

A Reflection on Mennonite Theology in Canada*

Peter Erb *Wilfrid Laurier University*

There is a common definition of theology which refers to it as "God-talk." As such, the definition has a broad application but has also been severely limited: for example, it has been for the most part treated as "talk about God" when the definition might as easily refer to "God's talk," i.e. his communication by and for humankind; again, it has often been limited to the "talk" of individuals (either within or without the church) about God and less often has it been discussed as an ecclesial function, i.e. as the "talk" of the whole church or of a specific denomination. It is on theology as an ecclesial function that I wish to reflect in this paper; the complications of interpreting theology as divine rather than as human communication cannot here be treated.

My reasons for approaching theology from this point of view are twofold. It would, first of all, be false of me not to note that my own theological formation was within the Amish Mennonite tradition in Ontario (now Western Ontario Mennonite Conference) and that as such I was directed always to think theologically of the church as a unified body first and of my own considerations thereafter. Secondly, it has become customary for me (perhaps because of my original setting) to consider a church's theology in the context of that church's social makeup. What becomes immediately apparent if these two aspects are described independently of one another, i.e., as theological phenomena and as social phenomena, are their differences (I am thinking here of the word "difference" in the French sense of the cognate term, viz. of the way in which each aspect is "different from" the other while at the same time "deferring to" the other). The questions which then immediately arise relate to the consistencies or more often inconsistencies between a church's social, ethnic and political structure and its theological expression.

A useful way of analyzing the question more closely may be to begin with Bernard Lonergan's definition of theology's function as "mediating

between a cultural matrix and the significance and role of religion in the matrix."¹ Lonergan's definition does not tell us what theology in itself is (as a discipline which speaks of a transcendent God, such a definition is impossible), but rather what theology does. Theology's mediating operation is concerned with culture. Etymologically the term "culture" is related to the Latin word *cultus* meaning "worship." Every culture is stabilized by the strength of its *cultus*, its transcendent disposition, and the worship resulting from such a disposition. Within its total field of meaning, *cultus* is by definition closely tied to the field of meaning surrounding religion as I here use the term. Viewed as mediating a religion, as arising out of a *cultus*, theology functions through believers. It is in the church, a function of the church. Within the Amish Mennonite tradition, and within traditional Christianity the *cultus* and the religion are the primary responsibility of the bishop. The bishop bears primary responsibility for the mediation of the cult, religion, and their attendant rites. The bishop is the primary theologian. In our contemporary Mennonite setting this primary function has been ascribed not only to the pastor, but to the whole laity as well because of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. For Mennonites, as a result, theology's function might best be discussed under the topic ecclesiology. It is an aspect of the pastoral care of souls within and without God's grace. It never functions aside from the church as an academic discipline alone. Theology thus is not the domain of certain scientifically trained individuals. I well recall persons within my own tradition who were open to the words of trained theologians, but unwilling to bow to such theologians' words alone; to a degree they had accepted the distinction made by Roman Catholics that theology's professional practitioners are *periti* (skilled theologians). The church does not contain non-theologians and theologians, but theologians and skilled theologians. The skilled theologians report to and are guided by the pastoral leadership, in particular the bishops for those Mennonite communities where this office is still continued, and the theologian's responsibility is to serve in the church's mission of mediation.

Because I understand theology in this way it has proven impossible to describe its state in the Mennonite church without polling all pastors and indeed, laity. With Cardinal Newman I believe that in the promulgation of all doctrinal matters the laity must be consulted.² To have done so for a conference on Mennonite Studies would have been impossible. To have consulted only the skilled theologians or to provide only a description of the activities of those academic practitioners at this time, would have been dishonest and perhaps (considering the definition here established) heretical. One can, however, reflect on this definition of theology for the present state of the Mennonite church. If my application of the

definition is correct or even partially correct, the first concern for Mennonites at the present time must be pastoral education. All serious concern with the training of theologians for the 1980s must direct itself in the first place to the nature of the culture, that is the cultivation of those persons who provide the primary leadership for the church. Although we may lack the will to implement our resolve, no one will deny that a theologian-pastor must maintain a grasp of all the basic modes of inquiry. Such a person must have a working knowledge of the biblical languages, of the facts of church history, of the traditional *chemae* and topics of Christian doctrine, and of the modes of interpreting and communicating all these to the church and the world. Obviously it is impossible for any one person to gain expertise in all these functions, nor is there any need that such an individual do so fully; theology is after all a church-community matter. It is perhaps because of the implicit acceptance of this fact that Mennonites at an earlier time have considered and now again are considering the implementation of the team ministry in local congregations and the reintroduction of genuine bishop oversight. For the latter to be operative in a significant way the church must be willing to risk the dismantlement of its bureaucracy and its understanding of local churches as administratively, rather than as essentially, linked. The problems inherent in shifting bureaucratic structures in a late capitalist (perhaps post-capitalist) world are immense and are particularly difficult for the church which, as a conservative institution, will of necessity fear for its stable continuation.

