

- 18 See Wright, pp.127-8.
 19 See Brueggemann, pp.5, 185.
 20 Brueggemann, p.53.
 21 Had not his father Omri bought the hill of Samaria? (1 Kings 16:24). Here was a tussle not only between luxury (an extension to the palace grounds) and livelihood, but between traditional society and a new commercialism.
 22 In a footnote Oswalt refers to Delitzsch, Cheyne, Jones and others who 'comment that the mixing of metaphors (as between possessing the land and being married to it) is much less of a problem for Hebrew poets than it is for us' (Oswalt, p.581n).
 23 Davies, p.31.
 24 According to C. J. H. Wright, the Deuteronomistic historians saw Israel as bound to the land, so that to lose it was to cease to be Israel in a theological sense. It was the insight of the Priestly mind that Israel remained the people of Yahweh wherever they found themselves (Wright, p.8). The landless Levites and Rechabites had ever been living reminders that the land was not everything – for God was Israel's true habitation (Jeremiah 50:7).
 25 See, for example, Ephesians 4:15-16; Colossians 2:19, and Steve Motyer, 'Israel in God's Plan', paper presented to the Evangelical Alliance consultation on the Holy Land, June 2003.
 26 As with the Isaiah 66 passage, these names seem to be 'a part standing for the whole'.
 27 Scott, p.526.
 28 Conzelmann, p.142.
 29 Williams, p.204.
 30 Wendland and Hachibamba, p.343.
 31 Morris, p.54.
 32 Conzelmann, p.61.
 33 Cullmann, p.191.
 34 Wink, p.28.
 35 Ferdinando, p.109.
 36 See Wright, p.111. For the land/world development, see also Romans 4:13. The theme of inheritance is developed in Romans 8:12-25, Galatians 3:27-29, 4:1-7.
 37 See the education section of the website of the Jewish Agency for Israel, www.jafi.org.il
- Bryan Evans works for TEAR Fund. His role prompted the present study and is the fruit of a research programme undertaken by him under the supervision of Sarum College, Salisbury. It is published with their permission.*

Individualism and the people of God

Tom Holland

KEYWORDS: salvation, corporate, Romans, baptism, burial, death of Christ, justified, Hellenism, typology, humanity, Exodus, 'old man', 'body of sin', community, synogogue, LXX, Jewishness, Reformation, Enlightenment

Excessive individualism is widely recognized to be a serious problem for evangelicalism. A contributory factor to this mind set is the method of reading the New Testament. The letters of the NT are traditionally understood as describing individual experience and morality. This paper explores the suggestion that as these letters are to the early churches, they do not speak primarily of individual Christian experience, but of the communities' experiences of God's saving activity and the churches' proper response to this saving event. It is argued therefore that the letters should be read in the light of the corporate dimension of their teaching and not until this is done should the personal/individual application be sought.

Paradigm Shifts

New Testament studies have gone through a number of paradigm shifts in the past two hundred years. The most recent one is the introduction of the Pseudepigraphal literature as a key tool for interpreting the New Testament text. Alongside this has been the discovery of the Jewishness of the NT writings. Prompted by these developments many changes have taken place in the way the apostolic writings are interpreted.

Of course, these changes are but the most recent in a series of methodological shifts that can be traced back to

the days of the apostolic church. I want to focus on these shifts and argue that they have led to a situation where the modern evangelical's understanding of the biblical texts is quite different from that of the early church. This faulty reading is shared by virtually the whole of Christendom.

With the recent discovery of the Jewishness of the NT documents, it might be thought that we have returned to a correct reading of the texts. It is the contention of this paper that major methodological work is, however, still to be done before we get close to reading or interpreting the texts in the way that the NT church did. It is also the contention of this paper that this difference in reading is one of the major reasons for the excessive emphasis on individualism that we find in evangelicalism. It is claimed that the discovery of the corporate reading, which the author claims is the apostolic method of reading and interpreting the NT texts would lead us back to a much more balanced and authoritative doctrine of Christian salvation.

