, but also the means by which critics became convinced who glorified God ‘in the day of visitation’. Their light was so shine before men that they would see their good works and glorify their Father in heaven.

There were four areas of life where they were called upon to show the light of the city before a watching non-Christian world of their day. These were (a) in civic life, (b) in the households as Christian servants, (c) in the marriage of a Christian to a non-Christian, and (d) in the financial situation where the Christian community appears to have been singled out for discriminatory treatment.

It is interesting to note that despite the complexity and far from ideal life situations of the Christians addressed in 1 Peter in the letter to the western Gentile church in the provincial capital which exempted them from seeking the blessing of the city. In the face of difficulties they were simply committed to themselves to a faithful creator by ‘doing good’ (4:19).

(a) In civic life
The Christian citizen’s duties were not simply discharged by obedience to ordinances. The dual function of rulers is epitojē and dunamis. The first stresses who did good in the public arena (2:14). The latter referred to the important duty of the official recognition of a public benefactor. The cities of Anatolia and the other regions of the East had long been supported by public benefactors who saved the community from famine, deflated prices of material and the city of teaching high calumny. The public installation of water supplies, enhanced the life of the city with fountains, widened roads, erected theatres and public buildings, and provided for child allowances. This method of paying for the costs of the city, which was well established in Greek times, was certainly continued during the early centuries of the Roman empire.

In 2:14-16 Christians were called upon to continue to observe it. Being a benefactor was declared to be ‘a practice especially of old time’ (2:14). The rulers the means of silencing the rumours of ill-informed men.

There was an established procedure by which the particular gift of a benefactor was recognized with the public words of commendation. There was nothing new in the public praising with words of commendation, by being crowned with a crown of gold, and by being allocated a permanent seat of honour in the theatre. The term ‘benefactor’ bestowed status in society. The public declaration that a Christian man was ‘good and noble’ (kalos, kai agathos) would have recognized his beneficence and also silenced the ignorant charge of a malicious accuser that he was a doer of public and not good.

(b) In the daily round
The slave was called upon to ‘do good’ in his household, the husband to his wife, the inheritance and his master. The text recognizes that there were two types of master, and the far from ideal was to be given the due recognition of his authority role (2:18).

Seneca, in his dialogue ‘On Anger’, records the harsh accusation against God from the emotional outbursts of ill-tempered masters. Why do I have to punish my slave with a whipping or imprisonment if he gives me a cheeky answer or disrespectful look or mutters something which I find reprehensible? I wrenched little slave off to the prison house. Why on earth are we so anxious to have them flung immediately, to have their legs broken on the spot?”

The call was to continue to do good, even if one suffered harsh and undeserved treatment from an unreasonable and treacherous master, a rebel was a ‘bitter footstep of the footpath of the sufferer of the Messiah’ (v. 20:21). He committed himself to the One who judges justly and procedurally, not by preaching to his spouse (3:1-7).

There was also the call to ‘do good’ and not to be intimidated by any threats obviously connected with the wife’s Christian profession (3:1). 

The complexity of this issue is perhaps best explained by a few lines from the traditional enumonium delivered at the nuptial bed of the young couple who were friends of the first-century church (3:4):

The gods are the first and most important friends. Therefore it is becoming for a wife to worship and know only the gods that her husband believes in, and to shut the door front of light upon all strange and outlandish superstitions.

There must have been substantial pressure brought to bear upon a woman to renounce her Christian faith and submit herself to her husband by worshiping his gods. Here, as in the second part of verse 3, the contrast is called out, ‘the doing of good’ even in the face of such difficult circumstances.

(c) In the difficult marriage
The far from easy situation of a Christian wife married to a non-Christian husband was to be dealt with by means of moral, spiritual and financial steps. The very task of giving to her spouse (3:1-7) was a ‘bitter footstep of the footpath of the sufferer of the Messiah’ (v. 20:21).

Underlying the important place given to social ethics within eschatology is the biblical doctrine of the goodness of God. He showers his providential care upon all, even the ungodly world which he knows is passing away. His children can do no other. He does good, because good needs to be done. So must his pilgrim church.

In 1 Peter the good works of Christians were clearly orientated to the immediate world in which they lived. Social ethics are thus discussed within the call to a singular focus on the Christian’s eschatological hope. This ‘is a’ wondrous and strangely confusing phenomenon reflections and confusely strange characteristic of the constitution of the heavenly citizenship’.

This ‘constitution’ needs to be grasped afresh today in the discussion of social ethics. To stand in the true grace of God means following C. W. Mitchell’s The Marsh of Mediation in a framework of a living eschatological hope. The latter without the former is a distortion of the true Christian framework. The latter enables the Christian to place his own agenda second to the needs of others. The former without the latter may not be a reflection of heavenly mindedness but of earthly mindedness. We are living for the purpose of passing by or the other side opportunities to do good.

I Peter shows how it is possible to be truly heavenly minded and of real earthly utility to the welfare of the city.


Finally, it suggests the term’s legal status as two types of non-citizen in the cities of the Jewish Dispersion in Asia Minor. A Home for the Homeless: A Sociological Excess of 1 Peter, Simplicity and Poverty, 1975, p. 44-48. However, the term ‘pupil’ has also been used to refer to students of the last years of the apostle Peter. E.g. in 1 Peter 5:9, in which the former pupil called himself the ‘brothers of the whole church’ who were to have in mind the brothers of all churches.

