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In the Fall of 2002 I was picked up at Heathrow Airport by an officer of the British Union. I had come to Britain to contribute to discussions of how the Adventist Church could be more effective in engaging the majority culture with the Adventist message. I asked my driver to describe the situation in the British Union. He told me that while Great Britain had experienced massive immigration over the last twenty years, 95% of the population was still English-speaking whites. But only about 2000 of the 20,000 Adventists in the country represented the majority culture. On the other hand, 2% of the country was of West Indian origin, but 85% of the Adventist Church was from the West Indies. Only 100 of the 8000 members in London belonged to the majority culture.

My first reaction to this news was, “Thank God for the West Indians or there wouldn’t be an Adventist Church in Great Britain.” But it soon became clear that most Adventist Brits felt that the statistics indicated a racial problem. Blacks were naturally open to the gospel and whites in Britain were naturally closed. And that was all there was to say about it.

Based on my experience in New York City and extensive research on Western Christianity I suggested a different explanation. In North America the divide of spiritual interest is not between white and black, but between indigenous and immigrant. Recent immigrants from Eastern Europe have been wide open to the Adventist message, as my German forebears had once been. But second and third generation German-Americans are not being reached. Large numbers of blacks from places like Haiti, Jamaica and Trinidad are baptized every year in New York City, yet the leadership of the Northeastern Conference is not aware of a single church that is successfully reaching African-Americans (indigenous blacks). The famed Ephesus Church in Harlem is 95% immigrants and 80% commuters, indicating that, in spite of all the churches, the neighborhood of Harlem itself may increasingly house an unreached people group.

Church growth among immigrant Hispanics remains massive, yet we rarely baptize a third or fourth generation Hispanic. Among Hispanics we are reaching immigrants and their children only. And finally, in the Asian community, there are massive defections among second and third generation Korean-Americans. This leads me to the conclusion that the real evangelistic challenge faced by the Adventist Church in the Western world is not how to reach whites, but how to reach the mainstream cultures of North America, Europe, Australia and other developed countries (recent research in Singapore produces similar results even though whites make up less than 1% of the population). When it comes to evangelism, we are not facing a racial problem, but an indigenous problem.

(Let me be clear about one thing before I go on. I am not in any way shape or form suggesting that there are no issues of race in the Adventist Church. Racism remains among us in overt as well as covert forms. What I am protesting here, if anything, is the systematic neglect of the African-American and Chicano communities in Adventist evangelism. Leadership seems to think that if large numbers of dark and Spanish-speaking people are joining the church, we are doing fine in those areas. But reality points to unreached people groups disguised among us. It is easy to “cream off” the hot interests, totally unaware that large segments of the audience aren’t even listening.)

When it comes to evangelism, we are not facing a racial problem, but an indigenous problem. We are not reaching the mainstream culture anywhere in the developed world and certainly not in the Islamic world either.

When I shared these thoughts with the largely West Indian audience of Adventist pastors in South England one pastor raised his hand. “Why are we wasting time talking about hard to reach people? We don’t have time for this. Let’s invest our time and money on people groups that are open. If the majority culture isn’t open to the gospel, it’s not our problem.”

I responded, “Do you care if your children and grandchildren are in the church? My experience as a second-generation German-American tells me that your children and grandchildren will be indigenous Brits, they
won’t be West Indians anymore. If the church doesn’t learn how to reach indigenous Brits, it won’t interest your children and grandchildren either."

My audience was ready for battle now. A white pastor raised his hand. “There’s something here I don’t understand. When the Adventist Church first came to Great Britain (toward the end of the 19th Century) we reached the British mainstream. If that wasn’t so we wouldn’t have any Anglicans in the church at all right now. What has changed between then and now?”

This discussion was one of those magical moments for me. Suddenly a whole lot of things came into perspective that I had never connected before. The opacity of social change and world events vanished for just a moment and I caught a glimpse of the mighty hand of God in the last place I would have looked. While my experience in Great Britain was the key to my new perspective, I believe what I am about to share is even more relevant to the situation in North America. Let me briefly describe how I think God brought us from there to here.

