

Hebrew Thought: Its Implications for Christian Education in Asia

*Ferdinand O. Regalado**

Introduction

Asian Theology, as some Asian theologians claim, should be biblically based.¹ If this call is applied to Christian education in Asia, it means that the basis and source of all Christian educational principles and philosophy is the Holy Scriptures. Centrality of the Bible in the Asian-Christian educational endeavour then is *sine qua non*. However, there are some misconceptions in understanding the Bible.² Some of its concepts and statements are “both attributed to and viewed from a western perspective.”³ This is especially true in Asia. Since Christianity came to Asia from the West, there is a tendency to look at the Bible as a Western book.⁴ Such perspective arises when one overlooks the original setting of the Scriptures which is basically Oriental, thus Asian.

By saying that the original setting of the Bible is Oriental, I mean that the predominant biblical thought is Hebraic. Our Christian Bible expresses a certain concept of reality which is essentially Hebraic. Hebrew thoughts, concepts and culture are evident throughout the Bible,⁵ a situation we can only recognize.

*Prof. Ferdinand O. Regalado teaches at the Adventist University of the Philippines, Silang, Cavite, Philippines.

A renewed understanding of Hebrew thought can have a number of crucial implications to Asian-Christian philosophy of education. In this essay, we shall see what implications the Hebrews, with their holistic outlook, their concrete and dynamic thinking, and their concept of group or community, may have for Christian education. Moreover, after outlining the characteristics of Hebrew thought, they will be contrasted with those distinctive to Greco-Roman thought, which undergirds much of Western education.

The Holistic Thought of the Hebrews

The Hebrew word '*avoda*' supports the idea that the Hebrew people view their life as a dynamic unity. Interestingly, this word is translated as both "work"⁶ and "worship."⁷ Thus, for the Hebrews, study *is* worship. Abraham Heschel, in a similar vein, poignantly noted: "Genuine reverence for the sanctity of study is bound to invoke in the pupils, the awareness that study is not an ordeal but an act of edification; that the school is a sanctuary. Not a factory, that study is a form of worship."⁸ The idea of "studying as a form of worship" is a great motivation in learning. Such motivation in learning would make a Christian scholar different from a non-Christian scholar. The Christian scholar is different in the sense that there is no room at all for "intellectual dishonesty" and mediocrity because she/he "believes that in all that she/he does intellectually, socially, or artistically, she/he is handling God's creation and that is sacred."⁹

Today, learning and education are viewed purely as secular pursuits. The Hebrews viewed such pursuits differently. Indeed, there are neither secular occupations nor sacred ones; every Hebrew views their "God-given-vocation – whether it be that of a farmer, herdsman, fisherman, tax collector, teacher or scribe – as a means of bringing glory to God by the very privilege of work itself."¹⁰ Paul reminded us this in the Hebraic idiom, "So whether you eat or drink or whatever you do, do it all for the glory of God" (1 Cor. 10:31).¹¹ He expressed a similar thought on another occasion saying, "Whatever you do, whether in word or deed, do it all in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Col. 3:17). For Paul, therefore, every aspect of life, including study, is to be viewed as worship.

Moreover, the holistic thought of the Hebrews is clearly seen in their sacred

view of life. For them everything is theocentric or God-centred. There is no distinction between the secular and religious areas of life. This aspect of Hebrew thought is clearly stated in the words of the psalmist: "I have set the LORD always before me" (Ps. 16:8). Thus, to modern Jews, "blessings are recited over some of the most mundane items, such as upon seeing lightning, hearing thunder, and even after using the washroom."¹² The totality of existence embraces the whole way of life. This kind of holistic thinking can be seen in some examples in the Bible. In the midst of his tragic experience, Job still blessed the name of the Lord whether God gives or takes away (Job. 1:21). It is with the same Hebraic frame of mind that Joseph, before he died, uttered these words to his brothers who betrayed him, "You intended to harm me, but God intended it for good" (Gen. 50:20). We can see here that even in some mysterious reversals of life, God is still recognized as the one who providentially overruled such circumstances in life. Romans 8:28 adds the same thought, "And we know that in all things God works for the good of those who love him, who have been called according to his purpose." It is to find the divine in the common place, that make up the holistic thought of the Hebrews.

