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**Editorial**

Self-justification is a human trait. The example I am thinking of is relevant to the EJournal which is concerned with the study of the Scriptures. Let us suppose you don’t do much reading and study of the Scriptures, how do you justify this? There are various reasons: ‘I am busy’, ‘I need to put in long hours to keep my job’, ‘I am tired, I need to relax’, ‘There are just too many things to do, what with family and work’, ‘I can’t, I don’t know how’, ‘It’s too hard’, ‘I have college’, *and so on*. These are practical reasons that can often be heard: Life is very busy. But my concern is about the *spiritual* self-justification that can accompany these practical reasons.

Spiritual self-justification is about life-style choices and making our conscience comfortable with those choices. There are several spiritual justifications for not studying the Scriptures and neglecting Bible reading. For example, ‘The Gospel is simple, we do not need to study’, ‘I like/prefer exhortation rather than study, that is what is important and it is up-building’, ‘We should praise the Lord rather than study the Scriptures; praise is encouraging’, *and so on*. Spiritual self-justification is the process when one spiritual good is used to cast aside another spiritual good and wilfully see its neglect. Such justification, if left unchecked as a pattern of behaviour over time, leads to the motivation for study becoming atrophied. What passes for ‘study’ is forever then the level of the ‘introductory’ (or the ‘dumbed–down’). The deeper things of Scripture are never approached. The malaise is set and it has its spiritual justification.

God has given us writing. For us it is old writing. The context of it being given is not always easy to recover. It is often difficult writing. It has deeper levels of meaning. It is very varied. We have it in translation but the writing was given in different languages. If God knows us from the beginning, and this is the nature of the writing he has given us, it would seem that he requires us to respond to him by studying. We are not quoting a verse here which says, ‘Study the Bible’; rather, we are saying that the *nature of the writing* itself requires study in order to be understood. God has planned his revelation so that it appears in *this* *kind of writing* (the varied and difficult writing in the Bible). Our response to him should meet what he has written rather than our own needs.

As individuals (or ecclesias) we may neglect the study of the Scriptures. This will be evident in talks, in our own speech, and possibly in our other behaviour. This, however, is not my complaint; neither is it the case that I am lamenting our busy lives. I just don’t think that we should buttress our busy lives (a problem) with a spiritual self-justification that neglects the Scriptures.

**Models of the Church**

**A. Perry**

**Introduction**

We are familiar with many valuable models of the church such as ‘family’, ‘house’, ‘community’; perhaps, ‘elect’, ‘believers’, ‘disciples’, ‘followers’—any number of words usefully capture something of the ‘body of Christ’. In this essay, we are interested in historical and dispensational models, of which there are traditionally three, and we want to describe a fourth.

**Historical and Dispensational Models**

An ‘historical’ or ‘dispensational’ model of the church is all about answering the question: What has the church been since the Apostolic Age under God’s guiding hand? Has there been a church? In the course of history since Adam, has God changed the principles of how he brings about groups of the faithful? Here are three answers to these questions for the period Anno Domini:

(1) God through Jesus created the church as the body of Christ with the Apostles; he has continued to bring people to Christ ever since on the same basis and there has always been his church throughout the course of history—it is the **universal catholic church** embodied in the Catholic Church, which can trace its history back to the apostles.

(2) What is stated in (1) is true except for the last part: the Catholic Church became apostate over the centuries and fostered false practices and teachings; what happened in the **Reformation** under God was a stripping out of these practices and teachings and the Protestant Church is now the embodiment of the universal catholic church which can trace its history back to the apostles.

(3) Catholic and Protestant views of the church in history are wrong. The church became corrupt in various ways and at various times in history, but the Reformation was not enough. What has been needed is a **restoration** of the original apostolic church and this has happened now under God in our [substitute preferred name] church.

These three views can be dubbed the **Catholic**, **Reformation** and **Restoration** models of the church. They are explanations of how God has interacted in history to bring about the faithful and maintain them as a body. The Roman Catholic Church holds to (1); an example of a Reformation church would be the Lutheran Church; and an example of a Restoration church would be the Assembly of God Pentecostals.

**A Fourth Model?**

These three models are very familiar; they all share the assumption that God has been at work in history among Gentiles to bring about and maintain bodies of faithful men and women as the ‘apostolic’ church. A logical fourth model, and not one that is really countenanced by Christians, would be that **God has not been at work in history in this manner**—this would be an individualistic model. It affirms that God has not been at work building and maintaining the universal Catholic Church or the Reformed or Restoration counterparts since apostolic times.

What would be the components of an ‘individualistic’ model? It has to cover individuals coming to the faith throughout history and, perhaps, associating together with like-minded individuals with the same faith. The following are some suggested elements of this model:

* God’s prophetic purpose is with Israel; with Israel dispersed among the nations, his providential activity has been with them to preserve them, pending the time that he would bring them back to the land to receive their Messiah.
* The existence of ‘the church’ is dependent on Israel being in the land and there being a ‘mission to the Gentiles’ in the last days.
* The bestowal of the Spirit was the driving force of the church in the first century, but with the dispersal of the Jews, this bestowal came to an end; it was a bestowal orientated towards the Jews.
* In the absence of the Spirit, Gentiles have the faith left behind by the apostles in the New Testament; it is for them to respond to this call and witness to those around.
* God has always been interested in individuals coming to Christ, but ‘the church’ is a body implied by the mission to the Gentiles in the Prophets for the last days and not throughout history.
* Individuals who believe the faith left behind by the apostles have banded together into communities; in the course of history, such communities have come and gone, but they should not consider themselves to be the Apostolic Church.

This ‘individualistic’ model of the church claims to be grounded in what the OT prophets say about Jesus and the mission to the Gentiles in the last days. The last days of the Jewish Commonwealth saw such a church which Jesus built, but in the last two thousand years such a spirit-guided mission has not been part of God’s purpose; nevertheless, this is shortly to be His purpose in the last days that are coming upon His people before the advent of their Messiah.

**Challenges**

The model throws down challenges in several directions. It is an obvious denial of the Catholic view of the church. It is also a denial of the Reformation view of the church because this is just modified Catholicism. Perhaps surprisingly though, it is also a denial of the Restoration model which, while evident throughout history, rose to prominence in the 1830s in America. The roots of the model lie in the Radical Reformation, which migrated to America, but the example we gave, Pentecostalism, traces its roots to the beginning of the twentieth century in California.

The model is a denial of restorationist views of the church because such churches are unrelated to a bestowal of the Spirit that pertains to Israel and their return to the land. Thus, claims to possess the Spirit fail to measure up because the Spirit so-claimed is not directing its energies towards God’s people and their repentance. Throughout OT history, this was the purpose of such bestowals and it is how the Prophets predict future bestowals.

The four models are mutually exclusive and they are ‘big-picture’ views of history. Christians sit inside one of the three standard models and these are obvious to the eye because they are manifested in large institutional churches. Christians inside the fourth model are unlikely to be noticed by the world—they don’t have the drive to create ‘the Church’ or replicate what Jesus and the apostles created. They stand outside the mainstream churches.

Individuals who are content to band together for the times in which they live are transient and their make-shift structures are likely to pass away if their witness to their neighbours falls upon deaf ears. The ‘individualistic’ model explains why such groups pass away: in the current dispensation that we call Anno Domini, God has given his Word and individuals have responded—He has not been about building and maintaining an institutional church.

**Conclusion**

This discussion piece has not elaborated upon or engaged the Catholic, Protestant or Restoration models of church history. The issues involved in a full-scale discussion are large and far-reaching. For example, within this topic area lays the answer to the question of the operation of the Spirit today, whether we are thinking about broader charismatic or narrower Pentecostal views. Instead, we have sought to sketch the claims of the ‘individualistic’ model. On this model, there are just individuals who have been baptised with the faith left behind by the apostles and who have associated locally with other like-minded individuals.

**The Harlotry of Israel**

**P. Wyns**

**Introduction**

The cities of Jerusalem and Samaria are metaphorically referred to as harlots in the OT. Is this language transferrable to the nation as a whole? This article hopes to demonstrate that the nation as a whole, as well as her constituent parts, can be described as a harlot.

**The Calling of Israel**

The nation of Israel was delivered from Egypt and a covenant relationship was established at Sinai. This covenant relationship was akin to ‘marriage’ and Yahweh says that he was a ‘husband’ to them (Jer 31:32). However, even before the ‘honeymoon’ was over the nation committed adultery with the golden calf. Moses ground the calf to dust and made the nation drink the remains (Deut 9:21) in imitation of the ‘waters of jealousy’—the test proscribed in the law for an unfaithful wife (Num 5:26). So from the very beginning the nation was adulterous; but can she be described as a harlot? The first woman is unfaithful to her husband and the second offers sexual favours for hire.

The verb ‘to commit harlotry’ (hnz, *znh*) and its related cognates (‘harlotry’: ~ynwnz, twnz) refer to all forms of illicit sex between a man and a woman, whether that be professional prostitution (Tamar; Gen 38:15), freely offered sex outside marriage (Moabite women; Num 25:1), or marital unfaithfulness, as in the metaphorical use of Israel ‘whoring after’ other gods though betrothed to Yahweh (Exod 34:15-16; Lev 20:5-6; Deut 31:16).[[1]](#footnote-1) G. Hall states,

The most common and important usage of the root *znh* is metaphorical. Since it referred to illicit sex, especially in violation of a covenantal relationship (betrothal or marriage) it could be used to refer to covenantal unfaithfulness on Israel’s part, since this covenant came to be viewed as marriage (Hos 2). This occurs in legal texts (Exod 34:15, 16; Lev 20:5), historical narrative (Judg 2:17; 8:27, 33; 1 Chron 5:25), and the Ps (73:27; 106:39). The prophets Hos, Jer, and Ezek exploit it to the fullest. The distinction between illicit sex and sex for hire is not clear in the metaphorical usage. The promiscuous wife (fornicator) is little different from the one who sells sex for a price. The promiscuous idolatry of Israel and Judah was like both, Israel was controlled by a promiscuous spirit (Hos 4:12; 5:4). She had sold sex for hire (2:5[7]). Judah was no better, waiting like a prostitute for her lovers along the road (Jer 3:1-3). The idolatry being attacked was the Canaanite cult that Israel and Judah had adopted. If the cult included sacred sex, then the power of the metaphor was grounded in real sexual misconduct as well (Hos 4:13-14).[[2]](#footnote-2)

Israel had therefore committed adultery and harlotry as becomes clear from the experiences of the prophet Hosea, who was instructed to marry a wife who was also a harlot.

**The Lewdness of Israel’s Youth**

The prophet Ezekiel mentions ‘the lewdness of your youth’ in connection with Egypt:

Yet she multiplied her harlotry in calling to remembrance the days of her youth, when she had played the harlot in the land of Egypt (v. 19)…Thus you called to remembrance the lewdness of your youth, When the Egyptians pressed your bosom because of your youthful breasts. Ezek 23:19, 21

In this chapter (Ezekiel 23), the two capital cities of the nation are called harlots. Jerusalem was the capital of the southern tribes and Samaria of the northern tribes. The cities are called ‘sisters’:

Son of man, there were two women, the daughters of one mother.They committed harlotry in Egypt, they committed harlotry in their youth… Ezek 23:2-3

They are the ‘daughters of one mother’—this allegory has the matriarchs of Israel in mind (Rachael and Leah) who were sisters and gave birth to the twelve tribes who ‘went down to Egypt’. It is quite obvious that the ‘cities’ of Israel (Jerusalem/Samaria) had never gone down to Egypt; however, the forebears of the citizens of those cities had come from Egypt, and committed harlotry in Egypt, and their descendants were still committing harlotry.

C. T. Begg sums it up succinctly when he says,

Ezekiel’s words disclose an overwhelming pessimism concerning the people’s capacity ever to choose rightly. For him, unlike Hosea (3.5) and Jeremiah (2.2-3), there never was a honeymoon period in Israel’s relation to Yahweh. Already during her time in Egypt (16.26; 20.8), as well as ever since, Israel has consistently chosen other gods in preference to Yahweh. Judah learned nothing from Yahweh’s punishment of the northern kingdom, only redoubling her own idolatry in the face of that experience (23.11).[[3]](#footnote-3)

G. Erlandsson comments; “Once again it is emphasized how the Israelites were already playing the harlot in Egypt (*zānāh*, v.3), i.e., even before the marriage/covenant”.[[4]](#footnote-4)

**A Wife of Harlotry and Children of Harlotry**

The prophet Hosea was instructed to act out an allegorical parable by marrying a prostitute. It seems that his wife continued her trade even while she was married thus conceiving ‘children of harlotry’. She was guilty of adultery *and* harlotry and became a fitting type of the nation who although redeemed from harlotry and made respectable[[5]](#footnote-5), continued to ply her trade and therefore added adultery to her sin.

It is sometimes argued that Hosea was only concerned with the northern tribes and Samaria and therefore the parable is not a commentary on the whole nation, but F. I. Andersen observes,

Hosea’s messages mostly attack the northern kingdom (1.4), but Judah is frequently mentioned side by side with Ephraim and similarly condemned, especially in the all-important chps.4-8. Some scholars wish to delete the references to Judah as secondary additions, but such a revision would seriously injure the fabric of the whole book. The references to Jacob in the latter part of the book secure a complementary historical perspective that shows a concern for all Israel as the covenant people. It reaches deeply into the past and Judah could hardly be excluded from Jacob’s descendants. The reference to David in 3.5 likewise recalls the original unity of the people, and looks forward to its future restoration.[[6]](#footnote-6)

**Jerusalem the Harlot**

There can be no doubt that the prophets (and therefore Yahweh) viewed the nation *as a whole* as a harlot. However, within this paradigm, the city of Jerusalem held a special place. The reason for this is because she was the city chosen as Yahweh’s dwelling place. The Temple was built in Jerusalem and the cult and the monarchy were centralised in that city. She was the capital of a united nation under a Davidic king. After the division of the kingdom, Jerusalem still held a privileged position and faithful northern pilgrims would travel to Jerusalem for the feasts. Even the calf-idols of Jeroboam could not completely break the influence of Jerusalem on the political and religious life of the northern tribes.

Prior to the captivity of Judah, the prophet Isaiah declared of Jerusalem:

How the faithful city has become a harlot! It was full of justice; Righteousness lodged in it, but now murderers. Isa.1:21

The city of Jerusalem came from lowly origins (Ezek 16:3), but was elevated by Yahweh who made a covenant with her and cleansed her; yet she played the harlot (Ezek 16:15) and became spiritually like her ‘sister’ Sodom (Ezek 16:46, 48, 49, 53, 55, 56).

The description of the woman, Jerusalem, in Ezekiel 16 is based on the **tabernacle and its priests in the wilderness** and is replete with irony:

* Yahweh clothed the city with badger skins (Ezek 16:10; Exod 25:5);
* A beautiful crown was put on her forehead (Ezek 28:36-38; Ezek.16:12);
* The linen priestly garments, ‘for glory and beauty’ were also embroidered with gold, blue, purple and scarlet (Exod 28:2-5; Ezek.16:13);
* The priests were “decked with ornaments” (the breastplate—Exod 28:15-29; Ezek 16:11).

