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**Editorial**

There is a large amount of advanced bible study carried out around the world. Two statistics illustrate this: firstly, the annual conference for the Society of Biblical Literature attracts more than a thousand participants. It is held in the USA as a joint conference with the American Academy of Religion and a joint conference program is run. For this joint conference, the attendees number up to five thousand and it is difficult to get an accurate proportionate figure for the SBL attendees. In the UK, the annual NT conference for the British New Testament Society attracts about 300 participants and the corresponding OT conference about one hundred participants (the membership for the OT Society is over three hundred). The periodicals *Old Testament Abstracts* and *New Testament Abstracts* each offer one-paragraph abstracts of articles relevant to biblical studies from over four hundred magazines and journals from around the world. In a typical year, *New Testament Abstracts* will abstract about two thousand articles and books in its field, and *Old Testament Abstracts* will abstract up to fifteen hundred. Of course, these statistics interpret “bible study” in broad terms to cover comparative historical and archeological research into bible times; both journals exclude university theses from their abstracts.

Any student samples this material and will form an impression of its value. On the basis of one sampling over many years, it seems that academic research contains a great volume of mistaken interpretation. This is a platitude easily proven by reference to citations of the work of other scholars. Secondly, and more seriously, the OT is “broken” in many ways: copyist errors (intentional and unintentional) are proposed as a matter of routine; multiple editorial changes during the history of transmission, particularly the exile, are accepted; multiple authors are proposed for the books, often late, and with competing agendas; and historical inaccuracies and theologically motivated presentation of events are *de rigueur*.

As fortune would have it, these two characteristics have a cancelling affect. If a scholar argues the text is “broken” in a certain way, there is bound to be a scholar who argues that in this instance it is not “broken”. S/he is likely to say that it is “broken” in other ways. Either way it does not matter. What this situation affords is an opportunity to reconfigure genuine scholarly insights within a framework that does not “break” the text. Conservative scholars, who are in the minority, offer some directions in this enterprise; but it is also often the case that conservative scholars have taken on board dominant critical readings. What is required is a flexible approach to the historical imagining of the text and close attention to the intertextual connections within the text.

**Demarcating Prophetic Oracles**

**Andrew Perry**

**Introduction**

If we define a prophetic oracle “unit” to be any discrete amount of text, we can then define a prophetic oracle to be comprised of one or more such units collected together from the same circumstances of delivery. Such a definition is somewhat abstract, but its discussion can move forward the understanding of prophecy.

It is a definition that takes oral delivery of oracle units as a defining characteristic; moreover, it takes the recovery of the circumstances in which an oracle unit is delivered to be the basis for understanding prophecy. As a methodological choice, this definition relegates elements in and among prophetic oracles that originate at the point of writing to the position of facilitating the understanding of the oracles on the part of the reader.

Many prophetic oracles, if not all, show signs of oral delivery. One obvious pointer would be the direct address to an audience, such as “Assemble yourselves together and come” (Isa 45:20), or a direct exhortation to a specific group, “Listen, O isles unto me and hearken, ye people, from far” (Isa 49:1). There is stamped across the oracles of Isaiah 40-66 the marks of oral delivery in the form of first person address. This is one reason why the conservative commentary approach to these oracles is wrong because it regards the oracles as having been *written in the first place* in isolation from its intended audience of Babylonian exiles.

The issue for discussion in this article therefore concerns the demarcation and arrangement of prophetic oracles and units. Decisions here affect interpretation and mistakes are easy as is evidenced in the possibilities canvassed by commentaries; the Cyrus oracles are a case in point.

**Isaiah 44:24-28**

This is the first oracle. The marker “thus saith the Lord” signals the start of the unit, and this is a common indicator of a both new oracle units and new oracles. C. Westermann observes[[1]](#footnote-1) after the “Thus saith the Lord” of v. 24 that there is a series of participle verbs without a main verb. This comes out in the KJV as a series of “that” clauses:

“I *am* the Lord that maketh…that stretcheth…that spreadeth…That frustrateth…and maketh…that turneth….and maketh…That confirmeth…and performeth…that saith to Jerusalem…That saith to the deep…That saith of Cyrus…” Isa 44:24-28 (KJV)

The oracle is easily demarcated because of the repetition of “Thus saith the Lord” in Isa 45:1 which is not a participle and repeats the common form of Isa 44:28. The effect of the series of participles is to create a preamble to the next oracle about Cyrus.

**Isa 45:1-7**

The beginning of the next oracle is easy enough to discern, but the end is less clear. Again, Westermann’s analysis is decisive. He notes[[2]](#footnote-2) firstly that the closing declaration of Isa 44:28 that Cyrus “doeth all” (lk hf[, KJV “performeth all”) is matched by the closing declaration in Isa 45:7 that the Lord “doeth all” (lk hf[). Secondly, he notes that the address to the “heavens” in Isa 44:23 to “sing” is matched by an address to the heavens in Isa 45:8 to “rain down” righteousness, and these two commands are best seen as utterances that bookend the oracles of Isa 44:24-28/45:1:7.

We can therefore be confident that Isa 45:8 is not part of the Cyrus oracle, even if we still need to explain its current location; we can also be certain that the units Isa 45:9-10 and Isa 45:11-13 are not “part” of the Cyrus oracle, because of the closure implied by the features in Isa 45:7-8; again, the location of Isa 45:9-10 and 11-13 require explanation. Here, we will look at Isa 45:11-13

**Isa 45:11-13**

While this oracle is easy to demarcate, the difficulty lies in explaining its placement and its association. Scholars[[3]](#footnote-3) have read it as a prediction of Cyrus and explained its association and placement on this basis. However, there are arguments against this reading, and the debate is illustrative of how forks in the road of interpretation lead to entire collections of wrong readings.

“Thus saith the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, and his Maker, Ask me of things to come concerning my sons, and concerning the work of my hands command ye me. 12 I have made the earth, and created man upon it: I, *even* my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded. 13 I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways: he shall build my city, and he shall let go my captives, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord of hosts.” Isa 45:11-13 (KJV)

1) The oracle is not delivered to Israel/Judah; it invites a third party to “ask him concerning his sons” (v. 11). The identification of the third party is that of the “islands”, and this is shown by the links between v. 13 and Isa 41:2, 25 – both texts concern who is raised in righteousness.

2) If Yahweh invites questions about his sons, it is likely that the statements that he goes onto make also concern “his sons”. Hence, the figure of a “man” created for the “earth” is likely to refer to “his sons”. The ambiguity of *eretz* for “earth/land” supports this reading, as Yahweh could well be asserting of the Promised Land that he had made it and placed “man” upon it. Similarly, the claim to have raised him up in righteousness would naturally refer to Israel/Judah or their king, as would the declaration to “direct all his ways”

3) The intertextual links of Isa 45:13 are to be noted. The Hiphil form of the common verb “to raise” is here in the perfect aspect and it occurs elsewhere only in 2 Chron 36:22, Ezra 1:1, 5, Isa 41:2, 25, and Jer 51:11. This linkage is taken to prove that the individual of Isa 45:13 is Cyrus, since 2 Chron 36:22, Ezra 1:1, 5 and Jer 51:11 directly or indirectly refer to Cyrus. Similarly, Isa 41:2, 25 are taken to refer to Cyrus on the same grounds. However, an alternative possibility is that the individual of Isa 41:2, 25 and 45:13 is Hezekiah whom God raised up in righteousness, and that Cyrus is an *ironic* counterpart. This supposition equally explains the intertextual linkage via the verb “to raise”.

4) Observations (1) and (2) above would support an interpretation of the one raised up in righteousness as Hezekiah. But so would the claim that the individual was raised up “in righteousness” as it is easier to apply this epithet to a Davidic king than a foreign potentate.

i) The expression “in righteousness” occurs 4x in Isaiah (Isa 11:4, 42:6, 45:13 and 59:4). Critically, Isa 42:6 states of the Servant, “I the Lord have called thee in righteousness”. In a complimentary way, Yahweh declares that he had “called” the individual in Isa 41:2 “to his foot”.

ii) The individual is raised up “from the east” (Isa 41:2) and “from the north” (Isa 41:25), which might be taken to indicate that there are two different individuals. However, the one “from the north” comes “from the rising of the sun” which uses the same form xrzmm for “from the rising” as “from the east”—xrzmm. Clearly, the one from the north comes from the east. Since, Yahweh is addressing the islands in Isa 41:1, this places them in the “west” and “east” elsewhere in the OT is the local east—the other side of Jordan, Edom, Moab and Ammon. So the raising up of the Servant has taken place in the east according to this cluster of texts.

iii) The verb “to raise” in its various forms is not uncommon (70x). One of its uses is to describe the rousing up of men to battle (Isa 10:26, 13:17, 15:5, 42:13, 51:9, 51:17, 52:1). This is the most common sense in Isaiah, and this pattern of use establishes that the claim “I have raised him up in righteousness” is a claim that Yahweh has raised up his Davidic king for battle. The information in Isa 41:2, 25 is that he has been raised up in the east and come upon the islands in the west. This emphasis on battle is the means with which the Servant will release the captives—battle rather than ransom payments (price and reward).

iv) The further claim is made that Yahweh will “direct (make straight) his ways”. The expression “his ways” occurs in Isa 57:18 in relation to the ways of the nation, and the exhortation in Isa 40:3 is that the cities of Judah make straight the ways of the Lord. This description is the basis of the irony that God would “make straight” the crooked paths before Cyrus (Isa 45:2).

5) The description of what the individual in Isa 45:13 will achieve is that he will “build my city” and “let go my captives”. It is in these details that the irony with Cyrus is struck. These were to be the achievements of Hezekiah, but because of his sin in the matter of the Babylonian envoys, the restoration of Judah was postponed along with its punishment. Cyrus is introduced as the one who will give the decree[[4]](#footnote-4) to build Jerusalem, whereas Hezekiah had been the one about whom it was said that he would build Jerusalem.

**Conclusion**

It is important to demarcate oracles and have some explanation of their placement. Isaiah’s oracles do not always follow a chronological sequence although there is some chronological ordering. Even if there is some chronological arrangement his oracles are mainly thematically ordered. In particular, it is important to observe a major break at Isa 45:8. The oracles from Isa 40:12-45:7 represent a developing dialogue with Judah that culminates in the *delay* of the restoration; the oracles of Isa 45:9-48:22 take a read back to the circumstance of Isaiah 41 and are a thematic group that also culminates in the *delay* of God’s punishment (Isa 48:9). The two blocks are synoptic and parallel to one another in that they describe the argument in Judah and Jerusalem around the time of the visit of the Babylonian envoys after the campaign in Edom (Isaiah 34).

**Gadarene Demoniac**

**Paul Wyns**

**Demonic Possession**

G. H. Twelftree reviews demonism in Jewish/Hellenistic Literature and summarizes as follows: “In Greek thought the word *daimonion* was used in a variety of ways: for a deity (Philo *Vit. Mos*. 1.276), a lesser deity (Plutarch *Rom.* 51), a divine power or unknown supernatural force (Josephus *J.W.* 1.69), the human element in touch with the divine (Galen *De Placitis* 5.6.4) and an intermediary between humans and the gods (*Corp. Herm*. XVI.18). When a demon overtook a person and caused sickness or frenzy and was life-threatening, it was thought necessary to expel it (*J.W.* 7.185). The demons were popularly thought to be spirits of the dead (*J.W.* 1.599, 607; 6.47; Lucian *Philops.* 29; Pliny *Nat. Hist.* 18.118)”. [[5]](#footnote-5)

The NT authors prefer to use the term ‘unclean spirit’ (Matt 12:43; Mark 1:23, 26; 3:30; 5:2, 8; Luke 8:29; 9:42; 11:24). Even when the term ‘devils’ or ‘demons’ is encountered (for Gentile audiences?), it is in association with ‘unclean spirits’. [[6]](#footnote-6) The constant referral to the state of being unclean has cultic overtones; particularly the ritual element proscribed in the cleanliness laws of Leviticus. The holiness codes in Leviticus regulated ritual cleanliness–unclean animals could not be touched or eaten, unclean diseases and unclean bodily discharges underwent cleansing rituals and quarantine. The priest inspected the impure person and pronounced judgment after certain purification ceremonies. The diagnosis of an unclean spirit is essentially **a priestly diagnosis** and that God often described the Jews themselves as an unclean people.