The holistic thought of the Hebrews covers all aspects of life. They see all of it in relation to God. The purpose of their celebration of different festivals is primarily spiritual or God-centred. "To the Israelite, the seasons were the work of the creator for the benefit of man. They manifested the beneficence of God towards His creatures. By these feasts, man not only acknowledged God as his Provider but recorded the Lord's unbounded and free favour to a chosen people whom he delivered, by personal intervention in this world."¹³

Both their civil New Year (which starts at the month of Tishri) and religious New Year (which starts at the month of Nisan) are viewed as theological. The civil New Year festival or *Rosh Hashanah*, signalled by the blowing of trumpets, was treated as religious due to the concept that "God had created an orderly world"¹⁴ by the appearance of a new moon in that month. Although the religious New Year is based on the barley harvest, yet it is considered as theocentric, a reminder of "God's constant provision for them"¹⁵ for the abundant harvest.

Related to this holistic thought is the emphasis on the totality of a person's being. The body itself is materially different from, but not necessarily separate from, the soul. The individual is viewed as a dynamic unity. The Hebrew word for "soul" (*nepes*), which is commonly understood by many today as something a person has, is in fact, referring to the whole person itself and implies "all the functions of man, spiritual, mental, emotional as well as physical."¹⁶ Thus, Deut. 6:5 enjoins every human being to "love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength." It is a call to serve and love God passionately, with one's whole being. What significance would such a passage have for us as Christian educators? One reality is that we should treat our students wholly, not only as intellectual persons but also as emotional, physical and spiritual beings. In fact, the Hebrews "were interested in producing what Jewish psychiatrists and educators today call a *mensch* (a Yiddish word for one who has his *total life* put together in an exemplary way)."¹⁷

Greek thought, on the other hand, is dualistic in its view of persons. Human beings are viewed in dualistic terms of soul and body. We can see such influence in most of our modern Western education. Thus, the strengthening of the mind alone is emphasized to the neglect of the physical and the spiritual needs of students. At times, the situation is reversed where spirituality is emphasized rather extremely, often viewed as some kind of "ascetic or monastic spirituality." Looking at the earthly life of Jesus, we see that He exemplified the true meaning of spirituality. His life was not spent in some remote places alone, but between the mountain and the multitude – a combination of a solitary and social life.

Part of the holistic thinking of the Hebrews is clearly seen in their outlook of one's illness. Accordingly, sickness is linked to human sin. Disease is the result of human's disobedience to God. Thus, many biblical texts describe obedience to God and to His laws as conditions of good health. Let me cite some selected texts:

If you listen carefully to the voice of the LORD your God and do what is right in his eyes, if you pay attention to his commands and keep all his decrees, I will not bring on you any of the diseases I brought on the Egyptians, for I am the LORD, who heals you (Exod. 15:26).

If you do not carefully follow all the words of this law, which are written in this book, and do not revere this glorious and awesome name – the LORD your God – the LORD will send fearful plagues on you and your descendants, harsh and prolonged disasters, and severe and lingering illnesses. He will bring upon you all the diseases of Egypt that you dreaded, and they will cling to you. The LORD will also bring on you every kind of sickness and disaster not recorded in this Book of the Law, until you are destroyed (Deut. 28:58-61).

If you pay attention to these laws and are careful to follow them, then the LORD your God will keep his covenant of love with you, as he swore to your forefathers. The LORD will keep on you the horrible diseases you knew in Egypt, but he will inflict them on all who hate you (Deut. 7:12, 15).

The spiritual dimension of health and diseases is also pointed by Christ. After healing the woman, who have been crippled for many years, and after reproving the synagogue ruler, who questioned his healing on the Sabbath day, Jesus spoke of “this woman whom Satan has bound for eighteen years” (Luke 13:16). D.H. Trapnell, who discussed disease as one of the causes of suffering, made a good point in his own analysis of the case of Job’s suffering.

