MIDWESTERN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Volume 4 Spring 2006 No. 2

CONTENTS

Editorial

This journal issue is devoted to some major contemporary issues in the church. Our featured contributor is Dr. Andreas Köstenberger, Professor of New Testament at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Wake Forest, North Carolina. He is the author of numerous scholarly works, including volumes on the Gospel of John in the Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament and the Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary series. Köstenberger guides our thinking by contributing three articles which constituted the 2005 Sizemore Lectures in Biblical Studies at Midwestern Seminary. In the first article, "The Moral Vision of John," Köstenberger seeks to "regain our moral compass" by grounding our ethical reflection on issues like abortion, same-sex marriage, etc., more profoundly in Scripture's teaching and Jesus' example. In the second piece, "The Biblical Framework for Marriage," he draws our attention to three major overarching yet overlooked principles found in the apostle Paul's letter to the Ephesians that form the biblical framework for marriage. In the third essay, "The New Testament Pattern of Church Government," he revisits the scriptural teaching on this subject so that we can clarify our thinking on these issues and discover new common ground.

This journal issue also includes other timely, relevant articles. Dr. Tom Johnston, Assistant Professor of Evangelism at Midwestern Seminary, provides us with "A Historical-Theological Analysis of Evangelicals and Catholics Together." The latter subject is a thorny one for many as some evangelicals have chosen to cooperate with the Roman Catholic Church on the gospel and other matters while some clearly have not. With the 200th anniversary of Baptists in Missouri approaching, Dr. Joe Early, Jr., Assistant Professor of Religion at the University of the Cumberlands, contributes, "Father John Clark: The First Baptist Preacher in Missouri." Finally, Dr. Godfrey Harold, Senior Minister at Livingstone Baptist Church, Richards Bay, and Lecturer at the University of Zululand, South Africa, furnishes "Suffering and the Christian: A Philosophical Problem and a Pastoral Response." As he offers a pastoral response that deals with suffering and the problem of evil he has in mind as a backdrop the suffering caused by the AIDS pandemic in Africa.

I hope that you will enjoy these articles. If I or any of my colleagues at Midwestern Seminary can ever be of service to you, please contact us and let us know. To God's glory!

Midwestern Journal of Theology 4.2 (Spring 2006): 3-23.

The Moral Vision of John

Andreas J. Köstenberger
Professor of New Testament
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Wake Forest, NC 27587

In a world turned upside down, where the killing of the unborn is cast as the virtuous expression of a woman's "right to choose," where same-sex marriage is touted as the pinnacle of interpersonal fidelity and commitment and those who oppose it on the grounds of the unequivocal teaching of both Testaments of Scripture are branded as intolerant, bigoted, and enemies of morality, it seems more important than ever to strive to regain our moral compass.

Where shall we turn in our effort to reset this compass and to reorient our moral vision? Shall we listen to the "talking heads" and self-appointed "experts" of the cultural and media elite who parade their wisdom night after night on cable television news panels? Will our best guides be legislators, or judges, including those on the United States Supreme Court? Anyone who has followed the public debate surrounding the pressing issues of our day for any length of time will concur that help for adjudicating these questions will not come from these individuals or institutions.

Emphatically, there is only one reliable source and authority for our ethical reflections and formulations: God's inspired and inerrant Holy Word. To be sure, Scripture does not explicitly deal with some of the moral dilemmas of our day, such as cloning, stem cell research, or other ethical quandaries brought about by the advances of modern medicine. Yet while Scripture is not exhaustive, it is sufficient in that it provides an ethical framework for decision-making that postmodern man ignores at his great peril.

Time does not permit me to look at biblical ethics at large. Nor will I deal with one particular ethical issue confronting us. My focus will be more limited, and my scope more general. In my quest to track the Bible's moral compass, I will seek to determine Jesus' ethics by studying one of the four canonical Gospels, the Gospel of John. It is my hope that such a study will ground our ethical reflection more profoundly in the soil of Scripture's teaching and of Jesus' example.

Preliminary Considerations

Before turning to a demonstration of this thesis, however, I must spend a few minutes trying to clear away and adjudicate several important preliminary matters. First, when I speak about "John's" moral vision, what do I mean? In recent years it has been increasingly suggested that behind John's Gospel stands a community that traces its origins to the apostle but that is engaged in its own struggle against a non-messianic Jewish synagogue. This community, which is responsible for John's Gospel, it is alleged, was expelled from the synagogue on account of its conviction that Jesus was in fact the Messiah.[1]

This reconstruction, also known as the "Johannine community hypothesis" in its various expressions, is in fact quite different from the traditional identification of the author of John's Gospel as the apostle John. With regard to my present topic, if the "Johannine community hypothesis" were true, we should speak no longer of *John's* moral vision—except perhaps in a fairly distant sense—but of the moral vision of the *Johannine community* in light of its recent experience of synagogue expulsion.[2] Moreover, the connection with *Jesus'* moral vision would be significantly more remote than if the apostle John were the Gospel's author.

This is not the place to engage in a full-fledged critique of the "Johannine community hypothesis."[3] For our present purposes, it has to suffice to say that this hypothesis rests on a rather precarious foundation and is not able to bear the weight that is put upon it by its adherents. For

---

[1] The classic expression of this thesis is found in J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968; rev. ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 1979). See also Raymond E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist, 1979). Unfortunately, Hays' treatment in *Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics* (San Francisco: Harper, 1996), esp. 146–47, presupposes the Martyn-Brown version of the "Johannine community hypothesis" (see ibid., 157, n. 15), identifying as the life-setting of John's Gospel—and ethics—the "communal crisis of identity" precipitated by the community's expulsion from the synagogue (which, according to Hays, is "referred to three times in the course of the Gospel"), which renders the Gospel's "exhortations for love within the community sound less exclusionary and more like an urgent appeal for unity within an oppressed minority community." See also Hays' comments on p. 154.

[2] A case in point is Allen Dwight Callahan, *A Love Supreme: A History of the Johannine Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), who says the Gospel has a writer but no author and that the epistles were written by an "anonymous editorial board of disciples" (3). According to Callahan, love vs. doctrine represents the "root conflict" in the Johannine community, and the writer's answer is that love, not doctrine, is to be the focus of the "Johannine community." But a brief look at 2 John 9–10 should lie the matter to rest. See the perceptive review by Scott Shidemantle in *JETS* 48/4 (2005): forthcoming.

[3] See Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 3.

this reason the "Johannine community hypothesis," which at one time has enjoyed virtually paradigmatic status in Johannine studies, has in recent years been subjected to serious critique by some of the world's foremost biblical historians and been abandoned even by some of its most ardent supporters.[4]

Problems associated with the "Johannine community hypothesis" in its various expressions include (but are not limited) to the following. The first is the "mirror-reading," "two-level" hermeneutic practiced by many of its adherents.[5] The most egregious example of this is the reference to synagogue expulsion in John 9:22 (see also 12:42; 16:2). On the basis of the presumption that the Gospel first and foremost tells about the history of the Johannine community rather than about Jesus' earthly ministry it is argued that the reference to synagogue expulsion in John 9:22 is anachronistic—it refers to the situation in around A.D. 90, not the time of Jesus' ministry in the A.D. 30s and the formerly blind man who is the overt subject of synagogue expulsion.[6]

However, this kind of reading seems to implicate the author (or authors) of John's Gospel in an improper retrojection of a practice into the days of Jesus' earthly ministry that according to those scholars did not in fact occur until decades later. While this may be true with regard to a concerted, formal policy as to how to deal with members of Jewish synagogues who confessed Jesus as Messiah, the incident in John 9 clearly represents an impromptu decision by the Pharisees to expel the man in order to discourage further growth of the Jesus movement. The other two references to synagogue expulsion refer to people's *fear* that they might be cast out of the synagogue (John 12:42) and Jesus' prediction that synagogue expulsion would be a destiny faced by his followers *in the future* (John 16:2). None of these passages speak of the kind of settled formal policy with regard to synagogue expulsion that some date to the A.D. 90s. Hence the charges of anachronism in the Johannine passages referring to synagogue expulsion evaporate when

[4] See esp. Martin Hengel, *Die johanneische Frage* (WUNT 67; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993); Richard Bauckham, ed., *The Gospels for all Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); and Robert Kysar, "Expulsion from the Synagogue: A Tale of a Theory" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Toronto, November 23–26, 2002). See also the stunning virtual absence of reference to the "Johannine community hypothesis" in the recent monograph *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums* (ed. Jörg Frey and Udo Schnelle; WUNT 175; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2004).

[5] The original use of this term in found in the writings of J. Louis Martyn, esp. the second edition of *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (1979). Unfortunately, the method is also embraced by Hays, *Moral Vision of the New Testament*, 153–54.

[6] But see the critique by D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 83–85, 369–72.

checked out more closely in context, and the entire hermeneutic of a "two-level reading" of John's Gospel finds no warrant in John 9:22, the passage most often cited in support of such an interpretive strategy. The obvious implication from the failure of the "Johannine community hypothesis" for the present study is that it continues to be appropriate to speak of "John's" moral vision rather than that of a later, more remotely related Johannine community.

A second preliminary consideration relates to the reliability of John's Gospel. Again, this is not the place to attempt a rehabilitation of the integrity of the Gospel's witness. The last few years have seen the publication of several significant works, including Craig Blomberg's *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel* (over against Maurice Casey's *Is John's Gospel True?*) and my own commentaries on John in the Baker Exegetical and Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary series,[7] which have demonstrated in some detail the trustworthiness of John's witness. It is no longer tenable to dichotomize between the Synoptics as interested in history and John as concerned with theology, as if the latter concern involved a disregard for history, especially in light of John's emphasis on eyewitness and truthfulness.[8] We may therefore proceed in the confidence that by looking at John's Gospel we will discover not only *John's* ethic, but also a reliable representation of *Jesus'* ethic, albeit refracted through the lenses of John's own perception and theological thought.

A third prolegomenon relates to John's relationship to the Synoptics. It is sometimes claimed that John's ethic differs significantly from that of the other Gospel writers. John, it is argued, similar to the Qumran community stressed the need for mutual love among Jesus' followers, but did not instruct believers to love their neighbor, more broadly defined, as does Luke, or even their enemies, as in the Gospel of Matthew.[9] John's vision was sectarian, while that of the other evangelists

---

[7] Craig L. Blomberg, *The Reliability of John's Gospel* (Leicester: Apollos, 2001); Köstenberger, *John* (BECNT); *idem*, "John," in *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary* (ed. Clinton E. Arnold; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002), 2.2–216.

[8] See also Richard Bauckham, "John for Readers of Mark," in *The Gospels for all Christians*, 147–71; Andreas J. Köstenberger, "Jesus as a Rabbi in the Fourth Gospel," *BBR* 8 (1998): 97–128; and Leon Morris, *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969).

[9] Hays, *Moral Vision of the New Testament*, 139, cites as examples Ernst Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus* (trans. Gerhard Krodel; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 59; J. L. Houlden, *Ethics and the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), 36; and Jack T. Sanders, *Ethics in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 100. See also the discussion in Hays, ibid., 145.

transcended narrow intracommunitarian concerns.[10] The problem with this portrayal that is most immediately obvious, however, is the strong emphasis on mission in John's Gospel. While not denying the existence of a strong dualism between believers and the world in John, the Gospel does not urge hostility or retreat, but rather evangelistic outreach in keeping with Jesus' own practice and in obedience to his parting commission. Hence John famously refers to God's love for the world prompting the sending of his one-of-a-kind Son, and when he tells his fellow believers not to love the world, this relates merely to the allures and temptations emanating from it rather than shutting down the believing community's mission in and to the world.[11] While John's moral vision may therefore be said to be unique and distinctive, it complements that of the other evangelists rather than standing in actual conflict with it.

Fourth, to set the framework for our study below, it will be helpful to note that the literary investigation of John's Gospel has been launched in full force with R. Alan Culpepper's 1983 monograph *The Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, in which the author analyzes the Johannine narrative in keeping with now widely accepted literary categories such as plot, characterization, implied author and reader, narrator, and so on. Culpepper's study is not without its problems. Not without some justification, he has been charged with imposing characteristics of the 19th-century novel onto the biblical material.[12] Even more importantly, Culpepper studies the text in virtual isolation from its historical moorings, neglecting to ask questions regarding real-life referents of characters featured in the Johannine narrative.[13]

While the notion of textual autonomy is in fact problematic, for unduly reductionistic, Culpepper's study demonstrates the coherence and cohesiveness of John's Gospel as a finished literary product.[14] This calls into question competing literary theories of a source or redaction-critical nature that claim to have uncovered various layers of tradition belonging

---

[10] Traces of this illegitimate stereotype are found in Hays' speaking of the "strongly sectarian character of the Johannine [moral] vision" (*Moral Vision of the New Testament*, 139) and of conceding that "the sectarian character of this material is undeniable" (140).

[11] Having said this, it is clear that John's definition of mission is not that mission is "everything the church is sent into the world to do," as John R. W. Stott famously wrote in *Christian Mission in the Modern World* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1975), 30, but Spirit-led, evangelistic outreach that preaches forgiveness of sins on account of Jesus' vicarious cross-death. See David J. Hesselgrave, *Paradigms in Conflict* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2005).

[12] See esp. the critique by D. A. Carson in *TrinJ* 4 (1983): 122–26, partly reproduced in Carson, *John*, 63–68,

[13] This is also a weakness of the exceedingly influential work by Hans Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

[14] This is insightfully noted by Carson, *John*, 67.

to different authors, periods, or schools.[15] The (unforeseen) benefit of Culpepper's work, then, is that his study establishes, albeit by somewhat doubtful means, John's literary integrity, so that it is entirely plausible and defensible to accept at the very outset of our literary study of John's moral vision the notion of textual integrity and coherence and to analyze literarily the final text of the Gospel without undue preoccupation with alleged "seams" (*aporiae*) or layers of tradition.[16]

Finally, a disclaimer is in order. While taking a literary approach to the investigation of John's moral vision, the present essay proceeds in the conviction that the literary presentation of a given biblical theme is not an end in itself but rather a means to an end. What is more, the end does not justify the means—our literary method of evaluation should be suitable for the subject of investigation. The end of literary study is theology, the apprehension of a biblical writer's theological message.[17] So if some of the following paper is taken up with drawing out various theological implications, the reason is that theology is the goal of the Bible's literary presentation—the text in its particular literary expression is but the form, the vehicle, the means.

Having established that we may indeed expect to find in John's Gospel an expression of John's moral vision, and, in fact, Jesus' vision; having affirmed the distinctive, yet complementary contribution of John's ethical outlook to the New Testament canon; and having established the limitations and parameters of the literary investigation of the particular theological theme with which we are concerned, we turn now to a closer examination of John's moral vision.

An Inventory of Johannine Ethical Vocabulary and Preliminary Investigations

Texts are made up of words, so literary analysis properly starts with *specific terms* used in a given piece of writing. In exploring John's moral vision, therefore, it will be useful to screen the Gospel for potential ethical vocabulary. It will also be instructive to see how one or several concepts are developed in the Johannine narrative in form of a *literary theme* or cluster of related themes. One important literary principle that will guide us here is to see how the stories John included demonstrate or embody moral examples that the reader is expected to emulate (you

[15] See, e.g., the work of Robert Fortna or the later Raymond Brown.

[16] See the brief discussion of "Literary Foundations" in Andreas J. Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples according to the Fourth Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 42–44.

[17] In my classes, and in my forthcoming hermeneutics text, I employ the figure of the "hermeneutical triad": history, literature, and theology, with the first two elements at the base and theology at the apex.

could call this the "incarnational angle" of John's moral vision).[18] Indeed, it is a well-acknowledged general literary principle that writers embody or incarnate their meanings, in the present instance ethical meanings, in concrete literary forms.

While this methodology seems sound in principle, however, it is not easily carried out in practice with regard to determining the Johannine ethic. There are at least three difficulties. First, one might seek to view John's moral vision through the lens of his presentation of Jesus' *signs and major discourses*, which makes up the bulk of chapters 1–12. The problem with this, however, is that Jesus' signs are consistently presented as *messianic* in nature (e.g., 2:11; 4:54; 12:36; 20:30–31), so that it is unclear how the *"signs"* could provide a *pattern of ethical behavior* to be emulated by Jesus' followers. As Richard Hays notes,

> The difficulty, however, is how this formal assertion of Jesus as ethical pattern is to be unpacked in terms of specific behaviors. Jesus in the Fourth Gospel does not actually do much of anything except make grandiloquent revelatory speeches. The actions that he does perform are primarily of a miraculous character: changing water into wine, healing the blind and lame, and raising Lazarus from the dead. Can these serve as patterns for the community's action?[19]

The fact that the term *sēmeion* ("sign") is never used in John's Gospel with reference to Jesus' followers (the reference to believers' "greater works" than Jesus in John 14:12 notwithstanding) also seems to suggest that founding John's ethic on Jesus' "signs" as narrated in the first half of John's Gospel would be rather precarious.[20]

Second, not only the "signs," but also Jesus' *discourses* and *major dialogues with individuals* in the Fourth Gospel are primarily devoted to *messianic revelation* and the *impartation of important spiritual truths* rather than to *ethical instruction*. This will become clear in our study of Jesus' interaction with Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman in John 3 and 4 below.

Third, the literary exploration of John's moral vision in the Johannine narrative is also rendered more difficult by the *seeming delay of the full expression of John's ethic until fairly late in the Gospel*. The first twelve

---

[18] Though see the cautions registered below. For a critique of the "incarnational model" of mission as applied to John's Gospel see Andreas J. Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples according to the Fourth Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 212–17.

[19] Richard Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament* (San Francisco: Harper, 1996), 143.

[20] On Jesus' "signs" in John's Gospel see Andreas J. Köstenberger, "The Seventh Johannine Sign: A Study in John's Christology," *BBR* 5 (1995): 87–103.

chapters of John's Gospel are primarily designed to show the Jewish rejection of Jesus' messianic mission (see esp. John 12:36–41); only in John 13 does Jesus seem to turn his attention more explicitly to the ethical instruction of his followers.[21]

What is John's moral vision, then? As mentioned, a good place to begin is taking inventory of the ethical vocabulary in John's Gospel. In doing so, however, one encounters yet another difficulty: the virtually complete absence of terms conveying a conventional understanding of ethics and morality, including expressions such as "repent" or "repentance," a reference to believers' "works," or the words "righteousness" or "righteous."[22] It quickly becomes clear that John's ethic proceeds along rather different lines than the conventional definition of morality. Rather than focus on moral integrity or the need for righteous conduct, both the Gospel and the epistles reveal an ethic that is primarily centered on love. Love terminology, in turn, interfaces with vocabulary related to commandment-keeping and mission.

A closer look at "love" terminology in John's Gospel also confirms our initial impression that John's ethic comes to the fore fully only in the second half of John's Gospel. While the first twelve chapters of John include only *three theologically significant instances* of the *agap-* word group—John 3:16 (by the evangelist), with its reference to God's love for the world, and the virtually identical affirmations of the Father's love for the Son in John 3:35 (also by the evangelist) and John 10:17 (Jesus)[23]—John 13–17 features as many as *thirty-one* instances of the *agap-* word group alone.[24] After two strategic instances of "love"

[21] At a closer look, this should not surprise us. If Nicodemus' and the Jews' greatest need was spiritual regeneration; if the Samaritans' greatest need was worship in spirit and truth; and if the Gentiles' greatest need was to be drawn to Jesus subsequent to his exaltation at the cross; it stands to reason that teaching Nicodemus, or the Samaritan woman, or the Gentile centurion, on their need for Christlike love would have been premature. Since Jesus' love commandment presupposes regeneration and faith in Jesus as God's Son, it is entirely appropriate that his explicit teaching on the subject is delayed until a later time.

[22] "Repentance" vocabulary (such as *metanoia*, "repentance," or *metanoeō*, "repent") is completely absent. The five instances of terms related to "righteousness" (*dikaios*, "righteous," *dikaiosynē*, "righteousness") are not relevant. Regarding believers' "works," see the telling interchange in John 6:28–29 which identifies faith in Jesus as the only "work" required. The reference to believers' "greater works" than Jesus in John 14:12 is no real exception.

[23] The only other instance of the *agap-* word group in the first half of John's Gospel is the reference to Jesus' love for Lazarus (John 11:5). For a defense of attributing John 3:16 and 3:35 to the evangelist, see Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 113–14 and 133.

[24] Five additional instances are found in John 18–21, namely references to "the disciple Jesus loved" (John 19:26; 21:7, 20; cf. 13:23) and to Jesus' commissioning of

terminology in the opening verse of the Farewell Discourse, these are clustered in four major passages: (1) John 13:34–35; (2) John 14:15–31 (esp. 14:21–24); (3) John 15:9–17; and (4) John 17:20–26.[25]

This strongly suggests that love is at the heart of John's moral vision, and that this motif forms the heart of Jesus' ethical instruction of his followers in the Farewell Discourse. Nevertheless, in light of the above-registered observation that writers embody or incarnate their meanings (in the present instance, ethical meanings) in concrete literary forms and characters, we will select two major narratives from the first half of John's Gospel, Jesus' encounters with Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman in John 3 and 4, for literary analysis.

The Anticipation of John's Moral Vision in the First Half of John's Gospel

The narration of the Nicodemus incident spans John 3:1–15. The conversation commences with a reference to Jesus' performance of signs (John 3:2; cf. 2:23). The emphasis in Jesus' response lies on the necessity of spiritual regeneration, which takes up essentially the entire interchange with Nicodemus (John 3:3–9). Throughout the narrative, there is also an emphasis on Nicodemus'—and, by implication, the Sanhedrin's—ignorance and unbelief. This is indicated by the repeated use of verbs of knowing (John 3:2, 8, 10, 11) and believing (John 3:11, 12, 15), or more specifically, references to people's ignorance and unbelief (cf. John 4:39, 41, 42).

The account of Jesus' encounter with Nicodemus in verses 1–15 is followed by the evangelist's own commentary in verses 16–21. While references to "love" are entirely absent from the actual narrative in verses 1–15, the evangelist frames the incident from the outset in terms of "love": "For God *so loved* the world . . ." (v. 16). A second instance of "love" terminology is found in verse 19, where people in the world are said to "love" darkness rather than light. Hence, what at first appears to be framed as a "battle of *knowledge*" between two Jewish teachers, Nicodemus "the Teacher of Israel" (v. 10) and Jesus, who is called

---

Peter (John 21:15, 16). Negative references involving "love" are found in John 3:19; 5:42; 8:42; and 12:43.

[25] The occurrences of the other major Johannine word for "love," *phileō*, corroborate this pattern of usage but add little to the overall semantic profile. The use of *phileō* in 5:20 corresponds to the use of *agapaō* in 3:35. For the references involving *phileō* in 11:3, 36, see the use of *agapaō* 11:5. With regard to 20:2, see 13:23; 19:26; 21:7, 20. Concerning the use of *phileō* in 21:15–17, cf. the use of *agapaō* in 21:15–16. For the negative references involving *phileō* in 12:25 and 15:19, cf. 3:19; 5:42; 8:42; and 12:43. The references to the Father's love for believers and to believers' love for Jesus involving *phileō* in 16:27 correspond to the references involving *agapaō* in the Farewell Discourse discussed above.

"rabbi" by Nicodemus (v. 2), in the evangelist's own subsequent commentary turns out to be a tale of contrasting *loves*—God's love for the world, which prompted him to send his one-of-a-kind Son (v. 16), and the world's self-love and preference of darkness over the light (v. 19).

On the one hand, then, John's love ethic is only touched at briefly in the evangelist's explication of the Nicodemus narrative in John 3:16 and the contrasting references in John 3:19–21. In another sense, however, John's love ethic is already present in Jesus, whose mission consists in expressing God's love to the world. As the paradigmatic Sent One from the Father, Jesus, in his encounter with Nicodemus, already embodies the coming of Love to the world. At the same time, the teaching that Jesus' followers must love *each other as Jesus loved them* in order for their mission to the world to be effective awaits the second half of the Gospel.

The second narrative, Jesus' encounter with the Samaritan woman in John 4:1–42, focuses squarely on the progressive revelation of Jesus' true identity. The woman first calls Jesus "a Jew" (v. 9). Later, she acknowledges him as "a prophet" (v. 19). Finally, she asks, "Could this be the Messiah?" (v. 29). While Jesus' actions toward the woman were doubtless prompted by love, this point is not explicitly made by the fourth evangelist; the account does not contain a single instance of "love" terminology. Rather, the overt emphasis is on *truth*: those who want to worship God must worship him in spirit *and truth* (John 4:23–24), and the Samaritans know that Jesus is "truly" the Savior of the world (John 4:42).

Nevertheless, as in the case of the Nicodemus narrative, if not more explicitly, there is a sense in which John's love ethic is already present in Jesus. I say "more explicitly" because embedded in the narrative of John 4:1–42 is Jesus' instruction of his followers with regard to *mission* in John 4:32–38. In the context of his outreach to the Samaritans, Jesus makes clear that his followers will be called to enter into their predecessors' labor and to reap the fruit of their efforts. Hence in the mission of Jesus, and in his confrontation of the Samaritan woman with her sin and need for a Savior (cf. John 4:42), God's love is shown to have come into the world and to engage in a mission to reach out to those separated from God.

The lessons that emerge from our study of John 3 and 4 are at least three. First, if John's ethic centers on love, this emphasis cannot easily be gleaned from these narratives, though the evangelist's commentary on the Nicodemus narrative in John 3:16–21 provides important confirmation for our thesis. God's love stands squarely behind Jesus' mission to the Jews, represented by Nicodemus; yet the overt focus of the narrative is on their need of spiritual regeneration. John 4:1–42, for

its part, does not contain a single instance of "love" terminology. While love is clearly not absent in Jesus' interaction with the Samaritan woman, it is hardly the overt focus of the evangelist's narrative.

Second, the fact that John's love ethic only surfaces later in the Gospel narrative underscores the hermeneutical wisdom of discerning doctrine on the basis of didactic rather than narrative passages (the Farewell Discourse rather than John 3 and 4). A study of narrative passages may corroborate findings attained by an analysis of didactic material, but it may be tenuous to derive one's understanding of a given aspect of John's theology primarily from narrative material.

Third, the Johannine narratives concerning Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman are by no means the only possible places where one finds a proleptic expression of John's moral vision. Jesus is motivated by cruciform love in everything he does in this Gospel. This is not limited to his various "signs" (such as the miraculous replenishing of the wine at the Cana wedding or the healings narrated in chapters 5 and 9); it pertains also to Jesus' speaking the truth in love to his opponents who are motivated by self-interest and do not truly love God they way they should (cf. John 5:42; 8:42; 12:43). With this we turn to an exploration of John's moral vision in the second half of his Gospel.

The Full Expression of John's Moral Vision in the Second Half of John's Gospel

Introduction

While the first half of John's Gospel contains precursors of John's moral vision—most notably, the evangelist's gloss on the meaning of the Nicodemus narrative in John 3:16—it is the second half of the Johannine drama that reveals Jesus' ethic to its fullest extent. From a literary standpoint, the *footwashing narrative* in John 13:1–15 (with its negative corollary, Judas' betrayal, in John 13:16–30) serves as a preamble to the Farewell Discourse by featuring Jesus as the *incarnate example of a love ethic* that is further explicated in didactic terms in the remainder of the discourse (John 13:31–17:26).

The significance of the footwashing in John's Gospel as an expression of John's moral vision is further underscored by the fact that, as an exemplary act of Christ encapsulating the Johannine ethic, the footwashing is utterly unique and without parallel in the rest of the Gospel.[26] Everywhere else, Jesus is the one-of-a-kind Son of God, who

[26] *Contra* James D. G. Dunn, "The Washing of the Disciples' Feet in John 13:1–20," *ZNW* 61 (1970): 247–52 (cited in R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983], 118, n. 40), who calls the footwashing "one of the long line of metaphors and pictures" in John's Gospel.

performs his startling messianic "signs"; who as the Good Shepherd dies a substitutionary cross-death for the sins of humanity; and who reveals God, whom no one has ever seen, as only God incarnate is able to do. In the footwashing alone do we find *an act of Jesus that believers are specifically urged to emulate in their relationships with one another*. This didactic use of a particular act would have resonated both with John's Jewish and Gentile readers. His Jewish readers would have been familiar with the pattern of "mystifying gesture-question-interpretation," which was common among the rabbis.[27] His Greek-speaking audience was used to being told of exemplary expressions of virtue that served as moral benchmarks for them to attain.[28]

The Narrative Preamble: The Paradigmatic Nature of the Footwashing

The stage for the footwashing is set by a lengthy *preamble* provided by the *narrator* in John 13:1–3 that serves the dual role of introducing the second half of John's Gospel as a whole and the footwashing as the opening scene. The preamble wastes no time in setting the ensuing events—culminating in Jesus' crucifixion—in the context of sacrificial, perfected love:

> It was just before the Passover Festival. Jesus knew that the hour had come for him to leave this world and go to the Father [a Johannine euphemism for Jesus' cross-death]. Having *loved* his own who were in the world, he *loved* them *to the end* (John 13:1).

With this preamble, the evangelist casts the footwashing as a paradigmatic—or "hypodeigmatic": the Greek word for "example" in John 13:15 is *hypodeigma*—demonstration of Jesus' love for his followers.[29] Love—perfect love—is hence the legacy Jesus bequeaths on his disciples, together with his peace (John 14:27; 16:33) and joy (John 15:11; 16:20–24; 17:13). The genre of farewell discourse is perfectly suited as a literary vehicle for conveying Jesus' final legacy.

In a highly dramatic *contrasting* fashion, the narrator follows up the reference to Jesus' expression of love with that to the devil's instigation of Judas' betrayal in verse 2. The statement is intensified in at least four ways: (1) the perfect participle *beblēkotos*, "cast"; (2) the reference to Judas by his full name, "Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot"; (3) the compact double genitive absolute; and (4) the somewhat convoluted

[27] Andreas J. Köstenberger, "Jesus as Rabbi in the Fourth Gospel," *BBR* 8 (1998): 115–17.

[28] For examples, see Köstenberger, *John*, 408, n. 47.

[29] Hays, *Moral Vision of the New Testament*, 144, calls the footwashing an "enacted parable."

syntax of the second half of the verse, "cast into the heart in order that he might betray him."

The emphatic reference to Jesus' complete knowledge at the outset of verse 3 (by way of another perfect participle) reiterates the similar reference in verse 1 and chiastically frames and envelops the reference to Judas' diabolically-prompted betrayal in verse 2, graphically illustrating the all-embracing, sovereign nature of Jesus' love and knowledge. Also reassuring are the references to "the Father" as the one to whom Jesus is about to return and as the one who had given all things into Jesus' hands in verses 1 and 3.

After the general, larger theological setting-in-scene in verses 1–3, verses 4–5 provide the more immediate setting of the supper (the reference to the supper, *deipnon*, in v. 4 harks back to v. 2), narrating at some length Jesus' preparations for the footwashing and the unfolding of the proceedings associated with it. The blow-by-blow account of the sequence of events, from Jesus' getting up to his taking off his outer clothing, to his wrapping a towel around his waist, to his pouring water into a basin, to his beginning to wash his disciples' feet, to his drying them with a towel, graphically represents the unfolding of this most amazing act before the disciples' very eyes, which no doubt had an agonizing effect on them as they looked on in utter shame, embarrassment, and astonishment.

With the narration of Jesus' arrival at Peter (called by his fuller name "Simon Peter" as elsewhere in the first reference to Peter in a given narrative in John's Gospel) in verse 6 the account reaches its focal point. Peter's protest is underscored by the emphatic juxtaposition of the personal pronouns (not required in the Greek) "you" and "my": [literally], "Lord, *you my* washing the feet?" Jesus' initial effort to reassure Peter in verse 7 fails to dissuade him, and his protest only intensifies: "You shall never, ever wash my feet!" (John 12:8; conveyed by a triple negative, *ou mē . . . eis ton aiōna*).

Jesus' second response overwhelmingly accomplishes its purpose, however, and Peter flip-flops to the opposite extreme, wanting Jesus not only to wash his feet but also his hands and head (v. 9). As Jesus calmly retorts, washing the feet is sufficient; the disciples are already clean (note that now the personal pronoun "you" is in the plural, v. 10), though not all of them—a not-so-subtle reference to the betrayer, as the narrator is quick to point out in an aside in verse 11.[30]

[30] It should be noted that Jesus, remarkably, appears to have washed even Judas' (the betrayer's) feet, demonstrating the love of enemies he taught in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5:43–48), though this point is not made explicitly by the fourth evangelist. Yet while Jesus apparently washed Judas' feet, he does not proceed with his final instruction

Hence the *focal point* of the footwashing narrative consists in a *single scene*, Jesus' interchange with Peter. *Dramatic suspense* is created by Peter's objection and Jesus' initially unsuccessful, but eventually effective, clarification of the significance of his stunning action. Peter and Judas, the two major characters besides Jesus in John 13:1–30, thus serve as contrasting examples of disciples: the one, Peter, is already clean, that is, effectively cleansed by Christ's imminent death on the cross; the other, Judas, removes himself from the circle of Jesus' love by his already-sealed act of betrayal (note the perfect participle *beblēkotos* in verse 2).[31]

A whole web of previous and subsequent references to Judas' act and its consequences is spun by the evangelist throughout his narrative, linking John 13:10–11 with the carefully woven fabric of the Johannine discourse (cf. John 6:70–71; 12:4–6; 13:21–30; 17:12). Cleanness, as effected in a literal sense by the footwashing but as metaphorically represented by the spiritual cleanness afforded by vital association with Jesus, hence becomes the ruling conceptuality in the footwashing narrative. The narrator's comments in verse 12 succinctly conclude the narrative up to this point, corresponding to the opening setting-in-scene in verses 4 and 5.

Jesus' words of explication in verses 13–17 provide a strong exclamation point by drawing attention to the complete reversal of status implicit in the footwashing: "Now that *I, your Lord and Teacher*, have washed your feet, *you also* [lowly disciples] should wash one another's feet" (v. 14). Whatever perceptions of differences in status there might be among his followers, Jesus calls them to lay these aside. If the one whose status was clearly higher than that of others, that is, the Teacher and Master of his disciples, laid it aside to serve those of lower status, how much more ought those who do not really differ in status at all—Jesus' followers—put aside any false perceptions of status superiority in favor of selfless, others-oriented service.

By capturing the essence of the significance of Jesus' act on the cross, the footwashing narrative, depicting first its enactment and subsequently its explication and expansions on its significance, thus provides an *antecedent commentary on the meaning of the cross*. When the reader finally arrives at the account of Jesus' crucifixion, he has already been provided with the clue to unlocking the cross's true meaning and significance: Jesus' commitment to sacrificial, selfless service as the outward demonstration of his perfect love for others.

---

of his followers until subsequent to Judas' departure from the Upper Room (cf. John 13:30).

[31] Peter is also paired with the "disciple Jesus loved" in the second half of John's Gospel: see Köstenberger, *Missions of Jesus and the Disciples*, 154–61.