**The Healing of Legion**

Probably the most important exorcism performed in the NT is the healing of Legion. It is instructive to compare the synoptic parallel accounts (Matt 8:28-34//Mark 5:1-13//Luke 8:26-33) as they have significant nuances. Legion is a paradigm for the nation of Israel:

“And always, night and day, he was in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himself with stones.” (Mark 5:5)

Mark is obviously drawing on Isaiah’s description of the people; “A rebellious people......which sit among the graves.....and eat swine’s flesh” (Isa 65:4). The “cutting with stones” is (in this context) a reference to the rite of circumcision–originally performed with sharpened flints (Josh 5:2). The binding of the man (cf. Pss 2:3) and the request not to be ‘sent away out of the country’ (Mark 5:10) is typical of the threat of exile in Deut 28:64-68 and the imprisonment and deportation of Zedekiah in chains (Jer 52: 11). Moreover, it has parallels with the prodigal son (although his departure was voluntary), who went to a far country and subsisted on pigs swill.

**The Eschatology of the Exorcism**

Matthew introduces an eschatological element into the narrative with the demoniac’s objection; ‘art thou come hither to torment us before the time?’ as if to say, ‘you are early, it’s not time yet’. It is an allusion to the “timely” man who released the goat (sent it to Azazel) on the Day of Atonement.

In this exorcism Jesus functions in the role of the ‘fit’ or ‘timely’ man, who sends the scapegoat bearing the nations impurities (the goat for ‘Azazel’) into the wilderness during the atonement ritual:

“And shall send him away at the hand of a fit man into the wilderness”(Lev.16:22)

The Revised Version renders this as “a man (Adam) that is in readiness” with the marginal notation stating “a man of opportunity”. These interpretations carry the idea of a man that has been specifically prepared for the task; although Herbert Rand suggests that it should be understood adverbially. [[7]](#footnote-7) The original Hebrew *’ittîy* carries the meaning of **timely** and derives from *êth* – time, in due season. Essentially this expresses the same meaning – a man appointed for this time or season. Note that the “fit man” who released the goat became contaminated by the act and as a consequence had to wash his clothes and his body before re-entering the camp.

Jesus transferred the ‘unclean spirit’ into an ‘unclean’ animal (this in contrast with the ‘clean’ scapegoat). Swine were unclean animals, and for a Jewish narrator it would be highly appropriate for ‘unclean spirits’ to inhabit them. The oscillation between singular and plural in the narrative denotes that the man represented the collective state of the nation. The man answers with the Latin loan word *legio* meaning a legion or regiment of soldiers. This suggests that the word expresses the man’s feeling of being inhabited by a multitude of evil spirits.

**Legion and the Apocalypse**

The Legion incident resonates with apocalyptic typology – the echoes and allusions can best be observed when the chapter division between Matthew 8:28 – Matthew 9:8 (the healing and forgiveness of the paralytic) is ignored:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Matthew 8:28-9:8** | **Revelation 11** |
| ‘Country of the Gadarenes which is over against Galilee’ (Luke 8:26), i.e. Galilee of the Gentiles | ‘It is given unto the Gentiles’ (11:2) |
| ‘Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?’(Matt 8:29) | ‘These two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth’ (11:10). |
| The unclean beast sent into the sea - (abyss in Luke 8:31) | ‘The beast that cometh up out the abyss (abyss) shall make war against them, and kill them’ (11:7). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Matthew 8:28-9:8** | **Revelation 11** |
| The paralytic raised: ‘Arise, and walk’ (Matt 9:1). | The dead witnesses raised: ‘Come up hither’ (11:12) |
| ‘But when the multitudes saw it they were afraid (RV) and glorified God, which had given such power to men’ (Matt 9:8). | ‘And the rest were affrighted, and gave glory to the God of heaven’ (11:13). |

The synoptic narrative is connected with the emergence of the apocalyptic beast from the abyss and the murder of the (two?) witnesses; resulting in the rejoicing of the people because the ‘two prophets had tormented them’ with their words. The parallelism is not accidental for the trumpet section in the apocalypse is based on Day of Atonement liturgy [[8]](#footnote-8) – Jesus had come to remove the unclean spirit – he warned that that unless the unclean spirit was replaced with the wholesomeness of the gospel it would re-emerge in a more virulent form (Luke 11: 24-36). The work of the witnesses is a continuation of the work of Jesus Christ and meets with the same resistance from the beast (possessed with the unclean spirit) that he had banished two millennia earlier.

**Conclusion**

It is obvious that healing of the ‘demon possessed’ in the NT are more than mere exorcisms–they are en**acted parables** –**teaching the people profound lessons.** Do the exorcisms have a historical basis? Most certainly, Jesus had such a reputation as an exorcist that his name was used in imprecations by fellow exorcists, and there is no reason to doubt the fundamental historicity of the accounts.

Jesus healed real people with recognized illnesses–Legion was most probably a schizophrenic hearing voices–but these voices articulated the words of the Old Testament and challenged Jesus’ authority. Jesus’ exorcisms were an outward expression of the nation’s impurity. Jesus had the power to remove the contamination of sin –but that removal would only achieve permanence if the ‘unclean attitude’ was replaced with the Gospel (cf. the healed demoniac sitting at Jesus’ feet fully clothed), if this did not happen the patient’s condition would become much worse. This was indeed the case in the first century with a collective descent into insanity and rebellion that resulted in the nation, like the scapegoat, being expelled from the land for nearly 2,000 years. However, even in this sinful state of alienation the nation is under divine protection (protected like Cain), for God will not allow the nation to become completely extinct.

**The End of Eschatology**

**Andrew Perry**

G. B. Caird, in *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, offers a discussion of the way in which the term “eschatology” has been used in Biblical scholarship up the 1980s.[[9]](#footnote-9) He supplies various definitions which form a useful table of the paths scholars have trodden; however, not all notions are correct interpretations of Biblical thought—texts used to bolster one notion or another are amenable to different interpretation, and this undermines the legitimacy of the given notion in question. Nevertheless, Caird’s discussion is useful as a catalyst for a presentation of our new proposal that what scholars take to be eschatological in a Biblical text is actually typological.

Before tabulating Caird’s notions, we should set out our stall: insofar as a prophetic text has an immediate application relative to the time in which the embedding oracle is delivered, any future application is properly considered as typological. Events in the past would be one category upon which a typology was constructed. By way of contrast, if a prophetic text has no immediate application but only a distant one, then this would make that text eschatological if it was about the “end”.

To a certain extent this kind of reasoning is just semantics; however, it does afford a clear statement of the point that most prophetic material is typological because it has an initial application proximate to its delivery—purely eschatological material is rare. In the OT such material is usually highly general (e.g. Deuteronomy 28) or to be found in the apocalyptic visions of Daniel.

Everything is a question of interpretation and someone may challenge the above by arguing that many texts have no contemporary application. For example, Isaiah 40-66 might be related to the Babylonian Captivity, 150 years on from Isaiah of Jerusalem. However, this judgment might be offered because no work has been done by scholars to interpret a text in immediate terms; again, Isaiah 40-66 is a case in point.

In his *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, B. S. Childs argues that the shaping of Isaianic materials placed later material into an eighth century context, with a consequent loss of the original historical context thus making the message “fully eschatological”.[[10]](#footnote-10) R. Clements argues a similar case for the Prophets in general, viz. that the editorial treatment of the books and their collocation into a “group” tended towards making their message more eschatological. Thus he comments, “the process of collecting and editing, leading to canonization of prophecy came to be invested with a number of basic guidelines as to its meaning, especially its spelling out of hope for the restoration and salvation of Israel”.[[11]](#footnote-11) R. P. Carroll argues[[12]](#footnote-12) that the perception of failure in prophetic predictions partly led to post-exilic editorial additions and changes that made the materials more eschatological. He also argues that such a perception also led to the treatment of prophetic predictions as symbolic (typological or allegorical).[[13]](#footnote-13)

The foregoing opinions are representative of a common approach to the Prophets in which an immediate application is not sought because the weight of scholarship has presented hypothetical editorial histories of the books. Accordingly, the work is not being done to imaginatively apply prophetic texts to the immediate age in which a prophet lived. Of course, this is done to some extent, but large amounts of material remain unrelated to a prophet and his generation. This presents an opportunity for fresh work that provides a counter-weight to scholarly commentaries on the Prophets.

Our contention would be that the prophet raised by God delivers oracles that are relevant to his generation. If there are futuristic statements then a principle of relevance needs to be sought for his generation. Thus, in the case of Deuteronomy 28, the long-term general future for Israel is highly relevant for the wilderness generation and any other generation that follows (e.g. Josiah’s time). S. R. Driver, in his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*,[[14]](#footnote-14) makes this argument for a Second-Isaiah. Believing that Isaiah 40-66 is about the Exile and beyond, he states,

Those whom the prophet addresses, and, moreover, addresses in person—arguing with them, appealing to them, striving to win their assent by his warm and impassioned rhetoric…are not the men of Jerusalem, contemporaries of Ahaz and Hezekiah, or even of Manasseh; they are exiles in Babylonia. Judged by the *analogy of prophecy*, this constitutes the strongest possible presumption that the author actually lived in the period which he thus describes, and is not *merely* (as has been supposed) Isaiah immersed in the spirit of the future, and holding converse, as it were, with the generations yet unborn. Such an immersion in the future would be not only without parallel in the O.T., it would be contrary to the nature of prophecy.

Driver is correct about the analogy of prophecy but wrong to interpret Isaiah 40-66 in exilic and post-exilic terms. Within scholarship in the last century, the work has *not been done* to apply Isaiah 40-66 to the age of Isaiah of Jerusalem; however, when this is undertaken, it can be shown that apart from Isa 44:24-28, 45:1-7, all of the oracles in Isaiah 40-66 have immediate application and form a typological basis for subsequent use in the New Testament. Some Christadelphians have led the way in this eighth century approach,[[15]](#footnote-15) while others have followed traditional conservative commentators. Further, even in respect of the Cyrus material, it is possible to relate this prophecy to Hezekiah if Cyrus is seen as an ironic Servant of the Lord.[[16]](#footnote-16)

The immediate application of oracles of salvation engenders expectation of deliverance on the part of the faithful. This is clearly seen in the prophecies of the Assyrian Crisis by the eighth century prophets. It is also true, but to a lesser extent, of the prophecies at the time of the Babylonian captivity which placed the restoration of the nation seventy years in the future. The question is whether Jesus’ prophecies should be any different.

Caird is concerned with NT eschatology; he offers the following definitions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Individual Eschatology (I) | The destiny of each person – death, judgment, heaven and hell. |
| Historical Eschatology (H) | The end of the world; the end of this age and the introduction of the new age. |
| Imminent Eschatology (K) | The characteristics of the current age show that it is passing away and the new age is imminent. |
| Realized Eschatology (R)  | The kingdom age has been inaugurated in the ministry of Jesus. |
| Existential Eschatology (E) | The “end-of-the-world” is a myth that lays claim upon an individual and urges him to make an existential decision for Christ. |
| Newness Eschatology (N) | Eschatology is about the new things that God is about to bring about and unrelated to the idea of a final “end”.  |
| Purpose Eschatology (P) | The eschatological aspect of prophecy concerns only the purpose, goals and aims of events. |
| Metaphorical Eschatology (M) | End of the world language is used as a metaphor for the existing crises. |

Caird sees evidence of immediate survival of the soul beyond death in NT writings and contrasts this “individual” eschatology from the “historical” eschatology that is also present. He says, “the one implies that entry into the future state is an individual matter and takes place at death…while the other pictures the dead as sleeping in the tomb until all are roused at the last trumpet”.[[17]](#footnote-17) Caird’s presentation offers no analysis of those texts that he takes to indicate survival of the soul at death, and he is content to let both pictures co-exist in contradiction. It is beyond the scope of this paper to consider this question and Caird’s analysis is too superficial to provide material for discussion.

The main interest in Caird’s paper lies in his analysis of the historical view of eschatology and the events of the NT. Jewish views in the 1c. were that the kingdom of God would be established at the end of the world and be centred on Israel. However, this “historical” view of what happens “in the end” has two significant variations.

1) A consistent picture in NT writings is that the kingdom was near (Matt 10:23, Mark 9:1, Luke 17:42, Rms 13:11, Phil 4:7, Heb 10:37, Jms 5:8, 1 Pet 4:7). Caird labels this definition of eschatology as *Konsequente Eschatologie* following its German pedigree, and we can term it “Imminent Eschatology”. This eschatology consists of the beliefs of NT writers about the imminent end of their age and the introduction of the new age.

