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Editorial Policies: The **Christadelphian eJournal of Biblical Interpretation** seeks to fulfil the following objectives:

* Offer analytical and expositional articles on biblical texts.
* Engage with academic biblical studies that originate in other Christian confessions.
* Defend the biblical principles summarised in the common Christadelphian statement of faith.
* Subject the published articles to retrospective peer review and amendment.
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Editorial

With the advent of the Internet, it is possible to distribute biblical study materials without traditional costs. The Christadelphian community currently has no journal that covers *academic* biblical studies. There is a need for such a journal both to introduce and engage with biblical studies as it is practiced today academically within secular institutions and other confessions of the Christian church.

Human beings are imperfect knowing creatures and there is much error in doctrine and practice in Christian churches; this extends to associated secular and confessional academic biblical study. On the other hand, within the Christadelphian community, there are errors in interpretation of scripture in our published materials and our ongoing thinking. However, it is a premise of this eJournal that the Christadelphian community has a deposit of doctrinal principles which aid the correct interpretation of scripture. These help filter out errors in secular and confessional academic bible study, but as Christadelphian interpretation comes into contact with such bible study, there is a need for the *presentation* of that interpretation to change and thereby engage with the churches.

It may be a platitude to affirm that there is a mixture of truth and error in the Christian Church today, but the position of this eJournal is that churches need to “turn” away from many traditions in practice and interpretation that they have accrued since the times of the early church fathers; they need to “turn” very much as the Jews needed to “turn” in the days of John the Baptist. It is the purpose of this eJournal to add to the Christadelphian witness for such a “turning”.

This online journal will be circulated by e-mail attachment and stored online on the **Christadelphian eJournal of Biblical Interpretation** website. Each issue will be in Adobe format and password protected. Passwords will be circulated with each issue. In addition to containing the eJournal, the website will include academic materials. In order to avoid spamming, the magazine will be circulated separately in small distribution groups.

The inclusion of articles in this online journal is the decision of the editors, but after publication, articles are subject to retrospective peer review. This will allow authors to respond to comments and change their articles in the light of remarks. Online publication allows articles to be changed after publication, and for this reason, the articles will be given a version number and the website will hold corrected articles.

This online journal is intended to be a forum for articles written in an analytical style. It is a vehicle for exegetical and expositional articles, a distinction that we draw in the following way: exegetical articles are concerned with laying bare the various levels of meaning in a text without regard to the application of this information in the ecclesia. Expositional articles are exegetical and in addition show how the textual material is relevant to the ecclesia. Devotional and homiletical material lies outside the remit of the eJournal, but doctrinal and apologetic articles are welcomed provided they have the necessary analytical and exegetical approach. Articles on prophecy will be published but the aim of such articles will be to show how prophetic oracles apply in the days of the prophet and in the days of Christ and the apostles. The application of prophecies to other times will build on this basis but focus on principles rather than speculation.

Finally, the policy of the eJournal is to publish material that will be of value over time. They should therefore be presentations of ideas rather than controversies of the moment. Criticism of scholars and the citation of scholars for the purposes of criticism should be minimized. The policy of the eJournal is that while it is valuable to footnote sources which contain different points of view, these sources should not be quoted for the purposes of rebuttal. Rather, any opposing ideas and arguments should be rephrased and presented by the author who submits an article. A bibliography should accompany an article, if sources are used that have not been placed in footnotes.

**Future Articles 2007**

In future issues this year (DV), the following topics are planned.

* the political symbology of demon miracles
* the meaning of the book of Job
* the holy Spirit in Isaiah
* first century Jewish views of the Spirit
* Pentecost and the “last days” of the Jewish Commonwealth
* John the Baptist and Elijah
* the Assyrian invasion of Judah
* the bestowal of the Spirit in the days of Hezekiah
* contextualizing prophetic oracles

These articles are part of a coherent strategy which will be followed (DV) in the next few years. In and among a selection of articles covering different subjects, the eJournal will have a focus on the **doctrine of the Spirit**, and the position of Israel and the church in the purpose of God.

**The Spirit Yesterday and Tomorrow (1)**

**The Manifestation of the Spirit in Luke 1-2**

**Andrew Perry**

The manifestation of the Spirit features strongly at the beginning of Luke’s story. Luke narrates a prophetic witness in terms that evoke Joel 2:28-32, which predicts dreams, visions and prophecies for old men and young men, sons and daughters, handmaids and servants. Zacharias, an old man has a vision (Luke1:22), utters charismatic praise (Luke1:64-65[[1]](#footnote-1)) and prophesies (Luke1:64); Mary, a handmaid, sees an angel and utters the Magnificat; Elisabeth, an old woman, prophesies (Luke1:41-42); shepherds experience a theophany (Luke2:9); Simon, an old man, has a revelation (Luke2:26), and Anna, an old woman, is declared to be a prophetess. Given the cessation of prophecy since Malachi, this explosion of prophecy, vision and praise, is as much a fulfilment of Joel as Pentecost, and as such, part of the “last days” (Acts 2:17).

