Critical Review of Harun Hadiwijono's Concept of *Sekutu* in *Iman Kristen*

Raden Bima Adi

Duta Wacana Christian University
Korespondensi: bima@staf.ukdw.ac.id

Abstract

Harun Hadiwijono's Iman Kristen describes God as the sekutu (ally) of man, and man as the sekutu (ally) of God. In Harun's claim, he formulated his book in popular form, unlike other dogmatics writings, considering an extended readership beyond Christians. By the time the readers read the book, he said, they will find out that it has its own place among those preceding books. Whether it is good or not, it is up to those who will judge it. Those words from Harun provide the impetus for this study. Indeed, Iman Kristen is a tremendous writing on systematic theology. However, for me, Iman Kristen is not a contextual systematic theology opus. It is, more or less, a "product" that indicates the influence of colonial mentality and the narrowness of the theology of the missionaries' vision in the past. In my conclusion, Harun was not aware of the danger of depicting the relation between God and humankind, and vice versa with the term sekutu. In short, it is indeed original and unique, yet brings many problems which are not even being realized by Christians in Indonesia.

Keywords: Sekutu, Iman Kristen, Harun Hadiwijono, Systematic Theology, Christianity

INTRODUCTION

Iman Kristen[1] is a monumental dogmatics book, written more than fourty years ago by an outstanding Javanese theologian, Harun Hadiwijono. He was a well-known systematic theologian who was highly competent in the fields of Christian faith, Javanese mysticism, and other religious traditions existing in Java. Many of his scientific works come from deep thought in regard to those comprehensions. However, the backgrounds of his thought and theology are, more or less, influenced by *Gereformeerd* missionaries' vision in the past who trained Javanese Christians in the Western ways of culture. Therefore, *Iman Kristen* is an interesting dogmatics book that should be studied and investigated with all due respect. As the writer intended, *Iman Kristen* is a systematic explanation of the essence of Christian faith.

The book consists of six chapters that deal respectively with the following doctrines: God's Revelation (I), God's Nature (II), God as Creator (III), Sin (IV), God as Saviour (V), and God as Redeemer (VI).

As highlighted by Harun in Chapters II and III, basically, this book describes God as the *sekutu* (ally) of man, and man as the *sekutu* (ally) of God. It is interesting that Harun chose to use *sekutu* (ally) to depict the relation between God and man, and *vice versa*. In Indonesia, the word *sekutu* suggests, strongly, a close association of nations or other groups formed to advance common interests, especially in a battle, to defeat their opponent. It is not impossible that Harun was influenced by the ambiance of the Second World War and the Independence War as if he depicted the alliance of God and man, *versus* some opponents. This alliance theme is very strong in the whole explanation of the essence of Christian faith, even, so to speak, becoming the spirit of *Iman Kristen* itself.

---

[1] Harun Hadiwijono, *Iman Kristen*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 1973).

As for churches in Java, *Iman Kristen* has been one of the most influential sources for teaching Christian faith. The mini versions of *Iman Kristen* written in Javanese, *Kawulo Pitados*[2] and of that written in Bahasa Indonesia, *Inilah Sahadatku*,[3] have been used in catechization since their very first publication.[4] *Iman Kristen* also has its own 'uniqueness.' In Harun's claim, he formulated this book in popular form, unlike other dogmatics writings, considering an extended readership beyond Christians. He tried to explain all the subjects in this book within comparisons with local cultures, such as *Kebatinan* (Javanese Mysticism), *Kejawen* (typically Javanese religious tradition), and other religious traditions as well as religious comprehensions such as Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam.[5] Through the content and the significance of its 'uniqueness,' *Iman Kristen* has become the stepping-stone for Javanese Christians to interact, at least as a discourse, with local cultures and other religions in Java, and *vice versa*.

In his foreword to *Iman Kristen*, first edition, Harun wrote that there were already three books written in *Bahasa Indonesia* concerning Christian faith: *Aku Percaya*, by J. Verkuyl,[6] *Dogmatika Masakini*, by G.C. van Niftrik and B.J. Boland[7] and *Ichtisar Dogmatika*, by R. Soedarmo,[8] however he encouraged himself to write the fourth one. By the time the readers read the book, he said, they will find out that it has its own place among those preceding books. Whether it is good or not, it is up to those who will judge it.[9]

Those words from Harun provide the impetus for this study. I want to give a critical review of Harun's concept of *sekutu* in *Iman Kristen*.

