

Dr. Colin Brown: Systematic Theology III

ST503

Ecclesiology and Eschatology

First Assignment: Course Notes

Christoph Lameter

FTS Box #466

2 March, 2003

Overview

1. Introduction to Systematic Theology	1
1.1. What is Systematic Theology not?.....	1
1.2. What is Systematic Theology?.....	2
1.3. Systematic Theology and Dogmatics	4
2. Ecclesiology	4
2.1. Interpretation of Matthew 16	4
2.2. The Identity of the Church	13
2.3. The Church and Mission	28
2.4. Worship and Prayer.....	31
2.5. Preaching	45
2.6. The Sabbath.....	52
2.7. The Sacraments.....	56
2.8. Baptism	60
2.9. The Lord's Supper.....	71
2.10. Ordination and Ministry	79
3. Eschatology.....	96
3.1. Different Approaches	96
3.2. Jesus' Teaching	101
3.3. Expectations of the End of the World.....	107
3.4. The Millennium.....	108
3.5. The Resurrection.....	115
3.6. Purgatory.....	118
3.7. Universalism	118
3.8. The Fate of the Lost.....	121
3.9. Resurrection and Afterlife	124
4. Critical Comments.....	128
4.1. Worldviews: Cause and Effect?.....	128
4.2. Jesus not forgiving Sins?.....	130
4.3. Infant Baptism	132
4.4. Evolution of Scripture?.....	135
4.5. The Rapture.....	137

Detailed Table of Contents:

1. Introduction to Systematic Theology	1
1.1. What is Systematic Theology not?.....	1
1.1.1. Constructing a System.....	1
1.1.2. Biblical Theology.....	1
1.2. What is Systematic Theology?.....	2
1.2.1. Approaching Systematic Theology.....	3
1.2.2. Different Sorts of Beliefs.....	3
1.2.2.1. Data Beliefs.....	3
1.2.2.2. Data Background Beliefs.....	3
1.2.2.3. Control Beliefs.....	4
1.3. Systematic Theology and Dogmatics	4
2. Ecclesiology	4
2.1. Interpretation of Matthew 16	4
2.1.1. Authenticity of the Passage	4
2.1.2. The Meaning of the Rock.....	6
2.1.2.1. Cyprian in On the Unity of the Catholic Church.....	6
2.1.2.2. The Papal "Unam Sancta"	7
2.1.2.3. The Council of Florence (1438-1445)	7
2.1.2.4. First Vatican Council (1869-70).....	7
2.1.3. The Gates of Hell (Verse 18).....	9
2.1.3.1. Interpretations	9
2.1.3.2. Difficulties in Interpretation	10
2.1.3.2.1. <i>Gates do not Attack</i>	10
2.1.3.2.2. <i>The Biblical Hell is not the Stronghold of Satan</i>	10
2.1.3.2.3. <i>The Phrase Used</i>	10
2.1.3.3. Considerations.....	10
2.1.3.3.1. <i>The Role of Gates</i>	10
2.1.3.4. Proposal.....	11
2.1.4. The Keys of the Kingdom	11
2.1.5. Binding and Loosing.....	11
2.1.5.1. Making and Establishing Rules.....	12
2.1.5.2. Placing under a Ban or Acquitting	12
2.1.5.2.1. <i>Digression: Did Jesus ever Forgive Anybodies Sin?</i>	12
2.1.6. Binding the Power of Satan and Evil.....	12
2.1.7. Concluding Reflections	13
2.2. The Identity of the Church	13
2.2.1. The Term "Church" in the Old Testament.....	16
2.2.2. The New Testament and the Term "Church"	18
2.2.2.1. Body	18
2.2.2.1.1. <i>Relation to Paul's Conversion Experience</i>	18
2.2.2.1.2. <i>Contrast to the Flesh</i>	19
2.2.2.1.3. <i>Historical Background</i>	19
2.2.2.2. Bride.....	20
2.2.2.3. Temple	20
2.2.3. The Church in the Protestant Tradition	21
2.2.3.1. Different Approaches to Understand the Church	21
2.2.3.2. The Teaching of Calvin and Brunner's Response.	22
2.2.3.2.1. <i>What is the Church in God's Purpose?</i>	23
2.2.3.2.1.1. <i>The Believers need Help</i>	23
2.2.3.2.1.2. <i>The Church contains the Body of the Elect</i>	23
2.2.3.2.2. <i>What is the Nature of the Church?</i>	23
2.2.3.2.2.1. <i>The Church is both Visible and Invisible</i>	23
2.2.3.2.2.2. <i>The Marks of the Church</i>	24
2.2.3.2.2.2.1. <i>A Place where Ministry is done</i>	24
2.2.3.2.2.2.2. <i>Separation and Schism</i>	24
2.2.3.2.3. <i>Emil Brunner's Response</i>	25
2.2.3.2.3.1. <i>The Definition of the Church</i>	26
2.2.3.2.3.2. <i>Personal Encounters</i>	26
2.2.3.2.3.3. <i>Church is not only External Faith Support</i>	26
2.2.3.2.3.4. <i>The Invisible Church</i>	26
2.2.3.2.3.5. <i>The Institutional Character of the Church</i>	27
2.2.3.3. Concluding Thoughts.	27
2.3. The Church and Mission	28
2.3.1. Arguments for Church Growth	28
2.3.1.1. It Works	28

2.3.1.2.	Scriptural Basis in Acts 6	29
2.3.1.3.	Avoid Cultural Barriers.....	29
2.3.2.	Against Church Growth.....	29
2.3.2.1.	Need to Distinguish between Principle and Phenomena.....	29
2.3.2.2.	Sometimes it Does Not Work.....	29
2.3.2.3.	Homogeneity Separates People.....	30
2.3.2.4.	Homogeneity Inhibits Personal Growth.....	30
2.3.2.5.	Homogeneity as a Denial of Reconciliation.....	30
2.3.2.6.	Paul's Strategy was Different.....	30
2.3.2.7.	Inaccurate Scriptural Base.....	30
2.3.3.	My Own Concern about Mission.....	31
2.4.	Worship and Prayer.....	31
2.4.1.	The Perspective of Different World Views.....	31
2.4.1.1.	The Scientific World view.....	31
2.4.1.2.	The Religious View.....	32
2.4.1.2.1.	<i>Bonhoeffer</i>	32
2.4.1.2.2.	<i>His Plot against Hitler</i>	32
2.4.1.2.3.	<i>Jailed and Executed</i>	32
2.4.1.2.4.	<i>Forsaken by God</i>	33
2.4.1.2.5.	<i>The World Matures</i>	33
2.4.1.2.6.	<i>Deus Ex Machina: The Powerless God</i>	33
2.4.1.2.7.	<i>God Does Not Intervene</i>	34
2.4.1.3.	The Philosophical View.....	34
2.4.1.3.1.	<i>Prayer makes God arbitrary and haphazard</i>	34
2.4.1.3.2.	<i>Phillips The Concept of Prayer 1965</i>	34
2.4.1.3.3.	<i>Answered Prayer Meaningless</i>	35
2.4.1.4.	My Response.....	35
2.4.1.4.1.	<i>To the Scientific World view</i>	35
2.4.1.4.2.	<i>To the Religious View</i>	36
2.4.1.4.2.1.	<i>Literature</i>	36
2.4.1.4.2.2.	<i>Farmer</i>	36
2.4.1.4.2.3.	<i>Lewis</i>	36
2.4.1.4.2.4.	<i>Contra Bonhoeffer</i>	37
2.4.1.4.2.5.	<i>Paul's Thorn in the Flesh</i>	37
2.4.1.4.3.	<i>The Philosophical Objections</i>	38
2.4.1.4.3.1.	<i>Arbitrariness</i>	38
2.4.1.4.3.2.	<i>Phillips</i>	38
2.4.1.4.3.3.	<i>Prayer and Falsification</i>	38
2.4.2.	The Lord's Prayer.....	40
2.4.2.1.	Form and Text.....	40
2.4.2.1.1.	<i>Luke is Original</i>	41
2.4.2.1.1.1.	<i>Matthew Contains All of Luke</i>	41
2.4.2.1.1.2.	<i>Tendency to Expand Liturgy</i>	41
2.4.2.1.1.3.	<i>No one would omit Something</i>	41
2.4.2.1.1.4.	<i>Luke's Address</i>	41
2.4.2.1.2.	<i>Matthew is Original</i>	41
2.4.2.1.2.1.	<i>Luke Abbreviates</i>	41
2.4.2.1.2.2.	<i>Liturgy is Abbreviated</i>	41
2.4.2.1.3.	<i>Jeremias' Conclusion</i>	41
2.4.2.1.4.	<i>Goulder's Conclusion</i>	42
2.4.2.2.	The Themes.....	42
2.4.2.2.1.	<i>Like the Ten Commandments?</i>	43
2.4.2.2.1.1.	<i>Hallowed be Your Name</i>	43
2.4.2.2.1.2.	<i>Daily Bread</i>	43
2.4.2.2.1.3.	<i>Thy kingdom come</i>	43
2.4.2.2.1.4.	<i>Forgiveness and Deliverance</i>	43
2.4.2.2.1.5.	<i>Conclusion</i>	43
2.4.3.	The Role of the Holy Spirit.....	44
2.5.	Preaching.....	45
2.5.1.	A Preliminary Definition of what Preaching is.....	45
2.5.2.	The Nature of the Word of God.....	45
2.5.2.1.	The Primary Form.....	46
2.5.2.2.	Scripture.....	46
2.5.2.3.	Preaching and Proclamation.....	46
2.5.3.	The Nature of Language.....	47
2.5.4.	The Practice of Jesus.....	48
2.5.5.	Apostolic Preaching.....	48
2.5.6.	Digression : Messianic Jews.....	51
2.6.	The Sabbath.....	52
2.6.1.	In the Old Testament.....	52
2.6.2.	In the Gospels.....	52

2.6.3.	In the Rest of the New Testament	53
2.6.3.1.	Teaching and Practice.....	53
2.6.3.2.	Hebrews	53
2.6.3.3.	Acts of the Apostles	54
2.6.3.4.	References to the Lord's Day	54
2.6.4.	The Historical Emergence of Sunday	54
2.6.5.	Review of Different Interpretations.....	54
2.6.5.1.	The Seventh Day Adventist Position	54
2.6.5.2.	Sabbatarianism.....	55
2.6.5.3.	Paul Jewett's Flexible Position.....	55
2.6.5.4.	Willy Rordorf.....	55
2.6.5.5.	Carson From Sabbath to Lord's day	55
2.6.5.6.	My Own View.....	56
2.7.	The Sacraments.....	56
2.7.1.	Definition of the Term.....	56
2.7.2.	Conflicting Attitudes in the Early Church	57
2.7.3.	The Catholic View of the Seven Sacraments.....	57
2.7.4.	Luther's Rejection of the Seven Sacraments	58
2.7.4.1.	Communion in Both Kinds.....	58
2.7.4.2.	Transubstantiation.....	58
2.7.4.3.	Its Use.....	58
2.7.4.4.	Baptism	59
2.7.4.5.	Penance	59
2.7.4.6.	Confirmation.....	59
2.7.4.7.	Matrimony	60
2.7.4.8.	Ordination	60
2.7.4.9.	Extreme Unction: Anointing of The Dying.....	60
2.8.	Baptism	60
2.8.1.	The Development of Infant Baptism.....	61
2.8.1.1.	The Early Church	61
2.8.1.2.	Medieval Period.....	62
2.8.1.2.1.	<i>Baptism takes the Place of Circumcision.....</i>	<i>62</i>
2.8.1.2.2.	<i>In Baptism we are Born Again.....</i>	<i>62</i>
2.8.1.2.3.	<i>Baptism for Security.....</i>	<i>62</i>
2.8.1.2.4.	<i>Original Sin.....</i>	<i>63</i>
2.8.1.2.5.	<i>Imprints a Character.....</i>	<i>63</i>
2.8.1.3.	The Catholic Position in the Council of Trent	63
2.8.1.4.	Calvin.....	63
2.8.2.	Arguments in Favor of Believer's Baptism Only	64
2.8.2.1.	Zwingli.....	64
2.8.2.2.	Beasley-Murray: Baptism in the New Testament	64
2.8.2.3.	Karl Barth	64
2.8.2.3.1.	<i>Baptism is not a Sacrament.....</i>	<i>65</i>
2.8.2.3.2.	<i>Meaning of Baptism in the Holy Spirit.....</i>	<i>65</i>
2.8.2.3.3.	<i>What is Water Baptism?</i>	<i>65</i>
2.8.2.4.	Paul Jewett: Infant Baptism and the covenant of Grace.....	65
2.8.2.4.1.	<i>The Analogy to Circumcision</i>	<i>65</i>
2.8.2.4.2.	<i>What does Baptism Archive?</i>	<i>66</i>
2.8.2.4.3.	<i>Reflection on Jewett.....</i>	<i>66</i>
2.8.3.	My Own View	67
2.8.3.1.	No One Baptizes Themselves	67
2.8.3.2.	Baptism is a Sign of Identity and Belonging.....	68
2.8.3.3.	The Element of Washing	68
2.8.3.4.	A Sign of Rebirth	68
2.8.3.5.	The Language of Baptism	68
2.8.3.6.	Continuity between Old Testament and New Testament.....	69
2.8.3.7.	The Replacement of Circumcision by Baptism.....	70
2.8.3.8.	Baptism as a Seal.....	70
2.8.3.9.	The Practice of Dedication	70
2.8.3.10.	Baptism in the Trinity	71
2.9.	The Lord's Supper.....	71
2.9.1.	The Catholic Position	71
2.9.1.1.	The Council of Trent (1441).....	71
2.9.1.2.	Vatican II	73
2.9.2.	Protestant Positions	75
2.9.2.1.	Zwingli.....	75
2.9.2.2.	Calvin.....	75
2.9.3.	My Own Position.....	76
2.9.3.1.	The Lord's Supper and The New Covenant	76
2.9.3.2.	The Redemptive Sacrifice.....	76
2.9.3.3.	The Role of Faith, Promise and Remembrance.....	78
2.9.3.4.	The Vertical and Horizontal Dimension	79

2.10. Ordination and Ministry	79
2.10.1. Three Classical Position.....	79
2.10.1.1. The Catholic Position: The Emergence of Bishops.....	79
2.10.1.2. The Anglican Position	80
2.10.1.3. The Reformed Response (Calvin)	80
2.10.1.3.1. Apostles	80
2.10.1.3.2. Prophets	81
2.10.1.3.3. Evangelists	81
2.10.1.3.4. Pastor	81
2.10.1.3.5. Teacher.....	82
2.10.1.3.6. Governors	82
2.10.1.3.7. Deacons.....	82
2.10.2. An Overview of Ministry in the New Testament.....	82
2.10.2.1. The Pattern Presented by Jesus Himself	82
2.10.2.2. The Office of The Apostles.....	83
2.10.2.3. The Question of Gifts and Ministers	85
2.10.2.4. Concluding reflection.....	85
2.10.3. The Role and Ministry of Women	86
2.10.3.1. Old Testament.....	86
2.10.3.1.1. Women as Possessions	86
2.10.3.1.2. No Covenant Sign.....	87
2.10.3.1.3. Vows of a Woman.....	87
2.10.3.1.4. Divorce.....	87
2.10.3.1.5. Military Service	88
2.10.3.1.6. The Effect of the Purity Laws	88
2.10.3.1.7. Dowries	89
2.10.3.1.8. Polygamy.....	89
2.10.3.1.9. Women in the Place of Worship.....	89
2.10.3.1.10. Women Witnesses.....	89
2.10.3.1.11. The Interpretation of the Image of God.....	90
2.10.3.1.12. Conclusion	91
2.10.3.2. New Testament	91
2.10.3.2.1. Tim 2:8.....	91
2.10.3.2.2. Jesus Attitude	92
2.10.3.2.3. The Apostle Paul.....	92
2.10.3.2.3.1. Kroeger's New Translation.....	94
2.10.3.2.3.2. Paul's Own Authority.....	94
2.10.4. My View on Ordination of Women	94
2.10.4.1. Saved by Bearing Children?.....	95
2.10.4.2. Glory?	95
3. Eschatology.....	96
3.1. Different Approaches	96
3.1.1. American Evangelicalism	96
3.1.1.1. Postmillennialism.....	96
3.1.1.2. Premillennialism	96
3.1.1.3. Amillennialism.....	96
3.1.2. Little Apocalypse Theory.....	96
3.1.3. Consistent Eschatology	97
3.1.4. Realized Eschatology	98
3.1.5. Bultmann and Demythologization.....	98
3.1.6. Salvation History.....	99
3.1.7. Pannenberg and Moltmann	99
3.2. Jesus' Teaching	101
3.2.1. Distant Events in Mark 13?	102
3.2.2. Imminent Events in Mark 13?	102
3.2.3. Explanations	103
3.2.4. My own approach.....	103
3.2.4.1. "This Generation"	103
3.2.4.2. "Abomination of Desolation"	104
3.2.4.3. Language of Mark 13	105
3.2.4.3.1. Terminology.....	105
3.2.4.3.2. The Coming of the Son of Man	106
3.2.4.3.3. The High Priest sees it.....	106
3.3. Expectations of the End of the World.....	107
3.4. The Millennium.....	108
3.4.1. The Importance of the Subject	108
3.4.2. Review of the History of Attitudes.....	109
3.4.3. Premillennialism.....	110
3.4.3.1. Evaluating Theories.....	110
3.4.3.1.1. Theory Fits the Data?.....	110

3.4.3.1.2.	<i>Theory Fits my Beliefs and Understanding?</i>	110
3.4.3.1.3.	<i>Is it useful?</i>	110
3.4.3.2.	Herman Hoyt	110
3.4.3.2.1.	<i>Scriptures Central Theme is the Kingdom of God</i>	110
3.4.3.2.2.	<i>His Principle of Interpreting Scripture</i>	111
3.4.3.2.3.	<i>Description of the Kingdom</i>	111
3.4.3.3.	Millennialism Because of Rev 20.....	111
3.4.3.4.	Ladd's View of Revelation.....	112
3.4.4.	Reflections on the Millennium	112
3.4.4.1.	Jesus and Paul do not Teach a Millennium.....	112
3.4.4.2.	Prophecy of Old Testament Superseded.....	112
3.4.4.3.	Revelation 20 contains nothing of Hoyt's imagery.....	112
3.4.4.4.	The Millennium as the Prophecy Dump.....	113
3.4.5.	Postmillennialism	113
3.4.6.	Amillennialism	113
3.4.6.1.	The Nature of Revelation	114
3.5.	The Resurrection	115
3.5.1.	Cor 15:12-.....	115
3.5.2.	Cor 5:1-.....	115
3.5.3.	In the Millennium.....	116
3.5.4.	Excursus: The Binding of Satan and the Millennium.....	117
3.5.5.	The First Resurrection.....	117
3.5.6.	Amillennialism: No Rapture	118
3.6.	Purgatory	118
3.7.	Universalism	118
3.7.1.	Origen De Principiis.....	118
3.7.2.	Victorian Writers	119
3.7.3.	Maurice.....	119
3.7.4.	Barth	120
3.7.4.1.	On judgment	120
3.7.4.2.	Universal Annihilation?.....	120
3.7.5.	John Hick.....	121
3.7.6.	Brian Hatcher	121
3.8.	The Fate of the Lost	121
3.8.1.	The Classical Position.....	121
3.8.2.	Conditional Immortality.....	123
3.8.3.	Judgment When?.....	124
3.9.	Resurrection and Afterlife	124
3.9.1.	Plato and the Phytagoreans	124
3.9.2.	Psychic experiences	125
3.9.3.	Response.....	125
3.9.4.	My view on this Topic.....	125
3.9.4.1.	Immortality or Resurrection?	126
3.9.4.2.	Reanimation of Dead Bodies?	126
3.9.4.3.	The Resurrection Comes to Light through Christ	126
3.9.4.4.	Immortality is a Future Acquisition	126
3.9.4.5.	Immortality a Gift of God.....	127
3.9.4.6.	Resurrection and Immortality Complementary.....	127
3.9.4.7.	Some are not Resurrected	127
3.9.4.8.	What Continues	127
4.	Critical Comments	128
4.1.	Worldviews: Cause and Effect?	128
4.1.1.	Science in the Lectures	128
4.1.2.	Contemporary Science	128
4.1.2.1.	Quantum Physics	128
4.1.2.2.	Real World Effects?.....	129
4.1.2.3.	Influence of Observation.....	129
4.1.2.4.	Causality?	129
4.1.3.	Conclusion.....	130
4.1.4.	Consequences	130
4.2.	Jesus not forgiving Sins?	130
4.2.1.	Forgiving cannot be delegated?.....	131
4.2.2.	How can Jesus authorize other agents?.....	131
4.2.3.	Jesus blood Cleanses us.....	131
4.2.4.	Jesus the Payment for Sin.....	131
4.2.5.	Conclusion.....	131
4.3.	Infant Baptism	132
4.3.1.	In the New Testament?.....	132
4.3.1.1.	John 3:5.....	132

4.3.1.2.	Col 2:11-12.....	132
4.3.1.3.	Baptism is a Confession.....	133
4.3.1.4.	Mark 10:13-16.....	133
4.3.2.	Circumcision and Baptism.....	134
4.3.3.	Conclusion.....	134
4.4.	Evolution of Scripture?	135
4.4.1.	Jewett's progressive Revelation.....	135
4.4.2.	Dan Fuller's Unity	136
4.4.3.	Conclusion.....	136
4.5.	The Rapture.....	137
4.5.1.	1.Thess 4:16-17.....	137
4.5.2.	Raptures in the Old Testament.....	138
4.5.3.	Luke 17	138
4.5.4.	Conclusion.....	138

1. Introduction to Systematic Theology

It is time to talk about what our understanding of Systematic Theology is.

I confessed to President David Hubbard sometime ago that I have never been trained to do Systematic Theology. I taught in England for 17 years at Tyndale Hall in Bristol. My subjects were Church History, historical Theology and Philosophy. I first taught Systematic Theology in Vancouver Canada. They used Berkhoff's *Systematic Theology* as a textbook, so I based the course on it. The trouble was that this approach was for me like David going out fighting with the amour of Goliath. It was an interesting book and contained good material and was up to date but it did not deal with the issues that I thought to be most important.

How do I do Systematic Theology? In short: I make it up as I go.

1.1. What is Systematic Theology not?

1.1.1. Constructing a System

Systematic Theology is not an attempt to construct a system out of pieces of Scripture. This is a common view reflected in many texts as also in Berkhoff. This views Systematics as like putting pieces of a jigsaw puzzle together. One has to find the "System" in the Bible. Hundred thousands of pieces are there in the form of verses contained in the Bible. Verses are written in letters and other pieces of literature which are not very systematic. Therefore for many people Systematics is shuffling verses to make up a System.

The besetting sin of most Systematic Theologies is that they impose their system on the Bible. They have an idea or certain controlling ideas and proceed to rearrange the Bible in the light of these controlling ideas. If you have a Calvinistic idea you start out with the perfection of God, God's immutability and God's sovereignty. In other words you start of with an idea of God who calls all the shots and controls everything. The history of the world is like a film script written by God. Everything is determined by God. All is planned from the beginning and you make the Bible fit the System.

Karl Barth does something different here. I studied Barth first in the sixties. Barth is a hero to be wrestled with. The most important thinker of the 20th century. Karl Barth has the most comprehensive Christ centered Systematic Theology that there is. Christ is the key to redemption, creation and so on. I got much from studying Karl Barth's System but in the end I have to reject it because it is based on a notion of Christ and not on the Christ of the Bible.

Systematic Theology should not start with the attempt to make a system.

1.1.2. Biblical Theology

Some do not make a distinction of Biblical Theology from Systematic Theology. Why? Biblical Theology asks what is the theology of the Bible? We divide it up into Old Testament and New Testament Theology. Then there is the question: Is there something like an Old Testament Theology? Often the answer is no and separate theologies for different authors are developed. The same is true of the New Testament. We have Pauline Theology, Johannine Theology, Theology of the Q-Source and so on.

The point here is that Biblical Theology is analytic and descriptive. It analyses and describes the theology of something. It does not matter whether that theology is true or not. It does not matter if that theology is relevant or not. Once the biblical theologian has described and analyzed then he is finished. Once you start asking: Is it true? Should I believe it? Why should I believe it? What is this saying about God? Then you are moving away from Biblical Theology into Systematic Theology. My own understanding of Systematic Theology is deeply linked with Biblical Theology.

1.2. What is Systematic Theology?

Systematic Theology seeks to answer certain basic questions. What do I believe? Why do I believe it? And how do I put it together?

Systematic Theology is the attempt to do it over and over and over again. In this case we talk about the Church. Why do I believe in the Church? What do I believe about baptism? Is it necessary? Should I baptize children or not? Should we insist on faith before baptism? With these questions you are into Systematic Theology.

Tillich understood Systematic Theology as a correlation. He meant relating the ideas of philosophy with the ideas of theology. Tillich wrote an autobiography called *On the boundary*. He saw himself forever struggling between biblical thought and philosophical thought. For Tillich philosophy was the way to identify the structure of everything. Into that framework he inserted theology. I do not do it that way. In my view philosophy is a secondary discipline asking questions about questions.

Systematic Theology is applied hermeneutics. Hermeneutics is the science of interpretation of the meaning. Hermeneutics is the way one should proceed to understand. Systematic Theology is applying the principles of understanding to the Bible.

I see theology best done in the tradition of Thomas Aquinas and his *Summa Theologiae*. What he is doing is to ask a string of questions. That is the way Systematic Theology is done today in the 20th century. He was looking at what others were saying in Islam and Judaism. Basically he has a threefold pattern. I embrace this threefold pattern or three steps. There is the same underlying pattern. Thomas always started out with his **objections**. He started out with "It seems that". For example "It seems that God does not exist" in one part. The second step is started with "But on the other hand". Here he was talking about his own faith. He was using a passage from Scripture or from the Church Fathers. He took a position that **counterbalances the objections**.

The third step is to explain it **his way or my way**.

This is really the right way to do Systematic Theology. Identify what you believe and figure out your answer. That is why I say I make it up while I go along. Systematic Theology is answering the questions that come up by the way.

I am trying to teach you a method that will go with you as you go out into ministry. Theology is what I believe and why I believe it. Ultimately I am working toward a system that should be consistent. I am not starting with a preconceived systems. Through the years I have gone through major shifts in my thinking.

In my seminary days in the fifties my most impressive teacher was Jim Packer in Tyndale Hall. I learned orthodox reformed Calvinism from him. When he left my first job was to take his job. Enrollment dropped like a stone. I began my research on Karl Barth. From that I imbibed what I thought would be the best of art. In the sixties and seventies my position was Reformed modified by Barth. In the seventies I did work on the Historical Jesus. That forced me to grapple more and more with the text and my understanding was modified.

The most crucial modifications came when I was at Fuller. When I wrote *Miracles and the Critical Mind* I was reading about these debates of the past. Some things began to dawn on me that had escaped people of the past. If you read the miracle stories you come up with these questions: Who is doing the miracles? Of course Jesus did them. Miracles prove Christ's divinity. Scholars often object: Did it really happen? I came to think that some things have been overlooked. If you look at the Synoptics you see that the miracles and actions of Christ are really ascribed to the Holy Spirit.

If you look at John you find the saying that the Father in Jesus is doing the work. As I wondered about these I began to reevaluate the doctrine of the Trinity. This had a major impact on my thinking. What I am saying is that my own thinking has evolved, especially here at Fuller. I would encourage you not to be afraid. Ask questions for yourself. Let me make two further observations about the discipline:

1.2.1. Approaching Systematic Theology

Often the question is: In what order should I study Systematic Theology? Systematics I, II, III? When our curriculum was first articulated by Paul Jewett it was set up so that you should do it in that order. Foundations in Systematics I. Christology and Soteriology in Systematics II. And in Systematics III Church and Eschatology.

Many thinkers today are very skeptic about laying indubitable foundations. That is a very important insight. For some people Systematics III is the best place to start and work backward. One way or the other you are involved in ministry. Systematics III is starting where you are dealing with issues which are real issues in the Church. It might be a good idea to start here. In my judgment it does not matter where you start. This course here raises questions about your understanding of Christ and so on. We are talking about a system of interrelated beliefs.

I agree with Wolterstorff when he criticizes foundationalism and says that nobody had yet succeeded in proving that there is a foundational system of beliefs and that other beliefs relate to these foundations.

1.2.2. Different Sorts of Beliefs

It is necessary to distinguish between different sorts of beliefs in Systematic Theology

1.2.2.1. Data Beliefs

This is something I got from Scripture and of what I believe that is the part of the Scripture. It is the **Data**.

1.2.2.2. Data Background Beliefs

What do I believe about the Gospel of Matthew? Is this really the teaching of Matthew or did he make it up? This is **the approach** to the data.

1.2.2.3. Control Beliefs

I believe in God. I believe in God's purpose with man.

Our knowledge is made up of the interrelation of these. In Systematics I "control beliefs" move up to be the first item of foundation.

1.3. Systematic Theology and Dogmatics

There is a simple answer. Dogmatics has to do with dogma understood in a good sense, that is the beliefs of a community. If you are a Presbyterian then the Westminster Confession is dogma for you. For most of the Orthodox Churches the first four councils of the Church are dogma. Dogma has to do with the given beliefs of a community. Fuller's Statement of Faith is dogma.

The problem is that we belong to different denominations. Some dogma might be for one but not for the other. Another problem is that theology is lighter than dogma. There are all kinds of things that are not covered by theology. There are all kinds of issues that are wider than dogma. In my judgment what we are doing here is wider than Dogmatics although we are looking at dogmas at times.

Systematic Theology III has to do with the Church and with the Church's ministry in preaching Eschatology. It is about Jesus and the future. What did Jesus teach about the future? What should we expect from the future? How about life after death?

2. Ecclesiology

2.1. Interpretation of Matthew 16

We start with Jesus' teaching for the Church as written down by Matthew in Matthew 16:13-23. There are five main topics that I want to address for this passage:

2.1.1. Authenticity of the Passage

What is the problem? Many Scholars think that Jesus did not say this at all and have several reasons for Matthew making it up.

- There is nothing in the other accounts (Mark, Luke) of Peter's confession about the Church and the rock or binding and loosing.
- The word *ekklhsia*. How many times does this word come in the teaching of Jesus? Twice and only in Matthew.

Generally Jesus is talking about the Kingdom of God or Heaven. In Matthew's Gospel Jesus talks about the Kingdom of Heaven, elsewhere he talks about the Kingdom of God. Matthew put this down as a pious Jew in refraining from using the Name of God. Remember the trial of Jesus and the question "Are you the Son of the Blessed?" This is an alternative to talk about God.

A. Loisy in *The Gospel and the Church*: Jesus announced the kingdom and what came was the Church. This implies a big letdown.

G. Bornkamm in *Jesus of Nazareth*: "Scholars reject it not only because they have no parallel and because this is the only place in the Synoptic Tradition where the word *ekklesia* appears in the sense of Church, but the authenticity is questioned chiefly because it is not easily compatible with Jesus' expectation of "the Kingdom to come soon". How do you fit the Church into this scheme?"

Above is the case against. But I have a living faith in the veracity of the Bible and I am not inclined to think that Matthew made it all up. Moreover I find various reasons why Jesus might have talked about the Church. All of my arguments are spelled out in the NIDNTT (*New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* in the following text referred to by the abbreviation) Vol. 2 page 731- in the article on *Open*. There is a Book by Oscar Cullmann *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*. My own view is very much indebted to Cullmann's work.

- First Cullmann observes that the word *ekklesia* although only used twice in the Gospel is a thoroughly Jewish word and concept. It occurs in the LXX (Septuagint) frequently for the people of God or for the assembly.
- Second: The idea of the messianic community. You cannot have a kingdom without people. Cannot have a messiah without a messianic community. And you cannot have a Son of Man without the community of the Son of Man. Cullmann argues that often the Son of Man and *ekklesia* go hand in hand (see Daniel 7:13 the Vision of one like a Son of Man). Notice in Matthew 16 you have the question: Who do people say the Son of Man is? If Jesus is thinking in terms of Daniel 7 then 7:18 refers to the Saints of the Most High. The Son of Man is essentially not to be separated from the Saints of the Most High. Cullmann is saying that you cannot separate the Son of Man or Christ from the community. Even as the community is not explicitly mentioned, it is implied.

I think Cullmann is making a good case for Jesus having in mind the community. Back in Aramaic the word would be KENISHTA(htcnq) which is like the word for Knesset meaning assembly. Jesus had in mind some kind of community. He had his twelve disciples and therefore had the kernel of a community. Therefore the objections are not as strong as they seem in the first place.

What did Jesus really intend to say? What did Jesus mean by the kingdom of God. Cullmann says that you cannot have a kingdom without the church.

Two other recent works which have significant contributions to understanding Matthew's Gospel:

- A. Graham Stanton *A Gospel for a new People: Studies in Matthew*. Stanton is Professor at King's College in London. One of his points is that Matthew's Gospel was written to explain the rift between the Church and the Synagogue. Matthew's Gospel was written to vindicate the separation of Church and Synagogue in the same way as the Damascus Document justified the separation of the Qumran Sect from mainstream Judaism. He is tracing the origin of the Church back to Jesus himself. Why did Mark and Luke not include references to the Church? It was not part of their purpose of writing the Gospels.

B. Wright *The New Testament and the People of God*. The first of five projected volumes on the New Testament. A very suggestive creative approach to New Testament Studies. Tom Wright has a major thesis for interpreting what is going on in the Gospels. It is laid out partly in the first volume (\$17 in bookstore). It goes back to the exile to the destruction of Jerusalem and the deportation of the people in the time of Jeremia. As we know the Jewish people returned and the temple was rebuilt. But Tom Wright argues that for many Jews it was as if Israel was still in exile. The Temple was there, the sacrifices were being offered, and yet Israel was still an oppressed people. We know from the Dead Sea Scrolls that the Qumran Community had no time for the Temple and the sacrifices. For Qumran the Temple was a dent of wickedness. They believed God was not there. Wright argues that in his own person Jesus mediates the presence of God. Jesus in a sense was like a walking temple the focal point of a new community.

And I would modify this slightly. There was in fact a mobile temple long before the Temple was built by Solomon, the Tabernacle. Jesus was not so much a walking temple but more like the tabernacle moving among the people of God. My own view is that Jesus was renewing the life of the people of Israel, restoring the presence of God among them. In fact that was the kingdom of God. The kingdom was present in Jesus and so he could say that the kingdom was at hand.

These considerations are also part of the consideration of what Jesus really was trying to do.

2.1.2. The Meaning of the Rock

This again only occurs in Matthew. What might have been intended by Jesus? Note the place of this passage in Roman Catholic Theology. This passage is pivotal in Roman Catholic thought. In view of the claim that Peter is the Rock on which Christ founded his church, you can see a discussion of mind in the course notes (*The Teaching Office of the Church* 1969 in *The Churchman* Vol. 83 pg. 184-196)

In the third century the church of Rome was becoming the dominant Church in Western Europe. This is illustrated by several basics in Roman Catholic Church History. There are four phases in interpretation of the rock:

2.1.2.1. Cyprian in *On the Unity of the Catholic Church*

Cyprian died 258 in the persecution. His book dealt with the problem of schism covering splits in the Church and the claims of schismatic churches to be the true Church. Can you be a member of the true church if you fled persecution? How do you define the true church from the false church? In chapter 4 he says that primacy is given to Peter and the Church. The Church is to be one. All are pastors but one flock. If a man does not hold to the unity of Peter then he does not hold the faith of the Church.

Cyprian is arguing that you need to be in communion with the Church of Rome to be in the Church. This is an early notion of Papal supremacy. You cannot have God for your father if you not have the Church for your mother. However there are two texts and two versions of his work. And the text I read is the so called primacy text. The other text (the received text) drops the reference altogether and refers only to the unity of the Church and omits references to Peter and Rome.

How do you explain the difference? Interpreters of the 20th century (like M. Bevenot) suggest that both texts are genuine but written at different time. The first text was written when Cyprian was still well disposed with the current pope. After a dispute he changed his mind and changed the text. Nevertheless Cyprian's text is evidence for the central focus on the Church of Rome.

2.1.2.2. The Papal "Unam Sancta"

This is a document by Pope Boniface VIII. It dates from 1302. The volume *The Church Teaches* is a collection of documents from the Roman Catholic Church in English translation. This collection is based on a work referred to as "Denzinger". He began collecting illustrative documents of the Roman Catholic Church. The latest edition is coedited by Schönmetzer and referred to as Denzinger-Schönmetzer (short DS). The part we are referring to is in Document number 158 p.174/175 of *The Church Teaches* (short CT).

The passage starts by talking about two swords. The sword of the emperor (secular) and sword of the pope (spiritual). Both are under the control of the Church. The first is yielded by the Church, the second is yielded on behalf of the Church. The first is yielded by the hand of the priest. The second by soldiers and kings but on behalf of the Church.

In other words the Church is the supreme authority. The authority of the state is subject to authority of the Church. Authority is given by the Church. This ultimately is going back to Peter. This authority given to man is not human but divine. Given to Peter by divine lips grounded upon him whom the Rock Peter had confessed. This ultimately goes back to Matthew 16. The amazing issue here is that it refers not only to authority over the Church but also over the state.

The text states (not exact quote) "We declare that it is essential and necessary for the salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff". Outside the Roman Catholic Church you cannot be saved. Currently this kind of statement is tuned down. But in other strong Roman Catholic places this kind of teaching is still emphasized.

2.1.2.3. The Council of Florence (1438-1445)

The Church Teaches Document 165 page 78.

This is a statement regarding the Greek Church with a claim that in the person of Peter the Pope is a successor of Peter and has the power to govern the whole Church. The Holy Roman Catholic Church believes that no one outside of the Roman Catholic Church can become partakers of the everlasting life unless they are joined to the church before the end of their life.

2.1.2.4. First Vatican Council (1869-70).

These are two Documents. The constitution on the faith and a constitution on the Church. It is the constitution of the Church which contains Papal Infallibility. This was under the direction of Pope Pius IX. He was elected as a moderate, but the state of affairs made him more and more conservative. He believed that a statement of papal authority was needed to deal with secularism and other phenomena (*The Church Teaches* #196-201, Philip Schaff *The Creeds of Christendom* Volume 2 page 256-271).

Four main paragraphs were included in the dogmatic constitution of the Church. They constitute a logical argument.

- Paragraph one: The papal supremacy of Peter based on Matthew 16. Also on John 20:21 and 21:15,17.
- The second paragraph argues that the authority given to Peter was subsequently given to his successor continuing his office of being the supreme shepherd and guard of the flock.
- The third chapter argues that supremacy extends to the whole Church.
- The fourth chapter argues that this authority includes infallibility.

I see infallibility of the Pope in a similar way as many Protestant Christians arguing for the infallibility of Scripture. It is also based on the urge to see God's will for the Church to be guided in the right way. It is a way of making sure that you are right.

The definition concludes: "We teach and conclude that the Roman Pontiff when he speaks ex cathedra possesses the infallibility".

The doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church is therefore irreformable because of their nature.

We have to underline two points. Note that the claim is not that the Pope is infallible whenever he opens his mouth. He is infallible only when he is speaking ex cathedra (from the Chair or Throne) when he is speaking officially seated on his throne formulating a doctrine of the Church. He is infallible only in dealing with faith or morals not otherwise. The Pope has to be intending to formulate faith or dogma. It is sufficient for the Pope to have the authority and use it. Note the number of occasions that it has been used. Nobody knows. The Pope had a trial run after the council when he formulated the doctrine of immaculate conception. In other words that Mary was sinless. Everybody knew that this was a kind of infallible utterance. Other utterances remain somewhat obscure. There never has been and never will be a list of infallible pronouncements.

Papal authority is a real matter and goes back to Matthew 16. If the Catholics would be right then we should all become Catholics.

Jesus is drawing a distinction between the rock (petra) and Peter (petro). Some argue that the faith of Peter was the rock. Saint Augustine took different views in the course of his life. What are we to make of it? My own view is heavily influenced by Cullmann. Cullmann notes that in Greek Petra generally means a big rock. A massive Rock. The kind of Rock you could build a building on. Petro means a small rock. But sometimes the reverse is true.

In any case Cullmann argues that if you translate both words back into Aramaic you will get the same word Kepha which is of course the name used for Peter in various places in the New Testament. In fact Paul regularly refers to Peter by the Aramaic form Kephas. What to make of it? I am inclined to think that Paul deliberately refers to him as Kephas in order to draw a distinction between Christ the foundation of the Church and Kephas, a pillar of the church. I am inclined to think that Cullmann is right in saying that both words go back to the same Aramaic words.

Petro was used to give Peter a masculine name in contrast to Petra which is feminine. Cullmann says that Jesus really intended to found his church on Peter as his successor. I agree with that. The difference with Roman Catholicism comes with various inferences that ones draws from that and the role Peter plays in subsequent Church History.

Peter is prominent in the early part of the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 2). The Church was opened up to Jewish believers. Earlier Peter played an important role in choosing a successor for Judas. In Acts 10 Peter is important when the Church is opened up to the Gentiles. Peter is also prominent in the affair dealing with Ananias and Sapphira. He is prominent in preaching (Acts 4:8-; 4:15-29; 9:32).

After this point Peter begins to fade out. Although he is present in Acts 15, he does not play a prominent part. I agree with Cullmann that the passage indicates that Peter was the founder/member of the Church. But that role, once that it was exercised, was finished. Therefore it was a unique office, that Peter had, not a continual one.

What was Jesus doing? I believe that he was staging a new conquest for the land. A new conquest was at hand. He is baptized by John. He is reenacting the entry into the land like Joshua did accompanied by twelve men. Moses got to see the promised land but never got into it. In that sense Joshua is superior to Moses. Jesus was a kind of reenactment of that.

When did Jesus become aware himself of being the messiah? Two answers I would give.

- When he heard the voice from heaven at his baptism. That was confirmation.
- The dawning of the consciousness began when he began to understand the implications of his name. Jahwe will help or Jahwe will save. Basically he had a mission to Israel to save them. Jesus was picking up twelve men accompanying him to reenact the conquest of the land. In the real sense the Spirit of God was not active in the Temple.

Jesus did appoint Peter as his successor but that does not mean a continual succession of apostles. The Acts of the Apostles does not give us sufficient reason that this was continued. He inaugurated the Church but afterward came into a more collegiate relationship with the Jerusalem Church.