John the Baptist and Jesus are presented as prophets in Luke’ story (Luke 1:76, 4:24, 7:16, 26, 13:33, 20:6, 24:19, Acts 3:22-23, 7:37), and as such their possession of the Spirit falls within the compass of Joel’s latter day bestowal of the Spirit. The principal term for their preaching is one employed in Joel’s prophecy. The LXX of Joel 2:32 has “they that have the good news preached to them” as the corresponding interpretation of the Hebrew term for “the remnant” (KJV). The same verb is used by Gabriel to announce the birth of John the Baptist (“to bring you this good news”, Luke1:19 RSV), as well as the general “preaching” of the Gospel (e.g. Luke 4:18), and the apostolic mission (e.g. Acts 5:42). This commonality ties the three ministries of Luke-Acts together as an activity directed to the same generation rather than separate actions belonging to different epochs.

A further detail that suggests Luke was writing the fulfilment of Joel’s prophecy into the terms of his story opening is the expression, “power of the highest” (Luke 1:35). This strikes an echo with Luke’s later expression, “power from on high” (Luke 24:49), which refers to the bestowal of the Spirit at Pentecost.

If Luke regarded the “last days” as beginning with the advent of John the Baptist, it is likely that he viewed the manifestation of the Spirit throughout Luke-Acts as fulfilling the terms of Joel’s prophecy. The utterance by Peter, “this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel” (Acts 2:17), does not exclude other instances of fulfilment. Three considerations can be offered in support of the view that Luke saw all of the narrative time of Luke-Acts as the “last days”:

1) Luke’s gospel explicitly notes a “beginning” (Luke1:2), and Acts a “continuation” (Acts 1:1). The assertion, “which Jesus began to do and to teach” does not suggest that Luke thinks that there has been a “change in the times” and that therefore the “last days” have now begun and a corresponding bestowal of the Spirit can now be identified.

On the contrary, Luke has Jesus express the view that, “The law and the prophets wereuntil[[2]](#footnote-2) John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached” (Luke16:16). This suggests that something new began with John, and that its defining characteristic was the preaching of the kingdom in which Jesus also shared.

2) Luke’s summaries and speeches provide a synopsis of events and his gathering of events together in such overviews shows that he regarded the Gospel story as the beginning. Thus, his summaries and speeches start with Jesus’ ministry (e.g. Acts 2:22, 5:31, and 10:36-37), integrate John’s ministry (Acts 13:24), and end with Jesus’ glorification (e.g. Acts 3:13). This holistic perspective does not suggest that Luke saw any transition in “the times” between John and Jesus, or Jesus and the apostles.

3) Luke uses the prophecies of Malachi to interpret the work of John the Baptist and Jesus (Luke 3:16, 7:27). Malachi closely couples the work of the forerunner and the Coming One, and this does not allow for a change in the characteristics of the “times” that the two individuals enter—they address the same problematic. In Luke, the message about the “times” appears to be the same from both prophets. Thus John the Baptist warns of the “wrath to come” on that “generation” (Luke 3:7); likewise, Jesus warns of “wrath” to come “to this people” (Luke 21:23), and he frequently warns his “generation” (e.g. Luke7:31, 9:41). This language shows that Luke viewed John the Baptist and Jesus as living in the same “age”, a leading characteristic of which was wrath and the need for escape—the “last days”. The preaching of both prophets was likewise one that centred on the need for “repentance” (e.g. Luke 3:3, 5:32), and this message is carried forward into Acts (e.g. Luke 24:47, Acts 2:38-40).

The “last days” in Luke’s scheme of things is the “last days” of the Jewish Commonwealth. The bestowal of the Spirit is tied to this period of time. With the destruction of the temple in 70 CE, this period of time came to an end, and the Spirit was therefore withdrawn.

**Contextualizing Prophetic Oracles (1)**

**Babylon in Isaiah 13-14**

**Andrew Perry**

Babylon is mentioned in several of Isaiah’s prophecies, and scholars typically date such prophecies to be later than Isaiah of Jerusalem. However, Babylon was a major player in the days of Isaiah, and it is possible to interpret Isaiah’s oracles about Babylon in relation to the history of his own times. It is important to recognize that while we know something about Babylon from historical records, the prophetic texts are themselves primary texts for constructing history.

**Historical Background**

Babylon was a significant city in Isaiah’s day, more so than Nineveh. Nineveh’s status “oscillated between being a centre of power and a centre of resistance”.[[3]](#footnote-3) Prior to Sargon II (721-705 BCE), Assyrian kings had ruled from Calah, but Sargon II ruled from Sargon’s Fort. It was Sennacherib who made Nineveh the capital, but when he moved the court to Nineveh it was “a relatively small and rather run-down city”.[[4]](#footnote-4) It was after Sennacherib’s retreat from his siege of Jerusalem that he set about making Nineveh into a great city. The “greatness” of the city is reflected in the prophecies of Zephaniah and Jonah. The point we want to note, however, is that “Babylon” is not a term used to refer to Nineveh in Isaiah’s prophecies; the descriptions of Babylon do not fit what we know about Nineveh prior to 701 BCE.