In those communities which have already rethought the bishop's role, the problems of instituting an episcopal office are at times as many as they are in those Mennonite communities which have not maintained the episcopal function. For example, there has been a tendency among many Mennonites to modernize the word "bishop" itself, to translate it literally into the word "overseer." The etymology (from *episcopus*) is certainly correct, but when the term is translated into "overseer" in contemporary society, it takes on connotations which it does not originally have; "overseer" in an agricultural setting connotes a person who because of his or her long experience in the society is best suited to give guidance to the cultivators of that society. In a post-agricultural, industrial society, however, the term "overseer" connotes not wise guidance but managerial expertise. Every attempt must be made to avoid such connotations when the bishop's function is reconsidered and reinstated. The suggestion that local churches should be considered as essentially rather than administratively linked, would if implemented support what is in fact the situation, namely that Russian and Swiss believers do share with their African, South American, and Asian co-believers, one faith and one baptism in spite of their many ethnic differences.

What I am calling for in all this is a high church movement among Mennonites, that is, a higher concept of the church and of its leadership. And I am suggesting that the theological explication of such a high ecclesiology is more in keeping with the Mennonite fact as developed in history, than is the over-emphasis on congregational sovereignty with its loose verbal assent to a visionary ideal, an unobtainable universal church. Better stated, I am suggesting that in its present state Mennonite theology is attempting to mediate a high church religious phenomenon with a low church theological language;³ that is, that the traditional Mennonite concern with community, with the importance of the baptismal act and of "worthy" participation in the Lord's Supper is the concern of a high church, whereas Mennonites' explication of the role of the ordinances as simple signs and description of the church in social compact terms reflects their tendency to write theology as low churchmen.

Mennonites and Historical Theology.

The point is strengthened I believe when one views the state of historical theology in the Mennonite church. Like any Christian denomination with a high ecclesiology, Mennonites are obsessed with history. I hasten to add that I am here making a radical distinction, although not a separation, between the practice of historical theology and of the work of church historians. Aside from a Mennonite group, one could seldom find the word "tradition" so often used. Even in the Roman Catholic or Eastern church community the term is not as much on the lips of every believer as it is in the Mennonite church. But one dare not use a word like "tradition" glibly, as Mennonites have far too often done, or one risks an inconsistent theological system and as a result fails to mediate the salvific religion effectively. We Mennonites have too long shouted tradition out of one side of our mouths and scripture out of the other. If one cannot see a duplicity in what I have described as a high church fact—low church theology, one must surely see it in regard to the Mennonite treatment of scripture and tradition. The word "duplicity" should perhaps be replaced with "thoughtlessness." I am not yet convinced that the lack of serious attention to this question should be judged a result of moral rather than intellectual turpitude. Almost every skilled Mennonite theologian of our century is primarily concerned with tradition. Theologians like Bender, Friedman, Yoder, and Kaufman function theologically within the confines of historical theology and at the same time hold biblical theology in tension with it. When the scripture has not been reduced to the tradition (note the reading of the peace doctrine into the text by proof-texting), the practice has reflected a two-sources theology of revelation. The time certainly is at hand to rethink at the very least our practice in this matter.