By implication, claims of love that are not accompanied by service remain hollow and inadequate, and outward displays of piety must give way to lowly service of one's fellow believer. Just as Peter (albeit reluctantly) yields to the necessity of divine cleansing, so all believers should recognize that they, too, have dirty feet—before they can wash the feet of others, they must first have Jesus wash theirs. Pride must not get in the way of service, be it a false sense of one's moral pedigree or a misperception of one's status.

Not only is John's love ethic incarnated in the footwashing narrative proper (John 13:1–17), the *negative corollary*, still in the opening narrative, is provided by the strongly contrasting *example of Judas*, who rejects Jesus' love and removes himself from the loving circle of fellowship surrounding Jesus and his disciples (John 13:18–30). Unlike the other members of the Twelve, Judas did not "remain" in Jesus' love (John 13:10–11; cf. 15:2, 6, 9).[32] Jesus' remarks in verses 18ff resume and further explicate his statement in verse 10 that not every one of the disciples is clean. The continued presence of both Peter and Judas and the identity of location provide literary *cohesion* between the footwashing in verses 1–17 and the exposure of Judas the betrayer in verses 18–30.

In verses 18ff., the narrator skillfully explores the mystery surrounding the betrayer's identity in the original context—though the reader has been let in on Judas's identity early on in the narrative—by narrating the sequence of events from Peter's motioning to the beloved disciple, to the beloved disciple's inquiry of Jesus, to Jesus' identification of a sign—his dipping of a piece of bread and giving it to a certain individual. In the narrative, only Peter and the beloved disciple appear to come to know the identity of the betrayer. The reference to Satan entering into Judas in verse 27 harks back to the anticipatory reference to this event in the preamble in verse 2 (an *inclusio*). Also conspicuous is the complete absence of "love terminology" in verses 18-30, with the exception of the reference to the "disciple Jesus loved" in verse 23. (Incidentally, the apostle John's self-reference as "the disciple Jesus loved" is in itself a poignant expression of his ethic. The fact that he knew himself loved by Jesus is central to his sense of identity and mission. And as the rest of John's love ethic, the title "the disciple Jesus loved" is delayed until chapter 13.)

---

[32] The evangelist had hinted at this at the first major juncture indicating the failure of Jesus' mission at the end of chapter 6 (cf. John 6:70–71). Judas' antagonism became even more explicit in his objection to Mary's act of devotion in John 12:4–8. For a comparative analysis of John's account of the anointing in relation to the Synoptics see Andreas J. Köstenberger, "A Comparison of the Pericopae of Jesus' Anointing," in *Studies in John and Gender* (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 49–63.

Moving on in the narrative, Judas' departure in John 13:30 is the signal for the Farewell Discourse proper to begin, as is indicated by the prominent closure statement, "and it was night." The implicit message is that by betraying Jesus, Judas departs from the "light" and steps into the "darkness," conveying his rejection of Jesus' love ethic (cf. John 1:5; 1 John 4:16 *et passim*). Subsequent to Judas' departure, Peter's misguided pledge of loyalty furnishes an example of the insufficient nature of human loyalty apart from the Spirit's enablement (John 13:36–38).

The Explication and Expansion of Jesus' Love Ethic in the Remainder of the Farewell Discourse

As we have seen, the footwashing narrative serves as a *preamble* to the full explication of John's love ethic in the remainder of the Farewell Discourse. *Jesus' act of love, and conversely Judas' act of betrayal, thus set the stage for Jesus' enunciation of his "new commandment"* in John 13:34–35:

> A new command I give you: Love one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another. By this everyone will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another.[33]

The designation of Jesus' commandment as "new" is startling at first. Clearly, the command to love one's neighbor was not new (cf. Lev. 19:18). Love within the community was highly regarded at Qumran (e.g., 1QS 1:10), and neighbor love was emphasized by the first-century rabbi Hillel (e.g., *m. 'Abot* 1:12). What was new, however, was Jesus' command for his disciples to love one another *as he had loved them*—laying down his life for them (cf. the discussion of John 13:1 above and of John 15:13 below; see also 1 John 3:23; 4:7–8, 11–12, 19–21). In the present passage, Jesus' followers are urged, not once, but three times (cf. John 21:15–17), to love one another, and this "new commandment" is grounded not merely in an external commandment, but in Jesus' own example. This kind of sacrificial, self-giving, selfless love, a unique quality of love inspired by Jesus' own love for his disciples, is to serve as the foundational ethic for the new messianic community and constitute the unique mark of Jesus' disciples.

The *first major expansion* of Jesus' love commandment is found in John 14:15-31, especially verses 21-24, where loving Jesus is defined as "obeying his commandments," in the larger context specifically his "new

[33] Cf. ibid. In his first epistle, John reiterates that fulfilling this commandment constitutes proof that a given person is in fact a believer (1 John 2:7–11; cf. 3:23; 4:19-21; 5:2-3).

commandment" of loving one another as Christ loved other people. Obedience is the proof of love. This gives concrete shape to the love required by Jesus. It is not merely a strong emotional attachment to Jesus (cf. John 13:36-38) or even a positive intellectual response to his teaching (John 2:23-25; 8:31). Not everyone who "believes" in Jesus or is called a "disciple" in John's Gospel truly believes or truly turns out to be Jesus' follower in the long run (cf. John 2:23-25; 6:60-71; 8:31ff.). Loving Jesus means obeying his commandments, none of which is greater than love.

The *second major expansion* of Jesus' "new commandment" is found in a passage that forms part of the literary "peak" of the Farewell Discourse, John 15:9-18. On the heels of John 15:1-8, a section which underscores the importance of sustaining a vital spiritual union with the exalted Christ through the Holy Spirit, John 15:9-17 reiterates and expands Jesus' earlier instruction for his disciples to love each other:

> As the Father has loved me, so have I loved you. Now remain in my love. If you keep my commands, you will remain in my love, just as I have kept my Father's commands and remain in his love. If you keep my commands, you will remain in my love, just as I have kept my Father's commands and remain in his love . . . My command is this: Love each other as I have loved you. Greater love has no one than this: to lay down one's life for one's friends. . . . This is my command: Love each other.

A close study of this passage reveals, first, that there is a close formal parallel between John 15:9 and the Johannine commissioning passage in John 20:21 (in turn echoing Jesus' final prayer in John 17:18). This parallelism implies that knowing *God's love in his Son precedes the call to Christian service and mission*. No one can go and tell others the gospel who has not first come to know for himself the love of God in Christ. Second, as believers embark on their mission, they are called to *remain* in Jesus' love (John 15:9-10), which points beyond one's initial realization of God's love to the need of *continuing* in love as believers relate to one another and engage in outreach to unbelievers (John 15:1-8).

Third, loving Jesus is said to find its necessary expression in *"obeying Jesus' commands,"* that is, abiding by his teaching and following his instructions (John 15:10; cf. John 8:31; 1 John 2:3-8). Jesus' body of teaching thus becomes a "new law" for believers in keeping with, and yet transcending, the pattern set by the regulations found in the Mosaic Law, indicating the fulfillment of Jeremiah's vision that God will write his Law on people's hearts in the days of the new covenant (Jer. 31:31-34). As Richard Hays points out, "[T]he Law of Moses plays no explicit role in John's moral vision; it is read as

prefiguring Jesus, and its meaning is seemingly absorbed into his person."[34] He continues, "Nowhere in John do we find any appeal to the Law as prescriptive of moral conduct; it cannot be assumed that the Torah implicitly remains normative for John's community."[35] Nevertheless, the Law is encapsulated by Jesus' "new commandment" of Christlike love among his followers for one another and for the world.

Fourth, the love of Jesus, which found its expression in the *concrete act* of the *footwashing*, is further accentuated in John 15:13: "Greater love has no one than this: to lay down one's life for one's friends" (cf. 1 John 3:16). Hence the love of the Son expressed at the *cross*, which, in turn, is an expression of God's love for the world (John 3:16), is at once the culminating act of the mission of the obedient Son (John 19:30) and the fullest expression of God's love, encapsulated in the principle of "laying down one's life for one's friends."[36] Significantly, this statement broadens the scope of reference *beyond the crucifixion* to the principle of *self-denying, others-oriented service*, in keeping with Jesus' earlier statement in John 12:24-26,

> Very truly I tell you, unless a kernel of wheat falls to the ground and dies [a veiled reference to the crucifixion], it remains only a single seed. But if it dies, it produces many seeds. Those who love their life will lose it, while those who hate their life in this world will keep it for eternal life. Whoever serves me must follow me; and where I am, my servant also will be. My Father will honor the one who serves me.

While "laying down one's life" for others is not limited to martyrdom, it includes it, which stresses the costly nature of serving others in the community of believers as required by Jesus.[37]

Fifth, the immediate scope of "laying down one's life," according to Jesus, is "one's friends," that is, *other believers*. The members of Jesus' new messianic community are united by a special bond—they all know of God's love for them in Jesus (witness the author's self-designation as "the disciple Jesus loved," John 13:23 *et passim*). Their practice of this love within their own community, in turn, is the indispensable

---

[34] Hays, *Moral Vision of the New Testament*, 138.

[35] Ibid., 139.

[36] Cf. Hays in ibid., 144-45, who writes that "Jesus' death is depicted by John . . . as an act of self-sacrificial love that establishes the cruciform life as the norm for discipleship" (145).

[37] So rightly Hays in ibid., 145. Hays also mentions the "pragmatic spin" given the love commandment in 1 John 3:11, 16–18, where application is made to the issue of economic justice.

prerequisite for the successful accomplishment of their mission, as the following pericope makes abundantly clear.[38]

The *third major expansion* of Jesus' love commandment is found in the final major cluster of references to love in the Farewell Discourse in John 17:20-26, the conclusion of Jesus' final prayer. Here emphasis is placed on the importance of believers' unity as they pursue their mission of proclaiming the gospel message. Jesus' "love commandment" is thus expanded for a third time by underscoring the necessity of love and unity in the church's fulfillment of its evangelistic mandate.[39] Importantly, this expansion provides an important complement to the original explication of Jesus' "love commandment" in John 13:34-35, which, taken by itself, could be taken to imply that John's moral vision was limited to love within the community of believers. As John 17:20–26 makes unmistakably clear, however, love among believers is not viewed as an end in itself, but as a means to an end—believers' mission to the world. Hence John's love ethic has found its full expression, from its initial incarnation in Jesus' act of washing his disciples' feet, to its explication in the new love commandment in John 13:34–35, to its three expansions, which culminate in the teaching that believers' love and unity are to be seen with the larger purview of mission.

Conclusion

It has been our assignment to discern John's moral vision, and to do so by literary means. John's "love" terminology proved to be an important signpost for locating the focal point of John's ethic. While we found an anticipation of the evangelist's love ethic in his commentary on the Nicodemus pericope in John 3:16-21, and globally in Jesus' continual pursuit of his mission of expressing God's love for the world, it became apparent that the full expression of John's moral vision is not given until the second half of John's Gospel.

One of the most important findings of the present study is that the footwashing narrative serves as the incarnation of John's ethic by presenting Jesus' act of love as a paradigmatic event that functions as a preamble for the explication of John's love ethic in the remainder of the Farewell Discourse. Our literary investigation has shown that the initial explication is found in Jesus' love commandment in John 13:34-35, which in turn is followed by three expansions in John 14:21-24, 15:9-18, and 17:20-26.

---

[38]As will be seen further below, loving one another is putting first things first, without reducing believers' obligations exclusively to reciprocal love.

[39] See further Andreas J. Köstenberger, "John's Trinitarian Mission Theology," *SBJT* (forthcoming).

John's moral vision is simple yet profound. Knowing the world's spiritual and moral darkness apart from the Light, Jesus Christ, John holds out no hope for those without Christ. He does not discuss keeping the Law; he does not explicitly address the issue of righteousness other than to urge rejection of sin (1 John 3:6; cf. 3:4-10);[40] he does not engage the issue of works, other than to report Jesus' answer to those who asked him what they must do to perform the works required by God: "The work of God is this: to believe in the one he has sent" (John 6:30).

John's moral vision, in a nutshell, is simply this. Sinful people must recognize that they are deeply loved by God and believe in the one God has sent (though John does not explicitly use the word "repentance"). By believing, they enter into the circle of love that exists between the persons of the Godhead, and they also enter into the triune God's purpose and mission: to spread the message of God's love for the world in his Son in the face of opposition and hostility. As John writes in his first epistle, "God is love," and "We love because he first loved us" (1 John 4:16, 19).

Nevertheless, believing oneself loved by God and entering into the triune circle of love is not devoid of moral moorings, which is indicated by John's (and Jesus') use of Old Testament language and particularly the repeated reference to Jesus' "commandments." "Whoever has my commands and keeps them is the one who loves me" (John 14:21); "If you keep my commands, you will remain in my love" (John 15:10); "We know that we have come to know him if we keep his commands. Whoever says, 'I know him,' but does not do what he commands is a liar, and the truth is not in him. But if anyone obeys his word, love for God is truly made complete in him" (1 John 2:3-5).

This may not be in keeping with our definition of morality or ethics.[41] But what does that tell us? It may be an indication that our definition of these matters privileges certain biblical writers—Paul, Matthew—while neglecting others (John). Yet at the core, John's moral vision is at least as valid, and perhaps even more profound, than that of other New Testament voices. In his simple manner of presentation, John cuts to the heart of a given issue, practicing what one may call a "sanctified

[40] "Righteous" (*dikaios*) in John's Gospel is only the Father (John 17:25; cf. 1 John 1:9; Rev. 15:3; 16:5, 7; 19:2), and the only two instances of the term "righteousness" (*dikaiosynē*) in John's Gospel probably have Jesus as a referent (cf. 1 John 2:1, 29; Rev. 19:11; alternatively, reference is made to the world's lack of righteousness; see the discussion in Köstenberger, *John*, 472). The sole exceptions in the Johannine corpus where the *dikaio-* word group refers to righteous actions by believers are found in 1 John 3:7 (positive reference), 10 (negative reference), 12 (Abel); and Rev. 22:11.

[41] Cf. Hays, *Moral Vision of the New Testament*, 146, who comments regarding 1 John 4:20–21, "This may not be the last word to be said about Christian ethics, but it is not a bad place to begin."

reductionism." Non-essentials are stripped away, leaving what is most essential.

In the present case, what is most essential is God's love for a lost world, his sending of his Son to die for humanity on the cross, and people's need to believe in the one God has sent. For those who do, however, the story does not end there. In fact, by believing they embark on a most amazing venture: joining the divine triune mission to the world by being taken into the sphere of the Godhead's love and mission. There is no dichotomy between Jesus being Savior and Lord, no dichotomy between discipleship and evangelism, no dichotomy between salvation and sanctification. All there is is Jesus' commission of his followers to serve as his representatives and to proclaim the good news of salvation and forgiveness in Christ and to "go and bear fruit—fruit that remains."

What is more, with its emphasis on intracommunitarian love and mission to the world, John's Gospel also highlights the clearly defined parameters of the community of Jesus' followers on the one hand and of those who do not believe in Jesus on the other. This, in turn, has important social implications as well. Conversion, while spiritual in nature and entailing regeneration (John 3:3, 5), must be accompanied by confession of Jesus and a transfer of allegiance from one's previous faith community to the new messianic community.

"Secret discipleship" is strongly disparaged (cf. John 9:18–23; 12:42-43), and indecision not an option.[42] Evasion of the world's hatred by failing to identify oneself clearly with Jesus and his followers is not consistent with Christian discipleship and places one outside the pale of the community of believers. Hence following John's moral vision entails not merely obedience but also courage: a willingness to emulate the example of Jesus, who was prepared to lose, and in fact did lose, his life for the sake of others, only to enter eternal life, which by virtue of our association with Jesus is ours already in the here and now and will be ours for all eternity.[43]

---

[42] See Andreas J. Köstenberger, "'What is Truth?' Pilate's Question in Its Johannine and Larger Biblical Context," *JETS* 48 (2005): 33–62, esp. 50–52; repr. in *Whatever Happened to Truth?* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2005). Cf. Hays, *Moral Vision of the New Testament*, 148, 155–56, whose discussion contains helpful insights despite his dependence on the "Johannine community hypothesis."

[43] On John's eschatology see Hays, *Moral Vision of the New Testament*, 148–50, 152–53.

Midwestern Journal of Theology 4.2 (Spring 2006): 24-42.

The Biblical Framework for Marriage

Andreas J. Köstenberger
Professor of New Testament
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Wake Forest, NC 27587

For the first time in its history, Western civilization is confronted with the need to *define* the meaning of the terms "marriage" and "family." What until now has been considered a "normal" family, made up of a father, a mother, and a number of children, has in recent years increasingly begun to be viewed as one among several options, which can no longer claim to be the only or even superior form of ordering human relationships. The Judeo-Christian view of marriage and the family with its roots in the Hebrew Scriptures has to a significant extent been replaced with a set of values that prizes human rights, self-fulfillment, and pragmatic utility on an individual or societal level. It can rightly be said that marriage and the family are *institutions under siege* in our world today, and that with marriage and the family, our very civilization is in crisis.

The current cultural crisis, however, is merely symptomatic of a deep-seated *spiritual* crisis that continues to gnaw at the foundations of our once-shared societal values. If God the Creator in fact, as the Bible teaches, instituted marriage and the family, and if there is an evil being called Satan who wages war against God's creative purposes on this world, it should come as no surprise that the divine foundation of these institutions has come under massive attack in recent years. Ultimately, we human beings, whether we realize it or not, are involved in a *cosmic spiritual conflict* that pits God against Satan, with marriage and the family serving as a key arena in which spiritual and cultural battles are fought. If, then, the *cultural* crisis is symptomatic of an underlying *spiritual* crisis, the solution likewise must be spiritual, not merely cultural.

In the book *God, Marriage & Family*, my collaborators and I have attempted to point the way to this spiritual solution: a return to, and rebuilding of, the biblical foundation of marriage and the family.[1] God's Word is not dependent on man's approval, and the Scriptures are not

[1] Andreas J. Köstenberger (with David W. Jones), *God, Marriage, and Family: Rebuilding the Biblical Foundation* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2004). The following material is adapted from Chapters 1, 3, and 8 of this book.

silent regarding the vital issues facing men and women and families today. In each of the important areas related to marriage and the family, the Bible offers satisfying instructions and wholesome remedies to the maladies afflicting our culture. The Scriptures record the *divine institution* of marriage and present a *Christian theology* of marriage and parenting. They offer insight for decision-making regarding abortion, contraception, infertility, and adoption. They offer helpful guidance for those who are single or unmarried and address the major threats to marriage and the family, homosexuality and divorce.

Time will not permit to deal with all these important topics today (though the book does). My purpose is more modest. In the few minutes I have, I want to draw our attention to three major overarching teachings regarding the *biblical framework for marriage* found in the apostle Paul's letter to the Ephesians.[2] As we study the well-known passage on marriage in Ephesians 5:21–33 in the *context of the entire epistle,* we will discover three important but often-overlooked principles that together form the biblical framework for marriage.

The Biblical Framework for Marriage

Before we look at the three major principles on marriage flowing from a study of Paul's teaching in Ephesians as a whole, it will be useful to provide a brief survey of the epistle. This will help us to understand Paul's teaching on marriage within the larger context of the theology of the letter as a whole. The letter is addressed to those set apart for God (*hagioi*) and faithful in Christ Jesus (*pistoi*, Eph. 1:1). Paul opens the epistle with a lengthy section of praise to God for endowing believers with every spiritual blessing in Christ (Eph. 1:3-14), followed by a section of thanksgiving and prayer (Eph. 1:15-23).

He reminds the recipients of the letter that they were once under Satan's control, but now have been made alive in Christ, by grace (Eph. 2:5). They have been raised and exalted *with Christ*, participating in his victory over Satan (Eph. 2:6). God's end-time plan to bring together all things in and under Christ is nowhere more evident than in his inclusion of the Gentiles in the community of believers together with believing

[2] See also the interesting recent discussion of Ephesians 5 by Francis Watson, *Agape, Eros, Gender: Towards a Pauline Sexual Ethic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 183–259. Watson keenly observes that both viewing Ephesians 5 as "a legitimation of patriarchal marriage" and claiming that it "transforms patriarchal marriage by subjecting it to the criterion of love" simplify the passage by ignoring its complexities (229, n. 6), referring to Ben Witherington, *Women and the Genesis of Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 156; and Sarah J. Tanzer, "Ephesians," in *Searching the Scriptures*, Vol. II: *A Feminist Commentary* (ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza; New York: Crossroad, 1994), 325–48, esp. 341.

Jews (Eph. 2:11-22; 3:6).[3] According to Paul, this is a salvation-historical "mystery" that in the past was concealed but now has been revealed by the apostle himself.[4]

At the close of his discussion of believers' spiritual blessings in Christ in chapters 1-3, Paul prays for that Christ would live in their hearts by faith and that, rooted and established in love, they would know the love of Christ (Eph. 3:17, 19). The fact that the apostle begins his prayer with a reference to God "the Father from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named" (Eph. 3:14-15) underscores the relevance of Paul's prayer not only for believers in general but for married couples and families in particular.

By calling God the Father from whom every family *on earth* is named, the Creator is identified as the one who both established marriage and who has rightful jurisdiction over it. By linking God's rule over families *in heaven and on earth*, his end-time purposes of uniting all things under Christ's headship are shown to encompass earthly families as well as heavenly realities, and since Christ is shown to have supreme authority over all supernatural as well as earthly beings, the husband's headship (affirmed in Eph. 5:23 below) by analogy connotes the exercise of authority over his wife as well.

The second half of the epistle is given to an exposition of the new life in Christ that believers are to enjoy in the unity of the "body of Christ," the church. They are to walk in a manner worthy of their calling, give preference to one another in love, and preserve spiritual unity in peace (Eph. 4:1-3; cf. 4:4-6). God has given spiritual gifts and instituted various ministries in the church to equip believers for ministry of their own. In all this, his goal is the "perfect man" (*andra teleion*, Eph. 4:13) who speaks the truth in love and in all things grows up into him who is the head, Christ (Eph. 4:13-16).

Paul proceeds to contrast the old self, with its independence, lack of submission to authority, rebelliousness, and bondage to passions and lusts, with the new self, which is characterized by proper submission, a

[3] Note that Gentiles comprise the majority of Paul's readership in Ephesians.

[4] See further at Eph. 5:32 below. The usual English translation of this expression by "mystery" is somewhat misleading in that "mystery" is at best a partial cognate of the Greek term *mystērion*. In fact, in a very important sense *mystērion* conveys the very opposite sense of "mystery," for while the English term means "something secret or unrevealed" or even "something intrinsically unknowable," the Greek expression refers to a truth that was previously undisclosed but has now been made known (see Andreas J. Köstenberger, "The Mystery of Christ and the Church: Head and Body, 'One Flesh,' " *TrinJ* 12 n.s. [1991]: 80–83). Other *mysterions* in Scripture include Christ himself (Col. 2:2; 4:3), the sanctification of believers (1 Tim. 3:16), the transformation (rapture?) of believers (1 Cor. 15:51), the current blindness of Israel (Rom. 11:25), and general lawlessness (2 Thess. 2:7).

respectful attitude toward authority, and love. Becoming a Christian is like putting off old clothes and putting on new ones (Eph. 4:22, 24; cf. Col. 3:9-10): there must be a marked, noticeable change in spirit and behavior—including behavior enacted in the context of marriage and the family.

In the context immediately preceding Paul's teaching on marital roles, the apostle exhorts believers to live lives of love in keeping with Christ's love who gave his life as a sacrifice for them (Eph. 5:1-2; cf. 5:25; John 13:34-35). Conversely, there must be no sexual immorality (*porneia*; Eph. 5:3; cf. 1 Cor. 6:15-16). As God's end-time community, the church (and hence every believer) ought to be filled with the Spirit (Eph. 5:18) in correspondence with God's filling of the Old Testament sanctuary with his spiritual presence.[5]

In the first instance, this Spirit-filling refers to congregational worship (and is thus corporate, rather than merely individualistic, in import; Eph. 5:19-20).[6] Still continuing the same sentence in the original Greek, Paul then relates Spirit-filling also to the marriage relationship (Ephesians 5:21-24). *Being properly submitted* (*hypotassō*, Eph. 5:21, 22) is thus a mark of Spirit-filling, in contrast to believers' previous life-style, which was characterized by rebellion toward authority.

Paul's twofold analogy between the headship of Christ and of the husband on the one hand and between the submission of the church and of the wife on the other in verses 23-24 makes clear that marriage in Christian teaching, rather than being an end in itself, is part of God's larger purposes in Christ (cf. Eph. 1:10). Just as Christ must rule over all heavenly powers (Eph. 1:21-22) and over the church (Eph. 4:15), he must also rule over the marital relationship (Eph. 5:21-33), the family (Eph. 6:1-4), and the workplace (Eph. 6:5-9).

Paul rounds out his discussion of marital roles with a familiar allusion to Scripture: ". . . and the two will become one flesh" (Eph. 5:31; cf. Gen. 2:24: "they"). Some believe that this reference to the creation narrative draws a connection between the marriage union and Christ's relationship with the church by way of typology, that is, a "typical" correspondence along salvation-historical lines, with Adam prefiguring Christ, Eve foreshadowing the church, and Adam and Eve's relationship

---

[5] See Andreas J. Köstenberger, "What Does It Mean to Be Filled with the Spirit? A Biblical Investigation," *JETS* 40 (1997): 229–40 for a detailed discussion of Eph. 5:18 and related passages.

[6] Cf. Timothy G. Gombis, "Being the Fullness of God in Christ by the Spirit: Ephesians 5:18 in its Epistolary Setting," *TynB* 53/2 (2002): 262–64, citing Thomas R. Schreiner, *Paul, Apostle of God's Glory in Christ: A Pauline Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001), 338; Köstenberger, "What Does It Mean?" 233; and Gordon D. Fee, *Paul, the Spirit, and the People of God* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996), 63–73.

typifying the union of Christ and the church.[7] This is possible, though it is important to note that the apostle's focus here lies squarely on the union of Christ and the church (cf. Eph. 5:30-32) and no longer on marriage (which dominated discussion in Eph. 5:21-29).[8]

In any case, Paul's major point seems to be that marriage has the honor of embodying the "one-flesh" principle that later in salvation history became true spiritually also for the union of the exalted Christ with the church, which is described by Paul in terms of "head," "members," and "body." This, too, like the inclusion of Gentiles in God's salvific plan, is a *mystērion*: it was hidden in the divine wisdom in ages past but now has been given to Paul to reveal. Marriage is thus shown to be part and parcel of God's overarching salvation-historical purposes of "bringing all things together under one head, even Christ" (Eph. 1:10 NIV).

Finally, a married couple, too, is part of that spiritual warfare that resolutely resists evil (Eph. 6:10-14) and seeks to promote God's purposes in this world (foremost the preaching of the gospel, Eph. 6:15, 19-20). Thus the marriage relationship should also be viewed in the context of Christian witness in an unbelieving environment, both directly by the husband's and the wife's living out God's purposes for the Christian couple, as well as indirectly by being part of a biblical church that actively propagates the gospel message. Not too often do we hear of marriage as a witnessing tool, but in God's plan, this is exactly what it is.

Principle #1: Marriage Is Part of God's End-Time Purpose of Bringing All Things Back Together under One Head, Jesus Christ (Eph. 1:10)

Now that we have surveyed the epistle to the Ephesians in its entirety, we are ready to look at the first major principle regarding marriage emerging from the book of Ephesians: Marriage is part of *God's end-time restoration of all things under the headship of Christ* (Eph. 1:10). As mentioned, in what may arguably be the key verse of Ephesians, Paul affirms God's overarching purpose for humanity (including married couples) in the age of Christ at the very outset of his epistle: "to bring all things in heaven and on earth together under one head (*anakephalaiō-sasthai*), even Christ" (Eph. 1:10 NIV).

This establishes *Christ* as the focal point of God's end-time program, and more particularly, Christ *as head* (Eph. 1:22), not only over the church (Eph. 1:22), but over every authority, in the present as well as the

[7] Cf. Peter T. O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 429–35.

[8] See Köstenberger, "Mystery of Christ and the Church," 79–94.

coming age (Eph. 1:21). Clearly, Christ's headship here conveys the notion of supreme authority, not merely that of provision or nurture, as is sometimes alleged. Otherwise, it would be necessary to attribute to Paul the unlikely, if not absurd, teaching that Christ is the source of demons.[9] Rather, according to Paul, Christ, as the exalted Lord, is the head (*kephalē*), wielding appropriate and God-given authority, and all things are subjected to him (*hypotassō*; cf. Phil. 2:9-11).

The first important lesson for marriage from Paul's teaching in his letter to the Ephesians is therefore that the marriage relationship must be seen within the compass of God's larger salvation-historical, end-time purposes, that is, the bringing of "all things in heaven and on earth together under one head, even Christ" (Eph. 1:10 NIV). This includes spiritual powers who will be fully submitted to Christ (Eph. 1:21); the bringing together of Jews and Gentiles in one salvation-historical, end-time entity, the church (Eph. 2:11-22; 3:6-13); the restoration of creation (cf. Rom. 8:18-25), which people, as divine image bearers, are currently striving to subdue (Gen. 1:28); and, most relevant for our present purposes, the restoration of the male-female marriage relationship as realized by Spirit-filled, committed Christian believers, who overcome the cursed struggle of manipulation and dominance (cf. Gen. 3:16)[10] in the power of Christ and relate to each other in proper submission and Christ-like love. While God's purposes are greater than marriage or male-female roles, they significantly include this relationship (see 1 Pet. 3:1-7).

Principle #2: The Instructions on Marriage Are Addressed to Spirit-Filled Believers (Eph. 5:18)

The second important lesson for married couples, as briefly mentioned above, is that the instructions for wives and husbands (as well as, incidentally, those for parents/children and slaves/masters later on) are *directed to Spirit-filled believers rather than to those outside of Christ* (cf. Eph. 5:18). It should therefore surprise no one that Paul's words are

[9] *Contra* Catherine Clark Kroeger, "Head," *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993), 375–77; see the critique by Wayne Grudem, "The Meaning of kefalh/ ('Head'): An Evaluation of New Evidence, Real and Alleged," *JETS* 44 (2001): 25–65, reprinted in Wayne Grudem, ed., *Biblical Foundations for Manhood and Womanhood* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2002).

[10] On Gen. 3:16, see especially Susan T. Foh, "What is the Woman's Desire (Gen 3:16; 4:7)," *WTJ* 37 (1975): 376–83, who rightly interprets Gen. 3:16 in light of Gen. 4:7 where "desire" conveys a sense of attempted mastery or control. See also the scenario at the Fall (Gen 3), which is cited by Paul in 1 Tim. 2:14–15 as one of two reasons for his prohibition of women teaching or exercising authority over a man in the church (cf. 1 Tim. 2:12).

foolishness to those who do not follow the path of Christian discipleship. This does not mean, however, that Ephesians 5:21-33 contains instructions on male-female relationships that are merely private in nature. Rather, these injunctions set forth the Creator's divine ideal and abiding will for *all* married men and women, rather than merely believers in Jesus Christ.

In the section following his command for believers to be Spirit-filled that contains his instructions for husbands and wives Paul uses the format of the ancient household code. He cites models for both wives and husbands to emulate: for wives, the church in her submission to Christ (Eph. 5:24); for husbands, Christ's sacrificial love for the church, resulting in her cleansing, holiness, and purity (Eph. 5:25-28).[11] Later, the apostle will add a second, common-sense analogy from the nature of things, appealing to self-interest: everyone loves one's own body; in light of the one-flesh union between husbands and wives, if husbands love their wives, this is tantamount to husbands loving themselves (Eph. 5:29-30).

On the basis of Ephesians 5:21 ("submitting *to one another* out of reverence for Christ"), some argue that Paul does not teach the submission of wives to their husbands *only* but *also* that of husbands to their wives in an arrangement termed "mutual submission."[12]

[11] See esp. Timothy G. Gombis, "A Radically New Humanity: The Function of the *Haustafel* in Ephesians," *JETS* 48 (2005): 317–30, who argues that "Paul lays out a manifesto for a radically New Humanity" (330) and yet eschews the egalitarian notion of "mutual submission" (323–24).

[12] See, e.g., Chapter 8 in David Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: The Social and Literary Context* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), esp. 236–37, who maintains "that there is no longer any need to teach submission. In NT days it would cause a scandal if the submission of wives was omitted from moral instruction, but not it is likely to cause an equal scandal if it is included. The threefold teaching of submission did not have a Christian origin, and the number of caveats and explanations added to this teaching by NT authors suggests that they were somewhat uncomfortable with it. They attempted to Christianize it by adding that the head of the household should show respect for those submitting to him, and perhaps submit to them in return." For this reason, Instone-Brewer says that no bride should be "forced" to vow submission to her husband, but if she opts to make such a vow, her husband should likewise vow to submit to his wife. For our part, we fail to see clear textual evidence for the New Testament authors' "discomfort" with teaching wifely submission. We certainly do not advocate "forcing" wives to vow to submit to their husbands. It is clearly fallacious to say that, because the Christian teaching of submission to authorities had non-Christian origins (assuming this to be the case for the sake of argument), that it follows that this scriptural teaching is non-authoritative. Nor does it appear to be possible to extricate biblical sexual morality from the submission principle. The analogy between the headship of Christ over the church and the husband's headship over the wife in Eph. 5:23-25, too, militates against setting aside the husband's headship and wifely submission as irrelevant and inapplicable for today. For these and other reasons Instone-Brewer's reasoning and conclusions must be judged not to cohere with Scripture's own message on the subject.

Admittedly, this is what Ephesians 5:21 read by itself might suggest, but we must not stop reading at Ephesians 5:21 but glean from the following verses what is Paul's definition of "submitting to one another." It is clear that the answer is that *wives are to submit to their husbands* who are called the "head" of their wives as Christ is the head of the church (Eph. 5:22-24) while *husbands are to love their wives with the sacrificial love of Christ* (Eph. 5:25-30). This runs counter to the notion of "mutual submission" within the context of an identity of gender roles.[13]

A comparison with Ephesians 1:22 and 4:15 confirms that *"headship" entails, not merely nurture* (though it does that, see Eph. 5:29), *but also a position of authority.* This authoritative position of the man is a function, not of intrinsic merit or worth on his part, but of God's sovereign creative will. Hence the husband's leadership, as well as the wife's submission, is to be exercised within the orbit of grace rather than legalism or coercion. It should also be noted that in the abbreviated Colossian parallel, "Wives, submit to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord" (Col. 3:18) sums up the entirety of Paul's counsel to Christian wives with regard to their marital disposition (no word about "mutual submission" here).[14]

The fact that wives are called to recognize and respect proper authority over them is not unique to them. Men, too, must submit to Christ, local church leadership and discipline, the civil authorities, and their employers. Nevertheless, as mentioned, this does not alter the fact that there is a sense in which wives are called to submit to their husbands that is *non-reciprocal* (cf. 1 Pet. 3:1-6 in the context of 1 Pet. 2:13, 18). Husbands' exercise of authority, in turn, must not be an arbitrary or

---

[13] See Wayne Grudem, "The Myth of Mutual Submission as an Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21," in Grudem, ed., *Biblical Foundations for Manhood and Womanhood*, 221-31, who suggests that the force of the Greek term *allēlois* is "some to others" (*contra* Roger R. Nicole, "The Wisdom of Marriage," *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke* [ed. J. I. Packer and Sven K. Soderlund; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000], 290; Charles H. H. Scobie, *The Ways of Our God: An Approach to Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 839, et al.). Rather than speaking of "mutual submission," it may be more appropriate to speak of "mutual humility" (note the shift from submission to humility in 1 Pet. 5:5-6). See also Daniel Doriani, "The Historical Novelty of Egalitarian Interpretations of Ephesians 5:21-22," *Biblical Foundations for Manhood and Womanhood*, 203–19; and Wayne Walden, "Ephesians 5:21: A Translation Note," *ResQ* 45/4 (2003): 254, who points out that the pronoun *allēlōn* is not so much reciprocal or mutual as it shows "random or distributive activity within the group" (Walden provides the examples of people trampling one another [Luke 12:1]; envying one another [Gal. 5:26]; and killing one another [Rev. 6:4], which hardly should be understood in a mutual sense). Hence Eph. 5:21 does not call for "mutual submission" of husband and wife, but calls on wives to submit to their husbands and for husbands to love their wives.

