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**Editorial**

This quarter there are two discussions: one on the question of women keeping silence ‘in ecclesia’ and the other on the Septuagint. Whereas other Christadelphian magazines may have a policy of not publishing opposing discussion pieces, and while yet others may publish standalone articles putting only one side of a controversial subject, the EJournal publishes ‘paired’ essays in controversial areas so that readers can evaluate argument against argument. In following this policy, we recognise that (without prejudice to any of the editors who engage in these debates) we are publishing the rights ***and*** the wrongs in a topic. The example from Eden is that those who would hold fast to faith do so in the face of wrong ideas. Our goal is to provide a controlled framework for a higher level of rigour and peer-review of areas of disagreement than there is elsewhere available in the community.

The first discussion “On Silence” comprises two papers written as competing exegesis but without any directed rebuttal to each other. Although the two authors were aware of the other’s argument from an email exchange, the two essays were written without sight of the other. Accordingly, they are not debating papers where the authors attempt to refute each other’s points and arguments alongside making out their own case. Rather, the two essays are contrary readings and illustrate contrary methods. As always correspondence is invited and if readers would like to see directed rebuttal, this could be considered for the next issue.

The second debate is about the Septuagint. The first essay argues that it was used by the Apostles; the second argues that the Spirit quotes its own writing. The issue at stake is the value we ascribe to the Septuagint in referring to it in exegesis; the first essay is more positive in its use whereas the second is more skeptical about the value of the Septuagint. This discussion is different from the first in that the second essay was written *after* reading the first and does engage in rebuttal; and as in debates, each writer then has a further rebuttal ‘speech’; correspondence is again invited.

In publishing discussions, we seek to avoid the shortcomings, often seen on Internet threads, of a) short undeveloped remarks with no sustained treatment; b) endless repetition and a ‘going round in circles’; c) just reading and presenting one scholarly point of view, i.e. a one-sided reading; and d) a lack of structure and resolution. The intellectual challenge to truth in the ecclesia today is different to that for former generations (which was church doctrine): its source is the handling of scholarship, which often becomes a kind of pseudo-scholarship in the process—second and third hand. This is the thinking behind *EJournal* discussions presenting competing scholarship alongside primary intertextual work.

**Articles**

**1 Cor 14:34-35**

**T. Gaston**

**Introduction**

The daughters of Philip prophesied (Acts 21:9). At Pentecost, Mary the mother of Jesus and other women were filled with the Holy Spirit and spoke in tongues (Acts 1:13, 2:1-4, 17), probably in the upper room that served as the earliest house-church (Acts 1:13; cf. 2:46; 12:12). Paul stipulates a covering be worn by those women (wives?) at Corinth who prophesied, apparently publicly (1 Cor 11:5).[[1]](#footnote-1) In the light of these examples of women being prompted by the Spirit to speak, apparently in church, how are we to understand Paul’s instruction that “women should keep silent in the churches” (1 Cor 14:34 [ESV]). Taken out of context these words would be an absolute prohibition that would be inconsistent with the examples noted above. It is therefore necessary to examine how these words are conditioned by their context. In this essay, I wish to explore how to interpret 1 Cor 14:34-35 in the context, both of the neighbouring verses and of the letter as a whole.

For completeness it is worth mentioning two theories that I believe have little merit. The first is the proposal that 1 Cor 14:34-35 is a later interpolation.[[2]](#footnote-2) There is no extant manuscript that omits these verses;[[3]](#footnote-3) the transposition of these verses after v. 40 occurs only in a group of closely related manuscripts.[[4]](#footnote-4) To argue for interpolation is to abandon sound textual criticism. The second is the proposal that vv. 34-35 are Paul’s quotation of the Corinthians’ letter.[[5]](#footnote-5) Whilst it is true that Paul is responding to information he has been sent (1 Cor 1:11; 7:1) and does quote from these sources (e.g. 6:12, 13; 10:23), the particle h'(“What?” v. 36 [KJV]) will not bear the weight placed upon it by these commentators. This disjunctive particle does not dismiss the preceding clause but introduces a contrasting statement that supports the preceding one and is better translated “or” (cf. Rom 3:29).[[6]](#footnote-6) Correctly read, v. 36 does not contradict the preceding verses but contrasts it with an alternative, i.e. that the Corinthians originated and alone received the inspired word. Neither of these theories excuses us from interpreting these as the words of Paul, who believes he is giving commands of the Lord (v. 37).

I will propose that Paul is addressing married women (wives) at Corinth and asking them to refrain from one particular practice that was causing disruption during the services.

**Order**

1 Cor 14:34-35 forms part of a section about order within church services. Paul introduces this theme in v. 26, writing “when you come together, each one has a hymn, a lesson, a revelation, a tongue, or an interpretation. Let all things be done for building up” [ESV]. Some of these are spiritual gifts, some are not (at least, not exclusively so). Though the first examples Paul considers are spiritual gifts (tongues v. 27-28; prophesy vv. 29-32), this introduction makes clear that all aspects of the church service are in view. This point is reinforced by v. 40, where Paul summarizes “all things should be done decently and in order”. In this context, vv. 34-35 should be read as an issue of church order; the implication is that the way women were speaking disrupted that order.

**“Submission”**

Paul writes that women are to “be in submission [*hypotassesthosan*]” (v. 34 [ESV]), that is subject to something or someone. Earlier Paul has said that “the spirits of prophets are subject [*hypotassetai*] to prophets” (v. 32 [ESV]). In v. 34 it is not mentioned to who or what women are to be subject to. It is possible that Paul means that women are to be subject to the commandments (cf. Rom 8:7; 10:3) or, that like all believers, women are to submit themselves to their fellow believers (cf. Eph 5:21). The more likely alternative is that Paul is referring to relationship between wives and their husbands (cf. Eph 5:22-24; Col 3:18).

**“As the Law also says”**

Paul does not quote any passage so we are left to speculate which part of the Law he is referring to. We would naturally assume “the Law” meant the Torah, though in v. 21 Paul cites Isaiah as “the Law” suggesting this phrase might imply “the Law and the Prophets”. Even with this expanded scope, it is not easy to identify which passage Paul is thinking of. M. Edgecombe suggests “the reference is generally to the consistent pattern of teaching throughout the Old Testament”.[[7]](#footnote-7) M. Lewis mentions Adam’s creation, the curse, the precepts of the Law and the prophets “who rebuked Judah because ‘women rule over them’”.[[8]](#footnote-8) Carson argues that Paul did not explicitly quote a passage because he had already referred to the passage he has in mind, namely Gen 2:20b-24 (cf. 1 Cor 11:8-9);[[9]](#footnote-9) yet neither Genesis 2 nor 1 Corinthians 11 mention women being subject to men. Perhaps the closest wording we find in the Law is the curse, “your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you” (Gen 3:16). The curse does not describe women *in general* being subject to men *in general,* but each wife being subject to her own husband.

**Women / Wives**

Most versions translate *hai gynaikes* in v. 34 as “the women” (ESV, NIV, NKJV, and NRSV). However *gyne* can refer both to a woman and a wife; the meaning is determined by context. Whilst when used of wives *gyne* is often accompanied by a pronoun or proper name in the genitive, there are examples where *gyne* alone is used to refer to a married woman. The prime example is 1 Corinthians 7, where throughout the passage Paul uses *gyne,* in singular and plural, to refer to married women without an accompanying pronoun; other examples include Eph 5:22-24 and Col 3:18.

In 1 Cor 14:35 Paul uses the phrase *tous idious andras* (“their own husbands”). Elsewhere in the NT when this phrase is used with *gyne,* *gyne* refers to married women (Eph 5:22-24; Col 3:18; 1 Pet 3:1-5). There seems no justification for translating *hai gynaikes* differently in 1 Cor 14:34.

**“Speak”**

The word “speak” here is *laleo.* In classic Greek this was the term for familiar speech and so meant “to prattle” or “to babble”, often referring to the sound of talking.[[10]](#footnote-10) In the NT it does not usually carry this disparaging sense. It is used to refer to inspired speech (cf. Matt 10:20; Mark 16:17; Luke 1:70; Acts 2:4; 1 Cor 12:3; Heb 1:1), but is also used in a range of other instances, including childish speech (1 Cor 13:11), unintelligible speech (1 Cor 14:11), foolish talk (2 Cor 11:17) and gossip (1 Tim 5:13). Indeed, *laleo* seems to be a general word meaning “speak” or “talk”, that ability to make sounds which the dumb do not have (cf. Matt 9:33; Luke 1:20). It does not seem possible to draw any significance from the use of this word.

**“Keep Silent”**

The word *sigatosan* (“keep silent” v. 34 [ESV]) is used twice earlier in this chapter. Paul writes regarding speaking in tongues that “if there is no one to interpret, let each of them keep silent [*sigato*] in church” (v. 28). Similarly, regarding giving revelations, “if a revelation is made to another sitting there, let the first be silent [*sigato*]” (v. 30). Though the word *sigato* is used, there is no absolute prohibition against speaking. Rather the prohibition against speaking is circumstantial and relates only to kind of speaking in view, i.e. speaking in tongues or giving revelation. When the same word is used in v. 34 it is reasonable to ask whether there are also specific circumstances in view here. These circumstances seem to be described in v. 35.

**“Desire to Learn”**

If we took v. 35 out of context it would read as an absolute prohibition against women learning [*mathein*] in church. Yet Paul has already instructed the Corinthians to prophesy in turn “so that all may learn [*manthanosin*]” (v. 31). The learning mentioned in v. 35 must be conditioned by the context supplied by the rest of the verse. Women who desire to learn should “ask their husbands at home”, indicating that the type of learning in view is not that received by listening to a prophet but that received by one-to-one enquiry. Consequently the learning (and speaking entailed) that Paul is prohibiting here is that one-to-one enquiry.

**“Shameful”**

Paul says it is “shameful [*aischron*] for a woman to speak in church” (v. 35 [ESV]). He used the same word earlier to describe the shame a woman might feel about being shorn (1 Cor 11:6), presumably because of the sexual immorality implied by a shaven head in that culture.[[11]](#footnote-11) In Eph 5:12 Paul uses the same word, saying “it is shameful [*aischron*] even to speak of the things that they do in secret” [ESV], referring to the sexual immoral and covetous (Eph 5:3-5). However, this word does not refer necessarily to sexual immorality, or sins of that order, and can be used of social embarrassment (cf. Luke 16:3). The word “for” [*gar*] connects v. 35b to v. 35a implying that the talking Paul considered disgraceful was asking questions in church.

**A Proposal**

From the preceding analysis there seem to be two implications. Firstly, Paul seems to be specifically addressing married women in 1 Cor 14:34-35. Secondly, Paul seems to be addressing the circumstance of one-to-one enquiry. Given that Paul is responding to a letter from the Corinthians, he may well be commenting directly on an issue they have raised. Two scholars outline possible scenarios:

The scenario we envision is as follows. During the time of the weighing of the prophet’s utterances, some of the wives, who themselves may have been prophetesses and entitled to weigh verbally what was said, were asking questions that were disrupting the worship service. The questions themselves may have been disrespectful or they may have been asked in a disrespectful manner. The result was chaos.[[12]](#footnote-12)

What is almost certainly in view is that the women are interrupting the *Scripture exposition* with questions. This would have caused an affront to more conservative men or visitors to the church, and it would have also caused a disturbance to the service due to the nature of the questions.[[13]](#footnote-13)

Carson objects to this kind of interpretation, asking why, under these scenarios, Paul would single out just women (or just wives).[[14]](#footnote-14) C. S. Keener suggests that women are more likely to have been uneducated, and thus were the ones asking the questions. B. Witherington argues that women are mentioned here simply because in Corinth women “were the cause of the problem”. The difference between Keener and Witherington, on the one side, and Carson, on the other, is that the former believe Paul is addressing a specific problem at Corinth whereas the latter believes Paul is giving a general regulation. Clearly if Paul is giving a general regulation, it would be strange for Paul to single out women for being uneducated (in general) or disruptive (in general).[[15]](#footnote-15)

**General or Specific**

There are two reasons we might take 1 Cor 14:34-35 to be a general regulation: v. 33b and vv. 36-38. It is often argued that v. 33b introduces v. 34 rather than closing v. 33a, that is, “as in all the churches of the saints, the women should keep silent in the churches” (ESV; cf. ASV, GNB, HCSB, NRSV, RSV).[[16]](#footnote-16) This paragraph-break is followed in UBS4 but not in editions by Westcott & Hort, Scrivener or SBL (cf. KJV, NASB, NIV, NKJV, and NLT). It is reasoned that the meaning of “for God is not a God of confusion but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints” is unclear, whereas the alternative scans better. Yet the alternative has its own inelegance due to the repetition of “churches”. Neither reading is beyond salvage so it is difficult to decide the matter on these grounds. In the ancient manuscripts v. 33b is separated from v. 34[[17]](#footnote-17) (which is why vv. 34-35, and not vv. 33b-35, are transposed in some manuscripts). In the absence of other considerations it seems preferable to follow the MSS on this point.

In v. 36 Paul implies that if the Corinthians object to his instructions it is as though they were claiming that they were the originators and sole-recipients of the inspired word, which, plainly, they weren’t. In effect Paul is saying that the Corinthians cannot ignore the practice of other churches. This links to v. 33b. Further, Paul adds that anyone who is moved by the Spirit would recognise Paul’s instructions as “a command of the Lord” (v. 37) so that if one denied Paul’s instructions he would show himself not to be inspired (v. 38). These verses (vv. 36-38) would seem to be describing widespread church practice based upon the Lord’s commandment; if these verses are coupled with the preceding ones then vv. 34-35 must be read as a general regulation.

However, it is not clear that this is what is intended. Paul completes his thoughts with two further lines (vv. 39-40). By saying, “so, my brothers, earnestly desire to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking in tongues”, Paul is alluding back to the opening of the chapter, “earnestly desire the spiritual gifts, especially that you may prophesy” (v. 1), and “I want you all to speak in tongues, but even more to prophesy” (v. 5). His final remarks, “all things should be done decently and in order” (v. 40) summarises his remarks in the last section vv. 26-35. Therefore it is inappropriate to read vv. 36-38 as referring only to vv. 34-35. Paul is not saying “women should keep silent” is universal practice and a command of the Lord, but that doing things in order for the edification of the church is universal practice and a command of the Lord. Paul’s theme is things being done in order; the Corinthian wives asking questions is just one circumstance of things being done disorderly.

**Conclusion**

Read in context, 1 Cor 14:34-35 addresses one of several issues relating to things being done orderly in the church. The Corinthian church seems to have had a specific problem with inquisitive wives asking questions (of their husbands?) during church services. Paul objects to this disruption and asking these wives to hold their peace, reminding them that they are subject to their husbands.

**Keeping Silence**

**A. Perry**

**Introduction**

The meaning of the ‘keeping silence’ verses in 1 Corinthians is bitterly disputed and contested. All sorts of points are made about the text: some have suggested the text is not ‘of Paul’; others have argued vv. 34-35 are an interpolation; feminist commentators dislike its chauvinist overtone and offer culturally bound contexts for its meaning; and conservative complementarians defend a traditional reading.[[18]](#footnote-18) It is doubtful whether there is anything new to say and this essay is an **intertextual** (‘Scripture interprets Scripture’) **typological** (Paul is, after all, a first class typological exegete) and **harmonic** presentation of the traditional position.[[19]](#footnote-19) There are several NT texts and arguments that form the battleground of the ‘egalitarian feminist’ versus the ‘complementarian traditionalist’ and 1 Cor 14:34-40 is one such passage.

**The Impetus to Speak**

The verb ‘to keep silence’ (siga,w) is not common in the NT letters (Rom 16:25; 1 Cor 14:28, 30, 34) and elsewhere only in Luke-Acts (Luke 9:36; 18:39; 20:26; Acts 12:17; 15:12-13). The verb carries the idea of ‘refraining’ from speaking in some sense. We can see this in the immediate context:

But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence (siga,w) in the church; and let him speak to himself, and to God. 1 Cor 14:28 (KJV)

If anything be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace (siga,w). 1 Cor 14:30 (KJV)

Refraining from speaking requires that there be a corresponding **impetus**. In 1 Cor 14:28, the one who could speak in a tongue (has that impetus) should refrain if there is no interpreter present. Similarly, if a prophet is prophesying and another does so, he is to refrain from continuing his prophecy (1 Cor 14:30). The point seems to be about doing things according to an order (v. 40), learning (manqa,nw, v. 31), and the preventing of confusion (v. 33). Holding back when there is an impetus to speak is also a feature of Luke 9:36 (wanting to tell about the theophanic voice); Luke 18:39 (the blind beggar wanting to attract Jesus’ attention); Luke 20:26 (the chief priests’ spies wanting to catch Jesus out); Acts 12:17 (the disciples wanting to know what had happened to Peter); and Acts 15:12-13 (the multitude clamouring).

The reason for our rehearsing these examples is to focus attention away from thinking about the silence and towards identifying what the impetus is behind 1 Cor 14:34. This is the impetus to exercise spirit-gifts such as tongues or prophesying: Paul is saying that women should be silent in respect of the impetus to speak vocally in tongues or prophesy. The difference between the Luke-Acts’ examples and 1 Cor 14:34 is that there is an additional reason for the silence: ‘for it is a shame for women to speak at congregation’.[[20]](#footnote-20)

**Generalisation**

Whilst our Luke-Acts’ examples are silences ‘of the moment’, 1 Cor 14:34 is generalised. This comes out clearly in the RSV, following the GNT/UBS, which renders 1 Cor 14:33a-34b as,

As in all the churches of the saints, the women should keep silence in the churches. 1 Cor 14:33b-34a (RSV; cf. NRSV; ESV; NIV, NEB; NJB; NET)

Both the GNT/UBS critical text **and** the Majority Text[[21]](#footnote-21) punctuate the Greek with a new sentence and paragraph at v. 33b. In the critical apparatus to the Majority Text, it is noted that a sub-group of the Byzantine miniscules add kai. to w`j. This addition by the sub-group shows a tradition of reading a new sentence with w`j. It is also noteworthy that while GNT/UBS and the Majority Text start a new paragraph at v. 33b, Stephanus (TR) and Westcott-Hort do not but **still** retain the upper-case ~Wj from the manuscript tradition rather than a lower-case w`j.

We can speculate as to why a difference like this might arise—why would v. 33b be associated with v. 33a rather than v. 34? P. Comfort offers a clue when he comments that associating v. 33b with v. 34 “creates serious exegetical problems”.[[22]](#footnote-22) These problems are how Paul can be legislating for silence in all churches for women when he allows praying and prophesying (1 Cor 11:5). Comfort does not consider our solution to this ‘problem’ (below)—but the ‘problem’ causes Comfort to favour associating v. 33b with v. 33a to get round (for him) an otherwise awkward generalisation.

In this connection, C. Niccum’s analysis of Old Latin manuscripts and bilingual (Greek and Latin) manuscripts in the western tradition is interesting: he offers a speculation as to why vv. 34-35 were transposed in some of those ancient manuscripts to a position after v. 40 (a transposition he regards as not original). He says of v. 33b, concluding his paper,

Considering the increasing power of women and the rise of female monastic communities in the Western churches during the third and fourth centuries, some may have perceived the collocation of women’s silence with ‘as in all the churches’ unfortunate.[[23]](#footnote-23)

While we may speculate as to why differences arise in the manuscript traditions, the safest course here is to follow the combined judgment of the GNT/UBS and Majority Text and associate v. 33b with v. 34. We can translate vv. 33b-34a following the Greek word order as follows:

 As in all the churches of the saints, the women in the ecclesias should keep silence.

There is a geographical sense given to ‘ecclesia’ here by the use of ‘all’ (the ‘churches of Galatia; the church in Smyrna, etc.) and a sense relating to membership: the women that Paul is referring to are those ‘**in** the ecclesia’. His silence command relates to them and not to any other women there who are ‘outsiders’.

