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**Editorial**

Theology was traditionally called the “Queen of the Sciences”. It is arguably the most challenging of the degree disciplines in a university. The argument is that it is a broad subject with many disparate skills and knowledge-bases (unlike other degrees). A theologian might specialize in one of many areas in the subject, but a generalist will require expertise in ancient languages, linguistics, grammar, text and manuscript evaluation, historical methodology and history, theology narrowly conceived as the development of doctrine, philosophy, sociology of religion, literary theory and exegesis, homiletics, and a myriad of other subject areas such as missiology and mission, social and pastoral care in the community, archaeology of the Near East, anthropology and comparative religion, psychology of religion, *and so on*. Quite a few of these areas and others not mentioned will be advertised as available modules in Theology degrees; a generalist is likely to be a jack of all trades and a master of none.

Minds are good at some things and not others. A person who has a talent for languages, say, may not be too hot with history, and the person who is good at mission, pastoral care or homiletics, may not be good at philosophy, *and so on*. Minds can usually have a go at most things with differing qualitative outcomes, but a mind that is good at one thing may be reluctant to acknowledge weakness in another area. This reluctance is a manifestation of the pride of life, and it is a particular problem for those who are actually very good in some things. In 1 Corinthians this point comes out in the “body has many parts” simile. The wisdom here is to accept what we can do well and accept what others can do better and be content with the complementary nature of human society. But is there anything wrong in having those who may be less able at something actually taking on the task?

The society in view here is comprised of believers in an ecclesia and/or in the ecclesias as a whole. John the Baptist illustrated the Christian virtue when, as a great prophet, he said of Jesus, “He must increase, and I must decrease”. The point here is not that Jesus was the lesser but that John was happy to be the lesser even though he was great. Those who look to have the upper hand in all things, and who may be multi-talented, have not learnt the greater value of “deferring to one another” and letting the other person do the doing. This is a different failure of not acknowledging the complementary nature of the ecclesia and the ecclesias. There is beauty of character in letting the lesser do what is needful rather than keeping the task to yourself because you are the greater at the time. When only the few are doing a job in the ecclesia or in the ecclesias, there is a two-way failure[[1]](#footnote-1) in giving and in the building up the body as a “one another” body.

These two failures think of the ecclesia and the ecclesias in different ways. In the model of the ecclesia as a body, the parts have their distinct roles and if you are good at something, then that is your part in the body. If you want to be another part in the body, you cannot, and those who are that part will say (in effect) that they have no need of you. In the model of the ecclesia as a family, those who are the older son or daughter (or father or mother) bring on the younger sons and daughters (i.e. they give way to the lesser). Insofar as the ecclesia or the ecclesias is/are a spiritual family, believers *can* (and ought to) be giving way to one another. The two models are in tension, but the question is: Which one is dominant in the community and is she in need of a different balance?

----------------

In this issue, we have included an exhortation and this will now be a regular feature of the EJournal. In the article, “Devotional Exposition”, in the last issue, it was explained that one model of exhortation (in the NT) is **devotional exposition**, and it is this kind of exhortation (rather than sentiment) that the EJournal will publish.

**Exhortation: Oil**

**J. Davies**

**Introduction**

We read in Ephesians:

Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light. See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil. Wherefore be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord [is]. Eph 5:14-17 (KJV)

For our exhortation, we would like to consider the enigmatic ‘oil’ of the parable of the virgins, and what it represents to see the powerful exhortation that it teaches us.

We will:

* Consider the lamps and the oil in the parable (Matthew 25)
* Establish the OT context in the Law of Moses (Exodus 27)
* Consider the relevance of the ‘oil’ (Ephesians 5)

Finally, we will look to Christ, the Word made flesh.

**Oil in the Parable of the Ten Virgins**

We can build up the following details regarding the lamps and the oil in the parable:

* All virgins have a lamp (v. 1)
* The foolish took no oil (v. 3)
* The wise took oil in their vessels (v. 4)
* All sleep and wake up (vv. 5-6)
* When the bridegroom comes, the wise use up their oil (v. 7)
* The foolish have no oil spare and their lamps are ‘going out’ (vs. 8)
* The oil is not transferable (v. 9)

The parable is constructed by the Lord so that we notice the distinction between the wise and the foolish. Put simply, **the distinction is ‘oil’**. It is therefore of primary importance for us to appreciate what is meant by the oil of the parable, so that we are ‘wise’ and not foolish.

***Verse 1***

Jesus uses Prov 6:20f. The virgins take their lamps. God’s commandment is a **lamp** (Prov 6:23). It protects the son from the wiles of evil women. It enables him to remain chaste – to remain a virgin (Prov 6:24). A passage from the psalms further establishes this:

Thy **word** [is] a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path. Ps 119:105

Proverbs 6:22 tells us that when **awoken** the commandments talk with the son (cp. Matt 25:7).

***Verse 3-4***

The language employed by the Lord also goes back to Proverbs 21.

*There is* treasure to be desired and oil in the dwelling of the wise; but a foolish man spendeth it up. Prov 21:20 (KJV)

Notice the similarity of language; ‘oil’, ‘wise’ and ‘foolish’. The proverb is teaching us that the oil is treasured by the wise so much that it is worth holding on to.

The wise are notable, by contrast to the foolish, because they take ‘oil in their vessels[[2]](#footnote-2) with their lamps’.

**Exodus 27 – ‘bring thee pure oil olive’**

Jesus’ use of ‘took’ in ‘took no oil’ echoes the command given to the children of Israel regarding olive oil.

And thou shalt command the children of Israel, that they bring thee pure oil olive beaten for the light, to cause the lamp to burn always. Exod 27:20 (KJV)

This command is part of the narrative explaining to Moses exactly what is required to construct the tabernacle (Exod 24:18). In Exodus 25 – 27, Yahweh explains to Moses exactly what needs to be **made** (‘thou shalt make’) in detail. At the end of this section, before considering the role of the priests, we have a reference to the need for oil.

***Verse 20***

The children of Israel were given a command to ‘**bring willingly**’ oil for the lampstand in the holy place (Exod 25:2, 6). In Exod 27:20 the oil is singled out as being something that every Israelite had to bring for the lamp to burn. Further, v. 20 explains that the oil had to be prepared. It had to be ‘pure’ and ‘beaten’ (3). This is teaching us that effort had to be expended to prepare the oil before it was brought to the priests; the olives had to be beaten (cp. Mic 6:15).

As no natural light would exist in the holy place, so the lampstand would produce light (Exod 35:14). The oil and the candlestick (or ‘lampstand’[[3]](#footnote-3)) were **both** required ‘for the light’ (same phrase for both), i.e. just having one wasn’t enough. At this point it is worth considering that the lampstand had been provided once by God, made by men with the spirit of God. However, by contrast, the oil was provided by the children of Israel, not just on one occasion, but rather continuously throughout Israel’s history. Given that the Word is a lamp (Ps 119:105), the commandment is a lamp (Prov 6:23), this teaches that we should continually have the Word in our life.

***Verse 21***

Verse 21 explains where the lamp will be burning, ‘in the tabernacle of the congregation, without the veil’, i.e. in the ‘holy [place]’ (cp. Exod 26:31, 33). Also, notice that the text explains that the veil was before the ‘testimony’ (Exod 31:18).[[4]](#footnote-4) We established from Proverbs 6 that the commandment is a lamp, and so seems appropriate in the context for ‘testimony’ to be mentioned.

The responsibility of looking after the lamps lay specifically with Aaron and his sons. The next two chapters continue by explaining further aspects of the priestly attire (Exodus 28), their consecration and aspects of their role (Exodus 29). Yet, before all of that, Aaron and his sons are given the responsibility of keeping the lamps alight.

This is teaching us an important principle about the priesthood; their primary responsibility was the Word of God and not on sacrifice and offering:

For the priest’s lips should **keep knowledge**, and they should **seek the law** at his mouth: for he [is] the messenger of the Lord of hosts. Mal 2:7 (KJV)[[5]](#footnote-5)

If the priests correctly taught the law, then they would not need anywhere near as many sacrifices! This is why Hosea says:

For I desired mercy, and **not sacrifice**; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings. Hos 6:6 (KJV)

Likewise, the Word of God for us is our primary responsibility. We have a great privilege of forgiveness in the Lord Jesus Christ through prayer to our God (1 John 1:9), much like Israel of old had in their offerings which pointed forward to Christ. Yet, like them, our primary focus should be on the Word of God which stands as an antidote to sin:

Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee. Ps 119:11 (KJV)

If the word is in our hearts, then we won’t sin and therefore require forgiveness. The priests were supposed to be Bible students and not sacrificial experts; we are supposed to be Bible students and not forgiveness experts.

Principles from the Law:

* The lampstand (the Word of God) was provided once by God, through men with the spirit of God
* The oil however had to be brought continually to ensure that the lamps did not go out
* It was a commandment for the oil to be brought, that really should be brought willingly
* Although greater responsibility lay with the priests regarding the oil, every member of ‘the children of Israel’ – male and female, were responsible for bringing their own oil

It was the responsibility of every single Israelite to ensure that the lampstand remained bright in the holy place, not just the priests. As we shall see, this is quite instructive for ecclesial life. It is not just the responsibility of the teaching brothers to apply themselves to the Word of God; it is the responsibility of every brother and every sister.

**Oil – ‘understanding the will of the Lord’**

In Matthew 25, we can see that the principles of the Law of Moses are picked up in the parable regarding ‘oil’. By looking at the Law we have considered the correct OT Biblical connection, where oil is being used for the lampstand so that the light never goes out.[[6]](#footnote-6) As each Israelite had to bring oil to the tabernacle to ensure that the lamp never went out in the holy place, so the wise virgins show the same diligence in preparing oil to ensure their individual lamp does not go out.

This is exactly the purpose of the oil in Matthew 25. Notice, however, that the oil is beaten. Work has to be done to the oil to ensure that the lamp shines. As we have illustrated in our comments on v. 1, the lamp represents the Word of God. Therefore oil is connected with the Word of God; it is the quality that makes the light shine brightly.

To understand more fully what is represented by the ‘oil’, we find that the Spirit in Ephesians seems to give a commentary on the parable (Eph 5:14-17). The language is lifted straight from Matthew 25: ‘sleepest’, ‘arise’, ‘fools’, ‘wise’. Yet, we ought to further establish a number of connections which solidify our claim that it is a commentary on the parable.

The Spirit through Paul refers to the believers being ‘light in the Lord’, much like the virgins taking their ‘lamps’ (v. 1).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Ephesians 5 | Ten Virgins (Matthew 25) |
| “now are ye light in the Lord” (v. 8) | “took their **lamps**” (v. 1) |
| “Awake thou that sleepest” (v. 14) | “all slumbered and **slept**” (v. 5) |
| “arise from the dead” (v. 14) | “all those virgins **arose**” (v. 7) |
| “*walk circumspectly*, not as fools, but as wise...be ye not unwise, but *understanding the will of the Lord*” (v. 15) | “five...**wise** and five were **foolish**...*took oil*” (vv. 2, 4) |
| “redeeming [Gk. exagorazomenoi] the time” (v. 16) | “**buy** [Gk. **agora**sate] for yourselves” (v. 9) |
| “hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God” (v. 5) | “I know you not” (v. 2) |
| “filled with the spirit” (v. 18 cp. v. 9) | “the wise took oil[[7]](#footnote-7) in their vessels” (v. 3) |
| “that he might present it to himself a glorious ecclesia...Christ and the ecclesia” (vv. 27, 32) | “they that were ready went in with him to the **marriage**” (v. 10) |

How appropriate therefore that the argument in Ephesians 5 concludes on the subject of **marriage**. As with the parable of the virgins, they went in to the ‘marriage’ (v. 10). Why? The Spirit through Paul alludes to the parable to teach the Ephesians, and us, of the ultimate consequence of walking **wisely** and not as **fools** (v. 15). If they, and we, fail to keep this exhortation, our part in the marriage of the Lamb is endangered.

Ephesians gives us an idea of what the oil represents. After exhorting the believers to rise out of lethargy, v. 15 introduces the theme of wisdom and foolishness, echoing the parable of the wise and foolish virgins. In v. 16, Rotherham translates:

**Buying out** for yourselves the opportunity, because, the days, are evil. Eph 5:16 (Rotherham)

The ‘buying’ provides us with another verbal connection with Matthew 25. So, the **wise** are those who buy up the opportunity, which by contrast the **fool**ish do not do when they have a opportunity. This is where we get our first hint at what the oil represents. The redemption of time, or the buying up of opportunities, is explained in v. 17,

For this cause do not become foolish, but have discernment as to what is the will of the Lord… Eph 5:17 (Rotherham)

The act of wisdom is the ‘understanding the will of the Lord’ (v. 17). This is the parallel to the ‘oil’ in Matthew 25, which the wise virgins have bought up in their lifetimes, but the foolish have not. Proverbs teaches this same principle:

**Buy** the truth, and sell it not; wisdom, and instruction, and understanding. Prov 23:23 (KJV)

**Get** wisdom, **get** understanding: forget [it] not; neither decline from the words of my mouth...Wisdom [is] the principal thing; [therefore] **get** wisdom: and with all thy **getting** get understanding. Prov 4:7 (KJV)

**The ‘oil’ therefore represents the ‘understanding of the will of the Lord’**. If we remember the purpose of the oil is to produce light, a verse in the psalms illustrates that we are on the right lines:

The **entrance of thy words** giveth light; it giveth understanding unto the simple. Ps 119:130 (KJV)

The understanding in question is that of how to live the will of God in our daily lives. The oil is paralleled with the ‘understanding of the will of the Lord’, which enables us to walk circumspectly, as wise (v. 15).

If ever there was an exhortation to do personal Bible study/meditation, we find it in the ‘oil’ of our parable, as Timothy was instructed:

Give diligence [Rotherham] to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, **rightly dividing the word of truth**. 2 Tim 2:15

Bible study doesn’t necessarily have to involve Greek and Hebrew words, it should simply be consistent Bible reading, comparing passages (spiritual with spiritual) to understand the will of the Lord.

As effort had to be expended in the beating of the oil in Exodus, so likewise, we should give diligence, buying up the remaining time in getting wisdom and understanding the will of the Lord. Oil is *treasured* in the house of the wise. Likewise, we should treat the word of God like treasure:

Yea, if thou criest after knowledge, [and] liftest up thy voice for understanding;If thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as [for] hid treasures; Then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God. Prov 2:3-5

To conclude our comments on the symbology of the ‘oil’ it is worth referring back to Exodus 27 where the beaten ‘oil’ ensured that the lampstand in the holy place shone brightly, and never went out. Likewise, our diligent, personal Bible study (‘understanding the will of the Lord’) should ensure that we ‘shine as lights in the world’ (Phil 2:15) in walking **wise**ly before our God.

In summary, the wise, in their lifetime, make effort to ‘understood the will of the Lord’ so that they can walk in wisdom before the bridegroom comes; the fools on the other hand, have not. That is the **key** distinction.

**Christ in Gethsemane**

We find an example of this principle at work in Matthew 26 with the Lord Jesus. We join the Lord Jesus, two days after he has taught his disciples about their need for oil in the parable of the virgins (Matt 26:2). Ironically, the disciples are sleeping (v. 40) and not watching (v. 41).

Recalling the ‘oil olive’ under the Law we notice that the Lord is on the Mount of **Olives,** in Gethsemane (vv. 30, 36). Gethsemane means ‘press’ of ‘oil’.[[8]](#footnote-8) As the oil was beaten under the Law; so the Lord’s trust in the Word of God was sorely tested. In amongst this suffering, the Lord Jesus learned obedience (cp. Heb 5:7).

The Lord concludes ‘Thy **will** be done’. The oil is pressed; the Lord Jesus understands the **will** of his Father and walks to his death in wisdom. How interesting it is then, that following his resurrection, when expounding the Scriptures on the road to Emmaus they say:

…did not our heart **burn** within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures? Luke 24:32

The Lord had been tested, and had understood the will of his Father, and so shone as the light of the world.

