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**Editorial**

Scholarship has fashions. In recent years, “reception history” has been in vogue in NT Studies. This is the study of how a NT was received by the early church after the apostles. A fashion can be discerned by the frequency of papers and theses that get written during a given period. In the history of NT scholarship, there have been many fashions. Such passing “trends” leave behind tendencies. They leave behind key ideas that influence scholars at a presuppositional level. In the case of “reception history” the tendency that might be left behind is an influence on what interpretation can be ascribed to the NT text. The argument can be put that if an interpretation proposed today is unrepresented in early church commentary, it is unlikely to be true because people much closer to the events and NT times did not come up with the ideas. Similarly a nuanced interpretation today can be bolstered in scholarly articles with the argument that it has ancient pedigree.

In peace-time, breaking a tendency requires a publishing event or a change in cultural mood. A tendency left behind by the redaction critical fashion of the 1960s was that the Gospel writers wrote for their communities. A common research exercise at the time was to hypothesize about the communities of the evangelists. Terms such as “the Johannine community” or “Markan community” were common-place. This tendency was broken in 1998 with the publication of *The Gospels for All Christians*.[[1]](#footnote-2) This is the sort of book that needs to be on a Bible student’s shelf and it demonstrates the principle that Gospels have a wider audience than any local community of which the evangelist was a part.

The Christadelphian community is a tertiary writing community. That is, without a professional clergy or Bible college, its writers use the secondary literature of scholars to teach about Bible background. This is not to deny that in and amongst this tertiary writing there is original thinking which has solved exegetical problems in the text. In fact, the doctrinal independence of the community has produced a fund of original lines of exegesis unknown or barely represented in the world of scholarship. However, reliance on scholarship for Bible background needs to recognize its passing fashions.

In closing, a note of irony: the fashion for feminist criticism of the Bible in the 1980s and 1990s has largely dissipated, although it has left its mark in the community. One of the effects of this criticism was to change the style of scholarly articles and university and journal guidelines for the use of the masculine pronoun. Today, more often than not the gender of choice for the implied reader of the scholar is feminine. The reader is a “she” or a “her”, and you will read things like, “The interpretation a reader makes will depend on her background”; sometimes, rarely, an author will use s/he and him/her. The irony in this shift is that articles by male authors (the majority) now give a stronger patriarchal impression precisely because of this shift to the feminine pronoun (they convey the male as a dominant teacher in the church and the female as a subordinate learner). This appearance of patriarchalism is far stronger than in articles, say, from the 1950s which treat the reader as a “he”; rather than follow fashion, a better approach would be to use s/he and him/her for gender neutrality.

**Note:** This issue sees a guest contributor. The EJournal will publish articles from writers outside the Christadelphian community who are sympathetic to the Abrahamic monotheistic faith of Christadelphians when these offer interesting proposals that are supportive of the beliefs of the community.

**Naming Cyrus**

**Andrew Perry**

A. Motyer observes that “many see the detailed prediction of the personal name of Cyrus in 44:28 as a problem”.[[2]](#footnote-3) It is a dividing line between critical and conservative commentators with each side showing equal conviction. Critical scholars insist that the prophet must have known of Cyrus’ early career and therefore be a contemporary; conservatives cite the “precedent” of Josiah (1 Kgs 13:2) and affirm their belief in divine inspiration as the explanation for Isaiah naming Cyrus. This article examines this question without recourse to but consistent with the explanation of “divine inspiration” using only the historico-critical method.

The problem here is that both types of commentator read the Cyrus material with the hindsight of history and infuse the oracle with an historical intention centred on the events of 538. The prior question is whether the geo-political situation of Isaiah’s day was such that it was possible for him to nominate a future liberator called Cyrus. We have no oracle *introducing* Cyrus; Isa 44:28 and 45:1 presuppose such introductory knowledge. Scholars have argued that Isa 41:2, 25 is such an introduction, but we have argued in a previous article that that these texts relate to Hezekiah.[[3]](#footnote-4) Accordingly, we have no record like, “A king will arise whose name will be Cyrus”. Our data is therefore a sample of the message. Could the Isaiah of the eighth century make such a prediction of a named individual?

The first point to establish is whether Isaiah would have prophesied about Anshan/Parsumash, a southern province of the Elamite Empire, and the geographical location of a future Persian named Cyrus. If Isaiah prophesied the rise of a conqueror who would confront Assyria, it is not implausible that he would choose Elam, neither is it unlikely that he would choose the southern part of the Elamite Empire and the junior partner of that alliance. Elam was the traditional ally of Babylon against Assyria, and Sennacherib’s campaigns refer to “Parsuas” and “Anzan” as confederate with Elam and Babylon during his eighth campaign.[[4]](#footnote-5) The southern areas of Mesopotamia were always more trouble to the Assyrian kings. It is not implausible that Isaiah would prophesy a role for Anshan/Parsumash in the plan of God for his people.

The next question is how Isaiah might have picked out the name “Cyrus”. The name “Cyrus” is typically Persian (Kūrush) and it *may* be a throne name[[5]](#footnote-6) for rulers in Anshan/Parsumash at least as early as 646.[[6]](#footnote-7) A text, from the thirtieth year of Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, has Kūrush paying tribute after the fall of Susa (the Elamite capital) in 646. The identification of this Kūrush is disputed, with some scholars willing to equate him with Cyrus I and date the start of his reign and this inscription and the fall of Susa to 640,[[7]](#footnote-8) while others regard 646 (another date for the fall of Susa) as too early for Cyrus I (who is also dated to 620-590) to be the ruler of Anshan/Parsumash. In this case, “Kūrush” would be another name for Teispes, the father of Cyrus I, and this possibility is important for assessing the plausibility of Isaiah making a prediction about Cyrus, as Teispes might have well been around as a young man in Isaiah’s day.

Throne-naming continued with Cyrus II (559-530), and after him the name of “Cyrus” continued to be used, but not as a throne name. Artaxerxes I originally bore the personal name of “Cyrus”,[[8]](#footnote-9) before taking the throne name of “Artaxerxes”,[[9]](#footnote-10) and Artaxerxes’ grandson was named “Cyrus”, although he only rose to the position of Satrap.[[10]](#footnote-11)

It cannot be proved that “Cyrus” was a throne name for Cyrus I and II; it could have been their personal name. Evidence for any personal names or the changing of names upon accession is lacking; however, the suggestion is not implausible. The evidence for throne names is only available for the later Achaemenids. Thus, as noted, Artaxerxes I was originally named “Cyrus”; Artaxerxes II had the private name of “Arsaces”; Artaxerxes III was originally named “Ochus”; and Artaxerxes IV was personally called “Bessus”. A comparable pattern of throne-naming is seen in the Darius series of Achaemenid kings: the personal name of Darius I is lost, but Darius II was originally called “Ochus” and Darius III was called “Artasat”.[[11]](#footnote-12)

The evidence therefore suggests that “Cyrus” *could* be a throne name[[12]](#footnote-13) from the early Achaemenid royal house, which changed when Darius I succeeded the son of Cyrus II. The Greek historian, Diodorus Siculus, offers the reason for the later choice of the Artaxerxes’ throne name, “Since Artaxerxes had been a good king and had been quite peaceful and fortunate, they [the Persians] renamed all kings ruling after him and ordered them to bear his name”.[[13]](#footnote-14) R. Schmitt offers the analysis that “Artaxerxes” carried the meaning “whose reign (or rule) is from (or: through) Rta, the Truth” and “Darius” carries the meaning “holding firm (or: retaining) the good”, and that these “names unmistakeably express a religious-political program or motto”.[[14]](#footnote-15) Darius I was the first king after Cyrus II and Schmitt postulates that the Achaemenid throne name was changed to “Darius” to express the motto of “holding the empire together”.

In 700, the Achaemenid dynasty was just beginning with Achaemenes, and the region of Anshan would have been perceived as an active part of the Elamite Empire, traditional enemies of Assyria and traditional allies to Babylon. The house would have been perceived in terms of the minor nobility of Elam, the junior governing partner in the Elamite alliance.[[15]](#footnote-16) It is not implausible to suppose that Isaiah would have nominated a future liberator from *Assyrian* dominance[[16]](#footnote-17) using a throne name from this region. Achaemenes may have had such a personal name, and as we have noted, there is evidence to suggest his son (Teispes, 675-640) did have this name. If we treat Isaiah’s oracle as primary evidence, then it is either evidence that “Cyrus” was a personal name for Achaemenes or a prognostication about Teispes who might have been a young prince at the time. With this latter possibility, “Cyrus” is not a throne-name but a personal name that became a throne name for Cyrus I and II.

It might be thought unlikely that Isaiah would have had knowledge of the politics of Elam and Anshan. However, the opposite supposition is more plausible. The geo-politics associated with the rise of Assyria would be known at the Jerusalem court and Isaiah was associated with the court. Moreover, given that Babylon and Elam were the natural allies against Assyria, the Babylonian envoys no doubt brought Hezekiah up-to-date with the politics of such an alliance while seeking his support in the west. It is entirely possible that the Babylonian envoys mentioned recent agreements with the Anshan royal house, and if “Cyrus” was a name of Achaemenes, and/or if Teispes was a young man waiting in the wings, then this would explain the mention of a “Cyrus” by Isaiah. It is also possible that Teispes was a delegate with the envoys. Isaiah could have used the very rhetoric of the Babylonian envoys in their “talking up” of the alliance with Elam to castigate Hezekiah. Such a mention would then be an irony directed at Hezekiah. His succumbing to such persuasion by the envoys was turned by Isaiah so that such a “Cyrus” is then appointed to be the one who would re-build Jerusalem rather than Hezekiah.

Historical reconstruction on the basis of single inscriptions is sound method provided that the evidence is cited and its uniqueness noted. The single inscription from the time of the sacking of Susa is evidence for Teispes bearing the name of “Cyrus”. Isaiah’s mention of “Cyrus” is equivalent to inscriptional evidence and could be taken to confirm the inscription from the time of the battle of Susa, or it could be unique evidence for Achaemenes being named “Cyrus”.

Our conclusion therefore is that an Elamite-focused prophecy using a Persian personal name is a plausible prognostication by Isaiah in 700; moreover, it is plausible that Isaiah’s mention of the name arose from the rhetoric of the Babylonian envoys. Isaiah is not therefore imagining Cyrus the Great and picking out an individual from the ether a hundred and fifty years down the road. The inspiration of his oracle lies in the use of contemporary information which because of throne-naming allows a future application. This fits the character of prophetic inspiration where the terms of prophecies emerge out of the immediate circumstances but their ambiguity is such that their application may be one or more generations down the road. The mistake that conservative and critical scholars make alike is to suppose that the reference of “Cyrus” on the lips of Isaiah has to be about Cyrus the Great because he was the one to “fulfil” the terms of the prediction. However, at the time of the oracle, the reference is ambiguous and could have been satisfied by one of many kings of Persia. As it happened the plan of God was worked out in respect of Cyrus the Great.