Paul’s point is a prohibition ‘it is not permitted’ reinforced by the opposite *desideratum* ‘to be under obedience’ and backed up by ‘the Law’ (v. 34b; Ps 8:6; Gen 3:16b). We have then a generalized command about speaking for which we need to have a generalised impetus condition and we have this in the generality of the spirit gifts. The ‘at home’ (KJV and other versions) can equally be translated as ‘in a house’.[[24]](#footnote-24)

**Speaking to Oneself and to God**[[25]](#footnote-25)

‘Learning’ and the exercise of the spirit-gifts are linked in the context. A person speaking in a tongue should do so if there is an *interpreter* present (v. 28), otherwise he is to **speak to himself and God**; a person prophesying should have another ‘judge’ (diakri,nw) so that all may learn (manqa,nw—the very object of a woman asking in a house). This linkage tells us in what sense a woman was to keep silent ‘in ecclesia’: if she felt the impetus of the spirit in a matter of prophecy or the exercise of a tongue, **she was to speak to herself**[[26]](#footnote-26) **and to God and ask about meaning later ‘in a house’ rather than ‘in ecclesia’**. The spirits of the prophets were subject to the prophets. We can see then that Paul does allow a form of speaking for women ‘in ecclesia’—speaking to oneself and God. This means that women might prophesy and speak in tongues *to themselves* ‘in ecclesia’ and then ask their own husbands in a house.

This interpretation supports and is supported by 1 Cor 11:5: “But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven”. The context for this verse is the coming together ‘in ecclesia’ (vv. 16-17);[[27]](#footnote-27) if a woman were to prophesy (speak) **to herself** **and God** uncovered, this would dishonour her head (Jesus, ‘the man’ of the new creation, v. 3).

**Praying and Prophesying**

Prophesying is an obvious link between 1 Corinthians 11 and 14. It is normally assumed that the prophesying of 1 Cor 11:5 is vocal, but the verb ‘to speak’ does not occur in the reasoning of 1 Cor 11:2-16; moreover, praying is often a silent activity. However, praying and speaking in tongues is connected in 1 Corinthians 14, and in fact it is only in these two chapters that Paul discusses praying in 1 Corinthians. He says,

For if I pray in an *unknown* tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. 1 Cor 14:13-15 (KJV)

It is reasonable to infer that the praying he has in mind in 1 Corinthians 11 *for women* is spirit-gifted praying and therefore it could and should be carried on privately. Thus, in coupling ‘praying’ with ‘prophesying’ (but not using the verb ‘to speak’) the Spirit through Paul is **anticipating** (rather than contradicting) the arrangement of silence in 1 Corinthians 14. Vocalisation is not explicitly noted in 1 Corinthians 11 and precluded for the women ‘in ecclesia’ by 1 Corinthians 14. Because Paul saw that praying with a tongue in the spirit to oneself was legitimate (as well as prophesying to oneself), he saw fit to counsel the Corinthian women about the need for head-coverings.

**Men and Women**

The addressees of 1 Corinthians 14 are ‘the brethren’ (vv. 6, 20, 26, 39; cf. 1 Co 7:9; 9:5) not sisters; the presumption for the prophesying throughout is that it is vocal and that there are those to judge and from which all learn; likewise, the speaking in tongues would be vocal with interpreters present. The fact that Paul is addressing brethren is shown by v. 34 when talking to them in the third person of ‘women’ (gunh**,**); the later Byzantine text tradition has ‘Let **your** women’ but the GNT/UBS is more likely the original: ‘Let the women’.[[28]](#footnote-28)

There is a generality in vv. 33b-34a, ‘As in all the churches of the saints, women in the ecclesias should keep silence’ (GNT/UBS). ‘Women’ is the correct translation for gunh**,** because there is no possessive element in the text which we would expect if the sense is ‘wives’ (as in 1 Cor 7:2; th.n e`autou/ gunai/ka). The Byzantine text tradition has introduced an interpretive element with ‘**your** women’ and incidentally shows that the absence of a possessive element was felt to be a deficiency.

The Greek of ‘ask their husbands’ (v. 35) does have a possessive element (tou.j ivdi,ouj; cf. Acts 24:24; Eph 5:22; Tit 2:5; 1 Pet 3:1, 5) and this is why translations uniformly make this choice. Paul is presuming (or he knows from personal contact that) the spirit-gifted women ‘in the ecclesia’ all have husbands. The linguistics of the text is such that we have the generality of ‘women’ along with the presupposition that such women have husbands.

There is a typological contrast being made here: the women are to ask *their own husbands* in a house, but ‘in ecclesia’ they are ‘under obedience’ (u`pota,ssw). This reason for silence is explained by Eph 5:21-22,

Submitting (u`pota,ssw) yourselves one to another in the fear of God—women, to your own husbands, as to the Lord.

When gathered together ‘in ecclesia’, the women represent the bride (1 Cor 11:7)[[29]](#footnote-29) and are ‘under obedience’ or ‘subject’ (s.w) to ‘the Lord’, who is head of the body. In the context of the Breaking of Bread, Christ is the ‘husband’ of the bride and not any other husband. It is the ‘husbandship’ of Christ that women are meant to show in their silence according to Paul’s reasoning. Thus, because the men represent Christ ‘in ecclesia’ (1 Cor 11:7) in this context, but not elsewhere, the gifts given by Christ for edifying or building the ecclesia (Matt 16:18; Eph 4:11-12) are exercised by the men.

Paul is giving guidance to brethren (men) and women, therefore, and not husbands and wives. There is no rationale for Paul giving a silence directive *just to wives*, whereas he may see a need for a distinction between men and women in how gifts are exercised at congregation. (The generality of the gifts is matched in the generality of ‘brethren’ and ‘women’.) Had he wanted to do so, he could easily have included the possessive element to indicate ‘wives’ as he does in 1 Cor 7:2, but he does not and the later Byzantine tradition has added this element.

**House Churches**

The Greek translated ‘at home’ (evn oi;kw|) can be equally ‘in a house’; indeed, Paul uses a different expression for ‘at home’ in 1 Tim 5:4 (to.n i;dion oi=kon; cf. 1 Tim 3:4-5, 12) using a possessive element. The contrast is between a ‘coming together’ to congregation from houses or from being ‘in a house’ (1 Cor 11:34). This contrast reflects the house-churches in Corinth (1 Cor 16:19) coming together to break bread. The ‘belonging’ that was associated with houses can also be seen in 1 Cor 1:11, ‘by the ones of Chloe’ (u`po. tw/n Clo,hj)—this is to be compared with the naming of Aquila and Priscilla and the church in ‘their’ house.

**The Scope of Silence**

Although Paul is addressing brethren, the women had vocal spirit-gifts and it is a command to be silent in respect of these gifts to which v. 34 relates. V. 36 is decisive for relating silence to prophesying rather than ‘asking’ because Paul rhetorically asks whether the Word of God ‘came out of you’ (women) and this is about the Spirit engendering the Word of God through gifts. Since the principle was that ‘the spirits of the prophets were subject to the prophets’ (v. 32), the women (and men) could control their gifts and prophesy in the spirit ‘to themselves’ in keeping with the guidance of v. 28 about speaking in tongues.

The ‘speak’ of v. 34 is getting its sense from what ‘speaking’ Paul *has been* discussing, because this is what ‘silence’ has been previously related to—tongues and prophesying (all ‘speak’ uses prior to v. 34 relate to proactive gifts like tongues and prophesying, e.g. v. 6). He does not say that women cannot use tongues or prophesy in the spirit ‘in ecclesia’—he only requires their silence—they could exercise these gifts ‘to themselves’ like the brethren are advised in v. 28 for tongues. The ‘speaking’ of v. 35 (‘it is a shame for them to speak’) is summative and picking up the reference of the speaking in v. 34; it is not an additional kind of speaking, i.e. ‘asking’.

**Asking and Learning**

Paul re-directs the ‘learning’ that goes with hearing prophesying being ‘judged’ (vv. 29, 31) to a different setting that is not ‘in ecclesia’. However, the ‘learning’ of v. 31 is not connected to any asking at this point, just to prophesying: ‘ye may all prophesy…that all may learn’. If women were silent and listening to prophesying, then they would be learning from the judging; there isn’t necessarily any need for asking. Why then does Paul recognise a need for asking in v. 35? The answer to this question is that, if the women were prophesying ‘to themselves and to God’, they would not be learning from any judging of **their own prophesying**; necessarily so, because those so gifted to judge would not have heard them speak. Accordingly, Paul states that they should ‘ask their own husbands in a house’.

Paul’s logic is anticipating an objection to the principle of silence – namely, what about the need for judging the prophetic gift that is exercised in silence by women? How can women get judgment? This is why he directs their asking to a ‘house church’ and repeats that it is a ‘shame’ for women to speak ‘in ecclesia’.

**Shame**

The ‘shame’ here is the same word as Paul uses in 1 Cor 11:6 and it is rare in the NT (4x, 1 Cor 11:6; 14:35; Eph 5:12; Tit 1:11). It is one of several links between 1 Corinthians 11 and 14. Because Paul associates ‘shame’ with ‘in ecclesia’, we know that he is not invoking (should there have been such in the first place) general Mediterranean cultural values about women speaking in religious meetings; those meetings are not like the Breaking of Bread. Similarly, he is not invoking Jewish synagogue practice because those meetings are also not like the Memorial Feast. It is not a shame for women to speak in all meetings, just the ‘coming together’ that is the congregation meal.

The ‘shame’ that is possible ‘in ecclesia’ has two possible causes – an uncovered head or speaking. The reasoning in 1 Corinthians 11 for why an uncovered head is a cause of shame (v. 6), is centred on the typology of who is ‘the man’ and who is ‘the woman’ of the new creation (1 Cor 11:7).

* In the adultery law of Numbers 5, the woman suspected of going aside to another man has her head uncovered, and made to partake of the jealousy offering. This action of uncovering the head of the woman is symbolic of the suspicion that she has gone aside to another man (Num 5:18). If she was to be proved innocent, she would remain with her husband. Paul’s comparison with this process is that a woman who is uncovered displays behaviour tantamount to a suspicion of unfaithfulness - a suggestion that she has gone aside to another man - someone other than Christ.
* Deuteronomy 21 describes how a captured woman was required to shave her head as part of the ritual of her being accepted as an Israelite wife (Deut 21:12, cf. Neh 13:25). In other words, this practice of shaving related to the transfer of the woman from an enemy to a man in Israel. In Paul’s argument, he says that an uncovered woman is like a shaven woman: he is saying it is the same as if the woman had gone aside from [remnant of] Israel to another man in another nation. As a paraphrase, we might say that being uncovered is an act of disloyalty to the man. Paul’s argument therefore focuses on the disloyalty shown to the man who redeems the woman, i.e. Christ.

The ‘shame’ that a woman bears ‘in ecclesia’ (1 Cor 11:18) if she is uncovered relates to Christ. This is because the Breaking of Bread is typical of the Marriage Supper of the Lamb and there is enactment of roles in this meeting by men and women: the men represent Christ and the women represent the bride of Christ (1 Cor 11:7). So it is that Paul can say that speaking ‘in ecclesia’ is also a shame for women. The one who speaks is Christ and in Paul’s day the men exercising the gifts of the Spirit from the Lord (Eph 4:8f).

**Miriam**

Paul establishes his authority to deliver such a principle with an allusion to the incident where Miriam and Aaron challenge Moses.

What, came the word of God out from you or came it into you only? (v. 36)

And they said, hath the Lord indeed spoken only by Moses? Hath he not spoken also in us? And the Lord heard it. Num 12:2 (KJV revised)

Miriam is the principal challenger because she is named first (Num 12:1) and she is the one to be struck with leprosy (Num 12:10). Miriam and Aaron had the Spirit and had spoken against Moses using that implied authority. Such an allusion on the part of Paul suggests that the practice of all the churches (1 Cor 14:33b) was being challenged by spirit-gifted women—Paul’s authority was being challenged.

After Miriam is struck with leprosy, Aaron acknowledges Moses as his ‘lord’ (Num 12:11) and this explains Paul’s remark,

If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of ‘the lord’. 1 Cor 14:37 (KJV revised)

This isn’t a reference in the first instance to the Lord Jesus by Paul, but rather it is his placing himself into the typical place of Moses in his confrontation with the ‘Miriam’ of his day—he is ‘the lord’ as Aaron acknowledged Moses to be his ‘lord’. The point being made by Paul is about ‘who thinks themselves to be a prophet’ and this picks up on the issue at stake between Moses, Aaron and Miriam: their claim was that the Lord had spoken by them. Paul’s logic reflects Yahweh’s speech:

If any man thinks to be a prophet…let him acknowledge

If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known to him… (Num 12:6; cf. 11:29)

The acknowledgement sought by Paul against the Corinthian women prophets mirrors the acknowledgement given to Moses by Yahweh (Num 12:7-8). Paul’s claim to be like Moses in the face of the challenge by the Corinthian women is further seen in his introduction to his command: it was applicable ‘in all the churches of God’ just as Moses had charge ‘in all mine house’ (Num 12:7).

The consequence for Miriam was that she was **ashamed** and put out of the camp for seven days (Num 12:14-15). This ‘shame’ was for speaking against Moses on the grounds that she was also a prophetess. The shame that Paul relates to women speaking ‘in ecclesia’ (v. 35) is like Miriam’s shame. This is a shame that can obtain ‘in ecclesia’ but not ‘in a house’.

**Conclusion**

Paul concludes his reasoning about the Breaking of Bread with the remark: ‘Let all things be properly decent and according to order’ (v. 40). The expression ‘all things’ is picking up occurrences that start with 1 Cor 10:23 and continue in various statements throughout this part of the letter (e.g. 1 Cor 11:2; 14:26). The requirement for such things to be properly decent relates particularly to what was not decent in the handling of the emblems (1 Cor 11:17f). The expression ‘according to order’ (kata. ta,xin) uses a word ta,xij that is mainly translated in the NT in relation to an order implied in a priesthood (Luke 1:8; Heb 5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:11, 20); it summarises the fact that Paul has drawn different roles for men and women at the Breaking of Bread.

**“The Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one” KJV 1 John 5:8 (cf. 1 John 5:6)**[[30]](#footnote-30)

**John Adey**

In the New Testament (NT) spontaneous praise, immediate “gladness and singleness of heart”, followed a baptism (Acts 2:46-47). Communally, such joy tokened God’s work “adding to the ecclesia such as should be saved”. A sinner had repented; there was rejoicing on earth and in heaven. Praise celebrated the victory over the flesh and the world made possible through the blood of the Lamb. A victory Jesus anticipated as the effect of his work, when expounding what “ordained strength” of the Psalm presupposed: “Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast **perfected praise**” (Matt 21:16; cf. Ps 8:2[3]).[[31]](#footnote-31)

In the Acts of the Apostles baptismal circumstances vary. The Ethiopian eunuch’s baptism, for example, was not public; a *communal* follow-up of praise is replaced with: “he went on his way rejoicing” (Acts 8:39). Whilst his approach to baptism was typical, and necessarily so, the circumstance of his baptism was not. His individual treatment shows the extent to which God, the ‘heart-knower’ (kardiognw,sthjActs 1:24; 15:8), will go for those who would be saved (e.g. Acts 10:34-35).

Despite time or circumstantial differences, a believer’s baptism is effective because it identifies with “the water and the blood”, symbols of Christ’s redemptive work. But, more than this, and what I aim to show in this study, these two combined elements also form part of a “three-fold cord” which includes (the role of) ‘the spirit’. The ‘spirit’ involvement presents God-made angelic agency (cf. Ps 104:4 in Heb 1:7, 14) and the promise of a perfecting, ultimately being ‘equal to the angels, to die no more’ (Luke 20:36). This is God, in circumstantial manifestation (cf. Matt 18:10; Acts 12:11, 15), His holy spirit work, producing: “spirits of just ones made perfect” (Heb 12:23).Involving ministering angels from the beginning of the redemptive process is why “there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repents” (Luke 15:10).

So, clearly, ‘the spirit’ is not some pre-baptismal (mystic or inward) influence, without which we could not understand Scripture or be converted. Rather, foreknowingly, God provides circumstances in which a “good and honest heart” (Luke 8:15) will hearken to His words (now solely in scriptural form). This is the Eternal Spirit’s “call” (e.g. Isa 49:1, 9; Matt 20:16; 1 Cor 7:21-22; Gal 1:15; Rev 17:14) to or for “such as should be saved” (Acts 2:47). The case of the Ethiopian Eunuch is paradigmatic of this: faith towards God that leads to repentance “comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God” (Rom 10:16-18). So it is in the OT era for example in the case for Rahab[[32]](#footnote-32) and Ruth.[[33]](#footnote-33) Therefore, the work realised, at the initial stage, is the birth of a new babe, born *out of* ‘spirit’; it is not a work of the ‘flesh’: “that which is born out of the flesh, is flesh; that which is born out of the spirit, is spirit” (John 3:5-6).[[34]](#footnote-34)

My foundational, three-fold cord, text is 1 John 5:5-6:

Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? This is he that came by **water** and **blood**, [even] Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the **Spirit** that beareth witness, because the **Spirit** is truth.

This state of affairs is still operative or “bearing witness in earth” today (v. 8):

And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.

So, I consider texts in which these three combine. Where baptism―‘the water and the blood’ ―is the outcome, ‘the Spirit’ appears as God at work: (a) through angels, and (b) by His ministered word. These Spirit agencies, (a) and (b), bring “those who would be heirs of salvation” (Heb 1:14) to identify with “the water and the blood”. This emerges from Acts 8.

The Ethiopian eunuch had left Jerusalem, the centre for mass conversions to the Gospel. Yet unconverted, he was journeying southwards *en route* for Ethiopia. God sends His angel (8:26), also referred to as “the spirit” (8:29) or “spirit of the Lord” (8:39), who instructs Philip to get up and go southward from Jerusalem towards Gaza. Philip finds the eunuch in the desert, where, at a standstill in his chariot, he was trying to make sense of a Scriptural prophecy about Christ. The (angel-)spirit instructs Philip further:

 [The Ethiopian eunuch was] sitting in his chariot read[ing] Esaias the prophet. Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot. And Philip ran thither to [him], and heard him read the prophet Esaias, and said, Understandest thou what thou readest? And he said, How can I, except some man should guide me? And he desired Philip that he would come up and sit with him. The place of the scripture which he read was this, He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth: In his humiliation his judgment was taken away: and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth. And the eunuch answered Philip, and said, I pray thee, of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man? Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus. And as they went on [their] way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, [here is] water; what doth hinder me to be baptised? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, **I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.**

At this point 1 John 5:5 can be recalled: “Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that **Jesus is the Son of God**?” Through belief and baptism the Ethiopian eunuch becomes “on the Lord’s side.” The narrative continues in Acts 8:38:

And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptised him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing.

The Ethiopian eunuch’s desire for baptism resulted from Philip’s Scriptural explanation about Christ’s suffering. Isaiah’s prophecy of a unique man’s death leads the eunuch to Christ. The figure of an innocent animal’s loss of life is used to describe Christ’s sacrifice. The slaughtering of an animal involves the shedding of blood; so also in Christ’s death in which the iniquities of others were laid upon him. Having preached Jesus, although what Philip actually said is not given, the record in Acts next mentions water and the eunuch’s request for baptism. So it transpired, that, brought to this moment by the **Spirit** (i.e. the angel and *in*spirited words, testifying in prophetic Scripture to the spirit of Christ), the **water** andthe **blood** associate with baptism. The need for baptism relates to the belief that **Jesus Christ is the Son of God.**

It is inevitable that Philip would have directed the eunuch to other OT passages about Christ. After all, at that time, these were the only available *Holy* Scriptures (the NT not yet available for added witness). Philip would have personally witnessed to Jesus’ life, death and resurrection in the way the Gospels now record. His argument would be compelling with Scripture’s recent fulfilment in Christ. Acts 8:26-39 is a compressed written account, but it serves its purpose. Historical reportage (for us/our learning) is accommodated to spiritual relevance. This is true of Scripture generally, and particularly of Jesus’ ministry, as is stated by John in his Gospel (20:30-31):

And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God [as the eunuch did]; and that believing ye might have life through his name.