**Conclusion**

Principles from the Law:

* The lampstand (the Word of God) was provided once by God, through men with the spirit of God
* The oil however had to be brought continually to ensure that the lamps did not go out
* It was a commandment for the oil to be brought; it really should be brought willingly
* Although greater responsibility lay with the priests regarding the oil, every member of ‘the children of Israel’ – male and female, were responsible for bringing their own oil

The same principles apply:

* The Word of God has been provided by God, through men with the spirit of God
* Our application (the oil) to the Word of God however has to be brought continually to ensure that we shine as lights in the world
* We are commanded to apply ourselves to the Word of God and the work of the truth, yet really it should be brought willingly
* Although greater responsibility lies with teachers in the ecclesia, every member of the ecclesia – male and female, are responsible for their personal application to the Word

Our exhortation is really:

And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to **the word of his grace**, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified. Acts 20:32 (KJV)

As we remember the Lord Jesus Christ, we appreciate the finest example of this principle. The Master learned obedience by the things which he suffered, became the Word made flesh and shone as ‘the light of the world’.

That if we faithfully ‘pass the time of [our] sojourning here in fear’, and ‘with all our getting, get understanding’ and ‘looking carefully how we walk, not as fools, but as wise’ ‘we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming’ and may be granted ‘the gift of God – eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord’.

And they that be **wise** shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever. Dan 12:3 (KJV)

### The Seventy Week Prophecy (2)

**T. Gaston**

**Introduction**

In the first article we examined the critical interpretation of the Seventy Week prophecy, which attempts to interpret the prophecy in the light of the Maccabean revolt with particular emphasis on the figure of Onias III. We saw that these attempts were not convincing and in several cases went against the plain meaning of the text.

In this article we continue our examination of exegetical problems in the text and propose an alternative to the critical interpretation. This consideration will ultimately lead us to Jesus of Nazareth.

**The Dispensation for Jerusalem**

The opening line of the Seventy Week Prophecy,

Seventy weeks are determined for your people and for your holy city … Dan 9:24 (NKJV)

is most naturally understood dispensationally; the seventy weeks are the length set by God for that era of the Jewish people and their city. This reading seems confirmed by the fact that the seventy-weeks commence with “the command to restore and build Jerusalem”, and that they end with the destruction of “the city and the sanctuary”. Therefore the focus of the seventy-week prophecy is the Jewish people, centered on the city of Jerusalem. This focus helps us determine the *terminus ad quo* and *terminus ad quem* of the seventy-weeks. The seventy-weeks ends with the destruction of Jerusalem. This did not take place in 164 BC;[[9]](#footnote-9) Jerusalem was destroyed in 70 AD.

The *terminus ad quo,* “the command [lit. ‘word’] to restore and build Jerusalem”, must be dated to the issue of some decree which instigated the rebuilding of Jerusalem. Though Cyrus’ decree in c.538 is contemporary with the date ascribed to Daniel 9, this cannot be a suitable candidate as it is solely concerned with the reconstruction of the Temple.[[10]](#footnote-10) Daniel 9:25 does not mention the reconstruction of the Temple but rather specifies the reconstruction of “the street” and “the wall”.[[11]](#footnote-11) Whether or not any reconstruction of the city took place beforehand, it is recorded in the book of Nehemiah that by c.445 the wall of Jerusalem still lay in ruins (Neh 1:3). It is at this time that, according to the book of Nehemiah, Artaxerxes I gives letters to Nehemiah for the purpose of returning to Jerusalem to reconstruct the wall (Neh 2:7-8).

**The Masoretic Accents of Daniel 9:25**

Know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the command to restore and build Jerusalem until Messiah the Prince, there shall be seven weeks and sixty two weeks; the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublesome times. Dan 9:25 (NKJV)

Know therefore and understand that from the going out of the word to restore and build Jerusalem to the coming of an anointed one, a prince there shall be seven weeks. Then for sixty-two weeks it shall be built again with squares and moat, but in a troubled time. Dan 9:25 (ESV)

The two versions presented above represent the two sides of debate regarding the correct interpretation of this verse; the dispute is centred on the Masoretic accents. In the Masoretic text (MT) “seven weeks” and “sixty two weeks” are divided by an *‘athnach* mark, “the strongest disjunctive Masoretic accent mark”.[[12]](#footnote-12)[[13]](#footnote-13) The disjunction would generally be interpreted by placing the two phrases into separate clauses (cf. ESV), rather than conjoining them (cf. NKJV). While this disjunction is a feature of the Masoretic accents (added between sixth and ninth centuries AD), and not original to the consonantal text, we cannot disregard this reading (presumably based upon scribal tradition) without justification.

One textual witness against the MT accent choice is the Greek text (θ’), incorrectly designated by some as the Theodotion version of Daniel,[[14]](#footnote-14) which conjoins seven and sixty-two weeks. The Vulgate follows θ’;[[15]](#footnote-15) the LXX version of Daniel, as preserved in Codex Chisianus, is also a textual witness to the conjoining of these two periods,[[16]](#footnote-16) though this translation is so free that great weight cannot be attached to it.

Perhaps the strongest argument against the Masoretic accent choice is that it separates the anointed one of v. 25 from the anointed one of v. 26 by a period of 434 years. Though it is possible that the author intends to allude to two separate anointed ones, this seems implausible since all we are told about the first anointed one is that he is anointed. If we removed or weakened the Masoretic accent, then we would naturally identify both anointed ones as the same figure.[[17]](#footnote-17)

The conjoining of the seven-weeks and the sixty-two weeks may seem a little awkward but it is clearly what is intended. The seven-weeks is the period of the reconstruction of Jerusalem. The sixty-two weeks is the period during which Jerusalem shall stand before the coming of the “anointed one”.

**The Anointed One**

There is no precedent in the OT for the use of xyvm (*mashiyach*, “anointed one”, “Messiah”) as a title for the high priest. It is true that the word ‘*mashiyach*’ was on occasion used adjectively about the priests (cf. Lev 4:3, 5, 16; 6:22; χριστων ίερέων—2 Mac 1:10), but no priest is ever referred to as **the** anointed. The expression “the anointed”, and its equivalents (“the Lord’s anointed”, “his anointed”, etc.), is almost exclusively reserved for the king of Israel, specifically Saul (1 Sam 12:3, 5; 24:6, 10; 26:9, 11, 16, 23; 2 Sam 1:14, 16, 21) and David (2 Sam 19:21; 22:51; 23:1; 2 Chron 6:42; Ps 18:50; 20:6; 89: 38, 51), and, more generally, as a synonym for the office of king (2 Sam 2:10, 35; Ps 2:2; 132:10, 17; cf. Ps 84:9; Lam 4:20). The notable exception is the prophecy regarding Cyrus.[[18]](#footnote-18) Though this is often interpreted typologically as referring to the Messiah, we should allow that *mashiyach* is not directly synonymous for “king of Israel”, and is also applied to those appointed to do the will of God.[[19]](#footnote-19)

Daniel 9:24-27 gives little reason for interpreting *mashiyach* as a title for a high priest against OT precedent. Though the sanctuary and the offerings are mentioned, the focus of the prophecy is the restoration of Jerusalem and the nation. In this context we would more naturally expect reference to the restoration of the nation’s king rather than its priests. This is confirmed by the fact that the *mashiyach* is also described as dygn (*nagiyd*, “a prince”, “a ruler”). The term ‘*nagiyd*’is used frequently to refer to the king[[20]](#footnote-20) but never for the office of high priest.[[21]](#footnote-21) Therefore the *mashiyach nagiyd* should be interpreted as the restored king of Jerusalem: the Davidic Messiah.

**The Purpose of the Seventy-Weeks**

The angel Gabriel lists six objectives to be achieved during the seventy-week dispensation. These are listed as [NKJV]:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| to finish the transgression | to bring in everlasting righteousness |
| to make an end of sins | to seal up vision and prophecy |
| to make reconciliation for iniquity | to anoint the most holy |

It has been noted that these six can be divided into three negative and three positive objectives. It has been suggested that these two sequences run in parallel (as above) the positive answering the negative.

The first three objectives regard [vp (*pesha*, “transgression”), hajx *chatta’ah* (“sins”) and !w[(*‘avon,* “iniquity”). *Pesha* can refer both to personal sins and national rebellion; c*hatta’ah* can also be used of both personal and national sins,[[22]](#footnote-22) but is also frequently translated “sin offering” (116 times in KJV). As this passage follows Daniel’s prayer confessing the sins of his people, we might suppose that it is Israel’s rebellion against God that is intended. However, in his prayer, Daniel specifies his peoples’ sins as breaking the commandments (Dan 9:5, 11) and connects them with his own sins (Dan 9:20), so it is probable that Daniel has individual transgressions in mind; this is supported by the use of *‘avon.* Further, the fact that these three negative clauses are followed by “to bring in everlasting righteousness” suggests that abolition of sin described here is final and universal.

If the first clause (“to finish transgression”) is interpreted as the end of all sin, then the second follows logically. The sin-offerings are brought to an end because where there is no sin there is no need for a sin offering. The third clause, “to make reconciliation (rpk *kaphar*) for iniquity”, may be interpreted in several ways. The root *kaphar* means “to cover”, and in this instance refers to the covering of sin; hence, “to make reconciliation” (NKJV) or “to atone for” (ESV). The question is: Who is the subject of the verb, and hence the one doing the covering? As Young summarizes:

If the subject who covers is a priest, the meaning is to cover the sinner (usually) by means of a propitiatory sacrifice, hence, to make atonement or reconciliation. If God is the subject, it means to forgive, i.e., to regard as covered (cf. Jer. 18:23; Ps. 65:3). In this present instance, it is difficult to make this distinction, since no subject is mentioned.[[23]](#footnote-23)

The subject may be determined from the context: if Gabriel were referring to the normal rituals of the Temple, then the high priest would be subject; however, since the passage gives an impression of finality then a human priest cannot be the subject as his ‘covering’ has to be repeated every year. The implication is that it is God who will ‘cover’ the iniquity.

“To seal up (~tx *chatham*) vision and prophecy” has generally been interpreted either as the ratification of prophecy (by its fulfillment)[[24]](#footnote-24) or the end of prophecy.[[25]](#footnote-25) However, neither of these suggestions reflects the usage of *chatham* elsewhere in Daniel:

“But you, Daniel, shut up the words, and seal [*chatham*] the book until the time of the end; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall increase”. Dan 12:4 (NKJV)

And he said, “Go your way, Daniel, for the words are closed up and sealed [*chatham*] till the time of the end”. Dan 12:9 (NKJV)

The “words” sealed presumably refers to the visions and prophecies given to Daniel. In this context ‘sealing’ does not seem to refer to either their ratification or their completion. Instead the “sealing” seems to imply that the meaning of the visions is hidden until “the time of the end”.[[26]](#footnote-26) If this reasoning is sound then “to seal up vision and prophecy” would imply that a period when vision and prophecy is not understood, when its meaning is hidden. It is possible that the “seventy weeks” is the intended period when the true interpretation of prophecy (this prophecy?) would be not understood.

The referent of the phrase “the most holy” (~yvdq vdq) is not immediately obvious. The phrase “the most holy place” is used frequently in the OT to denote the innermost part of the Tabernacle, and the Temple, in which the Ark of Covenant dwelt (Exod 26:33; Num 18:10; 1 Kgs 6:16; 7:50; 8:6; 1 Chron 6:49; 2 Chron 3:8, 10; 4:22; 5:7; Ezek 41:4; 45:3). It is also used adjectively (more frequently) with reference to offerings, altars and places that are dedicated to God, that is “the most holy things” (Exod 30:10, 29, 36; 40:10; Lev 2:3, 10; 6:25, 29; 7:1, 6; 10:12, 17; 14:13; 24:9; 27:28; Num 18:19; Ezek 43:12; 48:12). This second usage can be applied to anything, even people.[[27]](#footnote-27)

In these instances it is the context that determines the referent; however, there is no word in Dan 9:24 indicating that “the most holy” is a location or a person. Contextually, rendering the Hebrew as “a/the most holy place” (RSV, NASB) would seem inconsistent as the seventy-weeks culminates with the destruction of the sanctuary, not its anointing. Similarly, the anointed prince is specifically designated by his anointing, and there is no warrant for assigning this specific referent to “the most holy”. Without the definite article, the reference is more likely to be most holy things; if not physical items of the sanctuary (destroyed), then an order of holiness.

**The Messiah Cut Off**

And after the sixty-two weeks Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself. Dan 9:26a (NKJV)

The verb “cut off” (trk *karath*) can refer to any action of cutting whether it is of food (i.e. chewing), meat (i.e. butchery), people (i.e. killing) or any object. It can also be used of severance from the congregation (i.e. exile; cf. Exod 12:19); it is frequently used for penal execution in the Law of Moses.

The phrase “but not for himself” (NKJV) is disputed and is variously translated: “and shall have nothing” (ESV), “appearing to have accomplished nothing” (NLT), “and will have no-one” (NIV footnote), “no-one shall take his part” (REB), etc. The LXX translates this phrase as “and shall not be”, while the θ’ gives καί κρίμα ούκ έ̉στιν ε̉ν αυ̉τω (lit. “and there is no judgment in him”) implying that he is killed unjustly (cf. GNB) and the Vulgate: *et non erit eius populus, qui eum negaturus est* (“and there will not be a people of him, who is about to deny him”). E. J. Young takes the phrase to imply that “the anointed one” shall die without all that properly belongs to him,[[28]](#footnote-28) and N. W. Porteous, that he shall die without trial.[[29]](#footnote-29)

Taking the MT text, we could render the whole clause as implying that the one cut off gained nothing for himself through his death (cf. NKJV). However, the phrase might more naturally be read as referring to the situation of his death and not the resultant state of affairs (cf. “and none shall help him” Dan 11:45).

The Hebrew literally rendered is “and there is not to him” or “he does not have”, yet it appears to be without an object. Every possible translation we have considered attempts to a supply an object: accomplishment (NLT), defenders (NIV fn; REB; cf. Vulgate), life (LXX), condemnation (θ’), anything (ESV). Some translators take the object from the following clause, e.g. “and the city and the sanctuary are not his” (YLT), though this seems improbable. If we assume that a word was omitted then the θ’, as an early textual witness, may well preserve the original.[[30]](#footnote-30) If we do not supply an object then the phrase may refer to an all-surpassing loss at the moment of death (cf. “my God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” Matt 27:46).

**Jerusalem Destroyed**

And the people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. The end of it shall be with a flood, and till the end of the war desolations are determined. Dan 9:26b (NKJV)

It is improbable that “the prince who is to come” is the same as “the anointed prince” since the latter’s death is recorded early in the verse. The expression “the prince who is to come” may be compared with expressions such as “a king shall arise” (Dan 7:24; 8:23; 11:2-3), and is similarly employed to create a sense of mystery. The “people” in this context presumably refers to his nation, or more specifically, his nation’s army.

The word “flood” (@jv *sheteph*) is used metaphorically for armed conflict, as elsewhere (cf. Dan 11:22), possibly indicating that the city’s defenders are outnumbered and overwhelmed. The “desolations” (~mv *shamem*) are “determined” or “decreed” presumably refers to the atrocities of war.

**A Covenant**

Then he shall confirm a covenant with many for one week; but in the middle of the week he shall bring an end to sacrifice and offering. Dan 9:27a (NKJV)

And he shall make a strong covenant with many for one week, and for half of the week he shall put an end to sacrifice and offering. Dan 9:27a (ESV)

A. Laato proposes that v. 27 is not the original ending of the Seventy Week Prophecy, arguing that there is a disharmony between verses 26 and 27 since the latter assumes the Temple is still standing while the former prophesies its destruction.[[31]](#footnote-31) Though evidence for this proposition is not strong, it is clear that v. 27 does not follow chronologically from v. 26 and presumably intended to be read retrospectively.

The ‘he’ has no clear referent; conceivably it could refer to “the anointed prince” or “the prince who is to come”.