Is there a play on words? One possibility is a play with the name of Caiaphas. Peter is the Rock. In one sense Peter is in Jesus organizational structure. Peter will play the role that Caiaphas plays in the Temple.

2.1.3. The Gates of Hell (Verse 18)

The passage is often used in preaching "The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it".

2.1.3.1. Interpretations

The interpretations fall into two groups theological and critical. Theological if you look at the history of the Church you will find a certain pattern emerging. You find what Jerome or Hillary said. They tended to say things like this: The Gates of Hell threatening the church are heretics trying to undermine the church.

If you look at what the Protestant Theologians have to say: They agree but see the heretics differently.

Typically in the history of interpretation is that the Gates of Hell are the enemies of the church.

In modern times people have departed somewhat from this kind of view. The reason is that his kind of interpretation gives a hermeneutic without an exegesis. Many popular preachers have an interpretation they can use but it is really a hermeneutic forced on the text without asking what the text really is saying.

Wilhelm Bousset in *Kyrios Christes* argued that the passage really referred to a kind of mission to hell. That is when Christ died that Christ went down into hell and launched an assault and delivered people from the depths of hell. Bousset believed that this was the way the passage was intended. He did not believe this himself but felt that it reflected a popular belief.

Jeremias in Kittel suggests that the rock is a kind of cosmic rock sitting on the top of hell plugging it up holding back the evil forces beneath. This again does not seem to fit the passage.

2.1.3.2. Difficulties in Interpretation

2.1.3.2.1. Gates do not Attack

You go through gates. Gates might keep out. Gatekeepers might attack. This would mean that the Gatekeepers will not prevail. But the imagery is unsatisfactory here. This undermines a lot of preaching about the Gates of Hell.

2.1.3.2.2. The Biblical Hell is not the Stronghold of Satan.

If you ask where the devil is in the New Testament you get the answer that he is in the desert in the wilderness. Think of the phrase "the prince of the power of the air". The devil is in the air but not in Hell. There is no biblical ground for thinking that Hell is some kind of headquarters of demonic forces.

2.1.3.2.3. The Phrase Used

The Greek text has the text "The Gates of Sheol" will not prevail against it. Sheol was commonly pictured as a city. There was a kind of nasty quarter in that city, but is generally the abode of the dead and certainly not the place where Satan dwells.

The phrase of Gates of Sheol is actually a said expression (Isaiah 38:10; Wisdom 16:3; 3 Makk 5:51). For example in Isaiah. King Hezekiah is afflicted with a mortal sickness. He says that he must depart in the light of his day to the confines of the Gates of Hell.

Gates of Hell means more or less "Death's Door". The picture is of the place of the dead having a door. Once you go through them you never come back.

2.1.3.3. Considerations

2.1.3.3.1. The Role of Gates

You can go through but it keeps out. Remember that ancient cities had gates. Small cities had gates and sometimes when judgment was being meted out on somebody, he was brought outside and was executed like Jesus himself was executed. More important is still that the Temple in Jerusalem had gates. Psalm 118:17-20 has the passage about the stone that the builders rejected becoming the head. The Psalmist sees about a ritual in which one, who is being excluded from the Temple, is now allowed access. If that person is admitted there comes the response "Blessed is he that comes in the name of the Lord". There might be allusions to the cry of the crowd when Jesus entered Jerusalem on Palm-Sunday.

I am suggesting that Psalm 118 gives us the clue for our understanding of the passage. I believe that this passage is about Jesus going up to Jerusalem and inaugurate a new state of affairs. However Jerusalem is the city that kills the prophets and stones the people that are sent to it.

2.1.3.4. Proposal

I suggest that the passage is a passion prediction. Jesus is saying that he is going up to Jerusalem through the gates of the Temple reenacting Psalm 118, but instead of being welcome he will be rejected and the Gates will become the Gates of death.

This actually fits the context of the passage.

This is the form of a cryptic oracle spelled out in verse 21. This is repeated in the other gospels. But this is the original form of the passion prediction. Although Jesus will be killed the Church will not be overcome. By calling the Gates of the Temple the Gates of Dead there is already a sharp distinction to Judaism.

2.1.4. The Keys of the Kingdom

Here I follow Oscar Cullmann's interpretation. See also my article on *Open* in NIDNTT.

What does this passage mean? There are two keys to understand this saying.

- The first is to be found in Isaiah 22:22 and has to do with the House of David and the appointment of a steward over that House (Eliakim). "I will place on his shoulder the key of the house of David. He shall open and none shall shut. He shall shut and none shall open." If this is rightly understood as stewardship then Peter is being pictured as a steward in the household of Christ in Christ's messianic community and is given authority.
- The other reference or key is in Matthew 23:13 (parallel in Luke 11:53). The Pharisees are shutting people out of the kingdom. If I am right that there might just be a play of words between Kephas and Caiaphas the high priest then Peter is constituted as an alternative to the high priest. He and the disciples are given the key of knowledge of the kingdom of heaven. whereas the priests and the rest of the religious establishment will have nothing to do with God's reign.

2.1.5. Binding and Loosing

Here we are talking about Mt 16:19 with possible parallels in 18:18 and John 20:23. Mt 18:17 contains the other reference to "church" in the gospels and has a different sense from Matthew 16. Chapter 16 refers to the Church in general. Here it is the local church.

Matthew 18:18-20:

(18)"Truly, I say to you, whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. (19) "Again I say to you, if two of you agree on earth about anything they ask, it will be done for them by my Father in heaven. (20) For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them." (RSV)

Many people argue that Matthew 18:20 gives us a definition of the Church or at least a minimal definition. Two or three in my name and there I am. There you have got a church. I myself think that this is not intended as a definition for a church at all, but it presupposes the Church, it presupposes the existence of the Church and has to do with exercise of discipline. In the context of Matthew it is not a prayer meeting but it is a matter of procedure in church discipline, namely that the local church has power to make binding decisions. There are three ways of taking this matter of binding and loosing.

2.1.5.1. Making and Establishing Rules

Prohibit or to permit. There is quite a tradition of good scholarship arguing this. Gustav Dalman on *Binding and Loosing* in NIDNTT again the article on *Open*. More recently J.D.M. Derret at London University in Journal of Biblical Literature (JBL) Vol. 102 1982 page 112-117.

2.1.5.2. Placing under a Ban or Acquitting

This is the view of A. Schlatter and J. Schniewind. They argue that Matthew 18 gives just such an example for what it is. If someone does not accept the discipline of the Church then he is to be treated as someone outside of the community as somebody who is impure by definition. This view also fits John 20:23 talking about forgiving. In Roman Catholic Theology the priest is the only authorized person that is entitled to pronounce absolution.

2.1.5.2.1. Digression: Did Jesus ever Forgive Anybodies Sin?

Look at the text for example of the paralytic. What Jesus says to the paralytic is: "Your sins are forgiven you". In the Lord's prayer you pray to the Father "Forgive us our sins and we forgive those..."

I have got to say that Jesus did **not forgive** the sins of people but rather Jesus pronounced forgiveness in the name of the Father. He is acting as the Father's agent. Of course the Gospel present Jesus as someone who mediates the presence of the Father. Jesus is acting as the agent. Similarly he is commissioning the disciples to act as his agents.

This is an interesting question about prayer. Who do you pray to? I think Christians generally sometimes pray to the Father, but then we sometimes pray to Jesus and sometimes to the Holy Spirit and so on. I think the truth is that in practice it is like trying our luck.

I think about prayer and worship in a Trinitarian way. By Jesus we have access in one Spirit to the Father. We pray to the Father, but through him (Eph 2:18) in one Spirit. A Trinitarian conception. Ultimately it is the Father who is addressed.

2.1.6. Binding the Power of Satan and Evil

(See the article on *Open*. References in connection with exorcism outside of the Church *Jesus and the Witch doctor*. Tom Wright on the unclean spirit in P.W.L. Walker *Jerusalem Past and Present in the Purposes of God* page 60. Makkabean cleaning had resulted in an empty temple which would result in occupation by the wicked.)

How can one enter a strong man's house and plunder his goods unless he first binds him? Then he can plunder his house. That is exactly what Jesus was doing. That is why he is able to cast out demons.

R.H. Hiers *Binding and Loosing: The Matthean Authorization* JBL Vol. 104 1985 page 233-250. He argues that behind this lies the authorization to the disciples to be exorcists. The authorization to bind the forces of evil.

Later developments of this are seen in Acts 5 in the disciplining of Ananias and Sapphira. In 1 Cor 5 Paul talks about immorality in the Corinthian church and condemns the Corinthian church for not acting on it. All three are possibly envisaged in the saying to the disciples.

2.1.7. Concluding Reflections

- The first thing I would note is that in my judgment the Church is the messianic community that confessed Jesus as the Christ.
- Secondly the Church is a community of the Holy Spirit. You cannot have Christ without the Spirit. It is the Spirit that makes Jesus the Christ.
- Thirdly in the saying about Peter, I see Jesus as the rock in Psalm 118. Therefore Jesus is ultimately the foundation of the Church. But there is a sense in which Peter is the delegate and representative of Jesus carrying on his mission. I differ from Roman Catholicism in not seeing that the Roman Catholic Church has exclusive rights to that succession. Nor do I see Peter handing on that authority that Jesus has given him to open up the Church to the Jewish people and then the Gentiles.

Next I see in this passage, in relation to my understanding of the Gate of Hades, a passion prediction. Namely the death of Jesus as a result of his going to Jerusalem. The opponents of the Church will not prevail against it.

Finally I see an authorization to impose discipline and exercise discipline on behalf of Christ in Binding and Loosing and its ramifications of meaning. And I see here the beginning of the parting of the ways. At least a further parting of the ways after Matthew 12. A community is envisaged which is distinct from the nation of Israel. It may include Jews but the use of the term *ekklesia* for this body of Christian followers of Jesus, which is a Jewish term, marks a further parting of the ways and a separation of that body from Judaism as a whole.

2.2. The Identity of the Church

Yesterday I was talking about Wolterstorf and his idea that in knowledge there are essentially three components:

- Data Beliefs
- Data Background Beliefs
- Control-Beliefs

In talking about the Church I was talking about Data Beliefs and I am going to go on talking about Data Beliefs. Looking at the meaning of the Keys of the Kingdom and Binding and Loosing and then looking for data in the Bible concerning the identity of the Church.

I think I want to step back a bit and look over a bit with Data background beliefs.

Matthew 12:14-32 is a pivotal passage to get things into perspective.

The Pharisees are trying to destroy Jesus. Before that Jesus has healed a man with a withered hand. The making of the man whole has produced healing and the decision of the Pharisees to take counsel how to destroy him (Matthew 12:38-50).

In a sense this chapter encapsulates the Christology of Matthew and is important to understand who Jesus is. What is his Mission and his self-understanding. We are used to think in climaxes in the gospels with the crucifixion of Jesus. But prior to that the climax is Peter's confession of Jesus as the Christ (Matthew 16).

I want to submit to you that there are two confessions of Jesus, two climaxes or rather a climax and an anti-climax. The anti-climax comes first in Matthew 12. That anti-confession is the confession of the Pharisees. They accused him of casting out demons by the devil. The other one is Peter's confession: "You are the Son of the living God". What is Peter confessing? I think the conventional view is to say that Peter confesses the divinity of Christ. I do not regard the title "Son of God" as a divine title. In the genealogies Adam is a Son of God. The same in Matthew 2:50 "Out of Egypt have I called my son..".

I am saying that we cannot automatically assume that the title "Son of God" means Jesus divinity. What Peter is confessing is not that Jesus is the second person of the Trinity. This might be standard Sunday-School teaching but it does not fit. What is Peter confessing? He is confessing that Jesus is the Christ. Christ means Cristo" which translates the Hebrew MaSHiaCH (jcm).

If you ask by what is Jesus anointed then the answer of the Gospels is that Jesus is anointed by the Holy Spirit at his baptism and that is what makes Jesus the Christ. Before his baptism Jesus was not the Christ. Afterwards he was. All what I am saying here is that the coming of the Spirit constituted his anointing and the start of his ministry. Do not misunderstand me that he was only a man before baptism. This is an old heresy. Matthew made it plainly clear that Jesus was conceived by the Holy Spirit but he did not enter into his office as the anointed one until he was baptized through the coming of the Spirit on him.

Lets move to Matthew 12:16-18. Jesus was what he was because of the Holy Spirit (Verse 18b). The Spirit makes him the anointed one. The citations from Isaiah 42 and Isaiah 61 are constituted to define the identity of Jesus as the Christ and of his activity in ministry of the Holy Spirit.

Then we have a puzzling detour. There was a blind man. People ask can this be the Son of David? They did not ask if he was divine. What is going on here? Who is the Son of David? Solomon (Verse 42) was the Son of David but there was something greater here.

What is the point here? To understand you need to understand the background of the times, Philo and the Wisdom of Solomon (he had all knowledge of healing and so on). When they ask "Is this the Son of David?" then they are seeing him as Solomon as a healer, as a rightful healer.

B. Lanergan points out that knowledge is never a matter of just taking a look and seeing. He says all knowledge involves have a frame or frames of references in which you identify what you are seeing. What I am saying here is that the business of the Son of David is the frame of reference. The heir of David that possesses all wisdom and the power of healing is seen in Jesus.

Then comes the confession by the Pharisees: He does it by Beelzebub by the devil. The issue that we got shaped up here is the question by what power by what Spirit is Jesus is doing these things. And the Pharisees conclude that he is a deceiver and that he is leading the people astray. Matthew's side is: No, it is the Holy Spirit (Isaiah 42).

Jesus confronts the accusation that the devil is got into him, by the counterclaim that his power is the power of the Spirit of God. Notice how he links this with the Kingdom of God. What is the Kingdom of God? It is God's presence and power through Jesus.

I believe that the language of baptism with the Holy Spirit and Kingdom refers to the same thing. I will not argue it here. I believe when John the Baptist prophesied a baptism with fire by Jesus the understanding was as a prophecy that was fulfilled in the actual ministry of Jesus. Baptism is a cleansing referring to the casting out of demons, cleansing of the Temple, cleansing of sin and so on. That is what the evangelists are about. The gospels are apologetic documents presenting the Christian case. It is up to the reader to decide who is right. We cannot have an action replay. We have two different stories. The Gospels are very open about the accusations against Jesus. They are written to answer these.

The Pharisees ask for a sign (Verse 38). Typically biblical interpreters see this as a request from the do-not-knows. If Jesus would do a sign then they would be persuaded. I do not think this is right. If Lanergan is right of judging in their frame of reference then they had made up their mind that Jesus was doing this in the power of the devil. There was no sense in making a sign. They were actually hoping he would do a sign because they had failed to get him on the charge that he was casting out demons by Beelzebub. If Jesus really pulled something off like the feeding of the 5000 then it would be proof before their eyes that he was a magician and a sorcerer that he was using his power to lead people. A trick question to which he says: No sign will be given except the sign of Jonah.

Typically the reference to Jonah is understood as a sign of the resurrection. But to get the full force of this, we have to understand about the story of Jonah. Jonah is a prophet who is commanded to go to Niniveh to tell them to repent. Instead he flees to Tarsus thereby disobeying God. The people in the ship throw him overboard. Jonah 2 is talking about the Gates of Sheol closing behind Jonah, but God comes to the rescue and Jonah goes on to have a ministry to the Gentiles.

The sign of Jonah is a prophetic sign. A sign done to the prophet rather than by the prophet. Likewise the sign of the resurrection is a sign done to Jesus and not by him. Two further ramifications:

- First has to do with the name of Jonah (Dove). The Dove - the Holy Spirit - came on Jesus. There is an implicit allusion here to the Spirit. Jesus is the new Jonah.
- The other ramification comes in Matthew 16. All commentators say that this mean that Peter's father was called Jonah. There are two people who think otherwise. What Jesus is saying here is that he is giving Peter a new name, a composite name. Now he has got a new father. He is saying through confessing me you have essentially left your family relationship and have become my son. He is Jesus' son. The sign of Bar-Jona is linking Simon with Jesus. Now Simon is part of the mission.

In Verse 42 you have the saying about the unclean spirit. They live in the desert. The evil spirit will find certainly more. More evil than himself and the last date is worse than the first. Tom Wright has a persuasive interpretation of this passage. He sees this as a commentary on the history of Israel from the captivity onward, on the present state of Judaism. It actually fits the Damascus Document (G. Vermes *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*). The Damascus Rule says that the Qumranites believed that official Israel was all corrupt. In the same way Jesus here is making a statement on the current state of Israel.

The other comment has to do with his brothers and sisters. What are they doing? They want to cool things down. They think that he is in trouble. What are you doing? They may be washing their hands of him and disowning him. Part of a procedure recognized in the Dead Sea Scrolls is taking a disowned son to the elders to let him be killed.

So Jesus is declaring a new family. Matthew 12 is pivotal for understanding what is going on. The parting of the ways, the Church from Judaism begins right here. In Matthew 16 and onwards there is Jesus increasingly forming his own community, a messianic community, and looking towards inclusion of the Gentiles.

2.2.1. The Term "Church" in the Old Testament

Just for clarification the origin of the word "church". It is linked with the Greek *kuriako* meaning of the Lord's. The Lord's people. The term in the New Testament is *ekklhsia* from which we get *ekklesiastic*. This is a very common word in the Old Testament. It occurs something like 100 times as the Hebrew *qahal*(*lhq*) meaning an Assembly (Numbers 16:33). The congregation gathered together to make the covenant. In using the term *ekklhsia* the early church is appropriating a Jewish idea designating the assembly of the people of Israel. Some link this etymologically with the Hebrew noun *KAL* a call. See the article on *Church* in NIDNTT. The other term that is used in the Old Testament is *'edah*(*hdu*). Some think that this term *hdu* has to do with the verb to appoint. The appointed people of God (Exodus 12:3). Sometimes you find both terms put together (Exodus 12:6). This is especially found in Pentateuch in the Book of Numbers. 10 times in the Psalms. Interesting enough the term "Synagogue" also occurs in the Old Testament 220 times (*sunagwgh*). Repeatedly Jesus went to the Synagogue of Kapernaum. H.C. Kee thinks that there were no purpose-build Synagogues in the time of the New Testament. They might have had private houses. On this whole thing see the *Dictionary on Jesus and the Gospels*.

But to reiterate the Synagogue movement in Palestine in the time of Jesus seems to be quite informal. There was of course only one Temple. It was regarded as a duty of the Jew to go to the temple at the time of the Passover. But the ordinary Jew was not in a position to go to Jerusalem frequently. We have a concept of the community of Israel with this term *ekklhsia* used often in the Greek of the Old Testament. The church is now appropriating this term for itself. Note some related ideas.

The first of these ideas is the term covenant. The Old Testament mentions several covenants between men and God. It would seem that the idea of the covenant is an important idea in the Old Testament. God makes a covenant with Noah (Gen 9:9-17) promising that he would not send another flood on the earth. The theme of the covenant as constitutive for the people of God begins with the story in Gen 15/17. Central to the idea of this covenant is a threefold promise. That God will make Abraham's posterity a great nation. Secondly God will give them the land. The promised land for themselves.

The third part is the promise that through Abraham's seed all the nations of the earth will be blessed or - alternative - will bless themselves. An instrument in universal blessing.

This is linked with a covenant sign of circumcision. Given to all male members of the people of Israel including those who are incorporated into Israel like slaves or gentile converts. Also linked with this is the idea of sacrifice. Covenants are made and established through sacrifice. This leads to the covenant of Moses (Exodus 24). Established through sacrifice. This becomes definitive for Israel as the people of God and includes the giving of the Law, but the central idea of the covenant is the thought "I will be your God and you shall be my people". See Leviticus 26:12 and notice the way that this thought is appropriated in the New Testament (2 Cor 6:12). The thought that God will live among the people and have his being there. This ties in with the whole idea of the Temple.

What is important about the Temple? It was a building no better than Old Saints Church over there. Less big than Pasadena Presbyterian Church. For Jews there is an important difference. They were asking the question: Where is God? The orthodox answer is: In the Temple. The Temple is the dwelling place of God so that going to the Temple has a special significance. It is not the question of just going to any church. It is not a matter of indifference. For the Jew the Temple was the dwelling place of God in a very special sense. This is what the Damascus Document talks about when it questions that God has come back to it. Is it just empty? Probably filled with demons?

When Jesus cleanses the Temple he not only cleanses up the act a bit but it has to do with the restoration of God's Worship.

Among the related ideas is the idea of election and calling. Dt 7:6-8 is a basic passage for it.

The final idea I want us to notice is the idea of the remnant. That the whole nation is not the true elected one but only a part. See Isa 6:30;7:3;1 Kg 19:18 (7000 Remnant that have not bowed their knee to Baal). Then there is an intriguing allusion in Zech 9:7: "It shall be a remnant for its God".

Zech is talking about the Philistines, envisaging the incorporation of the Philistines as a remnant to our God. Of course you need to have the story of the book of Ruth to understand this. Ruth being a Moabites proved to be more faithful than the proper Jew, eventually marrying Boaz and becoming the ancestor of David.

In the Old Covenant in Ruth or Zechariah and elsewhere you have the thought of the inclusion of the Gentiles, essentially it is the inclusion of the Gentiles into Israel not the establishment of the Gentiles as a separate people. What would happen when Gentiles would be included? What happened all along? The male should be circumcised. That is part of the debate on circumcision for Gentile converts in the New Testament. There were many who thought that the Church was a Jewish thing so the proper thing to do was to circumcise them.

2.2.2. The New Testament and the Term "Church"

We noted that *ekklhsia* only occurs twice in the Gospels but in Paul it occurs many times. For example the letters to Corinth and Rome. If we read the opening addresses of the letters of Paul it is a bit like watching TV - the credits are coming up. We usually ignore them.

I want to suggest you that this is polemical stuff. The fact that Paul can address this group in Corinth as the *ekklhsia* of God appropriating a fairly Jewish term would be an offense to any Orthodox Jew. It would be an offense to Paul when he was Saul on the way to Damascus.

It would be an offense to the Sanhedrin and the Pharisees, for Paul to call these Christian converts Saints or Holy Ones, because Jesus has been condemned as someone satanic, a deceiver, and therefore by that very fact any followers of Jesus would be deceived and deceiving. Far from being Holy they would have been considered to have cut themselves off from the Jewish people with all that this would involve. This is an assertion of something important. Something on what Paul had changed his mind at an enormous cost. The churches that Paul is talking about are visible models existing in special places (Corinth, Ephesus, Galatia...). So the very existence is the existence of a separatist movement.

Let's look at some related ideas. In particular I want us to notice three of those related ideas. These occur in Paul's theology.

2.2.2.1. Body

This term is characteristic of Paul's thought. J.T. Robinson *On the Body*. More recently R.H. Gundry *Soma in the New Testament*. The term occurs in Rom 12:1- "I appeal to you..."

In verse 4 as in one body we have many members so we though many are one body in Christ and individually one member of another.

The church as the body of Christ perhaps the local church. Members being like the parts of the human body recognizing that different members have different functions. 1 Cor 12:12-27 takes up the same thought but with a slightly different emphasis. Different members are having different gifts. Gifts are given for the good of all. The thought is further developed in Col. 1:18. The idea of Christ as the head of the Body comes up. Likewise Eph 4:15,16. You have a mixed metaphor which takes the thought a little bit further. We are to grow up into Christ. The metaphor keeps getting extended.

Where did Paul get his idea from? How did he get the idea. I want to draw attention to three things

2.2.2.1.1. Relation to Paul's Conversion Experience

In Acts 9:5, on the Damascus Road, Saul is struck blind, he hears a voice, falls to the ground hearing Jesus saying "Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me?"

The implication seems to me to be linked to the Church. Who was Paul persecuting? Christians, followers of the way. But in this vision Jesus acted as he would be them. Could this be the notion of the agent in reverse? There is a kind of interconnection between the Church and Christ. The Church is the body of Christ.

2.2.2.1.2. Contrast to the Flesh

The notion of the body in contrast with the notion of the flesh. The notion of flesh plays a big role in Paul's thinking. Generally flesh is a bad idea. One it signifies sinfulness, evil desires and corruption. The other is the flesh that is removed in circumcision. The putting off of the flesh. There might be an implicit contrast in Paul's mind between flesh as something dead and the living body.

2.2.2.1.3. Historical Background

The third concept belongs to the ancient world more generally. The notion seems to have been used by others outside of the Church. I for one do not want to see Paul as one whose thinking is dominated by Jewish ideas. He is an apostle to the Gentiles. He is conversant with Gentile philosophy and ideas. May be this third source is also important. I am quoting from the Stoic philosopher Seneca (4 BC-65 AD). Paul is pretty much an exact contemporary of Seneca.

For if you are the cell of the state and the state your body - you see - I think how requisite is mercy. For you are merciful to yourself when you are seemingly merciful to another. Even reprobate citizens should have mercy as the weak members of the body. If there should ever be the need of letting blood, the hand must be under control to inhibit it from cutting deeper than necessary.

Where is this coming from and what is Seneca talking about? It is a treatise entitled *On Mercy*. But the person to whom he is addressing this is the Emperor Nero. Seneca is talking about the Roman State. The Emperor is seen as the head of the state. It is only fitting that he should be merciful. It was very timely to his addressee.

The conception of this is interesting and of course addressed to someone who is in Rome. Roman 12 contains the notion of the body. Maybe Paul is conversant with the Stoic ideas of the body of the state and is using it in a Christian way. This may be an idea that his readers might be familiar with. Paul is applying it in a Christian way.

Another piece from Epistle 92.30 Seneca *Reflection on the Nature of Divinity*

Why should you not believe that something of divinity should not exist in one who is a part of God? All this universe encompassing us is one. We are associates of God, we are his members.

A Stoic idea is that God is everywhere and in a sense everything there is, is filled with something divine. Could be eastern and New Age. And thus human beings could be considered members of God.

There is another line of thought which may or may not be related this is in the Jewish writer Philo of Alexandria (20 BC - AD 45). His life overlapped that of Jesus and Paul. There was a theory of an exchange of letters between Paul and Seneca but this is considered as apocryphal. For example Philo's work *Special Laws*. Here is Philo giving an exposition of the Jewish laws and their relevance to life and thought in his day. He is contextualizing talking about the high priest. The office of the high priest of making atonement. *Special Laws* 3:131

That every age and every part of the nation regarded as a single body may be united in one and the same fellowship making peace and good order their aim.

Philo sees the Jewish nation as a body and the high priest as the head of the body. Paul could be familiar both with Seneca's ideas and Philo's. Not familiar with the writings but with the ideas that find expressions in these writing. He is contextualizing these ideas for the Church drawing on ideas that appear to be current in society. Ideas which have a bases in the biblical tradition but also have some meaning outside of that tradition.

2.2.2.2. Bride

The second idea is that of the bride of Christ. One finds this idea in the New Testament in various places and with a number of variants (for example Eph 5:30,32).

The marriage relationship is seen as an image of the Church. You get the same idea in Revelation 21:2 which is a vision of the Holy City coming down from heaven prepared as a bride for her husband. Mt 22:1-14 is a parable of the wedding feast. The idea is ultimately grounded in the Hebrew Scriptures. Israel as the bride of Jahwe (Jer 2:2; further allusion 31:32). The notion of the New Covenant "I was their husband". The symbolism of Hosea marrying a harlot. What I am suggesting is that the images in the first instance belong to Israel but become appropriated by Jesus to the Church for the new community. One gets an implied reference in Mt 2:19.

2.2.2.3. Temple

The third idea is that of the Temple. The whole point of the Temple is that the Temple is the dwelling place of God. Who shall ascend to the Lord? One who is clean and pure.

Then there is the question if God was still really there? In the New Testament you get at least two lines of thought. One in Stephen's speech in Acts 7:48:

Yet the most high does not dwell in houses made with hands as the prophets said: What house will you build for me? says the Lord.

This is real fighting talk. At the end of the chapter Stephen gets stoned. That statement contains a repudiation of the Temple. So that is one line of thought.

The other line of thought is that it is the body of the followers of Jesus that now constitutes the temple (1 Cor 1:16+17; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2).

From an Jewish Orthodox standpoint this was exactly what they could say. But the Church is seen as the new Israel. We are the Temple of God. Therefore the Church is now conceived as superseding the Temple. Now I think this has various ramifications and implications. What has this all to say about Israel and the Churches relationship with them? Paul's answer is very clear that the Church is the new Israel consisting of Jewish believers and Gentile believers. And therefore there is a whole change that has come over the divine plan and the divine economy. Contrary to what the dispensationalist say the temple is not of any significance. There is no significance in a new Temple. Sacrifice, circumcision, sabbath, these are now past and obsolete. From now on it is the Church which carries on the mission of Israel. Lest the Church becomes proud and self satisfied Paul offers a reminder in Romans 11:19.

2.2.3. The Church in the Protestant Tradition

What I want to do here is to do three things:

2.2.3.1. Different Approaches to Understand the Church

This is to identify different polity or conceptions of the Church. Different ideas of the Church emerged in the Reformation. The continent of Europe was full with ideas in very sharp conflict with each other, all Protestant but in conflict. On the continent people talked about the Magisterial Reformation as contrasted to the Radical Reformation. Radicals are the Anabaptist, Mnesmonites and Spiritual Groups.

Luther was a representative of the Magisterial Reformation. Two texts are worth studying. Treatise of 1520 *Appeal to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* in Dillenberger *Martin Luther: Selections of his writings*. The Reformation had just gotten under way but the authorities of the Church are proving unreceptive to his teaching, so Luther appeals to the nobility of the German Nation, that is the Princes, the administrators in the various states, to reform the Church. He is going over the head of the priests and bishops. If they will not do it, let the lay people do it. In so doing Luther is inciting the state to reform the Church.

And as a result this established a pattern in Germany that to some extent is with us to this day because some Princes embraced the Reformation and some of the German States became Protestant while others remained Catholic. The outcome was politically the Peace of Augsburg (1554) which established a kind of truce embodied in the formulae "Cuius regio eius religio" (Whose reign, his religion). It recognized the right of the heads of the state to choose the religion for their state. It was a matter of the head of each state. There you got a pattern establishing a church/state connection. Luther justified his appeal to the Princes on the ground of the priesthood of all believers. That is if a lay ruler was a Christian then that lay ruler had the right and the obligation to reform the Church. Luther was breaking the monopoly of the priest and the bishop and was establishing the power of the lay rulers to govern the Church. Of course the idea works in a Christian society as long as you have a predominantly Christian society. If a society goes secular then you will have problem.

Luther's other writing on secular authority from 1523 in Dillenberger page 363-422 (see especially 368-). Here Luther modifies his earlier position and speaks of two kingdoms, the kingdoms of the world and the kingdom of Christ and argues that Christians are citizens of both kingdoms. We have an obligation to the state but also have a higher obligation to the faith.

That represents a standpoint of the Magisterial Reformation.

Calvin's position was essential the same. Calvin was always in tension with the Geneva Council. Calvin believed that the Council had the right and duty to enact Christian laws. Laws should have a Christian character. They were under obligation by the Scripture.

The radical Reformation. Here I want to notice different branches Mennonites, Swiss brethren and the Spiritualists. These were different groups but one thing in common in their belief was that Luther and Calvin and supporters of the Magisterial Reformation had sold out to the state. What has the Church of God to do with the state? They believe in the separation of the Church and the State. The Church should be exclusively consist of the people of God. Unbelievers should not be allowed in the Church.

The evangelical Anabaptists are distrustful not only of Luther but also of the Spiritualists and people who claim gifts of prophecy. They basically said: Let's go back to the simplicity of the Bible. Recover the lifestyle of the early Church. Recover the pattern of life that is depicted in the New Testament and the forms of ministry in the New Testament.

For Luther there were things that could be described as indifferent (adiaphora). For example should you have a prayer book? Pictures of the Saints? Hymns? For Luther these were matter of indifference from the Bible. But for others only things could be permitted that were permitted explicitly in the Bible. Therefore in one location in Switzerland they removed the Organs because there was no Organ in the New Testament. Others believed that infant baptism was a hangover from the old system and that Luther was compromising the Bible. Anabaptists is probably a false name saying there were baptized again. But they would only acknowledge one baptism.

The Spiritualists more stressed what God was doing now in the Spirit of God in leading new ways. There were tensions between various groups of the Radical Reformation.

In England were the same tension. The Reformation started under Henry VI. when Henry began to believe that his first marriage was a mistake. Henry had to get special permission before this marriage since she was the widow of his brother. After she did not produce an heir, he wanted to divorce her, but the Pope resisted so he made himself the head of the Church. Anglicans justified that by the example of Israel as a political nation and a common faith.

2.2.3.2. The Teaching of Calvin and Brunner's Response.

Calvin maps out a classical Protestant view of the church. Calvin is important because:

- A. His influence in molding thought in a mainstream Protestant Reformed and Evangelical tradition. That tradition is still alive and well today.
- B. Calvin typifies Protestant and Evangelical attitudes to the Church.

So what I want to do is to pick out some key ideas of Calvin and then look at the way Emiel Brunner responded to those ideas. Then I will offer some reflections of my own.

This is the pattern that I indicated that I took over from Thomas Aquinas.

Calvin's discussion of the Church is contained in Book IV of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. If you want to build a library I would recommend to have Calvin's *Institutes*. You can have them as two volumes in the Library of Classics translated by Ford Lewis Battles in the sixties. It remains by far the most useful version although some have accused Battles of modernizing the translation.

Calvin addresses some crucial issues.

2.2.3.2.1. What is the Church in God's Purpose?

2.2.3.2.1.1. The Believers need Help

We need help from outside of ourselves. In typical fashion Calvin puts it like this: "Since however in our ignorance and sloth - to which I add fickleness of disposition - we need help to advance faith to its goal. God has added this. There is treasure in the Church pastors and teachers through whose lips he might teach his own. He omitted nothing that would be helpful".

God institutes the sacraments as aids.

Calvin is not known for enthusiasm for Church Growth or mission. Why the Church? We need help. The Church is there to win souls for Jesus to bring people the good news of salvation. And the Church is God's appointed means to that end. Calvin is mainstream evangelical in this respect.

2.2.3.2.1.2. The Church contains the Body of the Elect.

The Church is made of those who are saved in Christ Jesus. The Church is thus like a kind of huge cluster of atoms. God's purpose is to save souls and the Church is the aggregate of the total number of those saved. For Calvin the saved are those whom God has predestined to be saved from all eternity. God has put them there and made them members of the body of Christ. Calvin is not ashamed to use traditional terminology. The Church is the Holy Catholic (all encompassing) Church, but he repudiates the claim of exclusivity by the Roman Catholic Church. The Church is Catholic (universal) because there could not be two or more churches. The elect are united in Christ, they grow together joined in one body.

God miraculously keeps his Church, sometimes in hiding places (1 Kgs 19:18). There are two points in Book IV chapter 1:1 and 2.

2.2.3.2.2. What is the Nature of the Church?

Here I want to draw your attention to two aspects of Calvin's thinking which has a lot of common ground with Protestant thinking. I mentioned earlier Philip Schaff's book *The Creeds of Christendom*. It remains the most comprehensive statement of the Christian faith and is still valuable even after 100 years. Volume III contains the Protestant Creeds. The Westminster Confession and so on.

Two aspects of the nature of the Church:

2.2.3.2.2.1. The Church is both Visible and Invisible

Here Calvin is siding with Augustine, Wycliff and Luther. What is the point at issue?

The visible church consists of all professing Christians. Absolutely everybody who makes some profession of faith. But that body contains a lot of pretenders, hypocrites and nominal Christians. Whereas the invisible Church consists of the true believers of all the elect living and dead. Calvin puts it well right this: "Just as we must believe that the former church is visible to the eyes of God alone so we have to keep communion with the latter".

The point is that the identity of the true believers is visible to the eyes of God alone. Nevertheless we must respect all people who profess and who come to Church regularly because the pastor and the elders have no way of telling who is for real and who is a phony in the end. It would be presumptuous for the pastor and for the elders to do God's job about it. This is an aspect of the Church. and something that Calvin did not invent. You can also find it in the confession of Augsburg article 8 (Schaff *Creeds of Christendom* Vol. III 3:12).

Similarly the point is endorsed by the Westminster Confession. Chapter 25 3:4

The Catholic Church has sometimes been more, sometimes less visible. Churches are more or less pure according to their worship and life.

2.2.3.2.2.2. The Marks of the Church

What is the essence of a church? How do you know you have got a church? What is the test of a church? Calvin is again in mainstream Protestant thinking following the Confession of Augsburg (where Melachton summarized what the Lutherans stood for in 1513, the classical foundational document of the Protestant Church). Calvin is almost echoing word for word Luther's and Melachton's views.

2.2.3.2.2.1. *A Place where Ministry is done*

Wherever we see the word of God purely preached and heard and the sacraments administered according to Christ's institution there it is not to be doubted that a church of God exists (Eph 2:20; Mt 18:20; Institutes IV 1:9).

A passing comment on this: Calvin cites Eph 2:20. He is taking Eph 2:20 to mean the teaching of the apostles and prophets. To me Ephesians is saying more than that. The Church is a living building built on the persons of the prophets and the apostles including the Ephesians and including you and me. Calvin is taking this in a specific limited didactic sense. The other passage he quotes Mt 18:20 is not a definition of the Church at all. There is nothing of the sacraments administered or the Gospel being preached. Mt 18:20 presupposes a church and states how a church might act in Christ's name.

Let me add that others have subsequently built on this classical definition (Westminster endorses it). Some Protestant confessions have added a third mark of a church. Namely the exercise of discipline. For example the first Scots Confession 18 and the Belgic Confession 19 make discipline a mark of the Church.

For Luther and Calvin discipline came under the broad definition of the Gospel being purely preached and heard. Because it is a very open ended definition. You have to ask: What is the Gospel? What does it mean to purely preach and hear the Gospel? That is very open ended.

2.2.3.2.2.2. *Separation and Schism*

When is it justified to split up? To divide a church? The Catholic Church argued that there is only one Church appointed by Christ for all eternity. That is the one and true Church. Yet here was the Reformation splitting the Church and separating off. When is it justifiable to divide the church? Not only the question of splitting off from Rome but there were divisions within Protestantism as manifested in the Anabaptists and the Spiritualists.

Calvin says that here two factors are important. One can split off for two reasons.

- A. The first concerns doctrine. If a church fails to preach the pure Gospel and people are not hearing the Gospel in a church then that church has failed to be a church.
- B. Second issue is holiness. Supposing a church gets corrupt and sanctions practices which are illegitimate. Such a case would be a church which approved of gay marriages like Old Saints across the road. What do you do in a situation like that?

You got two kinds of issues here: Doctrine and Morality (*Institutes* IV 1:9-29 4:2 A whole big discussion here). Notice how Calvin handles these issues. Some think of Calvin as an extremist. The way Calvin handles it shows him to be a moderate.

Institutes IV 1:12 is concerned with fault in administrations of sacraments or doctrine. This should not lead one to estrange oneself from the Church. There are some basic notions that should not be touched but fluidity in some degree must be tolerated and should not break the unity. Suppose one church believes that souls fly to heaven others believe that they live in the Lord.

Calvin's approach to this is that some are basic doctrines and grounds for separation, but there are other doctrines that permit a variety of interpretation and that should not be a ground for separation.

Phil 3:15: "Let us be of the same mind, if not God will reveal it to you".

Some are better instructed than others. The same point is made in 1 Cor 14:30. Similarly on the question of holiness Calvin says that we are called to be holy. The purpose of the Church is to be sanctified but in reality the Church is made up of sinful human beings. It's like the parable of the fishnet. The fish included in the net are good and bad but it is up to God to find out which is which. See also the parable of the sower (Mt 3:12).

Calvin says (*Institutes* IV 1:13) "The Church is to be weight down with this wickedness until the Lord comes". He is not seeking a church that is perfect. Calvin sees this exemplified in Paul's dealing with his missionary churches. At Corinth there was a gross case of immorality. Paul did not say you are no longer a church but he pleaded with them. He did not wash his hands of them. Likewise in Galatia. The Galatian churches were heavily infected by the circumcision party which had supplanted his own teaching. Nevertheless Paul does not write off the churches in Galatia. Calvin adopts a very moderate position here. He recognizes that there are crazies out there, that there are weirdo practices, but he is very hesitant to write the churches off. It is a model for us to follow. But when it comes to the Church of Rome the Church is no longer a church. It does not pass the test. A government of lies rules there which extinguishes the light. Rome fails in regard to teaching and also in the sacramental administration (*Institutes* IV 2:2). From there Calvin goes on to give a lengthy analysis and denunciation of the Church of Rome.

2.2.3.2.3. Emil Brunner's Response

Brunner in his own way exemplifies certain Protestant outlooks. He endorses Calvin up to a point but wants to modify him and criticizes him in some points. He was one of the two great systematic theologians on the continent. Paul Jewett studied under him.

Karl Barth wrote a huge Systematic Theology. Brunner wrote a smaller Systematic Theology still worth studying. Could be used as a textbook for Systematics III. Note some of Brunner's responses reflecting evangelical viewpoints.

2.2.3.2.3.1. The Definition of the Church

Brunner defines the Church as "Every form of historical life which has its origin in Jesus Christ and acknowledges in him its foundation and supreme norm".

What is the difference between Calvin and Brunner? Brunner's definition would include as the Church Campus Crusade, Intersity Fellowship, Fuller Seminary. My question is: Are they really churches? This is the kind of question that you could discuss in your comments. What do you see as a church? What is the role of bodies like this? I would say that it is a parachurch or part of a church, but it is not a church.

Some people have reservation against the Lord's Supper at Fuller because it signifies a degree of engagement much more than what the role of Fuller is. Fuller is made up of classes. My answer to this is that I would side more with Calvin than with Brunner. These bodies serve the Church and serve an indispensable function. They bring churches together in a way that would otherwise not be possible. I have to agree with Calvin against Brunner that they are not a church.

2.2.3.2.3.2. Personal Encounters

The second point of Brunner is that the Church depends on personal encounter with God. But the means of that encounter is the Holy Spirit (*Dogmatics* III:7). Brunner wants to stress the role of the Spirit in creating the Church and in holding the Church in its being.

2.2.3.2.3.3. Church is not only External Faith Support.

Brunner says that Calvin is wrong in seeing the Church as merely an external support of faith (*Dogmatics* Vol. 3 p.19). I have to agree with Brunner on this. I think Calvin could well represent a mainstream evangelicalism and see the Church only as an instrument. But the Church I see in the New Testament is more than that. God has a purpose not only for the individual but to create a people for himself and that people is the Church. I would want to stress with Brunner the corporate aspect of the Church.

