



# PRO VERITATE

*HELDER CAMARA*

Crushed by a triple violence

*ROBERT ORR*

Contact between the Afrikaans and English Churches

*R. J. McKELVEY*

The doctrine of the ministry in the New Testament

By die Hoofposkantoor as Nuisblad geregistreer  
Registered at the Post Office as a Newspaper

*Volume VIII No. 3 | Jaargang VIII Nr. 3*

*JULY 15 JULIE 1969*

# PRO VERITATE

## EDITORIAL

### EDITOR:

Dr. B. Engelbrecht.

### EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

Bishop B. B. Burnett; the Rev. J. de Gruchy; the Rev. A. W. Habelgaarn; the Rev. E. E. Mahabane; the Rev. J. E. Moulder; the Rev. C. F. B. Naudé (Chairman); Prof. Dr. A. van Selms.

## ADMINISTRATION/ CORRESPONDENCE

### CIRCULATION MANAGER:

Dr. W. B. de Villiers.

All letters to the editor and administration to: P.O. Box 31135, Braamfontein, Johannesburg.

## SUBSCRIPTION

Subscription payable in advance.

Land and sea mail: R1 (10/- or \$1.40) — Africa; R1.50 (15/- or \$2.10) — Overseas; 17/6 — United Kingdom.

Air mail: R2 (£1 or \$2.80) — Africa; R3.50 (£1.17.6 or \$5.00) — Overseas; £2 — United Kingdom.

Cheques and postal orders to be made payable to Pro Veritate (Pty.) Ltd., P.O. Box 31135, Braamfontein, Johannesburg.

## PLEASE NOTE

The editorial staff of Pro Veritate state herewith that they are not responsible for opinions and standpoints which appear in any article of this monthly other than those in the editorial and editorial statements.

PRO VERITATE appears on the 15th of every month.

(Price per single copy 10c).

CHRISTELIKE MAANDBLAD VIR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA  
CHRISTIAN MONTHLY FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

## IN THIS ISSUE...

- In a lecture held by Archbishop Helder Camara of Brazil in April this year in London, he spoke about the triple violence against the underdeveloped world. P. 4
- Prof. B. B. Keet discusses a recent resolution of the Christian Reformed Church, Grand Rapids, U.S.A., in which racism has been condemned. P. 6
- In a recent radio broadcast the Rev. Robert Orr of Pretoria discussed the problem of contact between the Afrikaans and English Churches. P. 8
- A lecture on the doctrine of the ministry in the New Testament, given by Dr. R. J. McKelvey at a meeting of the Church Unity Commission of the South African Council of Churches, is offered to our readers for study. P. 9

## IN HIERDIE UITGAWE...

- In 'n lesing wat hy 'n April in Londen gehou het, het aartsbiskop Helder Camara van Brasilië gepraat oor die drievoudige geweld wat daar teen die ontwikkelingslande van die wêreld gepleeg word. Bl. 4
- Prof. B. B. Keet bespreek 'n onlangse besluit van die Christian Reformed Church, Grand Rapids Amerika, waarin rassisme veroordeel is. Bl. 6
- Eerw. Robert Orr van Pretoria het onlangs in 'n radiopraatjie gepraat oor die probleem van kontak tussen die Afrikaans- en Engelsprekende kerke. Bl. 8
- 'n Lesing oor die leer van die ampte in die Nuwe Testament, gehou deur dr. R. J. McKelvey voor die kommissie van kerkeenhed van die Suid-Afrikaanse Raad van Kerke, word vir ons lesers aangebied ter bestudering. Bl. 9

## Editorial

*The Voice of the Church*

One of the most unfortunate circumstances which has arisen in South Africa over the last two decades is the fact that the voice of a Church confronting the Government with a unanimous witness has, it would seem irrevocably, become something impossible.

During these years, political power has increasingly become concentrated in the hands of **one** party, which is simply enforcing its own will irresistibly and with increasing implacability and intolerance. Political and social developments in our country, egged on by decisions and by legislation which, in the absence of an effective Opposition, could be resisted by no means, cried out more than once for the corrective witness of a proclaiming, confessing Church. For certain basic presuppositions underlying the political course adopted as well as laws passed from year to year to give impetus to it obviously run counter to the basic truths of Christian faith.

At a decisive juncture in the history of our country a definite course was selected when a choice between various ways could no longer be evaded. One of these was the way of faith in the Gospel, of obedience to God's Word and trust in his promises. In the course of two decades, however, it has become gradually ever more apparent that this was not the choice that was made.

Everyone will undoubtedly be in agreement as to the decisive significance these years have had. Regarded in the light of the fact that the way chosen was not that of faithful obedience, however, and regarded in the light of the present world situation and of inevitable developments in our country, it is almost unthinkable that posterity will not adjudge these years to have been the most fatal in our history. And it will remain a painful memory that the critical and corrective witness of a Church united in truth did not assert itself in connection with political decisions taken during this period.

There were sporadic Christian testimonies, to be sure, issuing from individuals, organisations and a few denominations. On a few occasions there were also hopeful signs that the Church itself was coming to a realisation of its responsibility as Church. Here we think especially of the Cottesloe Consultation of December 1960. The decisions taken there will indeed remain unassailed and unassailable, but the organised political resistance to them, which brought even synods to heel, successfully prevented them from ever becoming the witness of the Church in South Africa. It will always remain a puzzling mystery that political powers could, after Cottesloe, succeed in driving in so deep a wedge between churches and Christians in our country that, in stead of **one** proclaiming Church coming to a realisation of its responsibility then, a chasm opened up between the churches which, humanly speaking, is unbridgeable and which, regarded from the standpoint of particular political interests, must remain

unbridgeable at all costs. The tried and tested tactics of 'divide and rule' was here applied to the Church with political cunning and with almost unbelievable success. Seen from the viewpoint of the Church, all hope that a Church speaking with one voice would emerge in South Africa has since then effectively been squashed; and seen from a particular political point of view, all fear. The South African Council of Churches, on the one hand, and the three Dutch Reformed churches on the other — the latter also in their mutual relationship! — do not even stand in a relationship of dialogue to each other, as the Government and the Opposition still formally do in Parliament. There is no question of a discussion; and a unanimous witness is not even vaguely dreamt of.

What is most deplorable still is that the three Dutch Reformed churches are not only by no means keen to be approached by the Council of Churches, but that such an approach is actually flatly rejected. This attitude came to light once again in their reaction to the Message to the People of South Africa of September 1968. This message, issued by the Theological Commission of the Council of Churches, was submitted to member churches of the Council for study and consideration. For many Christians, not only in our country, but all over the world, it was a spark of hope that here, at last, there was a sign once again of a proclaiming Church. The Ned. Geref. Kerk, however, was called upon from within its own circle to disregard it — a call which was generally obeyed.

As if this was not bad enough, there were also some of the member churches of the Council who, to the sorrow of many a Christian and to the detriment of the Gospel, dissociated themselves from this message, the topicality and evangelical quality of which surely stand beyond all doubt. Rumours are even circulating that there are member churches who want to withdraw from the Council on account of the Message.

What has to be deduced from these facts and to be realised with fright by all responsible Christians, however, is that a unanimously speaking Church in our country, standing as a witness over against the Government to hold up to it the truth of God's Word on its fatal path of error, apparently has (on account of the guilt of the Church itself) no hope of existence.

Yet nothing should be regarded as more imperative for the survival of Christianity in South Africa. Men obviously do not realise what an enormous responsibility rests on the Church, and what guilt it incurs by evading this responsibility. Where the Church ceases to give witness vis-à-vis the Government, either because it is paralysed by its own inner divisions, or because it allows itself to be silenced, or because it willingly conforms to the wishes of the Government, there that factor disappears which has been set up by God to protect the Government as



his servant against demonism. A Government which is no longer confronted by a witnessing Church inevitably falls prey to demonic degeneration. And this is the dangerous process which is coming into effect in South Africa.

It is a distressing, terrifying thought that, with the exception of one or two denominations, no voice was heard from the side of **the Church**, for instance, in connection with Article 29 of the General Law Amendment Act which was recently piloted through Parliament. One is doubly grateful, therefore, that the most serious objections were expressed on the part of the judiciary against this law which obviously paves the way for the most naked tyranny and clashes with the most elementary sense of justice.

The Church must know, however, that it is doing the Government in our country no good turn by leaving it to its own devices. A Government which is left to its own devices is being left to the mercy of the devil.

This is ultimately the disastrous and in fact inevitable outcome when the Church ceases to be a proclaiming, confessing Church in the life of a people. The Church in South Africa must ask of itself whether it can give account of itself before God in this regard. This would immediately also bring it face to face with the problem that it can hardly fulfil its calling to be a confessing Church

whilst it remains a divided Church. In this connection, the South African Council of Churches will have to take into account that the chasm between itself and the three Afrikaans-speaking churches of the Reformed faith will remain unbridgeable in the foreseeable future. And member churches who are contemplating terminating their membership of the Council will have to realise that, by doing so, they will be exacerbating the most crying need South Africa has ever known, i.e. the need for the voice of a proclaiming Church, while the clear signs are there that the Church has already neglected its responsibility too long.

As the only ecumenical body in South Africa, the Council of Churches will, under these circumstances, have to take upon itself with so much greater responsibility its calling to let the voice of the Church be heard. It dare not disregard the churches standing aloof from it, but will have to keep on urging them to start realising the need for a proclaiming Church in this calamitous situation. Their aloofness dare not, however, deter or detain it in the execution of its divinely enjoined, holy duty to stand firm in its confrontation of the Government with the witness from God's Word. And since the Council does not at present have an organ through which it can timeously let the voice of the Church be heard in every given situation, it is its most urgent task to provide itself with such an organ.

#### INLEIDINGSARTIKEL

## Die Stem van die Kerk

Een van die ongelukkigste omstandighede in die Suid-Afrikaanse situasie soos dit gedurende die afgelope twee dekades ontwikkel het, is die feit dat die stem van 'n kerk wat met 'n eendragtige getuënis teenoor die owerheid staan, skynbaar onherroeplik iets onmoontlik geword het.

Gedurende hierdie jare is die politieke mag meer en meer gekonsentreer in die hande van één party, wat sy eie wil met toenemende onversetlikheid en onverdraagsaamheid eenvoudig onkeerbaar deurvoer. Die ontwikkelinge op die politieke en maatskaplike toneel in ons land, voortgestu deur besluite en deur wetgewing wat vanweë die afwesigheid van 'n effektiewe opposisie deur niks gestuit kan word nie, het by meer as een geleentheid luid geroep om die korrektiewe getuënis van 'n sprekende, belydende kerk. Want sowel sekere basiese veronderstellinge wat aan die politieke koers wat ingeslaan is, ten grondslag lê, as wette wat van jaar tot jaar gemaak is om daaraan vaart te gee, is met die grondwaarhede van die Christelike geloof klaarblyklik in stryd.

Op 'n beslissende keerpunt in die geskiedenis van ons land, is daar 'n rigting ingeslaan nadat daar, onontwykbaar, tussen verskillende weë gekies moes word. Een daarvan was die weg van geloof in die evangelie, van gehoorsaamheid aan Gods Woord en vertrouwe op sy beloftes. Gedurende twee dekades het dit egter gaandeweg al duideliker geword dat hierdie keuse nie gemaak is nie.

Oor die beslissende betekenis wat hierdie jare gehad het, sal almal dit ongetwyfeld eens wees. Gesien egter in die lig van die feit dat die weg wat ingeslaan is, nie dié is van geloofsgehoorsaamheid nie, en gesien in die lig van die huidige wêreld-situasie en van onvermydelike ontwikkelinge in ons land, is dit haas ondenkbaar dat die toekoms oor hierdie jare anders sal oordeel as dat dit die fataalste in ons geskiedenis was. En dit sal 'n smartlike herinnering bly dat die kritiese en korrektiewe getuënis van 'n kerk wat in die waarheid verenig is, hom nie laat geld het ten opsigte van politieke beslissings wat gedurende hierdie tyd geneem is nie.