[14] In that context, husbands' love is further defined as not being harsh with one's wife (cf. 1 Pet. 3:7).

abusive one, but should be motivated by love.[15] Again, Peter's teaching is found to cohere with that of Paul: "Husbands, in the same way be considerate as you live with your wives, and treat them with respect as the weaker partner and as heirs with you of the gracious gift of life" (1 Pet. 3:7).

It must also be pointed out that it is thus manifestly *not* true that female submission is *merely a result of the Fall*.[16] For in the present passage, it is Christian women—in whom Christ's redemptive purposes are to be realized—who are nonetheless enjoined to submit to their husbands. In his other writings, Paul (with reference to Gen. 2:18, 20) stresses that it is not the man who was made for woman, but the woman for the man (1 Cor. 11:9), so that "the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is man" (1 Cor. 11:3). Hence the united tenor of New Testament teaching, including several of Paul's epistles, confirms that the husband's headship and the wife's submission are part of God's original design for marriage rather than a negative consequence of the Fall.

Nor is it true that the restored pattern for marriage in Christ *transcends* that of submission and authority. This understanding is not borne out by the New Testament, be it here or elsewhere. To the contrary, Paul's argument in 1 Timothy 2:9-15 "turns to the story of Adam and Eve in Genesis for scriptural support of an understanding of the authority structure, the order of creation, which exists between men and women. . . . Adam and Eve are called into service as normative examples of how men and women should interrelate and what can happen if the proper authority structure is adhered to [or not adhered to] by subsequent peoples."[17]

In fact, in one his later writings (significantly, addressed to the Ephesian context) Paul refutes as heretical the understanding (as advocated by some in his day) that "the resurrection has already taken place" (2 Tim. 2:18), that is, that the future has so invaded the present that believers' present lives no longer need to heed principles built into the fabric of creation by the Creator. Contrary to the false teachers, God's created order continues to provide the framework for human relationships (cf. 1 Tim. 4:3). While subverted by the Fall, this order is not to be set aside by Christians. Rather, it is God's redemptive purpose

---

[15] Cf. Hawthorne, "Marriage and Divorce," *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, 596.

[16] See, for example, Stanley J. Grenz, *Sexual Ethics: A Biblical Perspective* (Dallas: Word, 1990), 28. Also, "Men, Women, and Biblical Equality," the statement of evangelical egalitarian beliefs states, "The Bible teaches that woman and man were created for full and equal partnership. . . . The rulership of Adam over Eve resulted from the Fall and was therefore not a part of the original created order" (pars. 1 and 4).

[17] Larry J. Kreitzer, "Adam and Christ," *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, 10.

in Christ to counteract the effects of sin in human relationships (and other spheres) by believers' new life in the Spirit. Only in heaven will people no longer be given in marriage but be like angels (Matt. 22:30 and parallels). Currently, they still marry, have children, and are to fulfill the cultural mandate of subduing and cultivating the earth in keeping with the male-female roles established at creation.

Before we move on to the third and final principle for marriage derived from Paul's teaching in Ephesians, three practical observations related to submission emerge. First, while some may view submitting to one's husband's authority as something negative, a more accurate way of looking at marital roles is to understand that wives are called to *follow their husband's loving leadership* in their marriage. This leadership and submission is to take place in the context of a true partnership, in which the husband genuinely values his wife's companionship and counsel and the wife sincerely values her husband's leadership. It is one of the unfortunate legacies of radical feminism that many tend to view male-female relationships in adversarial terms. This is contrary to God's desire and design and to the biblical message.

Second, there is a *difference between traditional and biblical marriage*. Traditional marriage may be understood as the type of division of labor by which women are responsible for cooking, cleaning, doing the laundry, and so on, while men are at work earning the family income. While Scripture does specify work outside the home as men's primary sphere and the home as the center of women's activity (e.g., Gen. 3:16-19; Prov. 31:10-31 [though the woman's reach is not *limited* to the home]; 1 Tim. 2:15; 5:10, 14), the Bible is not a law book and does not seek to legislate the exact division of labor husband and wife ought to observe.[18] Hence within the biblical parameters outlined above, there remains room for the individual couple to work out their own distinctive and specific arrangement. This may vary from couple to couple and ought to be considered a part of Christian freedom. For example, some women may be more gifted in the area of finances than men. There

[18] When we talk about the God-ordained "primary sphere" and "center" of men's and women's activity, we do not advocate or condone a husband's neglect of his wife and family or seek to confine a woman to the home as may be the case in traditional arrangements. Nor do we seek to take away from the man's and woman's joint responsibility to rule the earth for God. We are merely reflecting the biblical teaching in passages such as Gen. 3:16-19 that seem to draw a distinction regarding the man's and the woman's primary spheres of activity, indicating distinct yet complementary roles. Rather than pitting the husband's work outside the home against his devotion to marriage and family, it should rather be viewed within the larger context of his fulfilling his responsibility to provide for his family. As to the woman, her role in childbearing already indicates that, biologically, her role centers on children and family in a way that is distinctive and unique.

seems to be no good reason why women cannot be in charge of keeping family finances if the couple is agreed as long as the husband retains ultimate responsibility over this area. Conversely, some men may enjoy cooking. Again, there seems to be no good reason why in certain families men could not do most of the cooking as long as the couple is agreed. Problems may only arise if the pattern were to be so completely reversed that a given husband is focusing primarily or exclusively on the domestic sphere while the wife is part of the labor force. However, even this may not be problematic if for a *limited* time a couple, say, while the husband is pursuing an education, agrees on this type of arrangement.

Third, *improper caricatures* of the biblical teaching of wifely submission and the husband's loving leadership (which includes the proper exercise of authority) must be *rejected* as either deliberate or unwitting attempts to discredit such a model as unworthy of a woman's human dignity or our modern, "enlightened" times. The kind of submission Scripture is talking about is not akin to *slavery* where one person owns another. It is not *subservience* where one person is doing the bidding of another without intelligent input or interaction. It is not even truly *hierarchical*, since this conjures up notions of a military-style, top-down chain of command in which the soldier is asked to obey, no-questions-asked, the orders of his superior. None of these labels constitute an accurate description of Scripture with regard to the roles of men and women nor do they fairly represent the understanding of gender roles advocated in this lecture.

Rather, the biblical model for marriage is that of loving complementarity, where the husband and the wife are partners who value and respect each other and where the husband's loving leadership is met with the wife's intelligent response. If Christ chooses to submit to God the Father while being equal in worth and personhood, there seems to be no good reason why God could not have designed the husband-and-wife relationship in such a way that the wife is called to submit to the man while likewise being equal in worth and personhood. Paul writes to the Corinthians, "But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a wife is her husband, and the head of Christ is God" (1 Cor. 11:3).

Principle #3: Marriage Is Part of Spiritual Warfare (Eph. 6:10–18)

Finally, third, not only is marriage part of *God's end-time purposes in Christ* (Eph. 1:10) and part of the *Spirit's operation* (Eph. 5:18), it is also part of one other important larger reality that is often overlooked, namely that of *spiritual warfare* (Eph. 6:10-18). This means that marriage ought not to be viewed merely on a horizontal, human plane but understood as

involving spiritual attacks that require husbands and wives to "put on the full armor of God" in order to withstand those attacks.

Indeed, marriage and the family are not exempt from the cosmic conflict that is raging between God and his angels on the one hand and Satan and his demons on the other. Because marriage and the family are not merely a human convention or cultural custom but a divine institution, it should be expected that Satan, who seeks to rob God of his glory, would attack marriage. For this reason, too, we must treat marriage and the family not merely in the context of the current cultural crisis but also within the framework of the perennial cosmic conflict that requires a spiritual perspective and skilled engagement of the enemy in spiritual warfare.

Clearly, spiritual warfare surrounding marriage and the family is a reality, and awareness of this conflict as well as skill in engaging in it is imperative. Yet while there is a plethora of materials on marriage and the family, as well as a considerable body of literature on spiritual warfare,[19] rarely are those issues treated jointly. I am aware of no current volume on marriage and the family that provides even the most cursory treatment of spiritual warfare.[20] Regularly, the focus is on fulfilling one's partner's needs in marriage, improving one's communication skills, or resolving marital conflict. From reading any of these books, one would never know that spiritual warfare is a vital issue in marriage and the family. Yet nothing could be further from the truth.

Spiritual warfare has been a part of married life and childrearing from the beginning. The foundational biblical narrative in Genesis 3 recounts

---

[19] See especially Clinton E. Arnold, *Three Crucial Questions about Spiritual Warfare* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997) and *Powers of Darkness: Principalities and Powers in Paul's Letters* (Leicester/Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1992); Sydney H. T. Page, *Powers of Evil: A Biblical Study of Satan and Demons* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995); and the articles on "Elements/Elemental Spirits of the World," "Power," and "Principalities and Powers," *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, 229–33, 723–25, and 746–52. See also the helpful survey entry by David Beck, "Spiritual Warfare," in *Evangelical Dictionary of Christian Education* (ed. Michael J. Anthony; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 660–62.

[20] The only partial exception is Evelyn Christenson, *What Happens When We Pray for Our Families* (Colorado Springs: Chariot Family Publishers, 1992). There is no discussion of spiritual warfare in such popular books on marriage as Gary Chapman's *The Five Love Languages* (Chicago: Northfield, 1995), Larry Crabb's *The Marriage Builder* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), Kay Arthur's *A Marriage Without Regrets* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 2000), Willard Hartley's *His Needs, Her Needs* (Ada, MI: Revell, 1990), *The Language of Love* by Gary Smalley and John Trent (Pomona, CA: Focus on the Family, 1988), and Laura Walker's *Dated Jekyll, Married Hyde* (Minneapolis: Bethany House, 1997). There is nothing in best-selling books on parenting such as *Relational Parenting* by Ross Campbell (Chicago: Moody, 2000), *Raising Heaven-bound Kids in a Hell-bent World* by Eastman Curtis (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000), *Children at Risk* by James Dobson and Gary Bauer (Dallas, TX: Word, 1990), or *The Gift of Honor* by Gary Smalley and John Trent (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1987).

how the tempter, Satan, prevailed upon the first woman to violate God's commandment and how her husband followed her into sin. Ever since, marriage has resembled more a struggle for control and conscious and unconscious efforts at mutual manipulation than an Edenic paradise. The first known instance of sibling rivalry issued in Cain killing his brother Abel out of envy and jealousy. The rest of the Old Testament chronicles a whole series of ways in which sin has affected marital and family relationship ever since the Fall.[21]

The message of the New Testament is no different. Arguably the most important treatment of spiritual warfare, Ephesians 6:10-20, is preceded by extended treatments of marriage (Eph. 5:21-33) and childrearing (Eph. 6:1-4). These passages, in turn, are preceded by sections on believers' spiritual blessings in Christ (Eph. 1:3-14), on them having been made alive in Christ (Eph. 2:1-10) and now being one in Christ with other believers (Eph. 2:11-22; 4:1-16), and on living as children of light, putting off the old sin nature and putting on the new nature, "created to be like God in true righteousness and holiness" (Eph. 4:17-5:20, esp. 4:20-24). Unfortunately, these sections are regularly compartmentalized. In Paul's thinking, however, it is precisely in people's relationships with one another, be it at work or at home, among Christians or between believers and unbelievers, that spiritual warfare manifests itself and conscious dealing with it becomes a necessity.

In fact, Ephesians 6:10-20 is "a crucial element to which the rest of the epistle has been pointing."[22] In the structure of the entire epistle, the practical teaching in Ephesians 4-6 is predicated upon the doctrinal instruction in Ephesians 1-3. For this reason every believer must have a thorough grasp of what it means to be chosen in Christ to be holy and blameless (Eph. 1:4, 11); to have been predestined to be adopted as God's son or daughter in Christ by God's pleasure and for the praise of his glorious grace (Eph. 1:5-6, 11); to have redemption through his blood and the forgiveness of sins (Eph. 1:7); and to have been sealed with the Holy Spirit as a deposit guaranteeing our inheritance in Christ (Eph. 1:13-14). Believers must understand that their conversion entails turning away from sin, so that they no longer carry out the bidding of their sinful nature, and turning to God and serving him in the power of the Holy Spirit (Eph. 2:1-10). They must understand their unity in Christ with other believers (Eph. 2:11-22; 4:1-16) and confront sin in their own lives as they count their old sinful nature dead in Christ and themselves alive in their risen Lord (Eph. 4:17-5:20).

---

[21] For an example from the life of David, see Andreas J. Köstenberger, "Marriage and Family in the New Testament," in *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World* (ed. Ken M. Campbell; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003), 279.

[22] O'Brien, *Letter to the Ephesians*, 457.

In the more immediate context of Ephesians 6:10-18, the main command governing Paul's treatment of marriage and the family in Ephesians 5:21-6:4 is "Be filled with the Spirit" (Eph. 5:18).[23] The warfare passage in Ephesians 6:10-18 then seamlessly picks up where Ephesians 5:18 left off, calling on believers to take up the sword of the Spirit (Eph. 6:17) and to pray in the Spirit (Eph. 6:18), always remembering that their "struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms" (Eph. 6:12).[24] Hence it is vital to look at the biblical teaching on marriage and the family on the one hand and on spiritual warfare on the other in an integrated way. In living out their Christian faith in their marriages and families, believers must recognize that their sinful nature will lead them to rebel against God's plan unless aided by the Holy Spirit and that the devil will seek to use their sinful tendencies and inclinations to lead them astray.

What is the key element in spiritual warfare? According to Scripture, it is human minds. "But I am afraid that just as Eve was deceived by the serpent's cunning, your *mind*s may somehow be led astray from your sincere and pure devotion to Christ" (2 Cor. 11:3). "For though we live in the world, we do not wage war as the world does. The weapons we fight with are not the weapons of the world. On the contrary, they have divine power to demolish strongholds. We demolish arguments and every pretension that sets itself up against the knowledge of God, and we take captive every *thought* to make it obedient to Christ" (2 Cor. 10:3-5). Just as Satan reasoned with Eve as to why she should disobey God in the Garden, it is people's thought life that is the arena in which our spiritual battles are won or lost.[25]

For this reason believers ought to saturate their minds with scriptural teaching regarding their new position in Christ. As mentioned, the first three chapters of Ephesians are replete with references to the spiritual blessings given to believers in Christ (Eph. 1:3), including their election (Eph. 1:4, 11); predestination and adoption (Eph. 1:5, 11); redemption and forgiveness of sins (Eph. 1:7); and reception of the Holy Spirit (Eph.

---

[23] See Köstenberger, "What Does It Mean?"

[24] On Eph. 6:10-20 in the context of the letter of Ephesians as a whole, see especially the writings of Peter T. O'Brien: *Gospel and Mission in the Writings of Paul: An Exegetical and Theological Analysis* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 109-31; *Letter to the Ephesians*, 456-90, especially 457-60; and Andreas J. Köstenberger and Peter T. O'Brien, *Salvation to the Ends of the Earth: A biblical theology of mission* (NSBT; Leicester/Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001), 196-98.

[25] See, similarly, Beck, "Spiritual Warfare," 661, who identifies four critical issues: (1) underestimating the enemy; (2) identifying the enemy; (3) the nature of the weapons; and (4) the objective of the warfare.

1:13–14). While prior to their conversion they used to gratify the cravings of their sinful nature (Eph. 2:3), believers were raised up with Christ and transferred with him to the heavenly realms (Eph. 2:6). Their salvation is by grace through faith (Eph. 2:8). On the basis of this understanding of their new position in Christ, and only on this basis, believers will be able to deal effectively with the various temptations and struggles with which they are confronted in their marriages and families.

Several New Testament passages teach that the devil's efforts to destroy marriages and to subvert family life did not stop at the Fall but continue to this very day. While three particular infractions are singled out, doubtless others could be added. A first area of vulnerability Satan will seek to attack is that of susceptibility to *sexual temptation.*[26] In 1 Corinthians 7:5, Paul counsels believers not to abstain from sexual relations, "except by mutual consent and for a time" for the purpose of prayer, but then to come together again, so Satan may not tempt them because of their lack of self-control. This would seem to indicate that the sexual component of the marriage relationship is very much a regular target of Satan's attack and must be carefully guarded by the married couple.[27]

A second area of weakness that Satan will target in order to cause people to stumble is that of *unresolved anger*. As Paul writes in Ephesians 4:26-27, "Do not let the sun go down while you are still angry, and do not give the devil a foothold." While not limited to marriage, this pronouncement certainly includes the marriage relationship, cautioning believers not to allow broken relationships to render them vulnerable to the devil. Related injunctions pertaining to childrearing are found in Paul's epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians where fathers are enjoined not to provoke their children to anger lest they become discouraged (Eph. 6:4; Col. 3:21).

Thirdly, Satan will seek to disrupt marriages by sowing the seeds of *marital conflict* through the *husband's insensitivity* to his wife. The apostle Paul tells husbands to love their wives and not to be harsh with them (Col. 3:19). Peter writes similarly, "Husbands, in the same way be considerate as you live with your wives, and treat them with respect as the weaker partner and as heirs with you of the gracious gift of life, so that nothing will hinder your prayers" (1 Pet. 3:7). According to Peter, the husband's insensitivity toward his wife may be the potential cause for

[26] For a discussion of biblical principles for dealing with sexual temptation see Köstenberger, *God, Marriage & Family*, 188-91.

[27] On the background to 1 Corinthians 7 and for an exposition of verse 5, see especially Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 266-83.

spiritual disruption in marriage, and marital discord, in turn, becomes a hindrance to united, answerable prayer.[28]

Whether it is the couple's sex life, unresolved conflict, inconsiderateness toward one's wife, or some other area, the New Testament makes clear that all are part of spiritual warfare, and husbands and wives must take the necessary precautions in order not to lose in the spiritual war that rages concerning their marriage. What is more, it is important to realize that the enemy is not only an external one (i.e., the devil), but that our first ancestors allowed the enemy inside, as it were, by succumbing to the devil's lure and rebelling against the Creator. Thus the devil is now able to use the world at large which is separated from God as well as our inborn, innate sinful nature to reinforce the power sin has over us (1 John 2:15-17). The only way this power can be consistently and effectively overcome is for a believer to recognize himself or herself as a new creature in Christ and to live under the direction and guidance of the Holy Spirit (1 John 4:4).

How, then, are we to fight in this spiritual war in which we are engaged? At least three important lessons emerge from the biblical teaching on spiritual warfare discussed above. First, an *awareness of the fact that there is a battle* is imperative for success. Anyone who, in the case of war, fails to realize that he is engaged in conflict will no doubt be an early casualty owing to his failure to properly protect himself. It is the same in the realm of marriage. Arguably, divorce rates are skyrocketing, not primarily because of the lack of good intentions, the unavailability of resources and instruction on how to conduct a strong biblical marriage, or even the lack of love, but because many, unbelievers and believers alike, inadequately recognize that spiritual warfare is a certain reality that calls for a concerted, deliberately planned response.

Second, it is essential to *know one's spiritual enemy*. This enemy is not one's marriage partner. Nor is it one's children. It is Satan, the enemy of our souls, who employs a variety of strategies, methods, and schemes (cf. 2 Cor. 10:4; Eph. 6:11; 1 Pet. 5:8-9), including that of exploiting and inciting our sin nature and the sinful aspects of the godless world around us. While the devil is highly intelligent, he nonetheless remains a creature. Thus he is neither omniscient nor omnipresent; God and Satan are not evenly matched. The devil can, and in fact, does miscalculate—the most striking instance being the cross, when what Satan thought

[28] The question of whether it is only the husband's prayers (probably the immediate focus) or the couples' prayers (the necessary implication) that are hindered need not concern us here (see the relevant commentary literature; e.g., P. H. Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990], 123, n. 20). In the end, it is clearly the prayers of the entire couple that are negatively affected by the husband's insensitivity toward his wife.

would be his greatest triumph was turned into his final defeat three days later when Jesus rose from the dead. Satan specifically targets people's areas of weakness and greatest vulnerability, and every individual must be prepared for this in order not to be caught off guard. Yet like Paul, so believers today will find that God's grace is more than sufficient for every challenge they face in the power of Christ, as long as they are diligent to "put on the full armor of God."

Third and finally, *spiritual battles must be fought by the use of proper weapons*. As mentioned, some lose a spiritual conflict in which they are engaged because they fail to realize that a battle is in fact raging and their involvement is not optional but essential. Yet others may realize they are in a war but fail to use proper spiritual weapons (or protective gear, as it were). Once again, such persons will soon become casualties. In the context of Christian marriages, as well as in parenting, it is imperative that believers, in order to overcome a spiritual enemy—be it their own sinfulness or evil supernatural opposition—put on the "full armor of God" (Eph. 6:10-18):

- *Truth*: Like all believers, spouses must "put off falsehood and speak truthfully" to one another (Eph. 4:25), yet they must speak "the truth *in love*" and hence "in all things grow up into him who is the Head, that is, Christ" (Eph. 4:15). In their speech they must make every effort to "not let any unwholesome talk" come out of their mouths, "but only what is helpful" for *building each other up* "according to their needs" (Eph. 4:29).

- *Righteousness*: Righteousness is both one's right standing with God in and through Christ (e.g., Rom. 5:1, 9; 2 Cor. 5:21) and one's dealings with God and one's fellow human beings with integrity (e.g., Ps. 15). For this reason it is only marriages where both spouses are *Christians* that can truly and consistently live out God's will for marriage (Eph. 5:18; cf. Rom. 8:9).

- *Peace*: As believers, the husband and the wife have been given the peace of Christ in the Holy Spirit (John 14:27; 16:33). They know that they have been eternally forgiven and that they are sons and daughters of God (John 1:12; 1 John 3:1); being at peace with God (Rom. 5:1), they can be at peace with each other and act as peacemakers in the world around them (Matt. 5:9; 2 Cor. 5:17-18).

- *Faith*: As all believers, husband and wife must follow the Lord Jesus Christ in discipleship and learn to trust him to meet all their needs and overcome all challenges and adversity. Their overriding concern should not be material needs but the extension of God's rule in the world (Matt. 6:25-34). Faith in God also entails trusting God with one's

husband or wife and God the Holy Spirit's continued transforming work in their lives.

- *Salvation*: Because a married couple is secure in their assurance of salvation and eternal destiny, they can truly love each other unconditionally and selflessly; the husband can provide responsible, loving leadership without abusing his authority, and the wife can trust and submit graciously to God's leading of her through her husband (Eph. 5:21-33).

- *The Word of God:* Because there is no lasting foundation for our lives other than God's Word (cf. Matt. 7:24-27; Heb. 4:12-13; 1 Pet. 1:23-25), a married couple must be committed to "remain in God's word" (John 8:31; 15:4, 7) through regular personal and joint study of Scripture and faithful attendance of and participation in a local church where the Word of God is preached (1 Tim. 4:2).

- *Prayer:* Regular joint prayer is essential for marriage partners at all times to "keep the unity of the Spirit through the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3). Husband and wife ought to make a habit of bringing their thanksgiving and requests before God and trust him to act on their behalf (Phil. 4:6-7; 1 Pet. 5:7). In exceptional circumstances a couple may even choose to refrain from sexual relations for a time for the purpose of concerted prayer (1 Cor. 7:5).

What is more, while it is the responsibility of every individual believer, couple, and family to wage spiritual warfare in keeping with biblical principles, one must not forget the larger context of the local church, which provides a sphere of mutual support and accountability, if necessary even including church discipline. As Christians are engaged in spiritual conflict, they must embrace the truth that there is in fact a spiritual battle raging; they must strive to know their enemy, the devil, who incites human sin nature to resist God; and they must fight using proper, spiritual weapons. As the apostle Paul writes, "Our struggle is not against flesh and blood. . . . Therefore put on the full armor of God, so that when the day of evil comes, you may be able to stand your ground, and after you have done everything, to stand" (Eph. 6:12-13).

Spiritual warfare is the all-encompassing, ruling reality for the marital relationship. Those who ignore it do so at their own peril. Just as the devil attacks those with potential for church leadership, he seeks to subvert human marriages, because they have the greatest potential for displaying to the world the nature of the relationship between Christ and his church (Eph. 5:31-32). If believers want to show the world by their marriages what a glorious and good God they have, they must, for God's sake as well as their own, engage in spiritual warfare, and they must do

so by using spiritual weapons. Then, and only then, will Christian marriages reflect the image and design of the Creator. For in the end, it is God's glory, not merely human fulfillment and satisfaction, that is the proper goal of Christian marriages.[29]

Conclusion

Our study of Paul's teaching on marriage in the context of his letter to the Ephesians as a whole has yielded three important principles. First, marriage is part of God's larger end-time purpose of bringing all things back together under one head, Jesus Christ (Eph. 1:10). Second, Paul's instructions on marriage are addressed to Spirit-filled believers (Eph. 5:18). Third, marriage is part of spiritual warfare and requires husband and wife to put on the "full armor of God" (Eph. 6:10-18).

An understanding of marriage in this full-orbed biblical sense will go a long way toward strengthening our marriages. What we lack is not so much good intentions or good advice, but a proper biblical framework that sets marriage in its larger God-intended purpose. Marriage is a divine institution, and Scripture provides a very clear picture of the way in which God designed marriage. In our marriages, let us come together under our head, Jesus Christ, let us be filled with the Spirit, and let us resolutely resist Satan in the "full armor of God."

---

[29] There are many excellent ministries aimed at strengthening Christian marriages and families. Among the best are Focus on the Family (http://www.family.org), FamilyLife (http://www.familylife.com), Family Dynamics (http://www.familydynamics.net) and the "Kingdom Family Initiative," which is part of the "Empowering Kingdom Growth" movement in the Southern Baptist Convention (http://www.sbc.net/ekg/default.asp; see especially the seven pillars of a kingdom family at http://www.sbc.net/ekg/EKG-7pillars.asp). Another organization that includes promoting biblical principles for marriage and family is the Council of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (http://www.cbmw.org).

Midwestern Journal of Theology 4.2 (Spring 2006): 43-56.

The New Testament Pattern of Church Government

Andreas J. Köstenberger
Professor of New Testament
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Wake Forest, NC 27587

Ecclesiology has always been an important issue in Baptist discussion. In fact, the argument has been made that this is the theological area in which Baptists have made the most important contribution, particularly in the area of requiring a regenerate church membership. The past few years have witnessed a veritable avalanche of publications in the area of ecclesiology, and especially the issue of church government, for the most part written by Baptist scholars.

Gerald Cowen has posed the question, "Who Rules the Church?" Zondervan published a 4 Views book entitled, *Who Runs the Church?* which includes a contribution by Paige Patterson. Chad Brand and Stan Norman, professors at Southern and New Orleans Seminary respectively, edited a similar volume, *Perspectives on Church Government: Five Views of Church Polity*, with contributions by Daniel Akin and others. Both the *Midwestern Journal of Theology* and the *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* devoted recent issues to the subject. Southern Seminary student Ben Merkle contributed a published dissertation, *The Elder and Overseer: One Office in the Early Church*. Mark Dever, pastor of Capitol Hill Baptist Church in Washington, DC, has spoken out consistently on the topic of church government, most notably in his *Nine Marks of a Healthy Church*. The most recent contribution comes from Phil Newton, senior pastor at South Woods Baptist Church in Memphis, Tennessee, and is entitled *Elders in Congregational Life: Rediscovering the Biblical Model for Church Leadership*. If you thought "veritable avalanche" was an exaggeration, perhaps after this list of titles, all published within the last 5 years, you will agree that there have been few topics that have been the subject of more vigorous discussion in Baptist life than the issue of church government in general and of elders in particular.[1]

[1] Gerald P. Cowen, *Who Rules the Church? Examining Congregational Leadership and Church Government* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2003); Peter Toon et al., *Who*

It is clearly impossible for me in the short span of this lecture to do justice to the complexity of the topic and to consider adequately all the many pros and cons for the various positions on church government, elder rule, and so on, even within our Southern Baptist circles. Rather than deal with all the various exigencies and practical issues surrounding those matters, I propose to address the biblical data as a New Testament scholar who has recently had occasion to work through the Pastoral Epistles in my work on the forthcoming revised edition of the Expositor's Bible Commentary. While issues of application may change, the biblical data do not, and perhaps by revisiting scriptural teaching on the subject, we will be able to clarify our own thinking on some of these issues and find new common ground on this hotly debated matter.

Elders/Overseers

The area of church leadership is one area where the Pastoral Epistles quite clearly set forth paradigms for the church that reach beyond their original Ephesian or Cretan context. Even those who vigorously dispute that Paul's teaching on women's roles in the church in 1 Timothy 2:12-15 is normative for today regularly, though inconsistently, award binding status to the qualifications for church leaders in 1 Timothy 3.[2] In the following remarks we will deal with several disputed areas in recent discussions on the Pastorals' teaching on church government.

To begin with, it has been claimed by some that the church structure found in the Pastorals reflects the second-century pattern of a three-tiered ecclesiastical hierarchy involving a monarchical episcopate (e.g., Ignatius of Antioch). Yet closer scrutiny reveals that the Pastorals do not in fact conform to this model but rather display a synonymous usage of the terms "overseer" (*episkopos*) and "elder" (*presbyteros*) as referring to one and the same office (Titus 1:5, 7; cf. Acts 20:17, 28; 1 Clem. 44:1, 5; cf. Jerome, *Letter* 59).

With regard to specific terminology, 1 Timothy 3:1 uses the word *episkopē* (cf. Acts 1:20), denoting the "office of overseer" (cf. Luke

---

Runs the Church? 4 Views on Church Government (Counterpoints; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004); Chad Owen Brand and R. Stanton Norman, *Perspectives on Church Government: Five Views of Church Polity* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2004); *Midwestern Journal of Theology* 2/1 (Fall 2003); *SBJT* 7/3 (Fall 2003); Mark Dever, *Nine Marks of a Healthy Church* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2000); Benjamin L. Merkle, *The Elder and Overseer: One Office in the Early Church* (Studies in Biblical Literature 57; New York: Peter Lang, 2003); Phil A. Newton, *Elders in Congregational Life: Rediscovering the Biblical Model for Church Leadership* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2005).

[2] On the interpretation of 1 Tim. 2:12-15, see Andreas J. Köstenberger and Thomas R. Schreiner, eds., *Women in the Church: An Analysis and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9–15* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005).

19:44; Acts 1:20; 1 Pet 2:12), while in 1 Timothy 3:2 *episkopos* is found, referring to the person holding such an office.[3] In the LXX the term designates one in charge of an operation (Num 4:16); in Josephus it denotes an "overseer" (Antiq. 10.53; 12.254). The Qumran equivalent was the *mebaqqer* (1QS 6:12, 20; CD 9:18–19, 22; 13:6-7). Generally, *presbyteros* is Jewish in origin, signifying seniority, while *episkopos* is Greek, indicating a person's superintending role. Presumably overseers constituted the "board of elders" (*presbyterion*) mentioned in 1 Timothy 4:14.[4]

The overseer (equivalent to pastor/elder) bears ultimate responsibility for the church before God (see 1 Tim 3:15; 5:17). According to the instructions on the role of women in the previous chapter (esp. 1 Tim 2:12), only men are eligible for this office. This is confirmed by the qualification *mias gynaikos andra* in 1 Timothy 3:2. But what does this phrase mean? What are the exegetical options for the respective positions, how strong is the supporting evidence for each of the views, and which option is the most plausible?

The Mias Gynaikas Andra *Requirement*

English translations as well as commentators differ considerably regarding the meaning of the phrase *mias gynaikas andra* in 1 Timothy 3:2 and 12.[5]

(1) Does Paul here require church leaders to be married (excluding unmarried officeholders)?

(2) Is he seeking to prohibit applicants who are divorced?

(3) Does the requirement bar widowers who remarried from holding ecclesiastical office (NRSV)?

---

[3] See Acts 20:28; Phil. 1:1; Titus 1:7; 1 Pet. 2:25. For *presbyteros*, see esp. 1 Tim. 5:1, 17, 19; Titus 1:5; 1 Pet. 5:1, 5; James 5:14; and the book of Acts.

[4] Luke Timothy Johnson, *Letters to Paul's Delegates. 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity International, 1996), 145.

[5] The following treatment is partially indebted to Andreas J. Köstenberger, *Pastoral Epistles* (EBC 12; rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006). On the history of interpretation, see John Gorday, *The Pastoral Epistles* (ACCS 9; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000), 170-71 and 286-87. See also the survey in Ed Glasscock, " 'The Husband of One Wife' Requirement in 1 Timothy 3:2," *BibSac* 140 (1983): 244-49 and 253-56. The range of translations spans the following: "the husband of one wife" (KJV, NKJV, NASB, HCSB, NET, ESV [footnote: Or *a man of one woman*]), which leaves the question of interpretation open; "husband of but one wife" (NIV), which suggests a prohibition against polygamy; "married only once" (NRSV [footnote: Or *the husband of one wife*]), a prohibition against remarriage after being widowed, the prevailing view of the Church fathers; and "faithful to his (one) wife" (NEB, NLT, TNIV), "devoted to (lit. *a man of*) one woman" (ISV), "committed to his wife" (The Message), which takes the expression as an idiom for marital faithfulness.

(4) Does the apostle speak out against polygamy (as is implied in the NIV)?

(5) Or is he requiring that an officeholder be faithful in marriage if he is (and assuming that he usually is) in fact married, as opposed to being unfaithful to his wife while being married to her, as would be the case if he had one or several extramarital affairs? (This was often the case in the ancient world in the form of concubinage.)

Virtually all of these positions are taken by at least certain translations and/or commentators.[6] How can this difficult issue be satisfactorily resolved, and which interpretation is most likely in light of the meaning of the phrase and the ancient cultural background?

