

EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 9

Volume 9 • Number 2 • April 1985

Evangelical Review of Theology

*Articles and book reviews, original and reprints,
from publications worldwide for an international
readership interpreting the Christian faith for
contemporary living.*

GENERAL EDITOR: BRUCE J. NICHOLLS



Published by
THE PATERNOSTER PRESS



for
WORLD EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP
Theological Commission p. 100

ISSN: 0144-8153
Vol. 9 No. 2 April-June 1985

Copyright © 1985 World Evangelical Fellowship

Editorial Address:

The *Evangelical Review of Theology* is published in January, April, July and October by The Paternoster Press, Paternoster House, 3 Mount Radford Crescent, Exeter, UK, EX2 4JW, on behalf of the World Evangelical Fellowship Theological Commission, 105 Savitri Building, Greater Kailash-II, New Delhi-110048, India.

General Editor:

Bruce J. Nicholls

Assistants to the Editor:

Moti Lal Pandit, Solomon Samuel, Sunand Sumithra,
Kathleen Nicholls

Committee:

(The Executive Committee of the WEF Theological Commission)
David Gitari (Chairman), Wilson Chow (Vice-Chairman),
Edmund Clowney, Jorgen Glenthoj, Peter Kuzmic,
Michael Nazir-Ali, Antonio Nunez

Editorial Policy:

The articles in *The Evangelical Review of Theology* are the opinion of the authors and reviewers and do not necessarily represent those of the Editor or Publisher.

The Editor welcomes recommendations of original or published articles and book reviews for inclusion in the ERT. Please send clear copies or details to the Editor, WEF Theological Commission, 105 Savitri Building, Greater Kailash-II, New Delhi-110048, India. p. 103

Editorial Captivity to the Context

Evangelicals are critical of other theologians, especially those of the Liberation Theology school, who do theology by reflecting on praxis in the light of faith, without realising that they themselves often follow similar hermeneutical methods. Their strong commitment to mission and evangelism often leads them to shape their theology by immediate issues of the context. For example, the return of the Jews to Palestine, the formation of the State of Israel and the potential destruction of the world by nuclear war, become plausible starting points for putting together in a neat jigsaw, proof-texts of the coming End-time. Such events may be 'signs' of the times, but they cannot be our starting point. An exact and Spirit-given objectivity in exegesis of prophetic passages in the Old and New Testament, and an understanding of the relationship between themes such as 'Israel', 'the Kingdom of God' and 'salvation history' must be the framework for our belief and action. Evangelicals often reflect the *now* generation which is short on history, and they allow anthropological and sociological insights to overshadow faithful exposition of the Word of God. This in no way weakens the sense of urgency that the Lord will return to establish his reign on earth at a moment when men least expect it, but it will caution us not to ask 'Lord, are you at this time going to restore the Kingdom to Israel?' Issues concerning the relationship of prophecy to modern Israel will be one major issue to be explored in future issues of the *Evangelical Review of Theology*. The review of Colin Chapman's *Whose Promised Land?* opens up the field.

Another example of captivity to the context and past traditions is debated in E. A. Judge's illuminating study of Paul's repudiation of the value systems and practices in the Hellenistic education of his day. He argues that Paul sets forth a radically different set of values and patterns for human relationship in acquiring knowledge and wisdom. Christian education and especially theological education, whether of east or west, is all obviously captive to western, Greek and secular traditions in education. This call is for a radical return to biblical foundations. The same captivity applies to issues concerning both the breakdown of marriage and women's rights, also discussed in this number of the *Review*. The editor invites articles, original and reprints, responding to these issues. [p. 104](#)

Christ's Victory and Ours Easter Day 'He Has Risen'—Mark 16:6

Raymond Abba

Reprinted from Expository Times, April 1984 with permission

We celebrate today the greatest festival of the Christian church, the central fact of the gospel, the most stupendous event of all time—the Resurrection of Christ. No event in the NT is better attested; none is more significant. It underlies all our records and is presupposed by every writer. It is not an after-thought added as a kind of postscript to the Christian message to give it a happy ending, as H. G. Wells suggested; it is central in it.

The theme of the apostolic preaching was not just a crucified Saviour but a risen Lord. The central act of Christian worship, the Lord's Supper, was not just remembrance of a dead Jesus; it was communion with the risen, glorified Christ. Our gospels would never have been written unless the evangelists had been able to complete them with the account of the Resurrection. Its evidence is not just an empty tomb but the rise and progress of the Christian church, which is inexplicable without it.

The story of the Resurrection is the story of a sheer miracle. No merely natural categories are adequate to explain it. It is nothing less than a mighty act of God himself, conquering death and bringing life and immortality to light. But the miracle of the Resurrection has ceased to arouse wonder today, because men and women no longer realize what it really means. It is not that evidence is any less clear or convincing, but rather that it is made meaningless by the fact that few people today really believe in death in the biblical sense of the word.

The father of a Russian boy, Kostya, was dying. Kostya, greatly troubled, asks his friend: 'What d'you think about death?' 'What should one think about it?' is the reply. 'In the first place, I hope not to die at all. There will be some invention or other against it. But if I've got to die, I shall just die.' There you have the typical materialist attitude to death: delay the evil day as long as possible; refuse to reckon with it; but if it should perchance overtake you, then accept it and don't whimper. Death in this case is the end: man is snuffed out like a candle and ceases to be. Well, if that is all you believe about death, all talk about the Resurrection becomes a flabby and sentimental irrelevance: such a thing is clearly impossible, so why perpetuate a meaningless and misleading myth? [p. 105](#)

Many, however, will react against such materialism, as indeed Kostya himself did. 'It is quite a different matter', he observes, 'when someone dies who is near to me, as for instance my father now. I simply cannot stand at his bedside and reflect that this is just matter resolving into its components, that it is just that kind of process.' No; but such an attitude may lead to an equally inadequate view of death—the idea that the body perishes but the soul survives. That is the popular view of death today. It is, of course, the essence of spiritualism. But if that is so, the Resurrection becomes a mere commonplace: Christ only 'survived' death as do all men; so why the Easter celebration?

Death as the Bible speaks of it is something quite different. It is, as Dr. Marsh has put it, 'the final spiritual crisis, the last "day" of decision, the last opportunity. It is the acutest form of the question whether we will have God or no ... whether we will live with God, which is heaven, or without him, which is hell.' But, as Marsh points out, 'Death's tragedy is that we are not entirely free to choose, but are bound by the whole chain of our decisions throughout our life.'

Apart then from the mercy of God, death for every man and woman must mean final separation from God, for all have sinned and everyone is bound by the chain of his sin, so that in this last great crisis he cannot of himself choose to have God. This is the background against which the Resurrection must be seen if it is to have real meaning for us today, and seen against this background it means three things.

In the first place, it means that Christ has conquered death *in this sense of the word*. He tasted death for us all; that is, he really experienced this final spiritual crisis as unredeemed man must experience it—as a final and awful separation from God. But the miracle of the Resurrection is seen in the fact that this final state of alienation from God was *not* final for Christ: he rose! The Resurrection was no mere resuscitation of a corpse; nor was it the survival of bodily death by the soul of Christ. It was nothing less than a triumph—the triumph of God himself—over the powers of darkness that enslave the will of men and women and finally alienate them from the face of God.

In the cemetery at Colombo there is a hall where the Buddhist funeral rites take place, and on one of its walls is a picture of a human skeleton. For the Buddhist, life is transient and meaningless. The less a man possesses, the less there is for death, the thief of life, to rob him of. But in the cemetery there is also a hall where Christians bring their dead; and on the wall is an empty cross. The human skeleton is the symbol of death's victory; the cross is the symbol of death's defeat.

Secondly, the Resurrection means that you and I may share in the [p. 106](#) victory of the risen Christ. It is gospel—good news—not just fact. Christ's triumph avails for all men: it belongs supremely to those who are 'in Christ', who have so identified themselves by faith with him that they have died to sin and been raised with him to newness of life.

Man, the natural man, is a sinner; and a sinner he must die in the fullest biblical sense of that awful word. It is because the gift of God is eternal life, offered to him in and through Christ, that he can share in the triumph of Easter Day. 'If', says Dr. Weatherhead, 'you had visited a sick person until he became so weak that he could not raise a hand, let alone his head from the pillow, and if you had then seen him sit up in bed, and watched his face shine suddenly with a radiance not of this world, and heard him call to—I should say *respond* to—a dear one who had died a score of years before; if, then, with a look of calm triumph and unspeakable happiness on his face, the patient had fallen back dead, with the name of that dear one still echoing through the silent death-chamber, then, like me, in your heart you would want no further argument.'

Thirdly, the triumphant resurrection life of Christ is something which is given to us here and now. What this can mean for life in this world is graphically portrayed in the story of an American airman who was shot down and landed in the sea close to a South Sea Island, where he attempted to hide in the bushes. But he was found by the natives and lovingly cared for while his injuries healed. In an interview with the chief, he was told that in this island, where he would once have been boiled and eaten, there had not been a murder during the chief's lifetime. There was no gaol, no poverty, no drunkenness, no divorce, no brothel, and practically no disease. When the airman asked the reason for this extraordinary state of affairs, the chief gave him a reproachful look. 'You ought to know', he said. 'Your ancestors sent us missionaries. We are Christians. *We have taken Christ seriously.*'

When will we in this troubled, confused, frightened, materialistic Western world take Christ seriously? We did once. Will you, on this Easter Sunday morning, resolve to take Christ seriously? Only then will you experience the power of his victorious resurrection life.

Rev. Dr. Raymond Abba ministers in Melbourne, Australia [p. 107](#)

Are There Apostles Today?

Hywel Jones

Reprinted from Foundations, Issue No. 13, Autumn 1984 with permission

The Spirit's gifts of 'apostles' and 'prophets' are claimed by many Christians to be post-Pentecostal gifts to the Church. This article examines the biblical basis of the claim for a third level of apostleship. The implications of this claim for the nature of authority in the Church are of great importance, especially in Africa with the emergence of the Independent Church movement. The editor welcomes further articles on this issue.

(Editor)

It is a widely known fact that the term 'apostle' is not used exclusively of 'the Twelve' in the New Testament ([Romans 16:7](#)). That is not to be wondered at for the term represents a common enough reality and concept in the first century, meaning 'to be sent from another as his representative'. However, it is to be realised and remembered that not all 'apostles' are 'sent ones' in the same sense, nor are they all of a single kind. It is important to ask and to note in each case who did the sending and how or in what circumstances people were sent. Attention should also be paid as to why or on what mission they were sent. When this is done, we see that the Lord Jesus was sent personally by His Father; 'the Twelve' were sent personally by the Lord (and there are obvious differences between the Lord and 'the Twelve', together with their respective tasks); Barnabas and Epaphroditus were sent by the churches of Antioch and Philippi respectively, as were others by other churches, for example, the messengers of the church at Corinth ([2 Cor. 8:23](#)), and there are yet others who are termed 'sent ones', though who sent them, how and why they were sent is not specified in the New Testament. In studying the subject of apostleship, and doing so particularly in the present climate of deep disagreement, it is so important to make these distinctions. Otherwise, confusion will become worse confounded. An example of the importance of this procedure is in [1 Thessalonians 2:6](#), where Paul, Silas and Timothy are described as 'apostles of Christ'. There are differences to be noted here between the three mentioned in terms of their being sent.

However, even when this kind of discrimination characterises our study of the New Testament, not only is the disagreement over 'apostles today' not resolved, but conflict continues and even intensifies. This is chiefly because the real crux of the debate is not focussed [p. 108](#) on with precision, let alone examined. For example, it is possible for someone who studies the New Testament on this matter to arrive at the following framework for the uses of the term apostle in those sacred writings, namely, the Lord Himself, 'the Twelve', and a group of church-commissioned evangelists, missionaries or inter-church messengers. Now, such an outline has no obvious point of contact with that emphasis on apostles and apostolic ministry which is so characteristic of the contemporary Charismatic movement broadly considered. This is because the crux of the conflict is not touched on. Where does it lie? It is to be found in two matters which, though they are capable of being distinguished for the purposes of teaching and study, become closely inter-related in the case which is presented in favour of 'apostles today'.

It has been said that 'the onus clearly rests on those who assert that apostles were only intended to be a temporary institution, to prove it from the Scripture'. This is the aim in this article and its achievement will be attempted by examining each of two points in turn.

I THE NATURE OF PAUL'S APOSTLESHIP

One contemporary charismatic leader, namely Mr. Arthur Wallis, has written as follows in Restoration magazine:

'In considering the question "apostles today", it is crucial to see that Paul belonged to a third distinct class of apostle.'

The two other classes implied in this quotation are the Lord and 'the Twelve'. This statement is most helpful, both in its clarity and also in its emphatic nature. The first step in the case presented for 'apostles today' is to dissociate Paul from 'the Twelve' (with whom it is claimed he cannot be properly bracketed anyway) and to associate with Paul all the others who are termed apostles in the New Testament. So, the framework that results is the Lord, 'the Twelve' and then Paul and the rest. In this way a different kind of apostolic succession becomes possible and, of course, in the event, actual.

This framework will be examined, of course, by necessary implication when the narrower issue, namely Paul's apostleship is focussed on. So, a question is framed. '*Did Paul belong to "the Twelve" in the sense of sharing a common apostleship with them or not?*' To the answering of this question we now turn, aware and grateful that Paul himself addresses this question and answers it. His reply was that he was one with 'the Twelve'.

Paul's repeated claim that 'in nothing was he behind the very [p. 109](#) chiefest apostles' ([2 Cor. 11:5](#) and [12:11](#), KJV) is most probably to be understood as a sarcastic reference to those who were presenting themselves to the church as apostles and troubling it. A similar situation is referred to at Ephesus in [Revelation 2:2](#). However, the older interpretation of the statement which referred it to Peter, James and John, the inner circle of 'the Twelve' is perhaps not wholly out of place. If that interpretation were to be admitted, it would, of course, settle the matter under consideration with clarity and finality. But such a use will not be made of that text.

Paul's own substantiation of his link with 'the Twelve' is presented in those letters where his status as an apostle of Jesus Christ needed to be introduced or even asserted because it was in some way being challenged or even denied, that is Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians. It is in the light of what he has to say in these epistles about his apostleship that expressions like 'an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God' ([1 Cor. 1:1](#); [2 Cor. 1:1](#); [Eph. 1:1](#); [Col. 1:1](#); [2 Tim. 1:1](#)), or the other variants of this theme ([1 Tim. 1:1](#); [Romans 1:1](#); [Galatians 1:1](#); [Titus 1:1](#)) are to be understood. In what sense Paul was an apostle he makes particularly clear in 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians.

The obvious problem which Paul's apostleship raises is connected with time and its passing nature. In choosing a replacement for Judas Iscariot, in accordance with Holy Scripture, Peter said, 'It is therefore necessary that of the men who have accompanied us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us—beginning with the baptism of John, until the day that He was taken up from us—one of these should become a witness with us of his resurrection.' ([Acts 1:21, 22](#), NASB)

Now those terms could neither have described Saul of Tarsus nor even, and this is more important, Paul, the believer in Jesus Christ. He could never (or so it surely seemed) qualify for apostleship under those terms. And this not only because he was an unbeliever, which was the least of it, even though he was *such* an unbeliever, but, and this was the insuperable obstacle, because an era of revelation had passed by irrevocably. Jesus Christ would not only not be baptized again and minister on earth, but He had been raised from the dead and gone to heaven, having appeared to 'the Twelve' over a period of forty days. Those elements so necessary to apostleship surely could never recur. Only from those present in the Upper Room, before the day of Pentecost came, could an apostle of Jesus Christ arise. Therefore, by lots, for the choice of an apostle was directly the Lord's and this needed to be preserved as much as possible, Matthias 'was numbered with the eleven apostles' ([Acts 1:26](#)). [p. 110](#)

Paul was acutely aware of this theological situation for he knew the difference that Pentecost had made ([Galatians 4:1-7](#)). Yet he never saw this as constituting a problem which stood in the way of his being an apostle of Jesus Christ like 'the Twelve'. He saw it as part of the amazing, incredible wonder that Christ Jesus had made him an apostle.

Everything was against it: his previous life, his devastation of the church, his blasphemy, his unbelief and the passing of time, but Christ made all of these as nothing ([1 Cor. 15:9, 10](#); [Galatians 1:13–16](#); [Ephesians 3:8](#); [1 Timothy 1:13–15](#)). It was Paul's boast and claim—all glory to the grace of God in Christ Jesus—that his apostleship, when viewed in relation to that of 'the Twelve' only differed from theirs in that he was 'as one born out of due time' ([1 Cor. 15:8](#)). His was an apostleship which fully harmonized with the norm, but it was given in an abnormal, theological-chronological situation. What 'the Twelve' were given before and on the day of Pentecost, Paul was given after.

In Paul's presentation of his apostolic credentials in 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians, or the magnification of his office ([Romans 11:13](#)), he concentrates on the very two matters which distinguished 'the Twelve' as they are described in [Acts 1:23, 24](#) and [10:39–42](#). These were that apostles of Jesus Christ had to be able to be witnesses of His resurrection and had to be recipients of revelation from Him. Paul was convinced that he passed on both counts with flying colours, and it is what he had to say on both these matters which supplies the basis for associating him with 'the Twelve'. Let us consider what he had to say on each count.

The Apostle of Jesus Christ—A Directly-Commissioned Witness of His Resurrection from the Dead

The apostle of Jesus Christ is one who not only proclaims that Christ rose again, but one who declares that he has seen Jesus Christ who had died and had been buried, physically alive. On this point, could anything be clearer than Paul's challenge, 'Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?' ([1 Cor. 9:1](#)). In the list of resurrection appearances which he records in [1 Cor. 15](#), he includes himself, saying, 'And last of all, He was seen of me also' (verse [8](#)).

It is important to realize and stress that what happened to Paul on the road to Damascus was not in the nature of a vision, that is, something which is made present only to the inward sight and having no objective reality in time and space. Though [Acts 26:19](#) speaks of a vision, it refers to the kind of sight which results from an 'appearing' ([Acts 26:16](#)), that is an event of actual self-disclosure. It was, therefore, an incident of the same kind as those recorded in [1 Corinthians 15:5–7](#) p. 111 (the same verb is used) when the resurrected Lord made Himself visible and tangible. He was as physically present on the road to Damascus as He had been on the road to Emmaus. Paul was physically blinded by the One whom he physically saw—the Lord Jesus Christ, raised from the dead physically. As a result, Paul could preach that Christ had been raised from the dead as emphatically as Peter could and in the same sense ([Acts 25:19](#)).

The apostle of Jesus Christ, however, was more than a witness of the resurrected Christ. He received a commission directly from Him. Others saw Him alive again without being sent by Him as His representatives to the world and to His future church, for example, Mary Magdalene in [John 20:17](#) and the five hundred referred to in [1 Corinthians 15:6](#). The Lord appeared to some in order to commission them as His apostles ([Acts 1:2–8](#); [10:41, 42](#)). He did this with Paul ([Acts 26:16–18](#)). Paul was commissioned as an apostle by the resurrected Christ Himself ([Galatians 1:15–17](#)).

Now, Paul does not only lay claim to this event-experience but says that it occurred 'last of all' ([1 Cor. 15:8](#)). This means that Paul was the last, and was to be the last to whom the resurrected Christ physically appeared. No other person like him, therefore, could be added to the band of the apostles of Jesus Christ. Only one was to be added 'out of due time' to 'the Twelve'. The reference to the twelve apostles of the Lamb in [Revelation 22:14](#) is, therefore, a figurative one, representing completeness and is not to be taken literalistically.

The Apostle of Jesus Christ—A Chosen Recipient of Revelation from Him

To the eleven disciples in the Upper Room before His crucifixion, the Lord Jesus Christ promised the Holy Spirit ([John 16:7](#)). Among the several benefits which He would give to them for their work of witness-bearing ([John 14:27](#)) was the revelation of truth—truth previously declared which the disciples had not understood ([John 14:16](#)) and truth not yet disclosed because the disciples could not then receive it ([John 16:12](#)). So, as from Christ, the Spirit ‘would bring to remembrance’ what Christ had said and ‘lead into all the truth: and show what was to come’. This is how apostles were able to preach the gospel in the world and found churches in the truth. They were to teach disciples from all nations ‘to observe all that Christ commanded them’. They were made, therefore, infallible in all their actual teaching, whether in oral or written form ([2 Thess. 2:15](#)) because they were recipients of revelation from Jesus Christ Himself, the Truth Incarnate. (The case of Peter in [Galatians 2](#) does not contradict this claim because [p. 112](#) there we have an example of fallibility of *conduct*. It was what Peter did ([Gal. 2:12](#)) which was not in accord with the gospel and not anything he said. Paul dealt with him on the basis of the gospel which they both believed.)

How does Paul fit into this situation? He does so without any difficulty at all. He insists that just as no human being had appointed him to be an apostle ([Galatians 1:1](#)), so no human being had taught him the gospel ([Galatians 1:11](#) and [12a](#)). ‘For I would have you know brethren that the gospel which was preached by me is not according to man. For I neither received it from man, nor was I taught it.’ It was Paul’s claim that he received his gospel ‘through a revelation of Jesus Christ’ ([Galatians 1:12b](#)). Not only was the gospel divine, but he received it in a divine manner. This claim he supports by three arguments in [Galatians 1](#) and [2](#). They are as follows:-

- (i) Before his conversion, he could not have been taught by the apostles because he was a persecutor and his conversion was without human instrumentality. While after his conversion, he had no extensive contact with the disciples ([Galatians 1:13-24](#)).
- (ii) When he did eventually confer with the leaders of the Jerusalem church, it was not to learn the truth from them and they recognized that he already had the gospel and so they had nothing to add to him ([Galatians 2:1-10](#)).
- (iii) So independent was he of the other apostles that he openly rebuked one of them, Peter, when his conduct undermined the gospel of divine grace common to them both ([Galatians 2:11-21](#)).

It was, however, not only God’s way of salvation, so to speak, which was revealed to Paul. It was by revelation from Christ through the Spirit that he learned that Gentiles were to be included with Jews in the one church of Christ, without their having to embrace Judaism as well ([Ephesians 3:3-5](#)). That was also the case with regard to problems concerning marriage. Paul’s expressions ‘not I but the Lord’ and ‘I not the Lord’ refer to the distinction between teaching which the Lord gave while He was on earth ([1 Cor. 7:10](#) cf. [Matt. 19:6](#)) and teaching revealed by Him to Paul through the Spirit after His ascension ([1 Cor. 7:12](#), [25](#) and [40](#)). The latter revelation relates to cases not covered by the former. Though there is a difference of opinion about it, the same can be said of Paul’s account of the Lord’s Supper ([1 Cor. 11:23](#) and following). The prepositions used which are prefixed to the two verbs ‘received’ and ‘delivered’ are not only used in connection with the transmission of information from one human being to another in the New Testament. After all, did not the Lord tell him that He would appear to him in the future as well? ([Acts 26:16](#)).

So, Paul qualified for 'the Twelve', so to speak, on the same grounds [p. 113](#) as did they—he too was a directly commissioned witness to Christ in His resurrection *and* a divinely chosen recipient of revelation from Him for the nations and the church. Now it was as a result of this that he (and this would apply to the others of 'the Twelve' as well) was 'a wise master builder' ([1 Cor. 3:10](#)), laying a foundation by his doctrine for the church for all time and in every place.

Under this heading of Paul's claim to be, in effect, ranked with 'the Twelve', two other elements need to be mentioned. The first concerns the acceptance of that claim and his reception as an apostle by James, Peter and John, the 'pillars' of the Jerusalem church. Though Titus, a Gentile convert, and Barnabas, a colleague, accompanied him (and, therefore, Barnabas was given the right hand of fellowship as well as Paul), yet Paul is distinguished from them both in Galatians chapter [2](#). It was recognized that Paul 'had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised, *just* as Peter with the gospel to the circumcised' ([Galatians 2:7, 9](#)). Not only was Paul certain that theologically he belonged to 'the Twelve', but Peter and John, two of 'the Twelve', were so convinced as well. The second element concerns the divine confirmation given by signs and wonders that he was an apostle of Jesus Christ ([1 Cor. 9:2](#); [Hebrews 2:4](#); [Galatians 2:8](#)).