The point at which such thinking has begun and might most profitably continue is the contemporary discussion of the historical Jesus. There is an analogy between the theological solution of the historical Jesus-biblical Christ question and the scripture-tradition problem. Traditional Mennonite interest in the duties of the gospels has not surprisingly required many learned scholars to consider carefully the question of the renewed search for the historical Jesus, particularly as it has been popularized recently by Hans Küng. There is a necessary link between one's theology of the incarnation and one's ecclesiology. Thus when Menno first considered the establishment of a church community separate from that of his Roman Catholic tradition, he developed along with his ecclesiological concerns a new Christology. It may be that many Mennonites today cannot accept the peculiar nature of that Christology, but we must do Menno the courtesy of treating it as a mature theological attempt to bring consistency into the linking of statements regarding the nature of Christian community and of statements describing the physical presence of Jesus in the world. Theology, sacramentology, and incarnational theology are all linked. The church is the body of Christ, the eucharist is the body of Christ, and Jesus walked this earth in a body. Any theology which hopes to be effective in the modern world must insist on a consistency between these three theological topics. Since I have spoken and commented on this topic elsewhere I do not wish to extend the discussion here.⁴ Suffice it to say, that my feeling is that Mennonites will begin to move to a solution of both the historical Jesus-biblical Christ question and the scripture-tradition mystery only as they read Küng less and as they read Walter Kasper more.⁵

The distinction made earlier between historical theology and church history must be continued in the realm of biblical studies, although in this realm it may be far more difficult to maintain. What is certain is that Mennonites, along with their co-believers, must cease confusing biblical theology and biblical study. The historian's reconstruction of "what actually happened" needs to be dealt with, that is, it needs to be interpreted. It may be that the passage in I Corinthians 14:33-38 requiring that women keep silent in the churches is an interpolation, but I submit that this historic "fact" could be as easily used in a theology to maintain a subservient role for women as to liberate them.⁶ Historical theology is theologizing about history and, as already noted, it must work closely with the results of church history. The main attraction of historical theology must not be given up. Modern man is, as Nietzsche and others have told us, historical in a way in which classical man was not, and if Mennonites wish to speak to the modern world they must do so in history. They must, however, take care in the first place not to confuse theologizing about history with history "itself." Such a confusion has

occurred too often in the past and few of us would wish to support the notions of the forerunners of the Reformation that are offered in van Braght for example. To accept van Braght's theories would require that we accept a link between the Anabaptists and the Albigensians.

There is likewise the need to face the fact that Mennonites are not sixteenth-century Anabaptists and that in their history they have developed into something significantly different. Many of us have now become accustomed to thinking of our spiritual progenitors as arising polygenetically from loosely-linked, economically and sociologically determined, separate groups. As Pietist studies continue it will be even more difficult to accept the sharp delineation between Anabaptism and Pietism maintained by Robert Friedman. Moreover, Mennonite historical theologians must broaden their interests into systematic theology if they wish their mediation to be integrated. To do so they must cease to look at the black print on the pages and come to grips with the white spaces between the letters which both separate the literal forms into meaningless blots and unite them into meaningful wholes. The willingness to look at the white space between scripture and tradition, a space ignored for far too long, will force upon the resulting theology analogous considerations.

We have already noted the analogy between the historical Jesus-biblical Christ question and the scripture-tradition mystery, but there are two more direct parallels. The problem of scripture-tradition is associated with that of faith-reason and of grace-works. By accepting an anti-intellectual stance Mennonites have in the past been able to avoid the faith-reason controversy, which we can no longer do. As we enter the sophisticated spheres of economic, political, sociological, anthropological, and psychological studies we can no longer carry under our thumbnails, as it were, the theological remnant of Southern Manitoba or Waterloo County topsoil. We cannot blithely separate spheres in which we reason from spheres in which we dwell by blind faith anymore than we can divide our beings and actions into head and heart. To grasp the essence of the faith-reason mystery, we will almost certainly have to give up our reduced psychologies and possibly accept the difficult inevitability for us moderns of an earlier anthropology which recognized human functioning as the result of a concomitant discursive act acquiring knowledge (reason) and an apprehension of reality coming-to-know (intellect). Dealing with this problem may be a way of reintegrating theology into our academic and church curricula and overcoming the new non-discipline, from the '60s, religious studies, or at least create for it a full framework within which a liberal education can be achieved. Having once so broadened the possibility of what it means to be human we may well come to see the traditional Mennonite willingness to shout "By grace you are saved" in

the same breath as demanding obedience (works) not as falsity, paradox or bad logic, but as the fullness of the human and divine mystery and as explanative of the Chalcedonian formula, as well as of the transcendent-immanent relationship and of the mystery of a finite's creature's participation in an infinite creator's act.

Theology of Creation.

A fuller theology of creation is most definitely required, if theology is to mediate between a religion and its cultural matrix. We have considered theology up to this point as mediating a religion and as such we have viewed it as a sacred science, but theology is also secular. It speaks to and in human culture. A theology of creation not only speaks to the question of the two aspects of theology itself (that is, theology as sacred, dealing with religion, and theology as secular, dealing with culture) but also to the practical theological problems which must be addressed as theology functions in and to a culture. Theology is both practical and speculative.