To begin with, first, it is unlikely that Paul, who himself was unmarried throughout most, if not all, his apostolic career (cf. 1 Cor. 7:8) and who elsewhere extols the advantages of singleness for kingdom service (1 Cor. 7:32-35), would exclude single men from holding ecclesiastical office. Also, if the apostle's intention had been to limit the holding of church offices to those who were married, he could have said so much more unequivocally (e.g., by listing as a requirement that overseers be "married," *gamos*). It is therefore highly probable that the present requirement simply assumes that most potentially qualified candidates would likely be married and hence addresses a man's conduct toward his wife in marriage.

Second, if it had been Paul's intent to exclude divorcees, one can once again think of more direct ways in which the apostle may have articulated this requirement (e.g., "not divorced"). At least on the face of it, this can at best be considered a possible inference (from the wording, "husband of *one* wife") rather than a direct statement. In fact, divorce is not mentioned anywhere in all of the Pastoral Epistles (neither is remarriage).

Third, it is also unlikely that Paul sought to prohibit widowers who remarried from church office (who, by a literal reading, would in that case have been married, not once, but twice). The apostle elsewhere encourages those who are widowed to remarry and adopts an entirely positive stance toward those who have lost their spouses.[7] It would be

---

[6] Cf. Glasscock, "The 'Husband of One Wife' Requirement in 1 Timothy 3:2," *BSac* 140 (1983): 244-58, who notes that the third and fourth views (excluding remarried widowers, opposing polygamy) were commonly held among the church Fathers. The most common views today are the second and fifth views (excluding divorcees, requiring faithfulness in marriage). The first view (excluding unmarried candidates) is held by few.

[7] Most biblical references are to widows, not widowers, remarrying, since it was far more common for women to lose their spouses than husbands their wives (cf., e.g., Rom. 7:2-3; 1 Cor. 7:39; 1 Tim. 5:14), but there is no good reason why Paul's encouragement for widows (especially younger ones) to remarry should not applied to widowers as well.

hard to understand why Paul would bar widowers who follow his advice and remarry from church office. This is true especially since many of these persons would be older, mature men who command respect and possess the life experience and spiritual seasoning to provide competent and distinguished leadership in the church (cf. Titus 2:2; 1 Pet. 5:5; see also 1 Thess. 5:12; Heb. 13:17). In the case of widowers who remarry, remarriage does not imply any character flaw or moral failure on their part. Nor does the presence of a new wife constitute an obstacle to such a man's eligibility, since he would be no different from other married men who seek and hold church office. There seems therefore to be no biblical, theological, or even common sense reason why remarried widowers should be barred from church office.

Fourth, the theory that Paul sought to exclude polygamists from holding church office[8] runs into the difficulty that polygamy was not widely practiced in the Greco-Roman world at the time.[9] Considerably more likely is the possibility that the phrase *mias gynaikas andra* is geared toward barring men from holding church office who had one or several concubines, a widespread practice at that time.[10] Apparently, neither the Greeks nor the Romans regarded these practices as adulterous or polygamous. For Paul, however, concubinage was essentially equivalent to polygamy, since sexual union results in a "one flesh" relationship (cf. 1 Cor. 6:16).

For this reason, fifth, "faithful husband" is probably the best way to capture the essence of the expression *mias gynaikas andra*.[11] That the phrase constitutes a reference to marital faithfulness is suggested by the parallel in 1 Timothy 5:9, where a widow eligible for church support is required to have been "faithful to her husband" (NIV = TNIV) and where the equivalent phrase "wife of one husband" is used (cf. 1 Cor. 7:2-5). In the latter instance, the phrase cannot indicate a prohibition of polyandry (being married to more than one husband at a time, which in any case

---

[8] See the NIV rendering, "husband of *but* one wife" (note that there is no equivalent for "but" in the original; but see the change to "faithful to his wife" in the TNIV). See also John Calvin, *1 & 2 Timothy & Titus* (Wheaton, IL/Nottingham: Crossway, 1998; original ed. 1556, 1549), 54.

[9] See, e.g., William D. Mounce, *The Pastoral Epistles* (WBC 46; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000), 171.

[10] Cf. Steven M. Baugh, "Titus," in *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Backgrounds Commentary* (ed. Clinton E. Arnold; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002), 501-2.

[11] See esp. Sidney Page, "Marital Expectations of Church Leaders in the Pastoral Epistles," *JSNT* 50 (1993): 105–20, esp. 108–9 and 114, n. 27. For a discussion of the biblical teaching on marriage (including the husband's role), see Andreas J. Köstenberger (with David J. Jones), *God, Marriage, and Family: Rebuilding the Biblical Foundation* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2004).

was virtually non-existent in the ancient world) since it is made of a woman bereft of her husband. Moreover, it would hardly make sense for Paul first to encourage younger widows to get remarried and then disqualify them later on the grounds that they have (literally) been wives of more than one husband.[12] On a different note, the present requirement of marital faithfulness for church leaders (including deacons, 1 Tim. 3:12) is also consistent with the prohibition of adultery in the Decalogue (Exod. 20:14 = Deut. 5:18).[13]

If the above discussion is on target, therefore, it seems that the problem with the first four interpretations listed above is that they are based on a literalistic, if not rigid, reading of the phrase *mias gynaikas andros* as denoting *literally* marriage to only *one* woman *ever*: one as opposed to zero as in the case of single candidates for church office, or one as opposed to two or more wives, be it at the same time (polygamy) or consecutively (remarriage of widowers, divorcees). More likely, however, the phrase is to be understood *idiomatically* (designating "a one-wife-type-of-husband"), that is, as a term for marital faithfulness rather than as a literal enumeration of a certain number of marriages (one rather than zero or two or more) in which a candidate is required to be engaged.[14]

That this is in fact the case is further supported by inscriptional evidence regarding the Roman concept of a *univira*, that is, a "one husband"-type of wife.[15] This term denoting marital fidelity was initially applied to living women in relation to their husbands and later became an epithet given by husbands to their deceased wives. This is attested by numerous extant literary references and tombstone inscriptions. Hence the first-century B.C. poet Catullus wrote, "[T]o live content with one

---

[12] See Page, "Marital Expectations," 112; *contra* Gordon D. Fee, "Reflections on Church Order in the Pastoral Epistles, with Further Reflection on the Hermeneutics of *Ad Hoc* Documents," *JETS* 28 (1985): 150, who contends that the present passage "probably prohibits remarriage of widows/widowers."

[13] The present requirement contrasts with the Gnostic extremes of asceticism and sexual licentiousness. Marital fidelity was also held in high regard in the Greco-Roman world, so that this quality would commend a Christian office-holder to his pagan surroundings (cf. Page, "Marital Expectations," 117-18).

[14] David Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: The Social and Literary Context* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 227-28, concurs and notes that the phrase is equivalent to our phrase "having eyes for only one woman" (see also p. 313). Note that in all its occurrences, the expression "of one wife" or "of one husband" is put first in the original for emphasis (cf. 1 Tim. 3:2, 12; 5:9).

[15] Cf. Marjorie Lightman and William Zeisel, "Univira: An Example of Continuity and Change in Roman Society," *Church History* 46 (1977): 19-32. "Uni" is Latin for "one," "vir" means "husband," and the female suffix "a" refers to a woman or wife, hence the meaning "one-husband-type-of woman or wife."

man is for wives an honor of honors" (111). A Roman imperial inscription reads, "She lived fifty years and was satisfied with one husband" (*CIL* 6.5162). The late-first-century B.C. *Laudatio Turiae* records a husband saying about his wife, "Rare are marriages, so long lasting, and ended by death, not interrupted by divorce . . ."[16]

For these reasons we conclude that the Pauline *mias gynaikas andra* requirement is best understood as stipulating that candidates for church office (both elder and deacon) be faithful husbands (assuming that they are currently married). If this is correct, what, then, are the implications of this requirement for the church today? In the following discussion we will briefly consider the implications of this requirement for single, divorced, and remarried candidates for church leadership.

The first implication of the "faithful husband" requirement is that younger candidates who have yet to prove their ability to manage their own households well should ordinarily not be put in ultimate leadership positions in the church. While they may possess proper formal training as well as be both eager and otherwise qualified in terms of character and disposition, maturity and life experience are such an integral part of a church leader's necessary equipment for his role that any diminishing of this requirement may come dangerously close to appointing a recent convert, which is discouraged in Scripture in the strongest terms (1 Tim. 3:6; cf. 5:22).

Second, it is utter folly for someone to provide qualified, capable leadership for the church while neglecting his duties in his own family, be it owing to busyness in ministry or to improper priorities. Even while serving as pastor or elder, it is therefore imperative that men serving in this function regularly evaluate themselves to see whether or not they are able to oversee the church while continuing to be able to adequately fulfill their natural duties as husband and father. Otherwise, it may well be said with Paul that those men beware, lest possibly, after having preached to others, they may themselves be disqualified (1 Cor. 9:27).

Third, theologically, by linking the family so closely to the church, the New Testament presents the latter as the eschatological extension of the former. That which reaches all the way back to the divine creation of the first man and woman is seen to be further extended and explicated in the "household of God," the church (cf. Eph. 5:31-32). Hence the requirements that an officeholder manage his own household well, and that he be faithful in marriage and keep his children under proper control, all form the indispensable prerequisite for his suitability for church office. Before he can lead the household of God, he must first show that

[16] Cited in ibid.

he can properly discharge his leadership responsibilities in his own household.

But what shall we say about divorced men serving as pastor/elder or deacon? In light of the fairly stringent statements made by both Jesus and Paul regarding divorce and remarriage, and in view of the fact that serving as pastor, elder, or deacon in the local church is a high calling of considerable responsibility, should men who have undergone a divorce be barred from serving in roles of church leadership, specifically those of pastor/elder or deacon? In light of the high moral qualifications required for those serving in those offices, this would seem to be almost a foregone conclusion. How else would those in charge of the church model Christlikeness to the rest of the congregation?

In fact, for those who hold a "no divorce, no remarriage" position, the question of whether a divorced man can serve in church leadership does not even arise—divorce is never legitimate for any Christian, including those aspiring to positions of leadership in the church. As such, a divorcee certainly could not be considered a "faithful husband" or "above reproach." For those open at least in principle to the possibility that divorce may be biblically legitimate in a limited number of circumstances (cf. Matt. 19:9; 1 Cor. 7:15), however, the issue is not quite as clear-cut. The major passages dealing with qualifications for leadership (1 Timothy 3; Titus 1) do not directly address this question, focusing instead on the requirement of a candidate's faithfulness in a present marriage. The issue therefore turns to a significant extent on the question of what is meant by the requirement of being a *mias gynaikas anēr*.[17]

If, as has been argued, the expression means "faithful husband," then it may be possible for men who experienced a divorce to fulfill this requirement if they are faithful to their wife in their present marriage. Hence, divorced (and remarried) men would not necessarily be excluded from consideration as pastors/elders or deacons, especially if, in keeping with the general principles of the majority view on marriage and divorce, the divorce was legitimate. If the divorce was illegitimate (i.e., not covered by the Matthean "exception clause" or the Pauline privilege), service as pastor/elder or deacon is ruled out, because that person has an illegitimate divorce in their past, whether they repented of this sin or not.[18]

---

[17] See the discussion above.

[18] See the treatment of Matt. 19:9 (marital unfaithfulness), 1 Cor. 7:15 (desertion by unbeliever), and Rom. 7:2-3 (death of a spouse) above. Regarding the question of whether or not men who underwent a biblically legitimate divorce could also be considered for church leadership positions if the divorce has taken place in the distant

Overall, people should generally not be held to a stricter standard just to be "safe" and "conservative." If (and not all agree) both Jesus and Paul were willing to make an exception, we should be willing to follow their lead without fearing that a high view of marriage will thereby be compromised. Nevertheless, when coupled with the requirement that an overseer be "above reproach" (which includes community reputation), it may be best in many circumstances to weigh very carefully whether or not to appoint divorcees to the role of pastor/elder or deacon, especially when qualified candidates are available who did not undergo a divorce. This would seem to be the wisest course of action especially since there are many other avenues of service available to people in those kinds of circumstances apart from the highest ecclesiastical office.

Yet while the standard is one of *spiritual maturity* and *moral uprightness*, it is not that of *perfection*. In fact, the lists contain many attributes to which every Christian should aspire. To be sure, pastors ought to set an example of spiritual maturity, but their role is not to be conceived as representing Christ in such a way as to literally embody his own characteristics, be it in his unmarried state[19] or in his lack of divorce or remarriage. More appropriately, those officeholders who are married ought to model Christ's faithfulness to his spiritual bride, the Church, by being faithful to their wife (cf. Eph. 5:25-30). This is fully compatible with the above-presented view that Paul requires marital faithfulness of officeholders while leaving open the question of whether or not those who have undergone a divorce that is biblically permissible (if this is considered possible) are at least in principle eligible to serve.

Requirements Pertaining to Church Leaders' Children

Paul's epistles to Timothy and Titus both include not only the "faithful husband" requirement, but also a stipulation regarding the church leader's children. To Timothy, the apostle writes that the candidate for office "must manage his own household well, with all dignity keeping his children submissive" (1 Tim. 3:4). In an argument from the lesser to the greater, Paul continues, "For if someone does not know how to manage his own household, how will he care for God's church?" (1 Tim. 3:5). The requirement mentioned in the epistle to Titus seems to be even stricter, stipulating that a church leader's "children are *believers* and not

past (especially if the person was not a believer at the time) and if the man's present pattern (and proven track record) is that of marital faithfulness, see Page, "Marital Expectations," 103-13.

[19] There is little biblical support for the type of sacramental model advocated in the Roman Catholic Church which roots its celibacy requirement for the priestly office in the unmarried state of Jesus Christ himself during his incarnate ministry.

open to the charge of debauchery or insubordination" (Titus 1:6 ESV; NIV: "whose children are *faithful* and not open to the charge of being wild and disobedient"; TNIV: "whose children *believe*"). Again, Paul follows up with a reason: "For an overseer, as God's steward, must be above reproach" (Titus 1:7).

The Greek word underlying the rendering "believers" is *pistos*, which can mean either "believing" (ESV, TNIV) or "faithful" (NIV). While "believing" admittedly is the word's meaning in the majority of instances in the Pastorals, in the present case it is perhaps more likely that the expression means "faithful" in the sense of "obedient and submissive to their father's orders" (cf. 1 Tim. 3:11; 2 Tim. 2:2, 13).[20] The meaning "believing" is rendered less likely here in light of the context and the parallel in 1 Timothy 3:4, not to mention the theological difficulties of accommodating the doctrine of election within the scope of such a requirement.

The fact that the other two instances of "wild" (*asōtias*) relate to orgies of drunkenness (Eph. 5:18; 1 Pet. 4:4; cf. Prov. 28:7 LXX) and the other two instances of "disobedient" (lit., "unsubjected," *anypotakta*; cf. Heb. 2:8) to outright rebellion (1 Tim. 1:9; Titus 1:10) suggests that what is in view is not occasional disobedience but deep-seated rebellion against parental authority. Anyone who would be an elder in the church, which entails the exercise of authority over the congregation, must properly exercise authority at home, with his children responding in obedience and submission (whether or not they are spiritually regenerate). This is required if "God's manager" (*oikonomos theou*; cf. 1 Cor. 4:1, 2; 1 Pet. 4:10) is to be blameless (cf. 1 Tim. 3:5, 15).[21]

Deacons

The second church office addressed in 1 Timothy 3 besides that of overseer/elder is that of deacon. Structurally, the presence of *hōsautōs* in 1 Timothy 3:8 and 11 ("likewise"/"in the same way") suggests that qualifications are given for two other types of officeholders besides that of overseer (1 Tim 3:1-7). To put it differently, the framing device by which 1 Timothy 3:11 is sandwiched between 1 Tim 3:8-10 and 3:12-13 indicates that one large category is in mind, that of deacon, with Paul first addressing qualifications for male and then female office-holders,

[20] Cf. George W. Knight, *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 290, followed by Peter Balla, *The Child-Parent Relationship in the New Testament and Its Environment* (WUNT 155; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2003), 181.

[21] For a discussion of the biblical teaching on children and parenting see Chapter 7 and 8 in Köstenberger, *God, Marriage & Family*.

after which he briefly returns to male deacons and closes with a general statement pertaining to both. As mentioned, the two-tiered structure (elder/deacon) characteristic of 1 Timothy 3 is also evident from Philippians 1:1.

When comparing the qualifications for deacons with those for overseers, one notes the absence of terms related to teaching or ruling (most notably—"able to teach," 1 Tim 3:2; see also 1 Tim 3:5b). This suggests that, in keeping with the designation "deacon" (from the Greek *diakonos*, "servant") as over against "overseer," deacons are not part of that group that bears ultimate responsibility for the church.[22] At the same time, they, too, occupy a formal church office, for which they must meet certain requirements. While not part of the teaching/ruling body of the church, deacons nonetheless hold important leadership roles. This is most notably indicated by the similarity between the qualifications for overseers and deacons.[23] Although Paul does not spell out the precise realm of service for the office of deacon, one may surmise that this includes various kinds of practical help and administration, such as benevolence, finances, and physical maintenance.[24]

According to 1 Timothy 3:8, deacons (cf. Phil 1:1; not mentioned in Titus), "likewise" (cf. 1 Tim 2:9; 3:11; Titus 2:3, 6), are to meet certain qualifications, whereby 1 Timothy 3:8-10 and 12 relate to male and 1 Timothy 3:11 to female office-holders. There is no consensus as to the proper translation of the Greek word *gynaikas* in 1 Timothy 3:11, which can mean either "woman" or "wife." Since both meanings—"woman" (1 Tim 2:9, 10, 11, 12, 14) and "wife" (1 Tim 3:2, 12; 5:9; cf. Titus 1:6)—are found in the present epistle; context must decide.[25] Depending on one's translation of this term, the office-holder in view is either a woman deacon or the wife of a deacon.

Translations are divided on this issue. In some cases, even the same translation committee has changed its view on the most likely rendering.

---

[22] Cf. Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, 167; contra I. H. Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), 485.

[23] Philip H. Towner, *1-2 Timothy & Titus* (IVPNTC; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1994), 90–91.

[24] Mounce contends that "Paul does not teach that the deacon is under the overseer. . . both overseer and deacon serve the church in different capacities" (*Pastoral Epistles*, 207). Yet overseers are in charge of the entire congregation (e.g. 1 Tim 5:17), which would seem to include deacons.

[25] A third possibility is favored by Robert M. Lewis, "The 'Women' of 1 Timothy 3:11," *BSac* 136 (1979): 167-75, that of unmarried [single or widowed] female deacons' assistants. Walter L. Liefeld, *1 & 2 Timothy/Titus* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999), 134, conjectures that "at first the women who served as deacons were the wives of deacons."

The NIV, for example, translates *gynaikas* with "their wives" (though note that "their" is not in the original), but the TNIV changes this to "women who are deacons," that is, "women deacons" or "deaconesses" (cf. NIV footnote; see also Rom. 16:1). Some translations committed to a formal equivalence translation philosophy, such as the NASB and the HCSB, opt for the translation "women," which has the virtue of being "literal" but is of little help in deciding the issue, since the question still remains which kinds of women are in view, wives of deacons or women deacons.

Time does not permit a full airing of all the arguments pro and con. I will limit myself to citing what I consider to be the most important exegetical factors that have a bearing on the issue. On the whole, it is my judgment that "women deacons" is to be preferred, for the following reasons:[26] (1) the absence of qualifications for overseers' wives in 1 Timothy 3:1-7; (2) the phrase "in the same way" in 1 Timothy 3:11 indicating an office similar to the one previously mentioned (cf. 1 Tim 3:8); (3) the parallel sentence structure and similar characteristics in 1 Timothy 3:8 and 11 (including the lack of an article before "women"); and (4) the absence of qualifiers such as the possessive pronoun "their" in relation to *gynaikas* in the Greek.

The reason that Paul did not call these women "deaconesses" is that in his day the word *diakonos* was still used for males and females alike (plus the respective article to indicate gender); only later the term *diakonissa* was coined (*Apost. Const.* 8.19, 20, 28).[27] Phoebe is identified as a *diakonos* (note the masculine grammatical gender of the term) of the church at Cenchrea in Romans 16:1. Paul's mention of women deacons would cohere well with his earlier prohibition of women serving in teaching or ruling functions over men (1 Tim 2:12) and his lack of mention of women elders in 1 Timothy 3:1-7. Since being a deacon does not involve teaching or ruling, women as well as men would be eligible to serve in this capacity. The requirements for deaconesses are thus similar to those for male deacons.

It should be noted that in recent years the tide of opinion has significantly shifted toward the presence of women deacons in the early church. Until recently, most major translations took the reference in 1 Timothy 3:11 to be to the wives of deacons, as the following list illustrates:

---

[26] Cf. Jennifer H. Stiefel, "Women Deacons in 1 Timothy: A Linguistic and Literary Look at 'Women Likewise . . .' [1 Tim 3.11]," *NTS* 41 (1995): 442-57.

[27] See also the reference in Pliny the younger, who refers to two women "called deaconesses" (*ministrae*) in Bithynia under Trajan (*Epist.* 10.96.8; c. A.D. 115).

KJV = NKJV: "*their* wives"
NASB: "women"
NIV: "their wives" (footnote: or "deaconesses")
NRSV: "women" (footnote: or "their wives" or "women deacons")
NLT: "their wives" (footnote: or "the women deacons")

Thus until recently no major translation unequivocally affirmed in the main text that 1 Timothy 3:11 may refer to women deacons. With the recent release of the TNIV this has now changed: as mentioned, its text says "women who are deacons." Notably, too, the HCSB, by opting for the wording "women," marks a cautious departure from the KJV traditional rendering of "*their* wives."

To this turning of the tide with regard to women deacons should be added the fact that several major recent commentaries—written by complementarian scholars, no less—affirm that the reference to Phoebe as a *diakonos* in Romans 16:1 should be interpreted as her serving as a deaconess.[28]

The implication for the church's contemporary practice seems to be that it may be only a matter of time until more churches will allow women to serve in the role of deaconess (assuming a biblical definition of "deacon" as a non-teaching, non-ruling office). Already, several major churches pastored by those who are conservative on the issue of women pastors or elders have women deacons, including Grace Community Church (pastor John MacArthur) and Capitol Hill Baptist Church (pastor Mark Dever).

In any case, whether or not a church, or a given scholar, favors women deacons should not be made a litmus test for orthodoxy or conservatism, since, as mentioned, the issue cuts across the conservative/liberal divide and many pastors and scholars with impeccable credentials on the so-called "women's issue" *both* limit the office of elder to men *and* open the office of deacon to men and women.

Personally, as one who favors deaconesses, but one who has spoken out strongly against women elders and pastors (see the Baker publication *Women in the Church*, now available in a second edition), I believe this is a good opportunity to show that we recognize the ministry of women just as we do the ministry of men and that we do not discriminate against women in ministry. The unfortunate consequence of limiting the office to wives of deacons is that this excludes unmarried women as well as

[28] See esp. Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 786-87 and Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 913-14.

widows. This is unfortunate, since especially mature widows seem uniquely equipped to serve in such a role (cf. 1 Tim. 3:11; Titus 2:3-5).

Conclusion

The Pastorals reflect a two-tier structure of church government, with a plurality of pastors/elders/overseers in charge and with deacons (both male and female) fulfilling serving roles in the church. The "husband of one wife" requirement most likely refers to the stipulation that church leaders be faithful to their wives. If so, those candidates for pastor or elder who are divorced but whose divorce is biblically legitimate and covered by one of the exceptions stipulated in New Testament teaching would not necessarily be disqualified from serving.

I do not claim that these conclusions are the only ones possible from the New Testament data. Nor do I claim that I am necessarily right in all of my hermeneutical and exegetical judgments. There can be little disagreement, however, that the Pastorals are one of the most important New Testament writings for the practice of the contemporary church. The church must continue to wrestle with what Scripture teaches regarding church government, church leadership, and qualifications for leadership and commit itself to abide by what it understands the Scriptures to teach rather than personal preference or church tradition.[29]

I would also urge an awareness of one's own presuppositions and a willingness to revisit (or visit for the first time) the biblical data rather than following in the paths of one's denominational forebears. It is with the Reformation commitment to *sola Scriptura*, with the scholarly spirit of *ad fontes*, and with the dictum, "In essentials, unity, in non-essentials liberty, and in all things, charity" that I offer this modest contribution to our study *and practice* of the Pastoral Epistles.

---

[29] See the unpublished paper by Randall L. Adkisson, "Women Serving in the Church? A biblical and historical look at women serving in the church with particular attention given to the history and interpretation of Southern Baptists."

Midwestern Journal of Theology 4.2 (Spring 2006): 57-83.

A Historical-Theological Analysis of Evangelicals and Catholics Together

Thomas P. Johnston
Assistant Professor of Evangelism
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Kansas City, MO 64118

Once upon a time there was a significant lamb who wanted to meet with an old wolf. He thought that he might be able to work together with the old wolf in finding food. At first the old wolf did not want to meet with the significant lamb. After all, what do lambs know about finding food for wolves? They eat different foods.

As it turned out, however, the lamb population was increasing rapidly, much to the consternation of the old wolf. When the significant lamb came properly supplied with a gift in his hand, the old wolf agreed to meet with him. The old wolf considered that it might be beneficial to meet with the significant lamb and get to know his relatives. The meeting went very well, and an unwritten partnership was established between the significant lamb and the old wolf.

Now, the significant lamb had to hide his agenda from his relatives as they would not understand his motives. As time passed, they would surely come to understand and agree with his interest in partnering with the old wolf. Therefore, over several years the old wolf grew to know many of the relatives of the significant lamb. Later relatives of the significant lamb went to pains to write books explaining how sheep and wolves could work together in finding food. Sheep who mentioned that they eat different food than wolves or who questioned the wisdom of lambs working together with the wolves were shunned. They were considered intolerant and not understanding of their times. And so the story goes.

The dates were 1981 and 1982. The old wolf was Pope John Paul II. The significant lamb was Billy Graham. And now you know the rest of the story—or do you?

First, a few words about Pope John Paul II: Karol Józef Wojtyla, Archbishop of Krakow and Cardinal, was an ideal candidate for Pope when he was elected by the College of Cardinals in 1978. He had good relationships in Eastern Europe with Jews and Evangelical Christians, and he had inroads among the Russian Orthodox. Cardinal Wojtyla

seems to have allowed and encouraged Campus Crusade staff members to teach his priests personal evangelism. The cardinal had personally met Campus Crusade staff and their key supporters at a mountain retreat in Poland (one friend saw him come out of the shower with a towel around him). Through Bill Bright and Campus Crusade, Pope John Paul II had an immediate entry point into conservative Evangelicalism in the United States of America.

Second, a few words about Billy Graham: Graham's cooperation with Catholics has been noted by several people. In his 1995 book on the subject, Norman Geisler and Ralph MacKenzie close their theological assessment with a last chapter titled "Evangelism." They conclude their book, *Roman Catholics and Evangelicals,* with the following paragraph:

> Billy Graham has set the example for evangelical cooperation with Catholics in mass evangelism without compromising the basic gospel message. Despite ecclesiastical and doctrinal differences (see Part Two), there are some important things many Catholics and evangelicals hold in common not the least of which is the good news that Jesus died for our sins and rose again. Thus, there seems to be no good reason why there should not be increased ways of mutual encouragement in fulfilling our Lord's Great Commission (Matt. 28:18-20). Catholics and evangelicals do not have to agree on everything in order to agree on some things—even something important. We do not need to agree on the authority of the church before we can cooperate in proclaiming the power of the uncompromising gospel (Rom. 1:16).[1]

The erudite Geisler and MacKenzie seem to have forgotten the teaching of the Apostle Paul that "A little leaven leavens the whole lump *of dough*" (Galatians 5:9).[2]

---

[1] Norman L. Geisler and Ralph E. MacKenzie, *Roman Catholics and Evangelicals: Agreements and Differences* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 428-29.

[2] For further evidence of leaven, please note Jacques Blocher, *Le Catholicisme à la Lumière de l'Écriture Sainte* (Nogent-sur-Marne, France: Éditions de l'Institut Biblique de Nogent, 1979). In reality there are very few doctrines which remain uniquely biblical in Roman Catholicism. This author can think of none. For example, let's just take the deity of Christ as an example. What does the role of Mary do to the unique position of Christ as Mediator (1 Tim 2:5)? Note the following quotes from John Paul II's encyclical (thus deemed inerrant) *Redemptoris Mater* (25 Mar 1987): "She [Mary] puts herself 'in the middle,' that is to say she acts as a mediatrix not as an outsider, but in her position as mother" (sec 21); "In this way Mary's motherhood continues unceasingly in the Church as the mediation which intercedes, and the Church expresses her faith in this truth by invoking Mary 'under the titles of Advocate, Auxiliatrix, Adjutrix and Mediatrix'" (sec 40); quoting from Vatican II's *Lumen Gentium*, "She was exalted by the Lord as Queen of the Universe, in order that she might be the more thoroughly conformed to her son, the Lord of lords (cf. Rev 19:16) and the conqueror of sin and death" (sec 41); "for if as

Likewise, in his 1998 Ph.D. dissertation, "From Conflict to Cooperation? Changing American Evangelical Attitudes toward Roman Catholics: 1960-1998," Donald Sweeting discussed Graham's work with Roman Catholics as providing others an example:

> Why rehearse the changes that have taken place in Billy Graham's own thinking about Roman Catholics? First of all because the influence of Graham has been great, not only in the United States and the world, but within American Evangelicalism. . . . Secondly, the historic significance of Graham's actions in cooperative evangelism and ecumenical outreach have been duly noted. . . . Thirdly, Graham's example is now being held up as a model for the future. . . . Finally, not only has Graham's example

---

Virgin and Mother she was singularly united with him in his first coming, so through her continued collaboration with him she will also be united with him in expectation of the second" (sec 41); "For these reasons Mary is honored in the Church with special reverence. Indeed, from most ancient times the Blessed Virgin Mary has been venerated under the title of 'God-bearer.' In all perils and needs, the faithful have fled prayerfully to her protection. This cult is altogether special: it bears in itself and expresses the profound link which exists between the Mother of Christ and the Church. As Virgin and Mother, Mary remains for the Church a 'permanent model.'" (sec 42); "Thus also is exercised that motherhood in the Spirit which became Mary' role at the foot of the Cross and in the Upper Room" (sec 45); quoting Paul VI, "We believe that the Most Holy Mother of God, the new Eve, the Mother of the Church, carries on in heaven her maternal role with regard to the members of Christ, cooperating in the birth and development of divine life in the souls of the redeemed" (sec 47); "Indeed, as Paul VI hopes and asks, the Church must draw 'from the Virgin Mother of God the most authentic form of perfect imitation of Christ.'" (sec 47); "Thus the Church, throughout her life, maintains with the Mother of God a link which embraces, in the saving mystery, the past, the present and the future, and venerates her as the spiritual mother of humanity and the advocate of grace" (sec 47) "She is also the one who, precisely as the 'handmaid of the Lord,' cooperates unceasingly with the work of salvation accomplished by Christ, her Son." (49); and "Let the entire body of the faithful pour forth persevering prayer to the Mother of God and Mother of mankind. Let them implore that she who aided the beginning of the Church by her prayers may now, exalted as she is in heaven above all the saints and angels, intercede with her Son in the fellowship of all the saints. May she do so until all the peoples of the human family, whether they are honored with the name of Christian or whether they still do not know their Savior, are happily gathered together in peace and harmony into the one People of God, for the glory of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity" (sec 50); and finally "'Assist, yes assist, your people who have fallen!' This is the invocation addressed to Mary, the 'loving Mother of the Redeemer,' the invocation addressed to Christ, who through Mary entered human history. Year after year the antiphon rises to Mary, evoking that moment which saw the accomplishment of this essential historical transformation, which irreversibly continues: the transformation from 'falling' to 'rising.'" (sec 52). By the way, this teaching regarding Mary's role presumably comes to us from the Holy Spirit (and is thus infallible and inerrant), in fact to disagree with it is to sin against the Holy Spirit, which is unforgivable: "The Extraordinary Synod of Bishops held in 1985 exhorted everyone to follow faithfully the teaching and guidelines of the Council. We can say that these two events—the Council and the Synod—embody what the Holy Spirit himself wishes "to say to the Church" in the present phase of history" (sec 48).

> been noted and commended, it has been followed by key Evangelical leaders and parachurch organizations.[3]

He then went on to say, "Regardless of what happens in the wider world, I believe that when we reflect on relations between Evangelicals and Catholics there are reasons for hope."[4]

Similarly, Mark Noll and Carolyn Nystrom discuss unity with the Catholic church in a positive light, using Billy Graham's work with Roman Catholics as an example. In their 2005 book, *Is the Reformation Over? An Evangelical Assessment of Contemporary Roman Catholicism,* Noll and Nystrom wrote, "Graham, however, was undergoing a personal transition that mirrored and then led developments in the larger world of evangelical-Catholic relations."[5]

This paper will begin with an examination of Graham's "personal transition" as a backdrop to evaluate the Vatican's tactical change as regards ecumenism. Next, we will consider the tactical change in Rome which preceded and set the stage for this Evangelical *rapprochement*. Finally we will discuss the implications of this change in tactics in relation to cooperation (ecumenism) and evangelism (proselytism). My contention is that there is very little reason or need for Baptists and Evangelicals to cooperate with Roman Catholics at any level, especially in fulfilling the Great Commission. We begin with an overview of the transition in Billy Graham's view of cooperation with Roman Catholics.

Boston Roman Catholic Archbishop Cushing's "Bravo Billy" stunned Graham in the New Year of 1950.[6] It went completely against his training at Trinity Bible Institute and Wheaton College. Maybe his Bible training was a bit parochial after all. Cushing went on to receive the Cardinal's red hat as announced in the *Boston Globe* on January 14, 1950.[7] It seems that Pope Pius XII rewarded him for his shrewd approach

---

[3] Donald Sweeting, "From Conflict to Cooperation? Changing American Evangelical Attitudes toward Roman Catholics: 1960-1998" (Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1998), 145-48. Sweeting cites such key Evangelical leaders as James Dobson of Focus on the Family and Bill Bright of Campus Crusade for Christ.

[4] Ibid., 402.

[5] Mark A. Noll and Carolyn Nystrom, *Is the Reformation Over? An Evangelical Assessment of Contemporary Roman Catholicism* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 18.

[6] Graham spoke in Boston from 31 Dec 1949 to 16 Jan 1950. The "Bravo Billy!" article was written during the crusade (Billy Graham, *Just As I Am* [New York: Harper Collins, 1997], 161).