The ESV implies that a covenant is made at the beginning of the last ‘week’, while the NKJV implies that it is a preexisting covenant that it confirmed. This latter translation is the more probable given the use of rbg *gabar* (“confirm”, “strengthen”), rather than !tn *nathan* (“give”; cf. Gen 9:12; 17:2) or trk *karath* (“make”; cf. Gen 26:28; 31:44). As such, this phrase is unlikely to imply the making of temporary military alliance. The possibility that this is the Abrahamic covenant cannot be ruled out. In fact, the confirming of that covenant, which expresses God’s relationship with the nation of Israel, would be consistent with the dispensational view of this prophecy.

To “bring an end to sacrifice and offering” is often interpreted as a negative consequence,[[32]](#footnote-32) as is the case in other visions of Daniel (cf. Dan 8:11; 12:11). Yet here, in contrast to the other examples, there is no mention of the sacrifices being restored, rather there is a sense of finality entailed in tbv *shabath* (“bring an end to”).[[33]](#footnote-33) If *chatta’ah* in v. 24 is interpreted as referring to the sin-offering then this final removal of the sacrifices and offerings would be the fulfillment of one of the objectives listed by Gabriel, and consistent with the final “covering” of sin.

Seen in this light, then, these two clauses become positive consequences, which implies that the “he” is either God Himself or, more probably, his servant “the anointed prince”.

**The Consummation**

And on the wing of abominations shall be one who makes desolate, even until the consummation, which is determined, is poured out on the desolate. Dan 9:27b (NKJV)

“Wing” (@nk *kanaph*) is usually used figuratively in the OT and this is likely the case here, though literal fulfillments have been suggested.[[34]](#footnote-34) Various interpretations have been offered including, “overspreading” (KJV), “protection” (Darby) (cf. Ps 17:8), and the wing or corner of the Temple (NIV, HCSB) (cf. Isa 11:12; Ezek 7:2).[[35]](#footnote-35) However, the phraseology seems to suggest that “the wing of abominations” is not a location but rather a chronological sequence, hence “upon the wings of…”,[[36]](#footnote-36) and even, “as a climax to …” (NLT). Upon this basis it has been argued that the “abominations” are not necessarily deeds committed by the “one who makes desolate”. P. J. Ray has argued that the coming of the desolator is a consequence of the “abominations”, rather than the cause, interpreting “abominations” as the idolatrous practices of the Jewish people.[[37]](#footnote-37) Following-up the usage of the words “abomination” (#wqv *shiqquwts*) and “desolate” (~mv *shamem*) through the OT certainly seems to add weight to this conclusion. *Shamem* is frequently used to describe Jerusalem and the Temple after divine judgment (cf. Dan 9:18; also Lev 26:31-5; Jer 19:1-8; 32:36, 42-44), while *shiqquwts* is used to describe the sins of people preceding such judgment (cf. Ezek 5:11; 7:20; 11:18). On the other hand, the connection with the “abomination of desolation” (cf. Dan 11:31; 12:11)[[38]](#footnote-38) is apparent and this is “set up” by a foreign power. This phrase, therefore, may indicate no more than that many abominations (i.e. sacrilegious acts) will feature in the coming of the desolator.

“Consummation, which is determined”, or “the decreed end” (ESV), probably points to the end of the seventy-weeks and therefore the end of the dispensation. What is not clear is whether this also marks the end (i.e. death) of the “one who makes desolate”. The object of this final clause, *shamem,* may refer to either the one who makes desolate (ESV; NLT; HCSB; NIV; NASB) or the one who is made desolate (NKJV; YLT; ASV; Darby; Websters). Interestingly, both the Greek versions translate this final clause as meaning the end of the desolation: “a consummation will be granted to the desolation” (LXX); “an end shall be put to the desolation” (θ’). Since there is no reference here to a second restoration of the city and the sanctuary then it is unlikely that this last clause should be interpreted as dramatic reversal of their desolation. Rather, as this is the end of the seventy-weeks, the desolation should be final. Therefore it is most consistent to interpret this clause as the end “poured out” on the city and sanctuary.

**Summary**

Jeremiah’s prophecy prophesied a period of seventy years in which Judah, and the surrounding nations would be under the dominion of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, and the Jews would be in captivity. The prophecy had personal relevance to Daniel, who had been in captivity for the duration of this seventy year period and he responds with prayer and supplication. This is no doubt one of the reasons why it is Daniel who is visited by the angel Gabriel with a further revelation.

Juxtaposed against the seventy years of captivity, there are to be seventy year-weeks of a restored nation. Though ultimately this period is to end with the destruction and desolation of Jerusalem, the prophecy hints at a higher purpose. Sin, and the offerings for sin, is to be done away with and the complete covering made for sin. The end of this seventy year-weeks should usher in, directly or indirectly, a period of everlasting righteousness.

The seventy year-weeks commenced with the decree giving permission to the Jews to rebuilt the wall of Jerusalem c.445 BC. The initial seven year-weeks presumably refer to this period rebuilding. While we have no fixed date for the formal end of construction, or any other relevant event, that might mark the end of the seven weeks, the phrase “troublesome times” is pertinent to Nehemiah’s account of the reconstruction. The sixty-two year-weeks are given no description, except that they are to end with the anointed prince, that is, the coming of the Davidic Messiah. This period, therefore, is that period when Jerusalem is to dwell in relative security but without a legitimate king. Though Jerusalem was threatened and captured many times in the intertestamental period, the city and the Temple remained until the renewed building work for Herod the Great. And though, after the Maccabean revolt, a monarchy was established in Judaea, it was not an heir of David who sat upon the throne.

It is the final week that is described in the greatest detail. The week commences with the coming of the Messiah and, presumably through his efforts, an attempt is made to renew the covenant. Since this week ends with the destruction of the city, it seems this covenantal renewal fails. It may be that what is intended here is almost an ultimatum, the last attempt to renew the Jewish people before the determined end. In the middle of the week an end is made to the offerings to sin, implying that a complete covering has been made for iniquity. Though the cutting off of the Messiah is not dated, it is legitimate to correlate it with this act of covering, as it is he who is bringing an end of the offerings for sin. If we assume that a prophetic year is used (i.e. 360 days) then, regardless of disputes about exact dating of specific events, there is a figure at the end of the sixty-two year-weeks who answers to the criteria laid out in this prophecy. Jesus of Nazareth claimed to be the Messiah, preached to the Jewish people urging restoration of the true worship of God and was killed - an act which he and his followers claimed was to bring about atonement for sin. The coincidence of details, not least chronological, is extremely compelling.

The final half-week is characterized by abominations till the coming of some ruler who will come with war against Jerusalem. Ultimately the city is overcome and is destroyed, bringing an end to the seventy year-week dispensation for the Jewish people.

**Conclusion**

The “critical” interpretation of Daniel 9 is neither convincing nor compelling. Whilst it is understandable as an attempt to position the chapter in a Maccabean context, it can only be sustained by doing damage to the plain meaning of the text. The “conservative” interpretation is rich and powerful. The enigmatic language of the prophecy does create the potential for ambiguity that is exploited by “critical” interpreters, e.g. interpreting “anointed one” as a priest, rather than Messiah. However, it takes little investigation to demonstrate how weak the “critical” interpretation is.

In this two-part article we have explored the Seventy Week Prophecy and found the “conservative” approach to be the more compelling. We are also examined some of the proposed difficulties, including the Masoretic accents and the basis upon which the time periods are calculated. We have found that neither is an insurmountable obstacle to the interpretation. The remaining difficulty is that Jerusalem was not destroyed 3 ½ years after the Crucifixion. Almost all conservative scholars propose some kind of gap or breach in the prophecy, and viewed from a dispensational perspective this is intelligible. The preaching of John the Baptist, and Jesus himself, is empowered by the presentation of the impending doom to come upon the Jewish people – “the ax is laid to the root of the trees”. Like the message of Jonah to Nineveh, John and Jesus called to the Jews to repentance; if the Jews, like the people Nineveh, repented (or if sufficient number did so), is it not plausible that the “dispensation” should be extended until truly no good fruit could be found?

**Kosmokrator**

**P. Wyns**

**Introduction**

For we do not wrestle against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers (kosmokra,twr) of the darkness of this age, against spiritual *hosts* of wickedness in the heavenly *places.* Eph 6:12

Ephesians 6 presents many challenges to exegetes. The foremost problem is how to understand *kosmokrator* (kosmokra,twr)*.* The mention of *kosmokrator* in combination with the phrase “we do not wrestle against flesh and blood” indicates that these powers are not limited to mere human rulers or institutions; this is supported by the mention of “spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms” (NIB) and the “wiles of the devil.”(v. 11). Are the church and the individual believer, who are encouraged to don the amour of a Roman legionnaire (sic), under attack by supernatural powers?

This article will endeavour to demonstrate that Ephesians 6 employs a Passover metaphor that is crucial to unlocking the narrative. There is an underlying typology in the narrative that is not based on a Roman legionnaire, but on the Jewish Passover. The narrative is constructed to appeal to a mixed audience of Gentile and Jewish believers, with the readily identifiable picture of a Roman legionnaire operating on the surface of the text and more subtle Passover allusions operating at a secondary level.

**Ephesians and Hebrews**

The phrase “flesh and blood” in Eph 6:12 is literally “blood and flesh” (ai-ma kai. sa,rka) and is found in the same reverse order in Heb 2:14-15,

Inasmuch then as the children have partaken of flesh and blood [**blood and flesh**] (ai[matoj kai. sarko,j), He Himself likewise shared in the same, that through death He might destroy him who had the power of death, that is, the devil, and release those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. Heb 2:14-15 (NKJV)

The phrase “flesh and blood” or more accurately “blood and flesh” signifies by *synecdoche*, man or human beings. By why is the order reversed only here and in Ephesians? The correspondence between Hebrews and Ephesians is more than casual as both epistles are intertextually linked with Psalm 8 and both epistles are directed to the same church (but not the same audience).[[39]](#footnote-39)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Psalm 8** | **Ephesians 1** | **Hebrews 2** |
| **v. 1** O Lord, our Lord, How excellent *is* Your name in all the earth, Who have set Your glory above the heavens! | **v. 17** Father of Glory |  |
| **v. 2b** ...You have ordained strength | **v. 19** ...and what *is* the exceeding greatness of His power toward us who believe, according to the working of His mighty power |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Psalm 8** | **Ephesians 1** | **Hebrews 2** |
| **v. 4** What is man that You are mindful of him, And the son of man that You visit him? |  | **v. 6** But one testified in a certain place, saying: “What is man that You are mindful of him, Or the son of man that You take care of him?” |
| **v. 5** For You have made him a little lower than the angels, And You have crowned him with glory and honour. |  | **v. 7** You have made him a little lower than the angels; You have crowned him with glory and honour, And set him over the works of Your hands. |
| **v. 6b** You have put all *things* under his feet | **v. 22** And He put all *things* under His feet | **v. 8** You have put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that He put all in subjection under him, He left nothing *that is* not put under him. But now we do not yet see all things put under him. |
| **v. 1b** Your glory above the heavens!  **v. 6a** You have made him to have dominion | **vv. 20b-21** ...in the heavenly places far above all principality and power and might and dominion, |  |
| **v. 9** How excellent *is* Your name in all the earth | **v. 23** ...the fullness of Him who fills all in all. |  |

The author of Hebrews (ca. 67) was aware of the Pauline epistle to the Ephesians (ca. 58) and therefore employed similar phraseology and allusions. It is suggested that the reference to blood and flesh in Hebrews and Ephesians serves a dual function in denoting humanity, but that humanity is symbolised in the Passover blood (splashed on the lintel) and the flesh (that was eaten by the “children”). The Lord and his “children” partake of the same “blood and flesh” at the Passover meal, this signifies that the Lord is fully human, and like them shares in the same sacrifice. However, like Adam (before his apostasy), Jesus’ humanity was only marginally lower than the angels, but now, after his suffering, Christ sits in “heavenly places” with a more excellent name than the angels thus fulfilling the destiny originally intended for Adam. Jesus achieved this by destroying “him who had the power of death, that is, the devil”. Interestingly, Heb 2:14-15 ends with an allusion to Isa 14:3 “and release those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage”,

It shall come to pass in the day the Lord gives you rest from your sorrow, and from your fear and the hard bondage in which you were made to serve. Isa 14:3 (NKJV)

Hard bondage is a reference to slavery in Egypt (Exod 20:2),[[40]](#footnote-40) but in Isaiah it is employed as a metaphor for the Assyrian yoke. The nation was delivered from the Assyrian yoke by the angel of death on the Passover night[[41]](#footnote-41) (Isa 37:36), the same angel that had delivered Israel some centuries before from Egyptian bondage.

For the Lord will pass through to strike the Egyptians; and when He sees the blood on the lintel and on the two doorposts, the Lord will pass over the door and not allow the destroyer to come into your houses to strike *you.* Exod 12:23 (NKJV)

Just as the Egyptians had become dead men, so now also the Assyrians—messengers arrived post-haste to inform Hezekiah of the “good news”—the crisis was over—the enemy was dead.

How beautiful upon the mountains Are the feet of him who brings good news, Who proclaims peace, Who brings glad tidings of good *things,* Who proclaims salvation, Who says to Zion, “Your God reigns!” Isa 52:7 (NKJV)

The feet that bear the “good news” of the Passover triumph over the Assyrian enemy form part of the armoury of the Pauline soldier of Christ,

...and having shod your feet with the preparation of the gospel of peace. Eph 6:15 (NKJV)

**Angels of Evil**

Describing the plagues of Egypt the Psalmist says;

He cast on them the fierceness of his anger, wrath, indignation, and trouble, by sending angels of destruction *among them.* Ps 78:49 (NKJV)

This band of “evil angels” is not of itself evil but they dispense evil (messengers of evil (YLT), evil angels (LXE), destroying angels (RSV, NRS, NLT, NIV, NIB), and are the equivalent to the “spiritual *hosts* of wickedness in the heavenly *places”* (Eph 6:12)[[42]](#footnote-42) with the destroyer (angel of death) *kosmokrator* as their leader.

The word *kosmokrator* hardly occurs in early Judaism and is not found in the LXX, nor in Philo, Josephus, or in early pseudepigrapha. R. Feldmeier notes that, “In Rabbinic literature...the Greek term occurs as a foreign word for the angel of death, who is identical to the Devil”.[[43]](#footnote-43)

The angel of death holds universal sway in a world given over to sin and is literally “the ruler (*kosmokrator*) of the darkness of this age”; however, Jesus could say “the ruler of this world is coming, and he has nothing in me” (John 14:30). Jesus Christ was the only man over whom the angel of death had no hold because he was sinless.

But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour, that he, by the grace of God, might taste death for everyone. Heb 2:9 (NKJV)

Since, the *kosmokrator* holds sway over the dispensation of “sin and death”, he is the “prince of the power of the air” (Eph 2:2); not the “prince of the power of heaven”, because heavenly beings are sinless and immortal—the destroyer’s jurisdiction is limited to God’s earthly children of disobedience (Eph 2:2), who are in possession of the spirit of “sin and death” and therefore the destroyer has them in his power. God can and does use human agents as instruments of punishment as described in the apocryphal Judith (2:2), where Nebuchadnezzar “said that his thoughts were to bring all the earth under his empire” “and it was decided that every one who had not obeyed his command should be destroyed” (2:3).[[44]](#footnote-44) Here, then, Nebuchadnezzar typifies the universal sway of the divine agent *kosmokrator*, subjecting the whole earth and destroying the disobedient.