Jerusalem is depicted as a woman clothed with finery bearing a priestly crown on her head, yet she commits fornication with the surrounding nations. Her fornication was not only syncretistic but political. The city of Jerusalem is therefore particularly singled out for opprobrium because of her special status as Yahweh’s dwelling place. A sexually lose daughter of a priest was subject to being ‘burned with fire’ (Lev 21:9; cf. Gen 38:24; Judg 15:6) because her uncleanness defiled her father. The city of Jerusalem suffered this fate twice in her history in BC 586 (Jer 52:13) and in AD70 (cf. Matt 22:17; 2 Pet 3:10).[[7]](#footnote-7)

After the fall of Judah and the burning of Jerusalem, the inhabitants were condemned, once again, to wander in a ‘wilderness’. This was fitting because when Yahweh had brought them out of Egypt, their rebelliousness had caused them to wander in the wilderness (Ezek 20:13). Hence, it was prophesied that Yahweh would bring them into the ‘wilderness of the peoples’ (Ezek 20:35) and they would experience banishment from the land and from the Sanctuary. However, the wilderness was not only occupied by the generation of the wicked, it was also a place where the faithful were preserved. The faithful were Joshua and Caleb and the youngsters of that rebellious generation, they were the “good figs” of Jer 24:5—so both good and bad shared the same initial fate. The wilderness became a place of banishment but also a place of preservation and hope.

**Conclusion**

Although Israel was a harlot in Egypt (from her youth), nevertheless Yahweh ‘married’ her in the wilderness. She continued to play the harlot both in the wilderness and subsequently in the land. The city where Yahweh chose to dwell excelled at harlotry and persecuted and killed all who were sent to warn her. For this reason, she was consigned once again to the ‘wilderness’ a place of punishment for the wicked and preservation for a faithful remnant (this remnant accepted the New Covenant when Christ appeared). Once again, after harsh treatment and an even longer exile, they have been regathered to the land, and yet the chosen nation continues to play the harlot: “How degenerate is your heart!” says the Lord God, “seeing you do all these *things,* the deeds of a brazen harlot” (Ezek 16:30).

 **The Importance of the Ecclesia at Ephesus**

**P. Wyns**

**Introduction**

Understanding the situation in the ecclesia at Ephesus is crucial to understanding the context of many of the NT writings. At first glance the ecclesia at Ephesus only features in Acts 19 and in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Both writings are associated with the apostle Paul – Acts 19 (recorded by Luke) describes the situation that Paul encountered when he first arrived in Ephesus and the epistle addresses problems between Jews and gentiles at a later stage of development.

Was Paul the founder of the ecclesia at Ephesus or did he build on the foundations of others? Early church ‘tradition’ relates that the apostle John lived in Ephesus for some time; but is there any validity to this tradition, and did it occur before or after Paul’s visit/epistle? Many may question the usefulness of such an investigation; does it really matter? After all, the Bible does not tell us, therefore it is probably not important. However, by employing am intertextual method, this article hopes to show that John’s writings, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, were also addressed to the ecclesia at Ephesus. This is important because it throws new light on those writings and helps us better understand their first century context.

The following order of writing is proposed and will be tested against intertextual evidence:

* Fourth Gospel – author the apostle John
* Epistles of John – author the apostle John
* Acts 19 – author Luke
* Ephesians – author the apostle Paul
* Hebrews– author?

The hypothesis to be tested is that all these writings were directed to the ecclesia at Ephesus. The only writing that has not been included in this list is the warning to Ephesus from the book of Revelation. This has been deliberately omitted in order not to confuse the issue but evidence indicates that the author of Hebrews was aware of the warning given in Revelation.

**Interpretive Keys**

The very early ecclesia (pre-Pauline) at Ephesus was not a separate entity from the Jewish synagogue. Initially it would have contained large numbers of unconverted Jews, possibly a very few Jewish-Christians and a small number of gentiles that had converted to Judaism. The status of John the Baptist at the ecclesia at Ephesus is an important interpretive key. Many of the Jews at Ephesus would have travelled to Jerusalem for the high-feast days (cf. Acts 2:5) and some would have been attracted to the preaching of John the Baptist. The powerful preaching of the Baptist concerning repentance and the coming judgment marked him as a prophet and many unconverted Jews would have readily accepted his prophetic credentials. There was then a growing movement at Ephesus that regarded John the Baptist as a prophet and some may even have speculated that he was the promised Messiah. Luke recounts (Acts 19:1-7) that Paul found ‘about twelve’ (i.e., the new Israel) disciples of John the Baptist, who had not heard about Jesus, but who had been baptised by John the Baptist. They had only received the baptism of repentance (v. 4). These disciples of the Baptist were re-immersed and received the Holy Spirit.[[8]](#footnote-8)

The preaching of John the Baptist may well have been controversial but it did not fall outside the remit of Judaism. It would have been perfectly acceptable for a law abiding and morally upright Jew in Ephesus to hold to the teachings of the Baptist without risking excommunication.[[9]](#footnote-9)

The status of John the Baptist at Ephesus is an interpretive key because the Fourth Gospel is at pains to stress the superiority of Jesus’ ministry (John 3:30; “He must increase, but I *must* decrease”) and *Hebrews* emphasizes that for those who apostatize (i.e., go back to Judaism) it is impossible to renew them to repentance (Heb 6:6; “…if they fall away, to renew them again to repentance). In other words, those who received the baptism of repentance (the Baptist’s) in preparation for baptism into Christ (administered by Paul at Ephesus) could not go back to Judaism (deny Christ) and then hope to be re-immersed once again into John the Baptist’s baptism. Progression was irreversible – baptism by John (repentance) naturally led to baptism into Christ – the process could not go backwards (from Christ to John) but only forwards (from John to Christ).

**The Gospel and the First Epistle of John**

There is evidence that the Fourth Gospel (4G) and the Epistles of John were addressed to the same readers (Ephesus). Some scholars (and principally R. E. Brown) suggest that the 4G underwent two editions, with a second edition of the 4G (necessitated because John’s arguments were being wrested by a group in Ephesus) being distributed with a ‘covering letter’ (the first epistle).

There is considerable debate concerning the sequence of these four documents [gospel and three epistles] …but a consensus has emerged showing that they stem from the same community and, for many, they share the same author. Moreover, it is widely accepted that the problems addressed in the letters are reflected in the Fourth Gospel itself. A common compositional history argues that an early edition of the Fourth Gospel was followed by a theological crisis in the community. This crisis prompted a revision of the Gospel and the writing of 1 John. This explains, for instance, the parallels between the Gospel’s prologue and that of 1 John, as well as parallels between 1 John and John 14–17, John’s Farewell Discourse…Finally, 2 John and 3 John were penned to address a subsequent local problem.[[10]](#footnote-10)

G. M. Burge talks of ‘revision’ here but this is too strong a term to consider this hypothesis; we have no firm information here, so it is better to form the hypothesis in terms of the Gospel material coming out in stages and getting *added* to by John. Pursuing this hypothetical history, J. D. G. Dunn says,

At the same time, 1 John 1.1-3 may also give a clue to the Christological developments following the Fourth Gospel. In particular if R. E. Brown is correct, the secessionists from the Johannine community (2.19) based their understanding of Christ on the Fourth Gospel – a Christology which devalued the earthly life and ministry of Jesus (4.2-3); hence by way of response the stronger emphasis in 1.1-3 on the tangible historicity of the beginning of the gospel in the life and ministry of Jesus. In which case we can see how quickly the thought of Christ as the Son of God come down from heaven led in some minds to a devaluation of Jesus the man…[[11]](#footnote-11)

Of course, such Christology as John presented in the Fourth Gospel lends itself to abuse and even in the first century a warning against Docetic[[12]](#footnote-12) teachings was necessary - this came in the form of the First Epistle of John. However, it is not necessary to posit the existence of two editions of the 4G to note the striking affinity between the 4G and the first epistle, as both writings were dealing with the same problems.

To sum up the hypothesis: The situation had deteriorated to such an extent that many had ‘broken-away’ from the church at Ephesus to form a separate fellowship. The secessionists had a different view of the nature of Christ – for them Jesus did not really possess human nature, or he was not truly human. They refused to partake of the ‘bread and wine’ as this spoke of Jesus’ humanity. They possibly thought of themselves as sinless (1 John 1:18), and (because they claimed the Spirit) as living a life similar to their Lord (who only ‘seemed’ human).

In any case, both the 4G and the epistle stress the command(s) of Christ, this is the command (cf. John 14:15, 21; 15:10, 14, 17; 1 John 2:3; 2:4; 3:22, 24; 5:2, 3) to partake of the ‘bread and wine’, which was known as the **love feast** (John 13:34; *agape*), and the command to be born of water and Spirit (John 3:5). Particularly in the epistle, the word ‘love’ should be understood within the matrix of the ‘love-feast’ from which all acts of charity, brotherly love, and truth should flow. For John, it was crucial to identify with Jesus’ human nature because it was Jesus who had *overcome sin*. So, although Christ is *qualitatively* the same as us, his human nature is *quantitatively* different because he never sinned and therefore Jesus can encourage us to, ‘drink his blood and eat his flesh’ – that is, identify with his (crucified) human nature that had literally become *dead to sin*. The schismatics were loath to do this; hence, the Gospel records the reaction of some of Jesus’ followers,

Therefore many of His disciples, when they heard *this,* said, “This is a hard saying; who can understand it?”…From that *time* many of His disciples went back and walked with Him no more. John 6:56, 66

They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us; but *they went out* that they might be made manifest, that none of them were of us. 1 John 2:19

John constantly stresses the necessity to identify with Christ’s human nature and the only mechanisms for a Christian to do so is baptism (water) and the Eucharist (blood) coupled with the assurance of the Spirit. Peter is informed at the Last Supper that it is not enough to be baptised but his feet must also be constantly washed by Christ (John 13:8). John himself witnesses that Christ gushed ‘water *and* blood’ when he was pierced at the crucifixion (John 19:34). John testifies:

This is He who came by water and blood -- Jesus Christ; not only by water, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit who bears witness, because the Spirit is truth. For there are three that testify: the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement. 1 John 5:6-8 (NKJV revised with NIB)

Jesus was literally born of water and blood (born of a woman) by the power of the Spirit, more importantly his water baptism was assured by the Spirit (John 1:32-33), and the Spirit remained with him until he died at the crucifixion– in so doing Jesus poured forth *water and blood* and gave up the Spirit (John 19:30); essentially the suffering and travail of his death heralded a rebirth and Christ was ‘born from above’ – “You *are* My Son, Today I have begotten You” (Ps 2:7). For John, all believers must be “born from above” (John 3:7) and cannot inherit the kingdom unless their flesh and blood is identified (through water, Spirit and blood) with the crucified flesh of the Son of Man. Hence, this became for him the litmus test for true Christianity:

Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets have gone out into the world. By this you know the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit that does not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is not of God. And this is the *spirit* of the Antichrist, which you have heard was coming, and is now already in the world. 1 John 4:1-3; cf. 2 John v. 7

The ‘spirits’ (those who professed possession of the Spirit) could make claims in the name of the Spirit, but if those assertions were contrary to the confessional statement declaring (both positively and negatively) the humanity of Christ -- then that ‘spirit’ was in actuality a false ‘spirit’ (prophet) -- the ‘spirit’ of Antichrist.

Against this background, we can place the epistle to the Hebrews, which can be seen to pick up the same themes (addressed to the same readers?) and thus demonstrate awareness of the Johannine writings. For example, take Hebrews 2:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Hebrews 2** | **Reference** |
| v. 1 | things we have **heard** | 1 John 1John 4John 8 | which we have **heard** (v. 1, 5)we ourselves have **heard** (4.42)I **heard** from God (8.40)you are not able to **listen** (8.43)you do not **hear** (8.47) |
| v. 11 | For both He who sanctifies and those who are being **sanctified** *are* **all of one**, for which reason He is not ashamed **to call them brethren**. | John 17John 20 | ...that they also may be **sanctified** (v. 19)....that they **may be one** (v. 11)go to My **brethren** (v. 17) |
| v. 13 | whom God has **given** me  | John 17 | those whom **You have given Me** (vv. 6, 9, 11, 12, 24) |
| v. 14 | Inasmuch then as the children have partaken of **flesh and blood**, He Himself likewise shared in the same… | 1 John 4 | By this you know the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has **come in the flesh** is of God.... |
| v. 15 v. 16 | fear of death...subject to **bondage**…seed of **Abraham** | John 8 | We are **Abraham’s descendants**, and have never been in **bondage** to anyone. (v. 33) |
| v. 17 | to make **propitiation** for the sins | 1 John 4 | …sent His Son *to be* the **propitiation** for our sins. (v. 10) |

If we step through Hebrews 2, the following correspondences with John’s writings can be made:

(1) Hebrews 2 commences with the words, “things we have heard”,which is almost a leitmotif in the Johannine writings. In contrast ‘the Jews’ are not able to listen and do not hear (a charge that is established in John 8).

(2) The testimony of Jesus’ followers is confirmed by the ‘signs and wonders’ that they perform. The 4G holds out the same promise to Jesus’ disciples; “Most assuredly, I say to you, he who believes in Me, the works that I do he will do also; and greater *works* than these he will do, because I go to My Father” (John 14:12). However, it is the same gospel that stresses that John the Baptist “performed no sign” (John 10:41) and Jesus declared that he has, “a greater witness than John’s; for the works which the Father has given me to finish -- the very works that I do -- bear witness of me, that the Father has sent me” (John 5:36). The contrast is between the disciples of John the Baptist (who performed no sign) and the apostles of Jesus, such as Paul, who passed on the Holy Spirit to disciples of John the Baptist and performed ‘unusual’ miracles at Ephesus (Acts 19:6, 11). Thus, the gift of the Spirit and the re-baptism of John the Baptist’s disciples into the name of Jesus (Acts 19:5) confirm the superiority of Jesus’ ministry and the necessity for believers to be born of “water *and* Spirit” (John 3:5). Psalm 8 is referred to at this point (Heb 2:6-8) in order to establish the superiority of Jesus’ ministry and this Psalm is also echoed in the Pauline epistle to the Ephesians.

(3) The next verses in Hebrews 2 (vv. 11 and 13) allude to the prayer in John 17, and include key terms from the prayer, with a stress on **sanctity** (John 17:17, 19) and **unity** (John 17:22, 23), and a reminder that they are now all brethren of Jesus (cf. John 20:17), because they have been **given** (John 17:2, 6, 9, 11, 12, 24) to Jesus by the Father.

(4) Unity is emphasised because the church is threatened by schism (‘they went out from us’ in1 John 2:19; ‘if they fall away’ in Heb 6:6) over the nature of Christ; ‘flesh and blood’ (Heb.2:14) ‘flesh’ (1 John 4:2). Both Hebrews and the epistle to the Ephesians employ the phrase ‘flesh and blood’ in a Passover context; namely that of the destroying angel on the Passover **night** (cf. John 13:27, 30) – the prince of this world has ‘nothing’ in Jesus (John 14:30) and the Ephesians (6:12) are reminded that their wrestling (like that of Jesus) is not just against human institutions but against the rulers of the **darkness** of this world who killed the firstborn on Passover night.[[13]](#footnote-13)

(5) Vv. 15 and 16 of Hebrews 2 stress the twin motifs of slavery (in Egypt/to sin) and descent from Abraham. In Genesis 15 Abraham is told that his descendants would be slaves in a foreign land (Egypt). They were rescued at Passover. It is no coincidence that in John 8:33 the Jews make a claim for descent from Abraham alongside the false declaration that they have never been in bondage to any man.

