

Preaching Repentance And Remission Of Sins—With Application To Personal Witnessing—Luke 24:47

[Presented on November 8, 1977 at the Nebraska--Colorado District Missionary Conference in
Overland Park, Kansas]

By Richard D. Balge

It was evening of the day on which God raised Jesus Christ from the dead. The Emmaus disciples returned from that village to find the Eleven and those with them, saying: "The Lord has really been raised and has been seen by Simon" (v34). "They, too, explained the things that had happened on the road and how He had been made known to them in the breaking of the loaf" (v35). John mentions (20:19) that the doors were locked, but "while they were talking about these things He Himself stood in their midst and said to them: '*Shalom aleichem*'" (v36). They had been excited about the news of His resurrection and they heard His word of greeting; "but frightened and scared, they thought they were seeing a spirit. And He said to them, 'Why are you upset, and for what reason are doubts arising in your hearts? See my hands and my feet: It is I myself. Handle me and see, because a spirit does not have flesh and bones like you see me having.' And while He said this He showed them His hands and His feet. Then, while they were still incredulous for joy and filled with wonder, He said to them: 'Do you have something here to eat?' And they gave Him a portion of broiled fish. So He took it and ate it in their presence." (vv 37-43).

There is disagreement as to whether verses 44-49 were spoken by Jesus on the same occasion or whether they are a summary of His instruction during the forty days before His ascension. Since the verses 35-43 are parallel to John 20:19,20, and since John 20:21-23 speak of apostleship and the forgiving of sins, 21-23 may very well correspond to the verses which contain the subject of this paper. Lenski and Godet are among those who hold this view That there is substantial agreement between this instruction and the directives of Jesus in Matthew 28:19 and Mark 16:15 is also a fact. Representative of those who urge this view (at least with regard to Mark 16:15) are Arndt and Edersheim. Whatever the case may be, our passage does accord with what Jesus said on that first Easter evening and it does provide a summary of His post-resurrection instruction. It may even have been Luke's intention to let the passage serve this double purpose.

The Savior had assured these chosen witnesses that He was not a dead teacher. Now He wanted to instruct them further concerning God's gracious rule. He repeated and reviewed something He had told them when they had begun the final fateful trip to the Feast at Jerusalem (Luke 18:31-34) and which He had expounded for the Emmaus disciples earlier that day (24:27). "He said to them: 'These words of mine are what I told you when I was still with you: all the things written about me in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled.' Then He opened their minds so that they could understand the Scriptures" (vv 44,45).

I believe that verses 46,47 provide the thesis in summary for which Jesus expounded in greater detail in teaching His disciples the important truth contained in these verses and in inculcating the hermeneutical principle that the Scriptures urge Christ, focus in Him, reveal Him, are understood only in connection with Him. "And He told them, 'This is what is written: The Messiah will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day, and on the basis of His name repentance for the remission of sins will be preached to all the nations--beginning from

Jerusalem" (vv 46,47). The phrase "for the remission of sins" reflects the *eis* of UBS's third edition and Nestle's twenty-fifth edition and will be discussed later.

The *gegraptai*, with the perfect indicative's connotation of continuing validity, really expresses what the *dei* of verse 44 already expressed. Since God spoke by the prophets and His Spirit moved them, what they wrote *must* come to pass. *Gegraptai* has three infinitive objects. They are coordinate and have equal weight. Two speak of finished business: *pathein* and *anastenai*. The third speaks of unfinished business: *keruchthenai*.

Not only are the three infinitives, the three items of business, connected in the scriptural imperative (*gegraptai, dei*). They are connected in this that the unfinished business (*keruchthenai*) is based on and validated by the finished (*pathein, anastenai*). We are reminded of this by the *epi too onomati*. On the basis of (*epi*) Messiah's name a proclamation will take place. His name is the name of Him who suffered and rose on the third day, as it was written. On the basis of His accomplishment, reputation, and authority a proclamation will be made to all nations. The people of Israel will still be included among the nations, for the proclamation will begin at Jerusalem.

