

Foundations

**A Theological Journal
published by the
British Evangelical
Council**

**If the foundations
be destroyed, what
can the righteous do?**



Psalm 11:3

ISSUE No.9

Price £1.25

November, 1982

C O N T E N T S

PREACHING IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	p.1
Rev Dr R.E.H.Uprichard BA BD MTh	
SHOULD A CHRISTIAN MARRY A NON-CHRISTIAN - AND SHOULD THE CEREMONY TAKE PLACE IN AN EVANGELICAL CHURCH?	p.16
Rev Hywel R.Jones MA	
REVIEW OF THEOLOGICAL JOURNALS 1981 (Part Two)	p.25
Dr Eryl Davies	
REVIEW OF SOME OLD TESTAMENT PUBLICATIONS	p.32
Rev Stephen Dray MA BD	
THE PRESENTATION OF THE GOSPEL AMONGST HYPER-CALVINISTS: A CRITIQUE	p.42
Pastor Robert J.Sheehan BD	
THE NEW HERMENEUTIC (Part One)	p.47
Dr Eryl Davies	
COMMUNICATING CHRIST CROSS-CULTURALLY - A REVIEW	p.55
Keith Morris BSc	

FOUNDATIONS is published in November and May; its aim is to acquaint readers, especially Pastors and Elders, with contemporary theological issues and provide stimulating articles and reviews in the areas of biblical theology, exegesis, church history, preaching and pastoralia. We seek to combine sound scholarship with the practical and relevant needs of churches.

EDITOR Rev Dr Eryl Davies MA BD
23 Bryn Eithinog
BANGOR, Gwynedd, N.Wales
U.K. LL57 2LA

All MSS, Editorial Correspondence and Publications for Review should be sent to the Editor.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS Rev Professor A.C.Boyd MA BD (Edinburgh)
Rev Stephen Dray MA BD (London)
Rev Brian Edwards BD (Surbiton)
Rev Hywel R.Jones MA (Wrexham)

BUSINESS MANAGER Mr Aubrey J.Roberts
58 Woodstock Road North
ST ALBANS, Herts
England, UK AL1 4QF
Tel: St Albans (0727) 53148
(Evenings only)

All orders for this Journal must be pre-paid and should be sent to the Business Manager. Please make out cheques and postal/money orders to the BRITISH EVANGELICAL COUNCIL in £ sterling. The price per issue is £1.25 post free.

PREACHING IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Rev Dr R.E.H.Uprichard BA BD MTh

Dr Uprichard is
the Pastor of
Trinity Presby-
terian Church,
Ahoghill in
County Antrim,
Northern Ireland

Two major problems confront us in approaching this subject: the vast amount of written material on the matter, and the wide range of words used in the New Testament for the communication of the gospel. The literature on the subject of preaching is most useful.

Much of it tends, however, quite naturally to deal with the practicalities of preaching, while passing over the Biblical warrant for it quite cursorily. In this sense, it is not entirely relevant to our present purpose. Of those works which were found most helpful, mention might be made of the following: Charles Bridges: 'The Christian Ministry' provides valuable background Biblical proofs for the ministry of the Word, as also do Spurgeon's 'Lectures' and R.L.Dabney 'On Preaching'. More recently, J.S.Stewart's 'Heralds of God', and D.Martyn Lloyd-Jones 'Preaching and Preachers' serve the same purpose. However, on the particular aspect in view, C.H. Dodd 'The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments', R.H.Mounce 'The Essential Nature of New Testament Preaching', and E.P.Clowney 'Preaching and Biblical Theology' are even more relevant. The best and most stimulating introduction was J.R.W.Stott 'The Preacher's Portrait'. In this, a number of Biblical metaphors for the preacher are examined viz., the preacher as steward, herald, witness, father and servant, with John Stott's usual precision, insight and meaningful application. One of the most recent comments on the subject is by Dr James Daane in a booklet (1980) entitled, 'Preaching with Confidence - a theological essay on the power of the pulpit'. Dr Daane majors on the theme of the "Word of God" in both Old and New Testaments, defends preaching as a viable modern means of gospel communication and offers some helpful suggestions about sermon construction.

The wide range of words used in the New Testament for the communication of the gospel also confronts us. These include words like teach (DIDASKO and KATECHEO for the communication of material to be learned, and PARADIDOMI for the passing on of tradition), GNORIZO to make known, HOMOLOGEO to confess, MARTYREO to witness, the principal words for preaching - ANGELLO. KERUSSO and their derivatives

to speak. The additional fact that the New Testament usage of these terms is so fluid as to prevent their being regarded as technical terms further adds to difficulties of being definitive. However, indeed, possibly because of this, it is better if we limit our examination to what might be regarded as the central expression of New Testament doctrine in respect of preaching. We would propose to approach this under the following aspects: 1. The Importance of Preaching in the New Testament. 2. The Characteristics of Preaching in the New Testament. 3. The Relevance of Preaching in the New Testament for us today.

The Importance of Preaching in the New Testament

The centrality of preaching in N.T. thought needs little emphasis. It is evident on two scores at the very least. The verbal incidence of the concept is obvious. In Young's Analytical Concordance there are over 130 references under 'Preach', 'Preacher' and 'Preaching'. In addition to their mere occurrence, secondly, these constitute a major theme in N.T. truth: John the Baptist expressed his prophetic ministry in preaching. The primary emphasis of Jesus' work is represented in the same light, and He urged His disciples to do this also. Much of the activity of the early church as represented in the Acts was directed toward preaching, and that as a priority. The self-confessed passion of the apostle Paul's life and his own understanding of his apostolic office was conceived of primarily in terms of preaching. The Biblical record of his activities confirms this, as does his advice to others who were leaders in the Church. Preaching was central to the whole regimen of New Testament thought and activity. It ought still to be central with us.

The Characteristics of Preaching in the New Testament

The characteristics of preaching in the New Testament can best be understood by keeping in mind both the office of the preacher and the message he proclaimed. In this light, a number of emphases emerge:

1. Preaching in the New Testament is basically proclamation, heralding.

Of the variety of words used in the New Testament for communicating the gospel, those which occur most frequently, and are thus central

- 2.

to the idea, are two groupings: ANGELLO and its derivatives and KERUSSO.

ANGELLO means to announce and in its derivatives also bears the sense, to proclaim. It has quite a number of varying forms in the New Testament, most of which are recognisable from the addition of a prefix e.g. ANANGELLO; APANGELLO; DIANGELLO and KATANGELLO. There may be slight differences in nuances of meaning, but these are by and large negligible. Usually the words in this group mean in the New Testament proclamation in the sense of making known God's activity, his will to save. Most important of all these derivatives, however, is the form EUANGELIZOMAI which is found both transitively and intransitively and which compounds the two Greek words EUS meaning good and the verb ANGELLO, to proclaim. EUANGELIZOMAI is used over 50 times in the New Testament and emphasises the quality of the message itself. In general, ANGELLO and its derivatives constitute the offer of information or encouragement in terms of its proclamation.

KERUSSO has a slightly different emphasis. It means to announce, to make known, to proclaim (aloud). As a verb, it occurs relatively frequently, some 61 times. It derives from KERUX, herald, an office with varying vicissitudes in Greek history, whom Grimm-Thayer describes as "a herald, a messenger vested with public authority who conveyed the official messages of kings, magistrates, princes, military commanders, or who gave public summons or demand".¹ KERUSSO, thus tends to indicate a public and authoritative announcement which demands compliance.

Usage of these two forms may also be significant. While it is possible to over-stress the difference, the common feature behind both these forms, and indeed all the words used for communicating the gospel is that of authority, and this is so even in the case of ANGELLO and its derivatives. In that particular group, the authority of the proclamation arises from its ultimate source and enters deeply into the life of the messenger making total demands on him. Nor does this aspect of authority rest upon the derived background, as in the case of KERUX, the herald. Rather, it rests upon New Testament usage. The significant thing about both ANGELLO and KERUSSO is that they are predominantly found in the verbal form in the New Testament and relatively sparsely as nouns. This stresses the activity and the content of the proclamation rather than the

person of the herald. New Testament preaching, then, from an etymological point of view, is a heralding or proclaiming. It is an authoritative announcement or informing of certain facts, which are encouraged on the hearers in such a way as to require their compliance. It is a trumpet-call, affirming news of a salutary nature, directed with solemn authority at the hearer.

2. Preaching in the New Testament is ambassadorial heralding.

Those who preach in the New Testament exhibit a predominant sense of commission, which evidences itself in an inner compulsion to preach. Pressure of the many sick folk who needed his healing did not divert our Lord from the primacy of his task: "Let us go somewhere else - to the nearby villages - so that I can preach there also. That is why I have come." (Mark 1:38). Even before the Sanhedrin, Peter and John cannot but speak the things which they had heard and seen (Acts 4:20). Paul graphically describes the constraint he experiences to preach in his letter to the Corinthians: "Yet when I preach the gospel, I cannot boast, for I am compelled to preach. Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel." (1 Cor.9:16). These proclaim as those under pressure, because they are conscious of the One who commissions them, whose message they bring.

Preachers in the New Testament also evince an awareness of their representative capacity. This derives from their self-consciousness as heralds, as we have already seen. Even in proclaiming the message in terms of ANGELLO, this is apparent: "And this is the message (ANGELIA) which we have heard from Him and proclaim (ANANGELLOMEN) to you, that God is light and in Him is no darkness at all." (1 John 1:5). But this consciousness is above all prominent in that revealing remark of Paul to the church at Corinth, as he discloses the deepest emotions of the preacher's heart: "We are therefore Christ's ambassadors as though God were making His appeal through us - we implore you on Christ's behalf: Be reconciled to God." (2 Cor.5:20). It is not without significance that the word here translated "are ambassadors" is the verbal form PRESBUOMEN, which may well have important implications for the relationship between preaching and the office of teaching-elder. For us, however, the point is clear, there is ample evidence to show how loftily the New Testament preacher regarded his task.

John Stott trenchantly remarks, that this is one of the distinctions

between the preacher as steward, and the preacher as herald. For, while the steward is represented as conducting the affairs of the household even when the householder is a great distance away, the herald seems consciously to be proclaiming a word from a master near at hand. The preacher as ambassador, then, is aware not only of his exalted position as one specifically designated to represent his superior in declaring his message, he does this as one coming direct from that superior's presence. He represents only his superior's views, not his own. He is not at liberty to concoct his own terms of reference. His whole attitude to his task is motivated by an overriding desire to represent his master. It is this that begets in him the inner compulsion to proclaim. The implications of all this for our task of preaching are instructive, dynamic and fearful. But it does inspire us in the right direction. It reminds us that we are men under authority, and at liberty to proclaim only that, which we have been given.

3. Preaching in the New Testament is the proclamation of facts.

This, to a large degree, arises from the nature of preaching as proclamation or heralding. But it is also substantiated on other independent grounds, among which the following seem important:

a) The objective side of the proclamation. Even a cursory glance at references to New Testament preaching clarifies this. Both John the Baptist and Jesus are depicted as proclaiming the Kingdom of God. This continues to be the objective description of preaching during Jesus' ministry. As we come to the Acts and the epistles, a different range of references is used. Often it is "Christ crucified" (1 Cor.1:23); "Christ raised" (1 Cor.15:12 RSV); "the Son of God Jesus Christ" (2 Cor.1:19); or "Christ Jesus the Lord" (2 Cor.4:5). Sometimes it is "the gospel", or in the intransitive EUANGELIZOMAI, "the Word", "the faith" or even "repentance".

