

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)

<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

TSF BULLETIN

MARCH 1981

TSF BULLETIN VOL. 4 No. 4

Formerly *TSF News & Reviews*
Published by Theological Students
Fellowship, 233 Langdon, Madison WI
53703. ISSN No. 0272-3913

Editor: **Mark Lau Branson**
(TSF General Secretary)

Advisory Editors: **Clark H. Pinnock**
(Toronto School of Theology)
Paul A. Mickey
(Lutheran Divinity School, on leave '80-'81)

Managing Editor: **John Duff**
(TSF Administrative Assistant)

Associate Editors:
Stephen T. Davis (Claremont Men's
College) Philosophy; **Robert E.
Rykenberg** (University of Wisconsin)
World Religions; **Robert L. Hubbard**
(Denver Seminary) Old Testament;
Richard J. Mouw (Calvin College) Ethics;
Thomas C. Oden (Drew University
Theological School) Pastoral Theology;
Grant R. Osborne (Trinity Evangelical
Divinity School) New Testament; **Charles
L. Taber** (Emmanuel School of Religion)
Missions; **Donald Tinder** (New College,
Berkeley) Church History; **David L.
Watson** (Perkins School of Theology)
Evangelism; **Keith Yandell** (University of
Wisconsin) World Religions.

Contributing Editors (Professors):
Donald Bloesch (University of Dubuque
Theological Seminary); **Russell Burck**
(Rush-Presbyterian-St. Lukes Medical
Center, Chicago); **Donald Buteyn** (San
Francisco Theological Seminary); **Donald
Dayton** (Northern Baptist Theological
Seminary); **Charles Ellenbaum** (College of
DuPage); **Larry Hurtado** (University of
Manitoba); **Bernard Ramm** (American
Baptist Seminary of the West); **James
Parker, III** (Eastern Baptist Theological
Seminary); **Stanley Riegel** (Trinity Western
College, B.C.); **Gerald Sheppard** (Union
Theological Seminary, New York); **R.
Edward Turner** (Andrews University
Theological School).

Contributing Editors (Students):
Douglas Anderson (Graduate Theological
Union, Berkeley); **Vaughn Baker** (Perkins
School of Theology); **Terry Donaldson**
(Toronto School of Theology); **Kapp
Johnson** (Claremont Graduate School);
Susanne Johnson (Princeton Theological
Seminary); **David N. Jones** (Vanderbilt
University); **Hal Miller** (Boston College);
Kenneth Morris (University of Georgia);
Alan Padgett (Drew University Theological
School); **John Simpson** (Fuller Theological
Seminary).

Editorial Assistants:
John Hobbins, Terri Olson.

CONTENTS

FOUNDATIONS *(Doing theology on the basics of classical faith)*

Current Directions in Christology Studies II L. W. Hurtado 2

ACADEME *(Reports from seminary classrooms, special events, and TSF chapters)*

Teaching Evangelism at Perkins: A Conversation with David L. Watson Mark Lau Branson 3

INQUIRY *(Questions, proposals, discussions, and research reports on theological and biblical issues)*

Biblical Authority: Towards an Evaluation of the Rogers and McKim Proposal John D. Woodbridge 6

INTERSECTION *(The integration of theological studies with ethics, academic disciplines, and ecclesiastical institutions)*

The New Testament and Anti-Semitism: Three Important Books T. L. Donaldson 12

SPIRITUAL FORMATION *(Probing questions, suggestions, and encouragement in areas of personal and spiritual growth)*

"But YOU can't be a pastor..." Jan Erickson-Pearson 15

REVIEWS *(Notes and critiques on recent books and periodicals)*

Book Reviews (Itemized on back cover) 16

Kim's survey is a disappointing piece. The authors obviously labored long hours upon it, carefully forging their proposal. But despite their sincere Christian motivations for composing it, their efforts will probably be less than satisfying to them. Because they so desperately wanted to plea a certain cause, they generally sacrificed their claims to evenhanded scholarship by discounting out-of-hand contrary evidence, by neglecting worlds of technical scholarship bearing on their broad subject, by fixing too uncritically upon a neoorthodox historiography, and by relying too heavily upon secondary literature rather than examining primary sources for themselves. As a result, their volume lacks that quality of reliability which gives good historical surveys their endurance.