2.2.3.2.3.4. The Invisible Church

Brunner says that Calvin is wrong about the invisible church. He is individualizing Christianity and stressing election and predestination (*Dogmatics* III:20). Brunner wants to stress instead fellowship, specially corporate fellowship. My response is that I would stress the role of corporate fellowship too. Life together in Christ is something that is important. Life together in Christ and at the same time I have to say together with Calvin that it is God alone who sees the heart. I would not reject Calvin's distinction between invisible and visible church.

2.2.3.2.3.5. The Institutional Character of the Church

He says Calvin is wrong in stressing institutional character of the Church. This is the way Brunner read the New Testament (Page 32) "What belongs to divine service to Sunday, the Cultic the sacred falls entirely into the background compared with the vocation of mission to the world and loving to man". This is the way Brunner is reading the New Testament. I think he is overstating the case. Clearly in the ancient church Sunday was not kept as it was kept later. If the early Christians were slaves they had to work each day even on Sunday. To me the Pauline churches were not just one long continuous mission or even mission to the World. It did include the celebration of the Lord's Supper as Paul stresses and prayer and worship do form an important part for church life. So then I see some things in Brunner's critique that I agree with and others that I disagree with. It is up to you to evaluate various positions.

2.2.3.3. Concluding Thoughts.

- ◆ Calvin is wrong to see the Church just as an external instrument to nurture internal faith. It should do that but the Church upholds the vision for the Church as of life together in Christ. It is the Israel of God, it is the people of God. To be the people of God certainly involves mission but involves being as well as doing. Its focus is not just on evangelism or nurturing.
- ◆ Calvin is right in his distinction between visible and invisible church. The elders of a church should not search to weed out faulty and defective members.
- ◆ I would want to draw a distinction between Churches and parachurch supports on the other hand. I think the modern world needs both churches and parachurches. Parachurches help churches to function better. At the same time we should not confuse churches and parachurches.

Concluding remark. I want to ask the question: Should we try to recover the primitive church? Should we in our churches try to get back to model our church life on the primitive church? If the belief is that this was Gods own pure church. If we only got back to the pure model we got the right church.

I would say yes and no.

No in the sense that it is an impossible idea. Impossible for several reason, for there was not one pattern of church life in the New Testament. Some churches had deacons (Philippi, Jerusalem) others did not. I would see it as an impossible dream since there is no uniform life of church life in the New Testament.

There were no women among the apostles. If we would do this we have to say no ordained women today. I would say that there are differences. We need to learn from the churches in the New Testament. What I would see in the New Testament churches is not so much models to copy exactly in our day and age but rather we should try to see the underlying paradigms for church order and goals and apply them in our own age. This is were we are more into Systematic Theology. To my mind there is no single church which has the same form of ministry as we find in the New Testament.

What is the underlying factor here? The factor is the notion of development. This is something I encountered first in J.H Newman *Essay on the Development of Doctrine*. Newmann's problem was how can the Catholic Church in the 19th century be the legitimate heir of the early church when there are so many things that are different from the New Testament. He wrote this to justify his becoming a Roman Catholic.

The doctrine of development is something for all churches to wrestle with. Newmann saw several marks of true doctrine. I will just suggest one mark was important for him. That is he saw true development in the preservation of type. The point can be illustrated by saying if you just think of a human being that the adult human being is not simply an enlarged baby. Rather a human being grows adapts and matures or should do that. It enters into new relationships and yet there is a continuity of identity. And there could be bad things: If that person fails to mature if he goes on to be a enlarged baby that would be wrong. If the person loses essential identity another thing would go wrong. The key is to maintain the essential identity.

Development is an essential factor and it would be a delusion if we simply try to replicate without adaptation the patterns that we find in the New Testament.

2.3. The Church and Mission

I would certainly want to include in my studies at Fuller some study of Church growth. At least you should take in some aspects of the Church Growth Movement. I am impressed with the testimony of Donald McGavran and his experience as a missionary in India and also in America. McGavran had spend a great deal of money trying to evangelize in India without taking into account social structure and a lot of it was wasted effort.

Reflect about crusades where churches would get together and put a lot of effort in preparing a mission and you have a lot of people coming forward and a lot of falling away and someone says: Well, it was good if just one person was saved.

McGavran would say: You could put your money to far better use. I am sure that he is right. I would not want to say: Do not bother about crusades, but for me time and money is better spend in the context of the local church than televised evangelistic events. I want to focus on the question of homogeneity. The concern is to target certain groups, so your church is not an all purpose church. It is more effective Church Growth strategists argue that you target ethnic groups rather than try to evangelize in a general way. I want simply to offer some reflections:

2.3.1. Arguments for Church Growth

2.3.1.1. It Works

The strongest argument is simply: It works. It has proved to be very effective and one can for instance see the effectiveness of ethnic churches especially in Southern California. The homogenous Church Unit would be an ethnic church. Alternatively an all white-what church would be a homogenous Church. A homogenous Church Unit would be something like an Intersivity Group on a College-Campus. A group that has a special mission to a special group. There is no question that these groups have been very effective and there is impressive evidence that such strategy is effective.

2.3.1.2. Scriptural Basis in Acts 6

It can be found in the New Testament in the episode in Acts 6 concerning the Hellenists and the distribution of the food in the time of scarcity. At that point the Apostles decide to ordain seven persons to serve the Hellenists.

2.3.1.3. Avoid Cultural Barriers

The third argument is McGavran's point that if you preach the Gospel to somebody you should not raise unnecessary barriers. For example it would be no use to send a missionary overseas and the missionary is to preach in English. You have got to learn the language. McGavran says you have got to respect the cultural specialties. Do not convert to your own culture and society. We should export the Gospel but we should not export our own culture and the way of doing things.

The essential point is to identify the target group. You do better if you target your church so that you do not have Whites and Jews but only African-Americans in one place. You serve better if you have separate churches. It is more effective to do it that way.

2.3.2. Against Church Growth

2.3.2.1. Need to Distinguish between Principle and Phenomena

Paul Pierson made this point: He wants to distinguish between the Homogenous Church Principle and the Homogenous Church Phenomena. For McGavran it was a principle to follow. For Pierson it is more a matter of phenomena to be taken into account. For me that is an important and helpful decision. For McGavran it is like the Homogenous Church Principle is a law of science. The way God has structured the world.

Pierson is wanting to say: We should respect differences of culture but the differences are there. Ultimately the Church transcends those boundary. It seems that there is a danger of doing evangelism at all costs based on different races and say: We will sort it out in heaven.

We want to recognize that God's purpose for the Church is that all should be one. A megachurch like Lake Avenue is really made up of different Sunday School groups. The homogenous is found in the different groups, they are homogenous units in themselves. But overall the church is not homogenous. Homogeneity can be a sign of fast growth. But it is not necessary that the fastest growing is the healthiest.

2.3.2.2. Sometimes it Does Not Work

The attempt to create homogeneity has had divisive and ill effects. The evidence is not all on the supportive side. I have got a specific example in mind. We call it church X in Canada. They did have a Church Growth minded pastor. The person who told me, belongs to the faculty. For her this was a great disaster. It gave certain unity at the expense of stamping on certain people.

We need to look carefully at the evidence and not just focus on large statistical numbers. The bad accounts often come not up in the literature.

2.3.2.3. Homogeneity Separates People.

The third point is to say: Look what happens when homogeneity is practiced on a large scale over a prolonged period. In other words there is a fallout in society. There are certain classical examples: Northern Ireland is an example where the Catholic Community and the Protestant Community have been tightly kept as homogenous tribes since Oliver Cromwell in the 17th century.

They have a society almost beyond healing. Most people do not see any hope there. There are now people in those churches who want to reach out. If you get homogeneity that is fostered over a long time you get into trouble.

Look at South-Africa. And I think look at Los Angeles. If you have got Homogenous Churches then those groups need to be able to reach out beyond their culture and race to live again. There needs to be more than just the Homogenous Church.

2.3.2.4. Homogeneity Inhibits Personal Growth

Look what can happen on a personal level if personal growth in life is restricted and bounded and determined by life in the Homogenous Unit. You can become a caricature of a person rather than a mature person. There is strength in strategizing, but it can be also lead to severe limitation. It could be just the interest of winning people to Christ without Christ.

2.3.2.5. Homogeneity as a Denial of Reconciliation

The other point I want to make is if homogeneity is targeted for itself then it can become a denial of our reconciliation. For example Col 2 talks about breaking down the hostility. What is Paul talking about here? He is talking about double reconciliation. There are two kinds of barriers. One is the relationship with God. But there is also another barrier, the barrier between people, between Jew and Gentile. In Ephesians this is equally important for the creation of one new person.

2.3.2.6. Paul's Strategy was Different

Paul's strategy was not to have a Jewish Church and a Gentile Church but rather Jews and Gentiles is the same church (Gal 3:28). We must not lose sight of the ultimate goal of oneness. See James 2:1-7 where James is rebuking the rich for neglecting the poor person who might come into the church.

If James were Church Growth minded he should have said you should create a special church to deal with the poor. Perhaps this is the right way to go. There are essential things to be done specially for the poor. But the ultimate way to go is oneness.

2.3.2.7. Inaccurate Scriptural Base

It seems to me although the seven in Acts 6 came up by the need of the Hellenists. Nevertheless it seems to me that the Seven served the whole church and not just the Hellenists. When the Church is scattered Philip turns out to be an evangelist.

The church in Antioch is the most missionary minded in the New Testament and was far from homogenous. The way to go is to present all people in Christ (Col. 1:28). I can see no clear-cut solution. The lesson is that we learn and see the danger. For myself I prefer to belong to a church which is not homogenous and which is not growing either. I think these are questions that we have to let go.

2.3.3. My Own Concern about Mission

[Reading Philippians 4:1-9]

I could not help looking back at my own life and conversion in the later 1940s. I was a student at the university and strayed into a meeting I did not know what it was. It turned out to be an Intersociety meeting. For the first time I heard a credible interpretation of Christianity. In due course I joined them.

There I began to acquire a different perspective on life. Looking back I have to say that it was not all a good or wholesome perspective. If I want to characterize it, I see that it has a lot in common with a lot of churches. That is to ask: What is the chief purpose in life? The answer was to witness. To tell at least one person every day about the savior. It is not enough to go to church every Sunday or to go preaching in the open air. But after a time I began to wonder: Is this what Christianity is all about?

As I see others teaching the same on Christianity, it seems that the aim of the Church is to turn people into salesmen to make a sale for Jesus. There is something good about that. We should be concerned with the presentation of the Gospel. But all too often missionary meetings are like meetings of used car salesmen. The volume and sales are what matters.

Paul here says to be a completely different thing. Sure we are called to witness and to change society but at the same time we should be concerned with people. I think the Church does not only exist as an evangelistic tool. The Church is more than the best tool for evangelism. I think the Church is there to be the body of Christ. To be as well as to do.

Now it seems to me looking at the New Testament letters that everyone of them was written to put fires out because of problems. Wherever you have a church you have problems. Here you have two prominent women in the Church. That was one of the problems but there were the bigger problems of persecution. But all the time in Philippians Paul is putting things into a proper perspective, into Christ perspective. Have no anxiety in anything.

2.4. Worship and Prayer

2.4.1. The Perspective of Different World Views

2.4.1.1. The Scientific World view

The Scientific World view presents the world as a system of interconnected causes and effects. Admittedly nobody can see the system as a whole. Admittedly causes are of different kind but science postulates that phenomena can be adequately described in terms of natural causes.

The impact of this kind of thinking made itself felt in middle of the twentieth century in the teaching of Rudolf Bultmann and his famous demythologizing program. One of the classic texts of twentieth century theology is Bultmann's famous essay *The New Testament and Mythology* which is found in the Volume *Kerygma and Myth* edited by Hans Werner Bartsch Vol. 1 pages 1-44. This is the essay in which Bultmann launched the whole question of demythologizing the New Testament, starting one of the great debates of the twentieth century.

For Bultmann the New Testament World belongs to the world of Mythology with Heaven, Hell and the Earth in between. Angels and demons, intercessory prayer, sacraments and so on. It is not that Bultmann sees no value in this but he says that all is formed and expressed in the form of Mythology. Now what is needed is to reinterpret that Mythology.

This precludes the idea of divine intervention. On this view we are made to pray and worship the ground of being (Tillich) but we are not to expect that the sequence of events will be changed. Prayer changes our attitude and that reverse us to face up to what we really desire, our expectations.

On this view we should not expect prayer to make a difference. He would not have divine intervention. He would not see God as a being that intervenes in the events of this world. This is Mythos.

2.4.1.2. The Religious View

2.4.1.2.1. **Bonhoeffer**

In particular this is Dietrich Bonhoeffer and his views on prayer. In the Library there is a pictorial life of Bonhoeffer in English and German documenting Christianity in the early part of the century up to the Nazi-Era. Bonhoeffer was implicated in the attempt to overthrow Hitler. Bonhoeffer came from the highest parts of the German society. His brother was the head of Lufthansa and his father was a famous psychiatrist. When Harnack died Bonhoeffer was chosen to deliver the address at his memorial service.

2.4.1.2.2. **His Plot against Hitler**

Bonhoeffer wrote a volume on the *Cost of Discipleship* before the war. Bonhoeffer's view was that the grace of God is free at the same time it is costly. God's grace comes to you undeserved. But the life of discipleship is costly. You can have it free but never unachieved. This kind of thinking led him to found a seminary at the time of oppression in the thirties. He was in the United States when the War started and he could have stayed there, but his view on the cost of discipleship led him to return to Germany and to take part in the plot against Hitler.

On Hitler he took the view that it was rather like driving along the road in a car and a madman was at the wheel. What do you do? There are no easy answers for Bonhoeffer. You are living in a world where the good and bad is all mixed up. There is no real good or bad, no simplistic answers.

The simplistic answer would be to do nothing, but this would mean that Jews and lots of others would die in the gas chambers. To assassinate somebody is not sanctioned and not commanded in the New Testament. What to do? In this extreme situation Bonhoeffer sided with the people who decided to overthrow Hitler.

2.4.1.2.3. Jailed and Executed

Bonhoeffer was arrested and spent a lot of time of the Second World War in prison. He had the freedom to write letters, he wrote notes and that is what his book is.

They could never really put anything on him. But at the end of the war the Nazis made a determined move to wipe out key people who might testify against them. So Bonhoeffer was executed ten days before the end of the Second World War. So this book is a summary of what he wrote in prison.

2.4.1.2.4. Forsaken by God

Bonhoeffer's view on prayer in that situation - if I was to characterize it - I would say that it was the exact opposite of the Name-It and Claim-It theology. The view that if you have enough faith God will answer you prayer. If you are going to repeat one of the central ideas that Bonhoeffer made up see page 360-361. This is sprinkled with quotations in Latin and German.

Bonhoeffer says we cannot be bodies of Christ unless we recognize that we have to live in the world deus ex machina. That means as if God was not there. We have to live our Christian lives as if God was not there. That is just what we recognize before God. God himself compelled to recognize it through our coming of age to a true acknowledgment of our situation before God. We must live as men who manage our live without him.

The God who is with us is the God who forsakes us (Mk 13:34). The God who lets us live in the world without the working hypotheses of God is the God with whom we stand continually. Before God and with God we live without God. God lets himself be pushed out of this world onto the Cross (Mk 15:34) "My God, my God why have you forsaken me?"

He goes on to say: "Here is the decisive difference between Christianity and all the legends. Man's religiosity makes him to look in his distress to God's power in this world. God is the deus ex machina. The Bible directs men to God's powerlessness and suffering. Only the suffering God can help. To that extend we must say that the development of the world coming of age, which has done away with a false conceptions of God, opens our perspective to the God of the Bible who has power by his weakness."

The secular interpretation was a plan for a book. He planned to write a book on the development of Christianity in the World Come of Age.

2.4.1.2.5. The World Matures

The *World Come of Age* caused a lot of discussion in the fifties and sixties. Bonhoeffer suggests that modern society has become mature. You come of age when you are 21. You can drink alcohol and so on. Bonhoeffer envisaged the world as having come of age, that is it had laid aside parental authority, the divine parental authority. It becomes independent of God.

Bonhoeffer did not invent this. The phrase comes from Emmanuel Kant. In an essay Kant wrote: "What is enlightenment? Enlightenment means the world coming of age. Men thinking for themselves without the constraint of religion and of the state telling them what is right or wrong." For Kant neither religion nor the state should tell you what is right or wrong rather you should be affirmed by yourself.

2.4.1.2.6. Deus Ex Machina: The Powerless God

Bonhoeffer says that by 1940s the situation envisaged by Kant in the early 19th century has come about. Europe was a society in which God played no significant part and so we have to live without God. We have to reckon that God is not a deus ex machina.

This is a term from the classical theater. Deus ex machina in classical drama is a divine being appearing on the scene putting things right or punishing the evildoers. That is a God who intervenes about from the blue. Jupiter sending thunderbolts to judge. God who intervenes is not the God of the Bible. The central truth for Bonhoeffer about God is on the Cross where Jesus was abandoned "My God, my God why have you forsaken me?".

2.4.1.2.7. God Does Not Intervene

Therefore you should not expect God to intervene in prayer. Bonhoeffer was in different prison camps, but he cannot expect God to get him out. He had to leave the course of event to God who gave grace in weakness. We are talking about the situation of an air raid and someone who is not a believer who is praying to be saved.

What can Bonhoeffer say to him? All what he can say is that it will not last long. With that view of prayer you cannot do Name-It and Claim-It. This is a view of God which radically changes the notion of intercessory prayer.

This is not different from the first but is a religious application of the first, but approaching it not on the scientific path but on the religious

2.4.1.3. The Philosophical View

Three lines of argument that philosophers have put forth:

2.4.1.3.1. Prayer makes God arbitrary and haphazard

- I. If God is really loving then he surely would do good things to people in any case. Surely you do not have to convince a loving God to act in a loving way. If God is all knowing then God surely does not have to be told about human needs and human suffering in an attempt to persuade him to do something about it. God is arbitrary, otherwise he would not have to be persuaded to do good things.
- II. Prayer implies that God has favorites. God loves those who put in a good word for themselves.

III. When believers pray for contradictory things. For example in Southern California people might be praying for rain whereas others do not want rain because they want to go to Disneyland. To whom does God listen? To the one who prays hardest?

2.4.1.3.2. Phillips *The Concept of Prayer* 1965

This is the only major study concerning the practice of prayer or a philosophy of prayer. Philipps is a successor of John Hick at Claremont. This is a study of considerable interest especially if you are interested in philosophy.

Philipps sees himself as a follower of Wittgenstein. Belonging to the analytical movement in philosophy Wittgenstein concerned himself with the meaning of language. Wittgenstein argues that in order to discover the meaning of language you must investigate how language is used.

Philosophy should not change things but analyze use and meaning. Philipps is investigating prayer and prayer language including Bonhoeffer on prayer and how language of prayer functions. He asks what is the difference between prayer and talking to oneself? Is prayer like talking to yourself? We are the only ones who are there. Because in fact we do not hear God actually answer in the same kind of way as you and I would reply. In a sense it is a monologue or in case of corporate prayer it is a corporate monologue.

Philipps sees a difference because in practiced prayer people become aware of the presence of another. In prayer we sense a presence that surpasses understanding. Which believers say they would not experience if they would not pray. They would not have that sense that they are not alone without prayer.

Philipps says that prayer does involve a growth of self-knowledge. If you pray "Lord let it be fine weather" then this causes one to question ones motives. Of course one can give more serious examples of this.

Prayer does involve the practice of confession of sin. Again there is a difference between merely apologizing to you and telling it to God. Phillips also talks about the difference between prayer and superstition. What is the difference between praying for something and casting a spell, magic (pages 115-122)?

His answer is in magic the emphasis falls on technique, saying the right things in the right way following the right actions. Whereas in prayer the emphasis is on motives and desires and so on.

In a sense Phillips is agreeing with Bonhoeffer's view and the bottom line comes on page 122. Deep religious beliefs mean not so much asking God to bring it about but telling him the desires acknowledging that things might not go as wished. But they are asking to be able to go on living whatever happens. The believer is trying to find a hope to survive what is threatening to destroy him in his personal life.

Philipps focuses on "thy will be done". In the end it seems that Philipps says that we should not think of petitional prayer as changing the course of events. It is more to get in tune with God.

2.4.1.3.3. Answered Prayer Meaningless

Example: Your Church prays for somebody who is sick, desperately sick and is having a operation. You pray and the person gets better. And you say: Great God, God has answered our prayer.

Another person is seriously sick. You pray and lay on of hands and the person does not get healed and possibly dies. You say: Praise the Lord he has taken her home to himself.

It there a difference? You saying the same kind of thing regardless of the circumstances. What does it mean to say: God has answered our prayer? Is it not a kind of self-comfort?

2.4.1.4. My Response

2.4.1.4.1. To the Scientific World view

Here I would say we have got to accept physical causes. Wanting to define causes in whatever way is appropriate. But not taking refuge in a God of the ducks theory. That says in the normal flow of events things take their normal way. But there are gaps where God can intervene.

Another alternative would be to say: Well maybe God has preprogrammed everything, predestined everything, including the natural causes so that everything that happens, happens by divine decrees. Natural causes are the way God has executed his will. Nothing that we can do can change the cause of events. It is all in the script. Therefore intercessory prayer does not change things because it is already in the script. Prayer does not make a difference. That would seem to be the hyper-Calvinistic view.

I believe that the self is in a sense transcendent. It transcends physical causes and works with natural causes. If I switch off the light there would be no suspension of natural causes. There would be a reordering of natural causes. Persons relate and operate in the world by reordering their configuration.

That might be a way of thinking how God operates. A God who is able to configure and reconfigure causation.

2.4.1.4.2. To the Religious View

2.4.1.4.2.1. Literature

I was asked if I could recommend any kind of world view. See Colin Brown *Miracles and the Critical Mind* or Colin Brown *That you may Believe*. Chapter 5 asks the question in what sort of world do we live in? (page 51-61) Then on a more sophisticated level see Richard Swinder *The Coherence of Theism* which is a theoretical book defending theism.

2.4.1.4.2.2. Farmer

Let me read from a philosopher of the thirties H.H. Farmer. I just try to summarize rather than reading page 222-225 *Miracles and the Critical Mind* discussing Farmers view. Farmers view is to think of a piece of embroidering and look at it from both sides. From the underneath you can see knots and threads crisscrossing and sometimes it does not look as the finished pattern on the other side. What science is doing is looking at the underside of the cloth. Whereas in religion and in day to day life we looking at the same reality from the other side.

2.4.1.4.2.3. Lewis

C.S. Lewis's view is discussed at some length in *Miracles*. Lewis believed that God does not suspend causes. Miracles are never to be thought of as random acts. A random act in nature if there was something like it would signify nothing. Miracles express God ordering in the world.

There are two kind of miracles.

- First is the miracle of the Old Creation where God is ordering and configuring things which have natural explanations. What is special is the timing and configuration of the event. The Crossing of the Red Sea is for example explained by a wind in Exodus.
- Then Miracles of the New Creation. God coming, intersecting into our present order. For example the resurrection of Jesus. Again not a random act but something of a different order in our Space Time Order. Not the resuscitation of a corpse but the conversion to a Spiritual Body.

Answers to prayer are not of that kind. Answers to prayer belong to the first order that is a configuring of ordinary events that are linked with prayer.

2.4.1.4.2.4. Contra Bonhoeffer

We noted Bonhoeffer's position. We should not expect special intervention to save us but live by the grace that God gives us to live.

What can one say? I would have to say that we are encouraged in the Lord's prayer to pray for our daily bread and to be delivered from evil. If we did not pray then there might be a possibility that we might not get (James 5:17,18; Phil 4:6; 1 Kg 17:1; 18:1,42; Lk 4:25).

Expect a change in the course of events. Back to Phil 1:19 where Paul prays for deliverance. See Acts 12 where the Church is praying for Peter's release. They believed that it was answered. The Christian tradition and the biblical record encourage us to expect answers to prayer.

2.4.1.4.2.5. Paul's Thorn in the Flesh

Alongside Paul's thorn in the flesh has to be mentioned (2 Cor 12:8-). He asked God to remove the thorn three times. But God said to him that his grace was sufficient.

Here is a case where Bonhoeffer's view is beneficial. God says no or rather my grace is made perfect in weakness. This supports Bonhoeffer's view (See *Miracles and the Critical Mind* the last two chapters 179-, On the question of the thorn in the flesh see page 218-221).

All kinds of suggestions have been put forward to what this thorn was but a definitive answer cannot be given. Someone has suggested that Paul is talking about some kind of opponent. That does not seem to fit the way he is talking. Some suggested that Paul is talking about his moods of depression (K. Bonhoeffer, Bonhoeffer's father). My view is that it has to do with Paul's eyesight and to keep him from being too elated. My case is circumstantial. We know from elsewhere that Paul had difficulties with his eyesight:

Where is then the blessedness ye spake of? for I bear you record, that, if [it had been] possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me. (Galatians 4:15)

He is saying if possible they would have given him an eye transplant. Earlier Gal 4:30 he says that he was weak because of a bodily ailment. His illness was an occasion for him to stay there with the Galatians. Later he says: See what large letters I write(6:11). Not a long letter but big letters that fits the theory that Paul could not see very well. Paul usually had an amanuensis to write.

In 6:17 he says that he bears the marks of Jesus. We know that when Paul was converted he had an encounter with Christ on Damascus Road and was blinded and remained in that state until Hananias came and he was able to see. Putting it all together: I am inclined to say that Paul recovered his sight in a partial way. The loss of sight was bound up with the sightloss on the Damascus Road.

Luke was not only companion but also his personal physician. In Acts Paul does not know that the high priest is speaking to him, another tip that Paul had some trouble with his eyesight.

What can be said with certainty is from 2 Cor 12 that Paul prayed and God gave him grace to live with it. Christian prayer always has to say explicitly or implicitly "If it be thy will". The Lord's Prayer "Thy will be done". The first rule is that prayer should be in tune with God's will. This is no sign of lack of faith if you say "if it be your will".

It is also a confession of our ignorance (Rom 8) that we do not know how to pray. We are confessing that we do not know what is best and therefore there is a factor in understanding of prayer and our response to Bonhoeffer's view to the role of prayer. I am partly agreeing with Bonhoeffer. But Bonhoeffer has not said the whole truth and we should expect God to change the events in response to prayer.

2.4.1.4.3. The Philosophical Objections

I noted three kinds of objections:

2.4.1.4.3.1. Arbitrariness

Prayer makes God arbitrary and puts a question mark against the goodness of God and the omniscience of God.

We need to understand prayer in the context of the kind of world in which we live. We need to remember that God's goodness is given to people not just when they pray, but also when they do not pray. I refer to "God's common grace" Mt 5:45 (Name invented by old theologians). We are not saying that God's goodness is only appearing in response to prayer.

The case of prayer is not unique. The kind of things that we do as individuals or groups or societies also affect the world in which we live in and the life of others. Parents affect the life of their children for better or for worse. Politicians affect the life of the people for better or for worse. In other words the kind of world we live in is one in which what people do makes a difference for the sequence of events.

Praying is a kind of activity which can make a difference.

Thirdly it seem to me that prayer is God's way of getting certain things done. And in particular God wants us to do things in fellowship with God. We are not out there doing things independently on our own but rather we belong to a people the people of God which are represented by the churches to which we belong.

We are to live in fellowship with God's children but also with God himself. It is a way of living with God and brings about his will in the world.

2.4.1.4.3.2. Philipps

In the end it seems to me that it is reductionistic to see God as telling us about the strength of desires. Philipps ends up like Bonhoeffer without support on the matter of prayer. He is not faithful with his profession like Wittgenstein. Wittgenstein says philosophy does not try to alter things but understands what is entails.

Philipps therefore gives a reductionistic view of the role of prayer.

2.4.1.4.3.3. Prayer and Falsification

This is in response to the point that the answer to prayer is meaningless. Someone prays for something to go away and he would have thanked if it would go away but also for not taking away. Is it pious mumbo jumbo language which is ultimately worthless?

Nancy Murphy is wrestling with this in her article *Does Prayer Make a Difference* in the Book by Ted Peters *Cosmos or Creation*. Is this a meaningless activity as some people claim? Part of the discussion turns to give two instances which are formerly the same but in fact entail a difference. They concern childless couples. In the one case they remain childless for a considerable time and the wife conceives and it is put to accident.

The other kind is a similar situation and a prayer-group prays for them and in fact they get a child. That too might also be seen as a random act as the kind of things that happen.

Murphy says that the context of the believing community makes a difference and gives a certain credibility and rationality to the act of prayer. The fact that it is done in a context and it comes about makes it a rational activity.

Some thoughts about falsification. Is it possible where you got similar case to determine causal connection? Is it possible to rule out one or other explanation?

Copleston takes the statement "Jane is a good cook". How do you know whether this is a meaningful statement. The simplest thing would be to go to a meal. If you continually get bad meals from her you would suspect that something is wrong with her cooking and that statement simply means "I like Jane".

The charge against Christians is that Christians go on making claims of God's intervention regardless of the actual state of affairs. Is it possible to test them? That is what I am trying to offer. Are there certain condition where I say God answers to prayer?

F.Copleston is a very prolific writer. He wrote a multi volume history of philosophy, the most comprehensive volume on this topic which is very useful for the study of contemporary philosophy.

We are talking about whether religious claims are meaningful. For a claim to be meaningful it must be compatible with some state of affairs and incompatible with other states of affairs. What one is trying to do is try to narrow down what state of affairs would be compatible and incompatible with claims that God has answered my prayer.

This is my checklist, the way I would narrow down the meaning:

- i. That the thing prayed for at least sometimes comes about. You do not need a perfect score. But it should happen sometimes.

- ii. There must be some conceivable correlation between the prayer and the thing prayed for. A case in point is Peter who has been arrested, the Church has a prayer meeting for his release and Peter gets out of jail. Dr. Murphy's story of the childless couple wanting a child and the church prays for them and there is some kind of correlation. You have got a situation with Peter where the release seems to be unlikely. Nevertheless they pray and he gets out of jail. A secular interpretation is that the jailer left the door unlocked or there was an earthquake. The question is which perspective do you believe.
- iii. An essential feature of prayer is that one should align oneself with the will of God. And that what one prays for is compatible with the character of God. Suppose someone is drunk and spends his bucks on the California Lottery and he wins a millions dollar and he has prayed for it and the number comes up and he wins. I would say this is not a case of answered prayer because it is not in line with God's will.
- iv. In cases where the thing prayed for does not happen one might expect at the time or later to see good reasons why it should not have happened. And I think that is what Paul is doing in 1 Cor 12. He prays three times that it would go away. I think sometimes the number 3 is a symbolic number in Jewish thinking. It is a Jewish way of speaking. In retrospect Paul can say: It was to keep me from being too elated and to show that I can live by the grace of God. That God's grace is made perfect in weakness.

I would say that an important part of the Christian life has to do with paradigms or patterns. And I think this is what we have in Paul talking about the thorn in the flesh. He is giving us a pattern, a kind of control belief to help us in our own beliefs.

Elijah was also somebody like us and he prayed and God gave rain. All these are instances of paradigms or instances by which we interpret our life and seek guidance. The paradigms lay a very significant part in the interpretation of life and Christian conduct.

2.4.2. The Lord's Prayer

The Lord's Prayer is important as a pattern, a paradigm for prayer and a paradigm for Christian living. On this subject I would refer you to the article on *Prayer* in NIDNTT Vol. II page 869-873. Further reading: J. Jeremias *The prayers of Jesus* and also J.A.T. Robinson *Twelve more New Testament Studies* among those page 44-64 a study of the Lord's prayer. Joseph Fitzmeyer *Commentary on Luke* in the Anchor Bible Vol. II page 891-908.

I want to offer three thoughts on the subject.

2.4.2.1. Form and Text

We got a problem. We all know the Lord's Prayer. Matthew 6:9-13. But there is at least one other Lord's prayer that is in Luke 11:2-4 which goes like this

And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil. (Luke 11:2-4)

When we say the Lord's prayer the version that we use is Matthew's. There is also one other form of the Lord's Prayer to be found in the *Didache* chapter 8 which is a bit like Matthew and a bit like Luke.

None of these three has the glory and power part. That ending is not in the original text of the scriptural versions. So what do we make of it? You can see the three versions in Robinson page 45-46. Or if you just want the two version look at any Gospel Synopsis.

What is the difference? Luke is shorter and he omits the petition "Thy will be done..." and he omits "but deliver us from evil". If you look at the Lord's prayer you can see that it is divided into two halves. The "Thou" petitions and the "We" petitions in the second half. The first half has to do with God. The second has to do with us. If you look at it you see what Luke omits is a petition at the end of the first half and a petition at the end of the second half. Can we go further? We have to ask which form is the original? I want to note four points

2.4.2.1.1. Luke is Original

Luke's form and the argument that Luke is the more original version.

2.4.2.1.1.1. Matthew Contains All of Luke.

All of Luke is found in Matthew. Luke does not give us more than Matthew.

2.4.2.1.1.2. Tendency to Expand Liturgy

There is a well known tendency in composing liturgies to expand and to like blowing up phrases. The implication here is that Matthew's version is a liturgical expansion used in communal prayer in Matthew's community.

2.4.2.1.1.3. No one would omit Something

No one would dare to omit two petitions from the prayer if Jesus had really taught them.

2.4.2.1.1.4. Luke's Address

Luke begins simply with Father (*pater*) whereas Matthew has "our Father". It is suggested that Luke's version corresponds more closely to Jesus' characteristic use of the term "Abba". Jeremias and others have argued that this is an intimate expression whereas "Our Father" seems to convey a less degree of intimacy and may reflect a more traditional Jewish piety. By which Jews could address God as "Our Father" but not as "Abba". The suggestion is that Matthew has contextualized his translation.

2.4.2.1.2. Matthew is Original

2.4.2.1.2.1. Luke Abbreviates

It has been observed that Luke shows a tendency to abbreviate if we compare in general material contained in Matthew and Mark and Luke (Q-Material). The implication here is that Luke has abbreviated something slightly longer.

2.4.2.1.2.2. Liturgy is Abbreviated

Secondly there is the fact that liturgy sometimes is abbreviated. We have a stalemate here.

2.4.2.1.3. Jeremias' Conclusion

See Page 93 and 89 of his book. The first is the contention in the fact that we have two different liturgical wording of the Lord's prayer. The assumption is that each evangelist transmits the version of the Lord's prayer in his community. They are both contextualized versions. And thus Matthew's version is a version used in a Jewish-Christian church. Luke's version was used in a Hellenistic church.

Jeremias says that it would seem that Luke would give the oldest form with respect to length but Matthew's text is more original in regard to wording.

My opinion is: This is another way of saying what was in the previous petition: "Thy kingdom come..." essentially expressed in different ways. It is putting the same petition in different forms of word but not saying anything different. Likewise the final petition "And lead us not into temptation" Matthew adds something which expresses the same.

This raises the question if Luke has really omitted anything important.

2.4.2.1.4. Goulder's Conclusion

This appears in his Book *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* a brilliant study of the form of the teaching and the possibility that Matthew might use parts of the Midrash. Goulder's starting point is the obvious fact that we have two version of the Lord's prayer in Luke and Matthew but not in Mark.

Goulder also notes that Mark has some material which is very similar to the Lord's prayer. For example Mark 11:25-26:

And when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have ought against any: that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses. But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses. (Mark 11:25-26)

So you have teaching on prayer in Mark and these two verses contain at least two elements which reappear in the Lord's prayer in Matthew.

Goulder notes Mark 14:36 where Jesus addresses God his father as "Abba". A term which has passed into the Pauline churches and was used in ecstatic prayers (Gal 4:6; Ro 8:15). Notice that if you compare Luke's version with Mark's story Mark has "Abba" while Luke translates it as **pater**. This suggests a certain pattern. There is more than that because Jesus in the garden goes on to pray "Let this cup pass but not what I will but what you will." (Mk 14:36; Mk 14:38). Jesus urges his disciples to pray that they may not enter into temptation.

So Goulder is suggesting that though Mark has not the Lord's Prayer one can piece together much of the Lord's Prayer from Mark. The mentioning of the daily bread is missing. But the other elements are there.

From this Goulder makes the suggestion that the Lord's prayer is not the Lord's Prayer at all. Jesus did not pray the Lord's Prayer at all. Matthew composed the Lord's Prayer for the purposes of liturgy. There was no original Lord's prayer at all.

It is a creative idea but what about Luke's version? Where did Luke get the version from? I am not sure that Goulder would say that Luke got it from Matthew. But most scholars do believe in Q as a document or a collection of teachings. If the Lord's Prayer was in Q then it certainly was not Matthew's composition.

Goulder's contention is that Matthew composed the Lord's Prayer. This is also the conclusion of the Jesus Seminar in their most recent deliberations.

That the Lord's Prayer exists in Matthew and Luke as given, as a pattern of prayer, indicates to me that the form of the prayer goes back to Jesus, but that the prayer is not simply a formal prayer one prayer among many that one might pray, but that Jesus himself lived by the various petitions contained in the prayer.

2.4.2.2. The Themes

The prayer in a sense is a paradigm for living which offers direction and the way we might handle temptation or identify our goals in life. Therefore this leads me to the second point in the discussion of the Lord's Prayer namely the themes in the Lord's Prayer.

2.4.2.2.1. Like the Ten Commandments?

The status of the Sermon on the Mount and the recent discussion of this issue see Graham Stanton *The Gospel for a New People*. The point being that in a sense there is a comparison between the Sermon on the Mount and the giving of the Law on the Mount Horeb. The teaching on the Mount corresponds and indeed supersedes the Law given to Moses. More specifically one might draw a comparison between the Lord's prayer and the Ten Commandments and between the themes of the Lord's prayer and the themes of Exodus from Egypt. Specifically:

2.4.2.2.1.1. Hallowed be Your Name

The first petition of the Lord's prayer. "Hallowed be your name" recalls the third commandment not to take the name of the Lord in vain. "Hallowed be your name" is something thoroughly Jewish which takes up the theme of the first three commandments. You cannot pray that petition without "You shall not worship any other God, and you shall not make any graven image and not take the Name in vain. The first petition covers the bases of the first three of the commandments.

2.4.2.2.1.2. Daily Bread

The petition "Give us our daily bread" has been discussed at inordinate length by scholars. What does daily *epiousio* mean? There is an article by Colin Hemer in JSNT Vol. 22 1984 page 81-94. More recently A.J. Hultgren *The Bread Petition of the Lord's Prayer* in Anglican Theological Supplement Review Series 11 1990 page 41-55.

Origen thought that *epiousio* would mean **necessary** bread. J. Jeremias thought of it as bread for tomorrow. Bread in the time of the eschatological trial that would come. After his extensive review of the term Hemer and Hultgren thought that it means day by day. I think in the background there is the thought of the manna in the wilderness. God supplies the manna that they needed and that they should collect each day as the pilgrim people of Israel moved from Egypt into the promised land.

2.4.2.2.1.3. Thy kingdom come

Moving on from there I would suggest that "Thy Kingdom come (thy will be done)" - second petition - looks for the doing of God's will in the life of the people of God. It looks for the reign of God and seeks for God's reign to be made present. It looks toward the ideal situation in the promised land where God would supremely reign. It includes the sabbath because it specially was God's rest, the day to be devoted to the worship and service of God. But what this petition does is ask that this should be a reality all the time and not just confined to one day.

2.4.2.2.1.4. Forgiveness and Deliverance

The fifth and sixth petition look backwards and forwards. Backwards in a sense of seeking forgiveness for what is done wrong including self examination whether we have forgiven those who are doing wrong against us. We are looking forward to be delivered from temptation or the evil one (J. Robinson).

2.4.2.2.1.5. Conclusion

It seems to me that one can compare the Lord's Prayer with the Ten Commandments as a design for life. The Ten Commandments have to do with the life of the people of Israel. The Lord's Prayer has to do with the life of the messianic community.

If I am right in this analysis the petitions of the Lord's Prayer take up explicitly or implicitly the themes of the Ten Commandments. Commands like "though shall not covet", adultery and so on are covered essentially in "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done". One who truly prays this prayer cannot violate what is commanded in the Commandments.

There is a difference since the Ten Commandments come to us as an address to the people of God, as an address by God himself. They are external to us.

But the Lord's Prayer is something internal something that we are asking God to do. Doing God's will that God's kingdom will come. In other words it seems to me that this is the kind of situation envisaged by Jeremia when he looks to the New Covenant when the law will be written on the hearts of the people. The Lord's Prayer essential embodies just this. It is a sign that the Law is written in our hearts. The Lord's Prayer is the prayer of the new community.

Therefore in a real sense I want to say that the Lord's Prayer embodies a life in the New Covenant taking up the themes of the Ten Commandments and restating them.

2.4.3. The Role of the Holy Spirit

My talk here is centered on Romans 8:26-27

Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what [is] the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to [the will of] God. (Romans 8:26-27)

Now what I am about to say appears in the NIDNTT in the article on *Prayer* Vol. II 882-885. My thoughts are indebted to Ernst Käsemann and his discussion of this subject in *Perspectives on Paul* page 122-127. Käsemann argues that this teaching about the Spirit needs to be seen in the context of his analysis of the composition of the church in Rome. He argues that we are familiar enough with the thought that the Corinth was a charismatic church. He argues that the Roman Church too was charismatic. In particular he conceives a situation in which some of the charismatics engaging in ecstatic prayer saw this as a sign of their superiority and perfection. In other words it is a similar situation to speaking in tongues at Corinth. In Corinth Paul recognizes speaking in tongues but puts it in its proper place.

Therefore interpretation is necessary. Käsemann says that here in Romans Paul is adopting a similar strategy arguing that praying in tongues is not a sign of completeness but a sign of incompleteness. To Paul it is comparable to the groaning of the whole creation (Ro 8:22). Not only of the creation but we ourselves who have the first fruit groan as we await the fulfillment.

The Spirit is also groaning but also interpreting. Paul uses *entugcanw* to develop the thought that the Spirit intercedes for us (Ro 8:35). The Spirit also intercedes and is a go-between, an interpreter between us and God. This applies both to ecstatic prayer and also to ordinary prayer. We do not know what to pray or to pray as we ought. All prayer needs the interceding work of the Spirit of him who searches the hearts of man. In a sense our prayers are translated by the Spirit who is our intercessor.