This transition seems quite natural, since the kingdom was Christ and his rule. But is there any significance in the progression or development of these terms? Indeed, is there any development in them? It is usual to affirm that expressions such as "the faith" or "the Word" are later forms, as Christian teaching solidified. This may indeed be the case. However, that process may have been earlier than many suppose, since these expressions are also found in earlier portions of the New Testament, and the traditions (TAS

PARADOSEIS) occurs in an early letter like 2 Thessalonians. In these expressions, however, we find the objective substance of the proclamation. They emphasise and help clarify what was preached.

b) The KERUGMA. KERUGMA is the noun from the verb KERUSSO. It designates the thing preached, the preaching. It occurs twice in the Synoptics, six times in Paul. As a term it derives more importance, perhaps, from New Testament research in the last fifty years than from its New Testament setting. This work has been of valuable importance. In his book, 'The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments' 1936, C.H.Dodd examined the sermons in the Acts and the early credal statements in the Pauline epistles with a view to defining more precisely the substance of the apostolic KERUGMA. The result was that he outlined a sermonic frame-work including the following elements: the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies in the coming of Jesus of Nazareth; the death, resurrection and subsequent exaltation of Jesus as Saviour and Lord and a call to mankind to repent and be forgiven. This has been admirably summarised by R.H.Mounce as "a proclamation of the death, resurrection and exaltation of Jesus, that led to an evaluation of his person as both Lord and Christ, confronted man with the necessity of repentance, and promised forgiveness of sins."²

This work of C.H.Dodd was an excellent summary of the Biblical material involved. It succinctly points up the assertion that the apostolic preaching was indeed a proclamation of facts. They were really announcing or relating news. Events were at the core of what they said, and the personal relevance and purport of these events were forcibly presented to the hearers. By this means they were rehearsing before the people the recent historic events which constituted the good news, were clearly portraying before their eyes the crucified Jesus and the implications of that event for their lives. The preaching was factual and related to historic events. In its process it may have included explanation and reasoning, but it was not basically this. Preaching is not presenting philosophical concepts, lecturing on a subject or reasoning for a particular thesis. It may include and use these processes. But it is essentially proclaiming historical events and affirming their personal implication upon the hearer. It is heralding Christ as Saviour and Lord. It is ultimately founded not upon ideas but upon historic facts.

Now preaching if it follows in the New Testament tradition must
6.

surely have this emphasis. It must herald the events of the death, resurrection and exaltation of Jesus Christ as central and present this saving message to the world. But there were some aspects of Professor Dodd's work, or implications drawn by others from them, which unfortunately cloud and confuse the issue.

In the first place, there was said to be an emphasis on the resurrection rather than on the death of Christ in the Acts' sermons. This of course was true, but the emphasis was never intended to do detriment to the significance of the death of Christ, but rather, on the contrary, to confirm the divine pleasure in that death, as in the remainder of the New Testament. For the same reason, the exaltation was stressed to show the efficacy of the death, and to underscore the Lordship of the person of this Jesus. To argue that the apostolic preaching majored solely on the resurrection and exaltation is to misread the significance of these facets in the Acts' sermons, and to ignore the centrality of such statements in the Pauline letters as: "We preach Christ crucified" (1 Cor.1:23).

Secondly, Professor Dodd stressed greatly the distinction between "preaching" (KERUGMA) and "teaching" (DIDACHE). Pushed to its logical or illogical conclusion, this portrayed preaching as the church presenting the gospel to the world, while in teaching we have the church instructing the converted. While there is a degree of truth in this, this absolutizes the situation too much: Both activities are based on the same facts. The terms are used interchangeably in the Gospels, for example, in Mt.4:23 (teaching) = Mk.1:39 and Lk.4:44 (preaching); and Mk.1:21,22,27 (teaching) = 1:38 (preaching). They also overlap in Acts. There are clearly instances where proclaiming the gospel involved expository instruction, so that we can speak of "didactic kerugma". As Dr Mounce says: "teaching is the expounding detail of what is proclaimed"³ or again "Kerugma is foundation and didache is superstructure; but no building is complete without both".⁴

This is practically most important. We must affirm that preaching in the New Testament is indeed a proclamation of gospel facts, but this must not be construed as "a once-for-all-cry which might be compared to sticking up a poster." For Paul, it involved a whole process of kindred activities of a complementary nature. These included such endeavours as reasoning, exhorting, warning,

encouraging , pleading, caring, labouring day and night and from house to house to supplement the proclamation. This means that Biblical exposition is a proper form of preaching, providing the heraldic element is normative and that "dialogue" is only properly Biblical, when it observes a proclamatory stance, averring that it has within its possession truths, with which the hearer must comply. It was surely thus that Paul reasoned within both synagogue and market-place? Maintaining that preaching in the New Testament is the proclamation of facts should not drive us to exclude these other kinds of activity supplementary to the process. It should rather fix them in their proper subordinate and complementary position. But we should remember that in preaching we are basically committed to presenting Christ and His salvation for our hearers' compliance, and that anything which detracts from such a presentation is detrimental to the whole process.

c) The lucid nature of New Testament preaching. This is the third aspect which seems to underline New Testament preaching as proclamation of facts. By it, we mean the Pauline assertion that it is vitally important that preaching and its issues are not obscured with eloquent wisdom and lofty words (1 Cor.1:17, 2:1-4) and Paul's refusal to practise cunning or tamper with God's word, but rather his attempt to commend himself to each person's conscience by the open statement of the truth (2 Cor.4:2). It is almost as though the plainness of the fact and implications of the crucified Christ could be obscured in the manner of presentation. And since that saving Christ must be seen in all his glorious clarity, the preacher must be at great pains to portray this honestly, simply and lucidly. The motivation for this comes from the principle that the preaching is the proclamation of facts, facts concerning the death, resurrection, exaltation and person of Christ and his saving significance for men.

New Testament preaching then, is a proclamation of facts. These facts are basically the saving events of Christ's life, death, resurrection and exaltation, but must not be so rigidly interpreted as to exclude other ancilliary activities to bring the facts home, nor to reject other explanatory and additional material, which was gradually, even in the New Testament period becoming subsumed under the concepts of "the Word" or "the faith". The normative thing should be the clear portrayal of facts relevant to salvation. This portrayal was central, fundamental and factual. Christo-centricity is never at variance with "the full counsel of the Word of God".

They are supplementary and complementary, not antithetical themes.

4. Preaching in the New Testament is a proclamation requiring a response.

This arises basically from the kerygmatic nature of the proclamation, viz., that it is a proclamation of facts whose relevance for the hearer is fundamental. Consistently, this is in evidence in preaching in the New Testament. Both John the Baptist and Jesus heralded the Kingdom, and there were those who actively responded to their message. Subsequent to Jesus' proclamation of truth, John's gospel indicates a schism among the people. Peter's preaching on the Day of Pentecost produced the claimant confession: "What shall we do?", while his later witness before the Sanhedrin resulted in the opposite effect, for they were angrily cut to the heart on that occasion. Stephen was martyred as a conclusion to his gospel affirmations. Paul knew varied reactions to his preaching from the Jews at Antioch and from the Greeks at Athens. Generally in Acts we find such statements subsequent to gospel proclamation as that some believed, were obedient to the faith, or that the preaching won a large number of disciples. Where the same process is in evidence in the epistles, we find the same kind of result. Thessalonians turn from idols to serve the living God. Romans experience saving power as they believe this good news. Those, to whom Peter writes, discover in the fulfilment of prophecies subject to age-old scrutiny, personal awareness of electing grace, cleansing forgiveness, sanctifying righteousness, spiritual birth and persevering power. Hebrew Christians, compared to others, heard with profit gospel tidings, for it met with the personal appropriation of faith in them. Preaching both required and gained results.

Preaching then, is preaching for decision in the best sense of the term, for by its New Testament nature it demands a response. The presentation of Jesus as Lord and Saviour is bound to make overwhelming demands. The goodness of the good news is the dynamic focus of the relevance of these facts to my life.

These last two aspects of New Testament preaching, viz., its nature as proclamation of facts and facts requiring a response belong, as John Stott emphasises, together. They are necessarily coupled in the New Testament picture of preaching. The one without the other is defective. Preaching that is simply proclamation without appeal

denigrates the significance and relevance of the facts proclaimed. Preaching that is appeal without proclamation lacks a motivated response, and is no good news at all. Both were involved in New Testament preaching, and should be so today. New Testament preaching then is heraldic proclamation by an ambassador of kerygmatic facts, proclaimed in such a way as to constrain a response.

The relevance of preaching in the New Testament for today

In attempting to apply these Biblical principles today, four major questions will direct our presentation: Who should preach? What should he preach? How should he preach? and Why should he preach?

Who should preach?

It seems to have been normative in the New Testament that those who preached were called of God to the task. This, of course, is regarding preaching in the narrower New Testament usage of heralding, as compared with the activity of the people of God described by some in Acts as gossiping the good news. Out of this divine commission arose the inner compulsion to preach. The situation is somewhat different today. In a sense, it was simpler in New Testament times, for then there were apostles, prophets and evangelists, part of whose function was obviously preaching. All of these offices, even including the evangelist, have been regarded generally by reformed theology as 'extraordinary' and in some sense restricted to that particular era, as compared with the 'ordinary' office of bishop-elder, both in its teaching and ruling capacity, continuing from New Testament times and with us today. Certainly, the call in respect of preaching, regarding the apostle and prophet seems reasonably clear. The apostolic commission appears to have been in many respects unique, and its heraldic witness a development of personal relationship with the human Jesus. The prophet spoke as the recipient of a direct word from the Lord. The situation is obviously different today with no personal commission from the human or visionary-appearing risen Jesus, and with no direct prophetic revelation.

It might be thought, perhaps, that the evangelist is the nearest New Testament equivalent of the gospel-preacher today, and so ought naturally to correspond to the same. However, the New Testament 'office' of evangelist is difficult of precise definition, mainly

because of paucity of biblical evidence. There are only three references to the noun in the New Testament: Evangelists seemed to assist the apostles in their work. The office is distinguished from that of apostle and prophet and, in New Testament lists, comes after these two and before the pastor-teacher. Timothy was urged to do the work of an evangelist. Evangelist is, thus, related to apostolic work, but also to ministry in terms of teaching and pastoring. In balance, it seems to rank as an office as extraordinary in terms of being an extension of the apostolic function, but its activity is more stressed than the office. It bears little continuity resemblance to that of the office of bishop-elder, while the scarcity of biblical evidence allows us to say little more, nor to suggest a clearly warranted correspondence today.

Since there is nothing in the nature of a distinct New Testament office of preacher, surely the answer to the question: Who should preach today?, the only satisfactory explanation of the twentieth century call to preach, must be related to the ordinary office of bishop-elder in his teaching capacity? From the New Testament evidence for this particular office, it would seem that the call of God to preach must not only be a subjective consciousness evident in a proper desire after the office, but also a correlative confirmation by the Church, both in looking out among her sons men suitable by biblical definition for the task, recognising in them this gift and setting them aside for this great work. Dr Martyn Lloyd-Jones in his book, and Pastor Al Martin on tape are quite lucid and emphatic in stressing the same.

What should he preach?

The New Testament preacher proclaimed what he had already been given. Substantially, this involved, as we have seen, the heralding of historical facts not simply ideas, and the communication of the relevance of these facts. The coming, life, death, resurrection and exaltation of Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah as Saviour and Lord was the nub of this message. The New Testament also describes preaching the Word in contexts where it seems to mean asserting these gospel facts and their implications, as in Acts for example, but also in situations where more may have been included viz., the PARADOSIS or formal handing on of Christian teaching as well. So that ultimately, the pastor-teacher in the Pastorals is responsible for guarding the deposit of the faith and seeing that it is passed

on in purity and integrity. It is also obvious from earlier preaching as in Acts, that it includes exposition of Old Testament prophecy as indicating Jesus as Messiah.

The inference of all this for the preacher today seems reasonably clear. He is to preach what he has been given. He is not at liberty to proclaim his own ideas. The parameters of his message are clearly defined. They are defined in the revelation given to him, which is neither personal as in the case of the apostle nor direct as in the case of the prophet but mediately in Word-revelation. The only satisfactory explanation of this concept seems to be in the scriptural revelation, of which the New Testament, containing KERYGMA, DIDACHE and PARADOSIS, is the completion. The canonical development of Old Testament inscripturation presupposes the same of the New Testament, and that particularly so, in the light of Jesus' own assertions in the fourth gospel about His own words, and the possibility that Peter regarded Paul's letters as GRAPHE or scripture. The twentieth century preacher preaches a given revelation, the Scriptures, the Bible, as the symposium or deposit of kerygmatic substance. The use which the New Testament preacher made of the Old Testament and of the developing paradosis would appear to confirm this contention. Today's preacher preaches a given revelation - the Bible.