Sporadiese Christelike getuënisse was daar wel, komende van individue, organisasies en enkele denominasies. By enkele geleenthede was daar ook hoopgewende tekens dat die kerk self besig was om as kerk tot verantwoordelikheid te kom. Ons dink hier veral aan die Cottesloe-beraad van Desember 1960. Die besluite wat daar geneem is, sal as 'n waarheidsgetuënis wel onaangetas en onaantasbaar bly staan, maar die georganiseerde politieke verset daarteen, wat selfs sinodes daaraan diensbaar gemaak het, het suksesvol verhoed dat dit ooit die getuënis van die kerk in Suid-Afrika geword het. Dit sal altyd 'n verbysterende raaisel bly dat politieke magte daarin kon slaag om ná Cottesloe die wig so diep tussen kerke en Christene in ons land in te drywe dat, in plaas van dat één sprekende kerk daar tot 'n bewussyn van sy ver-

antwoordelikeheid gekom het, 'n kloof tussen die kerke ontstaan het wat, menslikerwys gesproke, onoorbrugbaar is en wat, vanuit 'n bepaalde politieke belange-oogpunt gesien, ten alle koste onoorbrugbaar moet bly. Die beproefde taktiek van verdeel en heers, is met politieke lis hier met haas ongehooflike welslae op die kerk toegepas. Sedertdien is, vanuit 'n kerklike oogpunt gesien, alle hoop, en vanuit 'n bepaalde politieke oogpunt gesien, alle vrees dat daar in Suid-Afrika 'n kerk sal wees wat uit een mond spreek, die nek ingeslaan. Die Suid-Afrikaanse Raad van Kerke aan die een kant, en die drie Afrikaans-Hollandse kerke aan die ander kant — laasgenoemde ook onderling! — staan nie eers in 'n dialogiese verhouding tot mekaar, soos die regerende party en die opposisie in die parlement dit formeel nog doen nie. Van 'n gesprek is daar geen sprake nie; en van 'n eenstemmige getuienis nie eers die vaagste droom nie.

Die betreurenswaardigste is nog dat daar van die kant van die drie Afrikaans-Hollandse kerke nie slegs geen toenadering van die kant van die Raad van Kerke begeer word nie, maar dat dit selfs botweg afgewys word. Dit het weer eens aan die lig gekom uit die reaksie teen die Boodschap aan die volk van Suid-Afrika van September 1968. Hierdie boodskap, wat uitgegaan het van die teologiese kommissie van die Raad van Kerke, is aan die lidkerke van die Raad aangebied vir bestudering en oorweging. Vir baie Christene, nie slegs in ons land nie maar oor die hele wêreld, was dit 'n flits van hoop dat hier eindelijk weer 'n teken van 'n sprekende kerk was. Die Ned. Geref. Kerk is egter vanuit sy eie midde opgeroep om dit te negeer — 'n oproep waaraan daar algemeen gehoor gegee is.

Asof dit nie erg genoeg was nie, was daar ook van die lidkerke van die Raad wat hulle, tot die verdriet van menige Christen en tot skade van die evangelie, gedistansieer het van hierdie boodskap waarvan die tydigheid en die evangeliese gehalte tog bo alle twyfel staan. Daar is selfs gerugte dat daar lidkerke is wat hulle, as gevolg van die Boodschap, aan die Raad wil onttrek.

Wat egter deur alle verantwoordelike Christene in ons land uit hierdie feite afgelei en met skrik besef moet word, is dat 'n eenstemmig sprekende kerk in ons land, wat getuigend teenoor die owerheid staan om die waarheid van Gods Woord op sy fatale dwaalweg aan hom voor te hou, vanweë die skuld van die kerk self skynbaar nie 'n kans van bestaan het nie.

Tog is daar niks wat noodsaakliker as dit geag moet word vir die behoud van die Christendom in Suid-Afrika nie. Daar word klaarblyklik nie besef watter enorme verantwoordelikeheid daar op die kerk rus, en watter skuld hy op hom laai as hy hierdie verantwoordelikeheid ontwyk nie. Waar die kerk ophou om teenoor die owerheid te getuig, of deurdat hy hom die swye laat oplê, of deurdat hy gewilliglik aan die wense van die owerheid konformeer, daar verdwyn dié faktor wat deur God daar gestel is om die owerheid as sy dienaar van demone te bewaar. 'n Owerheid wat geen getuigende kerk meer teenoor hom het nie, word onvermydelik die prooi van denomiese ontaarding. En dit is die gevaarlike proses wat besig is om hom in Suid-Afrika te voltrek.

Dit is 'n ontsettende, skrikbarende gedagte dat daar bv. ten opsigte van artikel 29 van die Algemene Regswysigingswet wat onlangs deur die parlement geloods is, met uitsondering van een of twee denominasies, geen stem van die kant van **die kerk** gehoor is nie. Des te dankbaarder stem dit 'n mens daarom dat daar van die kant van die regbank die ernstigste bedenkinge geopper is teen hierdie wet wat klaarblyklik die weg baan tot die naakste tirannie en indruis teen die elementêre besef van 'reg.

Die kerk moet egter weet dat hy die owerheid in ons land geen diens bewys deur hom aan homself oor te laat nie. 'n Owerheid wat deur die kerk aan homself oorgelaat word, word aan die duiwel oorgelaat.

Dit is uiteindelik die ramspoedige en tewens onvermydelike gevolg as die kerk in 'n volkslewe opgehou het om sprekende, belydende kerk te wees. Die kerk in Suid-Afrika moet hom afvra of hy dit voor God kan verantwoord. Daarmee is hy meteens ook gestel voor die probleem dat hy as verdeelde kerk sy roeping om belydende kerk te wees, nouliks kan vervul. Wat dit betref, sal die Suid-Afrikaanse Raad van kerke daarmee moet rekening hou dat die kloof tussen hom en die drie Afrikaanssprekende kerke van gereformeerde belydenis in die afsienbare toekoms onoorbrugbaar sal bly. En lidkerke wat dit oorweeg om hulle lidmaatskap van die Raad te beëindig, sal moet besef dat hulle dit doen met verskerping van die skreidendste nood wat Suid-Afrika nog ooit geken het, nl. dié om die stem van 'n sprekende kerk, terwyl die duidelike tekens daar is dat die kerk sy verantwoordelikeheid reeds te lank versuim het.

As die enigste 'ekumeniese liggaam in Suid-Afrika, sal die Raad van Kerke onder hierdie omstandighede sy roeping om die stem van die kerk te laat hoor, met 'n des te groter verantwoordelikeheid op hom moet neem. Hy sal die kerke wat van hom afsydig staan, nie mag negeer nie, maar by hulle moet bly aandring dat hulle die nood om 'n sprekende kerk in hierdie onheilvolle situasie sal besef. Hulle afsydigheid mag hom egter nie vertraag in die uitvoering van sy deur God opgelegde, heilige plig om pal teenoor die owerheid te staan met die getuienis uit Gods Woord nie. En waar die Raad tans nie oor 'n orgaan beskik waardeur hy in elke voorkomende konkrete situasie tydig en betyds die stem van die kerk kan laat hoor nie, is dit sy dringendste taak om hom van so 'n orgaan te voorsien.

**SOUTH AFRICAN OUTLOOK  
EXCLUSIVE!**

**André Biéler**

A world authority on Calvinism and author of numerous books on Calvin including "La Pensée Economique et Sociale de Calvin".

*Exclusive to S.A. Outlook*

**CALVINISM AND THE DEFENCE  
OF MAN**

August issue — subscribe now!

R1.20 for 12 issues (one year)

From: South African Outlook

P.O. Box 955

Cape Town.



# Crushed by a Triple Violence

Lecture delivered by **ARCHBISHOP HELDER CAMARA**, at the Haslemere Group Convention, London in April, 1969

## SPEAKING TO WILLING EARS

First of all, let me speak on behalf of the Third World, and thank those of you who represent the Haslemere Group for the Declaration which you are transforming into a programme of thought and action. I assure you, in my capacity as a man of the underdeveloped world, that your vision could not be clearer, nor your attitude more courageous. This is what I have already said in Manchester, at the Manchester Student Congress.

I have come here to co-operate with you; to urge you on in your effort in spite of the obstacles before you. I have come here to testify to the truth of the theme of this Conference.

I will try and quickly show you how this underdeveloped world is being crushed by a triple violence.

## THE TRIPLE VIOLENCE AGAINST THE UNDERDEVELOPED WORLD

### (i) Internal Colonialism, which means established violence:

Taking Latin America as an example, when people ask me if I think our Continent is threatened by violence I feel that the question is looking ahead to the possible, eventual violence of those who are now oppressed, whereas it does not take into account the already existing violence of the oppressors — a small privileged group whose wealth is maintained at the expense of the misery of millions of their countrymen.

Those who are unfamiliar with Latin America may think I am exaggerating; they may think I am being demagogic, or deliberately provocative. Let us then see what the voices of authority have to say on this point:

\* This is what Pope Paul VI, said in Columbia: "We know that social-economic development has been uneven in the great Latin American continent, and, although it has favoured those who promoted it, it has practically bypassed the great majority of the people, in most cases abandoning them to a level below human dignity and at times harshly treating and exploiting them."

\* The Latin American Bishops, gathered at Medellin, Columbia, whilst examining the problems of peace, referred specifically to that Internal Colonialism, maintained in the continent by a privileged group who create "marginal conditions of life, not only in the cities but also in rural areas". Although this is a world-wide phenomenon, in Latin America it assumes "particularly aggressive dimensions". The Bishops also pointed out that the reason for this was the very great lack of equality "which systematically prevents the satisfaction of the legitimate hopes of the people".

For anyone born and bred in a developed country, with no chance of visiting underdeveloped areas, it must be very hard to understand what is meant by sub-human, or the need for the "promotion of humanity". Let us take the example of land holdings in Latin America or in Brazil, to be precise. I am quoting from facts given by the Brazilian Institute of Agrarian Reform.

In Brazil there are 3 million seven hundred thousand rural properties covering an area of 390 million hectares, or let us say, about 970 million acres. 94% of these acres are held by only 6% of the number of properties; that is 6% of the landowners hold 94% of the acreage.

You cannot imagine how hard it is for these small land owners, some of them tenants, some small proprietors, some share-croppers, to farm their poor quality land. What is worse, the workers of the extensive 6% of the properties which cover 94% of the total area, very often are even poorer off than the owners of small plots. Their houses can barely be called houses, and as for clothing facilities, food, education, health and welfare — well, the situation is shameful.

All these conditions, it seems to me, amount to a state of violence. The small privileged group is possibly unaware that it is contributing to this existing violence by imposing such bad conditions on rural workers and small holders. And this is what I have called Violence Number One.

### (ii) Violence from the Developed World.

The second violence is imposed on the underdeveloped by the developed world. Here, I fully agree with your Declaration.

\* You are perfectly right to say that the so-called 'developing' countries are, in fact, underdeveloped if existing foreign policies of developed countries, including Britain, carry one.

\* You went to the heart of the matter when you stated that the international monetary and trade system was devised by the rich countries to suit their needs. And when their interests are involved, the rich can and do break the rules with impunity.

\* You have exposed the myth about Overseas Aid. What you have to say about Overseas Aid fits like a glove on the Alliance for Progress "at best, a wholly inadequate payment for goods received, at worst another name for the continued exploitation of the poor countries by the rich".

\* You have put clearly just what is the exploitation of underdeveloped countries by the developed ones. It consists of the refusal of the rich countries to allow the poor to own and use what material resources they possess in their own interests and in their own way.

\* You have understood very well that the Third World needs deep and urgent changes in its social structures. And you did not hesitate to point out that the developed world needs changes just as much in some of its economic and social structures. I am sure that unless you are able to change your own systems it will be almost impossible to change ours.

\* You have the ideal formulas in your Declaration. (May I say in **Our Declaration**?) For example, "Our technology is used to annihilate the distances between places, and widens the gap between men".

Capitalism, despite its championship of the human individual and freedom is egotistic, selfish and cruel. It does not hesitate to crush human

beings when profit demands it. Under the banner of saving the free world, it commits terrible atrocities against freedom. It speaks proudly of tradition and family but it does not create the right conditions for workers and small proprietors to rear their families. It makes much of religion when it supports its own interests, but it defies and persecutes it when it fights for the development of the whole man and of all men. In the name of individual initiative, it supports national and international trusts and combines.

For its part, Marxism calls itself the only authentic humanism. In practice, superpowers, professing inspiration from Marx, are as cold and egotistical as their capitalist rivals. They do not admit pluralism in the socialist world; they fear intelligence, liberty, creativity and originality when these do not conform to the rigid precepts of the Party; they nurture super-militarism, and promote wars which are in no way different from capitalist wars. They shut themselves up in atheism without realising that one can believe in a Creator and not feel oneself a slave but a co-creator charged with subduing nature and consummating Creation.

Taking all this into account, it is fair to conclude that underdeveloped countries besides putting up with internal colonialism within their own frontiers, being exploited by their own countrymen to a degree of national slavery, have also to put up with another kind of violence from developed powers, even though these powers claim over and over again to be practising neighbourliness, and are able to give an impression to their own citizens of generosity.