I think in Romans there is in fact an act of double translation. That is in chapter 8 Paul sets out this thought that the Spirit takes our prayers and brings them to the Father. The Spirit is our link with the Father. There is another act of translation (Ro 12) in giving our bodies as a living sacrifice.

In chapter 13 Paul urges the Romans to be subject to the governing society. The turning point here is Ro 12:1. Gk. has *logiga latrea*. Rational worship. Now what I believe I see Paul teaching here is that there are in effect two kinds of worship, two kinds of prayer when the Spirit translates us before the Father. There is also the worship that has to be translated into daily life. That affects what we do by having our minds transformed proving our life in daily life. The Christian form of sacrifice which supersedes the Jewish and Pagan form of Sacrifice. It is a form of worship that affects our relation to fellow Christians. The way we think about them. It involves blessing the ones who persecute us. It means not repaying, never avenging ourselves (Verse 19). It involves how we relate to the outside world.

2.5. Preaching

2.5.1. A Preliminary Definition of what Preaching is

My preliminary definition is taken from this dull unexciting book of Philipps Brooks *Lectures on Preaching*. Brooks was a minister in Boston and these lectures on preaching in the nineteenth century were given at the Divinity School of Dale College back in 1877. I think his definition is as relevant today as it was then:

Preaching is Truth mediated through Personality.

In other words there are two components in all preaching. The first is truth. What you preach should be the truth of the Gospel. What you do with people whether formally or whether you doing it in a classroom lecture or whatever, if you are the Christian minister it has to be truth, God's truth.

Secondly it has to be mediated through your personality. Preaching is not the same as writing an essay. It is so easy in seminary to confuse both skills. Essays are concerned with analysis. It would be useless to get up in you congregation and read one essay. The truth has be mediated through your personality. It is a great mistake to imitate somebody else or modify your preaching to that end.

Billy Graham has terrible sermons in a way. He goes on and on and on and then comes to a climax. He gives sermons on different topics but his sermons are always the same. There has to be more than this form of sermons. Do not model yourself on Billy Graham or Ian Pitt Watson. Study them all, but draw on them and use what you can use for yourself. The essential thing in preaching is being yourself and let God work. That has to be kept in check by the truth.

2.5.2. The Nature of the Word of God

See Karl Barth's *Church Dogmatics*. I am indebted to him for my thoughts. These thoughts later came to be expressed in my book *Karl Barth and the Christian Message* which tries to analyze Barth's Volume 1. Barth is very long winded. When I started on Barth I was reading great big thick volumes. I was reading and it took me a year to figure out what Barth was saying.

The language was clear enough but the meaning was very strange. The best is found in the first two volumes which is called Prolegomena. Barth talks about the Word of God as the basis for Theology. He develops a line of thought that there is one Word of God but it has three forms. Now I am rearranging the order. It makes more sense in this order.

2.5.2.1. The Primary Form

The word was made flesh in Jesus Christ. "In the beginning was the word and the word was with God and the word was God. All things were made by him." (John 1)

Verse 4 says that the word was made flesh and dwelt among us. For Barth in the strictest sense of the term the primary form of the Word of God is Jesus Christ, the Word of God made flesh. That view is supported by other passages from the Gospels (Mt 11:27-28; parallel Lk 19:9; compare John 14:6-10).

There is the thought that Jesus is the mediator of the knowledge of God. "He who has seen me has seen the Father" (John 14) and "I am the way the truth and the life and no one comes to the Father except by me."

Jesus Christ is God's word to human beings in a human way (1 Cor 11; Heb 1:2; Rev 19:30).

2.5.2.2. Scripture

This is the second form of the Word of God. This too is God's utterance to humankind. Barth calls Scripture a witness to the Word of God, a witness to revelation. Here he is drawing on passages like John 4:49. Many evangelicals have had problems with Barth's doctrine as a witness to God. Scripture is not the Word of God in a strict sense.

Barth needs to be examined carefully. The New Testament presents us with the Apostolic Witnesses looking back to the event of Christ. In the center is Christ. There is more to it for Barth. The heart of his idea of Scripture being witness is to be understood in the way (Lk 10:16; John 13:20). Jesus is commissioning his disciples. So in a very real sense Scripture consists of human word. It is the words of human beings. But human beings who are standing in a special relationship to God as those who represent and bear witness, so that people today can receive the witness of Scripture in and through their witness of Christ.

In a sense there is an act of revelation through Scripture. God is unveiling himself and his mind. In a very active unveiling there is a veiling again, clothing God's thought in human words. This is a kind of dynamic relationship.

2.5.2.3. Preaching and Proclamation

Barth argues that by the grace of God when human beings bear witness to God, God actually speaks through their words in such a way that their words become the Words of God to others. That is where Preaching Proclamation comes in. In my first preliminary definition I said preaching has to be mediated through personality. Barth insists that preaching has to be preaching through Scripture. Not something detached offering pious thoughts about this and that. Preaching should be focused on Scripture and be tested through Scripture.

So for Barth there is a dynamic relationship. We know the Word of God through preaching about the Word of God through teaching the Word of God. We come to the Scripture and God himself takes those words and speaks through them. Ultimately the Word of God incarnated in Jesus comes to the hearers mediated through us. But we do not have control over it.

Barth says that sometimes Protestants treat the Bible as a Paper Pope. But all is dependent on the grace of God and not on the Paper Pope. God is graciously speaking through us. Barth goes on to discuss the Holy Spirit. Christ is the objective side of God but the Spirit is the subjective side of God. He does not want to separate Christ and the Spirit. The Spirit applies Christ to us.

We must make our witness grounded in Scripture.

2.5.3. The Nature of Language

Perhaps here I might refer to the discussion on the religious language in my book *Philosophy and the Christian Faith*. See in particular page 176- setting out the nature of language. The book was published in 1969, therefore it is only for the start because it is old.

Language is not the kind of verbal photography of things. Although perhaps we ought to treat language in that way. We read a narrative, we read of Jesus answering in the Synagogue of Nazareth, being handed the Scroll of Isaiah and Jesus opening and reading from Isaiah 61. We perhaps have a picture of the scene in our minds eye. But how many people were in the room? Was it a big room? Were there windows? Where exactly was it? When you ask questions like that you see that words do not enable us to see things as they were. The narrative is not like a video where one would actually be able to see this as it happens. The Gospels are not like a kind of telescope which enables us to look back through the centuries and see things as they happen.

What is going on? I would suggest that language is something like a computer-bank of information of words, images which are deposited in our mind. Words are in the text but also in our minds. An when the words are seen on the page, the words as it were trigger off images that are stored in our memory banks so that we have an idea what was meant by Jesus. The sabbath as a day of rest and worship produces a configured set of ideas and impressions. A kind of construct in our minds but we are not actually seeing reality it is something produced in our minds.

The great twentieth century philosopher L. Wittgenstein spent a great deal of his life analyzing language and the fruits of his thoughts are contained in his philosophical investigation published in 1953. In part I page 114 Wittgenstein says: "The general form of proposition is: How things are."

I think it is important to note that we are not transferring images from our mind to the congregations mind. Rather we are setting up constructions. Perhaps a better term would be making models with words to enable people to grasp with words what we are seeing and appreciating. Our preaching is a kind of model making imagery showing how we perceive and the implications that we perceive from the text. To enable the hearers to grasp and understand the reality of which we are speaking, a kind of indirect form of communication.

I am also struck by the Danish Philosopher Soren Kierkegaard and his way of philosophy shaped mainly by Socrates. He talks about the meiotic method. The term comes from Greek midwife, being skilled as a midwife. Socrates mother was a midwife. Socrates saw himself as a midwife assisting in the gaining of insight. He was not telling his students objectives. Rather his aim in philosophy was getting people to see for themselves. In that sense it was like a midwife.

Kierkegaard took it a step further. He believed Christian communications took that form. Only God can be the Father in producing the insight. What the teacher has to do is to assist in the birth of insight and ideas.

2.5.4. The Practice of Jesus

In a sense Jesus was doing something like what Kierkegaard says a good teacher does. He communicates but in such a way as to challenge people to see for themselves. Jesus never did what Christian preachers regularly do Sunday by Sunday that is preach a formal sermon sometimes on an advertised topic from 20 to 40 minutes. The teaching of Jesus generally seems to have been given in an ad hoc sort of way and his parables are not simply sermon illustrations. Here I changed my mind and my most recent thinking is a discussion of the parable of the unjust steward in my honorary work for Ralph Martin last year.

I used to think that Jesus parables were like sermon illustrations. And I think sermon illustrations have two functions. They serve to illustrate the point the preacher is trying to make, but they are also there to give the hearers a rest. Because you cannot do in church 4 hours of hard grind like here. There is a sense in which a sermon illustration gives the free wheel a bit and helps in the furtherance in the way of what the preacher tries to accomplish.

When I reflected on the parable of the unjust steward I came across Jeremias' famous book on the parables of Jesus. He argues that Jesus did not teach the parables in order to present the Gospel. The parables of Jesus were not in and of themselves the presentation of the Gospels. That took the form of informal contacts. That is how Jesus addressed people in need.

What then is the function of the parables? The function is to defend Jesus action and his presentation of the Gospel. The parables are therefore essentially addressed to his critics and not those in need. The more I think about it the more I see that Jeremias is right. Therefore it might make sense in Mk 4 after Jesus has just told the parable of the sower he explains the purpose in verse 10 to his disciples.

And when he was alone, they that were about him with the twelve asked of him the parable. (Mark 4:10)

So the disciple get what Jesus is talking about. But the parables are puzzles designed to challenge outsiders, critics like the Pharisees to figure out who Jesus is, who they are and how they relate to each other. Notice that in the parables there is a movement, a story, a narrative the truth is communicated indirectly. What you need to do with a parable is go through the story identify the characters and identify the meaning.

I think preaching likewise involves a movement. It is bringing something to birth. For many the parables just did not work. But there is also the possibility of understanding and finding meaning in the passage. This conception of communication is important for our understanding.

2.5.5. Apostolic Preaching.

A couple of thoughts from 1 Cor 1:18. The word is folly for the clever and God will destroy the wisdom of the clever. 1 Cor 2:1 Paul came not in words or wisdom but knew nothing except Jesus crucified. He was weak and trembling but there was a demonstration of Spirit and Power. Faith rests in the Power of God.

What is Paul saying here? What can we learn from the samples of sermons in the New Testament. What is the essence of the Gospel? Now we need to draw a distinction between **Kerygma** and **Didache**.

- **Kerygma** is proclamation and therefore is evangelistic.
- **Didache** is teaching.

What we get in Paul's letters is mostly Didache. We do not get his evangelistic teaching. We get accounts of that in Acts. The bulk of writings has to do with writings to clear up messy situations. Essentially the letters of Paul are dealing with particular issues that came about through the faulty reception of the Gospel.

In Colossians 1:18 the Cross makes no sense to unbelievers. The Jews think Jesus was a false prophet. A crucified Christ makes no sense to wisdom loving Greeks. Chapter 2 says he wanted to know nothing but Christ crucified. This has been taken to mean that the only thing Paul was interested in was the preaching of Christ.

Bultmann argued that Paul was not interested in the historical Jesus at all. This falls in the line of Luther's thinking. Luther favored books which tell you about salvation. Bultmann and his followers put this to extremes by arguing that the earliest material we have in the New Testament is the message of the death and resurrection and that Paul had no interest in the life and teaching of Jesus. The Gospels, especially John, were constructed very late to satisfy curiosity.

For literature see NIDNTT the article dealing with Proclamation. A Survey is contained in *The Structure and Content of the Early Kerygma* Vol. III 57-67.

As you might guess I am fundamentally opposed to Bultmann and Luther. I come to the conclusion that Paul in 1 Cor is not saying that he is not interested in the historical Jesus. I think it means the only one he is interested in is the historical Jesus, the one that was crucified. And I would back this up that the Epistles of Paul present only half his teaching, the Didache part. I follow C.F.D. Moule in arguing that Paul's evangelistic strategy had two parts. That what he did and what his followers did. The partners were Mark and Luke. They kept alive the memory of Jesus that is preserved in the Gospels. It is the Gospels and the Letters that compose the message that is to be preached.

It seems to me that in the New Testament there are hints to a body of truth. A core message that the early Church believed in and practiced. I find this in Jude 3: "The faith once delivered to the saints" and also 2 Tim 1:3; 1 John 1:1; Heb 3:1; 4:14; 10:23; 2 Thess 2:15; Doctrine Ro 6:17; The Gospel 1 Cor 15:1; Ro 2:16; 16:25; Gal 2:2. Some of these phrases and statements are thought to be late and some have argued that these are late developments. But 1 Cor 15 is early and so is Galatians 2:2.

Paul is saying is that what he taught and preached is what he received as a body of tradition. There is a kind of **Core Teaching**. What was that Core Teaching? 1 Cor 15:3-5 summarizes the Core Teaching. We also find similar teachings in Acts. Back in 1936 C.H. Dodd a leading British New Testament Scholar published *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*. In the back of the book there is a chart and it is instructive to look at the chart. What he does in this chart is to examine examples of preaching in Acts and elsewhere.

The kerygma according to Acts and according to Paul (Acts 2:14-39; 3:13-26; 4:10-12; 5:30-32; 10:36-43). He calls this Apostolic Preaching but this is the preaching of Peter and the Jerusalem church. There is a similar sermon in Acts 13:17-41 and this is attributed to Paul. But parallel also are certain passages from Galatians 3:1; 1:3,4; 4:6; 1 Thess 1:10; 1 Cor 15:1-7; Ro 1:1-3; 8:34; 2:16; 10:8,9.

Now what Dodd does in this book is to show certain recurring themes. You will see it summarized in NIDNTT page 63 in the article I referred to. In particular the themes of the descent of Jesus from David guaranteeing his qualification to messiahship. His death and resurrection according to the Scriptures. His exaltation to the right hand of God. His deliverance of men into a new life. His return to consummate a new age. Dodd concludes that the coincidence between Acts and Paul enables us to carry back the actual tradition to an earlier time.

Paul must have received the tradition very early. He notes some difference. The Jerusalem church does not call Jesus the Son of God. This element is introduced by Paul. The Jerusalem church does not say that Jesus died for our sins. This link is made by Paul. The Jerusalem church does not say that Jesus intercedes for us.

There is a further ramification of Dodd's argument which is very attractive. Dodd elsewhere argued in his New Testament studies that the preaching that we find attributed to Peter in Acts constitutes the skeleton of Mark's Gospel. What we get in Mark's Gospel is essentially this preaching fleshed out. With details of how Jesus came to be accused and put to death. I find it a very attractive hypothesis thinking of Mark's Gospel as fleshing out the Jerusalem Gospel of Peter as an apology for the Cross.

More recently R.H. Gundry has published a commentary on Mark. Gundry argues that the entire purpose of Mark is to present an apology for the Cross. How was it that Christ was put to death and what is the meaning of the Cross?

Dodd's thesis has been criticized. Some have questioned whether these sermons accurately represent the apostolic preaching. The appeal to the Greek historian Thucydides in the *History of the Peloponnesian War* says that it was not possible to always record speeches accurately but that Thucydides could only represent what they were talking about as accurately as he knew.

It has been argued that the similarities in Acts were due to the fact that Luke summarized the same kind of thing on and on again. F.F. Bruce concluded that Thucydides does not conclude that the speeches are free inventions but an accurate account as accurate as possible. Certainly the speeches in Acts are summaries. They are far too short for sermons. My own conclusion is that we get in fact a summary and not the whole sermon.

There is one major aspect where I differ from Dodd. The sermons are essentially from Peter. There are other sermons in Acts which follow a different pattern. There is Stephen's speech in Acts 7. Then there is Paul's preaching in Athens in Acts 17 which follows a different pattern. How do we explain the differences?

My answer is in that article. The sermons are all very different occasions. Therefore it would be wrong to conclude like Dodd that there was only one form of preaching. Rather preaching is tailor made. Paul in Athens notes his audience and quotes from Stoic writers whereas he does not do that anywhere else. Some have argued that Paul in Acts 17 is trying natural theology and not stressing the Cross and the Resurrection. As a result Paul's preaching was ineffective.

But Acts does not give us the impression that the sermon and teaching given there did produce no result at all. In fact it produced a small church. And I think it would be wrong to say that Paul abandoned that kind of preaching. Acts 17 will turn up again in the first part of Romans. Paul does not abandon it.

What is the bottom line? The examples in Acts 17 show that Paul tailors his material to his audience. What do we make of the preaching of Peter? This is not all purpose preaching, but again tailored to a specific occasion. They address the Jewish situation in the interim period between Christ's death and the Church. His death occurred in accordance with the Scripture but his verdict was reversed in his Resurrection.

This preaching is addressed specifically to the Jewish situation calling the Jewish people to repent and return to God. The sermons in Acts are not models for preaching of all times. They contain the nucleus of the Christian message but they are dealing with a specific situation.

2.5.6. Digression : Messianic Jews

The Church is the Israel of God now. There is a radical change in the divine purpose. I do not think that God has two separate people. I would want to respect their Jewishness but I would not regard them as a kind of shadow people of God. What I would want to do is to stress Jesus Jewishness. We need to understand the Jewishness of Christianity. I would not want to see the Jews as a separate people of God. I do not see any significance in the return of the Jews or an attempt to rebuilt the temple. One of the most interesting book on this is G. Vermes *The Jewish Jesus*.

A footnote to what I was saying about the Gospel and Judaism. I think that very often Christians read the New Testament as if it has nothing to do with Judaism. That is a major mistake. One of the most useful books of late ed. Janish Couples Andersen and Steven D. Moore *Mark and Method* is about different techniques and methodologies about studying Mark. Especially chapter 6 *Social Criticism* is very important. Looking at Jesus in light of the purity Laws of Judaism. Notice also the Qumran Temple Scroll. The Temple Scroll is a version of the book of Deuteronomy for the Qumran community as it saw itself in the end times.

H. Clark Kee came to Fuller and spoke on New Testament. One of his points was that the Temple Scroll envisages people who should be admitted to the Temple and it excludes the sick, the blind, the lame, the unclean and so on. Kee pointed out that it is precisely those people that Jesus mixed with and sought out. Precisely the people excluded from the Temple by the Temple Scroll.

Two diametrically opposed views are here of who the people of God are. A key to understand Mark is to see him in relation to the purity laws. See the miracles in relation to the purity laws. There is a major difference between Jesus and the Pharisees. The Pharisees following the purity laws believe that a person becomes impure through contact. The nearer the Temple you got the more demanding became the Law.

Israel is more holy than other nations. Jerusalem is more holy than other cities. So it gradually heightens until the holiest of holiest. The Pharisees observed the purity laws everywhere for Temple Worship. They are extending the purity laws because of danger of contact with Gentiles. The Pharisees strategy is to avoid contamination. Jesus is exactly opposite. He has power and authority to make the unclean clean. The leper has to keep apart from the rest of the people. Jesus touches lepers and makes them clean by his contact. Jesus conveys holiness.

2.6. The Sabbath

2.6.1. In the Old Testament

The term sabbath is linked with the verb to cease from Heb. *šabac*. The term appears in Genesis 2:3. God ceased from all his labors. The final day in creation has no evening or morning. It leaves open the question what God did on the next day, but God rested from his labor. The sabbath is not mentioned, but the sabbath is certainly indicated. The Exodus account certainly indicated this. The fourth commandment is not to work on the sabbath linking Ex 20:8-11 with God's rest.

Dt 5:12-15 presents a different rationale for the sabbath. Exodus links with creation. Dt 5 links it with redemption from Egypt. The sabbath is to remember the slavery in Egypt and God's delivery.

The command to keep the sabbath is mentioned in all parts of the Law and no commandment receives greater emphasis. In later literature like Jubilees 2:17-33 we find expositions on the sabbath to find out what may be done on a sabbath. Similarly the Mishnah further defines what kind of work may be done and what kind of work may not be done.

The tractate on the sabbath has an interesting discussion of what might be done on the sabbath. A man being in the house and a poor man being outside. Is it permitted for the man outside to reach into the house and receive a gift or the man inside to reach out and give a gift? The answer is no. This involves a boundary and you should not cross boundaries on a sabbath. Sabbath is kept from dawn to dusk. Not the same reckoning style like our days.

2.6.2. In the Gospels

The sabbath's biggest prominence is in the actions of Jesus. One of the debates of scholars presently is whether Jesus actually broke the sabbath. E.P. Sanders *Jesus and Judaism* seeks to argue that strictly speaking nothing that Jesus did broke the sabbath commands, because Jews were allowed to do good on the sabbath.

Jesus' activities did not fall outside of the Law. This leaves me wondering whether Jesus did not go out of his way to do things on the sabbath. Jesus choose the sabbath for his principal activities. A pious Jew could argue that Jesus could have chosen to wait a day or until the sabbath was over without no harm being done.

For example in Mark Jesus heals in the Synagogue on sabbath 1:21- and this is the first incident in Gospel of Mark. After that he goes to the home of Simon and Andrew, and Simon's mother-in-law is sick and he lifts her up and the fever leaves her. Verse 32 is interesting. It is now evening. Many were healed. Why the evening? The people of Kapernaum are keeping the sabbath and come to Jesus only after the sabbath is over.

In chapter 2 there is the incident in which the disciples pluck corn in the fields on the sabbath (2:23-26). Sanders argues that this episode is hardly likely to have happened. He argues that Pharisees did not normally leave Jerusalem. You would not find Pharisees in the cornfields waiting for people to pluck corn. The whole thing is a creation of Mark.

E. Stauffer *Jesus and his Story* puts the whole event in perspective. What are the Pharisees doing? They are not ordinary Pharisees rather they constituted a deputation that has already being sent to check Jesus out. Whether he in fact he is a wonder worker and prophet. This group of Pharisees is a special deputation in order to report back to Jerusalem. The whole episode throws some light on Jesus and the sabbath. Jesus replies to the accusation: He refers to David and the eating of the Holy Bread. He is not citing a precedent. He is drawing an implicit comparison between himself and David and finishes off with the sabbath is there for the Son of Man.

The Son of Man in Hebrew is Ben Adam. It seems to me that the implication is that the sabbath was made for Adam not Adam for the sabbath. So the Son of Adam is Lord even of the sabbath.

Another incident which immediately follows (Mark 3:1-6; Mt 12:9-14) also takes place on a sabbath. The case of the man with the withered hand. This marks a turning point in the story. People are watching Jesus to see what he would do.

I see in this episode a deliberate contrast between serving life and killing. Making the mans hand whole and the Pharisees and the Herodians taking counsel on how to destroy him.

Question: Why did Jesus say: Stretch out your hand? It could be a per formative act. The very act of doing something restores the hand. He is just telling the man to use the hand.

There might be more to it than that. Is Jesus inciting the man to perform a work? But possibly there is the allusion that may have to do with Dt and the version of the Ten Commandments in Dt. Dt 5:15 related the sabbath to redemption in which the Israelite is to remember Egypt where the Lord brought them out with an outstretched arm. It looks like an echo of the phrase in Mark. Is this an implied invitation to join Jesus as a follower?

Another incident is Lk 14:10-17 the woman with an infirmity. Jesus compares the action with rescuing animals. Lk 14:1-6 raises the question of whether it is right to heal on the sabbath. And John also records an incident of Jesus on the sabbath. John 5 The man at the lake of Bethesda. John 5:17 God is working on the sabbath in sustaining and healing and therefore it is appropriate for Jesus to heal. John 9: The man born blind.

Luke reminds us that Jesus went to the Synagogue on Sunday[sic] as was his custom. Jesus at his trial was not accused of annulling the sabbath. The law punished breaking the sabbath by death.

2.6.3. In the Rest of the New Testament

2.6.3.1. Teaching and Practice

Gal 4:10 Paul says you observe days and months and seasons and years. Col 2:16 "Therefore let no one pass judgment on you... on regard of a sabbath". Ro 14:5,6 Paul says: "One esteems one day as better than the other... let everyone be fully convinced in his own way".

What do you make of it? Paul is clearly here relativizing the sabbath. The sabbath no longer has the force it had in the Old Testament.

2.6.3.2. Hebrews

The sabbath is a type. A type of the eternal sabbath (Heb 4:9). A sabbath Rest for the people of God. The sabbath in Heb is seen as a type comparable to the sacrifices of the Old Testament and the ritual and the priesthood. That is now superseded by what Christ has done in his death and resurrection. Its value now lays in its pointing to the rest of the people of God.

2.6.3.3. Acts of the Apostles

Paul at Troas holds a meeting with the churches (Acts 20:7) which may suggest that already the Church has moved its primary day of worship to Sunday, which was the first day of the week in the Jewish calendar. Possibly something similar is happening in Corinth (1 Cor 16:2). Possibly indicating that Sunday was a special day.

2.6.3.4. References to the Lord's Day

There is a reference to the Lord's day (Rev 1:10). This raises the question of what is the Lord's day? The answer given by most is the day marking the resurrection which now supersedes the Jewish sabbath.

2.6.4. The Historical Emergence of Sunday

Christians had to work on the Sunday since there was no official day of rest in the Roman Empire. The land of Israel would observe the sabbath. Sunday as a day of rest, of enforced rest first became obligatory in the Roman Empire under Constantine in 321. Constantine's decree is referred to in a letter by Constantine to a Governor in which he says: "All judges and all occupations should rest on the most honorable day of the sun. Agricultural personal can work" (Willy Rordorf *Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Early History of the Church* 1968 see p. 162). Notice two thing about Constantine's decree: First there is no reference to Christianity. It is the day of the Sun. It is religiously neutral in the decree. It is for all purpose a pagan day of rest. To this day Sunday has pagan associations linked with sun worship.

Notice the contrast between Constantine and Ex 34. Under the Jewish Law agriculture was forbidden on the sabbath.

2.6.5. Review of Different Interpretations

What do we make of all this material? What should we do in keeping Sunday or the sabbath?

Sander *Jesus and Judaism* looks at the question of the sabbath. More recently James D.J. Dunn *Jesus, Paul and the Law* and *The Parting of the Ways between Christianity and Judaism*. There is my own study which includes a study *Synoptic Miracle Stories* in Forum (Foundations and Facets) Vol. II/4 1986 page 55-76. This is the Journal of the notorious Jesus Seminar.

I will survey a range of options: Beginning with the conservative and ending with the radical.

2.6.5.1. The Seventh Day Adventist Position

See in particular the work of Samuel Bacchiocchi *From Sabbath to Sunday* by the Gregorian University Press. A very thorough and interesting study maintaining the Adventists thesis that Sunday was a big mistake and that the proper day of rest is the sabbath or Saturday and claiming that there is nothing in the New Testament which warrants a change or the change in the day.

In particular he notes that the Christian Church claimed to observe the Law. Paul claimed to have kept the Law (Acts 21:24). For Acts 20:7 Bacchiocchi argues that it was the day that Paul was in town so this was an irregular day of meeting and not a regular Christian practice. The reference in Rev 1:10 is so called because the author sees it in an anticipation of the day of the Lord, God's decisive day and therefore it is not the Christian Sunday that the author has in mind.

He is not very successful in dealing with Paul's argument. He argues that Sunday worship only became standard practice in the Church during the time of the Emperor Hadrian when Christians started worshipping on Sunday in order to demonstrate the difference between them and the Jews to the Roman public. But all this raises the question if the sabbath or Saturday is the right day for worship. Christianity does not abolish the sabbath but restores it.

Should not the Church keep the sabbath in the same way it was kept in the Old Testament? That would seem to be the logical conclusion. To my mind Bacchiocchi does not conclusively establish his point of the meeting in Troas. Likewise Paul's relativizing of the sabbath seems to weaken his case considerably.

2.6.5.2. Sabbatarianism

The Christian puritan tradition which sought to keep the sabbath as near as possible to the Old Testament regulation but on Sunday rather than on the sabbath. The day is for church going but absolutely nothing else. A view espoused in England by the Lord's Day Observance Society and other staunch traditional evangelicals.

2.6.5.3. Paul Jewett's Flexible Position

Put forth in his book *The Lord's day*. The best of all the shorter treatments. Jewett concluded the book with a question. How should the Christian keep Sunday? And he gave four general principles.

- I. Rest in God only for deliverance and redemption. It is no kind of Christian work. It is not intended to be a bargain chip with God. The first thing we need is the right kind of attitude. Sunday is a gift of God.
- II. Sunday is the day for meeting with the Lord's people for laying aside ordinary toils and gathering with the people of God for worship.
- III. Sunday should be kept as a day of joy rather than a day of gloom as it has been kept in the past.
- IV. It should be recognized as a day special to the Lord, who has hallowed and sanctified the day.

I think Jewett's answers here pretty well in the middle of the spectrum.

2.6.5.4. Willy Rordorf

He argues that Jesus abolished the sabbath and that the day is kept as a reminder of the easter encounter of Jesus with the disciples and the easter meal that Jesus ate with the disciples on the sea of Galilee. Other than that sabbath observance is to be rejected.

2.6.5.5. Carson *From Sabbath to Lord's day*

Any continuity between sabbath and the Lord's day is rejected. Jewett is treated as a compromiser between Sabbaterianism and a more radical view. We are not under any compelling to keep the sabbath.

2.6.5.6. My Own View

There is a discontinuity between the sabbath and Sunday that is I see the sabbath in the Old Testament as one thing. I see the Christian Sunday as something different. I see Sunday replacing the sabbath commemorating the resurrection of Christ and it should be celebrated as such, but I also see it as a day of rest and I see real value in resting one day a week from one's ordinary labor.

Jewett's recommendations point us in the right directions. I disagree with those who want to work on a Sunday or do all other things on the Sunday. I would not want to go shopping because I value Sunday as a special day and as the day par excellence for going to church. As I do my shopping on Sunday I am depriving people of doing the things that I enjoy doing, meaning going to church.

My main point is that even though my refusal to do shopping on Sunday will not change the habits of anyone, it is important that we do as much as we can so that others can enjoy the things that we value. It is important to have a day of rest and a day of not working.

What about the minister? The minister works hard on Sunday and therefore needs other days off. He should have a day or two days off like everybody else. It is no wonder that ministers get burned out and that a lot of people are out of the ministry after 5 or 10 years. It is very important to pace yourself. A particular problem is that there are many church meetings at night.

It is a crazy job with long hours and you need to watch how you spent you time. You just need to compensate and do need time to recover and recuperate and do something different.

Saturday evening services means missing the point of the Sunday. To me there is something important about having to work 5 to 6 days and then having that break. To break the cycle is important.

2.7. The Sacraments

What do we mean by sacrament?

2.7.1. Definition of the Term

What is the difference between an Ordinance and a sacrament? Some talk about Ordinances as distinct from sacraments. When people say an Ordinance it often is set to mean that some practice is to be followed, but they are just doing it out of obedience. Meaning we keep them and practice them but we do not understand them.

For me there is not a valid distinction between both. A sacrament is what it is because it is ordained by God for a special purpose.

The Term comes from the Latin "Sacramentum". In the early Greek Church the typical term was *mustrion*. Tertullian explained the term sacrament as being a sort of military term. A *Sacramentum* in the Roman Army was an oath of allegiance (see Tertullian *To the Martyrs* chapter 3). For Tertullian baptism and the Lord's Supper was something like an oath of allegiance to the army. The Lord's Supper would be a renewal of your pledge of allegiance. Over the years the terminology of mystery only survived in Orthodox and Catholic circles. Among Protestants sacrament is defined as an outward sign of an inward and invisible grace ordained by Christ as a means by which we receive that grace and as a pledge to assure us of it. So that the sacrament is a means of grace but also a pledge of grace as well.

2.7.2. Conflicting Attitudes in the Early Church

I am referring to the view that emerged with Cyprian that outside the Church there is no salvation. This raises the question of what is the value of sacraments if you receive them in the Church and then join a schismatic church or what is the value of sacraments administered in a schismatic church?

Cyprian argued simply that the sacraments of the schismatic and heretics do no good whatsoever and are invalid. Augustine took a more complex view. The sacraments of heretics may be valid but they do not do the heretic any good. How could that be so?

Augustine believed that in order to receive a sacrament properly one should do in faith and obedience. But if you would split off from the Church you could not be said to be in a state of love with others. So the sacraments would not do you any good because you had the wrong attitude of heart. This reinforces the Catholic tradition that only their sacraments are valid and anyone outside is outside of the Grace of God.

2.7.3. The Catholic View of the Seven Sacraments

In the Middle Ages was an ongoing debate how many sacraments there were. Piu of Saint Victor (died in 1141) enumerated as many as 30 sacraments. Later Peter Lombard reduced it to seven and the number seven became officially the Seven Sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church at the Council of Florence (1438-1445). See the *Decree of 1439* in *The Church Teaches* Document 663 Page 261 and 262.

One can think of the Seven Sacraments in terms of going through life. Five are necessary for Salvation and the remaining two are optional and in fact are mutually exclusive.

- Baptism
- Confirmation
- Eucharist or Lord's Supper or Mass
- Penance
- Unction or the Anointing of the Dying

Optional ones:

- Matrimony, Marriage
- Holy Orders Ordination

The Council of Florence sees the sacraments as confirming grace. Two of the sacraments impose an **Indelible Mark** namely baptism and likewise ordination.

There are three essential elements of the sacraments: Matter (Water in baptism, Water and Wine in the Lord's Supper) and then the form of the sacrament (Important to do it in the right way intending to do what the Church intends through the sacrament. I am not sure if the Catholic Church would sanction Protestant Churches drinking juice instead of wine). The third essential component is the Officiant. The person who officiates has to be a properly ordained priest in the Catholic Church in order to perform the sacraments correctly and effectively.

2.7.4. Luther's Rejection of the Seven Sacraments

I think this is useful as giving an overview but also useful to start with Luther to get the bearing on Protestant Theology in general. *The Bablonisch Captivity of the Church* 1520 or *The Pagan Servitude of the Church* in John Dillenberger *Martin Luther: Selections of his writings*. I prefer the first one because it reflects Luther's attitude. There is a double reference in the title. The first is to the captivity of the Israelites in Babylon from the time of Jeremia onwards. The second reference has to do with the time when the Papacy was removed from Rome to Avignon in France. This was referred to as the "Babylonisch Captivity". But the real captivity has come about by the misuse of the sacrament. The present look is a form of bondage. He goes through the Seven Sacraments and reduces them to three.

Luther starts with the Lord's Supper and deals with three issues.

2.7.4.1. Communion in Both Kinds.

The practice had become standard of not giving the cup to the laity for fear that the laity will spill the Blood of Christ. Luther said that this was unnecessary and unbiblical. Christ did it and therefore we should do it today.

2.7.4.2. Transsubstantiation

The view which appeals to Aristotle's view of matter which distinguished between substance and its accidents. This was a view adopted by Thomas Aquinas to explain what happens when the priest consecrates the Bread and the Wine. How it does become body and blood.

In this view the substance is changed into the actual body and blood but the accident (outward appearance) remains the same. In reality the bread and wine are changed through the act of consecration.

Luther rejected the theory behind it and he rejected the idea of change. His own view came to be known as "consubstantiation" although Luther did not use the term. In Luther's view Christ is truly present. Bread and wine remain but because Christ has said this is my body and my blood, Christ is present in a real way in and through the sacrament.

How could this be? Luther's answer was to say: Well, think of a poker - a piece of iron - in the fire. If you keep it there long enough the iron becomes red and starts glowing. The iron does not change. In this way Luther believed that Christ was present in the sacrament. Receiving the sacraments meant receiving Christ.

2.7.4.3. Its Use

Sacramental Theology turns on two issues. One has to do with the presence of Christ. The second is how does the sacrament relate to the sacrifice of Christ? The Catholic answer had been and still is that in a real sense the offering of the mass is an extension of the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross. It is not a renewed sacrifice, but a representation of that sacrifice extending it in time. Thus the mass is a sacrifice.

This is rejected by Luther. "This cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you and for many as the remission of sins" (Lk 22:20). The crucial question is what is a testament? This is of course the term covenant. The Latin translation is "Testament". Luther says that a testament is made by a man in view of his death. A testament does three things:

- It anticipates the death of the testator
- It embodies the promise of the heritage
- It appoints heirs

See Galatians 3:4; Heb 9. The words of Christ show the same quite plainly. Christ testifies of his. He names and designates the bequest when he says "the remission of sins" and he appoints heirs. Luther understand the last supper as making a last will. Christ is the testator and the heritage is the remission of sin. The heirs are you and the many who receive it. The sacrament is essentially a pledge and a promise. To receive the sacrament means to appropriate the promises of Christ. It is thus something we receive from God and not something that we offer to God. And therefore it requires the proper response of faith. Promises are needed to be received and appropriated by faith. The exercise of faith plays an important role.

Luther rejects the "ex opere operato" of the efficacy of the sacrament. "Ex opere operato" from the work having been performed.

2.7.4.4. Baptism

Likewise baptism is a promise. He takes Mk 16:16 as a starting point. He says our entire Salvation depends on this promise and we must be watchful to keep our focus on this promise because unbelief is accusing God of promises that are not kept.

Baptism embodies the promise of the Grace of God. Luther's answer is that baptism is a promise, therefore it can be given to the children. The parents are like friends of the paralytic. But the child has to grow up in faith in order for the baptism to be effective.

2.7.4.5. Penance

Luther regards the practice of penance at least at this stage as a sacrament functioning like the other two involving a promise and the response of faith. He sees a connection with Matt 18:18; 16:19; John 20:23 and the bestowal of the Power of the Keys to Peter. Later Luther came to see the rite of Penance as still to be used but not as a sacrament. There are two reasons why it is not a sacrament.

- ◆ To qualify as a sacrament the rite has to be instituted by Christ for the Church.
- ◆ A sacrament has sacramental matter. It is questionable whether Penance was instituted by Christ as a rite and it does not have the sacramental matter of the other two sacraments. Therefore eventually Luther discarded it.

2.7.4.6. Confirmation

Here Luther abandons the idea that it is a sacrament. He says prayer and preaching are valuable but not sacraments. It is true that we find the laying on of hand practiced in the New Testament but not in the rite of confirmation. Therefore Luther would retain confirmation, but would not retain it as an sacrament alongside other sacraments.

2.7.4.7. Matrimony

Is not a sacrament. There is no promise attached to it. No special grace conferred by it and it was not divinely instituted to the benefit of the church. Luther does not say that there is no benefit in marriage. The marriages of unbelievers and pagans are still marriages. Therefore he wants to draw a distinction between sacraments instituted by Christ and practices which are valuable and useful but are not sacraments in the usual way.

2.7.4.8. Ordination

Rejected as a sacrament. There is no special promise attached and it was not specially instituted for salvation. At this point he institutes his doctrine of the priesthood of all believers (1 Peter 2:9). All have direct access to the Father through Christ. What is then the role of the minister? Luther does affirm the role of the minister. Luther views Ordination in a functional way. It is necessary to have teachers and pastors but it does not put an indelible mark on the minister. Thus a person could be ordained to a service and then could move on to another form of employment.

2.7.4.9. Extreme Unction: Anointing of The Dying.

The practice is generally associated with James 5:14-15.

Luther says that may be so, but that the recommendation of James is not about the dying, because James expects the one prayed for to get better. Therefore Luther rejects it as a sacrament since it is not ordained by Christ.

Over the years I have thought about this a lot and I thought Luther was right in this discussion, but I now think that Luther was wrong. I think that James is talking about the dying. First James is talking about the sick in the church. It is not a kind of evangelistic tool. Notice that the sick person is not brought to the church. It is the elders of the church going to the sick person. The sick person is evidently too ill to get up. What then is James saying?

One has to look at this in the light of James teaching. Here he is addressing a situation where a person is too sick to perform any work. In other words I think the situation refers to the dying. And the promise is on the deathbed. Supposing you want to confess your sins to be reconciled. They anoint you and the prayer will save you. I think he is also talking about the Resurrection. I came to see that there is ground for anointing the dying and have a last rite for the dying.

But on the whole I am in basic agreement with Luther.

2.8. Baptism

Here are two quotations from Calvin about what a sacrament is:

"An outward sign by which the Lord seals on our consciences the promises of his good will towards us, in order to sustain the weakness of our faith; and we in turn attest our piety towards him in the presence of the Lord and of his angels and before men." (*Institutes* Book IV 14:1)

"For baptism attests to us that we have been cleansed and washed; the eucharistic supper that we have been redeemed." (*Institutes* Book IV 14:22)

Are there any significant differences? The basic difference is that in the first statement the sacraments are sealing God and the promises of God. In the second statement Calvin says they are sealing us. And I am not sure the Calvin consistently saw the difference.

Let me read to you some Scripture on baptism. This is a very problematic passages indeed but one might almost say that all passages on baptism cause problems:

What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. (Romans 6:1-4)

It would have been more straightforward had Paul not talked about baptism. Similarly in 1 Cor 10 where Paul talks about baptism in the Old Testament:

I want you to know, brethren, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and all were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, (1 Corinthians 10 RSV)

It seems that the very rite of baptism unites the Christian with Christ in his death and resurrection. Now is he saying that there is a sense in which the Jews were baptized unto Moses. Yet many fell away. This second reference seems even more troublesome because it is baptizing without any water at all. So what is going on? In the following text we will try to unravel it.

2.8.1. The Development of Infant Baptism

From the early Church to Calvin.

2.8.1.1. The Early Church

There are different books which keenly debate the issue in the twentieth century. Jeremias and Aland. Joachim Jeremias started with a book titled *Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries*. Kurt Aland replied with *Did the Early Church Baptize Children?* Jeremias countered with *The Origin of Infant Baptism*. Most of the views on infant baptism depend on how one interprets the data.

Basically we talk about a tunnel period. That is from the New Testament period there is no explicit evidence for the practice of infant baptism until you get down to the early third century to people like Tertullian. He wrote around 200 AD *On Baptism* in which he discussed the word of Christ "Let the little Children come to me". Certainly by this time infant baptism was practiced and some were justifying the practice by this verse. But in this work Tertullian is dubious about the practice. Evidence shows that there is some feeling against infant baptism. He argues that it is not good to bring children to baptism when they do not understand what is going on with them. Later he argued completely against baptism in his book *On Heretics*.

