

---

# “All things to all men...”

---

Jonathan Skinner

---

Those of us in the more reformed tradition often excuse our lack of evangelistic effectiveness by hiding in the concept of the sovereignty of God. A high belief in the God's sovereignty, if we are not careful, can make us passive and uncreative in the task of proclaiming the Gospel. This should not be so but it often the case. God has made us responsible beings and, with the Bible to set our principles, we need to be as imaginative as possible in communicating our faith to people within our culture.

The fact is that there is a lot of ineffective work going on. Hours of work are being employed but the yield is remarkably low. There is a need to re-examine the Scriptures and analyse our culture to see how the never changing Gospel can most effectively be communicated within the changing culture of our day. This necessitates a strong grasp of both the Word and the world and we need to apply the Word to the world in the most appropriate way. Our evangelism should always be culturally sensitive and often it needs to be cross-cultural.

## Is there a way forward?

The guiding principle may possibly be found in 1 Corinthians 9:22 which states, “I have become all things to all men so that by all possible means I might save some.” We need to think laterally and creatively to find ways or channels which we can use to communicate the Gospel effectively. We need bridges to make points of contact. There must be many valid ways forward here but what is now described is one of the roads our local church went down. Perhaps it will at least stimulate creative thought.

Our line of thinking went as follows: we need some event, some meeting, some structure in which to declare the Good News. If we separate it from the main meetings then we can be as radical as we like and offend few. We need to base the event around something more culturally acceptable for modern and post-modern folk in British society than a church service. There are two institutions in contemporary Britain which are accepted, and within which many folk feel comfortable, these are the Pub and the Evening Class. Perhaps we can build a culturally sensitive context for communication using these as models. We call this event *Exploring Christianity*.

## Context

Various courses are run on the same evening. We start with coffee in our coffee bar, which has a pub-like atmosphere and then split up for the various courses. The teaching sessions last about one hour. After these we join together again in the coffee bar and folk stay for as long as they wish.

This *period of social interaction* in the coffee bar is not seen as something secondary to the teaching sessions, it is viewed as a fundamental component of the overall strategy. There are several reasons for this. *First*, however informal and relaxed one tries to make the teaching sessions there remains a *gap between the 'clients' and the leader*. During the coffee bar sessions, many *barriers can begin to be broken down and relationships can be built*. This means that the group members become more

relaxed and are willing to be more open and ask the questions that are really a problem to them. Much one-to-one counselling and discipleship can then occur along with an improvement in the small group sessions. *Second, the relationships between the folk attending the whole programme begins to develop and a sense of “belonging” and “community” is the result.* This is crucial as one of the benefits of becoming a believer is entering into a new family, the church. But this step is often a problem due to the *culture gap* between where folk are coming from and “evangelical church culture”. In effect we may be producing a *halfway house*.

On hand there is a *team of about ten “staff”* who are responsible for personal evangelism, discipleship and the teaching of the courses. Alongside these there are two in the *“hospitality team”* who run the coffee bar.

## The Courses

*Check it Out* is the directly evangelistic part of the overall *Exploring Christianity* programme. As *Check it Out* is quite intellectually demanding, we provide a sister course called *Just Looking* which is a simpler presentation of the gospel. Those who complete one of these may then attend *Laying Foundations*, a twelve week basic discipleship course. After this we have *Looking at Jesus*, which is a year long small group study of Luke’s Gospel. Alongside these there is *Hitch-hiker’s Guide to the Bible*, which is an introduction and overview of the Old Testament. We are also at present developing a course on basic bible doctrines and themes.

## Definition

*Check it Out is a six week course which is designed to communicate to unchurched people what the core of the Christian faith is, and to persuade them that it is true and requires a response from them.*

## Basic Principles

Behind the details of *Check it Out* are some basic principles:

1. *Biblical Christianity is true.* By “biblical Christianity” we mean the historical , orthodox, Evangelical Faith. By “true” we mean objectively true in actual reality rather than merely subjectively or personally “true” for an individual. In other words that there is real religious truth and that it is possible to know it.

2. *Even though the truth itself never changes, it must be thoughtfully communicated and applied to a given culture in an appropriate way.* The cultural context and world view of the recipient must be considered in the process of communication. In other words it must be targeted.