A Word of Testimony

Forgive the following personal history, but I think it will help you to understand how my thinking and the framework of my argument have developed

I was a young pastor back in 1978. I had been out of theological college for six years and I wanted to get my teeth into Paul's letter to the Romans. There was one thing that held me back. I heard that the distinguished evangelical preacher Dr Martyn Lloyd Jones had said that he had waited until he understood Romans before he preached from it. I

had great respect for this man whom I had heard on a number of occasions. My admiration for him caused me to fall into the trap of living under his rubric. However, after six years into the pastorate I was getting frustrated. I had studied Romans in the Greek for my BD but did not feel that I understood what was going on. I finally came to accept that only by returning to the text and thrashing it out for myself, rather than being under the constraints of an exam system that demanded that you could recite the views of leading scholars, did I have any possibility of understanding the message Paul preached.

And so I began to preach through Romans on Sunday evenings in 1978. The first five chapters passed reasonably comfortably. After all, my method was simply studying what others had said about the text and trying to distill the insights recorded and make them accessible through my preaching to the congregation. There were no major disagreements or problems as far as I recall. But when I came into chapter six the prevailing peace shattered. It was not so much that the commentators were disagreeing among themselves, it was that I could not agree with them!

The first problem I had concerned Paul's description of baptism in the opening verses of the chapter. There was conflict among scholars over what Paul understood to happen in baptism. Did he see the Spirit being given in baptism or doing a work in baptism that united the one baptised with Christ? All of the possibilities that scholars suggested were familiar to me and I had formed my own view that reflected my Baptist background.

What I came to see was the way that Paul described the event. It was a baptism *into* death. Now, as I thought baptism was a picture of burial, it seemed that Paul was saying that we are buried (baptised) with Christ into death. A few moments of reflection will tell you that this is an abhorrent picture. Of all the burials I have performed, I hope that no one was being buried into death. Burial is the consequence of death, not the means of achieving it. I will come back to this point shortly.

The second point that caused me concern was already well known to me. I had struggled with it long before doing my degree studies and I still continued to struggle with it over six years later. What did Paul mean when he said 'For we know that our old self was crucified with him so that the body of sin might be done away with, that we should no longer be slaves to sin – because any one who has died has been freed from sin' (Rom. 6.6-7)?

Two Problems

The passage caused me two problems. Firstly, the understanding of the 'body of sin' presented in the commentaries left me with the distinct impression that the writers did not really know what this meant. Aware that Paul was a Jew, they were desperate to pull their interpretations back from the dualism that their explanations inevitably led to. Many of the commentators spent several pages telling the reader that the term was not saying that the body is in anyway sinful, even though that seemed to be the inevitable logic of their explanations.

The second problem I had was the cavalier way in which

the commentators all amended the text of verse 7. The original text says 'anyone who has died has been justified (*dedikaiōtai*) from sin'. Almost all translators agreed that Paul did not intend to say 'justified' but 'freed'. The reason why virtually everyone agreed with abandoning the Greek was that it was widely accepted that Paul began with the doctrine of justification and that out of this reality all other blessings and experiences flowed. By saying 'anyone who has died has been *justified* from sin' it seemed that Paul had gone against his own great gospel defining doctrine and had stated that death with Christ was the foundation of justification. In other words, experience became the grounds of justification. It is not my intention to engage with recent debates on the doctrine of justification, (I have done this elsewhere with different conclusions from those being argued for in the modern debate). My own conclusions are rooted in the methodology that I am arguing for in this paper.

I had a view of scripture that meant that I had to adhere to the clear meaning of the text. The fact is that *dedikaiōtai* is used by Paul on 15 other occasions. Not once was it suggested that the meaning in these texts was anything other than justified. There was no textual evidence to justify such a reading. This was a difficult conclusion to come to because it challenged the agreement reached by most translations and commentators from a wide range of theological traditions.