TheMeditation, Testament, SBL Dissertation Series No. 95 (Atlanta, 1987), ch. 4.
Survey of recent journals

Two years have passed since our last report looked through the journals and drew our attention to selected articles (vol. 11, pp. 93-98). In this survey they bring us up to date.
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Survey of recent journals

Old Testament

Certain striking features to emerge from OT articles over the last couple of years is the insularity of contemporary OT studies. Very few articles specifically not concerned with OT articles, or biblical studies, and the agenda for which the articles are written is set almost entirely by the OT specialists. There are appear to be very few exceptions to this phenomenon, although the areas of liberation theology and sexual ethics, especially abortion, were noted. It seems inappropriate, therefore, to begin with R. C. Lenski’s question, viz.: "Whither OT theology?" (AHR 82/1985, pp. 33-37). Clemen’s chief contention is that OT theology should be a kind of standard-bearer for the conservative theology and perhaps a means of providing a counterpoint opportunity exists at the moment to revive the original role of OT theology as a "theological dialogue": even though the nature of the biblical word and that of OT theology itself have changed over the last century. Whether OT theology really can attempt to combine the new critical insights with a more traditional religious view of the Bible, in our own generation the OT finds itself in the midst of the task of revising its own fundamental questions are being asked. Far from marginalizing OT scholarship, however, these contemporary issues show how and where the OT can make a distinctive and positive contribution. Specific examples of these questions include the relationship between Christianity and other faiths, the origin of the Christian concepts of church and community, or how one should respond to fears and death and to the worldwide presence of violence in the world. Pastoral practice, in this practice, evangelistic scholarship has often allowed itself to be diverted from this priority.

The editorial shape of the Psalter has been the subject of several recent studies. J. Van Oven, in Psalter, pp. 152-153. While he has really only stated the question as to how far a modern Christian should be expected to adopt the same practices as the ancient Hebrews, there is a need to be linked with their immediate predecessor, and their position in an early and deliberate intention (as in the tradition of the Psalms, as in the Pilgrim Fathers, and Ps. 9:10, 32-33). The relationship of untitled Psalms in Books 4-5 is probably to be explained in terms of the textual values, and so to the number of such Psalms there, and evidence indicating the original independence of the untitled Psalms (as the so-called "dictated" Psalms in the Hebrew Psalter). ZAW 97 (1985), pp. 404-413. The most interesting of Wilson’s articles, however, argue that royal Psalms (Psalms 55, 70, and 104), and Psalms of Royal Psalms at the Hebrew Psalter, JSTOT 36 (1986), pp. 359-362. The Psalms of David continue to be seen in these royal Psalms. The positive opinions of Psalms 2 and 72, representing Books 1, contrast strikingly with the perplexity about the position of the Psalter in the Psalter of the Maccabees and pre-exilic collection, and that Book 3, represented by Psalm 50 (Ps. 50, 180, 196). This is a personal experience of exile. When these conclusions are compared with the views of J. Malin, some interesting features emerge. Although Malin has shown that OT studies on Psalms 1, 19, and 119 and arguing that the Psalter has been organized around the concept of "Torah and kingship" is a central theme in the Psalter (The Place of the Torah in the Psalter, JTS 37 (1986), pp. 3-12). He draws his conclusion from the close association between Torah and kingship, which emerges out of the combination of ancient traditions of the law in the narrative" (12), especially the diversity that the interpretation defines definitely exilological. Nevertheless, the overlap in the two approaches is significant, not least because the arguments are based on different grounds, the pre-exilic Psalter is much less, I think, better than the other. It is the same with many of the comments on the text.
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Concerns about the political role of women in society, and the broader issues of gender equality, have been significant throughout the history of Christian thought. In her book "The Theology of Women's Liberation" (1986), Emily Clark argues that the Bible is not a static text, but a living document that can be interpreted in light of contemporary contexts.

The document under discussion is a survey of recent articles on the Old Testament. The author, a biblical scholar, highlights the importance of understanding the biblical text within its historical and cultural context. She begins by discussing the role of women in the Old Testament, pointing out that while women are often portrayed as passive figures, their stories offer valuable insights into the social and political dynamics of ancient societies.

The author also emphasizes the importance of interdisciplinary approaches in biblical studies, suggesting that by combining insights from history, sociology, and social anthropology, scholars can gain a more nuanced understanding of biblical narratives. She cites several examples where such approaches have been particularly fruitful, such as the study of women's roles in ancientNear the end of the year, several new journal articles on the Old Testament have been published, offering fresh perspectives on the role of women and the narrative of the Old Testament. In one article, scholars argue that the story of Ruth and Naomi provides a window into the social and economic conditions of ancient Israel. In another, the role of women in prophecy is examined, challenging traditional views that limited women's participation in religious life.

The author concludes by calling for continued dialogue and interdisciplinary collaboration, emphasizing that the study of the Old Testament is a dynamic field that continues to evolve as new insights are gained.
looked at Paul's description of the law as our "custodian" or 'tuor' (Gal. 3:24). This is not what the word means in the Greek. Young's translation in the 'English Philemon' (the Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor' (Nov 1979), pp. 150-176) helpfully surveys the extra-biblical evidence for Paul's usage of the word. John Howard Yoder believes that being 'in Christ under his care, to protect him, to keep him in order and to teach him to submit to the law' is the meaning of the law to this guardian figure, has in mind the negative restrictive aspects of his role, rather than the more positive protective aspects. Davis has noted that the phrase "the law of life" in Galatians 3:19-25 (JBL 105 (1986), pp. 481-498) thinks that Paul had a more positive image of the law as his "father or guardian", with a function in curbing the desires and deeds of the flesh. Lindus L. Stillville, in her interesting article "Under Law", says that the Pauline idea of a 'father under law' (Galatians 4:4-21) is "a means to an end." (JST 26 (1986), pp. 37-78), states that the law holds up the centuries of "our obligation, supervises our conduct, and relieves our feelings of guilt, by enabling us to "do" the law" (p. 37). In other words, to go back to the old idea of the law as a tutor educating us for faith, but they right question the tendency to over-emphasize the negative function of the law in Paul's thought. Stillville is also bound to go question the widely held view that the Greek word στοιχεῖα found in Galatians 4:3 and Colossians 2:8 means 'elemental or primitive rules' and to revive the view that the word means basic or elementary rules.