The book of Acts gives some interesting examples of this approach. Paul’s starting point in communicating the gospel varies according to the background of his hearers. When he is evangelising those who have the Scriptures he starts with his Bible. The Scriptures become his database from which he reasons. For example when speaking in Thessalonica, “As his custom was, Paul went into the synagogue, and on three Sabbath days he reasoned from the Scriptures, explaining and proving that the Christ had to suffer and rise from the dead” (Acts 17:2,3). Later in the same chapter he uses the same methodology with those attached to the synagogue in Berea (Acts 17:11,12). But his approach is radically different when speaking to pagans. His starting point is different when talking to those without a Bible than when talking to those with a Bible.

Later in the same chapter he comes to Athens where he first finds a synagogue and reasons from the Scriptures as before. But then he moves out into the larger pagan population. His initial response is not to reason from the Scriptures with them but to approach them in a different way. Firstly, he takes care to understand where they were coming from (Acts 17:23). Having done this, he then proceeds to reason with them on the basis of three areas which all human beings have in common, whatever their religious views. These three areas are our *shared world*, our *shared humanity* and our *shared history* (Acts 17:24-32). He whets their appetite and prepares the ground by looking at the order of the world around us, the ultimate needs and desires of the human heart and the history of the Christ Event. The account in Athens is only a summary but it is strongly implied that he then moved into scriptural themes (Acts 17:30,31). This gives us a pattern for communicating to people who have no confidence whatever in the Bible. *When the Bible is denied, we can still talk.*

3. *The truth is not just declared but reasoning and persuasion are used.* It is true that we have to proclaim the gospel but that does not mean that people need not be persuaded. As folk are confronted with the Christian message they often have problems. These should not be pushed away with a comment such as “just believe” or “they don’t matter”, as such questions do matter. If the gospel is not true then it is no gospel! People need to be convinced of its veracity, or their faith is not true faith and, furthermore, they will have no confidence in sharing themselves, what deep down they feel may be false. So, for evangelistic and pastoral reasons, sincere questions need to be answered. Francis Schaeffer writes, “Christianity is truth, and we must give honest answers to honest questions. Christianity is truth, truth that God has told us, and if it is true it can answer questions.”<sup>1</sup>

The temptation is to split man into spiritual and secular areas of life. The secular deals with truth but the spiritual domain is not concerned with truth as such. It is beyond an “earthly” level. However, this is not so. Truth affects the whole of man including the spiritual. In other words, the intellect is important in validating, seeking and confirming a religious belief.

We are not Christians primarily because the gospel works nor because it has changed our lives. Neither are we believers primarily because we have seen it change other people’s lives or because we have had some experience of God. We are primarily Christians because it is *true*. Many other things “work” or change lives or give experience but if they are not based on truth they are worthless. They are short term gains but that is all.

Faith must be in something or someone real, that is in an objective reality. Faith is not grasping the air nor is it blind. No, the basis of the Christian faith is that it is *true*. Now, because it is true it works; because it is true it truly changes lives and because it is true it can give valid experience.

Due to this emphasis on truth it is hardly surprising that the New Testament is so full of evidence, hard historical evidence. People need to be convinced of the truth. For example, John wrote his Gospel detailing carefully the miracles that Jesus performed in real space-time history, so that people should believe that Jesus is the Christ.<sup>2</sup> In other words he tells them why they should believe. John puts it like this, “Jesus did many other miraculous signs in the presence of his disciples, which are not recorded in this book. But these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son

of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name” (John 20:30,31). John and the other writers try to convince folk that what they say is true; they amass arguments and reasons. They do not just state nor simply proclaim but rather demonstrate that they are telling the truth.<sup>3</sup>

In 2 Corinthians 10:5, Paul writes that, “We *demolish arguments* and every pretension that sets itself up against the knowledge of God, and we take captive every thought and make it obedient to Christ.” In Philippians, Paul talks about *defending and confirming* the gospel (Phil. 1:7).

