

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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



BULLETIN

THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS FELLOWSHIP

JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1984

Vol. 7, No. 3 \$3.50

Mark Lau Branson Editor
Thomas H. McAlpine Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORS

Clark H. Pinnock, McMaster Divinity College
Paul A. Mickey, Duke Divinity School

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Ray S. Anderson, *Systematic Theology*
Fuller Theological Seminary
Stephen T. Davis, *Philosophy*
Claremont McKenna College
Donald Dayton, *News Analysis*
Northern Baptist Theological Seminary
Roberta Hestenes, *Christian Formation*
Fuller Theological Seminary
Robert L. Hubbard, *Old Testament*
Denver Seminary

Stephen C. Mott, *Ethics*
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
Grant R. Osborne, *New Testament*
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Donald Tinder, *Church History*
New College, Berkeley

David Lowes Watson, *Evangelism & Missions*
Perkins School of Theology

PERSPECTIVES EDITORS

George Cummings Chicago Theological Seminary
Luis Cortes Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary
Nancy A. Hardesty Atlanta, GA
Thomas F. Stransky Mt. Paul Novitiate
Sze-kar Wan Harvard University

FACULTY CONTRIBUTORS

Bernard Adeney New College, Berkeley
Donald Bloesch University of Dubuque Theological Seminary
Geoffrey W. Bromiley Fuller Theological Seminary
Harvie M. Conn Westminster Theological Seminary
Charles Ellenbaum College of DuPage
Vernard Eller University of LaVerne
Elouise Renich Fraser Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary
David Gill New College, Berkeley
Larry Hurtado University of Manitoba
Susanne Johnson Perkins School of Theology
Richard Mouw Calvin College
Richard Lovelace Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
PHEME PERKINS Boston College
Bernard Ramm American Baptist Seminary of the West
Gerald Sheppard Union Theological Seminary
Charles R. Taber Emmanuel School of Religion
Keith Yandell University of Wisconsin
Gregory A. Youngchild New Haven, CT

Jesus, Power, and Gender Roles
S. Scott Bartchy 2

**What is Distinctive about
"Evangelical" Scholarship?**
Donald A. Hagner 5

Reflections on the School of Process Theism
Royce G. Gruenler 7

Christopraxis
Competence as a Criterion for Theological Education
Ray S. Anderson 10

Children (and Others) and Money
Jacques Ellul 14

The Catholic Tradition of Spiritual Formation
Daniel Buechlein 16

**The Wholeness of Evangelism:
A Bible Study (Part B)**
Alfred C. Krass 19

**Christian Witness in the City:
An Annotated Bibliography (Part II)**
Clinton E. Stockwell 20

Recent Conferences:
Society of Pentecostal Studies, Wesleyan Theological Society,
Context and Hermeneutics in the Americas 22

Book Reviews (Itemized on back cover) 25

him ontologically or necessarily in time was to conceive of him as a God who cares. God is hardly a deity who cares for much since he cannot care for everything and everyone, and he is able to care for others only as they are either some other selves they will presently become, or the past selves they have already become. God cannot care for others as they actually are in the moment of their emergent immediacy because that is the free and private domain of the present self. In other words, in the Process system *God does not have the world as present*, but only as future possibility or as past. But if God does not have the world as present then he has only the perished data of the world to work on. In fact, those perished data of the past are supposed to be the effects which give rise to God himself as conscious cause. The mind boggles at such logic; the system bristles with difficulties.

It is far better, I began to realize, to stay with the self-revelation of God in the Judeo-Christian Scriptures and take the hard facts with the soft. That God is absolutely sovereign over the universe and time and space as its creator and sustainer is reiterated in the Scriptures again and again. That God has created human beings to make responsible decisions is also a clear teaching of Scripture. The language is logically odd from a human point of view, but Scripture is full of logically odd events, proclamations, and persons (such as Abraham and his promise of offspring, Moses and the Exodus, the Son of God born in Bethlehem, and crucified on Calvary Hill, raised from the tomb and coming again). Biblical merismus (a part here, a part there) is a major pattern of divine revelation. What the creature must do is not contest the rules or rail against God's language-game, or complain about his or her rights, but worship the sovereign Lord, accept his grace by faith and be obedient to him. Our analysis of Process theism's attempt to improve upon biblical-classical Christianity has brought to light that the logically odd revelations of Scripture are replaced by the logically absurd when autonomous human reason tries its hand at explaining the universe and its unavoidable polarities.