Paul, therefore, is not to be dissociated from 'the Twelve'. [1 Corinthians 15:5](#) and [8](#) in which it is alleged that he so differentiates himself is no more than a desire on his part to be historically and chronologically accurate—a concern which is so essential to the meaning and force of this great passage. [1 Corinthians 15:5](#) is a reference to the eleven disciples, the survivors of those who had come to be known as 'the Twelve'. Paul was not among them physically when the Lord revealed Himself physically to them ([John 20:19](#) and [Luke 24:36](#) and following). [1 Corinthians 15:8](#) is, as we have seen, a reference to the grounds on which Paul claimed to be associated with them.

It is true that Paul did also have another kind of apostleship. But this he shared with Barnabas because they were apostles of the church at Antioch ([Acts 14:4](#) and [13:1](#) and following). In this, they were not commissioned directly by Christ, that is, without human instrumentality, but mediately via the church. That is the third kind of apostleship presented in the New Testament—men sent to preach the gospel, plant churches and those women who helped them ([Philippians 4:3](#)), and having planted them, to cause them to prosper. This apostleship is not characterised by directly given revelation and infallibility in communication. Epaphroditus was another example of this kind of apostleship ([Philippians 2:25](#)).

However, Paul was primarily an apostle of Jesus Christ. The Lord [p. 114](#) Himself did the choosing, the sending, the showing of Himself alive and the disclosing of His truth to him. This is what Paul was, first and foremost—or to quote him, 'the last and the least' ([1 Cor. 15:8, 9](#)). Paul is not a different class of apostle, distinct from 'the Twelve'.

II THE APOSTLESHIP OF EPHESIANS 4:11

We turn now to the second point presented in favour of 'apostles today'. It concerns the identity or type of apostles referred to in [Ephesians 4:11](#). Though this is a separate matter, it becomes joined with the point already considered in the case presented by Mr. Wallis for 'apostles today'. He writes:-

'This third category of apostles referred to in [Ephesians 4:11](#) are, according to Paul, the gifts of the ascended Christ ([Eph. 4:7-11](#)). They are thus to be distinguished from 'the Twelve' who were appointed and commissioned by Christ in the days of His flesh. In a word, the appointment of 'the Twelve' was pre-Pentecostal, that of [Ephesians 4](#) apostles was post-Pentecostal. Paul was, of course, the outstanding apostle of the [Ephesians 4](#)

order and he loved to recount his personal meeting and commissioning by the ascended Christ.'

Clearly, what has to be considered is the intimate connection between the ascension of the Lord Jesus Christ and His giving of these apostles to the church. We shall face up to this by once again setting ourselves a question to answer. It is this. What is meant in [Ephesians 4:8-10](#) by the expression 'He ascended'?

It has been a mistake, often repeated in the course of the church's history, to regard the expressions 'He descended' and 'He descended into the lower parts of the earth' *too literally*. Doing that has given rise to strange notions about what our Lord allegedly did between His death and resurrection. Those quoted expressions are theologically figurative for the immeasurable condescension of the Lord Jesus Christ and His humiliation. By the same token, to regard the corresponding expressions 'He ascended' and 'He ascended up far above all heavens' as referring exclusively or even primarily to the event of our Lord's ascension is to make the same sort of mistake. 'He ascended' is theologically figurative for the infinite exaltation of the Lord Jesus Christ, corresponding to and consequent upon, His humiliation, which is represented by the expression 'He descended'.

[Psalm 68](#) as a whole is in Paul's mind in this passage, that is, [Ephesians 4:1-16](#), and from it he quotes with interpretation in verse [8](#). This Psalm struck two notes, namely Jehovah's victories over the foes of His people and His dwelling among them as Lord, distributing the blessings of His reign. Some commentators say that the occasion of this [p. 115](#) Psalm was the ark's return to Jerusalem. However, the theme is conquest and co-dwelling. The 'ascending on high' referred to in [Psalm 68:18](#) has the hill of the earthly Zion in view where the Lord's reigning presence and activity were symbolically presented to the people, but in reality, to those with faith. The Lord Jesus Christ's 'ascent' in [Ephesians 4](#) is His exaltation to reign among and for His people, following and because of His death.

Now, of course, it is not being suggested that our Lord's ascension does not figure in His exaltation. His exaltation would be incomplete without it, if such a possibility may even be theoretically considered. But what is being stated, not suggested, is that our Lord's exaltation did not *begin* with His ascension. The exaltation of the Lord Jesus Christ began with His resurrection from the dead. 'He ascended' in [Ephesians 4](#) includes the resurrection. Paul makes this clear in [Ephesians 1:20](#) where he speaks of God's power being manifested in Christ 'when He raised Him from the dead and seated Him at His right hand in the heavenly places, far above all'.

When the resurrection is included in our thinking about [Ephesians 4:8-11](#), the picture alters significantly about the identity of those apostles mentioned there. No longer are 'the Twelve' necessarily excluded because it is not the ascended Christ that is in view, but the exalted Christ, that is, raised, reigning and to ascend, who gives them to His church. [John 20:19-23](#) records such a giving or commissioning when, after showing the *disciples* His hands and side, Jesus said, 'As the Father sent me, even so send I you.' He then gave them an assurance of the Holy Spirit's bestowal to equip them for the task as He had been. [Luke 24:36](#) and following records the same truths as does [Matthew 28:18-20](#). [Acts 1:2](#) calls them apostles and [1:13](#) lists their names. [Acts 2:1](#) records their actual empowering.

So, [Ephesians 4:11](#) should not be regarded as of necessity teaching post-ascension apostles because of the expression 'He ascended'. These are post-exaltation apostles and they are 'the Twelve' with Paul included. In [Ephesians 4](#), the major perspective is that of a theological standpoint whereas in [1 Corinthians 15](#) it is an historical or chronological one. Paul never 'recounted his personal meeting and commissioning by the *ascended* Christ'. To suggest that he did is quite inaccurate. Paul referred to what happened on the road to Damascus as a meeting with the resurrected Christ. We have seen this from [1 Cor.](#)

[15:8, Galatians 1:1](#) is quite explicit on this matter, namely, ‘Paul an apostle by Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised him from the dead’. On the road to Damascus, the fact that Jesus Christ had ascended was immaterial; what was important and shattering was that He was no [p. 116](#) longer in the grave. He had triumphed and was Lord. As raised, He reigned among and for His people in converting Saul and calling him to be an apostle.

One other point is mentioned in the case argued for ‘apostles today’. It is based on the preposition ‘until’ in [Ephesians 4:13](#). In effect, it is a case built on the continuing need of churches to be brought up to ‘the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God to a mature man, to the measure of the stature which belongs to the fulness of Christ’. This is termed an experiential foundation in distinction from that historical foundation laid by ‘the Twelve’. Such a foundation, it is argued, can only be supplied by present day apostles and these are the master builders ([1 Cor. 3:10](#)).

We have seen that the twelve and Paul constitute one group theologically on the basis of Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians, and that [Ephesians 4:11](#) can refer to this group. On this showing, what sense can be made of the preposition ‘until’? Though these apostles are no longer on earth, their teaching remains, preserved by the head of the church who gave it to them, for churches in every age and place. The church or churches today do, therefore, have apostolic ministry—Paul, Peter, John and Matthew—and by them, Christ speaks by His Spirit to the churches.

The condition of the churches is not, therefore, to be attributed to their lack of apostles, but to the failure of and want of pastors, teachers and elders, and the mutual encouraging of one another. All these are to edify, that is, build up others in the faith and in grace and the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The need for edification is not the proof for the need of apostles.

There are, therefore, no apostles today in the sense being argued for in the current charismatic scene. The twelve and Paul were Christ’s master-builders. All others seek to work according to their pattern, given by the Lord and recorded by His Spirit. However, there are other ‘apostles’, that is church-appointed men and women who devote themselves to the work of the gospel. These can be better described as pastors, teachers, preachers, evangelists, or missionaries.

In this category, from time to time, there have been those whose labours have been so significantly owned of God in raising churches from ruins, rubble, dust and nothing that their contemporaries or successors justly regard them as having something apostolic about them, for example, the Reformers, ‘the apostle of the North’, ‘the apostle of the Peak’, ‘the apostle of Pembrokeshire’. Their work has demanded the figurative use of this term because of its undisputed colossal nature. May many more of their calibre be raised up!

Rev. Hywel R. Jones MA, is minister of Wrexham Evangelical Church, Clwyd, Wales, and tutor in biblical studies at the London Theological Seminary. [p. 117](#)

The Proofs, Problems, and Promises of Biblical Archaeology

Edwin M. Yamauchi

Reprinted from the Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation, Vol. 36, No. 3 September 1984 with permission

In some cases archaeology confirms biblical passages which were questioned, but in other cases it presents problems which are not easily resolved at present. This article seeks to show how far archaeology provides us with the data to reconstruct the setting of the events in biblical history. This amplified and annotated text of Dr. Yamauchi's presidential address to the American Scientific Affiliation was given on August 5, 1983 at George Fox College, Newberg, Oregon.

(Editor)

The first statement of faith we subscribe to as members of the American Scientific Affiliation declares 'The Holy Scriptures are the inspired Word of God, the only unerring guide of faith and conduct.' In a brief and selective way I would like to survey how archaeology has affected our understanding of the Bible and its backgrounds.

I would not wish to characterize archaeology as a 'science,' though in an increasing fashion—especially in New World archaeology—various scientific disciplines are being enlisted in excavations.¹ These p. 118 would include the use of radio carbon dating,² the neutron analysis of pottery,³ osteological analysis,⁴ and dendrochronological studies⁵—to name only a few examples.

But to an even greater degree than in the hard sciences, archaeological conclusions depend upon the subjective interpretations of various factors including one's disposition toward the Scriptures as a source of historical data. For example, scholars disagree as to whether the destruction of Lachish III was caused by the Assyrian king Sennacherib in 701 or by the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar in 597, a difference of over a century!⁶

Moreover archaeological interpretations are constantly changing. Every season unearths new data. This is not only what is exciting but also what is frustrating about the study of archaeology.

¹ D. P. Williams, 'As a Discipline Comes of Age: Reflections on Archaeology and the Scientific Method,' *Arch*, 29.4 (1976), 229–31; J. Pouilloux, 'Archaeology Today,' *AJA*, 84.3 (1980), 311–12; C. Renfrew, 'The Great Tradition versus the Great Divide: Archaeology as Anthropology?' *AJA*, 84.3 (1980), 287–98; J. A. Sabloff, 'When the Rhetoric Fades: A Brief Appraisal of Intellectual Trends in American Archaeology During the Past Two Decades,' *BASOR*, 242 (1981), 1–6.

² Problems of Radiocarbon Dating and of Cultural Diffusion in Pre-History,' *JASA*, 27.1 (1975), 25–31. Cf. M. G. L. Baillie, *Tree-Ring Dating and Archaeology* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1982).

³ One of my former students, Professor Michal Artzy of the University of Haifa, has become one of the leading scholars in this field. See for example: M. Artzy, I. Perlman, and F. Asaro, 'Cypriote Pottery Imports at Ras Shamra,' *IEJ*, 31.1–2 (1981), 37–47.

⁴ J. K. Eakins, 'Human Osteology and Archaeology,' *BA*, 43.2 (1980), 89–96; K. A. R. Kennedy, 'Skeletal Biology: When Bones Tell Tales,' *Arch*, 34.1 (1981), 17–24.

⁵ N. Lipschitz and Y. Waisel, 'Dendroarchaeological Investigations in Israel (Taanach),' *IEJ*, 30.1–2 (1980), 132–36; N. Lipschitz, S. Lev-Yadun, and Y. Waisel, 'Dendroarchaeological Investigations in Israel (Masada),' *IEJ*, 31.3–4 (1981), 230–34. Cf. G. Edelstein and M. Kislev, 'Mevasseret Yerushatayim: Ancient Terrace Farming,' *BA*, 44.1 (1981), 53–56.

⁶ This problem will be addressed later in the article.

Subjective factors which have affected archaeological interpretations include: 1) patriotism, 2) personalities, and 3) pietism. The early pioneers in Mesopotamia and Egypt strove to outdo their competitors in acquiring works of art for the British Museum or for the Louvre.⁷ Recently the Syrian authorities have been understandably upset that the media have stressed the importance of the Ebla texts for the background of Israelite rather than Syrian history.⁸

The archaeology of the Holy Land has been dominated by towering figures such as Kathleen Kenyon,⁹ W. F. Albright, Nelson Glueck, G. p. 119 Ernest Wright, etc.—with all of their strengths and their foibles.¹⁰ In some cases rather bitter rivalries have produced conflicting interpretations as in the notorious case of Yigael Yadin versus Yohanan Aharoni, two Israeli archaeologists.¹¹

In recent years ultra-orthodox Jews have attempted to stop Yigal Shiloh's excavations in Jerusalem because they feared that the excavators were desecrating Jewish burials.¹² Native Americans have also protested such a 'violation of sepulture.'¹³

In spite of these distracting factors, no one can deny the extraordinary value of archaeology in illuminating ancient texts. Among the public at large the impression has been diffused that archaeology proves the Bible. That statement needs to be qualified. There have indeed been striking cases in which passages, questioned by higher critics such as J. Wellhausen, have been corroborated by excavations.¹⁴ This was already stressed in the late nineteenth century by A. H. Sayce.¹⁵

⁷ J. E. Barrett, 'Piety and Patriotism—Secularism and Scepticism,' *BAR*, 7.1 (1981), 54–55; N. A. Silberman, *Digging for God and Country* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982).

⁸ A. Mikaya, 'The Politics of Ebla,' *BAR*, 4.3 (1978), 2–7; H. Shanks, 'Syria Tries to Influence Ebla Scholarship,' *BAR*, 5.2 (1979), 36–37; C. Bermant and M. Weitzman, *Ebla: An Archaeological Enigma* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1979).

⁹ Cf. P. R. S. Moorey, 'Prominent British Scholar Assesses Kathleen Kenyon,' *BAR*, 7.1 (1981), 46–48.

¹⁰ In the decade from 1970–80 many leading archaeologists passed away: in 1970: Paul Lapp; in 1971: W. F. Albright, N. Glueck, R. de Vaux; in 1974: G. Ernest Wright; in 1976: Y. Aharoni; in 1978: J. L. Kelso and M. Mallowan; in 1979: G. L. Harding; and in 1980: M. Burrows. See *SA*, pp. 1, 9.

¹¹ This rivalry has been brought out into the open in a series of articles in *BAR*. Even after Aharoni's death, the feud is continued by his wife and by his friend A. F. Rainey. See *BASOR*, 225 (1977), 67–68; *BAR* 3 (1977), 3–4; *BAR*, 6 (1980), 1.

¹² H. Shanks, 'Politics in the City of David,' *BAR*, 7.6 (1981), 40–44.

¹³ V. A. Talmage, 'The Violation of Sepulture: Is It Legal to Excavate Human Burials?' *Arch* 35.6 (1982), 44–49.

¹⁴ Likewise, the tendency of archaeology to confirm classical traditions against the criticisms of sceptical scholars may be seen in: *Composition and Corroboration in Classical and Biblical Studies* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed Pub., 1966); 'Homer, History and Archaeology,' *NEASB*, 3 (1973), 21–42; 'The Archaeological Confirmation of Suspect Elements in the Classical and the Biblical Traditions,' *The Law and the Prophets* (O.T. Allis Festschrift), ed. J. Skilton et. al. (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Pub., 1974), pp. 54–70.

¹⁵ A. H. Sayce, *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments* (1883); idem, *The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments* (1893); idem, *Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies* (1904). Sayce began as a higher critic and was rejected for Pusey's chair at Oxford as deemed too liberal by Gladstone. It is an irony that, after the discovery of the Tell Amarna tablets in Egypt, Sayce became an opponent of higher criticism, whereas Pusey's successor, S. R. Diver, became a proponent of such criticism. See B. Z. MacHaffie, 'Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies,' *Church History*, 50.3 (1981), 316–28.

But we must also recognize that there are, in addition to *proofs*, certain *problems* which have been presented by archaeology in regard to the interpretation of the biblical texts. The communication (see [p. 120](#) pp.139–141) by Richard L. Atkins notes some of these cases.¹⁶ Atkins assumes that the type of ‘wishful-thinking’ interpretation of the archaeological data stems from the doctrine of inerrancy, which he deprecates.^{16a} Though this may be the case with some popularizers and preachers, his conclusions are unwarranted in the case of the members of the Near East Archaeological Society, who sign the same statement of faith as the members of the Evangelical Theological Society.¹⁷ I would affirm that Scriptures do not err, but that our interpretations often need correction.

As examples of unwarranted attempts to ‘prove’ the Bible Atkins cites: 1) the ark on Ararat, 2) Joshua’s conquests, 3) Jesus’ birth in a cave, 4) the site of Calvary—among others. William Dever of the University of Arizona has also been so embarrassed by such attempts to correlate the Bible and archaeology that he has urged the abandonment of the name ‘Biblical Archaeology’ as unprofessional and proposes the more neutral term ‘Syro-Palestinian Archaeology.’¹⁸ Dever was a student of G. Ernest Wright, whom he admires for his expertise in archaeology but whom he criticizes for his attempt to combine theology and archaeology.¹⁹ But even Dever agrees that archaeology can provide valuable background information.²⁰

THE ALLEGED ‘ARK’ ON ARARAT

Although some conservative Christians have sought to ‘prove’ the [P. 121](#) biblical account by a search for Noah’s ark on Mount Ararat in eastern Turkey, other evangelical scholars are quite aware of the pitfalls of such an enterprise.²¹ In the first place, the location of the singular Mt. Ararat appears to be a relatively late development (9th cent. B.C.); the biblical text itself ([Gen. 8:4](#)) speaks of the ‘mountains’ of Ararat. Ararat is cognate with ancient

¹⁶ R. L. Atkins, ‘Extravagant Claims in Bible Archaeology,’ (in this issue). For a book which stresses the disharmonies, see my review of M. Magnusson’s *Archaeology of the Bible* in *Fides et Historia*, 12.2 (1980), 150–52.

^{16a} For a work which advocates a doctrine of ‘infallibility’ rather than ‘inerrancy’, see J. Rogers and D. McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979). For a response from an inerrantist position, see J. D. Woodbridge, *Biblical Authority* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982).

¹⁷ The NEAS includes such careful and competent scholars as Harold Mare of Covenant Theological Seminary, Bastiaan Van Elderen of Calvin Theological Seminary, Keith Schoville of the University of Wisconsin, Robert Cooley of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, etc. John D. Davis of Grace Theological Seminary in his article, ‘Archaeology and Apologetics,’ *Spire*, 11.4 (1983), 7–9, as an inerrantist deplores the abuse of archaeology in popular apologetics.

¹⁸ W. G. Dever, ‘Archaeological Method in Israel: A Continuing Revolution,’ *BA*, 43.1 (1980), 40–48; idem, ‘Should the Term “Biblical Archaeology” Be Abandoned?’ *BAR*, 7.3 (1981), 54–57.

¹⁹ W. G. Dever, ‘Biblical Theology and Biblical Archaeology: An Appreciation of G. Ernest Wright,’ *HTR*, 73.1–2 (1980), 1–15.

²⁰ W. G. Dever, ‘What Archaeology Can Contribute to an Understanding of the Bible,’ *BAR*, 7.5 (1981), 40–41. Cf. J. M. Miller, ‘Approaches to the Bible through History and Archaeology,’ *BA*, 45.4 (1982), 211–16.

²¹ ‘Critical Comments on the Search for Noah’s Ark,’ *NEASB*, 10 (1977), 5–27; ‘Is That an Ark on Ararat?’ *Eternity*, 28 (Feb., 1978), 27–32.

Urartu, which was originally located farther south between Lake Van in eastern Turkey and Lake Urmia in northwest Iran.²²

In the second place the radio-carbon tests of the wood which has been recovered from the glacier on Mt. Ararat yield very late dates.^{22a} It is true that Berossos (3rd cent. B.C.) refers to a tradition that the ark was associated with Mt. Ararat,²³ but this does not carry us back far enough.

As is well known there are striking parallels to the biblical story in the Babylonian traditions.²⁴ An evangelical scholar, Alan Millard, now at the University of Liverpool, while rummaging through some drawers at the British Museum recently discovered a major new Babylonian work, the Atrahasis Epic, which has both a creation and a flood story.²⁵ As impressive as the similarities are, the contrasts are even starker—the Babylonian gods send the flood because mankind has become too numerous and too noisy. After the flood subsides they smell the sweet savour of the sacrifices and crowd around it like flies, as they have been deprived of sacrifices for a week.²⁶

THE PROBLEMS AND PROMISES OF EBLA

One of the most publicized of recent archaeological discoveries is the recovery of a palace and archives at Tell Mardikh—ancient Ebla—in **P. 122** northern Syria by the Italian archaeologist P. Matthiae.²⁷ The excavations began in 1964 but the first of about 20,000 cuneiform tablets in a new Semitic language was not discovered until 1974.²⁸ The site flourished at the end of the Early Bronze period about 2350 to 2250 B.C. This is earlier than the usual date assigned to Abraham.

G. Pettinato, the original epigrapher of the expedition, aroused great excitement when he informed D. N. Freedman, then editor of the *Biblical Archaeologist*, that the Ebla texts contained the first reference to Sodom and Gomorrah and the three other cities of the Plain ([Gen. 14:1-2](#)) found outside the Bible.²⁹ If true, this would have required an earlier date for Abraham, inasmuch as Sodom and Gomorrah were never reoccupied. Indeed

²² See 'Urartu,' in *The New International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology* (hereafter *IDBA*), ed. E. M. Blaiklock and R. K. Harrison (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983) pp.463–65. *Foes from the Northern Frontier* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982), ch.2.

^{22a} L. R. Bailey, 'Wood from "Mount Ararat": Noah's Ark?' *BA*, 40.4 (1977), 137–46; idem, *Where Is Noah's Ark?* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1978).

²³ G. Komoroczy, 'Berossos and the Mesopotamian Literature,' *Acta Antiqua*, 21 (1973), 125–52.

²⁴ See A. Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1949).

²⁵ W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, *Atrahasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969).

²⁶ 'Anthropomorphism in Ancient Religions,' *BS*, 125 (1968), 29–44.

²⁷ See 'Unearthing Ebla's Ancient Secrets,' *CT*, 25 (May 8, 1981), 18–21; P. Matthiae, *An Empire Rediscovered* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1980). See also P. C. Maloney, 'Assessing Ebla,' *BAR*, 4.1 (1978), 4–11; idem, 'The Raw Material,' *BAR*, 6.3 (1980), 57–59; R. Biggs, 'The Ebla Tablets: An Interim Perspective,' *BA*, 43.2 (1980), 76–88.

²⁸ G. Pettinato, *The Archives of Ebla* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981), emphasizes Eblaite's western affinities. I. Gelb, *Thoughts about Ibla* (Malibu: Undena, 1977), stresses Eblaite's eastern affinities. Cf. C. H. Gordon, 'Eblaite and Its Affinities,' *Festschrift for Oswald Szemerényi on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1975), pp.297–301.

²⁹ D. N. Freedman, 'The Real Story of the Ebla Tablets, Ebla and the Cities of the Plain,' *BA*, 41.4 (1978), 143–64; H. Shanks, 'Interview with D. N. Freedman,' *BAR*, 6.3 (1980), 51–54.

around the southeastern end of the Dead Sea five Early Bronze sites, which are being investigated by W. Rast and R. Schaub, have been suggested as candidates for these five cities of the Plain.³⁰

Professional and personal differences led eventually to the resignation of Pettinato, who was replaced by A. Archi. With rather bitter invective Pettinato has questioned Archi's competence in Eblaite as his earlier speciality was Hittite. Archi in turn has challenged almost every important reading of the texts by Pettinato.³¹ For example, Archi p. 123 does not believe that Eblaite *Si-da-ma*^{ki} and *i-ma-ar*^{ki} can represent Palestinian Sodom and Gomorrah because they appear in lists with Syrian cities.³² Another point of contention is whether the ending -ya has anything to do with the divine name *Yahweh*.³³ In any event, the thousands of texts in a Semitic language related to Hebrew promise a rich philological harvest.³⁴

THE PATRIARCHS

The positive evaluation of the patriarchal traditions by E. A. Speiser, C. H. Gordon, and W. F. Albright³⁵ has been challenged by the recent revisionism of T. L. Thompson³⁶ and J. Van Seters.³⁷ They have in effect revived the Wellhausenian view that these narratives were not accurate representations of the second millennium B.C. but were anachronistic creations of the first millennium.