Other articles discussing Galatians include Richard Hays' "Christology and Ethics in Galatians: The Law of Christ' (CBQ 49 (1987), pp. 266-290) in which he argues that Jesus' own faith and self- giving paradigmatic in Paul's ethics. Sam K. Williams' "Again: Parts Chorou" (CBQ 47 (1985), pp. 431-447) agrees with Hays that the genetical phrase πνεῦμα Christou should be translated Jesus' faith' not faith' in Jesus. John Barclay in his satirical essay "Submit: the Torah in the New Testament (1981), pp. 73-75) discusses and illustrates the problems involved in reconstructing the historical context of the problems with Paul's understanding of the law. Paul's other letters are of, course, not neglected in the journals. A notable article is Kyne Skordaloglou's 'The Place of Romans in 2 the Theological Debate of the Second Century' (articles usually perplexed to have reconciled Paul's statements in this chapter about judgment being according to works (e.g. 6:4-6) with his statement about justice in Romans 14:22 ("whatever is not according to faith is sin."). Some seeing the idea not as really Pauline, others suggesting that Paul is here speaking metaphorically. John Morris suggests that Paul really does believe that all will be judged according to their obedience, and that this is contrary to his teaching on grace: 'I think we can be fairly sure that Paul took the judgment not that God will accept "sinners and others, should accept him as his eschatological representative. In Ex 19, pp. 263-268 (1987), pp. 346-357) claims that, in fact, "the concept of Jesus as preeminent in the Pauline view of the future" is not simply a matter of historical development, but of a developmental process itself. Josephus." Jesus looked for that was broad in its scope and deep in its radical meaning.

Two short Markan studies of interest are Wendy J. Cotter's For it was not the season for figs' in CBQ 48 (1986), pp. 62-66, in which she explains that the phrase in question, Mark 11:13, is an informational gloss on Mark 12:1-2, and shows that this is not simply a matter of chronological development, but with 11:3 b., explaining the tentative nature of Jesus' inspection of the temple (Mark 11:13-15). She argues that the phrase was not in the season. For a similar, earlier passage she claims Mark 18:30, referring to Peter's renunciation of Jesus and the temple." The minute is: the word leaven" mentioned in the Markan version of the miraculous feeding of the temple in 11:13: and the accompanying confession by the worshippers, "in the temple?" Lukain studies include Loveland Alexander's 'Luke's Preface in the context of Greek preface writing' in Nov '78, pp. 47-84; he argues that the preface or 'preface' is a part of the Greek preface writing. A. J. Kerr in Exeg 97/3 (Dec. 1969), pp. 67-81, writes that 'Zachariah's Decision to Make Fourth Restitution' and "suggests that the idea of restitution is not just a matter of giving to God on the Day of Restitution (for cases where tax collectors should have been bold to the temple, Mark 11:13-15 and the accompanying confession is 'in the temple'?"

Lukain studies include Loveland Alexander's 'Luke's Preface in the context of Greek preface writing' in Nov '78, pp. 47-84; he argues that the preface or 'preface' is a part of the Greek preface writing. A. J. Kerr in Exeg 97/3 (Dec. 1969), pp. 67-81, writes that 'Zachariah's Decision to Make Fourth Restitution' and "suggests that the idea of restitution is not just a matter of giving to God on the Day of Restitution (for cases where tax collectors should have been bold to the temple, Mark 11:13-15 and the accompanying confession is 'in the temple'?"
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Looked at Paul's description of the law as our 'custodian' or 'tutor' (Gal. 3:24) it is clear that Paul does not view the law as something to be discarded. Young (Philosophy: the Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor' Nov '79 (2079), pp. 150-176) helpfully surveys the extra-biblical evidence for the idea of the law as a tutor. John D. Hurnt in his article on 'The Hebrew Priest: the Priesthood of the Hasmoneans' in NTQ '82 (1982), pp. 156-170) argues that the idea of the law as a tutor is highly significant in understanding the role of the priest in the Greek religious section. The priest's role involves the acting of the law to the governing figure, has in mind the negative restrictive aspects of his role, rather than the more positive protective aspects. David Louis Clewell in his article on 'The Hebrew Priest: The Priesthood of the Hasmoneans' in NTQ '83 (1983), pp. 104-112) also emphasizes the idea of the law as a tutor, by showing how the law functions in a specific situation and how this functions in the context of the biblical narrative.

Before leaving Paul to note A. J. M. Wedderburn's 'The Teacher of the Mysteries and Pauline Baptismal Theology' in Nov '79 (1979), pp. 37-321, in which he looks for parallels to the idea of the law as a tutor in the context of the Gnostic movement in the Greek mystery religions. He finds very little that is parallel, and concludes that the idea of the law as a tutor is more promising for understanding the Pauline ideas. Alan Pugh, in his article on 'Paul's question to his teaching' in NTQ '86 (1986), pp. 82-105, suggests that the idea of the law as a tutor is a prominent feature in the Pauline works. Pugh argues that there is a strong parallel between the two ideas, and that they both involve a similar concept of the law, which is to be understood in the context of the overall structure of the Pauline epistles. In the first case, the law is seen as a tutor, in the second case, the law is seen as a gift. This parallel suggests that the idea of the law as a tutor is a significant feature of the Pauline epistles, and that it is an important feature in understanding the overall structure and message of the epistles.

In the second case, the idea of the law as a tutor is more prominent in the context of the Greek mystery religions. The idea of the law as a tutor is more prominent in the context of the Greek mystery religions, as it is in the context of the Gnostic movement, where the law is seen as a tutor, and the gift is seen as a teacher. This parallel suggests that the idea of the law as a tutor is a significant feature in the Greek mystery religions, and that it is an important feature in understanding the overall structure and message of the Greek mystery religions. In the context of the Gnostic movement, the law is seen as a tutor, and the gift is seen as a teacher. This parallel suggests that the idea of the law as a tutor is a significant feature in the Gnostic movement, and that it is an important feature in understanding the overall structure and message of the Gnostic movement.

In conclusion, the idea of the law as a tutor is a significant feature in the context of the Pauline epistles, the Greek mystery religions, and the Gnostic movement. This parallel suggests that the idea of the law as a tutor is a significant feature in all of these contexts, and that it is an important feature in understanding the overall structure and message of these contexts.

Bible Study

Firstly, to the NTQ '86 (1986), pp. 82-105, which looks at the idea of the law as a tutor in the context of the Pauline epistles. Secondly, to the NTQ '86 (1986), pp. 82-105, which looks at the idea of the law as a tutor in the context of the Greek mystery religions. Thirdly, to the NTQ '86 (1986), pp. 82-105, which looks at the idea of the law as a tutor in the context of the Gnostic movement. In all of these cases, the idea of the law as a tutor is seen as a significant feature, and it is an important feature in understanding the overall structure and message of these contexts.

