

Christadelphian
EJournal of
Biblical
Interpretation



Editors:

T. Gaston, A. Perry, A. Wilson, P. Wyns

Vol. 12, No. 1, Apr 2018

Contents

- Editorial
- The Emergence of Ideas about Pre-existence
- Sinai Typology at Pentecost?
- The Parallel Visions of Daniel 2 and Daniel 7
- Reviews
 - The Priesthood of Some Believers by Colin Bulley
- News
- Book Notices:
 - God is Judge
 - Pattern Recognition in the Apocalypse
- Marginal Notes:
 - Adoptionism and Divine Identity
 - The Son of Man
- Discussion Points:
 - Scripture and the Goodness of God
- Postscript
- Supplement: Adorning the Woman's Head

Editors: andrew.perry@christadelphian-ejbi.org
 paul.wyns@christadelphian-ejbi.org
 t.gaston@christadelphian-ejbi.org (Philosophy and Apologetics)
 andrew.wilson@christadelphian-ejbi.org (History)

Consulting Review Panel: David Levin (Hebrew)

Editorial

Welcome to the new twice-yearly EJournal! The break and reduced workload from a quarterly to a twice-yearly issue has been most appreciated on our part. Those in the brotherhood who edit monthly magazines in their free-time are to be highly commended because the labour involved is not to be under-estimated. However, having now had the experience of a break, and seeing that the world has not fallen apart without a January EJournal, the seed of doubt has been planted. Was it now time to bring the project to a close? This thought was given all the more persuasive power because, for different reasons, all the editors have been otherwise engaged in the last six months. Consequently, it has been decided that the October issue will be **the last one** (GW), thereby completing a run of twelve years. When the subscription expires, the website will be closed down and the domain name released. The EJournal will continue to 'exist' only on its current Facebook page where the archive will be held and any future papers/articles or adverts for new books posted. Both principal editors hope to continue writing and post material either to their own websites (in the case of Paul), to Lulu (as books), or to academia.edu, in addition to maintaining the Facebook page.

Times move on and there has been a decline in readership of Christadelphian magazines in the community for several reasons not least of which is the reduction in ecclesial numbers in the West. However, we are thinking more here of the impact of the Internet as the big factor in this decline and maybe the principal factor. People are now used to getting 'information' on demand quicker and easier on the Net and in smaller chunks.

In 2007, when the EJournal was started, social media was in its infancy, now it is ubiquitous. Facebook groups and newsfeeds can keep a person up-to-date on a wide range of biblical research. There are also Internet blogs and discussion forums as well as YouTube for people to access ideas. And of course, there are many Christian websites. So, it's not surprising that the readership of Christadelphian magazines is in irreversible decline.

For those who have not tapped into Facebook newsfeeds, or the Net's blogs and forums, the default starting point for any research these days is Google and its search results, whether they be good or bad. The chances of Christadelphian material appearing high in those search results are slim, but the chance of Christadelphian material being picked up by someone searching Google is worse than that material just having a low Google ranking. In choosing your selections from a Google search list, there is a bias (in the West) towards academic material – papers; (and pseudo-academic material is also picked up in this way as well). As each

year passes, the amount of academic material on the Internet expands exponentially. You just have to think of the sources available today that were not online back in 2007, such as academia.edu. The bias that an average person in the West has is simply one in favour of expertise which is presumed to go with academic style and credentials. Christadelphian writing is therefore doubly disadvantaged through Google.

Disadvantage and decline are not actually my points, and this is not a lament about declining subscriptions as these have been pretty static for the EJournal for several years at just under the five-hundred mark. We are just registering the cultural change away from magazines to smaller and more easily accessible units (chunks) of information that can be had **on demand**. And my main point is really just about the idea of a **unit** of information and its size. Magazines are not good units of information, nor are they good containers for such units. Whether monthly, quarterly or half-yearly, they aren't easily accessible vehicles compared to Google; information is buried behind contents lists. The smaller units of a newsfeed, a home page on a website, the ping and the pong in a discussion forum, or a topic specific research paper served up in a Google search, are much more likely to get attention. And when you **want or need** some information, you go looking for it via Google – magazines are bypassed.

We have a second point about magazines. They probably don't have the information you need or want **at the time they are issued**. They get skimmed, filed away and then forgotten. There are of course repositories of magazines and journals on the Net, but their use requires ploughing through indexes and contents lists. The Internet is set up for a demand driven economy and it requires a directly relevant small unit satisfying that demand. People are pro-active and know how to meet their information demands through the Net. Everything is geared to smaller units served up by search engines.

In sum: the message is clear. The unit people are accessing for information is not the magazine, whether in print or online, but the accessible, quick and easy smaller units of information served up on the Internet. Moreover, people get information when they want it; not when it is given to them by a magazine. Are we then sounding the death-knell for magazines and journals? AP

We can come across articles and papers in which there are mistakes – things with which we strongly disagree (e.g. say on the divine name). We can get upset; maybe we feel compelled to respond; or perhaps we just shrug our shoulders and let it pass. It has to be said that there are deeply entrenched exegetical mistakes within the

community which derive from church scholarship. It's easy to become somewhat pessimistic. However, while we might be tempted to write a 'letter to the editor', it is worth remembering that the Christadelphian community also has a wealth of good exegesis to draw upon in its writings of yesteryear (years in which it was not so influenced by church scholarship). If we neglect the thinking of former generations, we run the danger of being trapped by the church scholarship of today.

Articles

The Emergence of Ideas about Pre-Existence

T. Gaston

Introduction

It would be simple and convenient for Christadelphians to hold that any ideas about the pre-existence of Jesus only emerged with the development of Trinitarian orthodoxy, or that the only reason Christians began thinking about the pre-existence of Jesus was because of Greek philosophy. However, this thesis would be far too simplistic and would not do justice to the range of evidence from Christian texts of the first and second centuries. In this article, I will explore a number of texts that contain ideas about the pre-existence of Jesus. We will find that there were a number of different reasons why Christians began thinking along these lines. Whilst looking retrospectively these might appear to be examples of early “orthodoxy”, they are in fact evidence of considerable diversity within early Christian thought as it tapped into Jewish and Greek ideas.

Before proceeding, we should note some methodological problems with sources from this period. The selection of texts and fragments extant from the late first and early second century is patchy and cannot be taken as representative of the full spectrum of Christian thought. Often the texts survived because they were nearly included in the canon, and so reasonably well known. Whatever else might have been written in this period is lost to us. Whilst these texts are not uniformly orthodox, there were clearly orthodox enough for some copies to have survived. We should hardly expect explicitly Dynamic Monarchian texts, if there were such, to have survived.

Moreover, with those texts that have survived it is usually difficult to determine the date and location of the composition with any degree of certainty. In part this is because these texts are often misattributed, yet even if a text is correctly attributed this provides limited assistance if there is not biographical information available about the author. The sources that I will consider in this article are conventionally dated to the late first or early second century. Those dates seem plausible enough to me and I do not, for my purposes, require anything more specific. Nevertheless, given that such texts are often dated by the feel of their doctrine and practice, there is always a danger of circularity when using these texts to illustrate a sequence of doctrinal development. The best we can do is note the problem and proceed with this caveat in mind.

Epistle of Barnabas

The first example is a text misattributed to the companion of Paul. The epistle may be dated with reasonable confidence to the period 70-135. It refers to the ruins of the Temple in Jerusalem (16:3-4), so must post-date its destruction, but probably predates the erection of a Roman temple upon that site in reign of Hadrian.¹ J. A. T. Robinson dates it to around 75,² however its developed Christology may indicate a later date (c.125). Its composition is sometimes placed in Alexandria, though this is only an educated guess. This pseudonymous epistle seems likely to be a product of a Jewish-Christian tradition. It is akin to the Didache, sharing the Two Paths material (Barnabas 19-20) and a preference for the Gospel of Matthew (e.g. Barnabas 4:14). It omits any reference to the Pauline corpus and makes no effort to mimic his style, as Polycarp and Ignatius do; this epistle comes from a different tradition. The epistle itself is very critical Jewish practices but this reactionary attitude from the author may well indicate that he came from a Jewish-Christian background himself.

Despite having no apparent affinity with Pauline or Johannine Christianity, and their purported high Christologies, the Epistle of Barnabas does contain explicit reference to the pre-existence of Jesus. For example, the author describes Jesus as having been “the Lord of the entire world, the one to whom God said at the foundation of the world, ‘Let us make a human according to our image and likeness’,” (Barn 5:5; cf. Gen 1:26). He also explains that the Son of God had to come in flesh, otherwise humans could not have looked at him and survived: “for they cannot even look intently at the sun, gazing directly into its rays, even though it is the work of his hands” (Barn 5:10). These passages have the implication that the Son was with God in/at creation and was the creator (or, perhaps, co-creator). One might be tempted to read the Epistle of Barnabas as affirming a form of incarnation Christology, with the pre-existent Son taking on flesh to save mankind.

However, closer examination reveals that the author presupposed a different Christology, what we might term a Possessionist Christology.³ Concerning the law

¹ B. D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers* (2 vols.; London: Harvard University Press, 2005), 2.6-7.

² J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: Xpress Reprints, 1993), 353.

³ The term “Possessionist” is one coined by Michael Goulder to describe the view that Jesus was a mortal man who was possessed by the Holy Spirit, usually at his baptism. Goulder ascribes this Christology to the Ebionites, to Petrine (i.e. Jewish) Christians (who are responsible for the books of Matthew, James and some “strands” of Revelation) and to the opponents of Ignatius (usually identified as Docetics). For myself, I am not persuaded that Possessionism is the correct understanding of the Ebionite Christology, nor do I believe there is compelling

on fasting, the author writes: “For the Lord gave the written commandment that ‘Whoever does not keep the fast must surely die’, because he himself was about to offer the vessel of the Spirit as a sacrifice for our own sins” (Barn 7:3). The ‘Lord’ in this verse is, presumably, the Father but the ‘sacrifice’ is obviously a reference to Jesus. The translation ‘the Spirit’ is preferable to ‘his spirit’¹ given the absence of *autou*, and this reinforces the point that it is the Holy Spirit, and not the spirit of Jesus, that is being referred to. As God is offering ‘the vessel of the Spirit’ as the sacrifice, then Jesus must be identified as that ‘vessel’ (cf. Barn 11:9). To describe Jesus as ‘the vessel of the Spirit’ implies the possession of Jesus by the Holy Spirit. This may in turn indicate that the author did not regard Jesus as anyway divine in himself, but as a human vessel for the Holy Spirit.

Given a Christology that identifies the divine person dwelling within Jesus as the Holy Spirit, it is natural that the author should believe that this person existed with God at creation and was the creator because neither point would have been controversial for Christians. Genesis is explicit that the Holy Spirit was present at creation (Gen 1:2) and elsewhere in the Old Testament the creative activity of the Spirit is affirmed (cf. Ps 104:30). The proposal that God was speaking to the Holy Spirit when he said, “Let us make ...” (Gen 1:26) is not stated in the Genesis text but is a natural corollary of ascribing that creative role to the Spirit. The only aspect that might require explanation is the personhood of the Spirit, as for Jews and the early Christians, the Spirit was impersonal. However, once one had taken the step to understand Jesus as a man possessed by the Holy Spirit then adding personhood to the understanding of the Spirit may have seemed a natural implication.

The Shepherd of Hermas

A second text that seems to stand in the same tradition as the Epistle of Barnabas is the Shepherd of Hermas. Like the Didache and the Epistle of Barnabas, the

evidence to warrant projecting Ebionite views of early Jewish-Christians, nor do I believe that there is evidence of Possessionism in the opponents of Ignatius. Nevertheless, I can see the applicability of the term for the Christology expressed in the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. M. Goulder, *St Paul Versus St Peter: A Tale of Two Missions* (Louisville: WJK Press, 1995), 107-134; M. Goulder, “The Pre-Marcian Gospel” *SJT* 47 (1994): 456-457 (456-7); M. Goulder, “A Poor Man’s Christology” *NTS* (1999): 332-348; M. Goulder, “Ignatius’ ‘Docestists’ ” *Vigiliae Christianae* 53:1 (1999): 16-30.

¹ *pace* J. A. Kleist (trans.), *Ancient Christian Writers (Vol.6)*, (New York: The Newman Press, 1948), 47.

Shepherd makes use of the Two Paths material¹ and seems to be a product of the Jewish-Christian tradition.² The text may be tentatively dated to c.100.

It is significant how little attention Hermas gives to the life of Jesus, in contrast to contemporary writers like Ignatius. The name 'Jesus' is never mentioned. The title 'Christ' is used three times in doubtful manuscript variants (Vis 2.2.8; 3.6.6; Sim 9.18.1). C. Osiek explains these omissions as 'reverential avoidance',³ but actually there seems no reference to the historical Jesus at all.⁴ This would seem to indicate that for the author the man Jesus was of little significance. Yet, like the Epistle of Barnabas, Hermas explicitly affirms the pre-existence of the Son, saying "the Son of God is older than all his creation, and so he became the Father's counsellor for his creation" (Sim 9.12.2). Though Hermas does not quote Gen 1:26, this conversation would be the obvious source for the idea that the Son was the Father's "counsellor" in creation. However, though Hermas affirms the pre-existence of the Son, it seems that he meant something different by this than later Trinitarians would mean.

The Christological material in Hermas is largely confined to Similitude 5. In this section the angel tells Hermas a parable about a field. The owner of the field plants a vineyard and then chooses a slave to build a fence around the vineyard while he is on a journey. The slave does more than his master requires, also weeding the vineyard. When the master returns he is pleased and calls his 'beloved son', and other advisors, and they congratulate the slave. So, the owner makes the slave fellow heir with his son, and his son approves (Sim 5.2.1-11).

Now this parable has many familiar elements from the Synoptic parables (e.g. Matt 21:33-45). This comparison would lead us to expect that the owner would represent God, the son would represent Jesus and the slave would represent God's servants. However, when the parable is explained to Hermas, he is told 'the son is the Holy Spirit and the slave is the Son of God' (Similitude 5.6.2). Now while the phrase 'the son is the Holy Spirit' is only included in the Vulgate,⁵ there is every reason to suppose it was in the original. No alternative identity for the son is given in the other variants, whilst all the witnesses identify the slave as 'the Son of God'. G. F.

¹ Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.164; Osiek notes one possible allusion to the Didache in Hermas (C. Osiek, *The Shepherd of Hermas* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 27).

² G. F. Snyder, *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary* (6 vols.; New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1968), 6.16.

³ Osiek, *Hermas*, 34.

⁴ Snyder, *Apostolic Fathers*, 6.107.

⁵ It is omitted from the Codex Athous (15th century), the two Palatine MSS (15th century), and the Ethiopic version (6th century).

Snyder reasons that it was the presence of two sons in the passage that led later copyists to omit the phrase in an attempt to avoid confusion.¹ In any case, it is clear from the angel's explanation that the Holy Spirit is the son of the parable:

“God made the Holy Spirit dwell in flesh that he desired, even though it preexisted and created all things. This flesh, then, in which the Holy Spirit dwelled, served well as the Spirit's slave, for it conducted itself in reverence and purity, not defiling the Spirit at all. Since it lived in a good and pure way, cooperating with the Spirit and working with it in everything it did, behaving in a strong and manly way, God chose it to be a partner with the Holy Spirit. For the conduct of this flesh was pleasing, because it was not defiled on earth while bearing the Holy Spirit. Thus he took his Son and the glorious angels as counsellors, so that this flesh, which served blamelessly as the Spirit's slave, might have a place of residence and not appear to have lost the reward for serving as a slave” (Sim 5.6.5-7)

In this passage Jesus is described rather impersonally as ‘this flesh’, and his possession by the Holy Spirit is explicitly described. The intriguing conclusion of the parable describes how ‘this flesh’ (i.e. Jesus) was rewarded for his conduct bearing the Spirit with him to ‘a place of residence’, perhaps referring to the ascension of Jesus. It seems evident, then, that when Hermas says “the Son of God is older than all his creation” (Sim 9.12.2) he is not referring to Jesus but to the Holy Spirit that “pre-existed and created all things” (Sim 5.6.5). In contrast, Hermas did not regard Jesus as the Son from birth (or from eternity) but that this status was bestowed on Jesus because of his conduct.

Both Hermas and the author of the Epistle of Barnabas seem to affirm the view that the Holy Spirit is the pre-existent Son and that Jesus was an ordinary man who was possessed by the Holy Spirit. There are parallels with the Christology of Cerinthus, though these authors do not see the need to speculate about the existence of otherwise unknown spirit beings (like Cerinthus' Christ). One might speculate that the views of Cerinthus were a development upon something like the views endorsed by these authors. It is also not difficult to conceive of how this Possessionist Christology arose. The early Christians affirmed that Jesus could perform miracles by the Spirit, that the Spirit had descended on Jesus at baptism; it is an understandable, if crude, interpretation to suppose that Jesus not only used the power of the Holy Spirit but that he was possessed by it. Yet since the Holy Spirit did not originate with Jesus, but was known to be present at creation, then to say

¹ Snyder, *Apostolic Fathers*, 6.106.

that Jesus was possessed by the Spirit was to say that something in him had pre-existed.

Second Clement

What is commonly known as “Second Clement” is almost certainly misattributed but also misidentified as an epistle. It is best described as “an early Christian homily”.¹ There are various speculations as to the location of composition, including Rome, Corinth, Syria and Egypt,² and various theories as to the identity of the author, including Clement, Soter, Julius Cassianus and the elders at Corinth.³ As to date, C. Tuckett judges that “a date some time around the middle of the second century seems to create the least number of problems”,⁴ given the possible allusions of Origen and Irenaeus on the one hand and the lack of quotations of Paul and John on the other. This date also seems appropriate in terms of theology (unnuanced) and ecclesiology (presbyters but no single bishop).⁵

Though the main concern of this homily is not Christology, the author clearly presupposes that Christ pre-exists in some sense: “the Bible and the apostles indicate that the church has not come into being just now, but has existed from the beginning. For it existed spiritually, as did our Jesus; but he [or it] became manifest here in the final days so that he [or it] might save us” (14.2). The author believes that Jesus existed from the beginning, that he was sent by the Father (20.5) and that he underwent incarnation (or some change of nature) (9.5).⁶ However, he does not explicitly identify Jesus as God. The homily does begin “we must think about Jesus Christ as we think about God” (1.1), but this is explicitly in relation to the judgment being entrusted to Jesus (cf. Acts 10:42; 1 Pet 4:5), rather than being a statement about Jesus’ nature.⁷ When the author says Jesus pre-existed, this is not because he believes that Jesus is God or a divine person. In the quotation above (14.2) he compares the pre-existence of Jesus with the pre-existence of the Church. It is

¹ Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:154.

² C. Tuckett, *2 Clement: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Oxford: OUP, 2012), 58-62; Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:158; cf. Karl P. Donfried, “The Theology of Second Clement”, *HTR* 66:4 (1973), 487-501 (499); J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* (London, 1890), Part 1, Vol. 2, 197.

³ Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 15-16.

⁴ Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 64.

⁵ Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:159-160. Donfried connects Second Clement with First Clement so dates its composition shortly after the reception of First Clement in Corinth (c.98-100); see Donfried, “Second Clement”, 499.

⁶ Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 69.

⁷ Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:155.

conceivable that by “spiritually” he means something like “figuratively” (cf. Rev 11:8) but given what he says elsewhere it seems evident that “spiritually” means as a spirit-being. For example, Jesus is said to have been “first a spirit” and then flesh (9.5). (The implication of this might be that Jesus stopped being a spirit when he became flesh, though there is a danger of reading too much into this one line). Whilst it might seem odd that the author should hold that the Church pre-existed as a spirit being, he seems clear that this was the case. He writes, “we will belong to the first church, the spiritual church, the church that was created before the sun and moon” (14.1), and again, “the church was spiritual, it became manifest in Christ’s flesh” (14.3). Now we might be tempted to ease the peculiarity by proposing that he is being figurative, that the church pre-existed as an idea in the foreknowledge of God, except that he says that Jesus pre-existed in the same way. So, our choice of readings is either that Jesus only pre-existed in a figurative sense (and not literally) or that the Church pre-existed as a spirit-being.

Talk of spirit-beings might make one suspect that Second Clement is influenced by Gnosticism. Indeed, scholars have frequently argued for allusions to Gnosticism (or more specifically, Valentinianism¹), either as something the author promotes or rejects.² Affinities with Valentinianism might explain the concept of the Church pre-existing as a spirit-being. According to Irenaeus, in the mythology proclaimed by Valentinus one of the aeons of the primal ogdoad was named Ecclesia (Adv. Haer. 1.11.1). This aeon was the consort to Anthropos, and from this consort pair emerged twelve powers (cf. Adv. Haer. 1.1.1; cf. Heracleon, *Comm. John* 13.51). In a later Valentinian text, *The Tripartite Tractate* (third century), Church is the third member of the primal triad that “existed from the beginning” (57.34-35). In this text, Church is a composite entity, “consisting of many men that existed before the aeons” (58.30-31). In this sense, Church is not a single aeon by composite of individual aeons.

Yet whilst there are some reasons for suspecting some kind of interaction with Gnosticism, such as the emphasis on Jesus’ flesh and on ethical behaviour,³ it is difficult to read Second Clement as a polemic against Gnosticism. The author never directly addresses or criticises false teachers, he never implies that the role of God as creator is in doubt (15.2) or that his opponents regarded the material world as evil.⁴

¹ R. Warns, ‘Untersuchungen zum 2. Clemensbrief’ (Marburg: doctoral dissertation, 1989) 76-90.

² Donfried, “Second Clement”, 490.

³ See W. Pratscher, *Der zweite Clemensbrief*, KAV 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007).

⁴ Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 50-53.

Even when the author uses a saying, which is similar to one used in the Gospel of the Egyptians and the Gospel of Thomas (12.2), he does not give a Gnostic interpretation nor does he use the quotation to directly combat Gnosticism either.¹ Tuckett concludes: “If one is permitted to ‘mirror read’ what is said here (at least in general terms) and postulate ‘libertine’ tendencies in the community, it does not clearly point to a Gnostic background: not all Gnostics were necessarily libertines, and not all libertines were necessarily Gnostic”,² and, “given what is said, as well as what is not said and what seems to be accepted by all sides in the discussion, it is hard to see the ‘opponents’ here as Gnostics”.³

Focusing specifically on the question of the Church as a spirit being, “the author here gives no hint that he disapproves in any way of the sentiments of claims being made about the church”.⁴ This makes it unlikely that the author is seeking to correct “a gnostic misunderstanding of the church”, as Donfried proposes.⁵ On this view the author is combatting those who hold that they already belong to the spiritual church because they had already been saved.⁶ Yet this still leaves the author affirming that the Church is a spirit being, something he might be more coy about were he combatting Gnosticism.

Though Tuckett has reservations about concluding that the author is combatting Gnosticism, he nonetheless seems persuaded that the author is operating “in the context of some kind of (Valentinian?) Gnostic milieu”.⁷ Donfried also posits *Second Clement* on a “Gnosticizing trajectory” leading to Valentinian Gnosticism.⁸ We may speculate (and it can only be speculation) that *Second Clement* is a sort of missing link between Pauline Christianity (say) and Valentinianism. The author does not reject the material world, nor does he posit a malign creator, but perhaps his ideas about spirit beings provide a basis for Valentinian aeons. Of course, this analysis is too

¹ Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 54. “Detailed analysis of the saying here suggests that neither of these other versions is the origin of the version of the saying in *2 Clement*” (Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 41).

² Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 55.

³ Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 56.

⁴ Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 249.

⁵ Donfried, “Second Clement”, 493.

⁶ Donfried, “Second Clement”, 495.

⁷ Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 252.

⁸ Karl P. Donfried, *The Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity* (Supp. to Novum Testamentum vol. 38; Leiden: Brill, 1974), 1, 164; cf. Jean Danielou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity: A History of Early Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea* (Westminster Press, 1977), 302.

crude. Valentinianism developed in a wider Gnostic context, with its own aeonology, but perhaps a precedent in a milieu represented by *Second Clement* explains the designation of one of the Valentinian aeons as Church. Whatever the case, the possibility that the ideas expressed in *Second Clement* were part of a conceptual trajectory towards Valentinianism does not explain those ideas, and specifically does not explain why the author believes the Church (and Jesus) to have been a pre-existent spirit.

Both Tuckett and Donfried trace the origins of the pre-existent spiritual Church to Ephesians 1:4,¹ where Paul speaks about believers having been chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. This speaks somewhat to the idea of pre-existence but only in the sense of the foreknowledge of God, and that was not unique to Paul's letter to the Ephesians. Nor is Paul talking about the pre-existence of the Church but about the pre-selection of believers. This doesn't get us very far along the road to explaining the idea of the Church as a spirit.

Donfried provides an additional explanation from Galatians 4:26 and Paul's reference to the "Jerusalem above", which Donfried argues finds precedent elsewhere (4 Ezra 7.26; 1 Enoch 90:28-29; Book of Elijah 10; 2 Baruch 4:2-7; cf. Rev 21:2).² There is a connection here between Paul's quotation of Isaiah 54:1 with reference to the Jerusalem above (Gal 4:27) and the use of that same quotation in *Second Clement* with reference to the Church (2:1).³ Donfried proposes that Paul is engaged in aeon speculation, yet neither Galatians, nor the comparison texts, talk about Jerusalem as a spirit-being. In 4 Ezra and Revelation, the heavenly Jerusalem is the promise of an eschatological renewal, of spiritual Israel revealed, not a pre-existent spirit-being. In 2 Baruch, the heavenly Jerusalem is the heavenly pattern or ideal, of which the temporal Jerusalem is a shadow (cf. Heb 8:5). Of these, it seems more likely that Paul is speaking of Jerusalem in the latter mode, of the ideal of what Jerusalem should be, instead of what it has become—shackled by the Law. Given the shared allusion to Isaiah 54:1 and given that the shift from Jerusalem to the Church is natural (cf. Rev 21:2), then it is likely that *Second Clement* does derive its ideal of the spiritual Church from Galatians. It is just possible that what the author means by the spiritual Church is something like Paul's idea of the heavenly ideal, the church as it should be. But given the comparison between the pre-existence of the Church and the pre-existence of Jesus, it seems more probable that the author has moved beyond Paul, substantiating talk of God's ideals into discrete spiritual entities. In such a mindset anything that was previously said to pre-exist in the foreknowledge

¹ Tuckett, *2 Clement*, 248; Donfried, *Second Clement*, 164.

² Donfried, *Second Clement*, 192.

³ Donfried, *Second Clement*, 198.

of God might be given substance as a spirit-being, and Jesus is the most obvious candidate for this treatment.

Once again in *Second Clement* we have an early Christian text, which whilst appearing to agree with later orthodoxy about the pre-existence of Jesus, in fact has very different reasons for positing this conclusion. The author thought in terms of spirit beings, a mode of thinking that may have fed into Gnostic speculation, and in that mode of thinking the pre-existence of Jesus as a spirit being as a natural corollary.

Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus

The *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus* (hereafter JP) is the earliest known example of a genre of Christian texts in which a Christian and a Jew debate Christianity. This *Dialogue* is known only from quotations in later sources, the largest of which was only recently discovered.¹ Based upon the testimony of John of Scythopolis (PG 4.421; previously attributed to Maximus the Confessor), the *Dialogue* has usually been attributed to Aristo of Pella. John of Scythopolis claims that his source for this information is Clement of Alexandria, though noting that Clement says the author was Luke.² This latter claim is also repeated by Sophronius³ but has always seemed doubtful. The discovery of the new fragment has allowed textual comparison with the gospel on the basis of which Lukan authorship can be ruled out.⁴ The text is usually dated on two grounds. Firstly, it must date before Celsus' *True Account* (c.178), which cites it. Secondly, since Aristo was alive during the reign of Hadrian (117-138; Eusebius, HE 4.6.3), it was likely composed around this time. W. Varner dates the *Dialogue* to 135-165.⁵ This date means that the *Dialogue* is earlier than Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*.

Celsus Africanus gives a brief outline of JP, saying that Jason is a Hebrew Christian and Papiscus is an Alexandrian Jew that at the end of the dialogue is converted and receives baptism.⁶ In terms of the actual contents of the dialogue, we have only a few testimonies. John of Scythopolis records that the dialogue includes mention of

¹ F. Bovon & J. M. Duffy, "A New Greek Fragment from Ariston of Pella's *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus*", *HTR* 105:4 (2012): 457-465.

² W. Varner, "On the trail of Trypho: Two fragmentary Jewish-Christian dialogues from the ancient church" in *Christians Origins and Hellenistic Judaism: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament* (eds. Stanley E. Porter & Andrew W. Pitts; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 555.

³ Bovon & Duffy, "New Greek Fragment", 462.

⁴ Bovon & Duffy, "New Greek Fragment", 463.

⁵ Varner, "On the trail of Trypho", 557.

⁶ Varner, "On the trail of Trypho", 556.

the seven heavens (PG 4.421). Origen states that the dialogue “shows that the prophecies concerning the Messiah apply to Jesus” (*Contra Celsum* 4:52). Jerome gives two apparent quotes: “in the Son God made the heavens and the earth”, an apparent textual variation on Gen 1:1 (*Qu.hebr.Gen.* Gen 1:1), and “the execration of God is he that is hanged” (*Com. Gal* 3:13). Lastly we have the fragment in the works of Sophronius, which concerns the question of why Christians celebrate Sunday, as opposed to the Sabbath.

It is worth also considering the relationship between JP and later texts of this genre. It has been proposed that remnants of JP can be found in the triple tradition shared by *Athanaeus and Zacchaeus* (late 4th century), *Timothy and Aquila* (5th century) and *Simon and Theophilus* (5th century), and that is not dependent on either Tertullian’s *Adversus Judaeos* or Cyprian’s *Testimonia*.¹ If true, this would imply that the contents of JP could be partially sketched by reference to this triple tradition. O. Skarsaune has proposed that JP was a source for Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho*.² W. Rutherford explores this proposal with reference to Justin’s “second God” argument, attempting to find parallels between the triple tradition and Justin’s *Dialogue*.³ Though Justin does make use of some of the same proof-texts, given the difference in order and usage, Rutherford concludes that Justin is not dependent on JP for these arguments. Instead, he suggests that JP and the *Dialogue with Trypho* have parallels due to broader tradition, which Justin expands creatively.⁴ Varner is also unconvinced of any dependence by Justin on JP, arguing that the two texts are “in the same conceptual trajectory” and that any parallels are due to having the same subject matter and format.⁵ None of the other dialogues in the genre show literal dependency on the recently discovered fragment; Bovon and Duffy say that the closest comparator is Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho* which expresses similar concerns.⁶ These analyses suggest two things. Firstly that, whilst we may not be able to use later

¹ Will Rutherford, “Altercatio Jasonis et Papisci as a Testimony Source for Justin’s ‘Second God’ Argument?” in *Justin Martyr and his Worlds* (eds. Sara Parvis & Paul Foster; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 141. Varner also notes echoes of JP in later dialogue texts (Varner, “On the trail of Trypho”, 558).

² Oskar Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr’s Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (Sup. NovTest 56; Leiden, Brill, 1987), 234. He further speculates that Marcion made critical comments about JP in his *Antitheses*, which would explain some of the apparently anti-Marcionite tendencies of Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho* (242).

³ Rutherford, “Altercatio Jasonisi”, 137.

⁴ Rutherford, “Altercatio Jasonisi”, 144.

⁵ Varner, “On the trail of Trypho”, 558.

⁶ Bovon & Duffy, “New Greek Fragment”, 460.

texts to determine the precise contents of JP, it is likely that JP contained arguments and proof texts used by them. Secondly, that JP is unlikely to have originated these arguments, though it may have been the first text to incorporate them. Rather JP is representative of the Christian side of Jewish-Christian discourse from the early second century.

For our purposes the pertinent questions are whether JP affirmed the pre-existence of Jesus and, if so, what was the background of this affirmation. The former question may be answered in affirmative on two scores. Firstly, the fragments of JP are consistent with the pre-existence of Jesus. Jerome's quotation of the variant of Gen 1:1 "in the Son God made the heavens and the earth" entails that Jesus was present at creation. Similarly, the fragment preserved by Sophronius states that the creative word which proceeded from God "was Christ, the son of God through whom all the other things as well came to be". It is just possible that in this second case Jesus is identified as the Word in the same sense John does, as an impersonal abstraction that was embodied in Jesus, but given the quotation from Jerome this seems unlikely.

Secondly, there is the triple tradition. A key part of this core is back-and-forth between the Christian and the Jew over specific proof texts. "Beginning" in Gen 1:1 is identified with the Son; "let us make" in Gen 1:26 is taken to refer to God speaking to the Son; Proverbs 8 is taken to show that the Son was with the Father at creation.¹ Whilst we cannot be certain that JP included this sequence, it is at least significant that JP attests the same understanding of Gen 1:1. This interpretation also recurs in *Discussion of Zacchaeus and Apollonius*.² It is attested by Irenaeus (Dem 43) and likely by Justin too when he identifies Wisdom as a Beginning.³ Furthermore, Rutherford argues that JP may have included the "second God" proof text Gen 19:24, and perhaps also Ps 109:1 and Ps 44:7-8.⁴

Given these proof-texts, the explanation of JP's affirmation of the pre-existence of Jesus is likely the utilisation of rabbinic interpretations by Aristo (or by those Christians engaged in discourse that gave rise to this use of the proof-texts that JP represents). The identification of "beginning" with the Son may seem odd to modern readers but, according to Williams, is in accordance with Rabbinic methods

¹ Rutherford, "Altercatio Jasonisi", 142.

² Williams, *Adversus Iudaeos*, 297, 308.

³ Rutherford, "Altercatio Jasonisi", 140.

⁴ Rutherford, "Altercatio Jasonisi", 137.

(citing Rashi).¹ Moreover, Skarsaune writes that the “combination of Prov 8:22 and Gen 1:1 is commonplace in rabbinic literature”.² If Wisdom was being identified as the beginning within rabbinic Judaism then it was a small step from Christian interpreters to identify the Son as the beginning, given that Jesus was already being associated with Wisdom in the first century. Similarly, the question of the plurality of Lords within Gen 19:24 is known to have been a matter of dispute amongst the rabbis c.150.³ Skarsaune also demonstrates the rabbinic background for Justin’s arguments for the pre-existence of Jesus in the *Dialogue with Trypho*.⁴ It is worth emphasizing the conclusion that the use of these proof-texts is not dependent on Philo.⁵ Rather, it is rabbinic ideas of the late first and early second century that seem to be source for these arguments. Not that the Rabbis affirmed the pre-existence of Jesus, but they did believe in the pre-existence of the name of the Messiah (and, possibly, in the pre-existence of the Messiah), and in the role of Wisdom in creation, and in other elements that could be taken over and applied to Christ. Taking up these arguments, Christians were able to argue for the presence of Christ in the Old Testament, and thus in favour of Christianity in general. It would, of course, be too crude to suggest that certain Christians adopted the pre-existence of Jesus for narrow evangelistic purposes. But Christians did hold the Old Testament to be authoritative and were predisposed to find Christ in the Old Testament. The influence of Rabbinic Judaism on certain Christians seems likely to have shaped how they interpreted the Old Testament.

Justin and Logos Christology

In the earlier parts of this article, I have outlined several early occurrences of the pre-existence of Jesus in Christian texts and explored the likely background for these ideas. Yet, whilst these ideas were on the trajectory towards later orthodoxy, by themselves they would not have been influential in fixing Christian views about the pre-existence (or otherwise) of Jesus. The pre-existence of Jesus achieved its central position within Christianity in no small part due to the work of Justin and the adoption of his views within Western Christendom. Part of Justin’s argument for the pre-existence of Jesus comes from OT theophanies. He was convinced that it was impossible that the unbegotten God could have come down to a specific place on earth and conversed with men (Dial 127; cf. Dial 56; 60; cf. 1 Apol 63; cf. Didask. 28.3); these OT theophanies must be ascribed to someone else and for

¹ A. Lukyn Williams, *Adversus Judaeos: A bird’s-eye view of Christian Apologiae until the Renaissance* (Cambridge: CUP, 1935), 33.

² Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 388.

³ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 412.

⁴ E.g. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 381.

⁵ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 410, 413; Rutherford, “Altercatio Jasonisi”, 137.

Justin that someone was Jesus. Whilst it is possible that this argument from theophanies was an original contribution by Justin (perhaps directed against Marcion),¹ it was simply an extension of Jewish and Christian thought about intermediaries acting on God's behalf.² Justin's Jewish dialogue partner, Trypho, proposes the role of the Angel of the Lord in such theophanies (cf. Dial 60). In this sense Justin exhibits the same tendency as JP of reading Christ into the OT. However, there is another motivation for Justin's affirmation of the pre-existence of Jesus and that is his identification of Jesus as the Logos.

Justin draws a sharp distinction between unbegotten (= God) and begotten (= creation). This leads to a problem familiar from contemporary Platonic philosophy (and Justin was a Platonist before he became a Christian) of how to reconcile the transcendence of God, by his nature, with the immanence of God, in his activity.³ Justin claims that God is, by nature, unmoved and does not interact with the world (cf. Didask 10.7; cf. Numenius, fr. 12.13-14). Justin describes his own conversion as coming to realise that he could not hope to "look upon God" (Dial 2) through the pursuit of philosophy because the (begotten) human soul has no natural affinity with (unbegotten) God (Dial 4-5). The solution to this problem that leads to Justin's conversion is revelation: that knowledge of God can be achieved through reading the prophets (Dial 7). Judaism had already developed concepts to tackle to problem of divine transcendence, particularly from the Wisdom literature. In the Gospel of John this divine abstraction (Wisdom) had been named Logos and presented as having been embodied in Jesus. Justin expands the concept of the Logos to be more than a personified abstract.

For Justin, the Logos resolves the problem of how the human soul can come to knowledge of God if it has no innate affinity with God. The Logos is the rational power of God (Dial 61) through whom the human soul can gain knowledge of God (cf. 2 Apol 13.5). The seed of the Logos (*spermatikos logos*⁴) is implanted in the whole human race (1 Apol 32.8; 2 Apol 8.1), and through this seed each person is able to see "what is connatural [συγγενές] to it" (i.e. Christ; cf. 2 Apol 13.3), and through

¹ Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 422.

² For example, Hosea 12:4 asserts that Jacob wrestled with an angel (cf. Gen 32:22-32) and Hebrews 13:2 implies that it was angels that spoke to Abraham (cf. Gen 18).

³ E. R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin* (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1968), 139.

⁴ The term *logos spermatikos* was used in Stoicism with reference to the supposed gaseous element in sexual reproduction, and by extension to God as the active element in matter (Goodenough, *Theology of Justin*, 161), however it seems unlikely that Justin took the term directly from the Stoics (M. J. Edwards, "Justin's Logos and the Word of God", *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3:3 (1995), 277).

the seed Christ is in everything (2 Apol 10.8). This seed is human reason, the imitation of divine reason, through which the philosophers before Christ achieved knowledge of God (2 Apol 10.2, 6, 8, 13.3).¹ There are potential parallels here with the thought of the Middle Platonist Numenius. He says that knowledge is not only a gift of God but has same essence in both God and humans (fr.14). Eusebius links this passage with another in which Numenius describes the sowing of human souls (*Pr.ev.*XI.18.15; fr.13). Numenius seems to identify the First God with the seeds and explains that in this way all things participate with the First God. His comments on the gift of knowledge are a reasonable extension of the participation humans have with God through the soul. This is likely the explanation as to why Justin came to adopt Numenius' analogy for the gift of knowledge (one lamp lit from another) to describe the procession of the Logos (Dial 61).

For Justin, the Logos is the Son of God, not because he was born of a virgin, but because he proceeded from God (cf. 2 Apol 6.3; 1 Apol 53.2; Dial 61), mirroring Numenius' own language describing the procession of the second God from the first (cf. fr.12; fr.21). Like Numenius, Justin is reluctant to equate procession with creation. Though quoting Prov 8:21ff, which includes the word "created", Justin ignores this concept when drawing out the implication.² For Numenius the second God imitates the first, whereas created things are fashioned by their Forms; the second, as the intellect which contemplates the Forms, could not come into being by the same process. Also, like Numenius' second God, Justin ascribes to the Logos both a noetic and demiurgic function. He says "God conceived and made the world by the Logos", implying that God first conceived of the thought of the world, through his rational power (= Logos), and then created the world, also through the Logos.³ Whilst it would seem improbable that one who affirmed the *Shema* (cf. 1 Apol 16.6) could have followed Numenius in affirming a second God, Justin believes that Jesus can be rightly be called "God" (1 Apol 63.15), "second" after the Father (1 Apol 13.3-4; 60.7), and "another God" (Dial 50; 55; 56).

It would be too simplistic to say that Justin remained a Platonist after his conversion, or that he adopted Platonic concepts and dropped them unchanged into Christianity. Justin has a rich variety of sources and traditions behind his views and a

¹ D. Minns & P. Parvis, *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 65-6.

² Goodenough, *Theology of Justin*, 147.

³ Minns and Parvis argue that of the sentence is upon God creating purposively, rather than indicating the agency of the Logos (Minns & Parvis, *Justin*, 64). However, the comparison Justin makes with the myth of Athena would only make sense if the Logos parallels Athena in her creative activity.

good deal of originality to his thought. However, fundamentally, Justin represents a shift in Christian thought whereby the Johannine Logos has morphed from a divine abstract embodied in Jesus into a noetic and demiurgic power independent in substance from God. The conceptual framework for this change, if not the concepts themselves, is Platonic. Whilst Justin shares with later orthodoxy the affirmation of the pre-existence of Jesus, he does so for different reasons. For Justin, Jesus is not God. Jesus is the Logos, the rational power of God and the intermediary for God in the world; he necessarily is not God but a separate substance and power. Since the Logos is necessary for this mediating function between God and the world, then it must have existed prior to creation, and so if Jesus is the Logos, (and Justin has resources in the Johannine tradition for affirming this), then Jesus must have pre-existed.

Conclusion

In this article, we have examined a selection of early Christian texts and discovered that whilst they affirm the pre-existence of Jesus their reasons for doing so are not those of later orthodoxy. The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Shepherd of Hermas* represent a Possessionist Christology, which was presumably endorsed by others in this period, and affirm that Jesus was a man possessed by the Holy Spirit. These Christians affirm the pre-existence of Jesus in the sense that the Holy Spirit pre-existed and was active in creation. *Second Clement* represents a different form of Christianity, which might be regarded as somewhere on the trajectory towards Gnosticism, and it held that there were spirit beings that included Jesus and the Church. These Christians affirm the pre-existence of Jesus in the sense that he was one of many spirit beings. The *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus* represents an ongoing discourse of parts of Christianity with Rabbinic Judaism, engaging with and being influenced by those interpretations of the OT as they understand the role of Jesus prior to his birth. These Christians affirm the pre-existence of Jesus in the sense that he was ascribed the role of the Messiah, of the Angel of the Lord, and of Wisdom. Finally, Justin marks the beginnings (though perhaps not the very beginnings¹) of Christian engagement with Platonism and the contextualisation of Christian ideas in a Platonic conceptual framework. Justin affirms the pre-existence of Jesus in the sense that he was the rational power of God, performing a mediating function between God and the world both in creation and in coming to knowledge of God.

These findings are significant for a number of reasons. Firstly, though these texts anticipate later orthodoxy by affirming the pre-existence of Jesus, the reasons for these affirmations are not those of later orthodoxy and certainly not Trinitarian. The

¹ See Thomas E. Gaston, "The Influence of Platonism on the Early Apologists", *The Heythrop Journal* 50:4 (2009): 573-580.

Possessionist Christology of *Barnabas* and *Shepherd* did not identify Jesus as God or one Person of a triune Godhead. Possessionists may have affirmed the personhood of the Spirit, centuries before this was established in the creeds, but the Spirit was not a co-equal and co-eternal Person. Furthermore, Possessionism would seem to entail that Jesus, far from being an eternal divine Person, was a mortal man who was possessed by the Spirit. The ideas assumed by *Second Clement* about spirit beings would seem to entail that Jesus was not God but was a spirit-being, presumably of a lower order (though the text gives little enough by way of theology). Justin is adamant that God and Jesus must be separate because it is impossible for the transcendent God to appear on earth; the Logos is an intermediary for God and therefore something separate. Justin did not affirm the pre-existence of Jesus because he believed that Jesus was God but because he believed Jesus was God's rational power. It may be that these thinkers, especially Justin, were influential (indeed instrumental) in the development of what became orthodox doctrine, but they were not Trinitarians in the post-Nicene sense of the term.

Secondly, the earliest Christians did not identify the Spirit as the Son of God, nor did they ascribe personhood to the Spirit, nor did they view the relationship between Jesus and the Spirit as a (divine) person possessing a (human) person. The earliest Christians did not consider the Church to be a spirit-being nor did they consider Jesus to be a spirit-being; they acknowledged the existence of angels and perhaps other spirit-beings. It is debatable to what extent the earliest Christians identified Jesus with Wisdom, or with the Angel of the Lord, or with other "second God" OT passages. It seems likely that much of the Rabbinic interpretation that the author of *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus* assumed did not exist at the time of Jesus and his immediate followers. The earliest Christians had little, if any, acquaintance with Platonism and did not understand God or Jesus (or anything else) in that conceptual framework. Whilst Jesus was seen as an intermediary in terms of the Atonement, the earliest Christians had no problem with the idea of God being known directly or creating directly; there was no conceptual space for a Platonic intermediary. The emergence of these affirmations of the pre-existence of Jesus arose as Christianity (or certain parts of it) was developing away from its earliest roots.

Sinai Typology in Acts 2?

A. Perry

A common scholarly proposal is that Pentecost is an anti-type to Sinai, with the giving of the Law the type of the giving of the Spirit. Considerations of plot, episode details, as well as the character-roles of Jesus and the disciples, militate against reading Pentecost as an anti-type to Sinai:

1) While Pentecost is a “beginning” for the disciples (Lk 1:2; 24:47; Acts 11:15), it is not a beginning for Jesus (Acts 1:2). Sinai was not a beginning for Israel, rather the departure from Egypt and the crossing of the Red Sea were the “beginning”, as indicated by the institution of the calendar (Exod 12:2). Luke’s comparison of the bestowal of the Spirit to water baptism (Lk 3:16) suggests a natural antitype in the crossing of the Red Sea.

2) Sinai represents a covenant *agreement*; there is sacrifice and declaration of intent, and a giving of a law. The series of episodes represents an extended transaction between the people and Yahweh. These elements are absent from Acts 2. Had Luke intended a comparison or contrast with the Law and the Spirit, he could have used Ezek 36:26-27 or Jer 31:33, as Paul does in 2 Cor 3:3.

3) There are multiple ascents and multiple theophanies at Sinai; no one ascent or theophany serves as a type for Pentecost. A comparison can be made with the first theophany at Sinai (Exod 19:16) in terms of the “wind” and the “fire” but, crucially, Moses has not ascended to the top of Sinai prior to this theophany, and only communicates with God from the base of the mountain (Exod 19:20); law-giving is implied by the editorial conjunction of legal material that follows (Exod 20:1-17), but there is no explicit mention of “the giving of the law” or of any transaction to do with the making of a covenant.

Following an ascent/descent (Exod 19:20-21), the next theophany (Exod 20:18) duplicates the detail of the first theophany without the mention of “fire” but, again, Moses is with the people, “afar off” rather than up the mountain, and there is no mention of anything being given, although it is implied (again via editorial collocation) that the ten commandments were given before Moses had to return suddenly to the people.

The next theophany (“fire” — Exod 24:17) sees Moses up the mountain to receive the Law (v12), but it *follows* the covenant transaction, which takes place someway down the mountain, and at which both Moses and the elders of Israel are present. Furthermore, only tabernacle plans follow this theophany, rather than what might be considered “the Law”.

If Luke intends his readers to pick up on Sinai in his Pentecost account, he does not point them to any one episode. The right spatial relationship in which both Jesus and Moses are “up” and “give” something to the “people” does not coincide with the occurrence of the theophanic detail to which Luke is said to make an allusion (Exod 19:16).

4) Instead of inviting his readers to compare a single ascent of Moses up Sinai and the giving of the Law to Pentecost, Luke may actually invite a more general comparison between Moses and Jesus' multiple ascents to heaven after the resurrection. A typology is suggested in Jesus' cryptic remark to Herod, "Behold, I cast out demons, and I do cures today and tomorrow), and the third day I shall be perfected" (Lk 13:32). This remark describes a two-day time-period for his ministry, and then a "third day". The same lexical fragments pick out identical time periods in the Sinai account, "And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them today and tomorrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day" (Exod 19:9-10). This allusion may indicate Luke's perspective on Jesus' exorcisms, viz., that they were an anti-type to Moses' sanctifying of the people, prior to ascending the mountain to God on the third day.

The fragments, if they allude to the Exodus text, identify a "third day" upon which Moses ascended Sinai as being analogous to the period after the resurrection, which took place on the "third day" (Lk 24:7). Luke identifies an evidently symbolic period of forty days for this time in which Jesus was "teaching" the apostles (Acts 1:3), and this may allude to the forty-day periods during which Moses received tabernacle instructions and commandments from God (Exod 24:18, 34:28). Luke's account distinguishes two and possibly three ascensions of Jesus (Lk 24:51, Acts 1:9), as well as mysterious appearances and disappearances (Lk 24:31, 36). Luke's readers may therefore have seen a comparison with Moses' *multiple* ascents of Sinai and the period of the Ascension.

Accordingly, rather than equate Pentecost and Sinai, Luke's allusions suggest a comparison between the period of the Ascension and Sinai. Sinai has a narrative focus on Moses ascending and descending and bringing the commands and instructions to the people; this is Luke's record about the Ascension period. Such a comparison would be part of Luke's general presentation of Jesus as an anti-type to Moses.

5) The Ascension period is the concluding part of Jesus' ministry in relation to the disciples. Rather than comparing Pentecost to Sinai, Luke's readers are more likely to have compared Jesus' teaching throughout his ministry to the giving of a law. This is indicated by Luke's allusion to Deut 1:1 and the "words of Moses" in Jesus' final remark to the disciples in Luke 24:44. This closing Lucan epitaph sets Jesus' words as the anti-type to the Law given through Moses, and therefore it is unlikely that Luke's readers would have seen the "gift of the Spirit" as the anti-type to the gift of "the Law".

6) In terms of the *plot* of Exodus, the giving of the Spirit at Pentecost is more likely to evoke recollections of the bestowal of the Spirit upon Joshua through the laying

on of hands, in readiness for his work after Moses' departure (Deut 34:9). A typology based on this incident retains a Moses-like character role for Jesus (as in the conventional Sinai reading of Acts 2); it adds an element of "succession" (the disciples have the character-role of a "successor"), which is absent from the conventional Sinai typology; it offers a scriptural precedent for the "laying on of hands" motif in Acts; and it supplies a reason for the mention of "signs and wonders" in Acts 2:22 in connection with Jesus — such a mention of "signs and wonders" in connection with Moses immediately follows the bestowal of the Spirit upon Joshua (Deut 34:10-12). Alternatively, a comparison with the bestowal of the Spirit upon the seventy elders would be justified in terms of plot.

7) Luke's note of timing — Pentecost — may not be designed to connect with the giving of the Spirit, as most scholars suggest. It could equally provide a context for understanding the success of the disciples' initial preaching. Firstfruits was celebrated at the beginning of harvest (Exod 23:16), and the festival of "ingathering" at the end of the harvest. Luke has previously used a harvest figure to describe the mission of the seventy (Lk 10:1-2). This suggests that Luke would have conceived of the disciples at Pentecost as "labourers" in the field and the result of their preaching on this occasion (3000 converts; Acts 2:41) to be the first fruits of a future fuller harvest. Such a typology is consistent with Luke's view of "the preaching of the word" as a sowing of seed (Lk 8:11). This proposal locates the point of Luke's calendrical observation in Jewish scriptural traditions about Firstfruits, rather than contemporary Midrash upon Sinai traditions.

8) Finally, Sinai does not embody the response of praise on the part of the people. The people need cleansing (Exod 19:10), there is a danger of perishing (Exod 19:21), they are afraid (Exod 20:18), and there is the sin of the Golden Calf (Exod 32). Instead of a Sinai typology, the outburst of praise at Pentecost could have been seen as analogous to the praise delivered by the Red Sea.

In (1)-(8) we set out some typological objections to reading Sinai as a type of Pentecost. Of course, scholars have sought to draw typological parallels and it is a question of evaluating whether the evidence favours their case.

The Parallel Visions of Daniel 2 and Daniel 7

P. Wyns

It is usually taken for granted that the visions of Daniel 2 and 7 are parallel visions. Interpretive issues surrounding the "parallel" visions are further complicated by two different approaches – the critical view understands the fourth kingdom to represent

Grecian kingdoms and the traditional view understands the fourth kingdom to represent Rome.

The Critical View (4th kingdom is Greece)

Any approach to interpreting Daniel's image will inevitably be coloured by exegetical presuppositions concerning the authorship and dating of the book. If one believes Daniel to be a late pseudographic Maccabean production, then the fourth kingdom will be the Greek empire with the fractured feet equated with political alliances formed between the rival *didochai* as described in Daniel 11.

This is the accepted view in critical scholarship which equates the fourth kingdom of Daniel 2 and the fourth beast of Daniel 7 with the Syrian Greek Empire and the "little horn" of chapters 7 and 8 with the persecuting power of Antiochus Epiphanes that emerged from the Seleucid Empire.