One final thought is worth stating. Schmitt’s proposal that Achaemenid throne names are chosen for ideological reasons also raises the possibility the early Achaemenids became aware of Isaiah’s prophecy and that it motivated the choice of “Cyrus” as a throne-name for the early Achaemenids.[[17]](#footnote-18)

**The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Tongues**

**Andrew Perry**

The “Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice” are a selection of fragmentary Dead Sea texts that contain songs dedicated to particular Sabbaths in the first quarter of the year; the Songs are for angels to utter in the heavenly tabernacle-sanctuary. The dates for the texts range from c. 75-50 BCE to c. 50 CE, which indicates their enduring importance for the community within which they were found (Qumran).

C. Newsom suggests[[18]](#footnote-19) that the “songs functioned primarily to form the identity and confirm the legitimacy of the priestly community” at Qumran. This was a necessary desideratum because the priests of the Qumran community had renounced the priesthood at Jerusalem. The recitation of the songs, which exhort the angels in the divine temple to praise God, would have been a way of associating the divine temple with the worshiping community at Qumran. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, in his “Introduction” to the Songs states, “They lift one up emotionally and imaginatively into the midst of heavenly choirs”.[[19]](#footnote-20) M. J. Davidson concurs in this suggestion,[[20]](#footnote-21) and cites 4Q400 2 1, 6-7:

...to praise your glory wondrously with the divinities of knowledge, and the praises of your kingship with the m[ost] holy ones...how will it be regarded [amongst] them? And how our priesthood in their residences? And [...] their holiness? [What] is the offering of our tongue of dust (compared) with the knowledge of the divinity[ies?...][[21]](#footnote-22)

This quotation uses the Hebrew term *elim* for angels (translated “divinities”, cf. Psa 29:1), and the Songs are noted for their wide variety of terms of reference for angels. Our interest is in the use of the word “tongue” in “offering of our tongue (!wvl)”. This poetic description of the praise of the Qumran community is to be contrasted with the description of the “tongues of the angels” in 1 Cor 13:1. Some of the texts are fragmentary and lack full sentences, but our interest in the Songs is in painting a context for “tongues of angels” in 1 Corinthians.

[...] through the wonderful height [...] tongue of purity [...] gods (~yhla), seven [...]

4Q400 3 1, 1-2

...Psalm of praise, on the tongue of the fou[rth]...[Ps]alm of [tha]nksgiving, on the tongue of the fifth...[Psalm] of exultation, on the tongue of the sixth...Psalm of [singing, on the to]ngue of the seventh of the [chief] pri[nces,] a powerful song [to the God] of ho[lines] with its se[ven] wo[nd]er[ful songs] 4Q403 1 1, 1-6

Proclaim his glory with the tongue of all who proclaim knowledge, his wonderful songs with the mouth of all who proclaim [him. For he is] God of all who sing {knowledge} for ever, and Judge in his power over all the spirits of understanding. 4Q4031 1 36-37

...The tongue of the first will be strengthened seven times with the tongue of the second to him....{this is repeated for the series up to the seventh}... 4Q403 1 2, 27-30

[...Psal]m of singing, on the ton[gue of the seventh of the chief princes...] 4 Q404 1, 1

[...sp]irit of glo[ry...] [...] wonderful likeness of the spirit of the hol[y of] holies, engra[ved...to]ngue of blessing... 4Q405 14 2, 1-2

In the chiefs of the praise-offerings are tongues of knowledge. They bless the God of knowledge in all the works of his glory. 4Q405 23 2, 12

The import of these extracts from these songs is that there was awareness on the part of the Qumran sectarians that angels praised God in their own tongues. This may appear to be an unremarkable point except that it has a specific implication for 1 Cor 13:1. Paul’s reference to “tongues of angels” is a reference to tongues spoken within the Corinthian assembly when praising God. It is a reference to a glossolalia involved in praise, song, prayer and blessing, and it was a form a glossolalia that was thought to be the tongue that angels spoke in praise to God.

The same concept is present in the *Testament of Job*.[[22]](#footnote-23) This writing is usually dated to between the 1c. BCE and 1c. CE, but the later chapters (45-53) have been judged later (2c. CE). R. J. Spittler in his “Introduction” to his critical edition[[23]](#footnote-24) hypothesizes that,

...the Testament may have been reworked in the second century by Montanists. Eusebius (HE 5.17.1-4) preserves the argument of an unnamed anti-Montanist who demanded to know where in the range of biblical history any precedent appeared for ecstatic prophecy. The descriptions of Job’s daughters speaking in ecstasy (TJob 48-50) may have been a Montanist move to supply such a precedent.[[24]](#footnote-25)

Spittler points out some stylistic differences between *T. Job* 1-45 and *T. Job* 46-53 which is where (46-53) the references to “tongues of angels” come; such differences he hypothesizes indicate Montanist editing; Spittler’s suggestion however has been opposed by C. Forbes.[[25]](#footnote-26) The point at issue can be put to one side for our purpose. If *T. Job* 46-53 is early, then it forms part of the Jewish literary co-text for Paul and Corinth; if these chapters are late, then they are an analogous case to both the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and 1 Corinthians.

In the *Testament*, Job gives one of his daughters some sashes,

And she took on another heart—no longer minded toward earthly things—but she spoke ecstatically in the angelic dialect, sending up a hymn to God in accord with the hymnic style of the angels. And as she spoke ecstatically, she allowed “The Spirit” to be inscribed on her garment. *T. Job* 48:2-3

Job’s other daughters likewise took on “the dialect of archons”, “the dialect of those on high”, and the “dialect of the cherubim” (*T. Job* 49:1-50:3). The “cherubim” are also mentioned in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* as blessing God (4Q403 1 2, 15, cf. 4Q405 20 2, 3).

One difference, noted by Spittler,[[26]](#footnote-27) is that Paul does not use the Greek *dialektos* in 1 Cor 13:1, which is the term in the *Testament*. The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* do however use the ordinary Hebrew for “tongues” which does correspond to 1 Corinthians.

In his monograph,[[27]](#footnote-28) G. Hovenden has dismissed the evidence of the *Testament of Job*, but does not discuss the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. He concludes, “…there is no conclusive evidence that this speech was intended to represent what the New Testament understands by tongues”.[[28]](#footnote-29) He does not think that *T. Job* 46-53 has been subject to Montanist editing, although he allows the possibility that it has been edited by a Jewish redactor. His main point against Christian editing is that such an editor would not have used *dialektos* if they wanted to connect the *Testament* to 1 Corinthians; they would have used *glōssai* as in 1 Corinthians.

What is clear from the *Testament* is that there is a concept of angelic language being spoken. Hovenden claims that what is spoken by Job’s daughters is intelligible and that the angelic quality is a matter of “hymnic style” and therefore unlike Corinth. He notes that the songs that were preserved were available to the readers of the *Testament*. However, crucially, the writing of these hymns is described in terms that allow for the role of interpretation:

After the three had stopped singing hymns, while the Lord was present as was I, Nereus, the brother of Job, and while the holy angel also was present, I sat near Job on the couch. And I heard magnificent things, while each one made explanation to the other. And I wrote out a complete book of most of the contents of hymns that issued from the three daughters of my brother, so that these things would be preserved. *T. Job* 51:1-4

The process of “explanation” implies interpretation of the hymns and this corresponds to the requirement for interpretation in Corinth. If we return to a comparison of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and 1 Corinthians, it should not be surprising to find common concepts if 1 Corinthians is concerned with ecstatic praise in the tongues of angels. These are listed below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ...understand all mysteries 1 Cor 13:2 | The concept of mysteries appears in expressions such as “wondrous mysterie[s...]” 4Q401 14 2, 2, as well as in motifs such as “hidden things” 4Q401 14 2, 7 and 17 4; see also “mysteries” in 4Q403 1 2, 27; 4Q405 13 3. |
| ...in a spirit speaks mysteries 1 Cor 14:2 |
| ...knowledge 1 Cor 13:8 | The theme of divine knowledge is common in the *Songs*. .Angels are “divinities of knowledge”; they dispense knowledge through their songs in the heavenly sanctuary 4Q400 1 1, 4-5, 17 |
| ...speaking unto God 1 Cor 14:2 | The notion of “praise” is everywhere present in the songs, for instance, 4Q403 1 2, 15. |
| ...sing with the spirit 1 Cor 14:15 | The notions of chanting, melody and song are found in the *Songs*, for example, “Chant to the powerful God with the chosen spiritual portion, so that it is [a melo]dy with the joy of the gods...for a wonderful song...” 4Q403 1 1, 39-40 |
| ...bless with the spirit 1 Cor 14:16 | The concept of blessing is frequent in the *Songs*, for example, 4Q403 1 1, 11; 4Q403 1 2, 12. |
| ...hath a psalm 1 Cor 14:26 | The terms “psalms” is extensively used in the *Songs*, e.g. 4Q400 2 1, 4 |

In addition to these correspondences it is noteworthy that Paul uses a number of theatre amplification and musical analogies:

* “sounding brass, tinkling cymbal” 1 Cor 13:1
* “pipe or harp” 1 Cor 14:7
* “trumpet” 1 Cor 14:8

It is apparent therefore that the glossolalia in 1 Corinthians 14 included tongues of angels, and this term is readily understood in the context of Jewish angelology. Max Turner is therefore partial in his treatment of the topic of tongues in 1 Corinthians when he dismisses the evidence of the *Testament of Job* because it is late; he also doesn’t mention the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. He states that, “The outcome of Forbes’ detailed research is that there was no widespread Hellenistic phenomenon of ecstatic and linguistically incoherent speech to provide a background for the Corinthian problems”.[[29]](#footnote-30) This may be correct for Hellenistic Greek texts, but the Jewish evidence of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and the *Testament of Job* is not to be dismissed.

It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss Paul’s attitude to glossolalia at Corinth. We have sought only to establish that it includes both tongues of men and of angels. The syntax of Paul’s mention of the tongues of angels indicates that he distinguished such tongues from the tongues of men. If we reproduce the order of the Greek, he says,

“If with tongues of men I speak and/even of angels, and have not love…”

By placing the verb between the two expressions “tongues of men” and “of angels” he distinguishes the two kinds of tongues. The question for further consideration is what Paul thinks of such tongues of angels.