(6) In Heb 2:17, the verb ‘to make propitiation’ (NASB) links with the corresponding noun in 1 John 2:2, 4:10) which only occurs twice in the New Testament.

**Conclusion**

We have sketched an historical hypothesis about how the writings of John, Hebrews and the letter to the Ephesians have come about: (i) Ephesus was the recipient of John’s writings; (ii) the epistle to the Hebrews was addressed at a later stage to Jews at Ephesus; and (iii) Paul’s epistle should be placed between John’s writings and Hebrews.

Paul was especially interested in introducing the Gentiles to the ‘hope of Israel’, but the Jews at Ephesus already had problems accepting Christ as saviour and while some had ‘split’ the ecclesia by preaching a Docetic Christ, others reacted by clinging to John the Baptist’s preaching. Paul’s introduction of the Gentiles was the final straw and many went back to Judaism. However, it was not possible to renew them again to repentance (Heb 6:6; the repentance baptism of John the Baptist) as they had passed beyond this point when they ‘put on Christ’. There was no turning back.

**The Double**

**A. Perry**

Two translations of Isa 40:2 are,

Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the Lord’s hand double for all her sins. Isa 40:2 (KJV)

Speak tenderly to Jerusalem, and cry to her that she has served her term, that her penalty is paid, that she has received from the Lord’s hand double for all her sins. Isa 40:2 (NRSV)

The KJV represents the more common translation of the English versions, ‘warfare is ended’, while the NRSV represents the more common view of recent commentaries on Isaiah, which offer something like the idea of ‘her hard service has ended’. The problem with both translations is that they do not represent majority usage of the Hebrew words involved, which would otherwise suggest a translation of ‘her host is full’. It is interesting therefore to observe that the Christian translation of the English versions differs from Jewish translation and that of the commentary of A. J. Rosenberg, who translates the Hebrew as “she has become full from her host”.[[14]](#footnote-14) It is not difficult to see how this translation fits a pre-exilic setting in the lifetime of Isaiah of Jerusalem, but modern Christian commentaries are beholden to the post-exilic reading of Isa 40:1-11 set by the German Higher Critics and direct the reader to the idea of a term of service in exile as being over.

The second thing to note in this verse is the obscure reference to a ‘double’ or ‘doubling’. Is this a reference to a double blessing or a double punishment? The key to ‘double/doubling’ is Isa 51:19,

These two things are come unto thee; who shall be sorry for thee? Desolation, and destruction, and the famine, and the sword: by whom shall I comfort thee? Isa 51:19 (KJV)

The word for ‘two’ here is different but the verse mentions two pairs (not just two things), which gives us the exegesis of the ‘doubling’ of Isa 40:2. These terms (‘destruction’ and ‘desolation’; ‘famine’ and ‘sword’) have a ready reference in the recent Assyrian invasion and its aftermath. The rhetorical question, ‘By whom shall I comfort you’ picks up on the ‘Comfort ye, comfort ye’ of Isa 40:1 which is also an introductory pair. The logic here is that the **two** things of her host being full and her iniquity being accepted corresponds to (compensates for) the ‘double’ punishment she received.

**Scoping Symbology at the Breaking of Bread**

**A. Perry**

**Introduction**

The argument is made that men and women can carry out any role within the church. In support of this view it is denied that men and women enact a symbolic role in the church, i.e. it is denied that brethren represent Christ the bridegroom in a breaking of bread meeting while sisters represent the bride. Since, brethren and sisters are not literally and respectively Christ and his bride, it is denied that they symbolically portray such in the Lord’s Supper. It is usually held alongside this view that sisters can speak in a performative way at the Memorial Meeting and that there is no need for them to wear head-coverings on such an occasion. Our focus in this essay[[15]](#footnote-15) is not the question of ‘speaking’ or ‘head-coverings’ but on how you go about settling the issue of whether there is a symbolic role for brethren and sisters at the Breaking of Bread.

**Setting the Scope of Symbology**

The key texts for this are 1 Corinthians 11 and 14, Ephesians 5 and 1 Timothy 2 in the New Testament and Genesis 1-3 in the Old Testament.

(1) There is a distinction to be drawn between ‘role’ and ‘symbolic role’. The church *just is* the bride of Christ; she does not symbolize the bride; her role is that of a bride. However, a husband and a wife, as well as having those roles, also have a symbolic role in their married lives picturing Christ and his bride (Eph 5:32). So does such a symbolic role extend to men and women in the church generally?

(2) The symbolic roles of a husband and a wife are on-going, but is there a ritual that Christians enact that has symbolic elements? Do men and women have a symbolic role in that ritual? The Breaking of Bread has symbolic elements in its bread and its cup; this is readily agreed. We might say therefore that if there was going to be a ritual in which men and women had different symbolic roles, it would be the Memorial Meeting.

(3) Jesus institutes the ritual remembrance of him with reference to the future: “I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God” (Mark 14:25).

* The ‘new’ aspect of this promise is picked up in Rev 21:5: “Behold, I make all things new”.
* The aspect of drinking in this promise is picked up in the “marriage **supper** of the Lamb” (Rev 19:9).

(4) The ‘Lord’s Supper’ is a term unique to 1 Cor 11:20; the continual aspect of Jesus’ words “*until* that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God” is picked up in 1 Cor 11:26 “you proclaim the Lord’s death *until* he comes”. The Lord’s Supper, as an arrangement, looks back to what Jesus instituted, but it also looks forward to that supper which will be more explicitly about marriage.

(5) The Lord’s Supper does not only have symbolic elements relating to the bread and the wine; it is, as a whole, symbolic of the **marriage**[[16]](#footnote-16) supper of the Lamb in which Jesus will drink anew of the fruit of the vine. Jesus is not a participant in the on-going Lord’s Supper and so if there is to be a symbolic portrayal of the marriage supper of the Lamb, there will be different roles for brethren and sisters as ‘the man’ and ‘the woman’ of that marriage.

(1) - (5) above set the scope of the symbology in the Lord’s Supper to be that of a marital typology. Are there confirming points in the text of 1 Corinthians 11 that support this interpretation?

**1 Corinthians 11**

This chapter has a lot of symbology and typology in it, and it would be surprising if there was no symbology in the chapter for men and women; however, such a denial is the feminist argument. Paul’s main rationale for head-coverings comes in 1 Cor 11:7,

For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. 1 Cor 11:7 (KJV)

Since men and women are created in the image of God (Gen 1:26), Paul’s statement here differentiating men and women has to be about a symbology in which a man **is** (a type of) the image and glory of God whereas ‘the woman’ **is** the glory of ‘a man’. That is, there is a situation, namely the ecclesial Breaking of Bread, in which men and women have these different symbolic roles. Since it is Christ who is the ‘image and glory of God’ (Heb 1:3; Col 1:15) we have here a symbolic identity[[17]](#footnote-17) in which men are said to symbolically represent Christ; correspondingly, the symbolic role of women is said to be that of the ‘glory of a man’.

How is it that women are the glory of a man? The glory in 1 Corinthians 11 is connected to the *origin* of the woman (v. 8). In the context of the New Creation (‘all things’, v. 12; cf. John 1:3-4), the woman comes into being through the saving work of Christ—the man. It is this notion of glory - a notion to do with the glory of salvation which we must use to understand 1 Corinthians 11. It is a notion bound up with the New Creation. Paul explains elsewhere that Christ gave himself for the church so that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of the word, in order that he might present it to himself a ***glorious*** church, holy and without blemish (Eph 5:25-27). This is his work. It follows then that the church *has* glory from her Lord and as such is *his glory*. She is the ‘glory of a man’.

We have established that men and women have two symbolic roles, one in relation to Christ the image and glory of God, and the other in relation to his bride the glory of ‘a man’. We have suggested that these roles pertain to the Lord’s Supper which is typical of the future Marriage Supper of the Lamb. They are roles that pertain to the ritual of that meeting rather than any other meeting or in a general sense, for generally, we know that men and women are equally the image of God.

**The Breaking of Bread**

How do we know that the first part of 1 Corinthians 11 is about symbolic roles within the Breaking of Bread? We know that v.17f is about the Memorial Meeting and that 1 Corinthians 10 is about issues around the Table of the Lord, so it might be expected that 1 Cor 11:2-16 (in the middle of these other two sections) also deals with this meeting. The key text is v. 17,

Now in this[[18]](#footnote-18) that I declare *unto you* I praise *you* not, that ye come together not for the better, but for the worse. 1 Cor 11:17 (KJV)

The following points establish this verse as a bridge between vv. 2-16 and vv. 18-34,

* The expression ‘come together’ in v. 17 is used with ‘in ecclesia’ in v. 18, which is the language Paul uses for the Breaking of Bread meeting; this ties v. 17 to v. 18.
* Some translations (e.g. RSV) make 1 Cor 11:17 refer only to instructions that Paul is about to give concerning the breaking of bread rather than to the instructions he has been giving concerning head coverings. However, the tenses of the verbs are in the present, meaning ‘Now in this that I am declaring unto you, I am not praising you...” (cf. 1 Cor 4:14). Hence, the NASB has, “But in giving this instruction...” rejecting the RSV interpretation.
* Furthermore, once we pose the dilemma as to how Paul can say that the Corinthian brethren and sisters remember him in all things and yet receive so much criticism from Paul throughout the letter, we see that his ‘praise’ in v. 2 is not praise (but an irony), and this is what he makes plain in v. 17. In effect, v. 17 is a rhetorical *inclusio* with v. 2, and as such it sets the tone for the following remarks.

* Another indicator that 1 Cor 11:17 is a bridge verse is seen in the way that 1 Cor 11:18-34 is tied together as a unit. The Greek of this passage is a *men-de* structure in Greek reflected here[[19]](#footnote-19) in the English as “first of all…and the rest”. The rhetoric appears in the idiom:

Now in this I am declaring unto you, I praise you not, for to begin with you have sects at congregation...and the rest I will set in order when I come.

The idiom binds vv. 18-34 leaving v. 17 to function as a bridge. A bridge cannot just look forward; it must have an end on both banks of the river—and so v. 17 ‘praise’ not only links with v. 2 but it also links with v. 22.

For these reasons, we would reject the view that Paul is dealing with two types of meeting in 1 Corinthians 11. Accordingly, there are symbolic roles for men and women at the Breaking of Bread. Although we have not discussed the issues of head-coverings and sisters’ silence in such meetings, it would not be surprising if their rationale was tied to the symbology that enacts the marriage of the Lamb and his bride.

**Conclusion**

The original Passover (with its own lamb), the Last Supper and the Marriage Supper of the Lamb are all meals with symbology. ‘Showing’ the Lord’s death, for example, is a Passover motif in that the Israelites were commanded to ‘show’ what God had done (Exod 13:8); and the Marriage Supper is precisely described in Passover terms as being ‘of the Lamb’. We should expect therefore that there is a symbolic role for men and women at the Lord’s Supper. According to Paul, the Corinthians were coming together, but because of the wrong behaviour in that meeting, they were not actually ‘eating the Lord’s Supper’ (v. 20). The same possibility exists for us today if we do not recognise different roles for men and women.

**Sisters Speaking and Ecclesial Contexts**

**John W. Adey**

**Introduction**

Sisters’ different service to the spiritual life of NT ecclesias **complements** the contribution of brethren and is also of symbolic significance.[[20]](#footnote-20) Sisters’ silence at a conventional Christadelphian Sunday breaking of bread meeting (as also wearing a head-covering) is sometimes challenged. What is often not well-positioned or put forward is the vital and integral nature of the contribution to the Christ-ecclesial symbology that only the sisters can make. Often, feminist agendas or wrongly angled equality assumptions distort or do not promote this symbology.

**Contextualizing Sisters’ Speaking**

What we call a ‘Memorial Meeting’ today is assumed to relate to the Lord’s Supper in the texts of 1 Corinthians 11 and 14.[[21]](#footnote-21) As originally spoken about, it is that moment above all that situates a sister’s silent and submissive spirituality, coupling with the brethren’s roles in which several of them speak[[22]](#footnote-22), so that the Lord’s death is edifyingly remembered and “announced until he comes”. In this situation, both genders engage in self-examination relative to the spirit of Christ or discerning his body. Therefore, such Biblically characterised conditions define what it is to be “decently and in order” (1 Cor 14:30); ideally all who partake knowingly fulfil the aims of this ‘coming together’ moment. This occasion, distinguished from other NT situations where sisters’ speech acts are featured, is the foundation and starting point of this essay.[[23]](#footnote-23)

In these 1 Corinthian texts, terms of reference like ‘coming together’, ‘upon/concerning the same’, and ‘in ecclesia’ are key **framework creating constructs** for us to determine and practice what it is to be part of the Lord’s Supper.This Christian tradition was delivered from the Lord to Paul, part of his abundance of revelations (2 Cor 12:1, 7), and from him to us via the Corinthian epistle (1 Cor 11:2, 23).

**A Scriptural Framework and its Constructs**

An apostle’s *ecclesial* gender language is of heavenly purpose; is **not of this world**;and is thus culture-transcendent or timeless. Accordingly, we cannot dismiss the language as of just another time and culture. Peter, in fellowship with Paul, pens perspectives like ‘weaker vessel’ (1 Pet 3:7) as a comparative characterisation of the Christ-woman. Given this difference, the Christ-man compensates by honouring the woman/wife, within their designed (‘help-meet’) complementarity (Gen 2:24; Matt 19:5, 6; Mark 10:8; Eph 5:31).[[24]](#footnote-24)

In the Creator’s foreknown purpose, the man and woman,[[25]](#footnote-25) originally separately and differently formed, are designed to prefigure Christ’s ideal relationship: “the great mystery of Christ and the ecclesia” (Eph 5:22-33). This has to do with “passing the love of women” (2 Sam 1:26; Eph 3:19; 4:16); God’s love for us in Christ and Christ’s for his ecclesial bride; thereby “knowing the love of Christ that passes knowledge that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God” (Eph 3:19).[[26]](#footnote-26)

Thus, man and woman in Christ, whether “the married” (1 Cor 7:10) or not, manifest (fidelity to) this transcendent or “first love” (Rev 2:4, with Eph 1:4-10 and Prov 4:6-7, where this is embodied in feminised wisdom, God’s delight before creation: “Forsake her not...**love** her...wisdom is the **first** [KJV ‘principal’] *thing*”). Preordained, this love is of/for God: “We love him, because he **first loved** us” (1 John 4:19). From God it extends in Christ to each saint, and thereby saint-to-saint. Behaviourally constraining (Eph 4:25) to be “accepted in the beloved” (Eph 1:6), it is the fulfilling of the **first** commandment, loving God, and the second like unto it loving our ecclesial neighbour (Mark 12:28-34; Eph 4:25).