**(iii) Violence sustains the 'established order', which is legally installed by violence, which leads to subversion and more violence.**

When, in underdeveloped countries, movements are set up — no matter how democratic and non-violent they may be — which try to criticise internal colonialism and national slavery, and which work for a change in the social, economic and political structures; when in these underdeveloped countries, such movements try to uplift humanity, try to help people become human beings by overcoming despair and apathy and by teaching them to work together in teams, by encouraging and training leaders, then the local economic powers become

nervous, the privileged groups are alarmed, because they can see the possible consequences of this effort which we call 'conscientizacao' or, the awakening of social conscience. And they cry out 'subversion', Communist'. In the case of Latin America, it hardly seems to matter that the Latin American Hierarchy, assembled in Colombia, chaired by Pope Paul, attempted to stress the urgency of the need for basic reforms, and gave a warning against the exploitations committed in the name of anti-communism. We **should** have on our side the conclusions of the famous Punta del Este meeting, where the United States of America established as preconditions for aid from the Alliance for Progress, reforms of unjust and obsolete patterns of society. But it so happens that the USA looks upon our continent as their immediate area of defence, and are not willing to allow a second Cuba. The economic powers in Latin America have only to shout that there is a possible danger of Cubanization for the USA to be disturbed and the local government geared for action.

Nowadays, the Pentagon is in direct communication with Latin American armies, who receive, as an important Aid Item for their respective countries, out-of-date armaments from the USA; they receive military missions and hold meetings of command of all Americas at regular intervals. Inspired by the thinking they take in, Latin American Armies have worked out a theory of national security. An important sector of this national security is to be permanently on the alert against communism, thus forcing Latin America more and more into the arms of the USA who, by mere coincidence, represent for Latin America, the very incarnation of International Power.

Of course, I realize the responsibility of speaking frankly like this from a world-resounding platform like London. I am moved by the peace of mind of someone who has a duty of conscience to perform, and I am encouraged by the hope of seeing the Brazilian Army — and this already seems to be happening — return to its best traditions, because it is well known that in the days of African slavery when the abolition movement encouraged slaves to flee and the big Brazilian landowners asked the Army to help capture them, the answer was a definite NO. I long for the time when the wisdom and impartiality of our Armed Forces, without leaning to

Cuba, or Russia, or Red China, no longer identify their interests and aims with those of the USA. I long for the moment of enlightenment when our Armed Forces, as it seems might well happen, uphold without question the need for change in the archaic structure of our country; and no longer listen to the privileged minorities who consider the loss of the privileges they abuse, the same thing as subversion and communism. This gesture coming from Brazil would certainly echo throughout the continent.

Meanwhile, crushed by the violence of internal colonialism, by the violence of external imperialism, nearly all Latin America runs the risk of being crushed by her own Governments, conscious of their mission to save democracy and peace in their own countries and perhaps in the Continent.

**HOW TO ESCAPE THIS TRIPLE VIOLENCE WITHOUT MORE VIOLENCE.**

**(i) The responsibility of the Spiritual Forces in the underdeveloped world.**

There are countries in Latin America where it is still possible to appeal to the spiritual forces of the nation, such as the Church (and by Church I mean not Catholics only, but all our evangelical brethren, and all men of good will): the Press, Radio and Television (wherever it is free from the controls of Economic Power): the universities, and youth in general: and to the intelligent and sincere elements in our political life.

In some countries political parties are to all intents and purposes nonexistent; youth is silenced by threats such as the forfeiture of educational rights; the press, radio and TV is kept under tight control. In some countries the only voice that remains — and even that is under growing suspicion — is that of the Church.

It seems to me that an absolute requirement of the Gospel, a matter of being faithful to Christ — no matter how wrongly this fidelity is interpreted — is that the Church, as long as she is able to speak out, as long as her voice is not stifled, should demand changes in the inhuman social structures that are holding up the full development of our people, and that are keeping them in conditions which are subhuman and unworthy of the Children of God.



(ii) **Responsibilities of the Spiritual Forces of the developed countries.**

To the spiritual forces of the developed world, I can do no better than to indicate as a programme, provided it is not limited to beautiful and brave statements only, the Haslemere Declaration. I would especially emphasise this item of the programme: "We intend to build links with the groups that are fighting poverty, homelessness, racial discrimination or any other issue that reflects the failure of society to cater for the weak and op-

pressed". Putting this another way, we align ourselves with those who are **struggling for development**, fighting poverty and subhuman conditions that reflect the failure of our society to help, efficiently, the promotion of **human justice**, the indispensable condition of peace in the world. You have referred to some of the groups which are striving for development in underdeveloped countries in these words: "Many of these groups do not yet interpret their frustration politically; there is no common language or institution to express them. The task ahead is to weld these disconnected

feelings of protest into a coherent and united movement; to open a debate about the values and priorities and structures of our society that will involve those — particularly the young — who have stayed outside politics".

(Archbishop Helder Camara of Recife, Brazil is initiating a social reform programme in his country in October on the anniversary of the birth of Mahatma Gandhi. Our May issue carried a summary of an address he made to the Manchester Student Congress.)

# Die Kerk Buite Suid-Afrika

PROF. B. B. KEET

## WAAR STAAN ONS NED. GEREFORM. KERK?

Die Christian Reformed Church (Grand Rapids, Amerika) het in sy sinodale vergadering 'n besluit geneem waarop alle rassisme van die kerk en die gemeenskap streng veroordeel word. Hy het ook 'n oproep gedoen en 'n dag van verootmoediging en gebed bepaal om 'n vernuwing van die samelewing, en verklaar dat die kerk as broeders sal ontvang almal, van watter ras of kleur ook al, wat oor hul sonde berou het en hul geloof in Christus bely.

Die voorwoord lui: Omdat die sinode verlang dat mense van alle rasse saam sal lewe in gehoorsaamheid aan die Woord van God, wil hy hierdie getuïenis lewer aangaande die leer van die Woord, met die ernstige bede dat die krag van die Heilige Gees 'n vernuwing van die samelewing, volgens Sy wil, sal bewerk. In 'n sterk bewoorde verklaring sê die sinode verder: „almal wat lid is van die kerk moet die ontsegging van gemeenskap met elkeen, ondanks ras of kleur, as sondig beskou. Die sinode het duidelik verklaar dat vrees vir vervolging of verlies van persoonlike of institutêre voordeel, wat afhang van die gehoorsaamheid aan Christus, aan niemand die reg gee om gemeenskap en voorregte in die kerk te weier nie".

Die verklaring is onderteken deur Paul G. Schrottenboer, Algemene Sekretaris.

Ek wens ek het die ruimte om uit Gereformerd Weekblad aan te haal oor wat daar gesê word omtrent die verhoor in Den Haag, want dit raak die Christian Reformed Church en sy houding teenoor apartheid direk. Der-

halwe slegs 'n greep hier en daar, wat tog 'n indruk sal gee van wat ons Gereformeerde broeders in Nederland oor Suid-Afrikaanse aangeleenthede weet en verkondig. Ek refereer hoofsaaklik na wat in die verhoor in Den Haag deur ons vernaamste getuie beweer is oor die Bybelse fundering vir apartheid, dat die N.G. Kerk gesteun word deur die Gereformeerde Eku-meniese Sinode. Hierteen is heftig beswaar aangeteken. In albei, die meerderheids- en die minderheidsrapport, staan die sinode vierkant teen alle apartheidspolitiek. Dit sover as die vergadering in Grand Rapids betref. Daarom word ge-eis dat aan die Christian Reformed Church ekskuus sal gevra word waar hulle onder die voorstanders van apartheid geraken word.

Dieselfde geld vir die vergadering in Lunteren. Die minderheidsrapport het slegs 16 stemme verkry, omdat die meerderheid van mening was, dat hierdie rapport te konkreet was en die sondes, veral die institusionele en strukturele, te duidelik by die naam genoem het. In die meerderheidsrap-

port ontbreek hierdie konkretheid. Maar daar is geen sprake van dat hierdie rapport as steun van die apartheidswetgewing beskou kan word nie. Intendeel, elkeen wat daardie rapport lees, ontdek dat op baie versigtige wyse in meer as een uitspraak, die beginsels en beleid van die apartheidswetgewing net so sterk veroordeel word as in die minderheidsrapport.

Wat die opstellers van die minderheidsrapport gevrees het ('n vrees wat hulle openlik uitgespreek het) het gebeur. Sommige afgevaardigdes uit Suid-Afrika het in pers-onderhoude en geskifte beweer dat hierdie rapport dié beginsels en daardie beleid *nie* veroordeel het nie. Hierdie bewering is van alle waarheid ontbloot, soos elkeen kan bevestig wat die rapport lees.

Drie gevolgtrekkings moet hier gemaak word:—

1. Daar moet konsultasie kom tussen die leiers van alle bevolkings-groepe oor die stappe wat nodig is tot rekonstruering van die samelewing.
2. Daar moet 'n weg gebaan word vir alle groepe om deel te neem aan die regeringsverantwoordelike. Die kerk behoort sulke prosedures aan te moedig.
3. Die lastige wette wat op rassediskriminasie gebaseer is, moet opgehef word. Die kerke behoort by die owerheid daarop aan te dring.



# MOET ONS HIEROOR LAG? BLOOS? KWAAD WORD?

'n Suid-Afrikaanse student in Nederland stuur aan ons 'n uitknipsel uit die dagblad „Trouw” van 25 Junie. *Alweer een „ontugwet”,* geskryf deur die rubriekskrywer „Flex”.

Na 'n bietjie wik en weeg, het ons besluit om dit tog, interessantheidshalwe, in Pro Veritate oor te neem — onvertaald. Name wat in die stukkie genoem word, laat ons egter weg. By die X'e kan lesers maar dink aan Naudé, of Van Wyk, of De Villiers, of Engelbrecht, of Van der Merwe — nes u wil. U sal uself cers deeglik in die spieël moet gaan betrag voor u definitief besluit dat u eie naam hoegenaamd nie in die gedrang kan wees nie.

Maar bly tog maar weg van Nederland. Veral van „Flex”. Hy is blykbaar 'n ekspert op die gebied van rasseklassifikasie. En daar is meer soos hy.

'n Nederlandse predikantvriend het my ook op 'n dag daar in sy pastorie goed sit en bekyk, en my „geklassifiseer”. Ek sal vir niemand sê waar ek geland het nie, maar hy het my darem nog toege laat om onder sy dak te oornag. Ek is seker hy sou dieselfde gasvryheid kon betoon aan mense soos die X'e wat „Flex” noem. In Nederland is daar geen wet wat hom dit sou verbied nie. Maar om so onverhoeds „geklassifiseer” te word, al is die situasie nog so veilig, laat 'n mens tog olik voel, so asof jy vals „beskuldig” word en magteloos daarteenoor staan. As u nog altyd vir 'n „blanke” deurgegaan het, en iemand sê vir u reguit in u gesig: „Maar u is tog geen blanke nie?” sal u weet. Gelukkig dra jy jou persoonskaart by jou as onomstootlike bewys. Ja, my kaartjie spreek my vry, wie my ook as „geen blanke” beskuldig. Juigend kan ek end-uit gaan, in my land neem hulle my as blanke aan!

Maar luister wat sê „Flex”, die man van „Trouw”.

## ALWEER EEN 'ONTUGWET'

Wie eenmaal begint rassenwetten te produceren, weet van geen ophouden. Thans word in Zuid-Afrika nagedacht over een wet, die seksueel verkeer tussen kleurlingen

en swarten moet verbieden, so lees ik in Die Burger van zaterdag. (Voor degene, die 't niet weet: een kleurling is iemand, die zowel blanke als zwarte voorouders heeft). Eigenlijk is het vreemd dat men nu pas op het idee van een dergelijk wet komt, want als men zo bezorgd was geweest over het zuiver houden van de rassen, dan had de wetgever niet mogen volstaan met een verbod tot seksueel verkeer tussen blanken en anderen. Terloops blijkt dat de bestaande Ontugwet dus uitsluitend bedoeld was het blanke ras van vreemde smetten te vrijwaren.

Maar dit terzijde. Men gaat dus nu ook waken voor het zuiver houden van „het zwarte bloed”.