According to the critical view the author of Daniel recorded his historic "visions" at the commencement of the Antiochene persecution. He fully expected deliverance and anticipated divine intervention in the form of the kingdom. Of course, the eschaton did not arrive in BC 164/5 nor did the expected resurrection occur (Dan.12:1-3).

The critical understanding discounts the possibility of predictive prophecy and believes Daniel to be a *prophecy ex eventu* (prophecy after the event). Accordingly, the author was accurate in his descriptions of the Greek period in which he lived (sic) but wrong in his predictions concerning the fate of the persecutor (Antiochus) and inauguration of the expected eschaton. Presumably the author was martyred shortly before Antiochus died.

The Traditional View (the 4th kingdom is Rome)

The alternative approach to Daniel 2 is also underpinned by certain exegetical presuppositions – namely an early 6th century date and authorship by the exiled Daniel. The traditional interpretation has no problem with the possibility of predicted prophecy or with supernatural phenomena. In this approach the fourth kingdom of Daniel 2 and Daniel 7 is identified with the Roman Empire.

Early Jewish and Christian interpreters favoured the Roman view¹, but as J. H. Walton remarks; "While the unanimity [in identifying the fourth empire as Rome] is

¹ In the *Apoc. Bar.* 39:1-8 (see R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), 2.501). In 2 Esd. 12:10-12, where the vision of an eagle rising from the sea is described as Rome and is equated with

startling and even impressive we must remember that these works all date to the Roman period. They therefore do not necessarily reflect an attempt at discerning the intentions of the book of Daniel but could just as easily represent reinterpretation of data to suit what was perceived as historical reality”.¹

Western Rome fell in 476 AD and the Eastern Roman Empire fell in 1453 AD. Protestant interpretations identify the Holy Roman Empire (and sometimes now the European Union) as a continuation of the fourth Beast (the ten toes stage) and the papacy with the “little horn” of Daniel.

Towards a New Paradigm

It is apparent that both the liberal and traditional interpretations have certain limitations. The fourth beast of Daniel is described but it is not **explicitly identified**; it is therefore left to **the reader** to interpret the vision (let the reader understand). The reader participates in the prophecy by applying their own understanding of scripture and history to the text, but unfortunately this also includes their exegetical biases as well as cultural and social influences. The following *a priori* parameters guide the new paradigm:

1. The book of Daniel is not pseudonymous but was written by the Jewish exile Daniel who lived until the reign of Darius Hystaspis when the prophecy was finalized. The prophecy was therefore written before the Antiochene persecution (although this does not rule out later redaction).
2. The prophecy must have **some application** to Rome as it is applied by Christ to the destruction of Jerusalem and is also employed in Revelation in a context

the fourth kingdom of Daniel; “the eagle you saw rising from the sea represents the fourth kingdom in the vision seen by your brother Daniel. But he was not given the interpretation which I am now giving you or have given you”. According to J. Goldingay this confirms that the interpretation is “a novel one unknown to Daniel” (J. Goldingay, *Daniel*, Word Biblical Commentary [Vol.30], (ed., D. Hubbard, G. Barker, J. Watts R. Martin, Nelson Reference & Electronic, 1989), 175). Josephus explicitly states, “Daniel also wrote concerning the Roman government, and that our country should be made desolate by them” (*Ant.* 10.11.7). R. Johanan in the Talmud (*b. Seb.* 20; *b. Abod. Zar.* 2b) and typical usage of Edom as a rabbinic designation for Rome, where in *Lev. Rab.* 13:5 the four rivers of Eden are likened to the four empires designated as Babylon, Media, Greece and Edom (i.e. Rome cf. *Gen. Rab.* 99).

¹ John H. Walton, “The Four Kingdoms of Daniel” *JETS* 29.1 (1986): 25-36 (27).

of Roman persecution (although it is an oversimplification to see Rome as the full eschatological realization).

3. The prophecy must have **some application** to the Syrian Greek Empire as it features large in Daniel 8 with the “removal of the daily” (sacrifice) and the “changing of the times and laws” in Daniel 7 during the Antiochene persecution as well as the description of the rival *didochai* in Daniel 11.

In the first instance, the new paradigm that is offered seems to support the traditional view (Rome) – but a major obstacle is its irrelevance to the concerns of the Babylonian exiles, particularly regarding the reinstatement of temple worship. The critical view, on the other hand, does address the question of the fate of the Sanctuary and of cultic worship – this was relevant to the Babylonian exiles who were about to rebuild the temple (under Darius Hystaspis) and who were shown that after the Persians further devastations of the Sanctuary were to be expected under the Greeks. The following interpretation will fuse the traditional and critical view in an attempt to achieve a hybrid interpretation that will answer the problems that each interpretation cannot satisfy individually.

Charles Boutflower attempted harmonizing the critical and traditional views by making a distinction between the little horn of Daniel 8 (which he understands as Antiochus Epiphanes) and little horn of Daniel 7 (which he understands as the temporal power of the Papacy).¹ However, this proposal lacks plausibility and the distinction is artificial as both visions are dated to the reign of Belteshazzar and are complimentary, highlighting different aspects of the same “little horn”.

Rather than seeking a disjunction between the vision of the “little horn” of Daniel 7 and that of Daniel 8, it is more plausible to seek a break between the vision of Daniel 2 and that of Daniel 7. The new paradigm proposes that whereas the fourth kingdom of Daniel 2 concerns Rome the fourth beast of Daniel 7 and 8 concerns Greece. In other words, although both visions (in Daniel 2 and 7) have the same departure point (Babylon) they do not run completely parallel as is normally supposed.

¹ “Fundamentally these two powers are quite different. The little horn of chap. vii. is a fresh power springing up among already existing powers, and in some way different from them, able ere long to uproot three of them and to take their place. The little horn of chap. viii. , on the other hand, is described as a horn springing out of a horn, i.e. it represents, not a fresh power, nor a different kind of power, but a fresh development of an already existing power”. C. Boutflower, *In and Around the Book of Daniel* (London: Macmillan, 1923),15.

According to the traditional *and* the critical interpretations Daniel 2 and Daniel 7 are **exactly parallel**. In both interpretations the fourth kingdom of Daniel 2 is equated with the fourth beast of Daniel 7. In the traditional view this fourth kingdom becomes Rome and in the critical view it becomes Greece.

The proposed scheme understands the fourth kingdom of Daniel 2 as essentially different from the fourth beast of Daniel 7. Although the two empires share similarities, closer examination demonstrates that these are superficial.

Schematic overview of the new paradigm

	Daniel 2	Daniel 7	Daniel 8	Empire
1	Gold	Lion		Babylonian
2	Silver	Bear (3 ribs)	Ram (2 horns)	Medo-Persian
3	Brass	Leopard (4 heads/4 wings)	Goat with 1 horn followed by 4 horns	Grecian
		4 th Beast (Iron teeth/brass claws/10 horns – Little horn uproots three)	Little horn (among 10 horns)	Greek Syrian (Antiochus Epiphanes)
4	Iron			Roman
5	Iron/clay (feet and 10 toes)			Time of the End - book of Revelation

Notes on the schema:

1. The first beast (lion) and the head of gold are virtually unanimously interpreted as Babylon. Exegetical divergence emerges with the second beast/metal.
2. Radical interpreters identify the bear (silver) with Media and traditional interpreters with the composite kingdom of Medo-Persia. Daniel itself supports the traditional understanding as the ram-kingdom has “two horns” which are the “kings of Media and Persia” with “one [horn] higher than the other and the higher coming up last” (Dan 8:3, 20). The second horn (Persia) is **longer** and arises last as it reflects the uneven relationship within the Medo-Persian entity. The bear is depicted as **lopsided** with three ribs in its mouth. The bear’s stance depicts the

uneven relationship between Median and Persian power¹ and agrees with the depiction of the ram with disproportionate horns. The Median king Cyaxerxes conquered Armenia and united the Aryan kingdoms for the **destruction of Nineveh**. Together with Babylon, Media terminated the Assyrian Empire *ca* 625 BC (cf. Jos. *Antiq.* 10.5, 1). These same kingdoms (Ararat, Minni and Ashkenhaz)² are described as uniting with the “kings of the Medes” *by Jeremiah* (Jer 51:27-29) **for the destruction of Babylon**. Radical critics assert that this did not occur in the time of Daniel as it was Persia that destroyed Babylon (not Media) and that the reference to **Darius the Mede**³ in Daniel is a fictional figure introduced to validate the expectations of the Jeremiah prophecy, namely that Babylon would be destroyed by Media (in the same manner as Nineveh had been some 87 years previously). However, Media, as an inferior partner (one side lower than the other), did partake in the destruction of Babylon, together with the three ribs that had been picked clean (Ararat, Minni and Ashkenhaz) it was instructed to stuff more meat into its mouth, “arise, devour much flesh”. In the year 550 BC, the Persians whose country lay south and south east of Media, successfully rebelled under Cyrus king of Anshan (who was supposedly the great-grandson of Cyaxerxes). Media was therefore incorporated into the Achaemenid Persian hegemony as an inferior co-ruler (this is reflected by Dan 8:3, 20 – “kings of Media and Persia”).

3. Although the third kingdom would “rule over the whole earth” (Dan 2:39), the expression is not to be regarded as universal but as a technical term for the nation of Israel (note that the kingdom of God also filled the “whole earth” - Dan 2:35). Daniel was only interested in the relationship of human empires to the future of Israel. The identification of the goat with Greece is unambiguous in Dan 8:21-22 where we are informed that the “notable horn” (Dan 8:5) is the “first king”

¹ Medieval Jewish commentators such as Rashi and Pseudo-Saadia understand the raising up on one side as the division of the Medo-Persian Empire between the Medes under Darius, who ruled first, and the Persians. Similarly, Hartman and DiLella take the “one side” as a reference to the “only Median king known to the author, ‘Darius the Mede’”. Louis F Hartman and Alexander A. DiLella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB 23; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978), 212-213.

² In the Targum to Jer 50:27, Ararat, Mini, and Ashkenaz are paraphrased by Kurdistan, Armenia, and Adiabene. They are the peoples of the Ararat mountain ranges and the areas centred round Lake Van and north of Lake Urumiah. They were buffer states on the frontier of the Assyrian Empire. Boutflower (1923:13) comments that the kingdoms of Jer 50:27 have “thus some claim to be regarded as three ribs of the carcass of the old Assyrian lion, which the voracious Medo-Persian bear finds himself not quite able to gulp down (Dan 5:5)”.

³ We identify Darius the Mede as Darius Hystaspis.

(Alexander) and that his empire would break into four. This is not in dispute and is generally accepted by critics and traditionalists alike. However, critical interpreters understand **the fourth** terrible beast (not the third Leopard beast) of Daniel 7 as the Greek empire. Critical interpretations understand the third kingdom of Daniel 7 as Persia (the four heads being four prominent kings);¹ traditional interpreters identify the Leopard as Greece and the four heads as the four *Didochai* into which it splits at the death of Alexander. Can the Leopard be more readily identified with Greece (i.e. does it parallel the Goat kingdom with four horns), than with Persia? An indication that the Leopard is the Greece of the traditional view may well be found in the description that it is the only beast of which it is said that sovereignty **was given to it** (Dan 7:6). Universal rule is also predicated of the third metallic kingdom in Dan 2:39. Josephus has Alexander state that he had a dream when he was at Dios in Macedonia in which he was encouraged by the God of the Jews not to delay in his conquest of Asia as his domination of Persia **was foreordained**. Josephus even has the high priest point out the passages in Daniel that spoke of Grecian conquest.² Our proposed schema follows the traditional interpretation in equating the brass of chapter 2, the four-headed leopard of chapter 7 and the four-horned goat of chapter 8, with the Greek kingdom and the four *Didochai* into which it subsequently fragmented. It differs from the traditional view in understanding the fourth beast of

¹ The only Persian kings known from the Bible were Cyrus, Ahasuerus (Xerxes), Artaxerxes, and “Darius the Mede”.

² *Ant.* 11.8, 5; John S. Evans observes that, “Lendering contends that most of the account [in Josephus] rings true because of details like the following: (1) the Samaritans are allowed to build their own temple, which is a plausible punishment for the Jew’s refusal to provide assistance to Alexander’s army; (2) Alexander grants no privileges to the Jews that they did not already have under the Persian kings; (3) the idea that Alexander had a vision in which the God of the Jews played an important role is just too incredible to be invented” because “everyone knew that Alexander claimed to be the son of the Egyptian god Ammon”; and (4) Alexander’s demand for auxiliaries and his willingness to allow the Jews to have the same position under him that they had under the Persians “matches the demand made by Alexander to Darius that he would address him as the master of the Persian possessions.” Evans remarks that despite Lendering’s positive evaluation of the credibility of Josephus’ account he nevertheless adopts a dating of 165 BC for Daniel. Evans concludes; “Yet we can be reasonably certain that Josephus, a first-century AD Jew who was born shortly after the ministry of Christ, did not invent the story about Alexander’s visit to Jerusalem out of the blue and that the Jews of his day accepted the truthfulness of this story and believed in the Book of Daniel’s prophetic character.” John S. Evans, *The Prophecies of Daniel 2* (Xulon Press, 2008), 40-41.

chapter 7 as a subset, or a digression on the Greek kingdom. Of the four *Didochai* only two were of interest to the future of Israel – the Seleucid and Ptolemaic dynasties (kings of the north and south), with particular concentration on the Syrian Greek (Seleucid) dynasty that persecuted the nation. At this point the proposed schema is essentially in agreement with the critical view in identifying the fourth beast with the Syrian Greek empire and the little horn with Antiochus Epiphanes – where this schema differs from both the traditional *and* liberal view is that the fourth beast of chapter 7 does not parallel the fourth metal of the image in chapter 2. The fourth beast is unique in that it is **the only beast – that also has metal**. The fourth beast has elements of the fourth metal (iron teeth) and it also has elements of the previous metal (brass claws). It is obviously intended that the reader identifies the fourth beast with the metallic image-empires of chapter 2, which is why the hybrid monster has metallic appendages – but the correlation is deliberately unspecific, precluding complete identification *with either one or the other empire* of chapter 2 but containing *elements of both*. Therefore, the brass (Greek) empire of chapter 2 includes the split into four (Greek) empires in chapter 7 (Leopard with four heads) and chapter 8 (Goat with four horns) and subsequently focuses attention on the Syrian Greek empire (fourth beast) and the Antiochene protagonist (Little horn) of chapter 7 and 8.

4. The iron empire in our schema follows the traditional view in being Roman. Rome was defeated by the Parthians and Babylonia, Media and Persia *all remained outside the Roman Empire*. Under the proposed schema the fourth metal (Rome) is not analogous with the fourth beast (Greek Syrian).

5. The last stage does not depict an empire but rather a fractured alliance that lacks cohesion. The idea is one of division – a loose alliance (or co-existence?) that will not hold together just as the mixture of iron and clay cannot cling together – it has no tensile strength and is so weak that it will disintegrate at the slightest challenge. This alliance contains elements of the previous Roman Empire but is not Rome. Such elements may include Israel and Syria (previous Roman protectorates) but also elements of Euphrates clay (such as Iraq or Iran?).¹ The traditional view

¹ The first century situation is instructive and perhaps typical. After the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70, the Jews had two focal points: the Exilarch in Parthian controlled Babylon and the Sanhedrin in Roman controlled Palestine. The Parthians, perhaps earlier contented to allow local Jewry to receive instruction from Jerusalem, certainly took advantage of the change in Palestinian politics and the anti-Roman turn in Jewish world opinion, to establish local control of Jewry under close supervision. In the next century Jews were the most loyal supporters of the Parthian cause against Trajan, Septimus, Severus and Alexander Severus. In Palestine, circles

regards this as the remains of the Holy Roman Empire but an interpretation that disregards the context of the Middle East with Israel at the epicentre is hardly plausible. Daniel's only interest was the fate of his people and the reinstatement of Temple worship.

Most critical commentaries see here a reference to one or the other of the interdynastic marriages of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, the first being that of Antiochus II to Bernice in 252 BC the second being that of Ptolemy Epiphanes to Cleopatra, daughter of Antiochus III, in 193-192 BC. They correlate these unions with the marriages mentioned in Dan 11:6, 7. It is very probable that the author wishes the reader to recognise a link – but the link is purely thematic and typical. By that we mean that mingling with the seed of men in Dan 2:43 reflects intermarriage between the “sons of God and daughters of men”, a recurrent OT motif found in Genesis (Gen 6:2), repeated by Solomon (1 Kgs 11:1) and the returning exiles in the time of Ezra-Nehemiah (Ezra 10:2). It was also a problem in the Maccabean era, when covenants were made with the gentiles. This establishes a conventional narrative pattern that describes Jewish-gentile relations.

The eschatological vision of Daniel 2 consummates the end of human history (Dan 2:44); in contrast the Greek Syrian empire of Daniel 7 was not destroyed by the stone, nor did that empire see the in-breaking of the universal rule of God or the resurrection (cf. Dan 12:1-3). However, the destruction of the image had a first century fulfilment - the stone cut without hands (a euphemism for the supernatural origins of the Messiah) marked the in-breaking of divine sovereignty and the crucifixion and the resurrection (of Christ the first fruits cf. Dan 12:1-3) was not only a judgment on sin, but also on the deification of human power (institutionalized religion, imperialism, etc) and it resulted in the grinding and dispersal of Israel, like chaff to the four winds. The Christ-event is proleptic of the apocalyptic moment foreseen in Nebuchadnezzar's dream-omnia.¹ The rapid

of Jewish Messianists (the Bar Kochba revolt) were prepared to cooperate with the Parthians against Rome. The Bar Kochba revolt (second Jewish war, 132-135 AD) marked three and a half years of Jewish independence from Rome until the final destruction and dispersal of Judea. So-ended the alliance between the formerly iron state of Israel and the Parthian clay.

¹ That the resurrection of Christ had eschatological implications cannot be doubted: “And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised; and coming out of the graves after his resurrection, they went into the holy city and appeared to many” (Matt 27:52-53).

growth of Christianity was the commencement of a process that removed one mountain (the temple mount cast into the gentile sea cf. Matt 21:21; 43-44) to replace it with the mountain of God (Dan 2:35).

“You watched while a stone was cut out without hands, which struck the image on its feet of iron and clay and broke them in pieces. Then the iron, the clay, the bronze, the silver, and the gold were crushed together, and became like chaff from the summer threshing floors; the wind carried them away so that no trace of them was found. And the stone that struck the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth” (Dan 2:34-35).

“If you say to this mountain, 'Be removed and be cast into the sea,' it will be done” (Matt 21:21)

“Therefore, I say to you, the kingdom of God will be taken from you and given to a nation bearing the fruits of it. And whoever falls on this **stone will be broken; but on whomever it falls, it will grind him to powder**” (Matt.21; 43-44).

Israel emerged from the wilderness of the Babylonian exile (cf. Ezek 20:35) and compromised herself with the surrounding nations, both in the Maccabean era and also with first century Rome. John saw this clearly in the book of Revelation when he described the re-emergence of the composite Daniel beast (Rev 17:3). It ended in the first century with a repeat of Israel being dispersed in the wilderness of the people. The mountain building process is therefore not continuous - the process has only recently re-commenced with the return of the Diaspora and the establishment of the nation of Israel. It is a process that is yet incomplete as it awaits another supernatural intervention by the stone. The destruction of the image in Daniel 2 had an “already/not yet” realization in the first century but can only achieve finalization at the Second Advent. The proportionality of the image fits a first century setting; understanding the legs as a continuous expression of Roman rule (in its different aspects) would extend them from 65BC to the present – making the legs nearly four times longer than the body section – a strange image indeed! Many of the Danielic prophecies have either a dual fulfilment or are discontinuous (or contain both elements).

To summarise:

Traditional	Critical	Proposed
Babylon	Babylon	Babylon
Medo-Persia	Media	Medo-Persia
Greek	Persia	Greek + Greek Syrian (chaps. 2, 7-8)
Roman (chaps. 2, 7-8)	Greek (chap. 2, 7-8)	Roman (chap. 2)
Holy Roman (chap. 2, 7-8)	Greek Syrian	First Century + End time (Rev.)

The Fourth Kingdom of chapter 2 and chapter 7

Although the iron kingdom and the terrible beast share similarities, closer examination reveals the similarities to be superficial. The emphasis in Daniel 2 is strength (iron) that degenerates into division and instability (iron/clay). In Daniel 7 the emphasis is on the unique character (diverse from all kingdoms) of the terrible beast, in particular his ruthlessness (stamp the residue/tread down/break in pieces the earth) which culminates in the persecutions of the little horn. The fourth kingdom is different to all the others because of its aggressive stance towards the Jews, particularly against their religion. Such anti-Semitism could not be attributed to Nebuchadnezzar (even though he destroyed the temple), certainly not against the Persians or even the Romans.¹ The business end of the beast in Daniel 7 has Roman (iron teeth) and Greek (brass claws) characteristics. It is suggested that the instruments of aggression represent the Greek Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes, who passed fifteen years of his life as a hostage in Rome (1 Mac 1:10) – the “teeth” and “claws” of the terrible beast are therefore synonymous with the “little horn” – who was a product of Rome and Greece and who epitomized the aggressive, destructive, anti-Semitic aspect of the persecuting power. The “little horn” stands against the “Prince of Princes” (Michael) and is broken without hand (Dan 8:25); his demise is supernatural. There are three accounts of his death in the books of the Maccabees (1 Macc.6:1-17; 2 Macc.1:14-16; 2 Macc.9:1-29). Although there are significant differences in the accounts they agree that he was not killed during his failed attempt to rob the temple at Elymais but died shortly afterwards. Perhaps the most pertinent account to Daniel is found in 2 Macc.9:1-29,

“Thus, he who had just been thinking that he could command the waves of the sea, in his superhuman arrogance, and imagining that he could weigh the high mountains in a balance, was brought down to earth and

¹ Paradoxically, the Roman emperor Nero persecuted the Christians and had the characteristics of the little horn.

carried in a litter, making the power of God manifest to all. And so, the ungodly man's body swarmed with worms, and while he was still living in anguish and pain, his flesh rotted away, and because of his stench the whole army felt revulsion at his decay. Because of his intolerable stench no one was able to carry the man who a little while before had thought that he could touch the stars of heaven. Then it was that, broken in spirit, he began to lose much of his arrogance and to come to his senses under the scourge of God, for he was tortured with pain every moment. And when he could not endure his own stench, he uttered these words: "It is right to be subject to God, and no mortal should think that he is equal to God" (2 Macc 9:8-12).

That the "little horn" is of Greek Syrian origins is confirmed by echoes and allusions to the Isaiah oracle:

Daniel	Isaiah
"Shall destroy (corrupt) wonderfully" (Dan.8:24)	"His name shall be wonderful counsellor" (Isa. 9:6)
"By peace destroy (corrupt) many" (Dan.8:25)	"Prince of peace" (Isa. 9:6)
"And his power shall be mighty" (Dan.8:24)	"Mighty God" (Isa. 9:6)

Antiochus is contrasted with the messianic attributes found in Isaiah 9; he becomes the antithesis of messiah - the anti-Christ of the OT. The book of Daniel plays on the Syrian/Assyrian connections with references to the Isaiah oracle, making it unlikely that the "little horn" is anything other than the Syrian enemy Antiochus. For the Danielic author the **Syrian** corruption of the priesthood and desecration of the Sanctuary (under Antiochus) was but a repeat of earlier abuses encouraged by **Assyria** (2 Kgs 16:10-16). Further, the destruction of the fourth beast does not result in the establishment of the eschaton as we are informed that, although they are deprived of their sovereignty, the other beasts **have their lives prolonged** (Dan 7:12). This implies that sovereignty may be temporarily restored at some future time. It is suggested that this imagery is picked up in Revelation which describes a composite beast in Danielic terms. A series of contacts *and* contrasts is found between the fourth kingdom and the fourth beast/little horn:

Daniel 2	Daniel 7+8
Iron (fourth kingdom)	Iron teeth and brass claws (fourth beast)
Whole image destroyed	Fourth Beast destroyed others allowed to live for a time
Destroyed by a stone	Prince of the Host; Prince of Princes (Michael); One like a son of man
Stone cut without hand	Enemy broken without hand
Heavenly kingdom set up in the days of those kings (10 kings)	The time came that the people of the saints possessed the kingdom

In Daniel 2 the whole image is destroyed (including the fourth kingdom) and completely obliterated (no prolonging of life for a season) and replaced with God's sovereignty. The phrase; "cut without hand" (Dan 2:34) and "broken without hand" (Dan 8:25) are not analogous as the former refers to the supernatural origins of the stone and the latter to the supernatural intervention that destroys the little horn. Only God has the prerogative to change "times and seasons" (Dan 2:21) but the little horn seeks to change "times and laws" (Dan 7:25). Once again, these expressions are not synonymous, the former referring to divine providence (God sets up and removes kings) the latter to attempts by Antiochus to corrupt the festal calendar and the Law of Moses by removing the daily sacrifice and desecrating the Sanctuary. Similarly, the phrase; "And the kingdom.... shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High" (Dan 7:27), is not necessarily comparable with the kingdom that the God of heaven sets up (Dan 2:44). The "kingdom" of Dan 7:27 (although the passage is eschatological) is in the first instance the "pleasant land" of Dan 8:9 – the land of Israel which was subject to the persecutions of the little horn (Antiochus Epiphanes).

The Kingdom of Daniel 2 and Daniel 7

It is an oversimplification to understand the establishment of the kingdom in Daniel 2 as only occurring at the end of the historical continuum. It is far more than a particular moment at the "End of Days", for the in-breaking of divine sovereignty often occurs in the middle of history as it did with the "already/not yet" fulfilment of the ministry of Christ. The promise that the kingdom/reign of God/heaven will come/is near/has arrived is therefore a structural key to redemptive history. The first century glimpsed an outworking of the destruction of human power - universal history ended in universal judgment on the cross. That is not to say that the kingdom of God in its fullness has already been established as that is patently untrue, it is a recognition of apocalyptic thought patterns that make the present time subservient to the "End of Days", that rest on the tension between present reality

and future fulfilment - that allow historical events to take on meaning beyond their temporal significance.