Woodbridge's entire article can be secured from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2045 Half Day Road, Deerfield, IL 60515. Those interested in following this discussion should also read the book being discussed, The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible by Jack Rogers and Donald McKim (Harper and Row, 1980). Recently, this volume won the "Book of the Year" Award from Eternity magazine. In our next issue (April, 1981) Donald McKim will respond to Woodbridge's article.

INTERSECTION

(The integration of theological studies with ethics, academic disciplines, and ecclesiastical institutions)

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND ANTI-SEMITISM: THREE IMPORTANT BOOKS

By T.L. Donaldson, Th.D. Candidate,
Wycliffe College, Toronto.

If the Holocaust has not produced the same crisis of faith within Christianity as it has in some circles of Judaism, it has at least been profoundly unsettling to Christian consciences. When the full extent of the atrocities committed against the Jewish people in the Second World War became known, the question of how such a thing could have happened in the heart of Christian Europe immediately presented itself. It quickly became apparent to Christians and Jews alike that Hitler's anti-Semitism could not have borne such bitter fruit if the soil had not been prepared by centuries of anti-Judaic preaching and teaching in the Church. It was realized, in fact, that a straight line could be drawn from the *adversus Judaeos* tradition of the second and third century apologists who found it necessary to denigrate Judaism in order to win a hearing for the Christian position, through the Constantinian era in which the Church moved into a position in which it could influence the social legislation of the Empire, into the Medieval period with its systematic attempts to push Jews to the margins of European society, and down to the ovens of Auschwitz and Treblinka. This is not to say that Nazism was Christian; though it made some use of Christian terminology for propaganda pur-

STAFF POSITIONS AVAILABLE

All divisions of Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship are looking for qualified women and men for various management and ministry positions. In addition to Theological Students Fellowship's openings for regional field staff, Nurses Christian Fellowship, IVCF University ministries, TWENTYONEHUNDRED PRODUCTIONS (multi-media communications), Ethnic ministries, IV Missions, and various administrative departments are looking for new staff.

Write to IVCF Personnel Services, 233 Langdon, Madison, WI 53703. Include school and permanent address, phone number, and information about your degrees, experience, and areas of interest.

IF YOUR ADDRESS CHANGES BEFORE MAY 30 . . .

. . . Let us know. In sending your new address, advise us of your moving date and your current address. (If possible, send us a label from a TSF publication.) We don't want you to miss the May *Themellos*.

poses, it was decidedly anti-Christian. But it was able to draw freely on anti-Semitic capital which the Church had been laying up for centuries.

Some have gone farther and have suggested that the Holocaust can be explained only by extending the straight line back into the New Testament itself. In what follows, I would like to concern myself with this charge, that the New Testament is in some way or other anti-Semitic. The literature on this topic which has appeared in the past thirty years is extensive. My purpose here is to introduce the lines of discussion by describing three significant books which are fairly representative of the main approaches taken to the question.

The first of these is *Jesus et Israel* by Jules Isaac (1948). Isaac, born in 1877, was a prominent and respected French historian, at one time Inspector General of Education in France and author of standard secondary school and university texts on world history. Like many European Jews of his day he was not particularly orthodox, and showed little interest in his Jewish heritage until the German occupation of France. Deprived of his post by the Nazis in 1941, he began to turn his skills as a historian to the question of the roots of anti-Semitism. In 1943 his wife and several other members of his family were seized and executed, and he spent the last years of the war in hiding, working on his manuscript from farmhouse to farmhouse while he stayed one step ahead of his pursuers. In 1948 *Jesus et Israel* was published.

It was an impassioned book and it made an immediate impact. He did not set out to condemn authentic Christianity however. As he would write later:

Anti-Semitism is by definition unchristian, and even anti-Christian. A true Christian cannot be an anti-Semite; he simply has no right to be one. (Isaac, 1964, p. 21)

He felt rather that the Church had misrepresented Jesus and the New Testament.