METHOD

This article intends to be a systematic inquiry into Harun Hadiwijono's concept of *sekutu* in *Iman Kristen*, which views will be studied within the framework of systematic theology, especially dogmatics,[10] as well as that of contextual theology. It is a qualitative research using literature study. We will take on further investigation in regard to the "uniqueness" of *Iman Kristen* in the sense of what the form looks like, what it means, and what the significance is.

In the field of systematic theology, we will deal with *Iman Kristen*, generally, as a study of Christian theology organized thematically, focused on the attempt to arrange and interpret the ideas current in the Christian religion, and deal with the logical categorization of Biblical truths by tracing the self-revelation of God through the Scriptures as a whole and then carefully organizing it systematically. Specifically, we will deal with *Iman Kristen* as a dogmatics book, referring to the view of Gerald O' Collins, that dogmatic aims to examine and bring forward all the main Christian doctrines comprising Trinity, incarnation, atonement, sin and grace, church, sacraments, eschatology, etc. coherently and systematically.[11]

---

[2]Harun Hadiwijono, *Kawulo Pitados*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 1983).

[3]Ibid.

[4]Trijoko Rahyanto,"Pengaruh Pemikiran Harun Hadiwijono terhadap Pendidikan Agama Kristen di Gereja," in Yusri Panggabean, et.al., *Menuju Manusia Baru*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2000), 189-204.

[5]Harun Hadiwijono, *Iman Kristen*, 5.

[6]J. Verkuyl, *Aku Percaya*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 1954).

[7]G.C. van Niftrik and B.J. Boland, *Dogmatika Masa Kini*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 1958).

[8]R. Soedarmo, *Ichtisar Dogmatika*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 1965).

[9] Harun Hadiwijono, *Iman Kristen*, 5.

[10]As explained by A.A. Yewangoe, many dogmatics experts agree that Dogmatics belongs to Systematic Theology. It embraces other subjects including ethics, symbolism, history of dogma, etc. See A.A. Yewangoe et.al, *Kontekstualisasi Pemikiran Dogmatika di Indonesia*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2004), 9. See also Paul Tillich who uses the term Systematic Theology to explain Dogmatics, in Paul Tillich, *The Principles of Christian Theology*, (London: SCM Press, 19710), 14. An exception must be mentioned here, that is Schleiermacher who categorizes Dogmatics into Theology of History. See H. Bavinck, *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*, vol. I, (Kampen: J.H. Bos, 1895), 24-25.

[11]Gerald O' Collins, "Dogmatic Theology," in Alan Richardson & John Bowden (eds.), *A New Dictionary of Christian Theology*, (London: SCM Press, 1987), 163-164.

In the field of contextual theology, we will deal with contextual theology, as Stephen B. Bevans said as a way of doing theology in which one takes into account the spirit and message of the gospel, the tradition of the Christian people, the culture in which one is theologizing, and social change in that culture. Whether brought about by the western technological process or the grassroots struggle for equality, justice, and liberation, our cultural and historical context plays a part in the construction of the reality in which we live. Our context influences our understanding of God and the expression of our faith.[12]

We, of course, will also deal with contextualization, as said by William P. Russell, that contextualization has to do with how we assess the peculiarity of third world contexts. Authentic contextualization is always prophetic, arising always out of a genuine encounter between God's Word and His world, and moves towards the purpose of challenging and changing the situation through rootedness in, and commitment to, a given historical moment. Contextualization thereby means that the possibilities for renewal must first of all be sensed locally and situationally, yet always within the framework of contemporary inter-dependence which binds both to the problems of the past and present and to the possibilities for the future.[13]

DISCUSSION

The 'Uniqueness'

As mentioned before, *Iman Kristen* has its own 'uniqueness' compared to other dogmatics writings. According to Budyanto, this originality of Harun's method in writing the book was demonstrated by his effort to liberate himself from a traditional model of dogmatics which is ontological, toward a functional-contextual dogmatics. When Harun talked about the nature of God, he did not start with the attributes of God, solely or exclusively. Precisely, he explained God always in relation to man. The prominent example of it is the designation of the term *sekutu* to describe the relation between God and man, and *vice versa*. It is, indeed, unique because you will not find it in other dogmatics writings.[14]