## VERSWARTING

Ja, dat had u gedacht. De minister van Binnelandse zaken Muller, die met het idee voor een nieuwe Ontugwet op de proppen kwam, motiveerde het anders in de Senaat. Hij zei dat er een nieuwe Ontugwet moest komen, „om die verswarting van die Kleurlingbevolking te keer”. Over dat proces was hij „bekommerd”, zo zei hij. Nu was er een heel eenvoudig middelje geweest om dat proces te stuiten, nl. intrekking van de bestaande Ontugwet, zodat er weer een grotere portie „blank” bloed aan het gekleurde deel van de bevolking zou worden toegevoegd, maar dat was het prijsgeven geweest van de hele rassenfilosofie van blank Zuid-Afrika. Dat kon dus niet. Wel bij deze filosofie past het om de toevloed van meer „zwart” bloed naar de kleurlingenbevolking af te dammen.

De bezorgdheid over het „verswartingsproces” bij de kleurlingen is stellig oprecht bij de blanke Afrikaners. Alle schone rassen-theorieën ten spijt, staat de gemengd-bloedige kleurling hem nader dan de raszuivere zwarte. De blanke kaste staat bovenaan, daarna komen de kleurlingen en de Indiërs en daaronder bevinden zich de Bantoes. In deze kasteopvatting past stellig ook een scherpe scheidslijn tussen kleurlingen en Bantoes. Liever hadden de blanken achteraf gezien dat er helemaal geen kleurlingen waren

ontstaan, want hun loutere aanwezigheid in dat land maakt van alle rassenfilosofieën een lachertje, maar helaas. De vaders hadden kennelijk niet uit de Bijbel begrepen dat een gemengd huwelijk tegen Gods wil was.

## VERMENGING

Al onder Jan van Riebeeck begonnen blanke Nederlanders zich te vermengen met de zwarte bevolking. Jan zelf betuigde eens zijn instemming met het huwelijk van een blanke met een Hottentottenvrouw. Men dee maar aan. Vijf-en-twintig jaar na de invoering van de slavernij waren 75 pct van alle kinderen van de slavinnen kleurlingen. Veel families boden hun gasten seksuele gastvrijheid aan in de slavenverblijven, want dat betekende op den duur een vermeerdering van het slavenaantal zonder extra kosten. Vrijwel alle Kaapse families hebben genealogische banden met kleurlingen. Het is zelfs zeer de vraag of er in Zuid-Afrika wel veel echte blanken wonen.

X ( . . . 'n groot volksfiguur van die verlede . . . ) kan men toch geen gave blanke noemen. Vaak gebeurt het me dat zich een „blanke” bezoeker bij me aandient aan wie ik direct kan zien dat hij uit Zuid-Afrika komt. Z'n huid vertelt het me.

## X ( . . . 'n Belangrike Suid-Afrikaner . . . )

De X'e komen uit Kaapstad. Wie vorig jaar in . . . X goed bekeken heeft, betwijfelt of hij hier wel met een raszuivere blanke te maken had. Het is een zegen voor „blank” Zuid-Afrika dat in Europa niet de Zuidafrikaanse rassenwetten bestaan, want zeer vele leden van de Nationale Partij hadden hier stellig geen schijn van kans gehad om hier op een blank toilet te komen. In Zuid-Afrika zelf laat men het er in twijfelgevallen van afhangen of de betrokkene al of niet algemeen als blanke wordt aanvaard. Ten aanzien van de gebroeders X verklaar ik hen niet als raszuivere blanken te beschouwen. Elk blank echtpaar in Zuid-Afrika loopt het risico op-

eens een kindje te krijgen met een wat donkere huidskleur en kroezig haar, omdat een verre voorvader niet geheel blank was. Komt het op school dan begint de ellende.

**X ( . . . Nog 'n belangrike Suid-Afrikaner . . . )**

Nog steeds ervaren vele blanke Afrikaners de Ontugwet als on-

natuurlijk. Er worden nogal wat weekendslippertjes gemaakt naar Beetsjoeanaland en Mozambique voor seksueel verkeer met niet-blanke vrouwen. De huidige Afrikaners hebben heus geen andere neigingen dan de vaders. Toen X eens zijn familie opriep om de dag te herdenken dat zijn voorvaders naar Zuid-Afrika emigreerden, melden zich ook honder-

den gekleurde X'e voor het feest. X was woedend. Ze mochten er niet bij. De gekleurde X'e hielden toen maar een aparte herdenking. Wat humor hoort erbij. Maar 'k kan me voorstellen, dat het bij elke nieuwe rassenwet moeilijker wordt er nog om te lachen.

FLEX.

*Naskrif: Miskien lieg „Flex” nog alles wat hy praat.*

## Contact between the Afrikaans and English Churches

THE REV. ROBERT ORR

**Basically, the thing that strikes any observer of the South African church scene is the almost complete lack of official contact between the Afrikaans and English churches. Please don't get me wrong here. Personal contact, even friendly and cordial contact between ministers — this you will find. But it does not go much further than that. Official contact, co-operation, consultation is practically non-existent. And what's worse, there is a tragic lack of desire for such official contact.**

In preparation for this talk, I visited some of my minister friends in the Afrikaans churches and asked them a stack of sticky questions. Without exception I was most cordially received and my questions were freely and openly answered.

### COTTESLOE

Again, without exception, these friends agreed with me that there was a lack of contact, a lack of meaningful communication, between our churches. Understandably enough, they tended to put the blame at the door of the English churches. One of my friends said that over the years, as history would show, it was always the Afrikaans churches that had persistently taken the initiative in seeking inter-church conversations and consultations, but that they had become progressively more disillusioned with them. Why? Because, he said, time and time again, the English churches steered these conversations onto the question of race relations, politics, the rights of the non-European. This process, as far as he could see resulted in an explosion at the famous Cottesloe consultation. At that time, he said, it was a real pity that the English churches fell into the tac-

tical error of appearing to rejoice at what Cottesloe decided, as if to say, "At last the Afrikaans churches are coming to accept what we have always believed". It would have been better, he thought, for the English churches to have shown rather more understanding of the fact that the Afrikaans churches had stretched their theology and their political convictions to the limit at Cottesloe.

An English churchman, however, reminded me that shortly after Cottesloe the Prime Minister cracked the whip rather sharply about the Cottesloe findings and that this seemed to settle the matter for Afrikaans churchmen.

### PROTEST

Looking back, I am very much inclined to wonder if, at the crucial time — say the first ten years of National Party rule — the English churches didn't perhaps rely rather too heavily on the tactics of protest, verbal protest, against what we saw as objectionable features of government policy. In synods and assemblies, we often made a good deal of noise with resounding statements on any and every aspect of government policy that happened to catch out at-

tention. Looking back now, I can't help wondering whether these statements had much effect. I know that I played my part in helping to frame and vote for such statements, and I recall being highly incensed with one leading personality in my own church who compared the making of such statements to "the thunderous firing of popguns". But now I wonder. What effect did they have, these statements? Did they change government policy? Not as far as one can see. Government departments to whom we sent the statements gave us the brush-off curt and courteous. Did they affect our members? My impression is that our statements did not prevent our members becoming steadily more conservative in their political convictions.

This dominee friend did say something about the tactics of church protest. The glaring fault in it, as he saw it, was that, generally, the English churches rush to make statements without getting hold of all the relevant facts. Also, he said, it is no help for these statements to imply that the motives of those in authority and the motives of Afrikaans churchmen are suspect. If we could get out of this habit, he said, we might well open the way to deeper understanding.

### LANGUAGE

Another dominee friend offered as another reason for the Afrikaans churchman's reluctance to consult and confer with English churchmen the necessity for the Afrikaans churchman



to use English in such conversations. Not that he has any prejudice against English. But I had to agree that while the majority of dominees are perfectly at home in English, it is only the minority of English churchmen who can understand Afrikaans or use it with any facility. Naturally this hinders communication.

### DISTORTED IMAGE

One tragic result of this lack of contact between us is the distorted picture or image that we have of each other. Ask the average English churchman how he sees the Afrikaans churchman, and this is the kind of answer you'll get: "The Afrikaner is a member of a church that has all kinds of strong links with 'the establishment'; he is subjected to far too much politics from the pulpit; his ministers have no compunction about opening political party rallies with prayer — prayer that takes it for granted whose side God is on; he concentrates too much attention on dancing and mini-skirts and ice-cream bells on Sunday, and too little on justice and compassion for those who have little of this world's goods; if his ministers wonder about some aspects of national policy, they keep remarkably quiet about it..." and so on.

I don't say that this picture is all true. But it's there. And if it's not true, then that's because of our tragic lack of contact and our woeful ignorance of one another.

What I say now, I can't say with the same assurance. I'm trying now, you see, to put myself in another man's shoes. At some risk, I'm trying to see the picture which the average Afrikaans churchman has of us. I did ask my dominee friends about this, but somehow the conversation got diverted at this point. However, I would imagine that the Afrikaner sees the English churches as dominated by political parsons who see everything through United or Progressive Party spectacles; as being much more concerned with social revolution than with the gospel; as being sadly divided compared to Afrikaner churchly solidarity; as going after allies in the political struggle against the Afrikaner rather than after the salvation of men; as being ham-strung by a wide gulf between the clergy and laity, the clergy galloping in one direction and the laity in another and completely different direction.

Again, I don't say that this picture is true. I don't recognise myself in it at all. But it's there — or at least, I think it's there. And it's there because we don't meet each other and don't know each other.

### WHAT CAN WE DO?

What can we do? Specifically, what can the English churches do? One or two suggestions — which may suffer from being telegraphically short — are: first, let's realise and respect the tremendous mission and welfare work

done by the Afrikaans churches, their tremendous generosity to, for example, the Bible Society. Let's realise that the average African minister in the Dutch Reformed Church gets a much better salary than his counterpart in the other churches. Second, let's encourage the Afrikaans churches in their attempts to put their own official statements into practice, including the statements of the Reformed Ecumenical Synod at Lunteren. Many of these statements are far more courageous than we realise. Third, let's not think that the Afrikaans churchman is isolated from recent theological trends. I have seen books by radical theologians on dominee's desks. Fourth, from our side, let's go on making every possible attempt at contact and co-operation, even when we feel, as we do feel, that these attempts are being ignored or brushed aside.

I've been concentrating on the Afrikaans and English churches this evening. While there's no time to go into this in any detail, I feel I must add that there is an even more urgent and desperate need for Christians of different races to meet and to know each other. My own strong conviction is that if we don't do this we are laying up tremendous sorrow and trouble for ourselves.

*(This is the text of a radio broadcast delivered on the 24th June, 1969. Published with the kind permission of the English Programme Organiser of the S.A.B.C.)*

# The Doctrine of the Ministry in the New Testament

The Rev. Dr. R. J. McKELVEY

When the epistle to the Ephesians states that Christ gave the ministry to the Church it is expressing the fundamental conception of the Christian ministry. The essential nature of the ministry of the Church has been determined by Jesus Christ and his ministry.

### THE INTENTION OF JESUS

Anyone who enquires into the intention of Jesus in regard to the Church (and the ministry) immediately runs up against the difficulty of interpretation. The writings of the evangelists are Gospels and not memoirs. They are apostolic

testimony, and contain interpretation as well as history. If our task were simply a case of ascertaining what the Church (as represented by the evangelists) taught there would be no great problem, but if it is discovering what Jesus himself had in mind the matter is much less straightforward. Although an advance in re-

gard to establishing the authenticity of particular texts like Matt. 16:16ff has been made, scholars are still not in possession of agreed criteria by which the teaching of Jesus may be judged. Until there are such criteria, Loisy's dictum that Jesus proclaimed the Kingdom of God and what came was the Church, is bound to stick. We shall remain in doubt as to whether Jesus' outlook was wholly eschatological, in his expectation of the imminent end of things (cf. e.g. Mk. 9:1), or whether he foresaw



an interim (e.g. Matt. 28:18ff), and thus expected and provided for some kind of organization for his followers (Matt. 16:16ff). Certainly there is no clear evidence that Jesus formally rejected Judaism and its institutions. The evangelists believed that he rejected them, but they were writing at a time when Israel had rejected Jesus and the contingency present in the ministry of Jesus had thus disappeared by the time that they wrote.

Certain things are, however, clear.

Jesus proclaimed the coming of the Kingdom of God. All students of the synoptic gospels are agreed on this, whatever their interpretation of the imminence of the Kingdom may be. Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom set his ministry in direct relation to the Old Testament and Jewish hope concerning the rule and authority of God over men and their concerns. For Jesus or for the prophets and apocalyptists to say that the Kingdom of God is coming is to say that God is sovereign and his will shall be done. Since Jesus obeys God the Kingdom is present in his ministry. Where he stands God is sovereign, i.e. his kingdom comes. In the presence of the Kingdom of God, Israel must repent. That is to say, the people of God cannot expect to pass into the Kingdom and enjoy its blessings on their present level of existence. They must change. Israel is thus forced to make a decision. This decision will reveal whether she will have a place in the new age or not, whether she is the people of God or not.