2) Over against this definition of eschatology, Caird pitches a *realized eschatology.* This is an understanding of the kingdom of God as already present in the ministry of Jesus and in the reality of the church. The prophecies of the OT were being fulfilled (Luke 10:23-24); the kingdom of God was at hand (Mark 1:15); it had arrived (Luke 11:20); and was open for entry (Matt 21:31).

Again, Caird’s paper does not justify his grouping of texts, but even if *some* texts indicated a realized eschatology, the question arises as to how these cohere with a belief in the imminent end of the Jewish age. Caird regards the application of “end of the world” language to Jesus’ ministry as a metaphor and this is how he reconciles the two kinds of language—realized and imminent;[[18]](#footnote-18) alternatively, the events of Jesus’ ministry and the apostolic era could be viewed as a *proleptic*[[19]](#footnote-19) demonstration of the near-approaching kingdom.

The problem with both *imminent* and *realized* eschatology is that there has since been 2000 years of history in which there has been no material manifestation of the kingdom of God even approaching the terms of the Jewish prophets. One “solution” to this problem (popularized by the German theologian R. Bultmann, and canvassed by Caird) has been to demythologize NT writings and interpret them in symbolic terms relating to the *existential* decision that a person makes for Christ. The whole concept of the end of the world is a myth designed to impel a person towards Christ. It is beyond the scope of this paper to consider this “solution”. It was fashionable during the 1950s and 1960s but has passed with the fading of continental existential philosophy.

The problem of the last 2000 years is not addressed by Caird. He does however perceive the incongruence in defining eschatology purely in relation to the NT writings. The OT prophecies were quoted by NT writers in an eschatological way, and therefore any definition of eschatology should be applicable to both source materials. Accordingly, Caird proposes two new definitions of eschatology: the first is that it concerns what is *new* in the plan of God and the second is that it concerns the *purpose* of God.

On the first definition eschatology is what God declares to be the “new things” he is about to do leading to the consummation of his purpose. This obviously resonates with Isaiah 40-48, and it shifts the perspective from seeing eschatology in terms of what will happen “in the end” to what is now about to happen that will bring about *an* end and a new beginning (rather than “the” end). This definition expands on Caird, and it shows how eschatology now embraces the OT and NT. The second definition—purpose eschatology—shifts the focus from events to their purpose. Here, it is said that eschatology concerns the values and aims in the prophetic oracles rather than any series of events. Again, we expand upon Caird’s own definition here in order to bring out how the concept can embrace the OT and NT.

Caird’s introduction of the fact that NT writers quote OT prophecies brings us back to the point with which we began this paper. If an OT prophecy solely concerns the end of the world and has no intermediate application, then it can be termed “eschatological”. If a prophetic oracle has immediate application in the era of the prophet and *any* future application, then it ought to be termed “typological”.

As noted, Caird’s own proposal is that the language of the end of the world is a metaphor used by the prophets for the crisis of their own day. As he explains the notion of “the day of the Lord”, “they were inviting their hearers to see that day in the current crisis”. He asserts that they had a vision of the end and applied that vision to the events of their own day.[[20]](#footnote-20) The problem with Caird’s proposal is that metaphorical usage is asserted without citing any paradigm of the language being used in a non-metaphorical way. If he cited a case in which end-of-the-world language was used literally of that event, and then showed how this language was re-applied metaphorically to describe, say, the locust invasion of Joel, then his case would have a sound logic. As it is, in Caird’s worked example (the book of Joel) he only has the metaphor, and left-over traces of the “real” distant end-of-the-world application; the metaphorical and non-metaphorical is all mixed. Thus, his identification of the traces of the literal application of the language of Joel only consists in the vague time references (Joel 2:28, 3:1) and the apocalyptic symbology (Joel 2:31).[[21]](#footnote-21)

Caird offers a popular discussion and it would be unfair to criticize his interpretation of specific texts. He does however raise the issue of how the imminent quality of prophetic oracles is to be understood Oracles have a particularity that embeds them in the circumstances of their delivery and yet they are regarded as authoritative for later generations. Models for reading the OT are provided in the NT (as well as the OT). So, for example, Jesus applies Isa 61:1-2a to himself at Nazareth, even though the oracle of which it is a part has particular detail that embeds it in the eighth century. Thus, for Isaiah’s audience there is the real prospect of the release of captives, prisoners let go, vengeance, restoration of an infrastructure, *and so on*. With Jesus, there is an application of the oracle to the ministry of the Gospel. In Isaiah there is finality in the prospect being laid out: the Gentiles are subordinate and there is everlasting joy (Isa 61:6-7), an everlasting covenant (Isa 61:7), and blessings towards the nations (Isa 61:9-11). These prospects are tied into the particular reality in the land at the time the oracle was delivered, but Jesus uses the oracle in relation to himself.

Contrary to Caird, it is not the case that the prophets used eschatological language metaphorically to describe current crises, although they do use many tropes. Rather, their language of “the end” and “the everlasting” are applied to their circumstances and it expresses the actual prospects for their day. However, as events turned out, there was only partial fulfilment, and the oracle became open to later fulfillment. With an oracle partially fulfilled in the days of the prophet, any fulfillment is typological rather than eschatological. Thus, if we take Isaiah 61 as an example, its initial and partial fulfillment was in relation to Hezekiah; however, in Hezekiah’s day the restoration of Judah was postponed because of his sin over the visit of the Babylonian envoys. The oracles in Isaiah 40:12-48:22 records Yahweh’s dialogue at the time of this change in purpose and these condition the reader to be aware that the oracles of Isaiah 49-66 were only partially fulfilled. In this way they are led to expect a further typological fulfillment. It is this fulfillment that Jesus advertises in his speech in Nazareth.

**The Restoration of Israel**

**Andrew Perry**

**Introduction**

The subject of the restoration of Israel has been a focus of NT scholarship since the early nineties. This can be seen in writings such as those by N. T. Wright,[[22]](#footnote-22) M. Fuller,[[23]](#footnote-23) M. M. B. Turner,[[24]](#footnote-24) or in volumes of collected essays such as those by M. J. Scott.[[25]](#footnote-25) The accent of such scholarship is that the Jews of the Second Temple still expected restoration because the restoration under Ezra and Nehemiah was incomplete. So, for example, the return of Jews from Babylonian Exile was partial, the temple that was built was a shadow of the Solomonic temple, no Davidic monarchy was re-established, and there was no fulfillment of prophecies relating to the Israel’s position of lordship over the nations. Some Jewish writings of the inter-testamental period therefore looked for fulfillment of these things.

As a matter of historical analysis, it is asserted that if the Jews looked for restoration, then they must have considered themselves to be “in exile” in the land. Thus, Wright remarks, “The need for this restoration is seen in the common second-temple perception of its own period of history. Most Jews of this period, it seems, would have answered the question ‘where are we?’ in language which, reduced to its simplest form, meant: we are still in exile”.[[26]](#footnote-26) Whether this is the view of NT writers remains to be examined.

Fuller’s analysis of Second Temple literature offers four ideas of restoration: i) the physical return of the remaining Diaspora; ii) the gathering of a righteous group from within the land of Israel; iii) the gathering of the lost ten tribes; and iv) an allegorization of Israel’s re-gathering.[[27]](#footnote-27) Of course, Fuller accepts that the data offers a more complex picture, but these four ideas represent an opening analysis. In this article we want to discuss the idea of an expectation of a physical return of the Diaspora.

**Distinctions**

There are several distinctions to mark in this area which centre on words that occur in the scholarly literature.

* **Proclamation** – the restoration of Israel was being proclaimed as a possibility dependent on the repentance of the people.
* **Inauguration** – the restoration of Israel was being inaugurated with the bestowal of the Spirit upon John the Baptist and Jesus, and upon the early church.
* **Effect** – the restoration of Israel was being put into effect with the calling out of a remnant from Israel who would constitute the restored people after the wicked had been removed from the land.
* **Demonstration** – what the restoration of Israel would be like was being enacted in the parables and exorcisms of Jesus, and later in the miracles of the apostles.

These ideas are not inconsistent or mutually exclusive. The two difficult notions are that the restoration of Israel was inaugurated and was being put into effect in the first century. These ideas are difficult because, manifestly, Israel was not restored, and the dissolution of the state was prophesied by John the Baptist and Jesus from the beginning of their ministry. This point is not as decisive as it might seem because it is argued that if the church is a restored Israel – the remnant – then the parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity could be presented as a completion of the restoration of Israel in a new body – a New Israel. It is this doctrinal move that makes this issue an important and wide-ranging topic.

**Wrapping**

A lot is issues are wrapped up in this topic, for example,

1) Did the early church expect an imminent return of Jesus and the subsequent establishment of the kingdom of God; in this case, was the restoration of Israel inaugurated with the ministry of John the Baptist and expected to come to completion in the soon return of Jesus?

2) Did the early church consider itself to have been transferred to the kingdom and believe that it was in some sense present and realized in the church; in this case, did the church think of itself as the restoration of Israel?

3) Why has there been a period of two thousand years since the birth of the church? Is the church today (Christendom) the continuing remnant of Israel? Why did the return of Jesus not take place during the apostles’ generation?

4) Is there a future purpose for Israel? What is the relationship of the church today to Israel? How do both figure in the purpose of God?

These are difficult questions, but more so for those who do not follow a continuous-historic view of Revelation. Without such a reading, the last two thousand years are largely a blank page in the purpose of God. Having said this, even a continuous reading leaves the last two thousand years a blank page in respect of the vicissitudes of the Jewish Diaspora. Why have there been no Jewish prophets since the time of the early church?

**Answering Questions**

The answers to the above questions are partly hidden because there have been no prophets since the early church. However, there is precedent and pattern in God’s dealings with Israel and there is a prophetic program laid out in the OT. It is possible therefore to answer these questions from the standpoint of someone living in the first century – such a person would have no conception that there would be at least another 2000 years before the return of Christ.

The idea that the kingdom of God is “near” and that it is already in some sense a “present reality” among those who were “of Christ” is not without precedent. The idea that the kingdom has “begun” or been “inaugurated” – that it has started to be put into effect – this idea is represented in the eighth century prophets. It is no accident that NT writers appeal to Isaiah more than any other prophet. However, in Isaiah’s day the kingdom did not come to full realization. It began with the deliverance of Jerusalem; it was accompanied by a bestowal of the Spirit; many of the oracles in Isaiah 35, 40-66 paint the prospect of an imminent establishment of the kingdom under Hezekiah. However, it did not come about because of Hezekiah’s sin in the matter of the visit of the Babylonian envoys.[[28]](#footnote-28)

The precedent should have *tutored* a first century Christian to expect postponement in the purpose of God even with the pleading with Israel that was being undertaken by the church. This pleading is illustrated throughout the book of Acts, which is where the prophetically recorded history ends.

What else might a first century Christian have expected? Jesus had prophesied the destruction of Jerusalem and John the Baptist had prophesied a coming wrath. Such prophecies preclude an easy path to the restoration of Israel and the fulfillment of the national aspirations of the Prophets. Isaiah had also prophesied a preaching of the good news to the Gentiles. This was being fulfilled by the apostles and evangelists. How would a first century Christian have reconciled preaching to the Gentiles with an expectation that Jerusalem and the temple were to be destroyed? The issue can be put in Isaianic terms:

The preaching to the nations is captured by the motif “light to the Gentiles” (Isa 42:6, 49:6, 61:9, 66:19, KJV), but this outreach is part of a complex situation in which the idolatry of the nations is opposed (Isa 43:9, 45:20); nations are regarded as of little consequence (Isa 40:15, 17); nations will be subdued (Isa 41:2, 60:12, 64:1); nations will witness the military prowess of God (Isa 52:10); nations will carry Israel home (Isa 49:22, 66:20); nations will run to Israel and her light (Isa 55:5, 60:3, 5, 11, 66:18); judgment will be taken to the nations (Isa 42:1, 61:11, 62:2); Israel will expand into the territory of the nations (Isa 54:3); and Israel will receive tribute from the nations (Isa 60:16, 61:6, 66:12).

This is the prophetic context for the preaching of good news to the nations, and this poses the question: how did the first century Christian understand the fulfillment of Isaiah’s “light to the Gentiles” (Luke 2:32, Acts 13:47, 26:23) in the absence of a lack of fulfillment of other nationalistic prophecies.

The answer to this question lies in the Olivet prophecy insofar as that prophecy places the restoration of Israel *after* the destruction of Jerusalem and exile (Luke 21:24, 28). There is therefore in the NT scheme a central place for the destruction of Jerusalem and an exile, whereas in Isaiah, the preaching to the Gentiles is of a piece with the restoration of Judah.