This is particularly true of Daniel 7 where the end of time arrives in the middle of history. The destruction of the Greek Syrian Empire under the “little horn” Antiochus was such an apocalyptic moment. Robert Hamerton-Kelly observes;

“This identification of the centre of history with the end, is the identification of a spatial with a temporal concept, “here and now” with “then and there.” For most of us the promise of “then and there” is enough. Time attests our human frailty with respect to the appropriation of reality. We must, because of that frailty, be content to receive reality in “coffee spoonfuls” as TS Eliot puts it, dribs and drabs from time to time, because we cannot bear too much. We are time bound and reality comes to us along the trajectory of that bondage. Ultimately when the timeline ends, we go “face to face” (1 Corinthians 13:12), but in the mean time we, like the old time “remittance man”, receive our periodic allowance. The mystic, or revelator, or prophet, on the other hand, has episodes of direct contact with the really real, and is thus able to keep the rest of us informed and encouraged. The Incarnation of God as the authentically human gives us all a glimpse of the real, enables us to anticipate and enjoy, and therefore is the apocalyptic event par excellence, the end of history. Since it has occurred in the midst of time, it has the proleptic status, of the “already but not yet,” already in substance but not yet in duration”.¹

The in-breaking of the apocalyptic moment was referred to by Jesus during his trial when, in response to his accusers, he alluded to Dan 7:13 (Matt 26:64); “Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man...” This is understood by H.A. Whittaker as referring to a spiritual and mental grasp of truth concerning Jesus.² The little horn of Daniel 7 also forms the basis for the description of the Beast in Revelation 13. Moreover, in Revelation 12 we read of a battle between Michael and a dragon with seven heads and ten horns. The ten horns obviously derive from the fourth beast of Daniel 7.

¹ Robert Hamerton-Kelly, “Politics and Apocalypse: An Introductory Essay” [Online].

² H. A. Whittaker, *Studies in the Gospels* (Biblia,1989),742, notes that a similar formula (shall ye see) is used in John 1:51 and in John 14:7. However, this does not rule out the possibility that his accusers actually saw a vision of the risen Christ coming in judgment when Jerusalem was destroyed in AD 70.

Michael fights the dragon, although in the following passage the credit for the victory is given to the followers of Christ. The conflict vision in Revelation 12 is influenced by the antithesis of the “one like a son of man” and demonstrates at least a functional analogy between the archangel Michael and the figure in Daniel’s vision. Imagery from Daniel 7 is constantly re-employed by the Johannine Apocalypse because it had a dual reference; it was relevant to the first century *and* to the “End of Days.” The in-breaking of the kingdom was therefore seen in the time of Antiochus, seen in the first century at the trial/crucifixion/resurrection of Christ, and seen at the destruction of Jerusalem in 70. However, none of these apocalyptic “moments” exhausted the visions which still await their final consummation at the return of Christ.

Conclusion

The visions in Daniel 2 and Daniel 7 do not run completely parallel. Whereas the Fourth kingdom of Daniel 2 is Rome, the Fourth beast of Daniel 7 is the Greek Syrian Empire under the Antiochene dynasty. Antiochus Epiphanes is the “little horn” of chapter 7 and 8. The image of Daniel 2 had an “already/not yet” realization in the first century but can only reach true fulfilment at the second advent (with Israel back in the land); this conclusion is reinforced by the reuse of similar imagery in Revelation. Although the destruction of the Fourth beast occurred in 168 BC, the event has eschatological, one might say supra-historical overtones, and the “little horn” functions as a type of the anti-Christ. **Only in this sense** do the two events (destruction of the image/judgement of the fourth beast/little horn) have parallels, for although these events are spatially and temporally different, in essence they are a singular apocalyptic episode.

Reviews

The Priesthood of Some Believers
Colin Bulley (Paternoster, 2000)
Review by P. Wyns

Introduction

Colin Bulley introduces his book with a foreword from David F. Wright (New College, University of Edinburgh): “At the beginning of the third millennium of the history of Christianity, churches of different traditions are endeavouring with sharper seriousness to foster patterns of ministry and leadership less reliant on ordained priests and pastors. This has entailed reconsideration of the general priesthood of all Christian people and the notion of a special priesthood of the ordained alone. It is to this continuing enquiry that Colin Bulley’s work is a major contribution of front-rank importance...If general priesthood is to increase, special priesthood must decrease. Here is solid, scholarly evidence that, like the proverbial cuckoo in the nest, the two will not comfortably co-habit.”

Developments from General to special priesthood

In analysing the development of the special priesthood of the ordained and the general priesthood of all believers, five themes become central to the author’s examination; “**First**, the evidence of the first three centuries, **second**, whether the distinction between the clergy and the laity is essential, functional, or at all valid; **third**, the part that the priesthood should play in the understanding of the ordained, whether it is central and defining, important but less comprehensive than our understandings, or unhelpful compared with other understandings; **fourth**, how the priesthood of the ordained should be understood and where it is derived from, i.e., whether it is essentially different from, and superior to, the general priesthood, and involving an ontological transformation into participation in Christ’s priesthood and mediation, enabling the priest to bring about the Eucharistic sacrifice and to rule, or derives solely from the church’s participation in Christ’s priesthood and concentrates that participation, or again derives from both Christ’s and the church’s priesthood and represents both; and, **fifth**, on what basis it is biblically and theologically justified, apostolic succession from Christ, Paul’s use of cultic imagery for his apostolic mission, the sacrificial understanding of the eucharist, derivation from Christ’s or the church’s priesthood, its role in building up the church’s priesthood, analogy with the Levitical priesthood, development guided by the Spirit, or universal need.” (p. 316)

Colin Bulley finds the New Testament evidence for a special priesthood unconvincing; “There is no clear evidence of the succession of church leaders by

ordination from the apostles and the high priesthood of Christ.” (p. 317) The author examines Galot’s exegetical arguments that Christ performed a new act of creation resulting in a new, ontological priesthood and comments, “The gospel of Mark writes, ‘And he *made* twelve’ (Mk. 3:14) but Bulley points out that it should probably be translated as *appointed*,¹ as would be perfectly natural in the other cases of this verb with a personal object cited by Galot..... The saying in Matthew 19:28 which has the disciples ‘rule over the New Israel’ is understood by Galot to refer to the life of the church but Bulley rightly points out that we are not dealing with realized eschatology but with future eschatology (such as Rev.3.21 and 20.4), texts that refer to future rule with Christ.....none of the passages clearly implies, much less explicitly states, the priesthood of the Twelve.....” (pp. 21-22)

Neither does Bulley believe that Paul’s use of cultic imagery required that he saw himself as more priestly than any other Christian. His attention focuses on Romans 15:15-16 which, according to most scholars, demonstrates that Paul understood his apostolate as a kind of priesthood.

Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly unto you in some sort, as putting you in mind, because of the grace that is given to me of God, that I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit.

However, Bulley sees no difference between Paul’s ministry and the function of the general priesthood in I Peter 2:9, where “preaching the gospel” is also part of the specification of the “Spiritual sacrifices” offered by the believer (I Peter 2:5). He concludes that the references to Paul’s self-sacrifice in Phil 2.17 and 2 Tim 4.6 do not “indicate in either [passage] that it is viewed as peculiar to an apostle rather than a particular instance of the self-giving to God Paul urges on all Christians in Romans 12:1.” (pp. 24-25)

¹ Under the ‘priesthood’ of the twelve Bulley means the ‘special ordained’ priesthood – not the ‘general priesthood’ (royal priesthood) of all believers referred to by Peter. The Johannine literature has Jesus declaring; “I have kept them in thy name: those that thou **gavest** me” (John 17:12). The allusion is to Genesis 3:12 where Adam had been “given” a bride. God performed the initial act of creation, which was transformed into a “new creation” in Christ. Believers are therefore essentially a bride community. Bulley is therefore correct in understanding ‘made] as ‘appointed’, not as created as proposed by Galot.

Anglo-Catholics.... Justify the application of priestly language to the ordained on the basis of the part they play in the Eucharistic sacrifice and so in Christ's priesthood. (p. 16) But Bulley concludes that although the Eucharist was understood to have sacrificial connotations, no one person was considered more priestly than others because he presided at it. (p. 317)

Bulley also examines the remaining argument that the ordained priesthood developed after the NT canon under the guidance and inspiration of the Spirit. He rejects this option because the Spirit gifts were widely dispersed among believers – he concludes that this would enhance, rather than diminish, the general priesthood of all believers (and therefore diminish the 'special priesthood'). The author suggests that the ordained priesthood arose between '150 and 200, possibly later' and that Cyprian marked the watershed in the priesthood of the ordained (p. 111). Bulley notes that the two forms of priesthood co-existed in the time of Tertullian, who stressed the continuity between them both, but the fact that ordinary Christians could also baptise etc., led to tensions between the two.¹ It is only natural that this tension should lead to a separation between the general and special priesthoods; Bulley demonstrates how, especially from c.200 (p. 279) the ordained increasingly took over the power and public ministry in the church at the same time as their priesthood was being taught and emphasized, while the laity lost power and opportunities for public ministry as their priesthood was being devalued and/or largely ignored.

Discussion

Bulley remarks that, "the use of cultic language for Christ, the church and the individual Christian continued throughout [the first three centuries], echoing and developing the NT's allusions to their priesthood, sacrifices, and likeness to the temple as God's dwelling-places, with increasing references **to the OT sacrificial system.....it is often related to the OT Levitical priesthood and regulations for it.**"²

One area that is neglected in the discussion of general priesthood verses special priesthood is the theology of priesthood in the OT. The apostle Peter describes the general priesthood of believers in 1 Peter 2:9 in terms culled from Exod 19:5-6 – "a royal priesthood, a holy nation." It was the divine intention that the **whole nation**

¹ *Ibid*, p.162, see also p.68 and Tertullian's question: 'For are not we lay people also priests?'

² *Ibid*, p.318, Bulley believes that the rise of Gnosticism forced a re-evaluation of the Old Testaments relevance for the church (and obvious over compensation on priestly matters).

of Israel became a nation of king-priests.¹ The OT envisages a *general* priesthood which is also a *'royal' priesthood*; obviously a reference to the Melchizedek priesthood, **not the Levitical priesthood**. The necessity for a “special priesthood” was produced by the nation’s sin in the golden-calf incident. The tribe of Levi were consecrated and blessed because of their faithfulness (Exod 32:29). In this context, the “special priesthood” of the Levites should be understood as a degeneration of the divine ideal, namely the “general priesthood” of the entire nation, which was the preferred model based on the Melchizedek priestly function. The “special priesthood” failed almost immediately when the sons of Aaron contaminated the sanctuary, which necessitated the introduction of the Day of Atonement in order to re-consecrate the sanctuary and the priesthood (as the people’s representatives). The later prophets even threaten the withdrawal of the priestly blessing from the tribe of Levi (Mal.2:1-2 cf. Gen.49:5-7).

From Psalm 110:4 we gather that the Melchizedek priesthood was by appointment (an oath) and was therefore not an hereditary office. It also united the royal and sacerdotal roles – that of king/priest into one office (cf. Zech 6:13). Sometimes it is stated that the qualification “eternal” (*'ôlām*) used as an attribute for the Melchizedek priesthood (Ps.110.4) is also used to define Aaron’s priesthood (Exod 29:9). This does not however take the nominative use of *'ôlām* into account. The requirements of conditional covenants are described as “perpetual” in that, for example, the Siniatic covenant and Aaronic priesthood is understood as “a perpetual ordinance” (*buqqat 'ôlām*) this is in relation to the **regular observance** of the ordinance rather than the temporal-spatial dimension of the covenant (everlasting or eternal). Many of these prescriptions were to be **kept regularly** – feasts such as Passover, Sabbath

¹ The nation of Israel was effectively **a world government in waiting**. It seems that the 70 elders were chosen at Sinai (Exod 24:9-11) to mirror the “divine council” in heaven, whose 70 angels administered the 70 Gentile nations enumerated in the table of nations of Genesis 10. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan harmonizes the divergent readings of the MT (“sons of Israel”) and the LXX (“angels of God”) of Deut 32:8 by stating that the boundaries of the nations were determined by dividing humanity “among the seventy angels, the princes of the nations” at the time of the dispersion at the Tower of Babel; at the same time “He established the limit of the nations, according to the sum of the number of the seventy souls of Israel who went down into Egypt” (*Targum Onkelos* follows the MT). It is clear then, that the 70 elders of Israel were not just judges over Israel, but effectively a world government in waiting, with God dwelling in their midst (in the Tabernacle). The situation on earth was a reflection of the situation in heaven – the heavenly divine council administrating world affairs with Israel the instrument of that outworking on earth. Everything in heaven had its counterpart on earth, including the sanctuary.

keeping, lighting the lamps, blowing the trumpets as well as ordaining Aaronic Priests were *reoccurring requirements* (perpetual ordinances) of the Sinai covenant. The Sinai covenant and the Levitical priesthood are obviously not everlasting as they have been abolished and no longer exist.

When the nominative of *’ôlām* is used to modify a verb, sometimes standing alone, but usually with prepositions *l-* or *’ad* the nominative essentially means “his/her whole life.” “That they may believe thee [Moses] for ever” (Exod 19.9) – (*l ’ôlām*); “..that he [the child Samuel] may appear before the Lord, and there [at the tabernacle] abide for ever (*’ad ’ôlām*)” – for the rest of his life (I Sam 1:22); “The Lord is witness between me and you forever” (*’ad ’ôlām*) that God oversee the vow all their lives (I Sam 20:15). The same expression is used in Ps 110:4 “a priest forever, in the order of Melchizedek.” The recipient of the oath (a king) is promised a royal prerogative to exercise priestly power for the rest of his life. The argument from Hebrews seems to be that because Jesus’ now lives eternally, and the oath pertains to the rest of his life, the Melchizedek priesthood is therefore an eternal priesthood.¹

L. D. Hurst, sums it up as follows:

“For this writer [to the Hebrews] Melchizedek and Christ are priests “continually” (*eis to diēnekes*, Heb 7:3; *eis ton aiona*, Heb.7:24). F. L. Horton and D. M. Hay have correctly perceived that the burden of Hebrews 7:13-28 is the question of priesthood rather than that of any divine qualities. This then puts the expositor into a position to understand the author’s distinctive use of Melchizedek. The question he is asking is, What is the basis of the respective OT priesthoods? Since Aaron’s was founded on an external system of rules and regulations, his days as priest were numbered: they commenced with the initiatory rite (when the Levite reached a certain age –thirty) and were terminated by death. Melchizedek’s days as priest had no such temporally conditioned beginning, insofar as they were rooted in the eternal will of God. It is important to recognise that the phrases “no beginning of days” and “no end of life” are not strictly parallel. One looks backward, drawing the readers’ attention to a superior priesthood within God’s predestining purposes; the other looks forward, impelling the readers to consider the afterlife. While “no end of life” includes the idea of perpetual priesthood, it widens in scope to include the resurrection life itself.”²

¹ See NIDOTTE #6409.

² G. H. Guthrie, *Dictionary of the Later New Testament & Its Developments* (ed., R.P. Martin & P. H. Davids, IVP, 1997), 965.

The NT (and OT) ideal of priesthood is therefore based on the divine ideal, which is the “general priesthood” modelled on a Christological Melchizedek function. However, as we have noted, a Melchizedek priest can only be appointed by an oath (directly by God) and can only exercise an unlimited priesthood by the power of the resurrection life. The question remains how this office can be conferred on mortals and translated into a general priesthood of believers. The answer must be that the believer shares in the resurrection life, the priesthood, and the power of the kingdom by baptism (identification) with Christ. The believers become both individual (the members) and corporately (the body) representatives of Christ in his priestly function and in every other way. This type of congregational priesthood must be understood along the lines of realized eschatology (already/not yet) – the Christian is already in “heavenly places” (Eph 2:6) with Christ, but the full realization of the Christian’s priesthood can only occur after the resurrection and judgment.

The “general priesthood” of Christians is therefore directly linked to participation “in Christ”; the token of this is baptism into Christ and partaking of the Eucharist (symbolic of his body). The “bread and wine” is symbolic of the believer’s unity (with Christ) and is also a memorial of his sacrifice. The Christian is therefore constantly reminded of his fellowship with Christ (and with fellow Christians) and of the price paid for reconciliation and continued forgiveness of sin. However, the Eucharist also has eschatological significance as it holds the promise of the resurrection life typified by the messianic banquet. It is therefore fitting that the enigmatic Melchizedek offers Abram “bread and wine” and blesses him in the name of El Elyon ‘possessor of heaven and earth’ (Gen 14:18-19). Significantly it is now Jesus who declares; “All power is given me in heaven and earth” when he commissions the eleven to “make disciples **of all nations**” (Mt 28:19).¹ The Lukan account of the commission (Lk 24:47-52) also alludes to the Melchizedek blessing and the linked motif of *all nations*.² The doctrine of royal priesthood with its

¹ [ED AP]: The article in the last issue on Matt 28:19 showed that the baptismal formula is all about making a temple of believers.

² The priestly blessing was pronounced by Melchizedek on Abraham (Abram) outside of Jerusalem (the King’s dale *cf.* 2 Sam 18:18) after the defeat of the Gentile confederation. In Luke the blessing and commission to preach to the Gentiles occurs outside Jerusalem at Bethany, which means the place of date palms, and is reminiscent of the 70 palms (gentile nations?) and twelve wells (Israel?) at the Elim campsite (Exod 15:27). During his ministry Jesus sent 70 disciples on a preaching/healing mission (Lk 10:1), this ostensibly anticipates the later mission to the Gentile nations.

corporate, Christological essence and function of spiritual sacrifice is therefore the Biblical model, rather than the individualistic ‘special priesthood’ with its false division between ordained and laity, which is loosely based on the Levitical model.

Particularly relevant to this discussion is the summary offered by Malcolm Yarnell in his paper, “Congregational Priesthood and the Inventio or Invention of Authority”:

“In the early church, the priesthood of all believers was diminished as the special priesthood of the clergy rose to prominence. The administration of the life-giving sacraments was eventually confined to the clerical priesthood. Lay attempts at separation from the clerical priesthood were believed to invite divine disapproval. Over the centuries, the priesthood in the Western Church was attached to the rising authority of the papacy. Popes and papal apologists claimed ever greater powers for the Roman bishop. The Roman emperor’s office of *pontifex maximus* was granted to the pope; the pope claimed Italian territories on the basis of a spurious donation from Constantine; the pope, not satisfied with the title of “vicar of Peter,” eventually claimed the title of “vicar of Christ,” and when that was not sufficient, he claimed the title, “vicar of God.” By the time of Innocent III, the pope had become the royal priest *par excellence*. At the local level, the priest dispensed the presence of Christ in the host which he had made through the miracle of transubstantiation with his apotropaic powers. The host, which embodied the presence of Christ, brought with it soteriological power for the living and the dead, and various mundane powers for the needs of the living, from the quelling of riots to the putting out of fires. Besides having the power to confect God’s body, the priest was seen as actually becoming Christ in the Mass and its sacrificial service. Of course, one could not become a priest except through ordination by a bishop, and one could not become a bishop except with papal approval. The power over spiritual life was confined to the priesthood and their life-giving sacraments, and the episcopate held the power over the priesthood, and the papacy held power over the episcopate. The ecclesiastical hierarchy had defined and confined Jesus for its own purposes. Martin Luther was the first major theologian to proclaim that the Roman Catholic doctrine of the priesthood had diverged from the witness of Scripture. He believed that the Roman priesthood had become the powerful tool of the Antichrist to keep German Christians in ignorance and subjection. In response, he asserted that all Christians were priests and the clergy was substantially indistinct from the laity. The Lord’s Supper was not a re-presenting of the sacrifice of Christ, and salvation was dependent on faith in Christ alone. Clergy were simply authorized to act on behalf of the Church and could be disciplined by it. The Reformation doctrine of the priesthood of all believers was a political catastrophe for the Roman system. With the loss of soteriological power and

its attendant financial and political authority, it is no wonder people were put to death by the Romanists for questioning the received definition of priesthood. The powerful presence of Jesus in the priesthood was relocated to other parts of the Christian community by the Reformers, most often to the magistrate or the presbyterate.”¹

Although many denominations retain a ‘special’ priesthood, it is predominately within the Catholic community that a hierarchical ecclesiology is strenuously defended (for obvious reasons). The NT does contain a hierarchy with the twelve apostles appointing seven others (to serve at tables Acts 6:1-6) and with Paul acknowledged as the apostle to the Gentiles. The earliest Christian congregations were the counterparts of the Jewish synagogues, albeit of a more charismatic nature. The term bishop (*episkopos*) is used only in later documents with the exception of Phil 1.1; the other passages are Acts 1:20; 20:28; I Peter 2:25; I Timothy 3:1-2; Titus 1:7. The word *episkopos* and its cognates, refers primarily to caring for something or someone. Similarly, the term deacon (*diakonos*) has the meaning ‘servant’, especially in the sense of one who waits on tables. Bishops and Deacons were a specific group of leaders who look out for the well-being of the larger church, however,

“There is no further indication of how they might have functioned. The Pastorals associate certain responsibilities with the office. The *episkopos* is a teacher, a good host, possesses only one wife, is above reproach, and perhaps is good in a debate (Titus 1:7); there is no evidence that this overseer had responsibility outside the local church.”²

Commenting on church order and government in the apostolic age, K. N. Giles comments,

“But alongside the apostles and later the elders Luke has charismatically endowed ministers of the word active in preaching and teaching, whom he generally calls prophets.... Neither apostles, elders nor prophets are drawn as leaders of house churches. It seems rather that the owner of the home presided when believers assembled, as did the ‘ruler of the synagogue’, and people present contributed freely as the Spirit led.... Luke never suggests that particular congregations were autonomous.” Giles concludes that, “both institutional and charismatic forms of ministry were present from the

¹ *Journal for Baptist Theology and Ministry* 3/1 (Spring 2005): 110-135. [Available online].

² J. A. Overman, “Bishop” in *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* (ed., B. M. Metzger & M. D. Coogan, Oxford University Press, 1993), 91.

beginning, but gradually the more institutional forms came to prevail. Jewish communal and organizational ideas were taken over by the early Christians but changed along the way. For example, terminology was often altered. The word *synagōgē* was replaced by *ekklēsia*, although both words by the first century bore much the same meaning. Likewise it seems the title *archisynagōgos* became *episkopos* when used of a house church leader, and their assistants were not called *hypēretai* but *diakonoī*, while later *archōn* was replaced by a new usage of the term *episkopos*. But the dynamic presence of the Holy Spirit also brought other changes, notably a renewed outbreak of the prophetic ministry, which flowered for a while and then waned. Christians and Jews met in small groups, but for both their collective and universal communal identity as those obedient to the law [for Jews], or those subject to Christ, was always to the fore. For this reason early Christianity always allowed for trans-congregational leadership of differing kinds.”¹

Conclusion

Bulley concludes that, “only Christ and Christians in general and individually are understood in priestly terms in the NT, and ideas are found there which undercut conceptions of a peculiarly priestly group within the church, except for the possibility of leaders representing the whole church’s priestliness” (p. 321). Bulley cites N. T. Wright, “...since the ordained are baptized members of the church they necessarily share in the priesthood of the whole church. This makes their priesthood no different from that of the rest of the church, a view reflected in Wright’s contention that ‘we have no New Testament warrant for attributing to specific individuals a priestly function that goes beyond the range of functions appropriate to the priesthood of all the faithful.’ And later: ‘it is my contention that the New Testament’s failure to designate ministers as priests, that is, to distinguish them qua priests in any way from the general Christian priesthood, must lead us to conclude that no-one in the body partakes in the priestly ministry of the risen Christ in a way that is different from the rest of the body’s participation in it.’” (p. 16)

Probably the most important aspect of this book is its emphasis on the damage that the ‘special priesthood’ has done to the vitality of the church; “Indeed, it seems arguable that it is likely that any understanding of a special priesthood will detract from that of a general priesthood....it follows that the inherent priestliness of those recognised and accepted as leaders in the church can only ever be the same as that of every Christian. It is derived from the participation of all Christians – the church – in Christ’s priesthood by virtue of their baptism into and union with

¹ K. N. Giles, “Church Order, Government” in R. P. Martin and P.H. Davids, eds., *Dictionary of the Later New Testament* (IVP), 219-226.

him.....Whilst the NT and subsequent practice show that leadership and other specialized ministries, such as teaching, based on particular, individual gifts need to be publicly recognised by the church and appropriate respect given, this inflexible division into two contrasting bodies of Christians contributed strongly to the increasing restriction of power and ministry to the ordained. This suggests that it is likely that its removal, together with teaching in theory and practice concerning the general priesthood and the Spirit's gifts to each Christian, would significantly facilitate the participation of all Christians in the church's life and so enhance the church's vitality. To some extent this has been shown in the development of modern basic church communities, house churches, and home groups." (pp. 323-325)

News

Lonnie D. Bell, *The Early Textual Transmission of John: Stability and Fluidity in its Second and Third Century Greek Manuscripts* (Leiden: Brill 2018).

We have more early manuscript evidence for the Gospel of John than any other NT writing, including remnants of manuscripts dated to the third century, and in some cases the second century. Bell demonstrates that the manuscripts exhibit an impressive stability in the transmission of this text, Bell also compares the early manuscripts with those of the 4th century and finds that they compare quite favourably. All of this gives us confidence in the transmission of the text.

N. T. Wright Paul: A Biography (SPCK, 2018)

A new biography of Paul of 480 pp. Whether it is worth purchasing is another matter. So far, my impressions are that it is too much a popularization of Wright's views on Paul's theology and his understanding of the structure of Israel's history as the essential backdrop to Paul's teaching. If you are looking for insight into Paul, the man, his life and the times in which he lived, you won't get it from this biography. Wright may be a good NT scholar, but whether he is a good biographer is doubtful. If you enjoy reading historical biographies by those who are trained in that field, you will quickly realize that Wright is out of his depth in this book. Still, having said this, the book is an easy read and it looks good on a shelf. (AP)

BIBLINDEX (<http://www.bibindex.info/>) is an index of biblical references found in Christian literature, both Western and Eastern texts, at present covering the three first centuries, along with part of the fourth. The eventual goal is to cover the whole of Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, in order to renew the study of the

interpretation and history of biblical texts. BIBINDEX also may be used as an online Synoptic Bible (*Biblical tools*) or as an Index of Patristic Works (*Patristical tools*). Access to data is completely free.

Dead Sea Scroll Forgeries

There are such forgeries because private collectors are willing to pay for manuscripts, but the manuscripts they buy are tiny and fragmentary. When scholars are given the opportunity to authenticate them through various forensic texts, they publish their analyses in the professional literature. Two recent examples are: Kipp Davis et al., "Nine Dubious 'Dead Sea Scrolls' Fragments from the Twenty-First Century," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 24.2 (2017): 189-228 and Kipp Davis, "Caves of Dispute: Patterns of Correspondence and Suspicion in the Post-2002 'Dead Sea Scrolls' Fragments," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 24.2 (2017): 229-70.

M. J. Kruger Christianity at the Crossroads (IVP Academic 2018)

Christianity in the twenty-first century is a global phenomenon. But in the second century, its future was not at all certain.

Initially Christianity possessed little social or cultural influence and found itself fighting for its life. While apostolic tradition was emerging as a "rule of faith," factions contested the nature of the gospel, and pagan philosophers found its claims scandalous. And while its pathway was tenuous, Christianity was forming structures of leadership and worship, and a core of apostolic texts was emerging as authoritative. But it was the challenges, obstacles, and transitions faced by Christians in the second century that, in many ways, would determine the future of the church for the next two millennia. It was a time when Christianity stood at a crossroads.