**We do not wrestle against flesh and blood**

Struggling or wrestling brings to mind Jacob wrestling with the angel (not flesh and blood) when he was on his way to meet his brother Esau:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ephesians** | **Jacob** |
| Wrestle not against flesh and blood (6:12) | And in his strength he [Jacob] struggled with God. (Hos 12:3) |
| **Ephesians** | **Jacob** |
| Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might.(6:10) | And he prevailed with the angel and was strong (LXE Hos 12:3) |
| Supplication in the Spirit (6:18) | Yes, he struggled with the Angel and prevailed; He wept, and sought favor from Him. (Hos 12:3) |
| ...the trickery of men, in the cunning craftiness of deceitful plotting (4:14)  ...wiles of the devil (6:11) | Your father (Laban) has deceived me and changed my wages ten times, but God did not allow him to hurt me. (Gen 31:7) |

Jacob did not subdue the angel of death…he overcame[[45]](#footnote-45) his old nature in the same way that Jesus did;

Who, in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with vehement cries and tears to him who was able to save Him from death, and was heard because of his godly fear. Heb 5:7 (NKJV)

Finally, Jacob (the deceiver), who had himself been tricked and deceived, understood that he was not merely struggling with man but had been wrestling God all his life. There is then a human *and a supernatural element* to Jacob’s struggles which erupt in a confrontation—a moment of truth—when he is about to meet his nemesis, Esau. Instead, he wrestles with the angel of death; it is suggested that this death-struggle occurred on the Passover night.

**Passover**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ephesians 6** | **Passover Allusions** |
| …the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual hosts of evil in the heavenlies. (v. 12) | Passover: the only feast celebrated at night  A sending of Angels of evil amongst them (Ps 78:49)  …will not suffer the destroyer to come into your houses (Exod 12:23) |
| …praying always with all prayer and supplication in the spirit and watching thereunto… (v. 18) | Passover: a night of watching unto the Lord (Exod 12:42 RV mg) |
| …stand therefore (v. 14) | ...ye shall eat it in haste (Exod 12:11) |
| …your loins girt about with truth (v. 14) | …with your loins girded (Exod 12:11) |
| …and your feet shod with the gospel of the preparation of the gospel of peace (v. 15) | …your shoes on your feet (Exod 12:11) |
| …and the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God (v. 17) | …your staff in your hand (Exod 12:11) |
| …above all, taking the shield of faith…and the helmet of salvation (vv. 16, 17) | …protection by faith in the blood of the lamb (Exod 12:23) |

Moses exhorted the Israelites not to flee in the face of the enemy; “Do not be afraid. Stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord, which he will accomplish for you today. For the Egyptians whom you see today, you shall see again no more forever” (Exod 14:13). The Israelites who left Egypt only held a staff in their hand, but Paul exhorts readers to yield the “sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God” (Eph 6:17; cf. Heb 4:12). The shield of faith is divine protection (Gen 15:1) afforded to those who have faith in the blood of the Passover Lamb (and who stay in the house). The “whole armour” of God is described in Isa 59:17 and is based on the equipment of the high priest – breastplate, crown, ephod, girdle etc., and not the instruments of a Roman legionnaire.

**Conclusion**

As usual Paul employs a complex intertextual weave of OT passages to convey his message. Indeed, Paul writes many things that are hard to understand and they are often “wrested” to the detriment of those who are perishing. Using a polyvalent approach, Paul connects the Egyptian Passover deliverance, the Assyrian (Passover?) deliverance and Jacob’s (Passover?) deliverance. His message is that our struggles against human adversaries, human circumstances or human institutions are sometimes a struggle against God himself. However, the power of the destroyer has been destroyed; his sway is no longer universal provided we put on Christ the Passover Lamb...who is the whole armour of God.

**The Unknown God**

**P. Wyns**

**Introduction**

I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, as God Almighty (*El Shadday*), but *by* My name Lord (*Yahweh*) I was not known (*yd’*) to them” Exod 6:3 (NKJV)

Some of the weight of the **documentary hypothesis** has been hung on Exod 6:3 which supposedly suggests Patriarchal ignorance of the *Yahweh* name. In a previous article the title *Shadday* (translated “Almighty”) was examined and it was suggested in the conclusion that a tentative translation for *El Shadday* would be the “God who blesses (with offspring) and nourishes”.[[46]](#footnote-46) The patriarchs knew God as *El Shadday* but apparently they did not know God as *Yahweh*? What does it mean to know God as *Yahweh*? [[47]](#footnote-47)

**Knowing and not Knowing**

The irony of the Exodus situation is that the divine blessing of fertility implicit in the *El Shadday* title is so abundant that it causes problems for the descendants of Abraham—they become a vast multitude in the land of Egypt. This is perceived as a threat by the new Pharaoh as he did not “know” Joseph. This introduces another Exodus theme, namely, that of knowing and not knowing.

The new Pharaoh does not know Joseph (Exod 1:8), nor does he know Yahweh (Exod 5:2). On the other hand, Yahweh knows Israel (Exod 2:25) and knows their sorrows (Exod 3:7), and he also knows Moses by name (Exod 33:12, 17), even though the name of Yahweh is (apparently) unknown (Exod 6:3). However, the salvific act that Yahweh is about to perform will make him known to both Israelites (Exod 10:2) and Egyptians (Exod 7:5).

The key word is *yd’* (to know) a verb which, N. M. Sarna points out, appears more than twenty times in the first fourteen chapters of Exodus:

The usual rendering, “to know,” hardly does justice to the richness of its semantic range. In the biblical conception, knowledge is not essentially or even primarily rooted in the intellect and mental activity. Rather, it is more experiential and is embedded in the emotions, so that it may encompass such qualities as contact, intimacy, concern, relatedness, and mutuality. Conversely, not to know is synonymous with dissociation, indifference, alienation, and estrangement; it culminates in callous disregard for another’s humanity.[[48]](#footnote-48)

In the *NIDOTTE* entry for *yd’* T. E. Fretheim points out the problem of narrowing the term’s definition:

The meanings of *yd’* are difficult to relate to one another. They range from sensory perception to intellectual process to practical skill to careful attention to close relationship to physical intimacy. The relation to other verbs in this semantic field is difficult (cf. the vbs. in Isa 6:9; 32:3-4; 41: 20; 44:18). It is probable that precision in nuancing is not to be sought in such words in isolation; only the context allows such distinctions to emerge. In the broadest sense, *yd’* means to take various aspects of the world of one’s own experience into the self, including the resultant relationship with that which is known. The fundamentally relational character of knowing (over against a narrow intellectual sense) can be discerned, not least in that both God and humans can be subject and object of the verb.[[49]](#footnote-49)

**The Context of Exodus 6:3**

The context of Exod 6:3 is an accusation by the people of Israel shared with Moses that mention of the name of Yahweh to Pharaoh has not had the desired effect—in fact the opposite is true; demand by Yahweh to free the people had only worsened matters. The name Yahweh had brought evil on the people and increased Pharaoh’s intransigence. The documentary hypothesis treats Exod 6:3 as a duplication of Exod 3:14; in other words as a revelation of the divine name when it is actually a **response to an accusation but framed as a covenant.** R. Rendtorff [[50]](#footnote-50) identifies the following structural elements in Exod 6:2-8:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Self-introductory formula | **v. 2** | I am Yahweh |
| Parallel statements | **v. 4**  **v. 5** | **and also** established My covenant with them  **and also**..... have remembered My covenant |
| Covenant formula | **v. 7a** | I will take you for my people and will be God for you |
| Recognition formula | **v. 7b** | Then you shall know that I am Yahweh your God |
| Self-introductory formula | **v. 6** | I am Yahweh |
| Self-introductory formula | **v. 8** | I am Yahweh |

Interestingly, Rendtorff observes (p. 15) that the ‘self-introductory formula’ I am Yahweh is “explicitly set over against the introductory formula in Gen 17.1, ‘I am El-Shaddai’” and later remarks (p. 16) that he finds “a kind of chiasmus between these two texts” (i.e. Genesis 17/Exodus 6). Rendtorff also notes several unusual features in Exod 6:2-8, for example the verb ‘take’ (v. 7a) occurs in no other formulation of the covenant formula - “but it is certainly not by chance that this word appears at this precise point, where God addresses Israel **as a people for the first time**.” (p. 16); also, the Priestly recognition formula in its expanded ‘long’ form occurs here for the first time in the Hebrew Bible. Rendtorff concludes that Exod 6.2-8 is therefore, “.....in several respects a key text. This is true not only of its position in the wider context of the Exodus narrative, but also and above all because of its central theological statements about God’s relationship to Israel...this text, which is theologically so important, has been formulated throughout **with especially scrupulous care**” (p. 17).[[51]](#footnote-51)

The divine response to Moses’ complaint in Exod 5:20-6:8 is a finely balanced apologetic carefully structured around a covenant formula that has inter-relationships with earlier Abrahamic covenant material. God is reminding Moses that the patriarchs had known him as *El Shadday* – they had experienced him in his capacity[[52]](#footnote-52) as the “God who blesses{with offspring}and nourishes –“But the children of Israel were fruitful and increased abundantly, multiplied and grew exceedingly mighty; and the land was filled with them” (Exod 1:7). It was, in fact, this very blessing that had caused their current dilemma.

**Did Abraham know Yahweh?**

That the patriarchs (and here we think especially of Abraham) knew God in his capacity of *El Shadday* is unquestionable, but did they “know” him as *Yahweh*? The salvific acts experienced by Abraham during his sojourning, particular the revelation on Mt Moriah, suggest that Abraham did “know” *Yahweh* as his saviour. If that is the case the Hebrew should be understood as an **interrogative** - - “but *by* My name *Yahweh* was I not known (*yd’*) to them?”—but this is not supported by any Hebrew grammarian.[[53]](#footnote-53) Whatever meaning we attach to “know” it is indisputable that *Yahweh* “knows” Abraham,

For I have known him, in order that he may command his children and his household after him, that they keep the way of *Yahweh*, to do righteousness and justice, that *Yahweh* may bring to Abraham what He has spoken to him. Gen 18:19 (NKJV)[[54]](#footnote-54)

The question is whether this “knowing” was reciprocated—can Abraham “know” *Yahweh* in the same way that *Yahweh* “knows” Abraham?

The NT (1 Cor.13:12) suggests degrees of knowledge: “Now I know (*ginōskō*) in part, but then I shall know (*epiginōskō*) just as I also am known (*epiginōskō*)”. The Greek *ginōskō* is probably closest to the Hebrew *yd’* as it is used to express intimacy (cf. Matt 1.25; Luke 1.34) in a similar way to the Hebrew (“Now Adam *knew* Eve his wife”, Gen.4:1).

In the NT *ginōskō* frequently indicates a relation between the person knowing and the object known. The term *epiginōskō* suggests the development of advanced knowledge—a fuller relationship than *ginōskō.* Another Greek term translated as “know” is *oida* from the same root as *eidon* (to see)[[55]](#footnote-55) to know from observation or to perceive, and both forms (*oida/eidon*) are used to translate *yd’* in the LXX of the Exodus account (cf. Exod 3:7, 19; 5:2; 9:14; 11:7; 33:12, 17).

The sense of intimacy in *ginōskō* is particularly noticeable in Jesus’ response to Philip. Jesus said to him, “Have I been with you so long, and yet you have not known (*ginōskō*)[[56]](#footnote-56) me, Philip? He who has seen me has seen the Father; so how can you say, ‘Show us the Father’?”(John 14:9). The Greek literally reads: “so much time with you I-Am and not you-have-known me Philip?” Although the I-AM verb in the construct is purely functional, it resonates with significance when placed alongside the other Johannine I-AM sayings. The reference to time (so long/such a long time, NIV/YLT etc.) indicates that exposure to and intimacy with Jesus should have resulted in “knowing” him and therefore in “knowing” the Father. The twin themes of knowing and seeing God encountered in Philip’s question, and in Jesus’ subsequent promise of the comforter (John 14:17),[[57]](#footnote-57) echoes the “presence” of *Yahweh* in Exod 33:14. The allusion in John 14 is (similar to Exod 6:3) therefore linked with knowing the *Yahweh* name:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Exodus 33** | **John 14** |
| Show me now your way, that I may know You (v. 13)[[58]](#footnote-58) | And where I go you know, and the way you know. (v. 4) |
| You have not let me know whom You will send with me (v. 12)  My Presence will go *with you* (v. 14)  [Cf. “presence” in Isa 63:9-14] | the Father will send (in my name)  .... the Helper, the Holy Spirit (v. 26) |
| and I will give you rest (v. 14)  [Cf. Isa 63:14 ‘rest’] | Peace I leave with you, my peace I give to you (v. 27) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Exodus 33** | **John 14** |
| Please, show me your glory (v. 18)  [Cf. Isa 63:12, 14 ‘glorious’ – though not Hebrew ‘kabod’] | Lord, show us the Father, and it is sufficient for us. (v. 8) |
| I will proclaim the name of the Lord (v. 19) | And whatever you ask in my name, that I will do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. (v. 13) |

In Exodus 33, the phrase “Yahweh knows him [Moses] by name” is employed in v. 12 and v. 17 and forms an *inclusio* denoting Moses’ close relationship (face to face; cf. Deut. 34:10) with God. Moses is enquiring who God will send to help him shepherd the people into the Promised Land, specifically asking Yahweh to “show your way” (v. 13) and “show your glory” (v. 18). The way of Yahweh (cf. Gen 18:19) is Jesus Christ, “I am the way the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me” (John 14:16).

**Conclusion**

The sad fact is that throughout Israel’s long prophetic history the name of *Yahweh* was unknown (cf. Isa 52:6; Jer 16:21; Ezek 39:7) in the sense that the Jews were ignorant to the inherent purpose and character revealed in the *Yahweh* name. The prophet Jeremiah envisaged the time when it was no longer necessary to teach thy neighbour to know *Yahweh*  …this is an allusion to the Passover:

And if the household is too small for the lamb, let him and his neighbour next to his house. Exod 12:4 (NKJV)

And it shall be, when your children say to you, ‘What do you mean by this service?’ Exod 12:26 (NKJV); cf. Luke 2:46

In other words the “teaching” of “neighbour/children” is linked to the covenant meal that memorializes the Passover. This is the intellectual “knowing” of Yahweh…grounded in the historical facts taught about the Passover deliverance at the memorial...but the prophet envisages a future where no one needs to be taught...because they all have first-hand intimate knowledge of divine salvation.

The Jews could not lay claim to knowing God while at the same time refusing the one he sent:

Then they said to him, “Where is your Father?” Jesus answered, “You know (*eido*) neither me nor my Father. If you had known (*eido*) me, you would have known (*eido*) my Father also. John 8:19 (NKJV)

The relationship between Father and son is reciprocal:

As the Father knows (*ginōskō*) Me, even so I known (*ginōskō*) the Father... John 10:15 (NKJV)

Moreover, Jesus knows his sheep and they in turn know him and hear his voice (John 10:14-16). Ultimately, the only way to know *Yahweh* is by knowing Jesus:

If you had known (*ginōskō*) me, you would have known (*ginōskō*) my Father also; and from now on you know (*ginōskō*) him and have seen him. John 14:7 (NKJV)

In Jesus’ response to Philip in John 14:8-9 “knowing” is virtually synonymous with “seeing”. Abraham named the place where Isaac was sacrificed in Gen 22:14 *Yahweh-Yireh—*literally *Yahweh will be seen* (revealed)[[59]](#footnote-59), underpinning Jesus’ statement in John 8:55-56,

Yet you have not known (*ginōskō*) Him, but I know (*eido*) Him. And if I say, ‘I do not know (*eido*) Him,’ I shall be a liar like you; but I do know (*eido*) Him and keep His word. Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day, and he saw *it* and was glad. John 8:55-56 (NKJV)

In conclusion, Abraham did “know” *Yahweh* and did “see” *Yahweh* but that revelation was progressive and was only seen with the eye of faith until the appearance of the Messiah:

Now it came to pass, as He sat at the table with them, that He took bread, blessed and broke *it,* and gave it to them.Then their eyes were opened and they knew (*epiginōskō*) Him; and He vanished from their sight. Luke 24:30-31 (NKJV)

It is only in the act of salvation that the unknown God can be truly known.

