

stumbling block to be placed before young Christians in particular.

This is another matter altogether. From theoretical matters like the above we come to the practical. Surely no church's unity and no pastor's continuance in office should be jeopardised over this. But they may be. There is therefore need for full discussion between the church officers, between them and the engaged couple, between them and any relatives of the believer, and very discretely and sensitively in the church.

This problem is best dealt with in the home of the believer concerned. There teaching can be given before ever a friendship with an unbeliever is formed. (This should be reinforced in the church's ministry). If then such a situation should arise it is the believer and his or her family who out of respect for the church and its position solve the problem rather than accentuate it.

However, there is one possibility that needs to be borne in mind. It is that even after such a marriage God may be exceedingly gracious and the unbeliever be converted. Let no one attempt to justify such a marriage on this basis - least of all the disobedient believer. Many have argued like this and come to grief - great grief and lived to rue the day he or she was so intent on seeing. But let no one rule it out altogether either. But, in the light of such a possibility, while not minimising the disobedience and the danger, is it not better for the marriage to take place in the church? Might not God even use the way in which both believer and unbeliever are treated in the light of His truth and in the spirit of His love to humble the believer and to awaken the unbeliever?

REVIEW OF THEOLOGICAL JOURNALS 1981 (Part Two)

Dr Eryl Davies

Considerable discussion took place last year, too, on the genuineness and significance of the SHROUD OF TURIN. Besides detailed news coverage of the scientists' conclusions in CHRISTIANITY TODAY (20 Feb, p44 and 6 Nov, p68), the JOURNAL of the EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY included an article in its March issue by Gory R.Habermas

on 'The Shroud of Turin and its Significance for Biblical Studies'. The writer has researched with some of the scientists who investigated the shroud and his chief interest has been the philosophical questions surrounding the shroud and any possible evidence for the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

The claim, made by some evangelicals, that there is no historical data on the shroud before the thirteenth century is dismissed by Habermas as "nothing short of being absolutely inaccurate". He details a few historical citations of the shroud, "one as early as the second century (Braulio of Seville), a sermon concerning it given by a church official and paintings of Jesus' face that were plainly based on it even down to the exact position of numerous bruises. Additionally a detailed and very intriguing early Christian tradition exists that asserts that a mysterious cloth containing the imprint of Jesus' face had been carried by Thaddeus, Jesus' disciple, to Edessa, a small kingdom in what is today Turkey. After a stay of several hundred years it was moved to the city of Constantinople. From here its modern history is well known as it was taken to several cities in France and then to Turin, Italy Most important, much attention has turned lately to the coins placed over the eyes of the man buried in the shroud, a practice known to have been used by Jews in the first century. Through the aid of image enhancement, a recent report reveals that the coins on the shroud may be identified most probably from the Greek letters and design as a lepton of Pontius Pilate, minted from AD 29-32 After repeated tests", affirms Habermas, "the shroud has shown itself to be an authentic archaeological artifact." (p48)

The Michigan Professor is convinced that the shroud conforms to the New Testament accounts of our Lord's burial. Furthermore, this burial cloth also reveals "a man who was cut throughout the scalp by a number of sharp objects causing him to bleed quite freely. He suffered a number of blows to the face with large bruises on the cheeks and forehead, a twisted nose, one eye swollen half shut and a cut upper lip. Additionally he was beaten severely with an instrument identified as a Roman flagrum. More than 120 whipping wounds are visible on virtually every area of the body except the face, forearms and feet. Further, the man of the shroud was forced to carry a heavy object across his shoulders after his beating, recognizable by the large rub marks on the shoulder blades, which smeared the bloody wounds of the whipping underneath. He must have

stumbled and fallen down because there are contusions on both knees. More important are the five major wounds associated with death by crucifixion." Habermas's conclusion is that "the evidence reveals that the shroud of Turin is probably the actual burial garment of Jesus" and as such provides strong empirical corroboration for the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

The HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW continues to provide stimulating reading, at least for the reviewer. Volume 74:1 (January 1981) included two useful articles. One was by Richard A. Muller of Fuller Theological Seminary entitled, 'Christ in the Eschaton: Calvin and Moltmann on the Duration of the Munus Regium'.