The content of the proclamation is not essentially new or different. Before Jesus began His ministry, John was "preaching baptism of repentance for the remission of sins" (3:3). During His ministry Jesus made it clear that He had "not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." *Kerussein, metanoia*, and *aphesis toon hamartioon* are by no means new concepts or a new message. What has changed is that the suffering and resurrection which were anticipated in John's preaching and Jesus' ministry have now occurred. What is new is that now the preaching is to and for all nations. What John proclaimed in Israel the disciples will proclaim to all nations. What Jesus preached to the lost sheep of the House of Israel His Church is to proclaim in the whole world. As startling as that must have been when Jesus expressed it and as difficult as it was for the disciples to accept and carry out in practice, the *eis panta ta ethne* is probably not startling or difficult for the participants in this missionary conference.

The way in which you have formulated the topic, the understanding of the word "repentance" in the church's history, and the methods of certain modern-day evangelists suggest that the exegetical focus of this paper ought to be the words *keruchthenai ... metanoian eis* (or *kai*) *aphesin hamartioon*. The variant reading and the two possibilities of understanding *kai* will increase our work but not triple it. Nor will it materially affect our understanding of the message which is to be heralded.

The chief difficulty in understanding the words "repent" and "repentance" must lie in man's inherent opinion that an effort or attitude or action on his part can cause or contribute to his salvation. Old Adam hears "repent" and thinks that he is to exercise his reason and his will to make an intelligent decision. The difficulty is compounded by the fact that "repentance" does not at all convey the etymological and literal "change of mind" which *metanoi* suggests. Actually, "repent" simply Anglicizes the *agite poenitentiam* of the Vulgate. It is not surprising, then, that "repent" means "do penance" to many Christians. They do not have to accept a Sacrament of Penance to fall into this error. Webster's Third New International Dictionary defines repentance as "contrition for one's sins together with the dedication of oneself to the abandonment of unworthy purposes and values and to the amendment of one's life." That definition agrees very closely with the material aspect of the Sacrament of Penance: *contritio, confessio, satisfactio*. Random House Dictionary is less "catholic" than Webster but offers definitions which are also incomplete from the point of view of the New Testament: "1) deep sorrow, compunction, or contrition for a past sin, wrongdoing, or the like. 2) regret for any past action."

Even Luther's rendering of *metanoia* and *metanoieo* do not help. *Busse* and *bussen* or *bussetun* are rooted in *besser*. There is the idea of improvement, correction, and satisfaction in that.

The Bauer lexicon (Arndt-Gingrich) lists 24 verbs and 5 nouns which are compounds with *meta*. All in some way reflect the sense of change, removal, reversal, exchange. *Metanoia* is translated as "a change of mind, remorse, repentance, turning about, conversion." "A change of mind" is literal, but what about the derived meanings? How did our word come to mean those things as it is used in the New Testament?

Kittel's *Worterbuch* (Bromiley) traces the use of the verb and the noun in Volume IV, pp. 975-1008. In classical usage the change of mind was "not restricted to rational self criticism ... It is often accompanied by lively feelings expresses pain or grief at what has happened ... and in this way has an ethical character. ... For the Greeks *metanoia* never suggests an alteration in the total moral attitude, a profound change in life's direction, a conversion which affects the whole of conduct ... (In) the Stoic view ... the wise man is above a *metanoia*. This would not show him to be in harmony with himself. It would represent him as the victim of error. ... These ideas do not constitute a bridge to what the New Testament understands by *metanoia*."

Before considering *metanoia* in LXX and other Jewish literature, Kittel (l.c.) examines the concept in the Old Testament. "There is in the OT no special tt. for 'repentance' or 'to repent.' But the concept is by no means absent. ...The prophets ... regarded a common secular term as quite adequate to express the process they had in view, and they thus preferred it in their own usage. This word is SHUB. ... The sense of turning about is perhaps the best general rendering. ... The object of return ... is either expressly or contextually Yahweh, only once (Ne 9:29) the Torah. The object of turning from is evil conduct ..., previous conduct (DeRek), evil ..., wicked acts ..., violence..., idols ..., abomination Sin in the various terms. ..."

Examples of the use of SHUB in the sense of turning from an object to an object are:

Isaiah 10:20f - "Now it will come about in that day that the remnant of Israel ... will never again rely on *the one who struck them*, but will truly rely on the Lord, the Holy One of Israel. A remnant will *return*, the remnant of Jacob, *to the mighty God*."