His basic methodology was to set the New Testament texts side by side with the commentaries on those texts by the Church Fathers and later writers in order to demonstrate the vast gulf between the two. His book gives the result of this process of comparison, set out in twenty-one propositions in which he attempted to show that the Church had forgotten the essential Jewishness of Jesus and the early Christians. Jesus was, he insisted, a Jewish preacher, born into a Jewish family

o gave him a Jewish name and upbringing, whose preach- was completely within Jewish tradition, and who was re- ted, not by the Jewish people as a whole, but by a small erie of religious leaders who had him crucified out of lousy. The possibility of anti-Semitism arose, he insisted, y when the later Church forgot these Jewish origins and veloped what he called the "teaching of contempt"—that : dispersion of the Jews was divine punishment for their ection of Jesus; that Judaism at the time of Jesus was a alistic, external and degenerate religion; and that the Jews :re guilty of the crime of Deicide.

Though Isaac was, on the whole, positive towards the New stament, he did take exception to a number of passages, rticularly in the Gospels. He described the cry of "all the ople" in Mt. 27:25 as "atrocious." He insisted that John's e of the term "the Jews" is pejorative, though he castigated er commentators for focussing only on the pejorative ages and ignoring the positive references to "the Jews" in hn. He also charged that John read the "hardening of rael" back into the Gospel accounts:

These anticipated and anachronistic harsh judge- ments square poorly, to tell the truth, with the his- toric realities to which they are related and which the evangelists let us glimpse despite everything, almost despite themselves. (Isaac 1948, p. 190).

In other words, though it is not always evident in his work, e vast gulf which Isaac set out to describe does not lie be- tween the New Testament and the later commentators, but etween Jesus and his interpreters, of whom the New Testa- ment writers are the earliest. Thus, though Isaac's main con- ern was to show that authentic Christianity did not need to be anti-Semitic, his illumination of the Jewishness of Jesus has ast a shadow on the New Testament, a shadow of which he as only partly aware. Isaac's approach and conclusions vere anticipated somewhat in the bold pioneering work of ames Parkes, and these authors have been succeeded by any others who see the New Testament as somewhat ained by anti-Semitism.

The second book to be considered here was written as a direct response to the questions raised by Jules Isaac. Like saac, Gregory Baum had been raised in a secular Jewish amily which had suffered under the Nazi persecution. Unlike Isaac, Baum had become a Christian and a Catholic priest. Though profoundly sympathetic to Isaac's assertion of the theological roots of anti-Semitism, Baum felt that he had to bject to Isaac's charges against the New Testament. In his *Is the New Testament Anti-Semitic?*, a study of the Gospels, Acts, and the Pauline literature, he attempted

to show that there is no foundation for the accusa- tion that a seed of contempt and hatred for the Jews can be found in the New Testament. The final redaction of some of the books of the New Testament may bear the marks of conflict be- tween the young Church and the Synagogue, but no degradation of the Jewish people, no unjust accusation, no malevolent prophecy is ever sug- gested or implied. (Baum, p. 5).

Like Isaac, Baum pointed out the Jewishness of Jesus and the positive attitude towards Jesus exhibited by the crowds of common people. But he went further and attempted to con- front the anti-Judaic polemic of the New Testament head-on. He insisted that since the earliest Christians were Jewish, this polemic had no racial overtones but was part of the self- critical spirit within Judaism that was rooted in the prophetic tradition and was a common part of the sectarianism within the Judaism of the New Testament era. He contended that, unlike the later Gentile apologists, the New Testament writers did not see the Church as a replacement for Israel, but rather as the result of an "eschatological schism" that had passed through Israel because of the life and ministry of Jesus the Messiah. Whereas Isaac emphasized the Jewishness of Jesus,

NEW ASSOCIATE EDITORS ADDED

During this publishing year, three professors have joined the editorial team of *TSF Bulletin*. Tom Oden, Professor of Pastoral Theology at Drew, has recently authored *Agenda for Theology*. Richard Mouw, Professor of Ethics at Calvin College, is a visiting professor at Juniata College this year. He recently wrote *Called to Holy Worldliness*. Charles Taber, Professor of World Mission at Emmanuel School of Religion, was editor of *Gospel-in-Context* (a two year publishing venture in contextualization) and is currently on the editorial staff of the *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*. Readers have already benefited from their work. As editor, I am grateful for the scholarship and encouraging spirit offered by these friends.

