

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship (TSF) Bulletin (US)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin-us.php

TSE BULLETIN

MAY-JUNE 1987
VOL. 10, NO. 5
\$4.50

| | |
|--|----|
| Introducing This Issue <i>Vernon Grounds</i> | 3 |
| Singing With The Fundamentalists <i>Annie Dillard</i> | 4 |
| American Evangelicalism: Quo Vadis? <i>Vernon Grounds</i> | 7 |
| From Truth to Authority to Responsibility: The Shifting Focus of Evangelical Hermeneutics, 1915-1986 (Part II) <i>Douglas Jacobsen</i> | 10 |
| The Theology of Acts <i>F.F. Bruce</i> | 15 |
| Bibliography on Aging for Pastors and Other Church Leaders <i>David O. Moberg</i> | 17 |
| Leadership '88 Conference | 20 |
| REVIEW ESSAYS: | |
| The Chronology of the Apostle Paul <i>James D.G. Dunn</i> | 21 |
| Reading the New Testament as a Canonical Text <i>Scot McKnight</i> | 22 |
| Childs Responds to McKnight | 24 |
| Taking Mennonite History Seriously <i>Dennis D. Martin</i> | 25 |
| Early Christians in the Roman Empire <i>Christopher Haas</i> | 27 |
| Book Reviews and Comments | 29 |
| Vol. 10 Index | 46 |

A Publication of
**THEOLOGICAL
STUDENT
FELLOWSHIP**

with them, listen to them, and release them into responsible ministries.

6) Several minority and urban Christian leaders have felt that current seminary training, based primarily on academic excellence, has failed to equip them as leaders. They felt ill-prepared to lead, unsure of their gifts, ignorant of the Bible and how to integrate it into life situations, and lacking in personal spiritual development.

7) It is important to affirm both intuitive and managerial leadership of institutions. Both the intuitive visionary who often begins a institution and the manager who wisely organizes work effectively need to be utilized effectively so that institutions can enjoy the fruits of both gifts.

Character & Inner Life

1) The definition of the inner life includes both the private internal life and the private relationships of the leader with his immediate family.

2) The development of a vital inner life includes a close walk with God, transparency in fraternal relationships, intimacy in one's personal family life, and accountability with another individual or group.

3) Honoring the biblical teaching of the Sabbath rest is an important factor in maintaining intimacy with God, with one's family, as well as personal wholeness.

4) Emerging Christian leaders may need to acquire a new sense of the authority of God, particularly because so many

leaders in the 30-40 year old age group are an unfathered generation who need authoritative figures to father them (not dominate them).

5) Personal involvement in evangelism and sharing the love of Christ with a non-believer can be an important component in renewing and maintaining our spiritual vitality.

6) Our highest calling is not to be fruitful in ministry, but to love God and to enter into intimate relationship with Him.

7) Spiritual maturity is not instantly achieved and walking with God involves "practicing" the development of spiritual character.

Final Comment

The approach of the twenty first century promises to be as exciting as any time since the prophecy concerning the outpouring of the Spirit of God on all people began to be fulfilled at Pentecost. The great need is for an inter-generational, sex-inclusive, intercultural gift of supernatural power, a new Pentecost, through which all the peoples of the earth can have an opportunity to call on the name of the Lord and thereby be saved. We praise the Lord for all that has been done in decades past, but acknowledge with repentance the Church we have condoned and the society we have allowed. Together, young and old, women and men, we seek to humble ourselves as leaders to dream God's dream for His Church of the 21st century. We commend a new generation to the Lord of the greatest harvest which the Church has ever seen.

REVIEW ESSAYS

The Chronology of the Apostle Paul

by James J.G. Dunn

Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology
by G. Luedemann (Fortress, 1984, 311 pp., \$29.95).

This is the English translation of *Paulus, der Heidenapostel Vol. 1*, published by Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, in 1980. Some footnotes have been dropped, but bibliographical references have been updated and some minor adjustments have been made to the text. A six page Postscript lists and responds to some thirteen reviews. So this is in effect a second edition.

It is the first of a projected trilogy on Paul, the second part having already been published by Vandenhoeck under the subtitle *Antipaulismus im frühen Christentum* (1983). For understandable reasons Luedemann feels it desirable to reach a conclusion regarding the chronology relation and interval between Paul's letters, before embarking on an interpretation of his role and theology, since only within a soundly based chronological framework can we resolve such questions as whether there was enough time for Paul to change or modify his views on any subject.