**A Short History of Religious Thought**

At the risk of superficiality let me begin with a short history of religious thought. The question that will guide that history is, “How do people determine truth? How do they decide what is true and what is not?”

*The Pre-Modern Period*

In the Middle Ages (the pre-Modern period) truth was thought to reside in privileged groups. The average person on the street didn’t think he or she had a clue. Truth could only be found in the clergy or the Church. If you wanted to know the truth, you needed to talk to a priest. Whenever the priests would disagree, truth would be decided by the Pope or an action of one of the Great Councils. Truth was an idea reserved for those who were “in the know.”

*Christian Modernism*

With the Reformation, people’s confidence in privileged people and groups began to break down. Truth was no longer seen to reside in the Church or the state, but in logical statements based on careful biblical research. Priests, popes and nobles had no greater access to truth than anyone else. The Bible was seen as the ultimate source and safeguard for truth, not churches or bishops. The search for truth was an act of reason and logic, anyone with diligence and talent could understand the truth for herself through careful study of the Scriptures.

The world view of Christian modernism dominated 19th Century America. It was the milieu in which Adventism got its start and found its logical appeal to the American mainstream. Anywhere in the world that Christian modernism dominates is a place where Adventism still reaches the mainstream with power. But those areas are shrinking rapidly. The spearhead of philosophical change has already moved two generations past 19th Century America. In fact, I suspect that more water has gone over the philosophical dam in the last hundred years than in the previous 2000 combined.

*Secular Modernism*

With the Enlightenment the world experienced a shift from Christian modernism to secular modernism. While intellectual circles were already making this move in the 18th Century, secular modernism became the dominant world view in North America sometime in the early decades of the 20th Century. The Fundamentalist-Liberal controversy of the 1920s could be seen as a rite of passage, in which conservative Christianity lost touch with the mainstream.

For Descartes and others, the key to truth was methodological doubt. Secular modernists believe that truth is found by applying careful, scientific method to all questions, including religious questions. Truth is not found in the church or the Bible, it is found in a scientific process of careful observation and experimentation. In a sense, secular modernism eliminated faith by default.

The goal of secular modernism was to eliminate superstition by exposing the flaws in all previous thinking. The end result would be a “bomb-proof” minimum of truth in which one could have absolute confidence. With continued application of scientific method these “assured results” could be gradually increased until life could be lived with a fair amount of confidence that we knew what was going on. Humanity could not trust the church or the Bible, it needed to trust in the five senses and the application of human reason. Science would provide the “truth” and technology would provide the power to change the world. Education would spread this new “gospel”
and the result would eventually be a paradise of affluence and security.

But reality got in the way of this dream. A hundred years ago relativity and the uncertainty principle of quantum mechanics began to paint a very different picture of the universe than the Newtonian foundation upon which scientific modernism had been based. The twentieth century also shattered the dream of a technological paradise. Scientific progress seemed to go hand in hand with an increase in pollution and crime. While the Internet is one of the greatest advances in the history of the world, it is also the basis for a large increase in work-related stress and new forms of addiction. World War I, World War II, the Holocaust and other genocides, weapons of mass destruction and terrorism combined to wring the confidence out of scientific modernists. A new generation proclaims the god of secular modernism to be a false god. Humanity is turning away from the truth of science to look for truth in other directions.

Secular Post-Modernism

Beginning with “Generation X” (born 1964-1980 in the USA) an increasingly pervasive world view distrusts the scientific approach to truth. In post-modernism, truth is not primary found in science, the Bible or the church. It is found in relationships and the telling of stories. Building community becomes more important than the ideas that once held communities together. It becomes possible to conceive of a Super Bowl party as an evangelistic strategy.

For post-modernisms truth has become elusive. Rather than Truth (with a capital “T”) the post-modernism prefers to think of “many truths,” a “variety of truths,” or “truth for me.” It is felt that no one, whether scientist or theologian, has a clear grasp on truth. Everyone has a part of the picture, but it is small bits of expertise in a vast array of ignorance. The building of community, therefore, is a key component of the search for truth. As we each share that part of truth that we are “expert” on everyone benefits.

At first blush the “truth” of post-modernism seems a self-evident truth. Only an egotist would claim to have a handle on all truth. Human beings have long recognized that “in a multitude of counselors there is safety,” and that we all have a lot to learn. But there is something more than this going on here.