A growing concern

I became deeply concerned at the way scholars attempted to accommodate the Greek text. I could not understand how the clear lexicographical meaning of the text could be so readily abandoned. This concern caused me to pursue an examination of the issues surrounding the hermeneutics of Paul's theology for the following 27 years that has led me from prolonged personal study then onto doctoral and post doctoral studies. My conviction has grown increasingly that at the heart of our reading strategy is a major methodological flaw that hides much of the richness of the original arguments that were being made. The heart of this problem is that we have been taught to read Paul as though he was a Jew heavily influenced by Hellenism. One consequence of this flaw is an overemphasis being placed on individual Christian experience resulting in a dilution of the corporate arguments within the texts with a consequent loss of the scope of the NT doctrine of the church.

In the remainder of the article I shall seek to show how a corporate reading of Romans 6 illuminates truth and resolves the problems previously highlighted.

Pauline Typology

Firstly, on 'baptism' in Romans 6.1-4. I came to see that typology is crucial for Paul. All the explanations I was reading were not typologically-based but symbolically or mystically based. That typology should control the exegesis seems to me reasonable in the light of the fact that the whole of chapter five depends on a typological reading of the text to make any sense. There needs to be good reason(s) for abandoning this method of exegesis, especially when we recall

that the chapter divisions in Paul's letter never existed. In 1 Corinthians 10.1-4 Paul speaks of the Corinthians having been baptised into Christ, and the exegesis there is clearly typological. As the Jews were baptised into Moses so you have been baptised into Christ, says Paul. The type was nothing to do with water baptism and it was not baptism as a confession of faith. It was the historic salvation event when the entire Jewish community, of all generations, were united with Moses so making him Israel's legal representative and her mediator before God. This, I would suggest, is what Paul is saying in Romans 6. He is explaining how this new humanity, this new man, has been brought into existence. Paul has just argued that the whole of humanity is united in Adam. This union enslaves mankind in the kingdom of darkness.

That the Exodus image/type is present is supported by the very vocabulary of the opening verses. Power and glory are key words of the Exodus. It was in Israel's deliverance from the power of Pharaoh that Yahweh supremely revealed his power and displayed his glory. Then he created the nation of Israel under the headship of Moses when Israel was baptized into her head. Of course, the whole event was a corporate experience for the entire nation.

Just as when God rescued Israel and created a new covenant community through her baptism into Moses, so the eschatological new covenant community has been brought into existence through its baptism into Christ. Christ's death was about bringing a people out of bondage to Satan and creating a new covenant community; the new man. The argument is thus corporate.

And when did this baptism take place? In the case of the type it was in the exodus of Moses from Egypt. In the case of Christ, it was in his exodus (Luke 9.22, not 'departure' as NIV but 'exodus' as AV) from the realm of Satan's rule. His exodus, of course, was his death, and so the Roman believers, along with the whole church, had undergone baptism into death, the death of Christ himself. I argue elsewhere that this corporate understanding lies behind Gal. 3:25-28; 1 Cor. 12.13 and Eph. 4:6 & 5:25 (For more details see *Contours of Pauline Theology*, chapter 7).

Our old self

And how does this affect the way we understand the term 'our old self' (NIV) or 'old man' (AV which is nearer to what the Greek signifies in 6:6)? The highly individualistic interpretation that has governed exegesis has failed to read chapter six out of chapter five. I recall as a student reading Dodd's commentary on Romans. He pointed out that there was no way a western mind could understand the argument of chapter five if it did not appreciate the concept of solidarity that was fundamental to the Semitic mindset. However, after exegeting the chapter he immediately turned to his own western mindset when he interpreted chapter six and indeed the rest of the letter. Sadly Dodd is not alone in this practice, it is almost universal.

In the light of chapter five, how should we read 6:6? Surely we have to accept that it would be reasonable to test whether the term 'body of sin' carries a corporate meaning. This I contend is what Paul means. He is not saying that we died to our own human nature, our humanity; rather, he is

saying that as a community we have been rescued from another community, 'the body of sin'. This rescue is on the basis of the union that was created with Christ in his death. I was later to discover that there had been much written on Paul's use of *soma* (body) and that commentators tended not to engage with this literature. However, one scholar who would have no difficulty with what I am proposing, is T.W. Manson. He questioned the traditional assumption that in the phrase 'body of Sin' the term 'of Sin' is a genitive of quality; he argued that it 'does not yield a very good sense'. He took it to be a possessive genitive, and said 'It is perhaps better to regard "the body of sin" as the opposite of "the body of Christ". It is the mass of unredeemed humanity that is in bondage to the evil power. Every conversion means that the body of sin loses a member and the body of Christ gains one.'