In the latter half of Isaiah (40-66) the Gentile mission is part and parcel of the restoration of Judah, and Jerusalem is central to that restoration on several levels. In the NT, the mission to the Gentiles has been *brought forward* prior to a destruction of Jerusalem and with only the *prospect* of the restoration of Israel (Acts 3:19-21). This raises the question, why? Why was a restoration theme (the Gentile mission) juxtaposed and implemented alongside a theme of destruction and exile?

With Jesus’ prophecies of exile (“led away captive into all nations”, Luke 21:24), a first century Christian would naturally think of the Babylonian Exile as the historical model: what had happened then (and why) was now going to be repeated in his day. But there is a “coincidence” here that explains the Gentile mission.

*Prior to the nation being led away captive into all nations, the good news was preached in “all nations” – ecclesias were located in the existing Diaspora and ready and waiting for the enlarged Diaspora after AD70: God placed the remnant of Israel in the places where Israel were going to be scattered.*

This “coincidence” would tutor the first century Christian in his preaching after AD70 – to continue to preach the good news about restoration to Jews, but to expect this upon the return of Jesus.

**Conclusion**

This introductory essay is programmatic. It does not explain all of the reasons for the Gentile mission; it does not explore the explanation that the gospel was taken to the Gentiles in order to provoke the Jews to repentance; we have not emphasized the grace of God in widening the gospel to the Gentiles; and we have not shown how the redemption of God wrought in the death of Christ is the basis upon which deliverance is preached to all men. Our objective has been to introduce the topic of the restoration of Israel and argue that restoration is *not* inaugurated in the first century – rather the preaching to the Gentiles is brought forward to place the “righteous” where Israel were going to be exiled.

 **Deuteronomistic History in Romans 2 and 3 (Part One)**

**Paul Wyns**

**Introduction**

Modern Pauline scholarship is in a state of flux between more traditional views and that of the “New Perspective” on Paul.[[29]](#footnote-29) Within this debate Romans 2 and 3 play a crucial role. N.T. Wright calls Romans 2 “the joker in the pack”[[30]](#footnote-30) and James Dunn observes that Romans 2 has,

“...caused more difficulties than any other chapter for commentators, particularly because it seems to envisage final justification as depending on human deeds rather than on faith, and because its argument seems to depend on a far too sweeping indictment of Jews at large. The key is to note that the chapter is framed, on the one side, by a typically Jewish attack on Gentile lifestyle (Rom 1:18-32)[[31]](#footnote-31) and, on the other, by a protest that Jewish privilege has been undermined (Rom 3:1). What is in view in Romans 2, therefore, is almost certainly the very sense of Jewish privilege and distinctiveness which was so clearly echoed in Romans 1.”[[32]](#footnote-32)

S.J. Hafemann remarks, “Even adherents to the “New Perspective” on Paul, who have worked hard to renew our understanding of Paul within the Judaism of his day, have often not taken the Jewish matrix of Paul’s own thinking seriously enough as the decisive conceptual source for Paul’s thinking. Moreover, at the heart of the debate concerning the Law and justification in Paul’s thought is Paul’s understanding of redemptive history (cf. Gal 3-4; 2Cor 3:7-18; Rom 3:21-16; 9-11), which itself can only be solved by a renewed study of Paul’s use and understanding of the OT within the larger question of the relationship of Paul and his gospel to Israel as the old covenant people of God.” [[33]](#footnote-33) It is the intention of this article to *“take the Jewish matrix of Paul’s own thinking seriously”* in order to discover the OT roots of Romans 2 and 3.

**Working Hypothesis**

This paper will propose (in three parts) that Romans 2 and 3 can only be properly understood against the Deuteronomistic History (with the accompanying Psalms) that records the Davidic covenant and David’s subsequent fall from grace. It has already been suggested that the background to Romans 1:18-32 is the golden calf incident [[34]](#footnote-34) – this places Romans 2 and 3 firmly within an argument that examines the failure of Israel to keep the law of the covenant. Our new proposal is that in addition to this background typology, David’s sin against Uriah the Hittite informs Paul’s theology in Romans 2-3. A simplified overview would look something like this:

**Rom 1 –** Jewish National failure to receive the Law

 –background the golden calf incident, Jews sinning like Gentiles

**Rom 2/3 –** JewishInstitutional failure (monarchy) to keep the law

 – background David’s sin against a “faithful” Gentile

**Rom 4 –** The Law cannot justify – both Jew and Gentile saved by faith -background Abraham **and David** (vv. 6-7)

N.T. Wright has called to notice the importance of David to Romans:

“...we must also notice Romans 1.3-4, the one Pauline passage outside the Pastorals which mentions David specifically as Jesus’ ancestor. Of course this passage has been routinely marginalized, and treated as if it were a mere throwaway introductory line, designed to curry favour with Jewish Christians in Rome for whom such ideas were still important while for Paul, of course they were not. But there are four arguments which tell very strongly against this. First, we know from many of Paul’s letters that his opening passages are often carefully crafted with an eye to what he wants to say in the rest of the letter. It seems very unlikely that he would place in such a prominent position an explicit statement of something he regarded as at best inadequate and at worst misleading. Second, what Paul says about Jesus as the letter develops, not least in chapters 6-8, can be seen as drawing out the implications of this opening statement, not simply of the passage more usually said to be thematic, namely 1.16-17. Third, Paul seems to be alluding to various biblical passages (Psalm 2 and 2 Samuel 7 come obviously to mind) which we know as messianic proof- texts in Qumran. Fourth, at the letter’s thematic conclusion in 15.12, Paul quotes Isaiah’s prophecy about ‘the root of Jesse.’ Again, unless we are to say that Paul chose to end his longest and most carefully structured theological argument with a quotation designed to put his readers on exactly the wrong train of thought, we find ourselves compelled to the view that he really does see the argument of Romans framed by, and hence by implication consisting in, an exposition of the Messiahship of Jesus and its meaning and effects.” [[35]](#footnote-35)

Although N.T. Wright does not realise the full import of his observations he intuitively recognises the covenantal connections and messianic implications of the introductory mention of David. Pauline theology employs a paradigmatic approach to the problem of covenantal nomism with David and Abraham functioning in typical fashion or employed normatively to his developing argument.

 The following comparison table sets out the typology which will be discussed in the next part of this paper.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Romans 2/3 | Deuteronomistic History and Psalms |
| NKJ **Romans 2:1** Therefore you are inexcusable, O man, whoever you are who judge, for in whatever you judge another you condemn yourself; for you who judge practice the same things. | NKJ **2 Samuel 12:7** Then Nathan said to David, “You *are* the man!”  |
| NKJ **Romans 2:2** But we know that the judgment of God is according to truth against those who practice such things. |  Truth is a technical term denoting the covenant promises |
| NKJ **Romans 2:3** And do you think this, O man, you who judge those practicing such things, and doing the same, that you will escape the judgment of God? | NKJ **2 Samuel 12:5** So David's anger was greatly aroused against the man, and he said to Nathan, "*As* the Lord lives, the man who has done this shall surely die! |
| NKJ **Romans 2:4** Or do you despise the riches of His goodness, forbearance, and longsuffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leads you to repentance? | NKJ **Psalm 51:1** Have mercy upon me, O God, According to Your lovingkindness; According to the multitude of Your tender mercies, Blot out my transgressions. |
| NKJ **Romans 2:14-15** for when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do the things in the law, these, although not having the law, are a law to themselves, who show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and between themselves *their* thoughts accusing or else excusing *them)* | URIAH THE HITTITENKJ **2 Samuel 11:11** And Uriah said to David, "The ark and Israel and Judah are dwelling in tents, and my lord Joab and the servants of my lord are encamped in the open fields. Shall I then go to my house to eat and drink, and to lie with my wife? *As* you live, and *as* your soul lives, I will not do this thing." |
| Romans 2/3 | Deuteronomistic History and Psalms |
| NKJ **Romans 2:16** in the day when God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel. | NKJ **2 Samuel 12:12** 'For you did *it* secretly, but I will do this thing before all Israel, before the sun.' " |
| NKJ **Romans 2:17-21** Indeed you are called a Jew, and rest on the law, and make your boast in God, and know *His* will, and approve the things that are excellent, being instructed out of the law, and are confident that you yourself are a guide to the blind, a light (Uriah’s name means light) to those who are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, having the form of knowledge and truth in the law. You, therefore, who teach another, do you not teach yourself?  | NKJ **Psalm 51:12** Restore to me the joy of Your salvation, And uphold me *by Your* generous Spirit.NKJ **Psalm 51:13** *Then* I will teach transgressors Your ways, And sinners shall be converted to You. |
| NKJ **Romans 2:22-23** You who say, "Do not commit adultery," do you commit adultery? You who abhor idols, do you rob temples (commit sacrilege) You who make your boast in the law, do you dishonour God through breaking the law? | NKJ **2 Samuel 12:9** 'Why have you despised the commandment of the Lord, to do evil in His sight? You have killed Uriah the Hittite with the sword; you have taken his wife *to be* your wife, and have killed him with the sword of the people of Ammon. |
| **NK**J **Romans 2:24** For "the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you," as it is written. | NKJ **2 Samuel 12:14** "However, because by this deed you have given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child also *who is* born to you shall surely die." |
| Romans 2/3 | Deuteronomistic History and Psalms |
| NKJ **Romans 2:29** but *he is* a Jew who *is one* inwardly; and circumcision *is that* of the heart, in the Spirit, not in the letter; whose praise *is* not from men but from God. | NKJ **Psalm 51:10** Create in me a clean heart, O God, And renew a steadfast spirit within me. |
| NKJ **Romans 3:4** Certainly not! Indeed, let God be true but every man a liar. As it is written: “That You may be justified in Your words, And may overcome when You are judged.”(when you judge??) | NKJ **2 Samuel 7:28** "And now, O Lord God, You are God, and Your words are true, and You have promised this goodness to Your servant.NKJ **Psalm 51:4** Against You, You only, have I sinned, And done *this* evil in Your sight -- That You may be found just when You speak, *And* blameless when You judge. |

**Conclusion**

In the next part of this paper, we will present the detailed exegesis of Romans 2 and 3 and how this Davidic typology informs Paul’s thought.

**Market Place Oracles**

**Andrew Perry**

**Introduction**

If a prophet receives the word of the Lord and delivers it in the market place or in the king’s court or to a gathering of his disciples, the character of its oral delivery should be preserved in the written record. As oracles were written down and arranged, they may have undergone transformation, but any oral qualities should still be noted.

Whether an oracle was first delivered at court, in a market place, among disciples, or in religious settings, is not the focus of this article. The content of the oracles may lend credence to the choice of one setting rather than another, but this is a separate topic. Our interest is the feature of orality in oracles. Our examples will be from Isaiah 40-48, and we have chosen these because their oral nature is a decisive argument against the conservative commentators’ approach[[36]](#footnote-36) which states that Isaiah of Jerusalem initially *wrote* these oracles for the generation that would live at the end of the exile. Our argument is that these oracles betray their oral engagement with a contemporary audience.[[37]](#footnote-37)

**Oral Markers**

That a prophet spoke his oracles to an audience who found them relevant to themselves is perhaps an obvious principle. This does not mean that a prophet did not speak about the long-term future, but it does mean that such a future would be relevant to his audience. A written record of speaking should leave markers of such speech. This is what we find in Isaiah 40-48; these oracles have all the marks of a lively engagement between Yahweh and his people at the time of their being inspired. What therefore are the markers that indicate oracles were delivered orally?

1. It is often the case that a jarring effect is felt by the reader as s/he reads the text of Isaiah 40-48. This effect marks sharp boundaries between units in the text – a change of tone or topic, or a change of addressee. This recognition of units of discourse in the text does not preclude their arrangement making sense. Nevertheless, short independent units can be identified, and the question arises as to whether these originated in a writing context or whether they reflect an oral context of delivery.

Isaiah 40:1-11 would illustrate these qualities: vv. 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-11 are obvious units, and as you read, the boundaries are marked. Nevertheless, their arrangement makes sense: the call to speak in v. 1 is taken up in vv. 3-5; the voice that said “cry” in v. 6 picks up the speaker of v. 2 who says “cry”; the message of comfort for Jerusalem, in v. 2 is naturally followed by a message for the cities of Judah in vv. 9-11.[[38]](#footnote-38)

Such units reflect different oral situations: vv. 1-2 illustrates a situation where there is a command to speak to a city; vv. 3-5 indentifies the voice as someone in a wilderness; vv. 6-8 is a conversational fragment; and vv. 9-11 is a command to Jerusalem. This kind of analysis is a simple reading “off the page” and it shows that there is often a straightforward inference from the oracle unit on the page to an oral situation in which the unit was embedded as a part of a larger dialogue.