I agree with Budyanto that Harun tried to liberate himself from a traditional model of dogmatics, which is ontological. However, I doubt whether *Iman Kristen* is an effort toward a functional-contextual dogmatics. Let us start with my agreement. Actually, Budyanto does not give a further explanation of how Harun liberates himself from a traditional model of dogmatics. However, we can see in the second chapter of *Iman Kristen* that Harun begins his explanation of the existence of God by firstly displaying four important arguments (which are ontological, causal, teleological, and moral), and then confronting them with his own opinions. We have to be aware to understand *Iman Kristen* as there is no bibliography in this book. Harun puts his argument without mentioning the exact reference (article/book/publication). He just refers to name, tradition or religion. It is possible that he considered himself as capable enough to write this book with his in-depth knowledge and comprehension, as an expert on those resources, without mentioning their publication details. However, in my opinion, the reason is that Harun tried to make it simple and not too complicated as in high-level academic writing so that anyone could understand it.

Ontological Argument

Presenting the ontological point of view, Harun refers to Plato's *ideas*. According to Plato ideas are permanent, self-contained absolutes, which answered each item of exact knowledge attained through human thought. Also, ideas are in Plato's view concrete standards by which all human endeavor can be judged, for the hierarchy of all ideas leads to the highest

---

[12]Stephen B. Bevans, *Models of Contextual Theology–Faith and Cultures*, (New York: Orbis Books, 1992), 1-2.

[13]William P. Russell, *Contextualization: Origins, Meaning and Implication*, (Roma: Universita Gregoriana, 1995), 9-12.

[14]Budyanto, "Sambutan Dekan Fakultas Teologi UKDW", in Yusri Panggabean, et.al. (ed.), *Menuju Manusia Baru*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2000), xiii-xiv.

absolute - that of 'god.'[15] After explaining Plato's idea, Harun presents Anselm's ontological argument, which is inconsistent with Plato's philosophy.[16] As we know, Anselm defines God as "*aliguid quo maius cogitari non potest,*" (that than which no greater thing can be thought). If this definition of God is correct, it necessarily implies the existence of God. The reason for this is as follows. If God does not exist, the idea of God remains, yet the reality of God is absent. Yet the reality of God is greater than the idea of God. Therefore, if God is "that than which no greater thing can be thought," the idea of God must lead to accepting the reality of God, in that otherwise, the mere idea of God is the greatest thing which can be thought. And this contradicts the definition of God on which the argument is based. Therefore, given the existence of the idea of God, and the acceptance of the definition of God as "that than which no greater thing can be thought," the reality of God necessarily follows.[17] Confronting these arguments, Harun said that Anselm's argument is jumping from "thought" to "existence." What is being thought is not definite in reality. Harun, then, gives us an example that Javanese people have thought about *Semar*, but *Semar* is merely an imagination, not existing in reality.[18] To come to a better understanding of Harun's example, let me explain about *Semar*. In *Wayang* (Javanese traditional shadow play with leather puppets), *Semar* or *Sang Hyang Ismaya*, the oldest and most important character of the *panakawan* (*pana* means 'clear vision,' 'clever' and *kawan* means 'companion,' thus, those who have a clear vision

and can give wise advice), was originally a god, 'the twin brother of heaven.' He is the elder brother of the highest god, *Batara Guru*. As a punishment for a misdeed, he was given a grotesque form and sent to earth to serve the descendants of the *ksatria* (gods). He is the guide of the hero on a journey full of tribulations, which the hero must overcome before achieving his goal. The name *Semar* comes from the word *samar* (vague) and, as a master of secret theology, he can be called 'mysterious.' In Javanese mysticism, his name is composed of *se[ngsem]* (to lure) and *mar[sudi]* (to search, to do) meaning that one is lured to search or do good things. In short, *Semar* is a mysterious character, for he is not an ordinary human but a divinity from the *Suralaya* (heaven). For the Javanese people, who pay more attention to immanent ways of approaching the Divine, *Semar* is the *Sang Hyang Ismaya* (venerable God).[19] Continuing his explanation on the ontological point of view, Harun says that existence is not an attribute that can enrich an understanding (100 *Rupiahs* in our thought is equal in value with 100 *Rupiahs* in reality). This is just the same with an understanding of "God." Therefore, the ontological arguments are, according to Harun, not proof of the existence of God.