While post-modernism is generally accepting and inclusive, it is quite exclusive in three areas. 1) It rejects meta-narrative, big stories that try to explain everything, like the Great Controversy. It is felt that meta-narratives try to explain too much and therefore promote an exclusivism that leads to violence. It is, after all, faith in a meta-narrative that fuels the terrifying actions of an Al Qaeda or the medieval papacy. 2) Post-modernism rejects truth as an institution (church), particularly when that institution thinks of itself as unique or better than others (the true church). Thus the idea of a remnant church is quite problematic in a post-modern environment. The church is widely associated with colonialism and oppression, rather than a source of generosity and benevolence. 3) Post-modernism tends to reject truth as Bible, considering the Bible to be filled with violence, everlasting burning hell, and the subjection of women and minorities. While most of these charges are somewhat misplaced, they can be a significant barrier to casual exploration of the Scriptures.

In most Western countries people under the age of 35 tend to be post-modern. People 60 and above tend to be modern, whether Christian or secular. Everybody in between, including most of us here, are simply confused.

The Hand of God in Post-Modernism

Our topic for this year is The Mighty Acts of God in the World. As I contemplate the above trends it is easy to question whether the hand of God could possibly be seen in post-modernism. Is post-modernism an act of the devil or is it something that God could use? Is it, perhaps, even a necessary stepping-stone to where God wants the human race to go? As a Seventh-day Adventist nurtured in the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation I cannot fathom an environment that leaves God “without witness” (Acts 14:17). I am convinced that God’s hand is behind these changes and that we are heading to the place of His choosing. I have found eight reasons to believe that post-modernism is an act of God in the positive sense.

1) A Sense of Brokenness

Post-moderns definitely don’t share the self-confidence of secular moderns. They are much more likely than their grandparents to think of themselves as broken people. They often come from broken homes, or homes where the conflict and the put-downs are continual. When they share home stories with their friends, they discover that things aren’t any better on the other side of the fence. Post-moderns, as a result, have a keen sense of
brokendness, a deep need for inner healing. In my experience this is as true in the Adventist context as it is outside. While brokendness can lead to despair, it can also open the way to the refreshing winds of the gospel. So the hand of God seems to be at work here.

2) Humility and Authenticity

Living in an age where image is king, post-modern individuals place a high premium on humility, honesty and authenticity in interpersonal relationships. It is considered better to be honest about one’s weaknesses and handicaps than to craft an image or “play the audience.” But while true authenticity is prized, post-moderns are usually suspicious of personal claims to authenticity. This principle is closely related to the previous one. Post-moderns not only have a strong sense of brokendness, they are willing to share that sense honestly with friends they consider safe.

Humility and authenticity are, of course, at the root of Christian faith. Confession is nothing else than telling the truth about yourself. In modernism humility was thought demeaning to human value; people were only humble if they had plenty to be humble about. Post-modernism, on the other hand, sees genuineness as a higher value. God is bringing the culture to the place where it values one of the great testing truths of the Christian tradition (John 3:19-20).

3) The Search for Identity and Purpose

An awareness of being broken is closely related to the loss of personal identity. Post-moderns long for a clear sense of personal identity, yet question whether they could ever attain it for themselves. In their experience the identity claims of others often prove to be flawed or self-constructed. With few or no role models, post-moderns tend toward identity crisis. They may try on several “identities” to see which one will fit, but end up with no clue which identity is really theirs.

This state of affairs leaves an opening for the kind of positive identity that can come from knowing that one has been bought with a price. A well-rounded Christian faith helps people know why they are here, where they have come from and where they are going. Post-modernism is associated with the search for identity, the Scriptures, rightly understood and presented, provide the kind of identity post-moderns are looking for.

Related to this is the intense interest in a “purpose-driven life.” Post-moderns need their lives to have a sense of mission and purpose, a sense that their lives make a difference in the world. Scripture encourages the idea that each person is the object of God’s purpose for his or her life (Jer 1:5).