In Peter’s first letter he writes “But in your hearts set apart Christ as Lord. Always be prepared to give an *answer* to everyone who asks you to give a *reason* for the hope that you have” (1 Peter 3:15). Note that an answer is to be given (*apologia*) that is a defence and not just a statement, and that a reason or account (*logos*) is given of the faith and why it is believed. A declaration of the gospel is not merely a clear statement of truth but an active defence which is reasonable and logical. In being logical it uses the reasoning faculty.<sup>4</sup>

In Acts 13, Paul argues and urges from the scriptures the truths about Christ, he does not just state them. In verse 43, the word translated *urged* (*peitho*) in the NIV means “to apply persuasion, to prevail upon or win over, to persuade, bringing about a change of mind by reason or moral consideration.”<sup>5</sup>

The word is used again in Acts 19:8: “Paul entered the synagogue and spoke boldly there for three months, *arguing persuasively* about the kingdom of God”. Again it is used in 17:4, but this time in a passive sense, that is “were persuaded”. Paul is doing two things in his evangelism, one is proclaiming and the other is persuading, defending or reasoning. “As his custom was, Paul went into the synagogue and on three Sabbath days he *reasoned* with them from the Scriptures, *explaining and proving* that the Christ had to suffer and rise from the dead. ‘This Jesus I am *proclaiming* to you is the Christ,’ he said. Some of the Jews were *persuaded* and joined Paul and Silas, as did a large number of God-fearing Greeks and not a few prominent women”.

In Athens when working with Jews and Greeks Paul employed reason, “He *reasoned* in the synagogue with the Jews and the God-fearing Greeks, as well as in the market place day by day with those who happened to be there” (Acts 17:17).

In Acts 26 Paul gives his defence before Festus and Agrippa. When he raises the objective fact of Christ having risen from the dead, Festus interrupts and says, “You are out of your mind, Paul! Your great learning is driving you insane”. Paul replies that he is not insane but that, “What I am saying is *true and reasonable*”. In other words it is really true, objectively true and factually true. It is not just true in Paul’s head but it is true in reality. What is more, it is reasonable, that is it makes sense, it is logical.

4. *People are given adequate opportunity to interact, discuss and argue.* When the words used for evangelistic activity in Acts are studied one must conclude that the task was carried out in a way which not only declares the truth but also reasons, disputes, applies persuasion, prevails upon, convinces, gives an active defence or answer to questions.<sup>6</sup> True communication must engage the mind and this normally involves the recipient expressing themselves with words, as they get their mind around the concepts. Passivity on the part of the hearers needs to be avoided, their minds must be actively engaged.

5. *The primary means of communication is verbal.* God is a being who speaks, and we are created in his image. God speaks to us and we speak to each other. We are made

to be relational beings who have their highest form of communication through words. God has communicated to us through the written word which speaks of the living Word. Christian communication is fundamentally word centred, it is verbal. But this does not necessarily imply nor necessitate merely a straight talk. The listener does not need to be passive but can be drawn in to participate and be involved.

*Various media can be used to communicate our verbal message:* speaking, discussion, poetry, written material, audio tapes, video tapes, interactive computer software etc. Non-verbal media can be used to *reinforce* the message, such as music and visual images.

6. *The course is not the end but the beginning.* We are commanded not so much to make converts as to make disciples. Due to this “*Check it Out*” is only the beginning. After this there is a twelve week module called “*Laying Foundations*” which is a basic discipleship course.

7. *Prayer is vital.* There is a fundamental belief and principle that it is only through reliance on the Lord that we can achieve anything. Although God is sovereign, he calls us to pray and only as we align our wills with his in prayer and ask according to his will, will we see any significant fruit. In practice, we have a team of forty “prayer warriors” whom we ask to pray daily for the church’s work of evangelism. They are supplied with a prayer letter about every six weeks. We need our equivalents of Moses on the hilltop, while we Joshuas fight in the valley (Ex. 17:8-16).

## **The Argument**

There are many different ways of presenting the gospel. We are not claiming that this is the only way to do it, only that with people today it seems to be an effective approach. And more importantly, each step of the procedure can be sustained in principle as a biblical way of reasoning with unbelievers. The argument is as follows:

*There are many things in our lives that stimulate us to think about deeper issues and ultimate questions,*<sup>7</sup> for example, personal crisis and tragedy, feelings of guilt and shame, a lack of purpose and meaning, sickness, aging and death. The questions raised include, Who am I? What am I here for? How should I live my life? Can I change? Can I get rid of my feelings of guilt? What happens after death? Is there a God? Are there answers to these questions? Is it possible to know the answers to these questions?

*People are very cynical about Christianity and at some point they will raise the issue of proof,*<sup>8</sup> so it is better to raise it first. We often use the word “proof” in a way which suggests that the issue is absolutely certain, the conclusion is clear to any person of intelligence. The trouble is, while that may be the case in some areas it is not so in others.