My comments up to this point can be applied to theology in general but the significance of my nationalistic title becomes clearer as we proceed. That there are many different cultural Mennonite groups within Canada is fact; it remains, however, that they are all *within* Canada. Any theology which is to mediate a religion in Canada must be cognizant of the peculiar Canadian situation. We are a bilingual nation politically (not a multicultural one) and the bilingual fact has had its effect: our theology and understanding of conscription is different from that of our American co-believers because we, unlike them, were joined in our opposition to overseas conscription by French-Canadians. I cannot imagine a vital theological function in any of our Canadian churches which does not take this bilingual fact into consideration. The world is larger than Winkler or Wellesley and if we do not face it we are doomed; but more important, we are unfaithful to our mission.

Nor is the Canada question for Mennonites a recent, stylishly nationalistic one. For many years many parts of Ontario, to give only one example, have distrusted "Statsers." The reason for the distrust is not far to seek. It can be found in the little red book, the *Ontario Reader*, filled with poems from Tennyson, statements from Carlyle on duty, and from Kipling on Empire. Most Ontario Mennonites were not educated in Mennonite schools but in British Empire schools and the nationalistic lesson stuck. By the time those trained under the glory of the empire were ceasing to direct Ontario Mennonites, the Liberal Party reintroduced a revived nationalism in its marketing of the Canadian Flag and anthem after 1967. To suppose that our theological activities in Canada have not been shaped and do not continue to be shaped by political reality is foolishness. The fact that Canada has a nineteenth century, post-roman-

tic, parliamentary system which understands unity as consensus, as opposed to an eighteenth-century social-contract republic, can be neglected only to our theological peril. But there has been little attention paid to these factors, and even more than our American co-believers we Mennonite Canadians desperately need a theology of political life. Civil religion in the United States is explicit. I cannot accept that the bombs bursting in air and the rockets' red glare are proof of the stability of a society and neither can American Mennonites. But I am more easily attracted to supposing that Canada is my home and native land (when heaven is) and that the god who saves the Queen is my God, when in fact it is the national god of Great Britain who looked over the eradication of the Jesuits, the colonization of the world, genocide in Tasmania, destruction of the Ashanti, and the recent glory of defending a few rocks in the South Atlantic. It is too simple for Canadians to accept the ultimately arrogant assumption that all would be well in the world if only everyone else were as non-nationalistic as we Canadians. Only when we have solved these matters can we justifiably comment on liberation theology and call for justice in Canada and elsewhere. Because of the need for a theology of creation and the comment already made regarding the nature of theology as a pastoral function, it is little wonder that the political realities in Canada have forced a call for the establishment of a distinctively Canadian theological and pastoral education, particularly of a seminary education planned by and directed for Canadians.

A renewed theology of creation within a specific Canadian setting must raise other questions as well, not the least of which relate to a theology of social life. Because of the importance that the family has played in Mennonite life a major topic which should be discussed is the theology of marriage. It is my own position that in spite of the sociologists and psychologists a theology of marriage precedes a theology of sexuality just as a reflection on a community precedes reflection of the individual; that is, I am a husband and father before I am I; I am my social and institutional situation, not some deep-seated inner freedom attempting to express myself. (Such a position is the position of a Canadian — French and English — not that of an enlightened American or a continental Frenchman. It is one of the joys and sorrows of Canadians that we have not experienced the enlightenment. French Canadians were born before it, English Canadians after. We are, as a result, of necessity conservative in our social political theory.) A theology of marriage cannot avoid the woman's issue or the issue of a choice of a single life or the choice of a deliberately childless marriage. Both of the latter issues perhaps require that a serious attempt be made to develop a theology of celibacy; only as we are dealing theologically with these questions can we hope to reflect significantly on the homosexual and the church. Associated with all these

questions there is the need for a new theology of chastity. It may well be within the framework of a theology of marriage as here outlined that the question of ordination, both of women and of men, should be taken up. Such a question can only be approached within the context of the role of the pastor as theologian, the theology of marriage as already mentioned, and a theology of the spiritual life.