Although this ideal *genderless* love (“…unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently” KJV 1 Pet 1:22), prefiguring Christ’s union with his ecclesia, is reciprocal between man and man, man and woman, woman and woman in Christ, gender *difference* was divinely designed for love’s depiction in sin-free Eden. Hence, there is a bride and a bridegroom. This is as told from the beginning in the gender arrangement “God joined together” (Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9), and in “Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman [ecclesial-bride] for the man [Christ-bridegroom]” (1 Cor 11:8-9). The Lord’s Supper should therefore evoke or imitate Eden in this respect. Is not this about confirmed covenant hope of communion with our Lord in paradise?

**Fellowship at the Lord’s Supper**

The sacrificed-based fellowship moment has to do with that ‘coming together’ which engages with these ‘of the Lord’ elements: table, cup, supper, body and blood, and (to “announce his”) death (“until...”). Both man and woman participate or contribute to this symbolic and typological moment. That is, it is not just the bread and the wine or the supper itself as a whole that has a symbolic and typological significance, but also those involved—men and women.

In the Old Testament (OT) ecclesia in the wilderness (Acts 7:38), those baptised into Moses were “the body of Moses” (cf. Jude 1:9). The rites and prescriptions for priestly practice, and particularly the annual Day of Atonement, were in shadow or type both tutorial and a measure of what Jesus would accomplish, once for all, in his prepared body (Heb 10:5; John 2:19-22) as the ‘true’ (Heb 9:24. Cf. 1 Cor 10:1-6 ‘eat and drink’, and ‘examples’ = ‘types’). It is about this ‘body’ that discerning first takes place at the Lord’s Supper, aided by sharing the bread-body symbol. In this act of sharing, we identify ourselves as the body of Christ and as such we acknowledge that Christ is the head of the body (1 Cor 11:3; Eph 5:23).

Headship can also be seen in the case of the body of Moses. Moses should have been to Miriam and Aaron a prefigurement of the greatest prophet Yahweh would raise-up (Acts 7:37; cf. Deut 18:15). Speaking without submissiveness to the Divine arrangements (Num 12:8), as they did against Moses (their ‘Lord’, cf. Aaron in Num 12:11), Yahweh judged that Miriam the prophetess (Exod 15:20) should be put out of the camp seven days; His anger temporarily marking her as a leper (Num 12:10, 15). So, although both Aaron and Miriam were guilty, the punishment of his sister caused Aaron to plead with Moses for her. Miriam and Aaron had both said: “Has Yahweh indeed spoken only by Moses? Has he not spoken also by us? And Yahweh heard *it*” (Num 12:2). This outcome for Miriam suggests her speech-act had usurping intent; it violated the typology.

**In Ecclesia**

‘In ecclesia’ (KJV 1 Cor 11:18; 14:19, 28, 35 has “in the church” for the Greek phrase evn evkklhsi,a|)is being in an assembly and state resulting from having ‘come together’; doing so, in Greek idiom, ‘upon the same’ (thing or purpose, as in Acts 2:44; 3:1; or negatively as in Acts 4:26; [the KJV ‘into one place’ is wrong]). The idiom stresses the ‘together’ aspect that is a manifestation of a collective and complementary ‘unity’.

Messianic ‘Father and son’ typology is seen in Abraham and Isaac both going “together” in Gen 22:6 and 8, where wdxy/*yHdw* (a form of dxy/*yHD*, ‘together’ as per Ps 2:2) is used. Added to this, Yahweh’s thrice repeated characterization of Isaac as ‘your only one’ $dyxy/*yHydk* (Gen 22:2, 12, 16), stressing his uniqueness, structurally connects with the Hebrew for both ‘one’ and ‘together’. In fact, KJV Ps 133:1, with expanded paraphrase, exploits the ‘together’ and ‘one(ness)’ senses associated with words from this *y-H-d*/dxy stem in “Brethren . . . dwell together in unity.” Participants *in ecclesia* should spiritually enact and discern *this* kind of ‘together’ in order worthily to fulfil “announc[ing] the Lord’s death until he comes” (1 Cor 11:26).

It is of note regarding the phrase ‘in **the** church’ (e.g. 1 Cor 12:28) that sometimes there is the definite article in the Greek with the grammatically singular ‘church’/‘ecclesia’. For example,

This is he that was in the church in the wilderness (Acts 7:38).

The underlined phrase includes the definite article. This ecclesia is the body of Moses, the whole (mobile) congregation or (called out of Egypt) assembly in that desert setting. The presence of the definite article creates a distinction semantically from the anarthrous (article absent) form: evn evkklhsi,a|. ‘In ecclesia’ is about a state realised in **the** ecclesia at some point in time (e.g. the first day of the week), or in a place (e.g. “from house to house”, Acts 2:46; “the ecclesia that is in Nymphas’ house”, Col 4:15).

*‘In ecclesia’ presents the ‘in’ relationally like ‘in Christ’ does. Only those ‘in Christ’ can be ‘in ecclesia’.*

In English, we differentiate senses of ‘in church’ from ‘in a church’ or ‘in the church’, which do not need spelling out here. However, I am not supposing these English ‘church’ senses, with or without ‘in’, map identically onto Greek New Testament’s (GNT) ‘ecclesia’ in Corinthians or elsewhere.[[27]](#footnote-27) The GNT is making systematic use within a narrow context of ‘in ecclesia’, or ‘in congregation’/‘in assembly’[[28]](#footnote-28) as it might be translated (although compare the Hebrew ‘convocation’ discussed in p. 29 n. 1).

**Come Together**

1 Cor 11:18’s language “For first of all, when ye come together evn evkklhsi,a” and ‘come together’ used elsewhere in 1 Corinthians 11 and 14 (1 Cor 11:17, 18, 20, 33, 34; 14:23, 26) is an indicator that Paul is talking about the Breaking of Bread meeting. We should also note the collocation of ‘come together’ + ‘upon the same’ (evpi. to. auvto., 1 Cor 11:20; 14:23) to signify common purpose in relation to the Memorial Meeting.[[29]](#footnote-29)

When ye come together therefore ~~into one place~~, *this* is not to eat the Lord’s supper… 1 Cor 11:20 (Literally: ‘come together upon the same’/Sunercome,nwn evpi. to. auvto,)

If therefore the whole church be come together ~~into one place~~. 1 Cor 14:23 (Literally: ‘be come together upon the same’: sune,lqh| evpi. to. auvto,)

How is it then, brethren? When ye come together/sune,rchsqe. 1 Cor 14:26.[[30]](#footnote-30)

It is in this context and setting that Paul includes his instruction about women and silence.

**Silence**

With regard to women-in-Christ/sisters, we can use the foregoing constructs as the framework for the discussion of 1 Cor 14:34-35,

Let (your)[[31]](#footnote-31) women **keep silence** in the churches: for it is **not** permitted unto them to **speak**; but *they are commanded* to be under obedience, as also saith the law. 1 Cor 14:34 (KJV)

And if they will **learn** any thing, let them **ask** their husbands at home [= ‘in home’: evn oi;kw|]: for it is a shame for women **to speak** in the church [= ‘in ecclesia’: evn evkklhsi,a|.]. 1 Cor 14:35 (KJV)

We would make the following points:

(1) Women are to ‘keep silence’, and compliantly not ‘speak’ when ‘in ecclesia’ in the ecclesias. This moment or state concerns what it is decent and orderly to do to manifest ‘obedience’, to avoid ‘shame’, to fulfil ‘come together upon the same’, so that ‘announcing the Lord’s death until…’ takes place and all are edified.

(2) Greek forms of lale,w rendered by forms of ‘speak’ occur 24x in 1 Cor 14 (vv. 2 (3x), 3, 4, 5 (2x), 6 (2x), 9 (2x), 11 (2x), 13, 18, 19, 21, 23, 27, 28, 29, 34, 35, 39).[[32]](#footnote-32) This is the highest concentration of instances of ‘speak’ forms in the Bible. Specifying what speaking and by whom (including how many *in ecclesia*; 1 Cor 14:27) is the focus as the means to edify. **The man is always the speaker in this context.**

(3) There is a provision made for a woman to learn, that can involve her *asking-speaking,* but this necessarily relates to a different moment/occasion or state. Both ‘in ecclesia’ and ‘in home’ are contrasted in 1 Cor 14:35, cited above. The situation, ‘*in*/*at* home’ is where Paul counsels some to eat (1 Cor 11:34) before coming together ‘in ecclesia’ without distraction to eat the Lord’s Supper, i.e., symbolic food.

(4) For the reasons given in 1 Cor 14:28, 30, there are times when a man has to ‘keep silence’ or ‘hold his peace’ (Gk: siga,tw[[33]](#footnote-33)). However, in the ecclesias, when ‘in ecclesia’, ‘keeping silence’ (using a cognate of siga,tw the Greek word of vv. 28, 30) is applied universally to women in v. 34.

(5) This God-designed ecclesial arrangement reflects the creative order and need met by God when forming a woman out of the man for the man: two thereby can become one: “This is a great mystery…concerning Christ and the ecclesia” (Eph 5:31-32). This creation order, represented in the opening section of 1 Corinthians 11, is connected with prohibiting (the speaking that is) teaching in Paul’s prescriptions:

**1 Tim 2:10** But (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works.

**2:11** Let the woman learn in ~~silence~~ quietness [evn h`suci,a|: cf. Acts 22:2; 2 Thess 3:12] with all subjection.

**2:12** But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in ~~silence~~ quietness [evn h`suci,a|].[[34]](#footnote-34)

 **2:13** For Adam was first formed, then Eve.

However, although in principle such behavioural constraints regarding women-in-Christ ‘learning’ and ‘not teaching’ are appropriate to ‘in ecclesia’, this situation in Timothy is not presented as ‘in ecclesia’ and therefore relates as well to other moments. It is relatable to ‘in/at home’ (1 Cor 14:35): a state which is not ‘in ecclesia’.

To have ecclesial members ‘in home’ (evn oi;kw), but not ‘in ecclesia’ when in someone’s house, means that being there is simply not about a ‘coming together upon the same’ as when done to eat the Lord’s Supper.[[35]](#footnote-35)

So, in 1 Tim 2:11 this is not a ‘silence of not speaking’, but a ‘quietness of submission’ (“as becomes women professing godliness”). Since it is about a behavioural disposition of the woman in learning, and does not imply that a woman can’t say/ask anything of the man teaching her, this is not an ‘in ecclesia’ context: it is not the breaking of bread. Obviously, not teaching, where to do so would be to usurp authority over the man, means a man/brother would have to be present for that (wrongly or potentially) to happen.

She cannot teach ecclesial-men, since men being in the type of Christ do the teaching. For her to attempt to do so in the presence of a Christ-man would be to usurp Christ’s order and authority; it would oppose the submissive sisterly spirit sought. So, a woman/sister manifesting the submission to a man-head as teacher or edifier of a woman-ecclesial-bride/wife still applies.[[36]](#footnote-36)

To illustrate this, take the following two examples:

* Martha can ask her Lord to tell Mary to assist her (Luke 10:40), begin a discussion with Jesus, or reply to him on doctrinal matters (John 11:21ff.), but neither Martha, Mary, or other women in serving/ministering to him (diakone,w, Mark 15:41; Luke 8:3; John 12:2) are teaching him.
* With respect to converting someone to the right way both Priscilla and Aquila cooperated: ‘…**they** expounded - evxe,qento - to [Apollos] the way of God more perfectly’ (Acts 18:26). This instruction-giving was certainly not ‘in ecclesia’; Apollos was not yet in Christ as they were in Christ. Priscilla, without violating silence or submissiveness to her Christ-man Aquila, could speak, her subject being the man Apollos. Therefore, this married couple could **combine** in this extra-ecclesial, preaching-like, moment. (See p. 35, n. 2).

On the basis of the foregoing points (1-5), and our earlier considerations, we can say that, for the Memorial Meeting, two (complementarily designed) parties ‘come together’ ‘upon the same’ to manifest Christ, and more: his marriage supper. This connects with why there is subjection exhibited by silence and the head-covering symbolism of the woman.

The woman represents the ecclesial-bride of Christ; the man represents the bridegroom-head: Christ, (which is why the man’s head is not covered so identifying ‘headship’). The ecclesial-Christ-man can speak as prescribed in order to edify the ecclesial-bridal-woman (i.e. both brethren and sisters) to prepare (this collective) ‘her’ (Rev 19:7) for the final coming together of the marriage supper of the Lamb. ‘Lamb’ in ‘the Lamb’s wife’ in Rev 19:7; 19:9; 21:9 shows what the man Christ Jesus has done in “giving himself” in love for his ecclesial-wife (Eph 5:25) in sacrificial obedience.

The women’s role ‘in ecclesia’ and ‘in the ecclesias’ representing subjection before their men, is a palpable measure of what the ecclesia’s Lord has done for them both by his subjection to his Father (Heb 5:7-9). The desire of the Christ-woman is towards the Christ-man, and this is most evident ‘in ecclesia’ when both parties ‘come together upon the same’. However, specifically, the sister’s (true) spirit seeks to manifest that her Lord “rules in her” (the Hebrew is ‘in’ in Gen 3:16).

The power of the previous paragraph’s point would be evident in the NT era in the spirit gift context of “praying or prophesying” when a woman would speak.[[37]](#footnote-37) **Complying with the command not to speak ‘in ecclesia’ she would not utter prayer nor prophesy.**

**Singing and the Question of Speaking**

It is argued that if sisters are to be silent in the Breaking of Bread then they should not be singing. Is this correct? The two main texts are,

**Speaking** to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord… Eph 5:19

…**teaching** and **admonishing** one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord. Col 3:16

Christadelphian convention includes several hymns in the Sunday Memorial Meeting, some *before* breaking of bread and some *after* it. Not so in the NT. At some point whilst still sharing this unique (also typological) moment around the table with his disciples, *after* the bread and wine, following which Jesus said “arise and let us go hence” (John 14:31) and went to the Mount of Olives (Matt 26:30; Mark 14:26), they (he and them) engaged in singing praise. With respect to ‘speaking, teaching and admonishing’ it is to be noted that just as both parties, Christ and his (typical) bride, engaged in praising, so it is in the epistles (‘to yourselves’ and ‘one another’).

So, when all ‘come together’ a brother has a psalm (1 Cor 14:26), but it is the spiritual (pneumatikai/j, Eph 5:19) content of what is sung, in this melodic harmony manifesting medium, that does the speaking, teaching, or admonishing.[[38]](#footnote-38) Therefore, the principle of sisters not speaking ‘in ecclesia’ is not violated; they complementarily make-up “one voice”—two becoming one—taught of God. This does not restrict the singing of praise and thanksgiving to this one moment (Heb 13:15; Jas 5:13).

**Bible Classes, Business Meetings and Preaching**

In the community, a Bible Class is set up with formal functions (president, hymn, prayer, reading, talk, and perhaps discussion) and used for teaching. There is no obvious term or precedent for a ‘Bible Class’ in the New Testament.[[39]](#footnote-39) A Bible class or an internal ecclesial teaching-learner construct cannot therefore be ‘in ecclesia’; so how sisters feature will be different.

Typically, it is only this formality (or perhaps it is in some cases uncertainty about sisters’ roles) that prevents a sister from asking (or being allowed to ask) a question. Certainly, she can’t teach (or let her question lead her to teach) since that violates the pattern; as noted above in the ecclesias. Teaching in the ecclesias is by a ‘man speaking as the oracles of God’ (1 Peter 4:11).