The book of Job shows that the real issue is man’s relationship to God rather than his attitude to his own suffering. It is the principal OT refutation of the view, put forward with great skill by Job’s “comforters,” that there is an inevitable link between individual sin and individual suffering. ... It is important to realize that the biblical picture is not a mere dualism. Rather, suffering is presented in the light of eternity and in relation to a God who is sovereign, but who is nevertheless forbearing in his dealings with the world because of his love for men (2 Pet. 3:9). Conscious of the sorrow and pain round about them, the NT writers look forward to the final consummation when suffering shall be no more (Rom. 8:18; Rev. 21:4).¹⁸

Reflecting on such holistic thinking of the Hebrews, one could derive significant implications for Christian education. There is a noticeable tendency to dichotomize or compartmentalize the whole educational programme and

experiences, even in a Christian setting. The secular and the spiritual activities are being separated, conducted and operated in their own spheres. John Wesley Taylor illustrates this point well:

Those that operate under the "spiritual" designator include a brief devotional at the beginning of the day, the "Bible" class, chapel period, the Week of Prayer, and church services on weekends. Once these are over, however, we must "get on with business." And we carry on the academic enterprise with a decidedly secular orientation.¹⁹

After stressing the danger of such dichotomy in a Christian institution, Taylor forcefully suggests, "we must think Christianly about the totality of life and learning"²⁰ in all educational programmes and experiences.

Concrete and Dynamic Thinking of the Hebrew People

The structure of the Hebrew sentence gives us an idea of the manner in which the Hebrews think. The word order of the English language is different from that of Hebrew. The structure of the English language is analytic,²¹ meaning that the sense of the sentence is determined through its word order. It places the noun or the subject before the verb (the action word). For example, "the king judged." However, the word order of the Hebrew language "is normally reversed. That is, the verb most often comes first in the clause, then the noun; thus, 'He judged, (namely) the king'. In Hebrew grammar, the position of emphasis is usually the beginning of the clause."²² This kind of emphasis on the verb suggests that the Hebrews are action-centred people. Moreover, the root of all Hebrew words is derived from the verb.²³ They seldom used adjectives in any of their sentences,²⁴ indicating that their thinking is concrete rather than abstract. They are not like their Greek counterparts who are philosophical and abstract in thinking. A person's or student's intelligence is usually measured by the ability to make abstract and philosophical reasoning. The role of a teacher is more of transferring knowledge on the intellectual areas. For the Hebrews however, truth is something to do and not only to think, something to live out, to apply, and not just theorize. This is why the Hebrew Bible is more of the record of action, the record of God's

salvific act in history, than a “summary exposition of a theological system.”²⁵ Their emphasis is more on events and people, and not so much on abstract ideas or concepts. So in Christian education, truth or ideas should not only be theorized or philosophized, but also is something to live out and do. Ultimately, what is most important is the godly and Christian life of a teacher that effects changes in the students’ lives.

The root of the Hebrew word is one of the indications of their frame of mind. For example, “the root word *dab_r* means ‘to speak’ and ‘to act’. The word is the act.”²⁶ This is clearly seen in Isaiah 55:11 where God acts as he speaks: “So is my word [Heb. *dab_r*] that goes out from my mouth...[it] will accomplish [*a_ab*] what I desire.”²⁷ Furthermore, this Hebrew word means both “event” and “word.”²⁸ So the event (or the action) of the person is understood as his or her word.²⁹ Any word must have the corresponding concrete action. We will better understand then the words in Prov. 14:23 that “mere talk (literally in Hebrew ‘words of lip’) leads only to poverty.” It also emphasizes that words are not cheap to the Hebrews. This thought reinforces that

the Jews were pragmatics. They were never interested in making education a game of storing up abstract concepts or theoretical principles. Education had to be useful in meeting the challenges and needs of this world. To know something was to experience it rather than merely to intellectualize it. In short, to “know” was to “do” and learning was life. The whole person was engaged in what John, a New Testament Jewish writer, calls “doing the truth” (1 John 1:16).³⁰

Being seen as an action-oriented people, the Hebrews, therefore, are concrete in their thinking. They use few abstract terms. The Bible gives us many examples to illustrate this point. “Look” is ‘lift up the eyes’ (Gen. 22:4); ‘be angry’ is ‘burn in one’s nostrils’ (Exod. 4:14); ‘disclose something to another’ or ‘reveal’ is ‘unstop’ someone’s ears’ (Ruth 4:4); ‘no compassion’ is ‘hard-heartedness’ (1 Sam. 6:6); ‘stubborn’ is ‘stiff-necked’ (2 Chron. 30:8; cf. Acts 7:51); ‘get ready’ is ‘gird up the loins’ (Jer. 1:17); and ‘to be determined to go’ is ‘set one’s face to

go' (Jer. 42:15, 17; cf. Luke 9:51)"³¹ to mention a few. Such concrete ways of describing ideas and concepts signifies that "the Hebrews were mainly a doing and feeling people."³²