This proposed corporate reading does not finish with the identification of the body of sin. It explains why Paul used *dedikaiôtai*. The argument is not at the level of individual experience but of the community, and the term 'justified' in this particular argument is essentially corporate, covenantal and relational. The term speaks of legal acceptance of the new marriage relationship that has resulted from the death of Christ. The issue Paul is dealing with is how this community, that had once been part of the kingdom of darkness before its deliverance through the death of Christ, could become the bride of Christ. Under Satan's authority it had been in a covenantal relationship with Satan that was the opposite of what it was to become in its relationship with Christ. In other words, it had been part of the community that was the bride of Satan. Israel herself had formed such relationships with other gods when she played the harlot. Only if this relationship with Satan can be terminated can there be a new marriage – a justified relationship. In other words, 7:1-4 is an illustration that sums up the argument that has been going on in chapters 5&6.

This corporate reading helps make sense of the appeal to the believers in Rome not to yield their bodies as instruments of unrighteousness (v.13). When the passage is read at the corporate level it is seen to be an appeal to the community to discipline those who continue to live as though they were still members of the body of sin. The conclusion of the chapter, which states that the wages of sin is death but the gift of God is eternal life has been seen by some to be modelled on Moses' exhortation to the Jews to choose life. The OT passage that the verse is based on is an appeal to the community to follow Yahweh rather than an appeal to the individual Jew.

A Corporate Reading

I believe that the suggested corporate reading would have been natural to the NT church for the following reasons:

1. Paul uses the OT in a way that clearly shows that he expects his readers to follow his detailed exegesis. This suggests that the congregation had been well taught by its Jewish leaders. The letter does not grab texts to hang arguments on but rather is driven by texts that were being read in their OT theological context. This suggests that the mindset of the recipients was well tuned to OT theology, and this was essentially corporate.

2. The OT model was that the prophets rarely addressed

individuals. When they did, it was normally representative figures of the nation warning them of the consequences of their leadership. In other words, the OT set the pattern for scripture to be heard corporately.

3. The pattern found in the Dead Sea scrolls suggests that their teachings were constructed in the same way. They did not address the individual but the community. Such evidence points to the likelihood that this was normative for the Jewish communities. In other words, Israel was used to corporate reading and thinking and this was the cradle of the Christian message.

4. The synagogue reading of the Scriptures was normative for Second Temple Judaism and these Scriptures were describing God's dealing with his people, not the individuals *per se*. The NT church was clearly influenced by the Synagogue pattern of worship and with it the Jewish way in which its sacred texts were heard and interpreted.

5. Paul wrote his letters to churches (unless of course, they were personal letters to individuals such as Philemon, Timothy or Titus). There is no way that these letters to the church could be copied and distributed for private reading. Their message could be communicated only as the congregation came together and they were read to them. In other words, the very delivery was to the community and not to the individual.

In the light of the above, I would argue that it is an individualistic reading of the NT that has to be justified, not a corporate reading.

Misreading the text

So how did the church come to read the Scriptures in the way it does? The beginning of this transition took place in the second century with the emergence of Greek leadership in the church. Taught in the classics, the leaders unconsciously imposed their secular Greek thinking on the Greek of the apostolic writings. The mistake was so easily made, but disastrous. The apostles wrote in Greek – the alphabet they used was identical to that of their 2nd century disciples – but their dictionary was different. The apostles were bathed in the Greek of the LXX. This Greek had within it all the theological meaning and background of the OT text that it translated. Thus we are not intended to read their writings with a Greek dictionary by our side or in our mind, but with the LXX. They naturally intended these texts to be understood with the Hebrew meanings and not with secular Greek meanings. Thus, as the apostles wrote their letters they extended this glorious heritage of the OT's message and theology through their writings. Just see how often they quote the OT for evidence of this process. The loss of this OT theological context left the Patristic Fathers floundering for the meaning of many NT passages and their understanding soon drifted off into secular Greek patterns of thought that began to control the way the text was read. Their reading of the text soon became allegorical and philosophical rather than typological and redemptive historical.