This theme of God providing a lamb and by association the roots of baptism, go back to the beginning of Biblical history and before in God’s foreknowing mind. Hence Christ Jesus can be described as “the lamb slain from the foundation of the world” (Rev 13:8). The underlying message is about a sacrificial death, the shedding of blood, for Divine forgiveness of or covering for sins. Once sin entered the world and death by sin, God requires blood to cleanse and cover the sinner and thereby reconcile him with God. It was (from) then that a redemptive Gospel became necessary. Although baptism becomes a requirement for salvation with the coming of Christ in the NT, it is anticipated in the OT. Baptism identifies a believer with the death of Christ, “the Lamb of God”, whose shed blood “takes away the sin of the world” (John 1:29).

Importantly, baptism unites believer and redeemer with the historical moment of redemption: buried *with him* by baptism into death (Rom 6:4; Col 2:12). *That* expiatory moment is significant for all time. Only this single (*once for all*) act could create this relation of saving fellowship, as is clearly stated in Rev 1:4-5:

...from the seven Spirits...And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his blood.[[35]](#footnote-35)

In this text, the individual pronouns (‘our’, ‘us’; ‘him’, ‘his’) formalise or establish the relation the redeemer created through ‘washing’ - baptism - and ‘blood.’ This is “the water and the blood” theme related to Christ’s act of atonement (see above n. 1, p. 22). Revelation 5 links this directly with “the Lamb of God”:

And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a **Lamb** as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven **Spirits of God** sent forth into all the earth. Rev 5:6

And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast purchased us [cf. Gk. avgora,zw: e.g. 1 Cor 7:23; 2 Pet 2:1  ‘the Lord that bought them’][[36]](#footnote-36) to God by thy **blood** out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. Rev 5:9.

Later, ‘blood’ and ‘lamb’ are brought together as a complete statement. In this context the associated element of ‘washing’, given in Rev 1:5, is also present:

[End of v. 13: Who are these which are arrayed in white robes?] And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed [water = baptism] their robes, and made them white in **the** **blood of** **the Lamb**. Rev 7:14.

In 1 Cor 10:1-2, we are given a spiritual perspective on the exodus of Israel from Egypt. Although this incident is in the OT it is depicted as a baptism:

Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.

Noah’s flood is described in the NT as a being like baptism (1 Pet 3:20-21), but this is the first baptism of a whole body of people. They are effectively ‘buried’ in, or, by, their watery surrounding; Noah did not “pass through the sea” (1 Cor 10:1). Israel is God’s multitudinous son, his firstborn, called out of Egypt. Much can be made of this as a *type* for the saints. Indeed, 1 Cor 10:6 and 11 cause us to reflect on this piece of history in this personal way. The Greek text has the word for ‘type(s)’ so translated elsewhere; but this is obscured by the KJV’s ‘our examples’ and ‘ensamples’ in vv. 6 &11. The use of “*our* [examples]” defines a relation for *us* to the types.

Prior to their baptism, the Israelites were saved from death by the blood of the lamb. Every Israelite was there at the Red Sea because God’s angel had mercifully passed over them. Had they not daubed the blood of a slain lamb on the doorposts and lintels of their houses they would have died in Egypt. Egypt would have been their grave; they would never have risen to a newness of life out of the (covering cloud and) baptismal waters of the Red Sea. So here Christ is anticipated, prefigured, in this historical event. Redemption was by water and blood.

The point of contact between the Red Sea, Noah’s flood and baptism is that in each case the water represents both death and life: (i) death to the world by drowning; or as it is symbolised in baptism: the cutting off (‘circumcision’) of the flesh (Col 2:11-14); (ii) life (resurrection to newness of life) by overcoming the world; by being delivered from the condemnation of death.

The ark was “pitched within and without” (Gen 6:14) ensuring it was fully proofed against the agent of death: water. (The water also cleansed the earth of sin). So the daubing of the pitch secured deliverance for the occupants of the ark. The ‘pitch’, or ‘pitching’ did for Noah what the blood of the lamb did for Israel in Egypt, and what Christ’s shed blood does, and has done from the foundation of the world, for all who would be saved. It is significant that the Hebrew word for ‘pitch’ is a form of the Levitical ‘*kippur*’ used for ‘atonement’ (e.g. in Leviticus 16), since this involved acts of blood ritual to cover a multitude of sins.[[37]](#footnote-37)

Prior to the flood God said: “My **spirit** shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh” (Gen 6:3). After the flood [**water**] of death and salvation God informs Noah of new conditions regarding the significance of **blood**: “But the flesh with the life thereof, shall ye not eat. Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made He man” (Gen 9:4-6). So in the context of the flood, which Peter associates with baptism (1 Pet 3:20-21), this familiar three-fold pattern is present.

The first plague in Egypt, water becoming blood was a potent sign of Egypt’s impending death at the Red Sea. By contrast, the blood of the Lamb saved Israel and prefigured their baptism into Moses in the cloud and in the sea. It was either burial in the grave of Egypt or resurrection out of the watery tomb of the parted Red sea.

Two points can be noted in this context:

[1] Immediately after Israel’s baptism into Moses, Moses bursts into praise and song, celebrating God’s victory in their deliverance. This reminds us of what happened in NT times following baptism, as I mentioned at the outset.

[2] Isa 63:7-14 comments that it was the “Spirit of Yahweh” (v. 14), “His Holy Spirit” (vv. 10-11), that effected Israel’s deliverance; that is God, in the angel of His presence, in whom was His name (Exod 23:21), visited and redeemed His people. Thus again, we have “the spirit, the water and the blood” conjoined as in 1 John. 5.

When God’s Son came, having been born *out of* the Holy **Spirit**, **water and blood** pointedly associate with his work, his crucifixion or sacrificial death. For example: John the Baptist summons people to repent and be baptised to prepare for Christ’s coming. As Jesus comes to be baptised of John, the Baptist declares (John 1:29): “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” The sign from God which confirms who Jesus is—is the spirit like a dove descending upon him. (The dove had a special role with Noah). In short, we have ‘blood’ implicitly in “the Lamb of God”, ‘water’ to do with baptising, and **the Spirit** which descended on Jesus. These three have one focus: the Son of God. (This word used for ‘lamb’ is a rare NT word and only occurs in this context, in 1 Pet 1:19 and in Acts 8:32 where the Eunuch was reading from Isaiah 53.)

The first sign or miracle Jesus performed was turning water into wine at a marriage supper in Cana of Galilee. (In Egypt the first plague as a sign was the turning of water into blood.) Among other things this transformation prefaced his ministry with the reason for it. He witnessed the end in the beginning. The wine represents Jesus’ blood, the “blood of the new covenant shed for many for the remission of sins”. Water in baptism does not become blood literally. Transubstantiation in any shape or form is a Catholic myth. But what Jesus could see in the wine which was once water, must be seen by us in the water of baptism.

The Red Sea did not turn red, it did not become blood, but its water represented, typically, the blood of the lamb, as the Israelites were baptised into Moses. The water of baptism should be considered *as* blood; imparting to us the reality of our redeemer’s death, and, of course, of necessity the resurrection following, as the achievement of the giving of his life.

In the Garden of Gethsemane, following the Passover meal with his disciples, Jesus is in an agony of mind and will. The suffering of Christ was not just on the tree. Whatever he endured was his ‘baptism’ (Luke 12:50); a life of cutting off the flesh; his death being the final and effective circumcision (Col 2:11-15). He prays to the Father for strength. What is before him he describes in a figure as “this cup”. Here, the wine at Cana, or the wine of the New Covenant in the cup shared with his disciples, merge with his suffering. Luke 22:42:

Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done. And there appeared and angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him.

Consistently, God acts and a ministering spirit is sent. Jesus was pressed beyond measure with the weight of his death upon him and all that it meant in doing God’s will and saving his people from their sins, as prophesied in his name (Matt 1:21). “Water and blood” is implied in his experience; it is easy to miss the allusion (v. 44):

And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly (‘fervently’): and his sweat ***was as it were*** great drops of blood falling down to the ground.

One of history’s most ironic and sad moments was when Pilate, seeking to exempt himself from any responsibility for Jesus’ crucifixion, “took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it” (Matt 27:24). Sadly, his was not a baptismal washing in the blood of the lamb. His judgment was not just; therefore, he was guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

When just Abel was killed by his brother, God convicted Cain with the words; “the voice of thy brother’s blood crieth from the ground” (Gen 4:10). Jesus connects Abel’s treatment with his own at the hands of his brethren, the Jews (Matt 23:35). With Gentile compliance the people said, “His blood be on us, and on our children” (Matt 27:25). Hebrews 12:24 informs us that Jesus’ blood “speaketh better things than that of Abel”. This parallel with Abel, albeit with a measured difference, is significant in terms of a ‘speaking of blood after death’. The difference is that Abel’s blood was not shed for many, it could not touch others: Abel was just, but not the Just One. Abel’s blood did not relate to water. John 19:32-37:

Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other which was crucified with him. But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs: But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out **blood and water**. And he that saw [it] bare record, and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe. For these things were done, that the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken. And again another scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they pierced.

Jesus is dead on the tree but the reason for his being there speaks in: “**blood and water**”. His last words had been: “into thy hands I commend my **spirit**” (Luke 23:46). Now Christ is silent. But a final unspoken witness to his work issues from his body: the *voice* of his “blood and water”. A moment now imprinted in his body (hands, feet and side).

Christ’s **water and blood**, by the arrangements of God’s Spirit (defined by the contexts considered), are mercifully there still to touch lives. The water and the blood in baptism signals transformation from death to life. Grasping more deeply the personal significance of “the water and the blood” that unites the redeemed with Christ, should more effectively empower or aid the spirit-work of perfecting. Moreover, this identification with that once-for-all, yet ever availing, past moment, grants access by **one spirit** unto the Father. Therefore, Jesus’ blood continues to be effective in cleansing us from sin (1 John 1:5-9).

**Columnists**

**Intertextuality**

**R. Dargie**

**Isaiah 5 -The Song of Isaiah**

### Introduction

Isaiah chapters 2-4 begin with descriptions of the glory of a restored Zion, but the main thrust of argument is a rebuke to the existing community of Isaiah’s day for their spiritual failures. In Isaiah 5, we have the formal arraignment of the nation, both Judah and Israel, for their breach of the covenant promises. And in similar fashion to Nathan’s denunciation of David (2 Sam 12:1-12), the charge and sentence is set out in the form of a parable – but here in Isaiah 5 it is a parabolic psalm.

We have then in Isaiah 5 what is often referred to by commentators as “Isaiah’s Song of the Vineyard” (5:1-7), which is closely followed by the enunciation of six woes (5:8-24).[[38]](#footnote-38) The song and woes together form a comprehensive invective of great beauty yet chilling certitude. We will look into the beauty and power of this song and it’s surprisingly wide ranging intertextuality.

The likening of Israel to a vineyard has an ancient provenance (Gen 49:11, 22; Song 8:14). We have already had the “the daughter of Zion” compared to a “booth in a vineyard” (Isa 1:8), and the princes of Judah charged with “eating up” (Isa 3:14) God’s vineyard. But it is evident from Ps 80:8-16 that the approaching Assyrian storm clouds had at least caused Asaph (a probable contemporary of Isaiah[[39]](#footnote-39)) to use this Israelite metaphor in a prayer for national redemption.[[40]](#footnote-40) It is surely of note, from a circumstantial perspective if nothing else, that Isaiah chooses this same vineyard concept as the vehicle by which he will deliver his message of doom.

Isaiah 4 is closely connected to Isaiah 5. Instead of the “fruit of the earth” (Isaiah 4:2), we have “wild grapes” in chapter 5. In chapter 4:6 there are storm clouds but even here they at least water the land. In chapter 5 however, the clouds are bidden “to rain no rain upon it” (5:6) because the coming tempest that was to be unleashed upon the land would be fire (5:24) followed by warfare (5:28).

However, we should note that God had evidently heard Asaph’s (and certainly Hezekiah’s) prayer in preserving Jerusalem from the predations of Sennacherib in 701 BCE. For Samaria, however, the die was cast, so to speak, and after 3 years of siege the city fell to Sargon the Assyrian in the 6th year of Hezekiah’s reign (722 BCE).[[41]](#footnote-41)

#### **The Song of Solomon**

When penning Isaiah 5 it seems probable that Isaiah drew part of his inspiration from “the Song”. Thus, Isaiah in his song sings as follows:

Now will I sing to my well-beloved, a song of my beloved touching his vineyard.

The Hebrew word “my beloved”, standing here, is almost certainly a figure for God;[[42]](#footnote-42) it is found 26 times in the Song of Solomon, but nowhere else in Scripture save here in Isa 5:1. This is significant. Interestingly, the final verse of the Song (8:14) concludes with a reference to “my beloved” and 3 verses prior to this there is a description of Solomon’s vineyard at Baal Hamon (Song 8:11). When we look at Isa 5:1, we note that, the prophet having stated the subject of his song as his “well beloved”in verse 1, then goes on to detail the key features of the vineyard in the second half of the verse. See table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Isaiah**  |  | **Song of Solomon** |
| 5:1 | Now will I sing to my well-beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard | 8:14 | Make haste my beloved…. |
| 5:1 | My well-beloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill | 8:11 | Solomon had a vineyard at Baal Hamon… |

So here are two strong points of reference between both songs. But there is more. The Hebrew word *hamon* referred to in the Song (8:11) occurs twice in Isaiah 5 (verses 13 & 14 translated into the English as “multitude”).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Isaiah**  |  | **Song of Solomon** |
| 5:13 | …and their multitude (*hamon*) dried up with thirst | 8:11 | Solomon had a vineyard at Baal Hamon… |
| 5:14 | …and their glory and their multitude (*hamon*)…. |  |  |

So, now we have 4 points of contact. Finally, the latter part of Song 8:11 is referred to in Isa 7:23,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Isaiah**  |  | **Song of Solomon** |
| 7:23 | …where there were a thousand vines at a thousand silverlings… | 8:11 | …every one for the fruit thereof was to bring a thousand pieces of silver (silverlings)  |

So, within Isaiah 5 and the immediate context, we have at least five points of connection. It seems evident that these references in Isaiah 5 to “the Song” are a matter of intertextual design (following a process of deep thought, aided by divine inspiration) - as opposed to coincidence.

When we look again at the literal translations of the second half of Isa 5:1 and Song 8:11 we note an interesting feature:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Isaiah**  |  | **Song of Solomon** |
| 5:1 | My well-beloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill | 8:11 | Solomon had a vineyard at Baal Hamon… |
|  | **Literal translation** |  | **Literal Translation** |
| 5:1 | A vineyard was there to my well-beloved in *keren ben-shamen* | 8:11 | A vineyard was there to Solomon in Baal Hamon |

The phrase *keren shamen* equates to ‘horn of oil’. This combination of Hebrew words occurs only in 1 Sam 16:1 & 13 where Samuel anointed David, and 1 Kgs 1:39 where Solomon was anointed by Zadok. So, we have a hint/reference to the Davidic covenant and to the king that built the Temple which was the seal of the Davidic covenant. If the Hebrew phrase *ben-shamen* equates to “anointed”, it is reasonable to infer that *keren ben-shamen* equates to “the horn of the anointed” (on which see further Hannah’s prayer in 1 Sam 2:1).

Isaiah’s Song clearly has for its opening verse a thought pattern based on the Song of Solomon. In the language used in Isa 5:1 (*keren ben-Shamen*) there is a special reference to the Davidic covenant and the Temple of Solomon as the seal of that covenant. Given the rest of the message of Isaiah’s song concerns the failure to live up to the Sinai covenant and the breaking down of the fence, tower, and winepress, the referencing in to the early part of the Isaiah’s song to the Davidic line and the temple sets the tone that these are substantive matters dealing with God’s redemptive purpose for mankind working (in reality not working at all) through Israel.

**Conclusion**

Israel, the seed of Abraham, the friend of God, was a vine of noble stock, whose wine was to “gladden God and men” (Jud 9:13). This vine, planted in the fair land of Canaan with the presence of God hovering over it looked to be the “blessing to all nations” in which the righteousness of Abraham’s faith would overflow and overcome the earth. But, as the record shows, seduced by the world it was supposed to convert, the nation became a mockery to its neighbours. The blessings of Abraham would not be realized under the “tabernacle of Shiloh”.

David was anointed of the Lord, and to him there was granted great favours. But even the line of David could not be steadfast to the purpose, and the “mercies” granted to David were not realised under the Temple built by Solomon “the well beloved of the Lord” (2 Sam 12:24-25). A greater son of David would be required to see the matter through.

In Isaiah’s song, when we take into account the quality of the vine at the outset, the goodness of the soil, and the sun and sweet rain that God had lavished upon his vineyard, Isaiah asks the question what more could be done, than had been done??

If we fast forward to Luke 20:13 and the parable of the vineyard in the final week of the life of Jesus we get the answer. Jesus tells us that the Lord of the Vineyard said “I will send my beloved son”. But as the gospel record shows the gracious presence of Jesus only intensified the malignity of the wicked husbandmen, and so it was that the vineyard was given up to the burning in 70 CE.

Only when Jesus “the true vine” is planted in the earth, can the promise to David, or the oath to Abraham, be fully realised.

**Archaeology**

**J. Burke**

**Were camels domesticated in Abraham’s time?**

W. F. Albright, one of the most famous 20th century archaeologists, argued that the camel was not domesticated until around the 1st millennium, well after the time of Abraham.

**According to Albright, any mention of camels in the period of Abraham is a blatant anachronism**, the product of later priestly tampering with the earlier texts in order to bring more in line with altered social conditions.[[43]](#footnote-43)

This was considered persuasive by many Biblical scholars, who were convinced that references in Genesis to camels in Egypt during the time of Abraham[[44]](#footnote-44) are anachronistic.

**The almost unanimous opinion of Biblical scholars** is that mention of domesticated camels in the Patriarchal narratives (Gn 12:16; 24:10; 30:43) **constitutes an anachronism**. Camels, they say, were not domesticated until late in the second millennium BC, **centuries after the Patriarchs were supposed to have lived**.[[45]](#footnote-45)

**Evidence for domestication**

Some evidence alleged for very early camel use in Mesopotamia has proved dubious.[[46]](#footnote-46) Evidence for camel domestication reported by the French archaeologist Petrie in 1907dates to the Ramesside era in Egypt (1292-1069 BCE), still too late for Abraham (from around 1900 BCE), though significantly earlier than Albright’s date.

**The pottery figure of a camel laden with water-jars** was found in a tomb of the XIXth dynasty in the northern cemetery. There were no traces of a later re-use of the tomb; **the style of the figure is of the rough fingered pottery of the XIXth dynasty**, and quite unlike any of the moulded Roman figures; and the water-jar, is of the XIVIIIth-XIXth dynasty type and not of a form used in Greek or Roman times. **Hence it is impossible to assign this to the age when the camel is familiar in Egypt**, and it shows that **as early as Ramesside times** it was sufficiently common to be used **as a beast of burden**.[[47]](#footnote-47)

Evidence for early camel domestication elsewhere in the Ancient Near East and North Africa is well documented, and has been used to defend the Genesis account.

Camels are *not* anachronistic in the early second millennium BC, **but find only sparing attestation and use both in Genesis and external sources** then and until the twelfth century BC.[[48]](#footnote-48)

Both the dromedary (the one-humped camel of Arabia) and the Bactrian camel (the two-humped camel of Central Asia) **had been domesticated since before 2000 BC**. [[49]](#footnote-49)

Excavations in eastern Arabia, an area once believed to be a cultural backwater unworthy of archaeological investigation**, have turned up evidence that camels were first domesticated by Semites before the time of Abraham**. Much of this evidence has been examined by M. C. A. MacDonald of the Oriental Faculty at the University of Oxford.[[50]](#footnote-50)

It is recognized domesticated camel caravans must have passed through Egypt at an early date, even though the Egyptians made no reference to them at this time.

In view of the very early caravan links between Arabia and the Nile Valley, **it would be very surprising if the camel had not reached Egypt before the first millennium BC**; doubtless there **were religious reasons for the lack of representations of this animal earlier than this**. Camels could have been first introduced to Egypt from 1680 BC by the invading Hyksos, **but it is not until the end of the second millennium that references to them begin to be found**… [[51]](#footnote-51)

Bulliet observes that evidence for the early domestication of the camel in Mesopotamia cannot be ignored on the basis of their absence in Egyptian evidence.[[52]](#footnote-52) He agrees with Albright that evidence for Syrian domestic camel use during the 3rd to 2nd millennium is absent,[[53]](#footnote-53) and argues the undisputed evidence of their use elsewhere in Mesopotamia indicates they entered the area on a very small scale as pack animals by rich traders, rather than being herded in large numbers.