For example, in the field of mathematics, statements may be said to be non-negotiable or certain. There is an absolute quality attached to the nature of mathematics, two plus two always equals four. In the area of science things are not quite so certain, scientists may do many experiments, advance theories and even state laws but at the end of the day history teaches us that their conclusions are often wrong. Economics or politics employ an even more fuzzy use of the word “proof”, one has only to watch a debate on the television to see that! When we get into the area of ultimate questions and religion we have to be very careful what we mean by “proof” and this may not be the best word to use in the context of religion.

The concept of “proof” in the area of religion assumes that we are totally rational creatures, that we can think with clarity on the issue and can come to definitive conclusions. But are we totally rational? In principle, there must be some issues in the universe that are just too great for the human mind to weigh all the evidence neatly. Since we only have a few litres of brain, then some things must be beyond us! We are finite beings.

Not only are we limited, but we are also biased. It has been proposed that generally we do not think in logical, straight lines but rather that we hold a generalised picture or framework into which we fit a new piece of evidence.<sup>9</sup> It is not just that we might be influenced by the views we already hold, we are also biased in that consciously or subconsciously we can think through the implications of accepting another perspective. We may not like those implications.<sup>10</sup>

So how can we approach the problem? What are going to be our agreed set of “game rules” as we discuss whether Christianity is true or not? When we make most of the big decisions in our life we do not actually use pure logic nor do we use scientific experimentation. Think for example about finding a partner and getting married. We do not sift through a load of photographs and character profiles and then after several interviews and a trial period use the approach of Sherlock Holmes to detect the right one! Rather we begin to build up a picture of the person as we experience them day by day. This experience is not confined to our thinking capacities but uses the whole of our beings. If you like, our approach is “holistic”. Many different factors come together.

When we come to look at the really big questions of life and death and religion it is the same. Many different factors come together and need our consideration. We need to ask ourselves whether the overall weight of these pointers is sufficient to change our minds.

***So how can we go about answering the ultimate questions?*** If we look at the world around us it seems to point to something beyond itself.<sup>11</sup> The fact of the universe raises the question of how it was caused. And the complexity and apparent design of our world appears to indicate a designer. Brutal, ignorant, blind chance would be an unlikely cause of our sophisticated world. Furthermore, could chance randomly throw up such a wonderful thing as personality? Human beings are persons, we love, hate, relate, choose, desire, talk, understand and are self-aware etc. Can we be the result of a biochemical lottery? Then we are morally aware, we seem to have a comprehension of good and evil although often twisted and even perverse. Where could such an awareness have come from? Possibly a comprehension of law comes from a lawgiver. On top of this, by far the majority of people have a religious awareness and very few disbelieve in “God” totally. This is true even in cultures where indoctrination to atheism has lasted for a generation. All these factors point to there possibly being something, or perhaps someone, out there.<sup>12</sup>

However, much more, is needed. Such factors *stimulate the interest in the right direction, but something more concrete is needed. The next thing we need to look at is history. It does not matter what religious view or perspective a person holds, we all share the same history.*<sup>13</sup> Luke’s Gospel is history.

*Luke’s reliability as an historian is unquestionable.* Sir William Ramsay is regarded as one of the greatest archaeologists ever to have lived. He was a student in the German historical school of the mid-19th century. As a result, he believed that the book of Acts

was a product of the mid-second century AD. This would mean that it was written a long time after the events and therefore cannot be considered accurate in what it relates. He was firmly convinced of this belief.

In his research into the archaeology of Asia Minor he needed to consider the writings of Luke. As a result he was forced into a complete reversal of his beliefs due to the overwhelming evidence uncovered in his research. He spoke of this when he said: "I may fairly claim to have entered on this investigation without prejudice in favour of the conclusion which I shall now seek to justify to the reader. On the contrary, I began with a mind unfavourable to it... It did not then lie in the line of my life to investigate the subject minutely; but more recently I found myself brought into contact with the book of Acts as an authority for the topography, antiquities and society of Asia Minor. It was gradually born upon me that in various details the narrative showed marvellous truth. In fact beginning with a fixed idea that the work was essentially a second century composition, and never relying on its evidence as trustworthy for first century conditions, I gradually came to find it a useful ally in some obscure and difficult investigations."<sup>14</sup>

Concerning Luke's ability as a historian, Ramsay concluded after thirty years of study that "Luke is a historian of the first rank; not merely are his statements of fact trustworthy... *this author should be placed alongside the very greatest of historians*". Ramsay adds: "Luke's history is unsurpassed in respect of his trustworthiness".<sup>15</sup>

*If Luke can be trusted at every point we can test him, is it too much to accept his testimony when we cannot?* This author appears to write with care and integrity, what then does he say about the historical Jesus?