Thus the NT texts are not 'Greek texts'. Of course their alphabet is Greek but their thought forms are Hebraic, coming from the OT Scriptures themselves which they constantly quote. As Mark Nanos has stated, 'We now know that the

entire NT is a collection of Jewish writings.' We are, therefore, obliged to reflect on how we read these texts. Do we read them as the early Jewish/Gentile community would have read them or has our heritage determined that we read them as Greeks? Of course the early church was made up of Gentiles so how did they get into this mindset? The answer must be because the Jewish believers took their task seriously. They knew that they had been appointed to be a light to the nations. How else could the letters to the Romans or the Galatians be understood if Jewish teachers did not help them understand their message? Only if Jewish believers were helping their Gentile brethren could they understand these letters. These letters are saturated with OT theology and quotations and these facts are clear evidence that the church's mindset came from these scriptures.

Missing the Point

This point of a person's mindset not being identical to the language he uses is very important. At a recent conference, at which I raised the Jewishness of Paul's mindset, a lecturer from an internationally famous university dismissed the argument I was making as ridiculous. He said that I had 'shot myself in the foot because it was obvious that Paul wrote in Greek'. Others have similarly responded in reviews. This is missing a vitally important point that cannot be allowed to pass without challenge. In the UK there are millions of people who have settled as immigrants from all parts of the world. Amongst them is a large Muslim population. Many second generation UK Muslims have adapted to the adopted home of their parents remarkably well. They speak perfect English and have gone through some of the best of our universities to gain outstanding awards. However, if it was to be suggested that they are westerners they would be horrified. In their belief systems and practices they are as committed as to their Islamic convictions.

In other words, people can use the language of another culture without having to buy into its belief system. They can even make use of its economics and legal system without surrendering their belief system. If we want to know where they are in terms of being assimilated into the host culture we have to listen to them very carefully. It is not enough to claim that they have adapted to the host culture and assume that they have imbibed its beliefs and values. The only way that you could come to a decision about this is to listen to them very diligently and carefully evaluate what drives them in this vitally important part of their lives.

It is my contention that if you listen to Paul very carefully there is only one source that dominates his thinking; it is the Old Testament. Its message drives him as he declares the coming of the hope of Israel and its implications for the nations. As previously stated, the letters to Rome and Galatia alone show us that this is not the mind of a 'Hellenist'; it is the mind of a devout Jew who has understood that the covenant promises made to Abraham have been fulfilled in Jesus Christ.

Reformation Epistemology

The Reformation inevitably contributed to individualising the

text. It had to challenge the authoritative reading of the Roman Church and in doing this it encouraged everyone to read and apply the text for themselves. The reality was that very few could read the text for themselves until many centuries following the Reformation. That privilege was given to the wealthy and the educated, for they alone had the means to purchase their own copy and the education to read it.

Following the Reformation a new epistemology germinated. The Enlightenment challenged all traditional forms of authority. It was argued that reason was the final arbiter and in doing this made reading the text necessary if anyone wanted to decide on the claims others made concerning their meaning.

It was also about the time of the Enlightenment that the mass distribution of the Scriptures became a reality. This was achieved through the advance in printing technology, so making mass production a reality. With this mass production, of course, came affordability. The industrialisation of the West gave personal wealth to millions who were now able to purchase their own copy. Added to this was the spread of education that meant that ordinary people were now reading the Scriptures for themselves.

And so individual believers had their own copy of the Scriptures. They could read it as God's message to them personally. The heritage of the Great Awakening with its emphasis on personal salvation and a personal relationship with God encouraged an individualistic approach to reading the Scriptures. This mind set was preserved in the hymns that were sung in churches throughout the country. Modern hymnology is even more individualistic.

The last thing I want to do is dissuade individuals from reading the Bible. Would to God that we all do this more! But reading it as an individual without appreciating the history that has just been outlined, very easily blanks out the vitally important corporate relationship that the Scripture presumes, i.e. the church, and makes the individual the source of authority for understanding the text. The early church could not have recognized such a reading strategy!