J. Moltmann in his Christological study, 'THE CRUCIFIED GOD', addresses the problem of the ultimate relation of Christ to believers using as the focus of his analysis Calvin's exegesis of 1 Corinthians 15 verses 24-28. He argues that this locus classicus of Pauline subordinationism marks the point in Calvin's Christology at which 'divine rule' is transferred from Christ's humanity to his divinity. Moltmann then infers that, as far as Calvin's system is concerned, the incarnation will become 'superfluous' in the accomplishment of the work of redemption, leading to the ultimate sundering of the natures of Christ one from the other. This argument relies heavily on the work of Heinrich Quistorp and specifically on Quistorp's argument that, in Calvin's view, the humanity of Christ "recedes into the background" following the Judgement (cf 'Calvin's Doctrine of the Last Things', Lutterworth, 1955). If valid, then 1 Corinthians 15 verses 24-28 would provide an important key to the understanding of Calvin's Christology in so far as it describes the purpose and end of Christ's mediatorial rule. Consequently, Christ's kingly office must terminate in the eschaton since the office belongs not to the divinity of Christ IN SE but to the divine-human person of the Mediator.

Richard Muller rightly points out the inadequacy of this interpretation and reminds us, for example, of frequent assertions by Calvin that the 1 Corinthians 15 passage does not conflict with those other passages which refer to the eternity of Christ's kingship and this in itself indicates the wrongness of Moltmann's interpretation. The article contains twenty-nine pages of absorbing material involving the updating of basic Christological questions.

The other useful article was by John F. Jamieson, entitled: 'Jonathan Edwards' Change of Position on Stoddardeanism'. As some of our readers will know, when Edwards was made assistant to his grandfather Solomon Stoddard at Northampton in 1727, he assumed the major pastoral responsibility for the largest congregation in Western Massachusetts and, at the same time, became co-administrator of the 'lax' mode of admission to the sacraments that had prevailed at Northampton and throughout the Connecticut River Valley for about thirty years. The 'lax' system allowed baptism and communion to all provided they had historical knowledge of the gospel and were of a "non-sandalous" life on the assumption that these ordinances were capable of 'begetting' faith. Although Stoddard did not introduce the 'lax' approach yet it was usually referred to as 'Stoddardeanism' because Stoddard had been its most regular and influential proponent especially since his dispute with Increase Mather in 1700. For almost twenty years Jonathan Edwards accepted the 'lax' system and the author feels that his apparent, abrupt repudiation of Stoddardeanism, resulting in his dismissal, calls for some explanation. Jamieson draws attention to the following main points. First of all, Edwards had early and persistent misgivings about the 'lax' system and these misgivings came to a crisis in 1748-50. Secondly, his change of position on admission to the Lord's table and subsequent repudiation of Stoddardeanism may be due in part to his strenuous assertion of strict Calvinism in an attempt to thwart the Arminian and crypto-Arminian tendencies of the period. Again, Edwards's view and defence of revival compelled him to concentrate attention on the nature of Christian conversion and of true religious experience which in turn exposed the weakness of the 'lax' system. Finally, by 1746 (eg. his 'Treatise Concerning Religious Affections') he had thought through the implications of Calvinism for Church polity as over against Arminianism in its Stoddardean expression and also experimental piety and profession of faith as over against moralism (p99).

Continuing this historical note, I was pleased to see a brief article by one of our previous contributors - R.W. Oliver of Bradford-on-Avon - in the BAPTIST QUARTERLY (published by the Baptist Historical Society) under the title, 'John Collett Ryland, Daniel Turner and Robert Robinson and the Communion Controversy 1772-1781' (April 1981). A series of tracts published between 1772 and 1781 turned the attention of English Particular Baptist Churches to the question, who should be admitted to the Lord's

Table. Ryland, Turner and Robinson advocated open communion while their most able opponent was Abraham Booth of London. Pastor Oliver shows in his article how unreliable were the later writings of Joseph Ivimey. In the same issue Dr D.W.Bebbington has an interesting article on 'Baptist Members of Parliament 1847-1914'.

In 'THEOLOGY TODAY' (October 1981) Wolfhart Pannenberg espouses the more modern and sociological approach to the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century. His article is entitled 'Freedom and the Lutheran Reformation' and in it Pannenberg argues that "the impact of the Reformation on the course of modern culture is far more evident in the perspective opened by the issue of freedom than in entering into the technicalities of the doctrine of justification". Also in this issue appears an interesting 'Symposium on Scripture' undertaken against the background of the Lindsell-Rogers debate in America. While I found the articles disappointing, they are nevertheless essential reading for those who want to keep abreast of this debate. Geralt T.Sheppard wrote on 'Recovering the Natural Sense' and Avery Dulles on 'Scholasticism and The Church'. Jack Rogers in his 'Response' accuses both Sheppard and Dulles of not understanding the context of the debate, namely, American evangelicalism and the deep divisions within church life. Paul S. Minear's article, 'The Bible's Authority in the Congregation' illustrates the destructiveness of the critical approach to Scripture and, at the same time, challenges Evangelicals to obey the Scriptures in daily life. Minear suggests that "the more fully a congregation affirms the authority of the Bible, the more fully does its life contradict that affirmation" (p352). Whereas in 1930 Minear wanted to undermine biblical authority because of its irrelevance "to finding ways of dealing with successive crises", he is now impressed by two things: "(1) the minimal degree to which the Bible exerts its authority and (2) the maximal degree of self-deception involved in most current claims of loyalty to the Bible".