It is not the presence of formal functions that determine whether a sister should speak or not; just as these are not relevant (as criteria) to support the tradition among us that she should wear a ‘head-covering’ (*sic*) at other meetings as well as the Breaking of Bread. A Bible Class is not about, it does not construct, those terms and conditions of ‘coming together’ ‘upon the same’ to be ‘in ecclesia’, that apply to the Lord’s Supper.

Of course, if a decision is made to lead from a Bible Study/Class into a breaking of bread moment, then at the point of the definable change from class to the Lord’s supper, the coming together conditions apply, sisters cover their heads and brethren speak, two or at the most three, and the earlier Bible Class has no bearing or determining relevance on what is done.

Situations arise where breaking of bread follows a baptism. The same transference applies so that there is recognition and application of the breaking of bread.

*Business Meetings*

A business meeting, so called, with ecclesial members present, is not about ‘teaching’, and our formal form (presider, prayers, perhaps a reading, and in democracy imitative cases of presenting, seconding or voting on some proposal) does not have any obvious parallel in the NT ecclesia. It would be hard to defend from scripture, therefore, that where there is no spiritual teaching purpose an ecclesial-woman must not speak at all. However, the behavioural virtues of Christ apply to all parties on all occasions: “Likewise, you younger, submit yourselves unto the elder. Yes, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility: for God resists the proud, and gives grace to the humble” (1 Pet 5:5).

A sister/ecclesial-woman may point out during a business meeting something about which others, including elders present, seem to be unaware. This may be some practical concern for which she has some experience or can contribute (perhaps professional or qualified) expertise. **To speak thus is not to teach something related to what is spiritual.**

Of course, it may be that in the course of what she speaks on some practical matter some brethren, or elders, see spiritual implications, cite scripture or draw on its moral perspectives. If this arena is introduced then the most a sister might contribute, again if something of scriptural or Godly import had been missed, would be giving (non-teaching) ‘advice’, like Abigail did. All this is necessarily qualified or constrained by the love and principles of Christ.

**Conclusion**

My essay has applied scripture both to clarify and magnify sisters’ roles in ecclesial contexts, specifically in relation to their speaking or not; when and why. We appear to have let certain alien traditions deprive us, in practice or understanding, of the spiritual benefit intended for both the man and the woman in Christ in (our not consistently applying) the tradition once delivered.

So, I have sought to raise awareness of the constructs and NT ideals of Lord’s Supper ‘in ecclesia’ moment, as given in 1 Corinthians 11 and 14, and how a sister’s contribution to it is profoundly spiritual and symbolic. What makes this significant is that the Christ-man cannot do representatively what she does, and part of her contribution is to manifest silence and submissive teachability, as unto the Lord.[[40]](#footnote-40)

Other contexts were visited, presented as ‘in home’ or non-‘in ecclesia’ moments, when a sister could speak. This led to a consideration of what kind of speech-act it was to whom or how it was directed (e.g. *asking* her husband in home).

NT women Mary, Martha, Priscilla were mentioned, and to their example could be added some general categories like: (i) “the aged women” who “teach” or “admonish” the young women to love their husbands...” (Tit 2:3-4), or the speaking implied in (ii) the younger women “guide the house” (1 Tim 5:14). Miriam was referred to as a negative case of speaking against messianic type Moses. Abigail submissively ‘advising’ David contrasts with prophetess Miriam, who in speaking as she did usurped the authority of the meekest of men (Num 12:3) messianic type Moses.

Above all, the ideal of the “first love” coupling man and woman in Christ with each other, and with God and Christ, as divinely foreordained, was emphasised as providing a foretaste of the marriage supper of the Lamb, and beyond.

**The Two Books**

**An Early Christadelphian Exegetical Principle**

**J. Burke**

**Introduction**

The apparent tension between science and Scripture which came to prominence during the 17th century is typically identified by the trial of Galileo. However, it was scientific discoveries concerning geology and the fossil record that led to the greatest challenges to traditional Christian interpretation of Scripture, specifically concerning the age of the earth, the scope of the Genesis flood, and the age of the human[[41]](#footnote-41) species. Our own community was able to avoid this tension by application of the exegetical principle known as the ‘two books’.

**Tension in the Early Modern Era**

Near the beginning of the 16th century, Leonardo Da Vinci observed fossil remains which he observed were incompatible with a global flood in the time of Noah. Observations of the geographical distribution of the animals led commentators of the 17th century to propose that the flood was local, as Thomas Browne observed with disapproval,[[42]](#footnote-42) and geological discoveries in the 18th century persuaded theologians such as Matthew Poole[[43]](#footnote-43) and Edward Stillingfleet[[44]](#footnote-44) to support this interpretation of the Genesis flood narrative.

The discovery of remote civilizations in the Americas, and the indisputably ancient history of the Chinese (which was recognized as anteceding the accepted date of Adam), forced Biblical scholars in the 16th and 17th centuries to re-assess the belief that Adam had been the first human. Paracelsus and Giordano Bruno were early promoters of the theory,[[45]](#footnote-45) and Walter Raleigh and Thomas Harriott were accused of believing in pre-Adamic humans on the basis of the conclusions they drew from their explorations.[[46]](#footnote-46)

In 1655, Jewish Calvinist Isaac de la Peyrère’s ‘Prae-Adimateae’ systematized the available anthropological evidence from numerous ancient civilizations and combined it with Biblical data which he believed supported the existence of humans before Adam, humans who nevertheless had not sinned because they had never been illuminated by divine law.[[47]](#footnote-47) In Peyrère’s system Adam was the progenitor of a covenant community chosen by God to become the Jewish people, whilst the Gentiles were descended from humans created by God long before Adam.

Although initially rejected as heresy, the advantages of Peyrère’s theory to systematic studies of botany and anthropology (as well as to the untying of Biblical knots such as the origin of Cain’s wife), led to his work becoming highly influential among scholars of a range of disciplines. With time the theory of humans pre-existing Adam (either as part of a pre-Adamite creation destroyed by catastrophic judgment, or as the earliest members of a creation order which included Adam), become widely accepted by theologians despite remaining controversial. By the 19th century a range of pre-Adamite theories existed within mainstream Christianity, one of which was inherited by our own community.

The 18th century saw an accumulation of geological evidence leading to a re-assessment of the age of the earth. By the early 19th century a significant number of Biblical commentators accepted that the great antiquity of the earth (well over 10,000 years), had been well established by science.

**The Principle of the ‘Two Books’**

Although 19th century theological discussion over these subjects was typically heated and caused considerable division among Christians, the Christadelphian community met these challenges with little or no concern, and suffered no schisms as a result of apparent tension between science and Scripture.

The reason for this was the adoption by our earliest commentators of the centuries old exegetical principle known as the ‘two books’. This principle understands both Scripture and the natural creation as being reliably harmonious witnesses (when interpreted correctly), to God, His character, and His purpose. Bible passages typically understood as teaching this principle include Psalms 8 and 19, Acts 4:16-17, and Romans 1:19-20. Early Jewish expositors understood this principle, and Jesus likewise indicates that the natural creation is a reliable witness to the character of God (Matthew 5:44-45).

The principle of the two books was established by a number of early Christian writers, including Irenaeus (c.130-202),[[48]](#footnote-48) Tertullian (c.160-225),[[49]](#footnote-49) and Anthony the Abbot (c.251–356).[[50]](#footnote-50) For the next 1,600 years this principle remained the mainstream Christian approach to harmonizing scientific knowledge with Biblical interpretation.[[51]](#footnote-51)

**The ‘Two Books’ in the Early Christadelphian Community**

The earliest commentators of the Christadelphian community accepted and applied this principle to the interpretation of Scripture. J. Thomas appealed explicitly to the principle in the title of his periodical, *The Advocate*:

The Advocate: For the Testimony of God as it is Written in the Books of Nature and Revelation CONDUCTED BY JOHN THOMAS, M.D.[[52]](#footnote-52)

THE ADVOCATE will, therefore, exercise himself to the best of his ability and judgment, in setting forth the manifold wisdom of God as inscribed on the brilliant pages of those two interesting volumes.[[53]](#footnote-53)

Accordingly, Thomas accepted the existence of a pre-Adamic creation (complete with human inhabitants illuminated and finally judged by the law of God), on the basis of geological discoveries, which he believed harmonized the record of the ‘two books’.[[54]](#footnote-54)

Applying the principle of the two books to the controversies of his day, an early Christadelphian writer identified as ‘WDJ’ insisted that Scripture and the creation formed a consistently harmonious witness, and that any apparent contradictions were due to misinterpretation of the Bible or the creation.

NATURE makes no false impressions, and just so the Bible.[[55]](#footnote-55)

The inconsistency spoken of between nature and scripture, arises not from antagonism, but from the misinterpretations of both. It is man’s interpretation of the one set against man’s interpretations of the other. It is not nature versus scripture, but false science against true theology, or false theology against scientific fact.[[56]](#footnote-56)

This writer characterized science which derives knowledge from God’s creation as an ‘inspiration of God’s spirit’, [[57]](#footnote-57) so there is no competition of authority between science and Scripture; both are ultimately derived from God Himself, both reveal truths which He communicates through His two books.

Following the same principle, R. Roberts acknowledged without dispute the scientific evidence for pre-Adamic inhabitants, even though he rejected evolution.

That the earth had a history anterior to the six days’ work, **is certain, from both scripture and nature.** **Geology proves the existence of forms of life long before the Mosaic creation**; and the Bible tacitly affirms a pre-Adamite order of things, in the words addressed to Adam and Eve “replenish (or fill again) the earth,” which are the words made use of to Noah, when the world had been cleared of its antediluvian inhabitants. **It is probable that the fallen angels referred to by both Peter and Jude were related to this period**.[[58]](#footnote-58)

Early Christadelphian commentators also used the scientific findings of their day to make sense of apparent contradictions between the description of creation in Genesis, and existing scientific knowledge. In 1884, Roberts commented enthusiastically on correspondence received by ‘Brother Simons, of Outram’.[[59]](#footnote-59) Simons, in answer to a question he had read in the Ecclesial Visitor (‘Why God did not make everybody perfect at once, if He had the power to do so, &c., &c.?’), directed the questioner to the natural creation as understood by geology, making the following arguments.

* Geology teaches us that there was a time on earth ‘when animal life, if not totally, was nearly unknown, and only the lower order of vegetable life covering its face’[[60]](#footnote-60)
* This lasted ‘many thousands of years’, during which ‘the earth was undergoing wonderful and necessary changes to fit it for a creation of a higher order’[[61]](#footnote-61)
* When this stage was over ‘it was replaced by a creation of a higher order, when animal and vegetable forms of a far more wonderful structure were brought into existence and most admirably adopted to the atmosphere, climate, and peculiarities of that creation’[[62]](#footnote-62)
* This also lasted ‘many thousands of years, before it was ‘swept away, and a grander creation built on its ruins’, and ‘so on, stage after stage’[[63]](#footnote-63)

Other issues were treated in the same way. Harmonizing his understanding of the Biblical text with the geological, archaeological, and biological evidence, Roberts interpreted the Genesis flood as local.

**There are facts that compel such a conclusion: and as all facts are of God, they must be in agreement**. The animals of New Zealand are different front those of Australia. The animals of Australia, again, are different from those of Asia and Europe. These again differ entirely from those of the American continent: **All differ from one another: and the fossil remains on all the continents show that this difference has always prevailed**.[[64]](#footnote-64)

The comments of ‘WDJ’ on the scientific implications of Joshua’s ‘long day’ are another example of harmonizing Biblical interpretation to scientific facts.

The laws of motion and gravitation forbid us to presume that scripture speaks scientific truth in recording that the sun stood still, and that the moon stood still; or, that in believing that they both stood still, we are to scientifically infer that the earth stood that they might appear to do so, that the illusion they stood might be produced, but they cannot forbid us believing the truth of the record for all that.[[65]](#footnote-65)

These earlier Christadelphian approaches to issues in Genesis reveal a strong preference for accepting established scientific facts, and interpreting Scripture in harmony with them. It was understood that both the Scriptures and the natural creation are works of God by which He has revealed Himself reliably, and that the two will always be in harmony when interpreted correctly. Most importantly, these earlier commentators saw no struggle for authority between science and Scripture: “Every thing in art and science **are but copies of the workings of God’s spirit in nature**”, as WDJ wrote.[[66]](#footnote-66)

**Conclusion**

Consistent application of the two books principle would be of advantage to current Christadelphian expositors seeking to reconcile apparent tensions between Scripture and science, especially those tensions raised by enemies of the gospel.

**Reviews**

**B. D. Ehrman, *Forged: Writing in the Name of God – Why the Bible’s authors are not who we think they are*,(New York: HarperOne, 2011).**

Bart Ehrman is an interesting character. He is a learned and distinguished scholar, well read in biblical and early Christian studies. Originally an evangelical, he became a liberal as his studies continued and eventually lost his faith apparently due to the problem of evil. To hear him speak in interviews, he seems reasonable and temperate, and even speaks of his own heartache at his loss of faith. Yet for a number of years he has put out a number of popularising books, with provocative titles and bold assertions. He cannot, I suppose, be blamed[[67]](#footnote-67) for the way his books are marketed and certainly not for the way vocal atheists have twisted his conclusions. Nevertheless one wonders what Professor Ehrman hopes to achieve by airing these issues.

*Forged* deals with the issue of pseudepigraphy (i.e. writing under a false name) and its occurrence in early Christianity, with particular focus on the Bible. He also treats fabrication and misattribution (see chapter 8), but these are peripheral to his main topic. Specifically, he asserts that both canonical epistles of Peter, and six of the epistles of Paul (Eph, Col, 2 Thess, 1 Tim, 2 Tim, Tit), were not by who they claim to be. His arguments here are not original – indeed he takes them to be accepted by the scholarly consensus. What is additional is his challenge to the scholarly supposition of ‘friendly pseudepigraphy’, arguing that in ancient times, as in modern, writing under a false name was considered to be forgery (hence the title) and thus lies. The agenda of the book seems to be the claim that the Bible contains lies (forgery, fabrication and falsification) and that the early Christians were liars. He writes “the use of deception to promote the truth may well be considered one of the most unsettling ironies of the early Christian tradition” (p. 250).

Now I, with Ehrman, share doubts about the concept of ‘friendly pseudepigraphy’, the idea that someone could write under the name of Paul but that was okay because he was just honouring his master or some such. This would seem particularly relevant for any text claiming apostolic authority on some point of doctrine or practice. However, I disagree with Ehrman’s assessment of the evidence. Regarding the Petrine epistles, he presents some interesting evidence of just how low literacy was in first century Palestine; in any case, Peter was uneducated (Acts 4:13). Ehrman concludes Peter would have been unable to write the refined Greek we find in his epistles (chapter 2). Ehrman, of course, does not even consider the possibility that Peter wrote through the Holy Spirit, but also dismisses the possibility that Peter learned Greek for the service of the gospel. As J. A. T. Robinson noted a while back, “it is inconceivable that he [Peter] can have exercised any kind of leading ministry in Antioch or even Jerusalem, let alone in Rome, without the use of Greek”.[[68]](#footnote-68) Regarding the Pauline epistles, Ehrman cites differences in vocabulary and doctrine between the disputed and accepted epistles as evidence that the six he identifies were written by another author (chapter 3).