‘**In other words, the presence of camels in the Abraham story can be defended** and the story treated as primary evidence of camel use without disputing Albright's contention that camel-breeding nomads did not exist in Syria and northern Arabia at that time.’[[54]](#footnote-54)

**Conclusion**

Firm evidence for very early camel domestication in Egypt[[55]](#footnote-55) [[56]](#footnote-56) has caused some scholars to reconsider the Biblical narrative.

However, there is now a growing body of scholars who believe that **camel domestication must have occurred earlier than previously thought** (prior to the 12th century BC) **and that the patriarchal narratives accurately reflect this** (e.g., Ripinsky 1984; Coote and Whitelam 1987: 102; Zarins 1992: 826; Borowski 1998: 112–18).[[57]](#footnote-57)
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**1 Kgs 13:1-3 – AP**

Conservative and critical commentators read prophecies anachronistically. They see the ‘fulfilment’ in later Biblical history and read it back into the prophecy. They see in 1 Kgs 13:1-3 a prophecy about a future king, Josiah, and they correlate this prophecy with the later birth of a descendent of David who was named ‘Josiah’ – some 300 or so years later. Bible critics dismiss such a prophecy as a later interpolation into the text; conservative commentators accept the prophecy as proof of prophetic inspiration.

The critic is incredulous because s/he believes prophets prophesy relevant things to their own generation. The conservative response is that divine inspiration means a prophet can prophesy long range events. Both stances are making the same mistake and this is the mistake of letting the later ‘fulfilment’ control the reading.

The mistake is easily seen in the case of the critic. S/he needs to ask whether a prophet could have uttered what he did at the time. The simple answer is: Yes. He prophesies a future king who will destroy Bethel. In the politics of the day and compared to what we know about Near Eastern prophecy, the speech act of the prophet is unexceptionable and this is precisely because it has no time reference. When it was uttered, its fulfillment could have been as soon as the next king on the throne of David. His listeners would have had no other expectation and no conception of the actual time for fulfillment in the purpose of God. The fact that the prophet names the son is no problem. It’s a perfectly good Hebrew name for a future king. The prophecy is couched in the right way: ‘a child shall be born’.

The conservative commentator makes the same mistake when s/he defends this Bible text by an appeal to divine inspiration. The actual fulfillment is not the problem to be explained. There is in fact no problem for an appeal to divine inspiration to address. The prophecy is entirely plausible in its historical context. The fact that it was not made true for 300 years has nothing to do with the historical veracity of the prophecy.

We are making a point of logic. Another example of this mistake is the example of the Cyrus oracles which are often compared to this prophecy about Josiah.[[58]](#footnote-58) The fact that the Cyrus oracles were not fulfilled for 150 years is irrelevant to their historical veracity as prophecies by Isaiah of Jerusalem. All that is relevant to this question is how the Cyrus oracles *would have made sense* to the Jerusalem of Isaiah’s day. On this, Ken Kitchen makes the point that because there is a known Cyrus of Parsua from 646, fifty years after Isaiah,

…there is nothing untoward in an Isaiah being moved to proclaim that a ‘Cyrus’ (identity of his kingdom not stated) would reach power and free Hebrew captives in Babylon (whether of Merodach-Baladan’s time or indefinitely later). His prophecy was to be fulfilled, as we know now, but we in hindsight know more now than he personally ever did—simply because that hindsight has been gifted to us by our living in a much later day.[[59]](#footnote-59)

The historical veracity of the Cyrus prophecy vis-à-vis Isaiah of Jerusalem has nothing to do with our hindsight, to use Kitchen’s term; it only has to do with whether it was plausible for Isaiah to have uttered it in the Jerusalem of his day. Given the documented alliance of Elam and Babylon in Isaiah’s day, it is no coincidence that a Cyrus prince should have been mentioned in the context of the visit of the Babylonian princes to Hezekiah.

**Job 2:9 – AP**

The narrative function of Job’s wife is to pick up on the conversation between God and the Satan. She reproduces the words of God’s claim about Job that ‘he still held fast to his integrity’ (Job 2:3) by asking Job, ‘Do you still hold fast to your integrity?’ And she reproduces the challenge of the Satan that Job would ‘curse’ God when she says to Job that he should ‘curse God and die’. Her choice of words is the same and this tells the reader that her role is comparable to that of the Satan, a role that is hostile to Job. She is not playing the part of a character who is offering a fresh feminine insight or intuition (it is not a model of husband-wife relations)—she is merely repeating what the narrator has already set up in the dynamics of the story.

The reason for her rhetorically asking why Job *still* held fast to his integrity is the same one that underlies God’s earlier claim: in the face of the first cycle of disasters to befall Job, he *still* held fast to his integrity and did not curse God (Job 2:3); likewise, in the face of the second cycle (the affliction of his body), Job *still* held fast to his integrity—and he does not follow her direction and then curse God.

In terms of the dynamic of the narrative, Job’s integrity is defined as (a) not cursing God as the Satan expected and, instead, (b) demonstrating the qualities that God had predicated of him: “a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil” (Job 1:8).

Throughout the rest of the book, in the dialogue, Job continues to hold fast to his integrity (Job 27:5; 31:6). If he did not do so, he would prove the Satan’s case and make God’s first judgment about him to be a lie. We should not criticize Job for maintaining what God has said about him. Equally, we should not exonerate Job’s wife. Her narrative role is that of a flat one-dimensional character to prompt Job’s verbal response to the second cycle of affliction; this second response balances his earlier verbal response to the first cycle of disasters that befell him (Job 1:21; 2:10). Job’s assessment of his wife was that she was ‘foolish’ and the narrator’s evaluation of Job is that he ‘did not sin with his lips’ (Job 2:10).

**News Snippet**: In the last three years, the most accessed article online in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* was G. A. Barton “The Origin of the Names of Angels and Demons in the Extra-Canonical Literature to 100 AD” published in 1912. No doubt this is a testament to Dan Brown.

**News**

The book ***Reasons*** has sold well from off the LULU website now and has had a positive reception in the community. The Hong Kong ecclesia is sponsoring a Chinese language translation for use in preaching. All matters relating to this project are being handled by the ecclesia and we will keep you updated on its progress. A sequel to ***Reasons*** is to be produced, God-willing, called ***More Reasons***. It will continue in the mould set by the first volume, presenting additional reasons to be believe in God, Jesus and the Bible. Topics covered will include evolution, design, inspiration, other holy books, and religious experience. As before, this is collaborative project involving Christadelphians from around the world. We hope and pray that God will bless our efforts as we continue to respond to the challenges of increasingly secular world. The book ***One God, the Father***, was published in January 2013; (£8.99, 310 pages, www.lulu.com/willowpublications). It is a collection of 16 essays on this distinguishing doctrine as it is laid out in the OT and reinforced in the NT; how it has been held down the ages by various individuals and groups; and how it impacts on our understanding of Christ, the atonement and the question of worship and prayer to Jesus. It comprises,

**PART ONE: THE BIBLE**

One God: The Shema in the Old and New Testament (J. Adey)

Jewish Monotheism in the First Century (A. Perry)

Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels (P. Heavyside)

Jesus in John’s Writings (P. Wyns)

Jesus and Paul: A Summary of Pauline Christology (J. Thorpe)

The Holy Spirit (M. Allfree)

**PART TWO: HISTORY**

After the Apostles (T. Gaston)

The Trinity in the Fourth Century (D. Burke)

Before the Reformation: Medieval Christianity (K. Stewart)

Biblical Monotheism in the Radical Reformation (J. Andrews)

Antitrinitarian Textual Criticism in Early Modern Europe (S. Snobelen)

Biblical Monotheism in the Nineteenth Century (A. Wilson)

Biblical Monotheism Today (R. Hyndman)

**PART THREE: DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE**

Manifestation or Incarnation? (A. Perry)

Monotheism and the Atonement (R. Benson)

Worship, Prayer and Jesus (M. Morris)

**Postscript**

**Desert Island Books**

**T. Gaston**

In a strange twist of fate, another contributor to the *EJournal* finds himself marooned upon a desert island. Is this just unwelcome coincidence or is this judgment upon the material put out by that publication? Whatever the case, I find myself cut off from my television and my fridge by mile upon mile of ocean. One welcome accident of fortune is that I find myself stranded upon a different (and somewhat nicer) island than those currently inhabited by the other editors – finally I will be spared their writing.

As a consequence of yet another bizarre ball-fall of the roulette wheel of life I find that, despite having only packed my toothbrush and a pair of speedos, I have been washed up upon the shore with the very eight books that I would have wished to bring had I prognosticated my fate. Due to this fortuitous, and clichéd, convenience I can leave ignoble distractions of gathering food, building shelter and designing an escape raft to Man Friday, and continue the indispensable activity of writing for the *EJournal.* (I have decided that I shall dictate my articles *verbatim* to one of the parrots native to my tropical habitation, which will then travel to the neighbouring islands to regurgitate these words to the other editors).

The eight precious tomes, each preciously wrapped and stowed in a reed-basket, that are my fellow maroonees are as follows:

Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006). One of the most important works in recent gospel scholarship restores the role of testimony to our conception of gospels. Whatever else the gospels were to become, they are the preserved memories of those who walked and talked with Jesus. The detailed textual, historical and sociological analysis that Bauckham brings to bear upon his subject have implications for future study.

Kenneth A. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003). On many topics bible students are indebted to those of other disciplines for the light that they shed on the Scriptures. When much of Old Testament scholarship has followed the false trails plotted by the nineteenth century higher critics, it is refreshing to read from someone who actually pursued detailed historical research before attempting to pronounce on history. Kitchen does what few others could have achieved, encompassing hundreds of years of biblical history and numerous civilizations in one book.

James F. Sennett (editor), *The Analytic Theist: An Alvin Plantinga Reader* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). If you are limited in the number of books you take then best take a reader, and if you’re going to pick one Christian philosopher then best make it (arguably) the most influential Christian philosopher of the twentieth century. From his early work on God and other minds to his more recent work on epistemology, Alvin Plantinga has both challenged atheist orthodoxies and revived ancient theistic defences. This reader gives a representative sample of some of his most important work.

Sidney P. Clementson, *The Day Approaches* (Crawley: P. Hawkins, 1962). How one can pick just one work on Revelation, I don’t know; Christadelphian literature on the last book of the Bible dwarves any other topic. But if pressed, why not select one that is imaginative, creative and engaging. Lay aside the fact that it is probable wrong in most important respects, and relish in the joy of reading a bible student who was not afraid to contradict his own published views (see his *The End of Time*).

Edgar Andrews, *Who Made God?* (Darlington: EP Books, 2009). For the sake of Man Friday, it is important to have a work of Christian apologetics. Preferably one that is accessible, readable, entertaining but nevertheless robust. This Emeritus Professor of Materials takes his reader from the beginning of the universe, through the origin of life, to God’s ultimate purpose with mankind, leaving the reader prepared to start thinking about religion proper—wittier, and less whiny, than many apologists.

James D. G. Dunn, *Did the first Christians worship Jesus?* (London: SPCK, 2010). Anyone interested in New Testament scholarship will probably want some by Durham’s Emeritus Professor of Divinity but, given some recent works are thicker than breeze block, one will need to be selective. But this book is less than 200 pages and has the added advantage of being right. This pithy riposte to the Trinitarian (well, binitarian) conclusions of Bauckham and Hurtado is a valuable contribution, particularly for non-Trinitarian scholars.

Paul Launchbury, *Beyond Our Time* (New Barnet: The Epsis Consultancy, 1995). It is good to be challenged from time to time to think outside the box, and this is, perhaps, one of the most interesting out-of-box books produced by our community. Launchbury’s hypothesis – that the Kingdom exists outside time and so its citizens can interact with our timeline – is more philosophically problematic than he acknowledges but his approach is biblical and engaging. Far more profitable than embarrassing myself on Man Friday’s newly constructed volleyball court.

Harry Whittaker, *Reformation* (Cannock: Biblia, 1985). The works of Harry Whittaker are innovative, thorough and come in abundance. They are also periodically wrong. But if there is one book that all Christadelphians should read it is his *Reformation.* These thirty-four short essays are poignant and challenging: A useful reminder that the bible is more than bible scholarship.

**Supplement**

**Septuagint Debate**

**Did the Apostles use the Septuagint?**

**P. Wyns**

**Introduction**

A previous EJournal article on this topic questioned the validity of the LXX as an apostolic source[[60]](#footnote-60) and reflected on the ‘uninspired’ nature of the Greek LXX translation in comparison to the ‘inspired’ Hebrew and employed the example of Peter’s first epistle to highlight methodological flaws in determining quotation sources or translation issues. Many of the points raised in the article are valid but we should be careful not to ‘throw out the baby with the bathwater’ and emotive language such as ‘inspired’ or ‘uninspired’ tends to cloud/close the issue; after all, the Apostles were ‘inspired’ and if they chose to employ a certain translation, then who are we to second-guess their intentions?

**What Bible did the Apostles have?**

We know they didn’t have a Hebrew MT or a Greek LXX! The Hebrew MT (we use the term loosely as it also contains Aramaic) was finalized roughly 900 years after Christ. The LXX or, more accurately, the LXX/OG[[61]](#footnote-61) is a collection of different Greek writings that was also still being ‘standardized’[[62]](#footnote-62) (like the Hebrew Bible) during the apostolic period. That does not mean that sections of the LXX/OG did not exist or that sections of a ‘proto-MT’ did not exist during that period—but rather the ‘standardization’ process was still ongoing. However, certain writings *were considered sacred* (this is confirmed by Josephus)[[63]](#footnote-63) but ‘standardization’ of the text is not the same as ‘finalization’ and ‘canonization’.[[64]](#footnote-64) E. J. Bickerman observes that,

The Hebrew consonantal text[[65]](#footnote-65) was not frozen until sometime toward 100 CE, but once it was accepted as authoritative, all scrolls deviating from the standard recension were suppressed by the rabbinic authorities. Divergent manuscripts of the Septuagint, however, continued to circulate freely. Around 90 C.E., Josephus, in his paraphrase of pseudo-Aristeas, suggests that his readers ‘amend’ any text of the Septuagint manuscript that they possess if they find any addition or omission there.[[66]](#footnote-66)

However, this suppression of alternative versions was not as thorough as one might imagine since, as E. Tov points out, the Hebrew exemplar that Aquila used for his very literal LXX revision was only “very close to the proto-Masoretic text”.[[67]](#footnote-67) There was therefore an ongoing effort to ‘standardize’ the various texts (Hebrew as well as Greek translations) in the direction of a ‘proto-MT’, but at the end of the first century variations still existed. Moreover, the LXX/OG was often employed by Christians in Jewish-Christian polemics and Tov remarks that the Jews employed the drive to ‘standardize’ the texts as an opportunity to revise any Greek texts that gave Christians a polemical advantage:

Apparently Aquila made a special effort to replace renditions which had become ‘Christian’ terms. Thus the translation of *mascah* (christos) was replaced with *aleimmenos*. Partly because of this, his translation was well-liked among Jews, while avoided by Christians.[[68]](#footnote-68)

We might give as an example the LXX version of Jeremiah which is much shorter than the MT version. But here is the rub—shorter *Hebrew* versions of Jeremiah also existed in the first century.[[69]](#footnote-69) So, the LXX translator probably only had a shorter Hebrew version from which to work. Even in the Hebrew writings of that period there was considerable variation, although it must be said that their resemblance to the final form of the MT (as attested by the *DSS*) is very close. The Apostles had to make an informed choice which version to select, and this was obviously influenced by their theology. Who could be more suited to the task than an inspired Apostle! The Apostles did not have a “Bible” but a loose collection of sacred writings (Hebrew *and* Greek) from which they selected their texts and there was still a certain measure of “textual fluidity” during this period.

**Kyrios**

Some Greek manuscripts contain a space where the ‘name’ should be or a transliterated form of the ‘name’ or simply the Hebrew tetragram. J. Adey argues that the LXX choice of *kyrios* (‘Lord’) to translate the tetragram has been “attributed with little demur to revisionary work in the LXX in the light of the NT” by scholars such as J. A. Fitzmyer.[[70]](#footnote-70) However, a number of recent studies have appeared since the work done in 1979 by Fitzmyer that challenge this conclusion.

Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox demonstrate that that in the original translation of the Pentateuch[[71]](#footnote-71) the divine name was rendered *kyrios*, and that its replacement with the tetragram in a few Greek manuscripts reflects an “archaizing tendency”.[[72]](#footnote-72) In view of the fact that a few early Greek manuscripts contain some form or other of the tetragram rather than *kyrios*, Pietersma comments,

What we have tried to do thus far in our survey is to emphasize that of the four early texts that have been cited in support of an original tetragram, one gives no evidence at all, a second is non-Septuagintal, and a third contains hebraizing revisions (including at least one instance of the tetragram). Only one text, 4QLXXLevb, would seem to have good credentials as a typical exemplar of the LXX.[[73]](#footnote-73)

Even in the few Greek texts where the tetragram is encountered it was probably read aloud as *kyrios* (Lord) because of the Jewish reluctance to pronounce the divine name. If, as seems likely, *kyrios* was the original form found in the Septuagint then the direction of influence was from the LXX towards the Christian writings. It would make sense for the Apostles to adopt the most commonly used practices when writing to the Greek speaking *Diaspora* and if the *Diaspora* was used to reading and/or pronouncing *kyrios* instead of the tetragram in their Scriptures, then that is what the Apostles would have employed.

**How do we determine if a quote is from the LXX?**

Adey rightly points out methodological flaws in determining whether or not the NT is quoting or echoing the LXX. A translator only has a certain number of words to select from; so, if for example I had to translate the phrase, “The car is red” into Dutch, and someone else had to translate the same phrase, the likelihood is that our translation would be exactly the same. This does not mean that one translator is ‘quoting’ the other – the translation choice is limited and therefore the outcome would be (independently) the same. So, did the apostles make their own translation from the Hebrew directly into the Greek (and sometimes hit on exactly the same translation as the LXX/OG)?

The answer to this is probably yes…sometimes…but—not always. There are many instances when the NT ‘quote’ differs from *both* the Hebrew (proto-MT) *and* the Greek (LXX/OG). In this case the apostle is either employing his own free translation/paraphrase (to suit his theology) or is translating from, or using a document (a textual variant either Greek or Semitic) that we no longer have.

The whole issue of ‘**translation technique**’(TT) comes into question at this point, with matters concerning literal (formal) and dynamic equivalence requiring discussion. A literal translation is one that can be translated directly back to the original language without loss of meaning. However, attempts that were made to translate the Hebrew ‘literally’ into Greek were a failure because things like word order, syntax, figures of speech and idioms could only be replicated at the cost of making the text unintelligible. So, dynamic translations are not necessarily inferior to literal translations, provided they are done with integrity. There are bad literal translations *and* bad dynamic translations, but there are also good examples of different TT.