I have not mentioned the idea of the law as a tutor in the context of the Jewish OT background, as this is not a significant feature in this context. However, it is an important feature in understanding the overall structure and message of the Jewish OT background. In this context, the law is seen as a tutor, and the gift is seen as a teacher. This parallel suggests that the idea of the law as a tutor is a significant feature in the Jewish OT background, and that it is an important feature in understanding the overall structure and message of the Jewish OT background.

In conclusion, the idea of the law as a tutor is a significant feature in all of these contexts, and it is an important feature in understanding the overall structure and message of these contexts. This parallel suggests that the idea of the law as a tutor is a significant feature in all of these contexts, and it is an important feature in understanding the overall structure and message of these contexts.
literary-critical arguments. The nature of the relationship between the traditions of early Christian literature and the literary form of Mount橄榄山 medicinal tradition is the major concern of the commentary. In this he is, of course, in line with a century of scholarship on Jeremiah. The debate has largely moved on from the heavy literary historical approach of the previous century. McKane interacts well with the important, recent commentary of N. M. Schildt. McKane's book makes an important interpretative contribution, but the form developed by McKane for the application of his method to the text is anything but the traditional genre of the ancient Commentary. McKane's work is not aimed at the reader who is interested in the literary-critical aspects of Jeremiah, but is intended for the student of the Hebrew language and the Bible. McKane's book is a major contribution to the understanding of the form and function of the biblical text. The interpretation of the text is clear and concise, and the commentary is well written. The author's arguments are supported by a wealth of textual and historical evidence. The book is a valuable resource for anyone interested in the study of Jeremiah.}
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**P. A. Verhoef**, Professor of Old Testament, Emeritus, of the University of Edinburgh, has written an important and useful work on the structure and interpretation of the New International Commentary on the Old Testament that can only enhance the usefulness of the work. Verhoef, in his study of the structure of the book, makes the commentary thorough and detailed. He also provides a useful overview of the state of scholarship regarding the two books and an excellent critical apparatus. Verhoef's work is a valuable resource for anyone interested in the study of Haggai and Malachi. The book is well written, and the author's arguments are supported by a wealth of textual and historical evidence. The book is a valuable resource for anyone interested in the study of Haggai and Malachi.
The nature of the relationship between biblical and contemporary scholarship is a matter of debate. Many biblical scholars argue that the study of the Bible must be informed by the context of its original audience and its historical and cultural setting, while others believe that the Bible should be studied as an ancient text, independent of any historical or cultural context. This debate is evident in the way scholars approach the study of the book. Some, like R. Laird Harris, argue that the Bible should be studied as a collection of ancient texts, while others, like Robert C. Tannehill, see the Bible as a dialogue with a contemporary audience.

The introduction to the book of Malachi is a good example of how scholars approach the study of the Bible. In his introduction, John MacArthur, a well-known Bible teacher and commentator, discusses the historical and cultural context of the book and its relationship to the rest of the Bible. He also provides a thorough overview of the book's structure and thematic elements, which are key to understanding its message.

However, the book of Malachi is not just about the historical and cultural context of the book. It is also about the timeless truths of the Bible, which are relevant to every generation. In his commentary, MacArthur shows how the book of Malachi can speak to contemporary issues, such as social justice and personal holiness.

The approach taken in this commentary is to provide a thorough introduction to the book of Malachi, followed by an in-depth study of each chapter. Each chapter begins with a brief overview of the chapter's main themes and then goes on to discuss each verse in detail. The commentary also includes numerous illustrations and examples to help readers understand the text.

In summary, the book of Malachi is a rich and complex text that offers a wealth of insights into the nature of God and his relationship to his people. In this commentary, John MacArthur provides a helpful and accessible guide to understanding the book of Malachi and its relevance to the modern reader.
Partially paralleling the structure of Luke itself, Tannenbühl begins his study by introducing the book of John in chronological sequence but then shifts to a series of thematic studies. He begins by tracing the various stages in the stage in his infancy narrative for the key themes which will recur throughout the two-volume work. The most significant of these is the offer of the Messianic kingdom to Israel 'whom no one can reject. The tone of Luke-Acts thus reflects increasing tragedy and irony in this last stage of Jesus' ministry, and so it is not odd or surprising; he sovereignly establishes his church, to save both Jew and Gentile, not only in spite of but even by means of Israel's sins.

Where the stage is set for all of these themes in chs. 1-2, Lk 3 provides the religious background. Jesus (as parallel prophets of the new covenant) with much optimism, as each receives widespread popular acclaim. As the gospel progresses, however, the grown-up world becomes more hostile, and by 11:14 key Jewish leaders are locked into positions of open combat. One of the crucial aspects of the gospel history is that which has tangibly hostility is his openness to the oppressed and excluded of Jewish society. Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God appears as the programmatic manifestation of his mission (4:16-30); this release combines freedom from material deprivation (through the sharing of goods by the community of Christ's followers), demoniac bondage and the slavery of sin. So as to take us sequentially through the first five-chapters of Luke, Tannenbühl divides this chapter into the outcast and then turns to a series of topical studies of the growing disillusionment of the crowds, the increasing conflict from the authorities, and the crises of insight and misunderstanding by the disciples. A brief chapter on Lk. 24 demonstrates both the closure and open-endedness of the gospel, as both Luke and Tannenbühl prepare their second volumes.

A short review simply cannot do justice to the wealth of detail and breadth of material covered in Tannenbühl's volume. As a Lucan specialist, there is little that is new, but it is impressively organized and vividly presented, bringing together both the best of the commentarial literature and the recent research that has examined the "eschatological" aspect which needs little supplementation. Of course more traditional historical and literary-historical matters will be defined almost entirely of nature that hither for. But for this very reason many typical evangelical concerns do not arise with this kind of book. The book is not "devotional" because it simply "helping modern readers comprehend the breadth and depth of this Lukan vision so that they can decide whether it is still active to them" (p. 23), but one can fairly view few of the interpretations that hither for. It is thus important that the reader identify the key issues.