Set in the closest relation to the proclamation of the Kingdom of God is Jesus' choice of the twelve. This is what anyone familiar with the Old Testament eschatology would expect: "in Deutero-Isiah the preaching of the good news of God's Reign is inseparable from the gathering of the redeemed Israel, and the guidance of the flock of Yahweh."<sup>1</sup> Like Jesus, the twelve are an eschatological sign. Their number indicates that the people of God are being gathered and reunited as the prophets and others predicted would happen when the Kingdom of God came.

Jesus' calling of the twelve was very likely interpreted as the founding of the Church by the synoptic writers, who call them apostles (Lk. 6:13; Mt. 10:2; Mk. 6:30). Whether Jesus so regarded it is less certain. The Jews of Qumran had

twelve leaders, but they were not a Church. The original significance of the twelve was eschatological (Matt. 19:28; Lk. 22:30).

Closely related to the call of the twelve is the Last Supper. Once again the evangelists regarded this as the institution of the eucharist. But can one say that Jesus regarded it as such? Even if the command to repeat the meal comes from Jesus himself, there is still uncertainty as to what precisely Jesus wished his followers to perpetuate. Some scholars think it was the Passover interpreted in the light of the new mighty act of God.

If the results of our enquiry concerning the intention of Jesus do not appear to take us very far, it may be because in the past too much was made of them. In any evaluation of the evidence it is of fundamental importance to know just how much weight the text will carry. It would obviously be unwise for systematic theologians to rush in where New Testament scholars fear to tread. This is not to exclude effectively gospels from present day studies on the Church. Anyone who has read Hans Küng's book on the Church will know how positively a systematic theologian can use the evidence of the Gospels while accepting the limits imposed on him by New Testament theologians.

### THE TEACHING OF THE EVANGELISTS

Now, if the present state of synoptic criticism precludes us from saying as much as we would like about the intention of Jesus, there still remains the teaching of the evangelists. As we pointed out at the beginning, the evangelists are not passive recorders of the Gospel tradition, but historians and theologians, and, above all, members of the Christian community. Their selection and use of their material gives us insight into the beliefs and practices of the Church of their day. With this in mind we may survey the material in question.

By calling the twelve "Apostles" the synoptic writers, all clearly indicate that they regarded them as the founding members of the Church (Mk. 3:14 mgn; 6:30; Mt. 10:2; Lk. 6:13 passim). Nowhere is this clearer than in the writings of Luke, where we see a direct link between his use of the term "apostle" in the Gospel and, in Acts. It is to my mind not very clear whether the evangelists

thought of the twelve as the Church (in nucleus) or as the apostolate within the Church. There are texts in which the twelve feature along with other followers of Jesus, but it is significant that in the really determinative events of the ministry only the twelve are mentioned. The latter is particularly true in regard to the Last Supper. If the evangelists regarded the Supper as the institution of the Eucharist, as they undoubtedly did, then it seems likely that the evangelists regarded the participants as the Church and not just a part of the Church, i.e. the apostolic officers. In any event, the problem is more apparent than real. Whether the evangelists thought of the twelve as an office or not, the pastoral and diaconal functions which they attribute to them would in any case apply to the whole Church.

The famous Petrine text which Matthew connects to the confession of faith at Caesarea Philippi naturally merits particular mention in any discussion of the ministry in the gospels. Although careful study of this text has shown that it has enough Semitic flavouring to make scholars reconsider the case for regarding it as a genuine *verbum Domini*, doubt still remains in some minds. But that the text is evidence of what the author of the Gospel of Matthew believed about the founding of the Church and the place in the Church occupied by Peter (and the apostles)<sup>2</sup> is universally recognised. The evangelist believed that Peter was the foundation of the Church, but by so designating him indicates that he did not think of him as representing a continuing class. On the other hand, the conferring of authority as represented by the keys and the binding and loosing is apparently thought of as continuing, since in the parallel text, viz. 18:18, the authority is given to the whole Church. So in one sense Peter has successors, viz. the Church at large<sup>3</sup>.

The pericope on service in Mk. 10:35-45 and parallels is one of the more obvious passages in which the evangelists convey their understanding of the ministry. Others are less obvious, like the Feeding of the Five Thousand ("you give them some-

(1) R. N. Flew, *Jesus and His Church*, 1938, p. 51.

(2) In the incident at Caesarea Philippi, Jesus puts his question to the twelve, and Peter, in replying, acts as their spokesman. Cf. Mk. 8:29f. 33.

(3) Cf. E. Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament*, 1961, p. 59.

thing to eat" Mk. 6:37), which may be a reminder of the Church's pastoral responsibilities. Sometimes the findings of commentators in this connection look more like eisegesis than exegesis. But if one rigorously applies to any given pericope the question, Why did the Church select and preserve this particular story, one can usually mark out the area of probability..

The idea of ministry as service is clearly expressed in the fourth Gospel. Here a significant universalizing is evident. The term "apostle" has fallen out of use. It is of disciples we read, in particular the beloved or ideal disciple. The twelve are mentioned in only two places (6:6ff; 20:14). What is of importance for the author is the disciple, living in union with Christ. When, therefore, Jesus engages in the footwashing, He is setting a pattern for the whole Church. Similarly when the glorified Christ commissions his followers, bestows the Spirit, and grants authority to remit and retain sins, John does not single out the twelve, but speaks generally of 'the disciples' (20:19ff). The office assigned to Peter in chapter 21 is exceptional, but is probably to be explained by the fact that this chapter is very likely an appendix<sup>4</sup>.

### THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

The writer to the Hebrews states what is the most important conception of New Testament concerning the ministry when it describes Jesus Christ as priest and high priest. It is fundamental to the New Testament that the Church exercises a ministry only because of what Christ did on the cross and what He continues to do in the presence of God. Christians are priests only because Christ is the "great priest over the house of God" (Heb. 10:21). It is the above all that distinguishes the Christian ministry from its Jewish and pagan counterparts. It is this that makes the Church's offering not only acceptable to God, but possible at all. This thought is basic to all that the New Testament says about the ministry although it is prominent only in Hebrews.

According to Hebrews, Christ is a high priest *forever* (7:17). His priestly work has not ceased with his exultation. "We have (*echomen*) a high priest" (8:1). "Christ has entered . . . into heaven itself, now (*nun* emphatic) to appear in the presence of God on our behalf"

(9:24). *The function of a priest, as the writer observes, is to offer something; hence it is necessary for Christ to have an offering to make* (8:3). What is Christ's offering? It is, in the first place, the perfect and unrepeatable oblation of himself (7:27; 9:25f, 28; 10:12). Thus the writer says that Christians have an altar (13:10). Secondly, Christ offers the sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving made by his people (13:15f). Hence we see a link between Hebrews and other New Testament writings that describe the faithful as a "royal priesthood". Thirdly, Christ as priest makes intercession (7:25; cf. 10:11-14).

The idea of Christ's priesthood is also present by implication in I Pet. 2:5 where Christians are exhorted to offer sacrifices "acceptable to God through Jesus Christ". One should also compare the thought of Rom. 12:1. Christ's priesthood may also be in mind in the Book of Revelation, even though Christ is depicted there as the one who receives worship rather than (as in Hebrews) the one who offers it. According to the principle stated in Rev. 17:14 ("Because he is Lord of Lords and King of Kings those who are with him, i.e. his people, are called and chosen and faithful") we may say that Christ by making Christians "priests to his God and Father" (1:6) is thought of as a priest. Indeed many commentators think the figure of Christ "clothed with a long robe and a golden girdle round his breast" and moving among the lampstands is priestly (1:12f). The thought is not indeed characteristic of Revelation, which thinks of Christ as reigning with God. But inasmuch as the royalty of the faithful in Revelation is balanced by their priesthood it may well be that Christ is thought of as a priest as well as king.

### 1 PETER 2:9

From the priesthood or ministry of Christ we proceed to the priesthood or ministry of Christians.

Anyone who is at all familiar with the ancient world, or indeed with African culture, must find it remarkable that the practice of blood sacrifice found no place in Christianity. Even the Jews of Qumran who freely spiritualized sacrifice in terms of praise and thanksgiving could not regard this as a permanent substitute for blood offerings. In point of fact, we find Justin Martyr defending the Church on this very point. Some

commentators think that the New Testament texts like "We have an altar" (Heb. 13:10) and "I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with hands," (Mk. 14:58) are claims made in face of criticism that the Church lacked a cultus. Be that as it may, the explanation of course had to do with the Church's conviction that the death of Christ was the sacrifice which finally and effectively dealt with the problem of propitiation.

But having made this point the early Christians proceeded to say something else, viz. that Christianity did in fact have a priesthood and culture. What had happened was that the sacrifice practised by the ancient world was transmuted.

The key New Testament text in this connection is I Pet. 2:9f: "You are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people . . . Once you were no people but now you are God's people". The passage is taken right out of Exod. 19:6 (cf. 23:22 LXX). The words are now applied to the Church, the new people of God, no longer from one nation but many, who are given the evangelical task which Israel had failed to do. The corporate nature of the terms used are striking. It is the Church in toto that is priestly not particular Christians. This is seen both from the representation of the stones (of God's House) as priests and the quotation of Exod. 19:6, which refers to the whole of Israel. When the idea of the priesthood of the whole Christian community was lost during the centuries of clericalization classic Protestantism sought to recover it in the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, but unfortunately this has often been interpreted in an individualistic sense as the priesthood of each believer, and taken to mean simply the Christian's privilege of access to God, or, worse, his right to his own interpretation of the scriptures. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that it is the priesthood of the whole body which I Peter has in mind. To speak therefore of the priesthood of the laity is unfortunate. "Priesthood of the faithful" conveys what is meant to Protestant ears, but it does not help Catholics since the "faithful" for

(4) It has been suggested that the footwashing and John's note that it was a lad (young man) who presented the elements which Jesus used to feed the multitude point to the diaconate seems unlikely since the evangelist nowhere else draws attention to "office".



them denotes the laity. "The priesthood of the people of God" says exactly what is meant but is cumbersome. "Royal priesthood" is convenient but strange to moderns not familiar with Biblical language. Perhaps "Christian priesthood" is as good as any.

### THE BOOK OF REVELATION

The priesthood of the Church is also present in the book of Revelation: "To him who loves us and has freed us from our sins by his own Blood and made us a Kingdom, priests to His God and Father" (1.5f). "Thou wast slain and by thy blood didst ransom men for God . . . and hast made them a Kingdom and priests" (5.9; cf. 20:6). The idea is also present in the account of the martyr host "standing before the Throne and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes" (7:9). To stand before God in white dress is to be priests.

The Christian priesthood is also implied in various New Testament

exhortations to believers to offer sacrifices to God (Rom. 12:1; Heb. 13:15f) and wherever worship and witness are couched in sacrificial language (Heb. 4:16; 7:25; 10:21f; Eph. 2:18).

The Church is thus clearly viewed as realizing the Old Testament ideal of the priesthood of the whole of the people of God (Ex. 19:6; Isa. 61.6).

Priesthood and sacrifice is the language of the sanctuary and suggests to moderns a conception of the ministry which is inward-looking. A moment's reflection, however, should correct this impression. A priesthood never exists for its own sake. To call the Church priestly is to point immediately to its responsibilities in regard to the world. If *all* Christians are priests it follows that those on whose behalf they exist are men of the world<sup>5</sup>.

It is at this point that New Testament thinking of the Church's priesthood connects up with another strand of New Testament teaching, viz. the ministry (*diakonia*) of the Church.

### EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

In Eph. 4:11ff we are told that the ascended Christ supplied the Church with apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers "for the equipment of the saints for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ until we all attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

The meaning of this important text is brought out by Canon J. N. Suggit in a paper presented at the Church Unity Commission and I cannot do better than quote him:

"Here we see that the whole purpose of the Church is that its members should be equipped for ministry, service (*diakonia*). But the service which is to be directed to all men, has a special object — the

(5) This is supported by Ex. 19:6 "You shall be my own possession among all peoples, for all the earth is mine". It is "among all peoples" that Israel was to exercise its priesthood.

## CHRISTIAN WITNESS IN RHODESIA

The Christian faith involves a concern for every human relationship. This includes the relationship created by life together within one political body under one government. We cannot therefore agree with those who say that Christianity has nothing to do with politics. A country which professes to uphold and defend Christian principles must always be willing to let its political life be examined and judged in the light of God's will. Christians in Rhodesia must look carefully at the proposed constitution and ask whether it accords with their faith.