2. An oral delivery is often indicated by verbs of speaking. This is seen in Isa 40:2, where there is a command to speak to Jerusalem; it is shown in Isa 40:3 where a voice is “out there” crying in the wilderness; it is evident in Isa 40:9, where the command is given to take good news to the cities of Judah. Such indications show that the message of the prophet(s) is relevant to the audience that they are being directed to address.

Such relevance and orality can settle the question of the authorship of Isaiah 40-48. Most scholars ascribe these chapters to a Second Isaiah because the message is one that was delivered orally to an audience and because it bears the stamp of being made relevant to them. Such scholars therefore reject the view that Isaiah of Jerusalem could have been the one who delivered these oracles. Their content is, according to such scholars, about the end of the Babylonian Exile.

This logic is sound, and it shows why conservative scholars are wrong to hold that Isaiah of Jerusalem *wrote* these oracles about the *end of the Exile*. They envisage a process of writing for a future generation rather than a market-place engagement with the people, or a challenge to the court of the king. But the material in Isaiah 40-48 has all the marks of rhetoric and persuasion in a live environment. Accordingly, the only way to retain Isaiah of Jerusalem as the author is to read Isaiah 40-48 as about the *visit of the Babylonian envoys in 700* and the campaigns of Sennacherib against Babylon in 700. This re-configuration is quite straightforward if only because prophetic oracles have a certain historical indeterminacy about them that makes the identification of an historical catalyst uncertain.

The following table lists some expressions introducing speech. They constitute announcements, declarations, pronouncements, *and so on*. They may introduce oracles of salvation or judgment, perhaps a legal argument; in any event, if they were only *written* for use a hundred and fifty years later, they would lose their quality of being announcements, pronouncements *and so on*.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| “thus saith the Lord” | Isa 42:5, 43:14, 16, 44:2, 6, 24, 45:1, 14, 48:17 |
| “but *now[[39]](#footnote-39)* thus saith the Lord” | Isa 43:1, cf. 49:5 |
| “saith your God” | Isa 40:1 |
| “saith the Lord” | Isa 41:21 |
| “saith the Holy One” | Isa 40:25 |
| “declares the Lord” | Isa 41:14 (NASB), 43:10 (NASB) |
| “crying” | Isa 40:3, 6 |
| “pronounced” | Isa 43:12 (KJV, “declared”) |
| “the Lord has spoken” | Isa 40:5 |

3. Engagement through questions also indicates a live situation made up of two parties. For example,

“Woe unto him that striveth with his Maker! *Let* the potsherd *strive* with the potsherds of the earth. Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou? or thy work, He hath no hands?” Isa 45:9 (KJV)

This questioning is reinforced by the address of a “Woe!”. Many questions are posed in Isaiah 40-48,[[40]](#footnote-40) and answers are invited. Sometimes the questions are given a second person address, for example,

“To whom then will ye liken God? Or what likeness will ye compare unto him?” Isa 40:18 (KJV)[[41]](#footnote-41)

Questions may use names such as “Israel” and “Jacob”, for example,

“Why sayest thou, O Jacob, and speakest, O Israel, My way is hid from the Lord, and my judgment is passed over from my God?” Isa 40:27 (KJV)

This shows the dialogical nature of the oracles.

4. Engaging an audience can also be indicated through commands that require an immediate response, for example,

“Keep silence before me, O islands...” Isa 41:1 (KJV)

“Fear[[42]](#footnote-42) thou not...” Isa 41:10 (KJV)

“Let them bring them forth, and shew us what shall happen...” Isa 41:22 (KJV)

“Behold[[43]](#footnote-43) my servant whom I uphold...” Isa 42:1 (KJV)

“Sing unto the Lord a new song...” Isa 42:10 (KJV)

“Hear ye deaf; and look ye blind...” Isa 42:18 (KJV)

“Let all the nations be gathered...” Isa 43:9 (KJV)

“Remember these, O Jacob and Israel; for thou art my servant...” Isa 44:21 (KJV)

These commands mean something in the situation of their delivery; we do not have here a prophet writing for a generation one hundred and fifty years in the future. Accordingly, there is, for example, an offer of help for that fear (Isa 41:14), and there is a command to look at God’s servant. A command to sing suggests a hymn for use at the time of the command, *and so on*.

5. A second person address also indicates the oral nature of oracles, for example,

“But thou, Israel, *art* my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen...” Isa 41:8 (KJV)

“Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord” Isa 43:10 (KJV)

“For your sake I have sent to Babylon...” Isa 43:14 (KJV)

This kind of address indicates the presence of the audience listening to the delivery of an oracle which is about them:

“Behold I will make thee a new sharp threshing instrument...” Isa 41:15 (KJV)[[44]](#footnote-44)

Corresponding to the second person address, there is the first person assertion which is very common in Isaiah 40-48, for example,

“And who, as I, shall call, and shall declare it, and set it in order for me, since I appointed the ancient people? and the things that are coming, and shall come, let them shew unto them.” Isa 44:7 (KJV)

The move back and forth between the first and second person is a strong indicator of an oral situation from which oracular material has been preserved.

6. Demonstratives (“this”, “that”, “now”) are also important indicators of live dialogue. These expressions tie speech to live situations. For example,

“Remember this, and shew yourselves men: bring *it* again to mind, O ye transgressors.” Isa 46:8 (KJV)

“Thou hast heard, see all this; and will not ye declare *it*? I have shewed thee new things from this time, even hidden things, and thou didst not know them. They are created now, and not from the beginning; even before the day when thou heardest them not; lest thou shouldest say, Behold, I knew them.” Isa 48:6-7 (KJV)

“Come ye near unto me, hear ye this; I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there *am* I: and now the Lord God, and his Spirit, hath sent me.” Isa 48:16 (KJV)

The prevalent use of demonstratives is a strong indicator of oracles delivered in live situations.

**Conclusion**

The oral quality of Isaiah 40-48 is self-evident and not just because of linguistic features like demonstratives, questions, commands, and first and second person address. The more a reader reflects upon these qualities of the text, the more it becomes obvious that the oracles reflect a live engagement between Yahweh and his people. The oracles are therefore not an initially *written* vision of Yahweh’s engagement with his people at the end of the Babylonian Exile. They are a record of oracles delivered by Isaiah of Jerusalem at court, in the market place, or to his disciples, about the direction of policy in the light of the visit of the Babylonian envoys after the Edomite campaign.

**Issues in Danielic Studies**

**Paul Wyns**

**Introduction**

The book of Daniel presents exegetes with unique interpretive challenges. In virtually every field “problems” exist, whether they are historical “anomalies”, or problems regarding philology, morphology, semantics or dating. The relatively recent discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the increasing understanding of intertestamental socio-religious movements can help illuminate some of these challenges. However, this necessitates an inter-disciplinary approach across specialized fields of study and demands an exegetical method devoid of *a priori* assumptions. The prophecy of Daniel has been used by Jews and Christians for over two millennia, often in a literalist fashion that discredits the book. It has been employed as a battle ground between liberal critics and fundamentalist conservatives. It has been trivialised as a book of children’s stories. The book of Daniel is subject to as many preconceptions as its NT counterpart, the Apocalypse. It is not the intention of this article to resolve these problems (an impossible task in the available space) but simply to make the reader aware of textual and dating issues. Hopefully this will prepare the way for a future in depth analysis or commentary.

**Textual problems**

The main text of Daniel throws up many problems. For example, in the “Seventy Weeks” prophecy there are hapaxes,[[45]](#footnote-45) difficult constructions,[[46]](#footnote-46) uncharacteristic terms,[[47]](#footnote-47) ambiguities,[[48]](#footnote-48) as well as syntactic and semantic variants suggested by the Old Greek[[49]](#footnote-49) (sometimes erroneously referred to as the LXX[[50]](#footnote-50)). In addition, alongside the main Hebrew text, there are many variants in the Masora (the margins of the Hebrew text).

John Goldingay offers a consensus view of the Hebrew text,

“To the Jewish scholarship of the first millennium A.D, we owe the preservation and standardization of the Hebrew Bible, the consonantal text over the first five centuries, the pointing over the succeeding five. Generally this scribal work was concerned to preserve one standard text of the Bible, but a distinctive feature with regard to Daniel is the number of alternative readings retained. These appear in margins of extant manuscripts as the Masora (tradition) and are reproduced in the BHS: almost any verse, at least in the Aramaic chapters, provides examples. Some represent expansions or abbreviations of the text; most are matters of spelling, pronunciation or morphology, though even these reflect an instinct to keep the text up-to-date and readable. It is *a priori* likely that this instinct will also have affected matters of more substance in the text, for example, in the incorporation of explanatory glosses”.[[51]](#footnote-51)

Eugene Nida observes that at times, translators purposely and consciously “attempted to change a message in order to make it conform to his own  . . .  religious predilections.”   According to Nida, “These are particularly evident when a translator feels inclined to improve on the original, correct apparent errors, or defend a personal preference by slanting his choice of words”.[[52]](#footnote-52)

Linguistically Daniel also presents an enigma with the central section (2:4b-7:28) in Aramaic and the beginning (1:1-2:4a) and last five chapters in Hebrew. On the bilingual divide Towner comments, “Why the text of Daniel switches so suddenly from Hebrew to Aramaic and back again, no one has been able to determine.”[[53]](#footnote-53) Greek and Persian loan words further complicate the issue, as “Nebuchadnezzar’s music” is played on instruments with Greek, not Hebrew, names (including the first known use of the word *symphonia*, source of our symphony). Some scholars think that Daniel’s use of the word *Chaldean* to represent a caste of wise men, astrologers, and magicians rather than a nationality indicates a late authorship, because the word was not generally used in this sense in the 6th century, but others see no particular force to this argument. A further discussion surrounds the value of the Greek versions of Daniel, namely the Old Greek and the Theodotian as these versions contain “extra” Daniel material.[[54]](#footnote-54)

**Dating**

Historical “anomalies” in Daniel are seen as evidence for late (and therefore inaccurate) pseudonymous authorship. For example, Babylonian records inform us that Belshazzar was the son of Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon and not the son of Nebuchadnezzar. The identity of Darius the Mede has also been a problem. In 9:1, the writer of Daniel described the mysterious “Darius the Mede” (539 BC) as the “son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes,” but Ahasuerus (better known as Xerxes) was the king of Persia from 485-465 BC.Because of the chronological difficulties, S. R. Driver declared at the turn of the century: “the prophecy admits no explanation, consistent with history, whatever”.[[55]](#footnote-55)

The earliest date cited in the text is the third year of Judah’s king Jehoiakim (1:1), 605 BC, when Nebuchadnezzar first made a military expedition as far west as Syria-Palestine (cf. 2 Kgs 24:1). The last date is the third year of Cyrus (Dan 10:1), 537 BC, whose Persian empire replaced that of Babylon. The sixth century BC dating of Daniel was called into question as early as the third century AD (*ca.* 270-300) by the pagan Neo-Platonist philosopher Porphyry of Tyros, whose fifteen-volume work *Against the Christians* is only known to us through Jerome. Porphyry remarked that Daniel’s accurate knowledge stopped abruptly in 167 BC – the book then must have been written at that time as the prophecies (according to Porphyry) were inaccurate after 167 BC. Essentially, the same conclusion was reached by Norman Porteous, “…the end predicted by the author of the book of Daniel did not come true”.[[56]](#footnote-56) The historian Robin Lane Fox is scathing in his assessment of Daniel (Fox’s work is tendentious): “The author [of Daniel] put a time limit to this extremely turbulent future: from the ending of the Temple cult to the Last Judgement there would be 1,290 days (in a postscript, a later author extended it to 1,335). They ran therefore, from December 167 to spring 163: the author, presumably, was writing in early 164 (perhaps when the first prophecy of ‘three times and a half’ was looking too optimistic). Undeterred, he foresaw mayhem with Michael, victory, appalling suffering and then the rewards for those in the virtuous columns of God’s heavenly book....Daniel’s four visions of history (the first in Aramaic, the rest in Hebrew) were then connected together and attached to the six older stories of Daniel in Babylon (the first in Hebrew, the others in Aramaic)”.[[57]](#footnote-57)

Although many modern scholars accept a late Epiphanian date for Daniel they do not share Fox’s biased assessment. Accordingly many modern scholars find that the prophecies in the *Book of Daniel* reflect the persecutions of the Jews by Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164 BC), and his desecration of the altar as foretold by Daniel, consequently date its composition to that period. In particular, the vision in Chapter 11, which focuses on a series of wars between the “King of the North” and the “King of the South,” is generally interpreted as a record of Levantine history from the time of Alexander the Great down to the era of Antiochus IV, with the “Kings of the North” being the Seleucid kings of Syria and the “Kings of the South” being the Ptolemaic rulers of Egypt. Even conservative scholars such as Boutflower believe that Midrash has been incorporated into chapter 11 during the Maccabean period.[[58]](#footnote-58) It seems that scholarship has established a consensus that while chapters 1-6 are early,[[59]](#footnote-59) the remainder of the book is a late Maccabean creation, or that it at least contains substantial glosses. However, we have not brought the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the table yet.