How should he preach?

It is clear from our investigation that the key feature about preaching should be heralding gospel facts in such a way as to constrain a response. Immediately, this brings us to the question as to how this relates to the reformed concept and practice of expository preaching, that is, the systematic explanation of biblical text. At first thought it might be supposed that an expository form hardly suits a heraldic presentation. A number of considerations, however, tend to suggest otherwise:

Firstly, it seems axiomatic that preaching must be of those things which are already given viz., of a fixed revelation. If this is the case, then, in a sense, as Dr Martyn Lloyd-Jones maintains, all preaching must be expository. In expounding the Bible, we are not only explaining the kerygma, but also engaging in a preaching of the Word, in a guarding of the deposit, basic to the whole New Testament concept of heraldic communication as evident both in the

Pastorals and in earlier New Testament writings.

Secondly, a considerable amount of the preaching in the New Testament was of an expository nature. That is, it took as authoritative Old Testament scriptures and sought to use these and reason from them to explain and affirm the kerygma.

Thirdly, heraldic proclamation may be thought of as pertaining as much to the manner of presentation as to the content proclaimed. In this sense, there is no necessary dichotomy between exposition and heralding as far as the method of preaching is concerned. Providing our exposition of Biblical matter is an authoritative declaration requiring a response on the part of the hearer, the methods are complementary rather than antithetical. In this context also, we relate to exposition a whole host of New Testament concepts most helpful in communicating the gospel viz., convincing, warning, encouraging.

Fourthly, even in actual terms of the content of the proclamation, heralding and exposition are synthetic rather than disparate activities. We should be able to herald the gospel as effectually and effectively, whether we are expounding Deuteronomic law-codes, indicating the intent of Jesus' instruction in the Sermon on the Mount or declaring Pauline Haustafel. The regulative factor is simply that we relate this matter to the kerygma, and so show the preparation of a "Puritan law-preaching", for example, or the elucidation of Pharisaic self-righteousness or the implications to a domestic life-style as the effects of the death and resurrection of Christ by our exposition. The relevance of all these to a kerygmatic-gospel seems reasonably lucid. We will, thus, in our preaching avoid shunning the whole counsel of God, while positively, we will be proclaiming the good news fully and be guarding the deposit as well. Indeed, from this it might be suggested that the only true way to herald these facts is to do it in an expository fashion, for exposition is basically an explanation of the given facts and their relevance.

Why should he preach?

At least three motives stimulated the New Testament preachers to their work, and these three principles are still operative today.

a. A divine call producing an inner constraint.

A divine call to preach is evident in the life of our Lord, who proclaimed in the synagogue that he, with Isaiah, had been anointed to preach, and constantly asserts, in John's gospel, that he taught words given to him by his Father, God. Paul is similarly clear regarding the divine primacy of this task, both in remarking to the Corinthians that Christ had sent him not to baptise but to preach the gospel, and in claiming to Timothy on two occasions that he had been appointed a preacher. The disciples, of course, derived a direct commission from the Lord to preach, and the apostle in turn obliges his younger colleague and teaching-elder to continue in this by preaching the Word - a true apostolic succession.

It was out of this divine call that the inner constraint arose. This is clear in the life of our Lord, who maintained that he must go to other villages to preach, for that was the reason for his coming, and with Paul, who vowed deep personal distress if he did not preach the good-news.

A preacher must preach, motivated above all by the divine will, evident in a divine call to him to preach. This, arising in his subjective consciousness, is confirmed to him by the Church both choosing him and setting him apart for the task. He is, thus, urged legitimately to stir up the gift given to him.

b. The subject matter of the message.

This seems evident in a most natural way in the real fervour, excitement and anticipation which attended the preaching of the early Church. Significantly, it reached a white-hot pitch of intensity immediately after persecution. So, it was recorded of the apostles that they ceased not to preach and teach, notably after the healing of the lame man and the subsequent attempt of the Sanhedrin to suppress their witness. The persecution of the Jerusalem Church is directly related in the Acts' history to the statement that the people afterwards went everywhere "gossiping" (EUANGELIZOMAI) the gospel and Philip went to Samaria and heralded (KERUSSO) Christ. The import and effect of Christ preached was obviously stimulating them, even in the fires of persecution, indeed, more so then.

Paul perhaps defines the power of the message yet more precisely for us when he says to the Roman believers that he is ready to proclaim the gospel there also, for it is the power of God to salvation

to those who believe. The "foolishness of preaching", the way in which he alludes to the subject writing to the Corinthians (1 Cor.1: 21), has respect, perhaps, more to the folly of the content of this humanly-speaking ludicrous message than to the actual act of preaching. But this very folly which was so successful was a stimulus. The power of the kerygma and its affect must constantly inspire us to proclaim it. Each time we prepare the Word, we should be gripped freshly by this consciousness and experience.

c. Preaching is God's method.

This appears in the practical cause and effect, which Paul's preaching produced. While the preaching of the Cross was folly to those who perished, to believers at Corinth it was the power of God. The crucified Christ preached was an offence to Jews, nonsense to Greeks but to believers it was the wisdom and power of God. Paul preached and so the Corinthians believed. He can write to Titus that God's Word has been manifested (PHANEROO) to them through preaching (KERYGMA).

It seems also clear in the inevitable process, which Paul describes as the way to faith: Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the Word of God. This practically means that a man who calls on God in belief must have heard the message preached by one so commissioned: "How then, can they call on one they have not believed in? And how can they believe in the one of whom they have not heard? And how can they hear without someone preaching to them? And how can they preach unless they are sent? As it is written, 'How beautiful are the feet of those who bring good news.'" (Rom.10:14,15 NIV). There is a disarming simplicity and shattering necessity about this logic, which defines so clearly this divinely appointed instrument of gospel communication. It brings us back to where we began, to the call of God. It is as we recognise preaching as God's method that a further incentive to proclaim moves us to herald.

So, today, the divine call, the subject matter of the message and the fact that it is a God-ordained method drives us to proclaim with insistent fervour the good-news, just as it impelled the New Testament preachers to their task. What higher vocation or more exciting or exacting work can we be called upon to fulfil? For those called to it, this must be our primary passion, our life's work, our latest breath: We are heralds of God.

- (1) THAYER J.H.(GRIMM) 'A Greek/English Lexicon of the New Testament'
Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1896 sub. KERUX, p346
 - (2) MOUNCE R.H. 'The Essential Nature of New Testament Preaching',
Eerdmans, 1960 p84
 - (3) MOUNCE R.H. Op. cit. p42
 - (4) MOUNCE R.H. Op. cit. pp42,43
-

**SHOULD A CHRISTIAN MARRY A NON-CHRISTIAN --
AND SHOULD THE CEREMONY TAKE PLACE IN
AN EVANGELICAL CHURCH?**

Rev Hywel R.Jones MA

The aim of this article is to SUGGEST a biblical approach to a common, pastoral problem. Mr Jones thanks those who have discussed the subject with him and encouraged him to publish his thoughts. Readers' comments are invited but they will be published only if they contribute to a careful, biblical evaluation of the argument in this article.

The writer, of course, is an Associate Editor of this journal and Pastor of Borras Park Evangelical Church, Wrexham in Clwyd, N.E. Wales.

This problem is an intensely personal one for all concerned. Obviously it has an acute effect on the engaged couple, the parents of the believer who is engaged, the non-believer and his or her parents. It has, however, a wider effect. It bears upon the minister and officers of the church where it is requested that the wedding should take place, and where, perhaps, the believer may be a member of long standing and usefulness, and also upon the members and adherents of the church, particularly upon those who are as yet unmarried. Clearly, it is a matter fraught with the keenest emotions and therefore with the most far-reaching repercussions.

In our unprincipled and undisciplined age, problems like this are

likely to arise in the life of the church. The almost instinctive reaction, therefore, is to refuse the request on the grounds that it is symptomatic of the spirit of anarchy which is abroad these days. Should not marriage be given a high and honoured place in the church's life and witness? Do we not stand for reformation according to the Word of God? Does not Scripture say, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers"? (2 Cor.6:14). Are not widowed Christians free to remarry "only in the Lord"? (1 Cor.7:39). To all these questions an affirmative reply must be given. However, can too high a place be given to marriage by the church? Should it appear to be ranked with Baptism and the Lord's Supper and be made part of the exercise of discipline in the Church?

The purpose of this article is to suggest an approach to this vexatious matter. It is presented in the belief that it is both biblically justifiable and pastorally responsible. But is it? That is for each reader to judge.

The approach presented here is related to two fixed points of biblical teaching. In this lies its capacity to admit the non-straight-forward, non-black and white situations of which pastoral life is full. As both fixed points are scriptural this approach cannot be dismissed out of hand as smacking of compromise. These points are:

1. Marriage is human and religious
2. Marriage is human and sacred

1. Marriage - Human and Religious

Marriage is human, not just Christian, and religious, not just secular. It is so because it is a divine provision for all mankind. It was instituted at Creation by the kindly understanding and yet firm authority of God. In kindness God said "It is not good for man to be alone". In firmness God said, "I will make him a help meet for him". Marriage is therefore the result of God's understanding of man's personal and physical needs, and it is God's best and finest provision for him. Further to this, marriage was intended by God to be monogamous and permanent, and the context for procreation, as in this way God's good purposes for children, families, nations and the world would best be realised. (The current chaos as a result of the breakdown of the family unit, its relationships of love and authority, aided by humanistic propaganda underlines the truth of this).

From this it follows that marriage is not only for Christians and it is not only a "redemptive-spiritual" union. It was introduced before the Fall and therefore before Redemption was first announced and applied. But this does not mean that it is only earthly, social or, at worst, physical. It was and is a gift of God and it should never be regarded by unbelievers as a social convention (with the trimmings if conducted in a church) or as having merely a physical or earthly dimension. Instituted by God, it must be basically and essentially religious. In other words, there is a depth or a height (the two words are synonymous here) to the marriage-relationship which transcends the merely human and natural. Marriage bears the fingerprint of its author - God. What He has ordained, namely that "the two shall become one flesh", occurs in every consummated marriage. And this involves more than just a physical union! It is this other but associated inter-personal dimension which makes sexual infidelity and immorality such a dreadful thing. Marriage is therefore fraught with varying degrees of enrichment in the case of unbelievers as well as believers. (It is also fraught with varying degrees of distress and havoc as a result of the Fall, the progress of sin, as Satan in various ways corrupts God's good gifts).

Now with regard to the recognition of marriage i.e. by the state or the church (or by a mixture of both in the case of a minister being a registered person) it must be remembered that marriages in a Registry Office are as valid in the eyes of God, when in accord with the law of the land, as those solemnised in a building set apart for religious worship. The law given at Creation (Gen.2:18-25) is providentially still recognised, though in varying degrees, by most cultures.

While unbelievers are free to marry in a Registry Office, may they not be married in a church? Indeed should some of them not be? Cannot a case be made of even encouraging some unbelievers to be married in an evangelical church rather than deterring them on the basis that marriage is essentially religious? If the couple have a sense of the reality of God, and of the religious nature of marriage and a desire for God's blessing, surely they should be so allowed. On what grounds could they possibly be refused? They are neither being regarded as Christians nor are they being required to profess to be such, nor are they being given a sacrament by being married in a church. (Devotees of non-Christian religions would be excluded though the likelihood of their applying to be married in

church would be minimal to say the least). Otherwise would not a favourable response from an evangelical church be in line with our conviction and belief that unbelievers are still in the image of the God who made them, though that image is marred beyond human repair? It is not inconceivable that at such a time they may not only turn to God for a blessing on their marriage but in repentance and faith in Christ for salvation.