Babylon was a more significant city than Nineveh until the seventh century. Assyrian kings were intermittently kings of Babylon in Isaiah’s day. Tiglath-Pileser III first assumed the title around 728-727 BCE, and introduced the institution of the “dual monarchy” over Assyria and the Babylonia region, adopting the title “king of Babylon”. He was succeeded by his son Shalmaneser’s who reigned until 722 BCE. Around this time, in the confusion following Shalmaneser’s death and the succession of Sargon II, Merodach-Baladan, an Aramean tribal lord, assumed control of the city of Babylon until Sargon II took the city back in 709 BCE and once more assumed the crown. Merodach-Baladan accepted Assyrian rule until the death of Sargon II in 705 BCE. When Sennacherib, Sargon’s successor, installed a puppet king over the city of Babylon, around 703 BCE, Merodach-Baladan overthrew him and was again king of the city for a brief period until 702 BCE. Sennacherib retook the southern half of Mesopotamia in a campaign in 702 BCE and installed another puppet king who was unable to assume effective control. Eventually, one of Sennacherib’s sons took the title of “King of Babylon” in 700 BCE, reigning on behalf of his father. Sennacherib eventually sacked Babylon in 689 BCE, after an uprising by Elamites who had killed his son and taken the city.

**Isaiah 13-14**

Scholars typically treat Isaiah 13-14 (“the burden of Babylon”) as exilic or post-exilic and about the Babylonian empire. They do this primarily on the basis of the occurrence of “Babylon” in these oracles. However, the king of Assyria was at times during the eighth/seventh centuries the “king of Babylon” (e.g. 2 Kgs 17:24), and he boasted of this status.[[5]](#footnote-5) Accordingly, Isa 14:4 could be about the king of Assyria, and this identity is suggested by Isa 14:25, which uses the term “the Assyrian” of this king.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Sennacherib was never “King of Babylon”. Following the lead of Isa 14:25, the “king of Babylon” of Isa 14:4 could well be Shalmaneser, who invaded Northern Israel. This identification fits the dating superscription for the next oracle in Isa 14:28, which dates that oracle to ca. 715 B.C.E. (Ahaz’ death). Further, this king “boasts” that he will exalt himself above the “stars of God” (Isa 14:13), which is a figure for the tribes of Israel, and a suitable piece of propaganda supporting a programme of conquest for Israel and Judah. On this basis, we suggest that the king is Shalmaneser and that the context of the oracle is the invasion of Northern Israel in 722/721 B.C.E.

The imperial policy of the Assyrian kings towards Israel and Judah causes Yahweh to declare that he will “break” the king of Babylon (Isa 14:5), and that he will “break” the Assyrian (Isa 14:25) upon the mountains of Israel. The intention is declared and spoken against Shalmaneser, but it is not “fulfilled” until 701 B.C.E. against Sennacherib.[[7]](#footnote-7) The oracle is not spoken against the individual Assyrian monarch, but rather the Assyrian monarchy.

On this reading, it cannot be assumed that Isa 13:17 refers to a Median conquest of the city of Babylon. Rather, it is just as possible that since the Israelites were transported to Media (2 Kgs 17:6) by Shalmaneser, this caused unrest in that region, with the result that their places of settlement were attacked by the Medes. The Medes are brought against “them”—the displaced people, not against “it”—a city.

Similarly, it cannot be assumed that the oracle is predicting a destruction of the city of Babylon in Isa 13:19. There were several sackings of the city prior to its rise as the capital of the Babylonian empire, and the Medo-Persian conquest of the city did not result in its destruction. The prediction does not describe an *event* of destruction, but rather the eventual desolate *state* of Babylon. This changes the rhetorical purpose of the oracle. The eventual desolate state of Babylon is contrasted with the favour to be bestowed on Israel (Isa 14:1).

The prediction is that the city would become a “possession” for animals (Isa 13:20-22, 14:22-23), and the rhetoric here is a contrast: it will become a possession for animals instead of being a “possession” of the king of Assyria.[[8]](#footnote-8) Babylon was “the glory of kingdoms” (KJV), which conveys the idea of a glorious possession of the kingdoms (2 Sam 1:19, Jer 3:19, Ezek 20:6), but it changed hands several times during Isaiah’s lifetime between the Chaldean tribes and Assyria.

The point in declaring that Babylon would be a possession for animals is to discourage Judah from making alliances with the Chaldeans. During the eighth century, overtures were made to Judah by the Chaldean tribes for strategic purposes (Isaiah 39). As such, the prediction may have had the intended function of deterring those in Judah from seeking an alliance with Babylon against Assyria. There was no basis for security in such an alliance, because the “glory of the kingdoms” would be a possession for animals.

For these reasons, we locate Isaiah 13-14 in an Assyrian context, although it is possible to re-apply the oracles (in a secondary, typical, sense,) to Babylon.

**Understanding Demons (1)**

**Demons, Medicine and Jesus**

**Andrew Perry**

Jesus exorcised demons and used the language of exorcism. Many commentators would say that therefore Jesus believed in demons. However, it can not be simply assumed that Jesus believed in demons because he used the language of exorcism. He may have used such language because it was the language of the day. The question arises therefore as to how this issue can be settled either way.

The purpose of this article is to show that the language of exorcism was not the only language of the day available to Jesus. Magic was not the only medicine; orthodox medicine was critical of magic and sceptical of its claims. So why is there no record of Jesus’ criticizing the thought-world of exorcism?