A common response to differences in style and vocabulary in letters ascribed to the same author is that these works were written with the use of a secretary. Here is, perhaps, Ehrman’s most interesting chapter as he attempts to engage with the use of secretaries in the ancient world (chapter 4). His conclusions are that (a) generally only the upper classes could afford secretaries, (b) there are very few examples of secretaries adding significantly to the contents of letters, and (c) these examples are reserved to short correspondences, not long essays as in the case of the NT epistles.

Interesting as this is, I am not sure how relevant analogies to rich Roman scholars are. Of course, Paul probably could not afford a secretary but who is to say that a brother/sister did not volunteer his/her services. Indeed, it is a matter of fact that Paul had a scribe for many of his epistles (1 Cor 16:21; Col 4:18; 2 Thess 3:17), one of these, Tertius, is named (Rom 16:22). Perhaps more significantly, Paul had co-authors for many of his epistles, namely: Timothy (2 Cor 1:1; Phil 1:1, Col 1:1; 1 Thess 1:1; 2 Thess 1:1), Silvanus (1 Thess 1:1; 2 Thess 1:1) and others (Gal 1:2?). We do not know to what extent these co-authors had input into the text. In any case, are really prepared to say that it is inconceivable over the decade during which Paul was writing he did not alter his style, phraseology or vocabulary? I am not sure we have the parameters on which to base those judgments.

What is noticeable about *Forged* is how little attention is given to external evidence. Whether or not there is attestation to the authorship of a particular text seems irrelevant to Ehrman. To me this seems problematic since authorship (whether there was a connection to the apostles or not) was *the* criteria on which texts were judged to be canonical. And even 2 Peter, which arguably has the weakest attestation of the NT texts, has better credentials than any undisputed pseudepigraphical work. Whilst no canon is extant earlier the Muratorian Fragment (c.190), we can get a good indication of which works were considered authoritative by the fact that early Christians quote from or allude to them. Here is a sample:

**Theophilus of Antioch** (c.180): Matt, Luke, John, Acts, Rom, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Gal, Eph, Phil, Col, 1 Thess, 1 Tim, 2 Tim, Tit, Philem, Heb, 1 Pet, Rev.

**Justin Martyr** (c.160): Matt, Mark, Luke, John, 1 Cor, Phil, James.

**Ignatius** (c.115): Matt, Mark, Luke, John, Rom, 1 Cor, Gal, Eph, Phil, Col, 2 Thess, 2 Tim, James, 1 Pet.

**Polycarp** (c.115): Matt, Luke, Acts, Rom, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Gal, Phil, Eph, 1 Thess, 1 Tim, 2 Tim, 1 Pet, 1 John.

**Clement** (1st C): Matt, Mark, Luke, Acts, Rom, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Eph, Tit, Heb, James, 1 Pet, Rev.

Remember this is not a list of all the works these writers knew as authoritative, just the ones relevant for their works. Whilst it is possible that these writers may have been deceived, the earlier a text is dated the less likely it is to be a forgery because the greater chance of there being a living companion of Paul or Peter to refute the claim. It is significant that most, if not all, known cases of pseudepigraphical writings date from the second century or later.

In sum, Ehrman has presented some interesting considerations about writing practices in the Greco-Roman period. Unfortunately his polemical objective overrides any attempt at objectivity so his analysis of the authorship of NT texts is unoriginal, cursory and one-sided.

**T. Gaston**

**M. Hillar, *From Logos to Trinity: The Evolution of Religious Beliefs from Pythagoras to Tertullian*,(Cambridge University Press, 2012).**

Marian Hillar is Professor of Philosophy and Religious Studies and of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology at Texas Southern University. He is not a believer. He is editor-in-chief of *Essays in the Philosophy of Humanism.*  In his book he questions the existence of Jesus (p. 2), denies a temporal beginning to the universe (p. 13), and his first reference is to the New Atheists (p. 1, n1). Throughout the work are sporadic insults against Christianity. His agenda is not the restoration of primitive Christianity but, seemingly, to explain away Christian religion. Inasmuch as he regards the Trinity as a later development in Christian thought prompted by Greek philosophy and Egyptian religion, his book is of some value to biblical monotheists, however there is much here for readers to disagree with.

Whilst it is impressive that Hillar has mastered the musical chairs of his professorships, one wonders whether he has overextended himself. This work encompasses a range of disciplines, necessarily so for its broad remit, but it would be an accomplished polymath who could master these various strands successfully. For myself I would query to what extent Hillar has been successful.

The first chapter covers the Greek philosophers from Pythagoras to first century Stoicism but Hillar gives little consideration to the methodological problems associated with such historical endeavours. For example, our historical knowledge of Pythagoras is very slender and much of Pythagorean doctrine is, in fact, that of later followers. Plato, whose works are extant, is not as straightforward as Hillar proposes. There is some development from his early to late dialogues, and it is not always obvious whether one set of ideas can or should be reconciled with another; Hillar does not mention the unwritten doctrines of Plato (recorded by Aristotle). More importantly, it is not obvious what Hillar hopes to achieve by this summary, since he makes little use of this material in later chapters.

The second chapter covers “The Logos in Judaism”, though it gives only short summary of the Hebrew word *davar* (p. 36-37) and spends most of the chapter considering Philo. This is because Hillar believes that several Christian writers, Justin in particular, were influenced by the writings of Philo. This conclusion, though defended by early twentieth century scholars like Goodenough and Wolfson, is now out of date. The scholarly consensus is currently that Justin, whilst conversant with Hellenistic Judaism, did not know the works of Philo.

The third and fourth chapters trace the development of the Messianic tradition. Whilst he briefly acknowledges OT motives for Messianism, he devotes most of his consideration to apocalyptic literature. His purpose is revealed in chapter four when he seeks to explain the origins of Christianity as a Jewish Messianic sect, probably an apocalyptic group like that at Qumran, with Jesus and most of the NT being a later invention prompted by the mystery religions. Hillar seems to give no historical credence to the NT, but gives paramount significance to the fourth century writer Epiphanius (p. 112f), who is notoriously unreliable. His account of Jesus (p. 135-7) comes from the far fringes of scholarship, beyond even the ‘Jesus Seminar’ research group of American scholars. The contrast between his treatment of Pythagoras and that of Jesus is striking.

The next two chapters are devoted to Justin, his Logos doctrine, and his relationship to the Neo-Pythagorean thinker, Numenius of Apamea. Numenius posited a hierarchy of three gods and there is at least a case to be made that Justin was influenced by Numenius, or someone of this mold. Hillar notes some formal parallels but seems to give no consideration to the question of whether direct influence is plausible and how that might be detected. His analysis of Numenius is itself not unproblematic; he refers frequently to the “Logos of Numenius” though Numenius did not write about the Logos. One suspects Hillar may be unduly influenced by Guthrie’s poor translation of Numenius, which he frequently cites.

Chapters seven and eight are devoted to Tertullian, whom Hillar brands “the originator of the Trinity”. However it is far from obvious, even on Hillar’s own analysis, that Tertullian did originate the Trinity. Whilst he wrote about three *persona* in one *substantia¸* it is questionable whether he regarded the three as co-equal or co-eternal; Tertullian seems to believe the Son was created in time. Tertullian is credited with coining the term *trinitas* but Hillar acknowledges that the earlier Theophilus used the Greek term *trias.* More importantly, if Hillar wants to credit Tertullian with originating the Trinity then presumably he should present some evidence of the influence Tertullian had on later theologians but he does not. It is also frustrating that Hillar frequently describes Tertullian as being influenced by Stoicism and Egyptian religion but presents little by way of evidence that Tertullian was conversant in either tradition or was prompted by them to formulate his theology.

The final chapter is ostensibly about Thomas Aquinas, but is really a summary of Trinitarian doctrine from Tertullian to the present day. An appendix includes some claims about Israelite polytheism and then some summaries of Egyptian triads.

The general thesis of the book is that the development of the doctrine of the Trinity was influenced by Greek philosophy. I am sympathetic to this view; indeed my own research is concerned with this question. However, I do not think Hillar has achieved his objective. Whilst the book summarises various aspects of Greek philosophy, Jewish religion and some early Christian thought, it is only really his chapters on Justin that propose any direct influence between Greek philosophy and Christian thought, and these connections are underdeveloped. Though one might argue that Justin was formative in the development of the doctrine of the Trinity (this is my view), it is conceivable that Justin was exceptional and the Trinity developed from other sources. It is also conceivable that Justin knew nothing of Numenius, despite the parallels, and developed his doctrine from other sources. Convergence (or coincidence) is not the same as causation, and Hillar does not demonstrate causation.

Anthony Buzzard writes in the foreword to this book, “a scholar well versed both in the two biblical testaments and in the Greek philosophical schools of late antiquity has set his hand to provide us with just the information we need for an intelligent assessment of the pristine Christianity that preceded its remarkable deterioration from the second century” (p. ix). I’m afraid I do not share Buzzard optimistic assessment. Hillar does not believe the “pristine Christianity” ever existed and I am not confident that he has provided us with the basis for assessing how Christianity adopted the Trinity. I welcome Hillar’s contribution, insofar as it may renew interest in the role of Greek philosophy in second century Christian triadology, but I suspect it will not lead to “an almost complete rewriting of theological history” as Buzzard hopes (p. x).

**T. Gaston**

**Columnists**
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**Analysis**

**J. Davies**

In 1 Corinthians 1:17-3:23, Paul ‘according to the wisdom given unto him’,[[69]](#footnote-69) explains how he preached the gospel and taught the wisdom of God. For the next couple of ‘Analysis’ columns, the text of 1 Corinthians 1-2 will be examined to see how the ‘wisdom of God’ is revealed. We will intend to answer the following questions:

* How does God reveal his wisdom?
* What is the ‘mystery’ of 1 Corinthians 2:7?
* Why is the wisdom of God ‘hidden’ (1 Cor 2:7)?
* Who are the ‘princes of this world’ (1 Cor 2:6)?
* Is the Holy Spirit required to understand the wisdom of God (1 Cor 2:13)?
* What does it mean to ‘compare spiritual things with spiritual’ (1 Cor 2:13)?

The analysis of this, and other related, texts will have implications on how we approach the scriptures and interact with human ‘wisdom’. In this column, a brief overview of the passage will be given and the historical background will be highlighted.

Paul, by the inspiration of God, is explaining how he ‘preach[ed] the gospel’ (1 Cor 1:17) to the Corinthians (2:1). He explains that he did not do this with ‘wisdom of words’ but with the ‘wisdom of God’ (1:17, 2:7). In 1 Cor 1:17-31 the apostle explains how the preaching was received by the wise and foolish of this world. In 1 Cor 2:1-16, the Spirit through Paul then references his visit to Corinth and explains how the wisdom of God is ‘revealed’, how it is ‘received’ and how it interacts with the ‘natural man’.

To highlight the chasm that exists between these two types of wisdom, the Spirit contrasts the two types of wisdom throughout 1:17-3:19 (a full list of these references is tabulated below).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Wisdom of God | **Wisdom of Men** |
| * ‘the wisdom of God’ (1:21)
* ‘Christ...the wisdom of God’ (1:24)
* ‘Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom’ (1:30)
* ‘wisdom...wisdom of God in a mystery’ (2:6-7)
 | * ‘wisdom of words’ (1:17)
* ‘wisdom of the wise’ (1:19)
* ‘wise...wisdom of this world’ (1:20)
* ‘the world by wisdom knew not’ (1:21)
* ‘the Greeks seek after wisdom’ (1:22)
* ‘wise men’ (1:26)
* ‘the wise’ (1:27)
* ‘excellency of speech or of wisdom’ (2:1)
* ‘man’s wisdom’ (2:4)
* ‘wisdom of men’ (2:5)
* ‘wisdom of this world’ (2:6)
* ‘man’s wisdom teacheth’ (2:13)
 |

In 1 Cor 2:1, Paul makes reference to an occasion when he ‘came to you [Corinth – 1:2]’. The text highlights a couple of other details about this visit:

* When Paul visited he came ‘in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling’ (2:3)
* He preached Christ ‘unto Jews...and unto the Greeks’ (1:23)

A number of verbal connections highlight that this visit is *historically* described in Acts 18,[[70]](#footnote-70)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Acts 18  | 1 Corinthians 1 & 2 |
| “Paul...came to Corinth” (v. 1) |  “when I **came** to you” (2:1; cf. 1:2 ‘at **Corinth’**) |
| “persuaded the Jews and the Greeks” (v. 4) | “we preach...unto **Jews**...**and Greeks**” (1:23) |
| “testified...that Jesus was Christ” (v. 5) | “we preach **Christ** crucified” (1:23)“save **Jesus Christ**” (2:2) |
| “hearing believed” (v. 8) | “save them that **believe**” (1:21)“your faith...” (2:5) |
| “Be not afraid” (v. 9) | “in **fear**” (2:3) |
| “but speak” (v. 9) | “we **speak**” (2:6, 7, 13) |
| “teaching the word of God among them” (v. 11) | “the Holy Spirit **teacheth**” (2:13) |

In Acts 18, Paul arrives in Corinth and whereupon he ‘reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks’ (Acts 18:4; *cf.* 1 Cor 1:23). The Jews opposed Paul’s teaching, which led him to turn to the Gentiles (Acts 18:6-7).[[71]](#footnote-71) By comparing 1 Cor 2:1, where Paul states that he was with the Corinthians ‘in fear’, with Acts 18:9 ‘be not afraid’, it seems that Paul feared what the Jews would do to him (*cf.* Acts 17:5-9, 13).

The Lord’s vision in Acts 18:9-10 is to encourage him to stay in Corinth, in the face of Jewish opposition. Paul is told not to be afraid and is instructed to ‘**speak** and hold not thy peace’ (Acts 18:9). This vision evidently gave Paul the strength to continue his preaching at Corinth because he remains there for eighteen months ‘**teaching** the word of God among them’ (Acts 18:11). Hence, in 1 Corinthians 2 the Spirit references **speaking** and **teaching**:[[72]](#footnote-72)

Howbeit we **speak** wisdom among them that are perfect: yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to nought: But we **speak** the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom...Which things also we **speak**, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost **teacheth**; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. (1 Cor 2:6, 7, 13)

Whilst Acts 18 tells us that the Lord encourages Paul to ‘speak’, 1 Corinthians 2 explains what Paul ‘spoke’ – the wisdom of God.

By highlighting the historical background to 1 Corinthians 2, the context in which the Spirit is speaking, is established. Acts 18 shows that Paul spoke by teaching *the word of God*. Therefore, all of the details in 1 Corinthians 2 about how Paul **spoke** and **taught** all come under the umbrella term of ‘teaching the word of God’.

**Archaeology**

**J. Burke**

Is Solomon’s wealth a literary fiction? The Biblical account of Solomon’s wealth has been described as unrealistic in standard critical commentaries, though some express confidence that the description has a basis in historical fact. What evidence has been gathered for Solomon’s wealth?