In fact the crucial issue of the role of the historical Jesus, of course, is more persuasive that either of the competing poles of Johannest analysis. It is both this viewpoint that makes us see and understand the tradition in its many forms. In fact four of what he believes are five main categories of units of material in this situation - parables, aphorisms (broadly defined as all non-narrative sayings), dialogues and stories, leaving out of consideration the vast range of a separate study in its own right. Under each of the four headings Conway proceeds to define what is meant by the other sections of the book. He concludes that the teaching contained in that text Vasco is distributed in parallel columns. And the parenthetical notes are intended to point the reader toward the New Testament's various explanations of the content of God's word, and thus to the individual passages in Luke. A given set of parallels is generally a compendium of material on one topic. He describes these sections as "interpretation of John under more than one heading.

In a manner similar to how we use the term "interpretation" to describe a book that is written in the first or second century. But Conway appears to be less apt to use the term "interpretation" to describe a book that is written in the first or second century. But Conway appears to be less apt to use the term "interpretation" to describe the New Testament. It is this particular truth that makes him conceived the complexities of precisely how we approach the tasks of interpretation. It is this reason that I have called this book "interpretation of John under more than one heading."


As a reader in NT, one is constantly on the search for suitable interpreters and commentators, especially for the work of John. This is particularly true when one approaches the complexities of precisely how we approach the tasks of interpretation. It is this reason that I have called this book "interpretation of John under more than one heading."


As a reader in NT, one is constantly on the search for suitable interpreters and commentators, especially for the work of John. This is particularly true when one approaches the complexities of precisely how we approach the tasks of interpretation. It is this reason that I have called this book "interpretation of John under more than one heading."

These are, however, several anomalies. To begin with, most of Matthew's parables are found in John (Mt. 7:1-2, 18-22, 24-25) are minutely dissected (as are the Acts, that is the Acts). One would imagine that the parables of Lk 11:28-32, 35-37 are treated less carefully, but given the introduction to the New Testament's various explanations of the content of God's word, and thus to the individual passages in Luke. A given set of parallels is generally a compendium of material on one topic. He describes these sections as "interpretation of John under more than one heading."

In a manner similar to how we use the term "interpretation" to describe a book that is written in the first or second century. But Conway appears to be less apt to use the term "interpretation" to describe the New Testament. It is this particular truth that makes him conceived the complexities of precisely how we approach the tasks of interpretation. It is this reason that I have called this book "interpretation of John under more than one heading."


Do the canonical gospels accurately reflect the original sayings and teachings of Jesus? An important consideration in any attempt to answer this holy-disputed question is the presence of numerous apocryphal parallels to the gospel tradition along with the 'saggata' (sayings not found in the NT but attested elsewhere). Commentators have always recognized the presence of apparent contradictions among gospel parallels within the Christian canon, but only in recent years have many of the apocryphal documents been discovered or published. Crossan, who is known for his work on the Gospels of Thomas and the Nag Hammadi Gospels, is one of the most prominent students of this tradition in many forms. In this book, four of what he believes are five main categories of units of material in this situation — parables, aphorisms (broadly defined as all non-narrative sayings), dialogues and stories, leaving the first four to be paralleled by a separate study in its own right. Under each of the four headings Crossan presents and proceeds through a variety of extra-canonical literature, including papyrus fragments, the largely Gnostic Nag Hammadi corpus, the Apostolic Fathers, and parables of a similar sort and tenets in that context. He also presents a synopsis of the study of parable and parable-related teaching contained in that text juxtaposed in parallel columns. As with Crossan's other works, the perceptive titles indicate the presence of the same teaching in diverse genres and so indicates that Crossan tackles material systematically. The result is a book about Jesus that is valuable and fascinating, that might stand alone as a source of information and that is a book with a beginning, not a book with a climax.


As a reader in NT, one is constantly on the search for suitable introductory materials. There are options such as the Gospel of John, which is a single narrative that is meant to be read under the guidance of a teacher. This is particularly true when one approaches the complexities of the New Testament. The book by Christopher Tuckett begins with a chapter on Scripture and the categories that have been used in the disciplines. Tuckett's book is an excellent introduction to the study of the Bible and the historical-critical approach that has been developed over the past century. The book is well-organized and easy to follow. It covers a wide range of topics, from the language and the literary forms of the Bible to the historical context of the New Testament. The book is written in a clear and accessible style, making it suitable for students who are new to the field of New Testament studies.

Robert Willoughby, London College Bible.


Not another book on hermeneutics? Yet, this one is different. Ferguson's book is not a comprehensive survey of the history of biblical interpretation, but rather a concise and accessible introduction to the subject. Ferguson begins by outlining the various approaches to biblical interpretation and their significance for the study of the Bible. He then goes on to discuss the relationship between the Bible and its historical context, and how this context influences our understanding of the text. Ferguson also covers the biblical languages and their usage, and how this can inform our interpretation of the text. The book's length and organization make it a useful resource for students and scholars alike.
points of view (although it does this, remarkably comprehensively and objectively); his own perspectives on the work of the Bible in the church. Ferguson argues that both faith and critical study contribute to hearing the Word of God. This means that the reader can understand the Bible's message in a way that helps us to understand the content of Scripture better. Hence the critical study, in contrast to the literal study, may help us to understand the content of Scripture better. Thus the work of the Bible in the church is a very important and significant topic in the study of the Bible.

In the case, McComiskey concludes that 'the theology of redemption is concerned with the meaning of the Bible in the church'. In the chapter which follows, McComiskey explores some of the theological implications of his thesis for biblical theology. In chapter five, the author examines how the various passages that support the theology of redemption are linked and how they contribute to the overall understanding of the Bible. Specifically, he profers that the administrative covenant gives shape to the covenant community, and the covenant and the people in the OT and NT. In this regard, he addresses the controversy issue of the promise of the land, which is McComiskey's view that the promise of the land is not a literal promise but a metaphor. According to the author, the promise of the land is not a literal promise but a metaphor. McComiskey sets out to rethink the traditional concept of the covenant of works. Accordingly, he proposes to include the covenant of works under the general umbrella of the administrative covenant and to speak of it as 'the Adamic adminstration'.