The situation of the 1c. was not unlike that today where we have traditional medicine and “alternative” medicine. The Hippocratic Writings are a benchmark of orthodoxy and one of these writings, *On the Sacred Disease*,[[9]](#footnote-9) castigates those who treat epilepsy as symptomatic of demon-possession. The writer comments,

“I do not believe that the ‘Sacred Disease’ is any more divine or sacred than any other disease but, on the contrary, has specific characteristics and a definite cause. Nevertheless, because it is completely different from other diseases, it has been regarded as a divine visitation by those who, being only human, view it with ignorance and astonishment. This theory of divine origin, though supported by the difficulty of understanding the malady, is weakened by the simplicity of the cure, consisting merely of ritual purification and incantation. If remarkable features in a malady were evidence of divine visitation,[[10]](#footnote-10) then there would be many ‘sacred diseases’...” *On the Sacred Disease* 1[[11]](#footnote-11)

The natural explanation, (which we need not elaborate), offered by the writer of this treatise, appears fantastical by today’s measures. However, it is not his explanation that is of interest to us, but rather his criticism of the magical tradition. As part of the Hippocratic corpus, this criticism would have been central to Greek medical training. However, it is the method that it is important: - look for regular natural causes of disease.[[12]](#footnote-12) The method and theory shows that recourse to the *supernatural* (demon possession or possession by the gods) was not the only approach in the ancient world.

The influence of the Hippocratic tradition in medicine can be seen in Jewish medicine. For example, a positive attitude to medicine is illustrated in the Jewish book of wisdom – *Sirach* (ca. 2c. BCE).[[13]](#footnote-13) This text (e.g. Sir 38:1-15) illustrates a dependence on God and a use of natural remedies, along with prayer and sacrifice. Or again, Josephus reports in his *Wars of the Jews[[14]](#footnote-14)* that the Essenes researched medicinal roots and properties of stones for the healing of diseases:

“They also take great pains in studying the writings of the ancients, and choose out of them what is most for the advantage of their soul and body; and they inquire after such roots and medicinal stones as may cure distempers” *War* 2.135, cf. *Ant.* 8.136[[15]](#footnote-15)

We can also see the influence of the Hippocratic tradition in Roman medical writings of the period, like those of Celsus (14-37 CE) or Galen (129-199 CE). One scholar comments:

“The idea that human disease is the consequence of divine wrath does not appear in Greek medicine; Galen mentions it only to add that so few believe. Similarly rejected is the concept, which probably originated with the Persians, and which strongly influenced Judaism in the post-exilic period as well as early Christianity, that sickness is the consequence of demonic possession.”[[16]](#footnote-16)

This brief characterization of the Hippocratic tradition illustrates that Jesus doesn’t stand in this tradition — he has more in common with the language of Jewish exorcism.

The contrast between magic and medicine shows that disease and illness are social constructs and diagnosis and prognosis reflect social beliefs. That is, the *description* of symptoms and behaviours is determined by belief systems. Such belief systems condition the message of the “exorcist” or “doctor”. Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz comment, “Just as social expectations and patterns of explanation are a constitutive part of the sicknesses and infirmities, so too social expectations and interpretations play a part in the charisma of the miracle-worker.”[[17]](#footnote-17) Their argument here is that Jesus knew how to combine his extraordinary gift of healing with a message about the kingdom of God, which was to some extent cast in terms that the people understood. In short, there is a symbolic layer of meaning to Jesus’ exorcisms, a symbology to do with the kingdom of God.

The question posed at the beginning of this article can be restated. Does Jesus employ the language of the day in order to function as a healer? Does he exorcise demons in order to teach about the kingdom of God, but without belief on his part in any reality of demons? How can this issue be settled? Our proposal is that it can only be settled if the records show that Jesus exorcised demons in such a way as to make it clear that he did not believe in the corresponding demonology. This question will be investigated in future issues.

**Intertextual Study of the Hebrew Bible**

**Andrew Perry**

Intertextual Bible study today is carried out with computer tools. The advent of these tools is changing the face of academic study of the Bible. Intertextual analysis has always taken place, i.e. the comparing of text with text, but this process is greatly facilitated by computer tools. This kind of study can contribute towards establishing i) unity of authorship, ii) where a text quotes a alludes a precursor text, iii) where there is a relationship of echo, iv) common topics and contrasting points of view between texts, and v) the range of meaning for an expression.

The question arises as to how you show that two separate texts have a common topic. How do you show more than the obvious fact that “the author of text one used Hebrew like the authors of these other texts, and so he is bound to have some vocabulary in common”? The answer to this question lies in the idea of design.

The point of collecting texts with shared vocabulary is to ascertain whether there is a shared pattern that *explains* what is common between two texts. Whether a shared word is coincidental or not is a question of purpose and/or design. An author may intentionally quote or allude to other texts and this may explain the shared vocabulary; or an author may write about the same topics as other texts, and in this way share vocabulary with those texts; if there is a shared topic there will be a shared design.

If a “design” works in two texts, the elements of that design are working in the same way; the referential values of the shared vocabulary have remained constant. This is essentially the “Argument from Design”. It is less likely that one element in a text *coincidentally* means the same as its counterpart in another text if it participates in a larger design.