Though Thompson and Van Seters have made some valid criticisms of some of the parallels cited between the fifteenth-century B.C. Nuzi texts and the Bible, their own reconstructions are too radical to command wide assent. Other scholars have pointed out

³⁰ W. E. Rast and R. T. Schaub, 'Preliminary Report of the 1979 Expedition to the Dead Sea Plain, Jordan,' *BASOR*, 240 (1980), 21–62; H. Shanks, 'Have Sodom and Gomorrah Been Found?' *BAR*, 6.5 (1980), 16–37; W. C. Hattem, 'Once Again: Sodom and Gomorrah,' *BA*, 44.2 (1981), 87–92. But note the scepticism of J. A. Sauer, 'Syro-Palestinian Archaeology, History, and Biblical Studies,' *BA*, 45.4 (1982), 201–209, especially 207.

³¹ G. Pettinato, "'Declaration' on Ebla," *BAR*, 5.2 (1979), 39–47; idem, 'Ebla and the Bible,' *BA*, 43.4 (1980), 203–16; idem, 'Ebla and the Bible—Observations on the New Epigrapher's Analysis,' *BAR*, 6.6 (1980), 38–41; H. Shanks, 'BAR Interviews Giovanni Pettinato,' *BAR*, 6.5 (1980), 46–53. For A. Archi's responses to Pettinato, see: A. Archi, 'The Epigraphic Evidence from Ebla and the Old Testament,' *Biblica*, 60 (1979), 556–66; idem, 'New Ebla Epigrapher Attacks Conclusions of Ousted Scholar,' *BAR*, 6.3 (1980), 55–56; idem, 'Archi Responds to Pettinato,' *BAR*, 6.6 (1980), 42–43; idem, 'Further Concerning Ebla and the Bible,' *BA*, 44.3 (1981), 145–54.

³² H. Shanks, 'Ebla Evidence Evaporates,' *BAR*, 5.6 (1979), 52–53; A. Archi, 'Are the "Cities of the Plain" Mentioned in the Ebla Tablets?' *BAR*, 7.6 (1981), 54–55; idem, 'Notes on Eblaite Geography II,' *Studi Eblaite*, 4 (1981), 1–18.

³³ M. Dahood, 'The God Ya at Ebla?' *JBL*, 100.4 (1981), 607–608; H.-P. Müller, 'Gab es in Ebla einen Gottesnamen Ja?' *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 70.1 (1981), 70–92.

³⁴ See M. Dahood's Appendix in Pettinato's book (n.28); also M. Dahood, 'Ebla, Ugarit and the Old Testament,' *Bible and Spade*, 8.1 (1979), 1–15; idem, 'Are the Ebla Tablets Relevant to Biblical Research?' *BAR*, 6.5 (1980), 54–58, 60; D. N. Freedman, 'The Tell Mardikh Excavation, the Ebla Tablets, and Their Significance for Biblical Studies,' *NEASB*, 13 (1979), 5–35.

³⁵ See *SS*, pp.36–46; 'Patriarchal Age,' *Wycliffe Bible Encyclopaedia*, ed. C. F. Pfeiffer, H. E. Vos, and J. Rea (Chicago: Moody Press, 1975), pp. 1287–91; *SA*, pp. 1–3.

³⁶ *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1974).

³⁷ *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University, 1975).

their one-sided and selected use of the evidence and the impossibility of the view that Abrahamic traditions were created only in the first millennium.³⁸

Thompson cited for support of his view Y. Aharoni's interpretation of his excavations at Beersheba.³⁹ Since he found nothing earlier than p. 124 Iron Age materials associated with the site and its well, Aharoni concluded that the patriarchal narratives must date to the Iron Age (i.e. after 1200 B.C.).⁴⁰ But it is not certain that Iron Age Beersheba is necessarily the same as patriarchal Beersheba.⁴¹ There is no indication in the Old Testament that Beersheba in Abraham's time was a city.⁴²

MOSES AND MONOTHEISM

In his last book Sigmund Freud speculated that Hebrew monotheism really owed its genesis to an Egyptian named 'Moses,' influenced by the monotheism of Akhnaton (Amenhotep IV). Though such an Egyptian influence was also suggested by Albright, this is a most unlikely scenario.⁴³ For one thing the concept of the supreme god Yahweh was already maintained by the patriarchs.⁴⁴

The Hebrews were, with the exception of the abortive monotheism of Akhnaton and the later monotheism of the Greek philosopher Xenophanes,⁴⁵ unique in stressing the worship of a single god. The Hebrew language even lacks a word for 'goddess.'

New evidence has, however, now been found near a site identified with Kadesh-barnea in north-east Sinai,⁴⁶ which has raised some questions about the purity of Hebrew monotheism. The excavator found some cartoon-like figures of Yahweh and 'his Asherah.' Asherah was the name of a Canaanite goddess associated with the fertility cult,⁴⁷ and also of the wooden object which represented her.⁴⁸ But as p. 125 there is evidence that the traders at Kuntilet 'Ajrud came from Samaria about 800 B.C., their graffiti are no more than

³⁸ See *SA*, pp.3–6, 10. For a positive presentation of Abraham in a second millennium setting, see D. J. Wiseman, 'Abraham in History and Tradition,' *BS*, 134 (1977), 123–30, 228–37.

³⁹ Y. Aharoni, 'Nothing Early and Nothing Late,' *BA*, 39 (1976), 55–76.

⁴⁰ Z. Herzog, 'Beer-sheba of the Patriarchs,' *BAR*, 6.6 (1980), 12–28.

⁴¹ M. D. Fowler, 'The Excavation of Tell Beer-sheba and the Biblical Record,' *PEQ*, 113 (1981), 7–11.

⁴² N. Sama, 'Abraham in History,' *BAR*, 3 (1977), 9.

⁴³ *SS*, p. 165; *SA*, p. 13; S. Herrmann, *Israel in Egypt* (London: SCM Press, 1973), p.22.

⁴⁴ W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1968); F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1973).

⁴⁵ Whether or not Zoroaster preached the monotheistic worship of Ahura-Mazda is complicated by our late Zoroastrian sources. See the ch. on Iranian Evidences in *Pre-Christian Gnosticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973; Grand Rapids: Baker, rev. ed., 1983).

⁴⁶ R. Cohen, 'The Excavations at Kadesh-barnea (1976–78),' *BA*, 44.2 (1981), 93–107; idem, 'Did I Excavate Kadesh-Barnea?' *BAR*, 7.3 (1981), 20–33; Z. Meshel, 'An Explanation of the Journeys of the Israelites in the Wilderness,' *BA*, 45.1 (1982), 19–20.

⁴⁷ 'Cultic Prostitution—A Case Study in Cultural Diffusion,' *Orient and Occident*, ed. H. A. Hoffner (Kevelaer: Butzon and Bercker, 1973), pp.213–22.

⁴⁸ Z. Meshel, 'Did Yahweh Have a Consort?' *BAR*, 5.2 (1979), 24–36; J. A. Emerton, 'New Light on Israelite Religion: The Implications of the Inscriptions from Kuntillet "Ajrud,"' *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 94 (1982), 2–20. Such syncretism was also found among the Jews at Elephantine in the fifth cent. B.C. See B. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine* (Berkeley: University of California, 1968).

evidence of the striking syncretism which the Old Testament itself ascribes to the area of the Northern Kingdom.

THE EXODUS

H. Goedicke, a distinguished Egyptologist with the Johns Hopkins University, made the front page of the *New York Times* by setting forth arguments for an early date of the Exodus in the reign of Hatshepsut, and by linking the phenomena of the parting of the Red Sea and the fiery pillar with the cataclysmic eruption of the volcanic island of Thera (Santorini) in the Aegean in the 15th cent. B.C.⁴⁹ His views have been sharply contested and do seem to be highly speculative.⁵⁰

A more substantial contribution to the question of the Exodus is the important monograph by J. H. Bimson, *Redating the Exodus and Conquest*, which has called forth a flurry of reviews.⁵¹ In general, critics have responded favourably to his criticisms of the archaeological evidence used, for example, by Y. Yadin⁵² to support the late date of the Exodus and the Conquest.⁵³ But they have also reacted unfavourably to Bimson's own attempt to correlate Middle Bronze (MB) sites with an early Conquest by Joshua.⁵⁴ p. 126

As I have pointed out elsewhere the view which places Joshua's conquest in the thirteenth century faces problems with the sites of Gibeon, Jericho, and Ai. As the modern village of El-Jib still rests on the tell of Gibeon and as J. Pritchard did find Late Bronze (LB) tombs there, the possibility remains that the LB settlement there is yet to be discovered. Because of massive erosion, K. Kenyon found very little LB remains at Jericho.⁵⁵ Yadin suggests that MB walls were still being used in Joshua's day.⁵⁶

⁴⁹ H. Shanks, 'The Exodus and the Crossing of the Red Sea according to Hans Goedicke,' *BAR*, 7.5 (1981), 42–50; C. R. Krahmalkov, 'A Critique of Professor Goedicke's Exodus Theories,' *BAR*, 7.5 (1981), 51–54; H. Shanks, 'In Defence of Hans Goedicke,' *BAR*, 8.3 (1982), 48–53; Y. T. Radday, 'A Bible Scholar Looks at *BAR*'s Coverage of the Exodus,' *BAR*, 8.6 (1982), 68–71.

⁵⁰ For one thing Goedicke's reconstruction requires a northern route. Though some Israeli scholars, e.g. B. Rothenberg, 'An Archaeological Survey of South Sinai,' *PEQ*, 101 (1970), 4–29, have come to favour a central route, most scholars still favour a southern route: see D. M. Beagle, *Moses, The Servant of Yahweh* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972; Ann Arbor: Pryor Pettengill, 1979 repr.) pp.170–173; S. H. Horn, 'What We Don't Know about Moses and the Exodus,' *BAR*, 3 (1977), 29; G. I. Davies, 'The Significance of Deuteronomy 1.2 for the Location of Mount Horeb,' *PEQ*, 111 (1979), 87–101.

⁵¹ Bimson's monograph, which was part of his dissertation, was published by the *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* at Sheffield in 1978. Cf. E. H. Merrill, 'Palestinian Archaeology and the Date of the Conquest,' *Grace Theological J.*, 3.1 (1982), 107–21.

⁵² Y. Yadin, *Hazor* (New York: Random House, 1975); idem, 'The Transition from a Semi-Nomadic to a Sedentary Society,' *Symposia ...*, ed. F. M. Cross (Cambridge: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1979), pp.57–68; idem, 'Is the Biblical Account of the Israelite Conquest of Canaan Historically Reliable?' *BAR*, 8.2 (1982), 16–23.

⁵³ *SS*, pp.46–64; *SA*, pp. 15.–17, 22.

⁵⁴ See for example reviews by H. Engel in *Biblica*, 61.3 (1980), 437–40; by A. F. Rainey in *IEJ*, 30.3–4 (1980), 249–51; by J. A. Soggin in *Vetus Testamentum*, 31 (1981), 98–99.

⁵⁵ *SS*, pp.57–58; *SA*, pp.16, 22.

⁵⁶ H. Shanks, 'BAR Interviews Yigael Yadin,' *BAR*, 9.1 (1983), 16–23.

As for the great mound of Et-Tell, usually identified with Ai, it is possible that some LB remains may yet lie within the 28-acre site.⁵⁷ Others have found another site with LB materials called Nisyah, two kilometres east of Bireh, which they would identify with Ai.⁵⁸ This would require the identification of Bireh as ancient Bethel rather than Beitin.

One of the complicating uncertainties is the attempt to correlate the excavated sites with those named in the Old Testament. For example, though some scholars have identified Tell Deir 'Alī in Jordan with biblical Succoth, H. Franken, the excavator, rejects this identification.⁵⁹ Albright persisted in identifying Tell Beit Mirsim, which he excavated, as the site of Debir taken by Caleb, though the tell called Khirbet Rabud, excavated by M. Kochavi now seems to be a better candidate.⁶⁰

THE JUDGES

The Philistines were the most formidable foes of the Israelites during the days of the Judges and the early part of the United Monarchy.⁶¹ The most dramatic archaeological discovery to illuminate Philistine culture is the excavation of a unique Philistine temple at Tel Qasile just north of Tel Aviv by Ami Mazar.⁶² Though very small, the temple with its two **P. 127** column bases corresponds to the plan of the Philistine temple pulled down by Samson at Gaza ([Judges 16:29](#)).⁶³

An important ostrakon dated to the 12th century B.C. was found in 1976 at Izbet Sartah near Tel Aviv. Though the 83 letters in five lines are faint and defy attempts at decipherment, what is clear is that in the last line we have an Abecedary, written from left to right.⁶⁴ A. Demsky believes that the writer was an Israelite, and that this text lends strong support to the evidence for literacy attested in [Judges 8:14](#). Some critics had contended that the Israelites did not use writing for 'formal literature' as early as the Judges, in spite of strong inscriptional evidence to the contrary.⁶⁵ Commenting on the Izbet Sartah ostrakon, S. H. Horn notes: 'there can be no longer any doubt that fully

⁵⁷ *SS*, pp.57, 60. Cf. L. Allen, 'Archaeology of Ai and the Accuracy of Joshua 7:1-8:29,' *Restoration Quarterly*, 20 (1977), 41-52.

⁵⁸ W. Fields, 'Have We Found Ai?' offprint published by the author, Joplin, MO: Ozark Bible College, 1981.

⁵⁹ H. Franken, 'The Identity of Tell Deir 'Alī, Jordan,' *Akkadica*, 14 (1979), 11-15.

⁶⁰ M. Kochavi's excavations of the site in 1968-69 are reported in *Tel Aviv*, 1 (1974), 2-33.

⁶¹ See *Greece and Babylon, hereafter GB* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1967); 'Archaeological Evidence for the Philistines,' *WTJ*, 35.3 (1973), 315-23.

⁶² A. Mazar, 'A Philistine Temple at Tell Qasile,' *BA*, 36 (1973), 42-48.

⁶³ Timnah, where Samson obtained his first Philistine wife ([Judges 14:1](#)), has been identified with Tel Batash, which is being excavated under the direction of George Kelm and A. Mazar. A clay bulla is the first evidence that the Philistines wrote on papyri. R. D. Kaplan, 'Looking at Some Recent Excavations' *Christian News from Israel*, 27 (1979), 19-20.

⁶⁴ M. Kochavi, 'An Ostrakon of the Period of the Judges from "Izbet Sartah,"' *Tel Aviv*, 4 (1977), 1-14; M. Kochavi and A. Demsky, 'An Israelite Village from Days of the Judges,' *BAR*, 4 (1978), 19-31.

⁶⁵ 'Documents from Old Testament Times,' *WTJ*, 41.1 (1978), 1-32; A. R. Millard, 'The Practice of Writing in Ancient Israel,' *BA*, 35 (1972), 98-111; cf. idem, 'In Praise of Ancient Scribes,' *BA*, 45.3 (1982), 143-53; F. M. Cross, 'Newly Found Inscriptions in Old Canaanite and Early Phoenician Scripts,' *BASOR*, 238 (1980), 1-20. The Phoenician alphabet may have been transmitted to the Greeks at a much earlier date than the 8th cent. B.C. See N. Naveh, 'The Greek Alphabet: New Evidence,' *BA*, 43.1 (1980), 22-25; see *SA*, p.32, n.26.

developed alphabetic writing systems existed in the time of Moses, making it possible for him and his successors to write books in a script easy to learn.’⁶⁶

THE UNITED MONARCHY

According to [1 Sam. 13:19–22](#) the Philistines at first retained a military advantage over the Israelites by their mastery of iron until they were defeated by Saul. New studies are shedding light on the development of iron metallurgy in biblical lands.⁶⁷

David fled from the wrath of Saul to dwell among the Philistines at [p. 128](#) Ziklag, a site which is now being investigated.⁶⁸ During her excavations in Jerusalem in 1961–68, K. Kenyon discovered a corner of the so-called ‘Jebusite’ wall of the city which David captured.⁶⁹ She found almost nothing, however, of the structures of David and of Solomon. Current excavations in the same area under Yigal Shiloh now claim to have discovered structures dating from this early period.⁷⁰

The fabulous grandeur and wealth of Solomon seemed to be exaggerated to many critics.⁷¹ In recent studies A. Millard has pointed out that extra-biblical accounts of the wealth, especially evidence of gold-plated buildings and statues, lend credence to the biblical descriptions.⁷²

Solomon obtained much of his wealth in trading ventures with King Hiram of Tyre. Classical scholars have questioned the traditions of the early penetration of the western Mediterranean by the Phoenicians, but Semitists have been more sanguine. On the basis of the Nora Stone (9th cent. B.C.) from Sardinia, Albright had suggested that Solomon in partnership with Hiram was sending ships to far off Spain in the 10th century.⁷³ A recent article by F. M. Cross now dates a Nora fragment on the basis of comparative epigraphy to the 11th century.⁷⁴

When I was in Israel in 1968 I took the tourist bus to view the so-called ‘Pillars of Solomon’—impressive geological structures north of Eilat. I smiled within myself at the knowledge which the other tourists did not have that we were in an area of ancient copper mining activities as slag heaps were all around. Later I learned to my chagrin that Benno Rothenberg in 1969 discovered at the base of those pillars an Egyptian temple with

⁶⁶ S. H. Horn, *Biblical Archaeology after 30 Years (1948–1978)* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1978), p.10.

⁶⁷ T. Stech-Wheeler, J. D. Muhly, K. R. Maxwell-Hyslop, & R. Maddin, ‘Iron at Taanach and Early Iron Metallurgy in the Eastern Mediterranean,’ *AJA*, 85.3 (1981), 245–68; cr. J. D. Muhly, ‘Bronze Figurines and Near Eastern Metalwork,’ *IEJ*, 30.3–4 (1980), 148–61.

⁶⁸ E. D. Oren, ‘Ziklag: A Biblical City on the Edge of the Negev,’ *BA*, 45.3 (1982), 155–67.

⁶⁹ ‘Jebusites,’ *IDBA* pp.256–57; K. Kenyon, Jerusalem, *Excavating 3,000 Years of History* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1967).

⁷⁰ Y. Shiloh, ‘Excavating Jerusalem: The City of David,’ *Arch*, 33.6 (1980), 8–17; idem, ‘The City of David Archaeological Project: The Third Season, 1980.’ *BA*, 44.3 (1981), 161–70.

⁷¹ ‘Solomon,’ *IDBA* pp.419–22; *SS*, pp.67–71.

⁷² A. R. Millard, ‘Archaeology and Ancient Israel,’ *Faith and Thought*, 108.1–2 (1981), 58–59; idem, ‘Solomon in All His Glory,’ *Vox Evangelica*, 12 (1981), 5–18.

⁷³ W. F. Albright, ‘The Role of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization,’ *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. E. Wright (Garden City: Doubleday, 1961), pp.343–51.

⁷⁴ F. M. Cross, ‘Early Alphabetic Scripts,’ in Cross, *Symposia* (n.52), pp.103–19.

inscriptions of the XIXth–XXth Dynasties dating from the 14th to the 12th centuries B.C. Rothenberg therefore maintained that these were earlier Egyptian mines and not Solomon's.⁷⁵ In a p. 129 recent article Bimson argues that radio-carbon dates do indicate that the Timna mines were being utilized during Solomon's reign.⁷⁶

THE DIVIDED KINGDOMS

After Solomon's death ten of the northern tribes under Jeroboam I rebelled against Rehoboam, who was left with but Benjamin and Judah. According to [1 Kings 14:25–26](#) Shishak, the Egyptian pharaoh, took advantage of this dissension to attack Jerusalem and remove the treasures of the temple. Though this account has been questioned, a monumental stele of Shishak has been found at Megiddo. Furthermore we learn from Shishak's own reliefs and texts at Karnak in Egypt that he conquered not only Judah but areas in the Esdraelon Valley and Transjordan as well.⁷⁷

Jeroboam I set up golden calves at Dan in the north and at Bethel just above Jerusalem. Extensive excavations at Dan by Avraham Biran have uncovered a well preserved arch and gate from the Canaanite period, as well as a sacred precinct, and an Israelite horned altar.⁷⁸

The independence of the northern kingdom was gradually undermined by the expansion of the aggressive Assyrian Empire. Our earliest known synchronism falls in the reign of Ahab, the son of Omri,⁷⁹ and of Shalmaneser III of Assyria. Ahab was part of an anti-Assyrian coalition which fought the Assyrians in the famous battle of Qarqar⁸⁰ in Syria in 853 B.C., a battle which is not mentioned in the Old Testament. The famous Black Obelisk, which depicts the Israelite king Jehu,⁸¹ comes from the end of the king's reign and is a poor historical source for the battle. Assyrian accounts of the battle progressively inflate the number p. 130 of enemy casualties from 14,000 to 29,000; Assyrian casualties are hardly ever mentioned.

A text found at Tell er-Rimah in 1967 contains evidence that Adadnirari III (810–783 B.C.) exacted tribute from Joash of Samaria (802–787 B.C.): *Ya'a-su Sa-me-ri-na-a-a*.⁸² Shortly after this the Assyrians were ruled by weak kings, a circumstance which allowed

⁷⁵ B. Rothenberg, *Timna* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1972).

⁷⁶ J.J. Bimson, 'King Solomon's Mines?: A Re-assessment of Finds in the Arabah,' *TB*, 32 (1981), 145–46.

⁷⁷ 'Shishak,' *IDBA* pp.412–13; *SS*, p.71; K. A. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period* (Westminster: Aris 8, Phillips, 1973).

⁷⁸ A. Biran, 'An Israelite Horned Altar at Dan,' *BA*, 37.4 (1974), 106–107; idem, 'Tell Dan—Five Years Later,' *BA*, 43.3 (1980), 168–82; idem, 'Two Discoveries at Tel Dan,' *IEJ*, 30.1–2 (1980), 89–98; J. C. H. Laughlin, 'The Remarkable Discoveries at Tel Dan,' *BAR*, 7.5 (1981), 20–37; L. E. Stager and S. R. Wolff, 'Production and Commerce in Temple Courtyards: An Olive Press in the Sacred Precinct at Tel Dan,' *BASOR*, 243 (1981), 95–102.

⁷⁹ It was Omri who moved his capital to Samaria from Tirzah. For a re-examination of R. de Vaux's interpretations of his excavations at Tirzah, see M. D. Fowler, 'Cultic Continuity at Tirzah?: A Re-examination of the Archaeological Evidence,' *PEQ*, 113 (1981), 27–32.

⁸⁰ 'Qarqar,' *IDBA* pp.375–77; *SS*, p.72; *SA*, pp.36–37.

⁸¹ See *SS*, fig.6 on p.53.

⁸² *SA*, p.37; W. H. Shea, 'Adad-Nirari III and Jehoash of Israel,' *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, 30.2 (1978), 101–13.

Jeroboam II (786–746 B.C.) of Israel to expand at the expense of Syria—a development which was prophesied by Jonah ([2 Kings 14:25](#)).

The book of Jonah has troubled many commentators. Even a recent evangelical commentary by Leslie C. Allen has concluded that it is best to regard Jonah as a parable rather than as a historical narrative.⁸³ On the other hand, Donald J. Wiseman, Professor of Assyriology at the University of London, has recently examined the book of Jonah in the light of cuneiform sources and concludes:

It is submitted that this survey of some of the events which might lie behind the account of Jonah's visit to Nineveh supports the tradition that many features in the narrative exhibit an intimate and accurate knowledge of Assyria which could stem from an historical event as early as the eighth century B.C.⁸⁴

Tiglath-pileser III (745–727 B.C.) was one of the greatest of all the Assyrian kings.⁸⁵ He was also known as Pul ([2 Kings 15:19](#); [1 Chron. 5:26](#)), the name under which he ruled as king in Babylon. It was this king who devastated not only Damascus in 732 B.C. but also parts of Gilead and Galilee as well, deporting some of his prisoners to Mesopotamia. His campaigns are fully detailed in his inscriptions and can also be correlated with evidences of devastated Israelite cities from this time. He boasted that he placed Hoshea on the throne of Israel after the assassination of Pekah. The latter's name was found on a jar from the level at Hazor destroyed by the Assyrians.