**Psalm 72**[[60]](#footnote-60)

**The Prayers of David the Son of Jesse are Ended**

**P. Heavyside**

**Introduction**

Determining the meaning of the expression that forms the sub-title for this exposition has far reaching consequences not just for Psalm 72 but also for the second book of psalms. Yet this expression, quoted from Psalm 72:20, is taken by most expositors and commentators I have consulted as self-evidently a statement about David being the writer of Psalm 72. In this exposition we take a closer look at the statement to expound its significance and discover, indeed, it tells us something which affects profoundly our interpretation of all the psalms in the second book. We gain powerful exhortation also from a consideration of the last months of David’s life.

**The Prophet of Psalm 72**

The prophet through whom Psalm 72 was revealed is Solomon, as stated in its title. Those that read “the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended” (Ps 72:20) as self-evidently[[61]](#footnote-61) a statement by David of his authorship of the psalm take its title, rendered in the KJV “for Solomon”, to mean something like “about Solomon” or, with significant embellishment of the Hebrew, “written by David for Solomon”. Yet the Hebrew of the title tells us clearly that the prophet is Solomon. The Hebrew reads *lšlmh* (hmlvl) which means, straightforwardly, “to Solomon” or “of Solomon” and is a form of title found frequently in the psalms designating the prophet. For example, the title of Psalm 69 reads “of David (*ldwd*)” identifying David as the one through whom this psalm was spoken; that David is, indeed, the prophet of Psalm 69 is confirmed a couple of times:

The apostle Peter, quoting Ps 69:25 in Acts 1:20, says this psalm was spoken by “the holy spirit by the mouth of David” (Acts 1:16), and the apostle Paul, quoting Ps 69:22-23 in Rom 11:9-10, says of these words “and David says” (Rom 11:9).

Other examples where either a later scripture or the historical reference shows that the psalmist is indisputably David, restricting ourselves to those psalms whose opening expression is *ldwd* as *lšlmh* is for Psalm 72, are:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ps** | **Reason that this psalm, beginning *ldwd*, is David’s** |
| 32 | Rom 4:6; Ps 32:1-2 cited Rom 4:7-8 |
| 34 | The title is a reference to David’s experience in 1 Sam 21:10-22:2 |
| 56 | The title is a reference to David’s experience in 1 Sam 21:10-15 |
| 57 | The title is a reference to David’s experience in 1 Sam 23:29-24:8 |
| 59 | The title is a reference to David’s experience in 1 Sam 19:10-16 |
| 109 | Acts 1:16; Ps 109:8 cited Ac 1:20 |
| 110 | Matt 22:43,45; Mark 12:36,37; Luke 20:42,44; Acts 2:34; Ps 110:1 cited Matt 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42-43; Acts 2:34-35 |

This being the case, that Solomon is the one through whom the spirit revealed Psalm 72, what are we to make of its final verse: “the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended”?

**Positioning the Prayers**

A first aspect to note about the expression in Psalm 72:20 is that it speaks of prayer**s**, plural not singular. The significance of this arises from noting that a number of psalms are specifically described as prayers in their titles, as follows:

* “a prayer of David” (Ps 17:t)
* “a prayer of David” (Ps 86:t)
* “a prayer of Moses the man of God” (Ps 90:t)
* “a prayer of the afflicted when he is overwhelmed and pours out his complaint before the Lord” (Ps 102:t)
* “maschil of David; a prayer when he was in the cave” (Ps 142:t)
* “a prayer of Habakkuk the prophet upon shigionoth” (Hab 3:1)

It is notable that each of these titles speaks of the psalm that it heads as “prayer”, singular not plural. This shows that “prayer**s**” (Ps 72:20) speaks of more than just Psalm 72; it speaks of a number of psalms that are prayers.

A second aspect to note about “the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended” is its position. Psalm 72 concludes the second book of psalms and it is helpful to consider the concluding words of all the five books within the book of psalms as shown in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Book** | **Concluding Words** |
| book 1:  psalms 1-41 | “Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting and to everlasting. Amen, and Amen” (Ps 41:13) |
| book 2:  psalms 42-72 | “Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, who only does wondrous things. And blessed be his glorious name for ever: and let the whole earth be filled with his glory: Amen and Amen” (Ps 72:18-19) |
| book 3:  psalms 73-89 | “Blessed be the Lord for evermore. Amen and Amen” (Ps 89:52) |
| book 4:  psalms 90-106 | “Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting to everlasting: and let all the people say, Amen. Halleluyah” (Ps 106:48) |
| **Book** | **Concluding Words** |
| book 5:  psalms 107-150 | The whole of Psalm 150 seems to function as a similar closure for book 5: “Halleluyah. Praise God in his sanctuary: praise him in the firmament of his power… Let every thing that has breath praise the Lord. Halleluyah” (Ps 150) |

The similarity of the closures for the first four books, of blessing the Lord with Amen, is unmistakable. The departure from blessing the Lord to praising him for the closure of the fifth book plainly picks up the closing expression of book 4, “Halleluyah”, but requires further examination to discover the full significance of this shift; nevertheless, the similarity of sentiment for closure of the fifth book is clear.

Now, the significance of noting these book closures is this: the second book of psalms is closed by Ps 72:18-19; the expression we are examining in this exposition is positioned **after** the closure of the second book. This suggests that “the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended” is a statement about, at least, book 2 of the psalms. Read this way, Ps 72:20 is an editorial statement of compilation: having completed the compilation of the second book, the prophet David annotates it by making the statement: “the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended”. Given a couple of other factors, it is probable that “the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended” is a statement not just about book 2 but also about book 1; these factors are as follows:

* There is only one psalm included in the book of psalms prior to Psalm 72 which is actually titled as a prayer: “a prayer of David” (Ps 17:t); this suggests that David’s statement about his prayers being ended include also this psalm and therefore book 1 within which it is set.
* Psalm 37 is a psalm spoken when David was old: “I have been young, and now am old” (Ps 37:25). Consequently Psalms 1-41 cannot have been compiled into the first book of psalms until David’s later life, near-contemporaneous with his compilation of the second book of psalms as shown later; this also suggests that when concluding book 2 with his words in Ps 72:20 he was also making a statement about the recently completed book 1.

**The Prayers of David**

Seeing Ps 72:20 as an editorial statement of compilation then, indicates that the second book of psalms, at least, is a compilation of psalms put together by David as a book of prayers. This book of prayers includes psalms by David but also by psalmists other than him: Psalms 42-45 and 47-49 are for certain by the sons of Korah and Psalm 50 is for certain by Asaph. This being the case, that David can adopt psalms by others for his prayers in book 2, he can also adopt Psalm 72 by Solomon as his prayer. This resolves the dilemma seen by those who wrestle with the significance of Ps 72:20 and the psalm’s title “of Solomon”.

But is “the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended” a statement included by a later editor? There are a number of arguments against this. There are also matters that argue, even given the possibility of the statement being that of a later editor, that such a suggestion does not alter the conclusion that book 2 of the psalms was compiled by David. But first to the arguments for this expression being the words of David by the holy spirit, which include aspects related to timing and to self-reference. The arguments related to timing are as follows:

* The expression “David the son of Jesse” is found in only four scriptures: 2 Sam 23:1; Ps 72:20; 1 Chron 10:14; 29:26. But in these scriptures there are two distinct Hebrew spellings of David’s name: 2 Sam 23:1 and Ps 72:20 use *dwd* whereas 1 Chron 10:14; 29:26 use *dwyd*. The latter scriptures are, of course, dated at around the time of Ezra and, apart from one instance in Ps 122:5, the spelling employed in these is only ever used in scripture **after David’s death**: the first instance of such a spelling, other than that in Ps 122:5, is found in 1 Kgs 3:14. The “earlier” spelling used in Ps 72:20 argues for a chronology of this expression having been written at a time pre-dating 1 Kgs 3:14.[[62]](#footnote-62)
* This chronology can be narrowed to between the final months of David’s life and before 1 Kgs 3:14. This is derived from a consideration of the time of revelation of Psalm 72, which was by God in fellowship with Solomon during the rebellion of Adonijah[[63]](#footnote-63) recorded in 1 Kings 1. Thus, for Psalm 72 to be included in book 2 of the psalms, and for the expression “David the son of Jesse (*dwd bn yšy*)” (Ps 72:20) to accompany it, dates their inclusion to around the final months of David’s life,[[64]](#footnote-64) and before 1 Kgs 3:14, since David was “old and stricken in years” (1 Kgs 1:1) when Adonijah raised his rebellion.

* Furthermore, the use of “David the son of Jesse” uniquely in only one other place, in 2 Sam 23:1, when David was still alive, suggests Ps 72:20 was also penned before David’s death.

Thus, there are a number of arguments for a timing of the expression “the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended” (Ps 72:20) to be towards the end of David’s life.[[65]](#footnote-65)

The arguments related to “David the son of Jesse” as self-reference, that it is an expression that replaces “I” in David’s mouth, are these:

* In 2 Sam 23:1, the only other place where the expression “David the son of Jesse” occurs with the “earlier” spelling of David, these words are introduced as words of David, by which he refers to himself. The prophet who recorded this in 2 Samuel says: “and these are the last words of David” and he then records David’s words in 2 Sam 23:1b-7. From this it follows that “David the son of Jesse said…” is included in the last words of David[[66]](#footnote-66) and “David the son of Jesse” is an expression of self-reference by David.
* Reinforcing this identification of “David the son of Jesse” as words uttered by David is that both 2 Sam 23:1 and Ps 72:20 deal with an ending, with a completion. “The last words of David” (2 Sam 23:1) resonates strongly with David speaking of another ending, the completion of his compilation of book 2 of the psalms.

But, as was mentioned earlier, even if it is conceded that the words of Ps 72:20 are the words of a later editor, this does not alter the conclusion that David compiled book 2 of the psalms before he slept with his fathers. The argument that shows this is as follows:

* The positioning of Ps 72:20 after the closure of book 2 and referring to prayer**s** (plural) shows that this verse refers to at least all the psalms in the second book. The inclusion of psalms by the sons of Korah and Asaph requires that “the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended” speaks of the adoption of these psalms by David for his own prayers.
* Thus, even if “the prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended” are the words of an editor other than and later than David, they still accurately record the fact that David compiled book 2 as his prayers.

We are left then with two possibilities; either:

* David adopted all of the psalms in book 2 for his prayers and this fact was recorded by another editor; or, as I argue,
* David wrote the words of Ps 72:20 upon completion of his compilation of book 2, having including psalms by the sons of Korah, Asaph, Solomon and himself.

In either case, the compilation of book 2 was David’s work in fellowship with God, after Adonijah’s rebellion. And, yielding far-reaching consequences, all of the psalms in the book pre-date David’s death.

**Chronology**

Psalms 42-50 are often expounded against historical settings long after David’s death, commonly (though not exclusively) during the reign of Hezekiah. Psalm 45, for example, is expounded, other than within its prophetic significance of Christ and his bride, as a record of a joyous ceremony related either to the marriage of Hezekiah and Hephzibah or to the marriage of Solomon and Pharaoh’s daughter. But the meaning of Ps 72:20 shows that neither of these interpretations can be correct.

**Old and Stricken in Years**

The rebellion of Adonijah took place when David was “old and stricken in years… and… he got no heat” (1 Kgs 1:1): a frailty borne not just of age, no doubt, but also from the years of privations when he was persecuted by Saul and three thousand men, including in the waterless deserts of Judah, and from the severe, life-threatening illnesses he had suffered, as evidenced in the psalms. And yet, David raised himself from this debilitating weakness “in the strength of the Lord God” (Ps 71:16) that he might bring to remembrance the Lord’s righteousness and show his strength to that generation and that he might show his power “to every one that is to come” (Ps 71:16, 18).

The fruit of this activity is seen, at least, in this second book of psalms: raised from his debilitated state, David worked in fellowship with the Lord to compile this book of psalms for that generation and for every one that was to come, **for us**. Even during the final months of David’s life when he was old and grey-headed (Ps 71:18), quite apart from the immense work recorded in 1 Chronicles 23-29, the sweet psalmist of Israel produced this book of psalms for our profit and so that we might sing praises to the Lord. How do we envision our later years? Do we envision a life of increasing leisure? The prevalent talk of “retirement”, particularly in the developed world and in advanced economies, is a powerful pressure on our expectations of that which we anticipate for our later years. Yet, whilst the world talks of retirement, scripture speaks of finishing the course (2 Tim 4:7); this is certainly what David, one of scripture’s faithful cloud of witnesses, did.

How do we envision our later years? Do we envision working “all the day long” (Ps 71:24) to bring to remembrance the Lord’s righteousness and to show his strength to our generation? Or do we think we will leave that to others?

**Arius (2)**

**D. Burke**

Born in Libya around AD 250, Arius had studied at the feet of Lucian, presbyter of Antioch, who was later martyred for his faith. Lucian himself had studied under Paul of Samosata at one time, but had not embraced his Christology. Instead, he followed in the footsteps of Justin Martyr and Origen, seeing the Son of God as a superlative divine being, yet something less than God Himself.

Origen’s Christology provides some of the terms and definitions which Arius would later use (note the idiosyncratic reference to ‘two gods’ below). Arians had no difficulty referring to Christ as ‘God’ in the sense of a divine being ontologically distinct from the Father; to their minds, this did not compromise monotheism:

**Origen:** Is the Father God?

**Heraclides:** Assuredly.

**Origen:** Is the Son distinct from the Father?

**Heraclides:** Of course. How can he be Son if he is also Father?

**Origen:** While being distinct from the Father, is the Son also God?

**Heraclides:** He himself is also God.

**Origen:** And do two Gods become a unity?

**Heraclides:** Yes.

**Origen:** Do we confess two Gods?

**Heraclides:** Yes, [but] the power is one.[[67]](#footnote-67)

Origen goes on to explain that the Father and Son are ‘one’ in the same sense as Adam and Eve, citing Gen 2:24 and Matt 19:5. He adds the proviso that Adam and Eve are ‘two in one flesh’ but ‘not two in one spirit’ or ‘two in one soul.’ Citing 1 Cor 6:17, he says ‘the just person and Christ are “one spirit”... Yet when a just person is united to Christ the word is “spirit” and when Christ is united to the Father the word is not “flesh” or “spirit” but the more prestigious word “God.”‘ This is how Origen understands John 10:30 (‘I and my Father are one’).

The significance of Origen as an inspiration for Arianism via Arius’ mentor Lucian cannot be overlooked. On one hand, Arius rejected Origen’s belief in the ‘eternal generation’ of the Son. On the other hand, he appreciated the description of Christ as ‘a second God’[[68]](#footnote-68), and endorsed Origen’s teaching that the Father alone is *autotheos*:

And I am therefore of the opinion that the will of the Father alone ought to be sufficient for the existence of that which He wishes to exist. For in the exercise of His will He employs no other way than that which is made known by the council of His will. And thus also the existence of the Son is generated by Him.[[69]](#footnote-69)

Though decried as heretical today, Origen’s view was common to many of the early fathers:

The Christian writers of the second and third centuries considered the Logos as the eternal reason of the Father, but as having at first no distinct existence from eternity; he received this only when the Father generated him from within his own being and sent him to create the world and rule over the world.

The act of generation then was not considered as an eternal and necessary life-act but as one which had a beginning in time, which meant that the Son was not equal to the Father, but subordinate to Him. Irenaeus, Justin, Hippolytus and Methodius share this view called Subordinationism.[[70]](#footnote-70)

Lucian was a subordinationist of this type, considering himself an ‘Origenist’ (as did most of his Eastern friends) because his Christology was derived almost entirely from the teachings of Origen. Arius had inherited Lucian’s Christology, but courted disaster by refining it with increasing precision. The consequences of this development were deeply divisive. For as long as the precise nature of the relationship between Father and Son was left to the believer’s imagination, 3rd and 4th Century Christians could flatter themselves with the naïve assumption that they all believed much the same thing.