4) Need for Community

As mentioned earlier, post-moderns have a strong need for community. I have been amazed to watch this generation handle relationships. Unlike my generation, they seem much less likely to pair off. They tend to go out in groups of five (say two girls and three guys) or seven (say five girls and two guys), always with their friends yet somewhat afraid to go deep.

Community (koinonia) is foundational to New Testament faith, whether or not most Christian communities attain it. If Christian communities can learn to experience and express the kind of community the New Testament proclaims, they would find post-moderns quite interested in what they have to offer. Once again, the hand of God seems to be moving the mainstream a bit closer to the biblical ideal.

5) Inclusiveness

There is a refreshing inclusiveness in the post-modern attitude toward others. I don’t remember whether my wife or I said it, but my oldest daughter reacted angrily to a joking comment about homosexuals one day. “You don’t say stuff like that! Even if you don’t agree with what they are doing, they’re people and they should be treated with respect.” I was real proud of her at that moment and her comments seem typical of much of her generation.

When I was doing my doctorate, the intellectual atmosphere of AAR/SBL seemed much more controlled than it is now. One could only read papers and make meaningful comments in relation to the fairly rigid agenda of modernistic historical criticism. People presented their views with a high degree of confidence and cloaked personal uncertainty in technical language and obtuse jargon. But about fifteen years ago I was startled to hear David Barr respond to such a paper with, “I don’t have a clue what he was talking about.” That was my first sense
that change was afoot. Since that time the academy has been much more open to a variety of perspectives, including Adventist ones. The inclusiveness of post-modernism has opened the way for Adventist exegetes and theologians (not just text critics, linguists and archaeologists) to share the kinds of insights that we have benefitted from for a century and a half. I suspect the hand of God is in this.

6) Spirituality

I don’t think anyone questions that the younger generation is more spiritual than its predecessor. Even in AAR/SBL, people I would not have expected are becoming more open about their own personal faith and practice. While there is a strong suspicion of traditional institutions and the Bible, post-moderns are open to spiritual discussions with anyone who knows God and can teach others how to know God. I can’t imagine this is only the result of chance. God is at work here.

7) Toleration of Opposites

One of the fascinating characteristics of post-modernism is its ability to tolerate opposites. Philosophically, the Greeks saw the opposite of a truth to be false. Scientific modernism was characterized by clear logic, in Greek Western terms. But Hebrew logic could often see contrasting ideas, not in terms of true and false, but in terms of a tension between two poles. Thus the nature of Christ is not an either/or. He is both 100% human and 100% divine. Similarly, (with a nod to our previous ASRS President) we were reconciled to God in order that we might become reconciled to Him (2 Cor 5:18-20). We are saved entirely by faith and yet no one will be saved without works. With its rejection of the either/or categories of Greek philosophy, post-modernisms may have an easier time understanding the Bible than previous generations. I can’t help but think that is the way God wants it.

8) Truth as Story

As we have said, for post-moderns truth is found, not in church, Bible (as traditionally understood) or science, but in community and in story. The concept of truth as story provides a powerful corrective to traditional use of the Bible.

I think many Adventists are frustrated that the Bible was not written as a systematic theology. You cannot open its pages and see the 27 (or is it 28?) Fundamentals clearly stated there. You would think God would have been a little more logical about this truth business. But since I cannot outline exactly what God was thinking when He caused the Bible to be put together the way it was, I can only assume that the result is exactly what He wanted. Rather than forcing the Bible to say what I want it to say, I would rather take what is and seek to understand what that tells us about God. If God chose the Bible to be a collection of stories, then post-modernism might be our best chance to fully explore its implications regarding the character and purposes of God. Perhaps post-moderns will understand the Bible much more clearly than those before them. I can’t help seeing the hand of God in that.

Post-Modernism and the Adventist Church

This fundamental shift in thinking naturally affects the way people approach faith and their relationship to faith-based institutions. The Seventh-day Adventist Church, with its rigid structures and traditional approach to outreach, will certainly not be able to continue with business as usual in a post-modern world. I believe Jesus gives a glimpse of the Adventist dilemma in Matt 5:13-16. There He articulates two types of Christian community. One is based on the model of a city/fortress, the other is based on salt.