Since 1947 finds of exceptional importance have been discovered in caves near the ruined site of Qumran, just south of Jericho and near the western shore of the Dead Sea. Texts were written on papyrus and on animal skins – we now have the evidence of 175 manuscript copies of books known in our Old Testament which range in date from ca. 225 BC to AD 50: only four of them are more or less complete. They are not the only texts found at Qumran, but they include fragments of all our biblical books except Esther. The Danielic fragments[[60]](#footnote-60) can be tabulated as below.

The fact that Daniel is admitted to have been written before Qumran places it minimally pre-150, and, in light of the dual textual tradition, “canonical prophetic status”, and pre-sectarian origins, would support a date of origination much, much earlier than 165 BC. Although this does not necessarily support a 6th century date (or rule it out), nevertheless it demonstrates that it was written ***before*** ***the time of Antiochus***.

The reason for this is textual diffusion – the copying and distribution of texts, the evolution of textual variants and lastly the acceptance as canon *all takes time.* It is wholly implausible that a text (cf*.* 4Q114 *ca.*150) that was written about 165 BC was immediately considered authoritative cannon and therefore worth preserving and copying. It is normal to assume a period of at least 100 years before copies are distributed. The ancient Hebrews generally allowed an interval of time to elapse between the autograph and its recognition as canonical Scripture by its readers. This process had the effect of ensuring the consonance of the particular work with the ethos of the Torah, which constituted the standard of revelation and spirituality.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Manuscript | Number | Content Range | Date Copied |
| 1 | 1QDan(a) | 1Q71 | 1:10 to 2:6 | Herodian |
| 2 | 1QDan(b) | 1Q72 | 3:22-30 | Herodian |
| 3 | 4QDan(a) | 4Q112 | 1:16 to 11:16 | Mid-1st c. BCE |
| 4 | 4QDan(b) | 4Q113 | 5:10 to 8:16 | Ca. 20-50 CE |
| 5 | 4QDan(c) | 4Q114 | 10:5 to 11:29 | Late 2nd c. BCE  |
| 6 | 4QDan(d) | 4Q115 | 3:23 to 7:23? | Ca. mid-1st c. BCE |
| 7 | 4QDan(e) | 4Q116 | 9:12-17? | 2nd c. BCE |
| 8 | Pap6QDan | 6Q7 | 8:16? To 11:38 | Ca. 50 CE |

The literary criticism of Daniel must now be reassessed against the manuscript discoveries at Qumran, where several copies of the work were found. In addition, two fragments located in Cave 1 have proved on examination to be related palaeographically to the large Isaiah scroll (1QIsaa), dated by Millar Burrows about 100 B.C. All these documents, of course, are copies from the Maccabean age or later, making it necessary to remark, as Burrows has observed, that “the originals came from a period several centuries in advance of the earliest date to which these manuscripts and fragments can be assigned on any basis of reckoning”. [[61]](#footnote-61)

Another avenue for investigation is the relationship between the different streams of literature and the type of Judaism that they represent. During the Persian and Greek era there had been developing a substantial literature connected with the name of Enoch. Goldingay summarizes the situation as follows: “[Enochic literature] may be dependent on Daniel at a number of points, but current opinion dates much of 1 Enoch 1-36; 72-108 earlier than Daniel or within the same period, so that in principle it is as likely that Daniel is dependent on 1 Enoch as vice versa; indeed, many of the parallels (e.g., the use of animal imagery in 1 Enoch 90) need not require dependence of either on the other. With 1 Enoch 37-41 (the Parables) the situation is different. The Parables are uninstanced at Qumran, and current opinion regards them as belonging to the Roman period. Their most interesting parallel to Daniel (more likely suggesting dependence on Daniel than on a common source) is their taking up the humanlike and the one advanced in days of 7:13. “That Son of Man” (1 Enoch 46-48, alongside the “head of days” with hair like wool; see also chaps. 62; 69), God’s elect and righteous one, is eventually identified with Enoch (71.14).”[[62]](#footnote-62)

**Conclusion**

It was the intention of this article to raise awareness of the complex issues surrounding Danielic Studies, not necessarily to offer answers. It is important to ask the right questions. However, Danielic studies should not be merely concerned with the resolution of a number of puzzles – even though Daniel raises all the central questions about scriptural authority and inspiration, about history and faith, about pseudonymity and inerrancy, about criticism and hermeneutics. We must be prepared to understand the theology behind Daniel and to develop new approaches and perspectives on the prophecy. A preoccupation with merely historical questions (important as they are) or the accuracy or otherwise will prevent Daniel from being properly heard. It is long overdue that a new hermeneutic be brought to bear.

**Wisdom and the Goddess**

**T Gaston**

Since W. F. Albright advocated a Canaanite background to Proverbs, scholars have considered the possibility of a goddess being the inspiration for the figure of Lady Wisdom[[63]](#footnote-63)

**Introduction**

It was at one time posited that before Proverbs was written there was an ancient Israelite wisdom-goddess, which formed the prototype for the use of Wisdom in Proverbs. However “there seems to be no evidence to prove there was a goddess known by the name of Wisdom”.[[64]](#footnote-64) The Torah and the Prophets did not acknowledge a female deity, but many of the nations around Israel had prominent goddesses. The Canaanites worshipped the goddess Astarte alongside their principal deity Baal. The history of Israel records how frequently the Israelites would adopt these gods, Baal and Astarte, instead of adhering to the worship of Yahweh.[[65]](#footnote-65) In Mesopotamia the goddess Inanna was worshipped and in Egypt there was a strong cult of the goddess Isis.[[66]](#footnote-66) Some of the other precursors that have been suggested include “an unnamed Assyrian or West Semitic goddess (in the Ahiqar text)” and “a Gnostic divinity before Gnosticism itself”![[67]](#footnote-67) With all the suggestions the difficulty is not finding a feminine deity to act as a precursor of Wisdom but rather supplying a convincing explanation as to how and why that precursor manifested itself as Wisdom.

One suggested explanation is that the Wisdom passages were written to legitimize the already established worship of a goddess. We know, for instance, that Astarte was, before the exile, worshipped by the Israelites to the exclusion of Yahweh. It is imaginable that some degree of syncretism between the opposing worship systems of Yahweh, and Baal and Astarte, could have led to the introduction of female deity alongside Yahweh. But Proverbs simply does not read like a legitimization of this kind.[[68]](#footnote-68) Unlike Astarte, or other goddesses, Wisdom is not a wife and mother (if anything, she is a daughter).[[69]](#footnote-69) It would certainly be odd to legitimize the worship of a goddess and yet preserve few of her defining features (not even her name).

Another suggestion is that Wisdom was created to fill the void left by the eradication of the worship of certain female deities, like Astarte.[[70]](#footnote-70) J. Knox presented a similar thesis whereby Wisdom was a reaction to pressure from the Isis cult in the 3rd century BC. “The feminine features in Wisdom were a necessary element in the appeal that Judaism was making both to the faithful Jew and to the Gentile who evinced an interest in Judaism”.[[71]](#footnote-71) The kind of explanation is more convincing because it explains the emergence of the feminine in contemplation of the divine without requiring the Jews to have transposed a Gentile goddess into their pantheon (or rather, their monotheon).

Yet none of these explanations is required as it is equally possible to explain the origin of this character without appealing to the female deities of surrounding nations. As we shall see it is reasonable to suppose that Wisdom emerged as a literary device and a personified abstract. In fact, these latter explanations will be preferable as (to date) there is no evidence whatsoever of Wisdom ever being treated as a deity, having neither altars, nor images, nor cult.[[72]](#footnote-72)

**Wisdom as a Literary Device**

The opening chapters of Proverbs are written as the instructions of a father (Solomon) to his son.[[73]](#footnote-73) The aim of these instructions is to keep the son from sinners and from destruction by advocating to him the benefits of wisdom.[[74]](#footnote-74) One of the principal dangers the father warns against are the wiles of the adulterous woman,[[75]](#footnote-75) no doubt with the story of David and Bathsheba in mind.[[76]](#footnote-76) The father urges the son establish a relationship with Wisdom so that she may protect him from the temptation of the adulterous woman:

Say to Wisdom, ‘You are my sister’ and call understanding your nearest kin, that they may keep you from the immoral woman, from the seductress who flatters with her words[[77]](#footnote-77)

The dichotomy between Wisdom and the adulterous woman becomes quite strong in these chapters of Proverbs and so the adulterous woman is even named “Folly”.[[78]](#footnote-78) Given the juxtaposition between these two – Wisdom and Folly – it is natural that Wisdom should be personified as a (chaste) woman to draw out the comparison with the seductress Folly.[[79]](#footnote-79)

This use of the character of Wisdom as a literary device is quite apparent in these chapters. In any place she is discussed you will find nearby an appeal for the reader to get wisdom and understanding. Even the passage where Wisdom is described as being with Yahweh and participating in Creation is an advert for people to obtain understanding.[[80]](#footnote-80)

The situation has not much changed in *Ecclesiasticus* where again Wisdom can be seen as a literary device, not this time as instruction, but to highlight the uniqueness of Israel and centrality of the Torah. This Wisdom is described as dwelling in Israel[[81]](#footnote-81) and is identified with the Torah.[[82]](#footnote-82) Murphy writes: “when we consider the centrality which the Torah came to assume in the post-exilic period, it is really not surprising that it should become the epitome of Wisdom”.[[83]](#footnote-83) Though in the *Wisdom of Solomon* the concept of Wisdom is developed further, probably from the influence of Greek language and philosophical systems,[[84]](#footnote-84) Clarke still considers the use of Wisdom to be poetical.[[85]](#footnote-85)

Perhaps the clearest argument in support of the thesis that wisdom is simply a literary device is the fact that her role and relationships with God and man are not described consistently between texts or even in the same text. Schroer writes:

It is striking that in all these writings the relationship of (Lady) Wisdom with the God of Israel is not clearly determinable … *Sophia* is a shifting entity, not to be systematized, representing, in a variety of images and symbols, aspects of God’s goodness, kindness and love for human beings[[86]](#footnote-86)

**Personified Abstracts in Ancient Literature**

It has at times been asserted that the ancient mind could not grapple with abstract concepts and could not have engaged with personified abstracts, such as Wisdom, other than literally, ascribing to them literal personhood. Modern scholars tend to reject this view as it is overly simplistic. Burkert writes:

Linguistics leaves no doubt that there were abstracts not only in Indo-European, but also Semitic, and in Egyptian with explicit linguistic forms to characterize them[[87]](#footnote-87)

He examines numerous examples from around the Aegean and the Middle East (including personification of Wisdom in Proverbs[[88]](#footnote-88)) and concludes that the use of personification as a literary device “proves to be older than expected and more common”.[[89]](#footnote-89)

Stafford, who has done considerable research into personification in ancient Greece, in contrast demonstrates that many personified abstracts were treated as gods:

That is to say they had altars, temples and cult statues, they received sacrifices and more lasting dedications, and they were involved in hymns and prayers. Such trappings of cult are the best evidence we have to indicate that anyone ever believed in the real divine power … of personification[[90]](#footnote-90)

Stafford does acknowledge that the ancients also used personification as a “figure of speech with scarcely any personality at all” and that in between these two extremes there is any number of “stronger and weaker forms of personification”. [[91]](#footnote-91) Given this situation, she notes the difficulty of determining the way in which a personification was regarded by its author. This difficulty is exacerbated by the lack of distinction in the language.