Another example of the concreteness of the Hebrew thinking is the Hebrew translation of the English word "love." The word 'love' is often associated with emotion or feeling. Today, it is a common understanding that "to love" means "to feel love." But, an interesting study of Abraham Malamut³³ of the Hebrew nuance of the word love makes such an emotive and abstract concept of love concrete. According to him, *ahav* (the Hebrew word for "love") may also mean to be useful or beneficial or helpful. Hence, he translated the love commandment in Lev. 19:18 as follows: "You should be beneficial or helpful to your neighbor as you would be to yourself." Then he concludes, "the Bible is not commanding us to *feel* something – love – but to *do* something – to be useful or beneficial to help your neighbour (emphasis his)."³⁴

The concrete and dynamic thinking of the Hebrew people highlights the pragmatic aspect of their cultural psyche. They did not only want to think of truth but to experience it, and knowing the truth means doing and living it. Is there a message in all of this for Asian-Christian education? How should this Hebraic nature of being pragmatic improve Christian educational programme in Asia? The message is very clear. Practical education should never be neglected as part of the curriculum. Practical training such as the cultivation of soil and manual labour will fit students "to take hold of *any line of work* in the fields to which they shall be called."³⁵ Practical training in the "mechanic arts," "various industrial pursuits, as well as in the several branches of study," would develop habits of "self-reliance, firmness and decision."³⁶

The understanding of the Hebrew concept of knowledge and intelligence adds also to the concrete and dynamic thinking of the Hebrews. Significantly, the Hebrew seat of intelligence is in the ears.³⁷ In Psalm 78:1, it says: "Give ear, O my people, to my law: incline your ears to the words of my mouth" (KJV). You will find many examples in the Bible where the term 'ears' was used both in the transmission and acquisition of knowledge, concepts and ideas.³⁸ Intelligence for them is the ability to listen.³⁹ Moreover, this concept

supports the idea that knowledge to the Hebrew people is not intrinsic but something coming from outside – something to be received.⁴⁰ It is devoid of any form of humanism, where human beings are considered as the measure of all things, which characterizes many secular universities and colleges today.⁴¹ We can see then the significant role of “revelation” in Hebrew education. So the revelation of God is the source of all wisdom and knowledge.

This same principle could be applied to Christian education. There is a need for reiterating the importance of the Word of God and biblical revelation in the quest of wisdom and truth. If we will not do this, Prov. 29:18 reminds us that “where there is no revelation, people perish.” After all, the goal of education is to have a practical knowledge of God for salvation.

As we have pointed out through this paper, there is a considerable difference between the Hebrews and the Greeks in their view of life. Norman Snaith correctly summarized this kind of difference on the acquisition and of the source of knowledge.

The object and aim of the Hebrew system is *da'ath elohim* (knowledge of God). The object and aim of the Greek system is *gnothi seauton* (know thyself). Between these two, there is the widest possible difference. There is no compromise between the two on anything like equal terms. They are poles apart in attitude and method. The Hebrew system starts with God. The only true wisdom is Knowledge of God. “The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom.” The corollary is that man can never know himself, what he is and his relation to the world, unless first he learns of God and be submissive to God’s sovereign will. The Greek system, on the contrary, starts from the knowledge of man, and seeks to rise to an understanding of the ways and Nature of God through the knowledge of what is called “man’s higher nature.” According to the Bible, man has no higher nature except he is born of the Spirit.