In the fortress model of evangelism, the saints are safely enclosed in protective walls with strong gates. They avoid undue influence from “the world” and safeguard the integrity of the community. From time to time, however, they will hold a “crusade” by opening the gates, sending out the army, and snatching up a few captives. The captives are brought back to the fortress, the gates are slammed shut and all is well in Fortressland. But we live in a world where the captives are becoming fewer and the casualties larger as a result of this approach.

In the salt model of evangelism, the salt mingles with a dish of food and melts in to the point where one can hardly tell what is salt and what is food anymore. But the result of this process is that the entire dish tastes better. The salt model is an incarnational model. The saints go out into the world and seek to make it a better place by their presence.

While the fortress model worked extremely well in the age of Christian modernism and continues to work well in territories where a large number of Christian modernists can be found, I believe the salt model points the
way to a work for post-moderns that will engage the church and society in a productive interaction. I see nine changes in traditional Adventist outreach that will be necessary if we wish to participate in the mighty act of God that we call post-modernism.

1) From Public to Relational Evangelism

Traditional Adventist outreach uses public meetings as the crucial factor in spiritual “regime change.” But post-moderns are not comfortable in such a setting and are not likely to come or to be moved by it if they do come. Post-moderns are best reached one on one, through friendships and mentoring relationships. Such a shift in strategy should not disturb anyone since mentoring is the heart of the Great Commission (Matt 28:19-20). The only finite verb in the Great Commission is “make disciples.” It is not “hold public meetings.”

2) From Short Term to Long Term

Traditional Adventist evangelism is a short term project. A church invests in public meetings, tries to move people to baptism in 3-5 weeks, and then breathes a sigh of relief for the next year or two. A clear lesson in the recent New York Project is that mainstream Americans do not join the Adventist Church in a matter of 4-6 months. It takes a long term investment (at least 3-5 years) to make an impact in the indigenous culture. While Adventists have not shown much patience for this kind of approach, Jesus invested three and a half years in twelve people and even then suffered a dropout (Judas).

3) From Our Agenda to Felt Needs

Traditional Adventist outreach was based on a clear sense of what outsiders need to learn from us. We give it to them the way we think they should hear it, and if they don’t get it, it is “their problem.” Post-moderns have proven quite disinterested in our traditional agenda for their souls. A more successful approach is to listen before we talk, to find out the felt needs in the mainstream community and meet them in the power of the gospel. And when I say “felt needs” I don’t mean the needs that we think they should feel, but the needs that they themselves feel they have. Paul articulated such a felt-needs approach in 1 Cor 9:19-23. “Become all things to all people in order that you might save some.”

4) From Church-based to Neighborhood/Workplace Based

In the typical Adventist approach, meetings are held at the church building. Even if they begin in a public hall, they are moved as soon as possible to the church venue. But post-moderns are not likely to come to a church, even if they are interested in the topics being presented. Waiting for them there is a losing proposition. On the other hand, mainstream Americans are found in every neighborhood and every workplace. Adventists are located in the same neighborhoods and work places. To be successful in the Western world you need to meet people where they are. So a move toward neighborhood and workplace outreach is a step in the right direction. Paul endorsed this approach when he used his skills as a tent-maker to meet the mainstream people of his day.

5) From One Way to a Multiplicity of Approaches

The typical Adventist approach remains based on a schema that goes all the way back to an evangelist named Simpson in 1902. Though there are variations, the overall approach is fairly consistent. Those to whom it appeals respond very well, but that group seems to be declining rapidly. Post-moderns are as diverse as snowflakes, and need to be met with the kind of variety bequeathed by the Spirit (1 Cor 12-14). Truly Spirit-filled Christians are rather unpredictable (John 3:8). The variety of the Spirit’s gifts will lead to a multiplicity of approaches to meet the various mindsets and felt needs of the post-modern seeker.

6) From Conversion to Process

Traditional Adventist evangelism focuses on conversion and baptism. Imagine a continuum that goes from -10 to +10. -10 designates a person who has absolutely no knowledge of God. +10 designates a fully devoted follower of God. The zero point is the point of conversion and baptism. Traditional evangelism focuses on getting people from minus two into plus territory. But mainstream Americans tend to be far deeper into the minus continuum than the typical evangelistic “interest.”