R. T. McLay has established a set of criteria for analyzing citations[[74]](#footnote-74) which should help alleviate methodological flaws:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Compare the NT text to the OG.
 |  |
|  If they are different: | If they are the same: |
|  Proceed to step 2 | On the basis of TT determine whether the agreement is distinctive within the Greek text or whether the NT writer could have translated a Semitic text (step 3) |
| 1. Compare the text to the known evidence from other Greek texts and sources such as the versions.
 |
|  If they are different: | If they are the same: |
|  Proceed to step 3 | On the basis of TT determine whether the agreement is distinctive within the Greek texts or whether the NT writer could have translated a Semitic text. |
| 1. Compare the text to the MT. Form an initial opinion as to whether the NT text is based on a Semitic *Vorlage*[[75]](#footnote-75) like the MT.
 |
| 1. Compare the text to other Semitic sources. If there are alternative readings in any of these sources, analyze them to discern if they are related to the NT citation.
 |
|  If they are not: | If they are: |
|  Proceed to step 5 | Determine whether the NT citation is based on a *Vorlage* similar to this text. |
| 1. Examine the NT citation to determine whether any of the differences from all the texts surveyed may be explained by adjustments that the NT writer has introduced due to the context. They may range from minor grammatical alterations to larger changes such as adding or omitting words for theological reasons.
 |
| 1. Ensure that all possible sources for the citation have been examined. Is it possible that the citation reflects influence from a related biblical or nonbiblical text?
 |
| 1. Are there any remaining questions or issues that cannot be resolved on the basis of the available textual evidence?
 |

One of the examples employed by McLay is 1 Pet 1:24-25; he lines up the following textual variants:[[76]](#footnote-76)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NT 1 Pet 1:24-25 | OG Isa. 40:6-7 | 1QIsaa 40:6-7 | MT Isa. 40:6-8 |
| All flesh is like grass,and all its glory | All peopleare grass,and allthe glory ofhumanity. | All peopleare grass;theirconstancy | All peopleare grass;theirconstancy[[77]](#footnote-77) |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NT 1 Pet 1:24-25 | OG Isa. 40:6-7 | 1QIsaa 40:6-7 | MT Isa. 40:6-8 |
| like the flower of grass. | like the flower of grass. | is like the flower of the field. | is like the flower of the field. |
| The grass withers,and the flowerfalls, | The grass withers,and the flowerfalls, | The grass withers,the flower fades, | The grass withers,the flower fades, |
|  |  |  | when the breathof the Lordblows upon it;surely the peopleare grass.The grass withers,the flower fades; |
| but the wordof the Lordenduresforever. | but the wordof our Godenduresforever. | but the wordof our Godwill standforever. | but the wordof our Godwill standforever. |

McLay follows the textual comparison with a discussion, but we will only reproduce his introductory remark as our conclusion:

Our first observation is that the reading in 1 Peter has only a few minor variants and is fairly similar to the OG, which is closer to the shorter reading in the Qumran manuscript *1QIsaa* than to that in the MT.[[78]](#footnote-78)

Adey proposes that reference to Peter’s and John’s “ignorance” (Acts 4:13) could imply that, unlike the scribes, Peter was uninitiated in use of the LXX/OG. However, this need not be the case, it can mean that he was uninitiated in the art of rabbinic rhetoric—simply speaking, he was not a ‘trained theologian’. As far as his much later writing is concerned, the relevance of Acts is diminished.

There are distinct traces of Semitic features in 1 Peter:

In 1 Peter this abundance of diverse tradition has been skilfully integrated in a composition consistent in style and coherent in theme. The letter was written in a polished Greek revealing numerous traces of literary refinement. The near-classical employment of the article and exact use of tenses is coupled with a more Semiticappreciation of rhythm and parallelism (2:14, 22-23; 3:18; 4:6, 11; 5:2-3).[[79]](#footnote-79)

 But elements of Greek style are quite easily explained by the use of an amanuensis:

Silvanus (the full Roman name for which the similar name Silas served as a short equivalent) appears to have been the amanuensis, or scribe. Most letters were written through the agency of scribes. As a Roman citizen (Acts 16:37), Silas presumably came from a fairly well-to-do Jewish family that provided him a good literary and rhetorical education; Peter may have given him some degree of freedom in wording the letter.[[80]](#footnote-80)

That Peter would have used others (Silas may only have been the letter *carrier*, as in the letters of Ignatius) is highly likely anyway:

If 1 Peter is, as it appears to be, an encyclical on behalf of the church at Rome to a wide circle of churches on the frontiers of the Roman Empire in five provinces of Asia Minor, then the author would likely have had scribal help with vocabulary and style, and his helpers would likely have remained anonymous.[[81]](#footnote-81)

Secretaries often had commission to improve upon matters of style:

The author could permit the secretary to make minor changes in the form or content of the letter when preparing the final text from the rough dictation copy or from a preliminary draft prepared by the author himself...The implication is that it was part of Tiro’s function to correct slips made by Cicero and to ensure the accuracy of the finished work. In a word, he acted as a modern copy editor, who points out errors and asks if a particular formulation really conveys precisely what the author wanted to say...[[82]](#footnote-82)

So, the ‘ignorance’ or otherwise of Peter with regards to theological debate need not pertain to his later letters, especially when we consider that the remark in Acts 4:13 is intended to reflect the *opposite*, namely, that the authorities were astounded because these “unlearned and ignorant” men were able to match the best trained ‘theological experts’ in the land. Of course they were—because they had been with Jesus and were ‘taught of God’.

**The LXX/OG and Apostolic Theology**

A number of distinctive citations demonstrate that the apostles shaped at least some of their theology around the LXX/OG version(s) – this would be only natural as their *Diaspora* audience read the LXX; space permits us to discuss only a few examples:

(1)

Therefore, when he came into the world, he said: ‘Sacrifice and offering you did not desire, but a body you have prepared for me.’ (Heb 10:5)

The phrase “prepared a body” mirrors the LXX/OG reading, however, Adey suggests that this is due to revision and harmonisation of the LXX by *Christian* scribes[[83]](#footnote-83) and not a case of the NT citing the LXX version. I believe this is unlikely for a number of reasons, namely Jewish readers of the LXX/OG would have regarded this as ‘pious fraud’ and tampering with text(s) that were widely distributed and read by the *Diaspora*. There is no point quoting a ‘proof-text’ from the OT to further your argument if it is one you made up!

Further, the passage in Ps 40:6 is based on the manumission of a slave as described in Exod 21:4-6 where the ‘ear lobe’ was pierced through with an awl, thus attaching the ‘ear’ (lobe) to the doorframe of the sanctuary – a ceremony indicating that the person had voluntarily become a servant (slave) of God. How then do we account for the change from ‘ear (!z) piercing’ to ‘preparing a body’?

Interestingly, the word *gaph* (@n) occurs **only**[[84]](#footnote-84) in Exod 21:3-4. Of the Aramaic Targum version of this passage, I. Drazin says,

The Targum comments that it as an obscure noun. R. Akiba in Mek, Rava in b. Ked 20a, and Ibn Ezra, suggest a group *gwp*, “body.” If he comes with **his body** unimpaired, he shall leave unimpaired. The Targums and P explain the word as do R. Eleazar b. Yaakov in b. Ked. 20a and R. Ishmael in Mek. Tgs.[[85]](#footnote-85)

The Targums are late productions (second to fourth century A.D.) of what was transmitted orally (in the first century and long before)[[86]](#footnote-86) as an Aramaic interpretation /paraphrase of the Hebrew. Both *NIDOTTE[[87]](#footnote-87)* and *HALOT* give the meaning of *gaph* as ‘body’.

It seems that ‘body’ came to stand idiomatically for ‘slave’ (so this two letter word for body parallels the two letter word for ear and the ‘ear’ of the slave is idiomatically characterised by *synecdoches* as a “body”).

We find evidence of slaves idiomatically referred to as a “bodies” in the NT. For example, in Rev 18:13 the Greek word ‘body’ (sw/ma:*sōma*) is translated as either ‘slave’ (KJV) or ‘body’ (NKJV) and Paul uses the word sw/ma in his writings in the context of slavery (Rom 6:6; 7:24; 8:23; cf. Jude v. 9).

If this is the case then *preparing a ‘body’* is an idiomatic expression for the ceremony where a ‘slave’ is ‘prepared’ (made ready) to serve his master (voluntarily) *forever* by having his ear (body) attached to the sanctuary of the living God, but “he is free to leave with his body (and ear) unimpaired” if he so wishes.

It is not unfeasible that the route of this interpretive gloss originally came via orally transmitted Aramaic interpretations (cf. Neh 8:8) into the Greek LXX/OG from whence it was cited by the NT writer because the body/slave language was ideally suited to the ‘body’ of Christ (both in and individual and corporate sense) who voluntarily chose to serve God once they had been ‘liberated’ from the slavery of sin (once and for all…no more need for sacrifice).

(2)

Behold, the **virgin** shall be with child, and bear a Son, and they shall call his name Immanuel, which is translated, ‘God with us’. (Matt 1:23)

The Expositor’s Bible Commentary observes the following;

The LXX renders the word by *parthenos* which almost always means “virgin.” Yet even with this word there are exceptions: Genesis 34:4 refers to Dinah as a *parthenos* even though the previous verse makes it clear she is no longer a virgin. This sort of datum prompts C.H. Dodd (“New Testament Translation Problems I,” *The Bible Translator* 27 [1976]: 301-5, published posthumously) to suggest that *parthenos* means “young woman” even in Matthew 1:23 and Luke 1:27. This will not do; the overwhelming majority of the occurrences of *parthenos* in both biblical and profane Greek require the rendering “virgin”; and the unambiguous context of Matthew 1 (cf. vv. 16, 18, 20, 25) puts Matthew’s intent beyond dispute, as Jean Carmignac (The Meaning of *parthenos* in Luke 1. 27: A reply to C.H. Dodd, *The Bible Translator* 28 [1977]: 327-30) was quick to point out. If, unlike the LXX, the later (second century A.D.) Greek renderings of the Hebrew text of Isaiah 7:14 prefer *neanis* (“young woman”) to *parthenos* (so Aq., Symm., Theod.), we may legitimately suspect a conscious effort by the Jewish translators to avoid the Christian interpretation of Isaiah 7:14.[[88]](#footnote-88)

So the LXX/OG was revised, but not by Christians, *but by Greek Diaspora Jews* who did not like their own Greek Scriptures being used against them!

(3)

Jesus said to them, “Most assuredly, I say to you, before Abraham was, I AM”. (John 8:58)[[89]](#footnote-89)

The Fourth Gospel was written to Greek speaking Jews,[[90]](#footnote-90) the “other sheep” (John 10:16) symbolised by the ‘Greeks’ who approached Philip asking for an audience with Jesus (John 12:20-21). They had lost touch with the Aramaic language, so much so, that John thought it necessary to explain Aramaic terms and Hebraisms in his Gospel - John 1:38, “Rabbi” (which is to say, when translated, Teacher); John 1:41, “Messiah” (which is translated, the Christ); John 1:42, “Cephas” (which is translated, A Stone); and John 9:7, “Siloam” (which is translated, Sent).

These Greek *Diaspora* Jews would have regularly read or heard the LXX/OG version of the Pentateuch which had been circulating for centuries and the “I AM” of John 8:58 would resonate with them. The syntax of the phrase is unusual[[91]](#footnote-91) and it is only here (John 8:58) and in John 9:9 and 18:5 that the same syntax occurs, where “I am” is expressed in the absolute form (i.e., without the predicate). The Johannine ‘I AM’ (evgw, eivmi) rendering was influenced by the LXX translation of Exod 3:14 (evgw, eivmi) and although the present tense used by the LXX is not a grammatically correct translation of the Hebrew,[[92]](#footnote-92) the intent would be obvious enough to Greek readers especially as the original Hebrew verb *‘ehyeh* is a play on *Yahweh*. Moreover, for John’s purpose the present ‘I AM’ has the force of propinquity, rather than the ambiguous ‘I WILL BE’. It is no longer necessary to ask *who God will be* as the final revelation, as Jesus had arrived on the scene! That the Evangelist wishes to equate the ‘I AM’ with *Yahweh* is not in doubt as the utterance of the expression by Jesus at his arrest (John 18:5-6) causes the contingent of soldiers to fall to the ground. Jesus becomes a **manifestation of Yahweh** and the *healed blind man*, a symbol of the faith community who believed that Jesus was the messiah became **a manifestation** of the *works of Yahweh*. This is *Phanerosis* (fanerwqh/|) *theology* not the theology of incarnation and it is based on an apostolic reading of the OG Pentateuch!

...that the works of God should be made manifest (fanerwqh/|) in him. (John 9:3).

Christ could say; “I have manifested (VEfane,rwsa,) **your name** (i.e. Yahweh)” (John 17:6).

**Conclusion**

When citing Scripture, the NT writers employed translations from different Semitic versions including ‘proto-MT’. However, the NT writers (as well as the NT readers of the *Diaspora*) most certainly also employed the LXX/OG. The LXX/OG contains assorted material (as do the Semitic versions) of varying quality. Some of the material is apocryphal, midrashic, apocalyptic and/or eschatological and only useful from the viewpoint of socio-historical analysis. Other material is what we would call ‘scriptural’ and it is from this material that the Apostles selected texts. We are not arguing here for the ‘inspiration’ of the LXX/OG but simply stating that it was the prerogative of ‘inspired Apostles’ to select texts from version(s) that were well known and widely distributed among the Greek speaking *Diaspora*. [5111]

**Did the Spirit quote the Septuagint?**

**A. Perry**

**Introduction**

The study of the Septuagint is a specialist study within Biblical Studies, more so than other areas of the discipline like, say, ‘Pauline Studies’.[[93]](#footnote-93) The specialism requires fluency in Greek and Hebrew, knowledge of Linguistics and particularly translation theory, Textual Criticism, and Second Temple Judaism. Referencing the LXX in exegetical studies is something to be exercised with caution.

The consensus of NT scholars is that the apostles used the Septuagint. This generalisation is ubiquitous, **but** for any particular text, the judgments (especially in the research literature) are more tendentious. Scholars may disagree whether this or that text is dependent on the Septuagint. Another observation is that scholars conduct their analysis in human terms and considerations to do with inspiration are rare. Further, analysis tends to be focused on the text, rather on the apostle and what it means to say that they ‘used’ the Septuagint. This essay addresses these deficiencies.

The case made by Wyns is twofold: first, and primarily, the apostles had a loose collection of texts (Hebrew *and* Greek) and it would make sense to use the Septuagint when writing to the Greek-speaking Diaspora because that audience read the LXX; secondly, Wyns relies on correspondence between the Greek of the LXX and the NT text to affirm usage of the LXX. Our counter-argument will shift attention from audience to **author**, highlight any **lack of correspondence**, and suggest that distinctive corresponding theology in the LXX is the result of Christian scribes **harmonising the LXX** with the NT text.

**Distinctions**

There are many distinctions in terminology in Septuagint Research. If a recent ‘introduction’ to the Septuagint can comment, “The reader is cautioned, therefore, that there really is no such thing as the Septuagint”, and observe, “We have no evidence that any Greek version the Hebrew Bible, or even of the Pentateuch, was called the “Septuagint” prior to the second century of this era”,[[94]](#footnote-94) we should define our terms carefully. There is a danger of historical anachronism if we simply attribute usage of ‘the Septuagint’ to the apostles.

We use the term ‘Jewish Scriptures’ to refer to the writings held to be Scripture by Jews in Jesus’ day regardless of language. The writings might have varied for the sects of Judaism as might have the language (witness the DSS). We use the term ‘Hebrew Scriptures’ to refer to the consonantal Masoretic text insofar as that represents the standard text of the Jewish Scriptures in Hebrew in Jesus’ day. In recent decades, ‘Old Greek’ (OG) has become common to refer to the *original* translation of a book into Greek with ‘Septuagint’ a more general term for the Jewish Scriptures in Greek in the Second Temple era and later by the Christian Church.[[95]](#footnote-95)

Accordingly, we take ‘the Septuagint’ to be a textual historian’s term of art for the Jewish Scriptures in Greek in the Second Temple period, a term taken from later centuries and applied earlier in full knowledge of the anachronism. Thus, the issue under debate is not terminological, but for greater accuracy, we will often use the phrase ‘Jewish Scriptures in Greek’ rather than ‘the Septuagint’. Correspondingly, we will not retroject the term ‘Masoretic’ back into the Second Temple period using the idea of a ‘proto-MT’. This term comes with too much baggage for our purposes; we will simply talk of the ‘Jewish Scriptures in Hebrew’.

**Multi-Lingualism**

The contended evidence as to whether the apostles actually used the Septuagint (or not) lies in their writings. But their quotation of the Jewish Scriptures, their allusions and echoes, is such that there is **variation and agreement** from both the Hebrew *and* Greek of the Jewish Scriptures insofar as we have them in our critical editions. Thus, it isn’t a simple matter of observing correspondence in Greek between the NT and the OT in order to conclude that we have use of the Septuagint. The only course of action is to take a writer or a book or a text and consider this question in detail for the actual words, phrases and syntax.

There are some preliminary considerations before looking at texts. Galilee was a multi-lingual environment with Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew spoken. Given the affinity of Aramaic and Hebrew, it is not implausible to hypothesize that the writing disciples were to some extent tri-lingual (traditionally,[[96]](#footnote-96) Matthew, Peter, John, James, and Jude; John 5:2; 19:13, 17, 20). Further, because of his Pharisaic education, it is not implausible that Paul of Tarsus was tri-lingual (Acts 21:40; 22:6; 26:14). Traditionally, Luke has been taken to be a Gentile (Col 4:11, 14) and of Asia Minor (Acts 16:10); this would favour his first language being Greek, but the literary Greek of Luke-Acts betrays Semitic influences that allows us to infer Luke was tri-lingual (Luke 23:38). The point here is that we are dealing with (a) five Galileans and their knowledge (or not) of the Septuagint; and (b) a Diasporan Jew and a Gentile.

S. Freyne observes that “the evidence from inscriptions and other indicators suggests that a pattern of *diglossia*, and possibly *triglossia* (Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek) operated” in Galilee.[[97]](#footnote-97) J. L. Reed observes,

There is no doubt that the urban elites in Sepphoris[[98]](#footnote-98) were more Hellenized than rural Galileans. Much of their life functioned in Greek and they were likely at ease in a bilingual atmosphere, whereas rural areas tended to be pronouncedly Aramaic.[[99]](#footnote-99)

Galilee was a small area and the disciples were probably all rural—Greek and Aramaic bilingualism to some extent need not be doubted. However, the quality of some of the disciples’ Greek would have been limited compared to their Aramaic. We can see this later in the relative quality of, say, the Greek of Mark; but more generally, the evidence suggests that Greek would be more common for commerce and perhaps more widely known among the upper classes, while Aramaic was the language of the common man; inscriptional evidence suggests more Greek used in Lower Galilee than in Upper Galilee and in Judea.[[100]](#footnote-100) The point here is that disciples like Peter and John likely had relatively poor knowledge of Greek. This observation impacts what we might say of their exposure to (or use of) the Jewish Greek Scriptures—for them it would have been the Jewish Scriptures in Hebrew. It also places a question mark over their later *expositional* use of the Septuagint, which we might reasonably say requires a good level of Greek. Of course, this point does not apply to Luke or Paul, but this only goes to show that the likelihood of whether the apostles used the Septuagint is not to be equally distributed among them.

What of Hebrew? P. J. Tomson, noting that the characteristic Qumran documents are in Hebrew, as well as other popular literature like *Jubilees*, *The Apocalypse of Enoch* and *The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira*, and that Hebrew has been found in ordinary and government correspondence, observes that “multilingualism must be constantly kept in mind as the ancient Jewish and Jewish-Christian documents are interpreted”.[[101]](#footnote-101) Certainly, as any ‘Introduction’ to Aramaic will show,[[102]](#footnote-102) the similarities between Hebrew and Aramaic are such as to make the understanding of Hebrew easy for devout Aramaic-speaking Jews in Jesus’ day. Hebrew may well have been the first language for many, and for many the distinction between Aramaic and Hebrew might not have been any barrier for them.[[103]](#footnote-103) The relative distribution of Hebrew and Aramaic is not our concern here; our point is the minimal one made by M. Hengel, who observes that Hebrew was “the sacred language of religious worship and of scribal discussion” in Judea and Galilee.[[104]](#footnote-104) His point about **scribal discussion** is important but Tomson adjusts Hengel’s historical judgment when he notes that with the displacement of the Jews after AD70, Hebrew eventually became limited to prayers, scholarly discussions and the rabbinical literature.[[105]](#footnote-105) The two great centres of Rabbinic Judaism were to be Palestine and Babylon precisely because of the affinity of Hebrew and Aramaic.[[106]](#footnote-106)

If we assume that the disciples were ordinary working individuals until their calling by Jesus, we can presume that they were multilingual to some extent and that any exposure to the Jewish Greek and Hebrew Scriptures would have been through Synagogue (Luke 4:17; Josephus, *Apion* 2.175; Philo *Mos*. 2.216).[[107]](#footnote-107) We may suppose that there were Greek speaking synagogues as well as Aramaic and Hebrew speaking ones in Galilee and we have no reason to deny that both Greek and Hebrew Scriptures were in use for their respective types of Synagogue. The disciples may have been exposed to both Scriptures but obviously we have no knowledge of their lives before they met Jesus: however, the probability is that insofar as the disciples were likely rural labourers and tradesmen, their exposure to Scripture would have been in Hebrew with Aramaic and/or Hebrew commentary (following Neh 8:8). G. F. Moore comments,

In the Palestinian synagogues the lessons were read in Hebrew, and an interpreter standing beside the reader translated them into Aramaic.[[108]](#footnote-108)

However, in addition, for the disciples, if ‘scribal discussion’ of Scripture was in Hebrew, we may infer that beginning with their following of Jesus the Rabbi (Mark 9:5; John 3:2), **he discussed the Scriptures with them with reference to the Hebrew** (Acts 26:14); and as we shall argue below, an authority attached to the Jewish Scriptures in Hebrew that did not attach to the Greek.