**Jacob and Babel**

**Paul Wyns**

From his birth Jacob is locked in a struggle for supremacy with his brother Esau, whose heel he grabs. R. Alter observes, “In this instance, the etymology is transparent: *Ya’aqob* (Jacob) and *‘aqeb* (heel). The grabbing of the heel by the younger twin becomes a kind of emblem of their future relationship, and the birth, like the oracle, again invokes the struggle against primogeniture” [[30]](#footnote-31)

Jacob tempts Esau into trading his birthright (*bekorah*, 25:29ff.) and then deceives his father, Isaac, into granting the blessing (*berekah*) to him instead of Esau. Of, course this does not exculpate Isaac, who ought to have known better but was blinded by love for his firstborn — Esau, the twin covered in red hair — the man after the flesh.[[31]](#footnote-32) In contrast Jacob was a “plain” or “simple” man (*tam*); this does not mean that he was domesticated or ordinary, for Jacob certainly had his share of charisma, but rather the Hebrew *tam* suggests integrity or even innocence.[[32]](#footnote-33) Both the OT and the NT make it clear that Yahweh “loved” Jacob and “hated” Esau from the very beginning, even before birth. Yet both men displayed times in their lives when they neither deserved either Yahweh’s love or His hatred – “What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid”.[[33]](#footnote-34)

The “love-hate”[[34]](#footnote-35) relationship between the two brothers is also reflected in the lives of the two sisters, Rachel and Leah, who become the progenitors of the twelve tribes. It is surely ironic that Laban justifies his wedding night deception with the words; “It must not be so done in our country, to give the younger before the first born” (Gen.29:26).

Jacob’s actions had far reaching consequences for his whole family; resulting in his own deception[[35]](#footnote-36) and the sale of his favourite son Joseph (the firstborn of Rachel) into Egypt. Rachel’s own struggle with her sister ended in death – the birth pangs of Messiah; Ben-oni, the ‘son-of-sorrow’ who became Benjamin the ‘son-of-the-right-hand’. Jacob’s whole life is one of struggle and hardship; this is even reflected in his first encounter with Rachel, which reverses the usual norms surrounding the betrothal convention (the woman drawing water for the man):

In this case, not only does the bridegroom take care of the drawing of the water, but he has an obstacle to overcome – the stone on the mouth of the well. This minor variation of the [betrothal] convention contributes to the consistent characterisation of Jacob, for we already know him, as his name at birth (*Ya’aqov*) has been etymologized, as the “heel-grabber” or wrestler, and we shall continue to see him as the contender, the man who seizes his fate, tackles his adversaries, with his own two hands. If the well of the betrothal scene is in general associated with woman and fertility, it is particularly appropriate that this one should be blocked by an obstacle, for Jacob will obtain the woman he wants only through great labour, against resistance, and even then God will, in the relevant biblical idiom, “shut up her womb” for years until she finally bears Joseph. There is even some point in the fact that the obstacle is a stone, for, as J.P. Fokkelman has noted, stones are a motif that accompanies Jacob in his arduous career: he puts a stone under his head as a pillow at Beth-El; after the epiphany there he sets up a commemorative marker of stones; and when he returns from Mesopotamia, he concludes a mutual nonaggression pact with his father-in-law by setting up on the border between them a testimonial heap of stones. These are not really symbols, but there is something incipiently metaphorical about them: Jacob is a man who sleeps on stones, speaks in stones, wrestles with stones, contending with the hard unyielding nature of things, whereas, in pointed contrast, his favoured son will make his way in the world as a dealer in the truths intimated through the filmy insubstantiality of dreams.[[36]](#footnote-37)

However, Jacob also had a dream vision, the vision he received at Beth-el being as substantive as any that Joseph received.

**Stairway to Heaven**

It is noteworthy **that Bethel is a reversal of Babel.** The following table shows the contrasts:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Babel (Genesis 11)** | **Bethel (Genesis 28)** |
| Let us build…a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven (v. 4) | A ladder and the top of it reached to heaven (v. 12) |
| The Lord came down (v. 5) | Angels ascending and descending on it (v. 12) |
| The Lord scattered them abroad … upon the face of all the earth (v. 8)  | Thou shalt spread abroad to the east, and to the north, and to the south (v. 14) |
| Babel — a false “gate” and a false temple | This is none other than the house of God (Bethel), and this is the gate of heaven (vv. 17, 19) |

The theophany at Babel shows striking similarities (and contrasts) with the first Beth-el account. Although the name Babel[[37]](#footnote-38) carries the folk etymology of “confusion”, it is probably related to the Sumerian *babilla*, “gate [residence] of the gods” (NIDOTTE), and this is picked up by Jacob in Gen 28:17. Jacob obviously saw a Babylonian ziggurat reaching up to heaven, similar to the one described earlier in Genesis 11.[[38]](#footnote-39)

The reason behind building the Babel tower was hubris “to make a name” and this anticipates the renaming of Jacob in the other Beth-el account (Gen 35:10). It is clear that we are meant to draw the theological conclusion (which does not dawn on Jacob until Genesis 35) that he could not achieve the blessing by his own strength, or by deception; Yahweh had promised to make Abraham’s “name great” (Gen 12:2 again contrasting Gen 11:4) but could only do so to Jacob after he had undergone a change of character. In one fell swoop the narrative unites Genesis 11(and 12) with both Beth-el accounts.

It is fitting that Jacob has a dream that reverses Babel, that the vision promises to bless him and make his name great, like that of Abraham. However, the dream has an implicit warning for Jacob — self-sufficiency will not work. Over the next 20 years God will protect Jacob and enable him to return to the land with a large family and the many possessions that he had gained through his struggles — however, first he must encounter his nemesis and confront the reason for his hasty departure.

**The Therapeutae, Miriam and 1 Corinthians**

**Andrew Perry**

Philo describes the Therapeutae in *On the Contemplative Life*.[[39]](#footnote-40) These were a Jewish studious religious sect (“the disciples of Moses”, *On the Contemplative Life,* 63-64) found throughout the Roman Empire but mainly in Egypt (*On the Contemplative Life*, 21). A particular characteristic of the sect was their use of music in meetings in addition to contemplation and meditation. Philo notes, “...they likewise compose Psalms and hymns to God in every kind of metre and melody imaginable” (*On the Contemplative Life,* 29). Their meetings, on the seventh day, involved a simple communal meal, and every seven weeks the meeting was extended into a more elaborate affair. It is this meeting that Philo describes in some detail.

Insofar as Philo and Paul describe meetings of a sect, their language bears comparison:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **On the Contemplative Life** | **1 Corinthians** |
| Come together (30, 32, 66) | Come together (11:18, 14:26) |
| Eat bread/drink water (37) | Eat bread/drink wine (11:23-29) |
| Wear simple covering (38, 66) | Hair for a covering (11:15) |
| Arrangements are to order (67, 69, 75) | Order (14:27, 40) |
| A president expounds scripture (75, 79) | Exhortation (14:3) |
| Listeners contemplate the words (allegories) as in a mirror (78) | See through a glass darkly (11:12) |
| Psalms and hymns are composed and sung by men and women in order (25, 29, 80, 81) | Psalms (14:26) |

After this meeting, when it was the seventh week, celebrations carried on during the night (*On the Contemplative Life*, 83). Philo states that the men and women formed two choruses and separately sang:

“Then they sing hymns which have been composed in honour of God in many metres and tunes, at one time all singing together, and at another moving their hands and dancing in corresponding harmony, and uttering in an inspired manner songs of thanksgiving...” (*On the Contemplative Life*, 84)

After singing separately, the two choruses joined together in “...an imitation of that one which, in old time, was established by the Red Sea...Moses the prophet leading the men, and Miriam the prophetess leading the women” (*On the Contemplative Life*, 85-87). The chorus of male and female worshippers were formed “on this model” (*On the Contemplative Life*, 88). Philo indicates that the women were led by a Miriam figure. He does not mention the use of tongues in such worship, nor does he say that the Therapeutae had prophetesses. However, it is noteworthy that men and women sang individually in order.

R. J. Spittler notes the theory that the *Testament of Job* was written within the circle of the Therapeutae.[[40]](#footnote-41) The argument is that the *Testament* reflects their sectarian preferences:

* Women had a significant role in singing and in composition as in the *Testament* (*On the Contemplative Life*, 80-81, *T. Job* 48-50).
* Prayer for the Therapeutae was towards the East as in the *Testament* (*On the Contemplative Life*, 89, *T. Job* 40:3).
* The Therapeutae were concentrated in Egypt and Job is called the king of all Egypt (*T. Job* 28:7).

Spittler’s view is that “an origin of the Testament among the Egyptian Therapeutae seems very possible”.[[41]](#footnote-42) If this is the case, the songs and hymns composed by Job’s daughters would be representative of the hymns and songs composed by the women of the Therapeutae and they would be at least partly in the tongues of angels.

The singing of these songs within the body of the meeting at Corinth by a “Miriam figure” could explain the allusions to Miriam that Paul makes in 1 Cor 14:34-40.[[42]](#footnote-43)

Paul states,

“What? came the word of God out from you? or came it into (eivj) you only?” 1 Cor 14:36

This is an ironic reversal of the question posed by Miriam,

“Hath the Lord indeed spoken only by Moses? hath he not spoken also by us?” Num 12:2

At the Red Sea Miriam is described as a “prophetess” (Exod 15:20). Her claim to Moses was that the Lord had spoken by her and that therefore she had authority. She led the women at the Red Sea, and this is the pattern followed by the Therapeutae. In Numbers, Miriam is the leader challenging Moses.

Paul sets up a contrast in his two questions: “did the word *come out* from you” and “did the word of God *come into* you”. These two questions pick up on the character of what Miriam says at the Red Sea:

“Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea.” Exod 15:21

This quotes Moses’ words in the Song of Moses,

“I will sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously: the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea.” Exod 15:1

This repetition of what Moses had sung is the basis for Paul noting that the word of God did not come out from Miriam and did not come into her only. In the Corinthian context, this argument nullifies any claim on the part of women and women prophets that their words from the Spirit must be spoken in the assembly.

Paul reinforces his argument by saying,

“If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.” 1 Cor 14:36

Paul’s words here quotes Num 12:6 from the Miriam episode,

“If there be a prophet among you, *I* the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, *and* will speak unto him in a dream.” Num 12:6

By quoting from this stage in the episode, Paul puts himself into the position of “Moses” as the one who was more than a prophet and someone with whom the Lord spoke face to face (Num 12:7).[[43]](#footnote-44) Here Paul claims to deliver “the commandments of the Lord”. This cites the common refrain in the Law of Moses, for example,

“The Lord shall establish thee an holy people unto himself, as he hath sworn unto thee, if thou shalt keep the commandments of the Lord thy God, and walk in his ways.” Deut 28:9

Miriam was turned into a leper and sent out of the camp for seven days. This was a “shame” to her (Num 12:14), and it reflected the shame in her usurping authority over Moses. In 1 Cor 14:34, Paul says it is a shame for women to speak in the assembly, and his choice of “shame” is prompted by his reading of Miriam’s speaking in the camp (Num 12:2).

In claiming to deliver the “commandments of the Lord”, Paul places his words on a level with the Law of Moses. He can do this because in 1 Cor 11:23 he had said, “I received of the lord that which I also delivered unto you”. Paul was a “new Moses” receiving a law from his “lord”—Christ. The word had come “out of him” and the Corinthians should accept his revelation. Paul’s application of Moses typology to himself naturally balances his allusion to Miriam. However, it also reflects the thinking of the Therapeutae who celebrated the deliverance of Yahweh at the Red Sea and the role of Moses and Miriam every seven weeks. Their theology gave equal place to the exercise of the prophetic spirit by men and women in the assembly; Paul is arguing for the silence of women precisely because of Miriam’s history in Exodus 15 and Numbers 12.

