
This dissertation is an attempt to understand the phenomenon of postmodernism and its implications for preaching. It is also an attempt to offer suggestions that can help contemporary preachers in their task of preaching God’s Word in a postmodern world.

The first chapter is an attempt to explain the phenomenon of postmodernism and how it has implications for preaching. Postmodernism is marked by a pluralistic and relativistic worldview that challenges the authority of preaching. When preachers understand postmodernism, they can identify the implications for preaching and start thinking about how to deal with this context.

The second chapter presents three different proposals for preaching God’s Word to a postmodern world: (1) Ronald Allen’s proposal of mutual correlation; (2) Craig Loscalzo’s proposal for apologetic preaching; and (3) Paul Scott Wilson’s homiletical proposal of the *Four Pages of the Sermon*. From the analyses of these proposals, readers will be able to identify the principal characteristics of contemporary preaching.

Finally, the third chapter is an attempt to present some suggestions to help preachers face postmodern challenges and opportunities. Two basic directions are presented in this chapter: (1) in order to face postmodernism, preachers ought to reaffirm the foundations of preaching; (2) in order to reach postmodern hearts, preachers ought to consider new homiletical approaches for preaching, which includes an inductive structure for the sermon.


Contemporary moral philosophy is showing a heightened interest in virtue ethics. This interest has reinvigorated either Aristotle’s or Aristotelian types of teaching on virtue theory. Among the Protestants, however, there is an inclination to look suspiciously at any ethical theories that put more emphasis on human habituation—which is basic in Aristotelian virtue theory—and less on God’s command or grace. Nevertheless, recent historical studies on the history of the Reformation have unveiled that while the Reformers put much emphasis on the authority of God’s word, they never entirely rejected the moral philosophy of Greek philosophers.

Evidently, Peter Martyr Vermigli was one of the Reformers incorporating Aristotelian teachings and method into the context of Scriptural doctrines. Taking over Aristotelian philosophy of human being’s teleological nature, Vermigli believes that ethics is essentially about how one might go about living toward the highest end or happiness (eudaimonia). To live virtuously, therefore, means to realize our true nature and to reach our true end. To this structure, Vermigli introduces the biblical doctrine of creation, fall and redemption.
As a result, he affirms twofold eudaimonia; one accords with the exercise of the rational faculty, the other—the highest one—is the gift of reconciliation with God through Christ’s redemption. In so doing, he deems virtues and the exercise of them as essential components in Christian piety.


This thesis is a study of the puzzling location of Leviticus 27. Many modern scholars consider Leviticus 27 to be an independent appendix to the book of Leviticus, but some believe it is part of a larger unit in the book.

The literary structure of Leviticus 27 suggests that in this chapter God instructs Israel to do according to what you say or vow, and according to what I say by giving me what belongs to me. The macrostructure of Leviticus shows the literary cohesive unity of chapters 25-27. The “Sinai peroration” in Leviticus 25-27 emphasizes that Leviticus should be read in the context of the Sinai covenant. The blessings and curses in Leviticus 26, a treaty form of the ancient Near East, calls on Israel to make a decision or to “sign” the covenant. Prior to Israel making that decision, Leviticus 27, warning them not to “sign” the covenant without due consideration, functions as an exhortation to Israel to be sincere and faithful in their response to the covenant calling outlined in previous chapters. Therefore, rather than being an appendix, Leviticus 27 is fittingly placed at the end of Leviticus as an integral part of the entire book.


Charles Van Engen’s theory of contextualization seeks scriptural support in the biblical covenant for knowing God in context. This theory conjoins two streams of missiological thought: contextualization theory and the relationship of covenant and mission. Borrowing from Harvie Conn and others, Van Engen endeavors to build his theory of contextualization on the covenantal relationship of God with His people. The biblical covenant, he believes, is the way to solve the problem of the misfit of the gospel in human cultures.

Van Engen, however, is unsuccessful in avoiding the complexities of covenant theology. Using hermeneutical circles and the relation of kainos (continuity) and neos (discontinuity), he argues how the contextual knowledge of God in New Testament situations resembles the contextual knowledge of God and progressive revelation in Old Testament covenantal administrations.

Van Engen raises many important issues for contextualization. His hermeneutical method and his view of Scripture and revelation, however, are questionable. Furthermore, his theory is inconsistent with a Reformed view of the covenant. Though the biblical covenant has implications for missions, contrary to Van Engen, it cannot be used in missiology to support theories of contextu-