The Theology of Spiritual Life

The theology of marriage like the theology of human relationships generally (particularly friendship) must be discussed within both the framework of the theology of creation and of a spiritual theology. If the theory upheld to this point is credible, namely that Mennonites require a high theology of the church to best explicate their existence, it should gain special force in the reflection on spirituality. The seriousness with which the Lord's Supper is taken and the traditional confessional stance at preparatory service lends the hypothesis support. The practice of baptism provides a particularly valuable insight. It is often pointed out by the opponents of Mennonites that their stand on baptism is Pelagian; the argument is that a Mennonite chooses of his or her own free will to enter the community — the individual comes first, the community comes second; free will precedes election, works precede grace. As Mennonites have traditionally explicated their position, the attack seems plausible and because of this the explication must be changed. But an examination of the phenomenon of baptismal practice, the importance placed on it for children raised in the group (namely, it is expected that they will be baptised) and the increasing practice of infant dedication suggests that baptism is not, as understood by the Mennonite community, an act of the free will alone. There seems to be a sense in which persons from outside the Mennonite community who attend Mennonite churches *are* already considered in the church before the ordinance of baptism is practiced and that therefore, like the children of parents anxious that they not reach eighteen years of age before sprinkling or immersing, receive baptism from the church rather than entering the church through an act of will. In almost all cases the so-called act of choosing baptism is really, considered as phenomenon alone, an openness for baptism and that Mennonites receive the "sacrament" and its promises from outside themselves as much as any of the churchly traditions.

A renewed theology of baptism, now badly needed, will force upon Mennonites a theology of conversion. Conversion is a topic much spoken of in all North American society today but little reflected on by any denomination. For the most part conversion has been given over to the social sciences along with moral theology.⁸ A theology of conversion will

mean a resultant renewal of moral theology which for Mennonites has been served almost exclusively by ethnic norms.

If the Mennonite theological revision in regard to baptism and conversion proceeds towards an integration of the sacramental phenomenon and its theological explication, it is almost certain that discussion of the practice of the Lord's Supper will raise itself quickly. Surely, once again the phenomenon of Mennonites requiring regular participation of the confessed in the Lord's Supper is that of a high church and that the linking of Supper, community and history reflects a much more radical sense of the real presence in one body than the simple sign theory used to explain it indicates. Indeed, the sign theory, facing such a phenomenon, is not only inadequate; it is misleading. It would be most interesting for example to read the study of a ritualist who had reflected on the participation of an old order Amish community in the Lord's Supper. It may well be that such a student would find the best models with which to describe that phenomenon among those communities which uphold the re-presentation of the sacrifice of Christ; our ritualist's choice of description would almost certainly be affected by the extensive discussion of the importance of martyrdom, of suffering with Christ, and of being together as one body.

Renewal of a "thanksgiving" theology of the Supper (I hesitate to use the work "Eucharistic") can take place only within a renewed theology of worship. It was with worship, *cultus*, that this essay began, and with it, except for two corollary comments, it closes. A theology of worship includes a restructuring of liturgical practice, but the latter cannot proceed from the former. A few changes in the pattern of prayer and hymn-singing will only offend, not help people. One can only revise the liturgical practice and cultic dimension of a people if both are based on a fully mediated and mediating theology of worship, a theology which understands the requirements of the culture in which it is to mediate the significance and scope of its dynamic religion. To do so it must at least overcome the split between our separate explications of private and public prayer and must direct persons back once again to viewing worship in terms of space, not time. If one reflects primarily on space, time stands still. One is, as it were, in eternity. Words or music with such a space-eye orientation project into it not a sense of chronological time but of time made eternal, of time under control, of order, of beauty. It is therefore within a broadened theology of worship that I would treat aesthetics. It is within a discussion of *cultus* that I treat criticism which, in its mediation of a cultural object to a culture, is analogous in its activity to the mediating function of theology. It is for this reason that we ought to be troubled by the relatively unsophisticated literary and artistic criticism among Mennonites, compared with the relatively sophisticated productivity (the

word creation is deliberately avoided) in music, literature, and the plastic arts.

The two corollary comments relating to a theology of worship with which this paper concludes touch on pastoral care and the Mennonite peace concern. The first can be handled briefly; the second may strike one as strange in a theology of worship setting. Because of the broad nature of worship, *cultus* as here defined, pastoral care must take on new dimensions and be supported by a new theology. Since the 1950s (30 years behind the rest of society) Mennonites have increasingly allowed pastoral counselling to replace the theology and phenomenon of pastoral care. The result will be, unless arrested, the writing of a theology under the direction of the social sciences and not, as it ought to be, vice versa. A theology of pastoral care will include a revision of the position of the pastor as spiritual director, a broadening of moral theology from concern with individual morality to that of social morality (are there any sins which are social in our own day, and not merely the summation of individual mistakes?), a renewed explanation of the prayer life, private and public, and of the pastor as theologian. A renewed theology of pastoral care will be paralleled by a renewed pastoral concern with and practice of theology.