But what if that relationship was clearly delineated by a series of theological propositions? What if the language of Christology was officially formalised? What if the current, heterodox terminology was subdivided by necessity into ‘heretical terms’ and ‘orthodox terms’? What if the basic principles of 3rd Century Christology were taken to their logical conclusions? What would all of this mean for people’s understanding of Christ – and what would they do if they suddenly discovered that their apparent theological unity had been largely superficial? All of these questions were answered by the events of the Arian controversy.

Arius was not a contentious man, and there is no indication that he was looking for a debate when his views first came into question. He lived a quiet, simple life in Alexandria, confessing a typically Alexandrian Christology. He mixed easily with clergy and laity alike and lived his life by the principles of a strict spiritual asceticism which he nevertheless refrained from imposing upon others. He was also a man of tremendous faith and courage; during the Great Persecution under Diocletian he had remained in Alexandria even after its bishop (Peter) had fled.[[71]](#footnote-71) At considerable personal risk to himself, Arius offered succour to the Christian prisoners and spiritual guidance to those few who remained free.

Peter’s cowardice was disappointing to many Christians, but Melitius of Lycopolis (an Egyptian bishop who also functioned as metropolitan of the Thebaid) found it positively offensive. Alexandria was a great city and its bishop was partly responsible for several churches in Libya and Egypt, who clearly required guidance and support at this difficult time. Accordingly, Melitius left his own see, commandeered the position of Peter in Alexandria, consecrated two additional bishops to share the load and continued to perform ecclesiastical duties as if he had always been there.

From the safety of his hiding place Peter condemned Melitius with volume and vigour, ordering him to leave the city and forbidding the local clergy to obey him. But it was all to no avail. Melitius responded by coolly ignoring the absent bishop (which, with so much distance between them, he found quite easy to do) and his fellow clergymen, who saw nothing wrong with Melitius or his actions, followed suit.

In time, however, the persecution subsided and Peter returned to his see. Summoning a local council of like-minded churchmen, he excommunicated Melitius on the charge of abusing his authority. Shortly afterwards, Melitius was arrested by the Romans during a resurgence of the previous persecution, and sent to work in the mines of Palestine. There he served with courage and distinction as a prison priest for several years, eventually returning to Egypt as a free man.

Arius’ enemies would later claim that he had co-operated with Melitius during the rogue bishop’s brief rule in Alexandria; in fact, this was not true. Arius had been careful to remain aloof from the Melitian schism, a fact which Peter openly and gratefully acknowledged at the resumption of his bishopric. Bishop Achillas (Peter’s short-lived successor) even went so far as to make Arius a presbyter – a generous promotion which would not even have been contemplated if he had been a Melitian sympathiser.

Following the death of Achillas, the see of Alexandria was granted to Bishop Alexander, who divided the city into quarters over which he appointed four presbyters. Of the four places available, Arius somehow ended up with the worst: he was made presbyter of the Baucalis or wharf quarter, a seedy locale in the roughest part of the city.

In retrospect, he was an ideal candidate for the role. His age and wisdom commanded respect, his grey hair and slim build lent an air of distinction and his scrupulous personal morality (a somewhat irregular virtue in 4th Century presbyters) was much admired. Standing well above the height of the average man, he was also immune to physical intimidation and enjoyed an arresting presence.

Arius delighted his congregation by composing his sermons in rhythmic meter and singing them to the tune of popular ballads. These often contained explicit references to Arian Christology. Surprisingly, the wider implications of Arius’ views were not immediately apparent to his bishop.

Although disturbed by the thought of heresy being taught right under his nose, Alexander believed this was a minor affair of purely local significance. He generously proposed that Arius’ teachings should be examined in a private forum which would allow him an opportunity to clarify his beliefs and respond to his critics.

Thus, in the presence of Alexander, Arius is alleged to have stated:  
  
 Before he [Christ] was begotten, he was not.

By this Arius would have meant that Jesus Christ was the Word, or Logos; a created being which God called into existence before the creation of the world, in order to create all else through him. Even if the quote is falsely attributed, the essential predicate of Arius’ Christology remains the same: Jesus himself is not truly God but stands on the side of creation as a unique product of the Father, mysteriously ‘begotten’ by some incomprehensible process and therefore not actually ‘created’ *per se.*

Arianism was heterodox, but no more so than any other belief of the day. Alexander found it offensive, though he stopped short of punitive action. Over time, a series of increasingly agitated meetings were held between Alexander and his deacons as they struggled to agree on a suitable response to Arianism. These early investigations into Arius’ Christology were not belligerent; Arius was simply asked to withdraw and discard his teachings on the nature of Christ. He refused. Popular support was on his side, and he continued to preach as before. Shocked by this defiance, Alexander convened a local church council, which ruled that Arius should be deposed from office and excommunicated with his clerical adherents. Suddenly Arius found himself *persona non grata.*

Given Alexander’s initial tact, one might ask why this final judgement was so severe. Several factors may be involved. First, Alexander needed to reassert his authority. Secondly, he was now aware that Arius’ supporters comprised a significant proportion of the clergy. This threatened the stability of the entire Alexandrian church. Thirdly, Arius had recently criticised Alexander’s own Christology as Sabellian, and the bishop was keen to retaliate. Finally, Alexander needed to mitigate any criticism that he had been overtaken by events by failing to recognise the danger of Arianism.[[72]](#footnote-72)

If Alexander believed excommunication would marginalise Arius, he was wrong. Support for Arianism continued to grow, and its influence began to spread beyond Alexandria. Even the bishops of Ptolemais and Marmarica were persuaded by Arian Christology. Correctly noting that the church still lacked a universal Christology, Arius refused to recognise his excommunication and sent a letter of protest to Bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia, detailing his confrontation with Alexandria.

It was an adroit political manoeuvre, instantly depriving the conflict of its local limitations and ensuring its impact would be felt throughout the entire Eastern Church. The decision forced Alexander to take more decisive action. He immediately summoned a general council of all Egypt, at which one hundred bishops renounced the ‘Arian Heresy’ and re-affirmed the excommunication of Arius and all his defenders in the Egyptian and Libyan clergy.

The resulting encyclical consisted of a concise account of Arius’ false doctrine, an extensive refutation on behalf of the synod, and a stinging reference to Eusebius of Nicomedia, as payback for his passive support of the errant priest. But by AD 320 it was clear that no amount of intimidation would cause Arius to recant. He had moved back to Nicomedia where he drew up a profession of faith, signed by himself and all those who had been excommunicated with him. It asserted that the faith which they held was that which they had heard Alexander proclaim within the Church of Alexandria; namely, that only the Father is eternal – He alone is without beginning – and the Son, God’s perfect creature, does not possess his being with the Father, since the Father existed before the Son.

Eusebius of Nicomedia lent considerable authority to the Arian cause by convening a local council which declared Arius orthodox and readmitted him to communion. Encouraged by this success, and perhaps sensing an opportunity to consolidate his support base, Arius composed a new sermon called *Thalia* (‘The Banquet’) which contains some of the most famous references to his idiosyncratic Christology. An excerpt follows:

The Unbegun made the Son a beginning of things originated; and advanced Him as a Son to Himself by adoption. He has nothing proper to God in proper subsistence. For He is not equal, no, nor one in essence with Him...Thus there is a Triad, not in equal glories. Not intermingling with each other are their subsistences. One more glorious than the other in their glories unto immensity. Foreign from the Son in essence is the Father, for He is without beginning. Understand that the Monad was; but the Dyad was not, before it was in existence. It follows at once that, though the Son was not, the Father was God. Hence the Son, not being (for He existed at the will of the Father), is God Only-Begotten, and He is alien from either.[[73]](#footnote-73)

During the same year, Arius convoked a Bithynian synod which sent a circular to all bishops, calling for the restoration of ecclesiastical communion with those who had been excommunicated by the Bishop of Alexander. He protested that, since they were orthodox, pressure should be placed on the bishop to receive them back. His AD 320 profession of faith, with its multiple signatures, added considerable weight to this argument.

Alexander was now feeling pressure from many sides, and for the purpose of ecclesiastical harmony, it appeared that the time was coming for him to revise his judgement on Arius. Until such a decision became imperative, however, the bishop still felt obliged to warn others of the inherent dangers contained in Arius’ teachings. Accordingly, he embarked on a massive correspondence campaign. Letters were sent to the bishops of the East, and obtained the support of those in Egypt, Palestine, Asia Minor, Greece and the Balkan Peninsula. The Bishop of Rome (Silvester I) was informed of the recent events in Alexandria, including the excommunication of the Alexandrian clerics.   
  
It was not long before full-scale literary warfare had broken out between the Arian and Alexandrian factions. Clerical dignity was forgotten as polemic from both sides included historical misrepresentations, doctrinal distortions, and crude accusations of a most personal nature. Inevitably, the split in Eastern Christianity came to the attention of Emperor Constantine.

*To Be Continued*

**Principles of Interpretation — J. Davies**

Reading carefully and giving the sense (Matt 12 vs. 3, Neh 8 vs. 8);

Comparing spiritual things with spiritual (1 Cor 2 vs. 14)

Dividing it (2 Tim 2 vs. 15)

Looking at all the counsel of God (Acts 20 vs. 27)

Following words through (Prov 25 vs. 2, 30 vs. 5)

Repetition is for emphasis (Gen 41 vs. 32)

Meditating all the day (Josh 1 vs. 8, Ps 1 vs. 2, Ps 119 vs. 15)

Testing it (1 Thess 5 vs. 21)

Searching for Christ in the Old Testament (Luke 24 vs. 27, 44)

**Who is Immanuel?**

**A. Perry**

**Introduction**

Who is Immanuel? It is not sufficient to interpret the Immanuel prophecy as messianic; it is clearly that, but it also has contemporary application. Does it refer to Hezekiah? H. A. Whittaker says in his commentary on Isaiah that he is Hezekiah;[[74]](#footnote-74) C. C. Walker in his joint commentary with R. Roberts says of the sign of Immanuel, “Hezekiah, though a worthy king, and a pleasant contrast with idolatrous Ahaz, was no such sign to the house of David”.[[75]](#footnote-75) Who is right?

**Hezekiah**

The strongest argument in favour of a Hezekiah identification is the fact that the prophecy about Immanuel is a birth prophecy and the Servant (taken to be Hezekiah) affirms “The Lord has called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother has he made mention of my name” (Isa 49:1, cf. v. 5). Another critical argument is that Judah is described as Immanuel’s land (Isa 8:8), indicating that he is of the royal house. If we include Isa 9:6 and 11:1 as Immanuel prophecies, he is to sit upon the throne of David (Isa 9:6-7), again indicating he is a son of Ahaz; and he is to come out of the “stem of Jesse” (Isa 11:1).

The major problem with this identification is chronology. There are two aspects to the chronological difficulty. The first, acknowledged by Whittaker, is the age of Ahaz upon the birth of Hezekiah. Ahaz was 20 when he began to reign and he reigned for 16 years; Hezekiah was 25 when he began to reign (2 Kgs 16:2; 18:2). This would make Hezekiah 9 years old at the time of Isaiah 7 if that prophecy was delivered in the first year of Ahaz’ reign-count. Whittaker’s solution to the problem is to say that the MT is corrupt in giving Hezekiah’s age at accession as 25; he suggests that the Hebrew would require only a small emendation to become 15.

Since there are signs that in the ancient copies numerals were not written in full but were indicated by letters used with numerical value, it would need only the smallest distortion in the text to make Hezekiah 15 at his accession (and not 25).[[76]](#footnote-76)

In saying this, he seems to be assuming that the original Kings’ regnal notice used numerals (i.e. two Hebrew letters) and therefore it would be a small change to write ‘2’ for a ‘1’ with a ‘5’.[[77]](#footnote-77) There is no evidence for the supposition that the original Kings’ regnal notices used numerals and in the MT they have a variety of verb forms along with number-words as well as an idiom. If we suppose that the original had numerals then we do not have any inspired text in the regnal notices since they use words and idioms. We should rather take the current form of the regnal notices to be inspired, even if there have been errors of transmission since the record was written.

The Hebrew for “twenty-five” is vmxw ~yrf[ !b (“son of twenty and five”) and the Hebrew for “fifteen” would be hrf[w vmx !b (“son of five ten”, cf. 2 Kgs 20:6 for “fifteen” and 2 Kgs 16:2 for Uzziah’s age on accession which was sixteen).[[78]](#footnote-78) Any error in transmission here would involve two factors: first, a change to the word order (the tens denominator switches position); and secondly, a plural ending (~y) instead of a singular ending (h). This is quite an involved “error” and textual critics would need to explain how it occurred for it to have any cogency.

The first difficulty assumes a simple reading of the internal chronology of the Kings’ record. However, the Hebrew for Ahaz’ accession notice is different from other such notices and similar instead to that of Joash who was 7 “on becoming king” (wklmb vawhy). Similarly, Ahaz was 20 “on becoming king” (wklmb zxa), and like Joash who did not exercise his kingship from the age of 7, we should infer that Ahaz’ age relates to the moment when he became co-regent with his father[[79]](#footnote-79) rather than sole monarch. The length of co-regency that Ahaz shared with his father can be estimated to be as much as 12 years based on the synchronisms with Israel’s kings (2 Kgs 15:30; 16:1-2; 17:1). This would make Ahaz 23 or thereabouts when Hezekiah was born.

While this removes the first difficulty, the second difficulty is more severe as it can only be circumvented by rejecting Assyrian records and chronology. The second chronological difficulty is the absolute date assigned to the prophecy. This is determined by Assyrian chronology which assigns the Syro-Ephraimite Crisis to 735/734 (and perhaps a little earlier). Tiglath-Pileser, to whom Ahaz appeals for help, is in the Levant from 735 onwards and his sack of Damascus and his deposition of Pekah is assigned to 732/731. With Hezekiah born in 740 (Ascending the throne in 715, twenty-five years later), the Immanuel prophecy cannot refer him when it is delivered in 735/734.[[80]](#footnote-80)

**Immanuel as Maher-shalal-hash-baz**

The prophecy of Isa 7:14 is very specific, “the virgin[[81]](#footnote-81) shall conceive (hrh)”—the woman is at court. The sign to Ahaz and the house of David is not the birth itself but the overthrow of Pekah and Rezin before the child knows how to refuse the evil and choose the good. The young woman would call his name “Immanuel” but this name does not exclude other names being given to the child. The initial fulfillment of the prophecy is in Isaiah’s son, Maher-shalal-hash-baz. Support for this interpretation consists of,

* The next part of the narrative recounts the birth of Maher-shalal-hash-baz. The structure of the story corresponds to the Immanuel prophecy.
  + Isaiah goes into “the prophetess” and she conceives (hrh, Isa 8:3); the verb is related to the adjective in Isa 7:14 (hrh).
  + The son is named in connection with a prophecy that uses the same construction, “For before the lad knows…”

r[nh [dy ~rjb yk (Isa 7:16)

r[nh [dy ~rjb yk (Isa 8:4)

* + The prophecy in both cases is about the first knowledge gained by a young child – Immanuel will know how to refuse the evil and choose the good, and Maher-shalal-hash-baz will know how to call for his mother and father.
* Isaiah is instructed to write in a great roll (Isa 8:1); prophetic signs given to the king would typically be written in the Near East. The subject of what is written is Maher-shalal-hash-baz (Isa 8:1), but as yet he has not been introduced in the narrative; this implies he was retrospectively known to be a fulfillment of the Immanuel prophecy.
* Isaiah speaks to Immanuel who was present at court (Isa 8:8). This occurs after Maher-shalal-hash-baz is born. As a “sign” Isaiah would have taken him to court (cf. Isa 7:3).
* Isaiah states that the children given to him were for “signs” just as Immanuel was said to be a “sign” (Isa 8:18).
* Isaiah deconstructs Immanuel’s name into “God is with us” in reference to him and his disciples (Isa 8:10, 16).

For these reasons, commentators often regard the Immanuel prophecy to be fulfilled in the person of one of Isaiah’s sons; certainly, within a few years of the prophecy and the birth of Maher-shalal-hash-baz, Rezin and Pekah were vanquished. On the other hand, if the Immanuel prophecy is about the birth of Hezekiah, there is no corresponding narrative fulfillment. (Commentators also offer an unknown son of Ahaz as the fulfilment.)