We find this approach of the Greeks nowhere in the Bible. The whole Bible, the New Testament as well as the Old Testament, is based on the Hebrew attitude and approach.⁴²

Hebraic Concept of Group or Community

The Hebraic concept of community is reflected in their idea of "corporate personality."⁴³ This term denotes that "the individual was always thought of in the collective (family, tribe, nation) and the collective in the individual. This corporate solidarity was further reinforced by the fact that the entire community (past ancestors and future members) was viewed as one personality."⁴⁴ This idea of corporate personality is stressed even in the modern Jewish community, where at the celebration of the "Passover each Jew is obligated to regard himself as if he personally had come out of Egypt, not simply his ancestors."⁴⁵ In the NT times, the idea of "one family" had been underscored by Jesus, who taught his disciples to pray as "Our Father in heaven" (Matt. 6:9), signifying that the Father in heaven is not just a Father of an individual, but the Father of the community. Today, "most Jewish prayer employs the plural 'we' not 'I'. It expresses the cry of the whole community."⁴⁶

Relative to the idea of this Hebraic notion of group or community is the idea of social unity and brotherhood. This is reflected in the idea of *mishp_kh_* (clan or family). This term covers the whole clan including uncles, aunts and even remote cousins. Each *mishp_kh_* sees itself as part of a single worldwide Jewish family.⁴⁷ Johannes Pedersen notes that "the city community is a *mishp_kh_*, and consequently the fellow citizen becomes a brother."⁴⁸ So the question being asked of Jesus, "Who is my neighbour?" was "not so easy to answer in ancient Israel because the neighbour, the fellow citizen, is the one with whom one lives in community."⁴⁹

Levirate custom points out the Asian concept of family or community. The term levirate is "derived from Latin *levir*, meaning 'husband brother'."⁵⁰ This is a custom of the Israelites that "when a married man died without a child, his brother was expected to take his wife,"⁵¹ and "the children of the marriage counted as the first children of the first husband."⁵² This kind of regulation might be strange to our modern society, but this was established with the permission of God (Gen. 38:8-10; Deut 5:5-10) to protect the lineage of a family and to emphasize the sacredness of life. In the Talmud we read, "He who destroys a single life is considered as if he had destroyed the whole world,

and he who saves a single life is considered as having saved the whole world." (*m. Sanh.* 4:5).⁵³ Moreover, the purpose of this seemingly anomalous law "was to prevent the family from dying out."⁵⁴ This institution accordingly had an ethical foundation. The relative who married the widow did not profit financially."⁵⁵ So the *levir* is actually sacrificing him if he would agree to be one, for the sake of preserving the family. We can see that to the Hebrews, sacrificing oneself is not that important as long as it is for the betterment of the whole family.

Connected with the Hebrew concept of group and community is the idea of mutual responsibility and accountability. This is visible in the kinsman-redeemer practice of the biblical Hebrews. All Israelites, through this practice, "are mutually accountable for one another and mutually participate in the life of one another."⁵⁶ In Leviticus 25, this practice is fully illustrated. It describes how property and personal freedom can be redeemed.

Land that was sold in time of need could be repurchased by the original owner or by a relative of his (Lev. 25:25-27). If a man became poor and had to sell himself into slavery, he or a relative had the right to purchase his freedom (Lev. 25:48-53).⁵⁷ A good and true kinsman-redeemer is responsible for such repurchase and restitution if the original owner could not afford it."⁵⁸

How does this concept of solidarity apply to the philosophy of Christian education? This concept implies that our pursuit of learning is not an individual work but a collective and corporate one. The true meaning of education can only be found by the members of the community in their relationship to each other.

However, there is too much emphasis on rugged individualism⁵⁹ in our modern society, where the sense of accountability is losing and excessive self-interest is reigning. Asian Christian institutions are facing the same danger of individualism. Remember that the biblical concept of "the priesthood of the believers means that each Christian functions as a priest not only unto God, but also unto his neighbour."⁶⁰

It is interesting to note that the teachers in the Old Testament times regarded

their pupils as their sons (Heb. *b_nim*). Archaeologists have discovered ancient schoolrooms, which give us an idea on how the instruction was being carried out and about the relationships between teachers and students. For example, in the place called Mari of the Sumerian civilization, "school staff included the professor, often called 'the school father', with pupils called the 'school sons', an assistant who prepared the daily exercises, specialist teachers, and others responsible for discipline was called 'big brother'."⁶¹ Here we will notice that even in the ancient Near Eastern school setting, there is a prevailing concept of "family" which may have influenced the Hebrew people or *vice versa*. "In the Hebrew Bible, teachers (priests) are called 'father' (Judg. 17:10; 18:19), and the relationship between teacher and student (e.g., Elijah and Elisha) is expressed by 'father' and 'son' (2 Kings 2:3, 12). In addition, in the opening chapters of the book of Proverbs, the sage regularly addresses his student as 'my son'."⁶² This emphasis on "relationships" in education challenges today's growing technological type of education, where students can get a degree on-line without attending any formal classes and without any contact at all with the teacher – just with the computer at home or in the work place.⁶³ Applying this Hebrew concept of "family" suggests that healthy relational contact between students and teachers is still profoundly important because the teacher can be an effective living textbook. After all, "it is the personality of the teacher which is the text that the pupils read; the text they will never forget."⁶⁴