— MLB

Baum insisted that the New Testament itself, even with its polemical aspects, be seen within the wider context of Judaism. Only when this polemic was taken over by the Gen- tile Church did it become anti-Semitic.

More recently Baum has rejected this earlier position and has aligned himself with the stance taken by Rosemary Ruether in her important book *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism* (see also Baum's introduc- tion to the book), which is the third book I would like to con- sider. In this book she explored the attitude of the Church towards Judaism in the New Testament, in the Church Fathers, and in the history of Christian Europe. She concluded that Christianity is anti-Judaic at its center, and that this theological negation of Judaism gives rise in the social sphere to anti-Semitism whenever the Church has social and political power. For Ruether, the problem is the Church's view of Christ, a view grounded in a Christological midrash of the Old Testament which antedates the New Testament itself. As the Church attempted to proclaim its message that Jesus was the crucified and resurrected Messiah predicted in the Old Testa- ment, it found that it had to deny simultaneously the conflicting Jewish understanding of the Old Testament. Thus, Ruether argued, Christological proclamation and anti-Judaic polemic developed along parallel tracks:

What we have here are two sides of the same argument. On the one hand, the Church argues that the true meaning of the Scriptures is that of a prophecy of Jesus as the Christ. And, on the other hand, it developed a collection of texts "against the Jews" to show why the authority of the official Jewish tradition should be discounted when it re- futes this Christological midrash of its own Scrip- tures. (Ruether, p. 65)

Every Christological statement, therefore, contains within itself a negation of Judaism. Consequently for Ruether, anti- Judaism, which finds social expression in anti-Semitism, is deeply rooted in the New Testament. The anti-Judaic tares and the Christological wheat are so closely intertwined that the former cannot be uprooted without seriously affecting the latter:

There is no way to rid Christianity of its anti-Judism which constantly takes social expression in anti- Semitism, without grappling finally with its Christo- logical hermeneutic itself. (Ruether, p. 116)

Though these three are not the only important books on the topic, they have established the framework for the discussion of the New Testament and anti-Semitism and have laid down the main approaches that have been taken to the question. All three writers agree that the roots of anti-Semitism go back to the Gentile Church of the ante-Nicene period, but part com- pany over the degree of continuity with what went before. For

Isaac, there is a basic discontinuity between Jesus and his later interpreters, especially the Gentile Church but even some parts of the New Testament itself. For Baum, the discontinuity lies between the New Testament period, where the dispute between the Church and the Synagogue is a family quarrel, and the patristic period, where the racial element is introduced. For Ruether, there is no discontinuity; the Christian tradition has continuously engaged in an anti-Judaic polemic, which is deeply rooted in the New Testament and which inevitably gives rise to anti-Semitism.

This is not the place to enter into a lengthy discussion of these positions or the issues which they raise. My purpose here has been the more modest one of introducing the reader to representative and pivotal works in the current discussion. Nevertheless, two concluding reflections would not be out of order.

First of all, any application of the term "anti-Semitic" to the New Testament is anachronistic, not only because the anti-Judaic polemic of the New Testament arose in Jewish Christian circles, but also because it arose within a Judaism characterized by a proliferation of sects, parties and movements, each vying for positions of power and influence within Israel. The story of the development of Judaism from Ezra to Judah ha-Nasi is not the unbroken line of the gradual development of a "normative Judaism" in comparison to which Christianity and other non-Pharisaic movements were insignificant. Rather, before the Roman war which went a long way towards ensuring the success of Pharisaic Judaism, Hellenistic Jewish Christianity, along with the Qumran community, the Samaritans, and assorted apocalyptic movements, existed as nonconformist groups in opposition to the Jerusalem establishment. It is against this background that the origin of New Testament anti-Judaism is to be understood.