**Psalm 110**

**Andrew Perry**

Psalms 2 and 110 are often described as “coronation” psalms. J. Day offers these observations:[[44]](#footnote-45)

* Jehoiada the priest put the crown upon Josiah and gave him the testimony (2 Kgs 11:12). This could be the “decree” of Psa 2:7, which contains Yahweh’s promise to the king to subdue the nations.
* In Psa 110:7, it is said that the king will “drink of the brook by the way”; this may be an historical reflection of the anointing of Solomon at Gihon (1 Kgs 1:38-39), which was then encoded in a coronation ritual.

M. Vincent likewise follows the majority view and affirms that the “presence of another speaker who speaks about the king suggests a special occasion such as a coronation at which such a prophetic oracle or blessing might be given”.[[45]](#footnote-46) Other “Introductions” to the Psalms reflect this consensus.[[46]](#footnote-47) In his commentary, G. Booker does not set Psalm 2 against the backdrop of a coronation ceremony,[[47]](#footnote-48) but he does compare Psalm 110 to the coronation of Solomon.[[48]](#footnote-49) However, tying a psalm to one particular coronation does not require Psalm 110 to be a “coronation psalm”—a psalm *repeated* at coronation ceremonies.

Booker offers the following significant points in favour of a Solomonic reading of Psalm 110:

* David is the speaker referring to Solomon as “my lord” (v. 1).
* Solomon was crowned in the midst of a rebellion (v. 1).

The advantage of a *specific* Solomonic reading over against the consensus view is that it allows the NT interpretation to have an easy application. The point of the citation in Acts 2 is that David is the speaker, i.e. the present king is speaking. The NT does not allow the presence of another speaker talking about David or the Davidic king.

“For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand,” Acts 2:34

While we could insist that Psalm 110 only has messianic application, if it has an immediate application, then Solomon is the only candidate.

W. van der Meer has offered an analysis of Psalm 110 that contextualizes the psalm as one of *restoration of kingship* rather than enthronement. He affirms that the opening verses of the psalm (particularly v. 1b) “could indicate accession to kingship, but it can also be viewed as a reinstatement to power”.[[49]](#footnote-50) His reading is that David is invited to sit at the right hand of Yahweh’s throne until Yahweh makes his enemies his footstool. Van der Meer emphasizes the crisis setting of the psalm (it is not a psalm of ceremony and ritual): David is ruling in the midst of enemies (v. 2) and needs the help of Yahweh to subdue them and deliver him (v. 1). The promise is that David will lift his head above his enemies (v. 7, Pss 3:3), and the assurance is that he has been anointed a king-priest of Jerusalem for ever after the order of Melchizedek (v. 4).

Van der Meer discusses possible historical catalysts for the psalm and its redactional development,[[50]](#footnote-51)and avers that the revolt of Absalom may be a catalyst for the original psalm. However, the problem with this proposal is that David is the centre of focus in his reading; he claims that Yahweh invites *David* to sit at his right hand. However, Luke’s interpretation places the “son of David” to the centre of focus. This allows the suggestion that it is Adonijah’s rebellion that is the catalyst for the Psalm. Nevertheless, van der Meer’s insight about the theme of the Psalm—that it is about restoration of kingship—is useful. The insight is useful because it can be reconfigured—the Psalm is not about the restoration of David to the throne (or about a coronation) but rather it is about a rebellion that prevents the orderly *transfer of power* to Solomon.

The language of the Psalm connects with the historical traditions of David and Solomon:

* The promise to David is that he would have a son who would have rest from his “enemies” (1 Chron 22:9); likewise, the psalm is about the “enemies” of David’s son.
* The son is to build the temple which will hold the “footstool” of Yahweh (1 Chron 28:2). In a corresponding way, Yahweh will make the enemies of David’s son his “footstool”.
* It is Solomon whom David identifies as the one chosen to “sit” upon the throne of the kingdom (1 Chron 28:5); but the Psalm intervenes and invites David’s son to “sit” at the right hand of Yahweh.
* The description of Solomon by Yahweh is, “I have chosen him *to be* my son, and I will be his father” (1 Chron 22:10, 28:6) which is used of Christ along with Pss 110 in Hebrews 1 (vv. 5, 13).
* Bathsheba refers to the solemn “oath” by David in the name of Yahweh that Solomon would sit on the throne (1 Kgs 1:13, 17, 30).[[51]](#footnote-52) Likewise, Yahweh had “sworn” that Solomon would sit on the throne (Pss 110:4).
* Bathsheba and Nathan the prophet refer to David as “lord”, and this explains David’s choice of “my lord” for Solomon in this psalm. It is at this time of rebellion that the dying king needs to express his recognition of Solomon as king.
* Solomon is assured that he is a priest-king after the order of Melchizedek and this assurance contrasts with the split in the priesthood in Jerusalem with some of the priests supporting Adonijah (1 Kgs 1:7).
* Solomon is anointed by the brook Gihon (1 Kgs 1:33), and this reflects David’s words, “he will drink of the brook by the way” (Pss 110:7).
* Benaiah confirms David’s intentions in language reminiscent of Psalm 110: “the Lord was with my lord” (1 Kgs 1:37) reflects “the Lord said to my lord”.
* Adonijah and Solomon’s enemies in the city lost courage when Solomon entered the city to assume the throne and Adonijah bowed himself before Solomon (1 Kgs 1:53).
* In this act of obeisance by Adonijah, Yahweh lifted up Solomon’s head above his enemies (Pss 110:7, cf. Pss 3:3).

The rhetoric of Psalm 110 reads very well against this background. Yahweh assures Solomon through the word of prophecy from David that he will sit on the throne, but in the interim, he must sit at his right hand until his enemies are forced to bow as a footstool. It would be Solomon who would rule out of Zion. It would be Solomon who would be the king-priest of Jerusalem and subdue the nations.

The typology of Solomon’s anointing and Adonijah’s rebellion fits the purpose of Luke in Acts 2:34. Adonijah has seized the throne and he represents those who crucified Jesus—they had the power. However, God had exalted Jesus to sit beside him whilst he made his enemies his footstool. The courage of Adonijah and his supporters evaporated when Solomon was anointed king and entered Jerusalem. Jesus’ accession to the throne of David in Jerusalem is similarly delayed because of his enemies who will be made his footstool. In Luke’s narrative rulers who crucified Jesus lose power in the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple.

The interpretation of Psalm 110 is not without doctrinal significance. Some scholars argue that the kingdom of God has been inaugurated in the ministry of Jesus and his apostles. One way in which the metaphor of inauguration can be given meaning is to argue that Jesus has been enthroned upon the Davidic throne. M. M. B. Turner asserts that Jesus “becomes the Davidic king, exercising royal functions, through resurrection ascension”.[[52]](#footnote-53) This interpretation is partly based upon his reading of Luke’s use of Psalm 110 in Acts 2:34-35 in connection with Jesus’ resurrection and ascension.[[53]](#footnote-54) However, the Davidic throne was *in* Jerusalem, and Luke’s story holds out the prospect of a “return” of Jesus to Jerusalem (Acts 1:11, 3:20). It is more likely therefore that Luke anticipates that Jesus will assume the Davidic throne in Jerusalem upon his return (Luke 1:32-33). If as we have argued, Psalm 110 is about Solomon’s accession to the throne in the midst of rebellion, Jesus does not presently sit upon the Davidic throne in heaven, but is waiting until his enemies are made into his footstool.

**Additional Notes – PW**

1) “Zion” means a “dry place” – hence the psalm mentions “dew” in v. 3 – Zion will be inundated with the “dew of youth” (cf. Pss 133:3).

2) The Lord swore to Solomon that he was a priest after the order of Melchizedek (v. 4) and would therefore be king. The act of swearing refers to the covenant promise of 2 Samuel 7, which is described as an oath in Pss 132:11: “The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David, He will not turn from it; of the fruit of thy body will I set upon the throne”.

3) Accordingly, Yahweh would not withdraw his covenant mercy as he had done from Saul. The expression “will not repent” (v. 4) echoes “It repented me that I have set up Saul to be king” (1 Sam.15: 11).

**Jacob’s New Name**

**Paul Wyns**

Genesis 32 records the wrestling match and the renaming of Jacob on the borders of the land by the Jabbok River ford.[[54]](#footnote-55) Our question is: What does the account tell us about the meaning of Jacob’s new name.

M. D. Wessner observes that Jacob is alone when he meets his opponent.[[55]](#footnote-56) The solitary nature of the encounter is emphasized — Jacob is as it were “stripped bare” of all he owns and all his pretensions; this is a life and death struggle. He meets his opponent in the dark and can only guess at his identity — is it perhaps his brother Esau? The encounter with Esau in the next chapter plays on this solitary struggle “face-to-face” (Gen 32:30). J. Miles suggests that the opponent was indeed Esau. His arguments are interesting, particularly because Esau personifies and embodies Jacob’s life-struggles up to this point. It is certainly possible that Esau blessed Jacob and renamed him Israel; and that behind his wrestling and the face of Esau, Jacob perceived the face of God and his own resistance to divine discipline.[[56]](#footnote-57) However, the touching of Jacob’s thigh causing the dislocation of his hip points to a supernatural encounter.

Why did Jacob’s opponent wish to leave before the dawn? This has had various unconvincing explanations by scholars. The simplest explanation however is also the most satisfying – his opponent wanted to keep his identity secret.[[57]](#footnote-58) It seems that his supernatural opponent deliberately wished to leave Jacob in a state of uncertainty — had he been wrestling a stranger…or Esau….or …? This explains why no extraordinary power was used until Jacob had wrestled his opponent to a draw — a remarkable feat. The narrator has purposely left the reader in suspense until this point in the story — for like Jacob we are unsure who is represented by the “two camps” or who is the opponent. Jacob the deceiver is cheated of his victory by a supernatural touch. Suddenly, the identity of the opponent becomes clear to both Jacob and to the reader. But still Jacob will not let go — devious Jacob — now made crooked in his body as a reminder, holds on for dear life, weeping and begging for the blessing. He is now a wrecked and wretched man as all his emotions pour out in the realization that he has actually been wrestling God all his life. It is at this point of total surrender and submission to God’s will that he becomes the victor — he overcomes his old nature and is renamed — *Israel — God will rule.*

At this point it is crucial that we examine the meaning of “Israel”. Scholars have suggested many different meanings but any meaning that simply treats the naming as an aetiological outcome or an exercise in etymology without regard to the contextual setting will fail to grasp the author’s (or redactor’s) intent. The change of name reflects a change of nature or relationship. Jacob’s defeat was simultaneously also his victory.