Causal Argument

Briefly explaining the causal point of view, Harun notes that only nothing comes from nothing, everything else comes from something. Everything leads back to a more original form.[20] Here, Harun presents Thomas Aquinas' argument, that there is no case known in which a thing turned out to be the efficient cause of itself because in that case, it would be before itself, which is impossible. If, however, one thing was caused by another, there would be an infinite chain of cause and effect, which would

---

[15]Harun Hadiwijono, *Iman Kristen*, 74. I think Harun carelessly puts Plato's idea of the "good" with "god". It is Augustine of Hippo, who identified the "good" in Plato's philosophy with god.

[16]Ibid., 75. Harun does not give detailed information about Anselm's argument, but from his explanation, we know that it is Anselm of Canterbury's *Proslogion*, which was written around 1079.

[17]Note that the Latin verb *cogitare* is sometimes translated as "conceive," leading to the definition of God as "that than which no greater thing can be conceived." Both translations are acceptable. See Alister E. McGrath (ed.), *The Christian Theology Reader*, (Cambridge-Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1995), 8.

[18]Harun Hadiwijono, *Iman Kristen*, 75.

---

[19]Further reading on *Semar*: Sri Mulyono, *Apa dan siapa Semar*, (Jakarta: Gunung Agung, 1982), S.Y. Nugroho, *Semar & filsafat Ketuhanan*, (Yogyakarta: Gelombang Pasang, 2005), T. Sumukti, *Semar: dunia batin orang Jawa*, (Yogyakarta: Galang Press, 2005).

[20]Harun Hadiwijono, *Iman Kristen*, 76.

be impossible. However, if we take away the ultimate cause, we take away the effect. If in efficient causes it is possible to go on to infinity, there will be no first efficient cause, neither will there be an ultimate effect. Therefore, it is necessary to admit a first efficient cause, to which everyone gives the name of God.[21] Addressing this point of view, Harun clearly states that the argument is not a proof of the existence of God. He admits that in the chain of cause and effect there must be a first cause. However, concluding that the first cause is God does not prove the existence of God. Pointing out directly that the first cause is God is merely inserting our own belief, in our presumption. And this will not satisfy those who have different presumptions, who do not believe in the existence of God.

Teleological and Moral Argument

The third argument displayed by Harun is the teleological point of view. This is an argument for the existence of God as a creator based on perceived evidence of order, purpose, design and/or direction in nature. According to Harun, compared to the two preceding proofs, this argument is stronger. However, the supposition that there is a purpose or directive principle in the works and processes of nature does not prove, yet, the existence of God. The case is just the same as with the causal argument; we insert our conviction.[22]

Harun, then, presents the moralistic point of view as the fourth argument is displayed. This argumentation states that in every human being there is a moral consciousness, an awareness of 'the good' and 'the bad.' Where does it come from? This argument views it as a result of the work of God. Yet, for Harun, this argument does not prove anything about the existence of God. This is not a convincing argument, because this moral awareness is not the same in all situations.

It is an evolving order. Each place has its own morality.[23]

In his conclusion, Harun states that those arguments do not prove the existence of God. All these arguments would only emerge from those who already believe in the existence of God. For Harun, those proofs should be regarded as witnesses. For those who already believe in God, the arguments serve to strengthen their faith. For those who do not believe in the existence of God, the arguments prove nothing.

God is Transcendent

Now, as explained above, we can see how Harun liberates himself from the traditional model of dogmatics, but the question is, then, why Harun did that. Of course, as Budyanto said, it is the demonstration of his originality, but in my opinion, there is more than that. The answer is, actually, shown in Harun's statement, made after presenting the point of view of some religious traditions such as Hinduism, *Kebatinan*, and Islam, which are influenced by Plato in discussing the essence of God, as follows:

Harun said that for Plato (and then continued by Philo) God is transcendent - the highest and most perfect being - and one who uses eternal forms, or archetypes, to fashion a universe that is eternal and uncreated. Therefore, God is unreachable by man. Man cannot understand God's attributes and entity. As we know, Plato came up with the idea of the transcendence of God based on his disagreement with the Greek religion for depicting their gods in the form of human beings or having human attributes, who express human characteristics such as jealousy, hatred, or love.[24] According to Harun, many religions' teachings have followed this understanding. The result of this understanding is the idea of revelation, which can be viewed as the "self-adjustment" of God to humanity (*anthropomorphism*), so that man can

---

[21]Again, Harun does not give detailed information about Thomas Aquinas' argument, but from his explanation, we know that it comes from Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* written in 1265 and left unfinished at the time of his death in 1274.