It will be doubtless thought that we are straying from the point. But are we? It needs to be remembered that the unbeliever who is engaged to a believer is a creature in God's image and is an object of His love, and, other things being equal, has a perfect right to be married. All the foregoing is not irrelevant as we shall try to show.

2. Marriage - Human and Sacred

Like other creation ordinances e.g. work, marriage becomes enhanced for Christians for the gospel and the salvation it brings is not to be regarded as erasing what was introduced at Creation. It rather endorses, re-actualises and exalts it, while erasing gradually and eventually totally what was introduced by the Fall.

What therefore was originally expressive of God's kindness and authority becomes more than that by the revelation of His grace to sinners in Christ. Marriage between believers becomes a context for the mutual reception and expression of God's grace, compassion, wisdom and strength. It exhibits and promotes a union deeper than the richest union between the kindest, happiest and wisest unbelievers. It serves as an illustration of the deepest inter-personal union of all, namely that between Christ and the Church (Eph.5:22-33). So, in the consequent family unit, not only is God's kindness and authority revealed but also His grace.

Obviously, when two believers desire to marry, the best place for them to do this is the church. There they have the opportunity of demonstrating clearly their belief that marriage is not only human and religious, but also sacred. They proclaim by this means their grateful recognition of God as their Creator, Provider and Father; their united resolve to serve Jesus Christ their Saviour and Lord, as man and wife, and their confessed dependence on the aid of the Holy Spirit for every aspect of their life together. They become

"heirs together of the grace of life" (1 Pet.3:7). But in being married in church even they do not partake of a sacrament. The Lord Jesus Christ has not appointed marriage for all His people (Matt. 19:10-12; 1 Cor.7:7). If a law were to be passed prohibiting church marriages there would be nothing inherently sinful in believers complying with it, nor would such marriages be any the less valid in the sight of God or sacred in the estimation of the believers.

Now it is in the light of all this that the question of a believer marrying an unbeliever - and in church- is to be faced. We have seen that an unbeliever has a right to be married and, if religiously aware, to be married in a church. The heart of the problem which we are facing lies, of course, in the right of the believer to marry an unbeliever. And in church? We shall consider each matter in turn.

I. Should a believer marry an unbeliever?

The answer to this question must be "No". The unbeliever may marry a believer because he or she is only under the law given at Creation, but the believer may not marry an unbeliever because he or she is "in law" to Christ (1 Cor.9:21).

2 Corinthians 6:14 is the text which springs to the minds of many as foreclosing any further consideration of this matter. It may, however, be doubted that when Paul wrote, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers", he had a mixed marriage of the kind under consideration explicitly, let alone exclusively, in mind. The chapter which deals with problems associated with marriage, viz 1 Cor.7, does not mention such a situation. Verses 12-16 reflect on the consequence of an already married unbeliever having come to faith in Christ, as does 1 Pet.3:1,2.

Yet, in spite of all this, it is impossible to evade the applicability of the principle of 2 Cor.6:14 to marriage. A yoke joined animals for ploughing purposes. The prohibition in Deuteronomy 22:10 "Thou shalt not plough with an ox and an ass together", lies behind 2 Corinthians 6:14. A Christian's desire should be to serve the Lord first in everything. How can he or she seriously consider doing this when married to an unbeliever? The believer should be prevented from thinking that this is possible. Partners in marriage should please each other (1 Cor.7:33). God and mammon cannot be served together (Matt.6:24).

Another reference which makes this explicit is 1 Corinthians 7:39. Paul indicates here that a widow (presumably a widower as well) is "at liberty to be married to whom (she) will, only in the Lord". This restriction must be appreciated in all its force. The widow/er has a wide but not unlimited choice of a further partner. The marriage must be in the Lord, i.e. the marriage must be to a Christian. It is inescapable that this injunction should be applied to all first marriages of Christians.

The Old Testament material which bears on this matter is interesting and relevant, for it is there that explicit prohibitions of such mixed marriages are found (cf. Ex.34:16; Deut.7:3; Josh.23:12-13; Ezra 9:1,2 & 10:2,3, and Nehemiah 13:23-27). It is important to evaluate these references carefully. This is done by considering them in relation to their place in Biblical revelation. They are all located in the period of the theocracy which has come to an end with the inauguration of the New Covenant. There is therefore no specific prohibition in Scripture against a Christian marrying a non-Christian.

But there is other material in the Old Testament which is very forceful. It comes from the Patriarchal period and, being linked with the Abrahamic covenant, is valid for New Testament Christians, cf. Gen.24:3, 28:1 and 26:34. It should be noted, however, that this is a deduction from the covenant rather than an expressed stipulation of it. In exactly the same way a Christian should not marry a non-Christian because of the nature of the gospel and its purpose.

The Christian is someone who has given himself or herself to the Lord in faith, love and obedience for ever. A marriage with an unbeliever is evidence of a recalling of that solemn commitment, yet not in such a way that the person ceases to be a Christian, but rather that he or she ceases to walk obediently with the Lord. On this evidence no Christian should marry a non-Christian, or to take the matter further back, become engaged to a non-Christian, or further back still, which is where the matter can be resolved, put himself or herself in a position where that could happen.

II. May they, nevertheless, under certain circumstances be married in an evangelical church? If so, on what grounds?

The answer here proposed to this question is "Yes". It is recognised

that this will not be acceptable to all. It is, however, respectfully asked of all who disagree with this reply that they realise that an indiscriminate response in the affirmative is not what is being proposed. Certain conditions have to be fulfilled so that the marriage ceremony may be engaged in with a good conscience before God and the church. What are these conditions? They arise out of what has been said already and they are:

a) That the unbeliever acknowledges the religious dimension of marriage

b) That the believer acknowledges that he or she is being disobedient to the Lord and does not display an arrogant will.

We shall consider these in turn.

a) Regarding the unbeliever

To require that an unbeliever makes a credible profession of faith so that the marriage ceremony may take place in a church is unprincipled. No one needs to profess to be a Christian to get married - not even in an evangelical church. However, no unbeliever who is an atheist, or an agnostic, or plainly irreverent in relation to a church service, the solemnity of vows, and the name of God, ought to be allowed to do so for his or her own sake. The religious nature of marriage must be recognised by the unbeliever. Further, if the unbeliever has given no real indication of being helpful to the believer in the practice of his or her faith, the ceremony should not take place. This is an attempt to save the believer, if possible, from trouble.

In marrying such a couple in church, on these conditions being fulfilled, it is to be noted that the unbeliever is not being declared a Christian, nor being made a member of the church, nor being given a sacrament. Nothing is being said by him or her which compromises the gospel, for the service can be re-drafted in large measure. (The expression, "in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life", is much more open to objection in a funeral service of an unbeliever).

b) Regarding the believer

It must be stated to the believer in the presence of the unbeliever

22.

that such a marriage as is being envisaged dishonours God, is likely to cause spiritual loss and trouble to the believer and to any children of the union, and real offence in the church, and ought not to take place anywhere. (If time is available before the planned date the couple should be sent away to consider this. They could even be asked to postpone the planned date of the wedding). However, if the believer is emotionally unable to draw back, what should happen regarding the marriage ceremony? Should it take place in the church?

Why should it not? On what grounds could the request be refused? The following suggest themselves.

1. Such a marriage is an act of disobedience

While this is not being contested the question does need to be asked whether its nature is any different from other acts of disobedience committed by Christians and on account of which no disciplinary action is taken. If it is not different and as marriage is not a sacrament, on what ground could the request be refused? It would have to be granted with sorrow and the service conducted with a heavy heart if no other argument can be brought against it.

Even if, however, it is regarded as being in a different category of disobedience because it is an act as good as done against biblical teaching and pastoral advice previously given, is refusal to conduct the ceremony the appropriate response? Surely what should be considered after every attempt to dissuade the would-be partner of an unbeliever from going forward has been made, is not a refusal which drives them elsewhere to the very thing desired to avoid but an act of church discipline, e.g. public rebuke, temporary suspension from the Lord's Table. This under God's hand may bring the believer to a better mind. To refuse to marry resembles the use of a sword and not the power of a key.

The human element in all this must not be forgotten. The relationships between courting partners can proceed to a point of no-return. The emotional entanglement between two people can produce a situation where a believer can find it impossible to live without the other. The commitment may already have become so intense that a child is expected. To refuse to marry in such circumstances may mean the loss of a family to gospel influences for the rest of their

days.

2. To marry such people is to be involved in a sin of disobedience

The kind of involvement referred to here is of course the sharing of responsibility for the act. This is what the expression "Be not partakers in other men's sins" means, as the words which follow indicate, viz "Keep thyself pure" (1 Tim.5:22). The situation envisaged in the verse is the ordaining of unsuitable men to the ministry who ought to have been previously tested. The sin is the result of a failure in duty. In relation to marriage what we ought to do is to present biblical teaching and by pastoral counsel to seek to prevent such a marriage being contracted. This is to free oneself from that involvement which includes responsibility.

But what one does in a service has to be carefully considered. Can one do it in good conscience? There are two things to be weighed, viz praying for a blessing on the couple and pronouncing them to be man and wife.

a) Praying for the couple

It may be regarded that to do this involves asking God to bless an act of disobedience. A better and more accurate way of phrasing it would be asking God to bless people in spite of disobedience. Does this now constitute a problem? Are we not involved in doing this already? We ought to be both for ourselves and others. Do we not ask for blessing on the basis of the Lord's righteousness, not our own, and ask that He may show us our sins and bring us to repentance and reformation of life?

b) Pronouncing them to be husband and wife

As marriage is not exclusively Christian this declaration does not have to be made "in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost". The name of God will suffice. And does not God regard them as husband and wife?

Are they not joined together in His sight? If this is so, and it is difficult to say otherwise, where lies the difficulty in our making such a declaration?

3. To marry such people in the church may cause division and a

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.

REVIEW OF SOME OLD TESTAMENT

PUBLICATIONS

Rev Stephen Dray MA BD

Brockley, London

AN INTRODUCTION TO OLD TESTAMENT STUDY by John H. Hayes

Published by Abingdon Press and distributed in the UK by the SPCK.
400pp, Paperback £8.50

This book by the Editor of the Journal of Biblical Literature provides an excellent orientation in Old Testament study. As such it will be of considerable usefulness to the student freshly involved in Old Testament work and, also, a sourcebook of some value to the more advanced scholar.

Hayes' purpose in writing the volume is, clearly, less to provide a detailed Old Testament Introduction in the conventional sense (as e.g. Eissfeldt and Harrison) but rather to provide an understanding of the issues, problems and methodologies that lie behind contemporary study of the Old Testament. The book is well organised, clearly and interestingly written and shows some evidence of being the result of the author's seminary teaching. The bibliographies are extensive and, helpfully, exclusively relate to material available in English. Footnotes are lacking - the most important references being included in the text. All these features facilitate its use by the non-specialist.

The early sections of the book include discussion of the Canon and Old Testament Textual criticism and are followed by an outline of the Historical-Critical and Form Critical approaches to Old Testament study. As with the remainder of the work his method is to summarise, often with extensive quotation, the main authorities in the respective fields. This is usually done excellently and ought to give the reader an early mastery of the main issues. The latter part of the book is occupied with the particular areas of the Old Testament material. While clearly holding liberal views Hayes shows a sensitivity and balance in the majority of his comments. Even Harold Lindsell and E.J.Young receive a sympathetic mention in his discussion of the Pentateuch. This balance is, however, less marked in the later chapters of the book (especially

on Daniel) and, inevitably, in those areas which conservatives have, until recently, largely left to the liberals by default, e.g. the Historical books. The last mentioned section together with the material on prophecy is, perhaps, the thinnest part of the book, but a consideration of the discussions on the Psalms and Wisdom should not go unrewarded.

In sum. A most useful volume for the student of the Old Testament, especially if, e.g. Harrison or Young are consulted at doubtful points. For those of us in the ministry and particularly interested in the Old Testament Hayes has provided a valuable and stimulating survey of modern trends in a usually highly readable style.