Luedemann starts from the observation that most attempts to reconstruct Pauline

chronology have fallen into the trap of attempting in one degree or other to harmonize the chronology of Acts with information gleaned from Paul's letters. A sequence of critical observations, including particularly "contradictions between Luke's chronological information and data from world history" and "the redactional nature of Luke's chronological references," provides "a decisive critique of the use of Acts in such a direct or immediate manner. And thus the way is opened for Luedemann to put forward his primary thesis: that Paul's own witness in his letters must have absolute priority in determining Pauline chronology—"a chronology obtained solely on the basis of the letters" becomes a *leitmotif* running through the whole.

In chapter 2 Luedemann turns first to Gal. 1:6-2:14 as "the central pillar for a chronology of Paul." A form (or rhetorical) critical analysis along the lines of H.D. Betz opens up the possibility that Paul could have abandoned a chronological order in this section. Some detailed exegesis, particularly of Gal. 2:7-9, leads to the conclusion that prior to the Jerusalem conference Paul had already been engaged in an *independent* Gentile mission, Galatia included, with the Antioch incident (Gal. 2:11ff.) also probably falling before the conference. Gal. 2:10 then becomes the jumping-off point for the second major thesis: that the collection agreed in Gal. 2:10

provides a firm criterion of dating, since all references to the collection (1 Cor. 16:1ff, 2 Cor. 8-9, Rom. 15:26) must point back to Gal. 2:10.

The Corinthian and Roman letters and the mission they speak of must therefore fall after the Jerusalem conference and imply a 3-4 year period devoted to organizing the collection. Galatians itself implies the collection had already made some progress, but subsequent silence regarding Galatia must mean that in the interval it had been overthrown in Galatia. Moreover, the absence of any mention of the collection in 1 Thess. and in the founding visits to the Philippian and Corinthian churches implies that Paul's initial visit to these churches must have taken place *before* the Jerusalem conference. That is to say, Paul probably missionized (*sic*) Greece at an early stage in his Gentile mission in the 14 year period between his first and second visit to Jerusalem.

In chapter 3 critical analysis of the Acts traditions leads to the key conclusion that Acts 18:22 was Paul's *second* visit to Jerusalem, with 11:27ff. and 15:1ff. deriving from Luke's redaction (the conference of Acts 15 legitimizing Paul's subsequent world-wide mission), and that Acts 18:1-17 combines reports of two different periods in Corinth, the second related to the Gallio episode and the first to the 41 AD expulsion of the Jews from Rome. These results provide "surprising con-

James D.G. Dunn is a Professor of Divinity at the University of Durham in England.

firmation of the chronology developed solely on the basis of the letters."

The last main chapter analyzes Paul's eschatological statements in 1 Thess. 4:13-18 and 1 Cor. 15:51-52. The former considers the death of Christians before the parousia a rare exception; the latter conversely envisages the proportion of dead Christians as outweighing that of living Christians as the parousia. The likelihood is thus strengthened that 1 Thess. was written early, about 41, well before 1 Cor. (some 8 or 11 years later).

There are full notes, a concluding chronological chart, an extensive bibliography and indices of authors and passages.

This is a thesis—a *tour de force* in order to establish and defend a particular hypothesis. It is not a dispassionate review of alternative chronological schemes with a tentative resolution appended at the end. As such it is an excellent example of the genre. Those not prepared for full-blooded argument should look elsewhere. The clarity and tenacity of the argument make it easy to follow and a pleasure to read.

It must also be said that the two primary assertions must be given considerable weight. It is wholly right as a methodological principle to attempt to make sense of Paul on his terms *before* looking to Acts, lest we miss some of the Pauline distinctives by superimposing the relative blandness of the Acts' Paul on them. And the collection was undoubtedly of great importance for Paul (even though we would never know it from Acts) and does provide something of a key to the chronological relationships of at least some of the letters.

That being said, however, I find myself far from convinced by a good number of Luedemann's conclusions.

1. For all that he recognizes the central importance of Gal. 1:6-2:14 his exegesis of it is surprisingly selective. He has ignored the point already made by B. Holmberg, *Paul and Power*, Con. Bib., Gleerup: Lund, 1978 (and

developed by myself—*NTS* 28, 1982, 461-78) that this passage cannot be understood without taking account of the tension within it between acknowledging Jerusalem's authority up to the Jerusalem conference, but had since then distanced himself much more clearly from Jerusalem. In particular, the suggestion that Paul discussed his gospel with Peter on his first visit to Jerusalem pays no attention to the dispute over *historèsai Kèphan* and runs counter to the clear implication of Gal. 2:2. And the argument that Gal. 2:9 reads as if it was an undoing of church relations in already existing mixed congregations (p. 73) is highly tendentious. Paul's own language in Gal. 1 and 2 is therefore at odds with one of the central assertions of Luedemann's reconstruction—viz. that Paul was already an independent and world-wide missionary before the Jerusalem conference.