Can Process theism teach the biblical theologian anything at all? I think the major challenge for evangelical theology is to make clear that neither biblical faith nor classical Christian theology really views God as statically frozen in his absoluteness. That criticism of Process theism attacks a straw man, or a straw concept of God. Perhaps Thomistic theology might appear culpable because of its attachment to Aristotelian thought, but even there it is questionable whether the charge holds. The classical view of God as *actus purus*, Pure Act, really attempts to say that God's activity as self-contained and self-sufficient Triunity is absolutely pure: God is pure activity.

Perhaps we need to say it in new ways and in other terms. I no longer have any difficulty conceiving of God as ultimate sociality, utterly inexhaustible in his love as archetypal Family of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, One in Many, and Many in One. As the primordial Family in Triunity, quite independent of created time and space and

inexhaustible in terms of his dynamic love, God is the Archetype who has left his creative signature on all he has created in the ectypal or derivative universe. Everything created reflects one-in-manyness, manyness-in-oneness, being in becoming and becoming in being. God in his own supra-temporal and supra-spatial eternity is dynamic and inexhaustible love and communion between the Father, the eternally begotten Son, and the Holy Spirit who issues from both.

We must not think for a moment that God as he is in his own Trinity is lacking in dynamic activity; but we must not circumscribe that archetypal dynamism in terms of finite time and space. We are not necessary to God. Analogous to the mystery of atomic occasions which stretch our imagination by appearing in the same and different places at once, now as waves, and again as particles, God's unity and plurality, his complementary changelessness and dynamic inexhaustibility simply stretch our imaginations to the breaking point. We understand the mystery of God's inner relationships best through his own appearance in human form as Jesus of Nazareth, who makes such astonishing statements as, "Truly, truly, I say to you, before Abraham was, I am" (John 8:58); and prays, "Father, I desire that they also, whom thou hast given me, may be with me where I am, to behold my glory which thou hast given me in thy love for me before the foundation of the world" (John 17:24); and assures his followers, "I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Counselor, to be with you forever, even the Spirit of truth" (John 14:16 f.).

All the witnesses of Scripture, and consummately Jesus Christ incarnate, point to Someone inexplicably perfect and dynamic who is sovereign over us yet who is with us as Redeemer and Lord and who is closer to us than we are to ourselves. Creative freedom is not some right independent of God, but a gift of his grace that we might worship him and become servants of one another in his name. This truth will never be realized as long as we contest the rules of the game. God sovereignly establishes the language-game, and we tinker with it at our peril.

SUGGESTED READING

Alfred North Whitehead. *Modes of Thought*. New York: Capricorn Books, 1958.

_____ *Process and Reality. An Essay in Cosmology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Charles Hartshorne. *The Divine Relativity. A Social Conception of God*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

_____ *The Logic of Perfection*. La Salle, Ill.: Open Court Publishing Co., 1973.

John B. Cobb, Jr., *A Christian Natural Theology Based on the Thought of Alfred North Whitehead*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.

John B. Cobb, Jr. and David Ray Griffin, *Process Theology: An Introductory Exposition*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976.

David Ray Griffin and Thomas J. J. Altizer, eds. *John Cobb's Theology in Process*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977.

Paul Arthur Schilpp, ed., *The Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead*. The Library of Living Philosophers. New York: Tudor Publishing Co., 1941.

Christopraxis: Competence as a Criterion for Theological Education

by Ray S. Anderson

Theological students are often perplexed over the criteria by which they are evaluated as future ministers of the gospel. Indeed, the faculties responsible for preparing students for the ministry of the church are often ambivalent over the same issue.

Is the graduate of a theological seminary a "product" produced by the curricular assembly line, or a "practitioner" whose qualifications remain to be verified? If it is the former, then the question of competence will tend to be addressed to the "maker" of the product. A qualified faculty and a quality curriculum will insure a good product.