Such a concern will necessarily have to deal with the peace issue. Our theology of peace is fixated at a peculiarly primitive stage. Our biblical defence of peace issues involves only proof-texting, even at the present time, as does our historical defence of it, and it is likely that the biblical/historical sciences as they develop will increasingly take this defence from us.⁹ Peace, as practiced by Mennonites (primarily through MCC) is a theological function — it mediates between our religion and cultures around the globe, thus participating in the mediating activity of Christ. Can such activity be described under a theology of worship, a broader reflection of *cultus*? A beginning at broadening the peace question might be made by reflecting on the New Testament concept of *hupomone*, most simply translated as “waiting.”¹⁰ In the first chapter of I Thessalonians, Paul describes three types of work: the labour of faith (active), the toil of hope (active with elements of suffering), and the *hupomone* of love. *Hupomone* describes the activity of a slave, who waits outside the door for his master to call upon him. He does not try to control, to know, to extend his power, but only to wait in love. Such waiting is a waiting of love and in love. It is love’s waiting on others in active peace service and it is above all a waiting of love before the Divine in worship. Peace, then, is not a peculiar part of the Mennonite theology, but the source of that theology in concrete fact as mediating. The peace concern requires that one does not try to control the world but rather to serve the world. The peace concern requires that one does not try to

control God in the definition of theology but rather to love God. Any theology of work and labour which needs immediate attention can be considered under the same schema, namely of the distinction between work and labour in the Greek world and in Paul but, above all within the context of peace, the attitude of worship, the source of the spiritual life, the center of creation, the direction of human history, and the progenitor of theology.

Notes

* The paper which follows was requested as a response to William Klassen's paper on religious studies; conference organizers requested that it reflect on the question of Mennonite theology, a topic which could not be covered in the limited space of the Klassen paper. Because of the many problems in ascertaining specifically the "state of the art" of Mennonite theology in Canada, I understood the phrase to refer not to the state which the art has reached, i.e. what has been and is being done in theology by Canadian Mennonites, but rather to the state of the art facing the present and future, i.e. what are *some* of the matters a Canadian Mennonite will or should face at the present time. The paper is necessarily personal and understood as a discussion paper.

¹ Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972), xi.

² ". . . the English word 'consult' . . . includes the idea of inquiry into a matter of fact as well as making a judgement . . . Doubtless their [the faithful] advice, their opinion, their judgment on the question of the [theological] definition is not asked; but the matter of fact, viz. their belief, is sought for as a testimony to that apostolical tradition, on which alone any doctrine whatsoever can be defined." (John Henry Newman, "On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine," *The Rambler*, NS 1/2 [July, 1859], 54-55.) Part of the contemporary "consultation" must be a proper description of the social structures developed and maintained in fact by the laity and an interpretation of those structures theologically.

³ On the possibility of approaching the Anabaptists from the point of view of this essay, see the doctoral work in progress by John Rempel (Conrad Grebel College). One misconception which must be avoided is the false assumption that "high church" necessitates the practice of late nineteenth century Italianate ritualism.

⁴ "Theological Method and Contemporary Christology," paper presented at the Pastoral Leadership Training Seminar, Waterloo, Ont. Feb. 3, 1981.

⁵ Walter Kasper, *Jesus the Christ*, trans. V. Green (London and New York: Burns and Oates and Paulist Press, 1977).

⁶ One could argue, for example, that the interpolation was inspired by the "fact" that prophecy as problematical was practiced particularly by women at the time of the interpolator and that "he" therefore inserted his commentary at this point in the text.

⁷ See above all George Grant, *Lament for a Nation* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965), 68-69.

⁸ Cf. Lewis R. Rambo, "Current Research on Religious Conversion," *Religious Studies Review* 8/2 (1982), 146ff.

⁹ Is it likely that if Jesus rejected the "just war" position of his time, so little explicit comment would be given to his position in the New Testament?

¹⁰ See above all, Simone Weil, *Waiting on God*, trans. Emma Crauford (Glasgow: Collins, 1959), 66ff.