[7] "Abp. Cushing to Get Red Hat, Rome Hints," *Boston Evening Globe* (14 January 1950), 1, 2.

toward the rising star in Evangelicalism.[8] In his 1997 autobiography, Graham wrote of Cushing's comment, "Heartening us also was the response of the Roman Catholic Church, especially in light of the fact that the landmark decisions on ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council were still years away."[9]

In the following years Graham sought or allowed avenues for increased cooperation with Roman Catholics:

1952: According to William Martin's official biography, Graham avoided preaching against the White House appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican. Martin quoted a 1952 personal letter of Graham to President Truman, "I have refused to make any comment on the Vatican appointment because I didn't want to be put into a position of opposing you."[10] Graham then seems to have assisted with Ronald Reagan's appointment of an Ambassador in 1984.[11]

1961: William Martin also wrote of Graham's widening relationships:

> Graham's ever-widening acceptance of others who professed to be Christians manifested itself not only in his continued association with the World Council of Churches—he attended its general assembly in New Delhi in 1961 at the council's invitation—but also in an improved relationship with Catholics, especially after John XXIII assumed the papal chair. Following John Kennedy's election, he scrupulously avoided any statements that could be construed as anti-Catholic, a relaxation of wariness that bothered some of Graham's colleagues.[12]

1962: In his autobiography, *Just As I Am*, Graham wrote of his crusades in Latin America:

---

[8] In 1947, Graham assumed the presidency of the Northwestern Schools in Minneapolis, Minnesota, fulfilling the deathbed wish of its founding President, the fundamentalist W. B. Riley (William Vance Trollinger, Jr., "God's Empire: William Bell Riley and Midwestern Fundamentalism" [Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1990)], 152). Also note Billy Graham's early publications: *Calling Youth to Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1947), *Revival in Our Time* (Wheaton, IL: Van Kampen, 1950), and *America's Hour of Decision* (Wheaton, IL: Van Kampen, 1951).

[9] Billy Graham, *Just As I Am*, 161.

[10] Walter Martin, *A Prophet with Honor: The Billy Graham Story* (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1991), 144.

[11] "The President asked Graham to help the national security adviser, William P. Clark, to gather responses for establishing formal diplomatic relations with the Holy See" ("Billy Graham: General Teaching/Activities," [online]; accessed 19 Oct 2005; available at http://www.rapidnet.com/~jbeard/bdm/ exposes/graham/general.htm; Internet. This statement notes (*Charisma* [May 1984], 101-02).

[12] Martin, 294.

> My goal, I was always clear, was not to preach against Catholic beliefs or to proselytize people who were already committed to Christ within the Catholic Church. Rather it was to proclaim the Gospel to all those who had never truly committed their lives to Christ.[13]

It must be granted that *Just As I Am* was written thirty-two years after the fact and was probably edited by John Akers, but the passive stance soon morphed into a positive stance. Graham (or Akers) added that Ken Strachan, son of the founder of Latin America Mission, felt the same as him, "Ken held the same view I did: that there needed to be a coming together in some way and some form between Catholics and Protestants."[14] By the way, Graham's purported concern for "coming together" with Roman Catholics is incomprehensible to any Evangelical who has lived in and tried to win souls in a predominantly Roman Catholic country.[15]

1967: Graham appears to have had on his platform Orthodox and Catholic leaders for the first time. Donald Sweeting explained, "This [Zagreb, Yugoslavia] appears to be the first time that Graham had Roman Catholics on the platform in his meetings."[16]

This symbolic uniting of Orthodox and Catholic occurred prior to the 1968-1969 "Healing" of the 1054 mutual anathema between Orthodox and Catholics.[17] Could it be that the healing of the longest standing schism between territorial churches in Christian history was a part of Graham's peacekeeping legacy which he described later in 1982,[18] as well as in his biography *Just as I Am*?[19]

---

[13] Ibid., 357.

[14] Ibid.

[15] "Many evangelicals (not all) consider the institution, theology, and everyday practice of Latin American Catholicism as unbiblical. The commitment to evangelize those within that Church becomes for them a genuine duty" (M. Daniel Carroll R[odas], "The Evangelical-Roman Catholic Dialogue: Issues Revolving Around Evangelization—An Evangelical View from Latin America," *Trinity Journal* 21, no. 2 [Fall 2000]: 200).

[16] Donald Sweeting, *From Conflict to Cooperation?* 126.

[17] E. J. Stormon, SJ, *Towards the Healing of a Schism*, "Ecumenical Documents III" (Mahwah, NY: Paulist, 1987).

[18] "There has been an epic change in the heart of Billy Graham" (Frye Gaillard, "The Conversion of Billy Graham: How a Presidents' Preacher Learned to Start Worrying and Loathe the Bomb," *The Progressive* 46 [August 1982]: 30). Gaillard quoted Graham as saying, "'I plan to spend the rest of my life,' he [Billy Graham] says, 'doing two things—preaching the gospel and working for peace'" (ibid.).

[19] Graham begins his autobiography with an introduction entitled "Between Two Presidents: Harry S. Truman, 1950 and Kim Il Sung, 1992" (Billy Graham, *Just As I Am*, xvii). It is clear that he felt that arranging for a crusade in North Korea was a major accomplishment in his life. Also Graham brought messages to President Kim Il Sung from President George Bush, Sr. and Pope John Paul II (ibid., 626).

1977: It was in the late 1970s that Graham continued to broaden significantly his ecumenical approach. I quote from my 2003 book *Examining Billy Graham's Theology of Evangelism*:[20]

> Several years later, when overseas, Graham began to urge the participation of the RCC [Roman Catholic Church], when it was an important percentage of the population. When planning the 1977 trip to Hungary, Martin wrote: "Haraszti informed the Hungarian ambassador in Washington of the evangelist's concern over the modest agenda the Council of Free Churches had set for him. If at all possible, Graham wished to broaden the scope of the visit just a bit; specifically, to include preaching appointments at major Reformed and Catholic churches and a meeting with key leaders of the Jewish faith."[21]

The request was similar in planning the 1978 trip to Poland: "Graham wanted an invitation from the Catholic hierarchy but did not want the Church to control the visit."[22] During that trip, Graham just missed meeting (Karol Cardinal Wojtyla), as he was in Rome being elected Pope John Paul II.[23]

1981: In 1981, John Paul II "welcomed him [Graham] to the Vatican for a half-hour visit, the first time any pope had received him."[24] Martin explained their discussion:

> Noting that they had talked of "inter-church relations, the emergence of Evangelicalism, evangelization, and Christian responsibility towards modern moral issues" (an indication it had been a full half-hour), Graham told a press conference that "we had a spiritual time. He is so down-to-earth and human, I almost forgot he was the pope."[25]

1982:[26] In 1982 Sterling Huston became the North American Crusade Director for the BGEA, and in the Spokane Crusade, Bishop Lawrence Welsh wrote a letter in his diocesan paper encouraging his people to attend the crusade. The preface to his letter in the National Catholic Reporter explained:

---

[20] Thomas P. Johnston, *Examining Billy Graham's Theology of Evangelism* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003), 397-98.

[21] Martin, 484.

[22] Ibid, 489.

[23] Ibid., 490.

[24] Ibid., 491.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Johnston, 398.

> Bishop Lawrence Welsh wrote in the Inland Register, Spokane's diocesan newspaper, recognizing that if the experiences of other cities held true, numerous Catholics would attend the crusade. He said organizers of the crusade and officials of the diocese were developing plans for cooperation to follow-up people who ask during the crusade to be contacted by the Catholic Church. "This follow-up—which is more important than the crusade itself—often goes unnoticed and unpublicized as part of a Billy Graham crusade," Welsh stated.[27]

I have included under 500 words of this copyrighted letter in my footnote as found in the *National Catholic Reporter*.[28] This letter provides a

---

[27] Bishop Lawrence Welsh, "Catholics and a Billy Graham Crusade," *National Catholic Reporter* (2 September 1982): 185.

[28] "Dr. Billy Graham, the worldwide evangelist, will be conducting a crusade in Spokane at Joe Albi stadium Aug. 22-29. This crusade both poses some concern for us in the Catholic tradition and provides us with opportunities to reflect on the nature of evangelization and our relationship to Protestants who profess faith in Jesus Christ.

The Second Vatican Council's Decree on Ecumenism, reflecting on the Gospel, reminds us that despite historical and theological differences "all who have been justified by faith in baptism are incorporated into Christ; they therefore have a right to be called Christians, and with good reason are accepted as brothers and sisters by the children of the Catholic Church" (no. 3). We cannot forget this basic principle of charity and faith when dealing with our Protestant brothers and sisters.

That spirit of charity and eagerness for the spread of the good news of Jesus Christ welcomes Dr. Graham to Spokane and eastern Washington. As members of that community and as Catholics, we also welcome Dr. Graham as he comes to share the Gospel with us. Those who have seen Dr. Graham in person or have watched his frequently televised crusades know of his enthusiasm for Christ and his personal conviction to preach the Gospel. Such virtues are laudable in an age which tends to treat faith and religious matters with apathy, if not disdain.

It is true that Dr. Graham's preaching style leaves some of us uncomfortable. For some his interpretation of holy scripture seems too literal and fundamentalistic; for others his themes are too simplistic and not sufficiently nuanced with an integrated theology. In varying degrees those responsible for leadership in the Christian community voice these criticisms of Dr. Graham's evangelistic style and content. Each of these concerns is in itself subject matter for ongoing discussion and examination.

Our Catholic tradition and teaching have clear positions regarding some of these concerns, but it would be unfair for Catholics to look with disdain on Dr. Graham and his effort. Taken in broad perspective the Gospel he preaches is the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Because for all Christians Jesus is at the center of life, Dr. Graham always ends his sermons with what he terms an "altar call," an opportunity for personal commitment to Jesus Christ. This kind of activity is foreign to Catholic celebrations; the very vocabulary may leave us puzzled. Our theological perspective tells us that we are saved, that we belong to Christ because of what God has done for us in baptism. For the believing Christian conversion is a life-long process of dying to self and rising in Christ, it does not depend upon peak moments such as those experienced at religious crusades.

By this observation I do not intend to belittle the validity of religious experiences enjoyed by numerous people at Dr. Graham's crusades (or in other circumstances). It is important to note, however, that our Catholic understanding of conversion places such

milestone to mark the beginning of Graham's [full] cooperation with the RCC [Roman Catholic Church] in crusades in the United States.

1987: John Paul II asked Graham to participate in a combined ecumenical worship service in Columbia, South Carolina. Both Tex Reardon and John Akers of the BGEA were assisting in arrangements. Graham, however, had to cancel the meeting due to a prior invitation to China.[29]

1992: Graham shared in his biography that he brought a message from the Pope to President Kim of North Korea. He wrote:

> Pope John Paul II had also asked me to convey a message—a rather detailed one—to the North Korean leader. President Kim listened carefully but had no response. Our contacts later indicated that the pope had presented too comprehensive a proposal for the North Koreans to accept at that stage, given the lack of previous contact between the Vatican and the D.P.R.K.[30]

Graham's approach to Roman Catholics seems a bit naïve if we use hindsight to evaluate it. Yet this coincides with Graham's efforts to gain ecclesial support following his 1949 crusade in Los Angeles. We will briefly touch on Graham's cooperative efforts with the Anglican Church and the Lutheran World Federation.

---

experiences within a broader context. The Gospel calls all of us to rely on personal and living relationship with Christ, theology comes afterward.

For many people the Graham crusade will be a catalyst for evoking that rich awareness. Such an experience does not mark a participant as disloyal to the Catholic Church but it can be if not nourished by a community of faith. Without community support and sharing, faith experiences quickly fade. This is one of my chief concerns in relationship to Dr. Graham's crusade.

Dr. Graham and his organizers share that concern and have developed an elaborate follow-up system for those who seek a deeper walk with Christ as a result of the crusade. This follow-up—which is more important than the crusade itself—often goes unnoticed and unpublicized as part of a Billy Graham crusade.

Recently several priests and deacons met with me and with representatives of the crusade to discuss Catholic involvement with this follow-up program for Catholics who seek guidance and spiritual direction after their experiences at the crusade. Explicit steps are currently under way to assure that necessary support and guidance are provided.

. . . Catholics who attend the crusade are not acting against Catholic teaching; the church recognizes the power of events such as the Billy Graham crusade for the building of faith among Christians. Those who may choose to attend are invited to bring the graces of the crusade back to their home communities" (ibid., 185-86).

[29] Billy Graham, *Just As I Am*, 599. My father was involved in the discussions on the benefits and hindrances of Graham being on the same platform as Pope John Paul II. Perhaps Graham was not as comfortable as John Paul II in coming out of the closet.

[30] Ibid., 740.

Beginning with his publishing of *Peace with God* in 1952, Graham worked very hard to get the support of the Anglican Church. He finally received it in 1954 London Crusade at Harringay, as Ian Murray explained:

> Archbishop Fisher of Canterbury (who had previously declined to give his approval) pronounced the benediction at a final London gathering estimated to number more than one hundred thousand.[31]

That prayer of benediction opened the countries of the British Commonwealth to Graham's ministry, as well as the world.[32]

Graham also worked on getting the support of the Lutheran World Federation. According to Robert L. Kennedy, Graham never received the support of the Lutheran World Federation, based in Germany, even though he had multiple crusades in Germany in 1955, 1960, 1963, 1966, and 1970. The reason for the lack of support from German Lutherans was a desire to maintain good relations with American Lutherans.[33]

Dannenhaus concluded that since Lilje was president of the Lutheran World Federation, any strong support of a Baptist would compromise his position. It was not even certain whether Lilje would be permitted to do anything of that sort (support Billy Graham) "in light of the American Lutherans."[34]

So although he did not gain official sanction from the Lutheran World Federation in the late 1960s, by the time of the 1996 Greater Twin Cities Crusade, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America was fully involved, as was the Roman Catholic diocese of St. Paul, Minnesota (Fr. Martin Fleming was on the Executive Committee of the crusade). We can conclude that Graham valued cultivating and gaining the support of hierarchical and/or territorial (state) churches.

Two contemporary events provide milestones for United States Evangelicals as regards their/our relationship with the Roman Catholic church: (1) the 1994 Evangelicals and Catholics Together Statement,[35]

---

[31] Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided,* 34.

[32] "It [Harringay, 1954] did for the evangelist on the world stage what the Los Angeles Crusade of 1949 had done in the USA" (ibid., 33-34).

[33] "The faith taught by Graham is, therefore, not the same faith as taught in the Confessions" (Wilhelm Stoll, *The Conversion Theology of Billy Graham in the Light of the Lutheran Confessions* [St. Louis: Concordia Student Journal, 1980], 64).

[34] Robert L. Kennedy, "Best Intentions: Contacts Between German Pietists and Anglo-American Evangelicals, 1945-1954" (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1990), 506.

[35] "Evangelicals and Catholics Together: The Christian Mission in the Third Millenium," *First Things* (May 1994): 15-22.

which was explained and expanded in the 1994 Colson-Neuhaus Declaration,[36] and (2) the 2005 funeral of John Paul II that was attended by President George Bush with his wife Laura, two former presidents, and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice.[37] Was this in keeping with Graham's assistance in sending an ambassador to the Vatican Court?

By the way, the 1994 ECT was nothing more than a national or regional agreement, never having the official imprimatur of Rome. The Catholic church had prepared themselves for such regional and/or national statements with the 1975 publication of the SPCU (Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity), "Ecumenical Collaboration at the Regional, National, and Local Levels."

Why did no other presidents of the United States attend funerals of any prior Roman Catholic Popes? Just in 1950 the American Library Association named Paul Blanshard's *American Freedom and Catholic Power*[38] as one of the 50 outstanding books of the year. In the next year Blanshard published *Communism, Democracy, and Catholic Power*.[39] America's attitude toward Catholicism has done an about face in the past 50 years.

But what of the change of heart among Evangelicals in the United States? This change seems to be the result of Vatican ingenuity when they elected Puis XII Pope in 1939. We will begin by noting the "Shifting Ecumenical Posture" of the Vatican, and then examining its impact upon American Evangelicalism.

The answer to the Evangelical *rapprochement* with Roman Catholicism is found in the tactical change just before and during the pontificate of Pius XII (1939-58). There were three landmark changes in Vatican policies that led to a climate of *rapprochement*: (1) openness to higher criticism of the Bible, (2) change to a limited inerrancy position, and (3) openness to ecumenism.

First, Pius XII changed the anti-modernism hermeneutic of Leo XIII (1902) to openness to higher criticism in his 1943 encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu*. Listen to Leo XIII:

---

[36] Geisler and MacKenzie, 491-93.

[37] "About two million people came to Rome to see the Pope John Paul II over the week before the funeral. President George W. Bush was the first US President to attend a funeral for a Pope. Two former Presidents also went—President Clinton and President Bush. Also there at the funeral were Laura Bush and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice" ("Roman Catholic Funeral for Pope John Paul II," [on-line]; accessed 19 Oct 2005; available from http://catholicism.about.com/od/popejohnpaulii/a/funeralpjpii05.htm).

[38] Paul Blanshard, *American Freedom and Catholic Power* (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1949).

[39] Paul Blanshard, *Communism, Democracy, and Catholic Power* (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1951).

> The main point to be attained is that Catholics should not admit the malignant principle of granting more than is due to the opinion of heterodox writers. . . . "It is therefore not permitted to any one to interpret the Holy Scriptures in any way contrary to this sense, or even in any way contrary to the universal opinion of the Fathers."[40]

Now here is Pius XII:

> 30. For thus at long last will be brought about the happy and fruitful union between the doctrine and spiritual sweetness of expression of the ancient authors and the greater erudition and maturer knowledge of the modern, having as its result new progress in the never fully explored and inexhaustible field of the Divine Letters. . . . Let the interpreter then, with all care and without neglecting any light derived from recent research, endeavor to determine the peculiar character and circumstances of the sacred writer, the age in which he lived, the sources written or oral to which he had recourse and the forms of expression he employed.[41]

In doing so, Pius XII went against the famous "Oath against Modernism" required by Pius X.

Pope Saint Pius X issued this mandatory oath on September 1, 1910. It was mandated to be sworn to by all clergy, pastors, confessors, preachers, religious superiors, and professors in philosophical-theological seminaries:

> I firmly embrace and accept each and every definition that has been set forth and declared by the unerring teaching authority of the Church, especially those principal truths which are directly opposed to the errors of this day.[42]

The 1993 Pontifical Commission on Biblical Interpretation shows just how far Catholicism has accepted higher criticism (everything but feminism [split vote] and Fundamentalism).[43]

Second, again in his encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu,*, Pius XII moved from Leo XIII's inerrancy position, to a limited inerrancy position on biblical authority. I will note Leo XIII:

---

[40] Leo XIII, *Vigilantiæ* (30 Oct 1902), *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII,* 539-540.

[41] Pius XII, *Divino Afflante Spiritu* (30 Sept 1943); (on-line); accessed 15 July 2001; available from http://www.ewtn.com/library/ENCYC/P12DIVIN.HTM; sections 30, 33.

[42] Pius X, *Oath against Modernism* (1 Sept 1910); (online) accessed 30 June 2003; available from: http://www.dailycatholic.org/history/oathvmod.htm.

[43] Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, Président, Commission biblique pontificale, *L'interprétation de la Bible dans l'Église* (Quebec: Éditions Fides, 1994).

> For all the books which the Church receives as sacred and canonical are written wholly and entirely, with all their parts, at the dictation of the Holy Ghost; and in so far as possible that any error can co-exist with inspiration, that inspiration not only is essentially incompatible with error, but excludes and rejects it absolutely and necessarily as it is impossible that God Himself, the Supreme Truth, can utter that which is not true. . . . And the Church holds them as sacred and canonical not only because . . . they contain revelation without error, but because . . . they have God for their Author. . . . It follows that those who maintain that an error is possible in any genuine passage of the sacred writings either pervert the Catholic notion of inspiration or make God the author of error.[44]

By the way, this encyclical puts a definite damper in the Rogers-McKim proposal that Princeton theologians invented the doctrine of inerrancy.[45] One must note, however, that Leo XIII simultaneously affirmed that Catholic church tradition was also without error,[46] which included the infallibility of the Pope.[47]

Now let's listen to the shrewd approach of Piux XII:

> When, subsequently, some Catholic writers, in spite of this solemn definition of Catholic doctrine, by which such divine authority is claimed for the 'entire books with all their parts' as to secure freedom from any error whatsoever, ventured to restrict the truth of Sacred Scripture solely to matters of faith and morals, and to regard other matters, whether in the domain of physical science or history, as 'obiter dicta' and—as they contended—in no wise connected with faith, Our Predecessor of

---

[44] Leo XIII, *Provenditissimus Deus*, (18 Nov 1893), in *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benzinger Brothers, 1903), 296-97.

[45] Jack B. Rogers and Donald K. McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach* (New York: Harper and Row, 1979).

[46] "This supernatural revelation, according to the belief of the universal Church, is contained both in unwritten Tradition, and in written Books, which are therefore called sacred and canonical because, 'being written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author and as such have been delivered to the Church.'" (Leo XIII, *Provenditissimus Deus* [18 Nov 1893], par 1; accessed 8 Mar 2002; available from http://www.catholic-forum.com/saints/pope0256b.htm).

[47] For example Leo XIIIth ended his infamous *Apostolicae Curia*, which rendered the Anglican Orders null and void in this way, "40. We decree that these letters and all things contained therein shall not be liable at any time to be impugned or objected to by reason of fault or any other defect whatsoever of subreption or obreption of Our intention, but are and shall be always valid and in force and shall be inviolably observed both juridically and otherwise, by all of whatsoever degree and pre-eminence, declaring null and void anything which, in these matters, may happen to be contrariwise attempted, whether wittingly or unwittingly, by any person whatsoever, by whatsoever authority or pretext, all things to the contrary notwithstanding" (Leo XIII, *Apostolicae Curia* [15 Sept 1896]; accessed: 21 Oct 2005 at http://www.catholictradition.org/apostolicae-curae.htm).

> immortal memory, Leo XIII in the Encyclical Letter *Providentissimus Deus*, published on November 18 in the year 1893, justly and rightly condemned these errors and safe-guarded the studies of the Divine Books by most wise precepts and rules. . . . There is no one who cannot easily perceive that the conditions of biblical studies and their subsidiary sciences have greatly changed within the last fifty years. . . . Hence this special authority . . . is shown . . . to be free from any error whatsoever in matters of faith and morals.[48]

Third, and most important for this paper, Pius XII lifted the ban on "pan-Christian" activities of Pius XI. First let's hear from 1928 Pius XI's ban for Catholics to be involved in pan-Christian activities (i.e. the ecumenical movement):

> This being so, it is clear that the Apostolic See cannot on any terms take part in their [pan-Christian] assemblies, nor is it anyway lawful for Catholics either to support or to work for such enterprises; for if they do so they will be giving countenance to a false Christianity, quite alien to the one Church of Christ.[49]

The ban on Pan-Christian activities followed a flurry of anti-Protestant and anti-ecumenical writings of the Popes going back to the writings of Cyprian,[50] Augustine's *Contra Donatisten*, the Great Schism of 1054, and the inquisition. For example, The Council of Trent (1545-1564):

> . . . yet it must not be said that sins are forgiven or have been forgiven to anyone who boasts of his confidence and certainty of the remission of his sins, resting on that alone, though among heretics and schismatics this vain and ungodly confidence may be and in our troubled times indeed is found and preached with untiring fury against the Catholic Church ("Against the Vain Confidence of Heretics").

> Canon 9 [on Justification]. If anyone says that the sinner is justified by faith alone, meaning that nothing else is required to cooperate in order to obtain the grace of justification, and that it is not in any way necessary

---

[48] Pius XII, *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, sections 1, 11, 21.

[49] Pius XI, *Mortalium Animos: On Religious Unity*, 6 Jan 1928, section 8.

[50] "Whosoever is separated from the Church is united to an adulteress. He has cut himself off from the promises of the Church, and he who leaves the Church of Christ cannot arrive at the rewards of Christ. . . . He who observes not this unity observes not the law of God, holds not the faith of the Father and the Son, clings not to life and salvation" (quoted by Leo XIIIth in *Satis Cognitum* [29 June 1896]; accessed 8 Sept 2004; available from: http://www.ewtn.com/library/ENCYC/L13SATIS.HTM).

that he be prepared and disposed by the action of his own will, let him be anathema.

Canon 11 [on Justification]. If anyone says that men are justified either by the sole imputation of the justice of Christ or by the sole remission of sins, to the exclusion of the grace and the charity which is poured forth in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and remains in them, or also that the grace by which we are justified is only the good will of God, let him be anathema.

Canon 12 [on Justification]. If anyone says that justifying faith is nothing else than confidence in divine mercy, which remits sins for Christ's sake, or that it is this confidence alone that justifies us, let him be anathema.[51]

Clement XI wrote in his 1713 *Unigenitus,*

29. Outside the Catholic Church, no grace is granted.[52]

Pius IX said in his "Syllabus of Errors" (1864):

IV. Socialism, Communism, Secret Societies, Biblical Societies, Clerico-liberal Societies. Pests of this kind are frequently reprobated in the severest terms in the Encyclical "Qui pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846, Allocution "Quibus quantisque," April 20, 1849, Encyclical "Noscitis et nobiscum," Dec. 8, 1849, Allocution "Singulari quadam," Dec. 9, 1854, Encyclical "Quanto conficiamur," Aug. 10, 1863.[53]

Leo XIII wrote (1896):

36. Wherefore, strictly adhering, in this matter, to the decrees of the Pontiffs, Our predecessors, and confirming them most fully, and, as it were, renewing them by Our authority, of Our own initiative and certain knowledge, We pronounce and declare that ordinations carried out according to the Anglican rite have been, and are, absolutely null and utterly void.[54]

---

[51] *Council of Trent* (online); accessed 8 Jan 2005 at http://www.forerunner.com/ chalcedon/ X0020_15._ Council_of_Trent.html.

[52] Clement XI, *Unigenitus* (8 Sept 1713) (online); accessed 30 June 2003; available at http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Clem11/c11unige.htm.

[53] Pius IX, "Syllabus of Errors" (online); accessed 8 Sept 2004; available at http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Pius09/p9syll.htm.

[54] Leo XIII, *Apostolicae Curea* (15 Sept1896) (online); accessed 21 Oct 2005; available from http://www.catholictradition.org/apostolicae-curae.htm.

Pius X, *Lamentabili Sane* (1907), also included many points which condemned Protestants.[55]

Even with this long history of antagonism (and without any doctrinal change), Pius XII formed the Unitas Ecumenical Center ("Associazione Unitas") in 1945,[56] building on the work of the Dominican Congar who wrote *Chrétiens désunis* in 1937, as well as the *Una Sancta* movement born in Germany in 1938.[57] Thus Pius XII set in motion the machinery by which the Vatican shifted its educational and financial attention towards unity, both in the area of ecumenicity and in the area of biblical research. Later, John XXIII took ecumenism a step farther by founding the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity (SPCU) in 1964 and by naming Jan Willebrands (Archbishop of Utrecht [The Netherlands] from 1975-1983) as its Secretary, under the presidency of Cardinal Bea.[58] The Vatican II Council and the push for unity toward a common Eucharist in the year 2000 were a part of "the intellectual legacy left by Pius XII." John Paul II wrote:

---

[55] For example, "22. The dogmas the Church holds out as revealed are not truths which have fallen from heaven. They are an interpretation of religious facts which the human mind has acquired by laborious effort." "54. Dogmas, Sacraments and hierarchy, both their notion and reality, are only interpretations and evolutions of the Christian intelligence which have increased and perfected by an external series of additions the little germ latent in the Gospel." "55. Simon Peter never even suspected that Christ entrusted the primacy in the Church to him." "56. The Roman Church became the head of all the churches, not through the ordinance of Divine Providence, but merely through political conditions." (Piux X, *Lamentabili Sane* [3 July 1907] [online]; accessed 11 Nov 2002; available at http://www.rc.net/rcchurch/popes/pius10/ syllabus.asc; Internet.

[56] "Associazione Unitas, Via del Corso, 306, I-00186 ROME, ITALY, Tel. (+39) 06 68 90 52, F[ounded]: 1945, A[gency]: Roman Catholic supported, P[eriodical]: *Unitas* [frequency] (4/yr)" ("Centro Pro Unione" [on-line]; accessed 10 July 2001; available from http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dir-dir/e_dir-list_ie.html; Internet).

[57] "Jusque-là les catholiques qui s'étaient consacrés à la construction de l'unité étaient des pionniers isolés, souvent suspectés, voire suspendus dans leur tâche. Ces initiatives personnelles permirent, toutefois, cette ouverture récente. Mentionnons les conversations de Malines (1920-1926), menées à l'initiative de l'abbé Portal et de Lord Halifax, sous la présidence du cardinal Mercier, qui entamèrent le dialogue avec l'Église anglicane. En 1925, Dom Lambert Beaudouin fonda l'abbaye de Chevetogne; en 1926, le dominicain C.J. Dumont créa «Istina». Ces deux institutions, officiellement vouées aux contacts oecuméniques avec l'Orient chrétien, ont joué un rôle important et élargi progressivement leur intérêt à l'ensemble des problèmes œcuméniques. En 1937, un autre dominicain, le père Congar, publia *Chrétiens désunis*, ouvrage qui a été pendant vingt ans la charte théologique de l'œcuménisme catholique. En 1939, se créa en Allemagne le mouvement *Una Sancta*. Mais, sauf quelques ouvertures en faveur de l'Orient, les autorités romaines restèrent le plus souvent en retrait sur ces initiatives" ("L'oecuménisme"; accessed 10 July 2001; available at http://fr.encyclopedia.yahoo.com/articles/ni/ni_1212_p0.html).

[58] "A Tribute to Johannes Cardinal Willebrands," http://www.interchurch-families.org/journal/2000jul02.shtm; accessed: 25 February 2005.

> The Second Vatican Council is often considered as the beginning of a new era in the life of the church. This is true, but at the same time it is difficult to overlook the fact that the council drew much from the experiences and reflections of the immediate past, especially from the intellectual legacy left by Pius XII. In the history of the church, the 'old' and the 'new' are always closely interwoven. The 'new' grows out of the 'old,' and the 'old' finds a fuller expression in the 'new.' Thus it was for the Second Vatican Council and for the activity of the popes connected with the council, starting with John XXIII, continuing with Paul VI and John Paul I, up to the present pope.[59]

Vatican II left Evangelical workers in Catholic countries puzzled, and caught some Evangelicals by surprise. It was notable that in Berlin 1966, reports from predominantly Roman Catholic countries felt that Vatican II had somehow changed the theology of Catholicism.[60] At the London 1888 Centenary Ecumenical Missionary Conference an entire session was devoted to expose the tawdry missionary methods of Roman Catholic;[61] later this subject became taboo. At Berlin 1966 there was also

---

[59] John Paul II, *Tertio Millennio Adviente,* 14 November 1994, section 18.

[60] "We must also mention the progressive influence of the Second Vatican Council which is penetrating the mentality of a number of Spanish Catholics; this is creating a climate of more respect, understanding and tolerance toward the 'separated brethren.' . . . Ecumenism and the newer thinking within Catholicism also affect the position of many sincere Catholics. Several years ago these persons may have felt dissatisfied with their faith and with the church, but now they are discovering new spiritual possibilities within post-Council Catholicism, enough to satisfy them without having to join another Christian group outside the Catholic church" (José M. Martinez, *"Spain," One Race, One Gospel, One Task: World Congress on Evangelism, Berlin, 1966, Official Reference Volumes: Papers and Reports*, eds. Carl F. H. Henry and W. Stanley Mooneyham [Minneapolis: World Wide, 1967], 1:242, 243).

[61] James Johnston, ed., *Report of the Centenary Conference of the Protestant Missions of the World, Held in Exeter Hall (June 9th—19th), London, 1888,* Vol. 1 (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1888), 73-90. The following provides an understanding of the views of participants of London 1888 and New York 1900: Principal D. H. MacVicar, Montreal, Canada, addressed the subject of Roman Catholic missions. A copy of his outline will suffice to note his emphasis in his speech to *Centenary Conference of the Protestant Missions of the World*. "So much for the extent of Roman Catholic Missions. What of their character? They are distinguished:— 1. By unity and comprehensiveness of plan. . . . 2. Aggressive and persistent zeal in gathering all into the one fold. . . . 3. A third element in the character of these Missions is the use of coercive measures. . . . 4. A fourth factor in the character of these Missions is the dominancy of ecclesiastical authority. . . . 5. These missions are characterized by unworthy and unjustifiable methods of support. . . . 6. The sixth and worst feature of Romish Missions is the practical suppression of the Word of God" (D. H. MacVicar, "The Missions of the Roman Catholic Church to Heathen Lands, Their Character, Extent, Influence, and Lessons," *Report of the Centenary Conference of the Protestant Missions of the World,* 74-76). Following MacVicar was Dean Vahl of the Danish Evangelical Missionary Society, who said, "As to the Roman Catholic Church, I have not much sympathy with her, I cannot look upon

little negativism toward Roman Catholicism with the exception of a few lines expressing caution. Jacques Blocher of France noted, "French-speaking Europe has been sprinkled with the blood of martyrs for the Gospel; it still appears to be a mission field almost without fruit."[62] Augusto A. Esperança of Portugal wrote,

> Another obstacle to evangelism is the religious oppression of many Roman Catholic priests and the individual influence of many Roman Catholics upon the political administration of the country. There are a few who sympathize with us. . . . We need a united program of social work in order to fight the poverty and miserable conditions of the people, (Here we could co-operate with the Roman Catholics.)[63]

By the way, cooperation always begins with social issues, guided by a common (Socinian) moral philosophy or Christian (moralistic) worldview.[64]

---

her as a true branch of the Holy Catholic Church. . . . the more I see how old Mission-fields of the Roman Catholic church have, not all, but many of them, been totally neglected and new fields taken up, where Evangelical Missions have already begun, as it seems only, that they may be spoiled. . . . the Roman Catholic Missions have been rotten in themselves" (ibid., 78-79). Then the chairman spoke, "the object of our meeting today is not to discuss the Roman Catholic Church, about which we are all tolerably unanimous, if not wholly unanimous. . ." (ibid., 80). The next speakers all spoke likewise of the tone and character of Roman Catholic Missions: Rev. Henry Stout of Japan and Rev. G. E. Post of Syria, with discussion by Rev. J. A. B. Cook of Singapore, Rev. G. W. Clarke of China, Rev. H. Williams of Bengal, Rev. J. Murray Mitchell of India, Count van Limburg Stirum of Celebes, Rev. E. E. Jenkins regarding India, Rev. John Hesse of India, and Rev. N. Summerbell of the United States. Twelve years later, though not listing Roman Catholic Missions as a category in the 1900 "Ecumenical Missionary Conference," missionaries from predominantly Roman Catholic lands made mention of their difficulties. Hence, among others, Senor F. de Castells, agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society in Costa Rica said, "We find there [South America] the lowest and most degraded form of Romanism that can be conceived" (Seno F. de Castells, "South America," *Ecumenical Missionary Conference, New York, 1900* (New York: American Tract Society, 1900), 477).

[62] Jacques Blocher, "French-speaking Europe," in *One Race, One Gospel, One Task*, 1:250.

[63] Augusto A. Esperança, "Portugal," in *One Race, One Gospel, One Task*, 1:246.