On the other hand, if a Master of Divinity degree is meant to cer-

tify a practitioner, then the question of competence will tend to shift to the function of the person who is taught rather than to the form of teaching. This distinction is not meant to introduce an either/or situation. Obviously, the quality of competence revealed in the life of a minister of Christ reflects the quality of the faculty and curriculum by which the student was prepared for ministry.

However, if theological education is construed as the "making of a minister," then the graduate will tend to be viewed as a product, much as a house is the product of the act of building. Competence will then be expected of the builder, in the case of a house, and of the teacher, or mentor, in the "making of a minister." It is the thesis of this essay that the purpose of a theological education is to participate in a process of development through which a person becomes competent in the act of ministry. Thus, the criteria by which com-

Ray S. Anderson is Associate Professor of Theology and Ministry at Fuller Theological Seminary.

petence is determined emerge out of the action of ministry rather than out of the process of making a product.

This distinction between “making” and “action” lies at the heart of Aristotle’s distinction between making (*poiesis*) and action (*praxis*). The making of something has its end (*telos*) in something other than the process of making, said Aristotle, while action intends its goal within itself (*The Nichomachean Ethics*, IX, vi.5). Again, one could think of this in terms of the building of a house. The competence of the builder of the house is contained in the technical specifications and quality of the house as a product, not in the character of the people who will inhabit the house.

It occurs to me that this distinction provides a helpful insight into the nature and function of theological education, which continues to be plagued with an uneasy conscience over the supposed dichotomy between theory and practice, or between knowledge and skill. In *praxis*, as Aristotle suggested, the one who participates in the action has a stake in the result of the action which goes beyond the mere making of a “product.”

Look again at the structure of biblical theology. God is perceived as not merely “making” Israel into a good nation, nor as “making” out of Jesus of Nazareth a good Christian; rather, God is acting (*praxis*) in the very existence of Israel, and he himself acts as the divine, incarnate Word acts in the person and life of Jesus Christ. These actions of God become the basis for theological reflection because those who become drawn into these actions come to have a theological existence—that is, exist within the structure of the action in such a way that the very being of God is disclosed as true knowledge. In the consummate act of God in Jesus Christ, there is both a practice and presence of God by which both truth and goodness become normative for all true knowledge of God and knowledge of our own human existence (John 1:18; Matt. 11:27).

This is what is denoted by the technical term: Christopraxis. It is the act of God in Christ which occurred once and for all through the person Jesus Christ as the Incarnate Word, but which continues to occur through the mighty acts of revelation and reconciliation whereby the Holy Spirit glorifies Christ by coming into our sphere of historical and personal existence to manifest his resurrection power and presence (John 16:13, 14; Rom. 8:9–11). My thesis is that the criteria by which we determine that a ministry for Christ is good and effective are derived out of the same event of Christopraxis by which we have the criteria for true knowledge of God as revealed Word. Thus, revelation as well as reconciliation, true knowledge of God as well as true life with God, inhere in the same event of Christopraxis. Even as the discipline of theology must be rooted in the event of Theopraxis, so Christology must be rooted in the event of Christopraxis. Again, Christopraxis is not the “making” of a Christian through practicing the ideals of a Christlike life; rather, Christopraxis is the act of God in Christ which continues to impinge upon our own existence through the revealed Word which is at the same time the reconciling Word.

The implications for theological education, I hope, are quite obvious. The church, as the community of those who, by the Spirit of Christ, have been baptized into his one body (1 Cor. 12:12), constitutes the primary locus of Christopraxis. Here the power and presence of Christ have become the act which contains its own end (*telos*). The church becomes the “building,” or temple of God only because those who have experienced the act of God have become “built into it” (Eph. 2:19–22). The primary theological institution is the church because it is the primary locus of Christopraxis. Subsidiary to the church are institutions which serve the church in the educational function of preparation for ministry. The danger here is that theology will become detached from Theopraxis and christology from Christopraxis. To the degree that this happens, educators will tend to teach toward a discipline or field of study rather than teach toward a competence for ministry. Exegetical methods of biblical study as well as hermeneutics (biblical interpretation) can become primarily methods of arriving at conclusions rather than embodying the reality of God as the one who saves as well as speaks.