But secondly, the ever-present danger of the misuse and misinterpretation of New Testament texts must be acknowledged. We read the New Testament—a collection of writings produced by Christians who for the most part were also Jews—as Christians who for the most part are also Gentiles. We need to develop a hermeneutic which takes this ethnic transition into account. Because the earliest Gentile Church, as it took over the debate with the Synagogue from Jewish Christianity (there was continuity in the debate, if not in the ethnic origin of the participants), failed to take account of this altered situation, it contributed in no small way to a history which Christians can remember only with shame.

REFERENCES:

- Baum, Gregory
1965 *Is the New Testament Anti-Semitic?* Paulist Press. Formerly *The Jews and the Gospel*. London: Bloombury, 1961.
- Isaac, Jules
1948 *Jesus et Israel*. Paris: A. Michel. ET, *Jesus and Israel*. Trans., Sally Gran. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1971.
- 1964 *The Teaching of Contempt*. Trans., H. Weaver. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.
- Ruether, Rosemary
1974 *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism*. Seabury.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS NEEDED

Each year TSF accepts student applications for Contributors to *TSF Bulletin*. For 1981-82, the job description includes, (1) monitoring two periodicals in your academic field and keeping the Editor informed of the most worthwhile articles and reviews in that publication, and (2) submitting at least one book review as arranged in cooperation with an Associate Editor.

Letters of application must include current degree program, area of concentration, a sample of your writing, and summer and fall addresses. All applications should be received by May 30, 1981. Send to Editor, TSF Bulletin, 233 Langdon, Madison, WI 53703.

SPIRITUAL FORMATION

(Probing questions, suggestions, and encouragement in areas of personal and spiritual growth)

"BUT YOU CAN'T BE A PASTOR . . ."

By Jan Erickson-Pearson

Jan Erickson-Pearson is finishing an M.Div. at North Park Seminary (Chicago) this spring. This article first appeared in the January-February, 1979 issue of Daughters of Sarah. The magazine is an excellent source of articles on biblical texts, theology, and biographies to help women and men find their understanding and encouragement of biblical feminism. (Reprinted with permission. Daughters of Sarah, 4011 N. Ayers Chicago, IL 60616.)

Feminism. I don't remember when I first heard that word. I do remember that it made me uncomfortable. It sounded so political and radical. Women should have the freedom to choose other-than-traditional life-styles and careers, but need they be so militant and aggressive about it?

When I first started thinking about pastoral ministry as a vocation for myself, I saw no need to be a part of the feminist movement. So what if I am a woman? That shouldn't make any difference. I want to be a pastor, not a *woman*-pastor. If this is what God wants me to do, I don't need a movement to respond obediently.

I was wrong.

As soon as I began to tell people of my plans to enter seminary and prepare for pastoral ministry, I began to hear what many of you have likely also heard. "Pastor? You can't be a pastor. You're a *woman!*" "A lady minister, eh? Well, you certainly don't intend to preach, do you?" "I guess it's okay for gals to be pastors. But not in my church." "I suppose there is one good thing about lady ministers — they're prettier."

I knew that what I planned to do was new and different. I knew that some people would need time to adjust to it. But I had no idea that resistance and hostility would be so strong. I supposed that only tradition prevented women from involvement in the pastoral ministry.

I learned fast. With so much woman-excluding theology thrown at me, I sought the support of other like-minded women. We studied together, trying to deal with the philosophical constructs and historical precedents that did not appear consistent with the sum of biblical teaching. And with the very real question of what the Bible *does* say about women.

I needed the support of other women and men in order to deal both with questions of understanding and with the emotional stress that always seems to accompany the challenging of the status quo. When a man announces to family and friends that he plans to "enter the ministry," there is much rejoicing and praising God. When a woman makes a similar announcement, there is a lot of muttering. Regardless of how I perceived myself, others saw me as a potential *woman*-pastor. Not quite the same caliber as a *pastor*. I began to understand the need for a feminist movement and my involvement in it.

Of all the responses to my plans, one was particularly haunting. "So you are going to be a minister? You need to be awfully strong and talented to be a woman minister these days. You'll have to be *great* in order to prove that women can do it!"

I didn't know I was called to be great. God was calling me to be faithful and obedient, to use my talents as best I could. But to be great? I'm not great, so maybe I had better not continue. I would hate to blow it for those who follow. I'm no Superwoman.