Peter and John were uneducated and laymen and they surprised the council of rulers, elders and scribes, with their use of Scripture; but the leaders of the people perceived that they had been with Jesus (Acts 4:13) and this explained their competence. This comment of the narrator does not allow us to exclude any particular knowledge on the part of Peter and John; it does allow us to conclude that Jesus had taught his disciples in how to interpret Scripture. The Scriptures that Jesus used in exposition would have been their model, particularly for conflict and discussion with those who were learned in Scripture. If, in Judea and Galilee, Hebrew was used for scribal discussion, then our best presumption is that Jesus taught his disciples in this way.[[109]](#footnote-109)

A **Hebrew exemplar**[[110]](#footnote-110) is the most likely text for Jesus’ view that “Scripture cannot be broken” (John 10:35). An interesting incidental confirmation of this can be seen in how Jesus addresses such groups as the Pharisees, Sadducees and Scribes. He expects Jewish teachers to have *read* the Scriptures: ‘Have you never read’; but the crowds are addressed with ‘Ye have *heard* it said…’ The point here is that Jesus regards the role of a teacher as one which would have required a grounding in the *close reading* of Scripture not just hearing it read aloud at Synagogue. Close reading and discussion/debate over the text presupposes that society has a fairly fixed text; otherwise, Jesus would not have made the parenthetical remark about ‘breaking’ Scripture.

The purpose of this preliminary discussion is to establish the likely competency of the apostles in Greek on the basis of general considerations, given that we have none of their biographies. This is important because the main problem we will encounter in Wyns’ ‘distinctive’ textual evidence, considering whether the apostles used the Septuagint, is **the direction of conformity**: does this or that text show the apostle used the Septuagint, or has the Septuagint been aligned with the NT text in the course of its copying by Christian scribes?[[111]](#footnote-111)

Paul, Luke and James have the best literary Greek; we can reasonably suppose they had knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures in Greek. They are part of the literary co-text and part of the general influence on them as writers. Matthew, Peter, Jude and John have poorer literary Greek but it varies by writing. A. J. Tomasino comments that “the life of a Galilean peasant would not have been conducive to deep study and mastery of a difficult foreign tongue”.[[112]](#footnote-112) In terms of their writing Greek in later life, it is possible that they had help. According to Josephus, the Jews of his class did not value language learning (*Ant*. 20:263) and he himself employed Greek translators to assist him in his work (*Ap*. 1:50). His first edition of the *War of the Jews* was in Hebrew.

Papias records of Matthew, “So then, Matthew compiled the oracles in the Hebrew language; but everyone interpreted them as he was able” (*HE* 3.39.16).[[113]](#footnote-113) The presence of Aramaic and Hebrew behind the composition of the Gospels and Acts is also shown in the classic studies of Max Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* and Max Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*,[[114]](#footnote-114) even if such studies are hypothetical (being based on the later Aramaic of the Targums). Scholars have long discussed how the Gospel message moved from an Aramaic and Hebrew oral background to a written Greek record. This discussion is not our focus; our point is simply that the disciples were likely **not brought up with much exposure to the Jewish Greek Scriptures**.

Paul’s Pharisaic training in Jerusalem is important for deciding the relative value he placed on the Jewish Greek and Hebrew Scriptures. Acts states that he was brought up at the feet of Rabbi Gamaliel “and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers” (Acts 22:3; Phil 3:5). S. Moyise comments, “If the tradition about Gamaliel is correct, he would have known the Hebrew scrolls in use in Jerusalem and perhaps the LXX scrolls from Tarsus”.[[115]](#footnote-115) Moyise goes on to ask, “So when Paul introduces a phrase or sentence with an introductory formula (IF) such as ‘it is written’, we have to ask ourselves which version of the Scriptures he has in mind”.[[116]](#footnote-116) Moyise’ statement carries an assumption that Paul regards the Hebrew and Greek as equally ‘Scripture’; this is unlikely—Paul would have recognised the distinction between the Hebrew original and the Greek translation. Paul’s concept of ‘Scripture’ is that it is ‘given by inspiration’ (2 Tim 3:16) and, the legend of Aristeas notwithstanding (see below), it is unlikely Paul thought of the Jewish Scriptures in Greek as ‘given’ by God and therefore ‘Scripture’. It is also unlikely that he thought of ‘all’ of the Greek translation of the Scriptures as “profitable for reproof, for doctrine, for instruction and training in righteousness”. Certainly, Paul does not use any of the additional material we have in the Septuagint today. Moyise uses the concept of a ‘version’, but we have no evidence that Paul had such an idea—a ‘translation’ is not a ‘version’. Even if we affirm that Paul used the Jewish Scriptures in Greek, say, in his Diasporan preaching, this historical supposition does not mean we can then say he thought of such writings as equally ‘Scripture’.

**Sources and Materials**

It is not difficult to itemize how sources can be used by a writer: they may have access to scrolls (individual books would have been on scrolls); they may use their memory of a source; they may consult other’s recollection of a source, *and so on*. Ownership of scrolls was confined to those with wealth as well as synagogues.[[117]](#footnote-117) The apostles may have had access to scrolls because they owned some (2 Tim 4:13), or through wealthy individuals in the churches. Their memory of the Jewish Scriptures would have come from the Synagogue, hearing the lessons and talking (cf. Luke 4:16-30). In Lower Galilee, the disciples probably attended Aramaic or Hebrew speaking synagogues which would have used Hebrew scrolls with Aramaic *and* Hebrew commentary (cf. the sectarian DSS which are in Hebrew as an example of the insular use of Hebrew). In Tarsus, Paul’s experience may have included exposure to the Jewish Scriptures in Greek, but his Pharisaic training in Jerusalem would have trained him in the art of scribal discussion in Hebrew (cf. his use of Hebrew before the Council—Acts 22). Jesus’ engagement with the authorities over Scripture would likewise have referenced the Jewish Scriptures in Hebrew using Hebrew and/or Aramaic.[[118]](#footnote-118)

We cannot presume access, say, to an Isaiah scroll at the time of writing a quotation (although the small village of Nazareth had one!), and then a moment’s later access to a scroll of the Minor Prophets for a merged quote, say, of Isaiah and Joel. The question of whether the apostles used the Septuagint cannot presuppose such a convenient picture of a study, desk and pigeon-holes full of the scrolls of the individual books of the Jewish Scriptures in Greek. We know something of the writing circumstances of some of Paul’s letters (prison),[[119]](#footnote-119) but not the other books, although tradition locates the writing of Revelation to some sort of confinement on Patmos.

Luke used source materials for his history (Luke 1:1; Acts 1:1); for the other two Synoptics, scholars have developed theories about their underlying sources. Whether the theories are true or not, the implication for our question of whether the apostles used the Septuagint is complicated by them because they introduce the idea that scriptural material was embedded in a variety of sources (other than a scroll) and may have been simply *taken over* by the apostolic author rather than used. Thus, the source of such scriptural material might, in addition to memory, be lists of texts, pesher-like commentaries, Targum paraphrases, other historical accounts of Jesus and the birth of the church, interviews with witnesses, local ecclesial writing, *and so on*.

The more complex we see the reality of the writing environment of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, the less clear it becomes that their scriptural usage is simply from a Septuagintal scroll. The scholarly analysis of the NT’s use of the OT that a Bible student might encounter might be as simple as the generalised claim that ‘the writer is here using the Septuagint’. More specialized monographs like that of Wilcox are likely to be more tendentious and consider the use of the Hebrew both in a proto-Masoretic tradition and alternative traditions; Septuagint and non-Septuagint traditions; as well as the Jewish Targums.

The consideration of different and competing sources for scriptural usage (and the attending scholarly dispute) arises because of differences between the NT text and what has come down to us of the Hebrew, Greek and Aramaic. There are two further dimensions to the problem that we need to highlight. The first is the kind of ‘use’ being made of a source. For example, scholars might talk of a ‘Septuagintal style’ in Luke-Acts which is a kind of ‘influence’ of the Jewish Greek Scriptures in Luke-Acts;[[120]](#footnote-120) this may be unconscious or conscious on the part of Luke. If so, it is a kind of ‘use’ of the Jewish Greek Scriptures, but it is more general than, say, ‘quotation’. The stronger idea of ‘use’ is quotation, with allusions and echoes being less strong in their kind of ‘use’. Different judgments about the kind of ‘use’ are made by scholars for different texts in respect of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures.

The second dimension to the problem of sources (alluded to above) is the manuscript evidence for the text of the Jewish Greek Scriptures. How faithful are they to the original? Has their transmission by Christian scribes led to harmonisation? The textual transmission of the Septuagint is complex and scholars have neglected harmonisation with the NT as an explanation for the co-incidence of the Greek in distinctive texts. A good illustration of this would be the example in R. T. McLay’s introductory book *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*; his first chapter which is a case-study of the use of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-18 (pp.17-36) illustrates this point. His case-study is all about identifying the source for this quotation, but considerations to do with Christian ‘harmonisation’ are missing in his analysis.

There is also a question of definition and identity involved in this issue of the ‘use’ of the Septuagint. This arises from the fact that ‘the Septuagint’ is a translation whereas ‘Scripture’ is a concept to do with authorship—writing **given** by God. For example, Descartes, the father of modern philosophy, wrote in French and Latin; his writings have been translated into English. English speaking philosophy students quote ‘Descartes’ but *use* an edition of his work in English such as that of Anscombe and Geach. The Jewish Scriptures in Hebrew were deemed to be ‘original’ and ‘of God’—to say that the apostles used the Septuagint does not allow us to infer that they thereby *quoted* the Septuagint—rather, they were quoting Scripture—unless they thought that the Greek Scriptures were ‘of God’.

From our discussion, we can see that correspondence between the Greek of the Septuagint tradition and the NT could be due to a number of different (competing or complementary) factors:

* A direct confirming use by the apostle of a Greek scroll to hand—or such use by an amanuensis directed by the apostle.
* Memory recall by the apostle of the relevant Greek text in the Jewish Scriptures with a view to using that text regardless of the corresponding Hebrew.
* Consultation of a Greek scroll to hand by the apostle for the purposes of translating the Hebrew Scriptures.
* Consultation with others who had knowledge of the translation into Greek of the Jewish Scriptures, again with a view to translating the Hebrew.
* The memory of the apostle or an aide that has been influenced by prior use of the Greek Scriptures, with a view to translating the Hebrew.
* Mixed Hebrew/Greek recall by the apostle of Scripture.
* Spirit-gifted recall of Hebrew Scripture coupled with spirit-gifted use of a foreign language.
* Scribes (Christian) harmonising Septuagintal manuscripts in line with the NT text (or vice-versa).
* Use of sources (in the gospels) which have scriptural material which the writer simply ‘takes over’.
* Use of natural common Greek to translate common Hebrew, i.e. Greek that would naturally have been chosen by any Greek translator of the Jewish Hebrew Scriptures.
* Use of Greek influenced by translation precedents established by Greek translators of the Jewish Hebrew Scriptures, e.g. in matters of Semitic idiom, syntax, loan words, and semantic borrowing.

The above list of possibilities offers natural and supernatural explanations of kinds of ‘use’. Generally, questions of inspiration do not figure in scholarly discussion on ‘the use of the Septuagint’ i.e. it looks at the NT writers rather than the Spirit in answering the question of what is the *source* for a use of the Jewish Scriptures. Wyns tabulates McLay’s method (pp. 25-26) about which McLay states, “The procedure that has been outlined above [reproduced by Wyns] addresses **all of the issues** [my emphasis] that have been raised in this volume with respect to determining the origin of a quotation due to the problems of the textual evidence, the methods of citation, and the role that TT can play in the analysis of the texts”.[[121]](#footnote-121) From our point of view, McLay does not consider inspiration as a reason why there is agreement and variation in Scriptural usage. If all Scripture is given by inspiration, then the Spirit is essential to the causal explanation of the agreement and variation between the Old and New Testaments (see below).

**Attitudes**

We have evidence of a range of attitudes towards the Jewish Scriptures in Greek. This might not be surprising, but a consideration of attitude is important to this debate: did the apostles consider the Jewish Scriptures in Greek to carry equivalent authority to the Hebrew originals? The following evidence shows contemporary attitudes:

1) There was a distinction between the Jewish Scriptures in Hebrew and translations in terms of **authority**:

For the same things uttered in Hebrew, and translated into another tongue, have not the same force in them: and not only these things, but the law itself, and the prophets, and the rest of the books, have no small difference, when they are spoken in their own language. *Sirach Prolog* (KJV)

Jesus ben Sirach (ca. 2c. BCE) is here distinguishing commentary on Scripture as well as translations of Scripture and ascribing less ‘force’ to both commentary and translations.

2) There was a distinction between a narrow canon of books and other books. The Septuagint has a wider range of books from after the times of Ezra and Nehemiah. Josephus’ apologetic work, *Against Apion*, is evidence of less authority being ascribed to the later Septuagintal books:

For we have not an innumerable multitude of books among us, disagreeing from, and contradicting one another, [as the Greeks have], but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times; which are justly believed to be divine; and of them five belong to Moses, which contain his laws and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death. This interval of time was little short of three thousand years; but as to the time from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets, who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life. It is true, our history has been written since Artaxerxes very particularly, but has not been esteemed of the like authority with the former by our forefathers, because there has not been an exact succession of prophets since that time… *Ag. Ap.* 38-41

While scholars disagree on how Josephus’ 22 books match the 39 books of the Old Testament, our point is that the books included with the LXX that are later than Artaxerxes were considered of **inferior status**. This raises the question as to whether a distinction in authority also obtained with regard to the expansions and additions in the earlier books of the Septuagint (Genesis to Malachi), those held to be written prior to Artaxerxes.

3) A more positive view of the Jewish Scriptures in Greek can be seen in the *Letter to Aristeas* (ca. 2c. BCE). Jobes and Silva, following a standard scholarly view, speculate that the legend of how the Septuagint (Pentateuch) was translated with seventy two translators using Torah scrolls from Jerusalem (cf. 2 Macc 2:13ff) is an apologetic defending the translation against criticism.[[122]](#footnote-122) The allusions in Aristeas’ account are to the bestowal of the Spirit upon the seventy elders under Moses and this is a way of claiming divine inspiration for the translation. Philo agrees in thinking the translation was inspired (*Mos*. 2.37).[[123]](#footnote-123) Correspondingly, however, there must have been criticism of the translation of the Torah into Greek on the part of the Jerusalem hierarchy, acting as a catalyst.[[124]](#footnote-124)

These views, (1)-(3), are illustrations. The Christian sect does not have to take over the common views of its day, but Paul sets the standard of doctrine in his statement that ‘All Scripture is given by inspiration’. If NT writers are writing Scripture, then it is equally given by inspiration. This has an implication for identifying *what* it is that is quoted, alluded to or echoed in the use of earlier Scripture. The doctrine implies that the Spirit would quote, allude to or echo *its* *own writing*. There is no language barrier for the Spirit; this is shown by the gift of tongues. The argument that an apostle would use a Greek translation because of a language barrier on the part of his audience has no relevance for the Spirit. In terms of the superintendence of the Spirit over matters of language, our biographical information for the apostles is that they were multi-lingual. This is precisely the quality required if the Spirit is to quote, allude to and echo its own Hebrew and Aramaic writing in Greek,[[125]](#footnote-125) and for that Greek to have the authoritative status of ‘Scripture’ for the Roman Diaspora.

It can be overlooked that ‘Scripture’ just is the ordinary word for ‘writing’ (grafh**.**). What was written is therefore central to the concept of ‘Scripture’. A doctrine that some writing cannot be broken (John 10:35) illustrates an attitude towards a body of writing that carries an implication about language. It is the language itself in which the quality of being unbreakable inheres (this doctrine is consistent with later rabbinical views); this is confirmed by Jesus’ ‘jot and tittle’ saying (Matt 5:18). The reliance on words and phrases in the Hebrew original in apostolic exegesis continues this aspect of Jesus’ teaching.

In terms of the question-title of this paper then, our answer is that **the Spirit does not quote the Septuagint**; it quotes its own writing which was in Hebrew and Aramaic. It did this in Greek and multi-lingual individuals were involved. Knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures in Greek and in Hebrew, humanly speaking, will have varied among the NT writers. But the promise of the Spirit was that things would be taught and brought to remembrance (John 14:26). The coincidence here is that for devout Jews the reference body of Scriptures was in Hebrew; precision in exposition and scribal dialogue required such a reference point. Jesus and Paul agree in this doctrine of Scripture and they set the standard for the Christian Ecclesia.

**Examples**

The sticking point in this debate is not the common, natural and ordinary Greek shared between the NT and the Greek OT, but rather the distinctive words and phrases in the NT that are in the Greek OT and without literal counterparts in the Hebrew Bible. Wyns’ examples refer to the origins of *Kyrios*, 1 Peter, concluding with Heb 10:5, Matt 1:23 and John 8:58.

(1) **Kyrios**. Although briefly covered by Wyns, this is the most complex issue raised in his article. He cites Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox’s advocacy for *Kyrios* in the OG Pentateuch. Adey shows why the issue is complex. In a 2007 article he recorded,

I recall here that in a Cambridge seminar in 2007 on “The Greek Bible: Transmission and Reception”[[126]](#footnote-126) Emanuel Tov (Jerusalem) publicly stated that the Greek representations of the Divine name, like the aforementioned IAW or paleo-Hebrew (pre-exilic Hebrew script) forms of ‘Yhwh’/hwhy, reflected the Old Greek or original version. Therefore, Tov made it clear that he did not agree with John William Wevers’ published position (following his Toronto colleague Albert Pietersma), since he endeavours to maintain that *kurios* (of later mss or codices) was original.[[127]](#footnote-127) I would couple Tov’s position on these pre-NT era Greek OT translations (fragmentary Pentateuchal remains from the Judean Desert that do not display *kurios*) with an argument for the NT innovating *kurios*, within the presupposed perspective of revelation and theophany, in which the name ‘Jesus’ takes over from ‘Yahweh’ whilst Jesus manifested and came in his Father’s name (John 5:43; 10:25; 17:6).

What Adey is noting is that scholars in the field as eminent as Tov reject Pietersma’s (and therefore Cox’s) analysis. To this we should add that J. A. Fitzmyer’s essay originally published in 1975, cited by Pietersma and Cox in their 1984 essay, doesn’t signal a shift in scholarly opinion due to new evidence of which Fitzmyer could not have been aware; (his essay was subsequently then included in his 1979 collection.) Hence, Wyns is wrong to make the contrast, “However, a number of recent studies have appeared since the work done in 1979 by Fitzmyer that challenge this conclusion.” What we have here is ongoing conflicting scholarly analysis and assessment rather than recent, updating or correcting work by Pietersma and Cox of Fitzmyer—their targets are much older. They themselves cite other contemporary scholars, besides Fitzmyer, with whom they disagree.[[128]](#footnote-128)

(2) **1 Peter**. The similarity between both the proffered OG and the MT, apart from the addition in the MT, can be seen in Wyns’ table. The question therefore is whether Peter is quoting the Jewish Greek Scriptures or the Hebrew equivalent. As it stands, this cannot be determined since the table shows 1QIsa, a Hebrew text, is very similar also to the proffered Greek.