If this should happen, biblical study and Christian education take the form of “making” as earlier depicted by Aristotle. In this case, the biblical exegete and the Christian educator are concerned to produce a product, abstract truth on the one hand, and a technician on the other. Competency then is judged to be a quality ascribed

to the “maker” or to the “teacher” rather than to character of the event contained within the process. Performance evaluations of teachers in educational institutions invariably tend to assess the delivery mode of knowledge or the technical skill of “making” a product rather than the character of knowledge and truth that have become embodied in action. This sounds harsh and unfair when put in the form of a generalization. Realistically, most institutions for theological or Christian education have purpose statements that do incorporate a quality of life as a goal, not merely the dispensing of information or the perfecting of a technique. However, as one who has chosen to minister within such an institution, I know all too well how difficult it is to translate such purpose statements into curricular realities. This paper is not written to attack the efforts being made to do this, but to suggest that there may be a hidden discrepancy in the basic assumption by which theological education carries on its task.

Christopraxis: Reconciliation and Revelation

Let me begin again, this time from the perspective of what Christopraxis entails as a structure of reality in which both revelation and reconciliation are actions of God through which truth comes into being. Within the community of the church in the broadest sense, Christopraxis is itself the continuation of Christ’s own ministry of revelation and reconciliation. Christians, therefore, exist by virtue of this ministry and are empirical evidence of this ministry which takes place through the power of the Holy Spirit in connection with the authority of the revealed Word of Holy Scripture. To have Christian existence is, therefore, to have theological existence. It is to have both a presence and practice in the world which reveals Christ through a ministry of reconciliation. There are forms of ministry which appear to be comforting and even reconciling, but if they do not reveal Christ, these ministries are not of God. That is, these ministries are not actions of God. For God has acted in Jesus Christ and continues to act in him in such a way that Christ is revealed in all of God’s actions.

For example, there certainly are many forms of caring for people which alleviate genuine human distress and result in the restoration of human lives to functional health and order. These forms of ministry can take place in such a way that “creature comforts” are maintained, but without enacting the reality of God’s revelation and reconciliation through Jesus Christ. A social worker or a psychiatrist may be able to “make” people better, or to “make” the conditions

If theological education is construed as the “making of a minister,” then the graduate will tend to be viewed as a product.

of human existence better. But the end result tends to be just that—a result, a product from which the “maker” can detach himself or herself with no consequent loss of identity or meaning. However, in Christopraxis, the act itself becomes the embodiment of a life of community and wholeness which is derived from God himself through Christ. Thus, we know that reconciliation is more than making people or conditions better, it is inextricably involved with revealing the power and presence of God through the act.

In the same way, we can also say that there are forms of ministry which purport to proclaim revealed truths of God and to indoctrinate disciples in those truths, but if they do not also touch broken and alienated human lives with liberating and healing power, they are not of God. This assertion is certainly more troublesome, especially for many Christians. The implication of the statement is that one could preach the truth about God in a completely orthodox fashion from the pulpit or in personal witness, but that if no effect takes place in the form of saving faith, renewed life and fellowship in the community of God’s own people, then this ministry is not of God. Obviously, this assertion must be immediately qualified by the concession that we have no infallible way of determining what the effect of God’s

word and Spirit might be in any person's life. Thus, there may be a hidden work to which we are not privy. However, as a general rule, the biblical witnesses to God's truth were not content to leave aside the question of response and not only looked for response as evidence of the power of the Word of truth, but built their own confidence as true ministers of God upon such evidence (cf. Paul, in I Thess. 1 and 2). One could only argue that the true Word of God is proclaimed in the absence of response by appealing to the possibility of a hidden, secret response. For to assert that the Word of God remains true without accomplishing its true purpose is to argue against the very revealed Word itself: ". . . so shall my word be that goes forth from my mouth; it shall not return to me empty, but it shall accomplish that which I purpose, and prosper in the thing for which I sent it" (Isa. 55:11).

Theological reflection is the activity of the Christian and the church by which acts of ministry are critically and continually assessed in light of both revelation and reconciliation as God's true Word. Thus, truth cannot be abstracted from personal faith and knowledge, nor can personal faith be detached from the objective truth of God's own being and Word. Theological reflection as a critical exercise leads to competence in ministry by which the one who ministers unites both proclamation and practice in the truth of Jesus Christ. It is not only reflection upon the nature of ministry from the perspective of biblical and theological truths, but it is also reflection upon the nature of divine revelation from the perspective of its saving and reconciling intention in the lives of people.