Jeremiah 3:22f - "'Return, O faithless sons, I will heal your faithlessness.' 'Behold, we come to Thee; for Thou art *the Lord* our God. Surely, *the hills* are a deception, a tumult on the mountains. Surely, in the Lord our God is the salvation of Israel.'"

Jeremiah 25:5f - "'Turn now everyone *from the evil of your deeds*, and dwell on the land which *the Lord* has given to you and your forefathers forever and ever; and do not go after other gods to serve them and to worship them, and do not provoke me to anger with the work of your hands, and I will do you no harm."

Jeremiah 26:3 - "Perhaps they will listen and everyone *will turn from his evil way*"

Hosea 6:1 - "Come, let us *return to the Lord*."

Hosea 14:1 - "*Return*, O Israel, to the *Lord* your God; for you have stumbled because of your iniquity."

When we get to LXX the plot thickens. LXX never uses *metanoieo* to render SHUB. It uses *epistrephoo* (-*omai*) or *apostrephoo* (-*omai*). *Metaneo* is used 14 times to translate the niphal of NahCHaM, "regret." "But NiCHaM and SHUB, though they have different basic meanings, both denote movement away from a position previously adopted ..., and are thus often used as parallels (Jer. 4:28; Ex. 32:12); religiously, they can be almost synonyms, cf. Jer. 8:6 ... with 31:18ff ... the result is that in the LXX *metanoieo* and *epistrephoo* seem to be related in meaning . . . *Metanoieo* thus approximates to ... SHUB, the OT technical term for religious and

ethical conversion" (Kittel IV 989f). An example of the use of these words in tandem is Acts 3:19 - *metanoesate oun kai epistrepsate pros to exaleiphthenai humoon tas hamartias*. Acts 26:20 is another.

Kittel further reports that later Greek translations of the Old Testament, Greek apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, and Philo turned from *epistrephoo* to *metanoeeo* in rendering SHUB. It will be helpful in considering Luke 24:47 to remember this equivalence. *Metanoia* is speaking implicitly of a turn from evil to God.

The reading *kai* is favored by KJV, TEV, RSV, NIV (1st ed.), Luther, Arndt in his commentary and the first edition of UBS. The only example of the combination *metanoia kai aphasis* is found in Acts 5:31. That *might* argue for its authenticity here, on the basis of a rare use. The combination *metanoia eis aphasis* is found in Mark 1:4 and Luke 3:3. *Metanoia* is connected by *eis* with *zooe* in Acts 11:18, *sooteria* in 2 Corinthians 7:10, and *epignoosis aletheias* in 2 Timothy 2:25. The reading *eis* is favored by UBS's third edition, NASB, JBP, NEB, and Bauer (Arndt-Gingrich). Manuscript support is found in Ephraemi, the Byzantines, Beza, and some Latin versions *plus* the margins of Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus and p 75. As we shall see it is possible to accept either reading and either understanding of *kai* and still be orthodox. If one is bound to a heretical view of what repentance is and how it is worked, choosing the right reading in this verse will not be the cure.

Let us begin with *kai* conjunctive. Then what is to be preached is "repentance and remission of sins" two related but distinct objects of *keruchthenai*. That is what Luther does with Luke 24:47 in his 1525 treatise "against the heavenly prophets in the matter of images and sacraments" (Am. Ed. 40.82). He treats repentance and remission as Law and Gospel. A similar distinction is found in "Instructions for the visitors of parish pastors in Electoral Saxony, 1528." Then he wrote: "Many now talk only about the forgiveness of sins and say little or nothing about repentance. There neither is forgiveness of sins without repentance nor can forgiveness of sins be understood without repentance. It follows that if we preach the forgiveness of sins without repentance that the people imagine that they have already obtained the forgiveness of sins, becoming thereby secure and without compunction of conscience. This would be a greater error and sin than all the errors hitherto prevailing" (Am. Ed. 40.274). The Law-Gospel construct in terms of repentance and remission of sins is expressed in "The Keys," 1530: "... The key which binds carries forward the work of the law The loosing key carries forward the work of the gospel In short, the two keys advance and foster the gospel by simply proclaiming these two things: repentance and forgiveness of sins (Luke 24:47) (Am. Ed. 40.373).