Justin Martyr - somewhat earlier - presents an ambiguous piece of evidence for infant baptism. He (150-155 AD) mentions many men and women around the age of 60 who have been disciples of Christ from childhood and have kept their faith unblemished through their whole life (Justin Martyr's *First Apology*). Clearly Justin is not talking about baptism. Jeremias argues that if they have been Christians from childhood that this means that they have been admitted to the church in a very early age. According to ones leaning one interprets this passage. I would say that Jeremias is right in claiming that infant baptism is practiced in the second century. But it does not show that the practice goes back to the New Testament period. There are sign at this time that there is the growing belief that baptism washed away original sin. See Tertullian *On Penitence* and you can find a discussion in Jeremias' *Infant baptism in the first four centuries*.

There was the view that baptism washed away original sin. That is why Constantine put off baptism until a very late age.

This became part of Catholic Theology. Another part of the debate was what about sacraments of the heretics. Cyprian saw heretic baptism as no baptism at all. Augustine took a more liberal view that there was some validity but that validity did not kick in until the return to the Catholic Church. See A. von Harnack *History of Dogma*.

2.8.1.2. Medieval Period

Pope Innocent III 1160-1216 was an important figure in the issue. He was a remarkable pope. He claimed the title Vicar of Christ. The fourth lateran council of 1215 defined the Doctrine of Transsubstantiation. But here I want us to note a letter in which he addresses the question of the appropriety of infant baptism. Is it right to baptize Children? From the letter in *The Church Teaches* Document 683 page 267-268. The letter is known as *Maiores Ecclesiae Causas* (Major Causes of the Church). It is right to baptize Children on the following grounds:.

2.8.1.2.1. Baptism takes the Place of Circumcision.

According to Genesis 7:14 infants have to be baptized on the eighth day. If it was good enough for Abraham then it is good enough for us. Since baptism has replaced circumcision, baptism is applicable to children.

2.8.1.2.2. In Baptism we are Born Again.

John 3:5 speaks about being born again of water and of the Spirit. Certainly he makes an exegetical claim here that this is a discussion of baptism. This Innocent III takes to mean that prior to the coming of Christ no one actually entered the kingdom of heaven. Baptism opens the door of heaven to the faithful. It was not until the death of Christ that the doors of heaven are open.

2.8.1.2.3. Baptism for Security

Baptism is needed in order to do something for children who might die before coming to maturity. Clearly this means that baptism is necessary for salvation. If you are not baptized then you are not saved.

2.8.1.2.4. Original Sin

We all are heirs to original sin which we contracted as it were without willing it, we inherit it. Therefore if we can inherit original sin in that way then there is the thinking that baptism can counter this original sin. Original sin was contracted without a will and therefore baptism can be administered without will.

2.8.1.2.5. Imprints a Character

It leaves a mark on the Soul which is indelible unless a bar has been placed by the recipient which would block and nullify it. The block can only be placed at the time of receiving baptism. Children cannot resist but adult can resist the baptism.

2.8.1.3. The Catholic Position in the Council of Trent

Justification is linked with the sacraments of the Church. For all true justification either begins through the sacraments or once begun increases through them or is regained through them if lost (*The Church teaches* Document 664 page 662). So according to the Catholic Church justification begins with baptism and is mediated further through the sacraments. With regards to the canons on baptism, the council declared that it is possible to lose grace (Document 692 page 217) and it reaffirms that infants may and should be baptized (page 271).

Vatican II in 1964 reaffirmed the teaching of the Council of Trent but tends to acknowledge baptism outside of the Church (See *Decree on Ecumenism*). Baptism effects what it proclaims to offer and baptism is seen as a sacramental bond of unity in the Church.

2.8.1.4. Calvin

I picked Calvin because he represents a classic Protestant position (See *Institutes* IV 16:11). To get to the point we need to look at Col 2:11-12.

In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with [him] through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. (Colossians 2:11-12)

In other words Colossians 2 is saying that whatever happened in Christ you are buried with him in baptism. This takes the place of circumcision and as such it is a circumcision made without hands.

Calvin's comments that baptism is the same as circumcision. Paul here shows to the Christians that baptism is the same as circumcision for the Jews.

In Romans we have an argumentation based on famous Jewish figures Abraham and David. Abraham representing the foundations of the Covenant. David as the king par excellence. In Romans Paul argues that Abraham believed God and it was accounted for his righteousness (Romans 4:3 quoting Genesis 15:6 repeated in Galatians 3:6). How was Abraham saved? He was saved by grace. The way of salvation for Paul is exactly the same as under the Old Covenant. Then he asks how did circumcision fit in? Was he circumcised before or after? Therefore justification by faith comes in earlier. He received the circumcision as a seal of justification. The purpose was to make him the father of all who believe and also the father of all who are circumcised. So Calvin can argue that circumcision is likewise a sign or seal of faith and yet it could be given to infants eight days of age (Romans 4:11).

The Anglican Side of the debate can be found in Geoffrey Bromiley *Baptism and the Anglican Reformers* chapter 2 (Pages 97-121).

2.8.2. Arguments in Favor of Believer's Baptism Only

The Anabaptist's case is taken up in Donald Bridge and David Phipers *The Water that Divides* in a Series from Intervarsity which covers both sides and is easy to read. It is clear in a straightforward way and is a good useful book. It contains a certain amount of exegesis and history.

2.8.2.1. Zwingli

Calvin's contemporary Zwingli is described on page 103. Zwingli ministered in Zürich and led the Church there over to the reformed side. He had his own brand of Protestantism. He died 1541 in a battle as a chaplain to the Protestants. He predates Calvin. The debate Zwingli found himself in was a domestic debate. How far could you go with reforming the Church? Zwingli was a fairly radical reformer and as the same time was cautious and did not push for more that he thought was realistic.

On page 103 he writes "Nothing grieves me more than that I must baptize children for I know it ought not to be done." But the situation of the Reformation was precarious and Zwingli had to move with precaution. He had a kind of realism in it. He says "I leave baptism untouched and do not call it right and wrong. I find infant baptism nowhere written or practiced [in the New Testament]." Some of Zwingli's disciples pressed beyond where Zwingli wanted to go. They were persecuted and some were executed for advocating believer's baptism only.

Here is a list of some modern discussions. Three types of arguments:

2.8.2.2. Beasley-Murray: *Baptism in the New Testament*

He also wrote the article on *Baptism* in the NIDNTT.

He examines carefully the instances of baptism in the New Testament and shows that the identifiable cases refer to adults and shows the order of baptism in each case. The order is invariably coming to faith first and then receiving the sign. Beasley-Murray is arguing the classical Baptist case.

2.8.2.3. Karl Barth

Barth has two studies of baptism. The first was a brief book published in 1943 *The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism*. The other is the last thing he wrote in his *Church Dogmatics IV Part IV (Fragmentary)*.

The early Barth stressed revelation. Barth is arguing that we only know God as God reveals himself to human beings through his work. It was almost predictable that in the forties he would extend the argument and would say that the only recipient of baptism should be the ones who are in faith.

In the meantime Barth had developed his Covenant Theology. Christ is the mediator of revelation as he is the mediator of salvation. Barth asks who is this Jesus Christ? He is the son of God and the son of Man. In Christ God has taken humankind into relationship with himself. In that sense Christ is the covenant. And ultimately that is the sacrament. He uses this as a way of reinterpreting the whole range of Christian doctrine.

If that is so, all human beings are in Christ because of their common humanity. All are reconciled. Everybody is saved. Judas, Stalin, Hitler, because Christ died for all. What is the difference between a believer and Hitler? The difference is that the believer has turned to Christ in thankfulness for the gift of salvation. The unbeliever is saved but does not know that he is saved. The sin of Judas is the sin of despair. He could not believe that he was forgiven.

If all human beings are in Christ already what should prevent them from being baptized? Nothing. But Barth stuck to his earlier position and said that baptism is right only for believers.

Church Dogmatics IV Vol. 4:4 states that the first step of faith is a man's baptism with water which - by his own request - is administered by the community. He honors the freedom of this grace.

Continuing on Page 102 baptism as water baptism takes place in light of the baptism of the Spirit. It is not itself the baptism of the Spirit but is baptism by water. Not the instrument of grace but a response to a mystery of Christ. It is not a sacrament in itself.

Three key thoughts:

2.8.2.3.1. Baptism is not a Sacrament.

A sacrament is a history of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ as an event that is the sacrament and the means of Grace. Baptism as such is not.

2.8.2.3.2. Meaning of Baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Baptism in the Holy Spirit is the conversion experience for Barth. As such baptism is regeneration.

2.8.2.3.3. What is Water Baptism?

It is our response to God. It is a confession of faith and act of confession to God and to our fellow human beings.

2.8.2.4. Paul Jewett: *Infant Baptism and the covenant of Grace*

Jewett studied at West Minster Theological Seminary and the story went that he was always developing this theology as a student and this prompted his professor to write a book on the theology of infant baptism. It is exactly Calvin's position. Jewett is interesting because Jewett is trying to develop a theology of believer's baptism as a Presbyterian who believes in Covenant Theology.

2.8.2.4.1. The Analogy to Circumcision

We saw Calvin arguing over Colossians 2. Abraham believed first then circumcision came as a seal.

Jewett says we must honor that argument but he does not think that it is an insuperable difficulty for his position. He distances himself from Beasley-Murray who argued that originally circumcision did not have any moral connotations and that it only acquired such through the reflection of the prophets. Jewett argues that from the start circumcision had a spiritual significance calling for circumcision of the heart as also of the heart (Lev 26:42; Dt 10:16; 30:6; Jer 4:4; 9:26; Eze 44:7).

2.8.2.4.2. What does Baptism Archive?

Jewett's answer is that baptism functions as a seal. It seals a vital union with Christ and to my mind the pivotal point of the whole book comes out on page 87:

"We say that Baptism seals that but does not effect a vital union with Christ, because the function of a seal is to ratify something that has happened and not to bring it to pass."

A person gets converted and baptism seals that fact. Baptism does not bring about the conversion. He gives an example from the Old Testament Ester 8:8 in the story of King Ahasverus.

And you may write as you please with regard to the Jews, in the name of the king, and seal it with the king's ring; for an edict written in the name of the king and sealed with the king's ring cannot be revoked." (Esther 8:8 RSV)

Baptism is like this seal. His writing of the law into our heart makes our faith real.

2.8.2.4.3. Reflection on Jewett

It seems that Jewett is following Calvin's second definition. In fact he is taking that view. That is baptism attests to us that we have been cleansed and washed. The problem is that if you say this you are painting yourself into a corner. You are really mean to say that any baptized person is saved? Do you really mean to say that?

Jewett says that there are exceptions. He almost gets himself into a "ex opere operato" position. Jewett is committing himself to the view that baptism certifies that this regeneration has actually taken place.

What happens when someone makes a profession and then falls away? I think there are enormous problems with this kind of definition.

Is Jewett right in his understanding of the documents? Jewett takes it to mean that the seal ratified a previous decision and the previous fact. I do not think that is the way a seal functions. The seal ratifies the document. The seal shows that it is a real document of the king. That is where I come back to the two definitions. In the first definition the seal seals God and secondly it seals us.

Jewett takes the second view. I think whether you believe in Believer's baptism or infant's baptism you will be on safe ground if you assume this as a seal as confirming a decision. I do not think Romans 4:11 is saying that circumcision sealed the fact that Abraham was a genuine believer. Likewise I do not think that circumcision seals all subsequent Jews. Rather it seals to them the promises of God. In my view the seal functions like a guarantee as for example for a TV with the manufacturers warranty coming with it. It does not say your product will never go wrong, but it says that the manufacturer stands by the product and will make it go if it does not work.

Likewise seals seal God himself. When Paul talks about the seal of the Spirit, it does not certify that this person has the spirit forever, but it is God's pledge to that person that God will stand by this promises and thus those that accept those promise receive a double assurance.

For me that is the key to understand baptism and the sacrament's function.

What I am arguing is that Jewett has adopted "ex opere operato". Not that baptism effects but it effects the fact that it has happened.

Jewett wants to give recognition to the fact that circumcision does what baptism includes. Jewett has no problem of seeing a link between baptism and circumcision. Indeed he notes that Paul can say "We are the circumcision" that is the Christian Church superseded the Jews of old. Baptism includes everything that circumcision had and more. This leads Jewett to his final main point. Christians who believe in infant baptism are apt to read the New Testament as if it were the Old Testament and vice-versa. But he believes that there is an important difference.

- Beasley-Murray: Circumcision and baptism unrelated.
- Calvin: Sees circumcision and baptism as identical.
- Jewett: Circumcision is something to be applied to the whole nation. Baptism is something narrower. Baptism is always that baptism is for believers only and believers are the fit receivers of baptism.

Jewett claims that under the New Covenant God deals with people individually rather than corporately in groups. So that circumcision was appropriate for the nation of God because he dealt with them in blocks. Under the New Covenant God has a different way of doing things. That seems to me at least an overstatement of the things. Acts 2:39 seems to me include groups and families as well as individuals. I am questioning his view that the New Testament is as individualistic as he claims.

The other point is perhaps a rhetorical question. When you have infant baptism why not infant communion? Jewett talks about the need to discern the body. If you need discernment for that then you need discernment to receive baptism. There are churches where children receive communion. It is arguable that children are able to do indeed a measure of discernment that is sufficient.

2.8.3. My Own View

2.8.3.1. No One Baptizes Themselves

In the Christian Church no one baptized himself. An important symbolism that the sacraments have to do with is **receiving**. It symbolizes something that we receive rather than what we do for God. There is a further point here that is that in the New Testament baptism is never treated as an act of confession or witness contrary to what is taught in some churches.

The New Testament does not ever put on that argument, it is bound up with the fact that we receive baptism as a free gift.

2.8.3.2. Baptism is a Sign of Identity and Belonging.

It is more than that. Identity and belonging involves consecration. It is essentially an act of consecration or of being consecrated. The circumcision was a mark of identity of belonging to the covenant people of Israel. First under Abraham and then under Moses.

Then there is that passage 1 Cor 10:2. The Jews were baptized unto Moses in the Red Sea. Moses is not here just for the person of Moses but for Moses, the giver of the Law. We read in the Gospels that Jesus also was baptized. John the Baptist preached a baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.

I gave a lot of thoughts about what John the Baptist was doing. The Jordan is a dumb river to baptize in because it is a shallow muddy river and the rabbies would not allow baptism in the Jordan because it was not pure enough. The Qumranis disqualified the Jordan too. There is a lot of discussion about the precedent of the baptism in Christianity. What then was John the Baptist doing? In my view he was reenacting the entry into the promised land calling for a fresh start. His baptism worked in the same way that the crossing of the red sea was working. Therefore I think what John the Baptist did was to cross Jordan in a symbolic way in order to reenter in a sacred and holy way. It is a symbolic act. Mt 28:18-19 also has an element of consecration and identity "In the Name". Something which defines believers. We noticed also earlier in Romans 6 "baptized into Christ's death". Our way of identifying with Christ in his death and resurrection. Thus being consecrated to him. In baptism there is an element of consecration.

2.8.3.3. The Element of Washing

Titus 3:5 we find baptism as "the washing of regeneration". Compare this to 1 Cor 6:11 and 1 Peter 3:21. Baptism which corresponds to washing saves you. This is an appeal to God for a clear conscience. In one sense it looks like a washing but also an appeal. How can that be? It can be if you follow the logic that the sacrament involves a promise of God. It is a form of a promise of God. Thus the believer can say: I have been baptized and appeal to the baptism for God to clear the conscience.

And now why do you wait? Rise and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on his name.' (Acts 22:16 RSV)

Here Paul is talking about his conversion and baptism was seen as a washing away of sins.

2.8.3.4. A Sign of Rebirth

John 3:5 talks about being born of the Spirit. Moltmann in *The Way of Jesus Christ* (Page 83-87) sees the imagery in terms of being born from a human mother. He notes that the Spirit is female in Hebrew. Therefore to be born of the Spirit is a picture of drawing on human birth (Titus 3:5; 1 Peter 1:3). Some think that 1 Peter is a form of baptismal liturgy.

2.8.3.5. The Language of Baptism

The New Testament uses very strong language about baptism. This has led to the view in Catholic Theology that baptism actually effects what it signifies (Romans 6:3; Titus 3:5; Galatians 3:2). The rite itself is the means of accomplishing what it identifies (Acts 22:16).

Baptism is not optional for the church or for the member. It is not the case that the Christian Church could make it optional or replace it with something else on cultural grounds.

But it raises a question: Does **the rite** effect the thing it signifies? What is the place of faith?

My own church has taken the position that sometimes faith comes first and then the rite, sometimes the rite comes first and then the faith and sometimes people are actually converted through the rite itself by receiving the rite.

Examples of these:

In Romans 5:11: Abraham believed before receiving the rite.

This also was the case at Pentecost. There was belief first and then the rite was received.

In Acts 10:45 we find the story of Cornelius. The Spirit is "on Cornelius" before the rite which in turn constitutes a clear case for baptism. I do not think that anybody wants to quarrel with believers baptism in this question.

When was the apostle Paul converted? Acts 22:16 Paul's own argument. Paul's conversion began with his Damascus Road experience. Then he had to be led to Damascus and was there several days. It was not until the baptism that Paul's conversion was completed. It was actually completed in the washing away of sins in baptism. I do not think this is a normal experience in my church.

The washing away of sin took place in the baptism itself. For some people they could experience the release prior to the baptism. To me that helps explain the strong language of Paul in Romans 6. There is a coincidence with the actual rite. There is an act of appropriating the promises. The act symbolizes and seals God's promises.

Now there is one other thing that I want to say with regard to language which I have not stressed so far. That has to do with prophetic symbolism. Very often discussions of sacraments just start with the New Testament and omit to notice the tradition of prophetic symbolism. The prophets of the Old Testament often acted out their prophecies with symbolism. See for example Jeremiah's yoke, Isaiah went naked as a sign of desolation and Hosea married a harlot.

I think a number of Jesus's actions are to be seen in those terms. Of course John the Baptist lived in the desert. Why would that be? He was out there living in the desert by the Jordan, symbolizing the reentry into the promised land in the matter of Joshua. A number of Jesus' actions like taking the children into his arms, riding into Jerusalem had that character of prophetic sign language. I believe that baptism and the Lord's Supper belong to this symbolism. They are not effective apart from the message and apart from the appropriate response.

Thus baptism is a sign of regeneration of God's gift of the Gospel.

2.8.3.6. Continuity between Old Testament and New Testament

This continuity is rejected by Jewett.

Acts 14 tells of two household churches and treat the household as a unit in a way that carries over from the Old Testament. In the case of Lydia it may be argued that no children are mentioned. But one could argue that the rest just followed suit. You had adult baptism but not necessary adult believer's baptism!

Likewise 1 Cor 7:14 implies a household baptism and the treatment as a unit. See the words of Peter at Pentecost in Acts 2:39. The promise is to you and your children (Different in Western Text but the Western Text is not considered to be the original). What does this imply? One answer might be that the promise is to you and you descendants after you. To which I would reply: If Peter envisaged the Parusia as an event that could happen anytime then children has to mean children in the literal sense of the word.

2.8.3.7. The Replacement of Circumcision by Baptism

See Phil 3:3; Gal 5:6; Eph 2:11. The Church is the New Israel. Baptism is the rite of initiation and entrance and membership and therefore baptism replaces circumcision.

Why should baptism replace circumcision? It is a fact Col 2:13. We are the circumcision.

Why replace one rite by the other? It has to do with the change of the covenant. Between what is the Old Israel and the New Israel which includes Jewish believers and Gentile believers following the Roman argument that Abraham is the father of Gentile and Jewish believers.

What does this change entail: One of the changes involves the equal status of women with men under the New Covenant and therefore they received the sign. This was not given under the Old Covenant. In a very real sense women were appendages of men in the Old Testament. They are treated as possessions in the Ten Commandments. Under the New Covenant they have equal relationship. Therefore I think the change is bound up with the inclusion of women in a different status. I am in agreement with Jewett that it is wrong to read the Old Testament as if it were the New Testament. It is wrong to treat the New Testament as if it would be binding for the believer. It is bound up with the New Covenant. The Old Covenant is bound up with the promise given to Abraham to make him a mighty nation whose seed would possess the land. There is a different kind of symbolism.

The New Covenant starts with death and ends in life. So it turns around the symbolism. There is a radical different set of rites in the New Testament.

2.8.3.8. Baptism as a Seal.

I would argue that when we have references to the seal of the Spirit, these refer to God giving the Spirit as a pledge of what God will continue to do. It is not a certification that you are a born again certified believer, but a sign of what God will do and what is given to you (2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; Act 10:44-48; 11:15-18). I think that the function of baptism is to give the seal of God. It is personalizing the promises of God and thereby admitting us to the community of the New People of God.

2.8.3.9. The Practice of Dedication

As you know some churches offer a service of dedication instead of baptism for infants. And some churches like the covenant church offer both as an option. Some choose to have them baptized others do not.

This at the first sight seems a compromise in a confused situation. But I have to ask if there is any biblical precedent? Some say yes there is in the case of Samuel. Jesus himself was brought to the Temple (Lk 2:22-24). But I would have to say that these are not genuine precedents. They are precedents for dedication but in each case the child had been previously circumcised.

I do not think it is good theology to have dedication as an alternative to baptism. Baptism is a dedication too, but baptism puts the person baptized into the sphere of the Christian community. Whereas to consecrate and not baptize would put the child outside of the Christian community.

My view makes no appeal to the faith of the parents. Luther referred to the faith of the parents as like for the faith of those who brought the paralytic to Jesus.

2.8.3.10. Baptism in the Trinity

This is one of the most difficult problems. Mt 28:19 contains the great commission that all people should be baptized in the three names. Yet in Acts baptism is in the name of Jesus Christ. There are various examples, but we do not get the full Trinitarian Formula. The Holy Spirit comes through the laying on of hands (Acts 2:28; 10:48; 19:5).

Some would see confirmation as the completion of baptism. I would not want to tie it as neat as that.

Matthew 28:19 is not so much a formula as a statement of a reality, as it were summarizing the encounter with the risen Christ. What you get in Acts 28 would be a very brief encounter. To me it represents a summary of a commission rather than the verbatim words spoken by the risen Christ. Whereas what you get in Acts gives a form of words which implies the reality of the triune God. That is what does it mean to confess Jesus as Christ. I have argued elsewhere that the title Christ means the anointed one. Anointed by what? By the Spirit. There is an implicit reference to the Spirit. The Spirit is the Spirit of the Father. The instances of baptism in the Lord Jesus Christ are instances of baptism in the Trinity although it is not spelled out.

For us today I would say it is right to think in terms of the triune God and it is also right to baptize in the triune name. The triune name explains what baptism entails. This is one of the difficult problems of New Testament history and interpretation.

2.9. The Lord's Supper

Again I will try to divide the topic into three sections.

2.9.1. The Catholic Position

2.9.1.1. The Council of Trent (1441)

Extracts of the council's decisions can be found in *The Church Teaches* See #719 pages 728-. The *Decree of the Eucharist* focuses on the presence of Christ: "This is my blood and my body". The Council of Trent focused on the nature of that presence and noticed a difference between the Eucharist and other sacraments. This sacrament differs from all the other sacraments in a unique way because Christ is personally present in it, in a way he is not present in the other sacraments. He is substantially contained in the species of those things. And therefore the Lord's Supper is described as the souls spiritual food. Christ is present in the Eucharist before it is actually used. Through the very act of consecration Christ becomes present.

Chapter 3 of the Council's decrees deals with the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. Certain things follow from the nature of the real presence. Since Christ is present in the elements in bread and wine it is appropriate to venerate Christ through the veneration of bread and wine. In a Catholic Church you will see a tabernacle where consecrated bread and wine are kept and that ensures the presence of Christ in the Church. That is why Roman Catholics cross themselves before the Altar which contains bread and wine.

In 1 Cor 11:28-29 Paul talks about discerning the body. This has led to the growth of the practice of confession in preparing for the Eucharist. In Roman Catholic practice you would go to confession on Saturday and the priest would tell you what you needed to do as a preparation for receiving the sacrament on Sunday.

There are accounts of the Lord's Supper in all Gospels except in the Gospel of John. Additionally there is an account by Paul in 1 Cor 11:

But in the following instructions I do not commend you, because when you come together it is not for the better but for the worse. For, in the first place, when you assemble as a church, I hear that there are divisions among you; and I partly believe it, for there must be factions among you in order that those who are genuine among you may be recognized. When you meet together, it is not the Lord's Supper that you eat. For in eating, each one goes ahead with his own meal, and one is hungry and another is drunk. What! Do you not have houses to eat and drink in? Or do you despise the church of God and humiliate those who have nothing? What shall I say to you? Shall I commend you in this? No, I will not. For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it, and said, "This is my body which is for you. Do this in remembrance of me." In the same way also the cup, after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me." For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes. Whoever, therefore, eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of profaning the body and blood of the Lord. Let a man examine himself, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For any one who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment upon himself. That is why many of you are weak and ill, and some have died. But if we judged ourselves truly, we should not be judged. But when we are judged by the Lord, we are chastened so that we may not be condemned along with the world. So then, my brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another-- if any one is hungry, let him eat at home--lest you come together to be condemned. About the other things I will give directions when I come. (1 Corinthians 11:17-37 RSV)

We look first at the Catholic Position contained in Tanner's *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* Vol. 2.

There are two major issues raised by the Lord's Supper. The first one is the presence. In what sense is Christ present? The Catholic Church affirmed that Christ is present in the bread and wine through transubstantiation. Luther had the view of consubstantiation.

The other question is: Is the Lord's Supper a sacrifice? (See Council of Trent: Session 22 of 1562 in Tanner Vol. 2 Pages 732 -741). What is at issue here? Protestant charged the Catholic Church with teaching that the priest functions more or less like the priest in the Old Testament killing the victim and offering the victim up to God on the altar. The charges is that the priest offers up and sacrifices Christ over and over again. Note the date of this decree 1562. Luther and Zwingli were long dead. This decree is framed with an eye on Protestant accusations (See Tanner page 732- chapter 1 of the decree).

Christ himself is the high priest. It is Christ who offers himself as a priest after the order of Melchizedek (Heb 7:11,19). He does not belong to the traditional priesthood.

And this was a fulfillment under the Old Covenant because of the powerlessness of the levitical priesthood. It was necessary for another priesthood to arise after the order of Melchizedek. Christ was to offer himself alone to God on the altar of the Cross. This is the death that would secure eternal salvation.

But his priesthood was not to be eliminated by death. So in order to leave a visible sacrifice, by which that sacrifice on the Cross should persist to the end of time. Therefore on the last supper he announced that he would offer himself to God as bread and wine. He commanded his successors to do this again "in remembrance of me".

Christ's sacrifice has eternal validity and was anticipated in the Lord's Supper. It continues to have validity by being real in the sacrifices of the Church. There is the one sacrifice of Christ which continues down the ages and is made real through the mass.

There is one other aspect of Catholic teaching. When were the apostles ordained as priests? The answer given here is at the Last Supper. In giving the Bread and the Wine that constituted their ordination of ministry in the church. The decree goes on to deal with subsidiary issues like masses in the name of the Saints. The council points out that the masses are not offered to the Saints but in honor of the Saints. Chapter 7 justifies the practice of mixing water and wine by recalling that water and wine came out of the side of Christ. Chapter 8 decrees that the mass should be celebrated in Latin though explanations of its meaning should be given in the language of the people. The usual argument for Latin is that it is the common unifying language in the Roman Catholic Church.

2.9.1.2. Vatican II

(See Paperback by Austin Flannery also Tanner Vol. 2 Pages 820-843 and *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* of 1963, Flannery Page 60- or Tanner Page 830-). Vatican II represents a kind of turnaround. On the one hand it asserts that the teaching of the Council of Trent remains intact and is valid for the present and for all times. But several major changes have come about. Among them the movement known as the **Liturgical Movement** which studied ancient Liturgies and which gives a new twist to the notion of sacrifice. Instead of emphasizing the penal aspect of sacrifices the **Liturgical Movement** stresses the self offering in sacrifice (prophora). This is incorporated into Vatican II.

The document itself is divided into chapters and consecutively numbered paragraphs. The following covers chapter 2:48.

The council is concerned that people in church should not remain passive spectators watching what the priest does with his back to them mumbling away in Latin at great speed and therefore the fathers of the council want to encourage greater participation in worship. People should be aware to participate in the service. Notice the following: They should be formed by God's word and should learn themselves as they offer the inoculate victim. They are making the offering together with the priest. They should go toward their final goal of unity of Christ through worship.

Notice a new emphasis. In the Eucharist it is the whole Christ offering himself. It is Christ who is the victim and the offerer of himself. The priest is also a representative of the people. They are offering Christ and offering themselves as an oblation with the offering. In order to facilitate this Vatican II decreed certain turnarounds. (# refers to the paragraph in the document)

#50 recommends the vision and streamlining of the services.

#51 recommends the reading of the Bible and Bible exposition as part of the liturgy.

#52 encourages preaching.

#54 abolishes Latin and recommends that the service should be in the language of the people.

#55 says "Without in any way retracting Trent communion under both kinds may be allowed at the discretion of the priest." This is retracting the practice of only giving bread to the people.

#57 encourages "concelebration" meaning several priest officiating at the mass together.

In addition to the Council of Trent Vatican II has various discussions with other church bodies. Among the inner discussions is the one with the Anglican Church. There were a set of proposals in which the Roman Catholic Church would drop transubstantiation and the term priest. It explained the term transubstantiation as just being one attempt to explain of what happened but was not the main point. It wanted to stress more the memorial feast perpetuating and extending in time the sacrifice in Christ (AIKE *The Final Report* 1982). It was stalled and it is not clear whether anything can be done for greater mutual understanding. And there will be strong resistance to do more than that on both sides.

The Catholic Church has the view that once a doctrine is laid down it is de fide, and therefore unchangeable, but it can be supplemented. They will never say that it was wrong but they will add and add and add. This is a point of debate which was raised in the sixties and seventies partly by Hans Küng in a Book called *Infallible?* which dealt with Papal infallibility. His strategy was to say that the Vatican I defined the infallibility of the Pope therefore Vatican II should define the authority of the Church. G. Baum in *Concilium* went further and said that the Church should abandon false teachings of the past. Küng went so far that he was no longer seen as a theologian of the Church.

2.9.2. Protestant Positions

2.9.2.1. Zwingli

He is remembered for teaching an extreme Protestant position which is fairly typical for a lot of evangelicals. Zwingli is said to have taught that the Lord's Supper is essentially a service designed to recall and remember the death of Christ and its significance. After all the emphasis is "Do this for the remembrance of me". So for Zwingli the Lord's Supper is an act of remembrance. It is an act to remind ourselves of the Cross.

There is another view which indicates that Zwingli had a more complex position. You can see this in *Zwingli and Bullinger* ed. Geoffrey Bromiley Page 248-. Bromiley gives an extract from Zwingli's exposition of his faith. By the sign of the Bread and the Wine Christ is set before our eyes. We see and taste that Christ whom the soul bears within itself and in whom it rejoices.

In the process of recalling there is an encounter with Christ who also dwells in our souls. Earlier Zwingli wrote on the Lord's Supper in which he rejected the Catholic position and the Lutheran position and lays the emphasis on the real absence of Christ.

Why? Because Christ is ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of God. If he is there he cannot be here. He has a whole battery of passages Act 7:55; John 16:28; Mt 25:31; Acts 1:10-11. There is a sense in which Christ is not present and therefore he cannot be here on earth. Therefore Zwingli rejected the Catholic view which left out the resurrection and ascension and also rejected the Lutheran view which destroyed the humanity of Christ.

2.9.2.2. Calvin

The main places where you find Calvin's teaching is in his *Institutes* Book IV 17. See also his short treatise on the *Holy Supper of the Lord* Volume 2 in the Edition of his treatises page 163-198.

I would say Calvin's emphasis falls on two main points. The first point is his agreement with Zwingli concerning the absence of Christ. Christ is risen and ascended and therefore he is not physically present in the way that either the Catholics or the Lutherans conceive of.

Secondly he sees the emphasis falling on the notion of promise and a seal picking up that first definition of sacrament.

Rather it is to seal and confirm that promise by which he testifies that his flesh is food indeed and his blood is drink (John 5:66) it is to seal and confirm that promise *Institutes* IV 17:4

There are symbols or analogies by which we apprehend Christ. How then is Christ present? How do we relate to him? It is the Spirit that is the means of our relationship with Christ the means of our feeding on him. We do not feed on him in any literal sense.

When Calvin talks about the "spiritual" presence of Christ, he understand the "spiritual" as referring to the Spirit.

"For us the manner is spiritual because the secret power of the Spirit is the bond of our union with Christ." *Institutes* IV 17:33.

Calvin's emphasis on the Spirit undercuts several problems. Christ is with the Father. The Spirit is given to us so that we can have union with Christ. Christ is not present with us anymore. The Spirit is given as a paraclete. I find Calvin's position more satisfactory than others.

2.9.3. My Own Position

2.9.3.1. The Lord's Supper and The New Covenant

The word that is used in the accounts of the last supper is the word *diatheke* (διαθηκη). Luther is only partly right in treating the last supper as a Christ's last will and testament. He bases his thoughts on the Latin. Luther is partly right and he has at least one passage of Scripture on his side:

For where a will is involved, the death of the one who made it must be established. For a will takes effect only at death, since it is not in force as long as the one who made it is alive. (Hebrews 9:16-17 RSV)

So the Epistle of the Hebrew already develops this aspect of the death of Christ. To me the emphasis falls on the inauguration of the New Covenant. Previous sacraments were established by sacrifices (Genesis 15:17-18; Moses Ex 24:5,6,8). Notice that it is internalized here. The Jews never drank blood. Still less human blood and therefore I would think that there would be something horrific for an Orthodox Jew to think of drinking human blood. But in all four accounts the emphasis on covenant is made (Mk 14:24; Lk 22:20; 1 Cor 11:24; Mt 26:28). It is therefore presented as establishing a new covenant which replaces the old Mosaic covenant as such. The covenants emphasis on new is alluded to in Jer 31:34.

In the *Seminar Papers* for 1992 is a paper by Bernhard Lang *The Root of the Eucharist in Jesus' Praxis*. Lang argues that Jesus was deliberately substituting another form of sacrifice for the animal sacrifice.

What was actually eaten at the last supper? Jesus gave them bread. That partly and the question of the sacrifice of the Passover lambs had not yet taken place. Could this have been a meatless meal? Jesus did not give them anything "transubstantiated". The very least that we can conclude is that whereas baptism replaced circumcision, the Lord's Supper replaced the Passover for the Church and with it the New Covenant replaced the Mosaic Covenant. And as such each celebration of the Lord's Supper is a celebration of the New Covenant.

There is one further ramification and it has to do with the fact that from time to time christian leaders have developed covenant services or personal covenants. J. Wesley had at the beginning of a year a covenant renewal service. I would want to say that part of what we are doing is renewing and reaffirming our covenant relationship with God in Christ. Each communion service is a covenant service. Spurgeon made personal covenants too.

2.9.3.2. The Redemptive Sacrifice

Certainly there is a sense in which the Lord's Supper focused on the redemptive sacrifice of Christ. Paul says: "You proclaim the Lord's death until he comes". It is an active proclaiming of the Lord's death. Some have taken this as an evangelistic instrument. But I cannot see it that way since Paul mentions the need to discern.

What then does this proclamation refer to? I follow C.K. Barrett *Commentary on 1 Corinthians* page 270 (see also NIDNTT Vol. 3 page 47). Barret argues that the proper setting of the Last Supper is the Passover. We find it in Exodus 12:26-27:

And when your children say to you, 'What do you mean by this service?' you shall say, 'It is the sacrifice of the LORD's Passover, for he passed over the houses of the people of Israel in Egypt, when he slew the Egyptians but spared our houses.'" And the people bowed their heads and worshipped. (Exodus 12:26-27 RSV)

So in the celebration of the Passover the meaning is proclaimed and I take Paul's reference to proclaiming the Lord's death as a counterpart of the meaning of the Passover. Thus in a sense this is an explanation of the meaning of "Do this in remembrance of me". Just as the Lord's Supper modifies the Passover, it also includes a reversal of role. What I mean is this: When the Passover was celebrated it feasted the killing of the Egyptians and the crossing of the Red Sea. In the Lord's Supper it is the Son of God who gives his life, not the enemies, it is the self offering of the Son of God himself.

There is a kind of irony in John 1:11 and in the fact that Matthew can recall "out of Egypt have I called my son" only to be killed by his own people.

If you look at the "*Magnificat*" and "*Benedictus*" Lk 1:67-79 you find some pre-Christian hymns. We use them in some churches certainly in the Anglican Church.

67 And his father Zechariah was filled with the Holy Spirit, and prophesied, saying,
68 "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he has visited and redeemed his people,
69 and has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David,
70 as he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old,

71 that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all who hate us;
72 to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant,
73 the oath which he swore to our father Abraham,
74 to grant us that we, being delivered from the hand of our enemies, might serve him
without fear,
75 in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of our life.
76 And you, child, will be called the prophet of the Most High; for you will go before the
Lord to prepare his ways,
77 to give knowledge of salvation to his people in the forgiveness of their sins,
78 through the tender mercy of our God, when the day shall dawn upon us from on
high
79 to give light to those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our
feet into the way of peace." (Luke 1:67-79 RSV)

When we read this, we read it in a spiritual sense, but when this was uttered in the original context it implied the kind of things that Israel hoped for, that the enemies would be killed. That is the way that John the Baptist's father greeted the birth of his son. The Christian interpretation involves a reinterpretation of redemption. Redemption not in the sense of victory over our enemies but in a spiritual sense of redemption as victory over sin.

I have to say that I agree with Zwingli and Calvin about the absence. I agree with Calvin with regard to our knowledge of Christ through the Holy Spirit. I see the Lord's Supper as a way of appropriating Christ (John 6:35). There are some scholars saying that John 6 is really a discourse about the Lord's Supper. But in point of fact there is no Lord's Supper in John. There is the foot washing but no account of the meal.

My own approach would be that I think that the Lord's Supper is about what is described in John 6. The Lord's Supper is about John 6. The celebration of the Lord's Supper is a way par excellence to believe in Christ and to feed on him. As such I would lay emphasis on the whole process, that is the process of giving thanks, breaking bread, offering prayer and eating and drinking together.

So that I think if you ask where is Christ in all this? I would say in the entire process rather than in the consecrated bread and wine like in the Catholic Church. I do not want to localize the presence.

I have to say that in a sense there is something horrific about the communion. The whole thing of drinking blood is horrific to the Jew (Lev 17:10-; Dt 12:16,23,24). The Jerusalem Council forbade the drinking of blood. There is something sacred about blood and something very solemn about the Lord's Supper. The Christian Church has tended to tone this down. I knew of one minister who wanted to have white-wine for communion because red-wine reminded him of blood. It seems to me that this is an attempt to get away from the solemnity of the occasion. Churches have a way of domesticating and moving away from the implications.

There are two directions to accomplish that. Anglicans use precious silver chalices and so on. Perhaps these are being regarded as being appropriate for the blood of Christ. Others go into the opposite direction in having small plastic cups which do not contain wine at all but grape-juice. This undermines the symbolism that there should be one cup, using the wine of ordinary fermented wine. Some Churches insist in the recovery of the practice of New Testament baptism but the very same churches go into the other directions in the Lord's Supper.

Churches do funny things. I can say this here, I think it would be a pastoral mistake in your first church to say: "You are crazy". We need to be tactful and cautious.

2.9.3.3. The Role of Faith, Promise and Remembrance.

It seems to me that Luther was right to say that there is an element of promise here that requires discernment and obedient faith. Faith is a precondition. Faith in Christ who is God's word to us. Faith in the one whom we remember at the Lord's Supper.

But what does it mean to remember? In a sense we cannot remember Christ in person, because we did not know Christ. But we know the tradition. In looking at the modern Catholic position we noticed the emphasis on memorial.

I have to say that I am intrigued by J. Jeremias *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (also NIDNTT article on *Remembrance*). It has to do with *anamnhsi*". Jeremia's takes the opposite view of Zwingli. Jeremia's says that remembrance is not so much directed at us but at God, so that God might remember us. It is a plea, we are pleading the sacrifice of Christ to God comparable with Ps 132 "Lord, remember David in all his trouble!". This is a very Jewish way of looking at things.

2.9.3.4. The Vertical and Horizontal Dimension

The vertical dimension is relationship with God.

The horizontal dimension has to do with the unity of the Church and our relationship with each other. This comes out in 1 Cor 10:16-17.

The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread. (1 Corinthians 10:16-17 RSV)

2.10. Ordination and Ministry

2.10.1. Three Classical Positions

2.10.1.1. The Catholic Position: The Emergence of Bishops

There was a leading to **Moniscopacy** in the early Church and to the view that there are really three orders of Ministry in the Church bishops, priests and deacons.

This takes the form of a hierarchy. The bishop has pastoral oversight over a diocese. Only bishops may ordain and the priests function as the arms of the bishop. They are exercising the bishop's ministry. Only the priest may celebrate the sacraments.

How did this position arise? If we look at the early Church immediately after the New Testament period we are presented with a variety of ministries. The *Didache* (thought to witness church life in Syria and Alexandria in the second century) paints a picture in which the local church is served by bishops and deacons who are elected, but that there is also a highly visible itinerant ministry of prophets going from church to church exercising a prophetic ministry.

Problem: How do you decide if he is a genuine prophet? The *Didache* gives rules for that (*Didache* 11). Prophets are like the Old Testament prophets in the Old Testament situation. The prophets are part of the landscape but not everywhere. 1 Clement gives an account of the situation at Rome AD 96 and the work is generally attributed to Clement the early Bishop of Rome. If we look close it seems that authority was in the hands of the congregation led by presbyters.

There is nothing in Clement or the *Didache* to suggest that each church had a bishop. But the situation changes if we look at Ignatius Bishop of Antioch. Letters that he wrote to various churches give pastoral advice and it is clear from these letters that Ignatius thinks that each church should have his own bishop who has pastoral oversight and that the bishop is the focal point of unity in the Church. He urges the Philippian church to do nothing apart from their bishop. So at this stage there is no uniform pattern in the first century or the early second century.

The notion of apostolic succession plays no part so far. Now by apostolic succession I mean the Catholic theory of ordination that only those who are truly ordained by the bishops of the Catholic Church are genuine ministers. This theory poses that ordination goes back to the Twelve Apostles who were ordained by Christ.

In the same time Moniscopacy is to emerge in the teaching of Ignatius. As we move from there into the second century Moniscopacy becomes more and more important. Irenaeus sees the bishop as the guardian of orthodoxy and the true tradition. Ignatius is thinking about various heresies. For him a visible succession is important. You need to know who ordained you.