The prophet Hosea (Hos 12:2-5) has, “He [Jacob] had power with God” but the RV mg. renders this as, “He strove with God” ….and prevailed”. Once again the context is determinative: “He [Jacob] wept, and made supplication unto him” (Hos 12:5) — a strange kind of victory. A. P. Ross suggests that the confusion between the meaning “God strives” (fights/contends) and “God rules” is due to different pointing,[[58]](#footnote-59) but even this difference of meaning fits the contours of the narrative, for the acknowledgement of God ruling in Jacob’s life is a consequence of God contending with him. The elasticity of the pointing and translation fit the text.

We must add that Hosea understands Jacob’s opponent as God (*Elohim*) despite the use of the covenant *Yahweh* name in Hos 12:5, which refers to Jacob’s memorial at Beth-el, rather than his wrestling. Wessner adds; “Therefore, despite the elaborate attempts of some scholars to explain verse 5a [in Hosea 12] as parallel to events in Jacob's life other than his wrestling at the Jabbok (e.g., Gen 30:8), Hosea is simply referring to Jacob's physical struggle with [*elohim*] and is as ambiguous about the identity of his assailant as is the narrator of the Genesis account. For Hosea, the [*elohim*] with whom Jacob contended is not to be understood as God himself but rather as corresponding to [*malak*], that is, a messenger sent on behalf of God”.[[59]](#footnote-60)

The comments made by Alter on the change of Jacob’s name are worth citing:

“Abraham’s change of name was a mere rhetorical flourish compared to this one, for of all the patriarchs Jacob is the one whose life is entangled in moral ambiguities. Rashi beautifully catches the resonance of the name change: ‘It will no longer be said that the blessing came to you through deviousness [‘*oqbah*, a word suggested by the radical of “crookedness” in the name of Jacob] but instead through lordliness [*serarah*, a root that can be extracted from the name Israel] and openness.’ It is nevertheless noteworthy – and to my knowledge has not been noted – *that the pronouncement of the new name has not been fulfilled.* Whereas Abraham is invariably called “Abraham” once the name is changed from “Abram”, the narrative continues to refer to this patriarch in most instances as “Jacob.” Thus, “Israel” does not really replace his name but becomes a synonym for it – a practice reflected in the parallelism of biblical poetry, where “Jacob” is always used in the first half of the line and “Israel,” the poetic variation, in the second half”.[[60]](#footnote-61)

The meaning, “to rule, be lord over”, is the meaning allocated to “Israel” by Alter’. However, as he notes, “names with the *el* ending generally make God the subject, not the object, of the verb in the name”.[[61]](#footnote-62) The meaning of Israel is sometimes given as “Prince (or ruler) with God” [God is here the object] instead of “God is ruler” or “God will rule” [God is here the subject of the verb]. However, just as “Daniel” means “God will judge” [God is the subject of the verb] and not, “Judge with God”, so too “Israel” means “God will rule”.

In conclusion, the story of Jacob, the progenitor of the twelve tribes, is also the story of the nation. Steve McKenzie observes;

“The chiastic structure of the Jacob cycle is significant in terms of the theme and purpose of the cycle as a whole. At the structural centre of the chiasm lies the story of the birth of Jacob's children, the founders and namesakes of the twelve tribes of Israel. As various scholars have observed, the individuals, Esau and Laban, here represent the political entities of Edom and Aram, respectively. The Jacob cycle tells how the nation of Israel, represented in its ancestors Jacob and his sons, contends with Edom and Aram, represented in their ancestors Esau and Laban. It further describes how Jacob/Israel prevailed over all opponents and gained control of the land. The specifying of the children of Jacob, the fathers of the tribes of Israel, lies at the centre of the narrative both structurally and functionally. The Jacob cycle is the story of the perseverance and prevalence of Israel”.[[62]](#footnote-63)

A comparison between the two Bethel accounts (in Genesis 28 and 35), when Jacob leaves the land and then returns some 20 years later establishes that the very real events in the lives of the individual patriarchs were understood as pre-figuring the actions of the tribes and were therefore prophetic of future behaviour (Gen 49:1-4, 27). The Semitic sense of community and federalism dictated that current historic realities are interpreted as a consequence of past behaviour.  This is particularly true of the prophets where Jacob functions as a type of the nation.

# Deuteronomistic History in Romans 2 and 3 (Part Two)

**Paul Wyns**

The second part of our investigation will offer a detailed exegesis of Romans 2 based on the observations noted in the comparison table in the previous article. This will place the matrix of Pauline thought firmly within Deuteronomistic history; particularly within the Davidic royal court history (including the relevant psalms) recounting the Bathsheba incident.

The singular ‘the Jew’ is a rhetorical device often employed by Paul to address all Jews; however, he commences this section of his argument with what could be considered the more generic ‘man’**.** Paul deliberately prefaces ‘man’with the interjection ‘O’ for emphasis:

“Therefore you are inexcusable, O man, whoever you are who judge, for in whatever you judge another you condemn yourself; for you who judge practice the same things.” Rms 2:1 (NKJV)

‘O man’is an exclamation — suggesting equivalency with the accusation levied at David; “Thou art the man”.A particular man is here in view, namely the man who is in a position to pass juridical sentences,[[63]](#footnote-64) yet neglects to pass judgement on his own law breaking behaviour. As king of all Israel, David was in the privileged position to pass judgement on the hand of the law; in Pauline theology he functions as a type of the nation, given a unique status, and placed in a privileged position over the Gentiles by reason of the holy law covenant that was vouched safe to them. The nation (like the king) had a special responsibility to act as ministers (priests and kings) to the surrounding Gentile nations.

Paul follows (v. 2) with the remark that God’s judgement is according to the truth:

“But we know that the judgment of God is according to truth against those who practice such things.” Rms 2:2 (NKJV)

Truth is OT terminology for the covenant promises to the patriarchs (\*cf. Mic 7:20). J. D. G. Dunn comments, “Paul has in view a Jewish rationalization which could justify or excuse in itself what it condemned in others”. [[64]](#footnote-65) In this section Paul is contrasting hypocritical human judgement under the law covenant (in this case typified by David) with divine judgement which occurs on the basis of faith in the covenant promises (truth). Paul’s next observation is about the inescapable consequences of such hypocrisy (v. 3) — the fact that a man (or nation) is granted a position of privilege (administering the holy law covenant) does not excuse them of the consequences of sin — “You shall surely die” (Gen.2:17).

“Or do you despise the riches of His goodness, forbearance, and longsuffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leads you to repentance?” Rms 2:4 (NKJV)

The echo here is to Moses on Sinai. God’s goodness (v. 4) is expressed in his grace, which was revealed to Moses; “I will make my goodness pass before thee...and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy” (Exod 32:19). Paul is already anticipating the question of election in Rms 9:15. Paul’s mind is soaked in OT metaphor — divine goodness and truth find their concrete expression in the promised Messiah – the final unique self-revelation promised to the patriarchs. God keeps mercy (preserves mercy) for thousands...of generations....until Messiah. And it is the divine prerogative to forgive whomsoever he will (and *that* on the basis of *faith* in the promise not through the law). It was only the experience of personal sin that brought this lesson crashing home on David, as expressed in Psalm 51. That Paul has this also in mind cannot be doubted as he quotes Psalm 51 in Rms 3:4 and Psalm 32 in Rms 4:6-8.

Refusal (v. 5) to accept God’s goodness (his covenant mercy manifested in the messiah) results in the unrepentant sinner remaining under the law — the inevitable consequence is condemnation on the day of judgement.

“But in accordance with your hardness and your impenitent heart you are treasuring up for yourself wrath in the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who will render to each one according to his deeds: eternal life to those who by patient continuance in doing good seek for glory, honour, and immortality; but to those who are self-seeking and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness — indignation and wrath...”Rms 2:5-8 (NKJV)

Everyone (v. 6) will get what they deserve – Christian Jews andChristian Gentiles, unbelieving Jews and unbelieving Gentiles – those under the law and those outside the law — the consequences of sin are universal and God will “reward” everyone according to their actions.

This seems to completely contradict the Pauline gospel of justification by faith alone, and the emphasis on works has exegetes in a quandary. It is such an embarrassment that leads some exegetes to place the complete chapter in parenthesis, or to dismiss it completely.[[65]](#footnote-66) Paul explicitly quotes the Jewish theological opinion ‘that God will render to each one according to his deeds’ in order to combat Jewish hypocrisy that allowed justification and excused for itself what it condemned in the Gentiles.

At the heart of the Pauline gospel (v. 7) is the phrase, u`pomonh.n e;rgou avgaqou/ this is literally rendered (YLT); *“*in continuance of a good work”. However, it is an assumption to regard this “good work” as a human work. An alternative understanding is to regard the “good work” as the redemption that God wrought in Jesus Christ. This alternative is supported by the echo with Genesis, where it is stated that God saw everything that he had made and saw that it was good; this is described as a good work (Gen 1:31, 2:2). Thus, in the New Creation the believer continues this good work with “works of faith” (1 Thess 1:3) and not “works of law” (Gal 3:2).

Paul contrasts those who obey truth (v.8) with those who obey unrighteousness. Truth is a metaphor for the covenant promises — to “obey the truth” is to obey Jesus Christ, who is the embodiment of the truth (covenant promises):“I am the way, the truth, and the life”(John 14:6). The ellipsis must be supplied in the remainder of the phrase — to obey unrighteousness is to obey [the law that causes] unrighteousness — “for without the law sin was dead” (Rms 7:8). In Pauline theology the law becomes an instrument of God’s wrath and man’s unrighteousness.

Paul continues his argument as follows:

“...tribulation and anguish, on every soul of man who does evil, of the Jew first and also of the Greek; but glory, honour, and peace to everyone who works what is good, to the Jew first and also to the Greek.For there is no partiality with God.For as many as have sinned without law will also perish without law, and as many as have sinned in the law will be judged by the law(for not the hearers of the law *are* just in the sight of God, but the doers of the law will be justified...” Rms 2:9-13 (NKJV)

Dunn comments; “Paul attempts to undermine the confidence of those who think that because they have the Law they are advantaged in the judgement over those without the Law. On the contrary, Jewish teaching is precisely that doing the Law is more important than merely hearing it; the argument is *ad hominem.* The pride and the presumption of “the Jew”, by virtue of possessing the Law, becomes explicit in Romans 2:17-24. The intention of the forthright indictment of the typical Jewish interlocutor is not to condemn all Jews out of hand, but rather to argue that when the typical Jew breaks the Law in his presumption he undermines the whole basis of his privileged position”.[[66]](#footnote-67)

“...for when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do the things in the law, these, although not having the law, are a law to themselves, who show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and between themselves *their* thoughts accusing or else excusing *them)*” Rms 2:14-15 (NKJV)

Paul changes tack in vv. 14-15 by referring to Gentiles who act out of conscience — “who show the work of the law written in their hearts*”.* This is the New Covenant language expressed by Jeremiah (Jer 31:33) as reserved for the glorious future *of Israel*. But now it is employed by Paul to describe *faithful Gentiles.* Within the paradigm that Paul has established the faithful Gentile is represented by Uriah the Hittite.