The terms are separated and *metanoia* is treated as something distinct from *aphesis* in Formula of Concord V, Sol. Dec., TR953: "... To repent means nothing else than truly to acknowledge sins, to be heartily sorry for them, and to desist from them." Article XI, pointing to the "all nations," says "... as the preaching of repentance, so also the promise of the Gospel is universalis, that is, it pertains to all men" (FC XI Sol. Dec., TR1071).

In "The Proper Distinction between Law and Gospel" Dr. Walther equates repentance in our verse with contrition (p 249). Thus, he is also treating repentance and remission as distinct but related concepts. He is reading *kai* conjunctive. The Church's proclamation to all nations is a proclamation of Law and Gospel. It is a message for the converted as well as the unconverted. It proclaims, "The soul that sinneth it shall die" and, "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." Linguistically and theologically, it is possible to understand the *kai* as a simple connective.

Apologia XII.TR259 speaks of repentance as contrition and faith, and calls Luke 24:47 the sum of the gospel. The Gausewitz expository catechism uses our verse four times and each time equates or identifies "repentance and remission of sins" with the gospel. It is evident that in these instances "gospel" is being used in the wider sense, including Law and Gospel.

It is also possible to read it as an exegetical *kai*. Then the phrase would read: "repentance, that is, remission of sins." Obviously the term "repentance" in this understanding is not limited to the contrition that follows the preaching of the Law. It includes the *turning from* evil, false gods, self-righteousness and the *turning to* the Savior for life and salvation. It is something that only the Gospel could effect. The preaching of repentance is then the means of grace to effect repentance. The preaching of the remission of sins is then the means of grace to bestow remission of sins. Each is a term for Gospel.

That understanding of *kai* reminds us that the object of *keruchthenai* for John and Jesus and the apostles is always, in the last analysis, the message of Christ the Savior. Sometimes it is His Person, sometimes His gracious activity, sometimes His gifts. It is the kingdom of heaven, the good news of the kingdom, the year of the Lord's favor - expressive of God's gracious rule in people's lives. It is Jesus is Lord, Christ crucified, Christ has been raised from the dead, the Son of God. It is repentance and baptism for the forgiveness of sins, that people should repent, a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. "Repentance" is sometimes a word that summarizes the whole proclamation. Then it implicitly includes "remission of sins." "Remission of sins" is sometimes a word that summarizes the whole proclamation. Then it implicitly presupposes "repentance." It is not my object here to make a strong case for exegetical *kai*. I have not accomplished that anyway. It is to show that the object of the church's *keruchthenai* is always the Gospel, however that Gospel is summarized.

It is also to remind us that we must never think of *metanoia* as man's work and *aphesis* as God's. They are both God's work, both proclaimed. That is brought out especially well in three passages where *metanoia* is treated as a gift which God gives. Acts 5:31 says: "God exalted him to his own right hand as Prince and Savior that he might give *metanoian* too Israel *kai* *aphesin hamartion* (exegetical *kai*?)." Acts 11:18 reads: "When they heard this, they had no further objections and praised God, saying 'So then God has even the Gentiles *ten metanoian eis zoen edooken*.'" In 2 Timothy 2:25 Paul writes: "Those who oppose him he must gently instruct, in the hope that God will give them *metanoian eis epignoosin aletheias*." So much for synergism in repentance or conversion!

The latter two passages provide examples of the use of *eis*, the reading which both Nestle and UBS prefer for our verse. It is the *eis* which indicates the goal, is used with verbs of changing, and denotes purpose (Bauer, Arndt-Gingrich). Then we understand the words to mean "repentance that leads to the remission of sins," "... that has as its goal (or purpose) the remission of sins." The combination of words used in our verse appears in Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3.4. In Acts 11:18 it is *eis zoen*, in 2 Corinthians 7:10 *eis sooterian*, and in 2 Timothy 2:25 *eis epignoosin aletheias*. In every instance *metanoia* (which is God's gift) has as its goal or purpose that the repentant sinner receive the gifts of God's grace: remission, life, salvation, knowledge of the truth.

In this understanding, *metanoian* is the whole counsel of God, proclaimed with the goal of forgiveness in mind. It is Law and Gospel. It is "Sinner, turn from your self-destructive ways and turn to the living God who saves in Christ." The Word that proclaims it is also God's power to give it. The preaching of repentance is truly a means of grace, aiming for and resulting in the forgiveness of sins.