The Bible identifies ‘Ophir’ as one source of Solomon’s gold (1 Kings 9:28). Although the location of Ophir is unknown, an 8th century ostracon BCE identifies it as a historical source of gold, rather than a legendary motif. A. R. Millard states,

The expression “gold of Ophir” occurs not only in the Bible, **but also on an eighth-century B.C. ostracon\* found at Tell Qasile in Israel**. That ostracon, while showing that the name was current to designate the origin or type of gold, throws no light on Ophir’s location.[[73]](#footnote-73)

Millard also notes ancient uses of gold for construction which are analogous to Solomon’s: the tomb of Tutankhamen, extensive use of gold plating on buildings in the reign of Tuthmosis III, massive gold use on buildings of the Egyptian New Kingdom era, and the same kind of gold usage in Babylonia and Assyria.[[74]](#footnote-74) Millard also points out that items described as ‘of gold’ were not always solid gold; often they were covered in gold plate or gold leaf.

While words like ‘a gold statue’ or ‘a gold bed’ in ancient documents should not be pressed to mean ‘made of solid gold throughout’ or ‘the purest gold’, they can be understood to mean ‘gold all over’, that is to say, nothing else could be seen.[[75]](#footnote-75)

Solomon’s income of 666 talents of gold in one year (1 Kings 10:14),[[76]](#footnote-76) is considered fictional by some commentators.

Although this income is unique in Ancient Near East records,

The only ancient text that reports the annual income of a powerful king in Old Testament times is the Hebrew Bible. In 1 Kings 10:14 the figure of 666 talents of gold (almost 25 U.S. tons) is given for Solomon. This may refer to a particular year, just as the 420 talents (15.75 U.S. tons) from Ophir refers to a particular source (1 Kings 10:11). Only two figures in ancient records approach the amount of 666 talents: the total of Pharaoh Osorkon’s gift to the gods and the amounts of treasure Alexander the Great found in Persia.[[77]](#footnote-77)

None of these figures approach the amounts recorded for Solomon **except for the booty gathered by Tuthmosis III (11,500 kg; 11.3 tons)**.[[78]](#footnote-78)

However, the 120 talents of gold received by Solomon from Tyre (1 Kings 9:28) is matched and exceeded by gifts and tribute of gold from other Ancient Near East monarchs.

We learn from firsthand sources that Metten II of Tyre (ca. 730) **paid a tribute of 150 talents of gold** to our old acquaintance Tiglath-pileser III of Assyria, while in turn his successor Sargon II (727-705) **bestowed 154 talents of gold upon the Babylonian gods** - about 6 tons in each case. Going back almost eight centuries, Tuthmosis III of Egypt **presented about 13.5 tons (well over 200 talents) of gold in nuggets and rings to the god Amun in Thebes**, plus an unknown amount more in a splendid array of gold vessels and cult implements. **Worth almost a third of Solomon’s reputed annual gold revenue, this was on just one occasion, to just one temple**.[[79]](#footnote-79)

When Damascus surrendered to Adadnirari III, probably in 796 BC, the Assyrian received 2,300 talents of silver (**69,000 kg; 67.76 tons**), 20 talents of gold (**600 kg; 1,320 lbs**), and much else. Some sixty years later Tiglath-pileser III subjugated Samaria, placing Hoshea on the throne as his nominee. Samaria paid 10 talents of gold (**300 kg; 660 lbs**) as tribute (and an unknown amount of silver). The same emperor received the submission of Tyre, and with it **the large sum of 150 talents of gold (4,500 kg; 4.4 tons)**.[[80]](#footnote-80)

K. Kitchen notes the vast gold expenditure of pharaoh Orsokon I exceeded even Solomon’s.

In Egypt Shishak’s successor Osorkon I gifted some 383 *tons* of gold and silver to the gods and temples of Egypt in the first four years of his reign, many of the detailed amounts being listed in a long inscription (now damaged) (figs. 22A, B). That sum would (in weight) be equivalent to almost seventeen years of Solomon’s annual gold revenue…[[81]](#footnote-81)

Kitchen further suggests Orsokon’s wealth was the result of his father Sheshonq’s conquest of Solomon’s son Rehoboam (1 Kings 14:25-26), commenting,

Where could Osorkon have obtained such immense wealth, to spend on such a scale after only three and a third years of his reign? **Barely five years earlier, Osorkon’s father Shishak had looted the wealth of Jerusalem.** It seems unlikely to be a mere coincidence that almost immediately after that event Osorkon could dispose so freely of so much gold and silver.\***The vast amounts of Solomon’s golden wealth may have ended up, at least in part, as Osorkon’s gift to the gods and goddesses of Egypt**.[[82]](#footnote-82)

**Gender Issues**

**G. Horwood**

H. Blocher writes in regard to the creation of the first family unit in Genesis 2, “The constitution of any real community requires that there be order; it cannot be done simply by joining together two people, but it must possess its own structure and its metaphorical ‘head’.1 If there was a ‘head’ of the first family, then all indications in Genesis 2 are that it was the man who was to function in this role.

In Genesis 2 the man is undeniably the more prominent of the two humans. The man was created first and was for a time the only bearer of God’s image upon earth. The narrative is centred on the man; the provision of his needs and instruction in his responsibilities. The attention devoted to the man is that of a father to his only son. The man was given the task of serving and keeping the garden sanctuary, and to the man was the one commandment entrusted. The woman was created for the man (1 Cor 11:9), to be his companion and helper. The man therefore was to function as family ‘head’, whilst the woman was given a supportive function.

Adam and Eve were archetypes for future marriages and relationships between men and women. The author of Genesis 2 indicates this when he inserts the comment in v. 24, “*Therefore* shall a man leave his father and mother and hold fast to his wife”. Jesus referred to Genesis 2 when he wished to establish God’s original intentions for marriage (Matt 19:3-9). Paul refers back to Genesis 1-3 on almost every occasion when he makes an important point to do with gender roles, both regarding marriage (Eph 5:31) and regarding roles in the ecclesial family (1 Tim 2:13-14, 1 Cor 11:7-9).

The union of the first man and woman in marriage also foreshadowed the union of Christ and the ecclesia. This is called ‘a great mystery’ by Paul in Eph 5:31. When the mystery was revealed in Christ, New Testament writers such as Paul were able to read familiar texts such as the creation accounts with fresh insight. Parallels could be appreciated between Christ and the man, and the ecclesia and the woman. Accordingly, Paul advises husbands to emulate the love of Christ for the ecclesia; and wives to model the submission of the ecclesia to Christ (Eph 5:23-25).

Many egalitarians agree that some form of hierarchy is necessary in human communities, but question why a person’s place in the hierarchy must be determined by their gender. R. N. Longenecker puts his finger on the key issue for many when he says, “Certainly society requires order, with some people functioning as overseers and others as subordinates. But that one gender must necessarily have the one place and the other gender the other place is another matter”.2

A simple answer may be that there is value to a society in being ordered this way. Complementarian S. Clark notes that in all known human societies, labour has been divided by gender, with males dominating the public sphere and females the private sphere of home and children.3  Moreover, male and female preference for certain roles seems to be rooted deep in our biology. Even in societies where women are given a choice, this division of labour persists to some extent. It could be argued that this is an effect of the ‘curse’. It could also be argued that God designed men and women, in general, to perform different and complementary functions. The biological differences between men and women were created ‘from the beginning’ (Gen 1:27), and Adam’s relative prominence in Genesis 2 pre-dates the fall.

In 1 Tim 2:13, Paul says that he does not permit a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, “For Adam was first formed, then Eve”. Paul emphasises a similar point in 1 Corinthians – “The head of the woman is the man … he is the image and glory of God, but woman is the glory of man. For man was not made from woman, but woman from man. Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man” (1 Cor 11:3, 7-9).

Complementarian J. B. Hurley states, “Paul’s appeal to the prior formation of Adam is an assertion that Adam’s status as the oldest carried with it the leadership appropriate to a first-born son”.4 Although modern readers may find little significance in the order of creation, readers in a culture which practised primogeniture would likely have found the creation order highly significant, as did Paul.

Clark acknowledges some possible objections to this theory – namely that primogeniture normally only occurs between sons of the same parents, and that in the Scriptures primogeniture is often overturned and the younger son favoured over the elder. Nevertheless Clark argues that the principle of the precedence of the first in age applied more broadly than just to children in a family; and where the younger was chosen this was normally an act of special election whereby the younger became the legal first-born.

Egalitarian W. J. Webb acknowledges that Genesis 2 does contain “quiet overtones of patriarchy” and that the order of creation supplies “one of the strongest pieces of patriarchal data” in the creation story, given the importance attached to the firstborn in ancient Near Eastern thinking. However, he argues that the man’s precedence in creation is only one of numerous cultural components found in Genesis 1 and 2.6

Webb suggests that the presence of cultural features in the garden may be a deliberate foreshadowing of the curse; or a way of describing the past through present categories familiar to the reader, in order not to confuse the main message. Alternatively, we could counter that the patriarchy of the garden may have reflected God’s anticipation of the social context into which Adam and Eve were about to venture.

Webb defines the custom of primogeniture quite broadly to mean that the first within any creative order receives special prominence. Webb acknowledges that Paul’s reference to the order of creation in 1 Tim 2:13 is a probable reference to the custom of primogeniture, and agrees with Clark that Paul’s use of the firstborn idea is sufficiently elastic to include women within the sibling group (cf. Rom 8:29, Heb 12:23).

However, in Webb’s view, 1 Tim 2:13 has a significant cultural component, given that primogeniture is an ancient custom that is no longer practised today. Webb concludes that 1 Tim 2:12-13 does not reflect a transcultural principle because “the pragmatic factors that drove primogeniture customs were part of the ancient setting, but they are no longer part of our world”.7 Webb therefore dismisses not only the custom itself, but any principles derived from it.[[83]](#footnote-83)

The fact that primogeniture is not a transcultural principle and is not practised today does not necessarily mean that a hierarchal interpretation of the order of creation cannot stand. Christ’s status as the ‘firstborn of all creation’ (Colossians 1:15) and ‘firstborn from the dead’ (Colossians 1:18) is in no way diminished because primogeniture is not practised today; nor is Israel’s place as the firstborn among nations (Exod 4:22). The original audiences of the Old and New Testaments practised primogeniture and therefore the writers used firstborn terminology to describe a position of pre-eminence in rank or honour. That the practice which Paul bases his argument on **became** culturally bound does not mean that the argument or principle itself is culturally bound.

Complementarian C. Blomberg offers perhaps the best summary when he writes that at the very least the narrative of Genesis 2 leaves the door open for a hierarchal interpretation, and importantly, that this was Paul’s interpretation of Genesis 2. If one believes Paul to be the author of 1 Timothy and 1 Corinthians, and to have written these letters by inspiration, then his interpretation of the significance of the creation order must be given due weight.
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**Marginal Notes**

**Rev 1:10 – PW**

I was in the Spirit on the Lord’s Day, and I heard behind me a loud voice, as of a trumpet.

Various options have been suggested for this ‘Day’ (the Sabbath/Passover or the Day of Judgment); however, the reference to a ‘trumpet’ indicates that it refers to the beginning of the New Year, which is closely associated with the Day of Atonement (10 days later), referred to by Isaiah as “an acceptable **day** to the **Lord**” (Isa 58:3-5—a ‘Lord’s day’). On ‘the Day’ the ‘books’ were opened (cf. Dan 7:10) and the fate of the wicked and the righteous determined.

The 10 days between New Year and the Day of Atonement were figuratively a time of probation and trial (you will have tribulation ten days—Rev 2:10). Significantly, Daniel expected a great Day of Atonement at the end of time (for him at the end of 490 years) when the books would be opened, and he also experienced 10 days of trial. The ‘loud voice’ in Rev 1:10 is associated with calling the dead to life (cf. John 11:43) and therefore with the judgment and in the initial vision John experiences (figuratively) his own death and resurrection (Rev 1:17).

**Rev 1:19 – PW**

Write the things which you have seen, and the things which are, and the things which will take place after this.

Rev 1:19 has been understood in the following way,

1. That “what you have seen” is the vision of chapter 1 (cf. 1:20 “the seven stars you saw”); “the things that are” to the letters to the seven churches in chapters 2 and 3; and “the things that must occur after these” as the visions of chapters 4-22.
2. As a variation of (1) it is said that “what you have seen” is a repetition of the commission in 1:11 (“Write what you see”) with the tense of the verb ‘to see’ suitably changed, and with the present and future relating to the rest of the book.

The following objections are usually voiced against these approaches:

1. They are weak because the seven letters are not just dealing with the present situation (“things that are”), for eschatological warnings and promises are featured throughout chapters 2-3. The visions of chapters 4-19 also have past, present, and future aspects intertwined throughout.
2. It is arguable that the vision unit comprises vv. 12-20 (“the seven stars which you saw”, v. 20), and since John is still ‘within’ the vision when he writes v. 19, he is not being told about the vision.

A third interpretation (the one we favour) is that all three clauses relate to **the past, present and future orientation** **of the entirebook.** John is employing the tripartite prophecy formula that has previously been used in this chapter in v. 4 and v. 8 (is/was/is to come) and is employed again in v. 18 (lives/was dead/alive forevermore).

The three clauses in v. 19 parallel vv. 4 and 8 and relate to the eschatological perspective of the book as a whole. The use of “have seen” within the context of the tripartite formula which refers to past, present and future reaches beyond the confines of the initial vision unit (vv. 12-20 that John was still ‘within’) and relates to the wider framework of the book—it will be about past/present/future. There is enough evidence in Revelation indicating there are past elements; others relate to John’s present; and yet other elements relate to the future.

We would further suggest that the ‘past’ is the recent past of the newly formed NT church the one that Jesus was walking amongst….and had been walking amongst since his resurrection (past event).

John 20:19 Jesus came and stood in the midst, and said to them, “Peace *be* with you”.

Revelation 1:13 “…and in the midst of the seven lampstands One like the Son of Man…”

Just as Christ was involved with the Palestinian church from its very beginning (its birth), so also with the churches of Asia Minor from their inception (established in the 40’s).

What John “saw” was that the firstborn of the dead **had been active in his church from its very inception**…John is therefore instructed to write about what he “saw”…not just the vision…**but the past activity**.

**Luke 3:23 – AP**

This text says that Jesus began his public ministry at about 30 years of age. The reason seems to be based on the Levitical age for starting priestly service (1 Chron 23:2; Num 4:3, *passim*). Should this be an example for us to follow? Should young brethren begin public ministry at 30? This would allow the years prior to the age of 30 to be devoted to growing in knowledge and in maturity. Is this the reason why the Levitical age was set at 30? It would avoid the temptation of seeking vainglory through speaking at Bible schools and conferences—occasions at which there are large numbers of people listening to your every word. Does greater maturity or taking the time to deepen the knowledge of Christ help someone avoid succumbing to the temptation of vainglory? It seems intuitive to suppose that it might help. Perhaps it takes time to develop the content to go with the speaking skills. If this is so, why was the Levitical priesthood ‘retirement’ set at 50?