The first objection to this interpretation is that Judah is called Immanuel’s land. However, this cannot be regarded as conclusive since Immanuel was a Judahite and Judah was his land. There is no necessary implication that Immanuel must be the heir to the throne in this remark.

The second objection to the view that Maher-shalal-hash-baz is a fulfillment of the Immanuel prophecy is the anticipation of Isa 9:6-7 which is clearly about monarchy and succession and therefore not about the son of a prophet. The Hebrew verbs used are past tense (which the LXX renders as Aorist passives):

For unto us a child has been born, unto us a son has been given… (Isa 9:6; KJV revised)[[82]](#footnote-82)

This could refer to the recent birth of Immanuel, who would then not be Maher-shalal-hash-baz. Equally, however, it could express confidence in the young Hezekiah as the son who has been given and upon whom the hopes of the faithful are now focused.

The third objection is the prophecy of Isa 11:1 which predicts that there will be a rod and a branch out of the family of Jesse and this can only be the heir to the throne of David. If this prophecy is about the same individual as in the Immanuel prophecy then it is clearly not fulfilled in Maher-shalal-hash-baz. However, this identification is not necessary: we have had the birth prophecy of Immanuel in Isaiah 7; we have had an expression of anticipation about a child in Isaiah 9; so this third prophecy about a rod, a branch and a root (Isa 11:10) could very well refer to a **future individual** rather than the “births” that have already taken place.

**Wonderful Counsellor**

The notice and anticipation in Isa 9:6-7 comes from the accession of Hezekiah to the throne in 729-728 when he was 12.[[83]](#footnote-83) The language of birth was used to describe the giving of the new king to the people by Yahweh and to define the relationship of the king to God. This is clear from the enthronement psalm,

Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ps 2:6-7 (KJV)

The “son” given by Yahweh in the person of the new king is a “boy” (dly) and he is given various throne-names that express the hopes of the people. The relationship of sonship comes through again in Psalm 89,

Also I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth. Ps 89:27 (KJV)

Given this tradition, it is better to see Isa 9:6-7 in relation to Hezekiah’s accession rather than the birth of Immanuel.

**The Rod of Jesse**

Hezekiah is the Servant, as we have claimed in our “Introduction” above, but he is not the fulfillment of the Immanuel prophecy; in Isa 9:6-7 we have an accession oracle relating to Hezekiah sent round the cities and villages of Israel and Judah, so what are we to make of Isaiah 11?

* The prophecy that a “shoot” shall come from the “stump” of Jesse (Isa 11:1, RSV) is unusual language for the immediate royal family; it is more fitting for a branch (*sic*) of the royal family.
* The “root” of Jesse (Isa 11:10) would be an “ensign/standard” (sn) of the people. This “standard” is referred to again in Isa 49:22 and 62:10 with regard to the Arm of the Lord. The corresponding verb (ssn) is used in the oracle of Isa 59:16-21 in relation to Anonymous Conqueror, “the Spirit of the Lord shall raise up a standard (ssn) against him” (KJV).[[84]](#footnote-84)
* A branch (rcn) shall grow out of the roots of the stump (Isa 11:1). The word is rare (4x) and used in Isa 14:19 and 60:21. Isaiah quotes this prophecy when he says to the conqueror, “Then all your people *will be* righteous; they will possess the land forever, the branch (rcn) of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified” (Isa 60:21, RSV).
* The Spirit of the Lord would rest upon the Rod of Jesse (Isa 11:2); this is picked up by the Conqueror in Isaiah 61, “The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me” (v. 1) and Isaiah 59 (v. 21), “My Spirit that is upon you”.

For these reasons we propose that the Rod of Jesse is the Anonymous Conqueror and not Hezekiah. This does not mean that all the terms of the prophecy were fulfilled, because they have their true fulfillment in Christ. In particular, if we read the lament-psalm of Isa 63:7-64:12 as spoken by the Conqueror, he explicitly says that Israel did not acknowledge him (Isa 63:16) and so aspects of Isaiah 11 did not come to fulfillment through him.

**Conclusion**

The question of the number of individual character figures in the book of Isaiah is important. Each character is a type of Christ, and for this reason, the hopes in the oracles associated with each character do not have a complete fulfillment in those individuals. We identify three individuals: Immanuel, one of Isaiah’s children; Hezekiah, the Servant of the Lord; and the Rod of Jesse, the Anonymous Conqueror.

**New Book**

**God is Judge: A Commentary on Daniel**

**P. Wyns**

I opened the introduction of my commentary with a question – why is it necessary to have yet another commentary on Daniel? Surely the subject has received sufficient treatment by various commentators both Christadelphian and otherwise? Unfortunately this is not the case and Daniel is either regarded as a book that contains “children’s stories” of miraculous deliverance (and therefore not treated seriously) or it is used as a “prophetic” battle ground between conservative and liberal exegetes. Conservative scholars believe that Daniel was written in the Babylonian period and contains predictive prophecy. On the other hand liberal scholars believe that it was written much later (during the Greek period) and that it contains “quasi-prophecy” based on the desecration of the temple wrought by Antiochus Epiphanes. Critics believe that the strange numbers in Daniel (1260/1290/1335) are actually “revisions” of the expected end – the author got the “end date” wrong (the demise of Antiochus and the resurrection in chapter 12) and had to constantly “update” his predictions.

Another problem for conservative and liberal exegetes is the role of Cyrus in Daniel. The temple was not restored during the reign of Cyrus and Cyrus does not feature as a major character in any of Daniel’s stories. For this reason some have proposed that “Darius the Mede” is actually another name for Cyrus, or that perhaps he is one of Cyrus’ generals acting on Cyrus’ authority. Added to these problems is the intensely historical account in Daniel 11 which nearly everyone agrees has some sort of application to the Syrian-Egyptian wars but little relevance to the Jews apart from the description of the desecrations wrought by Antiochus Epiphanes.

Finally, there is the 490 year prophecy of Daniel 9 that is understood by Christians to be related to the crucifixion and “confirming” the new covenant. However, Christ himself used this prophecy to point to the **destruction of the temple** not to his crucifixion. The Jews also believe that the prophecy is related to the destruction of the temple but they “cheat” by leaving out 166 years of Persian era history in their calendar in order to make the interval between the destruction of the first and second temples exactly 490 years instead of the 656 years that is confirmed by historical accounts.

As all these problems have not (in my view) been adequately addressed it was timely that a new intertextual approach be adopted – “interpreting scripture with scripture”. It is fundamental to recognise that Daniel’s main concern **is the temple and true worship.** Even the stories of the three friends in the fire and Daniel in the lion’s den have this background as they reflect the burning of the temple in the Babylonian period and the “resurrection” of the nation under Darius Hystaspis.

It was Darius Hystaspis (Darius the Mede) not Cyrus, who actually rebuilt the temple exactly 70 years after it had been destroyed. Cyrus is irrelevant to the book of Daniel and therefore Daniel deliberately “skips” the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus and proceeds directly to Darius the Mede, who also conquered Babylon and liberated the captives. **Cyrus did not rebuild the temple Darius did.** So effectively Daniel comes out of retirement 21 years after Cyrus at the beginning of Darius’ reign to question why Jeremiah’s prophecy is (apparently) unfulfilled.

This places a large section of Daniel in the Persian period, making it contemporary with the ministries of Zechariah-Haggai, with their vision of the **“two lamps**” and the promise to restore the temple under Joshua the priest and Zerubbabel the governor. The promise to bless their endeavours was given the day before the Jewish “feast of lights” known as **Hanukkah**.

It is proposed that the Maccabees deliberately instituted this day (the 25 December) as an “official” feast day when they cleansed and rededicated the temple during the Antiochene crisis 420 years (4x70) after it had been rebuilt under the guidance of the “two lamps” (Joshua/Zerubbabel). The strange numbers of Daniel (1260/1290/1335) are not related to the Antiochene crisis (even though they approximate that period of persecution) but are related to Jewish feast days. It can be shown that the numbers are related to intervals in the Jewish festal calendar that commemorate the destruction of the first temple and the feasts of Hanukkah, Atonement, Passover and Purim. Two of these feasts (Hanukkah and Purim) are Persian era feasts. Therefore the fast that commemorates the destruction of the temple is the starting point of these calculations. Daniel’s prophecies had a partial fulfilment during the Maccabees’ period and in the first century – here we speak of an **“already/not yet”** fulfilment – the kingdom of God was “already” present in the person of Christ but the final consummation has “not yet” occurred until the Second Advent.

Daniel is concerned with the temple and the restoration of true worship. The book attempts to demonstrate that Jesus is the temple that Daniel looks forward to and shows that the “two lamps” who build the new temple are **Jesus and John** the Baptist. A chronology is presented that has John born on “Lights” and Jesus on “Pentecost” (the fruit of the spirit). These two men were born **70 years** before the Jewish war started. After **three-and-one-half years** of war the “old” temple was removed, thus “confirming” the “new covenant” – Jesus and his ecclesia form the new temple.

This theme is picked up in the book of Revelation which is rich in temple-language and Day of Atonement ritual. In Revelation 11 we encounter the **measuring of a temple** and the feast of **“Lights”** (two-lamps) and **“Purim”** (exchange of gifts) from the Persian period. The witnessing period is 1260 days – the last three-and-one-half years of Daniel’s prophecy. So once again we can speak of another delay of the 490 year prophecy – a long interruption of the prophetic programme from AD 70 to the present time (cf. the delay during the reign of Cyrus and during the Maccabees’ era). After this three-and-one-half year witnessing and “measuring” of the temple, the true temple will be revealed – one that descends from heaven – the New Jerusalem, consisting of the saints of all ages. The 490 years of Daniel’s prophecy will culminate in an eschatological Jubilee of Atonement.

For an abstract from the book see:

<http://www.biblaridion-media.com/>

See also the publication page on the EJournal website.

**News**

**EJournal Columnists**

The idea of a columnist in a magazine is well understood. S/he offers news, views and opinion on the subject-matter of his or her column. Columns are usually short and break up the longer articles. We think it is a good idea to bring on to the EJournal some regular columnists. The columns will be short, no more than a 1000 words, and reflect certain themes. There will be an **Archaeology column** reporting on all things happening in that world relating to the Bible; this will be written by J. Burke (starting next issue). There will be an **Intertextuality column** which will focus on the subject of how later Scriptures use earlier Scriptures, through echo, allusion and quotation; this will be written by R. Morgan (starting next issue). In addition, there will be **two further columns on Exegesis and Exposition** respectively, both of which are under discussion and so will not be launched in the next issue.

**Postscript**

**A. Perry**

Mistakes in writing about the Bible are made and disseminated in print. An opportunity for correction comes in the form of new editions (or revisions) of a book if the writing has been published in book form. The opportunity for correction in printed magazines comes through correspondence if readers believe there is a mistake and they write in to the magazine. An opportunity might exist if a magazine is in the habit of printing articles by an original author or others that correct mistakes that have appeared in earlier issues.

Mistakes should, as a rule, be corrected as part of good stewardship of a resource. A cavalier attitude to writing in which you quickly put writing “out there” and leave it to the gods is obviously not responsible. One problem here is that an author might not be amenable to accepting that they have made a mistake and even less welcoming of any correction appearing in print. Human pride is at play here, of course. There are several ways to ameliorate this situation.

First, online magazines can update older issues with little effort when mistakes are highlighted. There is no need to keep a change record provided the associated website has the latest version of an old issue. Secondly, the editorial peer review of several editors allows contested mistakes to be presented with contrary points of view in discussion pieces. Finally, the use of *contra*footnotes allows an author to correct mistakes of others.

As for books, corrections used to have to wait for new editions, and publishers do not do new editions unless there is demand and stock has been exhausted. As a result, mistakes are fossilised in many books in circulation in the community. Print-on-demand gets round this problem because it is now economically viable to print-on-demand rather than in bulk. Authors can keep their books up-to-date with additions and corrections. There is a case to be made here that only print-on-demand should be used for publishing in the community so as to allow additions and corrections to be made to books.

Although it is not comfortable to be told that you have made a mistake, it is better for the development of character and for this reason the EJournal has an open policy with regard to making corrections to its published material.

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

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

**Publication**: E-mailed quarterly on the last Thursday of January, April, July, and October; published as a collected annual paper-back obtainable from: www.lulu.com/willowpublications.

**Subscriptions**: This is a “free” EJournal to communities and individuals whose statement of faith is broadly consistent with the Christadelphian common statements.

1. Two-way because there are not only are those who *keep* the jobs, others are too passive and allow the others to do the jobs. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Cp. Exod 39:37 “and all the vessels thereof, and the oil for the light” and Num 4:9 “oil vessels”. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. As ESV, NET, Rotherham, RSV, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. It is interesting to note that just the ‘testimony’ is mentioned and not the ‘ark of testimony’. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Also, cp. 2 Kings 17:28; 2 Chron 15:3; and Ezek 7:26. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Although oil was used when anointing etc., **the context** is different. The oil in Matthew 25 is specifically for the purpose if enlightening a lamp. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. It is interesting to note that elsewhere ‘oil’ is paralleled with the ‘spirit’ e.g. Exod 29:7 and Matt 3:16. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Made up from two Hebrew words *gth* (e.g. “winepress” in Jud 6:11, “press” in Joel 3:13) and *shmn* (e.g. “oil” in Gen 28:18, Exod 25:6). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. J. A. Montgomery proposes that “destruction” (*shachath*) in 9:26b may refer to moral corruption, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927), 383. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. “…let him go up to Jerusalem which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord …” (Ezra 1:3). V. S. Poythress argues that Cyrus *did* say that Jerusalem itself should also be rebuilt on the basis of passages in Isaiah: “he will say of Jerusalem ‘Let it be rebuilt’” (Isa 44:28) and “he will rebuild my city” (Isa 45:13). Poythress also cites the evidence of the letter of Cyrus recorded by Josephus, which gives leave to the Jews to “rebuild their city” (*Antiquities* XI.1.3). Poythress’ remarks are influenced by his acceptance of a principle he calls “narrow hermeneutics”, which stipulates that Daniel 9 must be interpreted in only in the light of sources available to a Jew c.538. Though such principles may be useful in the interpretation of some OT texts, it cannot be applied dogmatically in this context, since the author intends to prophesy beyond his contemporary context. See V. S. Poythress, “Hermeneutical Factors in Determining the Beginning of the Seventy Weeks (Daniel 9:25)” *Trinity Journal* 6/2 (1985): 131-149, (134-137). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Many modern translations render #wrx(*charuts*,“wall” (NKJV)) as “moat” (ESV) or “trench” (NIV). The word #wrx derives from the root verb “to cut” or “to decide”, and would most naturally be understood as an incision, and thus as a trench. However, in this context such a translation is problematic as #wrxfollows the verb “build”; one does not **build** a trench. The old Greek text of Daniel, θ’, renders #wrxas τειχος *teichos* (“wall”). In any case, it is improbable that “moat” is intended since there is no record of Jerusalem having a moat either in the days of the kings or in the time of Nehemiah, and the only moat discovered in archaeological excavations of Jerusalem dates from the time of Herod. See L. B. Paton, “Jerusalem in Bible Times” *The Biblical World* 30.3 (1907): 162/167-178 (167), and B. E. Schein, “The Second Wall of Jerusalem” *The Biblical Archaeologist* 44.1 (1981): 21-26 (25-6). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. R. W. Pierce, “Spiritual Failure, Postponement, and Daniel 9” *Trinity Journal* 10:2 (1989): 211-222 (213). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. [ED. AP]: The strength of the *athnach* accent is disputed. The standard work, J. D. Price, *The Syntax of Masoretic Accents in the Hebrew Bible* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 27; Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990), 27, makes the accent a level II disjunctive accent along with *Silluq* but behind the level I *Soph Pasuq*. The disjunctive accent *athnach* is found (4x) with ‘seven’ in Exod 25:27; 37:23; Neh 7:67 and Ezra 2:65, where a separate clause follows. However, in none of these cases is the following clause straightaway a number and so they are not directly comparable to Dan 9:25.