N. T. Wright offers a different translation of the Greek underlying “do by nature the things of the law*”.* He proposes,

*“*For when the Gentiles, who by nature do not have the law, yet they do the things of the law.” Rms 2:14 (N. T. Wright)

He argues that it is by nature, (that is by birth), Gentiles are outside the covenant and not within the Torah, and yet Paul supposes that some do the things of the Torah”.[[67]](#footnote-68) He is most certainly correct in this reading of the Greek as the construction has a parallel in v. 27:

“And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law?” Rms 2:27 (KJV)

The normal assumptions about “natural law” that exegetes bring to the table are therefore wrong. Paul employs the phrase “by nature” as a description of the natural state of the Jews — i.e. they are born into the covenant and circumcision from birth (circumcised 8th day) and the natural state of the Gentiles (born outside the covenant) it has nothing to do with “natural law”.

We can set this argument against the backdrop of David and Uriah the Hittite. In Paul’s typology, the Gentile is Uriah the Hittite, who has cast his lot in with Israel. His concern for the ark (dwelling in a tent) mirrors David’s concern for the ark. Here was no ordinary, idol worshipping, lascivious Gentile — but a man of integrity — not a mercenary or a hired gun.[[68]](#footnote-69) Yet, this man was “by nature” outside the covenant (Torah) — contrast David, “by nature” privileged, yet plotting and scheming his Gentile servant’s downfall.

The apostle concludes (v. 15) with an observation about the conscience, which functions either as justifier or accuser (of the Gentile before God). In this Paul once again anticipates the role of the conscience that he develops in Rms 14:14 and particularly the qualifier in Rms 14:22b, “Happy is he who does not condemn himself in what he approves”. This was uttered as a warning to Gentile Christians who might think their understanding and morality superior than their “weaker” Jewish Christian brethren, especially regarding dietary requirements and Sabbath keeping. In Paul’s gospel, the motivation behind the action was all important — both for Jewish *and* Gentile Christians. Paul could be, “all things to all men” — not because he was a hypocrite — but because he understood both the value and meaning of the law (and respected it) and the importance of the messianic covenants. For him they were not in opposition, merely different operations of the one God. However, if Gentile Christians deliberately exercised their freedom in Christ against their consciences’ (or in order to deliberately antagonize their Jewish Christian brethren) then they would be condemned, as surely as any law breaker would.

Paul picks up the Davidic typology again, (v.16) with the law-breaking Jew being judged openly in the same manner that David’s secret sin was openly exposed (2 Sam. 12:12; 16:22).

“...in the day when God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel. Indeed you are called a Jew, and rest on the law, and make your boast in God,and know *His* will, and approve the things that are excellent, being instructed out of the law, and are confident that you yourself are a guide to the blind, a light (Uriah’s name means light) to those who are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, having the form of knowledge and truth in the law. You, therefore, who teach another, do you not teach yourself? You who preach that a man should not steal, do you steal?” Rms 2:16-21 (NKJV)

Paul condemns those who boast in the law (v.v. 17-21), yet honour it only in the breach. These “have a form of knowledge and truth in the law”.Paul denounces the attitude that compromised the truth (covenant promises) and practiced a reductionism that allowed the truth to be compressed into law. For the rhetorical Pauline “Jew” the law had replaced the messianic hope. Not so for David, as he realised that the law could not save him — “For You do not desire sacrifice, or else I would give it” (Pss 51:16) — no sacrifice under the law could atone for murder and adultery.

# The Jews should have been a light[[69]](#footnote-70) to the surrounding Gentile nations – but instead of illuminating darkness they were law breakers like David. The difference is that David was repentant when confronted with his sin and came to the realisation that he could only become a teacher once he had experienced divine grace: “ThenI will teach transgressors your ways, and sinners shall be converted to you.” (Pss 51:13). Unlike “the Jew” who taught the Gentile the law from the top of an ivory tower (while himself breaking the law), David, could teach from experience the meaning of grace (not law) and divine forgiveness — because not only had he had seen the risen Christ (2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 110), now and only now did he understand what the covenant promise truly meant — the truth had set him free. David could only expect condemnation under the law; it was faith in the redemptive work of the promised messiah that saved David.

“You who say, ‘Do not commit adultery’, do you commit adultery? You who abhor idols, do you rob temples? You who make your boast in the law, do you dishonour God through breaking the law?”Rms 2:22-23 (NKJV)

The charge of stealing and adultery (vv. 22-23) is in keeping with the Davidic undertone of the chapter – the charge of committing sacrilege is more difficult to place. Perhaps it is the occasion when David ate the showbread. If that is the case Paul is emphasizing the same point as Jesus in Matthew 12 namely, that his action was not lawful (even though on this occasion it was justifiable).

“For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you, as it is written.” Rms 2:24 (NKJV)

The same accusation of blasphemy (v.24) was levied against David by Nathan the prophet. Through his hypocrisy David had made the divine name a mockery in the eyes of the Gentiles.

“For circumcision is indeed profitable if you keep the law; but if you are a breaker of the law, your circumcision has become uncircumcision.Therefore, if an uncircumcised man keeps the righteous requirements of the law, will not his uncircumcision be counted as circumcision?And will not the physically uncircumcised, if he fulfils the law, judge you who, *even* with *your* written *code* and circumcision, *are* a transgressor of the law?For he is not a Jew who *is one* outwardly, nor *is* circumcision that which *is* outward in the flesh;but *he is* a Jew who *is one* inwardly; and circumcision *is that* of the heart, in the Spirit, not in the letter; whose praise *is* not from men but from God.” Rms 2:25-29 (NKJV)

The last section emphasises the Spirit not the letter, the inward not the outward; the same sentiment as David’s penitentiary prayer in Pss 51:10. *“*Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a steadfast spirit within me”.

**Using the New Testament in the Old Testament**

**Andrew Perry**

NT scholars generally investigate the topic of “The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament” rather than Old Testament scholars. However, as a matter of method, they use the consensus positions of Old Testament scholars to tell them what the OT text means and they assume that the NT writer holds the same set of opinions. This methodological presumption is adopted silently and seldom do you come across the question: Into what historical context did a NT writer place Isaiah or this or that Psalm? The reason for such a presumption lies in the fact that this question is difficult to answer. NT writers do not typically mention the historical context of a psalm. For example, Luke does not overtly advertise the view that Psalm 110 has its origins in the rebellion of Absalom or Adonijah or that it is a psalm written for a ritual connected with the coronation of the Davidic king.

It might be thought that this question cannot be answered; however, there are two lines of argument that can establish historical context. The first line is to adopt, as a controlling framework, the approach to the OT evident in Second Temple Judaism. Thus the ascriptions of authorship, the principle of inspiration, and the harmonizing method of interpretation, should be adopted by the scholar if he is to have a chance of securing Luke or Paul’s interpretation of scripture.

The second line of argument is typological. Here the principle is that since typology relates two historical circumstances in terms of details, (one OT and one NT), we can reverse the typology and consider what the NT situation tells us about the OT context. For example, in the case of Pss 110:1, in order for Luke to use this text of Christ, the original text must be about the son of David rather than David (i.e. Solomon). Further, in order for the psalm to prove that Jesus is in heaven sitting by the hand of Yahweh, it must reflect a situation in which David is alive and Solomon is not on the throne in Jerusalem but about to become the king. In short, in order for Luke’s secondary application of the psalm to work, the primary application can be inferred to be what we have stated—the *impending* coronation of Solomon.

Instead of arguing in this manner, NT commentators will ascribe to Luke the view that the psalm is purely eschatological—it is just about the future messiah and has no reference to Solomon. However, OT commentators are more likely to see in the psalm a reference to the coronation of the Davidic king and the speaker as someone other than David. A typical gloss would be that the “prophet” says of the Davidic king, “Yahweh said to my lord, ‘Sit thou on my right hand’...”. These two consensus readings by NT and OT scholar alike suffer from two different kinds of mistake. The NT scholar supposes that the psalmist (who can be David) would be inspired to compose a psalm about the messiah hundreds of years hence without regard to his own situation. This makes the psalm irrelevant to the needs of the moment and it ignores the particular allusions in the psalm to Israel and Judah (e.g. v. 7). The OT scholar, however, in seeking a local scenario in which to situate the psalm ignores the evidence of its interpretation by first century readers such as Luke (or Paul, or the other gospel writers). The OT scholar is likely instead to bring pre-exilic data to bear on the interpretation of the psalm—perhaps information about coronation rituals from Mesopotamia and how they involve decrees about the king by the god.

Instead of going to OT commentaries for our interpretation of the OT, we ought to follow the examples of the NT writers in their interpretation. Thus, if we are seeking to interpret Psalm 110, we can surmise its background by seeing how it is applied to the Lord Jesus Christ. Alongside this study of the use of the psalm in the NT, we can consider how it is used by other Second Temple writers, and “write up” a “compare and contrast” essay. In this way we develop our understanding of the distinctiveness of the NT writer’s approach to the OT.

Our two lines of argument do not apply across the board, but they are generally applicable when NT writers quote the Prophets. It is in these writings that historical context is more likely to be obscure. Isaiah 40-66 is a case in point. OT scholars read these chapters against the background of the end of the Babylonian exile and the period after the exile. If they are conservative scholars, they regard Isaiah of Jerusalem as the author and affirm that he was inspired to write about the end of the exile and the times thereafter 150 years or so before the events. Is this way of reading supported by any NT writer? Such writers quote from and allude to Isaiah 40-66 in many instances, but do any of these instances give away their historical reading of Isaiah? The short answer is that there is nothing explicit in the NT documents that gives away the NT writer’s reading of any primary historical application of Isaiah 40-66.

OT scholars typically aver that Isaiah 40-66 is difficult to contextualize, especially Isaiah 56-66. The exact exilic and post-exilic history that gave rise to the oracles is disputed. As a result, it is argued that the lack of historical information in the oracles is an indication that they should be read in an eschatological way—about the end-times. NT scholars are comfortable with this line of argument and presume that the NT writers use Isaiah in an eschatological way without regard to any original application. Accordingly, there is an absence of discussion in NT studies about the historical origins of these oracles. However, the fact that NT scholars are not asking what Luke or Paul thought about the historical origins of, say, Isaiah 61, does not mean that the question cannot be raised. There is a comic irony here in that OT scholars endlessly discuss the historical origins of these oracles (this is their livelihood) and NT scholars pay no attention to such theories. They just presume that NT writers placed their origins in relation to the exile or the post-exilic history of the nation and were only concerned with their eschatological meaning. Other Second Temple writings use Isaiah 40-66 in an eschatological way. But is eschatology the only approach? Are NT scholars failing to see the typological basis for the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament?