It is obviously arbitrary to insist that any links are just comprised of unique, exclusive, or rare words. This stipulation assumes that the surviving literature that we have (the Hebrew Scriptures) is the measure for what is unique, exclusive or rare. The insistence also rules out *a priori* the possibility of two texts being linked by common vocabulary. It is one thing to assert that such links cannot be *known* because the vocabulary is common; it is a separate claim to assert that such links are *not possible* using common vocabulary. Our counter-argument is that such links can be known, but the case is cumulative and a question of design.

It is important to distinguish what we mean by *sharing vocabulary*. There are two possibilities to note, diachronic and synchronic:[[18]](#footnote-18)

1) Some vocabulary may be shared because there is an allusion or quotation[[19]](#footnote-19) by the author of a text to a corresponding precursor text (or vice-versa). Such a connection may be part of a contrast with the precursor text or it may be in concert with the precursor text. This kind of argument requires us to show that the author of the later text has *intended* a connection with a precursor text (or vice-versa). Intentional sharing of vocabulary *can* be proven if some of the following obtain: i) the precursor text can be shown to be such, ii) the author knew of the candidate precursor text, iii) the vocabulary is *part* of a larger shared design, such as a theme, a motif, or a narrative plot, and iv) the vocabulary shared by the texts is rare or distinctive in some way.

The claim of sharing a design is as much a claim to an allusion as the claim of shared lexical material. In terms of method, the claim to a sharing of design is more impressive, because of its larger scope and the involvement of multiple elements. If these elements and concomitant design are found in another text within a shared and known literary environment, then it is more likely that there is allusion.

However, allusions and quotations are only *one* reason why vocabulary might be shared.

2) Some vocabulary may be shared without any intended allusiveness (or without any *intended* linkage). In order for a text to be talking about, say, an eighth century crisis, it is not necessary for the author to allude to any corresponding prophetic texts. The vocabulary might be shared simply because the *topic* is the same.[[20]](#footnote-20) The idea of matching one text to another does not imply there is a relationship of quotation or allusion between two texts. The idea is merely one that says that text one can be read in the same way as text two, if you take its shared vocabulary to have the same intended sense and reference. Whether we should do this is a matter of whether text one makes *more sense* in such an interpretative context.

In order to facilitate this kind of analysis, we use the notion of an “echo”: a text echoes another text where there is some shared vocabulary.[[21]](#footnote-21) If we restrict our method to this kind of analysis, we largely remove the idea of an author working in a literary environment.

The question arises as to how an interpreter can *know* whether the vocabulary that one text shares with another text is to be read in the same way. This reading can be justified using the argument from design noted above: if the rarer shared nouns and verbs consistently contribute to a single kind of reading (a single design), then this is a significant result; it is significant that the shared vocabulary is not pointing in different directions. Further, if the quantity of nouns and verbs that contribute to a single reading is large, then this makes the achievement of a singular reading all the more remarkable. However, the mere fact that such a reading is possible requires an explanation; the obvious (ironical) suggestion is that the design is *intended*.

**Reconfiguring Job (1)**

**Method of Study**

**Andrew Perry**

The literature on Job is vast. The approach taken in this series is found in one other commentary,[[22]](#footnote-22) and it is not the kind of reading offered by standard commentaries. Our view is that Job has something to do with *Judah*, and in particular it needs to be read as a *parable* of the times of Hezekiah, with Job being seen as representative of Hezekiah. Job is difficult to read. The normal key in the commentaries is the “wisdom tradition” of the Bible and other near-eastern writings. This key opens the surface of the book, but the key we use opens a parabolic level of meaning. This takes Job to be a discussion of God’s providential handling of Judah in the reign of Hezekiah. As such it is a discussion of prophecy and an explanation of Hezekiah’s suffering.

Job is a book that has been developed with a story about a patriarchal individual called Job. It is a drama written for performance[[23]](#footnote-23) using this story, but carrying an eighth/seventh century debate. The parable[[24]](#footnote-24) can only be uncovered by intertextual study. Strictly speaking, the parable only exists in the prologue and the epilogue: these parts of the book are obviously a story, but our argument is that the story is parabolic. The dialogue is *not* parabolic unless it is seen in relation to the narrative envelope.

If we put the prologue/epilogue to one side and take the dialogue on its own, the background information we have in the speeches takes on a new significance, and the character of that information is different. There are indications of kingship, political power, military conflict, policies of state, party groupings, diplomatic talks, and a crisis. It is then a question of identifying the historical context for this kind of dialogue. The prologue/epilogue disguises this level of meaning with a story about a patriarch.