With this in mind let us look at what the Bible says about the state, about humanity, and about racial distinction.

### A. The Christian concept of the State.

According to the Bible the state is based on a God-given authority used for the service of the whole people, both ruled and rulers. When the ruler acts rightly as a servant of God and a shepherd of the people, his rule makes for peace (the true well-being of every member of the state.)<sup>1</sup>

Both the Bible and history show

that governments tend to think of themselves as masters rather than as servants.<sup>2</sup> In every age safeguards against tyranny have to be discovered. In European and in African societies the safeguard of rule by the consent of the ruled has been developed. A broad based adult suffrage is necessary for this.

### B. The Christian view of Man.

The Biblical view of man is that he is created in the image of God as a free and responsible person. His freedom can lead him to extremes of selfishness and cruelty. Yet with the help of God he is capable of almost unlimited development. It is God's will that every man shall grow to the full stature of his humanity as measured by Christ. Because of this every man has value and artificial restrictions on his development are intolerable to the Christian conscience.<sup>3</sup>

When God revealed himself in the world, he did it through the human life of Jesus Christ, and his coming as a man is the highest honour of humanity. Any attack on the honour or dignity of a man is an attack on all human honour and dignity. A man who is despised is still free to believe that

this humanity has value, but the man who despises him has denied the value of all humanity, including his own.<sup>4</sup>

### C. The Christian view of Racial Distinction.

There is a great deal in the Bible that bears directly on the problems of race. The proclamation of the Gospel creates a multi-racial community "for every nation, from all tribes and peoples and tongues".<sup>5</sup> The tensions of creating such a community are reflected in the New Testament writings, but Christians believe that in Christ God has broken down the walls of division between man and man. All human differences of race or tribe or nation lose their divisive significance through the reconciling work of Christ.<sup>6</sup>

(From: *A Message and Appeal from Church Leaders to the Christian People of Rhodesia, June, 1969*).

1. Deut. 17:18-20, Ezek. 34, Romans 13:1-10.  
2. 1 Samuel 8:11-18.  
3. Genesis 1:28, Psalm 8, John 10:10, 1 Cor. 2:9, Eph. 4:13.  
4. Hebrews 2:5-17.  
5. Revelation 7:9.  
6. John 10:16, Acts 10:34-35, 11:1-18, Gal. 3:28, Eph. 2:14-16, Col. 3:11.



building up of the Body of Christ. This phrase refers to the Church (cf. Eph. 1:23), but is here used in widest sense, indicating that its mission is to bring all men into that unity with Christ which alone will produce mature manhood. The full manhood of each man will be found only in his unity with others in Christ. The Church (God's people), is here to serve, to minister to, the world and to promote that unity in Christ which Christ wills for all men. Every member of the Church, therefore, is a minister, a diakonos, and inevitably has a ministry or service to exercise towards others".

The Church then is ministry and ministry in all its forms is incumbent on the Church. The ordination of certain individuals as clergy in no way fulfils or lessens the obligations for ministry on the part of the rest of the Church. All Christians are ministers, some are parsons (Luther). "Ministry is not above or before, but within the Church".<sup>6</sup> This fact, as we shall see, comes out very clearly in the teaching of 1 Corinthians on the indwelling Spirit creating charisms in the Church.

To emphasize the New Testament conception of the priesthood or ministry of Christians, Yves Congar and others speak helpfully of "baptismal ordination".<sup>7</sup> In our baptisms we enter the Christian priesthood. We are enlisted in a ministry like Christ's. Jesus told His followers that they would share in His baptism, and just as His baptism looks not only to the past (confession of sin) but also to the future (witness to the coming of the Kingdom of God). Present-day formularies for the ordination of the clergy may be judged satisfactory in so far as they give expression to the fundamental fact of the ministry all Christians have by virtue of their baptism into Christ.

## 1 CORINTHIANS

The importance of 1 Corinthians for our subject has been realized in only comparatively recent times. Its importance derives from the fact that it is early and no other New Testament writing gives so much original and detailed information on Church order. It is also due to the new appreciation today of charismatic ministries.<sup>8</sup> The distinction which certain scholars in the past sought to make between an "official" and a "charismatic" ministry in the early

Church is false and misleading.<sup>9</sup> The new Testament cannot think of any ministry apart from the gift of the Spirit.

Perhaps the most remarkable thing about 1 Corinthians is that while it has a lot to say about the ministry, it has nothing to say about the ordination or the laying on of hands. It repeatedly mentions charisms (gifts) which are given to every Church member according to the measure of faith. This is in contrast to Acts and the Pastoral Epistles which, as we shall see, have a strongly emphasized theology of offices in the Church. As Küng observes, denominations have concentrated almost exclusively on Acts and the Pastorals, and consequently have emphasized the "hierarchical" form of ministry.<sup>10</sup> The rediscovery of Corinthians as a document on the ministry is thus making a new and interesting contribution to present day thinking.

The first thing which strikes one about Paul's description of the charisms is their variety: "God has appointed in the Church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then workers of miracles, then healers, helpers, administrators, speakers in various kinds of tongues" (12:28). Any list indeed to Paul's way of thinking would be incomplete, for "each has his own special gift from God, one of one kind and one of another" (7:7; cf. 12:7). Apostles have first place in the list. For Paul they included more than the original twelve (Rom. 16:7; 1 Cor. 9:5); they are the witnesses of the risen Christ, sent and commissioned by him to preach in his name (1 Cor. 15:3-11). Prophets held a very important place in the early Church.<sup>11</sup> 1. Cor. 14 shows that they were expected to take part in ordinary gatherings for worship, but had to be controlled: two or three should speak but no more. If a prophet who had not planned to speak had something revealed to him then he was given precedence. Associated with prophets were teachers (cf. Acts 13:1), who, more than the prophets were indebted to the apostolic witness and whose task it was to work out the systematic and theological development of ideas.

It is significant that the gift of leadership (kubernesis) is well down the list. What functions are in mind are not easily determined. It is interesting that there was no one apparently in the Corinthian Church to whom Paul could appeal to restore

order (cf. 14:32).<sup>12</sup> The troublesome prophets are told to submit to one another (14:3f). At 16:15f the apostle urges the Corinthians to be subject to the "first converts". Presumably these persons are similar to those described as "over you in the Lord" in 1 Thess. 5:12.<sup>13</sup> The one really in charge at Corinth was Paul himself! At all events, Küng is correct when he says that the charisms of leadership in the Pauline churches did not produce a "ruling class", separate from the community and over it.<sup>14</sup> Indeed, if Paul's list of gifts indicates anything, it is this: no one individual can be all things to the community, even though certain individuals (like the apostle himself) may have a number of gifts. In the very nature of the case, the Christian community can never be a one-man show: "Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Do all work miracles? Do all possess gifts of healing? Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret?" (12:29f).<sup>15</sup>

One naturally wishes to know how in such a community, where each person has a charism, chaos was avoided. The answer is to be found in the charismatic structure of the Pauline churches. It did not exclude a hierarchical structure but went far beyond it. Each member has his own gift — his own ministry — by virtue of the indwelling Spirit; that is the starting point. But he has it not for himself but for others. Hence the greatest of all charisms is love (1 Cor. 13). All charisms have one and the same goal; to build up the community in obedience to the Lord. "Since you are eager for manifestations of the Spirit strive to excel in building up the Church" (14:12). Gifts are for the good of the whole Church, and they are to be sought and valued only in so far as they serve to build up the Church.

It is obvious that the dynamic conception of the Church in 1 Corinthians is of great importance for the

- (6) *The Meaning of Ordination*, W. C. C. Study Paper, 1968, p.2.
- (7) *Lay People in the Church*, 1959, p. 175.
- (8) Cf. e.g. H. Küng, *The Church*, 1968 pp. 162-203.
- (9) A. G. Herbert, *The Form of the Church* 1954, p. 50.
- (10) *The Church*, pp. 179f.
- (11) E. Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament*, 1961, p.50.
- (12) The language of 1 Cor. 14:16 points to the celebration of the eucharist, but it does not help much in understanding who presided. If Jewish practice was followed then it may well have been the heads of families.
- (13) In Phil. 1:1 the apostle greets "bishops and deacons" but nothing is known of their role.
- (14) *The Church*, p.187.
- (15) Küng, *The Church*, p.186.

renewal of the Church and the ministry today. Its conception of a "people's Church" in which each member has a gift and performs a ministry, adds to the thought of Eph. 4:12 and 1 Peter 2:5,9.

### THE CAPTIVITY EPISTLES

There is thus a close connection between the teaching of Paul's earlier and later epistles in regard to the ministry which every Christian has. In Corinthians the charisms derive from the indwelling Spirit; in Ephesians they are the gift of Christ (4:11, where *autos* emphasizes that the gift is from Christ). The gifts of Ephesians 4, like the charisms of 1 Corinthians, are for the purpose of building up the Church so that it may fulfill its ministerial calling. The Church, thus equipped, develops powers of internal growth. "When each part (member) is working properly it (the Church) makes bold growth and upbuilds itself in love".

The epistle of the Philippians is addressed "to all the saints in Christ Jesus who are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons". It is not easy to determine who these leaders are or how they fitted into the charismatic structure we have been studying. Are the *episkopoi* the same as "those over you in the Lord" at 1 Thess. 5:12, or has the term acquired a more technical sense? Should one identify *episkopoi* here with the presbyter-bishops of Acts and see here the emergence of a hierarchical structure? Even if the latter is the case this development should not be interpreted as the beginnings of a clerical system but in the context of the fundamentally charismatic structure of the Church<sup>16</sup>.

### ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

Acts mentions apostles, deacons, presbyter-bishops, prophets and teachers. The twelve apostles are a clearly defined group. They are referred to by number at the election of Matthias (1:15-26), at Pentecost (2:14), and at the installation of the seven (6:22ff). Elsewhere Acts mentions "apostles". Since it calls Paul and Barnabas apostles (14:4,14) it may be that when it refers generally to "apostles" it sometimes has a wider number than the twelve in mind. As Luke describes the office held by the twelve (1:21f) it is clear that he did not think of it as one that could be continued. Other forms of church government appear as the Church grows and expands. In the

beginning, however, the Church is ruled by the twelve under the leadership of Peter (1:15-26; 2:14ff; 5:1ff; 6:2ff; 8:1, 14ff; 15:2ff).

The first development comes with the appointment of the seven. To these the apostles delegate pastoral responsibility. There is some uncertainty about the status of the seven. From the considerable prominence given to Stephen it appears that they were outstanding individuals with insight into the nature of the Church, who did not remain subordinate to the twelve but were soon engaged in work which the twelve had reserved for themselves (6:7ff; 8:5ff, 26ff; 21:8). Tradition identified the seven as deacons, but there are difficulties in equating the seven with the deacons of Phil. 1:1 and 1 Tim. 3:8-13. Luke avoids the title "deacon", which he must have known, not only in the account of the appointment and functions of the seven but also in his description of Philip (21:8). As Acts describes them the seven have a far greater importance than deacons subsequently had; they not only care for the poor but witness and baptize. Consequently, most scholars nowadays regard their appointment as a purely temporary measure to meet a particular need without any thought of the institution of a permanent order of ministry.

In the later chapters of Acts we find James occupying the position of leadership which Peter held in the earlier chapters (15:13ff; 21:18). How this is to be explained is not at all certain. It may have been due to his apostolic standing, personal piety, or to the dynastic principle, according to which he, as the nearest male relative to the Messiah, was his personal representative on earth till his return. On the other hand it may have had to do with the Judaization of the Jerusalem community. At any rate, the rule of the Jerusalem Church by James and the apostles and elders was unique, representing a kind of Christian counter-part to the Jewish Sanhedrin under the high priest.

The elders or presbyters in the Jerusalem Church appear, for the first time, without explanation at 11:30. Later we read that Paul and Barnabas appointed elders in their churches (14:23). Lightfoot is probably correct in inferring that the presbyterate was not a novel institution like the seven, but a spontaneous and natural borrowing from

the synagogue. Every synagogue was managed by a council of elders. The borrowing may have resulted from the persecution by Herod (Acts 12), when James was martyred and the apostles were dispersed. Since the apostolate was irreplaceable a new form of church government was introduced. Lightfoot is also probably right in thinking that "The episcopate was not formed out of the apostolic order by localization, but out of the presbyteral by elevation".<sup>17</sup> The actual office of presbyter, according to Luke, was pastoral (20:28-35). Since Luke can refer to the *presbyteroi* as *episkopoi* (20:28) it is clear that the titles were to his mind synonymous.