It must be said also that theological reflection does not lead to new revelation, for God has spoken once and for all in the revelation of Jesus Christ, and Holy Scripture is the normative and infallible truth of that revelation. However, theological reflection takes note of the presence of the One who is revealed in his continuing ministry of reconciliation through the Holy Spirit. The same Jesus who inspired the true account of his own life and ministry through the Holy Spirit in the form of Scripture, continues to be present in the act of reading, hearing, and interpreting the Scriptures. Thus, Scripture is not merely a product which was "made" by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and from which the maker can be detached, but Scripture continues to be the particular form of Christopraxis which provides a normative and objective basis for the life of the church. But, because Scripture is a form of Christopraxis, its infallibility is located in the Christ of Scripture as the only true Word of God, and not merely in Scripture as a product of inspiration which could somehow be detached from Christ. In this way, it can be said that Jesus is not only the subject of proclamation (the one about whom we preach) but he is himself the proclaimer in every act of proclamation (the one who proclaims himself through the event of preaching). Theological reflection does not ask the question, What would Jesus do in this situation?, because this would be a question which would imply his absence. Rather, it asks the question, Where is Jesus in this situation and what am I to do as a minister? When the Scripture is interpreted in such a way that direction is sought for lives who need to be conformed to the true and healing power of God's Word, we must remember that Jesus is not only the "author" of Scripture through the power of the Spirit, but he himself is a "reader" and interpreter of Scripture in every contemporary moment. Thus, to be a competent teacher or interpreter of Scripture, one must allow the purpose of Scripture and the authority of Scripture to come to expression as Christopraxis. This requires a particular kind of competence.

Competence in Discernment, Integration and Credibility

The particular competence which results from theological reflection is evidenced by discernment, integration, and credibility. Combined, these qualities in a minister produce an authentic spiritual authority and competence, rather than an authoritarian posture.

Discernment is the recognition of the congruence between the Christ of Scripture and the Christ in ministry. This discernment is thus both exegetical and practical and arises where the Holy Spirit has control over both the mind and the heart. Discernment can only be tested "in ministry," for it is a judgment rendered on behalf of persons in need of Christ's presence as much as it is true information about Christ. This is not meant to imply that there actually are "two Christs," one objectified in the propositions of Scripture and

the other a subjective perception on the part of the interpreter of Scripture. Rather, there is but one Christ who, in his own objective being and authority, unites the truth of divine revelation with the truth of divine reconciliation in the objective structure which we have called Christopraxis. Scripture anchors divine revelation in the infallible authority of the incarnate Word as enacted through the historical person Jesus of Nazareth. However, Scripture itself is anchored in the normative and objective reality of Christ who continues to enact the truth of God through his reconciling presence and ministry in the contemporary situation.

An exegetical or hermeneutical decision regarding a Scriptural teaching which is not also a judgment on behalf of the saving and gracious purpose of Scripture has not yet entered into the sphere of Christopraxis. There is, of course, a preliminary searching of the mind of Christ in Scripture which requires careful attention to textual exegesis and basic hermeneutical principles. However, the authority of the text cannot pass over directly into the assured results of such exegetical study, for in this case the text has been used to "make" the truth appear in such a form that it can stand independently of the "maker of truth." When this happens, infallibility and authority can become detached from the objective reality of Christ himself and can be used against the truth.

Theological reflection has the task of disarming the skill of hiding behind practiced piety on the one hand, and pedantic scholarship on the other.

This is precisely what happened when the Old Testament revelation becomes objectified in the form of infallible interpretation and so used to condemn Jesus himself, who was the incarnation of the Word of God: "This man is not from God, for he does not keep the sabbath" (John 9:16). The "orthodoxy" of the Pharisees came to stand outside the Christopraxis of the Incarnate Word as the divine act. Instead of the proper kind of theological reflection which would have enabled them to discern the act of God in their midst, they became incompetent to judge the truth and hopelessly blind. To have one's eyes opened to "see the truth" is to be able to discern the work of God in the present context and thereby to hear the Word of God as delivered by the inspired witnesses. In this way, the early preaching in the book of Acts called for this kind of theological reflection and discernment. "You killed the Author of Life," proclaimed Peter. But God raised him from the dead. "To this we are witnesses. And his name, by faith in his name, has made this man strong whom you see and know; and the faith which is through Jesus has given the man his perfect health in the presence of you all" (Acts 3:15-16). It is in this same sense that I have suggested that a particular kind of competence is represented by the discernment which is able to see the congruence between the Christ of Scripture and the Christ who is at work in the ministry of the church.