The parabolic approach is almost non-existent amongst the commentaries, which instead concentrate on determining the Hebrew text of Job, relating the text to comparative religious material, offering a surface paraphrase of the arguments in the book, and considering such questions as provenance, consistency and intent; to this mix they add value judgments on the lasting theological worth of the book (as a theodicy) in the Judeo-Christian tradition. Some commentaries observe that the book *may* represent an allegory of the nation of Israel and its suffering, but this has generally not been accepted.[[25]](#footnote-25)

Many commentators offer the view that the book is about the problem of Job’s innocent suffering. Our opinion is that the book is not about the “problem of suffering”; it is not a theodicy. The book is about whether a man can serve God for nothing (i.e. whether disinterested righteousness is possible). If Satan’s challenge is being tested in the book, this can only mean that Job’s suffering is the way that he is tested for disinterested righteousness during[[26]](#footnote-26) his life. His suffering brings about a state in which he has nothing, and this enables the test to proceed as to whether he serves God for nothing.[[27]](#footnote-27)

If we ask why an author would write such a narrative, our proposal is that it was written to explain the suffering of Hezekiah and the nation during the Assyrian crisis. The author has encoded this explanation in a play about Hezekiah, with Job representing the king. The value of this kind of writing in the period prior to the Exile is easy to appreciate, as it offers an explanation of recent suffering. It also bolsters confidence in “the land” in times of external threat; hence our suggestion would be that it is an apologetic prophetic work written during the times of Jeremiah.

Our study will uncover a parabolic meaning in the epilogue/prologue of Job, and a more literal political and military interpretation of the speeches. An original audience for Job might not have had the necessary background knowledge for such a reading. In the absence of such knowledge, the play works on a surface level as a dialogue about the suffering of a patriarch. If an audience had *some* background knowledge of the eighth century prophets, they could well have unlocked the deeper meaning that we present.[[28]](#footnote-28) Accordingly we conclude that it is entirely plausible to propose that an author would write a play about Hezekiah in a patriarchal style.

This study offers an answer to the problems left over by other models insofar as it i) explains how the prologue fits with the dialogue, ii) it explains how God’s speeches address the concerns of the dialogue, and iii) it explains the political and military overtones inherent in the dialogue. All of these issues are dealt with inadequately by conventional models. The reading proposed in this study is non-arbitrary insofar as it is derived from an intertextual reading of Job with the Prophets; it can be evaluated by assessing the proffered links. In future articles we will explore the language of Job and show how it is taken from the book of Isaiah.

**The Mission of the Seventy**

**Paul Wyns**

In the Old Testament the nation of Israel functioned as a microcosm of the heavenly sanctuary, with Yahweh enthroned in the midst of the nation. The Tabernacle was modelled on the Garden of Eden, which itself was symbolic of the ‘heavenly sanctuary.’ Israel was meant to become a nation of ‘kings and priests’ with *seventy spirit endowed “judges”.* The nation would have *effectively become the “‘divine council” on earth*, *with* God dwelling in the midst.

The sending of the seventy (two) in Luke is chronologically placed after the transfiguration encounter with Moses. The parallels with the Exodus (24:1) account are obvious – as Jesus had just descended the mount where he had communed with Moses. Luke has Jesus appoint 70 missionaries, in equivalence with the seventy elders who received the Spirit. When his disciples reported on the success of their mission it was in the language of the divine council (Isa.14: 12), that Jesus described their victory, *“I beheld Satan as lightening fall from heaven.”*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Jesus sends 12 disciples | Matt 10:1-14//Mk 6:7-13//Lk.9:1-6 |
| Transfiguration | Matt 17:1-13//Mk 9:1-13//Lk 9:28-36 |
| Jesus sends 70 “others” in pairs of two | Lk 10:1-12 |

The sending of the twelve in Lk 9:1-6 and the parallel in Matt 10:1-14 shows affinities both to Mk 6:7-13 and to the material in Lk 10:1-12. However, Luke omits mention of their being sent out two by two and Matthew has the same omission. It is only when the seventy are sent out that we learn of their pairing. What is addressed to the twelve in Matthew is addressed to the seventy (two) in Lk 10:1. [[29]](#footnote-29) Moreover, when Luke refers back to the instructions given to the twelve in 22:35, the allusion is in fact to the wording of Matt 10:4.[[30]](#footnote-30)

Israel never fulfilled the divine intention of becoming a missionary nation of kings and priests – sending its seventy spirit endowed elders with the gospel message (initially revealed to Abraham) to the typical seventy Gentile nations (Genesis 10). Instead some of the princes, who initially judged Israel, rebelled against God (Korah rebellion).

In Luke the seventy are sent to the villages of Israel. They are called *“others”* to differentiate them from the “twelve”. They go *“before his face”* (Luke 10:1) — reminiscent of the language used of the forerunner John the Baptist. The “harvest” is entrusted to the disciples — the OT background is the final gathering of God’s people (Isa 27:12; Joel 3:13), elsewhere carried out by angels or the Son of man (Matt 13:39; Rev 14). For Luke this mission clearly carries eschatological overtones — an urgent apocalyptic mission to summon Israel to radical repentance. The disciples are authorised to witness in the name of Jesus and the people’s response to their message, including their treatment of the witnesses, is counted as the response to Jesus and therefore to God himself.