During 1981 the 'BIBLICAL THEOLOGY BULLETIN' carried a series on 'Biblical Theologians and Theologies of Liberation'. Part I, entitled, 'Canon - Supporting Framework' explores "the significance of recent developments in biblical criticism that have created a new theological alliance, an alliance in which the biblical theologian may enthusiastically join common cause with theologians who respond to the contemporary cries for liberation" (April 1981, p35)

I have not previously referred to the 'BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS UNIVERSITY LIBRARY OF MANCHESTER' and I want to rectify this omission by referring to the Spring '81 edition of the Bulletin. F.F.Bruce contributed an article on 'The Philippian Correspondence' and another article provided us with a history of the first seventy five years of the Theology faculty in Manchester. Professor Morna D.Hooker wrote on 'New Testament Scholarship; its significance and abiding worth' (p419) but I was disappointed to find that the Cambridge scholar confined the article to a review and assessment of the four men who held the chair of biblical exegesis in Manchester - A.S.Peake who died in 1929 and whom Hooker describes - sadly - as "the greatest biblical scholar of his generation", C.H.Dodd, T.W.Manson and F.F.Bruce. Another new journal to be mentioned in this review is the 'BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGIST' which despite its technical and academic emphasis, provides valuable background information for preachers. The Winter '81 issue included a report on the continuing debate concerning the location of the second wall of Jerusalem and also the site of Paul's conversion at Kankab (four traditional sites are associated with it near Damascus). By contrast, the Summer issue contained some fresh views of some of the controversial Ebla tablets.

The 'BIBLE TRANSLATOR' continues to provide much stimulating material. Eugene A.Nida in 'Translators are born not made' refers to essential qualities in translators such as creative imagination, a capacity both to recognise problems and sense ways of communication. "Perhaps one key to the potential ability of a person to be a translator is his deep-seated dissatisfaction with existing translations and a sense of the creative use of words in wanting to explain to people what these wooden and often misleading translations are really trying to say" (p405). Two other interesting articles were, 'Should a translation of the Bible be ambiguous?' and 'Translation and Interpretation. A few notes on the King James Version' and the latter shows conclusively how free the KJV translators were from a one-word-for-one-word approach to translation. One of the examples used is 2 Samuel 24 verse 1 and 1 Chronicles 21 verse 1 where the KJV translators thought it improper to use the same verb for both the Lord and Satan "so interpretation has determined the translation of these two verses".

Some solid material is again to be found in the 'JOURNAL OF THE EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY' and its December '81 issue, for

example, included the following articles: 'Recent Studies in Old Testament Eschatology and Apocalyptic', 'A Theological Investigation of Motivation in Old Testament Law' and 'God as a Symbolizing God: A Symbolic Hermeneutic', and 'Preacher and Preaching'. The latter article provides some Lexical observations concerning the words 'preacher', 'to preach' and 'proclamation' as they function within the New Testament. The main point of this study is that a preacher who preaches to those ignorant of the gospel, and a minister - namely, one who shepherds the flock - are not one and the same. "It seems", writes the author Craig A. Evans, "that many pastors have confused the distinct activities of 'preaching' and 'overseeing'. If the pastor defines himself as a preacher, then on the basis of what he believes to be faithful adherence to what the NT teaches, emphasis is placed on preaching. Since preaching or heralding is almost always monologic it's no wonder", adds Evans, "that the congregation begins to feel like an audience. Monologue is inherent in heralding - appropriate for gospel proclamation - but it can be detrimental for edifying and the 'equipment of the saints, for the work of the ministry' (Ephesians 4:12). To be sure, occasion may necessitate a strong sermon of exhortation, refutation or teaching, but there are no biblical grounds for a tradition that tends to discourage congregational activity in worship and ministry. In this day of concern over the lagging vitality and ineffectiveness of many churches a re-appraisal is imperative. It may be that one area where fruitful change could take place is in understanding the role of the minister within the context of the assembled congregation" (p322). Such words are familiar to us particularly in the context of contemporary charismatic teaching but we need to do our homework and this article at least challenges us to look again at some of the New Testament words.