[64] Note what Charles Colson had to say about the place of a Christian worldview for unity: "It is our contention in this book that the Lord's cultural commission is inseparable from the great commission. That may be a jarring statement for many conservative Christians, who, through much of the twentieth century have shunned the notion of reforming culture, associating that concept with the liberal social gospel. The only task of the church, many fundamentalists and evangelicals believed, is to save as many lost souls as possible from a world literally going to hell. But this explicit denial of a Christian worldview is unbiblical and is the reason we have lost so much of our influence in the world. *Salvation does not consist simply of freedom from sin; salvation also means being restored to the task we were given in the beginning—the job of creating culture*" (Charles

What of Vatican II? Has it changed the Roman Catholic church? Before hearing the answer of John Paul II, let's listen to Donald Sweeting's answer:

> "Can Rome change?" This is the question Evangelicals have repeatedly asked. In the past, many have answered with a resounding "no." However, during the years 1960-1998, numerous Evangelicals have revised that opinion. As we have seen in chapters two and six, the Roman Catholic church has shown itself quite capable of change. Vatican II brought forth a number of major changes in the church. Among other things, the Roman Catholic church showed itself to be less isolationist. It affirmed religious freedom. It opened the doors to a new emphasis on the Bible.[65]

On the contrary, however, John Paul II made it clear that Vatican II had made no changes to the essence of the Roman church. The following quote comes from his speech "Mexico Ever Faithful" as recorded in the official newspaper of the Vatican, the *Osservatore Romano* (5 Feb 1979):

> The Second Vatican Council wished to be, above all, a council on the Church. Take in your hands the documents of the Council, especially "Lumen Gentium", study them with loving attention, with the spirit of prayer, to discover what the Spirit wished to say about the Church. In this way you will be able to realize that there is not—as some people claim—a "new church", different or opposed to the "old church", but that the Council wished to reveal more clearly the one Church of Jesus Christ, with new aspects, but still the same in its essence.[66]

The reader of the landmark decree of Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium* cannot help but notice the unusual nature of an addendum added by the Pope to reaffirm his absolute authority over the 21st Ecumenical Council of the Roman Catholic Church:

> The following explanatory note prefixed to the modi of chapter three of the schema: The Church is given to the Fathers, and it is according to the

---

Colson and Nancy Pearcey, *How Now Shall We Live?* [Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 1999], 295-96; emphasis mine).

[65] Sweeting, *From Conflict to Cooperation,* 394.

[66] John Paul II, "Mexico Ever Faithful," *Osservatore Romano* (5 Feb 1979): 1. The "old" and "new" language has been regularly used by the Roman church to equivocate on the role of Vatican II (e.g. John Paul II, *Tertio Millennio Adviente,* 14 November 1994, section 18).

> mind and sense of this note that the teaching contained in chapter three is to be explained and understood.
>
> The commission has decided to preface its assessment of the modi with the following general observations.
>
> 1. The word College is not taken in the strictly juridical sense, that is as a group of equals who transfer their powers to their chairman, but as a permanent body whose form and authority is to be ascertained from revelation. . . .
>
> 2. A man becomes a member of the college through episcopal consecration and hierarchical communion with the head of the college and its members (cf. art. 22, end of par. 1). . . .
>
> 3. There is no such thing as the college without its head: it is "The subject of supreme and entire power over the whole Church." This much must be acknowledged lest the fullness of the Pope's power be jeopardized. The idea of college necessarily and at all times involves a head and in the college the head preserves intact his function as Vicar of Christ and pastor of the universal Church . . . It is for the Pope, to whom the care of the whole flock of Christ has been entrusted, to decide the best manner of implementing this care, either personal or collegiate, in order to meet the changing needs of the Church in the course of time. The Roman Pontiff undertakes the regulation, encouragement, and approval of the exercise of collegiality as he sees fit.
>
> 4. The Pope, as supreme pastor of the Church, may exercise his power at any time, as he sees fit, by reason of the demands of his office.… The point is expressly stated in art. 22, par. 2 and it is explained at the end of the same article. The negative formulation "only with" (nonnisi) covers all cases: consequently it is evident that the norms approved by the supreme authority must always be observed (cf. modus 84).
>
> Clearly it is the connection of bishops with their head that is in question throughout and not the activity of bishops independently of the Pope. In a case like that, in default of the Pope's action, the bishops cannot act as a college, for this is obvious from the idea of "college" itself. This hierarchical communion of all bishops with the Pope is unmistakably hallowed by tradition.[67]

In other words, the Vatican II council had no extraordinary power, and was not much more than a public relations ploy for Protestants. The Pope could have sent out encyclicals containing the identical teaching, and it would have been no less valid—in fact, without the Pope's agreement, Vatican II was a mute point. But this public relations ruse seemed to work.

---

[67] "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church: *Lumen Gentium*" (online); accessed: 10 October 2005 at www.http://listserv.american.edu/catholic/church/vaticanii/lumen-gentium.html.

In the uncertainty of the post-Vatican II era, some Evangelicals and Evangelical agencies let their guard down. Like Sweeting, they assumed that the few superficial changes of the Roman Catholic church had actually changed its theology of salvation. Such seems to be the case with Billy Graham, Norman Geisler and Ralph MacKenzie, Donald Sweeting, and Mark A. Noll and Carolyn Nystrom.

Now what was the goal of Pius XII, and what is the goal of the "Shifting Ecumenical Posture of Roman Catholicism"? It seems that Pius XII was working toward making Roman Catholicism the one world religion. He set into motion a new approach toward the World Council of Churches, the Orthodox churches and Evangelicals, that would seek to absorb them as "Rites" of the Catholic church. The goal seems to have been a common Eucharist of all these churches in the year 2000.

The idea of gathering all churches as one was not new to the Vatican. In 1894, Leo XIII published *Christi Nomen* in which he explained his work toward reuniting with the Eastern Church (as a counter to the Lambeth movement).[68] Throughout all these years the model of reunion that has been put forth is the "Return Model," in which Protestants apologize for the Reformation, repent, and return to the rightful primacy of the Seat of Peter. Jude Weisenbeck, in his second doctorate received in 1986 from the University of St Thomas in Rome, explained the "Return Model":

> According to this model—stated quite simply and directly—those who have, for whatever reasons, severed their bonds with the one true, visible Church should acknowledge their error, repent of their sinfulness, and return to the Church of Christ which they have abandoned.[69]

---

[68] "2. From the apostolic letter 'Praeclara' published last June, you know that We invited and urged all nations to the unity of the Christian faith. Thus, through Us the divine promise of 'one sheepfold and one Pastor' would be realized. You have learned from Our recent apostolic letters concerning the safeguarding of the Eastern Rites that We look with special care to the East and its churches, renowned and venerated by many names. From these same letters you have learned the procedures by which, in consultation with the Eastern patriarchs, We have investigated how to bring about more readily the desired end, namely the union of the Roman and Eastern Catholic Churches" (Leo XIII, *Christi Nomen* [24 Dec 1894] [online; accessed 11 Dec 2002; available from http://www.rc.net/rcchurch/popes/leo13/l13east.txt).

[69] Jude D. Weisenbeck, S.D.S., S.T.L., "Conciliar Fellowship and the Unity of the Church," Ph.D. Thesis (Rome: Pontifica Studiorum Universitas, A S. Thoma Aq. in Urbe, 1986), 68.

The return model has always been the goal of the Catholic church. It was the desire of Paul VI in 1975.[70] And it appears to be the goal of the current pope, Benedict XVI, formerly known as Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, who, by the way, was responsible for the compiling of the 1993 *Catechism of the Catholic Church* and was president of the 1993 *Pontifical Commission on Biblical Interpretation* (which was strongly anti-fundamentalist).[71] Three days after the end of the Billy Graham sponsored conference, Amsterdam 2000, Ratzinger, at that time the Prefect of the Doctrine of the Faith, published the Declaration, *Dominus Iesus' on the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church* (6 Aug 2000). In the final section, the reader finds that John Paul II approved the declaration in an audience on June 16, 2000 prior to Amsterdam 2000. However, it must have seemed wise to Ratzinger to postpone publication until after the Amsterdam 2000 conference to avoid any communication to and fallout from the 10,000 worldwide participants.[72] The document caused consternation among many who had signed consiliar documents with the Catholic church as it read:

> 17§2. On the other hand, the ecclesial communities which have not preserved the valid Episcopate and the genuine and integral substance of the Eucharistic mystery, are not Churches in the proper sense; however, those who are baptized in these communities are, by Baptism, incorporated in

[70] "61§2. This is how the Lord wanted His Church to be: universal, a great tree whose branches shelter the birds of the air, a net which catches fish of every kind or which Peter drew in filled with one hundred and fifty-three big fish, a flock which a single shepherd pastures. A universal Church without boundaries or frontiers except, alas, those of the heart and mind of sinful man" (Paul VI, *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (8 Dec 1975) (online); accessed 8 Sept 2004; available at http://listserv.american.edu/catholic/church/papal/paul.vi/p6evang.txt.

[71] "The fundamentalistic approach is dangerous, for she is attractive to persons who are looking for biblical answers to their life problems. She can trick them by offering them pious but illusory interpretations, rather than telling them that the Bible does not necessarily contain an immediate response to each of these problems. Fundamentalism invites, without saying it, a form of intellectual suicide. It places false sense of security to life, for it unconsciously confuses the human limitations of the biblical message with the substance of the divine message" (Commission biblique pontificale, *L'interprétation de la Bible dans l'Église*, 50; translation mine).

[72] "The Sovereign Pontiff John Paul II, at the Audience of June 16, 2000, granted to the undersigned Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, with sure knowledge and by his apostolic authority, ratified and confirmed this Declaration, adopted in Plenary Session and ordered its publication. Rome, from the Offices of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, August 6, 2000, the Feast of the Transfiguration of the Lord" (Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, Prefect, Tarcisio Bertone, S.D.B., Archibishop Emeritus of Vercelli, Secterary, Declaration *'Dominus Iesus' on the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church* [Rome: Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 6 Aug 2000], sec 23).

> Christ and thus are in a certain communion, albeit imperfect, with the Church. Baptism in fact tends per se toward the full development of life in Christ, through the integral profession of faith, the Eucharist, and full communion in the Church.[73]

The new old wolf speaks. He makes it clear that we need to be in full communion with the life of the Catholic Church in order to be a church.

In fact, according to Paul VI, *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (8 Dec 1975), without the Catholic Church, Evangelicals are not obeying the Great Commission:

> 16. There is thus a profound link between Christ, the Church and evangelization. During the period of the Church that we are living in, it is she who has the task of evangelizing. This mandate is not accomplished without her, and still less against her.[74]

Nor do those without the Roman hierarchy have complete evangelism without the sacraments:

> 47. Evangelization thus exercises its full capacity when it achieves the most intimate relationship, or better still, a permanent and unbroken intercommunication, between the Word and the sacraments. In a certain sense it is a mistake to make a contrast between evangelization and sacramentalization, as is sometimes done.[75]

Also, without the proper Eucharist, Evangelicals and Baptists do not have the full Gospel message:

---

[73] Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *Dominus Iesus* (6 Aug 2000) (online); accessed: 21 Mar 2001 http://search.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000806_dominus-iesus_en.html; Internet.

[74] This portion continues as follows: "It is certainly fitting to recall this fact at a moment like the present one when it happens that not without sorrow we can hear people—whom we wish to believe are well-intentioned but who are certainly misguided in their attitude—continually claiming to love Christ but without the Church, to listen to Christ but not the Church, to belong to Christ but outside the Church. The absurdity of this dichotomy is clearly evident in this phrase of the Gospel: 'Anyone who rejects you rejects me.' And how can one wish to love Christ without loving the Church, if the finest witness to Christ is that of St. Paul: 'Christ loved the Church and sacrificed himself for her?'" (Paul VI, *Evangelii Nuntiandi* [8 Dec 1975]).

[75] This portion also continues: "It is indeed true that a certain way of administering the sacraments, without the solid support of catechesis regarding these same sacraments and a global catechesis, could end up by depriving them of their effectiveness to a great extent. The role of evangelization is precisely to educate people in the faith in such a way as to lead each individual Christian to live the sacraments as true sacraments of faith—and not to receive them passively or reluctantly" (ibid).

> 28. . . . For in its totality, evangelization—over and above the preaching of a message—consists in the implantation of the Church, which does not exist without the driving force which is the sacramental life culminating in the Eucharist.[76]

And further, evangelism without the universal church has no power:

> 63§3. Evangelization loses much of its force and effectiveness if it does not take into consideration the actual people to whom it is addresses, if it does not use their language, their signs and symbols, if it does not answer the questions they ask, and if it does not have an impact on their concrete life. But on the other hand, evangelization risks losing its power and disappearing altogether if one empties or adulterates its content under the pretext of translating it; if, in other words, one sacrifices this reality and destroys the unity without which there is no universality, out of a wish to adapt a universal reality to a local situation. Now, only a Church which preserves the awareness of her universality and shows that she is in fact universal is capable of having a message which can be heard by all, regardless of regional frontiers.[77]

So there we are, Baptists and Evangelicals, like little lost sheep out in the cold: no commission, no evangelism, no message, no power, and on top of that, no church!

It would seem clear that those Evangelicals who choose to cooperate with the Roman Catholic church in evangelism or in any other way must not be fully cognizant of their teaching. According to post-Vatican II encyclicals and apostolic letters, if you are not properly aligned to the Bishop of Rome, not only do you and can you not properly interpret the Bible, but you have no Commission, no evangelism, no Gospel, no power, and no church.

Last of all, the issue comes down to "sheep and wolves finding food together," in other words, evangelism or as some call it, proselytism. Isn't it interesting that the "Evangelical and Catholics Together" (ECT) statement decried Christians proselytizing of one another:

> Today, in this country and elsewhere, Evangelicals and Catholics attempt to win "converts" from one another's folds. In some ways, this is perfectly understandable and perhaps inevitable. In many instances, however, such efforts at recruitment undermine the Christian mission by which we are bound by God's Word and to which we have recommitted ourselves in this statement. . . . At the same time, our commitment to full

[76] Ibid.
[77] Ibid.

> religious freedom compels us to defend the legal freedom to proselytize even as we call upon Christians to refrain from such activity.[78]

The "Colson-Neuhaus Declaration" quoting the ECT also ended with a strong admonition against proselytizing:

> There is a necessary distinction between evangelizing [non-Christians] and what is today commonly called proselytizing or "sheep stealing." For "in view of the large number of non-Christians in the world and the enormous challenge of the common evangelistic task, it is neither theologically legitimate nor a prudent use of resources for one Christian community to proselytize among active adherents of another Christian community." Thus, "We condemn the practice of recruiting people from another community for the purposes of denominational or institutional aggrandisement."[79]

It is no surprise that the underlying issue came back to aggressive evangelism or proselytism. Similarly the last chapter of Geisler's and MacKenzie's *Roman Catholics and Evangelicals: Agreements and Differences* is titled "Evangelism." The ECT and Colson-Neuhaus Declaration were not saying anything new. Prior to the ECT statement, there was a barrage of ecumenical and Catholic anti-proselytism statements. For example, the 1970 Catholic-World Council of Churches' statement "Common Witness and Proselytism:"

> Witness should avoid behavior such as: . . . c) Every exploitation of the need or weakness or of the lack of education of those to whom the witness is offered, in view of inducing adherence to a Church. d) Everything raising suspicion about the "good faith" of others—"bad faith" can never be presumed; it should always be proved.[80]

In 1973, an Orthodox and Catholic common declaration read:

> In the name of Christian charity, we reject all forms of proselytism, in the sense of acts by which persons seek to disturb each other's communities by recruiting members from each other through methods, or because of

---

[78] "Evangelicals and Catholic Together: The Christian Mission in the Third Millenium," in Keith A. Fournier, with William D. Watkins, *A House United? Evangelicals and Catholics Together: A Winning Alliance for the 21st Century* (Colorado Springs: NavPress, 1994), 346.

[79] Geisler and MacKenzie, 493.

[80] "Common Witness and Proselytism—A Study Document," form the Joint Working Group between the Roman Catholic Church and the WCC, 1970; in Michael Kinnamon and Brian Cope, eds., *The Ecumenical Movement: An Anthology of Key Texts and Voices* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1997; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 352.

> attitudes of mind, which are opposed to Christian love or to what should characterize the relationships between Churches. Let it cease where it may exist.[81]

In 1975, the following paragraph appeared in "A Bolivian Manifesto on Evangelism in Latin America Today":

> We are ashamed of having mistaken proselytism for evangelism, of having satisfied ourselves with an intermittent and organized activism which we have named "evangelism," of having accepted to be a religious institution closed on itself, dominated by routine, conformity and apathy.[82]

In 1980, the Lutheran-Catholic Conversation, "Ways to Community, 1980" read:

> Naturally *discrimination* must cease if ministers are to cooperate on all levels. Partners cannot cast aspersions on each other and must renounce every form of proselytism (though not mutual criticisms or requests for change).[83]

The 1982 WCC Committee on World Mission and Evangelism described the growth of mission movements into countries where other churches already existed:

> Surely, many ambiguities have accompanied this development and are present even today, not the least of which is the sin of proselytism among other Christian confessions.[84]

Therefore, the ECT statement and the "Colson-Neuhaus Declaration" were not breaking any new ground. They merely borrowed the anti-proselytizing rhetoric from the Roman Catholic church and the World

---

[81] "1973 Common Declaration," in Thomas B. Stransky and John B. Sheerin, eds., *Doing the Truth in Charity: Statements of Pope Paul VI, Popes John Paul I, John Paul II, and the Secretariat for the Promoting of Christian Unity*, Ecumenical Documents I (Maryknoll, NY Paulist, 1982), 248.

[82] "A Bolivian Manifesto on Evangelism in Latin America Today," in Norman E. Thomas, ed., *Classic Texts in Mission and World Christianity* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995), 165.

[83] "Ways to Community, 1980," in Harding Meyer and Lukas Vischer, *Growth in Agreement: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level*, Ecumenical Documents II (Maryknoll, NY: Paulist, 1984), 235.

[84] "Mission and Evangelism—An Ecumenical Affirmation," WCC Commission on World Mission and Evangelism, 1982; in Kinnamon and Cope, 373.

Council of Churches, but they did it in the name of American Evangelicalism—now that was breaking new ground!

In 1966, Jacques Blocher warned of the dangers of this ecumenical anti-proselyzing rhetoric:

> In fact, today the Protestant theologians who want to be up to date, insist that evangelization should no longer seek to win new members to the church; this would be a type of proselytizing, something severely condemned in this century of ecumenism. According to these theologians, the Christian evangelizes through his activities in the world just by his presence and without trying to win anyone to his ideas. Though this theory of evangelism is not unanimously accepted—far from it—it nevertheless seems to us to be an important cause for the drop off in the number of Protestants, especially of those who do not practice their religion.[85]

Blocher was right on target. Anti-proselytizing is perhaps the most serious issue. Not being allowed to share the Gospel with adherents of other denominations undermines the plain reading of the Great Commission, "to all creation" (Mark 16:15). It undermines the need to "Do the work of an evangelist." It undermines salvation by grace alone through faith alone. And it undermines the Evangelical view of the need to be "born again." These concessions are why we must be very guarded in our cooperation. Paul reminded the Galatian Christians, "A little leaven leavens the whole lump of dough" (Galatians 5:9).

It is my contention and I have tried to prove that Roman Catholicism is the same old wolf it ever was.[86] Vatican II was an effective public relations ploy for Roman Catholicism. Quite a number of significant Evangelicals were fooled into thinking that we have a new or different Roman Catholic church. In so doing, they have cooperated with Catholics, signed the ECT, and even teach against proselytizing Catholics.

So now you know the rest of the story. Yours is to decide what sheep and wolves have in common as they search for food.

---

[85] Jacques Blocher, "French-speaking Europe," 1:250.

[86] See my paper, "Dying for the Great Commission: A 13th Century Struggle over Definition" (2005; available at www.evangelismunlimited.org), which examines the inquisition against the Albigenses and Waldenses using contemporary French historiography.

Midwestern Journal of Theology 4.2 (Spring 2006): 84-92.

Father John Clark: The First Baptist Preacher in Missouri

Joe Early, Jr.
Assistant Professor of Religion
University of the Cumberlands
Williamsburg, KY 40769

Missouri Baptists have many reasons to celebrate their heritage. Denominational records indicate that in 2005 there are more than six hundred thousand Baptists and two thousand Baptist churches spread across Missouri. These churches are anchored by a strong state convention that serves as the umbrella for sixty-four associations and dozens of ministerial programs. Missouri Baptists have established four undergraduate colleges, Southwest Missouri Baptist, Missouri Baptist College, William Jewell College, and Hannibal-LaGrange College. Missouri Baptists even boast a graduate school: Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, in Kansas City. The Missouri Baptist Convention also reported that 13,243 baptisms were performed in 2004. Despite the current squabble over the ownership of several denominational entities, Missouri Baptists are a strong, viable group whose presence can be felt across the nation. Their future appears bright.

When examining Baptist life in Missouri it is hard to imagine a day when Baptists were few in number, no ministers were present, and none of the current denominational machinery existed. Yet, prior to 1796, this was the situation. Missouri was just beginning to grow and become geographically important. Known as the "Gateway to the West," St. Louis was a critical city for settlers and pioneers moving west because it was the last major Anglo settlement before reaching the wiles of a largely unexplored wilderness.

Invariably, Baptists were numbered among these first trailblazers. The questions that then come to mind are: "Who was the first Baptist pastor in Missouri?" "When and where did he perform his ministry?" "What were the obstacles he faced?" "What were the results of his ministry?" These are but a few questions this paper will address.

At the dawn of the nineteenth century, Spain, though little more than an absentee landlord, claimed ownership of Missouri and much of what was known as the Louisiana Territory. Along with Spanish hegemony came the required allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church. In order for

a settler to immigrate and to acquire ownership of land, Spanish law dictated that the person would have to demonstrate that he or she was *un bon catholique*. Only Roman Catholics were allowed to move into any section of the Spanish Southwest. Any Protestant minister who ventured into Missouri placed himself in danger of being thrown into the *calaboose*. The majority of the immigrants, however, were Protestant and as such were unable to attend public worship services in accordance with their own beliefs and traditions. To provide spiritual direction for these settlers, John Clark defied the immigration law and in 1796 became the first Baptist pastor to minister in Missouri.[1]

Despite John Clark's pioneer and religious importance in Missouri, little information exists concerning his life. John Mason Peck provides most of the information in his biography, *Father Clark, or the Pioneer Preacher*.[2] Moreover, most of the extant information on John Clark appears to be drawn from Peck's work. All the major histories of Missouri Baptists such as R. S. Douglass's *History of Missouri Baptists*,[3] R. S. Duncan's *History of the Baptists in Missouri*,[4] and J. C. Maple and R. P. Rider's *Missouri Baptist Biography*[5] are drawn exclusively from Peck's work. Peck, who worked in Kentucky, Illinois, and Missouri, met Clark on several different occasions when their preaching circuits crossed paths. It would be safe to assume that if not for Peck's work, John Clark would be largely unknown in Baptist history.

Born in the parish of Petty in the port city of Inverness, Scotland, on November 29, 1758, John Clark was the son of Presbyterian parents.[6] His father was a farmer who taught him the importance of an education and hard work, but gave him little spiritual direction. His life was hard and his drinking was a mirror of this reality. All religious influence came by way of his mother who ensured his attendance in local Presbyterian Church and his memorization of the catechisms. Out of his father's desire for him to learn the classics, he was sent to a school in Inverness at age six. Clark, however, did not enjoy Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, but

---

[1] J. C. Maple and R. P. Rider, *Missouri Baptist Biography: A Series of Life-Sketches Indicating the Growth and Prosperity of Baptist Churches as Represented in the Lives and Labors of Eminent Men and Women in Missouri* (Kansas City, Mo.: Western Baptist Publishing House, 1914), 17.

[2] John Mason Peck, *Father Clark, or The Pioneer Preacher* (New York: Sheldon, Lamport & Blakeman, 1855; rpt. Rare Book Collection, Rutgers University, 1970).

[3] R. S. Douglass, *History of Missouri Baptists* (Kansas City, Mo.: Western Baptist Publishing House, 1934), 18-21.

[4] R. S. Duncan, *A History of the Baptists in Missouri* (Saint Louis: Schammell & Company, 1882), 46-49.

[5] Maple and Rider, 11-19.

[6] Ibid., 11.

was rather attracted to mathematics and geography.[7] Made aware of his aversion to the classics, Clark's father sent him to the parish school at Nairn to study mathematics. His father's hope was that his training would prepare him to join his brother Daniel in Jamaica. His love of math and geography came together to form the two greatest desires of his young life, to travel the world as a sailor and to live in the American colonies.

With his brother overseas and his father's drinking and squandering the family fortune away, Clark remained at home to support his family until he was twenty years old. He then signed on as a mate on a ship bound for the West Indies. While aboard this ship, Clark was a privateer who helped hijack Spanish and French ships. Before arriving at his final destination, however, Clark was pressed into service at Barbados by the British navy and commanded by Admiral Rodney. After attempting to escape, he was thrown into irons in the ship's hold.[8] When the ship was attacked by the Spanish, Clark was released, fought bravely, and was not required to return to the brig. Following the battle and while anchored at Tobago, he jumped ship, swam ashore, and began to look for his brother whom he had heard was living on the island. Clark was so disappointed when he found his brother and discovered that he was a drunken wretch and decided to return to Scotland to inform his parents.

To pay his passage home, Clark signed on as a mate on a British ship bound for London. Before leaving the Caribbean, however, his ship was captured by the Spanish and Clark was imprisoned in Havana, Cuba, for nineteen months.[9] Upon his release, he made his way to Charleston, South Carolina, where he was captured by a press gang and once again forced into the British navy. Clark had no desire to be in the navy and to fight against the Colonies, so, along with three friends, he jumped ship while it was anchored in Charleston, South Carolina. As a British deserter, Clark realized that his best hope of escape would be to find the American army. He and his companions managed to find the camp of American General Francis Marion, better known as the "Swamp Fox," who welcomed the British deserters.[10]

After the conclusion of the American Revolution, he spent the next several years working as a mate on ships delivering merchandise along the American eastern seaboard and in the Caribbean. While aboard ship in 1786, he became aware of his sinful situation, and he "resolved to go into the country and teach school, where I could have the opportunity to

[7] Duncan, 46.
[8] Maple and Rider, 12.
[9] Peck, 30.
[10] Maple and Rider, 13.

read my Bible, meditate, and attend to the salvation of my soul." He moved to Georgia to teach and became reacquainted with two "two Methodist preachers, by name of John Major and Thomas Humphries. He said they formed a circuit in those parts and preached at Col. Wooten's house, where I boarded. They pleased me so well that I joined them."[11] After teaching in Georgia and South Carolina for the next two years, he decided to return to Scotland and visit his family.[12]

Upon his arrival in London, Clark stopped an old man at the dock and asked where he might find a church. The man told him to visit the Foundry in Moorfields. When Clark arrived at the church none other than John Wesley himself was preaching.[13] Even though Wesley was eighty-five years old at this time, the founder of Methodism was still a powerful speaker. Clark was enthralled with Wesley's preaching and took his good fortune of being at the Foundry Church that day, as a sign that he was to become a Methodist minister. He also decided that after visiting his family at Inverness, he would return to America and seek appointment as a pastor in the Methodist Conference.

Clark returned to Georgia in 1785 where he became a member of the Methodist Episcopal Conference and settled in the small town of Fishing Creek. In 1791, he was ordained a deacon by Methodist Bishop Francis Asbury.[14] He was assigned a large preaching circuit that included stops as far away as South Carolina. Despite the sometimes great distances between stops, he always walked to his preaching engagements. It was said that Clark was scared of horses and was given one on more than one occasion, but he claimed that he did not want to injure the horse. He later gave another reason why he did not want to keep the horse. Clark hated slavery and he knew that money from slave labor paid for the horse.

After serving two years in the Conference, he became disenchanted with the Methodist manner of church government.[15] In particular, he held that each church had the biblical right to call or dismiss its own pastor and that this responsibility fell to the local conference or bishop. He would later also reject infant baptism and embrace believer's baptism as the only correct mode for the administration of this ordinance. Clark also despised the Methodist Conference's support of slavery. With these reasons supporting his rationale, he decided to move to Kentucky and minister to the settlers who were continually pushing west.

---

[11] Peck, 59.
[12] Ibid., 61.
[13] Douglass, 19.
[14] Duncan, 47.
[15] Maple and Rider, 16.

After spending several weeks preaching to settlers traveling through the Cumberland Gap, Clark pushed on into Kentucky before finally settling in Lincoln County. The settlers in Lincoln County recognized his educational and ministerial background, and he was hired to teach school and to serve as the local minister on the weekends. Clark did an excellent job in both respects. He is noted for introducing the first reading textbooks into Lincoln County and for his ability to instill a sense of morals into his students. He was also recognized for his strong biblical sermons and compassion for the settlers and the harsh life they faced. Clark remained in Lincoln County for two years and then pushed northwest to Illinois.[16]

Even though his Lincoln County congregation wanted to take up a collection and give him a horse as a token of their appreciation, Clark refused to accept the gifts and instead walked the entirety of the trip. He arrived at New Design, Monroe County, Illinois, along the Mississippi River in early 1797. He was immediately hired as a school teacher and unofficially served as the pastor to the region. Even though he still considered himself an independent Methodist, he was slowly becoming an independent Baptist.

Peck noted that the following year Clark first began to cross into Missouri to preach. He further stated that Clark was not only the first Baptist or Methodist ministers in Missouri but also the first the known Protestant minister to enter the territory.[17] Clark's claim is verified by the Reverend John Glanville who wrote his obituary for the October 1834 edition of the *Western Christian Advocate*. Glanville claimed that "the first preacher that brought the gospel, as understood and taught by the Methodists, across the mighty Mississippi, was the Rev. John Clark."[18]

Clark had a burden for the settler's souls who, because of the illegality of Protestant preaching, had not had the opportunity to hear the gospel since leaving the United States. Though somewhat lenient to newly arrived emigrants, the Spanish law enforcing Catholicism as the only legal religion in the region was clear: "Liberty of conscience is not to be extended beyond the first generation; the children of the emigrants must be Catholics . . . Emigrants not agreeing to this, must not be admitted, but removed, even when they bring property with them. This is to be explained to settlers, who do not profess the Catholic religion."[19]

---

[16] Peck, 151.

[17] Ibid., 228.

[18] *Western Christian Advocate*, October 1834.

[19] Cited in Francois Xavier Martin, *The History of Louisiana, from the Earliest Period*. 2 Vols. (New Orleans: Lyman and Beardslee, 1827), 2:90.

Clark was not dissuaded by the Roman Catholic religious requirement. He soon developed a circuit that encompassed the easternmost sections of the modern cities of St. Louis and St. Charles. On one occasion at Bate's Rock, Clark asked the local Spanish commandant, Zenon Trudeau, if he could preach in his jurisdiction. Clark was told no and was reminded that no religion other than Roman Catholicism would be tolerated. Clark then thanked the commandant and went to gather supplies. When the other people who were also present left, the magistrate found Clark and told him that if he did preach in Missouri, he would be given three days to stop before he would be arrested. Since Clark only preached in Missouri for one or two days at a time, the stipulation did not affect his ministry. Peck related that the magistrates' warning became something of a joke to the families in Missouri with whom Clark visited. When Clark showed up to preach the people would ask him how long he was going to stay. Clark would answer "three days." The congregants would then remind him that he had better not stay any longer or he would "be thrown in the *calaboose*." Some of the Spanish commandants were not so kind. In many areas Clark had to hold services at night and in secret in order to avoid arrest.[20] On several occasions Clark met with only a few families at a time in order not to draw the attention of Mexican authorities.

While traveling Clark, who was often alone, thought about the scriptures and theology. On one trip in the fall of 1803, he came to the realization that infant baptism was incorrect and could not be a true ordinance. After conferring with another Methodist minister named Talbert, who had been thinking about the same issue, both men decided that believer's baptism was more biblical and decided to be immersed. Clark baptized Talbert who in turn immersed Clark.[21] Several people who were present at this event also followed the minister's example and accepted believer's baptism. After his baptism, Clark began to associate with members of a Baptist group that called themselves "Friends of Humanity." Clark was initially attracted to this group because of their stance against slavery, but was also pleased with the Baptist concepts of local church autonomy, believer's baptism, and the lack of a bishop in Baptist ecclesiology.[22]

Though he had been baptized by immersion, he had not been ordained by a Baptist church. Thus, he was a Methodist minister who had given up the Methodist credentials for the Baptist faith, but as of yet was not an official Baptist minister. Clark, therefore, was a Baptist in doctrinal

[20] Peck, 233.
[21] Ibid., 237.
[22] Ibid., 258.

matters, but as of yet had no home church membership or an officials ties to the denomination.[23] Clark spent the next ten years with little official denominational affiliation or ministerial status, but these issues were of no concern to the Illinois and Missouri settlers. He was a Protestant preacher who was bringing them the Gospel. This reality took precedence over credentials.

Clark's ministerial skills were recognized by the Illinois Baptists in 1810. While attending an associational meeting of Baptist churches, several of the deacons decided to ordain Clark to the gospel ministry. After questioning him on the subject of Baptist doctrine and ecclesiology, the deacons decided he was qualified to serve as a Baptist minister and he was immediately ordained.[24] From this point forward, Clark, while remaining friendly with his former Methodist brethren, began to work more and more exclusively with Baptists.

After ten years in Illinois and frequent sojourns into Missouri, he decided to give up teaching and to dedicate all of his time to preaching. The main reason Clark decided to become a full-time minister was his frequent visits across the Mississippi River into the Spanish Country of Missouri. Whereas Illinois had few Baptist ministers, Missouri had none. Before the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, Protestantism had been illegal. Now, in 1810, with more immigrants moving westward and the legality of all faiths, Missouri needed full-time pastors to live within the region.

With his new mission field before him, Clark began to spend more time in Missouri, gather pockets of Protestants along his circuit, and help them organize into churches. His circuit, which later gave birth to a Baptist church in each locale, included Coldwater in St. Louis County, Florissant, Owens's Station in modern Bridgeton, Spanish Pond, and Fee Fee. Once a year these small Baptist churches would gather for an evangelistic meeting. These meetings gave rise to the Missouri Baptist Association in 1834.[25]

Clarks' local church membership was at the Cold Water Baptist Church where he became the church's second pastor in 1811. Founded in 1809 by Thomas R. Musick, the Coldwater Baptist Church, following the Fee Fee Baptist Church organized in 1807, was the second oldest Baptist church in Missouri. Because of internal problems concerning slavery, this church went out of existence in 1819.

Clark's anti-slavery position had been evident as early as his days as a Methodist minister in Georgia and South Carolina and later with his identification with the "Friends of Humanity" in Illinois. The Friends of

[23] Maple and Rider, 17.
[24] Ibid., 18.
[25] Ibid., 18.