The saying of Jesus to the twelve has been the subject of dispute: “But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come” (Matt 10:23). Various interpretations of this passage have been offered, the liberal view contends that Jesus believed the end of time would take place in his day, and thus the apostles would not accomplish their mission before he returned.[[31]](#footnote-31) Another proposal is to read it as; “You will not have finished your preaching in the cities of Israel until I come, that is, *until I catch up with you.*” [[32]](#footnote-32) Yet, another view[[33]](#footnote-33) contends that it is a reference to a literal *return* in A.D. 70, at which point there was meant to occur the resurrection of the dead, the judgment day, and the end of the world. However, this does not account for Matt 24:36 where (the pre-resurrection) Jesus declares himself ignorant of the timing of the *Return.* Furthermore, this view divorces the passage from its immediate and localized context, by arguing that the saying only relates to the end of time, leaving it with no relevance to the disciples.[[34]](#footnote-34) Other scholars relate the saying to his resurrection appearances,[[35]](#footnote-35) or the day of Pentecost,[[36]](#footnote-36) or possibly the transfiguration (coming in his Kingdom).

The majority of scholarship relates the “coming” event of the saying to the *Roman invasion of Palestine,* which occurred in A.D. 66-70. Divine punishments are commonly referred to in the Bible as a “coming.” [[37]](#footnote-37) The urgency of the mission (fleeing from city to city) seems to fit the looming Roman invasion (Christ “coming” in judgement), moreover, the warnings in Matthew 10 are thematically linked to Luke 21, a chapter which is primarily concerned with the judgement of Jerusalem (implemented by the Romans).

*The Faithful Witness*

The witnessing of Revelation 11 is structured around the witnessing missions in the Gospels. A brief comparison demonstrates that Revelation 11 alludes to the synoptic gospels when framing the mission of the two witnesses:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The witnesses sent out in pairs(Luke 10:1) | Two witnesses  (Rev 11:3) |
| “Nothing shall in any means hurt you” (Luke 10:19) | “If any man will hurt them…”(Rev 11:5) |
| “Brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony (witness) against them and the Gentiles” (Matt 10:18) | “Thou must prophesy again before many peoples and nations and tongues and kings” (Rev 10:11 = 11:3) |
| “And fear not them which kill thebody , but are not able to kill the soul but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell” (Matt 10:28)  | “The Beast shall overcome and kill them …. their dead bodies …. spirit of life from God entered into them” (Rev 11:11) |
| “More tolerable for Sodom in the day of judgment” (Matt10:15) | Spiritually called Sodom(Rev 11:8) |
| “I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven” (Luke 10:19) | “That great dragon (SATAN) cast out [of heaven]” (Rev 12:9) |

 *Conclusion*

This article tentatively suggests that a final witnessing will occur in Israel. The missionary activities of the disciples in the first century are employed as a template for the final witnessing in Revelation 11. The prophetic saying in Matt 10:23 reflects continuous and discontinuous elements — it was applicable to the coming in judgment of the first century, but will only reach its full potential in the final witnessing to Israel just before the “coming of the Son of man”, who is “the faithful witness”.

**Re-using Psalm 79**

**Paul Wyns**

In this article, we will evaluate the use of Psalm 79 in later scripture and other Jewish writings. Psalm 79 is part of the collection of the twelve Asaph Psalms attributed in recent studies to northern sources;[[38]](#footnote-38) however, we would argue that the Asaph Psalms reflect the original *Sitz im Leben* of Hezekiah’s reign — who openly courted the northern tribes in his attempt at reformation and cultic centralization.

The Psalm has an evident “last days” (eschatological) application,[[39]](#footnote-39) and by “last days” we mean that it has an application in a situation where the existence of the state is under mortal threat. This can be seen in Jeremiah’s use of the Psalm, by its use in the times of the Maccabees, and in Revelation.

1) The Psalm was subsequently employed by Jeremiah to lament the Babylonian destruction:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Psalm 79 |  | Jeremiah |
| 1 | The heathen are come into thine inheritance | Lam. 1:10 |
| 2 | Dead bodies for meat to the fowls, etc. | 7:33;15:3; 34:20 |
| 3 | None to bury | 14:16; 16:4,6 |
| 4 | Become a reproach | 24:9; 25:18;  |
|  |  | Lam. 2:15,16; 5:1 |
| 6 | Pour out thy wrath — thy name | 10:25 |
| 7 | Devoured Jacob | 10:25; 50:7; 51:34,35 |
| 8 | Our former sins (i.e., of ancient times) | 11:10 |
| 9 | Help us, O God | 14:7,21 |

2) The Psalm is also quoted in intertestamental writings. The apocryphal books of 1 & 2 Maccabees recount the Jewish struggle against the Seleucid Empire forces that had tried to prevent the people of Israel from practicing Judaism. Judah Maccabee and his brothers destroyed overwhelming forces, and rededicated the Temple in Jerusalem.

In this history, a deceitful expedition by Bacchides and his slaughter of men loyal to the Maccabeans is described in terms of the Psalm, “The flesh of thy saints have they cast out, and their blood have they shed round about Jerusalem, and there was none to bury them” (1 Macc 7:17). Other intertestamental writings to quote or allude to the Psalm include the Psalms of Solomon (2:2, 27, 4:19, 8:20).