Acts thus shows that development was a feature of early church order. The offices of the seven and the elders are created to meet the needs of an expanding Church. The apostolate is extended to include people like Paul and Barnabas. Elders replace apostles as leaders of the Jerusalem Church. Many questions are, however, left unanswered. It is not clear whether the presence of elders in the Church at Jerusalem had to do with the needs of a growing Church, as was the case in the churches founded by Paul, or whether it had to do with the disappearance of the twelve. Although Luke mentions the apostles and elders side by side at Jerusalem, he is silent on the relation of the two. Did the apostles appoint the elders as they appointed the seven? We have no means of knowing. Furthermore, we have the difficulty posed by the fact that while Luke says that Paul and Barnabas "appointed elders . . . in every city" (14:25), Paul says nothing of this in his own writings.

### PASTORAL EPISTLES

Elders also feature in the pastoral epistles (1 Tim. 5:17, 19; Tit. 1:5f). Evidently they were persons of importance (1 Tim. 5:17). Their function is to rule over the Church (1 Tim. 5:17), and they are to live an exemplary life (Tit. 1:5ff). Also described are the offices of bishops and deacons. The question therefore arises whether we are dealing with three different orders. The fact that the writer passes without a break from the qualities of a bishop to those of deacons (1 Tim. 3), with no mention of an intermediate order, may mean that he knew of only two orders, and

(16) Cf. Küng, *The Church*, p.190.  
(17) *The Christian Ministry*, p.25.



that the *episkopos* is one of the *presbuteroi* (cf. Acts 20). The same kind of conclusion is suggested by the fact that in Tit. 1 the writer passes from the appointment of elders to the qualities of a bishop.

Some scholars think it significant that whereas the author of these epistles speaks of elders in the plural he speaks of "the bishop" (sing. 1 Tim. 3:2; Tit. 1:7) and suggest that this indicates that there was only one bishop in a given place among a number of elders. This is not certain. It could be a case of particularizing the universal, or, as Schweizer says, of the writer inserting a traditional exhortation for a presbyter-bishop.<sup>18</sup> Küng thinks that the injunction "Let the elders who rule well be considered worthy of double honour, especially those who labour in preaching and teaching" (1 Tim. 5:17) indicates a contrast between those presbyters who have this ministry and those who do not. He notes that in 1 Tim. 3:2 teaching is a function of the *episkopos* and thinks that only a section of the presbyterate fulfilled the office of *episkopoi*.<sup>19</sup> In other words, by the time the pastoral epistles were written a distinction was emerging within the presbyterate. I think it is very difficult to argue this point on the evidence available.

In regard to the teaching of the pastoral epistles on the ministry, we also ought to note the ministry exercised by Timothy and Titus. They guard the faith from error and see that it is passed on intact to others. Titus is to "appoint elders in every town" (1:5). According to II Tim. 1:6, Timothy was ordained by Paul, and according to 1 Tim. 4:14 he was ordained by the elders. From the latter we may infer that in the time

of the writer, elders were responsible for ordination. It is not certain whether 1 Tim. 5:22 indicates Timothy's right to ordain, or whether it is simply a case of church discipline. But since Titus had the right to ordain (1:5) Timothy presumably also possessed it.

The pastoral epistles also give prominence to deacons (1 Tim. 3:8-13). The origin of the office is obscure. As we have seen, Acts 6 cannot be used to explain it. Some scholars think that the *diakonos* owes something to the *huperetes* who assisted the leader of the synagogue, but this official had only liturgical functions. Since the *diakonoi* appear along with the *episkopos* (1 Tim. 3) it is reasonable to conclude that the office grew out of the episcopate or the presbyterate-episcopate.

The Church of the pastoral epistles is a Church defending itself against false teaching. The church leaders described, presbyter-bishops, people like Timothy — guarantors of the true doctrine — represent the response of the Church to the situation it faced. We have to ask whether this was the only response possible. The question is important because it is widely assumed that the Church had no choice. But if one takes the New Testament as a whole it is clear that this was not the only response which the Church could have made. The epistles of John, as we have seen, show that in the same kind of situation other responses were possible.

### CONCLUSION

Those who study the Scriptures for the purpose of understanding God's will for the Church today must be quite clear as to how they intend to use their findings. The Scriptures are

our criteria for judging traditions which have grown up in the Church over the centuries. But it would be a wrong use of the Scriptures if we regarded their teachings as a law which we had to obey. If we should be in any danger of doing so, a moment's reflection on the witness of the Scriptures should disabuse us of the idea, for if our study has shown us anything it is that there is no one order of ministry in the New Testament, but several. Offices in the Church of the New Testament period were the Church's response to changing needs. They are characterized by variety and flexibility. Even within one document development is evident. Even if it were possible to reduce the different witnesses to some kind of system in the interests of making a model for present day practice we would not have advanced at all. We cannot be literalists. The mere reproduction of a New Testament order is no guarantee of the Church's authenticity.

On the other hand, it would be wrong to minimize the importance of the New Testament by regarding its evidence as purely relative or antiquarian. Christianity is an historical religion. It is bound to Jesus Christ, who we know through the Scriptures. Only as the Church returns to its origins, and examines afresh its structures in the light of its origins, can it change with a changing world without danger of losing its essential character.

(Dr. R. J. McKelvey of the United Congregational Church is lecturer in New Testament at the Federal Theological Seminary).

(18) Church Order in the New Testament p.85.  
(19) The Church, p.410.

## LETTERS / BRIEWE

### GOEIE WERKE NOODSAAKLIK

**Mnr. J. A. Duigan, Kamer 139, Uniegebou, Pretoria.**

Ek het ds. Van Loggerenberg se brief (*Pro Veritate*, Mei 1969) met 'n glimlag gelees. Hy het vier paragrawe van die brief met 'n onnodige berisping verkwis.

Ds. Van Loggerenberg sê: „Luther het geleer: die mens het geen goeie werke nodig om salig te word nie,

want Jesus Christus het die saligheid volkome verdien en die mens ontvang dit as 'n genadegawe deur die geloof. Ef. 2:8", ens.

Ek antwoord met Eségiël 18:24: „Maar as die regverdige afwyk van sy geregtigheid en onreg doen en handel volgens al die gruwels wat die goddelose doen — sal hy lewe? Aan al sy geregtighede wat hy gedoen het, sal nie gedink word nie; om sy troubreuk wat hy begaan het, en om sy sonde wat hy gedoen het, om hulle

ontwil sal hy sterwe". In vers 27 van dieselfde hoofstuk staan daar: „En as die goddelose hom bekeer van sy goddeloosheid wat hy gedoen het, en reg en geregtigheid doen — hy sal sy siel in die lewe behou".

Verder, Joël 2:12: „ . . . bekeer julle tot My met julle hele hart, en met vas en geweene rouklag".

Met ander woorde, dit betaam die sondaar om goeie werke te doen om die toorn van God te vermy, aangesien die saligheid van Jesus Christus



nie goedkoop is nie — dit moet verdien word!

Paulus waarsku ons in I Kor. 13: 1-13: „Al sou ek die tale van mense en engele spreek, en ek het nie die liefde nie, dan het ek 'n klinkende metaal of 'n luidende simbaal geword . . . En nou bly geloof, hoop, liefde, hierdie drie: maar die grootste hiervan is die liefde.

Vergelyk verder I Kor. 10:12; I Kor. 9:27; Fil. 2:12; Matt. 5:20, en die woorde van Jesus in Matt. 7:21-23: „Nie elkeen wat vir My sê: Here, Here! sal ingaan in die koninkryk van die hemele nie, maar hy wat die wil doen van my Vader wat in die hemele is. Baie sal in daardie dag vir My sê: Here, Here, het ons nie in u Naam geprofeteer en in u Naam duiwels uitgedrywe en in u Naam baie kragte gedoen nie? En dan sal Ek aan hulle sê: Ek het julle nooit geken nie. Gaan weg van My, julle wat die ongeregtheid werk!”

Ten spyte van al hierdie waarskuwings (daar is veel meer) verkies die volgelinge van Luther sy „eie uitleggings” bo dié van die apostels van Christus.

Ds. Van Loggerenberg verwys ook na die Jakobus-brief. Hy skryf dat Jakobus leer dat God geëer moet word met goeie werke, maar dat Jakobus nie die verdienstelikheid van die Roomse goeie werke verkondig „soos mnr. Duigan probeer te kenne gee nie”. Ek vra: Kan ds. Van Loggerenberg ons van 'n kort lys van al die verskillende soorte goeie werke voorsien? Hy skryf ook dat Luther geen beswaar gehad het teen Matt. 5:16 nie. Dan sê hy: Luther en Jakobus het saamgestem! Maar waarom het Luther dan die brief van Jakobus as 'n „brief van strooi” bestempel en hierdie brief geïgnoreer? Waarom het hy dit ook nodig gevind om die woord „alleen” na „geloof” in Rom. 3:28 by te voeg — ten spyte van Jesus Christus se waarskuwing (Openb. 22:18)?

Ds. Van Loggerenberg sluit sy brief af met die woorde „Dit is werklik moeilik om 'n gesprek met mnr. Duigan te voer”. Ek is bly om dit te hoor, en ek is bereid om ds. Van Loggerenberg te eniger tyd met sy Bybelprobleme te help!

(*Effens verkort—Red.*)

#### WHY DISUNITY?

**Mr. V. G. Davies, 89 Kloof Road, Sea Point, Cape Town.**

In his article “The Positive Answer” (May issue) Dr. W. B. De

Villiers says, inter alia: “As long as we Christians persist in speaking with so many different voices, vociferously arguing about the relative merits of our own interpretations of Christianity, so long shall we remain impotent and powerless.” But where do all these different interpretations of Christianity stem from if not one and the same source, namely, the Bible?

We know that the Bible is the word of God, but in spite of this it has brought about division, not unity. Why is this? Is it not because so many Christians, especially during the past 450 years, have separated the Bible from the visible authority which collated it for us and decided its canon, namely, the teaching Church? In other words, they have been looking to the Bible to find out what the Church teaches, instead of looking to the Church to find out what the Bible teaches, and the inevitable result has been, and as long as the method continues will be, disunity, not unity. Visible unity is not something to be achieved as a result of the work of man; it is a gift of God inherent in the structure of the Church He founded. Thus it has existed from the beginning and will always exist. To put the matter another way: if the people responsible for the break with the Papacy in the 16th century were alive today, would they not regret what they did, for would they not now realise that they could have helped to bring about a reformation without breaking with the Papacy, and without thereby disturbing visible Christian unity?

#### THE CORRECT WORDS

**Mr. P. M. Harker, Kings Lynn, Boyes Dirve, Muizenberg.**

In my letter published in your June issue, I am quoted (page 17, middle column, about 2 inches up from the bottom) as saying:

“After all, that is no more practical politics in 1969 than it was in 1935 and years ago, is it?”

Just in case some of your readers fail to see any significance in the year 1935, I should point out that my letter actually read:

“ . . . in 1969 than it was 1935 odd years ago” (i.e. in plus minus 34 A.D.).

The significance, of course, was the approximate date when Christ did himself defy practical politics and paid the price.

#### TOO IDEALISTIC

**Mr. V. G. Davies, 89 Kloof Road, Sea Point, Cape Town.**

I admire the idealism expressed by Mr. P. M. Harker (Letters, June issue), but feel that it is of little or no practical value. Because we live in a fallen world, not a world of good, practising Christians; these latter constituting a very small minority, we have to try to find an acceptable modus vivendi between that which should be and that which is. This is what I am trying to do.

#### “YOUTH REVOLUTION”

**Miss C. Goodwin, Johannesburg.**

I read the Editorial to the June Pro Veritate with mixed feelings. For what they are worth, I would like to give some of my own thoughts on the matter. Being over thirty, I am therefore not to be trusted but they might be of some value if they prompt one of the young people themselves to write.

#### Just Society

The rebellion isn't against the older generation, but a revolt against **dehumanised existence**, against the **machine-age**, against the **acquisitive structures** of society with their built-in forms of legalised and institutionalised violence — “it is the longing for a just society that is causing revolutions all over the world”, said the students at Uppsala. Because they are unaligned, the students remain the only catalytic force for change left. They are the secular prophets of our time. They are our hope for a better world. E.g. the French students revolted ultimately for a better France, the French workers for more money!