Humanity organized a church in Cold Water taking the name ""The Baptized Church of Christ, Friends to Humanity, on Cold Water" in 1834. This church accepted black members, whether slave or free, into its membership, and they were treated on an equal basis with their white brethren. This church ceased to exist in 1839, but in 1844 its former members joined with the former members of the Coldwater Baptist Church to become the Salem Baptist Church.[26]

Though the majority of his evangelistic endeavors were in Missouri, he continued to keep regular preaching appointments in Illinois. Once Clark was scheduled to preach at Upper Alton, Illinois, but ran into trouble on his way. After walking from St. Louis to the northern end of St. Louis County to the Ferry that would transport him across the Mississippi, he discovered that it had been swept away by a storm. He was then forced to walk back to St. Louis and catch a Ferry that would land him at a location far away from his Illinois appointment. After crossing, Clark then walked all night so that he would arrive on time. He had traveled more than sixty miles on foot to make his appointment. When a friend learned of what Clark had endured, he asked him why he had gone to so much trouble when no more than a handful of people would be in attendance. Clark answered, "This is nothing to what my Savior endured for me. Then, too, time is short and souls are precious. The people expect me to meet my appointments."[27]

Clark refused to be paid for his services at this meeting. In fact, he never accepted payment for preaching. The only tangible gifts he received were clothes that several of the women along his circuit made for him.[28] Unlike several Protestant denominations that did not believe that a preacher should be paid for performing the tasks of his call, Clark refused payment for other reasons. He realized that slaveholders were among this group, and he did not take any money acquired through what he considered an unchristian business.

While traveling his preaching circuit in Georgia and South Carolina in the late 1790s, Clark developed a love for the itinerant lifestyle of Methodist ministers. He enjoyed bringing the Gospel to those who were far removed from the possibility of regular church attendance. Even after his move away from the Methodist denomination, their itinerant spirit became a part of him. In 1810 Clark heard that preachers were needed in New Orleans in the region of west Florida, as it was still known in the early nineteenth-century. Since Louisiana had been controlled by the Roman Catholic Church until 1803, Clark believed they desperately

[26] Douglas, 49.
[27] Peck, 272.
[28] Maple and Rider, 19.

needed to hear the Gospel from a Protestant perspective. He took a canoe down the Mississippi River from St. Louis to New Orleans.[29] After spending several months preaching and organizing house churches in the Crescent City, he walked all the way back to Illinois and resumed his teaching and itinerant preaching ministry.

Clark was also something of an early colporteur. When he went on his circuit, he always carried Christian books, Bibles, and other materials to individuals who might never have the opportunity to purchase their own. Clark was also a strong proponent of an educated clergy, evangelism, missions, and associational work. Everywhere he traveled he always carried three spare Bibles that he could leave with the people he met out in the wilderness. Clark also helped John Mason Peck create Rock Spring Seminary. This seminary eventually became the Shurtleff College in Alton, the first Baptist College in Illinois. Clark had also gone to Kentucky in 1801 to participate in the revivals that were sweeping across the Bluegrass State. He believed the spirit was so strong in the revivals that he remained in Kentucky for more than a year. His students and congregants in Illinois became so concerned that he might not return that they sent someone to convince him to come back to New Design.[30]

During the final years of his life, Clark, infirmed with age, was forced to preach while sitting in a chair. After he became too weak to preach, his friends would carry him in a chair to services. In November of 1833 Clark went to a Methodist Church at Cold Water, which he helped organize ten years earlier, for worship services. During the service, he fell ill and was taken to the home of Elisha Patterson in St. Louis County where he died on November 15, 1833. After serving as a pastor in Missouri for twenty-two years, he was laid to rest at the Coldwater cemetery at Salem Baptist Church, the oldest Protestant cemetery, still in use, west of the Mississippi River. Clark's grave is somewhat unusual as both the Methodist and Baptist denominations have marked it and claimed him as their own.

---

[29] William Cathcart, *The Baptist Encyclopedia*, 3 Vols. (Philadelphia, Pa.: Louis H. Everts, 1881; rpt., Paris, Ar.: The Baptist Standard Bearer, 1988), 1: 227.

[30] Peck, 246.

Midwestern Journal of Theology 4.2 (Spring 2006): 93-100.

Suffering and the Christian: A Philosophical Problem and a Pastoral Response

Godfrey Harold
Lecturer, University of Zululand
Senior Minister
Livingstone Baptist Church
Richards Bay, South Africa

Introduction

The intention of this paper is not to give an answer to the problem of theodicy which arises because of suffering in this world, but to move beyond the polemic and to give attention to how a person can find meaning and hope in suffering. In giving a pastoral response this paper argues that the appropriate use of God-images/attributes in suffering will help persons find meaning in suffering thus enabling them to become more positive in their faith and service to God and humanity.

A Philosophical Problem

From its very inception Christianity has been continually challenged on both the philosophical and pastoral level by the reality of suffering in the world. How do Christians who claim the goodness and comprehensive sovereignty of God explain the fact that the world we live in is pervasively evil and literally filled with instances of suffering, disease, tragedy, and horrific acts of violence? Any ordinary person will observe that this world at times may be characterized as a terrible place to live. Yet, throughout these two millennia, believers in the Christian God have steadfastly maintained that God is both infinitely good and fully in command of the universe.

The problem of suffering touches Christianity at its core. It represents an apparent logical inconsistency with the claim that an omni-benevolent and all-powerful God exists in such a world littered with the debris and carnage of human suffering. The problem of suffering sets forth the philosophical and pastoral challenge to understand how a good and powerful God could possibly allow his creatures to act as they do. Perhaps even more importantly, the problem of suffering reveals the necessity of supplying a sufficient foundation for the discovery of

meaning and purpose in the midst of the massive tribulation and pain that this world inflicts upon men and women without discrimination and suffering that God apparently permits or is powerless to stop.

A Pastoral Response

In reality, the problem of suffering, in both its logical and evidential expressions, is a disturbing perplexity intrinsically related to the existence of the Judeo-Christian God and his alleged attributes more than a dilemma regarding the mere presence of pain and suffering itself. John Hick has insightfully observed this very point by noting that the problem of suffering does not attach itself as a threat to any and every concept of deity.[1] It arises only for a religion which insists that the object of its worship is at once perfectly good and unlimitedly powerful. The challenge is thus too inescapable for Christianity, which has always steadfastly adhered to the pure monotheism of its Judaic source in attributing both omnipotence and infinite goodness to God.

Likewise, Ronald Nash, a Christian theologian and philosopher, lays out the specific challenges confronting theists in the following propositions:

> If God is good and loves all human beings, it is reasonable to believe that He wants to deliver the creatures He loves from evil and suffering.
> If God is all knowing, it is reasonable to believe that He knows how to deliver His creatures from evil and suffering.
> If God is all-powerful, it is reasonable to believe that He is able to deliver His creatures from evil and suffering.[2]

The harsh realities of life, however, reveal that creatures loved by God do in fact suffer, apparently gratuitously in many cases, and often go to their graves unaware of any sense of purpose for their pain. This fact, for many, provides a philosophical basis for the probability that the God of Christian theism simply does not exist, or is at least much less good and powerful than he is assumed to be by believers.

Typically, traditional Christian theism has confronted the deductive problem of suffering by asserting that the existence of God and the presence of evil in the created order are not logically inconsistent propositions since God has good reasons for allowing evil to exist, and even flourish, in the world. Alvin Plantinga, by means of his critically acclaimed *Free Will Defence*, has convincingly argued that the divine

---

[1] John Hick, *Evil and the God of Love* (London: Macmillan, 1966), 251.
[2] Ronald Nash, *Faith and Reason* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988), 178.

granting of moral freedom and responsibility to the creature necessarily entails the possibility of evil decisions and actions.[3]

A world containing creatures that are significantly free (*and* freely perform more good than evil actions) is more valuable, all else being equal, than a world containing no free creatures at all. Now God can create free creatures, but he cannot cause or determine them to do only what is right. For if he does so, then they are not significantly free after all; they do not do what is right freely. To create creatures capable of moral good, therefore, he must create creatures capable of moral evil; and he cannot give these creatures the freedom to perform evil and at the same time prevent them from doing so.

Most agree that Plantinga's work on the *Problem of Evil* has sufficiently answered the deductive form of the challenge. Other traditional Christian theists, taking a somewhat different approach in responding to both the inductive and deductive forms of suffering, have proposed that God's sovereignty over the created order, including the choices and actions of moral agents, is logically consistent with the freedom to obey or disobey divine commands. D. A. Carson, for example, presents the claims of what is known as theological compatibilism:[4]

> 1. God is absolutely sovereign, but his sovereignty never functions in such a way that human responsibility is curtailed, minimized, or mitigated. 2. Human beings are morally responsible creatures—they significantly choose, rebel, obey, believe, defy, make decisions, and so forth, and they are rightly held accountable for such actions; but this characteristic never functions so as to make God absolutely contingent.

Traditional Christian theism (TCT), while proposing various responses to the problem of suffering, has tenaciously affirmed God's all-encompassing sovereignty and unique attributes, namely his omnipotence and omniscience, even in the face of apparently gratuitous evils. More specifically, TCT recognizes that God possesses exhaustive and infallible foreknowledge of all future events, even the future choices and actions of moral agents. Though there does exist some measure of disagreement as to the exact relationship between divine sovereignty and human freedom, proponents of TCT are consistent in their belief that God knows the future with absolute certainty.

---

[3] Alvin Plantinga, *Free Will Defence* (1989), 31.

[4] D. A. Carson, *How Long O Lord? Reflections on Suffering and Evil* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990), 201.

Applied Pastoral Care

In most South African congregations, people are confronted with the reality of suffering, which could be attributed to a number of factors including that of the HIV/AIDS pandemic. If we all could avoid the sufferings of the day or the moment, we will do it at all costs. No one likes pain or suffering encroaching on his or her life, but as a Christian it is something that one must go through. In fact, suffering in the life of a Christian is inevitable.

It is for this very reason that a proper understanding of the meaning in suffering needs to be undertaken. Many Christians, because they fail to understand the meaning in their suffering, rob themselves of the joy and maturity it can bring. We grumble and moan and curse to the point of doubt. Yet like gold in the hands of the goldsmith, we are in the hands of God.

The refining process of gold needs the fire to bring out its value and impurities. What fire is to gold, suffering is to a Christian. Thomas Cahill states:

> In all the tragic dramas of antiquity, whether lived or staged, we detect a pattern: the hero, be it Alexander or Oedipus, reaches his pinnacle only to be cut down. Only in the drama of Jesus does the opposite pattern hold: the hero is cut down only to be raised up.[5]

The idea of suffering is inseparable from the New Testament concept of fellowship. If we are to walk alongside Christ and arm ourselves with the mind of Christ we will have to suffer in the flesh (1 Peter 4:1). To suffer as a Christian (1 Peter 4:16) means to share in the sufferings of Christ (1 Peter 4:13).

Although such trials may be attributed to Satan or to our own personal choices that bring about the suffering, it is often said that coping with suffering is an art.[6] This does not imply that a certain technique or attitude towards suffering can be taught through pastoral care, but rather coping with suffering becomes an art when a person sees an opportunity for growth in their suffering. Practicing the art of coping with suffering comes down to the following: putting meaning into suffering, trusting while everything seems futile, and living in the face of death. Friedman states:

---

[5] Thomas Cahill, *Desire of the Everlasting Hills* (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 130.

[6] R. C. Cabot and R. L. Dicks, *The Art of Ministering to the Sick* (New York: Continuum, 1959).

> Ultimately, survival depends upon existential categories: on vision, for example hope, on the imaginative capacity, on the ability to transcend the anxiety of those around us, and on a response to challenge that suffering as opportunity for growth.[7]

Thus the crisis of suffering can be an opportunity for growth in life and faith, depending on the person's frame of reference, perception of life and understanding of God. So the pastoral response to the problem of suffering is to assist the person to understand the meaning in suffering.

Pastoral Care and the Quest for Meaning: A Hermeneutical Approach

The pastor's responsibility is to try to find out how suffering persons understand God and the interaction that exists between them and their expectations of God.

The therapeutic dimension of faith is closely connected with the person's concept of God.[8] According to Louw, the process of imparting meaning in pastoral care works with two presuppositions:

1. When people are in suffering or pain, their perception of God is distorted, thus this prevents constructive application of their faith potential. Once a person's emotional filters are blocked their vision of God becomes distorted. Thus the quest for meaning then becomes primarily a problem of a dysfunctional belief system; it becomes a problem of perception. Ammon. E. Kasambala states that when one has a distorted image of God in times of suffering, this will leads to what he terms *pathological faith.*

2. The task of the pastor is to help the sufferer understand and interpret God in the light of suffering and conversely to understand and interpret the person's experience of suffering in terms of God's involvement with suffering. The person's story must be put with God's story and vice-versa. Where the two stories converge, the person discovers God's fulfilled promised, and hope emerges. The discovery of God's faithfulness and a vision of Christ's resurrection results in that dynamic hope. When suffering disturbs this vision, hopelessness ensues. Hope is strengthened when a person's concepts of God once again becomes constructive and positive.

---

[7] Edwin H. Friedman, *Generation to Generation: Family Process in Church and Synagogue* (New York: The Guildford Press, 1985), 5.

[8] D. J. Louw, *Illness as Crisis and Challenge* (Doornfontien: Orion Publishers, 1994), 77.

A Pastoral Hermeneutic: Images of God

The section of this paper undertakes to work with the basic assumption which states that meaningful pastoral care ministry takes place within the South African congregation as it reflects upon God-images/attributes that are seen in Scripture. Some of the most helpful images are those that depict God in terms of human understanding, experience, ideas, needs and expectations (e.g. God as companion, Father, Comforter, Judge, etc.). And because of this reality, the pastoral ministry in South Africa is challenged with the search for appropriate God-images to bring hope and meaning in suffering. For people in pain and suffering helpful God-images convey a sign of God's care and love, hence bringing hope to their situation of distress and despair. The reality of God's care and love within the Christian congregation is made eminent by these appropriate God-images. John Mbiti rightfully observes:

> since God is considered to do all things (creator of all things, sustaining, providing for what he has created, and ruling over the universe), since many of these activities are similar to those carried out by people, it is helpful to the imagination for people to picture God as if he has human characteristics. Such mental pictures are aids to our understanding of God; they illustrate meaning about God. It does not mean that God be looked on as human being. These images have their limitation, but they nevertheless assist the mind to have a working knowledge of God. They also help people in communicating their idea about God. Other human images make people feel close to God even though he is their creator."[9]

Plude notes that the spoken word is the normal vehicle of faith . . . In our times the "word" also becomes images, colors and sounds.[10]

The notion of God-images is of great importance in giving pastoral care to people who are in suffering. It is important because people who are in suffering tend to hold different images of God—some which could be classified as appropriate or helpful while others can be distorted or unhelpful. According to Depoortere, "People in suffering either have helpful or unhelpful God-images."[11]

According to Louw[12] and Tidball[13] helpful God images are those images which enable people to come to terms with their situation and

---

[9] J. S. Mbiti, *Introduction to African Religion* (Praeger: New York, 1975), 53.

[10] F. F. Plude, "How Communication Studies Can Help Us to Bridge the Gap in Our Theology Megaphors" in *New Theology Review* 8.4 (Nov. 1995).

[11] K. Depoortere, *A Different God* (Eerdmans, 1995), 2.

[12] Louw, *Illness*, 80.

[13] D. Tidball, *Skilful Shepherds: Exploration in Pastoral Theology* (Great Britain: Apollos, 1997), 283-85.

appropriate their faith into action by doing something about the condition of suffering.

Some helpful images associated with God in times of suffering are:

- *God as a Companion*: This image depicts God as one who walks with the sufferer—a God that is not transcendental but near (Heb 13:5).

- *God as Father*: A God image that metaphorically represents God as provider, protector and a caring God (Ps 23).

- *God as Comforter*: A concept of God that is used in times of death, disaster and calamity (Isa 51:12).

- *God as Judge*: A notion of God mostly in crisis, stressing the fact that good will always triumph over evil. At the end of suffering justice will prevail (Ps 19:9).

People who are suffering find comfort when they reflect upon the images and attributes of God found in Holy Scripture.

Conclusion

The question could be asked: What is the meaning in suffering? From a Christian perspective it is an opportunity: (1) to discover more of God's love, grace and mercy and to know that God is indeed involved; (2) to be better equipped to take account of the mystery and inexplicability of suffering in the knowledge that, in his covenantal faithfulness, God is still in control; (3) to learn patiently as a believer to depend merely upon God in the knowledge that God sustains supports and holds him or her; (4) to realize that suffering could indeed shorten one's life but also enhance the quality as it teaches us responsibility towards life; (5) to recognize that suffering is a process of purification, a medium of education; (6) to understand that suffering brings spiritual growth; (7) to learn that suffering makes us more willing to serve God and fellow-man; (8) to comprehend that suffering will ultimately bring glorification: first the cross, then the glory.

When pastoral care asks the question of meaning in suffering, then it is busy engaging the changing, hurting and broken world. The task of pastoral care for the suffering is to take man's most difficult experience, which gives rise to a welter of human emotions, and try to place it in a more objective perspective. In so doing, the pastor will seek, to the limits of his finite wisdom and understanding, to explain the ways of God to

men. He will seek to show that God's power, holiness and love are not irreconcilable in the face of suffering. This core question of meaning in suffering is not what happens to us, but what can happen through us.

Book Reviews

Old Testament Turning Points: The Narratives That Shaped a Nation. By Victor H. Matthews. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005, 208 pp., $ 18.99.

The writers of the Old Testament re-used themes, re-visited subjects, and repeated language. They did so in order to carry to a new generation those historical-theological messages God had revealed in the past. Most modern seminary graduates and any number of today's Bible readers recognize this biblical strategy. Unfortunately, Victor Matthews' book does not present much that is new for modern Bible readers who are aware of this "repetition" of material in scripture.

The subtitle of Matthews' volume is his thesis. Old Testament writers recognized that certain events, according to Matthews, marked Israel as a people of the covenant. These events were preserved in historical narrative. Later, addressing new audiences and new settings, biblical writers re-used elements of those historical narratives (themes, language, theological message, etc.) to keep alive and to renew the idea that Israel was a covenant people. These basic narratives are seen in the volume under review as the "narratives that shaped a nation." Matthews' point is, then, that the shaping and re-shaping of the nation went on primarily through the re-use of the stories. Dr. Matthews illuminates the process using eight narratives but does not insist that these eight are the only ones re-used or the only ones which contributed to Israel's continuing identification.

The eight narratives discussed in this volume are: the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Eden, Yahweh's establishing a covenant with Abraham (including material from Genesis 12, 15, and 17), Moses leading the people out of Egypt (material from Exodus 2-20), David's selection of Jerusalem as his capital (extending through 2 Samuel 7), Jeroboam and the Northern Kingdom's secession, Samaria's fall, Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of Jerusalem and the subsequent exile, and Cyrus' victory over Babylon and the Exiles' return (including the work of Ezra and Nehemiah). Recognizing the inherent significance of the narratives chosen, few readers would fault Matthews for his choices. With the possible exception of the Garden of Eden account, each of the event-clusters is theologically significant and surfaces repeatedly in the Old Testament material. (This review does not quarrel with the theological significance of the Genesis 3 material. But one can question how often the narrative and its themes recur or are re-used in the Old Testament. In my estimation the Genesis 3 material is used or referred to more often in the New Testament.)

Professor Matthews has written extensively on Old Testament history and on Israel's setting in the ancient Near East. Consequently, the reader expects a thorough presentation of the historical events behind the biblical narrative and is not disappointed. More, the author provides occasional side-bar references to

extra-biblical literature to show the historical and intellectual context of the people of the Old Testament. This presentation of history and culture may be this small volume's greatest strength, but it is not the author's purpose. He wants to key on the audience's "insider information" which the prophet or biblical writer can assume (i.e., what the audience already knows about the story). Also, Matthews wants to find the "echoes" of the narratives in later writings, re-used themes or elements which the biblical writer used with later audiences to make an earlier message relevant. Matthews believes insider information and echoes constitute a "cultural portfolio," a portfolio which includes the terms of Israel's covenant with Yahweh, reflections of the ethical character of Yahweh, and the justification of Yahweh's punishment of covenant-breakers (7-8).

Chapter six of *Old Testament Turning Points* discusses the narrative of Samaria's fall and demonstrates Matthews' method. Initially, Matthews refers to questions raised by the destruction of the northern kingdom, a portion of the people of God, questions about Yahweh's activity and character and about the religious implications for Judah. Then the author presents the "Historical Overview," a quite good description of the northern kingdom's fall. Then he ranges back and forth through 1 and 2 Kings to identify the "Deuteronomic historian's" rationale for God's judgment on Israel. But Matthews does not make the "insider viewpoint," what later readers (those reading after 722 B.C. and even after the exile) knew or remembered. (By assuming the books of Kings and especially 2 Kings 17 are heavily edited after the exile, Matthews creates some difficulties for many readers of this journal.) Matthews believes the final form of Amos' and Hosea's books date to a time after Samaria's fall and believes they were edited in part to provide justification for Yahweh's judgment. Isaiah 9 and Rabshakeh's speech in Isaiah 36, along with Psalm 78, argued as post-exilic, echo the narrative of Samaria's fall as a testimony to Yahweh's judgment according to Matthews.

Any proposal describing how biblical writers used events and themes must deal with the dating of the various materials. But the gulf between critical scholars, of which Matthews is one, and conservative scholars is often broad on this issue. This small volume does an acceptable job of describing the prophets', poets', and biblical historians' use of past events to make their points about God's activity. But the question of whether or not 2 Kings 17-19, the edited books of Amos and Hosea, etc. reflect a post-exilic perspective is a difficult one. Some conservative scholars still question even the existence of a Deuteronomist or a Deuteronomistic History. Still, this volume offers something to the reader regardless of theological stance.

Matthews is a careful historian who knows the ancient Near Eastern world and the modern scholarly world. There is much to be learned here even if the reader disagrees with Matthews' developmental scheme. The author's twelve pages of "Works Cited" is a good reading list for Old Testament history. Moreover, the author provides a brief, but helpful, glossary of terms, defining terms such as "utopia," "reflection story," and "hegemony." A biblical index and subject index make the book more user-friendly, too. Still, this book is not for the biblical neophyte.

Albert F. Bean
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

Sodomy: A History of a Christian Biblical Myth. By Michael Carden. London: Equinox, 2004, 226 pp., $26.95.

The last half of the twentieth-century saw an explosion of books advocating a revisionist approach to the traditional Christian understanding of homosexual behavior as sin. *Sodomy: A History of a Christian Biblical Myth* is another such work. In fact, the author, Michael Carden, repeats many arguments made earlier by both Derrick Sherwin Bailey in *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* (1955) and John Boswell in *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* (1980). Yet, Carden goes further and illustrates the bizarre extremes to which "gay hermeneutics" can reach.

Sodomy: A History of a Christian Biblical Myth is actually Carden's dissertation from the University of Queensland. A self-identified homosexual, Carden claims the genesis of this book was a "Queer Men's discussion group" he was affiliated with in 2001. According to Carden, several men in the group discussed suicide. Carden claims one reason these men considered suicide is the culture of heterosexuality which abuses homosexuals. In this culture of oppression, he claims various passages of Scripture "have been twisted and braided to form the nooses that have choked out many a life" (2). Carden's dominant theme is that heterosexuality is used as a weapon of intolerance, especially by men. He bemoans what he calls a "heterosexual paramountcy [*sic*]" which "underlies the everyday routine of life" (1) and is deeply concerned because the dominant culture of heterosexuality "strives to enforce uniformity and abhors sexual plurality" (2).

Carden's hermeneutical goal is to "detoxify" the Bible of homophobic accretions (14). As one might imagine, the Biblical text which concerns Carden most is Genesis 19. To achieve this goal, Carden employs a hermeneutic of homosexual deconstruction. Carden claims the real sin of Sodom was not homoeroticism, but really homophobia! He says, "In my reading, therefore, inhospitality is signified by male rape as an act of *homophobic and xenophobic* violence." He goes on to say that male rape is actually used "to maintain a system of patriarchal, compulsory heterosexuality" (37). Thus, Carden inverts the traditional understanding of the Sodom story. In so doing, he demonizes heterosexuals in the same way he claims others have demonized homosexuals! Carden claims that a "homophobic reading" of Genesis 19 is a Christian invention in contrast to Rabbinic readings of the text which, he claims, did not emphasize sexual sin.

Reflecting an approach common among revisionist hermeneutics, Carden takes great care to explore the theme of Sodom as a "rich and powerful society/class that oppresses the poor" (47). In fact, this is indeed part of Sodom's sin as made clear in Ezekiel 16:46-58. However, Carden downplays the nature of Sodom's sin as described in Jude 7 and says there is nothing in Jude "that requires a predominantly homosexual understanding of Sodom and its

sin" (59). In reality, Jude 7 says Sodom and Gomorrah "indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh" (NAS). Carden simply fails to explore the substance of the text in Jude 7. The theme of sexual immorality combined with pursuing "strange flesh" reflects an understanding of licentious behavior among the cities. Many have understood the reference to "strange flesh" to mean a rejection of heterosexual marriage as being the creation mandated arena for sexual expression (Genesis 2:24-25).

If there is anything positive to be found in Carden's work, it may be in his review of the way early church fathers approached Genesis 19. Yet even here, his approach is flawed because he claims Chrysostom was the first to claim same-sex desire as the sin of Sodom (144). This is only plausible if one accepts Carden's questionable approach to Jude. Furthermore, Carden engages in an argument from silence. Just because some early church fathers do not explicitly state their understanding of Sodom's sin does not mean they would agree with Carden's interpretation. In fact, to a person the early church fathers would have found Carden *anathema!* By limiting his survey to their explicit references to Genesis 19, Carden leaves the reader with a less than adequate impression of the sexual ethics of early Christians. Without question, the early church understood heterosexual monogamous marriage as the only appropriate arena for sexual expression.

I want to warn the reader that Carden includes explicit descriptions of homosexual acts (34). In an anachronistic hermeneutical leap, Carden wants us to believe that contemporary immoral behavior is in some way informative for the meaning of the original text. The inclusion of numerous curse words and vivid descriptions of sexual acts reveal that Carden's work is not really about the meaning of the Biblical text, but it is more about abandoning boundaries for sexual expression. Given his overall presentation, Carden's claim that he is not trying "to prove that heterosexuality is bad, or that gay and bisexual men can do no wrong" rings rather hollow (38). Furthermore, on his website, Carden is more explicit about his motives and says, "My politics is definitely on the left with strong anarchist leanings" (see www.sodomology.com). His "anarchist" approach is demonstrated when he recasts the September 11, 2001 bombings as an incident of rage by the "outcast and oppressed" against the "affluent West" (195).

Carden does not veil his disdain for conservative Christians and says, "The hermeneutical divide between Christian fundamentalists and myself is vast, and furthermore, I refuse to acknowledge their . . . claim to be the sole custodians of genuine Christianity" (11). In reality, Carden's disjoint is not between himself and "fundamentalists," but between himself and any sense of reasoned exegesis.

J. Alan Branch
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

Principle Preaching: How to Create and Deliver Sermons for Life Application. By John R. Bisagno. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2002, 200 pp., $14.99.

John R. Bisagno, Pastor Emeritus of Houston's 22,000 member First Baptist Church, draws upon over thirty years of pastoral experience in *Principle Preaching*. The book represents Bisagno's attempt to teach pastors how to craft a sermon that will prove relevant in the lives of those who hear it. Bisagno states that most pastors preach a sermon outline that is predictable. In such a sermon, the points usually contain life application principles, though not identified as such. Herein lies the difference between Bisagno's method and the more "traditional" method he reacts to. His method advocates the use of applicable imperatives, statements the hearer can remember and apply, as opposed to the usual propositional statements that offer little more than information that is easily forgotten.

The book is quite valuable in that it is extremely practical. Here is a book that the average pastor can pick up and instantly benefit from. It contains forty-seven sermon outlines that the pastor can use to assist in formulating a principle-based sermon. Each sermon includes points that are highly applicable, complete with brief commentary by Bisagno. It also contains a tone of encouragement in that the author believes that preaching is a discipline that can be learned by anyone who will devote the time necessary.

Another strong point of the book is the attitude the author maintains about his method of preaching. He very clearly states that his is not the only way to preach. Because of this modest approach, the reviewer was much more open to hearing the things the author had to say. In addition, the author makes it clear that while there may be many applications to a given Scripture, there is only one correct interpretation. This might anger proponents of postmodern hermeneutics, but we should applaud Bisagno in this regard for taking a stand for Scriptural truth. Hence, the book has some definite value, but a few warnings might be in order before selecting it as a primary preaching text.

First, the book's structure is a bit weak. Of its 200 pages, only 20 are devoted to the principles behind the author's method. He proceeds to offer 180 pages of examples before he has offered substantial biblical or philosophical rationale for his method. However, such substantiation may not be necessary because of his many years of leadership and the certain allegiance he commands from many Southern Baptists. While his conclusions may not necessarily be in error, it is the reviewer's opinion that they are simply assumed and not supported. For one who is convinced of the author's credibility, this may suffice. However, others in the field might like to see a little more of the "why" behind the "how."

Secondly, the 180 pages of sermon examples given lack any exposition. The author freely admits this, but the student of homiletics must be left wondering how one can skip exposition and immediately arrive at application. Such a shortcut could, in some cases, prove quite dangerous theologically. The author maintains that expository preaching is, among other things, exposing the depth of the text. However, he offers no counsel on how this is achieved. It may be that the book is aimed at readers that already possess a working knowledge of

homiletics. In such a case, the danger may not be as great. However, if a first semester preaching student were to base his homiletical understanding solely on this text, he may learn a philosophy of preaching that is quite lacking.

Also disconcerting is the author's constant quotation of Rick Warren without citation. In fact, the author even admits that the steps of principle preaching come from Warren and not himself. Therefore, is the basis of this book found in Warren or Bisagno? In addition, the author defensively asserts, on more than one occasion, that principle preaching is not shallow preaching. If this is true, the reader is left wondering why this method needs to be constantly defended.

In comparison with other preaching texts, *Principle Preaching* makes a contribution as a supplement to a more in-depth text. Haddon Robinson's *Biblical Preaching* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001) is a far more informative text, but *Principle Preaching* will offer several sermon ideas to supplement the theory found in Robinson's text. Wayne McDill's *The Twelve Essential Skills of Great Preaching* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1998) is also useful as a primary text, but might challenge Bisagno in that it includes examples of sermon outlines that are not immediately applicable. Hence, the two, when read together, provide the student with differing perspectives that might enhance the learning experience.

In conclusion, *Principle Preaching* is a valuable text that would be helpful to today's pastor in that it challenges him to preach sermons that are relevant. The outlines and sermon ideas that are provided will greatly assist the preacher in getting started with this. However, the book should only be used as a secondary source. Hermeneutics, homiletics, and other principles of bible exposition are not found in this text. These disciplines need to be mastered before correct interpretation resulting in appropriate application can be made.

Jason Epps
Intermountain Christian School

Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature. By Craig A. Evans. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005, xxxvi + 539 pp., $34.95 hardcover.

The latest work by Professor Craig A. Evans is both impressive and overwhelming. Impressive, in that it presents as succinctly as possible a full spectrum of the literature related to, and loosely contemporary with the New Testament (NT), a massive body of writings with which the prospective student in the field should be more than merely familiar. Overwhelming, in as much as it confirms that the study of the NT, as understood and practiced today, is not for the faint of heart: it demands the breadth of knowledge of an encyclopedist, well versed in the literature, history, background thought, and culture of the times that cradled the writings of the emerging NT canon. The volume is designed as "an introduction to the diverse bodies of literatures that are in various ways cognate to biblical literature, especially to the New Testament" (i). It must be said at the outset that one could hardly find a more qualified author for such an

endeavor than Professor Evans, a trademark name in NT and cognate studies. He backs this survey of the literary background of the NT with an erudition proven through the publication of numerous volumes in most, if not all, the fields covered in this book.

As expected, there is an immense amount of valuable information between these two covers. The book divides the literature relevant to the study of the NT into eleven corpora. The first two chapters cover the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Chapter three is devoted to the Dead Sea Scrolls, while chapter four treats versions of the Old Testament, including the Septuagint, the Masoretic text, the Old Latin alongside the Vulgate, and the Peshitta. Chapter five is devoted to the foremost non-Christian Jewish authors contemporary with the events and writings of the NT: Philo and Josephus. Although technically the Targums could have been treated with the versions, their importance persuaded the author to allot them individual attention in chapter six. A fairly comprehensive presentation of the Rabbinic writings in chapter seven sheds light on the relevant passages in the Mishnah, Tosefta, and early midrashim for NT studies, without neglecting the later writings of the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds. The last four literary groups investigated are spin-offs of the NT writings themselves. The New Testament Pseudepigrapha—a group of pseudonymous gospels, books of acts, epistles and apocalypses—are treated in chapter eight. A brief survey of the Christian Church Fathers, primarily the Apostolic and several earlier Fathers is found in chapter nine. The Gnostic writings found in the Codices of Nag Hammadi, a wealth of primary sources for our understanding Gnosticism, make up chapter ten. Finally, chapter eleven includes important Greco-Roman authors (Tacitus, Suetonius, etc.) and the Corpus Hermeticum. The wealth of papyri, inscriptions, coins, and ostraca, rarely included in previous books of this sort, is given attention in this chapter as well.

Each one of these chapters opens with a complete listing of the primary sources considered under the respective category, followed by a brief description of the literary corpus as a whole. A concise paragraph summarizes each writing, followed by a segment of essential bibliography with titles grouped into texts, surveys, commentaries, and critical studies. A further subsection reviews the most important political and theological topic in the writings. In the case of the Apocrypha, for example, the topics considered include God, piety and martyrdom, salvation history, Zionism, defense of the Hasmonean dynasty, Messiah, resurrection, eschatology, intercession of the saints, and the canon of Scripture. Where necessary, a succinct presentation of other aspects pertinent to that literary corpus is included, such as the brief history of the community responsible for the writings associated with the Dead Sea Scrolls. A general bibliography concludes each chapter.

Through seven well-chosen examples chapter twelve highlights the practical role played by the extracanonical writings as backdrops for helping the exegete achieve a more nuanced understanding of the NT text. Selected for presentation are the Nazareth sermon in Luke 4: 16-30, the parables of the talents (Matt 25:14-30) along with the parable of the wicked vineyard tenants (Mk 12:1-11 and par.), Jesus' quotation of Psalm 82:6 in John10:33-36, Paul's take on

Deuteronomy 30:11-14 in Romans 10:5-10, the apocalyptic language and imagery in 1 Thessalonians 4:15-17, and, lastly, Paul's comparison between Jesus, the "last Adam," with the "first Adam."

The book continues to both enlighten and delight through the content of six very helpful appendices. Foremost among them, the 50 plus pages of the second appendix—worthy of a chapter on its own—tallies the quotations, allusions, and parallels to the New Testament; it is a gold mine of information that will put many students of NT intertextuality in its debt. Three sets of indices for modern authors, ancient writings and writers, and ancient sources, wrap up what will assuredly become a top reference book in the field for years to come.