[22]Harun Hadiwijono, *Iman Kristen*, 76.

[23]Ibid., 77.

[24]Plato's *Demiurge* in the *Timaeus* and his explanation in the dialogue *The Republic* (in which he particularly opposed the attribution of human failings to divine beings), are notable examples.

understand who God is. Therefore, there are two different knowledge of God: the one that only God knows, and the other one, which can be understood by man.[25] The first point of view displayed by Harun regarding that knowledge about God is the teaching from Hinduism: *Para Brahman* (or *Nirguna Brahman*) and *Apara Brahman* (or *Saguna Brahman*). The first one refers to the higher *Brahman*. Man cannot understand this *Brahman* because He is transcendent and absolute. The second one refers to the lower *Brahman*. Man can understand this *Brahman* because of His lower and rough entity.[26] Presenting *Kebatinan*, Harun makes a short note that there is a teaching about the transcendence of God as *tan kena kinaya ngapa*. It means that God cannot be described. We, as humans, cannot recognize what God looks like. God's entity remains untouchable for human logic. For me, it is a pity that Harun only mentioned the understanding of the transcendence of God and did not mention the concept of *Semar*. For the *Javanese*, who pay more attention to immanent ways of approaching the Divine, *Semar* is really an image of an "immanent" God. Harun, then, explains Islamic views about the essence of God. In short, the point of his explanation is that the *ulama* emphasize this phrase about God: *"Billa kaif wa laa tasbeh"* which can be understood, as "we cannot say anything about God's essence. We cannot compare God to anything."[27]

God is the *Sekutu* of Israel

After displaying those arguments for the existence of God and some religious traditions' points of view on the essence of God, Harun made an important statement that by displaying them he wanted to show that Christian theology is different. Accordingly, he accentuated this statement by presenting some biblical points of

view about God. By doing so, in my opinion, Harun places the Bible as a normative point of view,[28] overall arguments displayed before. For me, this is not a sign of effort toward contextual theology. He neither puts biblical concepts in dialogue with other religious traditions concepts nor 'excavates' other religious traditions' concepts to enrich Christian understanding about God. Referring to Exodus 3:13-15, Harun explains that God who sent Moses for the freedom of Israel reveals Himself as *Ehyèh asyèr Ehyèh*, which can be understood as God whose presence is recognized in His acts of liberating Israel from slavery and bringing them to the promised land. God is the *Sekutu* of Israel.[29] In my opinion, there is danger in using this term since in Indonesia the word *sekutu* connotes strongly a close association of nations or other groups formed to advance common interests, especially in a battle, to defeat their opponent. As noted before, it is not impossible that Harun was strongly influenced by the ambiance of the Second World War and the Independence War as if he is depicting the alliance of God and humankind, *versus* some opponents. The danger is that anything which has nothing to do with God or Israel, will be easily considered an opponent.

'Schöpfung und Bund'?

It is also not impossible that, as Hoekema says, Harun was influenced by Karl Barth.[30] As we know, in his *Church Dogmatics*, Barth has an extensive paragraph on 'Schöpfung und Bund' (Creation and alliance).[31] Unfortunately, Hoekema does not enter further into this matter. However, during my discussion with Hoekema, it seems to me that he is not fully convinced that

---

[25]Harun Hadiwijono, *Iman Kristen*, 78-79.

[26]Unfortunately Harun did not give any explanation about who *Brahman* is, in consideration for the lay reader who does not have any knowledge on Hinduism. It is important, because sometimes people are confused with *Brahma* and *Brahman*, which are different.

[27]Harun Hadiwijono, *Iman Kristen*, 79.

[28]In a similar way as Barth has done, Harun speaks about the Bible as our only normative (though man-written) witness. He did so already in chapter I. Ibid., 41-44, 54, 67-70.

[29]Harun Hadiwijono, *Iman Kristen*, 84. Compare 38-39.

[30]A.G. Hoekema, *Berpikir dalam Keseimbangan yang Dinamis*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 1997), 362.