APPROACHES TO OLD TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION by John Goldingay.

Published by the Inter-Varsity Press in the series 'Issues in Contemporary Theology' under the General Editorship of I. Howard Marshall. 192pp. Paperback. £4.25

This small volume is, unquestionably, one of the most important publications in the Old Testament field of studies in 1981. One of a series intended to provide a conservative overview of areas of debate in contemporary theology, Goldingay's work is a dialogue with the various viewpoints currently expressed on the subject of Old Testament interpretation. This feature tends to make the book unnecessarily complicated for the less tutored reader since it inevitably leads to a considerable philosophical bias (especially in chapter 3). In addition, Goldingay's position on the liberal wing of conservatism necessarily involves him in a number of debates which most readers of this journal would place under the heading of apologetics rather than hermeneutics. Despite these weaknesses, however, a careful study of the book should alert readers (i) to the importance of the subject (Goldingay quotes Gunneweg when the latter says "it would be no exaggeration to understand the hermeneutical problem of the Old Testament as the problem of Christian theology, seeing that all the other questions of theology are affected in one way or another by its resolution").

(ii) to the way ahead for Christian interpretation of the Old Testament. Goldingay notes that at least five approaches to OT interpretation may be discerned beneath current discussion. Each chapter of the book is devoted to the study of one of these

methodologies.

The third chapter of the book (together with the fifth) will be of least usefulness, except to the theological student. Within it the author surveys that approach to the OT which views it as the story of salvation. Although a large part of the chapter is occupied with discussion on the nature of history and the relationship of that history to revelation Goldingay does make a number of very important observations. He notes: (i) to view the OT properly as salvation history establishes a broader view of what the Scriptures mean by salvation than the solely spiritual viewpoint that tends to dominate Christian theology. On p87 he says "In OT times God wills Israel's salvation and blessing (national, personal, and spiritual well-being) and seeks to grant it by his initiatives and by the way his providence takes account of the acts of Israel and of other nations. But that will to save and bless is never fully satisfied, and the Christ event is his final means of achieving it".

(ii) To view the OT as salvation history avoids the necessity to treat it as figurative (while ignoring its literal meaning) or, simply in a literal way (which panders, for example, to liberation theology).

(iii) Such an approach also means that subsequent events in the narrative will throw light on the significance of earlier events. (Note, for example, the way Isaiah 40-55 interprets and illuminates the Exodus).

(iv) Perhaps the most important point that this chapter makes is that if the OT is salvation history this implies that the believer must appropriate it and apply it as his history.

The final chapter occupies itself with the growth of the biblical tradition, the OT's own methods of re-interpreting itself and the defining of the OT canon. Much of this material is very unsatisfactory from a conservative viewpoint. However, the final section of the chapter concerns itself with the interpretation of the OT as Scripture in NT times and emphasises the importance of knowing the contemporary methods of Jewish exegesis when seeking to understand the way the NT writers use the OT. Sadly, however, as with most other students in this area, Goldingay does not appear to regard apostolic exegesis as normative for the modern church.

Consequently, the reader is left wondering how far he can follow the apostolic examples.

More satisfactory and useful are chapters 1,2 and 4. In the first Goldingay notes that OT and NT faith is a fundamental unity. Such differences as do exist must always be seen within the context of this broad similarity. This necessitates the conceptualisation of OT faith, i.e. the provision of an objective and descriptive theology of the OT which dogmatic theology is able to take up and re-express in contemporary categories. Goldingay notes, very properly, that, in this way, dogmatic theology is able to build upon biblical theology and not, as has so often been the case, impose its own concerns on the biblical data in such a way as to hinder the biblical categories from emerging. If the above approach is used, however, the OT can be truly authoritative and normative for the believer.

The form of OT theology should reflect the structure of OT faith and should eschew any attempt to find one central 'key' to interpretation (e.g. covenant). Rather, Goldingay says, "Understanding the OT resembles understanding a battle or person or appreciating a landscape, rather than understanding the layout of an architect-planned town No one solution to the problem of structuring an OT theology will illuminate the whole: a multiplicity of approaches will lead to a multiplicity of insights" (p28-29). The justification for this endeavour is that "to accept the OT as faith means accepting it for what it meant to its adherents in OT times" (p33).

What is the relation of the OT to the NT? OT and NT are joint witnesses to faith and are to be studied together without denying the integrity of the OT by over emphasis on the NT's role in interpreting it. Christ does help to illuminate the OT but, equally, the OT helps us to understand Christ and we must be open to its insights. Moreover, Goldingay emphasises that careful attention should be given on avoiding an over-emphasis on the distinctiveness of the two covenants or of underplaying the differences. Such differences as do exist are not due to OT error but to the place that they occupy within the whole and are intelligible in the wider context.

Perhaps the most valuable discussion in the whole book is the second chapter entitled 'The OT as a way of life'. Having isolated

five ways in which the OT shapes behaviour and the necessity of integrating each of these elements into a comprehensive OT ethics Goldingay proceeds to trace the relationship of such ethics to those living under the new covenant. While the NT emphasises that Christian ethics are above all connected with the receipt of the Spirit, yet, ambivalently, the NT also recognises the normativeness of OT law for the Christian. Rejecting the threefold division of the law as an altogether too blunt instrument, Goldingay argues that the OT itself indicates the ways in which its laws are to be understood and utilised. The OT imposes its own structure and order and the canonical context offers guidance on the inter-relationship of the commands. Indeed, OT ethics is rather like OT theology. Just as theology undergirds the text of the OT and ensures the authority and normativeness of the OT so it is with its ethics. The Christian ethicist's task is also similar to that of the dogmatician, viz. to re-interpret such principles so that the believer is given specific and contemporary applications of such principles.

Goldingay emphasises that the diversity of standards in the OT should not be seen as a problem since biblical ethics is in a constant tension between ideal and condescension due to hardness of heart. Christian ethics must learn from the OT and include both elements.

Finally, Goldingay notes that charges are sometimes made that OT ethics are limited since they reflect a different world view to that of modern man. He suggests that it is at these points in particular that contemporary man should listen most carefully to what the OT is saying.

Chapter 4 is concerned with the OT's witness to Christ (which, one might add, is often the only use evangelicals have for the OT). Looking first at narrative material, Goldingay investigates typological interpretation and notes that the following elements characterise it: Typology embodies a conviction that there is a fundamental analogy between different divine acts; it believes that parallel events occur throughout salvation history although more is realised at the end than was experienced at earlier stages; that there is a degree of analogy together with anticipation or contrast and that symbolism or structural affinity is believed to exist between the events.

Allegory, on the other hand, is concerned with words not events.

Typology is an approach to theology while allegory is an approach to interpretation. Goldingay says, "valid typology will then be limited to study which sees the Christ event as the ultimate event symbolised by the anticipatory types. Valid allegory will be biblical interpretation which understands a particular statement as an expression of truths found elsewhere in the Christian Bible, though not in the overt meaning of this particular statement" (p107).

The problem that both approaches have to face is whether or not the 'new' meaning of the text has been brought to the text or event by the interpreter or whether it unveils an extra meaning to a text of univocal meaning. In fact, the text should limit the interpretation and the potential meanings of the text. Properly accomplished the NT not only illuminates the OT but the reverse is also true. Indeed the interpretation of Jesus' ministry was understood and limited by the apostolic use of OT symbols.

Goldingay seems a little uncertain as to how typology and allegory may be validly controlled. Perhaps his unwillingness to regard apostolic exegesis as normative gives him difficulties. Nevertheless, he notes that the OT itself provides examples of such exegesis, especially in the prophetic re-interpretation of earlier material. Moreover, he makes the very important point that the whole of the OT (not a selection of it) is open to typological interpretation precisely because in this way it all becomes normative to the believer. Further, he warns that the excessive scope that is sometimes given to the approach that begins with the Christ event must be limited or else interpretation becomes circular and the authority of the OT text is seen to rest outside of the OT itself.

The last section of the chapter deals with the 'explicit forward look' of the OT and especially of the prophets. Goldingay emphasises that the promise-fulfilment motif runs throughout the OT which is a book of ever increasing anticipation and re-interpretation since "these prophecies stand as statements of the purpose of God, not random resolutions. They represent God's ultimate purpose and the principles they embody can be re-applied in the future" (p121). Though Goldingay seems to underplay the significance of predictive prophecy in the OT yet his main point stands.

We still await a thoroughly conservative, easily intelligible OT

hermeneutics which will guide us safely through the shoals of OT interpretation. However, despite its shortcomings this book does at least alert us to many of the issues and suggest the path that we must follow if we are to move ahead. It is also a salutary book since it shows that evangelicals have largely ignored the massive problems associated with the interpretation of the OT. This is especially galling since such work as has been done has been accomplished by those whose views on Scripture might have suggested to us that they would not be interested in the subject. If they have laboured in the field, how do we explain our complacency?

THE LITERATURE AND MEANING OF SCRIPTURE edited by Morris A. Inch and C. Hassell Bullock.

Published by Baker Book House. 303pp

PAUL'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT by E. Earle Ellis

Published by Baker Book House. 204pp

It is a not altogether unjustified criticism of conservative evangelicals that, while they have declaimed at length on the nature of Scripture, they have neglected the crucial question 'What does it mean?'

Awareness of this hermeneutical vacuum is, however, growing. Nowhere is this more apparent among the publishers than in the productions of Baker Book House. This is discernable in two ways. Firstly, Baker have been quick to reissue works that may not be familiar to evangelicals but which are essential reading in this field. The 'Twin Brooks' series of reprints which has for some time included John Bright's 'The Authority of the Old Testament' has now been extended to accommodate Ellis' 'Paul's Use of the Old Testament'. Secondly, new and relevant titles have been forthcoming. Last year Walter Kaiser's excellent 'Towards an exegetical Theology' and Henry Virkler's 'Hermeneutics' were published. These titles have been recently joined by 'The Literature and Meaning of Scripture' edited by Inch and Bullock. The last mentioned volume and Ellis' book are here under review.

Inch and Bullock's volume is an important one which has been written because of the authors' conviction that (a) attention to the correct interpretation of Scripture is essential among Bible believing Christians, and, (b) that there is a need to treat such study from within the scope of Biblical Theology rather than

Systematics. This latter emphasis, the book argues, brings into being a work "for which they (i.e. the authors) could find no precedent, and therefore no guideline" (p9). The writers express the hope that "we think it may break ground for additional publications" (p10), a sentiment which the reviewer would like to endorse.

The twelve chapters of the book are each contributed by past or present members of the staff at Wheaton College and are intended to approach the meaning of the Biblical text and the special hermeneutics involved by dealing, individually, with the variety of types of literature found in the Scriptures. All the major categories are discussed and from a conservative standpoint. Each chapter is divided, approximately equally, into two parts. The first part deals with the distinctive hermeneutical features of the material under discussion and the second to a commentary on a Biblical text in which the principles outlined in the earlier section are applied by way of illustration.

Contributions vary in quality and in detailed format. For example, Barabas' article on the Johannine literature concentrates on providing an outline reading list. By contrast, most of the other essays concentrate on articulating their own guidelines for interpretation. Both these approaches are necessary and the fact that this volume is unable to do so within its scope makes it necessarily preliminary. Some startling facts are mentioned, e.g. Bilezikian (on Apocalyptic) notes that commentaries are still written on Revelation without their authors having any knowledge of the wealth of extra-biblical apocalyptic texts which go so far in helping us to understand what John's readers would have made of his book! Such assertions should lead to some heart-searching among those who are so dogmatic on the interpretation of such material. Brevity is also a problem in the book since the general lucidness of the text is occasionally obscured by a theological shorthand which may make the reader unfamiliar with the ideas expressed struggle to work out what is being said. However, so many excellent suggestions are made throughout the book that a complete reading is recommended. This is an epoch-making book which ought to make the diligent reader more faithful in rightly dividing the word of truth.