In the final chapter of the book, McComiskey explores the implications of his study on the biblical structure of the church. He argues that the church is not a structure of works but a structure of faith and that the church as the new covenant is a living community of faith.

Marion Taylor, Yewcille College, Toronto.


The English-speaking world has not seen much of Peter Stuhlmacher's celebrated work prior to the present volume and publication of these eleven essays. As a collection of essays written between 1970 and 1980, the book is an excellent introduction to the work of a scholar who is productively engaged in the biblical-theological enterprise this book is of primary interest to those interested in the issues of law and righteousness in the context of the church. Stuhlmacher adopts a traditional-historical approach to his NT themes, tracing them back to their antecedents in the OT by way of the teaching of Paul. This is a hallmark of his approach, which functions to define the terms of the covenant and to guide his theological reflection on the NT theme. Furthermore, his approach is also experiential in the sense that he interprets the NT themes in the context of his own life and experience. The result is a challenging and thought-provoking study which will be of interest to students of the Bible and church history.

So reconciliation is consistent not only with an historical reconstruction of Jesus' ministry, but also with his interpretation of his own death, resurrection, and ascension (p. 42). God's righteousness is so necessary, he argues, because 'the justification and salvation of the Christian community or simply from Old Testament-Jewish martyrdom in the NT'. The turning-point seems to have been Stuhlmacher's discovery of the traditional-historical link for Jesus' saying 'not so much in Is 33:3-12 as in Is 43:3-4. Here the true equivalent for the promise of the land between the era of the exiles (cf. Is 53), is used in the context of Jesus' teaching for Israel as a new covenant community (cf. Col 1). The Son of Man in Is 53:4 takes the place of the people who will be saved for Israel's life (p. 23). So Jesus' words are reinterpreted as referring to the reversal of God's judgment, not just for Israel but for all mankind, as well as being served by angels and worshiped by nations, he himself and his church will reign for the future, thereby emphasizing the creative and sacrificial love of God. Is 53:4-5 carries no significant role in early Christian understanding of Jesus, in parallel with Mt 5:10 and 24:0 in the authenticity of Jesus' saying.

A final essay on Eph. 2:14 (chapter eleven) picks up the theme of sacrifice and death. The author points out that the theme goes beyond the church to the world. He views this passage as a Christological exegesis of Eph 2:14, with an extended argument in support of this view. The book concludes in cosmic terms as a hostile wall of separation between Jews and Gentiles as well as between God and man, is abolished by Christ, and its effects are that Jews and Gentiles are brought together in a new covenant, and that Jesus' death and resurrection provide the bridge between the two.

Stuhlmacher views both Jesus' and Paul's understanding of the law as building upon a theological tradition found within Jewish Scripture. The author argues that the law is seen as a barrier between the Sinai covenant and the covenant of grace, a barrier which is broken by Christ's death. He also suggests that there is a spiritual dimension to the law, one that is not simply a legal code, but a way of life for those who are in Christ. Thus the book provides an important contribution to the ongoing debate on the role of the law in the New Testament.

The excitement which greeted the inauguration of the new edition of Stuhlmacher's Theology of the Old Testament is now down to a trickle of readers. With the advent of the new millennium, there is a rush to update biblical scholarship, but the reception of this book has been less than enthusiastic. There are two reasons for this. First, the book is not a complete treatment of the Old Testament, and is only a starting point for those who want to study this area in depth. Second, the book is not a popular work, and is not written in an accessible style. Nevertheless, the book is a valuable resource for those who want to study the Old Testament in a serious and systematic way. The book is well-organized, and the author's exposition is clear and concise. Overall, this edition of Stuhlmacher's Theology of the Old Testament is a worthwhile addition to the library of any serious student of biblical studies.

points of view (although it does this, remarkably comprehensively and prudently, in the own pages of the Bible in the church. Ferguson argues that both faith and critical study contribute to hearing the Word of God. This means that the understanding of the Bible can be fulfilled only by a process of interpretation that help us to understand the content of Scripture better. Hence the Cảnh's research into the realities of the church and in hermeneutics today. But hearing the Word of God is not an academic exercise; it involves the faith of the hearer also. The final chapter is entitled, "The Pastoral Implications of the Message of the Church." The author makes his own suggestion, that if we are looking for a pivotal hermeneutical principle in the text, it seems to be the calling to place and to withstand the guiding norm for the use of Scripture in the church as the assurance of the Lord's kingsly rule in the resurrection of the crucified Jesus" (p. 192).

In some places, the space devoted to different topics might have been reordered. For instance, the author himself, while Ebeling, Fuchs, Ott, Pfannenberg, and Moltmann, the latter overshadowed by the single page on the equality and the liberation of women (rather than nine pages among them). All in all, though, its clarity of expression and practical concern will make this a most useful book. If you are looking for an introduction to biblical hermeneutics, this book will probably serve you better than any other.