Integration is the second aspect of competence produced by theological reflection. Integration is the application of discernment where God's Word is both proclaimed and practiced in ministry with the result that Christ as truth both touches and is touched by human need. An integrated ministry overcomes the ambivalence which results from two levels of truth, one purely theoretical and the other merely functional. Integration, therefore, is a form of competence, not a theoretical component of a curriculum. Within the structure of Christopraxis, the "presence-in-action" mode of revelation stands as a barrier to all attempts to view the truth of God in abstraction from the work of God. "Do not, for the sake of food, destroy the work of God," wrote the Apostle Paul (Rom. 14:20). The eating or not eating of meat had become for some an absolute principle of the law in abstraction from the work of God in building up a body of people who existed in the mutuality of peace and love. The particular kind of competence represented by integration is demonstrated by Jesus who healed on the sabbath. This act of reconciliation became a normative interpretation of the law of the sab-

bath as a revelation of God. The sabbath does not lose its authority as a commandment because it is drawn into the work of God, but rather its true authority as a command of God comes to expression in the objective reality of the work of God.

The particular kind of competence represented by integration is demonstrated by the Apostle Paul when he withstood the attempts of the Judaizers to force circumcision on the Gentile converts, and to enforce a separation between the practice of Gentile Christians eating with Jewish Christians. The authority of Christ as the revealed Word of God is enacted in the table fellowship at which he himself is present. The table fellowship of Christopraxis, therefore, becomes a normative criterion for discerning and judging the truth of Christ. When Peter fell prey to the wiles of the Judaizers, Paul reproaches him openly in the church at Antioch for the sake of the "truth of the gospel" (Gal. 2:11-21). The integration of the Jew and Gentile is first of all, for Paul, an ontological reality grounded in the objective person of Jesus Christ. It is the Word of revelation, therefore, that contains the structure of integration, not the practice of reconciliation. Christopraxis grounds the criteria for competence in the very being of the truth as the personal being of God revealed through the historical and contemporary person and presence of Jesus Christ.

The competence of integration, therefore, is a special competence demanded of the theologian and the biblical scholar. Only when this competence is present as an essential component of theological education can the task of preparing men and women for ministry include the developing of competence for ministry. It is hard to see how this competence can be certified with the granting of a degree, unless the narrower scope of the curriculum with its focus upon abstract knowledge is set within the broader curriculum of discernment and integration. But if there is to be such a broader curriculum through which competence can be produced, it will entail circumstances in which judgments will have to be made as to the work of God in his own ministry of reconciliation.

A third form of competence is *credibility*. Credibility is the transparency of method and lucidity of thought which makes the presence of Christ self-evident and worthy of belief in every event of ministry. Christ is ultimately believable only in terms of his own unity of being in word and deed. It is the task of theological reflection to press through to this criterion at the expense, if necessary, of every claim of self-justification on the part of the minister (and teacher!).

"You know what kind of men we proved to be among you for your sake," wrote Paul to the Thessalonian Christians, "And you became imitators of us and of the Lord" (I Thess. 1:5-6). Paul was not conceding to others the authority to make judgments upon him. In another context he can say, "... it is a very small thing that I should be judged by you or by a human court. I do not even judge myself ... It is the Lord who judges me" (I Cor. 4:3-4). However, the Lord who is coming as the judge of all ministry (then what is true will be finally revealed!), is also revealed in this present time through actions of reconciliation. Christopraxis, therefore, demands a particular kind of competence which is manifested in being credible as a presentation of Christ himself, not merely as an infallible interpreter of Christ. This is a subtle distinction which eludes analysis but which becomes razor sharp when viewed from the perspective of the one who is truly seeking the truth and grace of God in Christ.