In 722 the great city of Samaria fell to the Assyrians ([2 Kings 17:6](#), [18:10](#)). Samaria had been the splendid capital of Ahab which had been adorned by Phoenician craftsmen brought south by his wife Jezebel. In the debris, excavators found richly decorated ivory fragments, p. 131 which illustrate the ostentatious luxury denounced by the prophets.⁸⁶

The Bible is correct in crediting the siege to Shalmaneser V, though his successor Sargon II claimed credit for the capture of the city.⁸⁷ Sargon boasted that he carried off 27,290 (or 27,280) persons from Israel, replacing them with various other peoples from Mesopotamia and Syria, who eventually intermarried with the natives to form the hybrid Samaritan population.

Sargon's armies conducted four campaigns in 720, 716, 713, and 712 to secure the Philistine coast. The invasion of 712 led by Sargon's general, mentioned in [Isaiah 20:1](#), is confirmed by a fragment of an Assyrian stele discovered in 1963 at Ashdod.⁸⁸

In 701 Sennacherib attacked Judah, capturing the southern city of Lachish though failing to take Jerusalem. This can be co-ordinated with the biblical account of the miraculous deliverance of Jerusalem under the courageous defiance of Hezekiah ([2 Kings 18–19](#); [Isaiah 36–37](#)). As I mentioned earlier one of the most controversial issues dividing archaeologists is the dating of the destruction of Lachish III. Was it the work of

⁸³ L. C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), pp.77–81.

⁸⁴ D. J. Wiseman, 'Jonah's Nineveh,' *TB*, 30 (1979), 38–39.

⁸⁵ 'Tiglath-pileser III,' *IDBA* pp.451–53; *SA*, pp.37–38.

⁸⁶ 'Palaces,' *ISBE* (forthcoming); *SS*, fig.5., p.51. Numerous ostraca were also found at Samaria, whose interpretation has been the subject of controversy. See A. F. Rainey, 'The Sitz im Leben of the Samaria Ostraca,' *Tel Aviv*, 6.1–2 (1979), 91–94; idem, 'Wine from the Royal Vineyards,' *BASOR*, 245 (1982), 57–62; I. T. Kaufman, 'The Samaria Ostraca,' *BA*, 45.4 (1982), 229–39.

⁸⁷ *SS*, pp.74–75, *SA*, pp.38–39.

⁸⁸ G. L. Mattingly, 'An Archaeological Analysis of Sargon's 712 Campaign against Ashdod,' *NEASB*, 17 (1981), 47–64; cf. idem, 'Neo-Assyrian Influence at Tell Jemmeh,' *NEASB*, 15–16 (1980), 33–49.

Sennacherib in 701 or of Nebuchadnezzar a century later? Recent excavations at Lachish under D. Ussishkin seem to have shifted the balance in favour of the Assyrian date.⁸⁹

In spite of some doubts which have been raised as to the identification of Tell ed-Duweir with Lachish,⁹⁰ the Assyrian texts and reliefs can aid us in a clear understanding of this siege.⁹¹ A new inscription of a letter of Sennacherib to his god Anshar was published in 1974 by N. Na'aman. This reveals that Sennacherib captured Azekah and Gath p.132 and then took Lachish (cf. [Micah 1:10-17](#)), before advancing upon Jerusalem.⁹²

The Assyrians were to be overthrown at the end of the 7th century by a coalition of Medes⁹³ and Chaldeans.⁹⁴ The latter were led by Nabopolassar,⁹⁵ the father of the great king Nebuchadnezzar, who is mentioned almost a hundred times in the Old Testament.⁹⁶ *The Chaldean Chronicles* published by D. J. Wiseman in 1956 have shed welcome light on the early years of Nebuchadnezzar. It was in his first year that Nebuchadnezzar's forces took away such captives as Daniel.⁹⁷

As to the Greek words in the book of Daniel, which have been used to date Daniel in the Maccabean era c. 165 B.C., it is essential to note that the Greeks penetrated the Near East long before Alexander.⁹⁸ Greek mercenaries fought both for and against Nebuchadnezzar. The argument from the close correspondence of [Daniel 11](#) with events of the Maccabean era to sustain a late date is a highly subjective one.⁹⁹ Those who do not believe in predictive prophecy of such precision will regard Daniel as a *vaticinium ex eventu*, 'a prophecy after the event.'

⁸⁹ SA, pp.40, 46; D. Ussishkin, 'Answers at Lachish,' *BAR*, 5.6 (1979), 16-39; W. H. Shea, 'Nebuchadnezzar's Chronicle and the Date of the Destruction of Lachish III,' *PEQ*, 111 (1979), 113-16.

⁹⁰ G. W. Ahlström, 'Is Tell Ed-Duweir Ancient Lachish?' *PEQ*, 112 (1980), 7-9.

⁹¹ D. Ussishkin, 'The "Lachish Reliefs" and the City of Lachish,' *IEJ*, 30.3-4 (1980), 174-95; cf. P. Albenda, 'Syrian-Palestinian Cities on Stone,' *BA*, 43.4 (1980), 222-29.

⁹² N. Na'aman, 'Sennacherib's "Letter to God" on His Campaign to Judah,' *BASOR*, 214 (1974), 25-39; idem, 'Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah and the Date of the LMLK Stamps,' *Vetus Testamentum*, 29 (1979), 61-86. Professor W. H. Shea informs me that on the basis of the reference to the god 'Anshar,' he will argue for two invasions of Sennacherib in a forthcoming article.

⁹³ 'Media, Medes,' *IDBA*, pp.304-06; Persia and the Bible (Grand Rapids: Baker, forthcoming).

⁹⁴ 'Chaldea, Chaldeans,' *IDBA*, pp.123-25.

⁹⁵ 'Nabopolassar,' *IDBA*, pp.326-27.

⁹⁶ 'Nebuchadnezzar,' *IDBA*, pp.332-34.

⁹⁷ D. J. Wiseman, et. al., *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel* (London: Tyndale Press, 1965). On various problems related to Daniel see: *GB*; 'The Archaeological Background of Daniel,' *BS*, 137.1 (1980), 3-16; 'Hermeneutical Issues in the Book of Daniel,' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 23 (1980), 13-21; 'Nabonidus,' *ISBE* (forthcoming).

⁹⁸ *GB*; 'Daniel and Contacts between the Aegean and the Near East before Alexander,' *Evangelical Quarterly*, 53.1 (1981), 37-47.

⁹⁹ D. W. Gooding, 'The Literary Structure of the Book of Daniel and Its Implications,' *TB*, 32 (1981), 43-80.

Space does not permit me in this article to discuss the numerous archaeological finds which have illuminated for us the books of Esther,¹⁰⁰ of Ezra,¹⁰¹ and of Nehemiah¹⁰² from the Post-Exilic era. [p. 133](#)

QUMRAN

Let me discuss some recent developments with respect to the Dead Sea Scrolls found at Qumran since 1947.¹⁰³ With the Israeli seizure of the West Bank in 1967, Yigael Yadin was able to acquire the 'Temple Scroll,' which had been kept under abominable conditions. Its length of some eight metres surpasses even the great Isaiah scroll.

In 1977 Yadin published a three-volume work on the scroll.¹⁰⁴ Though as yet no English edition or translation of the entire work is available, a German translation has appeared,¹⁰⁵ and numerous articles on the text have appeared in English.¹⁰⁶ The text is presented as the words of Yahweh. The Temple Scroll sets forth numerous and detailed injunctions. It ordains strict monogamy for the king (col.56:12f.). It sets forth plans for the placement of the toilets outside the city and lays down a blueprint for the erection of a new temple. It forbids the entrance of any diseased or blind person into the Temple City.¹⁰⁷ What a striking contrast to the attitude of Jesus!¹⁰⁸

In 1972 a famed papyrologist, José O'Callaghan, identified certain Greek fragments from Cave 7 at Qumran as the earliest manuscripts of the New Testament. O'Callaghan is the founder of *Studia Papyrologica*, head of the department of papyrology at the theological seminary in Barcelona, and also professor of Greek papyrology at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome. In the case of 7Q5, O'Callaghan identified this piece with [Mark 6:52-53](#) and dated it to A.D. 50. This sounded [p. 134](#) almost too good to be

¹⁰⁰ 'The Archaeological Background of Esther,' *BS*, 137.2 (1980), 99-117; cf. also on Susa, 'The Achaemenid Capitals,' *NEASB*, 8 (1976), 5ff.

¹⁰¹ 'The Archaeological Background of Ezra,' *BS*, 137.3 (1980), 195-211; 'Ezra and Nehemiah,' *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. F. E. Gaebelien (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, forthcoming).

¹⁰² 'The Archaeological Background of Nehemiah,' *BS*, 137.4 (1980), 291-309; 'Was Nehemiah the Cupbearer a Eunuch?' *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 92.1 (1980), 132-42; 'Two Reformers Compared: Solon of Athens and Nehemiah of Jerusalem,' *The Bible World: Essays in Honor of Cyrus H. Gordon*, ed. G. Rendsburg et. al. (New York: KTAV, 1980), pp. 269-92; 'Nehemiah, A Model Leader,' *A Spectrum of Thought: Essays in Honor of Dennis F. Kinlaw*, ed. M. L. Peterson (Wilmore, KY: Francis Asbury Pub., 1982), pp.171-80.

¹⁰³ *SS*, ch.3: 'The Dead Sea Scrolls,' *Wycliffe Bible Encyclopaedia*, ed. C. F. Pfeiffer, H. F. Vos, and J. Rea (Chicago: Moody Press, 1975), pp.432-42.

¹⁰⁴ Y. Yadin, 'The Temple Scroll,' *BA*, 30 (1967), 135-39; Y. Yadin, *Megillat Hammiqdāš* ('The Temple Scroll') I-III (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977).

¹⁰⁵ J. Maier, *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer* (Munich: Ernst Reinhardt, 1978).

¹⁰⁶ Especially by J. Milgrom, e.g. 'The Temple Scroll,' *BA*, 41.3 (1978), 105-20; 'Studies in the Temple Scroll,' *JBL*, 97.4 (1978), 501-23; ' "Sabbath" and "Temple City" in the Temple Scroll,' *BASOR*, 232 (1978), 25-28; 'Further Studies in the Temple Scroll,' *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 71 (1980), 1-17.

¹⁰⁷ B. A. Levine, 'The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character,' *BASOR*, 232 (1978), 5-24.

¹⁰⁸ 'The Teacher of Righteousness from Qumran and Jesus of Nazareth,' *CT*, 10 (May 13, 1966), 816-18; *SS*, pp.140-45.

true.¹⁰⁹ Since his initial studies made from photographs, O'Callaghan has studied the papyri themselves firsthand and also infra-red photos of the papyri, and has continued to maintain his identifications.

Unfortunately with few exceptions, almost all scholars who have examined his arguments, including some who have been able to study the fragments themselves, believe that O'Callaghan's arguments cannot be sustained. More plausible is their identification as parts of the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament. In most cases the fragments are too tiny to warrant any degree of confident identification.¹¹⁰

Recently some Greek biblical manuscripts, which appear to be a part of the great Sinaiticus manuscript which Tischendorf discovered, have been found in a back room at the Monastery of St. Catherine's in the Sinai. Full details have as yet not been revealed, but the notices are tantalizing.¹¹¹

JESUS CHRIST

The tradition that Jesus was born in a cave is a relatively old one, going back to Justin Martyr of Samaria in the second century.¹¹² Helena, the mother of Constantine, built a basilica there. Investigations in the present Church of the Holy Nativity have revealed mosaics which may go **P. 135** back to this structure. Jerome, the translator of the Vulgate, was inspired to make his home next to the alleged Cave of the Nativity in 385.

At the time when a popular movie about the search for the lost ark (of the temple) was being shown, Eric and Carol Meyers received great media attention for their discovery of an 'ark' from a synagogue in Galilee.¹¹³ Their 'ark' is quite different, however. It is an architectural decoration from a late synagogue. Unfortunately, with the exception of the

¹⁰⁹ 'Qumran New Testament Fragments?' *IDBA*, pp.379-81; J. O'Callaghan, '¿Papiros neotestamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumran?' *Biblica*, 53 (1972), 91-100; D. Estrada, 'The Fragments from Cave 7,' *Eternity*, 23 (1972), 25-26; idem, 'On the Latest Identification of New Testament Documents,' *WTJ*, 34 (1972), 109-17; W. White, 'O'Callaghan's Identifications: Confirmation and Its Consequences,' *WTJ*, 34 (1972), 15-20; idem, 'Notes on the Papyrus Fragments from Cave 7 at Qumran,' *WTJ*, 35 (1973), 221-26; D. Estrada and W. White, *The First New Testament* (Nashville: Nelson, 1978).

¹¹⁰ C. J. Hemer, 'New Testament Fragments at Qumran?' *TB*, 23 (1972), 125-28; idem, 'The 7Q Fragments Reconsidered,' *Themelios*, 9 (1973), 14-16; M. Baillet, 'Les manuscrits de la grotte 7 de Qumrân et le Nouveau Testament,' *Biblica*, 54 (1973), 340-50; P. Benoit, 'Nouvelle note sur les fragments grecs de la grotte 7 de Qumrân,' *Revue Biblique*, 80 (1973), 5-12; G. D. Fee, 'Some Dissenting Notes on 7Q5=Mark 6:52-53,' *JBL*, 92 (1973), 109-12; R. Lester, 'Does Qumran Cave 7 Contain New Testament Materials?' *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 2 (1975), 203-14. Inscriptions in Aramaic, Hebrew and Greek from New Testament times in Israel raise the possibility that Jesus may have been trilingual. See 'Aramaic,' *IDBA*, pp.38-41; P. Lapipe, 'Insights from Qumran into the Languages of Jesus,' *Revue de Qumran*, 8.4 (1975), 483-501.

¹¹¹ J. H. Charlesworth, 'The Manuscripts of St. Catherine's Monastery,' *BA*, 43.1 (1980), 26-34.

¹¹² *SS*, p.100; see J. Finegan, *The Archaeology of the New Testament* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1964); C. Kopp, *The Holy Places of the Gospels* (Freiburg: Herder, 1963).

¹¹³ E. M. and C. L. Meyers, 'American Archaeologists Find Remains of Ancient Synagogue Ark in Galilee,' *BAR*, 7.6 (1981), 24-39; E. M. Meyers, J. F. Strange, and C. L. Meyers, 'The Ark of Nabratein—A First Glance,' *BA*, 44.4 (1981), 237-43.

synagogue at Masada¹¹⁴ and a few others, almost all of the remains of synagogues in Israel come from the Byzantine period and not from the New Testament era.¹¹⁵

This seems to be the case with the celebrated synagogue at Capernaum. The possibility remains that the synagogue of Jesus' day may lie covered under the present remains which have been left in situ. Under the octagonal structure between the synagogue and the Sea of Galilee exciting discoveries have been made by V. Corbo since 1968. He discovered that the octagon was a basilica of the fifth century. Beneath that he found evidence of a house church with graffiti which mention Peter. The first-century level was a fisherman's house, which was transformed into a church. Not only is this the earliest structure which can be identified as a church, but it is plausible to believe that this was Peter's own house!¹¹⁶

Recent excavations have clarified the numerous constructions of Herod the Great, including his work in Jerusalem.¹¹⁷ We now have a better idea of the walls and of the streets of Jerusalem in Jesus' day.¹¹⁸ Investigations by B. Mazar have succeeded in giving us a clear understanding of the temple platform and of some of the decorations which p. 136 came crashing down when Titus destroyed the temple in 70.¹¹⁹ Debate over the exact location of the temple on the platform continues, however.¹²⁰

The harsh reality of crucifixion's brutality¹²¹ has been brought home to us by the discovery in 1968 of ossuaries at Giv'at ha-Mivtar just north of Jerusalem.¹²² Among the bones of thirty-five individuals, there is evidence that nine died from violent causes,

¹¹⁴ Y. Yadin, *Masada* (New York: Random House, 1966).]

¹¹⁵ E. M. Meyers, 'Ancient Synagogues in Galilee,' *BA*, 43.2 (1980), 97–108; idem, 'Synagogues of Galilee,' *Arch*, 35.3 (1982), 51–59; E. M. Meyers and J. F. Strange, *Archaeology, the Rabbis and Early Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981).

¹¹⁶ *SS*, p.102; V. Corbo, *The House of Saint Peter at Capharnaum* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1969); J. F. Strange and H. Shanks, 'Has the House Where Jesus Stayed in Capernaum Been Found?' *BAR*, 8.6 (1982), 26–37.

¹¹⁷ 'Archaeology and the New Testament,' *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. F. E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979), I, pp.645ff.; reprinted in *Archaeology and the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979),

¹¹⁸ J. Wilkinson, 'The Streets of Jerusalem,' *Levant*, 7 (1975), 118–36; idem, *Jerusalem as Jesus Knew It* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978); B. E. Schein, 'The Second Wall of Jerusalem,' *BA*, 44.1 (1981), 21–26.

¹¹⁹ It was my privilege to participate in the 1968 season directed by Professor B. Mazar just south of the temple mount. See B. Mazar, *The Mountain of the Lord* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1975); idem, 'Excavations near Temple Mount Reveal Splendors of Herodian Jerusalem,' *BAR*, 6.4 (1980), 44–59; M. A. Zimmerman, 'Tunnel Exposes New Areas of Temple Mount,' *BAR*, 7.3 (1981), 34–41; 34–41; J. Fleming, 'The Undiscovered Gate beneath Jerusalem's Golden Gate,' *BAR*, 9.1 (1983), 24–37.

¹²⁰ D. M. Jacobson, 'Ideas Concerning the Plan of Herod's Temple,' *PEQ*, 112 (1980), 33–40; C. L. Meyers, 'The Elusive Temple,' *BA*, 45.1 (1982), 33–42; A. Kaufman, 'Where the Ancient Temple of Jerusalem Stood,' *BAR*, 9.2 (1983), 40–59.

¹²¹ 'The Crucifixion and Docetic Christology,' *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 46.1 (1982), 1–20.

¹²² V. Tzaferis, 'Jewish Tombs at and near Giv'at ha-Mivtar,' *IEJ*, 20 (1970), 18–32; N. Haas, 'Anthropological Observations on the Skeletal Remains from Giv'at ha-Mivtar,' *IEJ*, 20 (1970), 58ff. On the dispute over the location of Calvary, see *SS*, pp. 108–11, and Wilkinson, *Jerusalem*, pp.180ff., 194ff. The site of Gordon's Calvary has no archaeological or traditional evidence for it, whereas the Church of the Holy Sepulchre does. See Charles Couasnon, *The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem* (New York: Oxford University, 1974); I. Grego, 'Il Golgota Monte Santo dei Cristiani,' *Bibbia e Oriente*, 23 (1981), 221–33; J. F. Strange, 'Archaeology and Pilgrims in the Holy Land and Jerusalem,' *BASOR*, 245 (1982), 75–78.

including a child who was shot with an arrow, a young man who was burned upon a rack, and an old woman whose skull was bashed in. Of the greatest interest is one ossuary which provides us for the first time with physical evidence of crucifixion. It is the ossuary of a Yehohanan, who was a young man between the ages of twenty-four and twenty-eight. He was crucified at some time early in the first century A.D.

Yehohanan's *calcanei* (heel bones) were still transfixed by a four and a half inch iron nail, which had been bent as it was pounded into a cross of olive wood. The right *tibia* (shin bone) had been fractured into slivers by a blow, the 'coup de grace' which was administered to hasten death (cf. [John 19:32](#)). The crease in the right radial bone indicates that the victim had been pinioned in the forearms rather than in the hands as in the traditional depictions of Christ's crucifixion. The Greek word *cheiras* in [Luke 24:39-40](#) and [John 20:20, 25, 27](#), usually translated 'hands,' can and should be translated 'arms' in these passages. p. 137

CONCLUSIONS¹²³

Numerous tombs in Jerusalem and elsewhere can illustrate for us the kind of tomb in which Jesus was buried.¹²⁴ But only faith can convince us of the reality of the resurrection!¹²⁵

Archaeology in some striking cases does present us with *proofs* of the validity of passages which have been questioned. In other cases it is not to be denied that there are still *problems* which cannot be currently resolved in reconciling the archaeological data with the biblical text. But here we need to be aware of the fallacy of arguing from silence.¹²⁶ There is no question but that we have but scratched the surface. There are almost limitless *promises* of new data and texts available to future generations.

When I think of the functions of archaeology, I am reminded of the three elements which make opera so enjoyable for me: 1) the lyrics, 2) the music, and 3) the sets and costumes. Scriptures correspond to the lyrics, faith creates the music, and archaeology provides the setting. We can understand the text by itself, or the music by itself, but how much richer is our enjoyment with the provision of the sets and costumes. Just so archaeology can provide us with the realia which help us recreate in our minds' eye the original settings of the Scriptures.

Notes

AJA

American Journal of Archaeology

¹²³ Space does not permit a discussion of how archaeology has illuminated the ministries of Paul and of John. See *SS*, pp.112-25; *The Archaeology of New Testament Cities in Western Asia Minor* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980); *Harper's World of the New Testament* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981); Jack Finegan, *The Archaeology of the New Testament: The Mediterranean World of the Early Christian Apostles* (Boulder: Westview, 1981).

¹²⁴ A. Kloner, 'A Tomb of the Second Temple Period at French Hill, Jerusalem,' *IEJ*, 30.1-2 (1980), 99-108; L. Y. Rahmani, 'Ancient Jerusalem's Funerary Customs and Tombs,' *BA*, 44.3 (1981), 171-77, and 44.4 (1981), 229-36; J. Zias, 'A Rock-Cut Tomb in Jerusalem,' *BASOR*, 245 (1982), 53-56; R. Hachlili, 'A Second Temple Period Jewish Necropolis in Jericho,' *BA*, 43.4 (1980), 235-40; R. Hachlili and A. Killebrew, 'The Saga of the Goliath Family,' *BAR*, 9.1 (1983), 44-53.

¹²⁵ Easter—Myth, Hallucination, or History?' *CT*, 18 (March 15, 1974), 4-7; (March 29, 1974), 12-14, 16.

¹²⁶ *SS*, ch. 4; *SA*, pp.17-20.

Arch	Archaeology
BA	Biblical Archaeologist
BAR	Biblical Archaeology Review
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research p.138
BS	Bibliotheca Sacra
CT	Christianity Today
GB	Greece and Babylon (1967)
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
IDBA	International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal
ISBE	International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia (rev. ed)
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JASA	Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
NEASB	Near East Archaeological Society Bulletin
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
SA	The Scriptures and Archaeology (1980)
SS	The Stones and the Scriptures (1972; 1981 repr.)

TB

Tyndale Bulletin

WTJ

Westminster Theological Journal

Dr. Edwin M. Yamauchi is Professor of History at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, U.S.A.

This article refers especially to articles published in 1980–83, as I have earlier published the following expositions of archaeology between 1972–80: *The Stones and the Scriptures* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1972; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), hereafter *SS*; 'A Decade and a Half of Archaeology in Israel and in Jordan,' *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 42.4 (1974), 710–26; 'Documents from Old Testament Times: A Survey of Recent Discoveries,' *WTJ*, 41.1 (1978), 1–32; 'Archaeology and the New Testament,' *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. F. E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979), I, pp.645–69; with D. J. Wiseman, *Archaeology and the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979); 'Archaeology and the Scriptures,' *The Seminary Review*, 25.4 (1979), 163–241; *The Scriptures and Archaeology* (Portland: Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, 1980), hereafter *SA*. Where no author is listed the reference is to one of my own writings. [p. 139](#)

Eastern Orthodox Mission Theology

James Stamoolis

Reprinted from International Bulletin of Missionary Research, Vol. 8. No. 2, April 1984 with permission. Copyright © by Overseas Ministries Study Center, Ventnor, New Jersey.

It is very unfortunate that there is so little dialogue between Evangelicals and representatives of Eastern Orthodox Churches. This article gives illuminating insights into the Orthodox Church's understanding of mission, that are often missing in Protestant missions. On a recent visit to Egypt this Editor was challenged by evidences of renewal in mission in some of the local churches of the Coptic Orthodox Church.