*When we look at the historical Jesus we find that he makes certain claims.*<sup>16</sup> Here is someone who says that they can forgive sins and who accepts worship. Here is a person in history who claims titles which imply that he is divine; here is the one who claimed to be the Son of Man and the Son of God.

*So it is history that Jesus existed and that he made these claims, but what credentials does he have to make them?*<sup>17</sup> Luke also describes many supernatural things which Jesus did, phenomena which give authority and validity to his claims. Jesus healed the lame, cured the sick, had power over nature and brought the dead back to life. More than that *he rose from the dead himself*<sup>18</sup> and was seen to have power even over this "grim reaper". The evidence for the resurrection of Jesus is very extensive. A former Chief Justice of England, Lord Darling, said, 'In its favour as living truth there exists such overwhelming evidence, positive and negative, factual and circumstantial, that no intelligent jury in the world could fail to bring in a verdict that the resurrection story is true.'

Another credential which we have to come to terms with is that there are many predictive prophecies in the Old Testament which Jesus fulfilled exactly. Chance could not account for this.<sup>19</sup>

*Now, if these credentials validate Jesus' claim to be the Son of God and the only way to the Father then we come face to face with the most significant event of history. Here is God breaking into our world. The trouble is how do we interpret this event? What does the life and death of Jesus mean? What we need is some document or handbook that will explain it to us. So far we have seen that Luke's Gospel in particular is accurate history, it is a trustworthy historical document. But that is all we have claimed for it. What we find now is that the historical Jesus revealed to us in this*

document points to the whole Bible as being more than history. *Jesus points to the Bible as being the Word of God.*

*There are three primary reasons we can give for the Bible being accepted as the Word of God.*

*First, Jesus claims it to be the Word of God.* The way he quotes the Old Testament when in dispute with the Jewish Leaders infers that he accepts it as authoritative (Luke 6:3-5; 19:46; 20:17-19; 37-40). In regards to the New Testament, Jesus trained up a group of Apostles to carry on his teaching. Furthermore he promises that the Holy Spirit would make them witnesses to him throughout the world (Matthew 28:16-20), and would bring his teaching to remembrance (John 14:26), as well as teach them new truth (John 16:12f.). This would be done by the writing of the New Testament.

*Second, the Bible claims to be the Word of God itself.* The writers claim that they are writing God's words and not merely their own (e.g. Micah 8:2; 2 Timothy 3:16; 2 Peter 1:20,21).

*Third, its very uniqueness implies a claim to be the Word of God.* The Bible is unique in its effect on individuals; its fulfilled prophecy, its continuity of theme; its circulation; its number of translations; its survival through time; in its content; its influence of other literature and its effect on society.

If we accept this we now have a document which can interpret the coming, dying, rising and ascending of Jesus. *We now have something which can communicate to us the content of the Christian faith.*

The Bible communicates that we are estranged from God due to our *rebellion* (Romans 1:18-2:16). However, it also shows us God's *rescue plan* (Romans 3:21-28) and how we should *respond* (Acts 2:38; 16:31) to it. It gives us the bad news about ourselves, but then shows us the good news in Jesus Christ, the only way to the Father (John 14:6).

## **Our experience**

Having run this course for some years now, we have found it has been used of the Lord to help people come to faith on a regular basis. We have also found it to be very useful for new believers who although they have come to faith have little understanding of the basis of that faith. Furthermore, it has a definite role in training believers to be able to "give an answer to everyone who asks you to give a reason for the hope that you have" (1 Peter 3:15).