By the time we get to the council of Nicaea Moniscopacy has become the norm and each church is presided over by a bishop. Not only that but certain sees have emerged as metropolitan sees, as the dominant churches controlling the other churches. Rome, Alexandria and Antioch control the network of churches in the empire. The council of Nicaea in addition to dealing with christology stipulates that the laying on of hands is the proper means of ordination and that three bishops are required in the consecration of other bishops.

Thus we get the foundations of the Catholic view that the bishops are the norm and the normative rules of the Church and that the Church is a network of dioceses governed by bishops assisted by priests. The Council of Florence (1438-1445) defined ordination to the priesthood in terms of celebrating the Lord's Supper which entailed as part of the ordination the bestowal of the chalice and the gospel.

The Council of Trent (1563) linked the office of priesthood with sacrifice. It posited that the act of ordination leaves an indelible mark on the person ordained and reaffirmed the Doctrine of Apostolic Succession.

2.10.1.2. The Anglican Position

The Church of England in the Reformation retained the threefold order of ministry and affirmed this pattern of ministry which went back to the apostles and claimed that this order of ministry was the authentic form of ministry which had been perverted by the Catholic Church.

In the intervening years there have been various attempts to unite the churches, particular in the 1890s. A Roman Catholic commission made a report *Apostolicae Curae*. The report ruled that Anglican orders were utterly null and void. There were defective in order and intent. Namely the form of ordination does not intend to be a priest in the same sense as Roman Catholics are priests. The Anglicans response was: We told you so.

2.10.1.3. The Reformed Response (Calvin)

He effectively says: All of the above is wrong. The whole idea of bishops rests upon a mistake. Calvin sees a different pattern of ministry in the New Testament itself. Calvin examines the question of ministry in *Institutes* IV chapter 3.

Here Calvin sees no less than seven different types of ministry in the New Testament. But some of these patterns of ministry are only temporary or if they appear again from time to time, they are not intended to be permanent whereas other forms are intended to be permanent. The first three of the following list are temporary the other four are permanent. Calvin is laying a foundation for the Presbyterian Church Polity.

2.10.1.3.1. Apostles

The Apostles laid the foundation of the early Church. They were the disciples whom Christ consecrated (Mk 16:15). No limits were appointed for their ministry. They could go anywhere and they did go. The intention was to present the Gospel to the world and lead the world back from rebellion.

But for Calvin the Apostles were limited to the twelve in the Acts of the Apostles and Paul. There were twelve apostles but Judas was replaced by Matthias. Acts 1 lays out the necessary conditions for being an apostle.

Namely that an apostle must be one who had accompanied Christ throughout his ministry and secondly he must be a witness to the resurrection. Thus when the original twelve begin to die out no replacement is found for example for James in Acts 12. The Apostles fulfill a foundational role in the Church (Eph 2:20 compare Rev 21:14).

Their foundational role is unique and therefore not repeated afterward. There is no apostolic succession in the Roman Catholic sense. So therefore the office of an apostle is a temporary office.

2.10.1.3.2. Prophets

Calvin says simply: Paul applies the name prophets not to all who were interpreters of God but those (Eph 4:11) who excel in a certain position. These do not exist today or are less commonly seen.

2.10.1.3.3. Evangelists

Evangelists are those next to the Apostles and function in their place. Such were Luke, Timothy, Titus etc. Perhaps also the seventy (Lk 10:1). Evangelists no longer exists.

2.10.1.3.4. Pastor

The pastor is a Presbyter (presbuthro") and also is identical with the Bishop (episkopo"). Calvin sees this as an essential ministry in the Church (*Institutes* IV 3:5). The office of the pastor has to do with teaching the Gospel and administering the sacraments in the local church. As such the pastor fulfills the Great Commission of Mt 28:19. This is Calvin's equivalent of the Doctrine of Apostolic Succession.

The pastor does in the local church what the Apostles did before in the church at large. However there is no doctrine of ordination guaranteeing authenticity. Rather it is a matter of function. What the Apostles performed for the whole church pastors have to perform for their own church. Calvin finds precedent for his teaching in Acts 14:23. The Elders are the presbuteroi the pastors. Likewise Titus 1:5; Phil 1:2.

Where as the other churches see a difference between bishop and elder, Calvin claims that they are one and the same. And I think his argument is a coherent one. Look at Acts 17:20-28. In the course of that address he says: "Take heed to yourself and the flock over whom you are overseer." The word that the RSV translates as overseer is episkopo". There are elders but they are to function as overseers to be guardians. So the essential role of the elders is to be an overseer. In this case the elders are very much different. The church at Ephesus hat several elders. Similarly Calvin draws attention to Titus 1:5,7

This is why I left you in Crete, that you might amend what was defective, and appoint elders in every town as I directed you, if any man is blameless, the husband of one wife, and his children are believers and not open to the charge of being profligate or insubordinate. For a bishop, as God's steward, must be blameless; he must not be arrogant or quick-tempered or a drunkard or violent or greedy for gain, (Titus 1:5-7 RSV)

So that in Titus it would seem that the office is termed elder but he functions as an episkopo". Calvin claims that the bishop is one and the same as the elder or presbyter and a church is served by several such ministers. Calvin rejects the hierarchy theory.

2.10.1.3.5. Teacher

And his gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, (Ephesians 4:11 RSV)

While I have agreed with Calvin so far his argument here is a little big thin. He has already dismissed apostles and prophets as being temporary. But here teachers are ongoing ministers. What he is getting at is finding some biblical justification for someone like himself who is spending his time in teaching without responsibility of oversight over a church.

2.10.1.3.6. Governors

The duty of a governor is the exercise of discipline (Ro 12:8). Each church had from his beginning a senate which had jurisdiction over penance. To see that as a part from the fabric of the church from the beginning is a little bit much. But it is part of Calvin's church.

2.10.1.3.7. Deacons

He sees the office of deacons justified (Acts 6:3; 1 Tim). Deacons did not preach or teach, they rather served.

Calvin says the ordained pastor is the *presbutero*". The lay leader is the governor. He does an exegesis of Acts 13. In Acts 14:22 Paul and Barnabas appoint elders by prayer and fasting. Calvin links this with laying on of hands. This word here to appoint means to elect. For him to appoint means to elect by a show of hands. He sees it as a kind of democratic form. I cannot see it like that. If it would be electing by show of hands then the churches would be doing the electing. But it is Paul and Barnabas who are doing the electing. Not a very democratic procedure.

Calvin does draw a distinction between the presbyter who is ordained and the lay men.

2.10.2. An Overview of Ministry in the New Testament

There is no single Church today that represents the pattern of ministry in the New Testament. I would go further and say that the pattern we find in the New Testament varies from place to place and that is part of the reason why no church is able to recover the patterns of the early Church.

If there is one pattern that is ongoing pattern then I do see a pattern of pastoral oversight that is in general common to the churches. The other thing that I see is flexibility. If there is any pattern that we can replicate today it is that of flexibility adapting different forms of ministry to the forms of the day.

2.10.2.1. The Pattern Presented by Jesus Himself.

In Mk 10:43-45 Jesus lays down a fundamental pattern for ministry which is his own guideline. The Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve. The distinctness of ministry is one of service, which in his case entailed giving his life as a ransom for many.

He employed various images to describe that service like Reaping and Sowing (Mk 4; Mk 12; John 4:44-48). Generally the person who labored in the heat of the day was not one who owned the property. So it is both arduous and not particularly prosperous. It is also describe in the form of fishing (Mk 1:17; Mt 13:1-30) but the fisher does not keep the fish.

(John 10; Heb 13:20; 1 Peter 5:6) There is a phrase that occurs in the Gospels for example Mk 6:34 "Jesus had compassion on them for they were like sheep without a shepherd." That is a picture of Israel which recurs from time to time in the Old Testament (Zech 11:13). The image of the Shepherd Eze 34. The earliest instance is in Numbers. Moses is concerned in Numbers 27 for what will happen to Israel after him. "Who will go out before them and come in before them?" Sheep without a shepherd? (Nu 27:17).

The striking thing about what happens next is that the Lord appoints Joshua to be the shepherd. Reflect about the name of Jesus being Joshua. Jesus himself took upon himself that role. We find in Mk 6 Jesus being concerned for Israel meaning his ministry as a shepherd.

Immediately after Nu 27 comes Nu 28. The interesting thing is after Joshua is appointed as a man in whom is the Spirit there are directions for sacrifice: "Command the people of Israel: You shall offer me in its due season". Description of offerings follows. This could tie in with Jesus' word "This is my offering" reaching back into the role of Moses in the Old Testament.

Jesus himself was perceived as a prophet or teacher. He sends his disciples into the world to make disciples of all nations. What then do we make of the various ministries of the New Testament?

2.10.2.2. The Office of The Apostles

In broad measure I am in agreement with Calvin. However I think that the office of the apostle is used in two senses in the New Testament.

First in a special technical sense the Twelve Apostles (Acts 1:21-22). Someone who had been with Christ from the beginning and a witness of the resurrection. By that token some would have said and did say that Paul was not a genuine apostle although he claimed to be one (1 Cor 9:1-2 "am I not an apostle"). His enemies would have said no! Then he says "Have I not seen the Lord?"

He goes on to say that he is one untimely born (compare 15:8) when he is talking about the resurrection appearances. "As to one untimely born he appeared to me....". There is some speculation whether Paul had actually known of Jesus in his earthly ministry. Paul's claim of his having seen the risen Christ constituted his apostleship. He uses an unusual Greek word *ektrwma*. because it occurred out of the time sequence.

In Acts 1 Christ ascended to heaven but Paul claimed to have an encounter with the risen Christ on the Damascus Road. What do we make of the ascension? Normally we have to think of the ascension as a rocket starting up from Cape Canaveral. Is that how we think of Christ? I think the cloud is the glory.

I am inclined to follow Ladd's *The Resurrection of Jesus*. For Ladd the ascension was not a kind of sequel to the resurrection. It was not like Jesus going into an elevator from death to the earth and then into heaven. Rather the reception into the cloud meant the end of the resurrection appearances. In a sense the resurrection entailed Jesus being seated at the right hand of God. There is no time frame between both in Hebrews. Christ became visible to the Church in his glorified state and he appeared to the apostle Paul in that state after he had ceased to appear to the other Apostles.

Calvin's position makes the apostles a unique role in that sense of the term. And when the original apostles died out the office of the apostle in that sense ceased.

There are however two instances of apostles where the word is used in a more general sense. Acts 14:14 talks about the apostles Barnabas and Paul indicating that at least Luke regards Barnabas as an apostle. But it could mean one that is sent.

Then there is the difficult reference in Ro 16:7:

Greet Andronicus and Junias, my kinsmen and my fellow prisoners; they are men of note among the apostles, and they were in Christ before me. (Romans 16:7 RSV)

There are a number of problems here (see Dunn *Commentary on Romans*). Who is Junias? Dunn argues that Junias is in fact Junia and that Junia was a woman. That is there are no instances of Junias being a male name, the nominative of Junias would be Junia and Junia is a woman's name.

Then there is the more difficult problem that they are known *en toi* "apostoloi". Known among the apostles? Known to the apostles? Or known as apostles? I do not think one could say decisively one way or the other. It is not a strong argument to think of Junia as an apostle. It is by no means a clear argument.

There are two kinds of apostles. What is the meaning of apostleship? There has been a debate in the 20th century initiated by K. Rengstorf arguing that the term behind *apostolo* was *Shaliach* (jlc) meaning an agent. The term is a rabbinic term but the idea is common enough in the Old Testament. They were Jesus' commissioned agents. Some have questioned whether an agent could serve in this role. An agent cannot commission others to be agents. For a review of this debate see F.H. Agnew *The Origin of the New Testament Apostle Concept: A Review of Research* in *Journal of Biblical Studies* (JBL) 105 1986 page 75-96.

The next major office mentioned is that of the Seven mentioned in Acts 6. Calvin refers to them as deacons. This is seen of the beginning of the office of deacons specially appointed to serve the needs of the hungry. Now one observation is that in Acts they are not called deacons. The Greek Noun is *diakono* and the verb *diakonew*. You will find the verb used but not the noun. They are referred to as the Seven in Acts.

This is not a permanent office but an office occasioned by a temporary need. When later persecution causes the church to be dispersed the Seven are also dispersed with the rest and Philipp in particular turns up as an evangelist in Acts 8:4 and Acts 21:8. He also had daughters who prophesied. What we have here is a ministry created to meet a special need to serve the table then that ministry disappeared when time and circumstances change.

The question of bishops, presbyters and deacons. It is to be noted that deacons are not mentioned in Acts. The Jerusalem Council (Acts 6:22-23) consists of apostles and elders. In my judgment Calvin is correct in saying that the elders and the bishops are the same for the reasons given. Notice at Philippi the church has bishops and deacons but there is no mention of elders.

Bishops are also mentioned in 1 Tim 3 and deacons are mentioned in the same passage. What is interesting in both cases is that the job is not described but a lot is said about the qualifications for the job.

Were there women deacons in the church? I would say yes. Phoebe the deaconess of Ro 16:1 from Cenchreae. It is quite rightly that she was the one who carried the letter to the Romans from where Paul had written it to Rome in view of the allusions to her. Notice in Ro 16:1 Paul uses the term *diakono* of Phoebe. The RSV translation of "Deaconess" would be wrong. I do not think that the early church did not differentiate between male and female deacons. Tucked in between the qualifications needed for a bishop and a deacon in the church Paul has an aside about the women: "The woman likewise must be serious". It is assumed generally that the women were the wives of the deacons. But if so why does he not mention them when he is talking about the wives of the bishops? I think he talks about the women deacons who need to have the same qualifications as the men.

2.10.2.3. The Question of Gifts and Ministers

The New Testament contains a number of passages that list spiritual gifts that differ slightly from each other (Ro 12:3-8; 1 Cor 12:4-31; Eph 4:11,12; 1 Peter 4:10-11). Some would argue that this is the point where I should have begun. In their analysis of the early Church the churches were characterized by people having spiritual gifts.

Gifts came first and the patterns of ministry came later. Thus they envisage a fluid loose charismatic situation at Corinth. Only as time progresses does the Church become "Catholic" i.e. institutionalized. They would see a trajectory from a free form of worship and only later -- many years later -- would the institutional church come about.

I have to question that interpretation. Certainly I would agree that the pastorals belong to the later writings. But when we look at 1 Cor 12 it seems that already gifts are associated with particular ministries.

Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; (1 Corinthians 12:4 RSV)

Paul thinks that those gifts already characterize certain ministers (1 Cor 12:26-). So already the gifts characterize identities and roles in the Church. I am not saying that they are fixed forms of ordination but it would seem that already in Acts Paul and Barnabas did appoint elders and that the way of appointing them is steadily identified with the laying on of hand.

2.10.2.4. Concluding reflection

The role of the apostle was a unique role, a foundational role characterized by knowing and having been a follower of Jesus. The twelve apostles emerge from the twelve disciples. The twelve disciples were deliberately modeled on the twelve men of Joshua representing the twelve tribes of Israel. In that sense the apostles were unique. When they begin to die out there are no replacements.

This ministry is foundational and has a pastoral oversight for the whole church. The original twelve kept largely to the Jerusalem Church, but there is some evidence that Peter for example was also in Rome.

I would want to say that if there is one pattern that is normative in the New Testament it is not the fact that there are certain orders of ministry everywhere, but that they are flexible. They do not match up. Teachers are mentioned in Ephesians and 1 Cor 12 and so on. I would deduce that the question of terminology depends partly on local usage. But it also depends on the particular ministry exercised in a particular church. It would seem that some ministries come in to being and then disappear like the ministry of the Seven in Acts 6.

Therefore I would see in this flexible pattern two factors. One local needs that caused the appointment of those appointed to serve in Acts and the gifts of the Spirit. But I also see in this various ministries exercised a need for pastoral oversight and teaching. Whether it is exercised by the apostles, the bishops or presbyters or whatever they are called. What is not constant is the need for deacons. It seems to me part of this flexible pattern.

One further thing about the deacons is that the deacons unlike today seem to be a permanent office. It was not treated as a kind of stepping stone or probationary office. Today you had to be a deacon first in order to become a priest. It would seem in the New Testament that deacons were not probationary priests but deacons in their own right.

What is the justification for having bishops today? If Calvin is right in saying that the bishops and presbyters in the New Testament are the same? My answer is that already in the New Testament there appears a type of ministry which is that of a pastor to pastors or an overseer of the pastors. It is precisely that role that Paul has. Similarly Timothy and Titus or Barnabas. Therefore I see plenty of precedent of having overseers of the church at large who link the different churches and serve the different churches with this kind of oversight.

It is not the term bishop that provides us for example this ministry, but the pattern of oversight. And even those churches who do not have a bishop often have people who do that.

For example in the Vineyard John Wimber functions like a bishop for the Vineyard churches.

2.10.3. The Role and Ministry of Women

2.10.3.1. Old Testament

I have several observations to make.

2.10.3.1.1. Women as Possessions

It seems that women were treated like possessions. This is implied in the Ten Commandments: "You shall not covet your neighbor's wife and anything that is his", thereby putting a woman on the same level as possessions.

I do not think the Ten Commandments in their original form are normative for us today. I think the New Testament reinterprets the Ten Commandments for us today. Not only do we not keep the sabbath but we also make certain adjustments to the role of the male.

In this connection the book of Ruth throws some light on the Old Testament situation. In a sense you will say that the book of Ruth represents a feminine perspective in a telling way. The real heroes are women. Boaz is a good guy but the real heroic stuff is done and illustrated in the life of Naomi and Ruth, who is not a Jew at all, but a Moabitess who sticks to her mother-in-law after the death of her husband and is a shining example of righteousness.

As you follow the story of the book there is a happy ending when Ruth marries Boaz but in the meantime, in order to get the marriage effective, there is some business about a field and about a kinsman who is nearer than Boaz, who has the first right. In order to get the woman one has to buy the field. The book presents this and it accepts the order of things, but it does subvert the outlook of the order.

2.10.3.1.2. No Covenant Sign

Women did not receive the covenant sign. The promise is made to Abraham and the sign is given to Abraham and the emphasis falls on Abraham rather than his wife Sarah.

2.10.3.1.3. Vows of a Woman

Third observation about the Old Testament situation is that a woman could make vows but the father or the husband could annul those vows (Nu 30).

2.10.3.1.4. Divorce

In the Old Testament a man could divorce his wife by presenting her with a piece of paper in which he said that he had found cause of "uncleanness" with her and sent her off and that was that. There is no question of a court case, the man simply could do it (Dt 24:1-4). But a woman could not do the same thing for her husband. It only applied to the male. And this, I think, has to be borne in mind when we look to the question of divorce today.

I would say that the question of purity and concept of purity are very important in the Old Testament. Such is the question of finding something impure as a ground for divorce.

Back in 1977 I had just flown out from England and on my first weekend here in the apartment where I was staying I saw the film *Jesus of Nazareth*. I am used to fall asleep before the TV. I woke up and saw the question put to Jesus: "Is it right for a man to divorce his wife?" (Mk 10:2) and suddenly I felt I got a new insight into the whole question of Jesus' teaching on marriage and divorce. Prior to that I saw a film in which Prince Charles, who was on leave in Japan, had an affair. The same actor played the part of John the Baptist in *Jesus of Nazareth*.

The thing that struck me was that the real decisive thing is the prior verse in Mk 10. The key lies in verse one. Jesus has come from Galilee into the region beyond the Jordan. This is where John the Baptist taught and preached and that were he was executed. This region was governed by Herod Antipas, who had dumped his wife in order to marry Herodias, who in turn had dumped her husband in order to marry him. It is precisely this union that John the Baptist condemned and this led to his execution. Therefore when the Pharisees come to Jesus and ask the question, they are asking: "Was John the Baptist right to condemn Herod Antipas?" It is a dilemma. If Jesus says that John the Baptist was right then he is risking his neck. If he would say John the Baptist was a bit of a stickler, was narrow minded and he was wrong, then Jesus would have repudiated John the Baptist and repudiated his own baptism and his messiahship.

So what Jesus does is to go back to the beginning. Go behind the law of Moses and say this is the purpose of marriage: "What God had joined together let man not put asunder". It is the person who by their action does whatever it takes to break the marriage apart. That is why Jesus talks about the woman divorcing her husband. Jesus saying has the very specific situation as the background. One needs to take the context of the teaching in mind before proceeding further.

One further thing on the question that in modern cases sexual misconduct is found as ground for a divorce. In the Old Testament this was not the case: Adultery was punished by the Death Penalty. So if one party had broken the promise the other would be free to remarry. This of course is the situation in John 8. What I am saying is that Jesus changes the situation and that the Old Testament situation cannot simply be transferred to us in the Christian Church in the later twentieth century.

2.10.3.1.5. Military Service

The next observation has to do with military service. A man could not be called upon for military service for a whole year after taking a wife. But the explanation that is given has to do with his happiness. Presumably the happiness would be to give time for the birth of the first baby.

The purity laws provide for this in the same way as when a man buys a vineyard which he should enjoy. This throws some light to the invitation of the great feast. Some excuse themselves with the buying of a vineyard.

2.10.3.1.6. The Effect of the Purity Laws

It seems that in term of the purity laws that all those people were fully in their right to decline the invitation. That's what they should have done if they kept to the Law. The invitation of the Gospel is something that supersedes those kind of laws.

Some further clarification on the subject of the purity laws. First thing is that it is very difficult for us in the Western world, in our post Enlightenment culture, it is very difficult to think us back into the Jewish situation. A major work is Mary Douglas's' Book *Purity and Danger* 1966. If you want to get a brief overview to try to get into the importance of purity see the article in *The Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* by J. Green and Howard Marshall, by Steven Westerhom *Clean and Unclean* pages 125-131.

The basic thing to grasp is that to the Jewish mind purity is an ontological concept and not necessarily a moral concept. Ontological has to do with our being. For us purity is a moral concept. But in the Old Testament the basic idea of what makes people clean and unclean is found Leviticus and Numbers 19. Purity involves wholeness, completeness and therefore some animals could not be offered in sacrifice. It had to be without spot. It had to be whole and complete. Now this notion applies to human beings too.

And there are three main causes of impurity: Leprosy, issue from the sexual organs and dead bodies. Thus a person with a discharge of any kind would be impure and could not worship in the temple. In particular women with menstruation are regularly disqualified. I think it is on that account that women are given a certain position in the Old Testament and therefore are disqualified as priests. Should this carry on unto the present age? Now there is an interesting side issue with regard to Jesus' practice. Comparing Jesus with the Dead Sea Scrolls and in particular the Temple Scroll. The Temple Scroll precludes access from the Temple to anybody who is unclean in any way or defective in any way.

And of course this is based on the Old Testament. A priest who had a withered hand or was blind could not qualify as a priest. This is an ontological category that would disqualify. The interesting thing is that those who are defective in any way are excluded from the Temple in the Temple Scroll of Qumran. It is precisely those people that Jesus sought out that constituted his followers.

Women played a very big part among his followers, tax collectors and sinners. He sought out the lepers and healed them and restored them into a relationship with God. If you want to see some discussion of this there is an article in M.J. Wilken *Worship Theology and Ministry in the Early Church* Page 143 contains my article on this.

2.10.3.1.7. Dowries

The price of a bride. Dowries were given with bride (Gen 34:12; Ex 22:15-16). In marriage the father's consent was essential but sometimes the bride also consented (Gen 24:58). The Old Testament has also the practice known as the Levirate Marriage from the Latin *levir* meaning a brother-in-law (Dt 5:5-10; Gen 38:8-9; Ruth; Mt 22:22-33; Mk 12:18-27; Lk 20:27-38).

2.10.3.1.8. Polygamy

Again this is an illustration of male dominance in the society, but also in part of form of social provision for widows. The emphasize falls on the male dominance. If a husband dies, the wife then marries the next brother in line so that he may raise up children to the deceased brother. And this would take place regardless of the marriage status of the brother. The Old Testament sanctions polygamy. Those heroes of the faith Abraham and David all had more than one wife. The practice of polygamy seems to have persisted into New Testament times. Herod has ten wives. The village of Aretas has been excavated and there were 120 men and at least a dozen of them had more than one wife.

2.10.3.1.9. Women in the Place of Worship

Women were permitted into the house of the Lord (1 Sam 1) but in Herod's Temple women were not allowed to go beyond the Court of the Law. They were separated in the Synagogue from the third century onwards. Men could be invited to read the Law (Lk 4), but women were not.

2.10.3.1.10. Women Witnesses

In court cases a point had to be established by at least two male witnesses (Dt 17:6-7; 19:15-16; Nu 35:30). I think this is important in understanding the New Testament situation especially in Jewish circles. Why is it that there are no women apostles? I think that it is bound up with the fact that was already noted and that women could not serve as witnesses.

This carries over into the New Testament when you compare the Gospels with Paul on the Resurrection. Women are among those who witnessed the resurrection and indeed this counts in the Gospels. But I am not sure if this had cut ice with the Jews. In 1 Cor 13 Paul does not mention the women. Why is this? Because women could not count as witnesses like men in the strict sense of Jewish observance.

Paul is operating within the rules of his society and he goes further than most Jews. One cannot understand what is going on without understanding this trajectory and the background.

2.10.3.1.11. The Interpretation of the Image of God

See Gen 1:26-27 and in particular Karl Barth's interpretation in *Church Dogmatics* Vol. 3:1 page 290-. You can see further discussion in my Book *Karl Barth and the Christian Message*.

Barth came up with the idea that the image consisted of male and female in his image. From this Barth drew the conclusion that the image was male and female together. This represents a marked advance for women's rights. The male and female together was the image of God. In particular Adam and Eve together. I have thought about this over the years. My own thinking has been influenced by D.J.A. Clines *The image of God in Man* in Tyndale Bulletin Vol. 16 1968 page 50-100.

I now think that Barth is brilliant but wrong for several reasons. One is that the animals are male and female and indeed plants can be male and female but they are not in the image of God. Barth's view would seem to imply that only husbands and wives can be the image in the proper sense and therefore anyone unmarried or widowed or whatever is less than the image, but in particular Clines is right in saying that the real way of looking at it is the near eastern image.

The deity is thought to dwell in the image. Where Babylonian kings are said to be the image of God. What I would say is that Genesis is saying that the image of God consists in being God's representative. Humans in general constitute God's presence. It is not the marriage relationship as such that is the image. Human beings carry out the function of the image. The image is a job description and is further defined when Genesis says: Let them have dominion over the fish of the sea etc.

It is a stewardship role. But I would want to say that this is given to male and female together. It is a joined function. The other thing I would want to say that is to having relegated the role of women to a subordinate role.

Some women are singled out as playing distinctive leadership roles. Miriam in Ex 15, Deborah was a judge of Israel (Judges 4:4), Ruth, Esther, then there is Rahab (in Joshua) and last and least Jezebel in 1 Kgs 18-22.

Then there is the further point in the wisdom literature, wisdom is depicted as a female figure. In the Old Testament the word of the Lord comes to the prophets giving knowledge to the prophet.

2.10.3.1.12. Conclusion

No Christian Church models its attitude to women according to the Old Testament as a whole. The churches are selective. What I think we need to do is to be conscious of what we are doing in our interpretation of the Old Testament. I would want to go on to say that interpretation involves two steps. First exegesis and exegesis has to do with understanding the meaning of the text. What does the text mean as it is written? But there is a second step which we all make consciously or unconsciously that is hermeneutics.

Not only what is the text saying, but what is its significance for us now. What part should it play in the shaping and framing of our ideas? This second step is just as important as the first.

2.10.3.2. New Testament

2.10.3.2.1. Tim 2:8-

We are reading a problem text in 1 Tim 2:8-

- 8 I desire then that in every place the men should pray, lifting holy hands without anger or quarreling;
- 9 also that women should adorn themselves modestly and sensibly in seemly apparel, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or costly attire
- 10 but by good deeds, as befits women who profess religion.
- 11 Let a woman learn in silence with all submissiveness.
- 12 I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over men; she is to keep silent.
- 13 For Adam was formed first, then Eve;
- 14 and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor.
- 15 Yet woman will be saved through bearing children, if she continues in faith and love and holiness, with modesty. (1:8-15 Timothy 2 RSV)

For many this settles the issue and women are simply not ordained. The second part has to do with the office of the bishop. The bishop here is the pastor of the church, one who has oversight over the local church. This is different from bishops in the Roman Catholic Church. The person here is the pastor of the local church. It is striking that the emphasis is laid on character and not just on the spiritual gifts and not on the ability to communicate but essentially on the character of the minister. The same applies to deacons. They too are to be of similar character. I would see this as again affirming the thought that in the New Testament patterns of ministry were as flexible as they are today. It most important to have the right people with the right character.

- 1 The saying is sure: If any one aspires to the office of bishop, he desires a noble task.
- 2 Now a bishop must be above reproach, the husband of one wife, temperate, sensible, dignified, hospitable, an apt teacher,
- 3 no drunkard, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, and no lover of money.
- 4 He must manage his own household well, keeping his children submissive and respectful in every way;
- 5 for if a man does not know how to manage his own household, how can he care for God's church?
- 6 He must not be a recent convert, or he may be puffed up with conceit and fall into the condemnation of the devil;
- 7 moreover he must be well thought of by outsiders, or he may fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.
- 8 Deacons likewise must be serious, not double-tongued, not addicted to much wine, not greedy for gain; (1 Timothy 3:1-8 RSV)

2.10.3.2.2. Jesus Attitude

Jesus attitude to women changes the situation. True there are no women disciples but there are women followers that play a prominent part. Women are treated on the same footing as men by Jesus. They appear on the same footing as men in the parables. Sometimes you get a parable featuring a man and a same one featuring a woman.

Like the parable of the lost coin which matches the parables of the lost sheep. In these parables the woman fills the part of God. The women seeking the lost coin matching the shepherd seeking the lost sheep. The women putting leaven in the flour. Jesus pictures himself in female guise in the hen gathering her brood (Lk 13:34-35. Mt 24:40-41; Lk 17:35). Man and woman are saved in the same way.

Some scholars draw attention to the role of wisdom in christology (Sirach 51). Jesus' saying in Mt 12:42 about the wisdom of Solomon. If wisdom is feminine then Jesus is the incarnation of the divine wisdom which also has a feminine aspect. Turning to the Acts we find women playing a prominent role.

Priscilla teaches alongside her husband Aquila. Whereas women could teach children in the Old Testament here Priscilla is teaching a man. Lydia is mentioned as a head of the house Acts 16:15 and Paul talks with her and Jewett notes that this action is certainly not common for a Jewish Rabbi to talk to a woman alone. Act 24:8 mention Philipps daughters prophesying. Peter at Pentecost cites Joel 2:28 about the sons and daughters prophesying. Pentecost is a fulfillment of the prophecy (Acts 2:17).

2.10.3.2.3. The Apostle Paul

We have already noted that Paul did not include women in his list in 1 Cor 15. On the other hand in Gal 3:28 he sees women as equal with men as being all one in Christ Jesus. There is a delicate balance between the status of women and slaves and observing the order and rules of the society in which he finds himself. Thus Paul adopts the position: The key to understand Paul is that he is all things to all men. I think part of his subordination teaching has to do with his observance of the law with regard to Jews even though he is not bound by that law.

Paul sees himself as free and not bound to the law and yet he becomes as one under the law in his ministry and work among Jews. And thus while he is free from obligation to observe the law he nevertheless respects it. I see a tension in Paul's teaching and practice.

Thus Paul does not lead a revolution of slaves against their master. He respects what society imposed on them and sends slaves back to their master.

The key seems to me to lie in the statement in 1 Cor 9:19-23. Paul has made himself fitting to the corresponding culture. For the sake of his ministry under the Jews he accepts the Law and to the Gentiles correspondingly their cultural background.

Now it seems to me that this helps to understand his teaching on subordination. He can therefore say in Ephesians: Wives be subordinated to your husband as in the Lord as in Col 8:17-18. He never says: Husbands be subject to your wives. If you follow through the line of his thinking in Ephesians he sees the marriage relationship in term of the relationship of Christ to the church, therefore he assigns a primacy to the husband. Notice that it is a primacy in self-giving and not in dominion. It is not a primacy in giving order and domination but primacy in self-giving. In 1 Cor 7:4 he makes this remarkable paradoxical statement. So in a sense Christian living is a life of paradox. Who is the boss? Nobody. The primacy consists in loving service and self-giving. That might help also why he puts himself under the law.

In 1 Cor 11 he seems to have a hierarchical view of human nature. Christ the head of every man. The head of a woman is her husband. The head of Christ is God. This leads to a very difficult statement about what women should wear in church. In the past it has been used to prescribe that women should wear hats in church. A hat is a compromise. It should be a veil. That is what the text says.

The principal seems to be that the glory of God should not be veiled in the presence of God and hence the men should not wear veils, but woman is the glory of man, hence the glory of man should be veiled in the presence of God. That seems to be the premise of the argument, but the practice today?

That is my best shot at exegesis, but hermeneutics has to do with its meaning for our church today. Those conservative churches should require women to be veiled in Church. Why do we not follow Paul's recommendation? The recommendations were specific to a situation to observe certain convention. Where certain views were understood and significant, But in a situation that is radically changed those recommendations are no longer obligatory to us. I do not recommend women wearing veils.

The most difficult piece of Paul's teaching comes in 1 Tim 2:11- : "I do not allow a women to teach, she is to keep silent." If that is all to it then we should not allow women ordination and we should not allow women to teaching of any kind in the Church. When I went back to England recently they had copies of the Times on the plane. On the front page was a picture of a women cabinet minister received into the Roman Catholic Church because of the Anglican Church position of allowing women's ordination. Her brother is a fairly well known evangelical. It seem to me to be absurd for this women cabinet minister. She should not be a cabinet minister at all. It seems to be inconsistent to allow women to have prominent places in business and not allow them to teach. There are two things I would draw attention to.

2.10.3.2.3.1. Kroeger's New Translation

First a book by Kroeger, Richard and Catherine, Alumni of Fuller. She thinks that the normal translation of the RSV is absolutely wrong. First she says that we need to envisage the background in Ephesians and Asia minor where there were woman teachers in the pagan religions. One of the beliefs that was taught was the supremacy of women, the priority of women.

She argues that the description of what women should wear or not wear fits the situation of the depraved situation with gold and stuff, the instruments of the prostitutes and women priestesses in pagan religion which said that in the beginning was the woman. After all all men come from women.

This verse should be translated as follows:

I do not permit a woman to teach that she is the originator of man, but she is to be in conformity with the Scriptures. For Adam was created first then Eve.

Now there are two points of grammar here. The word translated by RSV "to have authority over men" is *auqentew*. And she argues that it does not necessary mean authority but means the author of and that the word prior to that which is in the RSV prior to "to teach or to have authority" she would translate as "that" *oude*.

If they are right in their interpretation then the way is clear that this is not a prohibition of women's ordination and it certainly seems to fit the context. "For Adam was formed first...."

In chapter 3 Paul then turns to the office of the bishop. The case depends on whether they are right in translating *auqentew* and the letter that they reconstruct. I must say that they have made a strong case but I am not at all convinced. I certainly think that the case is worth looking at. For myself I think that they have not shown that the traditional view in the RSV is wrong. That could still apply in the context that they are reconstructing.

2.10.3.2.3.2. Paul's Own Authority

It could then be as follows: Note first what Paul is saying is what "I do". This is his personal rule, what he himself practices. The next point would be to say that this is his practice.

As far as Paul is concerned, he does not permit women to teach. This would fit 1 Cor 14:34: As in all the churches of the churches..

Even as the Kroeger's are right there still is this question: The traditional interpretation of 1 Tim fits the traditional interpretation of 1 Cor.

The reference to Adam and Eve: Paul is saying look at the classic case where a woman was permitted to teach and look what happened to Adam and the disastrous consequences. But that nevertheless does not say that women are not saved but they will be saved if they continue in faith.

2.10.4. My View on Ordination of Women

How then do I come out in the question of ordination of women?

First I would have to say that the general look at the New Testament must be a look as a whole, a look at where the trajectories are pointing. It is not simply a matter of exegesis, the question is also what is the significance of the passage today.

Like the veiling? Paul is making the recommendation that he himself follows as a Jew under the Law. What if circumstances change and are different for us today? For me the fundamental difference in ministry is bound up with needs and gifts. If there is a need for a ministry and the Spirit applies the gifts for the ministry then it seems to me that the precedence of the New Testament is permitting us the ordination of women. It is the hermeneutical issue that finally decides me on the issue.

I would have to say that I am not crazy of the idea of having a sole women pastor of a church. I am not crazy of the idea of a man being the sole pastor. Ministry should be shared. Ministry in the New Testament is a shared ministry. It is not against woman, but a biblical pattern is a pattern of shared ministry. I would have no objections to a women being the chief pastor in a church.

My Book *Christianity and Christian Thought* contains a note at the role of women in different ages. I have found this an interesting and illuminating thing to do. When I wrote the book I realized that it was written from a male point of view. I decided that it would be a useful thing to look at two things: Significant women teachers and thinkers.

Secondly the way women had been treated in the ages. It seems that women have been assigned a subordinate role in the history of the church because of two things.

- The way that the negative teaching of Paul as in 1 Tim 2 has been taken as normative for the role of the women.
- This has been put together with what major philosophers like Plato had said about women. That women were defective males. There was the theory that in the human generation that something had gone wrong with the semen and that this result was the second best when the women was conceived. If you put Plato and Aristotle together with the most negative teaching of the Bible then it is not surprising that women have been assigned subordinate role.

In 1 Tim 2 it is a point that Eve was responsible for the Fall. This is very well laid out by the Kroeger's in their book. Paul is saying this is the classic case of what happened. Adam does not come out to well here as well.

2.10.4.1. Saved by Bearing Children?

The question is: Why are women saved **by** child-bearing? They are saved **through** child-bearing. It is a statement that is bound up that the pains of child-bearing is a judgment on women. In a sense this is a reassurance that women can be saved.

2.10.4.2. Glory?

See 1 Cor 11. The concept of glory is one of the most difficult and at the same time one of the most important in Biblical Theology. The short answer is: I do not know in this context. Glory seems to have to do with the manifestation, the manifest splendour of God. It may be that Paul is saying that the woman is the manifest splendor of the male. I would have to say elsewhere that is bound with the glory filling the tabernacle and the presence of God. In Romans the continuous thought is the loss of glory of splendor through sin. And the ultimate restoration of that splendor. The transformation in chapter 8. It appears in every chapter. The woman is the splendor of man. In one sense a subordination but also an up-playing.

3. Eschatology

3.1. Different Approaches

Here are seven approaches. For more details see my article on *The Parusia and Eschatology in the New Testament* in NIDNTT.

3.1.1. American Evangelicalism

Here I simply want to note that American Evangelicalism has generally been preoccupied with the question of the Millennium and the judgment of the lost.

In particular the Millennium in God's scheme of things. For most American Evangelicals the question has been when will the Millennium happen?

3.1.1.1. Postmillennialism

This view was put forth by Charles Hodge and B.B. Warfield. The view that the present Gospel Age would lead into the Millennium which would be followed by the Great Tribulation and then the Parusia.

3.1.1.2. Premillennialism

This view maintains that Christ will return to set up his Millennial Kingdom prior to the Great Tribulation and then the end comes.

Premillennialism involves different dispensations in History. Fuller Theological Seminary used to have a premillennial clause in its Statement of Faith but it was removed on an initiative by Paul Jewett. Some felt that this was the first step down to liberalism.

Trinity Seminary has a premillennialist clause in its Statement of Faith. That was the first job offered in the United States for me which was very attractive. There were many reasons why I declined the offer. One of the reasons was the premillennial position. The more I looked at it the more I became persuaded that the New Testament does not teach it.

3.1.1.3. Amillennialism

The thought that the whole thing is a big mistake.

3.1.2. Little Apocalypse Theory

This is linked with T. Colani, a French scholar, who in 1864 published a book *On Jesus and the Messianic Beliefs of His Time*. The theory has to do with Mark 13 and the parallels. In Mark 13 Jesus and his disciples are looking at the Temple and the disciples say: "Look teacher how beautiful," and Jesus says: "There will nothing be left on each other". The disciples respond: "Tell us when this will be" (Mk 13:4). According to Colani Jesus' answer comes in verse 32: "But of that day no one knows." In other words: "I have no clue."

The Little Apocalypse Theory says that all the verses in between 4-32 that constitute an apocalypse, an account of the end of the world. Colani believed that Jesus was a good theologian. The apocalypse was written by somebody else drawing on the belief of the time in order to make Jesus more credible. Colani says it is all the invention of someone else attributed to Jesus.

3.1.3. Consistent Eschatology

This originated with Albert Schweitzer *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* 1911. The book is really a history of attempts to recover the life of Jesus originally entitled *From Reimarus to Wrede*. Reimarus lived in 18th century and believed that Jesus was simply a reformer. He had no intention of founding a new religion. The kingdom of God was God's reign and he believed that this could happen on earth. Jesus became more and more fanatic over time and believed that the Kingdom could come when he went to Jerusalem and died. He died despairing on the Cross.

The belief that Christ was risen from the dead and would come again in judgment was according to Reimarus the invention of the disciples. There had a nice easy time following Jesus, they did not have to work. When it became appearing that there was no persecution they invented the story of the resurrection.

Schweitzer regarded this as the most intelligent discovery in history (See NIDNTT and my article on the *Historical Jesus in Jesus and the Gospels*).

The Kingdom of God meant God's ethical lordship over man. A.B. Ritschl had a son-in-law J. Weiss and while Ritschl was alive the son-in-law did not venture to publish his view. J. Weiss came to believe that the Jesus of the Gospels thought that the kingdom was something that would break into time at the end of the age. It was not just business as usual or more moral lives. The kingdom that Jesus proclaimed was something that would break into history involving the transformation of history. According to Weiss Jesus believed that this would come about. Jesus preached that it would come about, but no more than that. Jesus did not know who would inaugurate it.

Along comes Albert Schweitzer and turns Weiss' Eschatology into **Consistent Eschatology**.

The difference is that according to Schweitzer Jesus himself thought that he would inaugurate the kingdom and that it would come about as Reimarus depicted it. Eventually he would die a martyr's death giving his life a ransom for many and God would then inaugurate the kingdom. For Schweitzer this was the alternative to greater skepticism (meaning you cannot know anything at all).

Schweitzer had the theory of the **Messianic Secret**. Jesus believed himself to be the Son of Man and the Messiah, but told only a few people.