Since ancient Israel had no system of formal schooling, learning commonly takes place at home. Home was the centre of education and the main source of learning. The father and the mother in the home played an important role in the instruction of their children, not only about practical things in life, but most importantly about God.⁶⁵ "Abraham is to instruct not only his children, but his entire household in the way of the Lord (Gen. 18:19). At an early age, children were trained in the everyday duties of the family, such as the pasturing of sheep (e.g., 1 Sam. 16:11) and the work of the fields (2 Kings 4:18). Girls learned household crafts such as baking (2 Sam. 13:8), spinning and weaving (Exod. 35:25-26)."⁶⁶ Knowledge then is transmitted from person to person, from parents to children, and so on. Children were trained by their parents'

example in the home. But because of the crushing experiences that the nation of Israel had gone through, "home life had been disrupted and parents themselves often needed instruction. To remedy this situation schools were established with scribes as teachers."⁶⁷ Nevertheless, we cannot deny the fact that the home is still an ideal centre of learning. Consider the positive result of Hannah's being a full-time homemaker and teacher to her son Samuel during his formative years (1 Sam. 1:21-23). Look also on the kind of home education that Jesus received. Although he was described as "without having studied" (John 7:15), because he did not attend rabbinical school in his time, "his character and ethics as a man on earth were far superior to anything the schools might have given Him."⁶⁸

The home as an ideal centre of learning and training for children was consequently changed. This was changed, according to Steve Farrar, because of the Industrial Revolution, especially in America. He keenly noted,

When factories became the source of income, men had to leave home, thus greatly diminishing their ability to influence their sons ... Work now separated father from son, when for generations they had worked together in the master/apprentice relationship. Men stopped raising their boys because they weren't present to lead their boys. And as the years have gone by, that all-important male role model has eroded even further.⁶⁹

Conclusion

Clearly then, the Biblical Hebraic holistic thinking, its dynamic and concrete thought, and its concept of "community," offer many profound contributions for Christian education. If we want the Asian-Christian educational process to remain authentically Biblical, we must never lose sight of these significant implications of the Hebrew thought for Christian education. With these insights on the Hebrew understanding of things, we cannot afford to neglect the Hebrew thought of the Scriptures in the formulation of philosophy, methodology, or curriculum of Christian education in Asia. I think it is appropriate to quote the words of Marvin Wilson to conclude this paper: "Truth must be incarnate in each member of the community. Quality education from a Biblical point of

Asia Journal of Theology

view is concerned with integrating learning with faith and living. This is the Hebrew model, and it is the lifelong task to which each Christian must continually address himself."⁷⁰