In a language [e.g. ancient Greek] which makes no formal distinction between animate and inanimate and which has no such convention as the initial capital for a proper name, where can the line be drawn between an abstract noun and its personification?[[92]](#footnote-92)

Stafford, as other scholars have before, attempts to explain how personified abstracts came to be worshipped as gods. Though we need not digress into the full discussion here, it is interesting to note that several scholars, including Stafford and Burkert, have concluded that the deification of these abstracts was “secondary”.[[93]](#footnote-93) The use of personification by a writer does not entail that the subject was regarded as a deity, or even a literal person. Though there are significant issues to be taken into account when interpreting the use of personification in ancient literature, it is often purely a rhetorical device. As we have seen there are some indications that make it more likely that Wisdom is used as a literary device. It is also improbable that Wisdom was regarded as deity as she does not conform to the pattern noted by Stafford of having temples, altars, etc.[[94]](#footnote-94)

**The Logos**

Assuming that the personification of Wisdom in pre-Christian literature was purely rhetorical, the question of how John regarded the Logos can be considered against the background of Proverbs. The text of John 1 is analogous in that anthropomorphic verbs are used of (what is generally) an abstract noun, but if John’s Logos is based upon Wisdom in Proverbs, then it is plausible to suppose that the Logos be interpreted as an abstract concept personified but without personhood.

However, there are significant differences. First the use of the term “Logos” (instead of “Sophia” [‘Wisdom’]) and second, more dramatically, John records that the Logos “became flesh”.[[95]](#footnote-95) These differences could be taken as sufficient reason to suppose that John regarded the Logos as a literal person.

The use of “Logos” instead of “Sophia” is not as significant as it might appear. We have already seen that Wisdom was called “Logos” in the *Wisdom of Solomon*.[[96]](#footnote-96) The choice of “Logos” over “Sophia” presumably stems from John’s desire to allude to the Genesis account (e.g. “In the beginning …”). It is interesting that “Logos” is used despite being a masculine noun, while Wisdom is consistently personified as a woman throughout the pre-Christian Wisdom literature. If John had taken that feminine personification literally we can expect him to have preserved the feminine gender in his own account. The use of a masculine noun in the Prologue implies did not regard Wisdom as a person.

The “incarnation” of the Logos is more problematic and is likely to have been so for John’s first century audience. It is one thing to say that God’s creative word is still active in the world bringing light and salvation to humanity; it is quite another to suggest that this creative word became a literal, historical, human being. Now while this does not of itself entail that the Logos was a pre-existent person, by the end of the second century this had become the standard interpretation of this passage. On the other hand, the personification of the Logos is far less blatant than the personification of Wisdom. The Logos does not “rejoice”,[[97]](#footnote-97) or build a house,[[98]](#footnote-98) or invite people to dinner;[[99]](#footnote-99) the Logos can be referred to as an ‘it’ without any loss of meaning. Moreover, it is significant is that John refers to the Logos without any formal introduction or explanation. John presupposes some acquaintance with the concept of the Logos in his audience. This acquaintance would, presumably, be through the Wisdom literature and this would entail that John’s audience would naturally read “the Logos” as a literary device rather than a person.

**Marginal Notes**

**1 Cor 15:8-10—PW**

The metaphor of “incarnation” is about location – it locates God on earth in a man. The Doctrine of the Trinity asserts that this is the person of God the Son. By way of contrast, the notion of “manifestation” is that of an “image” and it does not involve the idea of re-location of that which is imaged. This notion is not a metaphor because aspects of God can be said to be imaged in a human insofar as both are persons. From the very first humankind was intended as the *manifestation* of God on earth; man was made in the image of God–he was the divine agent, the pinnacle of God’s creation, and the highest expression of his effulgence. As the divine representative and vice regent he was made “a little lower” than the angels and creation was put under his authority (Psalm 8). Jesus is the “second man” of this creation (1 Cor 15:47), and therefore a manifestation of God.

**Manifestation and Names**

The act of naming is very important in Israel’s traditions; it often has prophetic or theological significance. The Tetragrammaton, YHWH, translated “Lord”, is introduced in Exodus 3 in the paronomastic account of the Burning Bush. Paronomasia, or the phenomenon of introducing names through word-play, is evident in Exodus 3 in the relationship between YHWH and the Hebrew verb “to be”. The name given at Moses’ request (Exod 3:13) is supplied in the statement, “Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, YHWH…hath sent me unto you”. This statement repeats the immediately preceding statement, “Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM…hath sent me unto you” (Exod 3:14, KJV) with the substitution of YHWH for “I AM”.

The common verb “to be” hyh (*hyh*) has as its third person imperfect form hyhy(*yhyh*);this is obviously very similar to YHWH. The difference is a change from a yod y (Y) to a waw w (W). A similar shift (from yod to waw) occurred when the adjective for “living” (*chy*) became the name “Eve” (*chwh*), which is another example of a paronomastic account. Hence we see that “Yahweh” has the sense of “he will be”, together with a *causal sense* that Yahweh will bring to pass the fulfillment of what “he will be.” In the immediate context, God makes the assertion that “I will be who I will be” (*’ehyeh ’ašer ’ehyeh*) and the candidate for who God will be is Moses. The divine name is therefore an expression of purpose, and that purpose is God manifestation in sons and daughters.[[100]](#footnote-100)

**A Son, an Apostle and a Blind Man**

The phrase “I am that I am” in the KJV is rendered, sometimes as a marginal note, as “I will be who I will be” in theNEB, RSV, RV, NIV, GNB, and Moffat. The phrase begs the question: **Who will God be?** The covenant promise to David gives the ultimate answers the question: “I will be his father, and he shall be (*yhyh*) my son” (2 Sam 7:14). This is an obvious word play on God’s name – the “son” would manifest the qualities and character of the Father. This passage is quoted in the future tense by the author to the Hebrews—“I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son” —within the context of inheriting a more excellent name (Heb 1:5).

However, the theology of God manifestation is also expressed in the unusual formulations used by the apostle Paul in 1 Cor.15:8-10 and the blind man in John 9:9:

“And last of all he was seen (w;fqh cf. Acts 7:30 w;fqh, burning bush episode) of me……For I am the least of the apostles (i.e. sent ones)….but by the grace of God I am what I am (eivmi o[ eivmi)….yet not I but the grace of God which was with me (su.n evmoi,)”

The links to Exodus 3 are as follows: i) Paul saw Jesus, just as Moses saw the Angel of the Lord at the burning bush; ii) the context of the passage is redemption and salvation (cf*.* Exod 3:7-10, 17); iii) Paul is an **apostle** (=sent one cf*.* “send” in Exod 3:10, 12, 13, 14, and 15); and iv) the grace of God was with Paul just as God also promised to be **with** Moses (Exod 3:12). Paul states “I am what I am” because he is a present tense fulfillment of one (like Moses) in whom God would be manifest. Hence, Jesus says, “Saul is a chosen vessel to bear my name” (Acts 9:15).

In a similar fashion the blind man, whose sight was restored (like Saul’s) could say: “I am” (John 9:9). The blind man uses exactly the same syntactic expression for which Christ was almost stoned in John 8:58 –yet he was not claiming to be “God”. Jesus explains that the man was blind so “that the works of God may be made *manifest* in him”.

**Isa 66:1 - AP**

The question posed in Isa 66:1 is “Where is the house that ye build unto me?”. It is a text that is taken to firmly indicate the absence of the temple,[[101]](#footnote-101) and it is used to prove that the oracle of which it is a part is post-exilic. It has also been used as evidence for the post-exilic nature of Isaiah 56-66 as a whole. However, a contrary proposal is that the text is using the figure of a temple for the faithful; in fact, this is certain.

1) God asserts that heaven is his throne which suggests that the point of the text is to declare that this place is God’s actual temple. The earth is a footstool, a function elsewhere predicated of the ark, which further suggests that it is not the temple with which God is concerned: i.e. the place of the ark, because the earth is his actual footstool.

2) Heaven and earth are “all those things” that God’s hand has made. This echoes Gen 1:31,

“And God saw all things that he had made, and, behold, *it was* very good.” Gen 1:31 (KJV revised)

This shows that the point of Isa 61:1 is not about *what can be made* by men, because everything has been made by God. Hence, Isa 66:2 says that “all those things have been”.

3) The point being made is “to this person will I look, even to the person who is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word”. This echoes Isa 57:15,

“For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name *is* Holy; I dwell in the high and holy *place*, with him also *that is* of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones.” Isa 57:15 (KJV)

The echoes here are several even though the vocabulary is different: i) God is “high” and “inhabits eternity”, likewise, heaven is his throne; ii) he “dwells” in a high and holy place but also with a certain type of person, likewise, God “looks” to a certain type of person; and iii) God looks to the “contrite”, “humble” and “poor” in spirit.

4) The question, “Where is the house that ye build unto me?” is the parallel contrasting clause to “but to this person will I look”: there is heaven and earth which God has made on the one hand, and there is a house/temple or a certain kind of person on the other hand. This parallelism is indicated by the play on words *’ê-zeh* and *’el-zeh* (“where is this” and “to this”) in the two statements.

5) That this is what God wants is further reinforced by the contrast in Isa 66:3—sacrifices and oblations were being offered, but they were not what God wanted. If all that is being offered are sacrifices of animals (v. 3), this is not enough because what God wants is the spiritual house of a man’s faith.

God’s question, “Where is the house that ye build unto me?” (v. 1) is not about the absence of a literal temple in Jerusalem. The temple had been burned (Isa 64:11) and denuded of its treasures (2 Kgs 18:15-16), and materials to repair and beautify the temple were promised (Isa 60:13). But a lack of repair work on the temple is not the complaint of Isa 66:1, which is instead about “building”. Rather, the “house” is a metaphor for the faithful in the land with whom God sought to rest.

The mention of “rest” secures this line of exposition. This “rest” is that which comes through the teaching of spirit-gifted prophets:

“Whom shall he teach knowledge? and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? *them that are* weaned from the milk, *and* drawn from the breasts. 10 For precept *must be* upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, *and* there a little: 11 For with mocked (g[l) lips and another tongue will he speak to this people. 12 To whom he said, This *is* the rest *wherewith* ye may cause the weary to rest; and this *is* the refreshing: yet they would not hear.” Isa 28:9-12 (KJV revised)

This teaching contrasts with the lies which the rulers of Jerusalem were pursuing in their agreement with hell during the Assyrian invasion. Those who had the spirit at this time were giving refreshing and rest through their teaching, if only the rulers of Jerusalem would listen.

During the siege the spirit was bestowed (Isa 28:11) and God taught the people to have faith in a foundation stone of a new house which was Hezekiah, and remain in the city (Isa 28:16). It was in their possession of this faith that God promised the people “rest”. When therefore God asks again, “Where is the place of my rest?” (Isa 61:1),[[102]](#footnote-102) he asks about those faithful with whom he could dwell.