Ellis' work is a more technical work, providing an exhaustive (and sometimes exhausting) treatment of Paul's use of the OT. It remains the standard textbook on the subject even though it was first

published in 1957. The topics covered are of fundamental importance not only to all interpreters of the Apostle but to all Christians who seek to study and expound the OT since the inspired interpretation of Paul must surely be the paradigm for all subsequent teachers. The first chapter majors on the subject of Paul's attitude to Scripture. This discussion is followed by a consideration and comparison of Paul's usage with that of contemporary Judaism and the other writings of the Apostolic Church. The final chapter draws together the various features of Paul's exegetical methodology in a seminal discussion of his topical emphases, typology, new covenant exegesis and the Apostle's adoption of a 'Midrash Peshar' interpretation of Scripture. The extensive indices (especially that which contains all the Biblical texts discussed in the body of the work) should make this volume one which is frequently consulted by those who are preaching Paul and those passages quoted from the OT in the NT. Properly used our preaching should be more Biblical and Christ-centred after consulting this book ... Can there be a greater commendation?

LOVE TO THE LOVELESS - THE STORY AND MESSAGE OF HOSEA

by Derek Kidner.

Published by the Inter-Varsity Press in the series 'The Bible Speaks Today'. 142pp. Paperback. £3.25

This is vintage, pithy Kidner at his fertile best! Commendation can be no greater than to suggest that this book is a happy sequel to the earlier volume in the series by Alec Motyer on Amos.

The exposition by Kidner sets out to be just that. It is not a commentary since its prime purpose is application. However, considerable exegetical endeavour lies behind the book and so regularly surfaces that many will probably feel that it is largely unnecessary to resort to more detailed commentary. Moreover, since the exposition is rooted in such thorough textual study, its message is both thoroughly contemporary and extensively 'bibline'. Thus the volume provides considerable guidance as to the how and what in all sermons and expositions of prophetic material and reclaims for God's people a relevant message in those Scriptures so often shrouded by eschatological and apocalyptic speculation.

Typically, the text abounds with the succinct phrases and sentences which so characterise Kidner's work, regularly suggesting an entire

sermon outline in a few words when others seem to require paragraphs and pages.

Perhaps a brief quotation from the Introduction will whet the appetite: "It is rather easy to grow up with a naive idea of God - something like a child's impression of the adult world The child's idea of his elders is a puzzled one. They make the rules (he says to himself) - there's power for you! And they have money, whatever they may say - there's freedom! What couldn't we do, we children, with all that freedom, all that power?

"In this book we see things not in these simplistic terms, where situations and people are uncomplicated and power is like a magic wand. Hosea introduces us to a family which is a miniature of our world - or rather, of the most enlightened part of the world of his own day. But it is a problem family, and God compares His situation not to that of an autocrat whose orders nobody dares question, nor of a father who rejoices in an adoring wife and children, but to that of a husband whose wife has left him, and a father whose children are like strangers in his own house and are fast destroying themselves.

"Where does omnipotence, where do instant solutions come into such a picture ... There is precious little exercise of power in such a story ..., for power would solve nothing. Instead, there is hurt, humiliation, waiting, personal approach and appeal, and, at last, mutual commitment. Cost, too; but mostly the cost of risking rebuff, reopening wounds, working at a difficult relationship and being determined that it shall last and grow." (p11-13).

So the summary of chapters 1-3.

Maps and an abridged survey lead to a final plea to the author: "Please, Mr Kidner, spend the rest of your retirement in further studies of this kind."

THE PRESENTATION OF THE GOSPEL AMONGST

HYPER-CALVINISTS: A CRITIQUE

Pastor Robert J. Sheehan BD

(Welwyn)

In our previous issue (May '82, Issue 8), Pastor Sheehan provided us with some historical background material to this subject with special reference to the writings of W.J. Styles and John Gill. We now publish his brief but helpful critique of the 'Hyper' position with regard to calling unbelievers to repentance and faith.

The writer is Pastor of Welwyn Evangelical Church, Hertfordshire.

Traditional Calvinists and Hyper-Calvinists are agreed that repentance and faith are gifts of God given to those in whom God is doing his work of Regeneration. However, there the agreement ends. The Hyper-Calvinist builds a superstructure on this truth drawing out what he believes to be its logical consequences. He argues that as repentance and faith are divine gifts for the regenerate:

(i) the unregenerate cannot be commanded to repent and believe

(ii) all Scriptural commands, exhortations and invitations to repent and believe must either be made to the regenerate or made in a context unconnected with spiritual salvation.

(iii) only those conscious of the Spirit's work within can heed the commands to repent and believe and only these should be directed to do so.

These conclusions were set out in detail in my previous article and now some response must be made.

Firstly, we ought to take great exception to the methodology of Hyper-Calvinism. It is fundamentally rationalistic. It takes certain truths from the teaching of Scripture and then builds up a system of theology on the basis of nothing more than human logic. Its method is exactly that of the Jehovah's Witness who begins with the Biblical truth that God is one and therefore logically deduces He cannot be three. Like the Jehovah's Witness, and all those ruled by a rationalistic hermeneutic, the Hyper-Calvinist does not ask

what the Scriptures teach as a whole but seeks to fit the teachings that do not comply with the truth he has grasped into a neat and logical system.

This preoccupation with logical systematisation leads the Hyper-Calvinist to ignore the possibility of antinomy or duality. Antinomy or duality is that situation that arises when two things that cannot logically be reconciled, or affirmed as true at the same time, are held in tension. Duality is a reality in physics: light is both viewed as waves and particles - an apparently contradictory duo. It is also present to a large extent in theology: God is one but three; Christ is human but divine; the kingdom of God is present but future. So with sovereignty and responsibility: repentance and faith are gifts of God, but man is responsible to repent and believe. This is precisely what Hyper-Calvinism denies but if it used its logic on other doctrines it would have to be unitarian or tritheistic, docetist or kenoticist.

The question that Hyper-Calvinists should have asked, but fails to is: Does the Scripture call on the unregenerate to repent and believe? If it does, then this truth must be held in tension with the fact that repentance and faith are gifts of God and consequences of regeneration. The Hyper-Calvinist, however, begins with his assumption from Scripture and fits the rest of the Scriptures into his logical superstructure accordingly.

Secondly, the Hyper-Calvinist attempt to make all Scriptural commands, exhortations and invitations addressed to the regenerate fails. As stated in the last article the Hyper-Calvinist makes a number of attacks on traditional Calvinism. He rejects the use of Old Testament commands and invitations as appropriate for the unregenerate because they were addressed to Israel, a covenant people. Most of the commands and invitations of the Gospels and much of Acts are dismissed in the same way. Israel is viewed as the backslidden people of God and is addressed as such. The normal unregenerate man does not stand in this relationship with God and therefore cannot be addressed as if he did.

At root the Hyper-Calvinist shows a gross misunderstanding of Israel. The Old Covenant made Israel a privileged people (Rom. 3: 1-2; 9: 1-5) with special responsibilities (Amos 3: 2). Her special privileges gave her special responsibilities but it did not mean that the people of Israel as a whole or even in the main were

regenerate. Indeed, the Scriptures suggest just the opposite! Not all Jews were true Jews (Rom.2:28-29) i.e. regenerate. Not all Israel is true Israel (Rom.9:6-7) i.e. regenerate. The implication of this is that the invitations and commands of the Old Testament which were addressed indiscriminately to the Jewish nation (e.g. Ezek.33:11) were addressed not to a regenerate people in a state of backsliding but to a privileged people who were, in spite of their privilege, unregenerate. Unless it can be proven from Scripture that every Jew from the time of Abraham to the fall of Jerusalem was regenerate then the commands to repentance and faith found in the Old Testament, Gospels and Acts were addressed to unregenerate people. If this is so the whole Hyper-Calvinist contention that only the regenerate can be so commanded collapses.

The Hyper-Calvinist attacks the traditional Calvinist because he uses commands and invitations found in the epistles in his preaching to the unregenerate. The Hyper-Calvinist argues that 2 Corinthians 5:20 is written in a letter addressed to a 'church' and 'saints' (2 Cor.1:1) and that it must, therefore, be a call to Christians to enter into the full privileges of reconciliation and not be an address to the unregenerate as these would not be called the 'church' or 'saints'.

Again the Hyper-Calvinist shows a failure to appreciate a basic principle of interpretation. In the Scriptures people are treated and regarded according to their profession of faith. It is only the profession of faith and the outward life that can be observed. It is beyond man to see the heart (1 Sam.16:7). On his profession of faith Simon Magus was baptised. His profession of faith is described in the same manner as that of others (Acts 8:12-13) and only subsequent events proved this believer's profession to be false (Acts 8:20-22).

In exactly the same way the churches of the New Testament are addressed according to their profession of faith and described in terms fitting for true believers. However, not all the members of those churches were regenerate, real saints. If they were then what do we do with the Corinthians? They are all described as 'the church' and 'sanctified' (1 Cor.1:2) but Paul must later shame them by asserting that some of them were devoid of the knowledge of God i.e. non-Christians (1 Cor.15:34). How appropriate that the non-Christian members of the church at Corinth should be exhorted to

be reconciled to God (2 Cor.5:20 along with any unbelievers at their meetings (1 Cor.14:23)!

It is evident that neither the Old nor the New Testament commands and invitations are limited to the regenerate. Christ Jesus came to call sinners to repentance (Matt.9:13) not the regenerate!

Thirdly, the Hyper-Calvinist attempt to argue that many of the references referred to by traditional Calvinists in their preaching to sinners are in fact nothing to do with salvation is erroneous. Styles may well argue (see the previous article) that the Spirit's strivings in the days of Noah, and Jonah's preaching in Ninevah were calls not to spiritual repentance resulting in spiritual life but calls for moral repentance to avoid merely temporal disasters but the Scriptures know of no such dichotomy. At the very least the Old Testament calls to repentance to avoid judgement are a prefiguring of the ultimate judgement and of the need for repentance unto salvation. Our Lord saw repentant Ninevites standing on the Day of Judgement in condemnation of the impenitent Jews (Matt.12:41). Peter saw a clear connection between the striving of the Spirit in Noah's day and Christian salvation (1 Pet.3:18-4:6). To argue that Ninevite repentance was not spiritual but merely national and that it has no eternal value is a gratuitous assumption.

Fourthly, the Hyper-Calvinist view of the reason why a person should repent and believe - because he sees the evidence of regeneration within himself and feels called of God - creates a deficient doctrine of Scripture.

Hyper-Calvinists often pride themselves on their 'careful' exegesis whereby they seek out the context of the invitations and commands and 'prove' that they are inapplicable to the unregenerate. In fact, Hyper-Calvinism is rooted in a low view of Scripture (albeit unconsciously) and a false dichotomy is established between the Word and the Spirit. The fact that the Scriptures command something is not enough. The sinner must wait until the Spirit applies the command to him and when the Spirit leads him then he believes that he has a part in the death of Christ. There is an incipient Barthianism in Hyper-Calvinism.

The prominent Hyper-Calvinist preacher, J.C.Philpot, explicitly

rejected that religion which required men to do something because the Bible told them to. He affirmed that only when the Spirit told him to do something would he do it.¹ Many charismatics would blush to say such a thing, but Philpot did not!

The sinner has to wait for God to act and speak: to act in regeneration and to give evidence of that act by giving a call to the sinner to repent and believe: a call not from the teaching of Scripture alone, but in addition to it, a personal call. It is an undeniable fact that many persons in Hyper-Calvinist congregations wait passively in their pews for decades and die leaving their relatives 'hopeful' but never sure of salvation.