My case is that the present individualistic reading of Scripture, which has largely lost the corporate dimension of the early church's mindset, has promoted an individualism that has sometimes been unbiblical, unhealthy and dangerously divisive. In saying this I am not suggesting that a corporate reading is a panacea for all of the church's woes, but I do believe a lot of them come from this distorted reading strategy. I believe that the church needs to hear the original meaning of the NT texts, a meaning that begins first with God, then with the people of God rather than the individual. I believe that in making this major correction, the church will understand her sacred texts more accurately and interpret her experience of God's grace more perfectly.

I also believe that a corporate reading of the NT will lead us to a fuller and richer ecclesiology in which we realize that the scripture is not emphasizing the individual above the covenant community but puts the individual in his/her rightful place within this holy nation. Instead of seeing the NT as having a doctrine of individualism that has little to say about the church, we will discover that when the texts are read corporately the focus of the NT is the church and the individual is not cut loose but is given a secure placing within the

people of God. Such a theological sense of community has long been absent from Evangelical theology and has been a reason for the rejection of Evangelicalism by those who are alarmed at its excessive individualism.

This is not to deny the existence of individualism within either the OT or the NT, but it is to highlight that biblical individualism starts with the community. Corporate and individualistic understandings are two sides of the same coin. The Jew naturally begins from the corporate side while the Greek naturally begins from the individual side. It is no coincidence that Marx as a Jew embraced a view of man that emphasized the community.

A final challenge

The appeal of this paper is that we concentrate our work on seeking to decide the meaning of the Scriptures in the context of the understanding of those who wrote the texts, and that we avoid interpreting the NT text through paradigms that were not shared by the Early Church. I believe that if this were done, it would not only restore confidence in the Scriptures but it would bring a reformation to our understanding of a whole range of biblical truth. Particularly, it would return us to a healthy form of individualism present throughout the whole of the Christian Scriptures.

Let me finally say that although I have referred to the 'Jewishness of the New Testament', I am in no way seeking to suggest that Jews have a mind set that we Gentiles have to adopt. There are many Jewish mindsets, and there is certainly nothing in the Jewish DNA that gives them greater insight into the Scriptures than non-Jews. Paul has made this fact abundantly clear. What I mean by this in relation to the NT Scriptures is that the Early Church read the Old Testament in the light of Christ's life, death, resurrection and teaching. Taught by Christ himself they had their own distinctive hermeneutic and this insight caused them to see how the OT spoke of Christ and pointed to him, not in some proof texting way, but much more significantly, through its paradigm of redemptive history. This reading of the OT did not produce a new theology. It stayed firmly within the OT theological traditions with its mindset and expectations. Thus the NT is not a new theology but the final chapter of the OT: it is its fulfillment. Anything that interprets the NT from any other perspective ought to be very carefully evaluated for consistency.

I am fully aware of the offence that my claims will give to some, for their entire mindset has been formed by a Hellenistic reading of the NT. However, I can come to no other conclusion than that we live in a period similar to the medieval school of theology when Aristotelianism controlled the interpretation of scripture: it almost killed the church. I believe that another mindset has been doing the same, and that academia and the church at large, have embraced it. This Hellenistic mindset hides from view much that would enrich and strengthen the church.

I am claiming that the conclusions of my research strongly suggest that there is a very major hermeneutical flaw in prevailing theological methodology. I believe that this demands a review of all theological literature, conservative as well as liberal, to recognize and appreciate the extent of this very

serious situation. We will be horrified to discover just how much of Christian thought, and that includes evangelical thought, is controlled by Hellenistic presuppositions. At the root of this problem is the fact that Hellenism has largely determined how we read the Bible. I am pleading that we begin the vital task of reforming ourselves under the Word of God, using the apostolic methods of interpretation. Those who are in pastoral charges, and have begun this process, encourage me: they tell me that it has helped to transform their ministries. The need for this reformation includes Christian communities throughout the world. This is because as a result of the western church exporting its theological methodology with its missionary endeavours, it has given

spiritual birth to children who have followed this individualistic road. Tragically, we have often displaced cultures where corporateness naturally existed and which would have given the new believers a valuable insight into the New Testament, with our western, Hellenised, individualistic, mindset.