For the Pharisees, the official interpreter of the law and the possessor of the official interpretation became identical with the giver of the law. But for Jesus, the distinction was absolutely clear. Jesus told them, "If you were Abraham's children, you would do what Abraham did, but now you seek to kill me, a man who has told you the truth ... If God were your Father, you would love me, for I proceeded and came forth from God ... " (John 8:39, 42). For all of their erudition concerning the law, they were basically incompetent with regard to the truth and reality of God. Their eyes were opaque, and they could not see the transparency of Jesus as the one who revealed the true God in his words and deeds (cf. John 9:40-41). On the other hand, the common people, despised by the Pharisees as unlearned, found Jesus to be truly credible as a "man of God."

Christopraxis and Holy Scripture

Theological reflection has the task of disarming the skill of hiding behind practiced piety on the one hand, and pedantic scholarship

on the other. The Pharisees "traverse sea and land to make a single proselyte," scolded Jesus, and "when he becomes a proselyte, you make him twice as much a child of hell as yourselves" (Matt. 23:15). Strong language! But those of us involved with the responsibility of preparing others for ministry must not mistake education for proselyting. Christopraxis is a ministry of making disciples—how else could it be! However, the particular competence demanded of a maker of disciples is that Christ himself be revealed as the discipler.

Christopraxis, it has been argued, is the normative and authoritative grounding of all theological reflection in the divine act of God consummated in Jesus Christ, and continued through the power and presence of the Holy Spirit in the body of Christ. Education for ministry is, therefore, not only preparation for ministry but it is an on-going pursuit of competence through critical theological reflection. This competence does not arise merely through repetition and practice of methods, but is gained through participation in the work of God in such a way that accountability for the judgments made in ministry situations are congruent with Christ's own purpose as he stands within the situation and acts through and with us.

Those who have followed the argument to this point and are "almost persuaded," will still be uneasy over what might appear to be a shift from the "objective" role of Scripture as the sole depository of revealed truth to the "subjective" discernment of the mind of Christ amidst the hopeless and ambiguous labyrinth of human feelings and impulses. Nothing that I have said should be construed as being sympathetic with such a movement from objective to subjective truth. I grant that the objectification of divine truth in the form of rational propositions deduced from Scripture appears to be a safeguard against the relativizing of truth to what seems to be right in each person's eyes. But all idolatry has its source in the desire to make the way to God more certain and more manageable. Consequently, I myself am not persuaded that one can legitimately detach the truth of God from the being of God and make out of it an abstract standard of correctness. Christopraxis, as I have attempted to present it, upholds the full authority and objectivity of the divine Word as written in Holy Scripture but only because Scripture itself is contingent upon the being of God as given to us through the incarnate Word. Should one wish to dissolve this contingency into a Word of God which exists as a sheer objectification of truth detached from God's being, it would be done at the peril of idolatry, in my judgment.

I do not hold that the objective reality of God over and against his own creature is ever surrendered to an objectified word which comes under the control of the mind of the creature. This would be a subjectivism of the worst kind. Christopraxis, as I have attempted to present it, upholds the full authority and objectivity of the Spirit of Christ as present and active in the creating and sustaining of his body, the church. The tormenting question as to how we can ever be *sure* of knowing what the purpose and work of Christ is through our own actions of ministry must push us to apprehend the objective reality of God himself, rather than cause us to comprehend the truth in categories more susceptible to our control. Rather than this causing confusion and anxiety, the Apostle Paul held that the objective reality of the Spirit in the body of Christ is the source of true knowledge and unity of thought and action (I Cor. 2:6-16; Eph. 4:1-6).

Even as Christ himself did not act against the commandments of God, but integrated them into his own act of revelation and reconciliation, so the Spirit of Christ in the church does not act against the teachings of Christ in Scripture, but integrates them into his own actions of revelation and reconciliation. My purpose has not been to show *how* this can be translated into a curriculum for theological education, but to attempt to persuade others that Christopraxis is a structure of reality which encompasses both thought and action, and is the objective basis for developing answers to the more practical question of method.

Competence in ministry is the ultimate theological examination. "Examine yourselves," says Apostle Paul, "... Do you not realize that Jesus Christ is in you?—unless indeed you fail to meet the test! ... For we cannot do anything against the truth, but only for the truth" (II Cor. 13:5, 8).