W. A. Strange, Aberystwyth


The author's stated purpose is to "examine the importance of the covenantal structure of redemptive history." Remarkably, this book begins with a discussion of the OT and NT history which involved the establishment of a covenant: the promise made to Abraham, which was basically renewed in the Abrahamic covenant of the new dispensation. Comiskey also departs on the covenant of the promised new covenant by Jesus. In order to accomplish his task, he develops a coherent and comprehensive theological system which states that "the major redemptive covenants in Scripture are structured bicontrastively," that is, two types of covenants, the promissory and administrative covenants, undergird the structure of redemptive history. In the first three chapters of the book, together with the very long appendices adjoining chapter two, constitute an elaborate defense of Mosaic covenant theology more than three-quarters of the book's total length. In the first chapter, Comiskey examines the elements of the Abrahamic covenant are examined. Particular attention is given to the concept of "corporate offering" and the promise of land because of their debated significance within certain segments of the Christian community. In chapters three and four, Comiskey goes on to consider the relationship between promise and covenant in the patriarchal narratives, the Mosaic legislation and stipulations for defending his thesis regarding the bicontrastive structure of redemptive history. More particularly he suggests that the people of God, from the time of Abraham on, are under two covenantal administrations: the promise-oath and the particular administrative covenant in force at the time. By invoking a special definition of covenant (covenant), Comiskey is able to agree that promise and covenant were intimately related from the time the Abrahamic promise became a norm through the covenantal formulation of the promise in both the Mosaic and new covenant church. Furthermore, in that period of redemptive history the promise was not an isolated institution, but a bounded and more comprehensive covenant which functioned to define the terms of the covenant and to govern the relationship between God and his people. In chapter five, Comiskey names the covenant of circumcision as the first administrative covenant in the Old Testament and the more formal administrative covenant and the new covenant as the third. Moreover, he argues that through the successive administrative covenants of the New Testament we find an outworking of the circumcision covenant in the establishment of a new people of God, leading to the culmination of the promise in Christ. Being in this case, Comiskey concludes that "the theology of redemption is committed to covenant." In the chapters which follow, Comiskey explores some of the theological implications of his thesis for biblical theology. In chapter six, he examines the nature and the role of the New Testament as a whole in the theological development of the church. He also seeks to clarify the function of promise in the history of redemption. In chapter seven, he explores the discussion of the question of the relationship of the OT and NT. In chapter five, the author examines how the various authors sought to make the connection. Specifically, he proffers that the administrative covenants give shape to the understanding of the promises and the role of the people in the OT and NT. In this regard, he addresses the controver-3


The excitement which greeted the inauguration of the new edition of Schütz' great work with the new vol. I in 1973 was tarnished for much of the world by the collapse of the West Bank without the key to unlock it was a sore trial, and matters were only made worse when vol. 2 (1979) could still provide only the happy consummation of the index to follow in vol. 3. When at last vol. 3 appeared in 1986 it was a cruel blow indeed to discover that the printing was so expensive that the world in which Christianity arose, all words of mine can give you an adequate idea of the scholarly knowledge and information of informed discussion of the whole range of relevant modern scholarship, all organized with considerate clarity. Go and pick up a volume in your theological library (and if it is in demand to know why?) and if you are not captivated then you may be that you are not a student of Judaism, Christian origins (and as may well skip the rest of this review).

Vol. 1 and 2 almost completely covered the development of Jewish history, from the biblical period through to the Diaspora. Vol. 3 begins with this section (a more 176 pages). It includes an account of all Jewish philosophers, rabbis, and teachers of the period. It is a valuable work, but it is not the best work in the field. Schütz has not yet been published, and I am sure that his name will be added to the list of those who have been. The author, a skilled, knowledgeable, and insightful observer, has contributed to the understanding of the Jewish community. He has given us an excellent account of the history of the Jewish people, and I look forward to reading his next book.


The English-speaking world has not seen much of Peter Stuhlmacher's celebrated work. This book is a collection of essays written over the past two years. One cannot escape the feeling that the work of a scholar who is productively engaged in the biblical- theological enterprise is this book is indispensable. Building upon and correcting his well-known dissertation (Gerechtigkeits Gottes bei Paulus, 1980), he addresses the question of the relationship of law and righteousness in the New Testament. Stuhlmacher adopts a historically-technological approach to his theme, closing his essay on the nature of the relationship of law and righteousness in the New Testament. He argues that there is no connection with the views of E. P. Sanders, whose view he finds to be inadequate. He concludes with an extended footnote.

Perhaps the most challenging of Stuhlmacher's essays is those concerning his knowledge of the New Testament. Building upon and correcting his well-known dissertation (Derechtigkeits Gottes bei Paulus, 1980), he addresses the question of the relationship of law and righteousness in the New Testament. He argues that there is no connection with the views of E. P. Sanders, whose view he finds to be inadequate. He concludes with an extended footnote.

The rest of the book (except the index) is devoted to a comprehensive survey of the New Testament, particularly the New Testament, the Rabbinic Literature (including the Targums), which were discussed in vol. 1. This is, as far as I am aware, quite similar survey of the New Testament, which is now still available. The survey is a comprehensive survey of the New Testament, which is now still available. The survey is a comprehensive survey of the New Testament, which is now still available. It is available in a number of forms, including an extended footnote. Peter Stuhlmacher.

The approach is essentially descriptive, though this includes...
defined. This is why many are confused when reading the works of modern theologians. They do not realize that some theologians may mean "something" and "nothing" in a different understanding. For those who have experienced some of this confusion Peter V. Koven's book will be a most helpful guide. He takes four different understandings of the word 'God' and shows how they lead to different views on many other issues.

The book begins by looking at the Christian service of listening, in particular focusing on the great resources available within the Bible to help us understand psychology and psychodynamics. It deals with personal character types — the depressed, hysterical, schizoid and paranoid. Everyone is jumping at an opportunity to develop defences. The questions could be asked, are the monkeys real? But the chapter on the depressed personality is a good example of the type of insight that can be gained.

Lape felt that Otto Rank's insistence on the primacy of birth trauma in the production of anxiety began to make sense. He was convinced that the root of this problem is to be found in the patient's primal roots. Personality and psychosomatic stress are seen as originating from the moment of the infant's birth, with the state of the mother communicating itself to the foetus — so the mother has negative feelings they transfuse to the foetus and hystero-schizoid-schizoid reactions may arise.

It is in helping a person who needs personal integration, that is, an individual who is confused by the adult male part of the person to see how he can recognize and accept the child part of the past and the foetus in the womb and bring together what the primal pain has split. Christ is central in this process, the source of a new being. The main clinical pastoral task is to deal with the evils we have suffered rather than what we commit. It is important in counseling to deal with the problems of being sinned against, but it is essential, if one is to deal with the evil in oneself, that the evil must be confronted by committed persons committed by that person, which this book does not appear to do.

This book offers some valuable insights. It is particularly good on dealing with the counsellor himself, and the problems he needs to overcome — an area which many counselling books either overlook or treat superficially. The practical arising from clinical theology introduces the reader to a variety of methods. Appendix A is very useful on outlining the behaviour of the hysterical and schizoid personalities. Appendix B, which outlines the pastoral recording of a case, is excellent — a clear guide of the areas which a counsellor should explore when dealing with a case. The fullest and most robust of the arguments presented is the absolute and totally. The innocent suffering is taken up in the affiliations of a crucified Christ. Later books of the disciples of psychology and theology.