I hope you will not suspect me of appealing to merely human authority if I use Professor John P. Meyer's dogmatics notes to summarize what has been developed exegetically. In the 1953 edition, II.63, we read: "Repentance is a change of heart - in which the person regrets his former sinfulness and through faith embraces the grace of God (*fiducialis desperatio*). Repentance has a double aspect. It involves 1) a regret over former sin 2) faith as its principal element. a) On the fact cf ... *Luke 24:47* ... b) This faith follows contrition Repentance of a sinner is the work of God It is the aim of God's calling. cf. *Luke 24:47* The means for repentance are the means of grace Exhortations to repent are Gospel invitations, effecting themselves what they call for. 1) They presuppose and declare a man's utter sinfulness. Insofar they have the effect of Law. - 2) Their purpose is: not to condemn but to rescue."

Need we add that while the Gospel proclaims the once-for-allness of universal redemption and justification through Christ's life and death and resurrection, the preaching of repentance and remission of sins is something that all of us need to hear for as long as we live? Thesis I of the 95 Theses reads: "When our Lord and Master Jesus Christ said, 'Repent,' he willed the entire life of believers to be one of repentance" (Am. Ed. 31.25). Writing "Against Latomus" in 1521, Luther said; " ... Repentance is the transformation of corruption and the continual renewal from sin which is effected by faith, the gift of God; and the gift of grace is forgiveness.... There must be repentance and renewal so that sin may be expelled as long as there is preaching, so long as there is life" (Am. Ed. 32.232). And, of course, the water of Baptism is the reminder that daily repentance is needed because the Old Adam will not stay drowned.

What are the practical implications of all this for personal witnessing? The need for repentance and remission of sins on the part of all human beings and the Lord's will that this be proclaimed to all nations indicate that the Gospel witness is not to be limited to "our kind" of people. The need of salvation is absolute for absolutely all human beings. There is no Savior but Jesus. There is no way of knowing Him but by the Gospel. The Gospel reaches people through other people.

The testimony which we offer is to have its base of authority on the revelation of Jesus Christ: *epi too onomati*. That gives us confidence and it imposes discipline upon us. No offer, threat, promise or guarantee can be made that does not have its source in the Savior's revelation of Himself. But we have the confidence that when we adhere to the witness of the apostles concerning Him, when we are faithful in proclaiming the apostolic Word, we speak God's truth. Jesus was not speaking directly to us when He said *humeis martures toutoon* (Luke 24:48). We have not seen and heard and handled and eaten breakfast with the Risen Lord. But those who did also received the promised Spirit (Luke 24:49 and Acts 1:8; Acts 2) and their testimony is true.

The *arxamanoi* in Luke 24:47 which does not have an antecedent, is understood *ad sensum* to refer to the group gathered with Jesus that evening. We must not identify ourselves directly with that group or construe the participle as a timeless command. Nevertheless, the fact that the proclamation should begin *apo Ierousalem* suggests that a practical place to begin is where you are. It is important to know the territory, understand the natives, speak the language.

There may be a place for apologetic in removing misconceptions and barriers to faith. But we must always remember that repentance and remission of sins are to be proclaimed, not argued. It is not our C. S. Lewis, John W. Montgomery, Francis Schaeffer clever evidences that convict. Only the dynamic of the Happy Message can do that.

Again, whatever form our witness takes it is the proclamation of an event - God's saving activity - and not a prescription or scheme. "Repentance and remission of sins" is not a step-by-step plan for prospective saints to follow. "Repentance and remission of sins" are not two

spiritual laws to replace the synergistic "Four Spiritual Laws" of Campus Crusade for Christ. As we have seen, "repentance and remission of sins" is just one way of summarizing Gospel in the broad sense, Law and Gospel, the Kingdom of God, the whole counsel of God, salvation in Christ. All of those declare what God has done.

Even contrition is not something the sinner can manufacture or that we urge people to produce in themselves. In connection with our verse Dr. Walther wrote in "The Proper Distinction between Law and Gospel"

" ... the contrition which precedes faith is nothing but suffering on the part of man. It consists of anguish, pain, torment, a feeling of being crushed; all of which God has wrought in man with the hammer of the Law. It is not an anguish which a person has produced in himself, for he would gladly be rid of it ... If a person sits down to meditate with a view to producing contrition in himself, he will never gain his object that way. He cannot produce contrition. Those who think they can are miserable hypocrites" (p 249).