A number of scholars think that the Son of Man is someone else than Jesus. Schweitzer says that Jesus thinks of himself in terms of Daniel 7. The secret was told to Peter and Peter told it to two others.

Judas act of betrayal was a not leading people to Jesus place. Judas betrayal was that he was going to stand as a witness that Jesus believed himself to be the Son of Man and therefore had authority over the Temple.

In Mk 14:61-62 the High Priest asks: "Are you the blessed?". Jesus answer is: "I Am". The High priest treats it as blasphemy. If Jesus is the Son of Man then he has more authority than the high priest. For Schweitzer "Consistent Eschatology" is the key to understand the New Testament. Schweitzer does not believe it himself and neither the resurrection except in terms of having a mystical experience.

3.1.4. **Realized Eschatology**

This is linked with the name of C.H. Dodd (Dodd's book *On the Parables of the Kingdom* 1936). Dodd based his teaching on his understanding of the parables and sought to put a distance between Jesus and popular eschatology of his time.

Jesus says the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. Jesus believed that the kingdom was already breaking through his own ministry and thus the future eschaton, the future end, was being moved into the present.

And thus the burden of Jesus own teaching was the experience of God in the present time rather than the future fireworks that people saw in Mk 13. What mattered was turning to God in the here and now.

And Dodd believed that Paul changed his mind over the course of time. Early in first and second Colossians Paul talks about judgment and so on. Later Paul puts more emphasis on the present time and the present experience of time.

The fourth Gospel more or less teaches a realized eschatology. Whoever believes has already passed from death to life. Dodd came to think that maybe Realized Eschatology was not the right way to put it because he realized a future element missing in his teaching. A eschatology in process of performing. Dodd's emphasis is more on the present on the breaking in of the kingdom through the ministry of Jesus.

3.1.5. Bultmann and Demythologization

Bultmann was the dominant figure in German New Testament studies from the 1920s through the 1960s. I think Bultmann is best understood as a representative of the History-of-Religion school. Christianity must be understood as a part of the history of religions generally, especially those of the near east. The ideas that we find in Christianity are to be understood in terms of the influence of other religions like Judaism on Christianity.

The New Testament therefore pictures everything in terms of a mythical world view. The idea of heaven and hell, angels and demons, a heavenly redeemer sent from heaven to redeem humankind and life after death. All these are mythical ideas inappropriate for us today because we have outgrown such ideas.

Therefore the Christian message must be demythologized, In particular Bultmann identifies two sources. One was the Jewish Apocalyptic and the other was Gnosticism.

Bultmann believed that when you have demythologized the message you will be left with the Cross and the Resurrection. This becomes our self-understanding and liberation from the world. Paul talks about the cares of the flesh. For Bultmann this is a way of talking about both inauthentic existence and authentic existence. The message of the New Testament can be explained in term of existential philosophy taught by Heidegger. The form of eschatology belongs to myth. (See my little book *Philosophy and the Christian Faith* which covers Bultmann among others.)

3.1.6. Salvation History

This is linked with Oscar Cullmann who believed that the key to understanding the Bible lies in the notion of Salvation History. What is the Bible? The Bible gives us Salvation History in the form of the record of God's saving acts in history.

First in the history of Israel and the redemption from Egypt. The story of the exile. Then the return. All this by way of preparing for salvation in the history of Jesus Christ. Cullmann wrote a lot of books. One of the earliest was *Christ and Time*. Time is like a line with a beginning and an end. History is like a line. But salvation is the story of God's intervention in history. Cullmann explained it like this: D-Day was of course the Allied Invasion of Normandy which marked the beginning of the end of the Second World War. That was in fact the decisive victory in the war, what turned things around. For Cullmann Christ death and resurrection is like D-Day, but the war still needs to be won. There is still resistance. We are living between D-Day and Victory Day.

3.1.7. Pannenberg and Moltmann

These are examples of eschatology in Systematic Theology. W. Pannenberg represents a reaction to Biblical Theology and theologies which laid stress on the word of God. Whether you are thinking of Barth's or Bultmann's view of the kerygma, the proclamation of the resurrection of Jesus as a means of salvation. These theologies lay too much stress on the word. Rather Pannenberg wants to look at history as the sphere of salvation, but he wants to take a broader view than Cullmann.

Cullmann's only interest is in salvation history in the Bible. Pannenberg is interested in world history. History is the medium of revelation. In what sense can we say that history reveals? History reveals in the broad sense that everything that happens is a revelation of reality. But does it all have any sense? Could it be like a tail towed by an idiot signifying nothing?

Our problem as people living in history is that we do not know how it is going to end. We are like people going into the movies and leaving before it is finished.

The decisive thing is the event of Jesus Christ (Pannenberg). In a sense the Resurrection give us a sneak preview of the end of history and thus of the meaning of history. A glimpse into the end and thus enables us to interpret history from that standpoint.

Moltmann also stresses eschatology. But in a different way. Moltmann stresses the factor of hope and the role of hope in human experience. Hope is as it were a driving factor in human experience.

God is inside of the Marxist Philosopher E. Bloch. You could perhaps illustrate it by asking the question: Why does Elizabeth Taylor keep on getting married? She is driven by hope. Life is got to be better. Moltmann is saying that hope is a factor in human experience. In a sense the future, this expectation of the future is not just one thing among many but something that affects our thinking and doing. Therefore all Christian theology should be conducted from the standpoint of the hope for the future of God. Our hope should be directed to the hope of the future of God.

In *The Crucified God* Moltmann says that death does not make any sense. Death is a denial of life, the end of life, it mocks the meaning in life. But in the death of Christ God has entered into that experience of meaninglessness and annihilation of pain and therefore theology ought always to be a theology of the Cross. The Cross is not one subject alongside others in our thinking about God. Thinking should be conducted in the light of the theology of the Cross, which leads to a theology of the Resurrection. We live between the theology of the Cross and the theology of hope.

3.2. Jesus' Teaching

3 And as he sat on the Mount of Olives opposite the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew asked him privately, 4 "Tell us, when will this be, and what will be the sign when these things are all to be accomplished?"

5 And Jesus began to say to them, "Take heed that no one leads you astray. 6 Many will come in my name, saying, 'I am he!' and they will lead many astray. 7 And when you hear of wars and rumors of wars, do not be alarmed; this must take place, but the end is not yet. 8 For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; there will be earthquakes in various places, there will be famines; this is but the beginning of the birth-pangs.

9 "But take heed to yourselves; for they will deliver you up to councils; and you will be beaten in synagogues; and you will stand before governors and kings for my sake, to bear testimony before them. 10 And the gospel must first be preached to all nations. 11 And when they bring you to trial and deliver you up, do not be anxious beforehand what you are to say; but say whatever is given you in that hour, for it is not you who speak, but the Holy Spirit.

12 And brother will deliver up brother to death, and the father his child, and children will rise against parents and have them put to death; 13 and you will be hated by all for my name's sake. But he who endures to the end will be saved.

14 "But when you see the *desolating sacrilege* set up where it ought not to be (let the reader understand), then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains; 15 let him who is on the housetop not go down, nor enter his house, to take anything away; 16 and let him who is in the field not turn back to take his mantle. 17 And alas for those who are with child and for those who give suck in those days! 18 Pray that it may not happen in winter. 19 For in those days there will be such tribulation as has not been from the beginning of the creation which God created until now, and never will be. 20 And if the Lord had not shortened the days, no human being would be saved; but for the sake of the elect, whom he chose, he shortened the days.

21 And then if any one says to you, 'Look, here is the Christ!' or 'Look, there he is!' do not believe it. 22 False Christs and false prophets will arise and show signs and wonders, to lead astray, if possible, the elect. 23 But take heed; I have told you all things beforehand. 24 "But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light, 25 and the stars will be falling from heaven, and the powers in the heavens will be shaken. 26 And then they will see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory. 27 And then he will send out the angels, and gather his elect from the four winds, from the ends of the earth to the ends of heaven.

28 "From the fig tree learn its lesson: as soon as its branch becomes tender and puts forth its leaves, you know that summer is near. 29 So also, when you see these things taking place, you know that he is near, at the very gates. 30 Truly, I say to you, this generation will not pass away before all these things take place. 31 Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away. 32 "But of that day or that hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father. (Mark 13 RSV)

See my article in NIDNTT on *Parusia*. It looks into more detail and also covers the teaching of Paul.

Among recent studies is Ben Witherington III *Jesus, Paul and the End of the World*. A book that lays out the issues and is fair. He does not disguise his position. Since that was published George Beasley-Murray came out with *Jesus and the Last Days*. Beasley-Murray in the fifties wrote a book called *Jesus and the Future*. This new book represents Beasley-Murray reappraisal of the debate and it takes into account the different positions that have appeared since he wrote his first book. This is the guide to the teaching of Jesus.

G. Beasley-Murray has given a summary of his teaching in an article *The Vision on the Mount: The Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13* in Ex Auditu (Annual Journal which is devoted to a particular topic each year) Vol. 6 1990 page 39-52. This issue looked at eschatology. The volume also contains a study of Leslie Allen on the Old Testament. It is recommended for an overview of the state of discussion.

I would also recommend N.T. Wright *The New Testament and the People of God* Vol. 1 of five Volumes planned. This is a book that gives a valuable reappraisal of what the New Testament is saying and what the Church is about.

What is the meaning of Mark 13? I have read Mark 13 but in fact there are parallels in Matthew 24 and Luke 17:20-37 and Luke 21:5-36. What is Jesus talking about? There seem to be two contradictory positions set out in this discourse.

3.2.1. Distant Events in Mark 13?

One position views that Jesus is talking about distant events at the end of the world. Things which will precede the last judgment and the second coming of Christ.

- I. The wars that will happen, nation rising against nation, earthquakes in various places, famines (Mk 13:8). This is suggesting for many, catastrophic events which will get worse and worse towards the end of time.
- II. The statement that before the end comes, the Gospel must be preached to all nations. This in verse 10 is part of the evangelistic mandate of the Church.
- III. The Tribulation in verse 19.
- IV. The cosmic events spoken of in 24 and 25. The shaking of heavens and the earth. The Parusia of the Son of Man on the clouds and the in gathering of the elect.

For this four reasons many say that this discourse is about the endtime, about what will happen at the end of history.

3.2.2. Imminent Events in Mark 13?

There are reasons that this envisaged events are something to happen soon, it is not a distant event but a near event. Again four reasons:

- I. The reference to the disciples being brought before synagogues and governors. It envisages situations which with the disciples were familiar. These are situations of the first century.
- II. The "you" in verse 14 is a direct address to the disciples.

- III. The reference to Judaea. Verse 14: "Let those who are in Judaea flee into the mountains." This is a local situation and this situation seems to be developed in the next verse.
- IV. The wording "this generation". "Truly I say to you this generation will not pass away before all these things take place." "This generation" suggests that it will all happen within the lifetime of this generation.

3.2.3. Explanations

So then what do we make of it? Let us look at some answers.

- I. It would all make sense if the end of the world had happened in the next thirty years. The two things would fit together very well. Therefore the opposite view is to think that the whole thing is discredited and the fact that these things did not happen have certainly been put forward from time to time as reasons for unbelief. Reimarus put forth that the early Church preached the coming of the Son of Man on the clouds and it got postponed and rarely anyone noticed that these things did not happen.
- II. A view favored by evangelicals is to say that the whole thing is like looking at a mountain range. The peaks look close together when you look at it but in point of fact they are miles apart. Therefore this contains things that are going to happen soon and things that are going to happen later.
- III. Beasley-Murray's final position is to say that the discourses of Jesus as we have got them in the New Testament put together material from different times and situations. Thus the Sermon on the Mount is presented formally as a convention as a continuous sermon, but it is in fact a composition drawing on different materials that Jesus presented in different times and presenting it together for stylistic reasons. The discourse of Mark 13 is something similar putting together elements of Jesus' teaching about what will happen soon and what will happen later. This is a variant of the mountain range view. Obviously these are life options.

3.2.4. My own approach

I look at various elements in the discourse and then try to put them together and then we will see where it leads. Are there any things in this discourse that we can nail down? That we can be certain what this refers to?

3.2.4.1. "This Generation"

The first thing comes up in Verse 30. "This generation will not pass away". The Greek here is *genea*. Some have suggested that it would make sense if it meant the race in particular the Jewish race and the Jewish people. This would allow for all these things to happen over a long time. "This generation has not passed away".

But having said that it seems to me (see article on *Generation* in NIDNTT. I was prompted to write it by wrestling with this issue) that the most plausible meaning here is the present generation. A life span of thirty years. Why think that this is the present generation? There are other references to the term "this generation" (Mt 17:17; Mk 8:38; Mt 12:39; Lk 11:29; Acts 2:40; Phil 2:15). The most obvious sense would be generation refers to the contemporary generation.

3.2.4.2. "Abomination of Desolation"

What the RSV calls the "desolating sacrilege" or in the KJV "the abomination of desolation". On the long term the interpretation of this is some great evil thing that will happen in the future and the readers do understand it but it has not happened yet. Here I follow Beasley-Murray's article in NIDNTT.

For a similar more recent interpretation from one of the leading German New Testament scholars Gerd Theissen in Heidelberg *The Gospels in Context* 1991 and in particular his discussion of this passage in chapter 3. Theissen has a very interesting interpretation.

Now what is this abomination of desolation. Can it be identified? Beasley-Murray and Theissen say yes and they are both following Nestle back in 1884 and they think that Nestle unraveled the problem. The phrase occurs here in Mark 13:13 and in the parallel Mt 24:15. But it has actually been taken from Dan 12:11 and it appears with slight variations in Dan 9:37; 11:31 and 1 Makk 1:54-.

In Daniel it has something to do with the Temple and the altar in the Temple. The removal of the continual burnt offering and in its place the abomination of desolation being set up. What lies behind the Hebrew expression? Beasley-Murray suggest it means an abomination which causes desolation. An abomination which causes spiritual desolation. Something that causes horror in the mind of those who see it or spiritual religious desolation in some form or other.

Nestle further argued that really there is a play on words in Hebrew. It is a play on words which turns on the Hebrew for Lord of Heaven. The Lord of Heaven is a pagan deity identified with Zeus who was the chief of the pagan gods. In Hebrew it is Ba'al Shamajin. Now the Jews could read the term and with a slight change of vowels pronounce it as Baal Shomain and what you get is the Lord who makes desolation.

What is it then? The story is told in 1 Makk 1:54 of what Antiochus Epiphanes did in the Temple. In 175-165 BC he invaded the Holy Land and caused a pagan altar to be set up in the Jewish Temple. And in 1 Makk 1:55 you have a description of the episode which triggered the Makkabean revolt.

Nestle is suggesting is that the original abomination was this incident in which a pagan altar was erected. That the Daniel book is about that situation written in a kind of code putting it into earlier times and describing the situation that lead to this reform. That is the basis of abomination and desolation.

What might it mean in the present discourse? Beasley-Murray's answer and that of Theissen and David Wenham is to say that it is a case of history repeating itself. Something similar that either might happen or did happen in the Temple.

Beasley-Murray finds another clue when he looks at Luke. Luke does not give "Abomination and Desolation" but has Jerusalem surrounded by armies Lk 21:20: "When you see Jerusalem surrounded..."

In other words Luke decodes the code. Jerusalem surrounded by armies. What would they have? Standards dedicated and depicting Roman deities. Beasley-Murray says that the "Abomination Desolation" refers to the invasion of the Temple by those armies and the destruction of the Temple. Something like that took place in 68 AD meaning within "this generation".

Theissen has an interesting variant. Theissen thinks that this discourse existed round about AD 40. This composition was not composed after the event but 30 years before it and in particular Theissen links it with the Roman Emperor Caligula. Caligula planned to invade the Temple and set up a statue of himself around that time.

And Theissen thinks that this phrase could have been seen by those who copied this document as a reference to Caligula's action. Caligula died before he could do it (AD 40). There is one further thing about Roman Standards. Out of respect to the Jews the Standards were kept in Ceasarea. And thus normally the Roman procurator would not bring the Standards to encourage good race relations.

If this is correct we seem to have two indicators that Jesus is talking about the coming judgment on the Temple which is linked with the rejection by the leaders of himself and the disciples. Namely this generation and the prophecy of the coming destruction being understood as history repeating itself. Just as 1 Makk saw it as a judgment on Israel so this is understood likewise.

3.2.4.3. Language of Mark 13

The next thing we need to look at is the language of Mark 13.

3.2.4.3.1. Terminology

My thinking here was influenced by studying the work of my friend Dick France and in particular his doctoral thesis dealing with Jesus and the Old Testament. Which is a study of Matthew's account of Jesus and his use of the Old Testament. See NIDNTT on *Parusia and Eschatology*.

Typically is the language about the sun and the moon not giving light and the Son of Man coming in the clouds. These expressions have been understood as cosmic events which could not have happened in the lifetime of Jesus. However these phrases are taken from the language of prophecy.

Thus in Mk 13:24-25 this is language which is found earlier in Isa 13:10; 34:4 and if you look at Isaiah 13:10 you will see that the first of this passages predicts the doom of Babylon and the second abomination.

Similar examples: Ezechiel 32:7 concerning Egypt; Amos 8:9; Joel 2:10 concerning Juda and repeatedly Joel 3 and 4 concerning God's judgment on Juda. See France's book and J.M. Kik his book on Matthew 24. What they are suggesting is that the language looks as if it is describing cosmic events the earth coming apart. But this, they argue, is the language of prophecy concerning this worldly events, events in history the overthrow of Babylon.

The point is that this language is used to describe ordinary events like burnings and catastrophes. Events you can see every day in Jugoslawia. This kind of cosmic language is used to attach a kind of divine dimension to it. It is a kind of metaphor a symbolic way of talking about judgment.

Thus Jesus is not predicting abnormal astronomical events. What he is predicting is judgment on the Jewish nation using the Old Testament language of judgment.

3.2.4.3.2. The Coming of the Son of Man

Mark 13:26 takes up the language of Dan 7:13. That is then "they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory". Typically this verse has been taken to refer to the return of Christ on the clouds coming back to earth in judgment. But it is the language of Dan 7:13 about the Son of Man or one like unto a Son of Man.

13 I saw in the night visions, and behold, with the clouds of heaven there came **one like a son of man**, and he came to the Ancient of Days and was presented before him.
14 And to him was given dominion and glory and kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed. (Daniel 7 RSV)

You have got another reference to coming in clouds. D. France asks: In which direction is he coming? Typically this was understood as coming back to earth. The symbolism of Daniel is in the opposite direction coming to the Father. France suggests that this does not refer to the visible return of Christ to earth but to the coming of Jesus to the Father with authority.

What you would see on earth as proof of it would be the judgment, the judgment of the Temple which had rejected Jesus. But in terms of where he is coming to, he is coming to the Father. If that is correct again it would fit the destruction of the Temple. Cosmic language describing worldly events. Dan 7 is a description of the ascension.

3.2.4.3.3. The High Priest sees it

And if one reads on to Mark 14 then you have another reference to it. This is Jesus confronted by the High Priest.

61 But he was silent and made no answer. Again the high priest asked him, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" 62 And Jesus said, "I am; and you will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven." 63 And the high priest tore his garments, and said, "Why do we still need witnesses?" (Mark 14 RSV)

Why could the high priest see that event? He will see it when his own power is taken away and Jesus would be given authority and judgment. This would fit the fall of Jerusalem and what Jesus replies to the high priest.

If the Jews really believed that the Lord dwelled in the temple then the visible sign would be like that.

Matthew 24 does not fit well. I would say the gathering of the elect refers to the gathering of the Church. I see certainly a reference to what would happen after the death and resurrection of Jesus. I certainly do not see a rapture of the elect.

France point is that this language can be understood without reference if any astronomical events actually took place. I do not think the argument is necessary. See France *On the Jesus in the Old Testament*.

3.3. Expectations of the End of the World

Expectations of the end of the world which would return to the original fire explosion was part of Stoic philosophy but not part of Jewish thought. Jews did not expect the end of the world. What we have in a lot of Christian interpretation is really a lot of fusion drawn unconsciously from Stoic philosophy right into this passages.

When Luke spoke this way they were not expecting the dissolution of this world. This leads Tom Wright to ask about Jewish expectations. In this connection I would draw attention to Hurst and Wright *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament* and the article by Markus Borg *An Orthodoxy reconsidered "The End of the World Jesus"* pages 207-217. In particular he is examining the kind of position that Schweitzer held. The Consistent Eschatology.

This really does not fit the outlook of Jesus. Tom Wright himself developed this point that has to do with the language of apocalyptic. Wright puts forward a novel thesis concerning Mark's Gospel. Everybody recognizes that Mark 13 contains apocalyptic. Wright argues that the entire Gospel is apocalyptic if it is rightly understood.

Wright says typically apocalyptic has been understood in a Stoic way, but his argument is really an extension of France's observation about this terms. Apocalyptic is not a genre upon the end of the world but it is a way of talking about God's action in history. That Jews in Jesus's day were not looking for the end of time, but for the fulfillment of God's promise to give them the land, to free them from their enemies and to restore prosperity in a renewed relationship with God.

They were looking for the restoration of the land deliverance renewed prosperity. All this of course in the context of a renewed relationship with God. I think if you look at Luke there are things like the Benedictus. That was the kind of things Jews were looking for. The primary focus of the discourse in Mark 13 is indeed what will happen in the coming generation. And if there is a reference beyond that it is to be understood in the light of the kind of judgment that is described as what will happen in history. If there is a judgment at the end of the world, it will be a kind of repetition of this judgment that took place in AD 70.

Finally if you look at the reference to the fig tree which follows the discourse about looking for the fruit. This means: Read the signs of the time, reinforcing the view that the primary focus of this passage is what will happen in this generation.

The burden of Mark 13 is not about the return of Jesus to the earth. If we are talking about the final end of things then we have got to look elsewhere for it. Essentially the theme of the passage has to do with the coming judgment in response to the destruction of the Temple. "Not one stone on the other" The burden has to do with the Temple. And therefore we have to understand the cosmic language of apocalyptic and prophecy in order to understand what the New Testament is saying. It is not saying that it is referring to the destruction of the world here.

3.4. The Millennium

This is a subject of importance to evangelicals and especially historically at any rate to American Evangelicals. If there is one book that helps to get a handle on the subject it is Robert J. Clouse *The Meaning of the Millennium*. It is valuable because it consists of the positions of four people including G. Ladd who is a Professor at Fuller. He was in many ways the most important evangelical scholar of his generation. Especially in regard to the kingdom and millennial teaching. He was brought up a dispensationalist but he developed his own teaching. Herman Hoyt represents the dispensationalist premillennial position, Ladd historic premillennialism, Loren Boettner postmillennialism and then the amillennial position by Antony Huckemer of Calvin Seminary.

There are various books referred to in the course outline. A very useful historical study is Webba *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming* at Denver Seminary. He looks at the development of premillennialism.

1 Then I saw an angel coming down from heaven, holding in his hand the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain. 2 And he seized the dragon, that ancient serpent, who is the Devil and Satan, and bound him **for a thousand years**, 3 and threw him into the pit, and shut it and sealed it over him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years were ended. After that he must be loosed for a little while. 4 Then I saw thrones, and seated on them were those to whom judgment was committed. Also I saw the souls of those who had been beheaded for their testimony to Jesus and for the word of God, and who had not worshiped the beast or its image and had not received its mark on their foreheads or their hands. They came to life, and reigned with Christ a thousand years. 5 The rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were ended. This is the first resurrection. 6 Blessed and holy is he who shares in the first resurrection! Over such the second death has no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and they shall reign with him a thousand years. 7 And when the thousand years are ended, Satan will be loosed from his prison 8 and will come out to deceive the nations which are at the four corners of the earth, that is, Gog and Magog, to gather them for battle; their number is like the sand of the sea. 9 And they marched up over the broad earth and surrounded the camp of the saints and the beloved city; but fire came down from heaven and consumed them, 10 and the devil who had deceived them was thrown into the lake of fire and sulphur where the beast and the false prophet were, and they will be tormented day and night for ever and ever. (Revelation 20 RSV)

3.4.1. The Importance of the Subject

Obviously the Millennium is something important in his own right. It means 1000 years and the doctrine of the Millennium is like this passage in Rev 20 about the binding of Satan for a thousand years. If there is a period of a thousand years then it is important in its own right.

The way you view the Millennium will affect the view of God's purposes. And the view of future history. It is important because it will affect your hermeneutic. The way you think of theology. If you believe in a Millennium then it will affect the way you read prophecy. It will affect the way you read different phases.

It will affect the view of the nation of Israel. Where Israel stands in relation to the purposes of God. The establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 and some would see the establishment of that state in relation to the rebuilding of Jerusalem as in a sense the capital of the world. The view of the Millennium especially if you are a dispensationalist will affect the view of political events.

It will affect the way you preach the Gospel. If you believe for example that God is going to establish a kingdom on earth for a thousand years it certainly will affect the way you preach. If you will believe that there will be a great tribulation but that the saints will be enraptured then part of your preaching will have to do with inviting people to join you and avoid the tribulation. I think this topic is important in its own right but also because it affects all kinds of other things.

3.4.2. Review of the History of Attitudes

In the early Church a number of church fathers were known as Chiliasts from the Greek *chilia* meaning a thousand. Meaning they looked for the reign of God on earth in terms of Rev 20. Now how deeply they were committed to a form of teaching that resembles later dispensationalism I am not sure. See for example Irenaeus *Against the Heresy*. He is teaching on the kingdom. It seems to be somewhat remote.

Nevertheless a number believed in the establishment of the kingdom on earth. Augustine rejected millennial teaching and his position was endorsed by the Council of Ephesus.

By and large the Protestant reformers were against millennial teaching. Extravagant teachings were often justified by Revelation. It is a source of information for all sorts of nuts and wacky interpretations. Especially those in 1530 who sought to build the kingdom in the town of Münster. They tried to implement various Scriptures and introduce the reign of the saints with disastrous results.

There were groups in the Church who had all sorts of strange teachings which brought Millennialism into discredit. It was revived in the 10th century by J.N. Darby 1800-1882. He developed the Plymouth Brethren and developed dispensationalism.

In order to make sense of Revelation, Darby proposed and divided different phases of history into dispensations. Jesus was seen to establish the kingdom of God. However the Jews rejected Jesus and therefore the kingdom was postponed and so we are living in the current church age waiting for the coming establishment of the kingdom which will take place when Satan is bound as described in Rev 20.

Darby's teaching influenced D.L. Moody the evangelist and in turn Scofield the compiler of the Scofield Reference Bible which gained prestige by being printed by Oxford University Press and became the Bible for many evangelical Christians. When I was converted in the 1940s I asked what kind of Bible should I buy? The answer was the Scofield Reference Bible.

If you would like to see more on Scofield: There is a book in the library which is vitriolic and full of mistakes nevertheless it provides an account of him: Joseph N. Hanfield *The Incredible Scofield and his Book*. Of course more recently people like Hal Lindsey and Dallas Seminary have taken up the topic. And a number of evangelical churches and Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. So then by an large for them 19th century onwards through Darby, Moody and Scofield evangelicalism has become identified with premillennialisms.

3.4.3. Premillennialism

Here I am going to look at some arguments from Clouse. But not in the order that they appear. For some reason Ladd is put in first but one cannot understand Ladd's position without understanding dispensationalism. Ladd is a reaction to the excesses of dispensationalism.

3.4.3.1. Evaluating Theories

One of the interesting features of Clouse's book is that each of the writers write their article and all the others write their reactions to it.

In looking at these different theories I want to suggest that in evaluating any position there are three things that you can do:

3.4.3.1.1. **Theory Fits the Data?**

Ask whether the view fits the data. Specifically in the case of the Millennium ask what data supports the claims.

3.4.3.1.2. **Theory Fits my Beliefs and Understanding?**

Ask how the theory fits the larger world of your beliefs and understanding. Let me give an illustration: Supposedly you have got two rival world views. One says the world is round and the other says the world is flat. I can test both view by the specific data. I live up in Altadena, I come down to Fuller and go back 5 days a week. This is my life. That experience would in fact fit either theory. Specifically it fits the theory that the world is slopy. The specific data in this case might fit all theories.

Which of these theories fits my general understanding? I discount the theory that the world is flat because my general world view including my experience of looking at the sun and the moon dictates it. This theory fits better the theory that the earth is round. That is my background beliefs.

3.4.3.1.3. **Is it useful?**

Ask does the theory yield useful knowledge? Does it lead on to other theories that may also help to explain history or my understanding of reality? In each of these views we can ask these types of questions.

3.4.3.2. Herman Hoyt

3.4.3.2.1. **Scriptures Central Theme is the Kingdom of God**

His claim is that the central theme of Scripture is the kingdom of God. So the basis of the dispensation list position is the claim that the kingdom of God is the central theme. Hoyt lists statistics: 450 times kingdom in the New Testament and so on. The theme runs through the whole Bible.

He sees the Bible like a play in two acts. Act 2 must be read in the light of act 1. If we had to give the Bible a title we could call it *The Book of the Coming Kingdom*.

3.4.3.2.2. His Principle of Interpreting Scripture

It is important to notice his principle of interpretation which affects the way he reads Scripture. He says that Scripture is given in clear straightforward language (KJV). It is a message intended for the rank and file people of all classes. Not for special theologians. All this argues for a principle of interpretation that brings the interpretation to the normal people. It is taking Scripture in their literal and normal sense. This applies to the all the Bible. This also applies to historical language. Any other interpretation robs God's people of the message contained in the Bible.

3.4.3.2.3. Description of the Kingdom

When applied to the kingdom it means that the kingdom is to be understood in a real literal sense (page 78). Literal in every sense of the word. The kingdom is not an abstract idea. This will be a real kingdom. The actual place of its location will be Jerusalem. According to Obadaja 12:31 a real king will sit on a real throne. Nations will participate in its welfare and deliverance. The wicked kingdoms will be brought to an end. The kingdom will be a revival of the Davidic Kingdom (Acts 15:16-18).

A faithful remnant will be restored and make the nucleus of this kingdom. Jerusalem will be the capital of the Great King from which he will govern the whole world. Thus Christ will come to inaugurate this kingdom and in store which will be centered on Jerusalem. It will last approximately 1000 years. It will entail a revival of Israel and the Old Testament religion (page 81).

Two nations are named in particular Egypt and Mesopotamia. They make yearly pilgrimages to the Great King. The Temple will be rebuild. The sacrifices will be restored but they will no longer be redemptive sacrifices.

For Hoyt and the dispensationalists this age is an age of transition. You will notice that I have given a number of references and there are more in the book. All the references are taken from the Old Testament.

On page 92 Hoyt makes this admission: "Little is said in the New Testament about the vast changes that will occur in this realm. These must be found in Old Testament Prophecy." Christ assures his believers that changes would take place as said in the Old Testament. The source of the teaching is to be found in the Old Testament not in the New Testament.

And the reason for taking this view is that Christ said that not a jot or tittle will fall from the Law until all is fulfilled. Therefore there must be a future fulfillment of these prophecies. He looks to their fulfillment in the Millennium.

When Jesus talks about the Kingdom of Heaven it is something different. For Hoyt the kingdom is not yet there.

3.4.3.3. Millennialism Because of Rev 20

Ladd in large measure agrees and in what he calls Historic Millennialism is an attempt to hold on to Millennialism while ridding premillennialism of some of his ridiculous elements. If it would not be for Rev 20 and the references to the first resurrection he would be an amillennialists.

3.4.3.4. Ladd's View of Revelation

For Ladd Revelation is a picture of history. For him Rev 19:11-16 pictures the second coming of Christ in terms of a Man on a White Horse so Rev 19 depicts the return of Christ. Rev 19:17-21 depicts the destruction of the Antichrist and Rev 20 depicts the power behind them namely Satan and the way that Satan will be bound for a thousand years.

In Ladd's vision of things in this period there will be the first resurrection. The restoration of life to the Saints. Notice it entails what I would call a mixed economy. That is in this period of a thousand years there will be people on the earth with ordinary bodies. It is not clear whether anybody will die with their ordinary body or whether they will live to great ages. But there will also be those that will be raised and have the spiritual bodies.

In Ladd's book *I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus* Ladd argues that there is a difference between the resurrection body and the normal body. It would therefore seem to me that Ladd's view would entail some having ordinary bodies and some having resurrection bodies. This would be a mixed situation.

A major difference between Ladd and the typical dispensation list has to do with the Old Testament prophecies like Ezechiel. Whether the king would sit on a literal throne. For Ladd the key to these prophecies is found in Heb 8:8-13:

In speaking of a new covenant he treats the first as obsolete. And what is becoming obsolete and growing old is ready to vanish away. (Hebrews 8:13 RSV)

Ladd took this to imply that all of the prophecies or a lot of the prophecies will not be fulfilled at all in a literal sense because they have been superseded by the New Testament. He was not looking for a New Temple in the Millennium. All those things that Hoyt is looking for Ladd is saying that it does not matter, but God in his mercy and freedom is free to give something better.

What is more Ladd wanted to say that the dispensationalists are wrong in saying that the kingdom has not come. It came with Christ and Christ is reigning now. The kingdom is here but there is also a sense in which there is a greater fulfillment. Christ does not have to wait to reign until his return. He is reigning now and his saints are reigning with him (Heb 1:3; 2:7-8:10; 12-13; Rev 3:21; 1 Cor 15:24-; Phil 2:4-10; Ro 10:9; 1 Tim 6:15; Acts 2:36).

3.4.4. Reflections on the Millennium

3.4.4.1. Jesus and Paul do not Teach a Millennium

It is interesting to note that there is nothing in the teachings of Jesus or Paul which speaks of a Millennium or supports the kind of picture painted by Hoyt.

3.4.4.2. Prophecy of Old Testament Superseded

Secondly it seems to me that Ladd is correct in his view that literal prophecy or language of the Old Testament have been superseded.

3.4.4.3. Revelation 20 contains nothing of Hoyt's imagery

Thirdly when we look at Revelation 20 where there is talk of Satan being bound for a thousand years. There is nothing in that passage which looks remotely like what Hoyt is talking about, the restoration to Jerusalem and so forth.

3.4.4.4. The Millennium as the Prophecy Dump

Finally it seems to me that Premillennialists treat the thousand years in Revelation 20 rather like people treat their garage or their attic. You dump into the garage everything you have no use in the house but which you cannot bear in the house. The hermeneutic is to recognize that we cannot find any literal fulfillment for these prophecies in the New Testament.

Hoyt wants to hang on to them and dumps them all in the thousand years, regardless of Rev 20, and leads one to expect a fulfillment of these prophecies. In a sense millennial teaching looks very much like a garage.

3.4.5. Postmillennialism

The position of Boettner. The first thing that Boettner wants to say is that the debate between the Premillennialism and Postmillennialism is not simply a debate about timing. It is a debate about different conceptions of the kingdom and the debate about the effectiveness of the preaching of the Gospel.

Boettner page 120: The Millennium expected by the Premillennialists is a different thing from postmillennialism. It is different in nature of the kingdom and the manner in which Christ exercises control. Premillennialism looks for a kingdom like a king of this world. Marriage will continue and so on. Sin will not be eliminated but reduced to a minimum. Social problems will remain. But postmillennialism sets forth a spiritual kingdom in the hearts of men.

One of the points he wants to make is that it will all be brought about is by the proclamation of the Gospel and the response to the Gospel. The word of God is effective and God will effect these changes. Boettner sees a difference between now and the first century. Foreign missions have brought the Gospel to all continents. In some way things are going to be better and better. Look at the Freeways and other accomplishments. G. Washington went around in a horse carriage. There is a kind of optimism and attitude there, which is not easy to take.

A point that he makes is to challenge the literalism of premillennialism especially with regard to how the New Testament itself treats Old Testament prophecy (pages 135-136). For example Gen 3:15. That prophecy was certainly not fulfilled literally by crushing a snake's head.

He then turns to Mal 4:5 "I will send Elija". This prophecy likewise was not fulfilled literally. It was fulfilled in John the Baptist. Again we have the prophecy Isa 40:3-5. This certainly was not fulfilled, no highway building program, but by John the Baptist who prepared the preaching of Jesus.

Mt 4:12-16 Boettner concludes that Isaiah was clearly speaking of the spiritual darkness and the spiritual light that would be brought. Ex 19:5;38 Palestine as a land of milk and honey. Literally that would be a mess. This literalistic approach to the fulfillment of prophecy is thoroughly wrongheaded.

3.4.6. Amillennialism

I could follow Huckemer's version but I will lay out my own understanding. I take the amillennial position.

3.4.6.1. The Nature of Revelation

We have to understand the nature of the book of Revelation and its structure. The dispensationalist or the premillennialist like Ladd sees Revelation as a book of prophecy describing successive events in future history. I myself take a different view. The key is the number seven corresponding to the days of the week but more particularly to the days of creation (See NIDNTT).

I am drawing on William Hendrickson's book *More than Conquerors* which is an interpretation of the book of Revelation. The key to Revelation is to recognize that the whole book is structured in a series of Sevens. The letters to the Seven Churches, the Seven Veils and so on.

What the suggestion is that Revelation is structured on the days of creation in Gen 1. And each of those days focuses on a theme. The suggestion is that Revelation takes those themes and looks at the world in terms of what happened on each of those days. Not as seven lots of successive events but seven different perspectives of the one event so that what we get in Revelation are seven perspectives on history rather than seven Epochs of history.

In particular I would change the image. It seems that Revelation is like looking at the tide coming in seven times over. Each time the tide comes a bit further.

Going back to the theme of Creation:

- ◆ Day one deals with the theme of light. Rev 1-3 deals with picturing Christ as the light amid the Seven Churches as a lampstand in a dark world.
- ◆ Day two, the firmament. Deals with world history from the perspective of heaven. The Seven Seals revealing what would come to pass (Rev 4-7).
- ◆ Day 3, the land the sea, the vegetation. The physical world. The Seven Trumpets (Rev 8-11:18).
- ◆ Day 4 the sun, moon and stars. The Seven Things seen (Rev 11:19-16:1).
- ◆ Day 5 life and death from the waters of the Seven Bowls (Rev 15-18:24).
- ◆ Day 6 Creation of Adam and Eve. The Seven Last Things taking up the theme of Adam and Eve in terms of corruption of man in terms of the Great Harlot. The judgment of the Seven leading to a vision of the New Earth (Rev 19-21:8).
- ◆ Day 7 the eternal sabbath in terms of the New Jerusalem (Rev 21:9-22:21).

If that is correct then what it means is that the period of a thousand years in chapter 21 is not an epoch coming at some future time but it is a way at looking at the present gospel age.

3.5. The Resurrection

3.5.1. Cor 15:12-

12 Now if Christ is preached as raised from the dead, how can some of you say that there is no resurrection of the dead? 13 But if there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised; 14 if Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is in vain and your faith is in vain. 15 We are even found to be misrepresenting God, because we testified of God that he raised Christ, whom he did not raise if it is true that the dead are not raised. 16 For if the dead are not raised, then Christ has not been raised. 17 If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins. 18 Then those also who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished. 19 If for this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all men most to be pitied. 20 But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep. 21 For as by a man came death, by a man has come also the resurrection of the dead. 22 For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive. 23 But each in his own order: Christ the first fruits, then at his coming those who belong to Christ. 24 Then comes the end, when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and every authority and power. 25 For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. 26 The last enemy to be destroyed is death. 27 "For God has put all things in subjection under his feet." But when it says, "All things are put in subjection under him," it is plain that he is excepted who put all things under him. 28 When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to him who put all things under him, that God may be everything to every one. (1 Corinthians 15 RSV)

Paul does not say that the resurrection proves the divinity of Christ. The argument is that God raised him from the dead. Never did Christ raise himself, it is always the Father that raises. There is the background that Jesus was condemned as a blasphemer. God in raising him brought immortality to light and overturned the verdict of those who condemned him.

Notice too for Paul how in the end life after death hinges on the resurrection of Jesus. It is not that all people are immortal or people have immortal souls but rather Christ was raised and those in Christ will also be raised.

Notice too there is no room for a Millennium of the kind envisaged by the premillennialists. There is a general resurrection at the end. Christ reigns and will reign until all enemies are destroyed.

3.5.2. Cor 5:1-

1 For we know that if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. 2 Here indeed we groan, and long to put on our heavenly dwelling, 3 so that by putting it on we may not be found naked. 4 For while we are still in this tent, we sigh with anxiety; not that we would be unclothed, but that we would be further clothed, so that what is mortal may be swallowed up by life. (2 Corinthians 5 RSV)

There are those who think that there is in Paul a progression. That Paul's thoughts changed over the years in the way he thought of the resurrection. I do not think he ever doubts the resurrection ever, but some see in this passage a different perspective. Among those see especially Murray J. Harris on this passage and also the references in NIDNTT on *Resurrection*. See his later work *Raised Immortal* which is one of the best discussions of the subject.

Paul changed his mind perhaps as the result of illness, perhaps thinking that he would not live to see the second coming. Thereby asking himself what really happens at death. Here is his answer. He thinks of the present life as living in a tent. Whereas what God will give in the future is a building, a house, not made with hands. This picture comes in Acts where Steven is talking about the Temple and says that God does not live in a house made by hands. What does Paul say what happens at death? He says at death we put on a new house, a house made without hands, and thus enter into the resurrection experience at that point. Notice that Paul is not saying that the body that we have now constitutes the raw material which is raised in the resurrection body. Rather he is talking about an exchange. An exchange of one body for another. An exchange of a tent for a more permanent body.

Death looks like the stripping off of the body. But he says it is not that we will be found naked. Notice this thought of the Spirit as a guarantee which ties in with what I said about baptism. God has given the Spirit as the pledge of what God is going to do in the future.

A lot of discussion about dualism and dualism in general is held by many to be a bad thing. But rightly understood there is a lot to be said for dualism. Body and soul constitute a unity. Good and evil, God and the world these are all different entities. In the end Paul is advocating a dualism. The old body is left behind and that self is given a house made without hands. See the book by John W. Cooper of Calvin College (he was taught by Richard Mouw) *Body and Soul and Life Everlasting*. He looks at dualism and comes out in favor. So is Paul a dualist? In this sense I think he is.

3.5.3. In the Millennium

I was arguing that a lot depends on how we understand Revelation. Is it a series of glimpses into events one after the other or is it a series of vision covering more or less the same epoch from the resurrection of Christ to the end of the age?