Where Hyper-Calvinism does not create mere passivity it creates introspection: not the introspection of a person looking for growth in grace and conscious that if we sin we have an advocate (1 John 1:5-2:2) but the introspection of a person looking for the evidence of regeneration that will give him reason to believe in Christ for salvation. Whereas most 'isms' direct men to look at their works for their hope of salvation, Hyper-Calvinism calls for men to look at God's work in them for their grounds of believing they have salvation. Hyper-Calvinism, therefore, directs men away from looking to Christ and requires them to first look within. It causes men to ask whether they are thirsty enough, hungry enough, willing enough, to be saved and develops a doctrine of discovering whether one is made worthy enough to believe. While it boasts of free grace it prefaces the enjoyment of free grace with internal searchings. While it boasts of exalting God it in fact turns attention from the cross of Calvary to the heart of man, and in doing so it places its adherents in a great dilemma because only God knows the heart (Jer.17:9).

Fifthly, the bankruptcy of Hyper-Calvinism as a true reflection of Biblical thought is to be found in the exegesis of its advocates. Much of the exegesis of Styles is embarrassing because it is so obviously forced. Hyper-Calvinistic exegesis joins many others in declaring a truth that all theological traditions do well to take more notice of: the Scriptures are not to be forced to fit into a system. It is better to have the tension of antinomy than the 'clever' but unconvincing interpretation..

Reference

1. Letters and Memoir of J.C.Philpot. Baker Book House. p120

THE NEW HERMENEUTIC (Part 1)

Dr Eryl Davies

In case this title appears unduly technical and remote to some readers, I want to begin by underlining the importance and relevance of the subject for ourselves. Since 1950 there has been an 'explosion of interest in hermeneutics'¹ and scholars like A.C. Thiselton² and W.C.Kaiser³ rightly speak of "the hermeneutical debate". The debate was initiated by German scholars with ensuing American discussion by men like James M.Robinson, John Dillenger, Robert Funk and John Cobb. Evangelicals have not really been involved in this debate but the time is 'long past', warns an American Evangelical, Walter Kaiser, "for our entry into this field once again".⁴ James Packer makes a similar point and speaks of Evangelicals as remaining "on the edge of the modern Protestant debate about Holy Scripture".⁵ This on-going hermeneutical debate centering on the nature of language and the fusion of word and hearer presents an enormous challenge to us as Evangelicals.

A second reason for discussing the subject here is the fact that the New Hermeneutic is "the most serious rival"⁶ today to our own grammatico-historical method for interpreting the Bible. While our own method carefully exegetes the text and establishes its meaning in the light of the writer's original intention, the New Hermeneutic has very different goals and threatens to eclipse our method even amongst Evangelicals. We must be alert to what is happening in contemporary theology in order at the same time to improve our own hermeneutics.

Another reason for studying the subject is the re-orientation of much contemporary theology in the direction of the New Hermeneutic. Ebeling, for example, claims that "the question of hermeneutic forms the focal point of the theological problems of today".⁷ For Old and New Testament studies, church history, systematic and practical theology as well as missiology 'the hermeneutical problem', he adds, "proves to be of fundamental significance".⁸ James Robinson is right in affirming that "the New Hermeneutic is a new theology ..."⁹

Fundamental issues then are at stake and we need to be aware of these issues while refusing, in D.A.Carson's words, to "worship

at their shrine". ¹⁰

ORIGINS OF THE NEW HERMENEUTIC

In this contemporary debate the term 'hermeneutics' is being used and defined in many different ways and "appears to exhibit elastic properties" ¹¹ and is "skidding around on an increasingly broad semantic field".¹² For Ebeling the words 'hermeneutics' and 'interpretation' are interchangeable ¹³ and the etymology of the Greek noun 'hermeneia' supports Ebeling's definition of the term. "The etymological origin of hermeneuein and its derivatives is contested", adds Ebeling, "but it points in the direction of roots with the meaning 'speak', 'say'" ¹⁴ As we shall see later, this conclusion is useful in confirming Ebeling and Fuchs in their distinctive view of language as 'event'. They both understand hermeneutics as an account of the way in which God's Word becomes an event time and time again in the realm of our human language; in other words, a fresh linguistic occurrence of the word takes place, particularly in the sermon.

Before we describe this position in greater detail, it will be helpful to trace briefly the background and development of this New Hermeneutic.

The leading exponents of this school are Ernst Fuchs and Gerhard Ebeling but the roots of the New Hermeneutic go back to the German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) whose 'Copernican' revolution altered radically the direction of philosophy and theology by removing, for example, Christian doctrines from the spheres of history and philosophy and unleashing and popularising philosophies such as scepticism, subjectivism and nihilism. Under strong Kantian influence, the work of Schleiermacher (1768-1834) "constitutes a turning point in the history of hermeneutics" ¹⁵ with his crucial distinction between the linguistic and psychological aspects of interpreting the biblical text. Ebeling and Fuchs accept as a major premise Schleiermacher's principle that a pre-condition for the proper understanding of a biblical or secular text is the recognition of the 'historicality' (a term we'll explain more fully later) both of the original author and the contemporary interpreter. Bultmann also incorporated this principle into his account of Vorverstandnis.

Another major influence on the New Hermeneutic has been Wilhelm

48.

Dilthey (1833-1911) and his account of historical understanding in which he denied the possibility of a 'scientific', 'objective' understanding of history. For Dilthey, man in the totality of his being, including the emotions and volition as well as mind, forms the subject-matter of history. There is a close affinity of thought between Dilthey and Bultmann. Both are heavily influenced by Kant and are primarily concerned with 'life' and the present significance of history. This is significant if only for the reason that Bultmann leaned heavily on Heidegger's philosophy so that Dilthey's account of historical understanding must be regarded as another major turning point in the history of hermeneutics. Heidegger, too, described by John Macquarrie as "among the greatest and most creative philosophers of the twentieth century"¹⁶ has had a profound influence upon the development of the New Hermeneutic. Rudolph Bultmann, for example, acknowledges that "Heidegger's analysis of existence has become for me fruitful for hermeneutics"¹⁷ while Heidegger's category of 'worldhood' is basic to Fuchs' description of hermeneutics.

A.C. Thiselton in his valuable work entitled, 'The Two Horizons'¹⁸ justifiably claims that Hans-Georg Gadamer "stands as a key figure in the area of hermeneutics". Gadamer's four volume work on the subject has been described by one critic as "the most substantial treatise on hermeneutic theory that has come from Germany this century".¹⁹ Gadamer accepts some basic ideas from Heidegger but expresses them more clearly and orderly. Formerly a pupil of both Heidegger and Bultmann, Gadamer goes beyond his teachers and even Dilthey by grounding hermeneutics more firmly in language rather than in existentialism or subjectivism. He argues that language and understanding are inseparable and that hermeneutics, consequently, is concerned with the relationship between thought and language. It is important to remember that the New Hermeneutic of Fuchs and Ebeling rests on a theory of language advocated by Gadamer and, earlier, by Heidegger.

One final stage in the development of the New Hermeneutic must now be mentioned, namely, the theology of the German New Testament scholar, Rudolf Bultmann, who in turn was greatly influenced by neo-Kantian thought and the philosophy of Heidegger as well as by the history of religious school, liberal and then the dialectical theology of Karl Barth. While, with reservations, Fuchs and Ebeling accept the validity of Bultmann's historical-critical method as

one pre-condition of interpreting the New Testament, they nevertheless disagree radically with Bultmann whose aim throughout is to reach beyond the mythological language to the authentic understanding which lies beyond the language. For Fuchs and Eberling the most important question in hermeneutics is, how do I come to understand? Their answer is that there can be no understanding or reality for us outside of our language, for "language ... makes Being into an event".²⁰ We will now try to describe this view in relation to hermeneutics.

FEATURES OF THE NEW HERMENEUTIC

"For the student brought up on traditional heremeneutics", writes D.A.Carson, "the 'new hermeneutic' is an extremely difficult subject to get hold of. The writings of Gadamer, Fuchs, Eberling and others are not easy, even in English translation; and many of their essays have not been translated".²¹ With this warning in view, I intend to simplify the teaching of the New Hermeneutic in as competent a way as possible and avoid undue technicalities.

According to the New Hermeneutic, the problem of hermeneutics extends beyond the text to the interpreter. For this reason it is claimed that the traditional approach is unbalanced and superficial. While we live in the last quarter of the twentieth century, the New Testament writers, we are reminded, lived and wrote in the first century. There exists, therefore, a temporal and cultural distance between the text and the interpreter which has to be overcome before the text can speak afresh to us. How, according to the New Hermeneutic, should we proceed to bridge the gap of 'historical distance'? This is the question we will now seek to answer as we describe the main features of the New Hermeneutic.

A. One necessary preparation is the critical analysis of the text

Confirming Bultmann's approach, Ernst Fuchs declares, "there is no objection to the historical method" for it "may establish what things were once like".²² Gerhard Eberling sees it as "the foundation of the Church's exposition of Scripture"²³ while, Walter Wink, another exponent of the New Hermeneutic, views the critical method as a 'key function' in obtaining an adequate level of objectivity in hermeneutics. Wink, however, is also critical of this method. First of all he complains that the critical method has "reduced the Bible to a dead letter"²⁴ and, secondly, it fails to help people

with their real, everyday problems.²⁵ Furthermore, scholars using the method tend to ask the wrong questions of the text; the correct approach, Wink argues, is to ask those questions which the text demands.²⁶ Finally, they tend to forget that their critical, textual work is only the first step towards an understanding of the text. Ebeling emphasises that the text must 'live' for us rather than remain a dead relic of the past. Another reason for the more limited role of the historical critical method within the New Hermeneutic arises from the philosophies of Gadamer and Heidegger, namely, that the text should never become a mere object of analysis in which the interpreter interrogates the text. Fuchs, for example, writes, "the truth has us ourselves as its object the texts must translate us before we can translate them".²⁷

Fuchs, Ebeling and others within the New Hermeneutic are not Evangelicals! They embrace the assumptions and aims of the historical, critical method yet rightly seeing its bankruptcy and failure to make the biblical text 'live' for ordinary people. Nevertheless this method remains for them a useful and necessary preparation for understanding the text.

If this is only a beginning, what, according to the New Hermeneutic, is the next stage in the process of understanding the New Testament text?

B. Without 'common ground' between the text and the interpreter no understanding of the text is possible

Bultmann describes this as 'pre-understanding' (Vorverstandnis) and Fuchs calls it Einverstandnis ('agreement' or 'common understanding'). Without this, claims Fuchs, the understanding of a text is impossible. He illustrates it by reference to a close family unit where the parents and the children have basic experiences, attitudes and assumptions in common. The family shares a common language in which even a gesture such as a smile or frown or the shrug of a shoulder can communicate effectively. Gadamer uses the illustration of children and lovers who have "their language by which they communicate with each other in a world that belongs to them alone. This is ... because a linguistic habit has grown up between them. A common world ... is always the presupposition of language".²⁸

An even better example is the parabolic method as used by our Lord.

The success of our Lord's parables, according to Fuchs, was due to the fact that he created and entered a 'world' which he shared with his hearers. He insists that it was not the purpose of the parables to convey an idea or truth but rather to challenge and disturb the interpreter by the creative word. For example, in reference to the parable of the vineyard workers in Matthew 20:1-16, he writes: "we too share the inevitable reaction of the first. The first see that the last receive a whole day's wage, and naturally they hope for a higher rate for themselves". However a shock awaits them: "in fact they receive the same ... It seems to them that the Lord's action is unjust". In his challenge to these workers, Jesus "singles out the individual and grasps him deep down" and in this way they have been brought into an event or engagement with Jesus which in turn "effects and demands our decision".²⁹ Here is a creative language event.

We must now mention a related technical term, the hermeneutical circle. While it has been described as "an unfortunate"³⁰ term it is used in at least two ways to refer either to the process of questioning the text or to the principle that understanding a group of words depends on understanding its individual words and vice versa. Here the term is used in the first sense of questioning the text. As the interpreter puts questions to the text, questions which are conditioned by his own historical, cultural and psychological characteristics, he is himself affected and changed in his approach by the text's answers. Consequently his next set of questions will be different as will be the answers and questions provided by the text. Here, then, is the 'hermeneutical circle'. Accordingly the interpreter acknowledges there is a 'distance' between himself and the text and he tries to reach a fusion of worlds or a 'merging of horizons'; this merging or fusion of worlds solves the problem of historical distance and ought to be the main hermeneutical goal.