Lest any readers be afraid to commit themselves to this task, in fear of where it will lead them, I want to assure them that if they follow it, they will come out with a biblical orthodoxy that does not reject the confessions of the church, but sees that God in his mercy kept the church despite her many confusions.

Dr. Tom Holland teaches at the Evangelical Theological College of Wales.

Reviews

■ THEOLOGY

Getting your Bearings

P. Duce & D. Strange, eds
Apollos, Leicester, 2003, 287 pages, £12.99,
paperback, ISBN 0-85111-287-0

This book complements a previous book published by Apollos (2002), *Keeping your Balance: Approaching religious and theological studies*. Edited by Duce and Strange, it is, in fact, a collection of 4 essays by Christopher Sinkinson on John Hick, Stephen Williams on Jürgen Moltmann, Timothy Bradshaw on Wolfhart Pannenberg and Mark Elliot on Postmodern theology. Some readers may well be familiar with some of these essays: all 4 are republications in previous monographs published by the RTSF.

The aim of such a collection is threefold: firstly, to engage with profound questions about theological method which demand a proper response from evangelical students and practitioners of theology. Secondly, to provide students with user-friendly and critical summaries to key scholars with whom they will be expected to engage within the academy. Lastly, the editors' desire is that by introducing students to well-summarised presentations of contemporary theological discourse, a new generation of evangelical theologians may be nurtured and encouraged.

In many ways, the editors' ambitions have been well-met. The reader engages with some of the most influential thinkers in the modern academy. It is to their credit that they engage with John Hick and his own particular take on religious pluralism. In turn, it is a wise choice to present

very user-friendly and accessible summaries of Moltmann and Pannenberg. Both are significant players in the theological game-park. Both, too, are difficult to access easily: Moltmann because of his vast output and tendency to change his mind from one volume to the next, and Pannenberg because he is such a demanding read as a classic German theologian. Both essays are excellent introductions to both men. Finally, Mark Elliot manages to compress the 'greasy-pig' phenomenon of postmodern theology into a very accessible and digestible essay in which he highlights the issues for evangelical students. Such an essay provides very useful handles on a complex and expanding topic.

Perhaps space precluded the addition of further scholars. It might have been helpful to have had a more evangelically-friendly theologian in this collection of essays. The significance of the late Colin Gunton cannot be underestimated in the contemporary scene: an essay on his theology would have been an encouraging antidote, say, to Hick. That said, this is a very useful introduction to some of the key issues any evangelical student of theology will have to face.

Graham W. P. McFarlane
London School of Theology

Great Doctrines of the Bible

D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones
Crossway Books, Wheaton, 2003, 370 + 276 +
264 pages, \$40.00, hardback, ISBN 1-58134-
497-X

At Westminster Chapel, from 1952-1955, on Friday nights, before he embarked on his colossal Romans series in 1955, Dr Lloyd Jones gave a series of lectures on biblical doctrine. These lay all but forgotten until the 1990s when Hodder and Stoughton in this country and Crossway in the United States put them into print.

Originally published as three separate volumes and at a rather high price, under the titles: *God the Father, God the Son; God the Holy Spirit and The Church and the Last Things* – Crossway have now brought these together in one large hardback at, relatively speaking, a more modest price.

It is a shame that they didn't repaginate the books. By not doing so they have, in effect, kept them as separate volumes. That means, as well as destroying the unity of the series, there are three separate contents pages, which you have to fish around for and six separate indexes (a scripture index and a subject index for each volume) at the back!

Nevertheless, it is good to have these lectures together, if not in one volume, at least in one book!

Tony Baxter, Derby

■ CHURCH HISTORY

Billy Bray in his Own Words

Chris Wright
Godalming, Highland, 2004
284pp, paperback, £8.99
ISBN 1-8979913-73-7

Toward the end of his life, the eccentric