Michael Kruger's introductory survey examines how Christianity took root in the second century, how it battled to stay true to the vision of the apostles, and how it developed in ways that would shape both the church and Western culture over the next two thousand years. *Christianity at the Crossroads* provides an accessible and informative look at the complex and foundational issues faced by an infant church still trying to determine its identity. The church's response to the issues of heresy and orthodoxy, the development of the canon, and the transmission of the Christian Scriptures not only determined its survival but determined the kind of church it would be for generations to come.

Society of Biblical Religion Jobs Report

The report issued by the society on the jobs market for 2016-2017 showed a continuing fall in the numbers of faculty positions advertised and a small increase in non-faculty positions. The report is available on their website.

Researching Questions of Canon

Plenty of books review the history of the canon. A good start would be the selection of essays in *The Canon Debate* (662 pages; eds. L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders, 2003). But for a collection of the primary source material in the original languages and English translation, you should have Edmon L. Gallagher and John D. Meade, *The Biblical Canon Lists from Early Christianity: Texts and Analysis* (Oxford University Press, 2017).

Centre for the Study of Christian Origins

This centre (<http://www.christianorigins.div.ed.ac.uk>) is attached to the University of Edinburgh and it usually runs free one or two-day conferences on some aspects of its remit every year or so with invited leading scholars. It's worth tracking for its articles and videos posted on the website. For example, there is currently a video on NT Methodologies with L. W. Hurtado.

The NT Manuscript Room (<http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/home>)

The site provides photos and transcriptions of all the NT manuscripts catalogued and used in the Institute for New Testament Text-Critical Research, the facility that edits the Nestle-Aland text and is working on the massive NT project titled the Editio Critica Major. NT students who can handle NT Greek should know about this site and learn to use it.

Book Notices

Daniel and Temple Theology

P. Wyns

Introduction

This notice serves to introduce *God is Judge*, a commentary on the book of Daniel and companion to a new commentary on Revelation, *Pattern Recognition in the Apocalypse*, (Biblaridion Media, 2018).¹ The thrust of the commentary on Daniel seeks to demonstrate that all the conflict stories and court tales in the first half of Daniel are situational midrash related to the fall and restoration of the temple (the three in the fire) during Nebuchadnezzar's reign and the "resurrection" of temple hope (the lion's den) during the reign of Darius Hystaspis. The problem of Cyrus as temple restorer and Jewish liberator is examined in depth and reaches the conclusion that the Isaiah prophecies concerned with Hezekiah (the suffering servant) were manipulated by elements that promoted an early restoration to portray Cyrus as the great liberator. Cyrus's input was ineffective and minimal, and the temple was restored 21 years later by Darius (the 21 days of Dan 10.13). The writings of Daniel reflect factional infighting between elements that pushed for a swift initial restoration under Cyrus and those (like Daniel) who sought an answer for frustrated hope at the failure of the Cyrus restoration. Daniel lived to see the commencement of restoration 21 years later but was informed that and even longer delay (70 weeks) was necessary before the true temple (the messiah) would be revealed and a great Jubilee of Atonement inaugurated.

Calendrical manipulation

Seder Olam, the Jewish calendar of a later era, was manipulated by omitting Persian era monarchs so that the interval between temple destructions equated to the 490 years of Daniel's prophecy allowing the Rabbi's to view completion of the Mishna as the end of the "Torah era" thus issuing in the "Talmudic era, which predominately found a home in Babylonian academies. Such revisionism was necessary because the expected messiah had (in their view) not appeared to inaugurate the new era (as predicted by Daniel).

Jewish history is replete with such revisionism and Daniel's prophecy featured large in messianic calculations and uprisings. The Maccabee uprising occurred 420 years after the destruction of the first temple – the timing no doubt influenced by Daniel,

¹ *God is Judge (GID)* and the companion commentary *Pattern Recognition in the Apocalypse (PRITA)* are available online: <http://www.biblaridion.info/index.html>

with the last “seventy” no doubt meant to herald the new era – but that also (like Cyrus the “temple builder”) proved to be a red herring. The divine time table cannot be forced or usurped.

The prophetic timetable was “reset” during the Jubilee year of 424/5¹ when Nehemiah reconfirmed the **Abrahamic covenant** with the people. Scholars frequently group Nehemiah 9 together with Daniel 9.² The covenant is proposed in Neh 9.38 and pledged in Nehemiah 10. Eskenazi comments as follows; “Like Abraham, and in sharp contrast to all the previous generations for whom you did so much, we are faithful. How is our faithfulness demonstrated? With the pledge that follows in chapter 10. Abraham was faithful, נֶאֱמַן. We are faithful, we sign a pledge – אִמְנָה”³

The covenant was confirmed in 424/5 BCE and 420 years later (6x7) *John the Baptist and Christ were born*. The Jewish Roman War commenced 70 years after the birth of Christ and 3½ years after that the second temple was destroyed leaving the remaining 3½ years of Daniel’s prophecy unfulfilled.

Lights and Pentecost

The Angelic annunciation of the Baptist’s arrival occurred when his father (Zacharias) was performing his temple duties in the Passover month of Nissan⁴ during the allotment of the priestly course of Abijah. John the Baptist was subsequently born during the Feast of Lights (but he was not “that light”, John 1.8)

¹ For 424 as a Jubilee year see M. Barker, “The time is fulfilled: Jesus and the Jubilee” *SJT* 53.1, (2000): 22-32.

<http://www.biblaridion.info/resources/barker.pdf> (see page 3).

² Tamara Cohn Eskenazi, “Nehemiah 9-10: Structure and Significance” *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 3 (2001): §1.8 “In a most helpful appendix, Boda charts the numerous designations that scholars have used to classify Nehemiah 9 and the various texts with which they group Nehemiah 9. It can be noted as a result that the vast majority of studies group Nehemiah 9 with Daniel 9 and Ezra 9. Among the 44 studies that Boda lists, 36 group it with both Daniel 9 and Ezra 9 and another six with either Daniel 9 or Ezra 9. In addition, nine groups also include Psalm 106 with Nehemiah 9”.

³ *Ibid.*, Eskenazi, §3.3 and §2.18 - Eskenazi adds a reference to Gilbert in a footnote, “Le place de la loi dans la priere de Nehemie 9”, M. Carrez, J. Dore, and P. Grelot, ed., *De la Torah au Messie*. Paris: Desclee (1981), 307-316.

⁴ This can be calculated by working backwards from the course of Jehoiarib who was serving on the 5th of Ab when the second temple was destroyed (*Ta’anith 29a*).

as a witness¹ *to the dedication of a new temple* and six months later Jesus was born in the second week of Elul and presented at the temple eight days later (as the fruit of the Spirit, the word made flesh) during Pentecost.

Dedicating a new Temple

The Feast of Lights, or *Chanukah*, was instigated by the Maccabees to rededicate the temple after the profanations wrought by Antiochus Epiphanes. The Maccabees were mindful of Danielic prophecies and also of the blessing accorded to Haggai concerning temple restoration **given the day before Chanukah**, “...from the four and twentieth day of the ninth month (Hag 2.18).....from this day will I bless you (Hag 2.19)...”

The Maccabee’s choice of the 25th of the ninth month for the “Feast of Lights” was therefore propitious, religiously motivated and politically expedient. It speaks of the blessing accorded to restoring the fortunes of the temple. It is fitting then that John the Baptist was born on this day. The Baptist was himself an Aaronic priest, but he came as the messenger of the covenant *to dedicate a greater priesthood and temple*.

Destruction of the temple and time periods

The enigmatic time periods of Daniel (1150, 1260, 1135,) are not *ex-eventu* prophecy or successive Maccabee era “corrections” hastily updated during the Antiochene crisis. They represent intervals on the Jewish lunar calendar between temple feasts. The starting point is always the *fast for the destruction of the temple* on the 9th of Ab and this is taken as year one of a 3½ year cycle; allowing for different combinations of deficient, regular and leap years, the different time periods **always terminate on a prominent feast day** (either on the Day of Atonement, Chanukah, Purim or Passover).

Conclusion

The theology of Daniel is concerned with temple restoration and atonement. In order for a new temple to be revealed the old temple had to be removed. That new temple was Jesus Christ: “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up” (John 2.19). The history of the Jewish people is schematized and interrupted by 3½ year cycles of intense persecution and temple profanation/destruction/attempted restoration (Antiochus, Roman War, Kochba Revolt) in a series of repeat patterns.

¹ Compare the two lamp-stands of Revelation 11. In the first century both John and Jesus performed the function of witnessing for a 3½ year cycle. Jesus is the “faithful witness” (Rev 1.5). The pattern established by Jesus (and the Baptist) is followed by the “two witnesses”.

These patterns were interrupted by a 2,000-year lacuna during which Babylonian Judaism was developed and the gospel was preached to the gentiles. The remaining 3½ year cycle of Daniel’s prophecy remains (at present) unrealized; the phenomenon of recurrent patterns is examined in a new commentary on Revelation, *Pattern Recognition in the Apocalypse*.

The Shema and Bar Kochba: the false messiah and 666

P. Wyns

Introduction

This notice serves as an introduction to a new commentary on the book of Revelation; P. Wyns, *Pattern Recognition in the Apocalypse*, (Biblaridion Media, 2018).¹ The offered commentary discovers recurrent patterns in the first and second centuries that are destined to repeat in the near future. The book demonstrates that Nero and Kochba are both portrayed in the Apocalypse as 666. The association of Nero with 666 is well known² and will not be treated here; less apparent are connections between the false messiah, Bar Kochba, the “Shema” and the number 666 (and 616). Both protagonists are not the “final manifestation” of the “man of sin” but they form archetypes of abusive and persecuting imperial and religious powers. As such they aid us in recognizing future patterns. As Mark Twain reputedly said, “History doesn’t repeat itself, but *it often rhymes*”. The view taken in

¹ Henceforth, *Pattern Recognition in the Apocalypse* is abbreviated as **PRITA**, available online or as a PDF download here: <http://www.biblaridion.info/index.html> **PRITA** has a companion commentary **GID** (*God is Judge*) on the book of Daniel (available on the same website).

² Although one cannot speak of a “consensus” view, Nero (as 666) is supported by the following scholars; “Fritzsche, Benary, Hitzig, Reuss, Ewald, Baur, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Hausrath, Krenkel, Gebhardt, Renan, Abbe, Reville, Sabatier, Davidson, Stuart, Bleek, Beyschlag, Farrar, and Cowles. Other scholars who have affirmed this view include: J. Stuart Russell, Shirley Jackson Case, George Edmundson, B. W. Henderson, Arthur S. Peake, Martin Kiddie, Charles C. Torrey, John Bright, Austin Farrer, G. Driver, D. R. Hillers, Bo Reicke, J. P. M. Sweet, Bruce M. Metzger, and J. A. T. Robinson.

On this see Kenneth L. Gentry, Jr., *Before Jerusalem Fell: Dating the Book of Revelation: An Exegetical and Historical Argument for a Pre-A.D. 70 Composition* (Dominion Press, 1989), 193-203. http://www.biblaridion.info/resources/gentry_full.pdf and J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1976), 210. <http://www.biblaridion.info/resources/redating-testament.pdf>

this notice (and in the recommended commentary) is that none of these prophecies are *ex eventu*. They were all written before the fact – with the Apocalypse dated close to the commencement of the Nero persecution.

Bar Kochba

The revolt against Rome was undertaken by a messianic revolutionary leader with the sobriquet **Bar Kochba** which was not the pretender's actual name but rather an epithet assigned by the chief Rabbi Akiba (Rabbi Aqiva ben Josef) taken from Num 24.17 and meaning "son of a star". Supposedly,¹ after the failure of the revolt Kochba was renamed by many within the Jewish community to Simon bar Koziba, meaning "the son of a lie" (the s changed to z to reflect the Hebrew root for "lie" *כִּזְבָּה*). Bar Kochba's actual name was likely Shimeon Bar Kosiba.² In the Aramaic alphabet, the letters Samekh or Simkat (ס pronounced as "s") and Shin (ש pronounced as "sh") interchange, for example, the name "Simon" is written in two ways - Shimeon (ש) and Simon (ס). In the Bar Kochba letters (written in Aramaic), Yigal Yadin demonstrates that Kosiba was written as either *ksba* (with Samekh or Simkat - "s") or *ksbba* (with Shin - "sh"). Sometimes, the final letter of *ksba* is "h" instead of "a". Several of Simon's letters found at Nahal Hever read: "From Simon ben [*or bar*]³ Kosiba..." (סמעון בן [בר] כוסבה). Two letters spell Kosiba with ש; and among the letters and documents of Murabba'at it is sometimes spelled כוסבה. One letter is written in Greek, and spells the leader's name, Σιμων Χωσιβα, thus possibly settling the question of which vowel (e or i) or consonant (z or s) was used.⁴

The linguistic situation seems to have been fluid and Yadin believes that during the revolt a transition occurred from Aramaic to Hebrew (including the introduction of Mishnaic Hebrew forms) and of course we also have Greek, the *lingua franca* of Diaspora Jews. In Greek we only have Χωσιβα which is a transliteration of the name (what it sounds like in Hebrew or Aramaic) and not a translation. Of course, with so many Hebrew/Aramaic variants we would also expect a number of different Greek

¹ It is more likely that Jewish-Christians invented the pun **during the revolt**.

² Heinrich Walter Guggenheimer translates the name with a double "s" in English: "By Roman sources, the war of *Bar Kossiba* (that is his true name revealed by his letters found in the Judean desert) started in 132 C.E." Heinrich Walter Guggenheimer, *Seder Olam: The Rabbinic View of Biblical Chronology* (Rowman & Littlefield, 1998), 263.

³ **Bar** is Aramaic for "son" - the Hebrew form is **Ben**.

⁴ cf. Y. Yadin, "Expedition D, 11 (1961), 36-52; *idem.*, *Bar-Kokhba* (New York: Random House, 1971), 132; B. Lifshitz, "Papyrus grecs du desert de Juda" *Aegypta* 42 (1962): 240-256 (248).

transliterations, but they are unfortunately lost to us. Variants (unpointed) are tabulated below:

Known variants of patronymic and epithet

Variants	SBL Translit	Anglicized	Meaning
בר כוכב	br kwkb	bar Kochba, Kokhba, Kokhva	"son of [a] star."
בר כושבה	br kwšbh	bar Kochba, Kokhba, Kokhva	"son of [a] star."
בר כוזיב	br kwzyb	bar Kozib	"son of [a] lie"
בן כוסבה	bn kwsbh	ben Koussaba	
בר כוסבא	br kwsb'	bar Koseba/ Kosiba (Kossiba)	
שמעון	šm'wn	Shimon, Shimeon	
סמעון	sm'wn	Simeon, Simon	
Σιμων Χωσιβα	Simōn Chōsiba	Simon Kosiba	

Deceiver, liar and pretender

R. Bauckham identified the false Messiah in ApoPt (*The Apocalypse of Peter*: second century?) as Bar Kochba. L. Peerbolte ¹ summarises as follows: "There are three elements which would point especially towards identification with Bar Kokhba."²

¹ L. J. Lietaert Peerbolte, *The Antecedents of Antichrist: A Traditio-Historical Study of the Earliest Christian Views on Eschatological Opponents* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 58 [including footnotes 10-11].

² For the history of the interpretation of the false messiah as Bar Kokhba, see R. Bauckham, "The Two Fig Tree Parables in the Apocalypse of Peter" *JBL* 104 (1985): 269-287 (286, n. 58).

Firstly, Bar Kokhba appears to have been hailed as a messiah by rabbi Akiba.¹ Secondly, it is reported that Bar Kokhba persecuted those Christians who did not deny Jesus or refused to partake in his rebellion against Rome.² Thirdly, the false messiah is characterized as ‘a liar’ (tr. Elliott: ‘deceiver’), while Bar Kokhba also became known as ‘Bar Koziba’, ‘son of a liar’ (= a liar). Furthermore, as Bauckham states, ‘We know of no other Jewish messianic pretender who persecuted Christians in the period AD. 80-160³’.

Simon S. Lee⁴ observes; “Following Heinrich Weinel, Buchholz argues that this false messiah, or the end-time deceiver, must refer to Bar Kokhba, who later became known as Bar Koziba “son of a liar.” When the Jewish Christians refused to take part in his revolt against Rome, Bar Kokhba persecuted and killed them. According to Buchholz, ApoPt is written in this context in order to explain the issue of theodicy regarding punishment of the evil persecutors as well as vindication of the righteous martyrs. It is, however, Bauckham who has become champion of this Bar Kokhba hypothesis by publishing a series of articles.⁵ Bauckham presents five major reasons why he sees in this parable references to Bar Kokhba and Jewish Christian martyrdom and moreover, to the origin of ApoPt in Palestine.”⁶

Particularly interesting is how this ties in with the curse against the heretics (*minim*) i.e., Christians who refused to deny that Christ was the messiah. They were asked to publicly join in with the congregation and repeat the curse in the synagogue and refusal resulted in ex-communication (or worse). Bauckham argues that the setting for the curse was the messianic claims made by Kochba.

Simon S. Lee⁷ continues by saying,

“Bauckham claims that ApoPt was written in the milieu of the Jewish revolt in Palestine around 132—35 CE and the persecution of the Jewish Christians by Bar Kokhba. He also reads the two major themes of ApoPt., as the punishment of the persecutors (chs. 3-24) and the vindication of the righteous

¹ See E. Schürer *et al*, *History*. vol. 1, pp. 543-544.

² Just., *Apol.* 1,31,6: Eus., *Chronicle*, Hadrian’s Year 17 (A.D. 133).

³ Bauckham, “Fig Tree Parables”, 286.

⁴ Simon S. Lee, *Jesus’ Transfiguration and the Believers’ Transformation: A Study of the Transfiguration and Its Development in Early Christian Writings* (Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 149.

⁵ Bauckham, “Fig Tree Parables”, 269-87; *idem.*, “The Apocalypse of Peter: A Jewish Christian Apocalypse from the Time of Bar Kokhba,” *Apocrypha* 5 (1994): 7-111.

⁶ Bauckham, “The Apocalypse of Peter,” 36-43.

⁷ Lee, *Transfiguration*, 150.

martyrs (chs. 15-17), from the perspective of another important rabbinic movement in Palestine, which is well shown in the so-called *birkat ha-mînîm* (benediction of God for cursing the *mînîm* [heretics or sectarians]). In the version known from the Cairo Genizah manuscripts, it reads:

For the apostates let there be no hope, and uproot the kingdom of arrogance, speedily and in our days. May the *Nazarenes* and the sectarians perish as in a moment. Let them be *blotted out of the book of life, and not, be written together with the righteous.*

In this benediction, the cursing of the *mînîm*, including the *Nazarenes*, is linked with prayer for the downfall of the kingdom of arrogance, i.e. the Roman Empire. Jewish Christians who resisted supporting Bar Kokhba's movement for the liberation from the Gentile power could be seen as taking the side of the kingdom of arrogance and consequently their names would be removed from the book of life. According to Bauckham, while the punishment scene (chs. 3-14) is a Christian response to Bar Kokhba's persecution, the Transfiguration with Paradise is their counter response to *the birkat ha-mînîm*".

D. C. Harlow states, "Richard Bauckham has convincingly argued that the author of the *Apocalypse of Peter* did not derive this parable from Luke but from an independent tradition..."¹ Of course, we cannot argue for a consensus view on ApoPt as scholars will forever debate the extent of the Kochba persecution and whether or not terms such as "liar" or "deceiver" are intended generically,² however, what we can do is demonstrate that the Apocalypse **also** identifies Kochba as the false messiah. The weight of cumulative evidence makes it likely that Bauckham's approach to ApoPt is correct and strengthens our argument which follows directly. Unlike the Apocalypse (given to John before the fall of the temple in 70) ApoPt was most certainly an *ex eventu* second century writing. Therefore, ApoPt had plenty of material (John's Apocalypse) with which to work.

¹ Daniel C. Harlow, *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 203.

² So Peerbolte, *Antecedents*, 59-60; "Next, the false messiah is presented as 'a liar'. The term 'liar' is used in the same non-titular way as in 1 John 2:22 and John 8:44. Since it is a common derogatory word it can neither be taken as evidence of any influence of the tradition of the Antichrist as found in 1 John 2:22 nor as a link to Bar Kokhba".

Jacob the Deceiver

The prophecy on which Kochba's sobriquet is based comes from Num 24.17 (NKJ);

I see Him, but not now; I behold Him, but not near; **A Star shall come out of Jacob; A Sceptre shall rise out of Israel**, and batter the brow of Moab, and destroy all the sons of tumult.

This prophecy was employed by Rabbi Akiba to herald the messianic status of Shimeon Kosiba and he became Shimeon **Bar Kochba** (Simon the Son of a star). Kochba took the epithet seriously and during the revolt he had coins struck depicting "his star" elevated **above the Ark of the Covenant** in the temple. Of course, the temple no longer existed as it had been destroyed in 70 but Kochba was undeterred in his ambition to introduce temple worship. Scholars debate whether or not his intention came to fruition, but he undoubtedly made preparations for a permanent building and we can speculate that in the meantime he pitched a tabernacle and reintroduced sacrifice on a purpose-built altar. There is no collaboration from archaeological or literary evidence to support such a hypothesis (historical information from that troubled revolt is sparse) – however, the messianic status conferred on Kochba, his support by important rabbi's and priests and his pretentious coins all point to the conclusion that some form of temporary worship existed. Here then was the "messiah" come to destroy the Romans, liberate Jerusalem and rebuild the temple.

The eponymous forefather, **Jacob**, who is mentioned in the prophecy of Num 24.17, carried a name that meant, "Trickster, supplanter or deceiver"; he was only renamed "Israel" after his confrontation and wrestling with God. All his life Jacob practiced guile to advance his ambitions, namely, to obtain the blessing through his own might. Kochba was known for his physical strength and charisma. The word **guile** (δόλος) is used in Jesus' encounter with Nathaniel (John 1.47); "Jesus saw Nathanael coming to him, and said of him, 'Behold an Israelite indeed, **in whom is no guile!**' (NKJV: Deceit)".¹ In other words – there is no "Jacob" in this "Israelite".

¹ The background to this incident is Nathaniel's upcoming Nuptials (in John 2). Nathaniel was contemplating how Jacob was deceived on his wedding night (the deceiver was himself tricked!) – Jesus effectively read Nathaniel's mind! For the background on this see H. A. Whittaker, *Studies in the Gospels* (Biblia, 2nd ed., 1989), chapter 20, pp. 78-82.

This Johannine passage (vv. 45-51) is notable for several reasons: (1) for association with **Jacob's ladder**; (2) for the mention of **Nazareth** (think here of the *Nazarene* Jewish-Christian community); and (3) chiefly for the way in which Nathaniel openly **declares Christ as the messiah, the Son of God**.¹ The same word (δόλος) is employed to describe the triumphant martyrs of Rev 14.5, “And in their mouth was found **no guile**”, a vision that contains a prophecy concerning the fall of Jerusalem and Kochba’s fortress in Betar. Whether wittingly, or unwittingly rabbinical writings of that era assimilate *the very language of the Apocalypse* when describing the horror and devastation of the failed rebellion.² The triumphant martyrs have **no guile** (Jacob) in their mouths because they refused to accept Kochba (the “star out of Jacob”) as their messiah, or to endorse his **shema** (put his words [lie] in their mouth as a sign of allegiance). Instead, they paid with their lives as witnesses to the true messiah.

The Shema and 666

The **Shema** is of course the well know monotheistic statement of Israelite faith expressed in Deut 6.4 that commences with the famous words;

Hear, O Israel....

שמע ישראל יהוה אחד

It is called the “Shema” for short and every Jew would know that “Shema” was shorthand for their statement of faith. Shema is the first word of the sentence שמע rendered by SBL transliteration as šēma[‘] - anglicized as **shema**. The correspondence of shema with the first name of Kochba – Shimon (שמעון) is no coincidence as both words **have the same root**.

¹ Think here of “putting out of the synagogue”, (John 9.22) and ex-communication of the *mínim* (heretics) i.e., the *Nazarenes*; it was dangerous to declare that Jesus was the messiah, especially during the Kochba revolt.

² For the similarity in language, see **PRITA**, chap.14 page 301: *Rabbinical accounts and the trumpets*. For the table of contents (TOC) see; http://www.biblaridion.info/Rev_TOC.html After the rebellion Israel was cast off and renamed *Palestine* – Jerusalem was officially declared a gentile city by Hadrian in fulfilment of Rev 10, see **PRITA**, *The Post 70 CE history of the Jews, Ploughing the city - Digression 6*, 99-114, (103), <http://www.biblaridion.info/Digressions/Post70.pdf>

The sobriquet of Bar Kochba can also be expressed as a statement of faith and no doubt this was encouraged by the priests and rabbis who saw Kochba as the legitimate messiah:

Hear, Son-of-star
שמעו בר כוכב
SBL: kwkb br šm‘w

In the *Hebrew Gematria* system the value of this statement equals 666 with number 6 representing the number of man (created on day six). It is the integer of the false messiah. Moreover, with a slight emendation the Hebrew reflects the alteration to “son of a lie” and this *may* well explain the variant reading 616¹ : שמעון בן כוסיב (Simeon ben Kosyb /SBL: šm‘wn bn kwsyb)² equates to 616. Similarly the *Greek Isopsephy* system equates to 616 in a version where the Hebrew “Kozib” (liar) is *transliterated* into Greek as Κοζιζβ³ and placed in the statement Κοζιζβ ὁ πλάνος (SBL: Koszib ho planos) giving the meaning; “liar that deceiver”, or “that deceptive liar” mimicking the derogatory accusation levelled at Christ (Matt 27.63) during his trial, ἐκεῖνος ὁ πλάνος (“that deceiver said..”).

Supporters of Kochba belonged to the “Synagogue of Satan; “When he speaks a lie, he speaks of his own: for he is a liar and the father of it” (John 8.44) and “if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive” (John 5.43). The pronouncements of Christ in the Fourth Gospel and in the Apocalypse are so prophetically accurate

¹ On the variant reading 616, see M G Michael, “666 or 616 (Rev. 13, 18)” *Bulletin of Biblical Studies*, 19, (2000): 77-83, <http://www.biblaridion.info/resources/666.pdf>

² The patronymic Kosiba (כוסבא) was altered to Kozib כוזיב (kzb=lie) by replacing **S** with **Z** and dropping the almost silent **A** (or **H**); the suggestion here is that rather than replacing **S** with **Z** the addition of a Yod would give the softer sounding כוסיב Kosyb (rather than Kozib), thus changing his surname to “liar”. The full phrase “Shimon son of a liar” (שמעון בן כוסיב) equals 616 in the *Hebrew Gematria* system. Note that “ben” is used rather than the Aramaic “bar”. We can imagine that Jewish Christians forced to pledge (in Aramaic) “Hear-son-of-Star” (666) instead replied (in Hebrew) “Hear-son-of-Liar” (616) or (in Greek translit- Koszib) “Liar-that-Deceiver” (616).