    [Ed. JWA]: In the last two decades a new school of “Delimitation Criticism” has arisen, devoted to highlighting the importance (as they see it) of a long- ignored tool for interpretation: unit delimitation markers in ancient manuscripts. E.g., evident in pre-Masoretic Qumran mss, textual subdivision into meaningful units by means of spacing and marginal signs. In the mediaeval period there is the addition of distinctive accents and opening (*petuHah*) and closing (*setumah*) section markers, as found in the Hebrew text of Masoretic manuscripts like the Codex Leningradensis (1009 A.D.). See M. Korpel and J. Oesch,eds. *Delimitation Criticism*, , *Pericope 1: Scripture as Written and Read in Antiquity* (Utrecht, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 2000). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. [Ed. AP]: Scholars are currently debating the relationship of Theodotion to the Old Greek Daniel, i.e. the extent of his work on the Old Greek—see K. H. Jobes and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 41-42. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Montgomery claims that θ’ is in error here, though produces no justification for this assertion (Montgomery, *Daniel,* 392). [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. “and after seven and seventy and sixty-two an anointing shall be removed” (Dan 9:26 LXX). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. We may speculate that the reason for the Masoretes to add the *athnach* disjunction in this segment was to preclude the Christian interpretation. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. “Thus says the Lord to His anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have held” (Isa 45:1). The *mashiyach* of Dan 9:25 cannot be Cyrus, as some have suggested, since in v. 26 the *mashiyach* is cut off shortly before the fall of Jerusalem. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. cf. 1 Kgs 19:15-17; also see 1 Chron 16:22 and Hab 3:13, which refer to a plural “anointed ones”, i.e. the people of God. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. **Saul:** 1 Sam 9:16; 10:1; 13:14; **David:** 1 Sam 25:50; 2 Sam 5:2; 6:21; 7:8; 1 Chron 11:2; 17:7; **Solomon:** 1 Kgs 1:15; **Jeroboam:** 1 Kgs 14:17; **Baasha:** 1 Kgs 16:2; **Hezekiah:** 2 Kgs 20:5; also see Ezek 28:2 regarding the king of Tyre. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Some priests are referred to as *nagiyd* but only with regarding their status as head of their household or as overseer over the ministers of Temple, not regarding the priesthood (e.g. 1 Chron 9:20; 12:27; Jer 20:1). [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. e.g. “… confessing my sin (*chatta’ah*) and the sin (*chatta’ah*) of my people Israel …” (Dan 9:20) [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. E. J. Young, *The Prophecy of Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), 199. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. C. Boutflower, *In and Around the Book of Daniel* (London: SPCK, 1923; repr. 1977), 188. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Young The Prophecy of Daniel, 200. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. cf. “none of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand” (Dan 12:10). [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. “Nevertheless no devoted offering that a man may devote to the Lord of all that he has, both man and beast, or the field of his possession, shall be sold or redeemed; every devoted offering is most holy to the Lord” (Lev 27:28). [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Young The Prophecy of Daniel, 207. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. N. W. Porteous *Daniel* (London: SCM Press, 1965), 142. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. See Montgomery, *Daniel,* 381. Porteous’ selection of “without trial” in place of “without condemnation” seems arbitrary, though it is possibly suggested to favour an identification with Onias who was murdered, not executed. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. A. Laato, “The Seventy Yearweeks in the Book of Daniel” *ZAW* 102/2 (1990): 212-22, proposes that vv 24-26 are the original core to which v27 has been appended, perhaps replacing the original ending, during the Maccabean period in order to reinterpret the original prophecy (Laato, “The Seventy Year-weeks”, (221). [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. J. G. Baldwin, (Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries; Leicester: Intervarsity Press, 1978), 171. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. cf. ~wr *ruwm* “taken away” (Dan 8:11); rws *cuwr* “taken away” (Dan 12:11); [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. For instance, it has been suggested that “wing” refers to the eagle-standards of the Roman legions (H. P. Mansfield & G. E. Mansfield, *The Book of Daniel: A Verse-by-Verse Exposition* (Findon: Logos Publications, 1992), 260-1). [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. See Montgomery, *Daniel,* 387; cf. Mark 13:14. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. W. H. Shea, “The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27”*,* in F. D. Holbrook (ed.), *The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy* (Washington: Review and Herald, 1986), 97. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. P. J. Ray Jr., “The Abomination of Desolation in Daniel 9:27 and Related Tests: Theology of Retributive Judgment”*,* in D. Merling (ed.), *To Understand the Scriptures: Essays in Honor of William H. Shea* (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1997), 205-213. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Both LXX and θ’ give “abomination of desolations” in 9:27; also see Montgomery, *Daniel,* 388. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Ephesians is directed to Gentile and Jewish readers, but Hebrews specifically targets Jewish believers at Ephesus. The Fourth Gospel, Hebrews and Ephesians were all written to the church at Ephesus See, P. Wyns, “The Fourth Gospel and Hebrews” in *Christadelphian EJournal of Biblical Interpretation: 2009 Annual* (eds. A. Perry, P. Wyns, T. Gaston; Sunderland: Willow Publications, 2009), 154-163. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Egypt is called the “house of bondage” thirteen times in Exodus. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. See the chapters, “Israel’s Ancient Passover Experience” and “Jerusalem Delivered at Passover” in H. A. Whittaker, *Isaiah* (Cannock: Biblia, reprint 2000), 50-53. See also the defence and then criticism of this proposal in P. Wyns, “Passover Deliverance in 701” *CeJBI* (Jan 2011): 50-61; A. Perry, “Dating the Deliverance of Jerusalem” *CeJBI* (Jan 2011): 62-71. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. These messengers have charge over the dispensation of death and evil. They are not evil for they are God’s messengers. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. R. Feldmeier, “Kosmokrator”, *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (eds. K. van der Toorn, Bob Becking, Pieter Willem van der Horst; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 908-9. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. This is no doubt a midrash on Nebuchadnezzar’s dream in Daniel 4: “The tree grew and became strong; its height reached to the heavens, and it could be seen to the ends of all the earth”. God gave Nebuchadnezzar power over “all the earth”. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. See P. Wyns, “Jacobs New Name” in the *Christadelphian EJournal of Biblical Interpretation: 2008 Annual* (eds. A. Perry, P. Wyns; Sunderland: Willow Publications, 2008), 95-100. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. See, P. Wyns, “El Shadday” in *The Christadelphian EJournal of Biblical Interpretation: Annual 2010* (eds. A. Perry, P. Wyns & T. Gaston, J. Adey; Sunderland: Willow Publications 2010), 85-96. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. The documentary hypothesis is a source theory about the Pentateuch that achieved its mature formulation in the work of J. Wellhausen (d. 1918). This theory proposed that the Pentateuch had basically four source documents: (J) Yahwist source, presumed to have been written about 850 B.C., (E) or Elohist source, about 750 B.C., (D) or Deuteronomistic source about 620 B.C. and the priestly source (P) in the completed Pentateuch about 500 B.C. Exod 6:3 is often employed as a “proof-text” for the documentary hypothesis. According to this theory the author of this verse was unaware that the Patriarchs employed the Yahweh name, and presumably the final editor of Exodus failed to correct the discrepancy. According to this theory this is evidence that the Pentateuch is a document compiled from different “sources”, some of them contradictory. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. N. M. Sarna, *Exodus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1991), 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. # T. E. Fretheim, “[dy” in the *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, (5 Vols; ed., W. A. VanGemeren; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1997), 2:409-414, (410).

    [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. R. Rendtorff, *The Covenant Formula: an Exegetical and Theological Investigation* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 15-17. I have summarised the analysis that he presents on pages 15-17 in the form of a table. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. See Elmer A. Martens, “Tackling Old Testament Theology” *JETS* 20 (1977): 123-132, who views the pericope of Exod 5:22-6:8 and the identity of Yahweh as the unifying theme of Old Testament theology. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. According to S. D. Glisson the preposition *b* in the phrase *be ‘el shaddai*, which can mean “in the capacity of”, acts as a governing preposition for both nouns. The reading is achieved when this is placed alongside *shemi* (name) in the sense of “my reputation, fame, or character.” S. D. Glisson, “Exodus 6:3 in Pentateuchal Criticism” *Restoration Quarterly* 28.3, (1985/86): 135-43, (141). [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. See H. G. Mitchell, “The Omission of the Interrogative Particle,” in *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper*, (2 vols; ed. R. F. Harper, F. Brown, and G. F. Moore; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908), 1:115-129, who restricts the number of occurrences in the Old Testament to 39, of which he attributes 12 or 17 to a corruption of the text. L. A. Heerboth, “Was God Known to the Patriarchs as Jehovah?” *Concordia Theological Monthly* 4 (1933): 345-349. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Jesus Christ was the descendant of Abraham who did as Abraham charged. Contrast John 8:39: “If you were Abraham’s children, you would do the works of Abraham”. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. The themes of “seeing” and “knowing” are twinned and are often synonymous. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. The form of the verb *ginōskō* employed here is the indicative perfect active 2nd person singular. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. “The Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees Him nor knows Him; but you know Him, for He dwells with you and will be in you”. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Hebrew “cause me to know” [Hiphil imperative of *yada`*]. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen (KJV). [Ed. JWA]: This is both a parabolic and a personal testing moment and the neuter ‘it’ of KJV is not neutral but insensitive to the spirit of Christ associated with this. Also, in Hebrew there is no neuter to be the pronoun ‘it’, but for the English sense (or sensibility!), literally reproducing ‘he’ or ‘she’ often does not seem appropriate. Sometimes, however, as in this Genesis 22 instance, featuring the gender of a term in translation connects with the non-linguistic identity whose gender is, on one reading, the male seed of Abraham. This being *he* whose day Abraham saw and rejoiced (John 8:56). [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. For the historical setting of Psalm 72 and the significance of Solomon being the prophet through whom it was revealed see: P. Heavyside, “Psalm 72: Prayer, Promise and Prophecy”, to be available at www.globalorient.com. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. By “self-evidently” I mean a reference to Ps 72:20 as proof that David is the writer of this psalm without any examination of the meaning of this verse. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. I am not suggesting that time-dependency is the only aspect that bears upon these two distinct spellings of David’s name; exposition will seek to identify the teaching that arises from them. It should be noted that this “earlier” spelling is adopted by later prophets such as Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, though never in the expression “David the son of Jesse”. For the exposition that needs to be undertaken, it is plain that the instances of *dwyd* in Chronicles and elsewhere refer to the unique use of *dwyd* during David’s lifetime in Psalm 122 whereas the instances of *dwd* in, for example, Isaiah refer to earlier portrayals of David and his teaching where *dwd* is used.

    [Ed: JWA]: See (i), F.I. Andersen and R.S. Hess, *Names in the Study of Biblical History: David, YHWH Names, and the Role of Personal Names*, Buried History Monograph #2 (Australian Institute of Archaeology, Melbourne, 2007); (ii) my review of this monograph in *Vetus Testamentum* 60 (2010): 292-293. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. P. Heavyside, “Psalm 72: Prayer, Promise and Prophecy”, to be available at www.globalorient.com. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. David’s statement, “now also when I am old and grey-headed” (Ps 71:18), by its inclusion in the second book of psalms, also requires that this book was compiled at the earliest during the last months of David’s life. David’s statement in Ps 37:25, “I have been young, and now am old”, likewise dates the compilation of the first book of psalms to, at the earliest, the later period of David’s life. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. There is also a feature in the psalms that argues for a compilation of book 2 earlier than book 5. A number of psalms of David (Pss 138-145) are ordered alongside a Babylonian exile psalm (Psalm 137); this indicates this book can only have been completed in the order that it has at the time of the exile at the earliest. Also, one of David’s psalms included in book 5 is said to be a prayer of David (Ps 142:t); the inclusion of this prayer in book 5 really only makes sense if the statement in Ps 72:20 predates the later compilation. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. This is consistent with how Balaam the prophet used such an expression in his prophetic utterances and David, speaking by the holy spirit, clearly strikes an association with these earlier prophecies; the reasons for this require exposition. “David the son of Jesse said (*n’m dwd bn yšy*)” should be compared with the following prophecies in which the prophet uses the same form of expression about himself: “he took up his parable, and said, Balaam the son of Beor has said (*n’m bl‛m bnw b‛r*)” (Num 24:3); and “he took up his parable, and said, Balaam the son of Beor has said (*n’m bl‛m bnw b‛r*)” (Num 24:15). [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. 1 Dialogue of Origen with Heraclides and his Fellow Bishops on the Father, the Son, and the Soul; books.google.co.uk. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. *Contra Celsum*, 5:39; www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf04.vi.ix.v.xxxix.html. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. *De Principiis*, 1.2.6; www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf04.vi.v.ii.ii.html. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. M. Schmaus, *Dogma* (6 vols; Sheed and Ward, London, 1971), 3:216. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. Peter’s escape at this time only served to delay the inevitable, for he was beheaded in AD 311 during the closing months of a second persecution. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. Such criticism was not slow in coming, and Alexander’s humiliation was acute. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
73. *Thalia*; en.wikisource.org. [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
74. H. A. Whittaker, *Isaiah* (Cannock: Biblia, 1988), 148. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
75. C. C. Walker and R. Roberts, *The Ministry of the Prophets: Isaiah* (2nd ed.; Birmingham: Published by C. C. Walker, 1923), 100. [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
76. Whittaker, *Isaiah*, 149. [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
77. [Ed: JWA]: What epigraphic evidence is there for this? Using Hebrew alphabetic letters for numerals would be unusual in contemporary or pre-exilic paleo-Hebrew inscriptions. From inscriptions of the time hieratic (Egyptian) numerical symbols were much employed, not just on weights and measures, but also in lists or messages among Hebrew words in texts. However, a troop list might be headed with the Hebrew number-word ‘ten’ and not a number-sign; or a stretch of text might include the hieratic ‘10’ sign followed by the Hebrew *´lPym* ‘thousands’ to represent ’10,000’. So, neither these various everyday applications, nor even the use of contemporary hieratic number signs, can be assumed to apply to the Bible’s different purposes or genre in the pre-exilic era. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
78. Amaziah, Jotham, Hezekiah, Jehoiakim are all said to be twenty-five on accession and there may be an age-related explanation for this pattern. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. Co-regency is also indicated by Isaiah’s language in Isaiah 7: he refers to Ahaz’ father separately from Ahaz, “The Lord shall bring upon thee, and upon thy people, and upon thy father's house, days that have not come, from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah; *even* the king of Assyria” (v. 17). [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. For general histories see J. Bright, *A History of Israel* (OTL; Revised Edition; London: SCM Press, 1972) and J. Maxwell Miller and J. H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (London: SCM Press, 1986). [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. The Hebrew can mean “young woman” or “virgin”. Following NT interpretation, and reading ‘virgin’, a Maher-shalal-hash-baz fulfilment requires that Isaiah is taking a new wife in “the prophetess” (perhaps his first wife died in childbirth). This is indicated by the *form* of the verb Isaiah uses (Isa 8:3 “went unto”), which occurs once elsewhere in the Law relating to **taking a wife** and entering her chamber (Deut 22:13-14). [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
82. [Ed: JWA]: The Hebrew verbs are past passive forms: “For a child **was born** to us, a son **was given** to us...” (cf., KJV Ps 87:4, 5, 6. In these verses for the same Hebrew passive ‘was born’ LXX, as in Isa 9:6, is consistent with Greek passive forms of gi,nomai. LXX Ps 86:4, 5, 6). [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
83. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1-12* (2nd ed.; London: SCM Press, 1983), 210-217; R. E. Clements, *Isaiah 1-39* (NCB; London: Marshall Morgan & Scott, 1980), 107-109. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
84. The RSV and NASB have “for he will come like a rushing stream, which the wind of the Lord drives” but we would argue that the KJV is correct. [↑](#footnote-ref-84)