As a worked example of the issue, we can here pose the question: Did Luke read Isaiah 61 in relation to the exile, after the exile, or in relation to the nation’s history before the exile? We do not need to consider any particular historical context; we can restrict our attention to the question of the three periods—pre-exilic, exilic and post-exilic. These three periods share the single detail of “the exile” (obviously) and scholars read the restoration oracles of Isaiah 40-66 against the backdrop of the exile and (by and large) exclude any pre-exilic application.

We can assume for our purposes the general characterization of these oracles as “restoration oracles”. If we assume that they are about the restoration of the nation after the exile, this immediately creates a dissonance with their NT usage. Luke is a case in point. He sets out from the beginning of his gospel the fact that Israel is *not* going to be restored: he warns of a wrath to come, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the scattering of the people. Why would he then use Isaiah’s oracles of restoration if they came from a time *after* the Jews have been scattered to Babylon and were now being restored in the land?

NT scholars address this difficulty by sidelining Israel. They make Isaiah’s oracles of restoration apply to the church as the remnant of Israel; the church is now the kingdom of God and the restored Israel of Isaiah. Luke, they say, is *revising* Isaiah. This approach does not really work as an interpretation of Isaiah because Isaiah’s focus is nationalistic—Israel *and* a remnant are the focus of the oracles. The return of Israel to the land in modern times is “non-scholarly” evidence that interpretations of Isaiah that sideline Israel are mistaken. If we claim that Luke or Paul or another NT writer is sidelining the nationalistic implications of the Abrahamic Promises or the Prophets, such a claim is given the lie by the return of Israel.

We cannot therefore assume that NT writers regard the church as the “restored Israel” of Isaiah. We cannot assume that NT writer’s thought that Isaiah’s oracles addressed the situation after the exile; rather we should assume that NT writers read them in the light of the *forthcoming* Babylonian exile—they saw this as a “type” of the forthcoming Roman scattering. In short, when the NT writers use these prophecies for their own times, they show how such prophecies come from a similar age in the nation’s past. NT writers apply these prophecies to their “apostolic” age and this age is the “last days” of the Jewish commonwealth prior to a forthcoming scattering. Similarly, Isaiah’s oracles of restoration were delivered against the backdrop of a forthcoming Babylonian “scattering”. They relate to the restoration of Judah under Hezekiah after 701, but such a restoration nevertheless took place against the backdrop of Isaiah’s prediction that the royal house would be taken captive to Babylon.[[70]](#footnote-71)

Our argument is that NT writers use Isaiah 40-66 in a “pre-exilic” way and that therefore they read these oracles in relation to Hezekiah. We can tell their reading was pre-exilic because they applied Isaiah’s oracles to their own day, which was just prior to the Roman “exile”[[71]](#footnote-72) of the nation. We can infer this because they had a high view of Scripture and an understanding of typology. They are therefore not claiming that Isaiah’s prophecies of restoration are fulfilled in the church rather they expect the reader to understand that just as Hezekiah’s restoration foundered so too will the “restoration” of the apostles. The time for the restoration of Israel was *always* set for a period beyond apostolic times. The model for understanding the “restoration” of John the Baptist, Jesus and the apostles is therefore proleptic—it is a type of the restoration to come, a demonstration of the kingdom of God—an invitation to the kingdom.

Our conclusion therefore is that NT writers quote and allude to the Old Testament in a context sensitive way. They have an historical understanding of the Prophets but this is only betrayed in their typological use of their oracles. The NT scholar’s eschatological approach is not incorrect but it fails to take into account the typological dimension of prophetic usage by NT writers. This kind of interpretation is separately undertaken but seldom related as a control upon eschatological readings.

**“Let all God’s angels worship him”**

**Gordon Allan**

**Introduction**

Hebrews 1:6 is often brought up to support the belief that that Jesus is God. Usually the first reason given is because the verse says Jesus is to be worshipped, and worship belongs to God alone. Usually the verse it is supposed to be quoting is Deut 32:43 (LXX) —sometimes Psa 97:7 (LXX and MT) is also considered as a possible source. A quick review of the underlying Greek word for worship in Pss 97:7, proskune,w (*proskuneo*), and the corresponding Hebrew form of hwx (*hawah*),[[72]](#footnote-73) soon reveals that the basic meaning of this word is to bow down in respect and is applied in scripture not only to God, but to someone who is considered to be superior for some reason (rightly or wrongly)[[73]](#footnote-74). In this paper, we will consider the relationship of Hebs 1:6 to Deut 32:43.

The initial problem with supposing that the worship of Jesus implies that he is God is that it makes no sense in the context of Hebrews 1, which starts by telling is that although God has revealed himself in many ways in the past, it is only in these “last days” that God has revealed himself through Jesus, who is described as being “appointed heir of all things”, (v 1), “having become superior to the angels”, (v 4), “having inherited a more excellent name” (v 4) – statements which make no sense if applied to the creator of the Universe. Even some Trinitarian commentators can see the validity of this.[[74]](#footnote-75) The second problem is that the writer uses these quotations as said to the Son by the Father.[[75]](#footnote-76) A quotation applied directly to “God” by Moses would make no sense in this context. J. Carter correctly observes, “Here is a manifestation of God; but as Paul expounds it, a manifestation through His Son”[[76]](#footnote-77). While this may be a valid insight, our purpose in this article is to explore another approach.

**Proposal**

The premise of this article is that there is evidence which strongly suggests that in the original Hebrew text of Deut 32:43 it was the *nation of Israel* that was the object of praise, and to whom the angels were ordered to do homage, not Yahweh[[77]](#footnote-78). As well as dealing with a Trinitarian objection, this understanding makes more sense of its context in Hebrews 1.

The first question with the text is in identifying the source of the passage that is being quoted. It was generally believed that the writer to the Hebrews was consistently quoting from the Septuagint (LXX), a Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures extant at the time of the New Testament writers.[[78]](#footnote-79) However, since the discovery of the Qumran literature, it is now probable that the text used by the writer is, on occasion, closer to, or based upon, a Hebrew original (though not necessarily the Masoretic Text), or a translation of this into Greek.[[79]](#footnote-80)

Heb 1:6

**kai. proskunhsa,twsan auvtw/| pa,ntej** a;ggeloi **qeou**/Å

and let all the angels of God do homage to him.

The Septuagint (LXX[[80]](#footnote-81)) of Deut 32:43:

euvfra,nqhte ouvranoi, a[ma auvtw/| **kai. proskunhsa,twsan auvtw/| pa,ntej** ui`oi.[[81]](#footnote-82) **qeou**/ euvfra,nqhte e;qnh meta. tou/ laou/ auvtou/ kai. evniscusa,twsan **auvtw/| pa,ntej a;ggeloi qeou**/

“Rejoice, ye heavens, with him, and let all the sons (angels) of God worship him; rejoice ye Gentiles, with his people”

As can be seen from the highlighted text the Greek is identical, and for our purposes we can postpone discussion of the relationship of ui`oi. qeou and a;ggeloi qeou in the two clauses. The *Odes of Solomon* 2:43 quotes Deut 32:43 with the clauses reversed, but the *Odes*’ relationship to Hebrews and any Old Greek textual traditions for Deut 32:43 is uncertain; it is a Christian work from the late 1c. or early 2c. CE, but it could be later.[[82]](#footnote-83)

Our interest is in the fact that there is no equivalent line in the Hebrew Masoretic Text (MT). It is partly for this reason that commentators have sought for a less well matched quotation (Pss 97:7), for which the MT does have an equivalent. This Psalm may indeed be a relevant source, since NT writers show that they are quite capable of combining multiple sources in their citation of the Hebrew Scriptures. However, we should not abandon Deut 32:43 in favour of Psa 97:7 because there is no matching clause in the MT.

In Deut 32:43, the Hebrew of the first line does not agree with the LXX translation (some would say mistranslation). The Hebrew has:

wm[ ~ywg wnynrh

Rejoice, O ye nations, *with* his people (KJV)

We can make the following observations on this text:

1) The “with” has been supplied in the KJV, and is not part of the Hebrew text. Other translations follow this such as the ASV, ESV though not always placing the “with” in italics. However, there is no grammatical precedent for translating the Hebrew as “with his people”. The Hebrew consonants wm[ could be pointed to give “with him” or “his people”, but could not mean “with his people”, as, for example, in Mic 6:2.

2) The Hebrew verb underlying “Rejoice” means “to sing out”. J. J. Owen[[83]](#footnote-84) suggests that the Hebrew form should be translated as an injunction “Praise!”. This sense allows,

“Praise his people, o nations”[[84]](#footnote-85)

The alternative pointing gives the awkward translation “Praise/sing out with him, O nations” which is not sustainable; hence, we conclude that **the object of the praise is Israel**.

There is no second line in the MT equating to the “Let all *elohim* bow down before him”. However, a Qumran fragment of Deuteronomy 32 (4QDeutq) throws some light on this problem. This Hebrew text **includes** the line that is missing from the MT but present in translation in the LXX. This supports the proposal that the quotation in Hebrews 1 is from Deuteronomy. The Hebrew text reads:

wm[ ~ymX wnynrh

~yhla-lk wl-wwxtXh

Praise his people,[[85]](#footnote-86) O heavens,

Bow down before him, all *elohim*

Another interesting difference between 4QDeutq and the MT is that those called upon to praise his people are the “heavens”, not the “nations” as in the MT.

The various texts MT, LXX and 4QDeutq are shown below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 4QDeutq | Masoretic Text (MT) | LXX |
| 1 Praise his people, O heavens:2 prostrate yourselves before him, all gods (*elohim*) | 1 Praise his people, O ye nations,  | 1 Rejoice, ye heavens, with him, 2 and let all the angels of God worship him; 3 rejoice ye Gentiles, with his people, 4 and let all the sons of God strengthen themselves in him;  |

4QDeutq is a Hebrew parallelism, in which the recipient of praise in the first line equates to those to whom the *elohim* bow down in the second.[[86]](#footnote-87) If we add the second line from 4QDeutq to the MT, we get the same parallelism.

An objection making this addition is raised by L D Hurst[[87]](#footnote-88), who argues that it is only valid if the two lines are taken *in* *vacuo*. As it stands the MT has,

Praise his people, O you nations;

for he avenges the blood of his servants… (RSV)

Hurst argues that “In the larger context it leaves the “he” of line 3 (which must refer to God) hanging in the air” (Hurst is referring to the phrase “for he avenges the blood of his servants” as line 3). However, this need not be the case, as the second line is a repetition of the first in different words (similar to an explanation in parentheses), but the thought continues from the first line to the third. Even Hurst accepts that 4QDeutq “shows that Nairne’s interpretation is not without merit”, and “It is nevertheless quite easy to read the text the other way, and even modern scholars have read line 2 as referring to *the people* rather than to God”.