³ One would expect Χωζιζβ or Χοζιζβ for Χωσιβα (Chōsiba) rather than Κοζιζβ the Χωσ has been substituted by Κοζζ. The transliteration Κοζιζβ sounds like the Hebrew Kozib (lie) but does not correspond with any ancient or modern Greek word that I am aware of (although Google translate renders it as “captain”- probably due to a faulty algorithm).

that it is tempting to evaluate first century arguments as *ex eventu* prophecy – as belonging to a later era (after the Kochba revolt). However, the woof-and-weave of the Apocalypse is embedded throughout the NT and this would necessitate pushing the dating of the whole NT beyond 150, a position that is unsustainable.¹ What then of the Apostle Paul’s pronouncements on the “man of sin” in Thessalonians, (an epistle that even hardened critics date pre-70)? “Who opposes and exalts himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, so that he sits as God in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God” (2 Thess 2.4).² This was certainly the intention of Kochba who had the temerity to depict **his star** elevated above the resting place of the *Shekinah* in the temple. What a contrast with Christ who thought equality with God was not something to be grasped? Kochba was the messiah who asked God not to interfere in his affairs (Do neither good nor bad, i.e., mind your own business). The “lying wonders and powers” that Paul speaks of are described in Revelation 13.³

Followers of Kochba, “did not receive the love of the truth” (v.10), truth being a Pauline technical term for the *covenants of promise* concerning messiah vouched safe to the forefathers (Micah 7.20) and embodied in the anointed, who declared, “I am the truth” (John 14.6). Jesus was the messiah there would be no other – certainly not an arrogant, self-appointed, shallow leader such as Bar Kochba who wrought ruin on the nation. They were indeed “*sent a strong delusion and believed the lie*” (v.11) ... the lie of the ancient serpent *that man can be God*. It could be argued that Paul received his own independent revelation (In Arabia? Gal.1.17; 2 Cor.12.3-7), however, it is undeniable that the Apocalypse was delivered to the first century church (before the fall of the temple in 70).

Conclusion

Scholars have noted that the Greek form of Neron Caesar transliterated into Hebrew characters is equivalent to 666 and the Latin form of Nero Caesar transliterated into Hebrew script is equivalent to the variant 616. Similarly, the “Shema” of Bar Kochba is 666 and his patronymic that was “modified” in order to reflect his true nature (that of a deceiver/liar/false messiah). We have then **two archetypes** of the persecutor of the church in the first and early second centuries

¹ See, **PRITA**, “Dating Matters”.

http://www.biblaridion.info/Digressions/Dating_matters.pdf

² Paul certainly had “Lucifer” the “morning star” from Isa 14.13 in mind, “You said in your heart, ‘I will ascend to heaven; above the stars of God I will set my throne on high; I will sit on the mount of assembly in the far north’”.

³ **PRITA**, http://www.biblaridion.info/Rev_TOC.html “Great Wonders (Rev 13.13-15)” Chap.13, pp. 280-284.

and both of them are associated with 666/616 – a distinct pattern. The first (Nero) was an imperial despot no doubt manipulated by the Jews (his wife/mistress was a proselyte) to scapegoat Christians, the second archetype (Bar Kochba) a false messiah supported by Babylonian Jewry, Palestinian priests and Rabbi's, also persecuted Jewish Christians. These are repeat patterns – we must learn how to read biblical patterns correctly in order to recognise the last and final manifestation of the deceiver that will shortly be upon us.

Marginal Notes

Adoptionism and Divine Identity - AP

In a Foreword to M. F. Bird's recent book (2016, ix-x) *Jesus the Eternal Son*, Richard Bauckham characterizes 'Adoptionism' as the view that Jesus was a man whom God adopted to be his son. He opposes this to the view that Jesus' divine sonship is not about Jesus *coming to be* divine but about his *coming from* God in the first place. However, he clarifies his thinking on what it means for Jesus to have come from God with the notion of pre-existence.

This binary presentation is obviously not the final word. We can easily affirm instead that Jesus was God's *actual son* born of the virgin Mary, an individual with no prior pre-existence. This precludes any Adoptionism and it gives a sense to the language of God sending his son into the world, i.e. the son that God would have, he chose to have *in* the world. We may dub this view 'Actualism'. Our English idiom today is not 'sending', but rather we 'bring' a child into the world.

Christadelphian theology is not therefore adoptionist and we would argue neither are the NT writers. Bird footnotes a point about Bauckham's 1990s book *God Crucified* which is worth highlighting. In this book, Bauckham puts forward the thesis that NT writers *included Jesus with the divine identity*. Bird's comment on this thesis is that "What Bauckham means by 'divine identity' is 'who' God is rather than 'what' he is, specifically the revelation of his name YHWH and his relationship to the whole of reality as creator and ruler" (pp. 1-2). With an emphasis on 'who' God is rather than 'what' God is, Bauckham intends to break away from the ontological categories of later church doctrine. Christadelphians will find Bird's comment rather resonant because they have since the 1800s stressed the meaning of the divine name as 'I will be *who* I will be'. But there is a difference to note here: Bauckham is thinking of **who God is**¹ whereas Christadelphians think of **who God can be**, and indeed who he has been in history. This exegesis obviously follows from Yahweh making his announcement to Moses, for he was promising **to be with** Moses and thus Moses would be included in the divine identity. Bauckham's shift towards the category of divine identity is therefore somewhat skewed but not uncongenial to a doctrine of God-manifestation. (Bauckham was introduced to Christadelphian

¹ The existential mis-reading of God's name still circulates in Christadelphian writing, which is ironic, as the analysis of God's name offered by John Thomas is probably the main theological achievement in his work.

thinking in the late 1970s at Manchester University through being given Alan Eyre's book *The Protestors* by me).

Bauckham might well think that we are hijacking his idea, and this might be so. On our approach, everybody remains *n/ho* they are in themselves, but clearly, they can *be* another if they manifest that person or if that other person manifests himself through them. God can manifest himself through others and they will thereby be included in his identity. The difference with Bauckham is that with a notion of pre-existence, he wants to see Jesus included in the divine identity in a manner that crosses the boundary of his birth. Christadelphians therefore have an antidote to this new approach to Trinitarianism in the theology that they developed through exegesis in the mid-1800s.

Identity is a useful notion to hook up with the relative pronoun 'who' and it obviously doesn't displace our thinking of the Father and the Son as persons, nor does it prevent us from having an 'everybody is already who they are' ontology. The notion of 'inclusion within the divine identity' doesn't carry any Trinitarian ontological implications. If we were to go in that direction, we would need to see claims for pre-existence in the NT letters.

The idea of 'inclusion within the divine identity' doesn't make a person God, but rather the opposite, if there is a point in time of such inclusion. The evidence for Jesus' inclusion with the divine identity, now understood as God manifesting himself through him, are his words, his deeds and his character, all of which **showed** the Father, as he declares in John. Hence, NT writers did not include Jesus in the divine identity because they thought of him as the incarnation of a pre-existent Son, but rather because they *saw* God in Jesus.

Son of Man - AP

In the Hebrew Scriptures, 'son of man' is an idiom for 'man'. The Hebrew is 'son of Adam' and we use the idiom today, along with 'daughter of Eve'.

God is not man, that he should lie, or a son of man, that he should repent.
Num 23:19 (RSV)

What is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou dost care for him? Ps 8:4 (RSV); cf. Job 25:6; 35:8; Ps 80:17; 146:3; Isa 51:12; 56:2; Jer 49:18, 33; 50:40; 51:43

The pattern here is to have two synonymous clauses using 'man' and 'son of man' showing that 'son of man' is a poetic expression of 'man'. All uses of 'son of Adam'

outside Ezekiel (12x) except for one occurrence conform to this pattern, but in Ezekiel we have Ezekiel addressed as ‘son of Adam’ 93x, making the book of Ezekiel unique. The exception is Dan 8:17 which conforms to the pattern of use in Ezekiel, “But he said to me, ‘Understand, O son of man, that the vision is for the time of the end.’”

This pattern makes Dan 7:13 stand out because it uses Aramaic and has ‘son of *‘nāsb*’ (בֶּר אֱנוֹשׁ). The Aramaic here corresponds to the Hebrew אֱנוֹשׁ (*‘nōsb*) which means ‘man’.

I saw in the night visions, and behold, with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man, and he came to the Ancient of Days and was presented before him. Dan 7:13 (RSV)

The expression ‘son of man’ here has one parallel in Ps 144:3,

O Lord, what is man that thou dost regard him, or a son of man that thou dost think of him? Ps 144:3 (RSV revised)

Clearly Ps 144:3 is a quotation of Ps 8:4 which uses ‘son of Adam’. On the basis of this evidence, our conclusion is that Daniel is not using a title but an idiom meaning ‘man’: “I saw in the night visions, and behold, with the clouds of heaven there came one **like a man**, and he came to the Ancient of Days and was presented before him.” What we have to explain is how **this idiom came to be used as a title**.

In the gospels, the expression is exclusively used by Jesus in direct speech (Matthew 32x; Mark 12x; Luke 25x; John 11x). It is rarely used by the narrator and third parties (Mark 8:31; 9:9; John 3:13; 12:34). Outside the gospels, it is used three times (Acts 7:56; Rev 1:13, 14:14) and Ps 8:4 is quoted in Heb 2:6. The best evidence of ‘the son of man’ being a title is the use by the narrator and third parties:

And he began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again. Mark 8:31 (RSV)

And as they were coming down the mountain, he charged them to tell no one what they had seen, until the Son of man should have risen from the dead. Mark 9:9 (RSV)

No one has ascended into heaven but he who descended from heaven, the Son of man. John 3:13 (RSV)

The crowd answered him, 'We have heard from the law that the Christ remains forever. How can you say that the Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man?' John 12:34 (RSV)

The narrator in Mark reports Jesus using indirect speech, and this is a writing from the early 40s. This is not an idiomatic use but a title for Christ. In John, the crowd ask Jesus about the Son of Man which might suggest that the title was new to them – they are not using the expression as an idiom. John 3:13 is a parenthesis by John the author and a comment on Jesus' dialogue with Nicodemus. This text is obviously one that is used to prove the pre-existence of Christ as the Son of Man, and some scholars observe at this juncture that the Son of Man was a heavenly being in Jewish thought. If this is right, the crowd in John 12 should have shown some knowledge of the idea of the Son of Man.

Jesus used the expression as a title for himself when talking of himself in the third person and his usage shows that he **grounded** the title in Dan 7:13 and this is clear from the allusions in what he says:

I saw in the night visions, and behold, with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man, and he came to the Ancient of Days and was presented before him. And to him was given dominion and glory and kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed. Dan 7:13-14 (RSV)

This is interpreted to Daniel as follows,

I approached one of those who stood there and asked him the truth concerning all this. So, he told me, and made known to me, the interpretation of the things. Dan 7:16 (RSV revised)

The key passage is vv. 21-22,

As I looked, this horn made war with the saints, and prevailed over them, until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most-High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom. Dan 7:21-22 (RSV revised)

What we have in Daniel is a vision of events on earth involving beasts and eventually the saints, but the tide is turned when the Ancient of Days comes. What the 'interpretation' doesn't do is identify **where the Ancient of Days is** when the Son of Man is presented before him. Further, the interpretation talks of the

kingdom being given to **the saints** while the vision describes the kingdom being given to the Son of Man. This suggests that one like the Son of Man is ‘the saints/holy ones’, i.e. in the vision of happenings in heaven the Son of Man represents the holy ones on earth. Whether we take the holy ones to be Israel, Judah, the faithful remnant of Judah or the true believers in Christ is a moot point for our purposes. What we have here is not symbolic but **actual**: The Son of Man approaching the Ancient of Days and receiving the kingdom represents the holy ones on earth receiving the kingdom.

Jesus grounds his use of the title in Daniel, but whether this usage and grounding is unique to him is not our concern. A study of the contemporary Second Temple materials would settle this point. Our interest is in where Jesus quotes or alludes to Daniel.

...then will appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven, and then all the tribes of the earth will mourn, and they will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory... Matt 24:30 (RSV); Mark 13:26

And Jesus said, ‘I am; and you will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power and coming with the clouds of heaven.’ Mark 14:62 (RSV)

Where does Jesus allude to Daniel?

For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of man also be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. Mark 8:38 (RSV)

This allusion would seem to clarify the Ancient of Days as ‘the Father’ and the ‘clouds of heaven’ as the angels. This text has three elements in common with Daniel, but other potential allusions have two elements:

For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shines even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. Matt 24:27 (KJV revised); cf. Luke 17:24

This allusion is also certain because of its close proximity to Matt 24:30; the same point applies to the allusions in Matt 24:37-44

As were the days of Noah, so will be the coming of the Son of man...And knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be...Therefore you also must be ready; for the

Son of man is coming at an hour you do not expect. Matt 24:37-44 (RSV); cf. Luke 12:40; 17:26

The upshot here is that allusions to Daniel 7 can be seen when the title ‘Son of Man’ is coupled with his *coming*.

When they persecute you in one town, flee to the next; for truly, I say to you, you will not have gone through all the towns of Israel, before the Son of man comes. Matt 10:23 (RSV)

Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom. Matt 16:28 (RSV)

When the Son of man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, then he will sit on his glorious throne. Matt 25:31 (RSV)

I tell you, he will vindicate them speedily. Nevertheless, when the Son of man comes, will he find faith on earth? Luke 18:8 (RSV)

One allusion worth singling out is,

...so will it be on the day when the Son of man is revealed. Luke 17:30

This is about the ‘apocalypse’ of Jesus.

Our conclusion is that: Daniel’s vision is of happenings in heaven, but these represent things that take place on earth. We could place the Ancient of Days on earth, literally, but the language of ‘God coming’ is about God-manifestation on earth in an individual or an event. The Ancient of Days could be said to come but in the person of the Son of Man and, if so, this means that the presentation of the Son of Man to the Ancient of Days **with** the clouds of heaven is the heavenly representation of the Son of Man coming to the earth **with** his holy angels.

Discussion Points

Scripture and the Goodness of God

Introduction

Sometime last year, I began to consider the possibility of another book of apologetics, following in the wake of *Reasons* and *More Reasons*. I wondered whether a book, provisionally entitled *Questions*, might be helpful to address common challenges to faith today. To that end I posted a request on a Christadelphian Facebook group for suggestions for issues that people would like to see addressed. Whilst such a limited survey can hardly be considered representative, the results were intriguing. The issues that people raised were not the usual fare of the historicity of such-and-such an event, or the apparent inconsistencies with these passages, or the relationship between science and religion. The issues that were raised were largely moral in nature. Questions over sexuality, over gender, over the morality of Old Testament events, and, yes, questions about suffering.

This presented a challenge as these issues are more complex, more divisive, and more difficult to untangle, than a simple question of historicity (say). But these answers were indicative of the fact that perhaps the biggest question facing Christianity today is not whether it is right (in the sense of being true) but right (in the sense of being good).

It is evident that I have not written *Questions*. It has been set aside for other things. But this article is an attempt to, if not lay the groundwork, at least poke around a bit and see where the groundwork might go.

The Problem

It seems to me that underlying many, if not all, of the questions relating to morality is a deeper question as to the basis of morality. For example, if one is to say that the Biblical view of gender or sexuality is moral deficient, then that entails that one has a separate standard against which the Biblical view can be judged. If one is to say that God was wrong to do such-and-such an act, or was wrong to command this or that, then one must have a separate standard against which those actions or commands can be judged. If Christianity (or theism in general) is to be condemned as immoral then one would require a non-theistic grounding for morality against which to judge it. For myself, I find attempts to ground morality within an atheist worldview to be entirely unconvincing, as do many atheist philosophers. In which case those atheists who object to Christianity, or the Bible, on moral grounds, are either just proclaiming their personal preferences (which isn't much of an argument) or else are borrowing moral values to which their worldview does not entitle them.

However, pointing out that atheism is intellectually unsatisfying does not let Christianity off the hook because Christians do believe in a moral standard and (generally) believe that this moral standard is grounded in God. So, for Christians there is a moral standard against which the Bible can be judged. In this sense the moral questions facing Christianity and the Bible are a species of questions about apparent inconsistency: “how can this or that be reconciled with your morality?”. So, the key to making progress on these questions is trying to understand how morality is grounded.

The Euthyphro Dilemma

In Plato’s dialogue *Euthyphro*, Socrates asks the question: “Is what is holy holy because the gods approve it, or do they approve it because it is holy?” (10a). This question has become the famous dilemma of moral philosophy: is something right because God wills it or does God will it because it is right? The latter option (God wills things because they are right) implies that morality is independent of God. There are some who would take this view, arguing that moral truths are necessary truths. There is no possible world in which acts like rape or murder would not be morally wrong; they are wrong in all possible worlds. This view seems to challenge divine aseity, since it makes God dependent on something outside himself. It is also runs into the same challenges as faced by the atheist; if morality is not grounded in God then what is it that makes it true?

The former option has its own challenges. If something is right only because God wills it, then acts of cruelty and brutality would be right if God commanded them. This seems objectionable. It seems contrary to our general moral sense to say that rape would be morally good if God commanded it. One might choose to stand firm on this point and argue that we have no basis to object to divine commands; just because we don’t like a hypothetical implication isn’t an argument against it. However, the implication is still troubling. Suppose that on the 5th July God said, “murder is wrong” and then on the 6th July God said, “murder is right”. According to this simple view of divine command theory, morality simply changes overnight. Any idea that morality is purposeful or teleological must be surrendered – morality would be purely contingent on a divine will.

For many Christians the solution to the *Euthyphro* dilemma is the divine nature. God is good – many would say, following Plato, that God is the Good – and therefore one does not need to choose either horn of the dilemma. What God wills is good because God is good. Many Christian philosophers nuance divine command theory in this way, arguing that whilst morality is grounded in divine commands, those commands will always be good because God is good. It is not possible for God to

command cruelty or brutality because it is not possible for God to go against his nature.

There may still be objections to divine command theory. One such objection is that when we talk about right and wrong, we usually mean something different than “commanded by God” or “forbidden by God”. One reason for this is that it is possible for God to command things or forbid things for reasons other than morality. For instance, when we think about God commanding the construction of the Tabernacle, we usually don’t think of this as a moral requirement but a ceremonial one. Similarly, God could (presumably) command an individual to make jelly, or grow their beard long, or join a group of Morris dancers, without issuing a moral command (or so it seems to me). Otherwise, we reintroduce the problem of moral arbitrariness. God is surely free to issue commands about all kinds of things at any time and for whatever span he chooses, but if all those commands are thus moral norms then morality thus becomes contingent again. Therefore “commanded by God” is not the same as morally right. Here we see the crucial difference between what is morally wrong and what is sin. Sin consists of things that displease or offend God. Sin includes all that is morally wrong, but also includes anything else that damages our relationship with God.

Therefore, we might want to modify our view of moral grounding still further. Why think that God needs to issue commands to ground morality? After all, do we believe that morality is a matter of commands? Jesus didn’t seem to think so. (This is the question of whether you’re a deontologist or virtue ethicist). I find it difficult to accept that morality is a matter of consequences. It would seem strange to suggest that only successful murder is wrong; surely an incompetent murderer is just as bad as a competent one, morally speaking. But if morality is a matter of intentions, rather than consequences, then it seems difficult to think that morality is a matter of rules. Rules constrain consequences, not intentions. So, if morality is a matter of intentions, rules seem insufficient. Therefore, whilst rules can be part of our moral landscape, I don’t think what is right is simply a matter of what is commanded. For this reason, I am sympathetic to view that morality is grounded in divine motives (or perhaps divine virtues) rather than divine commands. To do the right thing is to act on motives that imitate divine motives (or, perhaps, to act with virtues that imitate divine virtues).¹ These divine motives include justice, love and compassion.

¹ See Linda Zagzebski, “Morality and Religion” in *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Religion* (ed. William J. Wainwright; Oxford University Press, 2005), 344-365.

Could God command what is evil?

On the face of it, this might seem like a trivial question. If God is all-good, if God is the Good, if God's unchanging nature is goodness, then surely God could never command evil. We have already acknowledged that God is entitled to command things that are morally neutral. God could command anything of us that is consistent with divine motives and we should obey. But, we might think, it is surely impossible for God to command us to do something that is evil.

In fact, the question is not trivial. This is evident when looking at the analogy with the problem of suffering. There is suffering. Whether we believe that God directly causes that suffering or merely allows the circumstances under which such suffering takes place, either way we have to reconcile to the fact that God permits that suffering. Usually Christian philosophers reconcile the fact of permitted suffering with the goodness of God by arguing that God permits such suffering for a purpose. For example, the Free Will Defence argues that God is justified in permitting the moral evils that humans commit because it allows for the great good of free will. In this vein, analogies are invoked of cases where suffering is permitted to allow for a greater desired outcome (the dentist being one such analogy). But if it is morally acceptable for God to permit certain evils to allow for greater goods, then isn't it also morally acceptable for God to command certain evils to achieve greater goods? The parent not only allows the dentist to drill into the mouths of their children but also positively instructs them to do so (and pays them after!)

Of course, allowing suffering is not the same as causing suffering. In the dentist analogy, one of the key considerations is the question of consent. We would not consider it morally acceptable for vigilante dentists to go around performing operations without consent. On the other hand, we might think that the consent can be overruled in questions of danger to life, say. So, the question of what constitutes a greater good, and what is a sufficiently greater good to justify causing any particularly instance of suffering, will be complex. Nevertheless, the general principle seems sound: there are instances where God could command an action that would otherwise be an immoral action.

Conclusion

So, where does that leave us with the moral issues of the Bible? We do have a moral standard according to which we can judge the morality of the Bible, that is the divine nature. All other things being equal, we would expect divine actions and divine commands to be in accordance with the divine nature. The things that God is recorded to have done would be in accordance with his motives and virtues. There may be cases where God does something that would otherwise be considered wrong but is nevertheless in accordance with his divine motives because it serves a greater good. The things that God commanded would be in accordance with his motives

and virtues, either commanding things that morally good or morally neutral. There may be cases where God commands something that would otherwise be considered wrong but is nevertheless in accordance with his divine motives because it serves a greater good.

This is not a magic bullet for all our moral questions. There may still be cases where we think a recorded divine action, or a recorded divine command is unjustifiable – that there is no good that would justify the recorded evil. We may also have to acknowledge that since we cannot know all ends, we may not be in a position to determine what greater good was permitted by certain recorded acts or commands. Nevertheless, exploring the grounding of morality is the first and necessary step to exploring questions of biblical morality.

TG

Postscript

Living by sight is superior to living by faith. Living by sight is the normal state. If we ask then why it should be that God requires faith on our part today, the answer is clear: faith is a corollary of His absence or hiddenness, but this, firstly, is not a consequence of sin. Sin separates, and sin necessarily brings about God's hiddenness, but God's absence is also shown prior to the Fall when he left Adam and Eve in order to see if they would obey him.

Rather than leave humankind to go on sinning, or destroy humankind, God has provided a way of salvation, but he has chosen *faith in his word* as the first response on the part of men and women rather than another attitude on their part, and he has done this because the failure of Adam and Eve in the first place was *not to believe* his word. Someone might ask why faith is not then the greatest rather than love. Here the answer is that when we live by sight, love (and therefore obedience) will remain, while faith and hope will not, and so love is the greatest. Its greatness lies in its primordial primacy.

AP

Supplement

Is the adorning of a woman's head when praying and prophesying primarily of theological or domestic significance in Paul's argument in 1 Cor 11:2-16?

Andrew Perry

Introduction

In this paper we want to analyse Paul's arguments¹ in 1 Cor 11:2-16 from a social, ecclesial and theological perspective. We want to uncover the ecclesial situation implied by this passage, and in particular the role (and supporting views) of those women who were praying and prophesying at Corinth. We want to set this situation in the broader context of Greco-Roman and Jewish socio-religious norms and determine the extent of such influence (if any) on the ecclesial situation. Finally, we want to examine if and how Paul uses domestic and theological arguments to establish an order in the ecclesia.

The teaching is of some importance to Paul. We can gather this from the fact that while Paul "commends"² the Corinthians for following his "traditions" (*paradosis* – 1 Cor 11:2, cf. 2 Thess 2:15, 3:6), they had yet to recognize and practise a proper order in meetings (1 Cor 11:34). It is significant that what Paul was advocating was already to be regarded as "tradition", and that such tradition had developed even at this early stage in the evolution of the movement. What Paul enjoins upon the Corinthians is not a teaching of *local* and *ad hoc* application, or one that is innovative to this letter, but one that had received widespread support in the "churches of God" (1 Cor 11:16, cf. 4:17), and about which the Corinthians would therefore have some knowledge from their normal intercourse with other ecclesias.³ It should also be noted that Paul expresses himself in strong language:

¹ We will assume for the purposes of this essay that the passage is completely Pauline.

² Paul is being ironic in his "praise" of the Corinthians and he means that they were *not* following his traditions of which one was about a proper order in meetings.

³ The evidence for the inter-connectedness of the Pauline ecclesias is detailed in Wayne Meeks, *The First Urban Christians* (New Haven: Yale University press, 1983), 107-110.

I want you to know...dishonours his head...dishonours her head...the same as if her head were shaved...shameful ...indeed ought not to cover his head...ought to have...authority on her head...Is it proper? ...does not even nature itself teach you... 1 Cor 11:2-14

This is strong language - the language of moral imperative (what they ought to have been doing).

The passage is undoubtedly significant for settling practical ecclesial differences over worship.¹ Paul deploys arguments concerning honour and shame (vv. 4-5); he deploys an argument based on the account of creation in Genesis (vv. 7-9, 11-12); he has a cryptic reference to angels (v. 10); and finally, he appeals to what the Corinthians regard as “proper” (v. 13) and taught by “nature” (v. 14). Paul introduces his whole case with a principle of headship (v. 3).

The passage bristles with difficulty² and it is no exaggeration to say that scholars have disputed almost every aspect. For example,

- The meaning of individual words and phrases such as κεφαλὴ (“head”, v3), ἀκατακαλύπτω (“uncovered”, vv. 5, 13), κατακαλύπτωμαι (“covered”, vv. 6 (twice), 7), περιβολαίου (“covering”, v. 15), and κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων (“having his head covered”, v. 4), have been the locus of disputes about whether Paul is addressing head coverings or hairstyles.
- The *logic* of Paul’s argument has presented several puzzles. How does the principle of headship in v. 3 relate to the body of arguments in vv. 4-16? How do arguments about shame and honour, Genesis typology, and what is proper and taught by nature, cohere together? Perhaps the main puzzle of logic has been why Paul mentions angels in v. 10 - διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους.
- The social and cultural background has been disputed. One issue concerns the extent to which Jewish and/or Greco-Roman

¹ We know Paul is concerned with communal meetings of worship because his case is about prophesying (1 Cor 14:3, 22).