(Editor)

When Protestants and Roman Catholics look at the Eastern Orthodox Church's mission history, they are often puzzled. They find some missionaries to admire,¹ some practices to question,² and much that is difficult to comprehend. The general viewpoint seems to be that the Orthodox mission experience is a chapter in the history of the expansion of the faith, but is of little relevance today. Since the late 1950s, however, there has been considerable rethinking about mission within the Orthodox church.³ It is the purpose of this study to show that Orthodox missiology has more than historical interest, and p. 140 that there are valuable contributions to be gained from an understanding of Orthodox mission theory and practice.⁴

ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Historians conveniently use A.D. 1054 to mark the schism between the East and the West, but the separation started as early as the fourth or fifth century.

The developing distance in theological frameworks was apparent in two contemporaries, John Chrysostom and Augustine, who were both interpreters of St. Paul. Chrysostom looked to Paul for directions in living; Augustine drew out of Paul a theology of grace. While these positions are obviously complementary to each other, they are also in their extreme development foreign to each other.

The different biblical emphases appear with the development of the Pauline concept of justification in what might be termed Roman legal terminology. Whereas the doctrine of justification occupied the West, the East found a theological centre in the idea of union with God. The great theme was the incarnation and the consequences of this event for the believers. 'God became man, that man might become God.'⁵ First found in Irenaeus, this concept is repeated in Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, and many other patristic authors.

This theme at once encompasses redemption and goes beyond it as it is often understood in the West. What is in view is not only humankind's standing before God with

¹ See, e.g. Bishop Tucker's judgment that Nicholas Kasatkin was 'the outstanding missionary of the nineteenth century' (Henry St. George Tucker, *The History of the Episcopal Church in Japan* [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938], p.103). Cf. the similar sentiments found in Richard Henry Drummond, *A History of Christianity in Japan* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971), p.354.

² It was not uncommon for Russian missionaries to dispense baptism as a mere legal formality without any Christian instruction, to bribe potential converts with gifts, and even on occasion to resort to the use of physical violence. See Nikita Struve, 'The Orthodox Church and Mission,' in *History's Lessons for Tomorrow's Missions* (Geneva: World's Student Christian Federation, 1960), pp.109-11.

³ The historical circumstances of Orthodoxy, for the Greek church since the Ottoman oppression and for the Russian church since the Communist revolution, have made the questions of pastoral care and survival more urgent than missionary expansion. However, there is a growing interest in missionary work. *Porefthendes* was for a decade (1959-69) the publication of the Inter-Orthodox Missionary Centre in Athens. The Apostoliki Diakonia of the Church of Greece commenced publishing in 1982 *Panta Ta Ethni*, a quarterly missionary magazine to provide information 'on Orthodox missionary efforts throughout the world.' The editor is Anastasios Yannoulatos, who had served as the director of *Porefthendes*. For information on *Panta Ta Ethni*, write to Apostoliki Diakonia, 14 Io. Gennadiou St., Athens (140), Greece.

⁴ See Stamoolis, annotated survey of Orthodox missiology, 'A Selected Bibliography of Eastern Orthodox Mission Theology,' *Occasional Bulletin of Missionary Research* 1, no.3 (1977): 24-27. A more comprehensive bibliography appears in Stamoolis, 'An Examination of Contemporary Eastern Orthodox Missiology' (D. Theol. dissertation, University of Stellenbosch, South Africa, 1980), pp.276-308.

⁵ Vladimir Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God* (London: Mowbrays, 1975), p.97. Lossky's entire essay on 'Redemption and Deification' (pp.97-110) clearly contrasts the Orthodox view of *theosis* with the Western preoccupation with justification.

regard to its sinfulness, but humankind's ultimate standing before God in the heavenly places. Christ's descent makes possible humanity's ascent into God's presence. However, it is not solely the work of the Second Person of the Godhead that secures the ascent. In the present age the ascent to God's presence is the work of the Holy Spirit.

The full realization of being partakers of the divine nature ([2 Pet. 1:4](#)), or *theosis* as it is properly called in Orthodox theology, must await the final consummation of all things in Christ. Nevertheless, through the mediation of the Holy Spirit, this ascent into God's presence is the [p. 141](#) experience of the church at worship.⁶ While it would appear that worship does not pertain directly to mission, yet in this joining of incarnation (and its consequent *theosis*), liturgy, and the church, we have the three major elements of Orthodox missiology. In the words of Alexander Schmemmann: 'Nothing reveals better the relation between the Church as fullness and the Church as mission than the Eucharist, the central act of the Church's *leiturgia*, ... The Eucharist is always the End, the sacrament of the *parousia*, and, yet, it is always the beginning, the starting point: now the mission begins.'⁷

THREE THEOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES

There are abundant references to the centrality of the incarnation in the Orthodox faith. The liturgical witness and the local community as the key elements in the missionary witness of Orthodoxy are themes that have been stressed in recent reflections on the subject.⁸ As these three concepts are studied in the context of Orthodox thought, fresh insights can be gained for the church's missiological task.

INCARNATION AND THEOSIS

The obvious connection between the theme of union with God and mission is that God desires all humankind to be in union with himself through Christ. This theme is worked out by Orthodox theologians in their discussions on motives for missionary work.⁹ God's love for humankind forms the strongest motive for mission, since it was God's love that mandated the incarnation.

The Orthodox understanding of the incarnation does have a feature that was unique to missionary thinking in the earliest period of the church: the Orthodox maintained that each race, each culture, each identifiable group had the right to receive the gospel in its own language. As Christ became incarnate in the word of humanity in order [p. 142](#) to bring God's Word to the human condition, so must the Word of God be translated into every language to become incarnate in the lives of the people. The stress on communication of the divine message so that the people could understand and participate is a direct result of the Orthodox theological framework. By way of contrast, the Latin missionaries refused to use the vernacular. Their theological system did not depend on an incarnational model

⁶ 'Through the sacrament of the Eucharist, human nature enters into union with the divine nature of Christ' (Demetrios J. Constantelos, *Understanding the Greek Orthodox Church* [New York: Seabury Press, 1982], p.65).

⁷ Alexander Schmemmann, 'The Missionary Imperative in the Orthodox Tradition,' in *The Theology of Christian Mission*, ed. Gerald H. Anderson (New York: McGraw-Hill, and London: SCM, 1961), p.255.

⁸ Ion Bria, 'On Orthodox Witness,' *International Review of Mission* [cited subsequently as *IRM*] 69 (October 1980–January 1981): 527–28.

⁹ Cf. Anastasios Yannoulatos, 'The Purpose and Motive of Mission,' *IRM* 54 (1965): 281–97.

of relationships but on juridical justification before God's law, even if the one being justified was ignorant of the exact terms of release. In Moravia, where the Byzantine brothers Cyril and Methodius were working among the Slavs, the Latin missionaries so opposed the use of the vernacular that they eventually forced the missionaries who were using it out of the country.¹⁰

Orthodox theology counts of utmost importance the real participation of the believer. For real participation to take place, the fundamentals of the faith, and especially the worship services, must be intelligible to the congregation. Thus in historical and contemporary practice, great efforts have been expended on the translation and explanation of the Liturgy. Modern Greek missionaries have diligently worked on translations into the languages in which they are ministering.¹¹ Commentaries are also prepared for the nominal Orthodox so that they can understand and participate in the services they have been attending.¹²

THE LITURGY

It seems strange that an event for the believing community, an event from which the unbaptized were excluded in the early church (the present form of the Liturgy continues the form of the exclusion, without its being practised),¹³ should be an element of missionary theology. **P. 143**

However, in contemporary Orthodox writings the Liturgy functions exactly in this way. There are two aspects to the missiological function of the Liturgy, the internal and the external. The internal aspect pertains to the life and sustenance of the church. During the Ottoman period, 'it was the Holy Liturgy which kept Orthodoxy alive.'¹⁴ Likewise, this identification with the language was part of the indigenization of the faith. As Ion Bria points out, this led to the 'transfiguration' of the culture and history by the gospel.¹⁵ Paradoxically, this close identification of culture and faith has prevented the Orthodox diaspora from reaching out in mission.¹⁶ This failing does not reflect so much a flaw in

¹⁰ Francis Dvornik, *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1970), pp.115, 129–30.

¹¹ See *The First Five Years of Porefthendes, Activity Report 1961–1966* (Athens: InterOrthodox Missionary Centre, [1966]), p.20.

¹² Some examples are Nicon D. Patrinos, *The Orthodox Liturgy* (Garwood, N.J.: Graphic Arts Press, 1976); Stanley S. Harakas, *Living the Liturgy* (Minneapolis: Light and Life, 1974); and George Mastrantonis, *The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom* (St. Louis: Logos, 1966). The last-named book contains a pictorial commentary on the liturgical text to enable the reader better to follow and understand the action.

¹³ See *The Priest's Service Book* (New York: The Orthodox Church in America, 1973), p.259. Some Orthodox churches repeat the prayer for the catechumens and their subsequent dismissal audibly before the congregation while in some other churches these prayers are repeated inaudibly by the priest at the altar.

¹⁴ Timothy Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1963), p.111.

¹⁵ Bria, in *Martyria/Mission*, ed. Ion Bria (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1980), p.10.

¹⁶ The attitude is shown in the multiplicity of ethnic jurisdictions that are common in the non-Orthodox countries to which the Orthodox emigrated. This ecclesiastical coexistence (which is contrary to the church canons) 'is considered by an overwhelming majority of the Orthodox people as something perfectly normal, as expressive of the very essence of that diaspora whose main vocation, as everyone knows and proudly proclaims, is the preservation of the various "cultural heritages" proper to each "Orthodox world" ' (Schmemmann, *Church, World, Mission* [Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1979], p.13). The first chapter of Schmemmann's book is an excellent introduction to the problems facing Orthodoxy today.

Orthodox theology as a tendency not to look beyond one's own racial or cultural boundaries.

Orthodox missiologists increasingly see the Liturgy as a motivating factor for mission by providing both the context and the content of mission. The context is the return from the presence of God to the need of the world. The contrast between the state of humankind as God intends it to be and the state of humankind as it demonstrates the need of mission. The message from God gives the content of mission, the message that states God in Christ has come among us so that we may come to be with God. 'It is impossible to participate in Christian worship without reference to the world mission, and it is impossible to engage in real Orthodox mission without a living participation in Holy Communion,' writes Anastasios Yannoulatos.¹⁷

Since the Orthodox church is primarily a worshipping community, it is not difficult to see that worship is central to Orthodox mission. It is of the esse of the church. But it is harder to understand how the Liturgy can be a method of mission. Some help comes from the traditional p. 144 story of the conversion of Prince Vladimir of Russia. The Liturgy in Constantinople so impressed Vladimir's envoys that they recommended Orthodoxy to him.¹⁸ Is it so far removed from present experience not to expect the worship of God to produce awe, appreciation, and ultimately conversion?

At the 1974 Bucharest consultation on 'Confessing Christ Today,' the question of whether or not the Liturgy is a suitable form of witness was discussed. The main thrust was the witness of the liturgical community in the world after that community has participated in worship. This is often referred to as the liturgy after the Liturgy. The actual witness of the Eucharist itself was also noted: 'Conversions still take place through the magnetic attraction of the Eucharistic service. The casual visitor slowly becomes a regular attendant and then studies the faith of the Church and asks for baptism.'¹⁹

The consultation stops short of recommending the Liturgy as a method of mission. However, it does see a use for the non-Eucharistic elements of the Liturgy to be used in evangelism. These 'non-Eucharistic liturgical expressions, non-Eucharist liturgical prayers, liturgical Bible readings, icons, hymnology, etc. can and should be also used for proclaiming the Gospel and confessing Christ to the world.'²⁰ In point of fact, one wonders if the consultation's recommendations are really only a recognition of what Orthodox missionaries had been doing. Nicholas Kasatkin (1836–1912)—in Japan, better known as Father Nicolai—had his evangelists teaching the creed and the Lord's Prayer to the enquirers (both of which are in the Liturgy).²¹ Stephen of Pern (1340–96) attracted the

¹⁷ Anastasios Yannoulatos, 'Orthodox Mission and Holy Communion,' *Porefthendes* 6 (1964): 58. This article is a transcript of a draft contribution presented during the discussion in Section IV (The Witness of the Christian Church across National and Confessional Boundaries) at the Commission on World Mission and Evangelism, Mexico City, 1963.

¹⁸ 'Vladimir Christianizes Russia,' in *Medieval Russia's Epics, Chronicles and Tales*, ed. and trans. Serge A. Zenkovsky (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1974), pp.65–71.

¹⁹ Ion Bria, 'Confessing Christ Today: An Orthodox Consultation,' *IRM* 64 (1975): 69.

²⁰ 'Confessing Christ Today: Reports of Groups at a Consultation of Orthodox Theologians,' *IRM* 64 (1975): 85.

²¹ Otis Cary, *A History of Christianity in Japan*, 2 vols.; vol.1: *Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Missions* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1909), pp. 383–84.

Zyrians with the beauty of the church he built.²² Macarius Gloukharev (1792–1847) insisted on a long period of pre-baptismal instructions for his converts, during which time he taught the fundamentals of the faith.²³ Many other names could be added to this list. Perhaps it is in the liturgical elements that p. 145 the appeal of the Liturgy to the unconverted lies. The liturgical witness is not only talk about God, it is also talking with God. The method and the message become one.

THE CHURCH

The local liturgical community has long been regarded as the centre of the Orthodox religious experience.²⁴ The communal aspect of the Orthodox church is evident in its soteriology: 'We know that when any one of us falls, he falls alone; but no one is saved alone. He who is saved is saved in the Church, as a member of her, and in unity with all her other members.'²⁵

This concept of community is in accordance with the movement toward unity with God. In other words, the corporate nature of salvation is a direct result of the doctrine of *theosis*. If the ultimate goal is for man to be like God (*theosis*), then this goal must include the unity of all who profess the same purpose, since there can be no disunity in the Godhead. Indeed, N.M. Zernov can see division between Christians as a violation of the bond of love and the inevitable separation from the Holy Spirit, which ultimately endangers one's salvation.²⁶

It follows, then from the close identification of soteriology with ecclesiology that the church should play a central role in the missiology of Orthodoxy. Recent studies have focused on 'the importance of the local liturgical community as the basis of mission and evangelization.'²⁷ The stress, however, does not lie in the organization and structure of the church. For it is not structure, but nature and essence that are crucial. The local church is the visible and concrete expression of God's redeeming work in the world. Therefore, to be true to its nature, the local congregation must be active in mission and evangelism.²⁸ Anything less is a denial of the gospel. p. 146

In the development of the Orthodox idea of the local congregation, however, there is little concept of the foreign missionary who goes to areas where there is no established

²² George P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind (II): The Middle Ages, the 13th to the 15th Centuries* (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland, 1975), p.236. Fedotov has the best available description in English of Stephen's life and work.

²³ Nikita Struve, 'Macaire Gloukharev, A Prophet of Orthodox Mission,' *IRM* 54 (1965): 312. The period of instruction varied with each case.

²⁴ Various studies by Orthodox theologians have appeared. In addition to the ones cited below, cf. George Florovsky, 'The Church: Her Nature and Task,' in *The Universal Church in God's Design* (New York Harper & Brothers, 1948), pp.43–58; Vladimir Lossky, 'Concerning the Third Mark of the Church: Catholicity,' in his *In the Image and Likeness of God*, pp.179–81; and N. A. Nissiotis, 'The Ecclesiological Foundation of Mission from the Orthodox Point of View,' *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 7 (1961–62): 22–52.

²⁵ Alexy Stepanovich Khomiakov, *The Church Is One* (London: Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, 1968), p.38. The Russian original was written around 1850.

²⁶ N. M. Zernov, 'The Church and the Confessions,' in *The Church of God, an Anglo-Russian Symposium*, ed. E. L. Mascall (London: SPCK, 1934), p.214.

²⁷ Bria, 'On Orthodox Witness,' p.527.

²⁸ Cf. M. A. Siotis, 'Thoughts of an Orthodox Theologian on "The Missionary Structure of the Congregation"' *Concept* 3 (1963): 1.

congregation. Because the picture of the corporate nature of the church is drawn so strongly, it excludes the pioneer missionary. Ultimately there should be no conflict, since the missionary's role is precisely that of establishing local congregations.

While the emphasis on the corporate nature of the church may be seen as a welcome corrective to what the Orthodox term the excessive individualism of the West,²⁹ the real value of Orthodox ecclesiology lies in the concept of the worshipping community as the goal of mission. The work of evangelism is not accomplished until a worshipping, witnessing community has been established. Here Orthodox ecclesiology returns full circle. The congregation is the focus of mission work and witnesses to the gospel both in its own locale and through its representatives to the wider world. Its representatives, or missionaries, endeavour to establish other local congregations that can repeat the process. Mission does not end until the whole world is praising the Lord of all creation.

THREE ELEMENTS OF MISSION PRACTICE

In looking at the history of Orthodox missions, one can isolate three distinct elements of mission practice, present since early Byzantine times.³⁰ All three derive from the theological understanding of the Orthodox church. All three account for the success of Orthodox missions in transmitting the faith to an ever-increasing number of linguistic and cultural groups.

USE OF THE VERNACULAR

All Orthodox missions that have in any way been successful in establishing a church have translated the Liturgy and the Scriptures into the vernacular. This, more than any other aspect of Orthodoxy, accounts for the deep penetration that the Orthodox church has made **P. 147** into diverse cultures.³¹ In dealing with nonliterate cultures, Orthodox missionaries first devised an alphabet. Language study was and still is the key element on the missionary's agenda.³²

It is misleading to give the impression that all Orthodox missionaries were interested in translation, however. The use of Christianity to 'Russify' the non-Russian peoples of the eastern regions of the Czarist empire is by no means a highpoint in the history of Orthodox mission.³³ Mass baptisms in the absence of any serious Christian instruction were the order of the day. As might be expected, so were mass apostasies.

²⁹ See Zernov, 'The Church and the Confessions,' pp.215-18, for a most enlightening perspective on Western individualism.

³⁰ See, e.g., Serge Bolshakoff, 'Orthodox Missions Today,' *IRM* 42 (1953): 275; Nectarios Hadjimichalis, 'Orthodox Monasticism and External Mission,' *Porefthendes* 4 (1962): 13:12-15; and Anastasios Yannoulatos, *Monks and Mission in the Eastern Church during the 4th Century* (Athens: Porefthendes, 1966).

³¹ 'The greatest contribution which the Orthodox Church can make to the African Churches is the Holy Liturgy ... Not only for the Greek Orthodox, but also for the African Orthodox, the Liturgy is the strongest appeal of the Church' (D. E. Wentink, 'The Orthodox Church in East Africa,' *The Ecumenical Review* 20 [1968]: 42-43).

³² Anastasios Yannoulatos, 'Initial Thoughts toward an Orthodox Foreign Mission,' *Porefthendes* 4 (1968): 19-23; Elias Voulgarakis, 'Language and Mission,' *Porefthendes* 4 (1962): 42-43.

³³ See Glazik, *Die russisch-orthodoxe Heidenmission seit Peter dem Grossen* (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuch Handlung, 1954), passim.

Not all the advances in vernacular translations were made by pioneer missionaries. The most notable corrective to the return to Islam of the baptized Tartars was made by the linguist Nicholas Ilminski. Working at the Ecclesiastical Academy at Kazan, Ilminski discovered that the literary language of the Tartars was not their common language, but the language of Islam. The only Tartars who understood the literary language were those educated in Islamic schools, Ilminski severed the link with Islam by translating the Liturgy and the Scriptures into the vernacular, and in the process raising it to a written language.³⁴

INDIGENOUS CLERGY

Generally Orthodox missions operated with very few 'foreign' personnel. There was a great reliance placed on the converts early in each missionary enterprise. In some cases, funds to pay the national workers came from the missionary's home base. Possibly the reliance on indigenous clergy was necessary because it was difficult to obtain missionary recruits for some areas,³⁵ but the use of national workers fits P. 148 in very well with the incarnation of the gospel. Even today it is regarded as a matter of policy that clergy be nationals.³⁶ In the Russian Orthodox mission to Japan, several benefits of this policy can be seen. The church survived the Russo-Japanese War because only three of the thirty-nine clergy were Russian.³⁷ The adaptation of Orthodoxy to Japanese customs is further testified to by the experiences of a convert in 1880, who saw Orthodoxy as a new fulfillment to Japanese tradition.³⁸

Part of the reason that indigenization of the clergy succeeds at an early stage of church development arises from the Orthodox view of clerical duties. The priest is primarily responsible for the liturgical services. If these are in the vernacular, then the priest only needs to be able to read the various offices. The homily can be given by another member of the congregation, as is the case in some rural sections of Greece where the schoolteacher may be more educated in theology than the priest.³⁹ Or, the priest can read a homily prepared for him by the bishop. This is not to imply that the Orthodox church places a low value on theological education, since this is not the case. Well-trained clergy have been a hallmark of the church, and promising candidates were often sent from the mission church back to the 'homeland' for training.⁴⁰ The point is that there are levels of clerical training in Orthodoxy which permit converts, relatively untrained in theology, to

³⁴ Eugene Smirnoff, *A Short Account of the Historical Development and Present Position of Russian Orthodox Missions* (London: Rivingtons, 1903), pp.30ff.

³⁵ See, e.g., the story of how John Veniaminov at first declined, as did all the other clergy in the diocese, the call to mission work in Alaska (Paul D. Garrett, *St. Innocent, Apostle to America* [Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1979], pp.32–36).

³⁶ Chrysostomos Konstantinidis, 'New Orthodox Insights in Evangelism,' in *Martyria/Mission*, pp. 14–15.

³⁷ Serge Bolshakoff, *The Foreign Missions of the Russian Orthodox Church* (London: SPCK, 1943), p.78.

³⁸ See the story of Sergei Seodzi in Martin Jarrett-Kerr, *Patterns of Christian Acceptance, Individual Response to the Missionary Impact 1550–1950* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972), pp.142–51.

³⁹ See Mario Rinvulcri, *Anatomy of a Church, Greek Orthodoxy Today* (London: Burns & Oates, 1966), pp.13–44.

⁴⁰ Most of the training these days takes place at the theological faculties of the universities of Athens and Saloniki, though some candidates have trained at St. Vladimir's Theological Seminary in Crestwood, New York, and Holy Cross School of Theology in Boston.

minister the sacraments. This system does not correspond to a lay-minister programme but, rather, has full, recognized priests serving the developing mission work.

THE SELFHOOD OF THE CHURCH

The third characteristic of Orthodox missions was the selfhood of the mission church. The supposed goal of all Orthodox mission work was P. 149 the creation of an autocephalous church that could run its own affairs.⁴¹ This was in keeping with the other two elements just discussed, because it signified a church that spoke one language, spanned one culture, and was the incarnation of the gospel message to one people. Therefore, while these national churches usually corresponded to political boundaries, in their conception they were first of all cultural and linguistic entities. National churches were to share the common tradition and faith of Orthodoxy while maintaining ecclesiastical independence.

It was in this third element that Orthodox missions most often failed. The creation of autocephalous churches had political overtones that often prevented the appointment of native bishops. The close connection between the church and the state during both the Byzantine and the Russian periods of missionary work often prevented the natural transition of authority. Even today the issue of supposed suppression of emerging national churches is keenly debated within Orthodox circles.⁴²

The historical inability to follow through on all elements of Orthodox theology should not detract from the total scope of Orthodox missiology. The fact remains that the theoretical base and the vision can be found both in the history of Orthodox missions and in contemporary missiological writings by Orthodox.⁴³ Perhaps the Orthodox are in a better position now, since the church, both in the diaspora and in Greece, is not linked to any colonial power. It can fulfill what it sees to be its calling by God, that of having Orthodoxy, 'the right praise' of God, fill the whole earth.

IMPLICATIONS

When the elements of Orthodox missiology are viewed in isolation, it P. 150 is possible to draw parallels to a number of concepts in Western theology. But it must be noted that parallels do not exist at every point, nor do they match precisely. However, to regard the aspects of Orthodox missiology as independent points is to miss the congruity of the theological position, for it is in its wholeness that Orthodox missiology makes an impact on the study of missions. The framework of the approach is as important as the approach. There is a cohesiveness inherent in Orthodox theology that leads to mission work. It is being recognized that to deny mission is to deny Orthodoxy.⁴⁴

⁴¹ In Orthodoxy, an autocephalous church is one that selects its own head and is therefore independent from the control of another church.