Salt evangelism occurs not just when there is a baptism, if a person moves from -8 to -6 successful
evangelism has occurred. The process I am talking about is related to the idea of centered sets presented at last year’s meeting. The key to the process is to make sure the people we are working with are moving in the direction of Jesus. The idea of process is also relevant to the “plus” side of the spectrum. Jesus illustrates attention to the process in the way He worked with both Judas and Peter.

7) From Community as Church to Community as?

Adventists have grown accustomed to the idea that a church community has to have a building called a “church.” But post-moderns have been burned by the church idea. In Britain many post-moderns will cross the street rather than walk by a church. The very style of the church building can be a turn-off. A church interested in reaching post-moderns will seek out new models for community. Among the models that have been tried are cafes, health centers, gymnasiums and “house churches.”

Many people are shocked when I point out that the oldest known church building in the Roman World is at Dura-Europus in Syria, usually dated somewhere between 250-300 AD. For more than 200 years the church flourished without church buildings. Our fixation with such structures today is a legacy of Constantine, a character we don’t normally take as a model of sound NT thinking.

8) From Church Controlled to God Controlled

Moving to long-term, relational, and process evangelism that is not closely tied to traditional church structures moves things a little out of our control. The traditional process tracks people from first contact through interest to evangelistic series to baptism. Post-moderns are more likely to go through a process that is difficult to track and to enumerate. The process may include entities not tied to the church or even based in other religions. We will have to work for God with much less control of the process and the outcome. As Paul said, “I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase” (1 Cor 3:5-7). Sometimes we will reap a harvest from the work of others, others will reap a harvest from ours. Perhaps in this generation the concept of “sheep-stealing” will lose its approbrium and will be recognized as the norm.

9) From Exclusive to Inclusive

I have felt for more than a decade that the Seventh-day Adventist Church faces a crisis of identity. On the one hand, we desire a relatively small, focused, doctrinally pure church with consistent standards of lifestyle. On the other hand, we need a more inclusive approach that ties us together on major points of consensus, but allows a lot more flexibility in matters of lesser concern. It is a tension between exclusiveness and inclusiveness, between a focus on pure teaching and the openness of grace. Will we become smaller and more idiosyncratic as a church? Or will we become a “great multitude” from a variety of backgrounds and perspectives united by a common faithfulness to God?

It seems to me that we have, as a group, avoided this question and tried to run a route down the middle, thus losing the potential benefits of both approaches. Based on the philosophical model I have traced in this address, it is a choice between a church that remains totally faithful to where it was regardless of the cost (the Amish provide an excellent model of such a community), and one that seeks to be a dynamic player in what it perceives as God’s mighty act for the End-time. Perhaps God’s ideal is to pursue both sides of this seeming dilemma (and the Hebrew mind often said “yes” to such dilemmas). But if we must choose between these approaches, I would prefer to surf the wave of God’s mighty action in the present. The spirit of the times suggests greater attention to the statement of Jesus, “He that is not against us is for us” (Luke 9:50; cf. Mark 9:40).

Conclusion

Time will tell, but the growing base of evidence that God is doing a mighty work in this world has persuaded me. From now on I want to build bridges rather than destroy them. I want to heal hearts rather than break them. I want to learn from all of you rather than decide in advance which of you is worth listening to. And I hope, when all is said and done, that I will have captured just a little of the spirit of Jesus.
## Two Biblical Options for a Post-Modern World

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fortress</th>
<th>Salt</th>
<th>Biblical Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>One to One/Relational</td>
<td>Matt 28:19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Jesus’ Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Agenda</td>
<td>Felt Needs</td>
<td>1 Cor 9:19-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church-based</td>
<td>Neighborhood/Workplace Based</td>
<td>Paul’s Tent Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Way</td>
<td>Spiritual Gift Based/Multiplicity of Approaches</td>
<td>1 Cor 12-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td>Process (Engel Scale)</td>
<td>Peter, Judas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community as Church (church = building)</td>
<td>New Models for Community (homes, pubs, cafes)</td>
<td>No Churches Until Fourth Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Controlled</td>
<td>God Controlled</td>
<td>1 Cor 3:5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive</td>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td>Luke 9:50; Mark 9:40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>