[31]See paragraph 41 of Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatic*, volume III/1, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958).

Harun used the word *sekutu* in a confrontational way. Hoekema says that for Barth God is the ally of men, men should be allies of God; here the Hebrew background is the word *bᵉrith* (covenant), which often occurs in the Old Testament, and has an affinity with *koinonia* in the New Testament. I am aware fully that the idea of *bᵉrith* (covenant) has long been one of the main ways in which the biblical encounter between man and God is understood. Even more, this term has been especially popular among today's political theorists with an interest in Scripture, who have tried to marshal the biblical term for contemporary political applications. However, these efforts have often only clouded our understanding of the biblical concept of covenant. Invariably they employ anachronistic political theories or much-later understandings about what the word means to interpret the term, and then to read it back into the biblical text.

An Exclusive Relationship

Daniel J. Elazar offers a good example of the problem. Seeking to mine the term for its contemporary implications, Elazar depicts a covenant, following Max Weber,[32] as a bonding agent among members of the Israelite community. Yet the covenant in the Bible is between God and Israel, and any definition that is not built around this relationship must necessarily miss the point.[33] In short, it is an exclusive relationship. Therefore, I agree with Singgih, who says that Harun begins from an assumption, which was widely accepted in the 60s – 70s, which confronts the Bible directly with the mundane world.[34] Precisely, many arguments or points of view from other religious traditions displayed by Harun, as explained above, are considered as different from Christian faith. Therefore, in my opinion, the term *sekutu* only describes the alliance of God and Israel to defeat them, because they are considered as opponents. It is dangerous.

Toward a Functional-Contextual Dogmatics?

Now, discussing my doubt concerning Budyanto's opinion that *Iman Kristen* is an effort toward a functional-contextual dogmatics, I would like to refer to Banawiratma.[35] He states clearly that such a functional-contextual effort deals with doing theology based, explicitly, on the human experience and faith experience (or in other words, based on a contextual experience), aiming to get a better comprehension of faith. Banawiratma also emphasizes that there are reasons why theology necessarily needs functional-contextual efforts. Firstly, Christian faith comprehension always has taken place in a certain situation, atmosphere, or culture. The Word of God greets people in a particular context. Comprehending our faith should take the context in which we live into account. Furthermore, this tangible context we are talking about, is not merely an 'object,' for the Bible. In fact, it is an active 'subject.' All the human values within the context are needed to enrich the comprehension of our faith.[36] I am not sure why Budyanto concludes that Harun's theology becomes more contextual[37] while Harun absolutely confronts other religious traditions besides Christianity either with his own opinion or with a biblical point of view. As he only presents arguments that differ from the Christian faith, Harun closed any possibilities of learning from the other to get a better comprehension of faith. Therefore, Harun is actually trapped in his own situation, whether or not he liberates himself from the traditional model of dogmatics towards a functional-

[32]See the overview of covenant in the writings of Max Weber in Ernest W. Nicholson, *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), 38-42.

[33]Daniel J. Elazar, *Covenant and Polity in Biblical Israel: Biblical Foundations and Jewish Expressions*,Vol. 1, (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction. 1995.

[34]See E.G. Singgih,"Di Sebelah Timur Eden: Kejadian 4:1-16", in Yusri Panggabean, et.al. (ed.), *Menuju Manusia Baru*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2000), 144-145.

[35]Banawiratma,"Teologi Fugsional - Teologi Konteks-tual," in Eka Darmaputera (ed.), *Konteks Berteologi di Indonesia*, (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 1991), 51.

[36]Banawiratma, *Konteks Berteologi di Indonesia*, 52.

[37]Budyanto, *Menuju Manusia Baru*, xiii.

contextual model. For me, Harun is in between them.

CONCLUSION

In my conclusion, Harun was not aware of the danger of depicting the relation between God and humankind, and *vice versa* with the term *sekutu.* In short, it is indeed original and unique, yet brings many problems which are not even being realized by Christians in Indonesia. An example of this is the use of the term *persekutuan*, which is usually translated as 'fellowship.' *Persekutuan Pemuda* is simply translated "Youth Fellowship,' whereas the term *persekutuan* from the word *sekutu*, means 'alliance,' not fellowship, so it should be 'Youth Alliance.' Another example is the name change of *Dewan Gereja-gereja di Indonesia* (Indonesian Churches' Council) to *Persekutuan Gereja-gereja di Indonesia*, which is still translated as 'Indonesian Churches' Council.' It should be 'Indonesian Churches Alliance.' This alteration, recognized or not, giving rise to the unawareness of the comprehension of faith as if as in *persekutuan*, they are on one side with God in a battle to defeat anything different from them.