⁴² John Meyendorff discusses the attempts at the Hellenization of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church (*The Orthodox Church: Its Past and Its Role in the World Today*, trans. John Chapin [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962], p.169). Demetrios J. Constantelos maintains that had Hellenization been the aim, the Greek church could have used many opportunities, especially during the Ottoman period, but chose the path of toleration and diversity (*Understanding the Greek Orthodox Church* [New York: Seabury Press, 1982], pp.86–87).

⁴³ Anastasios Yannoulatos, 'The Purpose and Motive of Mission,' *IRM* 54 (1965): 281–97. A fuller revision of this article with very complete notes appears under the same title in *Porefthendes* 9 (1967): 2–10, 34–36.

⁴⁴ 'Can a Church that for centuries now has had no catechumens, but jealously guards the treasure of faith for itself, totally indifferent to whether other people are being born, breathe, live and die, within the Lie—

Thus, if one is to understand and learn from Orthodox missiology, it is imperative to begin with a holistic approach to Orthodox theology. The framework of Orthodoxy provides the starting point for mission. The richness of the Orthodox tradition, obscured from the West by long centuries of theological isolation and historical separation, offers a vital contribution to Christian knowledge.

Dr. James J. Stamoolis is Theological Students' Secretary for the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students. He was formerly a missionary in the Republic of South Africa. p. 151

Gospel Definitions of Adultery and Women's Rights

G. J. Wenham

*Reprinted from The Expository Times, Vol. 95, No. 11, August 1984
with permission*

This article argues that Jesus taught that remarriage following divorce is adultery. A number of important corollaries follow.

(Editor)

Christian readers of the OT are usually surprised to learn that in pre-Christian times the seventh commandment applied only to married women and not to married men. If a married man indulged in sexual relations with a single girl or patronized a prostitute, that did not count as adultery against his wife. If on the other hand a married, or even a betrothed, woman had sexual intercourse with anyone except her husband that counted as adultery, so she and her partner were liable to be put to death ([Lev. 20:10](#), [Dt. 22:22-24](#)).

This definition of adultery, which sees it essentially as an offence against a husband, was not peculiar to ancient Israel. It was common to the legal traditions of the ancient Near East, Greece and Rome. This view of adultery tied a woman exclusively to one man, whereas men were legally free to contract several unions. Hence polygamy was possible under Mesopotamian and OT law, while Roman law allowed men to keep a concubine as well as a wife. But women could not be polyandrous.

However it should not be supposed that in OT times polygamy was common: the cost of marriage effectively made polygamy the prerogative of kings and rich patriarchs. Nor did the law encourage married men to have affairs with single girls, as the penalties for such behaviour show ([Ex. 22:16-17](#), [Dt. 22:28-29](#)). Nor was resort to prostitutes approved by wisdom teachers or prophets ([Prov. 5](#), [Jer. 3](#), [Am. 2:7](#), etc.). Nevertheless

which therefore is alien to the feelings of world love and justice—be really “Orthodox”? (Anastasios Yannoulatos, ‘Orthodox Spirituality and External Mission,’ *IRM* 52 [1963]: 300). For a review of recent mission work, see Alexander Veronis, ‘Orthodox Concepts of Evangelism and Mission,’ *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 27 (1982): 44-57.

none of these acts counted as adultery, which was a capital offence under Near Eastern, OT and early Roman law. So there was built into this husband-orientated view of adultery a fundamental inequity between spouses: the wife had to be totally loyal to her husband on pain of death, but the husband would suffer at most financial loss or social stigma if he was disloyal to his wife.

TEACHING OF JESUS

It was the teaching of Jesus that revolutionized this situation, that put both man and wife on an equal footing as regards conjugal rights, so **p. 152** that both had to be totally loyal to each other. He makes his points in the dispute with the Pharisees ([Mk. 10:2-12](#), [Mt. 19:3-9](#)) and in his new definitions of adultery scattered throughout the gospels ([Mt. 5:27-32](#), [19:9](#), [Mk. 10:11-12](#), [Lk. 16:18](#)). It is these definitions I wish to focus on here.

Form critics generally regard [Lk. 16:18](#) as the earliest and most demonstrably authentic form of Jesus' logia about divorce. 'Everyone who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries a woman divorced from her husband commits adultery.' Its authenticity is vouched for in that it presupposes a Palestinian setting, because it envisages only the man taking the initiative in divorce, yet it totally transcends first-century Jewish views of marriage. For while ostensibly regulating in typical case-law fashion marriage after divorce, Jesus' new definitions of adultery imply also a revolutionary approach to polygamy and extra-marital affairs.

To appreciate the magnitude of this revolution, both parts of [Lk. 16:18](#) must be examined in turn. Verse [18b](#) is closely paralleled by [Mt. 5:32b](#) 'Whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.' To a first-century Jewish audience such a statement would have sounded fantastic, for the principal purpose in writing a certificate of divorce (*gēit*, cf. [Dt. 24:1](#), [Mt. 19:7](#)) was to free a divorced woman from the charge of adultery if she remarried. Indeed the Mishnah says that a divorce certificate is not valid unless it explicitly states, 'Thou art free to marry any man' (*Gittin* 9:3).

Jesus is not therefore simply condemning divorce. He says it does not achieve what it purports to, namely, give freedom to remarry. Remarriage despite the legal form of divorce is adultery. This new definition of adultery implies the indissolubility of marriage, a point Jesus argues theologically on the basis of [Gn. 1:27](#) and [2:24](#) in his debate with the Pharisees ([Mt. 19:3-9](#), [Mk. 10:2-9](#)). Dupont aptly sums up what Jesus has done by redefining adultery in this way.

Note the way Jesus puts it. He does not say in a general abstract sort of way: 'divorce does not dissolve the marriage'. He describes a concrete situation, that of a divorced woman, and declares to him who wants to marry her that this marriage is adultery. The affirmation is so much more striking in going right to the consequences. This woman whom a divorce has liberated is not free. Contradictory? Not at all, but a way of making us feel more vividly a quite new teaching, which deprives divorce of its essence. Jesus keeps the term, but changes its content. This freed woman is not really free: the dissolved marriage still exists. In speaking as he does, Jesus makes his hearers realize that divorce has no effect on the marriage bond: although separated, the spouses remain united by the marriage. That is why a new marriage would be adultery.¹ **p. 153**

Thus the new definition of adultery in [Lk. 16:18b](#) serves to give married women some protection against male caprice. A wife cannot simply be turned out at the whim of her

¹ J. Dupont, *Mariage et divorce dans l'évangile* (Bruges, Desclée de Brouwer [1959], 57.

husband. In the eyes of Christ at any rate she is still bound to her husband even after divorce.

RIGHTS OF WOMEN

But more striking from the point of view of women's rights is [Lk. 16:18a](#): 'Every one who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery'. In v. [18b](#) it is the woman's second husband who commits adultery, that is, he sins against her first husband. But here in v. [18a](#) it is the first husband who commits adultery by divorcing and remarrying. But who is he sinning against? His second wife could well be a spinster or widow. Evidently by marrying a second time the man is committing adultery against his *first* wife. [Mk. 10:11](#) makes the point explicitly by adding 'against her'. And it is a very great innovation to say a man can commit adultery against his own wife. The OT knows of men committing adultery against other men by having intercourse with their wives, and of women committing adultery against their husbands, but not *vice versa*. By this pronouncement Jesus binds husbands to their wives with the same exclusiveness as wives were bound to their husbands under the Old Covenant. A real reciprocity between spouses is thereby implied by Jesus' teaching.

It is this new definition of adultery condemning remarriage after divorce as a sin against one's first wife which carries with it the implication that polygamy and extra-marital affairs are wrong for men too. A divorce was regarded as securing the right of both parties to remarry without being stigmatized as adulterers. As we have seen Jesus denied that divorce gave freedom to remarry. Now it follows that if he held that it was adultery to take a second wife *after* divorce, which in first-century eyes entitled one to take a second partner, how much more adulterous must it be to take a second partner *without* the legal form of divorce. Thus bigamy and polygamy are ruled out by [Lk. 16:18](#) and parallels. Furthermore married men who had affairs with unmarried girls must by analogous reasoning be guilty not just of fornication but of adultery against their wife. In this very brief statement then is encapsulated a revolution in the rights of married women: Jesus expects every husband to be completely faithful to one woman. Where his new definition of adultery is respected, a wife cannot be discarded by divorce, demeaned by polygamy, or outraged by her [p. 154](#) husband's extra-marital affairs or his resorting to prostitutes. All these sins now count as adultery by the husband against his wife, just as any infidelity on her part counted as adultery against him under OT law. Thus full reciprocity between spouses was introduced by Jesus' remarks.

MALE CHAUVINISM

According to Mark and Luke, Jesus' new definition of adultery turned it from being primarily an offence by married women against their husbands into a sin by either spouse against their partner. But the prime target of Jesus' redefinition is male infidelity. His attack on male chauvinism is taken even further in Matthew's gospel. In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus condemns men who lust for committing 'adultery in the heart' ([5:28](#)). He further implies that divorce by itself may be adulterous ([5:31-32](#)) not just divorce followed by remarriage as Mark and Luke insist. That this is clearly Matthew's understanding is shown firstly by his arrangement of the material.² [5:31-32](#) continues the

² See F. W. Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew. A Commentary* (Oxford, Blackwell [1981]), 153-54.

R. H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans [1982]), 89.

exposition and application of the seventh commandment begun in [5:27](#). The unusually brief introductory formula, 'It was also said' ([5:31](#)) compared with the long formulae introducing the other antitheses in [5:21](#), [27](#), [33](#), [38](#), [43](#) shows that Matthew understood [5:31-32](#) to follow on from [5:27-30](#). Secondly, 'everyone who divorces his wife, except on the ground of unchastity, makes her an adulteress' ([5:32a](#)) shows Jesus putting the blame for the breach of the seventh commandment on the husband, a feature that is prominent in the rest of the synoptic tradition. Only where a man has been forced to divorce his wife because of her own unchastity is the husband exempt from being blamed as adulterous for initiating divorce.³ P. 155

CONCLUSION

To sum up. There are a variety of definitions of adultery in scripture ranging from the narrow OT husband-centred view to the broad definitions of the Sermon on the Mount. They may be tabulated as follows:-

OT	adultery is	infidelity by a married woman
Lk. 16:18		infidelity by a married
Mt. 5:32b		man or woman,
Mk. 10:11-12		polygamy, and remarriage after divorce
Mt. 5:32a		divorce alone (except for unchastity) ⁴
Mt. 5:28		lust is 'adultery in the heart'

Though the definitions of [Mt. 5:28](#), [32a](#) are broader than those in [Lk. 16:18](#) and parallels, it would seem unnecessary to posit that they must represent Matthaean expansions of the primitive dominical statement. All the divorce logia attributed to Christ exhibit a concern with the rights of women. If he could say that remarriage after divorce and therefore

J. J. Kilgallen, 'To What are the Matthaean Exception Texts (5:32 and 19:9) an Exception?', *Biblica* 61 [1980], 102-5.

³ It seems that unchastity (*porneia*) means any sexual immorality, most frequently adultery. Although Matthew allowed divorce in this situation, there is no indication that he permitted remarriage even then. See E. Lövestam, 'Divorce and Remarriage in the New Testament', *Jewish Law Annual* 4 [1981], 47-65. J. Dupont, *Mariage et divorce*, 136-157. R. H. Gundry, *Matthew*, 90-91. For further discussion see W. A. Heth and G. J. Wenham, *Jesus and Divorce* (London, Hodder & Stoughton [1984]).

[Mt. 19:9](#) apparently brings together the common synoptic definition that remarriage after divorce is adultery, and [Mt. 5:32](#)'s definition that divorce by itself, except for unchastity, is also adultery. See G. J. Wenham, 'Matthew and Divorce', *JSNT* (forthcoming).

polygamy and any male infidelity is adulterous, it seems quite feasible that he might have condemned unwarranted divorce equally forthrightly.

These dominical innovations were maintained by Paul and by the majority of the early Christian fathers, who insist on the mutuality of conjugal rights between married couples and forbid Christians to remarry after divorce.⁵ For them the loving husband totally loyal to his wife whatever her faults was a powerful image of the devotion of Christ to his church. And to this day married women still hope for the same loyalty from their husbands as their husbands expect from them, even though they are usually ignorant of who first formulated their expectations.

Dr. G. J. Wenham lectures at The College of St. Paul and St. Mary, Cheltenham. p. 156

The Power and the Powerless The Pastoral Vocation of the Hispanic Church in the USA

A. William Cook

Printed with permission

This lecture was delivered during the Hispanic Emphasis Week October 17–20, 1983 at the annual Convocation of the Hispanic Studies and Ministry Programme of the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary. The purpose of the week's activities was to highlight the importance of Hispanic culture in North America and the missional challenge which Hispanics posed for the Christian church in the United States during the last quarter of the 20th century.

The Hispanic Studies and Ministries Programme of Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary has been designed for students who either out of ethnic origin and/or vocational commitment want to minister to Hispanics in the Americas. Its aim is to develop competency for an effective ministry with evangelical passion and ecumenical outlook. The programme includes theological, cultural and field studies. It seeks to create within the entire Seminary community an awareness of the challenge of Hispanics to the church as a whole, the beauty and depth of their spiritual and cultural traditions, the relevance and breadth of contemporary Hispanic theologies.

For more information write to:

*Hispanic Studies & Ministries Programme
Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Lancaster and City Avenues
Philadelphia, PA 19151 USA*

⁵ Cf. [1 Cor. 7:3–4, 10–11](#). For the evidence of the fathers see H. Crouzel, *L'Église primitive face au divorce* (Paris, Beauchesne [1971]).

(Editor)

The experiences of Israel during the two periods when they were far away from their homeland (the Egyptian captivity and the Babylonian-Persian exile) constitute an attractive point of reference for a reflection on the Hispanic experience in North America, and its relation to the Church's mission here as well as in Latin America. What were the temptations that confronted the people of Israel in such situations? p. 157 What were the challenges and opportunities that they faced as they struggled to maintain their national identity (their sense of people-hood) and to be faithful to their divine calling in the midst of hostile and overpowering cultures?

It may sound strange to North Americans, and in particular to white anglo-saxon Protestants (WASPS!), to speak in terms of 'captivity' and 'exile' in relation to the United States. Isn't, after all, 'America' the 'promised land'—the great 'melting pot' that beckons the peoples of the world with the shining torch of liberty and of a new hope which is symbolized in our national consciousness by the Statue of Liberty? I remember several years ago listening to an irate caller on a New York City late-night talk show roundly condemning the dissimilation (lack of assimilation) of U.S. Hispanics. 'Instead of learning English like my Polish parents did', he said, 'they are forcing us to pay millions in tax dollars while imposing upon us their tongue as a second national language!'

Whether or not the U.S. was ever the warm melting pot of our national myth, it most certainly is so no longer. The Statue of Liberty's torch has grown rusty, in more ways than one, and is badly in need of costly structural repairs (if not changes) if it is to truly shine forth with the brilliance that has become the stuff of U.S.-American legend.

For Hispanics the North American experience has been a mixed blessing. On the one hand, it has meant a relative economic improvement—for example, in the case of under (and non)-paid pastors coming from Latin America; but it has also signified for many wrenching social dislocation, cultural alienation, and anomie—in a word, dehumanization. With few exceptions, Hispanics and other dark-skinned minorities, have been treated as second-class citizens in this 'land of opportunity' by the social institutions and churches with which they have chosen to become identified, whether by citizenship, birth or affiliation.

BIBLICAL PARADIGMS

Does the experience of Israel have anything to say to my fellow-Latin Americans, to my Hispanic sisters and brothers and to the WASP church in the USA? I have chosen to focus schematically upon the experience of four great leaders of God's People in the Old Testament (Moses, Daniel, Esther and Nehemiah) whom I see as paradigms of the pastoral vocation of contemporary 'captive' and 'exiled' Hispanic Christians, and other minorities, in these United States. P. 158

Moses

Moses was born in Egypt, a sixth or seventh generation exile in an alien land. His forebears had been brought to this land by a very successful kinsman who, under God's guidance, had achieved the highest possible position next to the Pharaoh, during a non-Egyptian dynasty. Initially, Jacob and his family had prospered in very propitious surroundings. But had they 'kept the faith'? How much of their ethnic identity had they lost over several generations? Although we cannot be sure of the answers to these questions, the incident of the golden calf, many years later, hints at syncretism and a gradual surrender, at least on the part of some, to the idolatrous culture of Egypt.

Then there arose an Egyptian Pharaoh 'who knew not Joseph' and with him, I suspect, the temptation to 'go along', to 'play ball' with the system—or, in contrast, to develop an attitude of resistance to an alien culture. But, for most, this was not to be. Bondage became their lot.

[Heb. 11:23-29](#) is a theological reflection (a 're-reading', if you please) of Moses' role as leader of the Exodus. Just as Stephen had done earlier in his defence before the Sanhedrin, the author of Hebrews adds new insights and makes new applications of the basic story ([Exod. 2:11-15ff](#)). Hebrews cast the story of Moses' personal pilgrimage in the context of a 'power encounter', or, to put it differently, of cultural attraction vs. counter-cultural resistance. Notice how many times the words 'Pharaoh', 'Egypt' and 'Egyptians' are used. These are code words for the absolute system which had enslaved the Israelites and now tempted Moses to 'go along.' Take note, also, of the expressions 'king's edict' ([11:23](#) NIV) and 'king's anger' (v.26) which reflect a system of coercive laws, customs and mores which limited Moses' options.

In the face of this—and in spite of his having received the best education available to the priestly and military classes of his day—Moses makes his own decisions. He chooses to identify with ('to become solidary with', is the way we would put it in Latin America) a despised and oppressed people. The Book of Hebrews states this in the strongest possible terms: Moses 'refused' a position of princely privilege (v.24) and 'chose mistreatment' with the people of God 'rather than enjoy the pleasures of sin (the temptations of power?) for a short time.' (v.25)

This statement omits the long and agonizing process which Moses underwent in order to reach these decisions. As we know, he first—impulsively—struck down an Egyptian taskmaster who was mistreating one of his fellow-Israelites. But it was perhaps not so impulsive a gesture as it might seem. Stephen Martyr gives us an interesting insight. p. 159 Moses, 'powerful in speech and action', took the conscious step at age forty to let himself be confronted by the social reality of his people. Then, he killed the Egyptian, says Stephen, not in the white heat of anger, but 'because he thought that his own people would realize that God was using him to rescue them, but they did not' ([Acts 7:22-25](#) NIV). Delusions of grandeur? Or perhaps the first stirrings of a political awareness? Exposure to the reality of marginalized and oppressed peoples—and particularly our own—is a first and necessary step for understanding, not only their plight, but God's concern for the poor.

But what guided Moses in his momentous decision—or series of small decisions which eventually became a major decision—according to the author of Hebrews, was his sense of history. That is, he was able to relate his newfound socio-political concern, if you will, to a particular world-view, which we today know as 'Salvation History.' Social concern, bereft of a theoretical frame of reference, will usually degenerate into a paralyzing vicious circle. This did not happen to Moses.

Over against the relatively 'short time' in which he could have enjoyed the trappings of power and all of the comforts and advantages of Egyptian civilization, he weighed—in faith—the Messianic hope, and the former was found wanting. 'He regarded the disgrace (humiliation, identification with an outcast people) for the sake of Christ (the Messianic hope) as of greater value than the treasurer of Egypt, because he was looking ahead to his reward. By faith he left Egypt, not fearing the King's anger; he persevered because he saw him who is invisible' ([11:25-27](#)). To take the side of the downtrodden, according to one prominent Brazilian theologian (Leonardo Boff), is to believe that 'utopia' is more concrete than current history and that the justice of the Kingdom of God is even more real than the weight of concrete facts.'

The powerful of this world, be they governments, socio-economic interests, ecclesiastical authorities, or just plain people like most of us, will usually view with displeasure the conscious decision of a minority (be it a person or a social grouping) to 'buck the system' to 'refuse to play the game.' But, for the Christian, this refusal is more than a political statement. It is in a very real sense, a liturgical act—a way of proclaiming the sovereignty of Jesus Christ over all of the powers of this age. 'By faith (Moses) kept the Passover ...' (v.28). 'So Jesus also suffered outside the city gate to make his people holy through his own blood. Let us, then, go to him outside the camp, bearing the disgrace he bore. For here we do not have an enduring city, but we are looking for the city that is to come.' ([Heb. 13:12-14](#) NIV) p. 160

Moses' decision was also the end process of forty long years of tending mindless sheep on the back-side of an arid desert. How discouraged he must have been! How much reflecting and planning he must have done! God never calls his servants in a vacuum. He meets them in Burning Bushes and on Damascus Roads while they are in a process of awareness of His actions within their own particular history.

Moses' decisions weren't his alone to make. Neither are our choices individual acts—a sort of 'men and women against the tide,' the stuff of the legendary 'American Dream.' His decision was, I repeat, a part of a lengthy pilgrimage during which he became increasingly conscious of his cultural and religious identity (of his '*hispanidad*,' or 'Blackness,' if you please). There were undoubtedly many unrecorded interactions with people—beginning with his childhood upbringing—before he reached his momentous decision. And, of course, the final outcome of his 'option for the poor' was the liberation of an entire nation, the salvation of a whole race, the seed of the Messiah. 'By faith the people passed through the Red Sea' (v.29).

Daniel

Our second example was born in Judah of noble, and perhaps royal, blood. He may have been the product of the religious revival under Josiah. He was probably taken captive by Nebuchadnezzar during the second of his three sweeps through Palestine ([2 Kgs. 24:15-17](#) and [Dan. 1:1-3](#)). Daniel was a Hollywood image-maker's dream. A sort of Hebrew Ricardo Montalban. It is recorded that he was 'without any physical defect, handsome,' apt for 'any kind of learning, wellinformed and quick to understand'—in a word, uniquely 'qualified to serve in the king's palace. (NIV)' And, on top of this, he was given the best post-graduate training in political science and administration in the empire, as were his colleagues—Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah ([Dan. 1:3, 4](#)).

Like Moses, Daniel also faced momentous choices. But compared to Moses' options, these choices seem rather insignificant and unworthy of the risk of throwing away a brilliant career in 'his majesty's service.' But, as we know, what was at stake was infinitely more than counting calories and sticking to natural food diets. It was, once again, a power confrontation between Yahweh the only true God and the God of Daniel's people, and an idolatrous socio-economic and religious system. A confrontation between the God of the downtrodden and a world empire. That clash between culture and counter-culture came to a head, of course, at the foot of Nebuchadnezzar's image on the plain of Dura and in the fiery furnace. Much later, the rival powers— p. 161 God and empire—met head on in Belshazzar's drunken banquet hall and, under a later empire, in a lion's den.

Dare to be a Daniel; dare to stand alone.

Dare to have a purpose firm;

Dare to make it known.

But Daniel, my childhood chorus notwithstanding, did not stand alone. Aside from the obvious fact that God was always at his side, Daniel stood in solidarity with his people. This is an unwritten presupposition of the entire Book of Daniel. As a provincial governor and imperial counsellor in Babylon, and later a chief minister in Persia ([2:48](#); [6:1, 2](#)) he may have been responsible, according to some authorities, for administrative matters relating to the large number of Jews now living under imperial jurisdiction. Nonetheless, Daniel did not lose his sense of historical perspective. To him was given the wisdom to interpret historical events—past, present and future—and to pronounce judgment on a dying empire ('Mene, Mene, Tekel, U-parsim'). But he could only do this while he remained faithful to God and to his own cultural heritage.

Esther

The winner of the Miss Persia Pageant of c. 480 B.C. was a member of a minority race which still conserved a strong sense of national identity despite some six decades of exile. In spite of this handicap (which she was instructed to conceal, probably to avoid racial discrimination) she became the favourite queen of Xerxes, a despot who ruled a vast empire of 127 provinces from Pakistan to the Sudan.

Esther got her chance to ask all for her people because her predecessor (the first women's libber) refused to flaunt her body before the gaping nobles of the royal court. Is this not an unlikely scenario for an heroic stand against the 'principalities and powers'? Yet it was this beautiful and shy niece of a partial contemporary of Daniel—and maybe even of Nehemiah ([Esther 2:5-7](#))—who saved her race—and who knows, perhaps the Davidic line from which our Saviour was born—from total extinction. And it was Mordecai, another member of a minority, who would someday become Xerxes's chief minister, who strategically thrust her from the king's harem into the vortex of history. When an egomaniac with genocidal tendencies made his grab for power he was thwarted by Mordecai's astuteness and by Esther's decision to risk, not only her reputation and social status, but her very life.