(3) **Heb 10:5**. Wyns’ first argument is about the Greek audience, but the audience for Hebrews is disputed.[[129]](#footnote-129) If we assume it is a Greek speaking Roman Diaspora audience, their language requirements are simply provided for by the fact that the letter is in Greek. Would those using the Jewish Greek Scriptures have regarded Heb 10:5 as fraudulent? This depends on what was in those Greek Scriptures and this is what is under dispute. If those Greek Scriptures corresponded to what we now have in the Hebrew, then the answer is that they would have not taken Heb 10:5 as a “pious fraud”. Wyns’ ‘fraud’ argument is assuming what he needs to show, namely, that the LXX of Heb 10:5 is as it was in the 1c.

There is a further weakness in Wyns treatment of Heb 10:5. He offers the interesting suggestion of Exod 21:3 and its ‘body’ as the basis for an intertextual quote combining Ps 40:6 with Exodus, citing rabbinical support from the Babylonian Talmud (B.Quidd.20a) for ‘body’ as the meaning of the Hebrew. The idiomatic translation of the Hebrew as we have it would be, “If he comes in with his body, he will go out with his body” (Rabbi Eliezer ben Jacob).[[130]](#footnote-130) The Targums (Onkelos, Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan) have “by himself” and the LXX has “alone” which are interpreting the idiom. If the author of Hebrews is combining Ps 40:6 with Exod 21:3 on the basis that the Psalm is commenting on the manumission law, then he is not using the LXX of Exod 21:3, nor any Targum, but rather the Hebrew idiom.

Wyns doesn’t address Adey’s challenge: how could a pre-NT Psalms’ text have had ‘body’ in the first place?[[131]](#footnote-131) The LXX of Exod 21:3-4 does not have ‘body’. Within the context of apostolic theology, we have a story to tell about ‘body’ theology and thereby explain Heb 10:5; we have no such rationale upon which to draw for the hypothetical Psalms translator’s theologizing, substituting ‘body’ for ‘ear’. Given that the Greek Pentateuch was translated first, and assuming we have the OG for Exod 21:3 in our LXX, the Greek ‘alone’ in Exod 21:3 for the Hebrew ‘body’ idiom takes away any Greek basis for the OG Psalms translator choosing ‘body’, and the Aramaic evidence offers no basis as it interprets the Hebrew idiom just like the Greek. So, there is no route here from Aramaic to the LXX. Rather, the Talmud has recorded ‘body’ for the Hebrew and incidentally confirmed the originality of Heb 10:5’s body theology and its reliance on Hebrew as opposed to Greek.

(4) **Matt 1:23**. The Expositors’ Commentary observes that the ‘later’ Jewish translations of Symmachus, Theodotion and Aquila use nea/nij and not parqe,noj in Isa 7:14, but it does not explain why the Christian parqe,noj is ‘earlier’. It assumes that it is original to the LXX/OG; but equally, if the Jewish translations of the 2c. CE favoured Jewish doctrine and replaced parqe,noj with nea/nij, so too Christian scribes could have been favouring Christian doctrine and replaced nea/nij with parqe,noj. As far as the information in the quote from the Expositor’s Commentary goes, the Jewish translators could be continuing the LXX/OG tradition against a Christian harmonisation.

The Hebrew in Isa 7:14 is hml[ and it is rendered elsewhere in the LXX by parqe,noj (Gen 24:43), nea/nij (Exod 2:8; Ps 68:26; Song 1:3; 6:8) and neo,thj (Prov 30:19). The Hebrew means ‘young woman’;[[132]](#footnote-132) where virginity is required, the story of Rebekah shows that hlwtb is used alongside hml[ (Gen 24:16, 43). The database of texts is small but the Septuagintal pattern favours nea/nij in any scholarly dispute over the original word in Isa 7:14. The database of texts for hlwtb is much larger and this word is generally translated in the Septuagint with parqe,noj, i.e. ‘virgin’.[[133]](#footnote-133) So, in any dispute, the case for nea/nij is stronger when we factor the Septuagintal pattern for hlwtb into account. With regard to the Jewish Scriptures in Greek available to Matthew (but note he may not have been a *reader* of the Scriptures in Greek, see above), Isa 7:14 is more likely to have had nea/nij.[[134]](#footnote-134)

The original application of the prophecy in Ahaz’ day (Isa 8:1, 4) does not require a virgin birth but a young woman giving birth. It is difficult to see why the Jewish LXX translator would have chosen parqe,noj. Of the 65 occurrences of parqe,noj in the LXX, 45 translate hlwtb which itself occurs 52 times. The only exception, aside from Isa 7:14, is Gen 24:43, and this is explained by Gen 24:16 and is an inexact translation.

Given the theological prominence of Isa 7:14 as a Christian prophecy, it is more likely that the use of parqe,noj here is a Christian harmonisation; the original OG is more likely to have been nea/nij, (unless the Jewish translator was rather prescient and expected the Messiah to virgin-born). What Matthew has done under inspiration is interpret the Hebrew “Behold, the young woman *will be* with child, and bearing a son, even call his name ‘Immanuel’” as a prophetic type of the virgin birth. What drives this inspired perception of a ‘virginal’ birth is not the virginal-state of the young woman in Ahaz’ court but the conjunction in the prophecy of ‘the young woman *will be* with child’ and how ‘God with us’ is to be fulfilled.

(5) **John 8:58**.

Wyns’ final example is not a quotation and so a different response is needed. Wyns states that John’s ‘I AM’ “was influenced by the LXX translation of Exod 3:14”. ‘Influence’ might be a kind of ‘use’ of the Septuagint, but it is clearly not a *quoting* use. Again, there is an appeal to the Greek speaking Diaspora audience, but this audience has been disputed. J. A. T. Robinson’s study, *Re-dating the New Testament*, places the writing of John before AD70 and cites its Palestinian characteristics in partial support.[[135]](#footnote-135) The point here is that the theology of John has its origin in the teaching of Jesus and the recording of traditions about Jesus in the early days of the apostles (Acts 6:2, 4; 8:14, 25).

John is recording the words of Jesus. What we can say about John and the Septuagint is different to what we might say about Jesus and the Septuagint. Given that Jesus is speaking to scribes and Pharisees in Jerusalem, it is likely that he is speaking in Hebrew here and referencing the Jewish Scriptures in Hebrew, because this is what John 8 is recording—scribal discussion. The *use* of the Septuagint can be excluded, and even its influence in this setting seems implausible.

The Septuagint of Exod 3:14 is evgw, eivmi o` w;n (‘I am the Being’); there is a predicate and the assertion is well-formed; the closing assertion is o` w'n avpe,stalke,n me pro.j u`ma/j (‘The being has sent me unto you’). Jesus does not use a predicate in saying ‘Before Abraham was, I am’; further, the ‘I am’ of Exodus is just an ordinary first person use of the verb ‘to be’ with the significant existential phrase ‘the Being’. Jesus’ speech has no point of contact with ‘…the Being’ and his first person use of the verb ‘to be’ is unusual in not having a predicate. Instead, Jesus’ language (as translated) has its point of contact with the Hebrew and its unusual repeated use of the verb ‘to be’: ’*ehyeh* ’*asher* ’*ehyeh* (‘I will be who I will be’) and ‘I will be (’*ehyeh*) has sent me to you’. The targumic evidence is supportive of this as it does not translate the Hebrew along the lines of the Septuagint but reproduces the Hebrew *in toto*.[[136]](#footnote-136) Jesus’ theology is that he is a present-tense manifestation of God’s future-tense declaration. This theology is not part of the Septuagint’s existential translation and any Christians using the Greek Jewish Scriptures would be alerted by Jesus’ different predicate-less ‘I am…’ to this fact. The theology of God-manifestation is not there in the Greek of Exod 3:14 because it has removed the ‘…who…’ of the Hebrew. Jesus is using this and there is no reason to think John is not recording his teacher’s speech faithfully.

We have discussed three examples (1)-(3). There are others and each has to be considered on a case by case basis and a cumulative position can then be established as to whether an apostolic author is using the Septuagint.

**Conclusion**

Our departing question from this essay would be: Is it likely that distinctive Christian theology is coming from anonymous Jewish translators of the third and second century BCE? It is not enough to see corresponding Greek between the LXX and the NT; we need to tell a theological story about the LXX translation to reinforce any claim on its part to originality. The examples we have discussed are not original to the Septuagint but to the NT’s use and variation of the Hebrew.

However, if we put aside the unique and distinctive, we also need to say that the common and the banal of the Greek translation of the Hebrew is part of the literary co-text of the NT writers, part of their culture. An influence for the Septuagint in cultural terms cannot be excluded from our understanding of Second Temple Judaism, and this has consequences for how we appreciate aspects of the Greek in the NT, including quotations, allusions and echoes of the original Hebrew Scriptures.

What is the usefulness of the Septuagint for a Bible student?[[137]](#footnote-137) It is useful for understanding Jewish interpretation in the Second Temple period; it is useful for understanding Greek, for ideas of translation; and it is helpful as a tool for identifying possible correspondences between the NT and the Hebrew/Aramaic Scriptures. However, as regards intertextual exegesis, what counts is the alignment that a Bible student makes with the MT (still regarded as our best representation of the original Hebrew). The agreement and variation between earlier Scripture and later NT usage is not adequately explained by reference to the Septuagint as the cause.[[138]](#footnote-138) Where the NT varies the Hebrew/Aramaic OT, we need an explanation *internal* to the priorities of just these texts—this is the Spirit’s domain. [8240]

**Rebuttal**

**P. Wyns**

(1) Much has been said about the bilingual or trilingual (or otherwise) competency of the writers. Perry generally accepts that they were all (to a greater or lesser extent) at least bilingual. However, reader perception is of paramount importance in the transmission of Scripture. If the audiences are Greek readers (like those of the Fourth Gospel) then the Gospel would be written in Greek. The readers of the Fourth Gospel had lost their Palestinian roots to such an extent that John had to explain common Semitic terms (such as Rabbi, etc.). Even if it can be determined that some Scripture was originally Aramaic (Semitic) before being reworked, the fact remains that the whole NT was written in Greek. Moreover, the Greek was most probably edited or reworked by an amanuensis or secretary under apostolic supervision. This makes the issue of the quality of the Greek, or the bi-tri-lingual nature of the writers, a moot point.[[139]](#footnote-139)

(2) It is perhaps informative to explore how apostolic contemporaries (Josephus, the rabbis, etc.) used ‘Scripture’.Philo, as an Alexandrian Jew, ascribed the highest level of divine inspiration to the LXX (the Pentateuch only), and called the translators ‘prophets’ (*Life of Moses*, II.38-40)! Josephus, like Philo, writes in Greek, but is a Palestinian Jew and not Alexandrian. He uses the LXX at places as well:

Josephus claims to have based his account on the Hebrew text of the sacred writings (Ant. I, 5). This claim appears to hold good for the Hexateuch. In the later books of the bible, however, he has clearly consulted the Septuagint.[[140]](#footnote-140)

Josephus also used Greek translations other than the LXX, most notably the proto-Lucian texts[[141]](#footnote-141) and he also praises the pagan king, who received the Greek translation of the Pentateuch (*Ant* 1.10-13).

In the rabbinical period (which is later than the first century) we still find rabbinical citations *of the OT* that depart from Masoretic Text (MT). E. Tov notes,

At the same time, the biblical quotations in the rabbinic literature also differ from time to time from MT, both in direct quotations and in variants underlying the *derashah*, ‘sermon’.[[142]](#footnote-142)

Further, M. Wilcox, commenting on the apostle (rabbi) Paul, says,

It has long been known that Eph. 4:8 cites Ps. 67(68):19 in a form which diverges from both the MT and the LXX but in that deviation agrees with the targum.[[143]](#footnote-143)

He adds,

In investigating the text form of the OT in the NT we need to keep several principles of method in mind. (1) We have no right to assume that the one NT writer will have always used the same OT textual tradition in his work(s). In the case of Matthew and Luke this is clearly not so...(2) Apparently minor deviations, such as the ‘replacement’ of one word or phrase by another in a text which otherwise looks verbally identical with a known OT textual tradition (e.g., the LXX), also occur (a) between extant Greek OT versions, and (b) between the targumim, and in fact from one targum MS to another...it is characteristic of targum to replace a word or phrase which more or less literally renders the Hebrew by another (or even a longer passage) which gives the traditional interpretation of it...(3) The present ‘deviant’ form of an OT quotation may be a result of an earlier piece of exegesis...[[144]](#footnote-144)

On the textual issue, relative to NT times, all major groups within the Judaism of the day could, and did, use various text types. The early Christians were accordingly no different than their non-Christian counterparts; they reflected the prevailing ‘methodology’ and understandings of first century Judaism with one very important caveat – *apostolic textual choices were inspired.*

(3) The question whether or not the ‘original’ LXX contained *kyrios* (Lord) or YHWH (the Tetragram henceforth abbreviated as ‘Tet’) is indeed a complex issue still under assessment and discussion by scholars.[[145]](#footnote-145) Concerning the Septuagint, A. Pietersma has acknowledged that:

…it might possibly still be debated whether perhaps the Palestinian copies with which the NT authors were familiar read some form of the tetragram.[[146]](#footnote-146)

Secondary to that question is whether or not the Tetragrammaton was harmonized in the LXX back to *kyrios* by Christian scribes or whether or not apostolic writers adopted *kyrios* from the LXX. It is indeed true that Tov shed new light on the situation with the publication of the Greek manuscripts among the DSS.[[147]](#footnote-147) However, Pietersma’s argument is that the practice of ‘archaization’ of biblical manuscripts (by re-introducing the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters and/or in giving a Greek transliteration) began in the second century BC or so (as a Jewish reaction against forced hellenization efforts under the Seleucids).

So, it is possible that the DSS biblical texts reflect this re-Hebraizing and that earlier Greek mss might have had Greek translations of YHWH (e.g., as *kyrios* or *despotes*, etc.). The writing of YHWH in ‘archaic’ Hebrew characters, and the fact that in at least some Greek manuscripts the Hebrew YHWH seems to have been written by a scribe different from the one who copied the Greek, suggest that the written ‘sign’ YHWH was a ‘scribal/visual’ artifact, not to be read out, but in fact intended to alert readers to do the opposite (and thus pronounce *kyrios* instead). It is more likely that Jewish Diaspora scribes (no longer familiar with Hebrew) would change the ‘archaizing’ Hebrew of the Tetragrammaton in the LXX back to *kyrios*, especially if the common Synagogue practice was to read out the Tetragrammaton as *kyrios*. There is no need to posit the mechanism of ‘harmonization’ or innovation by Christian scribes to explain the presence of *kyrios* in the LXX. D. B. Capes remarks that,

The consistency in rendering of YHWH as Kyrios in all NT references would be difficult to explain if there were not already either an established tradition to read Kyrios where YHWH appears in a Greek manuscript, or an established body of texts with Kyrios already in the Greek.[[148]](#footnote-148)

(4) Admittedly, the similarity between 1 Peter in the NT and 1QIsaa is close but other unusual features point to the LXX as probable source, though even McLay acknowledges the complex nature of the relationships between the manuscripts of the MT, LXX and NT. For example, both the OG and 1 Peter use the word do,xa(glory) – the OG has ‘the glory of humanity’ (do,xa avnqrw,pou), 1 Peter has ‘its glory’ (do,xa auvth/j) but 1QIsaa has ‘their (plural) goodliness’ (wydsx) and the MT has ‘its (wdsx, singular) goodliness’. This is the only passage in the LXX where dsx[[149]](#footnote-149) is rendered with do,xa**.**.It seems that Peter is using ‘glory’ from the OG and combining this with the singular suffix from the MT,leading McLay to comment,

Given the fact that there is virtually no textual support for the inclusion ofavnqrw,pou in 1 Peter, either the author of 1 Peter had access to both the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures or there was a Greek manuscript that had the pronoun auvth/j instead of avnqrw,pou..[[150]](#footnote-150)

However, despite anomalies, the comparison demonstrates that 1 Peter is closest to the OG, followed by 1QIsaa with approximation to the MT coming last. Finally, this OT quote was never at the basis of any Christian-Jewish polemics (unlike Isa 7:14), therefore it did not advantage either the Jews or the Christians to harmonize the text(s) as there was no ‘theological hay’ to be made.

(5) The audience (readers) of Hebrews may well be disputed but previously convincing evidence (intertextual and contextual) was presented that demonstrated that the Fourth Gospel and Hebrews targeted the same readers (the church at Ephesus). Their needs were not simply provided for by ‘writing in Greek’ as they required a point of reference and that was, of course, the Septuagint. If I wrote an epistle to Dutch readers, I would write it in Dutch and quote from the Statenvertaling or ‘States’ Bible’ (similar to the KJV), rather than *Groot Nieuws Bijbel* (Good News Bible), or the Catholic *Willibrordvertaling* (WV), etc. Of course, there was no such thing as a ‘Bible’ in those days, but rather a collection of sacred writings.

J. Adey’s challenge (how could a pre-NT Psalms’ text have had ‘body’ in the first place?) seems to me to have been sufficiently answered. No translation except the LXX has the word ‘body’, so we are left with two routes (both hypothetical):

(1) The first occurrence of this unusual idiom is in Heb.10:5 and Christians ‘harmonized’ this in their own (Christian?) version of the LXX in Ps 40:6. (The LXX has therefore copied ‘body’ from Heb. 10:5).

(2) The LXX use of ‘body’ in Ps 40:6 is the original and Heb 10:5 has quoted the LXX.

Whereas the Hebrew (MT) has ‘body’ in Exod 21:3 the LXX has ‘alone’, the Hebrew has ‘ear’ in Ps 40:6 whereas the Greek LXX has ‘body’. The LXX/OG is a heterogeneous, intermittent work, compiled by different translators over a long time period. The Pentateuch was translated into Greek some time before the rest of Scripture. It is certainly not implausible that a different translator at a later stage contemporized the text of Ps 40:6 by adapting the targumic idiom *current in his day*. The translator employs the technique of dynamic equivalence based on the original Hebrew (and Targum) of Exod 21:3 (the LXX translator(s) would have based their choice on all of the sources available to them). The fact that the LXX Pentateuch has ‘alone’ instead of ‘body’ suggests the possibility of a Greek variant that did contain ‘body’ in Exod 21:3 (harmonizing it with the Hebrew) instead of ‘alone’.

Moreover, it appears that the author of Hebrews was familiar with OG/LXX writings as Heb 11:35-37 alludes to inter-testament history found in 2 Macc 7:1, 13-14.[[151]](#footnote-151) Also, the method of Isaiah’s death (sawn in half by Manasseh) is agreed upon by both the Babylonian Talmud and Jerusalem Talmud, and is alluded to in Heb 11:37.[[152]](#footnote-152) This indicates that the author of Hebrews was comfortable employing diverse materials (including LXX/OG) in his writing. He was not alluding to exoteric, sectarian or obscure traditions, but to writings and traditions that were well known to his readers.

All the similarities between the NT and LXX/OG writings can supposedly be explained away by the mechanism of ‘Christian harmonisation’. One wonders why Christians would deem it necessary to change the LXX/OG when they could point to their own inspired Scriptures (i.e., the NT). Would they not simply argue that the LXX/OG translation *was wrong* (as we do when we come across a tendentious translation)? If Heb 10:5 said ‘body’ and the original LXX/OG had something else in Ps 40:6 would they not simply point to the inspiration of their apostles? Why change an established text and be exposed to the charge of revisionism? A far more likely alternative is that Greek readers were familiar with the term ‘body’ as it was already in use in the LXX long before the NT was written. And the LXX translation choice for Ps 40:6 was itself rooted in *Jewish tradition*. The fact remains that the Jews eventually turned away from using the LXX/OG and attempted to introduce a new Greek translation (would the Jews not simply have preserved the ‘original’ LXX/OG writings that had not been ‘tampered’ with by the Christians—why then the necessity of resorting to producing yet another Greek translation?). If anything it is the Jews who should be accused of harmonization and revisionism, not Christians.