While one would think twice before pointing out any deficiencies of such a project, this reviewer wonders about the relatively minor importance allocated to the Patristic Writings, a mere ten pages, especially in light of the fact that its cousin corpus, the Rabbinic Writings, were allotted no less than forty pages. In addition, some of the author's assessments appear a bit too enthusiastic in support of the digital revolution. This is true of Evans' comment on G. Lisowsky's *Konkordanz zum hebräischen Alten Testament* that "computer-accessed databases have made this work obsolete" (157). While it is true that computer technology has significantly enhanced the ability to analyze the biblical text, the classic format reference volumes will always be needed at least to double-check the computer generated data, if not actually to provide valuable information still unavailable in electronic format. A case in point is E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the OT* and its useful lists of Hebrew-Greek and Greek-Hebrew equivalences. Evans' assessment reflects rather a future goal than a present reality, since parallel and simultaneous searches in MT and LXX are unavailable in any of the Bible software with which this reviewer is familiar. Finally, while the author's choices in compiling the bibliographical sources fully satisfy if not exceed the reader's expectations, an important title here and there has been omitted, none more noticeable than the first volume in David Instone-Brewer's *TRENT* series (Eerdmans, 2004) for the bibliography on the Rabbinic writings.

These caveats, however, will hardly diminish the usefulness of this remarkable repository of information. While it is true that the material covered has already been published in earlier compendia—*inter alia*, Stone's *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Fortress, 1984), Mulder's *Mikra* (Fortress, 1990), Saebo's *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament* (Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1996), or the *Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200*, (7 vols.; CUP, 1984-88), Evans' *ATNTS*, with its updated bibliography, its compact format, and its breadth of scope recommends itself as the most judicious alternative, especially, though not exclusively, for the prospective student in the field. One only wishes that the publishers had included in the price the possibility to access the electronic format of the volume's bibliographies and thus assist the customers in updating their bibliographical database.

Finally, proper acknowledgement should be given to the dedication note in the opening pages of the book, a part that is prone to go unnoticed. In it, Prof. Evans acknowledges his indebtedness to the mentoring of another renowned NT

scholar, Prof. James A. Sanders. Valued by most, but perhaps not as widely practiced, mentoring, or—to use the NT parlance—discipleship, is most certainly the finest way in which the wealth of information in this book should be disseminated among the guild of NT students.

Radu Gheorghiţă
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

Hebrews: A New Translation and Commentary. By Craig R. Koester. The Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 36. New York: Doubleday, 2001, xxiii + 604 pp., $47.50 hardcover.

The last two decades have witnessed a radical change of fortunes in the scholarly attention given to *pros Hebraious*, with half a dozen substantial contributions in some of the most respected series of NT commentaries. Each one of these commentaries, with their particular strengths, has proven to be an invaluable guide for a fresh understanding of this important 1st century document. Craig Koester's commentary on Hebrews continues the ascendant trend by replacing the somewhat idiosyncratic commentary of G. W. Buchanan, *To the Hebrews* (Doubleday, 1972), the previous entry in the Anchor Bible Commentary series.

The commentary keeps to the familiar format of the series. The substantial introduction covers a vast array of prolegomena, followed by an extensive bibliography grouped in two sections: commentaries chronologically arranged and other books and articles. In a section-by-section fashion, the commentary proper includes a new translation of the epistle, followed by textual and exegetical notes and by theological reflection.

The introduction is divided into five major sections. The first section offers a helpful conspectus of the place and role of the epistle throughout the history of biblical scholarship, going as far back as Clement of Rome (for the Western Church) and Clement of Alexandria (for the Eastern Church). Beside the patristic and medieval eras with their dominating issues, also surveyed are various positions and controversies belonging to the Humanist, Lutheran, Reformed, and Roman Catholic traditions, and modern times. It must be emphasized that, while most commentators include brief reviews of previous commentaries, Koester's interaction with his predecessors is significantly more substantial. This rich diachronic arrangement is very beneficial for the modern exegetes, more prone than their predecessors to disregard the deep roots of the scholarship on Hebrews. With all its usefulness, however, such a chronological layout has its drawbacks, none more evident than the somewhat arbitrary placement of the issues addressed. For example, some prolegomena issues such as authorship, date, destination and the addressees are allotted to the first section, while others—a more thorough profile of the addressees—are discussed under section two.

The second section on social setting profiles the history and present stance of the Christian community addressed. Koester contends that by the time the epistle

was written, the community had already undergone two distinctive phases: conversion, as a result of the apostolic kerygmatic activity, followed by a period of persecution which consolidated their communal solidarity. With the passage of time, however, a new spiritually unhealthy and dangerous phase of friction and malaise had set in. The stern warning passages in the epistle make perfect sense in this particular situation. As far as the community's constitution is concerned, Koester argues that the pattern in the epistle suggests that "Hebrews addressed one of several house churches in a given area" (74). This particular Christian group, distinctly different from its counterpart, an ordinary Jewish community, was under various attacks from the non-Christians, with whom they coexisted in an environment dominated by Greco-Roman culture.

The third section deals with one of the most prominent aspects of the epistle, its literary and rhetorical style. Instead of opting for either the deliberative or epideictic rhetoric as the rhetorical pattern of the epistle, Koester acknowledges, much in agreement with this reviewer, that a clear demarcation between the two is both impossible and unnecessary. Rather, it is precisely the combination of these two forms which assures that the epistle's exhortations both mirror and address the various needs of the spiritually mixed congregation. The two main imports of the rhetorical analysis are, first, its contribution to the elucidation of a proposed fivefold structure of Hebrews, reminiscent of H. D. Betz' organization of Galatians in his ground-breaking commentary (Hermeneia, 1979) and second, its offering the reader a fresh glance into the *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos* of the author's rhetorical strategy. In the closing subsection (94 ff.), one finds a conglomerate of patterns of speech and other stylistic features well known to the careful reader of Hebrews, helpfully catalogued and illustrated.

Concluding the introduction are the sections on the theology and the text of Hebrews. In the former, Koester interacts with selected theological dominants in the author's message: cosmology and eschatology, Christology, promises, covenants and Law, the Scriptures, divine action and human response. The latter includes a helpful tabulation of the textual witnesses for the epistle, wrapping up this rich and very informative introduction.

The reader's high expectations are further gratified by the thorough and balanced exegetical work offered in the commentary proper. The epistle is structured in five major sections, following the categories of classical rhetoric: the *exordium* (1:1-2:4), arresting the attention of the hearer/reader; the *propositio* (2:5-9) that succinctly states the main issues addressed; the *arguments*, a three-tiered strategy of persuasion with cumulative impact (2:10-6:20, 7:1-10:39, and 11:1-12:27), amassing the evidence to support the author's position; and, finally, the *peroratio* (12:28-13:21), the closing exhortation. Each section opens with a brief statement of the argument, followed by the author's new translation, one subsection at a time, with exegetical notes of various nature (primarily text-critical, grammatical, syntactical, and lexical, but unfortunately a bit thin on discourse analysis). The *Comment* in turn probes the theological thought of the epistle. Throughout the commentary, the reader finds extensive interaction with the text and the critical scholarship, and even more, a fair presentation of legitimate exegetical alternatives, especially in those key passages in which the choice is notoriously difficult, e.g., 4:13, 5:14, 6:4-8, or

10:30. While the author is judicious in adducing evidence to support his arguments, not all are conclusive or sufficient. A case in point is the analysis of the quotation of Psalm 8:3-4 in Hebrews 2:6-8, in which Koester assesses the implications of the Author's using the LXX text of the Psalm as opposed to a Hebraic text. While this reviewer agrees with Koester's overall conclusion, he finds fault with his assertion that "the MT reading *m`ṭ* can only be taken quantitatively to mean 'a little lower' in status, while the LXX's *brachy* can also be understood temporally as 'a little while'" (216). The Hebrew text of Job 24:24, Isaiah 10:25, and Hosea 1:4, seem to indicate otherwise.

A point of more serious disagreement with Koester's commentary, however, is with his proposed overall structure of the epistle, which emerges primarily as result of employing the instruments of rhetorical analysis. It is beyond dispute that renewed attention given by NT scholars to rhetorical approaches has greatly improved our understanding of the message of the NT documents. At times, however, the application of rhetorical criticism does not appear to enhance our understanding, but rather to confuse it. This seems to be the case for the unconvincing choice of Hebrews 2:5-9 as the *propositio* of the epistle. While certainly such a choice is possible, to this reviewer it is at least disputable, if not highly improbable, especially in light of other towering theological statements in the epistle, such as the recurring use of Psalm 109 LXX in, *inter alia*, Hebrews 4:12, 8:2,3, and 10:19. Furthermore, competing against Koester's choice stands the intricate microstructure of the epistle in the opening section 1:5-2:18, consisting of two inclusio-type expositions, 1:5-13 (marked by "for to which of the angels . . . ?" in 1:5 and 1:13) and 2:5-16 (with the distinctly similar 2:5 and 2:16, "for it is not to angels . . . "), bracketing the first warning passage 2:1-4. To isolate a *propositio* from this beautifully constructed and balanced passage, which in turn forces a rather unnatural division of the text (1:1-2:4; 2:5-9; and 2:10-6:20!), borders insensitivity to the stylistic pageantry exhibited by the author of Hebrews.

Be that as it may, the commentary will rightfully be ranked among the most important analyses of the epistle to the Hebrews, and any further work on this ancient document will have to engage with its distinct approach and conclusions. If there is a downside to Koester's masterful addition to the plethora of valuable commentaries on Hebrews, it must be the fact that his work has made the painful conundrum of choosing one single good commentary on Hebrews even more difficult.

Radu Gheorghiţă
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

1 Peter Baker Exegetical Commentary of the New Testament. by Karen H. Jobes. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2005, 364 pp., $39.99

The Baker Exegetical Commentary of the New Testament (BECNT) seeks to provide "commentaries that blend scholarly depth with readability, exegetical detail with sensitivity to the whole, and attention to the critical problems with

theological awareness". Karen Jobes has faithfully executed the BECNT mission. In addition, she brings two fresh contributions to the study of 1 Peter by offering a new proposal for the sociohistorical background of the letter, and by providing a much needed objective criterion for discussing the quality of the Greek of 1 Peter.

With respect to the sociohistorical background of the letter, Jobes observes that most commentators simply assume that the original audience was native to Asia Minor and that their conversion was *in situ*. Jobes questions the validity of this assumption by asking how there could be so many conversions over an area of about 129,000 square miles when there is no historical evidence of evangelistic efforts in most of the regions mentioned in 1 Peter 1.1. As an alternative, Jobes proposes that the Christians of 1 Peter previously lived in Rome during the time of Claudius' reign (early 40s). It was in Rome where they were converted and where they first had contact with Peter. They were later exiled to Asia Minor because of the disturbances between Jews and Christians regarding Jesus. Jobes corroborates her proposal by integrating three seemingly independent datum: (a) Claudius intensely colonized all five of the provinces of Asia Minor mentioned in 1 Peter 1.1; (b) it was not uncommon for emperors to colonize new territories with groups viewed as troublemakers in Rome; (c) various traditions put Peter in Rome in the early 40s. As a result, Jobes takes a similar line as John Elliott, arguing that the recipients of 1 Peter were literal foreigners (parepi/dhmoi) and resident aliens (pa/roikoi) whose literal experience served as a spiritual metaphor for Christians everywhere who were culturally alienated because they were Christians.

The primary weakness of this proposal is its silence with respect to one key testimony from the internal evidence. 1 Peter consistently presupposes that the recipients of the letter were at one time participating members of the very society that now ostracizes them, and that it was their conversion to Christianity, their new 'way of life' (a0nastrofh/) that was responsible for their changed social status amongst their compeers (see esp. 1 Peter 4.2-3). Nevertheless, Jobes' insightful research into Claudius' colonization program in Asia Minor could be combined with an investigation of the rapidly growing influence of imperial theology and emperor worship in Asia Minor to shed new light on the nature of suffering in 1 Peter.

Jobes' second fresh contribution addresses the issue of authorship. Most who deny Petrine authorship do so on the foundation that the Greek of the epistle is simply too good for an uneducated fisherman from Palestine. Using quantitative analysis, Jobes compares the Greek syntax of 1 Peter with writings from native and non-native Greek speakers. The primary conclusion of this comparative study is that Semitic interference is clearly present in 1 Peter. Additionally, her objective examination of the Greek syntax calls into question the rather subjective claim that 1 Peter's Greek is of high quality. While her contribution cannot prove Peter was the author, it does show that whoever wrote it spoke Greek as a second language. No one arguing for non-Petrine authorship of 1 Peter can afford to ignore this important study.

Jobes' fresh contributions do not end with introductory matters. Her familiarity with the Septuagint makes her approach unique among 1 Peter

commentators and the reader benefits from the many times she roots Peter's words to the Septuagint context to which they allude. One example of this can be seen in her analysis of the milk metaphor in 1 Peter 2.2. While almost every 1 Peter commentator understands the pure milk as a reference to the word of God, Jobes' intimacy with the Septuagint has led her to argue convincingly that the pure milk refers rather to God. Picking up on the allusion to Psalm 34 (33 LXX) in the succeeding verse, "if you indeed have tasted that the Lord is good," she hears the milk metaphor within the greater context of the psalm that speaks of hoping and taking refuge in God in times of anxiety, persecution, affliction and want. Thus, the word preached (1 Peter 1.25), has given 1 Peter recipients the initial taste of the Lord. In exhorting his readers to crave the pure milk, Peter is urging them that their logical (logiko/n) response to tasting the Lord's goodness is to seek Him all the more for spiritual nourishment.

Readers who come to 1 Peter with an eye to exploring the relationship between Christianity and culture will be rewarded. Throughout her commentary, Jobes details Peter's nuanced understanding of the church's role of accommodating, rejecting, subverting and transforming culture. Of particular note is her examination of the household codes of 2.18-3.7 in the light of first century Graeco-Roman values.

Jobes is to be commended for writing a commentary that meets the needs of the pastor preparing a sermon or Bible study and which at the same time warrants the attention of the academy. Though not as technical as the 1 Peter commentaries from Anchor Bible and Hermeneia, Jobes' 1 Peter can and should be mentioned in the same breath with John Elliott, Paul Achtemeier, Leonhard Goppelt and Ramsey Michaels.

Kelly David Liebengood
Seminario ESEPA, San José, Costa Rica

First Steps in Egyptian. By E. A. Wallis Budge. London: Kegan Paul, 2004, 321 pp., $85.00. Hardcover.

First Steps in Egyptian was originally published in 1895 when the study of Egyptian Hieroglyphs was still experiencing rapid development. With the aid of the Rosetta stone, Jean Champollion's made the first breakthrough in decipherment 73 years earlier in 1822, and from that point on an entire discipline was born. Among the early twentieth century Egyptologists, Budge and Breasted may be the best known—the former because of the voluminous output of his popular publications. But, even during his own lifetime, Budge was understood as lagging behind German and French scholarship, to the point that his grammatical and lexical efforts were deficient by the measurements of his day.

The distance between Budge's age and ours makes these deficiencies more acute. For example, a renovation in Egyptology occurring near the end of Budge's life was codified in Gardiner's *Egyptian Grammar* (Oxford University Press, 1957). And, recent achievements are refining the discipline still further.

James Allen's textbook, *Middle Egyptian* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), is fast becoming a modern classic that offers corrections to Gardiner's verbal system. Allen's book is to be much preferred as an introductory grammar over and against anything produced by Budge.

Despite the continual advances in Egyptian grammar, many of Budge's antiquated works remain in print—largely due to the fact that they are out of copyright. Dover Books has a paperback version of *First Steps in Egyptian* priced far more reasonably than the Kegan Paul production—perhaps reflecting the diminishing value of Budge. The $85.00 price-tag of this Kegan Paul version is a little perplexing, especially as free and legal electronic copies of his books are periodically showing up on the Internet.

First Steps should primarily be purchased as an Egyptian reader, as the bulk of the book is devoted to interlinear versions of 31 ancient texts (79-274). The first and smaller section of the book presents a rudimentary sign list, grammar, and dictionary. After comparing a few of the definitions to R. Faulkner's *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian* (Oxford University Press, 1962), I was satisfied to abandon Budge's dictionary as unreliable. In fact, pages 1-79 should be used only lightly—as the grammar and sign list are now obviously outdated.

Budge was known for his comparative and Biblical research. He properly sought to identify the linguistic ties between Egyptian and Hebrew as Egyptian is both an Asiatic and African language. A point of Semitic contact is seen in the Egyptian use of the *–t* ending to demarcate feminine nouns. But care is needed when reading Budge's Semitic identifications. In one instance he posits that the Egyptian *p* is a picture of a door and related to the Hebrew word *to open*. However, the *p* is a stool, or a mat, not a door, thus rendering a Hebrew connection as conjecture. In his ubiquitous two volume lexicon, *An Egyptian Hieroglyphic Dictionary* (Dover Publications, 1978), Budge similarly identifies a great number of Hebrew and Egyptian synchronizations. There are links between the two languages, but the safer and more careful scientific handling of the subject is found in Y. Muchiki's, *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic* (Scholar's Press, 1999).

To complicate matters, Budge used a unique transliteration system—one not employed in any significant manner outside of his own publications. For this reason alone, *First Steps in Egyptian* would not be the right place for someone to learn the Egyptian signs and mappings. One needs to memorize nearly 150 signs to get started in translating Egyptian—an investment that will cause anyone to want the most exact lists possible. Besides having a non-standard system of transliteration, there are deficiencies in the sign list—the least being glyphs that are assigned one value where two are possible. However, despite any negative impact this might have on the interlinear, the issue is moot when the reader makes his or her own transliterations based on Gardiner or Allen.

More problematic are several discrepancies in the Egyptian texts. Authoritative transcriptions are not preserved in *First Steps*. In "The Destruction of Mankind" (218) Budge substituted the sign for "Egyptians, mankind" for another just to supply the determinative. Other examples are more egregious.

Regardless of these shortcomings, *First Steps* is a one of a kind attempt at collecting and printing original Egyptian writings. It includes texts that will be

of great interest for Biblical studies. The speech of Amen-Ra to Thutmose (156) is a primary source for seeing how king, priest and image work in the Egyptian context. The record of the Battle of Megiddo (141) is relevant for understanding warfare, vassal states and Egyptian hegemony in Canaan. The "Destruction of Mankind" (218) is an Egyptian account of the destruction of humanity, a kind of parallel to Noah's flood. The "Hymn to Ra" (235) is an oft cited parallel to the Hebrew way of speaking of Yahweh in Psalm 104. The "Legend of the Seven Years' Famine" in Egypt (261) evokes comparisons to the Joseph story.

In Acts 7:22, Stephen recalls how Moses "was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." Studying original Egyptian texts will enhance one's understanding of Moses, the writings he left us, and the Egyptian born Hebrews who were led out of captivity. Budge can still direct someone along *First Steps* into an ancient culture that was the matrix of theocratic Israel—he is the one who introduced many of us to the fruitful field of Egyptology.

Stephen S. Rives
Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

Reconstructing Pastoral Theology: A Christological Foundation. By Andrew Purves. Louisville: Westminster-John Knox Publishing, 2004, 288 pp., paperback, $29.99.

Andrew Purves holds the Hugh Thomson Kerr Chair in Pastoral Theology at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary. The author is an ordained minister with the Presbyterian Church USA. Purves received his Ph.D. degree from the University of Edinburgh. He earned a Th.M. from Duke Divinity School. Previous publications from Dr. Purves include *Pastoral Theology in the Classical Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster-John Knox Publishing, 2001), *Union in Christ* (Louisville: Witherspoon Press, 1999) co-authored with Mark Achtemeier, and "The Trinitarian Basis of a Christian Practical Theology" in *The International Journal of Practical Theology* (http:www.pts.edu/purvesa.html; accessed January 19, 2006).

In *Reconstructing Pastoral Theology*, the author presents a new model for pastoral theology in response to the clinically-based standard of the last eighty years. As noted by Purves, Seward Hiltner was the first to develop a practical theology by combining logic-centered and operative-centered models. The lamentable result has been an utterly secularized pastoral theology that is primarily psychological rather than theological; that tends towards clinical psychotherapy instead of spirituality; and that emphasizes human ingenuity as opposed to the work of God through Jesus Christ.

Dismissing the bifurcation between logic-centered and operative-centered practical theology, Purves presents a pastoral dogmatic (pastoral theology extending from classical doctrine) that offers a gospel-centered pastoral theology. The foundation for pastoral ministry is to be found in the union in Christ that is true of every believer confessing Christ as Lord. In particular, the author concentrates on the doctrine of the *homoousion* (Christ is of the same

substance as the Father, Nicene Creed, A.D. 325) and on the hypostatic union (divine and human attributes of Jesus Christ). By making Christology the center of his pastoral dogmatic, the author attempts to produce a model of pastoral care whose focus is the gospel.

In Christian history, the doctrine of the *homoousion* is the basis of Christ's divinity. All of the divine attributes of God the Father pertain to the Son as well in a communion shared with the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, by way of the *homoousion*, believers share in the Trinitarian communion because of the hypostatic union of Christ's divine and human natures.

In other words, Jesus Christ becomes the Second Adam in his human side, enabling him to be our high priest. Yet Christ's priestly function operates not only in behalf of God towards humanity but also of humanity towards God. All believers' confessions, petitions, and acts of worship are translated into Jesus Christ's perfect offering before the Father. Furthermore, the fact that believers are one in Christ and Christ is one with the Father means that the Church shares in the fellowship of the Godhead. As Purves writes,

> The position for which I argue is this: first, Jesus Christ is himself both God's saving Word of address to humankind, and the human response of hearing and receiving that Word and acting in perfect obedience toward God...This dynamic twofold nature of Christ's ministry is the heuristic truth embedded within the doctrine of the hypostatic union, in which Jesus Christ is understood to be wholly God and wholly human in the union of his one personhood (45).

The first section of *Reconstructing Pastoral Theology* elucidates the theological implications of a robust Christological-focused pastoral theology. After defending the role of doctrine in pastoral care, Purves highlights why pastoral ministry is primarily the work of God through believers. Then the author unpacks the implications of Christ's priestly ministry. A discussion of the doctrine of the union of Christ follows. The doctrine of the royal priesthood is then explained, with a chapter on the eschatological implications of a Christological-focused pastoral theology concluding the first section.

The second section on ministry in union with Christ unfolds the practical implications of Purves' pastoral theology. The author examines four ministries: the Word of God, the Grace of God, God's Presence, and His reign. Each is grounded in the author's understanding of the believer's union with Christ, implying that pastoral ministry is primarily the work of Jesus Christ and that the activity of the minister is derivative of that union.

The author deserves commendation for his efforts in rebuilding pastoral theology in a modern context. His shift away from a clinical to a dogmatic focus is a move in the right direction for pastoral theology. Furthermore, an orthodox Christology should be the locus of pastoral theology. Both emphases contribute to a richer pastoral theology that emphasizes the gospel.

Yet in other ways, Purves compromises the gospel message. He presents a pastoral theology that attempts a hypostatic union of its own. On one side, Purves strives to develop a pastoral theology that is ecumenical and that

acknowledges the paleo-orthodoxy of Thomas Oden by referring to church fathers such as Gregory of Nazianzus and Athanasius (primarily in his section covering the *homoousion*). The other side is the one with difficulty. It reveals the Neo-Orthodox tendencies of the author, who was influenced by Thomas F. Torrance during his doctoral studies at the University of Edinburgh.

The problem with the Neo-Orthodox emphasis in Purves is its latent christocentrism. Karl Barth (Neo-Orthodoxy's founder) shunned the immanentist theology of Schleiermacher and presented a theology so emphatic on the transcendence of God (through our union in Christ) that there is little attention given to creation. Ironically, Purves wishes to reconstruct a practical theology that is anything but practical—one that focuses on the Word of God who is behind the written Word, to its own detriment.

Furthermore, his devotion to Thomas F. Torrance results in a fatal rejection of the substitutionary atonement, replacing it with the vicarious atonement theory of John McLeod Campbell. Despite the author's attempts at church renewal and a classical emphasis on pastoral theology, this denial of a central tenet of the faith once delivered unto the saints compromises his work. This portion of Purves' pastoral theology requires revision.

The reviewer recommends *Reconstructing Pastoral Theology* with certain caveats. First, acknowledge the Neo-Orthodoxy within Purves' theology. Second, understand that Purves denies substitutionary atonement. Finally, accept that what is presented should be recognized as only a first step in reclaiming pastoral theology to its doctrinal foundations.

S. Trevor Yoakum
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Book Review Index

List of Publishers

Baker Book House, P.O. Box 6287, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49516, (800) 877-2665

Broadman & Holman Publishers, 127 Ninth Avenue North, MSN 114, Nashville, Tennessee 37234, (800) 448-8032

Doubleday Books, Random House, Inc., 1745 Broadway, New York, New York, 10019, (212) 782-9000

Equinox Publishing Ltd., Unit Six, The Village, 101 Amies Street, London SW11 2 JW, United Kingdom, (44) 20 7350 2836

Hendrickson, P. O. Box 3473, Peabody, Massachusetts 01961-3473, (800) 358-3111

Kegan Paul, P. O. Box 256, London WC1B 3SW, United Kingdom, (44) 20 7436 0899

Westminster John Knox Press, Presbyterian Publishing Corporation, 100 Witherspoon Street, Louisville, Kentucky 40204, (800) 227-2872

Books Received

Allen, Blaine. *When People Throw Stones.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2005, 176 pp., paper.

Allen, Ronald J. *Preaching: An Essential Guide*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2002, 135 pp., $16.00 paper.

Anderson, Kenton C. *Preaching with Integrity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2003, 144 pp., $10.99 paper.

Anthony, Michael and Warren Benson. *Exploring the History and Philosophy of Christian Education*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2003, 443 pp., $22.99 paper.

Anthony, Michael J. et al. *Management Essentials for Christian Ministries.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2005, 400 pp., $39.99 hardcover.

Bailey, Richard A. and Gregory A. Wills. *The Salvation of Souls (Nine Previously Unpublished Sermons on the Call of Ministry and the Gospel by Jonathan Edwards)*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2003, 176 pp., $19.99 hardcover.

Bauckham, Richard. *Bible & Mission.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004, 128 pp., $13.99 paper.

Benson, Clarence H. *Biblical Faith (Doctrines Every Christian Should Know)*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2003, 112 pp., $10.99 paper.

Birkitt, James N. *Birkitt's Bible Concept Search.* Glen Allen, VA: Biblical Research Center, $139.95 CD.

Blackaby, Henry Notes by. *Experiencing the Word New Testament.* Nashville, TN: Holman Bible, 2001, 640 pp., $17.99 paper.

Boa, Kenneth. *Augustine to Freud.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2004, 288 pp. $14.99 paper.

Borchert, Gerald L. *The New American Commentary (John 12-21).* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2002, 398 pp., $29.99 hardcover.

Brand, Chad Owen, et al. *Perspectives on Church Government.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2004, 368 pp., $17.99 paper.

Caner, Ergun and Emir Caner, eds. *The Sacred Desk: Sermons of the Southern Baptist Convention Presidents.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2004, 358 pp., $29.99 hardcover.

Clark, David K. *To Know and Love God.* Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2003, 540 pp., $35.00 paper.

Cooper, Anna. ed. *Ishmael My Brother: A Christian Introduction to Islam.* Grand Rapids, MI: Monarch, 2004, 352 pp., $13.99 paper.

Dayringer, Richard et al. *The Image of God and the Psychology of Religion.* Binghampton, NY: The Haworth Press, Inc. , 2004, 120 pp., $14.95 paper.

De Gruchy, John W. et al. *The Church Struggle in South Africa.* Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 304 pp., $20.00, paper.

Dockery, David S. and Gregory Alan Thornbury. *Shaping a Christian Worldview.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2002, 206 pp., $12.99 paper.

Draper, James T. Jr., ed. *Preaching with Passion: Sermons form the Heart of the Southern Baptist Convention.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2004, 629 pp., $24.99 hardcover.

Dunn, James D. G. *A New Perspective on Jesus.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005, 136 pp., $12.99 paper.

Easley, Kendell H. *Holman Quick Source Guide to Understanding the Bible.* Nashville, TN: Holman Bible, 2002, 405 pp., $19.99 paper.

Erickson, Millard J. et. al. *Reclaiming the Center.* Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2004, 416 pp., $20.00 paper.

Esler, Philip F. *New Testament Theology.* Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2005, 366 pp., $40.00 hardcover.

Feinberg, John S. *The Many Faces of Evil.* Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2004, 544 pp., $35.00 paper.

Fox, Brian. *The Seed.* Gardena, CA: Gloryhouse Publishing, 2005, 212 pp., $14.00 paper.

Habermas, Gary R. *The Risen Jesus & Future Hope.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003, 239 pp., $24.95 paper.

Hall, Douglas John. *Bound and Free.* Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2005, 168 pp., $17.00 paper.

Harvey, L. James. *701 Sentence Sermons.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2005, 152 pp., $10.99 paper.

Heimbach, Daniel R. *True Sexual Morality.* Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2004, 448 pp., $25.00 paper.

Hemphill, Ken. *Empowering Kingdom Growth: The Heartbeat of God.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2004, 308 pp., $19.99 hardcover.

Hernando, James D. *Dictionary of Hermeneutics.* Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2005, pp., $29.95 hardcover.

Hodges, Andrew. *Jesus: An Interview Across Time.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2003, 385 pp., $16.99 paper.

Holman, Maps by. *Atlas Biblico Conciso Holman.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2000, 47 pp., $7.99 paper.

Holman. *Yeso Est'a Enla Biblia?* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2002, 563 pp., paper.

Holman Christian Standard Bible. *New Testament with Psalms & Proverbs-Ultratrim.* Nashville, TN: Holman Bible, 2002, 684 pp., $5.99 paper.

Holman Christian Standard Bible. *Share Jesus Without Fear (TruthQuest Student Evangelism New Testament).* Nashville, TN: Holman Bible, 2001, 464 pp., $12.99 bonded leather.

Holman Christian Standard Bible. *The Gift (the New Testament for New Believers with Psalms & Proverbs).* Nashville, TN: Holman Bible, 2002, 592 pp., $9.99 paper.

House, Wayne H. *Charts on Open Theism and Orthodoxy.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2003, 139 pp., $19.99 paper.

Howard, Jeanette. *Into the Promised Land.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2005, 208 pp., $12.99 paper.

International Bible Society. *Walking With Jesus New Testament.* Colorado Springs, CO: International Bible Society, 2002, 373 pp., paper.

Ironside, H. A. *Daniel.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2005, 144 pp., $18.99 paper.

Kostenberger, Andreas J. *God, Marriage and Family.* Wheaton, IL: CrosswayBooks/Good News, 2004, 448 pp., $20.00 paper.

Kostenberger, Andreas J. *Women in the Church.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005, 288 pp., $21.99 paper.

Maalouf, Tony. *Arabs in the Shadow of Israel.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2003, 367 pp., $14.99 paper.

McKenzie, Alyce. *Preaching Biblical Wisdom in a Self-Help Society.* Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2002, 255 pp., $22.00 paper.

Morgan, Christopher W. ed. et. al. *Hell Under Fire*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004, 256 pp., $19.99 hardcover.

Moyer, R. Larry. *21 Things God Never Said.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 176 pp., $10.99 paper.

Moynagh, Michael. *emergingchurch.intro.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 256pp., $13.99 paper.

O'Mathuna, Donal P., et.al. *Basic Questions on Healthcare.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2004, 112 pp., $5.99 paper.

Parry, Robin A. and Christopher H. Partridge, eds. *Universal Salvation? The Current Debate.* Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004, 319 pp., $27.00 paper.

Patterson, Dorothy Kelley. *A Handbook for Ministers' Wives.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2002, 244 pp., $16.99 hardcover.

Perry, John. *Walking God's Path: The Life and Ministry of Jimmy Draper.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2004, 256 pp., $19.99 hardcover.

Phillips, John. *Exploring I & II Thessalonians.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2005, 240 pp., $21.99 hardcover.

Piper, John. *Brothers, We Are Not Professionals.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2002, 286 pp., $14.99 paper.

Poythress, Vern S. et al. *The Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2004, 528 pp., $24.99 paper.

Reid, Alvin L.. *Raising the Bar: Ministry to Youth in the New Millennium.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2004, 412 pp., $29.99 hardcover.

Robertson, A. T. *Word Pictures of the New Testament: Volume One.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2004, 412 pp., $29.99 hardcover.

Rogers, Rex M. *Gambling: Don't Bet on It.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2005, 224 pp., $12.99 paper.

Ryken, Leland. *The Word of God in English.* Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books/Good News, 2003, 336 pp., $15.99 paper.

Schapiro, S. A. *The Holocaust.* Milwaukee, WI: New Millennium Publishing Co., 2002, 201 pp., $20.95 paper.

Smith, Mark. *The Memoirs of God*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2004, 208 pp., $21.00 paper.

Tanner, Kathryn. *Economy of Grace.* Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2005, 172 pp., $16.00 paper.

Thomas, Robert L. Ed. *Three Views on the Origins of the Synoptic Gospels.*Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic & Professional, 2002, 400 pp., $18.99 paper.

Toussaint, Stanley D. *Behold the King.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2005, 400 pp., $19.99 paper.

Vaughan, Curtis and Thomas Lea. *Founders Study Guide Commentary (I Corinthians).* Cape Coral, FL: Founders, 2002, 176 pp., paper.

Ware, Bruce A. *Father, Son & Holy Spirit.* Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2005, 160 pp., $14.99 paper.

Ware, Bruce A. *God's Greater Glory.* Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books/Good News, 2002, 240 pp., $17.99 paper.

Welch, Robert H. *Church Administration.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2005, 400 pp., $34.99 hardcover.

Wells, C. Richard and A. Boyd Luter. *Inspired Preaching.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2002, 240 pp., $19.99 paper.

Wiencek, Henry. *An Imperfect God.* New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003, 416 pp., $26.00 hardcover.

Wilson, Stephen G. *Leaving the Fold*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2004, 176 pp. , $25.00 hardcover.

Wise, Kurt P. *Faith, Form, and Time.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2002, 287 pp., $14.99 paper.

Midwestern Journal of Theology
Subscription Form

Name____

Address____

____

City______________State___________Zip_______Country______

Phone (   )________________E-mail________________________

____One year—$20   ____Two years—$35   ____Three years—$50

____Please find payment enclosed.

____Please add me to your general mailing list.

Please send my friend a subscription (payment enclosed):

Name____

Address____

City______________State___________Zip_______Country______

_ _

Clip and mail to: Editor, *Midwestern Journal of Theology*,
MBTS, 5001 N. Oak Trafficway, KC, MO, 64118

The faculty of Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
invites you to subscribe to the
Midwestern Journal of Theology,
a scholarly journal written to assist Christians and churches
in making disciples throughout the world.

Published biannually, each issue includes exegetical and theological articles, inspirational sermons, and reviews of recent important books.

Please visit the MBTS website at www.mbts.edu