It is clear that Esther had been placed in a position of privilege and potential influence, not because of her feminine graces, but to accomplish [p. 162](#) a mission on behalf of her people. Yet, she was not indispensable. God had other instruments that He could use if she failed to rise to the occasion. In the blunt words of Mordecai,

Do not think that because you are in the king's house [at the seat of the empire] you alone of all the Jews will escape. For if you remain silent at this time, relief and deliverance ... will arise from another place, but you and your father's family will perish. And who knows but that you have come to royal position for such a time as this?

[\(4:12-14 GNB\)](#)

Esther is galvanized into action. Flouting convention, and willing even to resort to 'civil disobedience,' she risks everything for the sake of her people. 'I will go to the king, even though it is against the law. And if I perish, I perish' ([4:16](#)). Once again, a member of a despised minority who had managed to 'make it' within the dominant 'power culture,' through an unlikely set of events, has made a conscious 'option for the poor,' her own people. She has been willing to give up the trappings of power for the sake of solidarity with an oppressed people. For she was not alone: She called her people to join in her valiant stand. 'Get all the Jews in Susa together, hold a fast and pray for me,' ([4:16](#)).

Nehemiah

Let us look briefly at a fourth exile, Nehemiah by name. He had attained the privileged position of cupbearer to Artaxerxes of Persia. As one who protected the king from food

poisoning, he literally held the sovereign's life in his own hands. Here we have again another Israelite who had 'made it' in the halls of power of a world empire. Probably a second-generation exile with no first-hand remembrance of his ancestral land, Nehemiah could have been thought to have only a small obligation to the land of his forefathers, which was, after all, in ruins. He could have sustained the same attitude as the majority of the Jews of the Diaspora who chose to remain in the capital of empire rather than return to Jerusalem.

But not so. We read that Nehemiah (1) kept in touch with the current historical situation of his people through relatives and other travellers; (2) demonstrated an active concern for the miserable state of his nation in prayer and fasting; (3) became solidarious with the sins of his people ('I confess the sins we Israelites, including myself and my father's house, have committed against you'); (4) challenged God to live up to His Word and (5) involved himself in specific actions on behalf of his people in Jerusalem (cf. [Neh. 1](#)). p. 163

And so it happened that Nehemiah returned to the land of his forebears with authority to act. God had paved the way for him, first in his dealings with the king, and later in his westward journey. Yet, at no time does he act arbitrarily. He is always conscious that he is a member of a nation, and acts in solidarity with his people. Nehemiah first takes stock of the situation, noting the damage that had been done seventy years before. Only then does he gather the leaders of the people—who we can suspect were sceptical at first—and mobilizes them, and through them, an entire discouraged community. The end result, of course, is the reconstruction of a city and the revitalization of a nation.

IMPLICATIONS FOR HISPANICS

What do these somewhat similar experiences of four great Jewish leaders have to say to Hispanics in the USA today? Permit me to close with some additional observations.

1. Although the situation of Hispanics in the US may seem to us far removed from an Egyptian-type bondage or Babylonian exile, there is a very real sense in which cultural minorities the world over—and certainly not excluding the USA—are often in socio-economic bondage and cultural captivity. To a greater or lesser degree, depending upon historical circumstances, the cards have been 'stacked against them.' This is especially true in the case of peoples who have come from the so-called 'Third World.' They are even looked down upon by one-time ethnic minorities from Europe.

2. Ultimately, it is a question of power. Of who wields it, and for the benefit of whom. Marcel Garaudy, the French Marxist turned Catholic, defined the condition of the people at the base of the social pyramid as 'that sector of society that has been bereft of possession, power and knowledge' whose cultures are manipulated by the dominant cultures in ways that serve to legitimize the prevailing social order.

How much of this is true in the USA, and in relation to Hispanic minorities? More to the point, how much of this is true in Hispanic churches? To what degree are our own Latin American sisters and brothers (including, of course, US Hispanics) in socio-economic bondage and cultural and political captivity to powerful ecclesiastical and missionary institutions? Perhaps we need to pay more heed to the voice of the liberating God who once again commands us: 'Let my people go!' I like the way in which my friend, Fr. Joao Batista Libanio, the Brazilian Jesuit theologian puts it: 'It is of no use to discern the will of God in actions which attempt to deal with the contradictions and conflicts of society if these actions do not change history by their application p. 164 to it.' (*Spiritual Discernment and Politics*, [Maryknoll: Orbis, 1982], p.2)

3. But, you say, ‘Hispanics have just as much of a chance to move upward on the social and ecclesiastical ladder as anybody else—just as our own forebears did. All it takes is some hard work!’ True, and yet not true. For the socio-economic system is far more complex today, and the resources and opportunities are far less available than they were to Eastern and Southern Europeans, as we all know. The unlimited frontier of the American Dream has come to a screeching halt. Furthermore, are we not failing to take our deep-seated racial prejudices into account? Prejudice was not, to the same degree, a hindrance to the success stories of our Middle and Southern European immigrants.

Nevertheless, we must recognize that, here and there, representatives of minorities, Hispanics included, have ‘made it to the top.’ This continues to give credence to the American success myth. And it provides a false utopia for the struggling minorities. Sadly, those few that do succeed often forget their roots and become part of the system that continues to hold their people down. It is at this point, precisely, that the difficult choices of Moses, Daniel, Esther and Nehemiah are not unrelated to the situation of some successful Hispanic church leaders, for example. When the siren song of a seemingly superior culture and of an overpoweringly alluring and materialistic system rings in our ears, how, my Hispanic sisters and brothers, shall we respond? May Moses, Daniel, Esther, Nehemiah and the people whom they lead provide us even today with the inspiration for right action.

4. As each of these Bible personages have demonstrated, success is not inherently wrong. Power is not intrinsically evil. But its ‘scope is enormous.’ As J. B. Libanio observes ‘Power ... is the locus where one finds demonstrated most clearly both the greatness and depravity of human nature’ (*Ibid.*, p.2). It is what we do with success and how—and for whom—we use power that counts. In the up-side-down logic of the Kingdom, the servant of all is the one who has true power—and not the one who pulls the strings from on top (cf. Jesus’ remarks to his quarrelling disciples in [Mk. 10:42–45](#) ‘You know that those who are regarded as rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be slave of all. For even the Son of man did not come to be served, but to serve and to give His life a ransom for many’). Hispanics have just as much right to success and to leadership positions as do their ‘Anglo’ sisters and brothers. But it would be a sin against God and a crime against God’s people to use [p. 165](#) whatever privilege we may attain for self-aggrandizement, instead of for the spiritual, cultural, economic and political liberation of our fellow Latin Americans, at whatever personal cost.

5. To conclude, the example of Nehemiah challenges the Hispanic church in the US to undertake its pastoral responsibility in relation to Latin America and to the Latin American church. By ‘pastoral’ I, of course, do not mean the autocratic idea that so many of my Latin American colleagues have concerning the pastoral ministry—which they learned from bad missionary example and carried to even further extremes. ‘Pastor’ and ‘shepherd’ in Greek and in Spanish are the same word. Except for references to shepherds of sheep and for the one mention in [Eph. 4:11](#), the term always refers to our Lord Jesus Christ. It is He, therefore who provides us with the model for a pastoral ministry in the Hispanic and Latin American context. ‘The Good Shepherd gives his life for the sheep.’ Was not the Cross the greatest of all power confrontations?

The servant vocation, the martyr role, that willingness to risk all and to give up everything for the cause of Christ and of our people—that is the true pastoral vocation of the Hispanic church in the US today. And, as was the case with Nehemiah, it may be a vocation which involves a return to the land of our forebears to rebuild in the words of Isaiah, ‘what has long been in ruins, building again on the old foundations,’ so that we might ‘be known as the people who rebuilt the walls, who rebuilt the ruined houses,’ even

as we shout aloud 'and do not hold back,' raising our voice 'like a trumpet,' declaring to our people their rebellion and proclaiming the full-orbed justice of the Lord, and His love for the poor and oppressed ([Isa. 58](#)). And for those whom God calls to remain in the capital of the Empire, there is a responsibility to perceive one's present privileges and opportunities in the light of our *Hispanidad* and Latin American heritage to look upon all of this in the context of a pastoral vocation to *all* of Latin America: 'who knows but that you have come to the Kingdom for such a time as this!'

Dr. William Cook is General Director, Latin American Evangelical Centre for Pastoral Studies, Box 1307, San Jose, Costa Rica and a member of WEF Theological Commission. p. 166

The Reaction Against Classical Education in the New Testament

E. A. Judge

*Reprinted from Journal of Christian Education Papers 77 July 1983
with permission*

This is one of the most incisive and scholarly articles ever published by the Evangelical Review of Theology. Its implications for Christian Education are indeed profound.
(Editor)

In talking of 'Christian Education' one advances well beyond the framework of New Testament thought. Indeed, insofar as we are talking about schooling, we have to say that it is a matter that is not dealt with in the New Testament at all. The fact that some of the ministries in the churches, notably teaching, are described in educational terms, and that educational metaphors are sometimes used of church life, is not at all a good reason for thinking that the principles of upbuilding in Christ can be transferred to schooling in particular. The subject is available for metaphor because it is not being dealt with in itself. This only sharpens the problem of why the New Testament writers were not concerned with schooling. In other cases, such as economics, where the New Testament does not seem to face a subject in our way, we may say that it is because such questions were not conceptualised in our way at the time. But with education the opposite applies. By New Testament times the Greeks had for centuries both practised education and discussed it in essentially the same terms as we do.¹

Hellenistic education proceeded through primary, secondary and tertiary levels roughly corresponding to ours. Grammatical and literary studies were dominant at the lower levels, but linked with mathematics, music and physical training. Girls and boys were treated alike. But from adolescence boys were admitted to the privileged ephebic

¹ F. A. G. Beck, *Greek Education, 450–350 B.C.*, London: Methuen, 1964; id., *An Album of Greek Education*, Sydney: Cheiron Press, 1975; H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, London: Sheed & Ward, 1956.

education in the gymnasium, originally intended for military training. It became a kind of public school system in the elite sense, conferring social status. From Roman times one might seek official registration in the old boys' union of 'those who were from the gymnasium', provided one's family had been in it for several generations.² For tertiary p. 167 education one might expect to move to a major centre, to study under a famous rhetorician (a sophist), or under a philosopher. These two types of school were distinguished by two basically different curriculums, not unlike our distinction between Arts and Sciences, and they were highly critical of each other. The rhetoricians specialised in the training of a man for public life, while the philosophers concentrated upon the theoretical analysis of man and the universe.

Broadly speaking this is the pattern of education that has persisted, witness especially the tradition of the British Public School or the German Gymnasium, into our own lifetimes. Central to it has always been the study of the classical authors. Students in St. Paul's day concentrated upon the same writers, and by much the same methods of grammatical analysis and literary commentary, as would a modern Classics student—Homer, the Athenian dramatists, and Demosthenes; or Cicero, Horace and Vergil if they were being educated in Latin. But behind the ascendancy of these studies in nineteenth-century church schools lies a paradox. Classical literature embodies ideals profoundly in conflict with those of the Bible: polytheism, for example, and an ethical stance that fostered exploitative sexual and social relations. In the early centuries the churches denounced this as poison, to which church training in the Bible was the antidote. But why did it not arise as a problem in the New Testament?

A simple explanation would be that the churches were made up of uneducated people. This was frequently asserted against them by their critics in the next two centuries. It was taken up as a serious historical explanation in the early part of this century, when the newly found papyrus letters were held to show that the New Testament letters came from a similarly sub-literary level of culture.³ Paul seemed to endorse this in [1 Cor. 1:26–29](#) and perhaps, it was said, could not even write himself, simply adding his signature to what he had dictated as in [Col. 4:18](#). But we now have a petition and a letter from Lollianos, the public grammar-school teacher from Oxyrhynchus in the mid-third century, p. 168 which shows that he also preferred to dictate.⁴ Indeed, not writing one's own letters was the mark of a gentleman, who could afford a secretary. Paul's low rating of the Corinthians is probably sarcastic. The commonest opinion now is that the churches were partly drawn from educated circles. It has been shown that the papyrus letters of ordinary people do not document the level of Greek seen in the New Testament. It is to be identified rather with the professional prose used by technical writers of the time. This was the contemporary Greek of educated people, though distinctly modern compared with the already ancient classical Greek of the Athenian fifth century. There was a vogue starting

² See the applications for scrutiny of credentials published by J. R. Rea, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol.46, London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1978, nos. 3276–3284.

³ G. A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910; for the history of the debate in the past 25 years see E. A. Judge, 'The social identity of the first Christians: a question of method in religious history' *Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 11, No.2, December, 1980, pp.201–217; and for discussion of some recently published papyrus documents, id., *Rank and Status in the World of the Caesars and St. Paul*, Christchurch: University of Canterbury, 1982, pp.9–20.

⁴ P.J. Parsons, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol.47, London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1980, no.3366, text reproduced with discussion by E. A. Judge, 'A state school teacher makes a salary bid', in G. H. R. Horsley ed., *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1976*, North Ryde: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, 1981, pp.72–78.

in Paul's day for trying to reimpose this as the standard of educated expression. By a massive effort of educational archaism it subsequently prevailed in the schools, so that the great Fathers of the Greek church in the fourth century, notably John Chrysostom, wrote in the style of 800 years before. These classicisers were well aware that Paul did not use the Attic diction now essential to the educated man. They had lost sight of the fact that Paul was writing in the form of the language current amongst educated people in his day.⁵

Nor need we attempt to say that as a Jew Paul would not have been at home with Greek.⁶ Judaism, like Hellenism, passed into an archaising phase in later antiquity, so that to read the Talmud one might think there had been little cultural contact between the two. But the very existence of the New Testament, as of Philo and Josephus, shows how closely interlocked the two cultures were. Modern studies have shown that one must allow for a diversity of cultural arrangements in the Judaism of the first century.⁷ Paul would have had the opportunity of a Greek education even in Gamaliel's school at [p. 169](#) Jerusalem. The Talmud means by 'Greek wisdom' specifically the formal education that was necessary to cosmopolitan life.⁸ Even Bar Kokhba, the last great Jewish nationalist in the second century, found it easier to write his letters in Greek, as recent discoveries have shown.⁹

The terminology of education arises occasionally in the New Testament letters. But it is used for the discussion of other matters. Neither *paideia* (the general word for the education of children) nor *gymnasia* (the word for training), nor the cognate forms, is used with reference to the central intellectual content of education (though an instance of this occurs in [Acts 7:22](#)). In [Heb. 12:5-7](#) *paideia* is used of the paternal discipline which shows that God is treating us as sons. The word is in effect taken back to its root meaning, disregarding the educational sense it would normally carry in Greek. This is so even when it is applied to the actual upbringing of children as in [Eph. 6:4](#). Similarly in [1 Tim. 4:8](#) *gymnasia* is explicitly identified as physical training (which is what the word literally meant), while in [2 Pet. 2:14](#) it is taken up pejoratively as a figure of calculated and practised acquisitiveness. A cynic might say that it was not the last time that education has fallen out between the punishment and the sport.

On the other hand what the New Testament churches were doing could in some respects very readily have been described in educational terms. There is a considerable amount of teaching going on and great emphasis is placed on growth in understanding. But when analogies are sought for this, as in [2 Tim. 2:2-6](#), they are not drawn from

⁵ L. Rydbeck, *Fachprosa, vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament*, Uppsala: Universitetsbiblioteket, 1967; E. A. Judge, 'St. Paul and classical society', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, Vol.15, 1972, pp.19-36; id., 'Paul's boasting in relation to contemporary professional practice', *Australian Biblical Review*, Vol.16, 1968, pp.37-50.

⁶ E. A. Judge, 'The conflict of educational aims in New Testament thought', *Journal of Christian Education*, Vol.9, No.1, June, 1966, pp.32-45.

⁷ M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974; id., *Jews, Greeks and Barbarians*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980; S. Freyne, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian*, Notre Dame: University Press, 1980.

⁸ R. J. Z. Werblowsky, 'Greek wisdom and proficiency in Greek', in *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme: Influences et Affrontements dans le Monde Antique (Melanges offerts à Marcel Simon)*, Paris: Boccard, 1978, pp.55-60.

⁹ He excuses himself from using Hebrew because he 'could not make the effort', B. Lifshitz, 'Papyrus grecs du désert de Juda', *Aegyptus*, Vol.40, 1962, p.241.

education. Not only then do the letters not deal with the educational system as a problem for believers, but they fail to recognize what was going on in the churches as a kind of schooling. The whole matter seems to be of no concern to them.

Nevertheless, the basic significance of education as a cultural boundary-marker is clearly registered by Paul. When he says in [Rom. 1:14](#) 'I am under obligation both to Greeks and to barbarians,' he refers to the classic distinction made by Greeks between those who shared their *paideia* and those who could not speak Greek at all. Similarly, when he speaks in the same sentence of 'the wise' and 'the foolish', he refers to the distinction within Greek culture between those who were highly educated and those who were not. The word [p. 170](#) *anoetos* means 'mindless'. Julian was to use it at the end of his rescript on Christian teachers for the children of Christian parents, who need to be cured by a proper Hellenic education.

Yet Paul does not grapple with these problems. He simply rides over them, and supersedes the issue of educational development by taking his followers on to the infancy of a new life in Christ.¹⁰ It is not a matter of reconstructing the existing system, but of starting a new way of life as an adult. In what may well be his earliest letter, we find Paul dwelling on the theme of the nurse who suckles the child she has not borne.¹¹ He is very interested in the beginnings of the new life, but otherwise his mind jumps to adulthood. Childhood is something to be left behind.¹² Those who are still there¹³ are restricted in their response to others. Similarly in Hebrews, it is seen as a defect to be still learning the ABC¹⁴ when one should oneself be a teacher of others. The reference to the 'first principles' picks up a term from elementary education, but the term 'teacher' does not come from the Greek schools so much as from Jewish tradition—a teacher of the law or the gospel as the case may be. The object of the teaching is moral discrimination.¹⁵ Paul does however twice pick up a distinctively Greek technical term of schooling and apply it to the experience of the believer. In [Gal. 3:24](#) the *paidagogos* supplies a metaphor for the law in relation to Christ. The *paidagogos* was the servant who walked the child to school, his 'custodian'. He is not the teacher. Similarly in [1 Cor. 4:15](#), Paul uses the same metaphor to distinguish his own paternal relationship to his converts in Christ from that of the countless others who were only custodians. The consistently deprecatory use of educational terms is probably not a coincidence. For although Paul shows no sign of finding primary or secondary education a source of problems, there are very clear indications that he had thrown himself into a total confrontation with those who espoused the reigning values of higher education.

It is tantalisingly unclear whether Paul had had a full-scale rhetorical education at tertiary level. To a modern observer he seems a great controversialist. His letters are overwhelming in their argumentative drive. They turn the mind with insistent logic or appealing metaphor, and compel assent with pleas or reproaches. Yet we know from the fourth-century Fathers that he did not conform at all to the complex [p. 171](#) rules of classical rhetoric. Moreover, he poured scorn on the rhetoric of his rivals, who one may

¹⁰ [1 Cor. 3:1](#).

¹¹ [1 Thess. 2:7-11](#).

¹² [1 Cor. 13:11](#).

¹³ [2 Cor. 6:13](#).

¹⁴ [Heb. 5:12](#); [6:1](#).

¹⁵ [Heb. 5:14](#).

assume followed the standard pattern. It is my belief that he deliberately refrained from the formal techniques of persuasion because he rejected the moral position one must adopt to employ them, and that he was driven into a confrontation with those in the churches who did use them by the fact that his own followers were disturbed by his irregularity. They would have liked him to have done it properly too.¹⁶

For Paul it was not simply a question of style. He rejects also the substance of academic debate. Rational calculation in the Greek tradition is vitiated by idolatry.¹⁷ The fundamental error of the Greeks over the nature of God makes their reasoning futile. The same terminology is used to condemn disputatiousness within the church at the end of the letter.¹⁸ By 'disputes over opinions' he refers to legalistic arguments in the Jewish tradition. The Pastoral epistles criticise such a spirit of argumentation that had by then established itself in church life.¹⁹ In [1 Cor. 1:20](#) Paul challenges the three main types of tertiary scholar of his world: the rationalistic philosopher ('the wise'), the Jewish legal expert ('the scribe') and the rhetorician ('the debater').

Whereas in other respects (for example in the field of personal relations and the ministries in church) Paul is very ready to forge his own vocabulary, here he by no means concedes their terms to his opponents. Wisdom (*sophia*), reason (*logos*) and knowledge (*gnosis*) are all ideals central to his own position. He stigmatises what is invalid in the case of others by qualifying the terms with phrases such as 'of the world' or 'according to the flesh'. The error lies in exalting these ideals into self-sufficient powers. Paul disclaims any 'excessive' reliance upon speech or wisdom,²⁰ and pin-points 'persuasiveness'²¹ as the particular excess he wishes to avoid. This is because his test of truth is that it comes from God and is demonstrated in positive human relations. The way to the treasures of wisdom and knowledge concealed in Christ is through the hearts that are 'knit together' in love.²² Against that we find set two terms unique in the Pauline vocabulary: 'persuasiveness of speech' ([2:4](#)), and 'philosophy' ([2:8](#)) which is coupled with [p. 172](#) 'empty deceit'. Both the great divisions of Greek higher education are explicitly discounted at this point.

In asserting a new source and method of knowing about the ultimate realities of the world, and about how one should live in it, Paul is occupying the territory that belonged to higher education. He is promoting a new kind of community education for adults. This involved him in a confrontation with his own churches because they wanted him to adopt the status in life that was appropriate to a tertiary teacher.

When Paul says,²³ 'we are not, like so many, peddlers of God's word', he is criticising his rivals at Corinth for accepting professional status. They took payment for their teaching. They also had their professional credentials verified ([3:1](#)). It turns out that the Corinthians actually objected to not being able to pay Paul for his services ([11:7](#)) but that he was determined not to give in on this point, though he readily accepted support from

¹⁶ For an analysis of the epistle to the Galatians in rhetorical terms see the *Hermeneia* commentary by H. D. Betz, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

¹⁷ [Rom. 1:21](#).

¹⁸ [Rom. 14:1](#).

¹⁹ [1 Tim. 1:4](#); [6:3, 4](#); [6:20](#).

²⁰ [1 Cor. 2:1](#).

²¹ [1 Cor. 2:4](#).

²² [22. Col. 2:2](#).

²³ [2 Cor. 2:17](#).

other churches ([11:9](#)). It is a matter of status ([12:14](#)). They should depend upon him as their parent, and not the other way around. In other words, in their case (presumably because of the construction they placed upon it in distinction from the attitude adopted in other churches) he will not put himself under an obligation to them. Gifts and benefactions in the ancient world were a recognized way of establishing social patronage. One's dependents might be classified as friends, but it was a friendship that was created from above and placed the privileged recipient under commitments. To refuse such a benefaction, on the other hand, constituted a breach of friendship, and one could slip into the exhausting rituals of formal enmity. The tense and contentious atmosphere of the second letter to the Corinthians may well imply that Paul is being drawn into a confrontation of this type.²⁴

That correct professional behaviour as a teacher is at stake is shown by another trail of complaints that Paul plays back to the Corinthians. His critics complain that 'his letters are weighty and strong, but his bodily presence is weak and his speech of no account'.²⁵ Notice the coupling of physical bearing with quality of speech. Beauty and truth [p. 173](#) support each other in the Greek ideal, and Paul's authority is discounted because he is physically unimpressive. The fact that he could write powerful letters, which they concede, ought to mean that he had the capacity to deliver himself of persuasive speech as well. One must assume that he deliberately chose to add to the handicap of a poor physique the default of not adopting the arts of rhetoric. He will not use the techniques expected of a man in his position. This is confirmed by another term he quotes from his critics. He is 'unskilled in speaking'.²⁶ The word *idiotes* means 'unprofessional'. It was to live across the centuries to haunt Paul's memory. In the trial of Phileas, bishop of Thmuis, under Diocletian, the governor, Culcianus, attempting to break the bishop's resistance, challenges him with the non-professionalism of Paul's style, using this very term.²⁷ The fact that Paul concedes this point to the 'superlative apostles'²⁸ proves that his rivals were performing in the church at Corinth as professional rhetoricians or sophists, and presumably being paid for it into the bargain.