Proclaiming repentance and remission of sins is not to be thought of as following a "formula for converting people." We all know something about the formulas of certain "evangelistic" groups, which really seem to be manipulative pressure tactics which owe more to sales psychology than to an understanding of the Gospel as history and means of grace. That is to say, the exhortations to "surrender," "decide," "invite" suggest that those who use them do not believe in the persuasive and repentance-working power of the Good News: "God did this in Jesus Christ and He did it for everyone and there is nothing for you to do." In the successful application of a formula for conversion there are conditions to be met, and as soon as there are conditions to be met there is a conditioned Gospel and synergism.

To proclaim repentance and remission of sins, by preaching or by personal witness, is to make an unconditional announcement. Nothing illustrates that more strikingly than the baptizing of an infant. There is no idea that the forgiveness of sins is there for that infant *if* he believes. It is the announcement of forgiveness (the Word of God in and with the water) that works faith. There is no Word of God in Baptism that says "This will hold you as a child of God *until* you get confirmed." There is no idea that the child is now in God's family *but* later on he will have to decide whether to stay there. There is no teaching that God's grace *and* the child's decision combine to effect forgiveness, life, and salvation. Generally speaking, even those passages which call for faith call for it in opposition to man's doing, invite man to trust the Trustworthy One. They are not "iffy."

The Bible itself offers a great variety of ways in which repentance and remission of sins has been and can be proclaimed. But what is consistent and unvarying in the message and the method is this: it directs people *away* from themselves and their own resources *to* Christ. Decision, surrender, commitment theology in the last analysis directs man once more to himself and his doing. The difference between that and Luther's monkish struggles is only one of degree. It is synergism and semi-pelagianism no matter how much it is denied and how often those who practice it tip their hats to the doctrine of divine monergism.

Preaching repentance and remission of sins or preaching repentance for the remission of sins is one way of summarizing what the Church of Jesus Christ does and is to do until the Day of His Return. It is not a method. To say that is not to deny that methods may be developed and used for personal witnessing as they are for preaching, teaching, and visiting the sick. Rather, it is to say that there is no prescribed method. It is to say that the power is in the message and not

in the method. It is to say that we have not exhausted the possibilities for growth when we have mastered a method. It is to say that no method can ever be a substitute for the convincing power of the Gospel.

Certainly no virtue attaches to not having a method. We would not suggest that in our other proclaiming work. The "method-ist" might well say to us: "I like my way of doing it better than your way of not doing it." When we are suspicious or skeptical with regard to a method or to methods there must be a reason other than that we are unmethodical and disorganized.

We have mentioned the synergistic flaw in sectarian methods of evangelism. I don't believe that the "Talk about the Savior" method is synergistic. But it could be abused by a synergist.

Again, it preaches repentance and remission of sins in that it follows the Law-Gospel, sin-grace, from-to construct. That is very Lutheran. But "the danger with (the Law-Gospel construct), of course, is that such a scheme can petrify and degenerate into a kind of rather cheap psychological gimmickry and manipulation. One might operate as though one could get people into heaven only by first quite literally 'scaring hell' out of them ... " (Gerhard O. Forde in *Dialog* 15.185, 1976). The longer a specific method is used the greater is the danger that it will be treated cynically by those who have heard it before and mechanically by those who have used it before.

It would be unhistorical to say that witnessing was not done in our Synod before the Commission on Evangelism was organized. It would be inaccurate and uncharitable to say that it was not done well before the TAS Program was offered. It would be unrealistic to say that it is being done and done well by "everyone" now. It would be tragic to take any extreme position with regard to witnessing. "All method is intrinsically bad" is one untenable position. "TAS is *the* God-pleasing method" would be another. There are still other untenable positions between those extremes. Perhaps we can consider the implications of Goethe's line, "I have lost my character and must devise a method." And consider whether our failures to witness personally have been for lack of a method. And whether our confidence is ever in a method rather than in the preaching of repentance and remission of sins. And why it is that some of us did better before we learned about a synodically-approved, field-tested method.

However, it is best to continue going to the Scriptures for our own spiritual nourishment, to keep growing in Christ, to be convicted and convinced, to be equipped for public ministry and personal witness. Then the methods we use will be evangelical and the evangel will create its own methods to meet the needs of each situation.