Indeed, Harun Hadiwijono's *Iman Kristen* is a tremendous writing on systematic theology. However, for me, *Iman Kristen* is not a contextual systematic theology *opus*. It is, more or less, a "product" that indicates the influence of colonial mentality and the narrowness of the theology of the missionaries' vision in the past.

Such systematic theology is improper due to the Indonesian context. I assert this, referring to The Commission on World Missions and Evangelism of the World Council of Churches which gathered in Bangkok under the theme "Salvation-Today", which underscored that proper theology is a reflection on the experience of the Christian community in a particular place at a particular time. Therefore, it will necessarily be a contextual theology; it will be a relevant and living theology, which refuses to be easily universalized because it speaks to and out of a particular situation.[38]

REFERENCES

Banawiratma. "Teologi Fugsional-Teologi Kontekstual," in Eka Darmaputera (ed.) *Konteks Berteologi di Indonesia*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia. 1991.

Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatic*. volume III/1. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1958.

Bavinck, H. *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*. vol. I. Kampen: J.H. Bos. 1895.

Bevans, Stephen B. *Models of Contextual Theology– Faith and Cultures*. New York: Orbis Books. 1992.

Budyanto. "Sambutan Dekan Fakultas Teologi UKDW", in Yusri Panggabean, et.al. (ed.) *Menuju Manusia Baru*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia. 2000.

Elazar, Daniel J. *Covenant and Polity in Biblical Israel: Biblical Foundations and Jewish Expressions*. Vol. 1. New Brunswick: N.J.: Transaction. 1995.

Hadiwijono, Harun. *Iman Kristen*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia. 1973.

Hadiwijono, Harun. *Kawulo Pitados*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia. 1983.

Hoekema, A.G. *Berpikir dalam Keseimbangan yang Dinamis*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia. 1997.

McGrath, Alister E. (ed.) *The Christian Theology Reader*. Cambridge-Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc. 1995.

Mulyono, Sri. *Apa dan siapa Semar*. Jakarta: Gunung Agung. 1982.

Nicholson, Ernest W. *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon. 1986.

Niftrik, G.C. van and Boland, B.J. *Dogmatika Masa Kini*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia. 1958.

Nugroho, S.Y. *Semar & filsafat Ketuhanan*. Yogyakarta: Gelombang Pasang. 2005.

---

[38]The Commission on World Missions and Evangelism of the WCC in "Culture and Identity," Report of Section I of the Bangkok Conference, *International Review of Mission*, 52/246, (Geneva: WCC, 1973), 190.

O' Collins, Gerald. "Dogmatic Theology," in Alan Richardson & John Bowden (eds.) *A New Dictionary of Christian Theology*. London: SCM Press. 1987.

Rahyanto, Trijoko. "Pengaruh Pemikiran Harun Hadiwijono terhadap Pendidikan Agama Kristen di Gereja," in Yusri Panggabean, et.al. *Menuju Manusia Baru*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia. 2000.

Russell, William P. *Contextualization: Origins, Meaning and Implication*. Roma: Universita Gregoriana. 1995.

Singgih, E.G. "Di Sebelah Timur Eden: Kejadian 4:1-16", in Yusri Panggabean, et.al. (ed.), *Menuju Manusia Baru*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia. 2000.

Soedarmo, R. *Ichtisar Dogmatika*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia. 1965.

Sumukti, T. *Semar: dunia batin orang Jawa*. Yogyakarta: Galang Press. 2005.

The Commission on World Missions and Evangelism of the WCC in "Culture and Identity," Report of Section I of the Bangkok Conference, *International Review of Mission*, 52/246. Geneva: WCC. 1973.

Tillich, Paul. *The Principles of Christian Theology*. London: SCM Press. 1971.

Verkuyl, J. *Aku Percaya*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia. 1954.

Yewangoe, A.A. et.al. *Kontekstualisasi Pemikiran Dogmatika di Indonesia*. Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia. 2004