The problem with Paul was that he would not compete. He refuses to class or compare himself with some of those who commend themselves.²⁹ We know what is referred to here from a papyrus letter written by a university student in Alexandria to his father at home in Oxyrhynchus.³⁰ Neilus complains of the difficulty he has had in finding decent teachers,

²⁴ See the unpublished Ph.D. thesis of Macquarie University by P. Marshall, 'Enmity and other Social Conventions in the Relations between Paul and the Corinthians'; S.C. Mott, 'The power of giving and receiving: reciprocity in Hellenistic benevolence', in G. F. Hawthorne ed., *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975, pp.60-72; and F. W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field*, St. Louis: Clayton 1982.

²⁵ [2 Cor. 10:9, 10.](#)

²⁶ [2 Cor. 11:6.](#)

²⁷ H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, Oxford: University Press, 1972, no.27, col.8 (based on the Bodmer papyrus); for the new Chester Beatty papyrus being edited by A. Pieterstoa, see G. H. R. Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1977*, North Ryde: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, 1982, no.106.

²⁸ [2 Cor. 11:5.](#)

²⁹ [2 Cor. 10:12.](#)

³⁰ C. H. Roberts, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol.18, London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1941, no.2190.

since the cleverer one he had hoped to use had died. There was a shortage of sophists, and he had had to settle for Didymus. 'What makes me despair is that this fellow who used to be a mere provincial teacher sees fit to compete with the rest.' Paul suffered a double handicap: he would not do it properly anyway, and thus could not attempt to compete with the rest. The term for the competition in the student's letter is Paul's term *synkrisis*, 'comparison'.³¹

Self-recommendation is the point at which Paul draws the line. It may seem a conventional triviality to us living in a culture which has fully absorbed the Pauline principle. But the long paroxysm into which p. 174 Paul enters over the matter reveals how fundamental and agonising a break he was making with what was expected in his day. GraecoRoman culture set a high value on self-esteem. Not to praise oneself was to neglect one's own virtues. But Paul regards boasting as folly. Yet his argument with his competitors draws him inexorably into it ('you forced me to it'³²) and he suddenly launches himself into a formal and long-sustained recital of his credentials.³³ It recognisably conforms to the schematic conventions of self-display as we know them from other sources. But Paul, in an appalling parody, inverts the contents of his self-eulogy, in order to boast of his weaknesses. Again we face the difficulty that this too has become a convention in our culture. But for Paul's day it is an unprecedented atrocity, which must have profoundly shocked his listeners. Why did he do it? Because he had learned from the case of Christ the paradox that weakness and humiliation put one in the position where God's power prevails.³⁴

This is a revolutionary point in our cultural tradition. The valuesystem upon which Greek education had been built up is deliberately overthrown. Paul was not apparently concerned with the threat which classical literary studies represented to children at primary and secondary levels. But he reacted powerfully against the perversion of human relations which he saw inculcated by the ideals of higher education. It was a perversion because it enshrined the beautiful and the strong in a position of social power. In his own case he deliberately tore down the structure of privilege with which his followers wished to surround him. In its place he set out a fundamentally new pattern of human relations in which each is endowed by God with gifts to contribute to the upbuilding of the others.

Professor E. A. Judge is Professor of History and Director of the Ancient History Documentary Research Centre at Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. p. 175

Book Reviews

FAITH AND CHURCH

³¹ See a study of this matter by C. B. Forbes in a forthcoming number of *New Testament Studies*.

³² [2 Cor. 12:11](#).

³³ [2 Cor. 11:22-33](#).

³⁴ [2 Cor. 12:9-10](#).

Dr. H. H. Rowdon (ed.), [*Christ the Lord*](#)

Reviewed by Rev. John Job

THEOLOGY AND CULTURE

Dr. Osadolor Imasogie, [*Guidelines for Christian Theology in Africa*](#)

Reviewed by Dr. Tokunboh Adeyemo

THEOLOGY OF MISSION

A. M. Abraham Ayrookuzhiel, [*The Sacred in Popular Hinduism*](#)

Reviewed by Dr. Roger E. Hedlund

Gerald Anderson and Thomas Stransky (eds.), [*Christ's Lordship and Religious Pluralism*](#)

Reviewed by Christopher Lamb

ETHICS AND SOCIETY

Rev. Colin Chapman, [*Whose Promised Land?*](#)

Reviewed by Dr. J. Gordon McConville p. 176

Faith and Church

CHRIST THE LORD

Edited by Dr. H. H. Rowdon

(Leicester: IVP, 1982)

Pp.344, £8.95

Abstract of a review by Rev. John Job, lecturer, Cliff College, Sheffield

Donald Guthrie has himself made a vast contribution to the evangelical cause in recent years. The measured presentation of matters of introduction in his major work has established a real alternative to the negative scepticism which tended to characterize New Testament scholarship, and this book which is a tribute to him upon his retirement is a very worthy one.

Its writers have chosen a very timely subject. All the essays in the book are related to Christology, and in the wake of the publication of *The Myth of God Incarnate*, nothing could count as a more pressing theme for such weighty and scholarly treatment.

Some of the contributions are wide-ranging. Howard Marshall deals economically but effectively with the extent to which the idea of incarnation comes elsewhere than in the Johannine literature, and Dick France with the question of the way Jesus was worshipped according to the New Testament sources.

Others, deal with very specialized areas. Leslie Allen, for example, discusses the setting of [Psalm 45:7-8](#) in both Old Testament and New (though this apparently narrow discussion has surprisingly far-reaching implication) and F. P. Cotterell writes a chapter on the Christology of Islam—an interesting and imaginative inclusion.

The three essays which stand out as being of exceptional merit are those by Tony Lane, H. D. McDonald and Richard Sturch. The Chalcedonian formula, dealt with by Lane, is of particular importance in today's debate, and it was very helpful to see how a biblical perspective, though wedded to the main thrust of that formula, might not only tolerate but actually demand detailed modification for a different philosophical climate.

McDonald's essay must rank as one of the most masterly summaries and critiques of Bultmann's standpoint that there has been from an evangelical scholar. While covering the two most significant aspects of [p. 177](#) Bultmann's Christology—(1) that faith has no historical foundations beyond the mere 'thatness' of Jesus and (2) the kerygmatic Christ as present through the proclamation of the message—he also deals penetratingly with Bultmann's roots in Heidegger's existentialist philosophy, and provides a most helpful answer to the kind of questions which are likely to arise in the mind of any theological student.

Sturch's essay is on the question, 'Can one say, "Jesus is God"?' He deals with the logical issues that are raised by the christological debate, and has a number of fine illustrations.

Altogether a priority for any theological student's basic library, and a symposium excellent both in conception and in the care with which the plan has been carried through, culminating in one of the best introductions to Christology on the market, especially at the price.

Dr. H. H. Rowdon lectures in Church History at the London Bible College, England.

Theology and Culture

GUIDELINES FOR CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY IN AFRICA

by Osadolor Imasogie

(Africa Christian Press, P.O. Box 30, Achimota, Ghana, 1983)

Pp.86

Abstract of a review by Dr. Tokunboh Adeyemo, General Secretary, AEAM, Kenya.

Dr. Imasogie's book is a worthy contribution to the ongoing debate of contextualization of theology. He has said in an organized systematised form what some other African thinkers have been saying in fragmented form.

In chapter one, the author demonstrates that though Christianity is a cosmic religion, it has always particularised itself within cultures (the primary one being Jewish, then the Roman-Grecian) in order to be relevant. Therefore, the task of every theologian in every generation, argues the author, is to communicate the Gospel in the theologian's particular culture using the language, symbols and thought-forms that make sense in that culture. Both the divine source of theology and the temporal situation in which the eternal Presence must be discerned should be kept together in creative tension. Imasogie reasoned, and [p. 178](#) rightly so, that the Reformation raised not only doctrinal but also cultural questions. Failure to contextualize the Christian Faith when it entered Africa has resulted 'in many Africans not accepting Christianity completely as the all-sufficient religion that meets all human needs' (p.23). 'The truth of this assertion is borne out by the

fact that in times of existential crisis many respectable African Christians revert to traditional religious practices as the means for meeting their spiritual needs' (p.23).

The author makes a good case for the failure of Western missionaries who brought the Gospel to Africa to contextualize. In fact, in many cases they dogmatized or absolutized their form of Christian doctrines. Dr. Imasogie views the quasi-scientific worldview underlying the traditional Western theology as the greatest handicap of the Western missionaries when brought to another cultural context—the Third World in general and Africa in particular. By quasi-scientific worldview, the author means a by-product of the Enlightenment which at best accommodates Faith to scientific materialism (a process whereby God was made an absentee Landlord of the universe) and at worst explains away the supernatural as mere superstition. The early missionaries did not appreciate the African worldview that places a lot of emphasis on spiritual realities. Consequently, African perception and interpretation of the spirit world and the dynamic influences of spiritual forces on human existence especially with regards to crises were largely dismissed as primitive and superstitious. More unfortunate according to the author is the introduction of a strange God and of a Christ who could save from sin but who seemingly could not deliver from the demonic and anti-social forces. As a result of the sad ambivalent situation, the author concludes many so-called African Christians usually resort to traditional African religious practices such as divination, sacrifices and wearing of protective charms or amulets in times of crisis.

It is therefore imperative for every African theologian, concludes the author in his final chapter, to re-examine his theological presupposition and methodology. He argues strongly that for any Christian theology to be relevant in Africa, account must be taken of the African worldview and the self-understanding of the African people. He has called (1) for a new appreciation of the efficiency of Christ's power over evil spiritual forces; (2) for a new emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit and the present mediatory efficacy of the Living Christ; and (3) for a new emphasis on the omnipresence of God and the consequent sacramental nature of the universe. Excellent as these are, one is disappointed at the author's failure to isolate a thorough study of Africa's cultural anthropology and sociology as part of a necessary prerequisite p. 179 for theologising in Africa. Further, writing in 1983, one expects to find allusions to vital contributions being made by African theologians in the areas of contextualization. The author's silence seems misleading. One would have preferred an analysis of Allen Boesak's *Black Theology and Black Power* written against the socio-political oppression of South Africa to the author's consideration of Juan Luis Segundo's Liberation Theology coming from The Latin America context (see pp.38–43).

Undoubtedly, as a 'guide', the book is a significant contribution to theologising in Africa. Dr. Imasogie's proposals demand our attention if Christian theology is going to be relevant in Africa. The book is well written and easy to read, but overburdened with unnecessary suspense and repetition. It is recommended for every Bible College library and theology class.

Dr. Imasogie is Principal of Baptist Theological College, Nigeria.

Theology of Mission

THE SACRED IN POPULAR HINDUISM

by A.M. Abraham Ayrookuzhiel
(Madras: Christian Literature Society, 1983)
Pp. 198, Rs 22.00 (India only)

Abstract of a review by Dr. Roger E. Hedlund, Lecturer, Church Growth Research Centre, Madras, India.

It is possible to study the Hindu scriptures and traditions and still fail to understand the religion of the masses. In order to know how the Hindus themselves perceive their religious concepts and practices it is necessary to study Hindu beliefs, myths, rites and festivals in their local setting. This empirical approach is followed by the author. The setting is Chirakkal, North Malabar (Kerala). The author describes the symbols and conceptions of the sacred as expressed in the language, shrines, rituals, festivals, stories, fears, beliefs and practices of the people. An effort is made to determine the degree to which world-view, beliefs and practices have been conditioned and modified by structural changes in society, religious reforms and modern scientific concepts.

No judgment is made as to the truth or objective reality of the symbols studied. To the contrary, it is assumed that 'the objective dimension of the symbols will be reflected in the affections and meanings people experience through their medium.' In other words it is [p. 180](#) supposed that the religious symbols have 'truth' for those who believe in them. This study assumes that belief in the symbols says more about those who believe or disbelieve in them than it does about the truth-values of the religious symbols themselves.

Popular Hinduism includes worship of innumerable gods but also of cows and serpents, trees and plants, rivers and planets, tools and grain. Belief in the evil eye, spirit possession, haunted houses, and illnesses caused by evil powers is common. Practices of ritual purity and pollution, caste concepts, observance of auspicious and inauspicious times and belief in karma all have a bearing on everyday life. Popular Hinduism is basically animistic—although the author nowhere states this—a point which is missed in the traditional study of Hinduism as a religion. 'The classical type of study of the religion of the Hindus is very inadequate if the object is to know of their religious concepts and practices.' And therein lies the chief contribution of this book. It breaks away from the classical approach via the literature and historical development of the great tradition and gets down to the daily experience of an ordinary Hindu.

The author has tried to view popular Hinduism from the inside. His methodology was to talk to people about their gods and shrines and various objects of worship, rites and festivals, practices and beliefs. To do this he lived in the village, visited the temples and shrines of the different communities, and participated in some festivals and ceremonies. Herein is another value of the book. It presents a model for doing field research as a participant/observer. To what extent a Christian can participate in Hindu ceremonies without compromise is not indicated.

In Chirakkal the author found twelve temples of the brahminical type where the classical deities of Hinduism are worshipped. The other important worship tradition consists of *Teyyam* shrines at which dancers assume the identity of the gods. The former is generally associated with the higher castes whereas the latter tradition is characteristic of the lower castes who maintain their own priests and public and family shrines. There is an inter-change between the two traditions on particular occasions and for special purposes. Power to destroy and to influence is associated with certain of the popular deities.

The *Teyyam* worship is taken seriously by some people from all of the castes in Chirakkal. 'The belief is that the gods descend upon the dancers and take possession of

them while they dance.’ Closely associated with this belief is the practice of fire-walking which is believed to be possible because of the power of the deity which enters the body of the dancer. p. 181

Another common practice is snake worship. Out of 187 interviewees, 108 stated their belief in the power of the Serpent. ‘The Serpent is one of the potent religious symbols among the people.’ Popular religion is largely concerned with issues of power.

In addition to exploring attitudes towards the gurus, ritual purity, intercaste marriage and other social questions, the author provides information about important festivals and religious customs as well as key concepts such as *karma* and belief in evil powers. This collection of information is a valuable tool for communicators of the Gospel. Apart from insights into a section of Kerala, the study is an indication of the kind of religious investigation that can be carried out in any local situation. The book therefore is of value to Indian missionaries, Christian social workers, and other students of religious culture as it is actually lived in the village setting.

Not everyone will agree with the ‘scientific’ approach to the study of religion which strives to maintain an object neutrality toward every aspect of belief and practice. It may be questioned whether complete neutrality and objectivity are possible at every point. Certain components of religious practice will be judged less desirable than others by any observer. Some readers may question the spiritual reality that presumably underlies aspects of popular religious belief and practice. Others may wish that the author had entered into an evaluation of certain components such as fire-walking and possession. Such an analysis, however, was not the intended purpose of the investigation. The author has provided a descriptive study. Let the reader make his own valid judgments. There is room for further investigation of the subject. Additional studies of this type are needed in countless local communities throughout India.

This book is highly recommended for Indian mission executives and for everyone engaged in evangelization in the Hindu world.

CHRIST’S LORDSHIP AND RELIGIOUS PLURALISM

Edited by Gerald Anderson & Thomas Stransky

(New York: Orbis Books, 1981)

Pp.209, £5.50

A review by Christopher Lamb, Birmingham in *Themelios*, April 1984.

The record of a conference with sixteen major contributors does not sound as though it would make inspired reading. When those sixteen p. 182 are deliberately chosen to represent different viewpoints from across the whole spectrum of Christian thought we may well fear a thoroughly indigestible concoction. In fact certain themes emerge with great clarity from this book-of-the-conference, and although it took place in 1979 and involved primarily North American participants, I believe we need to listen carefully to what these people, rich in experience and understanding, were saying. For they were widely representative, from conservative evangelical to Roman Catholic, feminist to Eastern Orthodox, and their traditions were clearly stated.

No-one pretends that there are not deep differences between the world faiths. It is impossible to avoid choosing between their claims. Anything else is ‘suicide of thought’, for they cannot all be right. The problem noted here by nearly every writer is what the radical evangelical Orlando Costas calls the ‘cultural (ideological), social (racist and classist), economic (capitalistic), and political (imperialistic) captivity of Jesus Christ’. Margrethe Brown, from a different theological tradition, agrees: ‘It is nearly impossible for us today to differentiate between the refusal to “convert” to a Western lifestyle and

submit to Western political power, and the genuine call to turn to Christ.' Western history, western domination of the world masks the true character of the lordship of Jesus Christ. Some writers question the term 'lordship' itself, since it never appears in the Bible and suggests to some an oppressive control which is far from the kind of ministry Jesus exercised.

But in what sense did Jesus point beyond himself? Krister Stendahl says: 'Jesus had preached the kingdom, while the church preached Jesus. And thus we are faced with a danger: we may so preach Jesus that we lose the vision of the kingdom, the mended creation.' That kind of 'Christomonism' is indeed one danger—the pietist withdrawal from the world, summoning converts out of it. The opposite danger is to regard Christ as one of a number of means of reaching the kingdom, or bringing it about. A more sophisticated version of the same position has Christ as the supreme example of the universal pattern of God's work in the world. One train of thought emphasizes the uniqueness of Jesus, the other the continuity of Jesus with all the work of God in the world. 'What is needed', argues Gerald Anderson, 'is uniqueness *with* continuity.' He goes on to identify one of the key issues for mission—mission to the Jews. For if the Jews do not heed Christ—knowing God, it is argued, through their ancient covenant relationship with him—then similar arguments can be found for all other faiths. 'Either all people need Christ or none do'.

In a book containing much theological shorthand, here is the critical [p. 183](#) question posed. All do. But sometimes it takes a keen mind to hold on to it through all the richness and profusion of *Christian* pluralism.

Ethics and Society

WHOSE PROMISED LAND?

by Colin Chapman

(Tring: Lion Publishing House, 1983)

Pp. 253, £1.95 paperback

Abstract of a review by Dr. J. Gordon McConville in *Evangel*, January 1984

Of all events of the present century probably none has captured the imagination of Christians, and generated so much heat among them, as the birth and adolescence of the modern state of Israel.

Colin Chapman's book is an island of careful exegesis and sensitive historical assessment. The author has spent fifteen years in different countries of the Middle East, most recently in Beirut. His experience has been primarily, though not exclusively, among Arabs. Yet the book is certainly not anti-Jewish. Its essence is fairness.

The author is convinced that an understanding of the twentieth-century history of Palestine is an essential pre-requisite of a proper use of the Bible in relation to it. (As every preacher knows, it is exceedingly difficult to apply scripture to a situation about which one knows little). To this end there is, first, a brief account of the history of Palestine from Abraham to the present day. There follows an invaluable chapter simply containing extracts from the writings of people who have been closely involved in the events, including the early Zionists such as Herzl and Weizmann, their spiritual sons, Moshe

Dayan and Menachem Begin, Arabs, journalists and British politicians. Other relevant documentation such as the vital Balfour Declaration completes the picture. This chapter, for which alone the book is worth buying, is historically convincing because of the different viewpoints represented, and moving, because of its catalogue of the horrors and ironies of the sorry tale. It makes clear that each side has its share both of tragedy and guilt. Neither is the natural or moral superior of the [p. 184](#) other. Most interesting is the development that is charted from the early Zionists' naïve belief that the Arabs would present no problems and that the Jews themselves would without doubt be a model of fairness, through the dawning awareness that there was indeed a problem in the meeting of which they might well emerge with discredit, to Menachem Begin's chilling: 'In our country there is only room for Jews', (p. 168). Already, the reviewer has interpreted the material. The author simply lets it appear, not flinching from presenting anything which would put either side in a poor light. Along with Jewish ruthlessness, it is abundantly clear that Arab greed (in land-sales, often by wealthy absentee landlords) and internal divisions have made a major contribution to their present deprivation.

Chapman then turns to prophecy. His main contention in this section is that the New Testament writers believed that many of the prophecies in question were fulfilled in the life and work of Jesus—or *would* be fulfilled in his second coming. The following strands of prophecy-fulfilment, identified by Chapman, may be mentioned here.

i) Those who greeted the birth of the child Jesus saw the event as *the restoration of Israel* (pp. 120 ff.).

ii) In the Beatitudes, 'the meek shall inherit the earth,' is an application of an Old Testament passage ([Ps. 37:11](#)) which referred to 'the land', i.e. the land was not regarded by Jews in a narrow nationalistic sense. Rather, what was true of it in the Old Testament is now extended to the whole earth (pp. 124f).

iii) The book of Revelation sees the fulfilment of Ezekiel's prophecies as taking place in 'new heavens and a new earth' (pp.147f., [Rev. 21:1ff.](#), [22](#)), a further example of the 'denationalization' of land.

iv) Much of the language of [Mark 13](#), [Matt. 24](#), [Luke 17](#) (viz. the so-called 'mini-apocalypse') is, on the basis of clear Old Testament analogy (such as [Isaiah 13](#)), applicable to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD, and not to modern events, pp.130ff. ([Mark 13:24ff.](#), however, relates to the second coming of Christ). The whole argument is thorough and detailed, and cannot be adequately reflected here. The reader is advised to peruse it carefully for him or herself.

The final major chapter of the book asks the question whether biblical prophecy can be used to assess modern events in Israel in any other way than as a prediction of them. The result is a searching criticism of Israeli methods and tactics in the light of Israel's own law—the Old Testament. When land-acquisition takes the form of confiscation in place of purchases, when life is held so cheaply that Golda Meir can claim the Palestinian people never existed (p.168), then there is a serious question whether there is respect among Jews for the God [p. 185](#) who, they claim, has given them the land. As any serious student of the Old Testament knows, God's people of old never held the land by absolute right. Even in their tenure of it they could be called 'sojourners' (p.105, [Lev. 25:23](#)), and that tenure was only ever secure while there was devotion to the Lord and his ways (105–111, [Deut. 28](#)). This telling treatment of prophecy in relation to the land is all in the light of the promise to Abraham ([Gen. 12:1–3](#)) of which a vital—and neglected—aspect is that God's people should be a blessing to 'all the families of the earth' (p.100f). Can the Israelis honestly say that they are a blessing to the Arabs in Palestine?

It is clear that, from the perspective of both prophecy and modern history, the issue of *Whose Promised Land?* is by no means so simple as it appears to those who see in modern

events the unequivocal signs of the end-times. What can they make of the prophetic statement: 'Blessed by Egypt my people', [Isaiah 19:23-25](#) (p.190) or of the awkward historical fact of the presence of Arab Christians in Palestine (p.104).

Rev. Colin Chapman now teaches Missions at Trinity College, Bristol, England. [p. 186](#)

Journal Information

Publications Referred to in This Issue

Evangel

A quarterly review of biblical, practical and contemporary theology. Rutherford House, 77 Claremont Park, Edinburgh EH6 7PJ, Scotland. Subscriptions £4.95 UK, \$14 USA.

Expository Times

Published by T & T Clark Ltd, 36 George St., Edinburgh EH2 2LQ. Subscriptions £10.95. New subscription £9.50 (monthly).

Foundations

A theological journal published by the British Evangelical Council, 113 Victoria St., St. Albans, Herts, AL1 3TJ. Subscriptions £1.25 UK, £2.25 elsewhere (two issues).

International Bulletin of Missionary Research

Published by Overseas Ministries Study Centre, Circulation Dept. P.O. Box 1308-E, Fort Lee, New Jersey 070249958. Subscriptions \$14.00 (quarterly).

Journal of American Scientific Affiliation

P.O. Box J, Ipswich, Massachusetts 01938, USA. Subscriptions \$20.00, students \$12.00 (quarterly).

Journal of Christian Education

Published by the Australian Teachers' Christian Fellowship, P.O. Box A569, Sydney, South Australia 2000. Subscriptions \$12 Aust, \$22 US, £6 stg. (3 issues).

Themelios

Published jointly by the British Theological Students Fellowship and the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students. 38 De Montfort St., Leicester LE1 7GP UK. or 233 Langdon Madison, Wisconsin 53703, USA. Subscriptions £3.00 UK, \$6.00, Sfr. 10.00 (3 issues).