## **References**

- <sup>1</sup> Francis Schaeffer, *Two Contents, Two Realities: The Complete Works Of Francis Schaeffer*, 3 volumes (Crossway, 1982), vol. 3, book 4, p. 412
- <sup>2</sup> See Leon Morris, *Jesus Is The Christ: Studies In The Theology Of John*, (Leicester, IVP, 1989).
- <sup>3</sup> See also for example the prologue of Luke (1:1-4) in the use of investigation and evidence and Matthew's first chapter for convincing Jews from the Scriptures.
- <sup>4</sup> The root for the Greek words answer and defence is *log*, from which we get our word logic. The epistemological position taken here is not rationalism. It is right to say that the faith is rational but not that it is rationalistic. Rationalism starts with man and reasons to construct a complete world view. It makes at least two false assumptions: first, that we are capable of such reasoning, although our thinking is biased and part of our fallen nature; second, that we have the information available for such an enterprise without revelation. But both we and our

source of data are limited. To reach correct conclusions we need not only an external source of revelation but also a work of the Holy Spirit. However, even though we are fallen, we are created to think and our ability to reason should be employed. This must be done in dependence upon God, for although men can give an external gospel call, a response relies on God's effectual calling by his Spirit.

- <sup>5</sup> WE Vine, *Expository Dictionary Of Bible Words*, (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1981) p. 179.
- <sup>6</sup> *Dialegomai*, to reason or dispute with others (Acts 17:2&17; 18:4,19; 19:8&9; 24:25); *peitho*, signifies to apply persuasion, to prevail upon or win over, to persuade, bringing about a change of mind by the influence of reason or moral considerations. It can also mean to be persuaded or convinced (Acts 13:43; 17:4; 18:8; 26:28 & 28); *sophrosune*, denotes soundness of mind or sound judgment translated soberness, good sense, sober truth and reasonable (Acts 26:25); *altheia*, means true or fact in an objective sense, unconcealed and manifest, i.e. not just an emotion of being "true for me" (Acts 26:25); *apologia*, a verbal defence or answer (Acts 22:1; 1 Peter 3:15). See Vine, *Expository Dictionary*, for more details.
- <sup>7</sup> This approach is used in Scripture in passages like the Book of Ecclesiastes; Acts 17:22-23; Rom. 2:14-16.
- <sup>8</sup> Thomas is an example of this: John 20:24-31 as are the Bereans: Acts 17:10-12. To ask questions about proof can be good in that the person may be sincerely seeking to find out what is true, but it can also be a sinful smokescreen once they have sufficient evidence but are not willing to believe and change their lives.
- <sup>9</sup> See Del Ratzsch, *The Philosophy Of Science: The Natural Sciences In Christian Perspective*, (Leicester, IVP, 1986).
- <sup>10</sup> Behind this comment is the doctrine of human depravity, where every part of our fallen nature is tainted and twisted by the results of the fall.
- <sup>11</sup> The Scriptures use this approach in passages like Acts 17:24-28; Rom. 1:18-20; Psalm 19:1-6.
- <sup>12</sup> These are pointers, they merely set the scene for God's personal revelation in Jesus Christ and his written revelation in the Scriptures. We must never stop here, we only begin here. Christ must be the centre of our evangelistic and apologetic endeavour. Evidence in the world around us and within our own humanity cannot make us Christians, but it can make us hungry for something beyond this world. It can whet the appetite but not satisfy it.
- <sup>13</sup> Evangelists in Scripture use this approach in passages like Acts 7:1-53. Here Stephen uses real history to make his point.
- <sup>14</sup> Quoted in Josh McDowell, *Evidence that Demands a Verdict*, Vol. 1, p. 71 (San Bernadino, Here's Life Publishers, 1972), originally quoted from Ramsay's book, *St Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1962).
- <sup>15</sup> McDowell, p. 71.
- <sup>16</sup> E.g.: Luke 4:38-44; 5:17-26; 9:18-27; 22:66-23:1
- <sup>17</sup> E.g. Luke 4:38-44; 7:11-17; 24:1-12; 36-49. This evidence is referred to in Peter's sermon on the Day of Pentecost Acts 2:22.
- <sup>18</sup> Peter uses the resurrection as evidence in his Pentecost Sermon: Acts 2:29-32 and then before the Sanhedrin, Acts 3:15.
- <sup>19</sup> The Apostles throughout the NT appealed to two particular areas of the life of Jesus of Nazareth to establish his being God's supernatural messenger or Messiah. One was the resurrection and the other was fulfilled messianic prophecy. Rom. 1:1-4; Acts 2:23-36; 3:18 & 22-25; 10:43; 17:2 & 3; 1 Cor. 15:3 & 4 etc.

---

Jonathan Paul Skinner BSc (Hons) PGCE is currently assistant minister of Widcombe Baptist Church. Bath

---