(6) It is highly unlikely that Jesus debated with the Sanhedrin or the Pharisees in Greek. However, John is not writing to the Sanhedrin or the Pharisees *but to Greek speaking Jews* (both Christian converts and non-Christian Jews) at the church at Ephesus. While it is true that scholars such as J. A. T. Robinson argue for the *Priority of John* (the name of Robinson’s book), that is not the same as stating that it was not written for Greek speaking Diaspora Jews. That is to confuse two separate arguments, namely, Robinson contends for the distinctive authenticity of the Gospel,[[153]](#footnote-153) but he also acknowledges that it was written to Greeks of Asia Minor.[[154]](#footnote-154) So, the Fourth Gospel was early (before 70) and written by an eyewitness (John) a Palestinian Jew but it was sent to the Diaspora (church at Ephesus) which is why it was written in Greek. John was not simply telling a “story” (or writing a biography) about Jesus but addressing particular problems facing his readers at Ephesus. So, he selected those incidents from Jesus’ life that would support his exhortations. He obviously translated the speeches from Aramaic to Greek and we might assume employed a free paraphrase (dynamic equivalence) under the guidance of the Spirit to reproduce if not the ipsissima verba (the very words) certainly the *ipsissima vox* (the very voice)[[155]](#footnote-155) of the Lord. In so doing it would be natural for him to use the ‘Bible’ that his readers were familiar with, namely, the Greek LXX/OG.

The Septuagint translates the Hebrew phrase ’*anî hû*’ (KJV, ‘I *am* he’) as *ego eimi* in Isa 41:4, 43:10 and 46:4. In each of these instances the phrase ’*anî hû*’ appears at the end of the clause, and is so rendered (or punctuated) in the LXX (just as it is in John). The phrase *ego eimi* appears as the translation of a few other phrases in Isaiah as well that are significant to this discussion. It translates the Hebrew ’*anōkî* ’*anōkî hû*’as *ego eimi* in Isa 43:25 and 51:12. Once (Isa 52:6) ’*anî hû*’ is translated as *ego eimi autos* (basically an even more emphasized form).[[156]](#footnote-156) And once (Isa 45:18) we find *ego eimi kurios* for ’*anî Yahweh*! This last passage is provocative in that it is in the context of creation, an act ascribed to Jesus by John (John 1:3) and other New Testament writers (Col 1:16-17; Heb 1:2-3). Of course, we know that the Genesis creation is not what is being referred to in the NT, but rather the new creation ‘in Christ’.

So, the fact that LXX readers were familiar with the ‘I AM’ circumlocution (not just from Exodus) reinforces the argument that John is alluding to these passages. It might be true that the targumic evidence does not support this translation and it is also certainly true that the LXX does not render the correct Hebrew tense (at least not in Exodus) but the ‘progressive present’ makes the point forcefully that **in Jesus** the Jews were now dealing with ‘**God manifest**’[[157]](#footnote-157) and this circumlocution (‘I AM’) is only found in the LXX version with which John’s readers were familiar.

 (7) The meaning of the Hebrew word *‘almâh*, (translated “virgin” in the ESV) has been extensively debated in scholarship. Some have argued that *‘almâh* simply means ‘a young woman of marriageable age’ and should be translated ‘young woman’ because had Isaiah meant ‘virgin’, he would have used the term *betûlâh* . However, J. N. Oswalt demonstrates that the translation is appropriate[[158]](#footnote-158) and J. A. Motyer contends for the specificity of the Hebrew word *‘almâh*;

The translation virgin (*‘almâ*) is widely disputed on the ground that the word means only ‘young woman’ and that the technical word for ‘virgin’ is *betûlâ*. Of the nine occurrences of *‘almâ* those in 1 Chronicles 15:20 and the title of Psalm 46 are presumably a musical direction but no longer understood. In Psalm 68:25; Proverbs 30:19 and Song of Solomon 1:3 the context throws no decisive light on the meaning of the word. In Genesis 24:43 and Exodus 2:8 the reference is unquestionably to an unmarried girl, and in Song of Solomon 6:8 the *‘alāmôt* contrasted with queens and concubines, are unmarried and virgin. Thus, wherever the context allows a judgment, *‘almâ* is not a general term meaning ‘young woman’ but a specific one meaning ‘virgin’. It is worth noting that outside the Bible, ‘so far as may be ascertained, *‘almâ* was ‘never used of a married woman’.[[159]](#footnote-159)

So, although the database of texts is small, the LXX does not necessarily favour[[160]](#footnote-160) *neanis* (‘young woman’) above *parthenos* (‘virgin’). Witherington observes,

Third, the term *‘almâh* is never used in the OT of a married woman, but does refer to a sexually mature woman. There are no texts in the OT where *‘almâh* clearly means one who is sexually active, but it is possible that Song of Solomon 6:8 (cf. Prov 30:19) implies this. It would appear then that *‘almâh* normally, if not always, implies a virgin, though the term does not focus on that attribute. Fourth, several of the Greek translations of the OT (i.e., Aq, Sym, Theod) translate *‘almâh* with *neanis*;however, the LXX clearly translates it with *parthenos.* It is probably correct to say that if *‘almâh* did not normally have overtones of virginity, it is difficult if not impossible to see why the translators of the LXX used *parthenos* as the Greek equivalent.[[161]](#footnote-161)

Matthew was not introducing new and untried “translations” of his own – he was proving the fact of the virgin birth *from their own Scriptures* (the Greek LXX/OG) and this is why the Jews felt the need to introduce an alternative Greek translation.

(8) Unlike Philo we are not arguing for the inspiration of the LXX Pentateuch! Rather, we are contending for the freedom of the apostles to choose (under the guidance of the Spirit) which text(s) they would use. It seems to me counterproductive and counterintuitive to suggest that Christians went and changed the Septuagint in order to align it with their NT. In places where the messianic status of Jesus was being argued with Greek speaking Diaspora Jews it would be counterproductive to point to a text that had deliberately been changed! In places where the harmonisations were not a question of dispute it is counterintuitive – why make a change if does not fundamentally alter the meaning of the text? It makes sense that the apostles would employ Greek writings that were already familiar to their readers. [3773]

**Rebuttal**

**A. Perry**

(1) Establishing the likely linguistic competence of authors is a key *desideratum* for a debate on the use of the Septuagint; it can hardly be a moot point as Wyns asserts. Tri-bi-lingualism is a factor that helps to explain a person writing in Greek but quoting and alluding to Hebrew Scriptures rather than the Septuagint.

(2) Wilcox’ 1960s work was a corrective to scholars too easily attributing use of the OT by NT writers to a use of the Septuagint. He sought to show an Aramaic and targumic background for some quotations in Acts rather than a Septuagintal background. His scholarly example illustrates the correct methodology in the face of a consensus: go to the textual data and argue case by case whether a given use of the OT in the NT is influenced by/a quotation of/ the Septuagint by the author.

The attitude to the Hebrew Scriptures for the Christian sect can only be settled by evidence from within the sect’s writings. The attitude of Philo, Josephus or the later Rabbis to the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures cannot over-ride that evidence. The existence in the first century of what scholars call different ‘textual traditions’ does not settle whether the five Palestinian writers under Jesus’ tutelage, say, were taught (or not) to privilege the Hebrew Scriptures.[[162]](#footnote-162)

Wilcox is useful to my case because he argues **against Septuagintal use** for the examples he discusses, arguing for Aramaic text forms, non-Septuagintal Greek forms, as well as non-MT Hebrew forms underlying some NT quotations.[[163]](#footnote-163) However, his analysis doesn’t discuss inspiration, whether the NT writers privileged the Hebrew Scriptures, and what *kind of use*[[164]](#footnote-164) they were making of any source. His work is too source-driven, although he does open the field of explanation for a given NT text to ‘exegetical tradition’. This is an important complicating factor because if we attribute a NT writer’s use of the OT to an Aramaic tradition (embodied in a Targum), or to non-Septuagintal Greek traditions of translation, we don’t thereby imply that the NT writers had a collection of physical Septuagintal scrolls to hand which Wyns thesis requires. (Likewise, we don’t suppose they had a set of scrolls representing various text-forms.) Scholars work with the human dimension and dependency is always traced to another source or, more vaguely, a tradition; inspiration is not included in their analysis. The problem for all commentators is the sheer volume of differences between the NT and the possible range of sources and traditions that have come down to us—leading to the schematic analysis ‘**this text is more like** the LXX/proto-MT/Targum/non-MT Hebrew/non-LXX Greek, **so it comes from** the LXX/Proto-MT/Targum/non-MT/non-LXX source/tradition text form’.

(3) The remark of D. B. Capes (quoted by Wyns) illustrates my argument. New Testament scholars (not Septuagintal specialists) have in the past run too quickly to the Septuagint as the source of a textual feature. A ‘reading tradition’ is an alternative explanation to ‘the Septuagint’ as the source for *kyrios* in the NT. The use of a surrogate for the Tetragrammaton in Second Temple texts encodes a ‘reading tradition’ and an illustration of the Jewish reverence for the Hebrew text.

A. Pietersma’s dismissal of the four early Greek texts is informative. For two texts, he argues that they are **not sufficiently exemplary of the LXX** and their use of an Aramaic or paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammaton is evidence of making the Greek conform more to the Hebrew, since each text shows corrections towards the Hebrew—it is not evidence of the use of the Tetragrammaton in the original LXX/OG. This argument suffers from the objection that a paleo-Hebrew and Aramaic Tetragrammaton is not ‘Hebrew’ as such and shouldn’t be included with the genre ‘corrections towards a Hebrew text’—they are surrogates for Hebrew. If anything, it would be evidence of ‘correction towards a cultural norm’. However, the key point in his first argument is his judgment on what is sufficient to count as part of the LXX tradition—scholars may disagree on this measure. He affirms that a third text has a space of sufficient size to take an Aramaic surrogate or a paleo-Hebrew one as well as *kyrios*, so it can be set aside; he only admits the fourth text as evidence. G. Howard, against whom Pietersma writes, disagrees and his assessment of the four texts is,

From these findings we can now say with almost absolute certainty that the divine name, hwhy, was not rendered by ku,rioj in the pre-Christian Greek Bible, as so often has been thought.[[165]](#footnote-165)

E. Tov is prepared to assert in his standard textbook (2012 edition) that the one uncontested text “probably reflects the original, pre-Christian rendering of the Tetragrammaton preceding ku,rioj of [the Septuagint]”.[[166]](#footnote-166) Putting aside the issue of whether these texts are ‘sufficiently close’ to the LXX to be grouped under that label, they are evidence of copies of the pre-Christian Jewish Greek Scriptures **not** **using ku,rioj**. Pietersma’s concession, quoted by Wyns, that Palestinian Jewish Greek Scriptures may not have used ku,rioj is telling for our thesis given that we are discussing five Palestinian writers.

P. Skehan[[167]](#footnote-167) places the manuscript evidence relating to the Jewish Greek Scriptures into four stages according to date, with only the last post-Christian stage showing the introduction of *kyrios*. Pietersma inverts this scheme by arguing that stage four reflects the original LXX and stages one to three are an archaizing or a hebraizing of the Greek original. He has two arguments, the first of which is useful. He notes that the Alexandrian philosopher, Philo, must have read *kyrios* in his biblical text.[[168]](#footnote-168) This prompts the point that talking about God and non-sacred writing about God in Greek used both *theos* and *kyrios*. The use of *kyrios* in quotations from the Jewish Scriptures could be the language of the day when talking and writing in Greek. The thesis that the Septuagint is the source of quotations in the NT is obviously not supported by this view of the matter.

Pietersma’s second argument that *kyrios* is original to the LXX is a technical one centred on translational consistency. He asserts that the way stage four Septuagint manuscripts have rendered the difference between hwhyl and hwhy, with and without a Greek article, from earlier (even the earliest) Septuagint manuscripts, shows that surrogates for the Tetragrammaton cannot have been involved in those manuscripts—as they lack the preposition l. The discussion thread cited by Wyns includes R. Furuli’s assessment of Pietersma’s second argument and Furuli thinks that Tov’s manuscript evidence, also cited by Wyns, refutes Pietersma’s second argument. We would add two further considerations: first, what resources does a scribe have to hand in copying a Greek scroll? Does he have not only the main document being copied, but other Greek and Hebrew sources for comparison? Pietersma’s argument rests on the assumption that a later scribe is working from one Greek source (*vorlage*) that he is copying. The second problem with Pietersma’s argument is that it doesn’t offer a criterion for distinguishing the translational consistency of the original translator as opposed to that of the later copyist or emending scribe; furthermore, where scholars observe more than one scribal hand in a manuscript, these are likely to be working together to produce a completed copy.

The argument that the apostles used the Septuagint because their use of *kyrios* for the Tetragrammaton must come from the LXX fails for lack of pre-Christian manuscript evidence despite Pietersma’s attempt to invert the evidence. Christian scribes could well be responsible for modernizing the Septuagint for the Diaspora. Of course, the failure of Wyns’ argument does not mean that the apostles did not ‘use’ the Septuagint; it is just that *this* argument fails.

(4) It is worth pausing when looking at the example of 1 Peter. What don’t we know? We don’t know if Peter had knowledge of 1QSa or its Hebrew text form (we don’t know the extent of distribution for such a text form—it could just be a Qumran scroll); we don’t know what (if any) Greek scroll of Isaiah Peter might have had access to or have read in the past. Was it a Septuagintal type scroll or a non-Septuagintal type of scroll? We don’t know what the process was in the writing out of the quotation of Isaiah in his letter. Were others consulted? Were various scrolls of Isaiah looked at or brought to mind? Was it memory recall?

Nevertheless, when we think about inspiration, there is a problem of explaining the difference(s) between the text of the various candidate sources and Peter’s letter. Wyns argues that the Spirit has set aside the dsx (‘goodliness’) of the Hebrew in favour of the do,xa of the Septuagint, but because the Septuagint has a plural suffix, and the MT has a singular suffix, Peter is using the singular suffix of the Hebrew with the do,xa of the Septuagint. We disagree. It is more likely that the Spirit is quoting its own writing and taking do,xa from 1 Pet 1:21, “Who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him **glory**; that your faith and hope might be in God”. The glory given to Christ is contrasted with the ‘glory’ of the flesh. The Spirit is not rejecting the inspired dsx of the Hebrew in favour of the uninspired do,xa of the Septuagint; rather it is developing its exposition in Peter’s letter by varying the Hebrew. As Wyns points out, LXX Isaiah 40 is unique for using do,xa for dsx and on this measure it is poor translation.[[169]](#footnote-169) It is therefore more likely that the Spirit is using its own expositional development of do,xa in 1 Peter, rather than giving credence to the poor translation of the Septuagint. In fact, the idiosyncratic uniqueness of do,xa in LXX Isaiah 40 suggests Christian harmonization.

(5) Wyns’ argument was, initially, and to paraphrase, “here is ‘body’ in the LXX but not the MT, and so the NT writer is using the LXX”. He offers *no theological or societal reason* as to why an Alexandrian Psalms’ translator would use the Hebrew and/or Targum ‘body’ of Exod 21:3 (assuming there was an Aramaic Targum tradition in Greek Alexandria?), especially as ‘ear’ is there in Exod 21:6 to back up the ‘ear’ of Ps 40:6. In further rebuttal, he now throws into the mix, ironically, the possibility of an early non-Septuagintal Greek Pentateuch with ‘body’ in Exod 21:3 for the later Psalms’ translator to use. The choice between our two positions is this:

**Wyns**: the Psalms’ uninspired translator is doing somewhat intricate intertextual exegesis with Exod 21:3 to undo the simple Hebrew of Ps 40:6 for some reason or other.

**Perry**: the Spirit is doing the intricate intertextual exegesis through the author of Hebrews with Exod 21:3 and Ps 40:6 to teach about the body of Christ in Heb 10:5.

We are not excluding knowledge of the Jewish Greek Scriptures (e.g. 2 Maccabees); and neither are we explaining away all correspondence between the Septuagint and the NT writings as Christian harmonisation. We are arguing that this *is* the case for Heb 10:5 and we are integrating the Spirit into our explanation of NT quotation.

(6) Wyns argues that “it would be natural for him [John] to use the ‘Bible’ that his readers were familiar with, namely, the Greek LXX/OG”. The assumption to question here is not that Greek speaking Jews were familiar with the Jewish Scriptures in Greek but rather that they were *not* familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures. Unlike us, John knows his Ephesus’ audience (to follow Wyns); he knows its size, whether there were ‘egg-heads’ in the ecclesia who knew Hebrew/Aramaic; its native and migrant make-up, *and so on*. A mixed make-up would facilitate the ecclesia’s understanding of John’s use of Scripture with regard to the differences between what we have in the MT and the LXX. Moreover, we should also question the assumption that John’s audience is not wider, given that he is writing a ‘gospel’.[[170]](#footnote-170) What Wyns needs to show from the text is that the implied reader *needs* his or her Septuagint to understand the use of Scripture in John.

Today, we might be familiar with several versions of the Bible; each version may have some influence on our thinking. We may use different versions for study and general reading; we may choose to quote one version even if we are communicating with others who use a different version—we are adaptable in the arena of different Bible versions.

It is fairly easy to see how *parthenos* (‘virgin’) could be a Christian motivated emendation in Isa 7:14—it’s theologically loaded (see below), but how do we tell whether John is quoting ’*anî hû*’ or *ego eimi* from Isaiah—is he using Greek or Hebrew? The Septuagint is a close literal translation of the Hebrew at just the point that underlies John—Isa 43:10-11 (thereby making a choice of source difficult on textual grounds), but it then becomes suspect in Isa 43:13,[[171]](#footnote-171) which makes the choice of a Hebrew source more certain. Nevertheless, given that the Septuagint is part of John’s literary co-text, there is an influence on John’s translation to take into account. Just as the Septuagint translators put *ego eimi* for ’*anî hû*’, John may be following common convention. But the intertextual connections[[172]](#footnote-172) between John 8 and Isaiah 43 indicate that Hebrew is the source—‘believe’ John 8:24, Isa 43:10; ‘know’ John 8:28, Isa 43:10; ‘before’ John 8:58, Isa 43:10; and ‘day’ with ‘I, I’ John 8:56, 58, Isa 43:11, 13 (MT only). It is because the Hebrew of Isa 43:13 “From the day, I *am* He” is important for Jesus’ reference to Abraham seeing his **day** (John 8:56), and then his assertion ‘before Abraham was I, I am’, that we can infer it is the Hebrew Scriptures which underlie John’s exposition.

(7) Christian commentators have a vested interest in Isa 7:14; if we turn to a Jewish commentator, we find the opposite opinion. Thus the Jewish commentator, J. Rosenberg, says of hml[ (*‘almâh*) “The word is used for a young woman, regardless of whether she is a virgin or not.”[[173]](#footnote-173) The issue is determined by the weight of the linguistic data and then the likely understanding of Isaiah’s words to his audience.

i) The Motyer quote is about the Hebrew and not the Septuagintal translation pattern favouring nea/nij (*neanis*). My argument was about the likely original Greek based on Septuagintal patterns of translation. Accordingly, when Motyer says, “Thus, wherever the context allows a judgment, *‘almâh* is not a general term meaning ‘young woman’ but a specific one meaning ‘virgin’.”, he is pitching his twentieth-century scholarly judgment against the judgment of the LXX translators.

ii) Motyer’s judgment rests on Song 6:8, but harems don’t usually have female virgins in them! Further, the LXX has nea/nij for hml[ in this text.

iii) The Witherington quote opposes Motyer in that he thinks ‘virgin’ is ‘possible’ for Song 6:8 whereas Motyer thinks this can be asserted without qualification. What Witherington does not show in the quote is why ‘virginal state’ is part of the *sense* of the word.

Our conclusion therefore is that Witherington and Motyer do not add anything to the debate here; Matthew is not quoting the LXX/OG *as Scripture*; rather, the Spirit is quoting and varying the Hebrew to bring out the typological application of the prophecy, inferring ‘virgin’ from the combination of ‘young woman’ with ‘God with us’.

(8) Our argument is that Greek translations of the Jewish Scriptures are part of the literary co-text for NT writers; the *influence* of the Septuagint is not discounted. Further, the superintendence of the Spirit over the lives of the NT writers no doubt made them aware of the variety of forms (‘versions’) of the Scriptures around in their day. However, Jesus’ teaching privileged the Hebrew Scriptures and this is the exegetical model to follow. Scholars typically stop at the Septuagint in their explanation of quotations if they see a good alignment; our argument is that we cannot stop there—we need to pass by to the Hebrew original and affirm that it is from here the Spirit quotes and it is from here that the NT writers quote regardless of the role (if any) we assign to the Septuagint. [3216]
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