3) Revelation 11 also draws on elements of Psalm 79 and synthesizes them:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Psalm 79 |  | Revelation 11 |
| 1 | The heathen (Gentiles) are come into thine inheritance… they have defiled.. | 2 |
| 2 | The dead bodies of thy servants. | 8,9 |
| 2 | The flesh of thy saints… the beasts of the earth.. | 7 |
| 3 | None to bury them. | 9 |
| 4 | A reproach to our neighbours, a scorn and derision…. | 10 |
| 5 | How long Lord? | 11 |
| 6 | Pour out thy wrath upon the heathen. | 18 (16:1) |
| 11 | Let the sighing of the prisoners come before thee. | 11 |
| 12 | Render sevenfold into their bosom. | (7 vials ch16) |
| 13 | We will give thee thanks for ever. | 17 |

Revelation 11 employs Psalm 79 as a backdrop to the witnessing. A Psalm that has as its subscription: *Shushan-Eduth* – the witness/testimony/covenant of the Lilies. It is a Psalm that has a long history that is only pertinent to the nation of Israel in times of Gentile persecution.

**Psalm 2**

**Paul Wyns**

According to Gunkel’s classification into genres,[[40]](#footnote-40) Psalm 2 belongs to the “Royal Psalms”.[[41]](#footnote-41) Most are thought to be postexilic and symbolic; they are not regarded as historical poems based on a king’s enthronement, but rather cultic texts which belonged to a ceremony celebrating the Davidic covenant and the messianic promises within the general setting of the covenant festival. However, recently more attention is being paid to editorial work in the Psalter [[42]](#footnote-42) on the grounds that the governing principles of the final collection are not liturgical but rather literary. Accordingly, the Psalter has not developed in a haphazard and arbitrary way, but has been carefully woven together in such a manner that previously independent compositions or smaller collections of such compositions now comment upon or respond to one another. Brennan concludes that approaching the Psalter as literature (rather than generic cultic liturgy) opens the way to an eschatological and messianic interpretation of many texts which had originally only a limited national and historic setting.

In his Introduction, B. S. Childs focused on the final form of the Psalter and saw eschatological reinterpretation as its governing motif. We would argue for the importance of all the various elements, the original historical setting (recognizing that this is often difficult to establish), the liturgical and cultic *Sitz im Leben*, and the final edited literary form.

The apostles refer to Psalm 2 as Davidic (Acts 4:25-31), but this does not exclude it being re-used and/or adapted by Hezekiah.[[43]](#footnote-43) In Hezekiah’s day, the setting for the Psalm would have been an enthronement ceremony enacted by Hezekiah after his recovery from the dual threat of mortal illness and Assyrian invasion. It celebrates the re-establishment of the Davidic covenant when the nation and the king survived the threat of extinction. The psalmist exhorts the pagan nations to abandon their rebellious plans against Yahweh and His anointed king and submit to the authority of this king whom God has ordained to rule the nations and smash all rebellion. The psalm begins with a rhetorical question, “Why do the nations rage?” The psalmist is expressing amazement and indignation at their foolish act of rebellion. This theme of re-establishment of the monarchy is picked up in two NT passages.

1) The re-establishment of the Davidic monarchy is the underlying typology for the reference to Acts 4 by Peter. The Psalm was applied by the apostles Peter and John in Acts 4:25-31 to the redemptive act wrought by Jesus. Christ (the anointed) King who re-established the Davidic covenant, and who, like, Hezekiah was “raised” on the third day (2 Kgs 20:5), and enthroned on high, thus saving the nation from extinction.

2) The establishment of the monarchy as a response to a “last days” crisis, such as that of 701, is also the eschatological element that has been used in Revelation 11. A tabular comparison demonstrates the correspondence between the motifs in the Psalm and Revelation 11:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Revelation 11 (Seventh Trumpet) | Psalm 2 |
|  |  |
| “The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ” (v.15). | “Yet have I set my king, upon my holy hill at Zion” (v.6). |
|  |  |
| “And the nations were angry” (v.18). | “Why do the nations rage?” (v.1). |
|  |  |
| Thy wrath is come” (v.18). | “Then shall he speak to them in his wrath and vex them in his sore displeasure”(v.5). |
|  |  |
| “Thou hast taken thy great power, and hast reigned” (v.17). | “Ask of me, and I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession” (v.8). |
|  |  |
| “A man child, who is to rule all nations with a rod of iron” (12:15). | “Thou art my son” (v.7).“Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron” (v.9). |
|  |  |
| “Woman travailing in birth” (12:2). | “This day I have begotten thee” (v.7). |
|  |  |
| “The kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ” (Gr. anointed) (12:10). | “Against the Lord, and against his anointed” (Christ) (v.2). |
|  |  |
| “That thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name” (v.18). | “Blessed are they that put their trust in him” (v.12).“Serve the Lord with fear and rejoice with trembling” (v.11). |
|  |  |
| “Destroy them which destroy the earth” (v.18). | “Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel” (v.9). |

We have elsewhere[[44]](#footnote-44) argued that Psalm 79 has a history associated with Gentile persecution of the nation of Israel. Psalm 2 on the other hand (which we believe comes from the same original setting) celebrates a complete reversal of fortune (resurrection). The Psalm represents a triumph and an enthronement. It is the climax of covenant renewal both individual and communal – for the king represents the people. God has not yet finished with the people of Israel – *for the receiving of them shall be life from the dead* (Rom 11:15).
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