² For example, E. Schüssler-Fiorenza observes that the passage is “very convoluted and far from being intelligible even today”, *In Memory Of Her* (2nd Ed.; London: SCM Press, 1995), 219.

religious customs are informing the Corinthian practices, or underpinning what Paul is advocating. A second issue is whether Paul is advocating a household patriarchal code of behaviour as a model for ecclesial relationships.

- The meaning and significance of Paul's use of the doctrine of creation has been disputed. Paul asserts that man is the "image and glory of God" whereas "woman is the glory of man". Scholars have disagreed over whether this is a valid use of Genesis and whether Paul's advocacy of such a created order is consistent with the baptismal principle that there is neither male nor female in Christ (Gal 3:28).¹

We cannot avoid any of these areas of difficulty in addressing the question of whether Paul's teaching in 1 Cor 11:2-16 is primarily of theological or domestic significance.

The notion of "domestic significance" in our question could be construed in several ways. For example,

- Paul's teaching has domestic significance if it is about how husbands and wives behave at ecclesial meetings, possibly those meetings that are held in their house.² Here Paul is understood to be reinforcing the common cultural household model of the day.
- Paul's teaching has domestic significance if it is using (and/or adapting) first century socio-religious norms in respect of male-female relationships to govern the religious meetings of the new sect.

¹ It is assumed here that Galatians dates from before the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15) and about five years before 1 Corinthians (normally dated in the mid-fifties C.E.). The arguments for this position are summarised by D. Guthrie in *New Testament Introduction* (4th ed.; Leicester: Inter Varsity Press, 1990), 477-480.

² It was the practice of the early church to meet in houses (see W. Meeks, *Urban Christians*, 75-77), and with the mixed social makeup in the ecclesia (cf. 1 Cor 1:26), it is likely that there would have been tensions arising from disagreements over the proper way to behave in meetings. For example, did the patriarch of a house have any authority over an ecclesia meeting in his house? How was a matriarch of a household to behave with regard to her husband (or any baptised servants) in the more egalitarian setting of an ecclesial meeting?

- Paul's teaching has domestic significance if it is about relatively trivial local matters of fashion such as the way men and women have their hair or choose head-coverings.

We shall consider each of these notions in our discussion of whether Paul's argument is primarily of theological or domestic significance.

The passage undoubtedly has domestic significance if only because Paul is at least putting forward views about the way men and women adorn their heads. However, in itself this claim is trivial; it doesn't account for Paul's strength of opinion. We need to fill out a more substantial domestic context. This could be done sociologically using either an 'integration' or 'boundary' model.

If Paul is ordering husband-wife relationships using a familiar household model, or using male and female norms from common socio-religious practices, then he can be understood to be *integrating* the Corinthians' sense of Christian identity with wider society. Alternatively, Paul could be distinguishing proper behaviour for meetings from other cults and, by this, setting some *boundaries*. Either model would be a kind of Pauline **domestic agenda** and define the domestic significance of the passage in a way that accounts for Paul's passion.

The passage has these two kinds of domestic significance, because throughout 1 Corinthians Paul is engaged in applying the Gospel to practical ecclesial circumstances. The state in which the ecclesia found itself had come about (speaking in the most general terms) as a result of men and women from mixed social backgrounds coming together into a new group. Inevitably, community meetings were evolving as the Corinthians applied the ideology of the Gospel in conjunction with their previously learned cultural norms. Paul is clearly attempting to bring order to this mix.¹

Does Paul apply theology to the Corinthians' situation? There are a number of questions to ask if we are to determine the theological significance of the passage:

Headship – is this a purely domestic notion to do with ecclesial or marital relationships, or is it grounded in a theology of creation or new creation in Christ?

¹ The emphasis on order (cf. 1 Cor 14:40) should also be seen against the backdrop of the Corinthians' tendency to schism (1 Cor 1:11-13).

Shame and Honour – are these social concepts or is Paul deploying a typology from the Old Testament?

Creation – is Paul using the doctrine of creation to enforce a social patriarchal order in male/female behaviour, or is he drawing an analogy between the creation of Adam and Eve and the ecclesia in order to enforce a theological distinction between male and female “in the Lord”?

Propriety and Nature – do Paul’s closing arguments have any theological merit, or are they a hermeneutical key proving that Paul has been concerned all along with purely domestic matters?

We shall explore each of these avenues in our discussion of whether Paul’s argument is primarily of theological or domestic significance.

Headship and Honour

Paul begins his discussion by stating that there is a series of “heads” that define certain relationships between God, Christ and men and women in the ecclesia.

But I want you to know that the head of every man is Christ, the head of woman *is* man, and the head of Christ *is* God. 1 Cor 11:3

Paul is interested in drawing out a corollary of the headship of the man in respect of woman, and a corollary of the headship of Christ in respect of every man. He doesn’t develop any teaching from the principle that God is the head of Christ.

The metaphor of “headship” employed by Paul has been the subject of scholarly dispute. There have been two main proposals:

- a “head” is someone who has “authority over” other(s)
- a “head” is someone who is “the source of” other(s)

These two possibilities have different consequences for our discussion as to whether this passage is primarily of theological or domestic significance. If Paul is saying that the man has authority over woman, then this clearly has domestic significance; if Paul is saying that the man is the source of woman, then this appears to be a theological doctrine derived from the Genesis creation accounts.

The traditional approach is that a “head” is someone with authority over others. This is certainly the case in modern English culture, but was it the same in the first century? J. A. Fitzmyer¹ has argued that in Hellenistic Greek κεφαλή carried the metaphorical significance of “position of leadership or authority”. Fitzmyer states his conclusion in these terms,

The upshot of this discussion is that a Hellenistic Jewish writer such as Paul of Tarsus could well have intended that κεφαλή in 1 Cor 11:3 be understood as ‘head’ in the sense of authority or supremacy over someone else.^{2,3}

The basis of Fitzmyer’s conclusion is a collection of passages from the LXX, Philo, Josephus and the *Shepherd of Hermas*. For example, one passage that Fitzmyer uses is from 2 Sam 22:44,

φυλάξεις με εἰς κεφαλὴν ἔθνων λαός ὃν οὐκ ἔγνω ἑδούλευσάν μοι

You have kept me as the head of the nations. A people I have not known shall serve me. 2 Sam 22:44

Fitzmyer makes the point that the last half of v. 44 makes it clear that κεφαλή is used with the connotation of “authority” or “supremacy”.⁴ We do not need to list each of Fitzmyer’s dozen or so examples as his point is the same in each case.

A. Perriman⁵ provides a convincing discussion of each of Fitzmyer’s examples. He argues that Fitzmyer’s analysis is not sufficiently nuanced in that the examples show more the notion of “prominence” rather than that of “authority”. Taking the example of 2 Sam 22:44, Perriman concludes,

¹ J. A. Fitzmyer, “Another Look at ΚΕΦΑΛΗ in 1 Corinthians 11:3”, *NTS* 35 (1989): 503-511.

² J. A. Fitzmyer, “Another Look”, 510.

³ Paul does deploy the notion of “authority” in this passage (v. 10); however, his point is that the woman has authority on her head. Paul doesn’t use the proposition that Christ has authority over every man or that the man has authority over woman in his argument.

⁴ J. A. Fitzmyer, “Another Look”, 508.

⁵ A. Perriman, *Speaking of Women* (Leicester: Apollos, 1998), 19.

I would suggest, rather, that the pre-eminence of David as God’s anointed king...constitutes a more relevant set of associations for the interpretation of *kephalē* here.

Perriman’s argument is finely balanced. A person who has a position of prominence or pre-eminence may very well be a leader and have authority over others. However, this doesn’t mean that κεφαλῆ carries the metaphorical sense of “having authority” – it may just carry the metaphorical sense of “prominence”. A context in which the metaphor of headship occurs may very well also have notions of authority and leadership, but they may be carried by different language and complement the use of the “headship” rather than unpack that metaphor. Interestingly, Perriman shows that the notion of being a “representative” is closely associated with the metaphor of headship in some of Fitzmyer’s LXX examples (e.g. Jud 10:18, 11:8-9 {A}, and Jud 11:11 {A} {a}).

Although Fitzmyer and Perriman differ in their reading of certain (principally LXX) passages, they should be regarded as batting on the same side. An opposing interpretation of the metaphor of “headship” is put forward by G. D. Fee, who states his conclusion in these terms:

Paul’s understanding of the metaphor, therefore, and almost certainly the only one the Corinthians would have grasped, is ‘head’ as “source” and especially “source of life” ...¹

The basis of Fee’s argument is twofold:

- the occurrence of the metaphor “headship” as “authority over” is rare in profane² Greek literature, and where it does occur, it should more properly be regarded as conveying the sense of “leadership” rather than “authority”.
- there are several examples of a metaphorical sense of “source” in profane Greek. Fee quotes examples from Philo, Artemidorus, and an Orphic fragment.

For example, Fee cites Philo from *De Congressu Quaerendae Eruditionis* 61,

¹ G. D. Fee, *1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 503; Fee cites other scholars in support.

² It should be noted that the “authority” interpretation of the metaphor does claim most of its support from *septuagintal* usage.

And of all the members of the clan here described Esau is the progenitor, the κεφαλή as it were of the whole creature [meaning the source of the whole clan].¹

We do not need to examine Fee's other examples as the argument is the same in each case.

This example (and others) is discussed by Perriman, and once again, the analysis is more nuanced. His comment on the Philo text is that it is about the prominence and historical *priority* of the patriarch.² His comments on Fee's other texts have broadly the same outcome – the metaphor has more to do with precedence and priority rather than expressing the idea of “source”.³

Hence, C. D. Yonge translates the above Philo text as,

But as the head is the chief of all the aforementioned parts of the animal, so is Esau the chief of this race...⁴

Yonge's translation goes beyond the idea of prominence and introduces the notion of leadership. Although Perriman and Yonge disagree, they are nevertheless in the same ballpark and opposing the proposal of Fee that the metaphor of headship that Philo uses is about physical descent.

In addition, Perriman makes two general observations: firstly, the interpretation of a metaphor is particularly sensitive to context; for example, in geomorphology, the head of a river may be its “source” – but this doesn't mean that in a social context the head of a person is the source of that person's life. Secondly, ancient writers may use ‘head’ in a specific way, but a specialized use of ‘head’ doesn't show that ‘head’ carried that particular metaphorical sense in general; for example, Artemidorus in *Oneirocriticum* 1.2 writes,

¹ Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 503, n. 45.

² Perriman, *Speaking of Women*, 26.

³ Paul does make a point about the *source* of the man and the woman - they are out of each other in different ways (vv. 8-9, 12); but this point makes *both* a source (the ‘source’ reading of v. 3 makes just the man the source of woman).

⁴ C. D. Yonge, *The Works of Philo* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997), 309.

In real life, the father of this man, too, died; for just as the head is the source of life and light for the whole body, he was responsible for the dreamer's life and light.¹

Perriman's comment on this text is that Artemidorus is making a specialized use of 'head' that fits the analogy he is drawing between parts of the body and members of the family – this doesn't mean that 'head' has the metaphorical sense of "source".

There is then a need to respect the context in which a metaphor occurs and a need to respect the distinction between *discourse usage* and a *lexical sense*.²

Perriman's conclusion and lexical proposal about the metaphor of headship is as follows:

I would suggest, therefore, that the common metaphorical application of *kephalē* embraces a coherent range of meanings that can be mapped as follows, and that it is within this area that we should expect to find the proper background to Paul's use of the word: (1) the physical top or extremity of an object, such as a mountain or river or pillar...; (2) more abstractly, that which is first, extreme, either in temporal or spatial terms; (3) that which is prominent or outstanding; and (4) that which is determinative or representative by virtue of its prominence.³

The notion of "headship" which we will then adopt then is that a head is the one who is prominent in respect to another or group of others. Paul identifies this series of heads just so that he can go on and assert that two of these heads are dishonoured by failure on the part of men and women in the ecclesia to adorn their heads appropriately. The concept of headship is critical to Paul's point in vv. 4-6 but not subsequently.

If the metaphor of headship is construed in the sense of "the one who has prominence", then it can be plausibly argued that Paul is applying a household

¹ This is cited in Perriman, *Speaking of Women*, 28.

² The distinction between the "discourse usage" of an expression and the lexical sense of an expression is outlined by P. Cotterell and M. Turner in *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation* (London: SPCK, 1989), 139-145. Cotterell and Turner use the metaphor of "headship" as one of their worked examples to introduce the distinction.

³ Perriman, *Speaking of Women*, 32.

model to ecclesial meetings – a household code of conduct in which normally the man is “the head of the household”. Within this code certain behaviour by members of the household would bring dis-honour to the head of the household. This proposal clearly defines one way in which we might say that Paul’s argument has *domestic significance*. Paul is applying a common domestic code in his appeal to the Corinthians.¹

Honour and Shame

Paul states that a “covered” head dis-honours (καταισχύνω) Christ on the part of the man (v. 4), and an “uncovered” head dishonours the man on the part of the woman (v. 5). Honour is a social construct; it can be *ascribed* to a person or it can be *acquired* by a person. The ascription of honour in Mediterranean society would follow from that person’s social standing in a family, i.e. membership of a family (the basic unit of society was not the individual). In contrast, the honour that can be acquired by a person would derive from their having achieved certain things in their life, typically, this would be honour regarded as moral virtue.²

The membership of a family or household would convey a certain honour and this honour would pre-eminently be represented by the head of the household. Accordingly, as a member of the household, a person would dis-honour the head if they behaved inappropriately – in this way they represent the head of the household.

Paul is contending for a particular understanding of honour³ to be respected in the ecclesia and in so doing he is applying a significant social construct which would

¹ A development of the concept of the headship of Christ can be seen in the household code of the Letter of Ephesians (Eph 5:22-25). On this, see D. G. Horrell, “The Development of Theological Ideology in Pauline Christianity” in *Modelling Early Christianity* (ed., Phillip. F. Esler; London: Routledge, 1995), 230-233.

² This twofold approach to “honour” in Mediterranean societies is outlined in H. Moxnes, “Honour and Shame” in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* (ed., R. Rohrbaugh; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996).

³ Paul has already contended for a new understanding of what is true honour in his praise of the “shame of the cross” (1 Cor 1:18-31). This is an argument for an *acquired* honour through the work of the cross, rather than honour that Christ had in virtue of his sonship. And again in 1 Cor 4:6-21, Paul tries to re-orientate the Corinthian’s perceptions of honour and shame presenting himself as their *paterfamilias* (v. 15). On the theme of Paul as the *paterfamilias* of the Corinthians see, S. J. Joubert, “Managing the Household: Paul as ‘Paterfamilias’ of the Christian Household Group in Corinth” in *Modelling Early Christianity* (ed., Phillip. F. Esler; London: Routledge, 1995), 213-223.

have had well understood cultural applications. However, Paul's coupling of the concepts of headship and honour/dis-honour is not a straightforward application of a patriarchal model to the ecclesia.

We can surmise some theological reasons underpinning this household model of headship and honour/dishonour. Christ has a "head" because he was the son of God (1 Cor 1:9); likewise, every man has a "head" because he is a "servant" owned by Christ and takes from Christ the example for his behaviour (1 Cor 3:11, 23, 7:22, 11:1).¹ A man is a servant of Christ "in his household" because of Christ's work of redemption. However, while there may be a natural "fit" between theology and a cultural and ethical model in these two applications of headship, it is less clear how woman has the man as a "head" *in the ecclesia* in a theological sense.

Scholars often assume a marital context for Paul's point about the headship of the man and the honour or dis-honour that might arise from a woman's behaviour.

But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a woman is her husband, and the head of Christ is God." 1 Cor 11:3 (RSV)

The main reason for this "marital" reading lies in Paul's use of Genesis and the account of the creation of Adam and Eve (1 Cor 11:7-10). However, there are difficulties with this interpretation. Firstly, the Greek for 'woman' - γυνή – has no indication of "possession" in this context; where γυνή means "wife" there is the presence of the simple genitive or an indication of possession (e.g. 1 Cor 7:2, 14:35). Secondly, the point Paul is making about the adorning of the head is clearly general, affecting not only every man (married or not), but every woman who prays and prophesies (married or not).² And lastly, it seems incongruous for Paul to mix a literal application of a household code with an analogical use of this code. In applying the household code to model the relationship of Christ to God and the relationship of Christ to every Christian man, Paul is applying a common social model by way of analogy. But if Paul affirms the headship of the husband in respect

¹ There is possible a line of influence between Paul and the author of Hebrews at this point. The author of Hebrews makes the point that Jesus was a "son" over his own house (Heb 3:6).

² The fact that Paul is concerned with every man and woman in the ecclesia indicates that he is not addressing just one socio-economic group within the ecclesia, although it may have been a single group (such as the women prophets) who were the catalyst for his remarks.

of his wife, Paul is simply applying the code in a literal way to the state of Christian marriage.

For these reasons, we conclude that Paul is not concerned with married men and women. Instead, we propose that just as Paul is applying different aspects of the household model as an analogy for understanding the relationship between God and Christ (sonship in a house), and Christ and every Christian man (servants in a house), so too Paul is drawing the same analogy when he says that “the man” is head of “woman”. Paul is drawing the analogy a third time in order to convey a theological point. In some sense, women in an ecclesial meeting should manifest a behaviour that could reasonably be expected of a man and his wife in a household. In a household, the wife’s behaviour is representative of her husband and can bring dis-honour to her head – she represents “the man” – and can dis-honour him.

In effect Paul is setting up a typology between Christ and women in the ecclesia. When he says that “the head of woman is the man” he is not describing a relationship between men and women, as if to say that the head of *any* woman in the ecclesia is *any* man. Paul is talking about “woman” and “the man”, using the account of the creation of Eve in Genesis 2 (Gen 2:23f). He is deploying the singular definite description “the man” to refer to Christ as the second man and last Adam (1 Cor 15:45-47). This is an “Adamic” typology that Paul will further enlarge in vv. 7-9; in this typology the women of the ecclesia should consider themselves collectively as “the woman” (Eve) corresponding to “the man” of the new creation.¹ In this arrangement, they can dis-honour Christ if they do not adorn their head in an appropriate manner. Paul is using typology to model and order the behaviour of women in the ecclesia.

This reading removes the difficulties that have been put forward concerning this passage and the issue of male and female equality in Christ. It removes the men in the ecclesia from a direct relationship of authority over the women and places Paul’s point into a typological framework. This approach underpins the social significance of Paul’s point about adorning the head with a theology centred on the prominence

¹ W. J. Martin assumes a similar interpretation. However, he reads too much into Paul’s argument. His interpretation is that women in the ecclesia represent “the church” and men represent Christ. This is taking Paul too far and overlaying later theology (perhaps teaching from Ephesians) on top of 1 Corinthians 11. Instead, Paul’s point is more austere and not as developed. See W. J. Martin, “1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation” in *Apostolic History and the Gospel* (eds., W. Ward Gasque and R. P. Martin; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1970), 231-241.

of Christ. As such it dovetails with the theme of Christ's lordship which is central to Paul's thought in 1 Corinthians (cf. 1 Cor 11:1).

Paul will enlarge upon this typology in vv. 7-9, but before we examine Paul's central argument in these verses, we must explore the social and cultural background to the issue of adorning of the head.

Social and Cultural Catalysts

There is clearly a social and cultural background to 1 Cor 11:2-16. Paul is addressing an issue of concern to him, but the behaviour of the Corinthian men and women was presumably based on competing social and/or religious norms. Paul is advocating a very specific social behaviour to do with adorning the head; he isn't counselling them about general moral behaviour. Accordingly, scholars have sought to explain the social and cultural context by reference to Greco-Roman and Jewish practices regarding the adorning of the head. Scholars have also sought to show that Paul is supporting one extant social and cultural practice over against another.

If Paul's teaching has domestic significance, then it is likely that this is because some or all of the Corinthians were using (and/or adapting) first century socio-religious norms in respect of male-female relationships to govern the meetings of the new sect.¹ An alternative (although not necessarily competing) approach argues that the Corinthians were advocating socio-religious practices on the basis of *Christian theology* rather than contemporary cultic norms. They were taking a fundamental principle of the Gospel and working out the implications in community life. It is possible that this principle was being particularly put forward by the woman prophets in Corinth.²

With their baptism into Christ, the Corinthian men and women had taken on an equal status and presumably able to carry out equal roles in the ecclesia. Paul explicitly teaches the principle of salvific equality in Galatians:

¹ J. D. G. Dunn, arguing from the likelihood that the whole Corinthian church met in the house of Gaius (Rom 16:23) and the typical entertaining facilities of well-to-do houses (accommodating around 40), observes that the social tensions and dynamics of opposition in the Corinth would have involved small numbers – J. D. G. Dunn, *1 Corinthians* (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1995), 18. Dunn's point is salutary - Paul is writing a letter and doing theology in a pastoral context, and the problem is small and local.

² See A. C. Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1995).

There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free,
there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.
Gal 3:28

This is widely regarded as a baptismal liturgical formula in use around the ecclesias. As W. Meeks¹ argues, this formula makes a factual claim about an objective change in reality that was achieved through the performative act of baptism. This rite of initiation fundamentally modified social roles. It broke down common social distinctions instead of integrating them into the working of the body of Christ. Paul alludes to the same principle in 1 Cor 12:13 to teach the unity of the body and in particular, the common participation by everyone in the spirit-gifts:

For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body -- whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free -- and have all been made to drink into one Spirit. 1 Cor 12:13, cf. Col 3:10-11

This common participation in the Spirit is illustrated in 1 Corinthians 11 where Paul mentions men and women equally prophesying and praying in the spirit. This principle implies the breaking down of the distinctions between men and women in how they were meant to behave in religious settings. In the situation addressed by Paul, it is usually assumed that it was particularly the women who were asserting their *Christian* equality by not adorning their head as might have been the norm for non-Christian religious women. Alternatively, it might be that they were intentionally copying a male custom common in other religious groups.

Meeks argues, in common with others, that Paul is modifying the baptismal principle of equality in 1 Corinthians 11. Meeks' view is that equality of status implied an equality of role but that did not mean for Paul that men and women were not to observe some *symbolic* differences between the sexes in the present age while waiting for the age to come.² Whether equality of role is so implied by an equality of status is an argument for another paper; here we are just concerned with the symbolic difference conveyed by adornment of the head.

¹ W. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne: Some uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity" *History of Religions*, 13/3, (1974): 165-208.

² For example, another scholar following a similar line is R. Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman" *JAR*, 40, (1972): 283-306. The *historical* argument here is that in the development of the church, the baptismal formula is pre-Pauline and in 1 Corinthians 11 we have the beginnings of a reaction to this egalitarianism.

Styles of Hair or Head-Coverings

A critical point of debate regarding the social context of Paul's remarks is whether Paul addresses a matter concerning the Corinthian women's hair styles or whether he is insisting on the wearing of an external head-covering. The traditional and older commentary view is that Paul is arguing for an external head-covering for women and the absence of such a covering for men. However, recent criticism has argued the case that Paul is concerned about hair.

The arguments depend on a distinctive translation of certain Greek phrases and identifying the correct social context in Corinth *and abroad*¹ amongst the Pauline ecclesias (1 Cor 11:16).

The disputed phrases are:

- The phrase κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων - rendered as “having his head covered” (v. 4)
- The adjective ἀκατακαλύπτως rendered as “uncovered” (vv. 5, 13)
- The verb κατακαλύπτομαι rendered variously as “covered” and “to cover” (vv. 6 (twice), 7)
- The noun περιβολαῖον - rendered as “covering” (v. 15)

We will discuss these in turn and consider first the case that Paul is concerned about hair; after this, we will consider the case that Paul is concerned about head-coverings.

The Case for Hair

Two possible translations of κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων are the following:

“Every man praying or prophesying, having [his] head covered, dishonours his head” 1 Cor 11:4

“Every man who prays or prophesies with long hair dishonours his head.” 1 Cor 11:4 (N.I.V. footnote)¹

¹ Paul may well have used the same teaching elsewhere in establishing a custom among the ecclesias, and these would have had a different cultural bias (e.g. Galatian, Jewish, Greek). Taking this wider perspective, the domestic and social significance of Paul's arguments are broader in scope.

Several scholars² argue for the “hair” interpretation although each scholar has a slightly different take on the passage. Each of them makes the point that Paul mentions hair in vv. 14-15 and they take Paul’s explicit mention of hair at the end of his argument to clarify the difficult expression *κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων*.

J. Murphy-O’Conner makes two points:³

- The verb ἔχων has a missing object and it is natural to suggest that the ‘object’ might be hair; otherwise it is difficult to imagine why Paul did not mention something like a veil if he was referring to an external head-covering.
- The preposition *kata* with genitive (of object i.e. ‘head’) should be taken to mean ‘down’ or ‘down from’ and this fits with the suggestion of hair (hanging down from the head).

Hence Murphy-O’Conner argues that Paul is saying that for a man to have long hair hanging down from the head would be a dis-honour.

This line is supported by A. Padgett⁴ who additionally observes that the normal Greek for ‘veil’ – *kalumma* – does not occur in the passage, and that the preposition *kata* does not generally mean ‘on’; were the verses concerned with head-coverings, it would have been more natural for a preposition like *epi* to have been used.

In coiffure, stylists will talk of having hair ‘up’ or ‘down’ in various associated styles. It’s not unreasonable to suppose that it was the same in Corinth. Such talk implies

¹ K. L. Barker, *The Accuracy of the NIV* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 90, observes that this footnote was included in the N.I.V. because reputable scholars think the passage is about hair, and that the interpretation was possible and of sufficient importance to be represented in a footnote.

² For example, J. Murphy O’Conner, “Sex and Logic in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16” *CBQ* 42, (1980): 482-500.

³ Murphy O’Conner, “Sex and Logic”, 484-485.

⁴ A. Padgett, “Paul on Women in the Church: The Contradictions of Coiffure in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16”, *JSNT* 20 (1984): 69-86 (70). It should be noted that while Padgett interprets the Greek phrases in the same way as Murphy O’Conner, he thinks that 1 Cor 11:3-7^b is a quotation of Corinthian arguments rather than Paul making his own case. A rebuttal of this approach is beyond the scope of this paper.

nothing about *length* of hair, but rather about whether a person has his or her hair ‘up’ or ‘down’.