2. If exegesis of Paul's own letters is, quite properly, to have the primary say in such questions, then we must not only take into account *all* that Paul said which is of relevance, but we must also recognize the *limits* of exegesis, the unavoidable ambiguity of Paul's language. Despite his carefulness, Luedemann, like his fellow chronologist Jewett, falls into the trap of pressing a particular plausible exegesis of one or two key texts into a firm datum from which he then draws wide ranging conclusions. Where the evidence does not quite fit his reconstruction he is willing to recognize exegetical ambiguity (as in pp. 135 n.185 and 180 n.48). Whereas, in order to substantiate his thesis, he has to insist that Phil. 4:15 cannot refer to the beginning of Paul's whole missionary endeavor—thus rendering the thesis of a Pauline mission in Greece *before* the Jerusalem conference "certain" (pp. 105, 199)!

3. It is clear that Gal. 2:10 must refer to the collection itself and must mean that thereafter the collection was such a dominant concern for Paul that he could not write to one of his congregations without mentioning

it. I think not. Galatians itself is an embarrassment on that score, since it says nothing about the collection in Galatia; Gal. 2:10 can hardly be ranked with the explicit instructions and exhortations of Rom. and Cor. Conversely, the failure of Rom. 15:26 to mention Galatia among those contributing to the collection is simply explained by the fact that Macedonia and Achaia were within Rome's horizon and so could serve as a powerful example to the Romans, whereas Galatia was a much more distant territory. But if treatment of the collection is not such a definitive characteristic of Paul's post-conference epistolary concern, another of Luedemann's central pillars is undermined.

4. Space permits only a brief mention of a few other points. (a) Does 1 Thess. 4 mean that only a short time had passed between the first Easter and Paul's initial visit to Thessalonica (p. 238), or that only a short time had elapsed between the initial visit and the letter? (b) The refusal to allow plausible speculation seeking to make sense of the Acts evidence as "historicizing" (e.g. pp. 159-60) is an unwelcome form of methodological fundamentalism. (c) On the Key issue of whether there was one expulsion of Jews from Rome (AD 41) or two (41 and 49), Luedemann's response to Hübner's criticism that Luedemann had failed to use E. Smallwood's *The Jews Under Roman Rule* is hardly to the point (p. 290). Hübner's point was that Smallwood's careful consideration of the evidence leads to the conclusion that there were *two* expulsions. Simply to note that he (Luedemann) had referred to Smallwood (but not to the passage in question!) hardly answers the point.

In short Luedemann's first volume shows all the strengths of a *tour de force*—but also the weaknesses. When a civil engineer is determined to push his road through along a certain line it is hardly surprising if he is unable to observe all the contours of the territory traversed.

Reading the New Testament as a Canonical Text

by Scot McKnight

The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction
by B. S. Childs (Fortress, 1985, 572 pp., \$22.95).

One could list only a handful of scholars in the world who would not only attempt to discuss the whole barrage of issues in both Testaments but who could also accomplish the feat. Professor Childs is a world-renowned scholar for his insightful analyses in Old Testament studies; this book will now earn him respect in the field of New Testament studies.

Scot McKnight is Instructor of Greek Exegesis at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.

In reading it I was humbled by the amazing grasp Childs has, not only of the literature pertaining to the NT, but also of the exegetical issues involved at each juncture.

Let me begin by stating what this *Introduction* is not. Childs has not written yet another standard introduction to the New Testament, merely to re-examine issues such as authorship, date, addressees, etc. Though Childs regularly raises one or more of these typical issues, his interest is of a different order and he offers for his readers a groundbreaking introduction to reading the NT *as a canonical text and the hermeneutical approach one must have if one takes the NT as canon*. In short, Childs is doing battle on the hermeneutical front, not the historical, proposing,

in contrast to the normal historicist approach, that the NT must be interpreted at the final layer if one is to discern the true role the Bible has in the life of the believing Church.

Each chapter functions, if I may use the label, as a sort of "pronouncement story": first, we have a salient description of the context of scholarship in both its conservative and liberal forms, usually unable to resolve its own difficulties created by its desire to find historical referentiality; secondly, Childs offers a *via media* which seeks to exploit the best of both worlds, a hermeneutical stance called "canonical exegesis." The last part of the chapter is usually a short, pithy section which functions as more than a casual reminder that the NT scholarly world needs to