To recap: the evidence, so far, is as follows:

1. The quotation “let all God’s angels worship him” has been assumed to be a quotation from the LXX of Deut 33:42
2. There is no Hebrew equivalent in the MT for this line
3. A scroll of Deuteronomy discovered at Qumran gives a Hebrew equivalent for the line missing from the LXX
4. The Hebrew of Deut 32:43 is mistranslated as “with his people” in several translations, but correctly in others.
5. In both the MT and 4QDeutq, the object of praise is God’s people Israel. The subsequent phrase, in Hebrew poetic form is a repetition of the same idea. The heavens (or the nations) are being told to prostrate themselves before God’s people Israel.

**Contextual evidence**

While it has to be admitted that the evidence so far is not entirely conclusive due to the uncertainty of the original text, the contextual evidence is compelling. Why does the writer of Hebrews specifically make a connection between Hebs 1:6 and Deut 32:43 and the coming of the “firstborn” (Christ) into the world (most likely at his return - Heb 2:5)?

Several prophecies identified in the NT as relating to the Messiah have an initial fulfilment in Israel. Matthew[[88]](#footnote-89) quotes Hosea 11:1 “When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son” to demonstrate that the going down to Egypt for safety and return to the land by Jesus was a fulfilment of OT prophecy (or perhaps better “an OT type”[[89]](#footnote-90)). The precedent is set for Israel to be a type of the Messiah. However, more specifically, God calls Israel “my firstborn”: Exodus 4:22 “And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the LORD, Israel *is* my son, *even* my firstborn:” This is repeated at Jer 31:9 “for I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim *is* my firstborn”[[90]](#footnote-91).

There is therefore a logical connection between Deut 32:43 and Heb 1:6 in that the title “firstborn” applies to both Israel and Christ. It makes no sense that the verse in Deuteronomy would be applied to God (the Father) as “firstborn”. Looking to a future application of Deuteronomy, Nairne says: “It is, therefore, when God brings His people, after their humiliation (of exile, etc.), into the fellowship of the nations (th.n oivkoume,nhn) again, that He bids all the angels worship this people who are His firstborn son (Jer 33:9, Hos 11:1).”[[91]](#footnote-92) The writer to the Hebrews is therefore making the contrast between Christ’s humiliation (i.e. lower than the angels) and his return to kingship over the land of promise and over the angels as God’s true firstborn Son.

**Conclusion**

It can be safely concluded that the object to whom the angels bow down in Deut 32:43 is the nation of Israel, God’s firstborn. In keeping with the use of Old Testament texts as fulfilled in the New Testament, the parallel between Jesus and Israel is used to prove that Jesus is superior to the angels, because the angels bow down to him when he comes again into the world. The object of the writer is to demonstrate that Christ is superior to the angels, not that he is God.

**Linguistic Issues in Daniel**

**J. Burke**

In an oft quoted challenge based on the language in the book of Daniel, S. R. Driver alleged (emphasis in original):

The Persian words **presuppose** a period after the Persian Empire had been well established; the Greek words **demand**, the Hebrew **supports**, and the Aramaic **permits**, a date after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great (332 B.C.)[[92]](#footnote-93)

Contrary to Driver, conservative scholars have argued that Daniel was completed in the early Persian era. The events of the Babylonian era are spoken of in the past tense, and the last king referred to as contemporary with Daniel is ‘Cyrus king of Persia’, the last vision which Daniel receives being in the third year of his reign (Daniel 10:1).

If conservative views are correct, we would expect to find the following general features of language in Daniel:

* Chaldean (Babylonian), used accurately but not predominantly
* Persian words and phrases used frequently, even to describe events which took place in the Babylonian era
* Aramaic which is in greater agreement with the exilic than the post-exilic era
* An almost complete lack of Greek terms

Scholars have made a plausible case for exactly this situation, and we will rehearse their points for each of the languages represented in Daniel.

**Persian**

Driver argued that specific Persian words[[93]](#footnote-94) used in Daniel were not used until a later date in the Persian era, beyond that in which Daniel is traditionally said to have lived. These words have been reviewed by W. D. Jeffercoat who comments, “According to Driver, the use of fifteen Persian words to describe government officials under the Babylonians before the conquest of Cyrus shows that Daniel was written in a period after the Persian Empire had been well established”.[[94]](#footnote-95) Jeffercoat argues that Daniel could have both learned and used these Persian words at an early date. Firstly, since Daniel was an official in the Persian Empire he would have learned the relevant political vocabulary (Persia was a foe of Babylon and court politics would have been concerned with Persia). Secondly, many words which have previously been thought to be Persian words have since been found to be Babylonian words which passed into the Persian vocabulary. Daniel could have learned some of these words whilst a member of the Babylonian administration.[[95]](#footnote-96)

In addition, a number of the Persian words in Daniel were of sufficient antiquity to be unknown to the translators of the LXX, who mistranslated them completely. E. Pusey noted that a number of these words were no longer used by the Maccabean era, and noted that “several of them were misunderstood or not understood by Aramaic translators”.[[96]](#footnote-97) D. Conklin observes that of the Persian words used in Daniel, none are found in use by the Persians after 300 BC,[[97]](#footnote-98) and two of these terms are found only in Aramaic of the 5th and 6th centuries BC.[[98]](#footnote-99)

**Aramaic**

Even if it is agreed that the Aramaic ‘permits’ an early date, it is clear that Driver did not consider the Aramaic of Daniel to be, of itself, evidence for such a date. In fact, the Aramaic in Daniel provides strong evidence for a late, rather than an early date. A. Ferch states that “In terms of the Aramaic of the text it has been concluded that the book could not have been written later than 300 B.C”.[[99]](#footnote-100)

The two main arguments about the Aramaic in Daniel are:

* That it displays characteristics of a Western origin (implying post-exilic Aramaic), rather than characteristic of an Eastern origin which is to be expected if it was written during the exile.
* That it shares characteristics with the Aramaic of the post-exilic era, proving that it must have been written long after the time which the book itself claims.

Considerable evidence exists to contradict these claims. Just as earlier books of the Old Testament contain evidence of editorial updates (replacing or accompanying archaic terms or geographical references with the contemporary equivalent), so Daniel “may have been revised in spellings and endings, in order to conform to the current usage, as late as the second century B.C”.[[100]](#footnote-101) Further, the Aramaic used in the book of Daniel is of an ‘Eastern’ type, suggesting an origin in Mesopotamia, rather than a ‘Western’ type which would be the case if the book was written in Israel during the Maccabean era. Finally, it can be argued that the Aramaic in Daniel corresponds substantially to the Aramaic used in the 7th century B.C onwards, and to Aramaic of texts recognized as dating from within the 5th century B.C.[[101]](#footnote-102) This is not to be expected of a book written in the 2nd century B.C. Conklin notes that this is well recognized and states, “A linguistic analysis indicates that in morphology, vocabulary, and syntax of the Aramaic of Daniel is considerably earlier (on the order of several centuries) than that of Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen) and the Targum of Job (11QtgJob) which date from either the late 3rd or 2nd century B.C”.[[102]](#footnote-103)

**Greek**

Had the book of Daniel been written in the Maccabean era, it is at least likely that it would have been written in Greek since the Jewish Scriptures had already been translated into Greek by this time. Or again, it might be expected that would be Greek loan words transliterated into Aramaic. In fact there are only three Greek terms transliterated in Daniel; they are found in only one chapter of the entire book, and all three of them are musical instruments (Dan 3: 5, 7, 10, 15). The three Greek terms are kiqa,raj, yalth,rion, sumfwni,a. Driver’s argument (in 1891) was that these words did not appear in the Middle East until the 2nd century BC, or were not even coined in Greece until this time, leading him to conclude that ‘the Greek demands’ a late date for the composition of Daniel. This claim is contradicted by the wealth of evidence which has become available over the last 100 years.

Both sumfwni,a and kiqa,raj were used long before the 2nd century in literature contemporary with Daniel. Conklin points out that the term sumfwni,a was used by Pythagoras at least as early as 530 BC.[[103]](#footnote-104) However, the meaning and use of this term is uncertain. It could have an adjectival use meaning ‘in unison’ (as is the meaning of the English word ‘symphony’, derived from the Greek sumfwni,a), or it could be “a dialectal form…which dates back to at least the sixth century BC”.[[104]](#footnote-105) Similarly, the word kiqa,raj was in use at least as early as Homer (8th century BC), proving that it was certainly in use by the Greeks well before the book of Daniel was written.[[105]](#footnote-106)

Considerable evidence exists that words borrowed from Greek were already entering Semitic culture well before the Babylonian captivity.[[106]](#footnote-107) In Ezra 2:69 and Neh 7:70, 72, an Aramaic loan word for the Greek drachma is mentioned, despite the fact that both of these books are dated indisputably to the 5th century BC.[[107]](#footnote-108) Further corroboration is found in Greek loan words in the Aramaic Elephantine documents, also of the 5th century BC.

**Hebrew**

There are two lines of evidence which contradict Driver’s claims[[108]](#footnote-109) that the Hebrew in Daniel ‘supports’ a late date:

* Extensive study has demonstrated that the Hebrew of Daniel shares features of early Hebrew books.
* It has also been demonstrated that the Hebrew of Daniel is very different to later Hebrew texts.

This kind of evidence was presented by Pusey, even prior to Driver’s arguments. Indeed, Pusey also demonstrated that even in his own day the theory that Daniel’s Hebrew was post-exilic did not have considerable support among the Higher Critics, citing Gesenius, Bleek, De Wette, and Ewald.[[109]](#footnote-110) Other 19th century scholars agreed. Conklin cites the opinions of Stuart and Delitzsche, both of whom were supporters of ‘Higher Criticism’, but who agreed with the conservative assessment of Daniel’s Hebrew.[[110]](#footnote-111)

Conklin also cites the studies of Archer,[[111]](#footnote-112) which demonstrate the complete difference between the Hebrew of Daniel and the later 2nd century BC Hebrew of the Qumran documents:

Archer concludes that “in the areas of syntax, word order, morphology, vocabulary, spelling, and word usage, **there is absolutely no possibility of regarding Daniel as contemporary**” [to other second century documents]. He submits that “centuries must have intervened between them”.[[112]](#footnote-113)

These findings mean that the Aramaic documents from Qumran require that Daniel was written far earlier than the Maccabean thesis allows and that the book was not written in Palestine.

**Conclusion**

Driver’s “Introduction” is a synthesis of critical results from the 19c. and it popularized German Higher Criticism amongst the clergy in the English speaking world of his day. His linguistic arguments for the dating of Daniel were opposed at the time and have since been combated by conservative critics. The linguistic arguments considered decisive by Driver are no longer considered the basis for dating Daniel to the Maccabean era.

**END**

The next issue of the EJournal hopefully will be distributed via Google Groups. We have set up a group for the sole purpose of facilitating the mail shot. This subscriber list is now held in a Google Group, but whereas access to these groups is normally open, the group has been restricted to the editors as it is only for use as a distribution tool.
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