**END**
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1. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66* (London: SCM Press, 1969), 154. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Westermann, 154. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Westermann, 168. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Cyrus will give a decree; it is not said that he would build Jerusalem. The irony is stuck but there is this significant variation. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. G. H. Twelftree, “Demons” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (eds., J. B. Green, S. McKnight, I.H. Marshall; Leicester: Inter Varsity Press, 1992), 163-164. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Whereas, Mark 1:23-28 has ‘unclean spirit’ the parallel in Luke 4:33 has ‘spirit of an unclean devil’ (cf*.* Rev.18: 2). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Herbert Rand suggests that the word *ittîy* in Lev. 16:21 be translated adverbially, i.e., emphasizing the temporary status of the one sending away the scapegoat: “and shall dispatch [it] by someone [ad hoc] into the wilderness”, H. Rand, “The Translator's Dilemma: What is *itti*?”, *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 22 (1994):110-114. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Significantly the trumpet section (Rev 8:3-11:19) commences with a parody of the *Yom Kippûr* ritual, for instead of the priestly blessing (and forgiveness) being pronounced on the nation of Israel upon exiting the “Most Holy” place (the heavenly sanctuary), the angel executes retribution. A series of escalating calamities befall the people until the introduction of the *eschaton* at the sounding of the seventh trumpet. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. G. B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (London: Duckworth, 1980, ch. 14. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. B. S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1979), 326. Childs’ conclusion is that “the final form of the literature provided a completely new and non-historical framework for the prophetic message which severed the message from its historical moorings and rendered it accessible to all future generations”, 337. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. R. E. Clements, “Patterns in the Prophetic Canon” in *Canon and Authority* (eds., G. W. Cook and R. O. Long; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 42-55 (52). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. R. P. Carroll, *When Prophecy Failed* (London: SCM Press, 1979), 40, 55. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. *When Prophecy Failed*, 66. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (9th Edn.; Edinburgh; T & T Clark, 1913), 237. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. H. A. Whittaker, *Isaiah* (Cannock: Biblia, 1988). [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. A. Perry, “An Ironic Cyrus” *CeJBL* 1 (Oct, 2007). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. *Language*, 247. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. *Language*, 253. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. For a discussion see R. H. Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1954). [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. *Language*, 258. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. For a further critique of Caird see D. C. Allison, *The End of the Ages has Come* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 84-90. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (London: SPCK, 1992). [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. M. Fuller, *The Restoration of Israel*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003). See also D. Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995). Both Fuller and Ravens are concerned with Luke-Acts. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. M. M. B. Turner, *Power from on High: the Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000). [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. M. J. Scott, *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, & Christian Perspectives* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001). [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Wright, *New Testament*, 268. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Fuller, *Restoration*, 24. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. We presume here an eighth century reading of Isaiah 40-66. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Reformation understanding of Paul’s theology contrasts law and grace in a doctrine of justification by faith. On this view, Paul’s opponents are legalistic Judaizers. The “New Perspective” on Paul can be traced back to Sanders seminal work *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (1977) where he views the Pauline opposition as supporting *covenantal nomism.* Rather than demanding perfect works-righteousness *covenantal nomism* regards the law as the basis of the covenant. According to Sanders, “the intention and effort to be obedient constitutes *the condition for remaining in the covenant*, but they do not *earn* it” (180, emphasis his). If Sanders assessment of the first century setting is correct, then Paul’s objections are not, *per se*, against using the law as a vehicle for self-justifying works, but against deployment of law as a badge of privilege and as a sign of Jewish exclusivity. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. N.T. Wright, “The Law in Romans 2” in *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (ed. J. D. G. Dunn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 131-150. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Romans 1:18-32 is not an attack on Gentile lifestyle – it is based on the golden calf apostasy and orgy at the giving of the law, more on this anon. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. J.D.G. Dunn, “Letter to the Romans” in *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters* (eds. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, and D.G. Reid; Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 838-850. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. S.J. Hafemann, *Paul and his Interpreters*, Ibid, 678 [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. As far as I am aware this approach to Romans 1 was first propounded by H. A. Whittaker, in his reassessment of the chapter—*Bible Studies* (Cannock: Biblia, 1987), 305-308. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. N.T. Wright, *Paul: Fresh Perspectives* (London: SPCK, 2005), 44. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. J. A. Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1993); *Isaiah* (Tyndale; Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1999). [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. The standard work in this area is Y. Gitay, *Rhetorical Analysis of Isaiah 40-48: A Study of the Art of Prophetic Persuasion* (Unpublished PhD thesis, Emory University, 1978); see 1-57 for his review of scholarship. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. For a defence of this Judean reading see H. Barstad, *A Way in the Wilderness* (*JSS* Monograph Series 12; Manchester: University of Manchester, 1989), 8-20. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. It was “now” that the Lord was pleading with Judah. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Questions: Isa 40:12-14, 41:2, 4, 26, 44:7-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Second Person Questions: Isa 40:21, 25, 28, 42:23, [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Fear Commands: Isa 43:2, 5, 44:8 [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Behold Commands: Isa 40:15, 41:11, 24, 29, 43:19, 44:11. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Second Person Address: Isa 41:24, 43:2-3 [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. A *hapax legomenon* (pl. *hapax legomena*, though sometimes called *hapaxes* for short) is a word which occurs only once in the written record of a language, in the works of an author, or in a single text. Many *hapax legomena* appear in the Seventy Weeks prophecy: *nechettak,* “determined” (9:24); *charutz,* “moat,” (9:25); *tzoq*, “trouble” (9:25); as well as terms, e.g.,;, and terms: *kenaf,* “wing” (9:27). [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. For example, in the Seventy Weeks prophecy—*shiqutzim meshomem*, “desolating abominations” (9:27) is difficult. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. For example, again in the Seventy Weeks prophecy, *berit*, “covenant” (9:24; cf. 9:4; 11:22, 28, 30, 32), *[ha]rabbim*, “the many” (9:27), and even the term *mashiach*, “anointed, Messiah” (9:26) are uncharacteristic terms. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. So, in the Seventy Weeks prophecy, the Hebrew term *shavua’,* usuallytranslated as “week”, is a deliberately ambiguous term denoting “sevens”. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. The Septuagint and Theodotian imply many textual variants on the Masoretic text. For example, in the Seventy Weeks prophecy, the presence of the athnah accent in Dan 9:25 causes problems. In Hebrew there are two types of accents and they act as punctuation marks. The strong accents serve as stops (periods), colons, and semicolons. One of these accents is called the athnah. The function of the athnah is to mark the first half of a verse and serves as a strong break within a sentence. The Hebrew text contains an athnah under the Hebrew word for “seven”, which in the text closes the first period of sevens. Thus, in Hebrew, the accent makes a separation between the two periods of weeks. Translations (e.g. RSV) following the Hebrew Masoretic text accents take the *athnah* into account and adopt a disjunction, with “**a** messiah” appearing after the initial 7 weeks. (7 weeks........ **Then** after62 weeks). However, the KJV is influenced by Theodotian which does not reflect such an accent, and has “until **the** Messiah” shall come after 69 weeks (7 weeks **and** 62 weeks). [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. The Septuagint proper (LXX) is only the Pentateuch, in contrast the wider Old Greek text (which includes Daniel) is hereafter called ‘LXX’ in order to differentiate it from the LXX – see the article by John Adey, *CeJBI* October 2007 [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. J. E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (London: Nelson, 1989), xxxii. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. Eugene Nida, Toward a Science of Translation, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964), 155. Translators often employ Hebrew dictionaries and grammar written in English.  Thus, the structure of the English language is bound to be an influence in any translation, “regardless of the translator’s wish to avoid ‘linguistic contamination’” (p. 148). Nida notes that one basic requirement for a translator is that s/he must have empathy for the original author.  The words which translators must employ to translate a text are already set out for them by the original author.  Using this empathetic spirit, translators must be like the original author; translators must not try to improve or to excel the original author. Nida wrote that the translator “must exert every effort to reduce to a minimum any intrusion of himself which is not in harmony with the intent of the original author and message” (p. 154). [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. W. Sibley Towner, “Daniel” in *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* (eds. B. M. Metzger and M. D. Coogan; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 150. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. The Prayer of Azariah and Song of the Three Young Men (inserted after 3:23 of the Hebrew text); the story of Susanna and the elders (chapter 13 in the ‘LXX’), and the story of Bel and the Dragon (chapter 14 in the ‘LXX’). In addition a number of extra-canonical Danielic materials have appeared among the Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran, the most interesting of which is the “Prayer of Nabonidus” which parallels Nebuchadnezzar’s madness found in Daniel. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. S. R. Driver, *Daniel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900), 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. Norman Porteous, *Daniel* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), 144. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Robin Lane Fox, *The Unauthorized Version* (London: Viking Press, 1991), 336. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Boutflower discusses the work of C. H. H. Wright who examined this phenomenon, he comments as follows: “The eleventh chapter of Daniel is, then, in the first place, a translation from the original; and, in the second place, it is a translation that has been added to by way of interpolation; and to this is due the form which it has come down to us. What has happened to the Greek Septuagint translation has also happened to the Hebrew translation of chapter 11; *it has been added to*, and the nature of the additions resembles to some extent the expository comments which we meet in the Hebrew Targums. The writers of the Targums, or ancient Aramaic commentaries on the Scriptures of the Old Testament, loved to introduce into Scripture prophecies fulfillments, actual or supposed, in such a way that they appear as parts of the original prophecy. In such paraphrases, writes Dr. Wright, phrases of the original are retained, although often so modified and obscured by expository comments that if we possessed only the Targum it would be often impossible to restore the original text.” C. Boutflower, *In and around the book of Daniel* (London: SPCK, 1923), 5-7. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. “Modern scholars have argued that the first half of the book, dealing with the experiences of Daniel at the Babylonian court, dates to the third century B.C.E., while the remainder, describing the Maccabean period and its aftermath in apocalyptic terms, dates to the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, 167-163 B.C.E.” H. Schiffman, *From Text to Tradition: A History of Second Temple & Rabbinic Judaism* (New York: KTAV Publishing, 1991), 123. “The date of the origins of these tales [Daniel 1-6] is open to surmise. A third or fourth century date might be suggested, but there is nothing to preclude that some of the material might be earlier, even going back to the events they describe. The collection, however, would be much later.” David G. Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon,* (Tubingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1986 ), 87-88. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. Notice Items #5 and #7, portions from the last half of the Book of Daniel, which were *copied* (**not “written”!**) between 150 and 100 BC. Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*,[vol. 2](eds., Peter W. Flint and James C. Vanderkam; Leiden: E. J. Brill,1999), 53. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955), 118. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. J. E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC; Nelson,1989), xxxviii. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. J. M. Hadley, “Wisdom and the Goddess”in J. Day, R. P. Gordon & H. G. M. Williamson (eds.), *Wisdom in Ancient Israel: Essays in Honour of J. A. Emerton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 234. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. J. Wood, *Wisdom Literature: An Introduction* (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1967), 104. Also see S. Schroer, *Wisdom has built her house: Studies on the figure of Sophia in the Bible* (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 29. Wood does refer to a Canaanite goddess called *hoknoth,* which does bear some similarity to the Hebrew word for Wisdom, *hokmâ*. But, as he records, there seems to be no association between the two beyond the similarity of these two words. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. Judges 2:13, 10:6; I Samuel 7:3-4, 12:10; see Wood 1967:107. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. Hadley 1995:235. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. R. E. Murphy, “The Personification of Wisdom*”* in Day 1995:223. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. Hadley 1995:236. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. Some translators render Proverbs 8:22 to the effect that Yahweh begat Wisdom. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. Hence, “the gradual eradication (or assimilation into Yahweh) of legitimate goddesses such as Asherah [Astarte] has prompted a counter-reaction where the feminine needs to be expressed” (Hadley 1995:243). [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. Wood 1967:106 [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. Hence, “Perhaps the single strongest objection to considering Lady Wisdom as a divine figure in her own right is the fact that, to date, *hokmâ* is not listed in any onomastica or extra-biblical literature as a goddess” (Hadley 1995:242). [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
73. Proverbs 1:8, 1:10, 2:1, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
74. Proverbs 1:2-6, 2:1-5, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
75. Proverbs 5:1-6, 5:15-20, 6:24-29, 7:1-27, 9:13-18. [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
76. II Samuel 12. [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
77. Proverbs 7:4-5 [NKJV]. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
78. Proverbs 9:13 [ESV]. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. Murphy 1995:225-6. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. Proverbs 8:32-36. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. *Sirach* 24:10-11. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
82. *Sirach* 24:23. [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
83. Murphy 1995:227. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
84. E. G. Clarke, *The Wisdom of Solomon,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
85. Clarke 1973:121. [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
86. Schroer 2000:114. [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
87. W. Burkert, “Hesiod in Context: Abstractions and Divinities in an Aegean-Eastern Koiné” in E. Stafford & J. Herrin (eds.), *Personification in the Greek World: From Antiquity to Byzantium* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishers, 2005), 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
88. Burkert 2005:9-10. [↑](#footnote-ref-88)
89. Burkert 2005:5. [↑](#footnote-ref-89)
90. E. Stafford, *Worshipping Virtues: Personification and the Divine in Ancient Greece* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 2000), 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-90)
91. Stafford 2000:2. [↑](#footnote-ref-91)
92. Stafford 2000:9. [↑](#footnote-ref-92)
93. Burkert 2005:14. [↑](#footnote-ref-93)
94. Stafford 2000:2; see also Burkert 2005:15, and Hadley 1995:242. [↑](#footnote-ref-94)
95. John 1:14. [↑](#footnote-ref-95)
96. *Wisdom of Solomon* 9:1-2. [↑](#footnote-ref-96)
97. Proverbs 8:30. [↑](#footnote-ref-97)
98. Proverbs 9:1. [↑](#footnote-ref-98)
99. Proverbs 9:5. [↑](#footnote-ref-99)
100. A. Gibson, *Biblical Semantic Logic* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1980), 151-164 [↑](#footnote-ref-100)
101. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66* (London: SCM Press, 1969), 413. [↑](#footnote-ref-101)
102. The concept of “my rest” (ytxwnm) is used in Pss 95:1 to refer to the land that the generation in the wilderness would not enter; it is also used to refer to Zion and the temple (Pss 132:8, 14). [↑](#footnote-ref-102)