Notes

1. See for example Saphir Athyal, "Toward an Asian Theology" in *Asian Christian Theology*, rev. ed., Douglas J. Elwood (ed.), (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980), p. 69.
2. This has been recognized by R.K. Harrison in the issue of approaching and understanding OT history. He notes, "Since modern occidental methods of historical interpretation may present decided problems when imposed upon oriental cultures, particularly those of antiquity, it is probably wise to consider the historical outlook and methods of compilation of the Near Eastern cultures on their own terms also, lest the historiographical attempts of antiquity unwittingly be assessed in terms of the scientific methods of mere recent times, with equally unfortunate results." R.K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), p. 295.
3. Zdravko Stefanovic, "For the Asian First and Then for the Westerners," *Asia Journal of Theology* 4(1990), p. 413.
4. "A common error of the most Bible readers is to put into the Scriptures Western manners and customs instead of interpreting them from the eastern point of view." Merrill T. Gilbertson, *The Way It Was In Bible Times* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959), p. 2.
5. See for example Stefanovic, pp. 412-13, where some of the examples in the OT and NT which are Eastern or Asian in concepts and practices are enumerated. See also Ferdinand O. Regalado, "The Old Testament as One of the Resources for Doing Theology in Asia," *Asia Adventist Seminary Studies* 2 (1999): pp.41-50, for the same treatment although restricted to the OT only and its implications for "doing theology in Asia."
6. There are many instances where '*bad*' is translated as "work." See, e.g., Gen. 29:27; Exod. 1:14; Lev. 23:7-8; Num. 28:18, 25-26; Ps. 104:23; 1 Chron. 27:26.
7. See Walter C. Kaiser, "'*bad*," *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, ed. R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr. and Bruce Waltke (Chicago: Moody, 1980), 2: pp. 639.
8. Abraham J. Heschel, *The Insecurity of Freedom* (New York: Schocken Books, 1972), p. 42.
9. Arthur F. Holmes, *The Idea of a Christian College*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), p. 48.
10. Marvin R. Wilson, "Hebrew Thought in the Life of the Church," in *The Living and Active Word of God: Studies in Honour of Samuel J. Schultz*, ed. Morris Inch and Ronald Youngblood (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), p. 131.
11. All scriptural references cited in this paper are from the New International Version (NIV) of the Bible unless otherwise indicated.
12. Yechiel Eckstein, *What Christians Should Know About the Jews and Judaism* (Waco, TX: Word, 1984), p. 70.
13. D. Freeman, "Feasts" in *New Bible Dictionary*, 2nd ed., ed. J.D. Douglas (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity, 1982), p. 374.

Asia Journal of Theology

14. Pat Alexander (ed.), *The Lion Encyclopedia of the Bible*, new rev. ed. (Tring, Herts, England: Lion Publishing, 1986), p. 122.
15. David and Pat Alexander (eds.), *The Lion Handbook of the Bible* (Tring, Herts, England: Lion Publishing, 1973), p. 180.
16. Jacques B. Doukhan, *Hebrew for Theologians: A Textbook for the Study of Biblical Hebrew in Relation to Hebrew Thinking* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993), p. 210.
17. Wilson, "Hebrew Thought," p. 131. Emphasis mine.
18. D.H. Trapnell, "Health, Disease and Healing," in *New Bible Dictionary*, 2nd ed., ed. J.D. Douglas (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity, 1982), p. 464.
19. John Wesley Taylor V., "A Biblical Foundation for the Integration of Faith and Learning," a paper presented at the 27th International Seminar on the Integration of Faith and Learning, Mission College, Muak Lek, Thailand, 3-15 December 2000, p. 14.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
21. See Bernard Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation: A Textbook of Hermeneutics*, 3rd rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956), p. 5.
22. Wilson, "Hebrew Thought," p. 137.
23. Doukhan, p. 192.
24. Robert L. Cate, *How to Interpret the Bible* (Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1983), pp. 67-68.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
26. Doukhan, p. 195.
27. See also Psalm 33:6, 9; 12:1 ff; 148:5; Gen. 24:66; 1 Kings 11:41.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 201.
29. *Ibid.*
30. Marvin R. Wilson, *Our Father Abraham: Jewish Roots of the Christian Faith* (Grand Rapids: MI: Eerdmans, 1989), p. 131.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 137.
32. *Ibid.*
33. See his shorter article, Abraham Malamet, "Love Your Neighbour as Yourself: What it Really Means," *Biblical Archaeology Review* 16 (July/August 1990): pp. 50-51, which is an adaptation of his article with full scholarly apparatus in the *Festschrift Rolf Rendtorff*, edited by E. Blum (Nuekirchen-Vleryu).
34. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
35. Ellen G. White, *Fundamentals of Christian Education* (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing, 1923), p. 512. Emphasis mine.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 72-3. See also Ellen G. White, *Counsels to Parents, Teachers and Students Regarding Christian Education* (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1943), pp. 387-88.
37. Doukhan, p. 194.
38. See also e.g. Job 13:1, Exod. 17:14, 1 Sam. 9:15, Rev. 2:7; 3:22.