Revelation 20 is a picture of the present age in which the Church lives. The second point I want to reiterate. There is no solid evidence of a Millennium anywhere else especially in the teaching of Jesus and Paul. The only way one can get a picture of the Millennium is drawing a composite picture from the Old Testament. There is nothing in Rev 20 to indicate that these prophecies belong there.

Note: A Millennium raises all kinds of questions about the nature of the people who will be around in it. Will there be resuscitated corpses? Hardly, especially if what I am going to say is correct or what Paul has said is correct. It would necessitate a mixed economy. Some with earthly body mixed with people with resurrection bodies. Such a state of affairs is not impossible but it raises questions.

3.5.4. Excursus: The Binding of Satan and the Millennium

Another point that I would make that Charles Hodge used to make in answer to the premillennialists of his time. 1 Cor 15 "Flesh and blood cannot inhabit the kingdom of God" Verse 50.

But what about the binding of Satan? The angel coming with a chain and casting Satan into the bottomless pit? Clearly this is figurative language. No one not even the most ardent premillennialist would think that Satan could be bound with a chain being a spiritual entity. Hal Lindsay is talking about the horses with iron tails and sees them as Helicopter Gunships.

With Augustine I would have to say that this refers (see *City of God*) to the binding of Satan by Jesus in the present (Matt 12:29; par Mk 3:27; Lk 11:21). This may echo a phrase in Isa 49:24-25.

Jesus' statement implies that he has bound Satan and in Lk 10:17-20 the disciples return full of joy and happiness about the victory over Satan.

The assumption of the premillennialists is that with the binding of Satan, evil will be abolished. I think the statement about Jesus binding Satan means that Satan is restrained but nevertheless evil does continue. Now the text in Revelation defines it a little bit more precisely and this may help to understand in what sense Satan is bound. Rev 20:3 "Thrown into the pit that he should deceive the nations no more till a thousand years will be ended."

Amillennialists take this to mean that the Gospel is now preached to the nations and that God's truth is now available to them that was not the case prior to this time. In chapter 12:9-10 there is a picture of Satan being cast out of heaven. And it could be that the picture in chapter 20 and 12 that these are two different pictures and perspectives could be the same. Satan has lost the ground on which he could accuse the followers of Christ. And so the amillennialists see a different meaning and at the same time some biblical justification elsewhere for the language of the binding of Satan.

3.5.5. The First Resurrection

Likewise the language about the first resurrection which could be understood in the same sense as John 5:24. Eternal life immediately after belief. So that in one sense believers already have eternal life as an present possession and thus could participate in eternal life. Alternatively it could be a reference to the dead who are raised with Christ already and thus share in his reign in the here and now. It is possible to look at an alternative interpretation of this passage. Which makes more sense of the scripture as a whole than others.

The reign of the dead believers with Christ is mentioned in Rev 1:6 and another possible passage in Lk 22:28-30. A way of looking at it is that the reign will be in the here and now.

Jesus spiritual body was able to do physical things. The Emmaus disciples did not recognize that he was apparently a body that was able of appearing and disappearing. He was more than a resuscitated corpse.

Lazarus would have an ordinary body after his resurrection. There are stories of resuscitation in the Gospels. They are restored to life. But the resurrection body is a different kind of thing. Nowhere is an argument put forward based on the resuscitation stories in favor of the resurrection.

3.5.6. Amillennialism: No Rapture

Amillennialists do not believe in the rapture. Raptures are based on statement like two women grinding and one is taken and the other one left. The end to say would be that is judgment. See Austin Farrough *A Rebirth of Images* and Antony A. Hoekema *The Bible and the Future*.

3.6. Purgatory

This is a belief that belongs to Roman Catholic Theology. I am just offering some thoughts on its origin and what it is.

Purgatory is a form of temporal punishment and it is this punishment or purging or refining is something that is experienced only by the Church because unbelievers go directly to Hell and Purgatory is not Hell. It is a form of purging and preparing the soul for the beatific vision of God. The thought is that not even the saints - maybe some - are fit to enter the immediate presence of God in the afterlife and there must be a time of further purging in order to prepare the believer for God's immediate presence.

Some attempt has been made to see purgatory in 1 Cor 3:11-15

11 For no other foundation can any one lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. 12 Now if any one builds on the foundation with gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, straw--13 each man's work will become manifest; for the Day will disclose it, because it will be revealed with fire, and the fire will test what sort of work each one has done. 14 If the work which any man has built on the foundation survives, he will receive a reward. 15 If any man's work is burned up, he will suffer loss, though he himself will be saved, but only as through fire. (1 Corinthians 3 RSV)

The emphasis here is on refining and testing the work that we have done.

The purgatory was developed first by Clement of Alexandria and then by Augustine in the *City of God* and it became official part of Roman Catholicism at the Council of Lyon (1279) and Florence (1439).

It is also part of Orthodox theology but is generally not part of Protestant theology on the ground that justification entails just that justification and therefore the sinner is righteous and acceptable.

3.7. Universalism

There are various types of universalism:

3.7.1. Origen *De Principiis*

In this work Origen developed the doctrine of the universal reconciliation of all creatures. This doctrine is known as **apokatastasis**. It means the restoration of everyone. See 1:6 1-4 with regard to human beings and finally with regard to the Devil 3:6:5. And Origen could appeal to two lines or argument. There are some passages in Scripture which might seem to suggest universalism. Ro 11:36 "For from him and to him are all things." Col 1:20 "through him to reconcile to himself all things whether on earth and on heaven making peace by the cross".

The other argument is that God created all things good, but evil is not an entity. Evil is a form of acting but is not a thing or being alongside other things. Evil is acting inappropriately. It is not a substance a thing. Origen says that in the end, evil will be removed and what will be left will be God's good creation. And thus he suggests that even the Devil could be saved.

See ed. Henry Bettenson *The Early Christian Fathers* page 355: "When it is said that the last enemy shall be destroyed (1 Cor 6:26) it is not to be understood as meaning that his substance which is God's creation but that its hostility will vanish. This does not come from God but from himself. Destruction means not ceasing to exist but ceasing of hostility. If things are made so that they might exist then they cannot become nonexistent."

Thus the Devil will be purged. This led AD 553 to Origen's condemnation as a heretic.

3.7.2. Victorian Writers.

On this there is a major study by an Oxford scholar *Hell and the Victorians* Rawl(?).

A volume of Essays *Essays and Reviews* was produced in 1880 largely by a number of scholars connected with Oxford University in which the essayists tried to put forward a more liberal interpretation of theology because the Church had to move with the time (See H.B. Wilson *The National Church*). Wilson argued that because the Church of England is the national church it should be as comprehensive as the nation itself. And therefore it should adopt a broader theology than the 39 articles. In particular he believed in an afterlife. He said that with appropriate adaptation the doctrine of purgatory would be suitable. After all many citizens do not make much spiritual progress. They must be given an opportunity to make progress. This could only be taken place in an afterlife. This was his intend of national improvement.

There was a great uproar. In the end the bishop decided to prosecute the essayists because the views of the various essayists seem to be out of touch with the Church of England. The case went on and on and went to the Supreme Court. In the end Wilson got off on a technicality.

This controversy and Bishop Colenzy(?), who took a very liberal view of the Old Testament, prompted great consternation in the Church of England. One of the outcomes was the hymn "The Church's one foundation is the Church Jesus the Lord". This was directed against liberalism in the 1860s.

3.7.3. Maurice

Frederick. D. Maurice made two points (he was one of the first professors of theology in the recently founded University of London and died 1872). One of his early works was entitled *Theological Essays*. Which contained an essay dealing with eternal life. In this he argued in favor of a universalistic position resting on the inclusive love of God for human beings. It is God's will that no one should perish (1 Tim 4). God is love and in connection with the question of punishment he thought that it did not mean endless punishment but rather the punishment of the age to come.

Let me try to give an explanation for the phrase eternal life and eternal punishment. Does eternal mean ongoing or does it have to do with the Jewish distinction of the present age from the age to come? Maurice says the eternal life it is the life that expressed duration. And the word eternal expresses the quality in relation to God. Likewise in eternal punishment. Punishment is not necessary endless. The abyss of love is deeper than the abyss of death. So at this stage God's love is deeper and more ultimate than anyone that could frustrate God's love.

There was an uproar that caused him to be dismissed. And this took place in 1848. Then in his later writing he further developed his thoughts and in so doing invented Karl Barth long before Karl Barth was born. What I am saying that the position of Maurice anticipated the position of Karl Barth.

What was Maurice saying? Mankind[sic] stands in Christ rather than Adam. Adam is really a picture of human disobedience. But there is a priority of Christ over Adam. Christ died for them, therefore Christ died for everybody. There is no such thing as a lost soul. Therefore sin is to be seen as Barth later thought as a rebellion against grace that was all encompassing. On that score Maurice believed in universalism.

3.7.4. Barth

Karl Barth lived from 1886-1968. We noted Barths threefold form of God. Barth believed that humans do not have any knowledge of God unless God gives them this knowledge in his Scripture.

All of God's dealings with humans being are effected in and through Jesus Christ. In the early Barth the emphasis fell on Revelation through his word Jesus Christ. As Barth went on he developed a further angle to it. He asked himself who was Jesus Christ? Christ was God in human form. In that one person God has established his covenant with humanity. So like Maurice Barth is saying that God is the head for all humankind.

If Christ died for all then God has dealt with their punishment. The wrath of God has been manifested in the Cross and therefore has been dealt with. The difference between the unbeliever and the believer is that the believer knows it and responds to it with thankfulness. The unbeliever tries to live as if he is not in a grace relationship. They are forgiven, but they do not know it. The justification takes place on the Cross and therefore God's love is all embracing. This leaves Barth on the brink of universalism. He always said "I am not like Origen and I am no universalist", but this raised the question what kind of universalist are you? He always rejected the idea that he was a universalist. The logic of this position pushes him into that position. Since he never completed his *Church Dogmatics* he as led off the hook.

3.7.4.1. On judgment

When students in Barth's graduate class used to say: What about those passages in Scripture of judgment? Barth would say: That is a remnant of Jewish ideas.

3.7.4.2. Universal Annihilation?

Another observation by Dan Fuller. Dan Fuller argues that for Barth the only person raised is Jesus Christ and that Barth did not believe in the general resurrection of believers and thus the reconciliation would be a reconciliation limited to this live. When Barth was pressed to what he believed about human individuals, he would say they are retained in God's memory.

Barth held a paradoxical position arguing that all are reconciled and included in God's grace but nobody will survive. A kind of universalism combined with annihilation.

When I tried to follow this turned out to be somewhat true. Barth has a book *Resurrection of the Dead*. When you look at that book all falls on the resurrection of Christ and nothing about the resurrection of human being. If you look at the index volume to find what Barth might have to say about a more general resurrection there is not much there. There is something to corroborate Dan Fuller's position.

However in his commentary *Dogmatics in Outline* one can find some bits of a general resurrection. But he does not say all that much about it and it is all that peculiar.

3.7.5. John Hick

John Hick and Hick's Book *Death and Eternal Life* 1976. It is really bound up with Hick's view of the nature of human existence and the problem of evil. Basically Hick is arguing for a comparative approach drawing on different faith's arguing that all or most of the major religions have some view of life after death. This world is a valley of soul making in which human beings encounter evil, but the good side of it is the way they handle their problem and handle adversity and as such will mature and eventually in the next life all human beings will receive some kind of compensation for the ills that they experienced.

3.7.6. Brian Hatcher

Finally I like to note an article by Brian Hatcher and this deals with the question of eternal punishment as a missionary motive *Eternal Punishment and Christian Missions* Anglican Theological Review Vol. 72 1990 page 39-61. The view is that the heathen were perishing without the Gospel was a strong missionary motive in the Christian Churches.

3.8. The Fate of the Lost

3.8.1. The Classical Position

I will cite two statements and then I want to look at the evidence for it. The first statement in Jonathan Edward and his famous sermon *Sinners in the Hand of an Angry God* preached in 1871.

"Fourthly it is everlasting wrath. It would be dreadly to suffer this one moment but you must suffer it for all eternity. There will be no end to this misery. When you look forward you will see a boundless measure before you. You will despair of having any deliverance at all. You know certainly that you will wear out ages with fighting this vengeance. When so many ages have been spend then you will know that even more remains. Punishment will be infinite. All that we can possibly say about it is a faint view of it. Who knows the power of God's anger?"

The sermon goes on and on like this. There are two things I want to notice. Its text Dt 32:35 "Their foot shall slide in due time" and that there is no exegesis in that sermon whatsoever pertaining to New Testament teaching. It is really a meditation on the thought of endless torment and the text itself has nothing to do with endless torment.

The other person is Charles Hodge in particular his discussion of this subject at the end of his Systematic Theology 1972 Vol. 3 page 868-880. This position represents the old Princeton view which does what Edwards did not do namely present arguments in favor of endless punishment. Two types of arguments: One general considerations and secondly biblical teaching.

- There was an unanimous teaching of endless torment down the ages of the Church
- This was the view of the Jews in Jesus' day and indeed before that and Jesus did nothing to correct those views. I am not so sure that it was their position. In fact there is a lot about judgment in the Old Testament but judgment is general temporal in history. Destruction is in time.

A reflection on what it means to destroy: To destroy means to ruin, but a wrecked ship still remains a ship. I am not so sure that it does. So the general consideration the way with Hodge I do not find all that persuasive.

I turn now to his exegesis of passages (pages 875-). And the thing that strikes me is one how few passages actually he has to quote and of those that he quotes fewer still seem actually teach expressly the kind of punishment that J. Edwards envisaged.

Isa 33:14 "The sinners in Zion are afraid.. Who shall dwell with everlasting burning". Isa 66:24 "Their worm shall not die neither shall their fire be quenched". What is eternal here? The fire is eternal and the worm is eternal, but I am not persuaded that that means that the person goes on burning as it were. When something is burned it is consumed.

Mk 9:42-48 where Jesus says: "the fire shall never be quenched". Similarly Mt 25:41,46 the parable of the sheep and the goats. "And one goat goes unto eternal life and the other goat into eternal punishment". What does eternal mean? And Hodge takes it self-evident that it means eternal. Eternal life means eternal life so eternal punishment means eternal punishment.

What is life but ongoing activity? It is life that expresses duration. The word "eternal" expresses the quality of it. The life of the new age, life in connection with God as compared with the judgment which is God's judgment. So I think in the end we have to ask: What do these passages mean? I think it is possible to take different views of these passages.

What form is the judgment? Judgment is judgment. I am only raising the question that judgment is eternal punishment for ever and ever. In fact there are in my judgment of the various passages that Hodge cites of them there are two which lend support to the view that there is an afterlife for the damned and they going to suffer endless punishment.

- The rich man and Lazarus in Luke 16 where there is a reversal of fortunes. Lazarus goes to Abraham's bosom and the rich man is in torments. The rich man pleads with Abraham and Abraham says there is no way between both (Luke 16:19-31).

- The other passage is in Rev 14:9-11 9 And another angel, a third, followed them, saying with a loud voice, "If any one worships the beast and its image, and receives a mark on his forehead or on his hand, 10 he also shall drink the wine of God's wrath, poured unmixed into the cup of his anger, and he shall be tormented with fire and sulphur in the presence of the holy angels and in the presence of the Lamb. 11 And the smoke of their torment goes up for ever and ever; and they have no rest, day or night, these worshipers of the beast and its image, and whoever receives the mark of its name." (Revelation 14 RSV)

In the final vision of Revelation people are not tormented but just excluded (Rev 21). This supersedes the prior. This is vision of the end. The other visions, each certain vision carries it a bit further, but the last day is the eternal sabbath looking beyond the present age and the various visions are replaced by this concluding vision of the New Jerusalem.

3.8.2. Conditional Immortality

What is happening? This is a view that does merit some consideration. I ask myself what does it mean to be saved? What does it mean to be a human being? My answer is that I reject the Platonic view and Origen that human beings have eternal souls. That there is something about each individual that is eternal (ongoing). For Plato there is a difference between what is physical which perishes and what is nonphysical which endures. The soul is a different kind of entity from the body and each Soul has an intrinsic immortal quality.

It seems to me that the view of eternal punishment is bound up with that view. A lot of people who espouse this view seem to have this view. The soul goes on in the afterlife. My own view is different. As creatures we are finite, limited, we do not preexist as Plato believed and it is only by God's grace that we are kept in existence.

What is eternal life? In John those have passed from death to life who believe in Christ, in a Life in Christ. Because he loves we shall live. therefore in the life beyond it is because we are in Christ that we shall live. What about those who are not in Christ? The answer is that they perish. They are not indestructible entities. There certainly would be a judgment. But because they are not in Christ they do not go on existing. I am aware that this is a very difficult subject to pronounce.

Literature: NIDNTT the article on *Resurrection* looks at different views of death and afterlife tracking from Plato Greek thought and then into Christian thought. There is from a philosophical point Swinburne *The Evolution of the Soul*, a very interesting philosophical book. One of the hope in coming to Fuller was that with the three schools I would get more light on this question. I have some but I have not progressed as far as I have hoped.

There would be a judgment. A book that deals with the passages (the title was changed) is in the course outline. Erik Fudge *The Fire that Consumes*. This book contains the fullest discussion of a view which is sometimes called conditional immortality. So I would certainly commend that as a book to study. This would be annihilationism in some ways.

It is obviously a figurative story and it certainly stands as a solemn warning about judgment. Yes it is there and we need to heed it. Things do not follow in a neat pattern.

Interpretation of the people outside the gate are excluded from life. It is a picture in time and space. I believe that the difference between the resurrection body and the natural body is that the natural body is a space time entity in contrast to the non space time entity of the resurrection body. The vision in Rev 21 and 22 is a vision in terms of space and time and you cannot press all the details.

Another way has to do with the tree of life. The judgment on Adam was to be cast out of the garden of Eden and thus to have his access to the tree of life removed. The tree of life reappears in Rev 22. Those that have access to it have life. The others are excluded. This fits the annihilationist picture.

The image of God has to be understood in what it means in ancient times. I do not think the image of God idea can be pressed into service.

3.8.3. Judgment When?

When is the judgment? And where are the people who have died in Christ? Is it to be thought of as a final event like the SuperBowl that some emerges winners and the rest loses? There are passages who support that. Or could this be that it takes place in death right now? That we are judged moment by moment.

There are two passages in Paul which refer to the judgment seat of God and that is in Romans 14:10 (the judgment seat of Christ). Paul says whether we are at home or away we are here to please him so that everyone might receive good or evil according to what he has done in the body. Every single human being will be judged. Christians will be judged, 1 Cor 3 refers to our work being tried. The general assumption is that all this will happen at some future date, but it is possible that each person will judge and be judged when they go and meet their maker at death.

What about Rev 20? There seems to be two sets of pictures in this regard. One is a last judgment of a kind, the other is each an individual judgment when human beings do meet their maker. We just have to decide how we are going to put it together.

Specifically Mt 25 is not dealing with the generality of all people except I think insofar as they have encountered Christ.

3.9. Resurrection and Afterlife

On what grounds may we believe in an afterlife and what may we say about the resurrection? Let me start by looking at some general arguments very briefly.

3.9.1. Plato and the Pythagoreans.

Two arguments in Plato *Meno* where a slave boy is brought into the discussion and the slave boy is able to do complicated geometry. How did he get this knowledge? Plato's concluding is that he got it in a prior existence. The knowledge goes along with the soul.

Is it really a proof? No the boy is asked logical question and by his ability he is able to reason it is not knowledge acquired in another life. The Scientologists teach a kind of Platonism. They argue that psychological hang-ups are due to the experience in previous existence's. The kind of therapy is to receive counseling with counselors trained to bring these memories of encounters with spaceships and dinosaurs and bring them to the surface to bring relief.

Another story: A soldier (Er) is slain in battle and after the battle they burn the bodies. Suddenly Er sits up and tells about his experience in death. He saw a lot of coming and going of souls in a kind of holding patterns. They are waiting to go into the next life. Plato is teaching the transmigration of souls and the eternity of the soul. This is certainly very far from Christian belief and the reasons for holding such a position is very tenuous.

3.9.2. Psychic experiences.

Hick is interested in these phenomena. In his little textbook *Philosophy of Religion* he talks about the value of psychic experiences. In the end he does not think that much can be based on them. A medium was able to identify a person that was in somebody's mind. Trouble was that the person was a fictitious person. It was no genuine case of contacting the death. Another case deals with a person Gordan Davis that came up. He was real enough but he turned out to be selling real estate at the time. The Old Testament gives one example but it is an example to be avoided that is when Saul tried to conjure up the spirit of Samuel in 1 Sam 28.

Then there are experiences of near death and dying. And Elizabeth Kübler-Ross has discussed these. More recently Hans Küng has discussed some of them in his book *Eternal Life?*. Even more recently the leading British agnostic philosopher A.J. Ayer had an experience. In 1988 at the age of 88 Ayer choked on a piece of salmon and was taken to hospital and was technically dead but was resuscitated. There was a report in the LA-Times about this in an article in some length. He had the sensation of being confronted by a red light. There is an account here but I will not go into the details. Afterwards Ayer thought that the experience could have been a delusion and said that it certainly was no proof of the existence of a deity.

3.9.3. Response

I think Hans Küng's observation on Kübler-Ross are important. Some of the sensation and experiences are not uniform. A lot of them are like Ayer's sensation of the red light and are a positive experience, others are dreadful. Similar experiences have been induced through drugs. For Hans Küng the bottom line is that these are experiences of dying and not experiences of returning from death. It could be some form of body activity although they are formally dead. They do not prove what the advocates want them to prove.

3.9.4. My view on this Topic

What kind of continued existence can we envisage for the person? What kind of environment can be envisioned?

For me the starting point in all this are two verses in the pastoral epistles.

- In 1 Tim 6:16 Paul says that God alone has immortality and dwells in unapproachable light, "God whom no man has ever seen or can see." This characterizes all attempts to find general reasons for belief in immortality.
- In 2 Tim 1:10 he is speaking about the appearing of our savior Jesus Christ who abolished death and brought light and immortality through the resurrection.

And I have to say that this corresponds to the way I read the Old Testament see the article on *Resurrection* in NIDNTT. Various passages about the resurrection are in the New Testament. In general the Old Testament has little to say about life after death. That is not the same as if it has nothing to say.

In Ezechiel 37 it is not the picture of the afterlife but rather a picture of the present condition of the nation. And therefore in the end I would have to say the grounds of the Christian beliefs are grounded in the resurrection of Christ. You will see in that article a lengthy discussion of the resurrection and what people have said about the resurrection of Jesus in recent history. The article concludes with the implications for our current belief. I want to conclude with this from NIDNTT Vol. 3 302-305.

Eight Points. Indebted to Murray-Harris.

3.9.4.1. Immortality or Resurrection?

Sometimes it is said that the Christian Church believes not in immortality but in resurrection. That is not strictly true. Paul uses both. In fact the terms mutually define each other. But specifically immortality in New Testament is not endless personal survival but participation in the eternal life of God. Thus I would relate it to the passages I have noted. God only has immortality and believers have immortality by being related to him. The image of the access to the tree of life is a figurative picture of this.

There is no Temple in the New Jerusalem it is all temple, a picture of life with God.

Ro 2:7 speaks of those who by patience in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality. To them God will give immortality. Immortality is a gift not a present possession. Not something that we have intrinsically in our own life.

3.9.4.2. Reanimation of Dead Bodies?

Resurrection in New Testament is not the resuscitation or reanimation of corpses. It is the transformation of the whole person into the image of Christ. As we noted earlier there are examples of restoration to life in the New Testament (Lazarus and others). These are temporary and different from the resurrection.

We tend to speak of the resurrection of the body and of the flesh but the New Testament speaks of the resurrection of the dead, or resurrection from the dead. The dead shall be raised and son on.

Christ's resurrection body is as it were the prototype of the resurrection of the believer. Christ is the first fruit the firstborn of the dead (1 Cor 15:20-23; Col 1:18; Rev 1:5).

3.9.4.3. The Resurrection Comes to Light through Christ

Only with the death and resurrection of Christ does the idea of resurrection and immortality emerge from the shadows of the Old Testament into the full light of day (see 2 Tim 1:10). There are grounds for thinking that some Jews believed in a doctrine of immortality distinct from resurrection in the second century BC but this is not widespread. The passages in the Old Testament are not numerous.

3.9.4.4. Immortality is a Future Acquisition

Immortality is not the present possession of all but the future acquisition of believers. I disagree with C.S. Lewis on a lot of issues. Lewis has a mixture of theology and all sorts of stuff. This is not surpassing since he spent his career with a lot of myth. He is OK up to a point but he is not one of the great theologians for me.

Immortality as a further acquisition (1 Cor 15:42,53-) so it is the same as the resurrection of the dead. What is sown is perishable what is reaped is imperishable. The dead will be raised imperishable and we will be changed. The perishable must put on the imperishable (Verse 51-53). Which corresponds to 2 Cor 5 with putting on a building not made with hands. Immortality is a gift of something different to the continuing self. It is not as if the present body, the physical body, is as if were the raw material of the resurrection body. There is a kind of continuing self. But it is a transformation rather than a reconstituted body.

3.9.4.5. Immortality a Gift of God

The agent in the New Testament is the Father (Acts 26:8; Ro 4:17 and 11). On occasion it is also the Son (John 6:39; 4:44,54). Specifically in Romans it is the state of holiness the state to have raised Jesus (Romans 1:4).

3.9.4.6. Resurrection and Immortality Complementary

In Paul's thought resurrection and immortality are inseparable and complementary ideas (1 Cor 15:43,50-62).

3.9.4.7. Some are not Resurrected

All believers will be transformed but not all will be resurrected. That is some will be alive at the Parusia (1 Cor 15:51). The dead will be raised and transformed (1 Cor 15:50,52).

3.9.4.8. What Continues

It is not the physical body. It is certainly very difficult to conceive how anyone whose body is decomposed and dead a long time can have his raw material come together again for the resurrection body. It seems that for Paul the continuity is provided by the self. This corruptible body must put on incorruption (1 Cor 15:44). It is raised a spiritual body. Although Matthew 22:29 implies that in the resurrection there is no marriage or giving in marriage or sex in heaven, it does not mean to say that the distinction between the sexes will be obliterated or that individuality will be lost. But the final goal is to be conformed to the image of himself (Ro 8:29) in order that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. This according to Paul is the purpose of predestination.

In a sense the story of the epistle to the Romans is the loss of glory and the restoration of glory in the Resurrection.

4. Critical Comments

4.1. Worldviews: Cause and Effect?

This is in response to two passages from the lectures of Colin Brown concerning difference worldviews (My section number 2.4.1). I am specially concerned here about the postulated scientific worldview, but this critique also affects the religious worldview (2.4.1.2) and the philosophical worldview (2.4.1.3) since they are both deducted from the presented scientific worldview. I will keep my writing here to three pages although much more should be said on the subject. I will use John Gribbin's book *In Search of the Big Bang: Quantum Physics and Cosmology* 1986 to make various points.

4.1.1. Science in the Lectures

Colin Brown claims that the view that science takes of reality, is to see the world as a system of interconnected causes and effects. The system is huge so that no one is able to grasp it fully.

Phenomena can be described in terms of natural causes.

4.1.2. Contemporary Science

4.1.2.1. Quantum Physics

Gribbin makes the following statement about the behavior of the elementary parts of matter:

We cannot know, not even in principle, both the position and momentum of a particle. There is an inherent uncertainty about where the particle is going, and if a particle starts out at point A and end is later detected at point B, we cannot know exactly how it got from A to B unless it is watched all the way along its path. (page 239). We cannot be certain where a particle is and we cannot be certain where it is going, so we must not be too surprised if it turns up where we don't expect it (page 235).

The elementary units of matter do not behave according to cause and effect. The behavior can only be adequately described by chances. That is we have to acknowledge that we cannot pose a cause and effect. We can just make a statistical empirical analysis. From this statistical analysis we can deduce that the items have behaved in such a way in the past and we expect them to behave in the same way in the future. There is a big debate currently going on in the scientific community about the question of causality.

4.1.2.2. Real World Effects?

Since we cannot handle the most elementary parts of matter with cause and effect the same becomes true in the bigger world of our reality. But here the chances of anything extraordinary happening become infinitesimal small since they are multiplied for each particle. Yet these show up for example in the distribution of gases in a room. This behavior was surveyed by the Ludwig Boltmann in the 19th century. He states that the behavior of gas in a room is totally random depending on the random motion of molecules colliding with each other. Thus it is theoretically possible (although highly unlikely) that all the oxygen molecules move to the other side of the room leaving nothing to breathe for a person in the room (page 368).

Again we have the failure of a cause and effect.

4.1.2.3. Influence of Observation

Cause and effect get even more messed up when other phenomena are surveyed. Griffin in pages 227-232 *The Central Mystery* deals with the behavior of light depending what kind of look we are taking at it. Light switches its characteristics from particle to wave depending on how we want to analyze the behavior. Light conforms to observation. If light is to be analyzed as particles then it will behave like a particle and vice versa.

Cause and effect are modified by the very act of observation and the very act of observation seems to determine the behavior of matter.

4.1.2.4. Causality?

All this leads to a big question mark about causality in contemporary science and a long and unfinished discussion broke out in the scientific community ever since Heisenberg publicized his theory of *Uncertainty* in the 1930s. This issue has become even more pressing over time as more knowledge about Quantum mechanics was gained and the implications of Einstein's *Theory of Relativity* and connected works were worked out.

4.1.3. Conclusion

We have to change our scientific worldview to see that all our knowledge about the world is empirical or statistical. We can only predict the behavior of matter with a certain amount of probability which may be high in case that a significant amount of material is involved but gets lower the smaller the part of the world is we are looking at. Griffin page 369:

These probabilities for the occurrence of exotic and non commonsense events are so tiny that they have no effect on our daily lives.

Therefore we can never rule out that something extraordinary would happen. This is even coherent with our current scientific knowledge. Miracles and wonders are always explainable for science by the chance-factor that is there, since our scientific laws are just a prediction of the most likely outcome.

Science has in effect shown us that God can intervene in reality any time without violating any scientific laws. In fact the application of scientific laws to rule out God's intervention and to deny extraordinary events shows the ignorance of the one doing so.

4.1.4. Consequences

All of this in effect means that Bultmann, Bonhoeffer and the philosophers have built their theories on a worldview of a cause and effect relationship in reality that we know now does not exist. This effectively removes the basis for their fatalistic denial of God's intervention in the world.

This old worldview might still be popular thought of as "scientific" but it is not. It is a simplification of a larger truth.

4.2. Jesus not forgiving Sins?

The claim is made in 2.1.5.1 that Jesus did not forgive sins himself but that he rather was acting as the agent of the Father. This means that Mark 2:10 has to be interpreted that the authority, which Jesus had to forgive sins, was on behalf of the Father and that Jesus was the agent.

4.2.1. Forgiven cannot be delegated?

The Jews held to the notion that God alone can forgive sins (Mk 2:7, See also Dan Fuller *Unity of the Bible* page 409). The authority to forgive cannot be delegated. If this is true then the authority cannot have been delegated to Jesus from the Father. Jesus is the direct source of forgiveness within the Trinity.

4.2.2. How can Jesus authorize other agents?

In the Gospels Jesus is authorizing his disciples in turn so that they also can forgive sins (Mt 16, see also 2.1.7). If it is true that an agent cannot authorize other agents then Jesus cannot authorize his disciples. If on the other hand Jesus is not the agent but the one that forgives then one could see all believers functioning as mediators of forgiveness from Jesus. Forgiveness must come directly from Jesus.

4.2.3. Jesus blood Cleanses us

John 1:7 reads: "If we walk in the light as he himself is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin."

How can the blood of Jesus clean us if Jesus is only God's agent? The issue cannot be as simple as that. This whole issue gets deep into the issue of the Trinity. Clearly Jesus is more than an agent mediating forgiveness. He also provides the instrument of cleansing.

4.2.4. Jesus the Payment for Sin

Heb 9:28 "Christ was offered once to bear the sins for many, will appear a second time not to deal with sin but to save those who are eagerly waiting for him".

This takes up the last topic again. Christ bore the sins and therefore he cannot be the agent but must be the source of forgiveness. God's forgiveness is made possible through the sacrifice of Christ.

4.2.5. Conclusion

Jesus is much more than the agent for forgiveness. He has accomplished forgiveness for us and therefore is also able to forgive out of his own authority. He is God as a member of the Trinity.

4.3. Infant Baptism

The issue of infant or believers baptism has been very divisive and has caused dug-in heels on both sides of the issue. Here is my attempt to sort this thing out for myself on the church background where I come from the Protestant Lutheran State Church in Germany. I agree with Colin Brown and most others that the primary function of baptism is the unification of the believer with Christ in death and resurrection (2.8 Introduction).

4.3.1. In the New Testament?

Sadly there are no clear-cut passages that show clearly the way to go. Evidence is largely inferential and historically based.

4.3.1.1. John 3:5

John 3:5 "No one can be enter the kingdom of God without being born of water and Spirit".

This "water and Spirit" has often been seen as referring symbolically to repentance since it was associated with it by John the Baptist. But I would say with Innocent III (2.8.1.2.2) that this implicitly also refers to the rite of baptism itself. True this refers to the initial repentance of the believer, but this repentance is followed by baptism in all of the New Testament.

4.3.1.2. Col 2:11-12

Baptism has a double function as a sign of repentance and as a sign of the joining of the believer with Christ in death and therefore joining with Christ in the future resurrection (Col 2:11-12, See 2.8.1.4).

4.3.1.3. Baptism is a Confession

I disagree with Colin Brown in that baptism is also a form of confession and also treated as such in the New Testament (See 2.8.3.2). Certainly John the Baptist used baptism as a confession (Mt 3; Mk 1; Lk 3; John 2). People were confessing their sinfulness and were receiving cleansing from sin through his baptism. Baptism was usually reserved only for unclean Gentiles that wanted to become Jews (*John the Baptist* by W.H. Brownlee in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* ed. Krister Stendahl page 36).

Therefore baptism for a Jew meant confessing that he was unclean like a Gentile. It was commonly understood that baptism in itself did not effect cleaning of sin but the repentance accomplished that (Josephus in *ibid.* page 40, also Qumran see NIDNTT Vol.1 page 700). The effect of baptism can only be a public acknowledgment and therefore a witness to have the need to be cleansed. The baptism of Jesus and the rest of the New Testament has therefore to be understood in a similar way.

It would make no sense for an infant to be baptized in this way since no sins can be confessed and thereby no cleansing in this way can be accomplished.

4.3.1.4. Mark 10:13-16

This passage was cited in the early church as an argument for the baptism of children. People are bringing children to Jesus. The disciples try to get rid of them but Jesus accepts the children and blessed them (See 2.8.3.5).

It is to be noted that Jesus does not baptize the children. Certainly none of the children was baptized since - as mentioned before - baptism was bound up with repentance by John the Baptist. Would Jesus have intended that infants and immature children be baptized then he could have instituted it here. But he chose to bless them and promise them that the kingdom of God belonged to them without baptism.

Therefore I would see this passage as a clear indicator against the baptism of infants.

4.3.2. Circumcision and Baptism

Col 2:13 says that we are the circumcision. Baptism and circumcision were both designed as entries into a relationship with God. Circumcision was an additional sign to show an real ethnic belonging (2.8.3.2). In the same way baptism shows and ethnic belonging but this time to a group that supersedes all other ethnicity's.

4.3.3. Conclusion

I would see baptism as the entry into a relationship with God and an expression that I have given up the right to my own life and that I am now willing to live the life that God has for me and that I am humbly accepting God's grace as necessary to go through with this through my life. Baptism is a receiving of God's grace and at the same time it is sign of my resolve to be committed to him as he is committed to me.

All of this is not possible for an infant to do. Therefore I have to reject infant baptism. I do not doubt that baptism has early roots (see 2.8.1.1) in the Church, but I consider the roots to be bad. The effect of infant baptism in our churches - also in my home churches - has been to mellow down Christianity and to empty the meaning of being a Christian. Everyone is a Christian since he was baptized. Most do not know anything about Christianity yet do hold on to claiming to be Christian through having been baptized. Infant baptism has been a major cause for the degeneration of churches throughout the ages (See page 56 in Otto Riecker *Kirche und Christen im Wandel der Zeit*).

I would not reject infant baptism totally. If someone makes a commitment to God later in life and accepts his infant baptism as his real baptism then I would count the later commitment as a fulfilling of the baptism. But I would advise anyone to get baptized after having come to faith in God and discard what was before. Otherwise mix-ups and unclarities can result.

Of course believers baptism leads to hostilities among the ones just Christians by name and by infant baptism who feel that their status before God is put into doubt. I think this is a very healthy thing to do (See also Otto Riecker p.196).

4.4. Evolution of Scripture?

In a lot of passages throughout the class a strong emphasis was made of the distinction between the Old Covenant and the New Covenant. Stress is put on development over time (2.2.3.3 at the end). A redefinition of Redemption 2.9.3.2. The Old Testament prophecy has been superseded 3.4.4.2 by the New Testament. Especially in the issue of women's ordination biblical teaching is seen as having been superseded.

I cannot see a strong discontinuity between both covenants. There is a lot of continuity and I feel that some of the issues are pressed here. I want to discuss two views that I encountered while studying at Fuller:

4.4.1. Jewett's progressive Revelation

(see 2.8.3.6 Jewett denies continuity between Old Testament and New Testament. All following references are from his book *God Creation and Revelation: A Neo-Evangelical Theology*)

Paul Jewett sees scripture as refining itself in the development of history. The Old Testament has to be understood in the light of the New Testament proven by Jesus redefining the law in the Sermon of the Mount (page 144). That is clearly understandable so far. Then he adds that the New Testament also has to be understood "in the light of itself, a light that is centered in Jesus Christ" (page 145).

This means that one is able to go beyond scripture in the understanding of faith. The understanding of the New Testament is dictated by the (subjective) view of Jesus. This in turn defines the understanding of the Old Testament.

Jewett needs to put his view on Jesus to censor his understanding of the New Testament since he finds certain defective teachings in the New Testament (most importantly slavery and submission of women). This leads him on to find even more defective teachings in the Old Testament which have to be rejected by his understanding of the New Testament.

I think this is dangerous position which opens doors to make all sorts of interpretations possible. According to the same technique it would be very easy to justify the acceptance of practicing homosexuals. One could say in the same line as Jewett that the teachings of Paul on this subject have been superseded by our understanding of Jesus. Gal 8:28 says that there is neither man nor women in Christ. We have to conclude then that the roles of the sexes are not important at all and sexual preference should play no role. Was this not what Paul intended to say? Is this not a pointer to our views today?

Therefore we clearly see that the New Testament did not intend to teach rejecting homosexuality. Continuing Jewett's line of argument we have to reject all passages of the Old Testament dealing with homosexuality since the New Testament redefines the position.

"Progressive Revelation" opens up a can of worms that are not easy to tame. I would say that progressive revelation is not an adequate way of understanding scripture.

4.4.2. Dan Fuller's Unity

(See Dan Fuller *Unity of the Bible*). Dan Fuller sees that the Old Testament and New Testament both have a coherent message (page 24). He finds justification by faith in the Old Testament and views the Law not as a way for the Jews to gain righteousness. In the same line as Paul in Gal 3 he argues that the Old Testament also communicates righteousness by faith alone. He shows that there is no reason to draw a big distinction between both covenants. The Old Testament contains the same message as the New Testament although it is expressed in a different not so evident way.

4.4.3. Conclusion

I think there is the need to understand Scripture as it is and not with our modifications necessitated by contemporary ideology. Colin Brown has a tendency to Jewett's understanding (For example the reinterpretation of Redemption 2.9.3.2) and correspondingly negativizes the teaching of the Old Testament in many respects.

I found the thought of observing patterns in the Bible very helpful. The principle was first put forth in 2.2.3.3 in the different ways that ministry was done in the New Testament. The preservation of types is connected with this. This should lead to the conclusion of Paul and Dan Fuller that redemption in the Old Testament is already there. The New Testament brings the meaning to full light, but there is no redefinition of redemption. The essential type is kept.

In the same way I cannot say that the Sermon of the Mount (2.4.2.2.1) does supersede the Law. It might clarify the meaning but the essential message is the same.

4.5. The Rapture

I can clearly see Colin Brown's argument for Amillennialism (3.4.6). That it would do away with a lot of difficulties I had with the strange teachings of Millennialism. But one point in Amillennialism seems not to be correct. Amillennialism says that there is no Rapture (3.5.6) and interprets statements to this respect as judgment. (For references to the rapture see Fritz Rienecker *Lexikon zur Bibel* page 344 article on *Entrückung*.)

4.5.1. 1.Thess 4:16-17

The interesting passage here is 1 Thess 4:16-17:

For the Lord himself, with a cry of command, with the archangel's call and with the sound of God's trumpet, will descend from heaven, and the dead in Christ will rise first. Then we who are alive, who are left, will be caught up in the clouds together with them to meet the Lord in the air; and so we will be with the Lord forever. (NRSV)

The point of this passage is that Paul is still expecting the imminent return of Christ and the literal taking up of the believers in the rapture. This thought is communicated to the Thessalonians as comfort in the time of persecution. Paul does not expect a kind of judgment but a rapture, a literal meeting of Jesus in the air to be with him.

4.5.2. Raptures in the Old Testament

Other passages refer to the same like Heb 11:5 to the rapture of Enoch (also Jud 14) in the Old Testament (Gen 5:24)! Here again is a type of the Old Testament that is understood in the New Testament and leads to the expectation that the rapture will happen in the same way for all believers alive when Christ is coming. The same happened to Elija (2 Kg 2:11).

The rapture is bound up with the taking on of the new spiritual body. Paul mentions the changing of the body to a spiritual body in the air (1 Cor 15:53-54).

4.5.3. Luke 17

The view of the Rapture is already in Jesus' sight in Luke 17:30-35. One is taken the other one left. It is difficult to interpret this as judgment (3.5.6) since there is an type of this already in the Old Testament as we have seen. Therefore the hearers and Jesus presupposes this knowledge of the rapture of Elija and Enoch in his hearers. If Jesus would not have wanted this association to be made then he would have clearly indicated that this is judgment. The passage in Luke 17 talks about the second coming and not about judgment.

4.5.4. Conclusion

From the biblical data a rapture can be clearly expected. In combination with Amillennialism this could be interpreted in a way that the ones remaining are the ones to face judgment. Therefore the rapture have to be interpreted as judgment for the ones remaining but as actual raptures for the ones taken up to Christ.