If Paul is concerned with the length of men’s hair in v. 4 or whether his hair is hanging down from the head, then it would seem a false antithesis for Paul to talk of external head coverings for women in vv. 5-6. The key words in these verses are ἀκατακαλύπτος and κατακαλύπτομαι and one possible translation is,

And every woman who prays or prophesies with no covering of hair [ἀκατακαλύπτος] on her head dishonours her head - she is just like one of the “shorn women”. If a woman has no covering [κατακαλύπτομαι], let her be for now with short hair, but since it is a disgrace for a woman to have her hair shorn or shaved, she should grow it again [κατακαλύπτομαι]. 1 Cor 11:5-6 (N.I.V. Footnote)

This rendering of ἀκατακαλύπτος as ‘no covering of hair’ and κατακαλύπτομαι as ‘no covering’ is assuming an object for the verb (hair) and this explains the rather free rendering of the second occurrence of κατακαλύπτομαι as ‘she should grow it again’. This assumption fits Paul’s comparison with the class of “shorn women”.

Murphy O’Conner and Padgett argue that the word ἀκατακαλύπτος is better rendered ‘unbound’ – so that on this reading (for Murphy O’Conner) Paul is objecting to women having unbound hair or untidy, unkempt hair in meetings.¹ Each scholar cites the same comparative evidence from the Septuagint. The word ἀκατακαλύπτος occurs once in the LXX,² translating a Hebrew participle *pārōga*:

The leper who has the disease shall wear torn clothes and let the hair of his head hang loose [*pārōga*], and he shall cover his upper lip and cry, ‘Unclean, Unclean’... Lev 13:45 (RSV), cf. Num 5:18

They also support this approach by reference to 1 Cor 11:15 where Paul describes a woman’s hair as a “cloak” or “wrap” (περιβολαίον), and argue that hair is given “instead of” (ἀντι) an external covering.

Scholars supporting the view that Paul is concerned with hair offer a variety of social catalysts for Paul’s remarks:

¹ Murphy O’ Conner, “Sex and Logic”, 488-489; see also Padgett, “Paul on Women”, 70.

² There is textual variation for this word - Rahlfs’ critical edition of the LXX has ἀκατακαλύπτος, but Bagsters’ Vaticanus edition has ἀκαλύπτος.

(1) Murphy-O’Conner suggests that Paul’s opposition to men having hair hanging down from the head is based on an aversion to male homosexuality, and he cites evidence from Philo and Pseudo-Phocylides in support of the view that long dressed hair was a homosexual trait.¹ On this reading, Paul is concerned to ensure that there is no gender confusion displayed by the ecclesia.

(2) Padgett argues that Greek women wore ornamental bands or combs, with their long hair bound up, plaited or wrapped around their heads. (Greek men wore their hair short). A woman with her hair not bound up on her head would be like one of the “shorn women”, i.e. like a woman of ill repute. He concludes therefore that the argument is about a social code to be imposed on the Corinthian women.²

(3) Schüssler-Fiorenza argues that the catalyst for Paul’s remarks was an unsightly copying of the ecstatic frenzy associated with prophetic behaviour in other cults such as that of Dionysus, Isis, and others; again, she cites archaeological evidence.³

If Paul is concerned with hair, then it can be argued that Paul’s argument at least in vv. 4-6 is concerned only with social propriety and that it has no theological significance. On this view, Paul is seeking to impose common social norms to do with honour/shame and hairstyles (Murphy O’Conner), integrating the Corinthians’ cultural background with the requirements of a Christian life. He is also separating and distancing the Corinthians from the excesses of other cults (Schüssler-Fiorenza).

The Case for Head-Coverings

In Roman society, the characteristic form of worship was the sacrifice, and leftover parts of the sacrifice were sold in market places (cf. 1 Cor 10:25-31). The sacrifices were accompanied by prayers to the deity, which took the form of striking a bargain for the deity’s favour.⁴ Head-coverings were worn by men and women when performing sacrifice. Several stone reliefs depict altar scenes in which the one

¹ Murphy O’Conner, “Sex and Logic”, 485.

² Padgett, “Paul on Women”, 70.

³ Schüssler-Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her*, 227.

⁴ See J. E. Stambaugh and D. L. Balch, *The New Testament in its Social Environment* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986), 127-137.

offering the sacrifice is the only one with a covered head, and Plutarch mentions the practice in *Roman Questions*.¹

One scholar, B. Witherington III, argues on the basis of this evidence for a Roman cultural background to the issue of head coverings.² Corinth was a Roman colony with a high proportion of Roman citizens; it might be argued therefore that the social significance of Paul's strictures lies in an endorsement or a contrast with Roman religious practices regarding the adorning of the head.

This makes the phrase *κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων* refer to an external head-covering against the head. Witherington also offers linguistic evidence and concludes,

The literary evidence also supports the contention that we are dealing with head-coverings rather than hair. Plutarch uses the same phrase that Paul does, *kata kephales*, to refer to something resting on the head, not hair, and much less long, flowing hair.³

Witherington's opinion is that Romans were more concerned with proper apparel in worship than Greeks, and therefore Paul's Roman background is to the fore in 1 Corinthians 11.

There is also LXX evidence supporting this interpretation of *κατὰ κεφαλῆς*. In Esther 6:12 we read that Haman hurried to his house, mourning and having his "head covered". The underlying Hebrew (*hāpāh*) means "to cover" as in "overlay" (cf. 2 Chron 3:5-9, Ps 68:13), and indicates an external covering. This expression is translated by the Greek *κατὰ κεφαλῆς*.

Head-coverings are also known in Greek customs. Witherington comments,

The inscriptional evidence suggests that it was possible for women to participate in the mystery processions and rites with a bare head. The specific evidence we have for Corinth, however, seems to indicate that this was not the usual practice in most religious contexts...C.M. Galt has collected a vast amount of evidence, both pictorial and inscriptional, to show that the predominant custom for adult women in Greece during the Hellenistic age and later in

¹ Plutarch, *Roman Questions*, (Loeb IV, 27, 1936), 266f, 267a.

² B. Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 232-235.

³ Witherington, *op cit*.

ritual contexts was to wear a head-covering. She has also shown that in Greek religious rites and dances adult women commonly wore a head-covering and that this custom is evident particularly at Corinth.¹

There is also evidence for Jewish customs regarding head-coverings. It would seem that Jewish women wore veils in public places, but not in the synagogues, where they sat separately from the men.² However, it is unlikely that Paul has in mind Jewish veils. He nowhere mentions veils in his letters. A veil would cover the face, and the context in 1 Corinthians 11 is all about the *head*, so any external covering that Paul had in view would come down from the sides of the head.

It would seem then that there are then equally plausible social contexts relating to the wearing of head-coverings as there are if we regard Paul as being concerned with hair. On either approach, Paul might be regarded as either distancing Christians from other cultic activity or inculcating common social norms. How can we settle this matter?

The crux of the scholarly dispute over “hair or head-coverings” revolves around the absence of an object for ἀκατακαλύπτos (vv. 5, 13) and κατακαλύπτομαι (vv. 6 (twice), 7), and whether the mention of hair in v. 14 should be taken as the clue to the identity of the object. The verb κατακαλύπτομαι means “to cover fully” and it is used in a wide variety of contexts in the LXX. Of itself, it does not settle whether Paul is concerned with hair or head-coverings.

We have noted that scholars in favour of “hair” appeal to the LXX usage of ἀκατακαλύπτos in Lev 13:45. This argument is by no means certain; putting aside the point that the LXX might be a mistaken rendering of the Hebrew participle *parōga*, the correct understanding of the participle is a matter of interpretation. The basic sense conveys “loosening”, whether of the constraints of discipline, or of a head-covering, or of hair. Since the context of the passage is about bald heads and bald foreheads in which there is the sign of leprosy, i.e. hair is absent, the likelihood is that the participle is about head-coverings. Lepers may have covered their heads to

¹ B. Witherington III, *Women in the Earliest Churches* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1988), 81.

² J. Lightfoot, *Commentary on the Talmud from the New Testament* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1989), vol. 4, 229-241.

disguise their leprosy.¹ Hence the Law required that their heads be unbound - i.e. not have a turban bound round the head.²

However, even if these points were conceded, it is argued that the mention of hair in v. 14 shows that Paul has been concerned with hair style in the early part of the argument.

Propriety and Nature

Paul invites the Corinthians to judge among themselves whether it was “proper” (πρέπον) for a woman to pray uncovered (v. 13). He could be appealing to their sense of cultural propriety or he may be inviting them to reflect on his traditions and see that they implied a need for proper adornment of the head (cf. later pastoral uses of πρέπον in 1 Tim 2:9-10, Tit 2:1).

He deploys an argument from “nature” - ‘doth *not even* nature herself teach you’ (v. 14) - as a supplement to his previous argumentation and as an appeal to the Corinthians’ own wisdom. (Paul thought that nature could teach things contained in the Law³ – Rom 2:14). Nature was meant to teach that stylised locks of hair (κόμη) for the man was a shame, but a glory for the woman.

Paul makes a connection between ‘covering’ and ‘glory’ in the argument from nature: the hair is given *for* (ἄντι) a covering. This can be construed equally as meaning “instead of” a covering, but it can also mean “corresponding to” – so that if⁴ stylised locks of hair are given to a woman, then she has a covering.

On this basis, it can be argued that Paul is supporting the need for head coverings with an argument from nature such that *if* women have been given stylised locks of hair, this shows that women in general need a head covering when praying and prophesying.⁵ Paul describes the covering as a cloak or vesture (περιβολαίον, cf. Heb 1:12). He doesn’t enlarge on why such a bodily feature might be considered to be a vesture. It is possible that Paul thinks of head-coverings as a ritual display of what it

¹ Alongside this rationale, we might ask: if hair is meant, what would be the *point* of the instruction that lepers have their (remaining scraps of) hair loosened?

² This interpretation is suggested by BDB, 828.

³ If Paul is thinking of the Law in connection with hair, then he may have in mind a typology based on the Nazerite vows relating to hair.

⁴ Commentators overlook the fact that Paul uses a conditional in his logic; he is not assuming that all women have hair of the quality that can be styled as locks.

⁵ This is the argument of Witherington, *Women in the Earliest Churches*, 83.

means to “put on Christ” (Gal 3:27), and that those women with beautiful hair have a display from nature of the need to have a “clothing” from God.¹

Summary

The extent of the influence of social and cultural factors on Paul’s argument has to remain a matter of speculation, however the possibilities are clear. If Paul is concerned with hair, then he may have been concerned to steer the Corinthian men away from the appearance of homosexuality or at least to enforce proper gender distinctions in behaviour; for the women, he may have been concerned to impress the need for “respectable” standards of hairstyle and the need to avoid the appearance of being like members of other cults. If Paul is concerned with external head-coverings, then likewise Paul may have been setting boundaries and building on common perceptions of religious practice. He may have wanted to make the women wear a head-covering and not the men to distinguish believers from Jewish synagogue practice. In advocating head-coverings for women, he can be seen to be integrating the Corinthian’s growing perceptions of what it means to be a Christian with their cultural background knowledge of Roman and Greek cultic practice.

The determination of whether Paul is concerned with head-coverings or hair is not difficult; on balance, it seems that Paul is concerned with head-coverings.

The Creation Argument

Paul reinforces his argument about honour and shame with an argument based on the Genesis creation account.

For a man indeed ought not to cover *his* head, since he is the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man. For this reason, the woman ought to have *a symbol of authority on her* head, because of the angels. Nevertheless, neither *is* man independent of woman, nor woman independent of man, in the Lord. For as woman *came* from man, even so man also *comes* through woman; but all things are from God. 1 Cor 11:7-12

¹ A discussion of the possible symbolic significance of clothing for Paul is beyond the scope of this paper. However, it is worth noting that if this approach could be sustained, it would show that Paul’s argument from propriety and nature was more theological than domestic in its significance.

The argument isn't being deployed as a premise in support of Paul's conclusions about honour and shame; these conclusions are *consequences* of either covering or not covering the head. Rather, Paul's argument here is a theological foundation for a practice relating to head-coverings. Although Paul has just appealed to Corinthian notions of honour and shame, he is nevertheless concerned to underpin a practice relating to head-coverings based on a doctrine about creation. The central position of this creation argument is evidence that Paul's thinking is primarily of theological rather than sociological significance. It makes the social reasoning of vv. 4-6 to be of less importance, in keeping with Paul's tirade against cultural wisdom in 1 Corinthians 1 and 2 (cf. 1 Cor 2:5) and his remark about the passing nature of fashion (1 Cor 7:29-31).

The argument has not been without controversy. It is based on a harmonised reading of the two creation accounts in Genesis. In particular, Paul quotes from Gen 1:27 and interprets the Hebrew to refer to the *male* of the species in his ἀνὴρ εἰκῶν καὶ δόξα¹ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων rather than humanity.² In addition, he states that ἡ γυνή δὲ δόξα ἀνδρός ἐστίν, and he explains this in terms of the woman's origin, relying the creation account in Genesis 2.

This reading of Genesis 1:27 has been termed the “asymmetric reading”, and it separates in thought the parallel clauses, “So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him...”, and makes these refer to Adam - the man. The third clause of the verse, “...male and female he created them...” is joined in thought with Gen 1:28 as a lead-in to the announcement that Adam and Eve were to be fruitful and multiply. In other words, the mention of the female is separated off from the declaration as to who has been made in the image of God.³

¹ The notion of glory is absent in Gen 1:27; Paul is picking it up from Ps 8:5 which is a commentary on Gen 1:26-28.

² The evidence for this approach in Jewish writings prior to the emergence of rabbinical Judaism in the second century C.E. is set out by A. Hultgard, “God and Image in Early Jewish Religion” in *Image of God, Gender Models in Judeo-Christian Tradition*, (ed., K. E. Borresen; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1995), 29-49.

³ For two justifications of this reading, see M. G. Kline, *Images of the Spirit*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980), chap. 1 and P. A. Bird, “Sexual Differentiation and Divine Image” in *The Image of God, Gender Models in Judeo-Christian Tradition*, (ed., K. E. Borresen; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1995), 5-28. It is beyond the scope of this essay to defend or refute the asymmetric reading of Gen 1:27; however, given Paul's cultural upbringing and his inspired use of ἀνὴρ in 1 Cor 11:7, it appears that it was *his* reading.

The thrust of Paul's argument has traditionally been taken to reinforce a hierarchical social order based on creation. Summarising this approach, the feminist scholar L. Fatum observes,

The consequence of being created in God's image is to Paul a mark of qualitative value, reflecting at once man's special distinction as a creature in relation to God and the distinction of the man, his gender role and status, in relation to the woman. Woman's status as a creature subordinated to man makes her subordinated and dependent on him in her relationship to God.¹

The head-covering is then taken to be a reflection of this order.

Whether this interpretation of Paul's theology is correct has been questioned on two levels:

- We have already noted that the notion of headship in v. 3 is not hierarchical and authoritarian; it is unlikely therefore that Paul would then use the order of creation to make such a point.
- As pointed out by scholars such as Padgett, this interpretation is at odds with the baptismal principle of equality in Christ (Gal 3:28). This principle is fundamental to Paul's taking of the Gospel to the Gentiles (Gal 2:8); further, he reiterates the principle as the basis of the spirit-filled ministry a few sentences on in the letter (1 Cor 12:13).

Consequently, scholars have sought to mute what they have perceived as Paul's patriarchal views. For example, Schüssler-Fiorenza comments,

...perhaps sensing that his midrashic proof could be misunderstood, Paul insists that he does not want to deny the equality of women and men in the Lord (1 Cor 11:11) ...²

However, it is possible to avoid these difficulties by treating Paul's use of Genesis as typological. Instead of making a literal application of the created order to social relationships in the ecclesia, Paul is pitching his points at the level of type and anti-type. This approach diminishes the social significance of the argument (it removes

¹ L. Fatum, "Image of God and Glory of Man: Women in the Pauline Congregations" in *The Image of God, Gender Models in Judeo-Christian Tradition* (ed., K. E. Borresen; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1995), 50-133.

² Schüssler-Fiorenza, *In memory of Her*, 229.

the patriarchal overtone), and proposes instead that Paul is advocating that men and women in ecclesial meetings respect some *typological* and *symbolic* differences.

A typology is suggested in Ephesians,

Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for her, that He might sanctify and cleanse her with the washing of water by the word, that He might present her to Himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that she should be holy and without blemish. Eph 5:25-27

The point here is that the ecclesia is a “woman” and the recipient of attention by Christ (“the man”) whose aim is to obtain a “glorious” ecclesia. It follows from this that the ecclesia has glory from her Lord and as such is *his* glory – the glory of *the man*. This is an Adamic typology whereby the ecclesia represents a new Eve who has her source of life in a Last Adam (cf. 1 Cor 11:8-9). The women of the ecclesia therefore represent the glory of a new creation. The symbology of the head-covering represents the fact that the woman is the glory of the man.¹ For a woman to discard a head-covering would dis-honour Christ: the head-covering represents her created status in Christ and she represents the ecclesia. The symbolic role of the men in the ecclesia complements this role on the part of women. They are representative of their head – Christ – the one who is the image and glory of God.

It may be that Paul was consciously developing his argument in 1 Corinthians 11 in Ephesians by making this typical identification between the ecclesia and “woman”. Paul does link the notion of “glory” with the new creation (Rom 8:18-21, 9:23, 2 Cor 1:20). He also applies the concept of the “image of God” to Christ (2 Cor 4:4) and he makes *this* image and glory the end-goal for believers (2 Cor 3:18).

¹ An implication of this approach is that the notion of “the glory of man” does not carry a negative overtone; for example, it is not a notion to do with sin or man’s fallen state as in 1 Peter 1:24. This is shown by the fact that Paul is using material from the creation account in Genesis 2 *prior* to the Fall of Man. The notion of glory is something to do with *creation* not sin. This approach is the opposite of that proposed by M. Hooker in “Authority on her Head: An Examination of 1 Cor 11:10”, *NTS* 10 (1964): 410-416. Hooker argues that a woman is to wear a head-covering in order to *hide* the glory of man, whereas I have argued that the head-covering *displays* the glory of “the man” (Christ) – it symbolises His work with the ecclesia.

On this typological reading there isn't a conflict between the baptismal principle of equality and Paul's use of the doctrine of creation because Paul is not subordinating women to men in the ecclesia. Instead he is ordering two social behaviours (one for men and one for women) so as to reflect a relationship of representation that each has to Christ. Paul is not supporting an old patriarchal order based on creation but using the order of the old creation to model the new creation.¹

Angels

Paul concludes his theological argument with a statement involving angels; this has been a puzzle to commentators. The reason for difficulty is easier to state than it is to provide any satisfactory solution.

For this cause ought the woman to have authority on [her] head
because of the angels.

1 Cor 11:10

The most common suggestion by commentators as to what this 'authority' means is that the covering is a reminder that she is *under* the authority of her husband. The essential problem with this proposal is that it does not incorporate the head-covering *into* the typology being enacted by women, since it suggests that its function was to *remind* the women that they were *still* under the authority of a man (i.e. it would be an afterthought in typology). A more satisfactory proposal would *incorporate* the head-covering into the overall symbology of their behaviour.

The better suggestion to consider is that 'authority' means *authority to do something*. For example, Paul spoke of his authority to minister spiritual things (1 Cor 9:4-6, 12), and this is typical of how the word 'authority' is used in the New Testament.² Likewise in our case, it is argued that the Corinthian women were doing something which *required* authority. They were exercising the spirit gifts of praying in tongues (1 Cor 14:13-15) and prophesying by the Spirit (1 Cor 14:24). This exercise of power required a token of authority for the women but not the men.

¹ In case he is misunderstood by the Corinthians Paul balances his teaching about the distinctive symbology of "the man" and "the woman" in the ecclesia with a statement about their interdependence (vv. 11-12).

² Three more examples where *exousia* is used with the verb 'to have' indicate that it means 'authority to do something' - Jesus had the authority to take up or lay down his life (John 10:18); Saul possessed the authority to jail Christians (Acts 9:14); Paul claimed to have authority (2 Thess 3:9). See also Matt 7:29; 9:6; Mark 1:22; 2:10; 3:15; Luke 5:24; 12:5, 19:17; John 19:10-11.

1 Corinthians 11:10 refers backwards to previous argumentation, and the second clause picks up the leading idea with which Paul has been concerned - *angels*. A parallel example can be found in 1 Thessalonians:

For this cause, we were comforted, brethren, in all our affliction and distress, because of your faith. 1 Thess 3:7

The cause of Paul's comfort has been the return of Timothy with the general news of Thessalonica - their faith, their charity, and their desire to see Paul; but Paul singles out the main reason for his comfort to be Timothy's report of their *faith*. In the same way, Paul singles out 'angels' as the leading idea of his previous argument. The problem presented to commentators is that Paul hasn't previously said anything about angels.

The two main proposals¹ in the literature are,

- the angels are "evil angels" who lusted after women (Gen 6:1ff); and a woman needs a head-covering to hide her feminine allure.
- the angels are the "good angels" that govern creation. They are concerned with seeing that order is maintained, especially with the people of God. Hence, a woman should wear a head-covering to maintain a proper order in worship and obey the angelic order of things.

A variation of the second idea has been developed by Fitzmyer who cites Qumran material to support the proposal that good angels were present at sacred assemblies.² This is perhaps the best suggestion in the field because Paul's treatment of head-coverings is sandwiched between two passages that deal with sacred assemblies (1 Cor 10:16-33, 1 Cor 11:17-34). The requirement for head-coverings is most readily seen as applicable in a context where Christians met to remember Christ in a memorial meal. Such a feast would have had symbolic significance in terms of expressing allegiance to Christ and recognizing what Christ had done for each believer. In this framework the ritual display of Christ's headship through dressing or not dressing the head could very well have been Paul's *paradoxeis*.

¹ These proposals and variations are discussed by in "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor 11:10" in *The Semitic Background of the New Testament* (ed., J. A. Fitzmyer; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 187-204.

² Fitzmyer, "Qumran Angelology", 198-200.

However, it should not be a surprise that angels are mentioned because Paul has been deploying an argument from Gen 1:26-27, which presupposes an angelic council around the throne of God:¹

And God said, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness...’ Gen 1:26

The source of Paul’s point is Psalm 8 and its exposition of Gen 1:26-27,

Yahweh...thou hast made him a little lower than the angels (*elohim*) and hast crowned him with glory and honour. Ps 8:1, 5; cf. Heb 2:7; Luke 20:35-36

What we have here are the ideas of a ‘crown’, which is a head-adornment that is a symbol of authority on a king’s head; honour as opposed to dishonour/shame; and the making of ‘the man’ linked to angels. The matrix is the same as 1 Cor 11:2-16 and with this context we can deduce Paul’s argument: the ‘lower than angels’ aspect of human beings implies that there will be a requirement for authority on the part of men and women to exercise the ministering gifts of, to use Paul’s examples, praying and prophesying. That is, in precise terms, if you are ‘lower’ you need authority if you are going to function in a ‘higher’ capacity.

However, this argument of Paul’s would seem to apply equally to men and women – it would appear that both should then wear their authority on their head. The Spirit was bestowed on men and women, sons and daughters, old and young (Joel 2:28-32; Acts 2:17-21). Women did not require authority to pray and prophesy in a sense that men required no such authority. The bestowal of the Spirit was an equal bestowal.

This counter-point overlooks the fact that Paul has distinguished men and women in the ecclesia, with men representing ‘the image and glory of God’ (Christ) and women representing ‘the glory of the man’ (the ecclesia). Accordingly, it is for women to wear ‘authority’ on the head. It is in order to show this authority to pray and prophesy in the spirit that ‘the woman’ wears authority on her head – and this is because of the angels. Hence, we don’t need to relate Paul’s arguments more generally to Jewish ideas about angels; we only have to follow the lead he supplies from Gen 1:26-27/Ps 8:1, 5 and relate these scriptures to his concern for praying and prophesying in the spirit.

¹ For a discussion of El and his council see F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Univ. Press, 1977), chap. 2.

Conclusion

It is not an underestimate to say that 1 Cor 11:2-16 is a difficult text. Virtually every aspect has been the subject of dispute. It is unlikely that there will be any consensus in the foreseeable future. However, for our purposes the passage has proved fruitful as a primary source from which to gather information about the social realities of the early New Testament communities.

In many ways this passage is a microcosm of 1 Corinthians as a whole: it addresses a practical situation and works out an ethic for that situation; it appeals to common social standards and theological principles rooted in the Gospel; and it seeks to inculcate a sense of unity and common purpose in the ecclesia.

The question as to whether the passage is primarily of theological or domestic significance encapsulates the exegetical problems of the text. It is no exaggeration to say that at every point in the text different scholars have proposed alternative sociological and theological interpretations. One scholar can claim that Paul's arguments are "based largely on contemporary social custom" (Hooker), while another scholar argues that Paul's arguments are "deeply grounded in his theological understanding of creation, redemption, their interrelation, and how they should be manifested in worship" (Witherington).¹

Our approach has been mixed. We have argued that the notions of headship, honour and shame are primarily social notions. However, we have argued that Paul is applying a social model (that of the household – father/son, master/servant, husband/wife) to model ecclesial relationships and introduce a theological typology that represents women in the ecclesia as the new "Eve". Insofar, as we have made a theological application of a social model, we cannot say that Paul's opening argument is either primarily of domestic or theological significance. Paul is integrating the Corinthians' understanding of social proprieties with a principle of headship rooted in Christ. He is giving these social proprieties a basis in a new order – the order of communal life under Christ.

We have argued that Paul's central argument centred on creation and it is primarily of theological significance. This underpins Paul's teaching about the headship of Christ in relation to the ecclesia. It presents an "Adam and Eve" typology in which women represent the bride of Christ (his glory) and men represent Christ, the image and glory of God. in saving a body of people. Thus, men and women have complementary but different symbolic roles.

¹ Hooker, "Authority on Her Head", 410; Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth*, 238.

Is the adorning of a woman's head when praying and prophesying primarily of theological or domestic significance in Paul's argument in 1 Cor 11:2-16? Perhaps the question is a moot one; Paul's argument has both kinds of significance. Throughout 1 Corinthians Paul is setting social boundaries and rules of behaviour; he is also dealing with issues using the social and ethical concepts of the day. Nevertheless, in all of this Paul is doing theology, a practical and pastoral theology. For this reason, we conclude that the adorning of a woman's head was primarily of theological significance for Paul.

Editorial Policies: The *Christadelphian EJournal of Biblical Interpretation* seeks to fulfil the following objectives: offer analytical and expositional articles on biblical texts; engage with academic biblical studies that originate in the various Christian confessions; defend the biblical principles summarised in the common Christadelphian statements of faith; and subject the published articles to peer review and amendment.

Submission of Articles: Authors should submit articles to the editors. Presentation should follow *Society of Biblical Literature* guidelines (www.sbl.org).

Publication: E-mailed twice yearly on the last Thursday of April and October; published as a collected annual paperback obtainable from: www.lulu.com/willowpublications.

Subscriptions: This is a 'free' EJournal to churches and individuals who recognise that it is produced within the Christadelphian community.