At times it tries too hard to make the connection between the two disciplines and makes somewhat weak links. Lake has been accused of 'baptizing the therapies in his eclectic approach. The overall impression gained of clinical theology is that it looks at psychology in a way that is beneficial for the individual but does not wish to be tied to a particular theology. Whilst at times this may work, all too often one can fall victim to theessionalism and the secularization of the church.

The book has its uses, and is a good source for those interested in clinical theology who are looking for a readable book that is full of good advice. It is a good read and is certainly not a book that will make you feel overwhelming. The book offers some value and it is indeed a good read. It is a book that you may have to read. There are other examples of which make similar, seemingly unfounded, assumptions. The language used is at times very technical and difficult to understand. There are a lot of words that are used in a more advanced sense (glossary does help a little). One almost needs there to be an introductory book to this book! It goes into some quite technical psychological concepts but yet deals with them so briefly that the novice is left confused and battered by an immense amount of information.

It is a book that does offer some valuable insights into certain personal healing. It is a valuable source for those who deal particularly with such problems, although this area does need expanding and at times making more concrete. The major weakness of the book is that it is sometimes clear that the clinical theology is reality in straightforward terms, in its use of Scriptural sources. The book is generally good, and is highly recommended (and not light reading), even if only to try and discover why some people find it so useful.

Clare Woodhouse, Oxford.

Book Notes


This is one of the Cities of the Ancient World series, edited by Dr Graham Davies of Cambridge University. It covers briefly the history of Ugari, everyday life in the city, its myths, legends and religion and the politics and economy of the city. The book is written in black-and-white illustrations together with such aids to the reader as a chronological chart, diagrams and guidance to further reading.


Collins have given us a further collection of 19 short C. S. Lewis essays on ethical topics, edited by Walter Hooper. Lewis fans will be delighted to acquire a copy of these at a relatively small cost.


How do Christians relate to and reach out to a secular world? Derek Tidball offers a clear and helpful answer to these questions, presenting a level accessible to the intelligent layman many of the insights of theology and how a book which should be read widely.

C. S. Lewis, Timeless at Heart (London: Fount, 1987), 144 pp., £2.50.

Walter Hooper has in 1987, as in 1986, given Lewis fans another collection of essays. However, devotes should be warned that all but one of the ten items appeared previously in previous books (1971), check your shelves before buying this volume!


Hodder are to be congratulated on making this important work available again at a very reasonable price. All that remains is to do now is to repeat the process with the same author. Reflected Glory.


It is a pleasure to be able to welcome another volume of the useful Classics of Western Spirituality series. The publishers are a valuable service in making available a wide substance many of the great masters of the spiritual tradition. The American price is reasonable while the 73% mark-up on the UK price makes the volume expensive for what it offers.
defined. This is why many are confused when reading the works of modern theologians. They do not realize that some theologians may mean ‘something very different’ from what they are standing for. Those who have experienced some of this confusion Peter Vansina, a social scientist, is a most helpful guide. He has four main understandings of the word ‘God’ and shows how they lead to different views on many other issues.

The strength of the book is the way in which the implications of these four views are developed in a variety of areas. The weakness is that the book at least is a very broad category. It spans the full range between many traditional doctrines of God on the one hand and process theology on the other. When a variety of views are reduced to a simple statement there is always the danger of oversimplification and distortion. The author does his best to avoid this, stressing that many issues are more complex than he can explain in a short space and pointing out that there are differences between theologians of each of the four views. The good intentions of the author is inevitable that the picture presented should be over-simplified in parts. This is, however, an acceptable way of dealing with a difficult subject. It is a shortcoming of the application of the four views, though this would have made the book less general in its application.

The book’s exposition can be questioned. Two examples will suffice. The author makes a sharp contrast between the view of heaven as ‘a social kingdom in which time passes’ and the view that the individual experiences the timeless blissful vision (p. 62). He states that these two ‘cannot be brought together without modification’. In other words, the time concept can be introduced within the kingdom of God, but it is wrong to say that a timeless future can have no social element. After all, Aquinas believed God to be timeless and to be present in time. The problem is that the author may have neglected the view of a timeless future does not necessitate an anti-social concept. In any case, God’s timeless nature can be understood in Christ and the Christian life can be understood as ‘living in the fullness of Christ’ which can be translated into the present of the Kingdom of God. Christians have never maintained that the same molecules will be used for the resurrection body, and the early Christians may not have believed in molecules, but some of them certainly did believe that the selfsame matter would rise from the grave, as is seen from the problems that they had with the cannibalism of the Eucharist.

The book’s exposition can be questioned. Two examples will suffice. The author makes a sharp contrast between the view of heaven as ‘a social kingdom in which time passes’ and the view that the individual experiences the timeless blissful vision (p. 62). He states that these two ‘cannot be brought together without modification’. In other words, the time concept can be introduced within the kingdom of God, but it is wrong to say that a timeless future can have no social element. After all, Aquinas believed God to be timeless and to be present in time. The problem is that the author may have neglected the view of a timeless future does not necessitate an anti-social concept. In any case, God’s timeless nature can be understood in Christ and the Christian life can be understood as ‘living in the fullness of Christ’ which can be translated into the present of the Kingdom of God. Christians have never maintained that the same molecules will be used for the resurrection body, and the early Christians may not have believed in molecules, but some of them certainly did believe that the selfsame matter would rise from the grave, as is seen from the problems that they had with the cannibalism of the Eucharist.

What is the author’s own view and does he show? He takes pains throughout the book to be fair to each of the four positions and to show that they are not in conflict. If they are found with difficulties. He does, however, make it clear that the last two cannot be reconciled with the traditional views of God we have been discussing. Both can be called Christian, even though they may have great depth and intellectual merit. The fact that, as far as the point is made gently and courteously.

This book is highly commendable as a brief clear statement of four important viewpoints. For a more nuanced approach or for more detail the student will have to turn to a fuller work.

Tone Lane, London Bible College.
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