What are the implications of the circularity for hermeneutics?

1. According to the New Hermeneutic, one never arrives at a final, complete understanding of a text for interpretation is a process which continues indefinitely. No objective meaning is available in the text so that interpretation is always an on-going, open-ended process characterised by repeated language-events between text and interpreter in which the meaning 'occurs'.

2. The principle of the hermeneutical circle also stresses man's 'historicality', that is, man's place in history. While Gadamer speaks of the interpreter standing within an historical tradition which provides him with assumptions and value-judgements, Heidegger insists that we see objects from our own ego-centric perspective.³¹

3. Again, for the New Hermeneutic the meaning of any historical text cannot be restricted to the intended meaning of the original writer.

C. The next step in understanding the New Testament, according to Fuchs, is listening in "receptive silence and openness to the text"³²

After "active critical scrutiny" of the text, writes Fuchs, the interpreter "must wait for God or Being to speak in the tranquility of faith where noise is reduced to silence, a VOICE is heard ..."³³

This is a notion Fuchs borrowed from Heidegger who taught that there must be an alert openness to Being and even a whole lifetime of waiting when we interpret a text. Is this attitude of silence and openness an expression of submission to God and His Word? No, for it has to do rather with Heidegger's pre-occupation with language. But why is language so important for Heidegger, Gadamer, Fuchs and Ebeling? Heidegger tells us that language is the 'house' or 'custodian' of Being so the interpreter's job is to find the "place where Being can come to speech for us".³⁴ Similarly for Fuchs and Ebeling language has primarily a performative role rather than a means of conveying information. "We do not get at the nature of words by asking what they contain", writes Ebeling, "but by asking what they effect, what they set going ..."³⁵ Gadamer gives his now famous illustration of interpreting legal texts.³⁶ Obviously the lawyer must be familiar with the original legal text which bears upon his case but his appeal to the text has the aim of making the text 'speak' to the particular law-case in court. In this way there is an interaction in which eventually the texts bring their verdicts upon the court case. "Understanding the text", affirms Gadamer, "is always already applying it".³⁷ Such application is essential to the experience of understanding a text, for understanding and meaning always operate at the level of interaction and practical concern.

D. After these preliminary steps there occurs between the text

and interpreter a 'merging of horizons'

Fuchs prefers to call this merging a 'language-event' which is equivalent to Ebeling's 'word-event'. What is meant by this? As the respective horizons of the text and interpreter are gradually shared, a common understanding emerges and a deep interaction occurs between them affecting the interpreter's thinking and questioning in a disturbing and unexpected manner. It is in this way that the words of the text become a language-event and the interpreter is thus challenged in relation to 'authentic human existence'. This is the ultimate aim of hermeneutics and it is at this moment that the 'meaning' of the text 'occurs'.

In the next article we will consider the weaknesses and challenge of the New Hermeneutic.

REFERENCES

1. D.A.Carson, Themelios, p12, Vol.5, No.2
2. The Two Horizons, p25, Paternoster, 1980
3. Inerrancy, p117 (ed.N.L.Geisler), Zondervan, 1979
4. ibid
5. Themelios, p3, Vol.1, No.1
6. ibid
7. Word and Faith, p27, SCM, 1963
8. ibid, p28
9. New Frontiers in Theology, Vol.1, p67, Harper & Row, 1964
10. op cit, p21
11. Explorations in Theology, C.F.Evans, Vol.2, p69, SCM, 1977
12. D.A.Carson, op cit, p14
13. Word and Faith, p321 and Is 'Holy Scripture' Christian? p33, SCM, 1971
14. Quoted by James Robinson in New Frontiers in Theology: Vol.1, p3.
15. quoted from the writings of Heruz Kimmerle by A.C.Thiselton in New Testament Interpretation, p310, Paternoster
16. Martin Heidegger, p1, Lutterworth, 1968
17. The Theology of Rudolf Bultmann, C.W.Kegley (ed), p275, SCM, 1966
18. op cit, p25
19. Validity in Interpretation, E.D.Hirsch, p245, Yale University Press, 1967

Volumes 1-3 of Gadamer's four volume Kleine Schriften have

- been partly translated into English and published by the University of California Press (1976) under the title, Philosophical Hermeneutics.
20. Studies in the Historical Jesus, E.Fuchs, p207, SCM, 1964
 21. Themelios, Vol.5, No.2, p14. Similar statements by other scholars are to be seen, for example, in Explorations in Theology, Vol.2, C.F.Evans, p79 and Existentialism from Within, E.L.Allan, pp2 & 40, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953
 22. Studies in the Historical Jesus, p194
 23. Word and Faith, p32
 24. The Bible in Human Transformation, p4, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1973
 25. ibid, p6
 26. ibid, pp6-15
 27. Quoted by A.C.Thiselton in New Testament Interpretation, Paternoster, p313
 28. Truth and Method, p367, Sheed and Word, 1975
 29. Studies in the Historical Jesus, pp33-37
 30. The Two Horizons, A.C.Thiselton, p104
 31. Being and Time, pp95-102
 32. Studies in the Historical Jesus, p192
 33. ibid
 34. On the Way to Language, p85, Harper & Row, New York, 1971
 35. The Nature of Faith, p187
 36. Truth and Method, pp289-305
 37. ibid, p291

COMMUNICATING CHRIST CROSS-CULTURALLY

by David J. Hesselgrave

Zondervan 1978 Paperback 511pp. £6.00

In modern Britain alien cultures freely co-exist with those of the native British. That there are areas of misunderstanding and suspicion is evident from the recent spate of riots, which have been partly racial, as well as frequent newspaper reports of friction. Since the gospel is relevant to all men it is the responsibility of all Christians to consider how this may best be proclaimed to them. It is no longer sufficient, if ever it was, merely to preach the Word in the context of our own particular Western culture. For any who cling to that assumption here is a book both to challenge and to stimulate.

Professor Hesselgrave's book is the "ripe fruit of many years as a working missionary and now a decade and a half as a scholar in the study and in the classroom" we are informed in the Foreword. The book is aimed at the missionary, more particularly the North American missionary. The main emphasis naturally falls on situations to be met with on foreign soil. The author has clearly made a deep study of the science of communications, and it is from this perspective that the arguments of the book are developed.

There are nine major Parts, each of several chapters. In Part I the scene is set with a discussion of Communication and Mission. The basic jargon of the science is introduced and explained with the aid of diagrams (e.g. 'source' corresponding to speaker; 'respondent' corresponding to audience; 'encoding' corresponding to the transmitter of electronics; 'decoding' corresponding to the electronic receiver). Part II Communication and Culture is an analysis of the nature of 'culture' of a society and the implications for the missionary. The remaining seven Parts of the book are a further detailed analysis of culture under the aspects: world views, i.e. ways of perceiving the world; cognitive processes i.e. ways of thinking; linguistic forms, i.e. ways of expressing ideas; behavioural patterns, i.e. ways of acting; social structures, i.e. ways of interacting; media influence, i.e. ways of channelling the message; motivational resources, i.e. ways of deciding.

There are useful chapters in the book on such items as contextualisation, the vital importance of language, and the relative values of radio, TV, visual aids etc. in gospel presentation. Several of the issues handled are controversial (e.g. group conversions pp445/6).

Generally the chapters are fairly short and most are fairly easy to follow, though some in the technical realms (psychology, sociology) are occasionally hard-going. At the end of each Part there is a conclusion, problems for study and discussion, and a list of selected readings. Notes on the text are recorded at the end of the book. There are Indexes for Persons, Places and Peoples of the World, Subjects, and Scripture References.

Professor Hesselgrave's evangelical conservatism appears in statements like: "We should not overlook the fact that the authority for our message rests in the Word of God as it was written in the

autographs of the Old and New Testaments..."(p397). Again, he points out that the congregation to which Edwards preached his powerful 'Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God' was different from that in modern America, and suggests that adaptation is necessary. He continues: "But compromise is not called for! And it is compromise or worse that occasions the almost total lack of preaching on topics like judgement, hell and repentance today The valid reason for preaching about hell has never been to frighten people but to deliver the whole counsel of God!" (p426).

However, at certain points this reviewer was left dissatisfied. For example, in chapter 4 'Perspectives from the science of communication' it is contended that: "'the message' never exists in the sense of having an independent existence. Its existence is in the source, in the encoded form, perceived by the respondent and decoded by the respondent. Much misunderstanding would be averted if we could but grasp the truth that in a very real sense messages are in human beings - in sources and receptors - not in words or pictures or acts" (p29). (Emphasis is mine).

This basic point is developed in the context of man to man communication throughout the remainder of the book, with great cogency. However, its development in the context of God to man communication is almost nil. Scripture is God's message to man in words. The Law was written by God Himself on tablets of stone - in what sense was that message "in human beings"? Surely Professor Hesselgrave would agree that the Lord Jesus Christ, the supreme revelation of God to man, was more than merely a message 'in a human being'; did He not also exist independently prior to incarnation? The whole question raised is not trivial: can the analysis of communications presented here be accommodated to Biblical teaching on revelation?

A second example is that in dealing with concrete relational thinkers (e.g. Chinese) the following quotation is used from Hajime Nakamura: "We can see a distinctive feature of the Chinese way of thinking, i.e. the true way is not to be obtained by words - not through universal propositions - but only through concrete experience" (p225). Yet later we find the statement by Professor Hesselgrave himself: "Experiences are usually capable of more than one interpretation" (p230). So it is rather strange to find him

suggesting the communicator should: "make full use of legitimate visual forms ... the potential inherent in drama and ritual" (p232) Though this may be a legitimate option from the perspective of communications science, we enquire as to its Biblical warrant? To the Galatians Paul wrote: "... before (your) eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth crucified among you" (Gal.3:1) and he is referring to the "hearing of faith". Paul preached the Word. To the Corinthians he wrote: "... it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe" (1 Cor.1:21). Where in the New Testament do we find evidence that they used other methods of communicating the gospel? Do we imagine the Lord did not cater for concrete relational thinkers in His appointed means of proclamation? Surely our fundamental need is to know the same abundance of power as the apostles and others in revival times, and not a resort to communication methodology, much less indulgence in theatrical performances?

On page 421 Professor Hesselgrave states the Biblical position: "Neither fact nor feeling, logic nor enthusiasm, can constitute the sine qua non of repentance and faith The Holy Spirit must convict (elengchein) (John 16:8)! The Word must be heard (Romans 10:17)!" However, nerve later fails him as we read: "It is one thing to appeal to men to repent, believe the gospel, and 'grow up in all aspects into Him, who is the head, even Christ' (Eph.4: 15). However, it is quite another thing to succeed in getting them to do it. The decision is theirs." (p444 emphasis mine). One cannot but sympathise with him in grappling with the issues, but because his procedure is scientific rather than Biblical, with his foundation ill-laid, the building is somewhat disproportionate.

With these qualifications, this book has much to say to ministers and missionaries, and we ought not to neglect to listen carefully. All who desire to know more about the peoples, races and cultures of the world will benefit from reading this book. There is a good deal of useful information and many stimulating insights. The layout permits easy use for reference with culture-related problems. It will not present solutions to them, but it might often help in understanding. In one pithy sentence Professor Hesselgrave makes the point: "An ounce of understanding is worth a pound of recrimination" (p227). Another arresting sentence to more bilious effect is on page 147: "But most naturalists perceive pulpit pounding as being the preacher's proxy for a penetrating pondering of profound

problems." Are all alliterations artful?

Keith Morris BSc (Hons) G.Cert.Ed
London Theological Seminary

A review of the Anglican Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC VI) will appear in the next issue.

The personal views of writers are not
necessarily endorsed by the B.E.C.

Readers wanting information about the aims,
activities and Doctrinal Basis of the B.E.C.
should contact the General Secretary

Rev. Alan Gibson BD
PO BOX 132
ST ALBANS AL1 4SX
Herts

ISSN 0144-378X