Half of the world's population is under 19: the university population has never been as great as it is today. Young people i.e. the post-war generation, have never been so well-educated. Not being directly involved in the economic and industrial system, they can look objectively at it. They are refusing to be social prostitutes

by selling themselves to big business, big this, big that. They see that the world they are inheriting is a pathetically divided one. They see that previous generations have allowed 2 World Wars, Korea, Vietnam. They may not be able to do better — they know they can't do worse. Hence they demand a real stake in decision-making wherever they are. They are not going to accept a few token responsibilities. Their demand is a real stake, no sops. Not as a paternalistic gesture but because they happen to be representative of half the world's population.

### Tensions

Furthermore the traumatic experience of the world wars, the education explosion, mass media, world insecurity have all created radical gaps between the pre- and post-war generations — generational, attitudinal, sensitivity, value, etc., etc. These result in radically different understandings of life, the world, the Church. These gaps give rise to tensions. These tensions can be creative. To be creative, democratic procedures must allow them a real chance of participation.

But they see that the leadership in the world is in the over 60 bracket — gone are the short golden days of John F. Kennedy. They know that if Christ went to Uppsala he would have been too young for a vote!

But the young people (youth is a derogatory word, I sense) are not only students. They include the "drop-outs" like the hippies and yippies. Marshal Maclehan said that clothes are an extension of the skin. Their bizarre fashions are a way of speaking — a way in which they think they will be heard. It is a way of speaking and witnessing like John Lennon and his Japanese wife spoke for a week with a tulip in their Amsterdam lie-in recently. They spoke without saying a word. And that is non-verbal communication. Yet **behind** the bizarre clothes and life-style, lies something that is struggling to be said. Of course it is aberrational. But it is a message primarily of rejection. Somehow we must seek this message in its medium and idiom because this is part of the world as it now is and in which the Church must live and to which the Church must relate.

### A Way of Speaking

Another example. It would similarly be a problem of language, if some

Catholics requested that Archbishop Helder Camara were made Apostolic Delegate to South Africa. This request would not mean that they agreed with the whole system of having papal envoys among the world's bishops. Nor would it mean that they actually wanted Archbishop Camara to become such a Delegate as this would be a misfortune for a man of the Archbishop's calibre. But it would be one way in which they voiced their views as to the kind of leadership they would like to see in South Africa. It would be a form which those removed from the effective decision-making body use in order to be heard.

Has the Church and especially the leadership the ears to hear and the ability to perceive and the strength to act? Do they even hear these new forms of language? Can society hear and interpret the voices of young people as they rebel against the evil we have helped create and to which we have now grown accustomed?

### Our Children?

And finally, I very much doubt whether young people are "painfully aware that they are **our** children, and at the deepest root of their rebellion there lies a desperate cry of the heart for **our** help and guidance."

On the contrary, they are the children of the present; not only of world starvation, nuclear warfare, space flight etc., but of a thrust in evolution, a breakthrough in consciousness, a more highly developed intuition. Hence they recognise clearly that they ought to be better equipped for the technological age than the older generation, hampered as it is by memories of a world that was different. They (we?) are unable to fully see the harshness of present reality, and therefore living in a fool's paradise are unable to take the drastic steps necessary to bring about a **united** world.

Yes, they are looking for love and understanding, this is what man is made for. But the price is that one loves and understands the **other** man **first**, and this is what our young people demand. This is what they will achieve, at the cost of turning the world upside-down if need be, so that every man, be he black, white, or striped, may be a new man, standing tall in the knowledge of his own dignity and worth.

## BOEKBESPREKING

C. van Leeuwen, „Hosea”, De Prediking van het Oude Testament, Uitgeverij G. F. Callenbach N.V., Nijkerk, 1968, 304 pp., f. 23.50 en vir intekenaars op die serie f. 21.

Hierdie nuutste kommentaar op die profeet Hosea het verlede jaar verskyn in die serie „De Prediking van het Oude Testament”, onder redaksie van dr. A. van Selms en dr. A. S. van der Woude. Wanneer 'n mens hierdie jongste toevoeging tot die serie deurlees, besef jy dadelik dat dit uitmuntend goed voldoen aan die verwagtings wat aangaande die serie gekoester word; verwagtings wat ontstaan het na die verskyning van *Genesis* I en II deur dr. A. van Selms en I Konings deur dr. H. A. Brongers, nl. dat die kommentare wat in die serie sal verskyn nie net linguïsties- en histories- verantwoorde eksegeese van 'n bepaalde boek sal bied nie, maar dat die klem ook sal val op die boodskap van die boek as geheel en die perikope afsonderlik. Dit is dan ook deur dr. van Leeuwen in hierdie kommentaar gedoen: aan die einde van elke perikoop gee hy 'n samevatting van die prediking van daardie perikoop. Sodoende kry die boodskap van Hosea nuwe en aktuele betekenis vir die Christelike kerk in die 20ste eeu. Die kommentaar belig die prediking van Hosea vanuit die politiek- en godsdienshistoriese situasie waarin dit uitgespreek is sonder om egter die finale vervulling van die profesieë in Jesus Christus uit die oog te verloor. Die waarde en betekenis van die betrokke kommentaar, asook van dié wat reeds in die serie verskyn het, vir die kerklike publiek en vir die kerklike prediker is veral geleë in hierdie na vore bring van die prediking van die Ou Testament. Juis deur aan die boodskap aandag te gee word die boek toeganklik vir die gewone leser, die nie-ingewyde in die Ou Testamentiese wetenskap, en smaak hy iets van die onuitputlike rykdom van die Ou Testament. Die kommentaar bied inderdaad veelvuldige homiletiese stof aan dié prediker wat ook graag uit die Ou Testament wil preek.

Dr. van Leeuwen begin sy kommentaar met 'n bespreking van die naam „doodeka propheton” (twaalf profete), hulle plek en volgorde in die kanon en hulle betekenis vir ou Israel en ook vir die Christelike gemeente. Vanaf bl. 12 word aandag



geskenk aan die inleiding tot die boek Hosea, bv. die tyd waarin hy opgetree het: onder Jerobeam II (ca. 750 v.C.) en sy opvolgers tot kort voor die val van Samaria (721 v.C.); die persoon en herkoms van Hosea: sy persoonlike lewe wat in beslag geneem is deur die diens van God, sy huwelik met Gomer en die Noord-Israelitiese heiligdomme in Betel en Gilgal as moontlike plekke van sy optrede.

Hierna word stilgestaan by 'n belangrike aspek, nl. die taal en styl van Hosea. Dr. van Leeuwen breek met 'n redelik-algemene opvatting dat die teks van Hosea korrup is. Hy skryf die moeilik-verklaarbare woordvorme en veelvuldige *hapax legomena* (woorde wat net een keer in die Ou Testament voorkom) heel tereg toe aan 'n Noord-Israelitiese dialek van Hebreeus; 'n dialek waarvan ons wel enkele voorbeelde het, maar eintlik nie veel weet nie. Hy wys daarop dat die stylvorm wat Hosea by voorkeur in sy prediking gebruik dié van die regsgeeding is en dat daar ook formules voorkom wat aan die kultus (6:1-6; 14:2-9) en aan die wysheid (4:11, 14; 8:7) ontleen is.

Treffend is ook die veelvuldige vergelykings wat Hosea gebruik. Op bl. 17-19 word aandag geskenk aan die ontstaan van die boek Hosea. Volgens Van Leeuwen het die boek in finale vorm ontstaan uit aantekeninge van die profeet self, die versameling en opskrifstelling van profesieë deur volgelinge van die profeet en uit die werk van 'n waarskynlik Judese redaktor.

Die boodskap van Hosea vind, volgens Van Leeuwen, sy agtergrond in die kanaänitiese religiositeit en is gerig teen die populêre volksgodsdiens van daardie tyd: onder die dekmantel van die diens van die Here word die Baäls gedien. Teen hierdie ontrou en verloëning van die Here en sy verbond het Hosea 'n heftige polemiek gevoer. Deur beelde uit die Baälmite oor te neem en te omvorm, verkondig die profeet die eksklusiwiteit van Israel se God en sy volstreekte heerskappy oor die natuur en die geskiedenis.

Deur sy huwelik met die ontugtige Gomer — volgens Van Leeuwen 'n

werklike huwelik — moes Hosea sigbaar aan Israel haar skandelijke ontug en troueloosheid verkondig (1:2-9). Hosea 2:1-14 is 'n bewoë getuigenis van God se pogings om die trou van sy bruid, Israel, te herwin; die trou wat sy aan haar minnaars, die Baäls en die buitelandse magte, toegesê het. Wanneer Gomer Hosea verlaat, ontvang hy die opdrag om haar terug te koop: die teken dat die Here Israel wat van Hom afvallig geword het nog liefhet en haar nog as sy vrou wil terugneem (3:1-5). Hierdie beeld van die huwelik om die verhouding tussen die Here en Sy volk te beskryf, kan ook by latere profete gevind word asook in die Nuwe Testament waar die verhouding tussen Christus en sy gemeente as 'n huwelik, 'n nuwe relasie tussen God en mens, gesien word.

In die tweede hoofdeel, 4:1-9:9, staan die profeet breedvoeriger stil by Israel se ontug. Hy rig sy aanklagte teen die inwoners van die land (4:1-3) en veral teen die priesters wat die onderrig in die „kennis” verwaarloos (4:4-6) en teen die leiers wat die volk verlei (5:1-7). Hoe aktueel ook in ons tyd! Die gevolge van hierdie verleiding is allerlei sosiale misbruike: vloek en lieg, geweld en moord (4:2). In die beskuldiging wat in hoofstukke 7 en 8 'n oorheersende plek inneem, breek die profeet alle eïemagtig-gesoekte sekerhede van Israel af, omdat Israel die verbond en die wet van die Here oortree het. In die binnelandse politiek is daar woelinge rondom die koningskap; sameswerings en vermoording van die konings. Die konings word aangestel buite die Here, die eintlike Koning van Israel, om. In die buitelandse politiek het die leiers hulle wantrou in die Here bewys deur te heul met die groot moondhede, veral met Assirië. Die bou van vestings en bolwerke is 'n bewys dat hulle die God aan wie hulle hul bestaan te danke het, vergeet het. Die profeet keer hom ook teen die vreugde van die loofhuttefees omdat dit 'n vreugde sonder die Here is en eintlik deel vorm van die vrugbaarheidskultus (9:1-9). Teen al hierdie dinge het Hosea die oordeel van die Here in direkte woorde en deur die simboliese name van sy

drie kinders: Jisreël, Lo-Ammi (niet-volk-nie) en Lo-Rugama (geen-ontferming) verkondig.

God se gerig en oordeel is egter nie die laaste woord nie. Omdat Hosea bewus was van die liefde en verbondstrou van die Here het hy geglo in 'n nuwe begin, 'n „nuwe terugkeer na die woestyn”, 'n terugkeer na die begin van die verbondsverhouding tussen die Here en sy volk (9:10-11:11). Omdat God getrou bly en sy liefde sterker is as die menslike ontrou, het Hosea ook geglo dat God nog tot Israel kon spreek en dat Israel weer na haar Eggenoot sal terugkeer. Dan sal Lo-Ammi, Ammi; en Lo-Rugama, Rugama word. Hierdie verkondiging van God se lyding as gevolg van die ontrou en sondes van sy volk, van God se worsteling om die behoud van sy volk en van God se onweerstaanbare liefde en erbarming het 'n ryke vervulling gevind in Jesus Christus, die sigbare prediking van God se liefde.

Bladsye 23-278 word gewy aan die eksegetiese, wat as „uitstekend” beskryf kan word. Die eksegetiese is linguïsties en histories goed verantwoord. Telkens word dit onderbreek deur waardevolle besprekings van bepaalde begrippe en Hebreeuse woorde, outentisiteit van 'n betrokke vers ens. Die voetnote getuig dat die kommentator oor 'n wye kennis van die literatuur op sy vakgebied beskik. Hy het ook kennis geneem van buite-Bybelse, veral die Ugaritiese en Akkadiese, literatuur en van die oud-oosterse wets- en sosiale gebruike. Sodoende word die prediking van Hosea geplaas binne die raamwerk van sy tyd en milieu.

Die kommentaar sluit met 'n register van name, Nederlandse woorde en getranskribeerde Hebreeuse woorde en met 'n keuse uit die resente literatuur oor die profetisme, kommentare op en literatuur oor die klein profete en spesifiek Hosea.

In die geheel beoordeel, is dit 'n besonder goeie en keurig versorgde kommentaar. Dit verdien beslis die aandag en belangstelling van die Ou Testamentikus, die prediker en die gewone lidmaat.

H.J.D.