Asia Journal of Theology

39. Doukhan, p. 194.
40. See for example Ps. 119:125, 144; Job 32:8.
41. The prevailing "humanism" and other "isms" in secular universities has been emphasized by Eta Linnemann, *Historical Criticism of the Bible: Methodology or Ideology?* Trans. Robert W. Yarbrough (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1990), pp. 23-36, in the chapter entitled: "The Anti-Christian Roots of the University."
42. Norman H. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament* (New York: Schocken Books, 1964), pp. 184-85.
43. Wheeler Robinson used this expression – "corporate personality." H. Wheeler Robinson, "Hebrew Psychology," *The People and the Book*, ed. A.S. Peake, pp. 353-82; *idem*, "The Hebrew Conception of the Corporate Personality," *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*, ed. J. Hempel ('Beihefte zur ZAW', 66), pp. 49-62. Quoted in Thorleif Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1960), p. 70, note 1.
44. Wilson, "Hebrew Thought," pp. 133-34.
45. Breur, *Concepts of Judaism*, ed. J.S. Levinger (Jerusalem: Israel Universities Press, 1974), p. 296, quoted in Wilson, "Hebrew Thought," p. 134. See also Exod. 13:3-16.
46. Wilson, "Hebrew Thought," p. 133.
47. Wilson, *Our Father Abraham*, p. 188.
48. Johannes Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture*, vols. 1-2 (London: Oxford University Press, 1926; Copenhagen: Branner og Korch, 1926), p. 59.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 60.
50. J.S. Wright and J.A. Thompson, "Marriage" in *New Bible Dictionary*, 2nd ed., ed. J.D. Douglas (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity, 1982), p. 743.
51. *Ibid.*
52. *Ibid.*
53. Quoted in Wilson, "Hebrew Thought," p. 134.
54. Paul Heinisch, *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. William G. Heidt (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1955), p. 204.
55. *Ibid.*
56. Wilson, "Hebrew Thought," p. 134.
57. See Herbert Wolf, *An Introduction to the Old Testament Pentateuch* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1991), p. 24. Another practice recorded in Num. 35, which emphasized mutual responsibility is the "blood-revenge" (or a "redeemer of blood") system. Since many Middle Eastern people are living in some remote desert place, far from any civil government, this kind of justice system is practiced. This is one way of surviving in a harsh desert society, where most people barely live. "All males are obliged to defend and avenge each other, just as they are all liable to suffer revenge for the misdeeds of one. For an individual does not exist in his own right but only as the extension of his clan" (Clinton Bailey, "How Desert Culture Helps us Understand the Bible: Bedouin Law Explains Reaction to Rape of Dinah," *Bible Review* 7[August 1991]: p. 20).

Asia Journal of Theology

58. Laird Harris, "g_ 'al", *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, ed. R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr. and Bruce Walke (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), 1: p. 144.
59. The American individualism was borne out, according to Lourdes Morales-Gudmundsson, of "Protestant understanding of individual responsibility in personal salvation." She continues, "Americans admire the self-reliant, self-made person who overcomes obstacles to achieve success. Success, in turn, is measured by the individual's ability to earn money (ideally by dint of hard, honest labour, and clever money management) or to acquire high levels of education." Lourdes E. Morales-Gudmundsson, "Building Community out of Diversity," *Journal of Adventist Education* 60 (October/November 1997): p. 15.
60. Wilson, "Hebrew Thought," p. 135.
61. Alexander, *Encyclopedia*, p. 245.
62. Wilson, *Our Father Abraham*, p. 280.
63. I have nothing against the "on-line learning" or "distributed learning" programme, *per se*. Although, I have some reservations in some of its processes where there is *no contact at all* between on-line students and on-line teachers.
64. Abraham J. Heschel, "The Spirit of Jewish Education," *Jewish Education* 24/2 (Fall 1953): p. 19. Quoted in Wilson, *Our Father Abraham*, p. 280.
65. See, e.g. Exod. 10:2; 12:26-27.
66. Kaster, p.30.
67. "The Jews of the First Christian Century," in *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, ed. Francis D. Nichol (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1956-1980), 5: p. 58.
68. *Ibid.*, 5: p.59.
69. Steve Farrar, *Point Man: How a Man Can Lead His Family* (N.p.: Multnomah Books, 1990), p. 40.
70. Wilson, "Hebrew Thought," p. 131.