**Gen 2:23 – GH**

The phrase ‘bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh’ (Gen 2:23) was used to denote a family or ‘flesh and blood’ relationship (cf. Gen 29:14; Jud 9:2; Heb 2:14). Thus, Eve was both Adam’s sibling (sister) and his wife, as they shared the same father. This is a theme which runs throughout Scripture. Sarah was Abraham’s wife and half-sister, through sharing the same father. The bridegroom of Song of Solomon makes several references to ‘my sister, my bride’ (Song 4:9, 10, 12; 5:1). These types pointed forward to Jesus, who is both the elder brother and bridegroom of the ecclesia (Rom 8:29).

**Correspondence**

Dear Editors,

I have just finished reading your last EJournal and enjoyed many of the articles. I would like to comment on the postscript as this problem you highlight is one that has been a concern of mine for many years.

Not all members of an ecclesia will be natural students but I am sure that our Heavenly Father will position those in a community who are equipped with the skills and enthusiasm for the maintenance of spiritual health. The real concern is when those so equipped do not fulfil their responsibilities.

If there is an enthusiastic and diligent number, however small, who share their knowledge and understanding with the community in a way that invites an enthusiastic response then Bible study will become a joy and profitable for all. This is a difficult task and without Gods guidance and strength, would be impossible.

The ecclesia is made up of many parts each contributing to the whole but unless there is the bond of love uniting the parts with a sound scriptural base the ecclesia will not function as God intended.

**T. Evans**

Dear Editors,

Bro. Richard Dargie in his January column seems to suggest that the quotations from Ezekiel in the Apocalypse support the idea that the harlot of Revelation 17 is Jerusalem. However, he also points out that there is abundant use of the judgment on Tyre in Ezekiel in Revelation 18. He quotes the following:

The Revelation is a Christian rewriting of Ezekiel. Its fundamental structure is
the same. Its interpretation depends upon Ezekiel. The first half of both
books leads up to the destruction of the earthly Jerusalem; in the second they
describe a new and holy Jerusalem. There is one significant difference.
Ezekiel’s lament over Tyre is transformed into a lament over Jerusalem…

Again, he seems to suggest that the Jerusalem spoken of is the Jerusalem of AD 70, i.e. the Preterist interpretation of Revelation. However, I don't believe you can have it both ways. On the one hand he wants the quotes regarding Jerusalem to refer to the literal Jerusalem as a harlot, but the quotes from Tyre to be used as a type of Jerusalem and not of Tyre itself. That sounds to me like mixing the use of OT quotations.

Instead, what is wrong with saying that both Jerusalem and Tyre are being used as types to describe a system that is like both cities but in a new historical context? Is Revelation merely reiterating OT prophecy concerning Jerusalem or is it using the harlotry of Jerusalem as described in Ezekiel and saying “what happened to Israel also happens in a NT context”?

The context of Revelation is that it was written to servants of Jesus Christ, not to the Jews. If it was written to the Jews and warning them about AD70 (or the equivalent futurist time) then fair enough, but it was written to the Gentile ecclesia warning them about things in their world. Just as Israel fell into apostasy so would the ecclesia; and the result is eventually what we see in Revelation 17-18.

Furthermore, the historical context, in which the city on seven hills was known as Rome, the other links between Revelation 17 and Rome, leads me to the conclusion that Rome is the best identification for the system in Revelation. The covenant people of God fell away from truth to form the NT apostasy we now know as Christendom. This is all very exhortational for us, but the idea of Revelation simply being a reiteration of OT prophecy regarding AD 70 and/or a future invasion of Jerusalem, leaves the book entirely meaningless for the vast majority of believers through the ages.

To summarize: I understand the book of Revelation's use of OT quotations in the simple sense of using OT events as types, i.e. “look at what happened to Israel, because the NT church follows the same pattern”.

**R. Morgan**

**Reply**:

Thank you for your observations, some of the matters that you refer to have already been dealt with in previous issues by others. On the question of who are the ‘servants’ (Rev 1:1), the Diaspora Ecclesias of Asia Minor had a mixed make-up of Jew and Gentile.[[84]](#footnote-84) The message was sent to this mixed audience who used it to warn Judaizers of the coming temple destruction (must shortly take place, Rev.1:1) and to bolster (and vindicate) the faith of first century Christians (both Jew and Gentile).

A Preterist interpretation of Revelation is not being offered here –   that would mean that Revelation was completely fulfilled in the first century when it is obvious that much still lies in the future.  However, that does not preclude a partial fulfillment in the first century that forms a pattern (type) for future events.[[85]](#footnote-85) We think here of the Olivet Prophecy that has relevance to the first century and also to the future.

The question of the Harlotry of Israel is dealt with in the current issue. The nation of Israel and Jerusalem in particular, is the OT harlot par excellence. Only two cities outside Israel are accused of harlotry in the OT; Tyre (Isa 23:16-17) and Nineveh (Nah 3:4). Yet, both these cities had been in covenant with God (1 Kings 5:1-12; 9:13; Amos 1:9; Jonah 3:5-10).

Finally, the question of how to interpret OT metaphor and symbol when employed in Revelation 17-18:  Do we understand ‘Babylon’ as Rome, or as referring to Jerusalem (or perhaps something else?). This needs an extended discussion. I would invite you to submit an article for discussion that the ‘great city’ of Revelation is Rome.

**R. Dargie**

Dear Editors,

Thank you for your work in the *Supplementary Discussion* addressing the meaning of *mesitēs* (*EJournal of Biblical Interpretation*, Vol 6, No. 1, Jan 2012): it is an important discussion which merits this treatment.

If I may, I would like to introduce further aspects of Scripture’s portrayal of this intermediary role that bears upon the discussion. There are two matters not mentioned (other than in passing by Paul) that I want to raise *en route* to what I believe to be a further conclusive argument for the *intermediary* sense.

The first is the mention by Paul that the law was ordained by angels “in the hand of a mediator” (Gal 3:19). This is a clear reference to Exod 32:15 which states: “Moses turned, and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were **in his hand**”. We shall see as we proceed, quite apart from the evidence already provided by Andrew, that it is right to see in ‘mediator’ (Gal 3:19) a reference to Moses so that ‘in his hand’ is represented as ‘in the hand of a mediator’. But it is also important to lay Gal 3:19 alongside the testimony of Stephen who said: “this [Moses] is he, who was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spoke to him in the Mount Sinai, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give to us” (Acts 7:38). The work of God’s angels through Moses to the people is clearly seen in both descriptions and this indicates it is right to see ‘mediator’ (Gal 3:19) as a reference to Moses. The “two tables of the testimony” (Exod 32:15) that were in the mediator’s hands are “the tables of the **covenant**” (Heb 9:4). This establishes a further important point which will be developed as we proceed. The work of the *intermediary* is not merely that of a messenger, it is the work of a messenger appointed to bring the word of the covenant to people who are invited to accept this word and become one in God through Christ.

Moses was in this role of bringing the two tables of the covenant, in part, because of what had happened at the theophany on Mount Sinai before all the people who in dreadful fear said to Moses: “You speak with us, and we will hear: but let not God speak with us, lest we die” (Exod 20:19). Nearly forty years later Moses reflects back on this incident to a new generation: “The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, evenus, who areall of us here alive this day. The Lord talked with you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire, (I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to show you the word of the Lord: for you were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount” (Deut 5:3-5). There is here clear confirmation that Moses was descending the mount with the two tables of the covenant because he now stood between the Lord and the people to show them the word of the Lord due to their fear.

The word ‘between’ speaks of Moses’ role as intermediary and anticipates the six uses of *mesitēs* in the apostolic writings. It is clear that *mesitēs* is from the same family of words as *mesos* (‘midst’ or ‘middle’); of course, when speaking of being in the midst of just two parties, (such as God and the people), it is also appropriate to use the expression ‘between’. Whilst I agree with Andrew that it is right to excise the term ‘between’ in his revision of the KJV of 1 Tim 2:5, nevertheless it is important to reflect on why leading English language versions (NKJV; ASV; ESV; KJV; NASB; NIV; NKJV; RSV; NET) persist in having the term *between* in this verse following ‘mediator’ (or ‘intermediary’ in the case of the NET). It is evident that these translators see some sense of ‘between’ (for the midst of two parties) in *mesitēs* and this confirms the association I have made with Moses standing “between the Lord and [the people]”. In sum, Moses standing between the Lord and the people to show the word of the Lord to the people was Moses’ mediatorial role.

Now we can proceed to the significance of this, because Moses makes further reference to these circumstances. He later says to the same generation: “According to all that you desired of the Lord your God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. And the Lord said to me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken” (Deut 18:16-17). And what was it that the Lord appointed in response to this?

The Lord your God will raise up to you a prophet from the midst of you, of your brothers, like to me; to him you shall **hearken**… And the Lord said to me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise them up a prophet from among their brothers, like to you, and will put my words in his mouth; and **he shall speak** to them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not **hearken** to my words which **he shall speak** in my name, I will require it of him (Deut 18:15,17-19)

Moses clearly has his own foreshadowing of this in mind when he spoke of standing *between* the Lord and the people when he introduced this part of his speech saying: “**Hear**, O Israel, the statutes and judgments which **I speak** in your ears this day, that you may learn them, and keep, and do them” (Deut 5:1). Notice also Stephen’s association of his words, which are parallel to Gal 3:19’s portrayal of Moses as mediator of the law (cp. Acts 7:38), with this promise of the prophet like to Moses: “This is that Moses, which said to the children of Israel, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up to you of your brothers, like to me; him shall you hear” (Acts 7:37).

This shows that the role of a mediator in Scripture is a prophetic role. Like a prophet, a mediator shows the word of God to the people. The thing that distinguishes a mediator from a prophet is that the mediator, more particularly, standing between God and the people, shows the word of the covenant to the people inviting them to accept this and to become one with God. The very common association of the work of a mediator with the role of a priest is seen not to be Scripture’s association.

There is another conclusion that arises from this: that Christ is a prophet like to Moses, a promise established in the context of Moses’ appointment to stand between God and the people to show the word of the Lord, shows that it is not right to contrast Moses’ mediatorial role as that of ‘mere messenger’ with Christ’s mediatorial role as necessarily a different, fuller sense of ‘mediator’ (though, of course, the new covenant of which Christ is mediator is better than the old covenant of which Moses was mediator; but this *better than* relationship contrasts the qualities of the covenants not the roles of Moses and Christ as mediators). Rather, since Christ is a prophet like to Moses, Moses’ role as mediator likewise foreshadows Christ’s fulfillment of the same role for the new covenant.

Bringing these conclusions from a consideration of Exodus 32 and Deuteronomy 5 & 18 to bear on uses of ‘mediator’ about the Lord Jesus Christ yields the following further insights:

* 1 Timothy 2:5’s use is clearly set in a context of the new covenant being brought to all men, gentiles as well as Jews, that they might be saved. God’s will to have all men to be saved is dependent on them coming “to the knowledge of the truth” (1 Tim 2:4): the man Christ Jesus is the mediator of God and *all* men to show the word of the Lord to *all* men by which they come to this knowledge. Paul’s appointment as preacher, and an apostle, a teacher of the gentiles (1 Tim 2:7) was clearly one way by which Christ fulfilled his role as mediator of God and *all* men. I say “*all* men” because that is the purpose of the apostle’s further identification of the man Christ Jesus as one “who gave himself a ransom for **all**” (1 Tim 2:6): that Jesus gave himself for **all** is proof indeed that the word of the Lord must be shown to them through Christ’s mediatorial work that they might be saved. It is for this reason that the apostle opens this part of the letter with exhortation, first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions and giving of thanks “be made for **all** men” (1 Tim 2:1): God will have **all** men to be saved. It is clear that “the man Christ Jesus” cites the expression “the man Moses” (Num 12:3) and not Zech 6:12. Not only because “the man [name]” structure plainly appears in both contexts whereas it is absent in Zechariah, but, more significantly because Numbers 12’s portrayal of Moses as a special prophet with whom the Lord speaks mouth to mouth to speak to the people resonates with Christ’s role as mediator in 1 Timothy 2.
* The ubiquitous expression “mediator of… covenant” about Jesus in Hebrews picks up Moses’ role of showing the word of the covenant to the people.
* Hebrews 8:6 speaks of Jesus’ more excellent ministry which was established on better promises for which he is “the mediator of a better covenant”. The better promises, the covenant of which he was mediator, are explained in fuller detail in the lengthy citation from Jer 31:31-34 in Heb 8:8-12. Note how this work of Christ’s ministry, being the mediator of a better covenant, is described: “I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts… all shall know [the Lord], from the least to the greatest”. As we saw in 1 Timothy 2, this knowledge of the Lord with his laws in their mind and heart, is accomplished by Christ in his role as mediator through the work of preaching of this covenant.
* The “redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant” by means of the death of Christ (Heb 9:15) is the promise of the new covenant: “I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more” (Heb 8:12). Thus, the death of Christ for the redemption of transgressions is a reference to one of the outcomes of the ‘new covenant’ of which Christ is mediator (Heb 9:15), not an explanation that his work as mediator is a work of expiation. Christ’s role as mediator of the new covenant is to show the word of the new covenant to a people, who hearing and obeying, can then have this said about them: “they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance” (Heb 9:15). These people were *called* to this inheritance because of the work of the mediator of the new covenant through faithful servants such as Paul preaching the gospel that they might be called (2 Thess 2:14).
* The mention of “Jesus the mediator of the new covenant” (Heb 12:24) occurs in a context that pervasively draws on the events of Exodus 19 & 20, the historic situation in which Moses was appointed to stand between God and the people to show the word of the Lord to them. Having spoken in many different terms of the things to which the Hebrew believers had come, including “to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant”, he warns them, picking up the language about the prophet like to Moses in Deuteronomy 18: “see that you do not refuse him that speaks [Deut 18:18,19]” (Heb 12:25). Having been called to the general assembly and church of the firstborn by the work of the mediator of the new covenant, the apostle warns them they must not turn away, refusing the one that had spoken (and who continued to speak) calling people to the new covenant.

There is much in what Paul writes about the many and gracious accomplishments of God in Christ with which we can all agree. But that Christ is the one through whom God accomplishes these is not evidence that his work as mediator is the title amongst his very many titles that speaks of these things.

**P. Heavyside**

**Reply**:[[86]](#footnote-86)

Thank you for your comments, that is the beauty of the discussion section; it allows a deeper examination of the issues from different perspectives. The Galatians text is a difficult one and has caused headaches for many exegetes. I have only given examples of two scholarly opinions (Wright and Bachman) but could have added many more. A. Oepke has suggested hyperbolically that there are 430 different interpretations of Gal 3:19-20, an obvious play on the 430 years mentioned in Gal 3:17. However, most commentators recognize the existence of at least 250-300 different interpretations on the text, some even as high as 400. It is therefore a difficult passage to understand and my EJournal article does not pretend to be the last word on the matter.

Firstly, the word mediator is barely used in the NT and our investigation has demonstrated that it can be understood as either ‘intermediary’ or ‘reconciler’.

Secondly, the context of the Pauline argument is the inferiority of the Law; the Promise came before the Law and was confirmed after the Law (by the resurrection) – the Law was therefore a temporary interlude. The Law could only bring cursing and the Law was divisive causing alienation between God and man and Jew and Gentile. Vv. 19-20 are therefore the rhetorical climax of the Pauline argument against the Old Covenant; it is hardly likely that Paul then wants to argue that Jesus mediatorship is the same in type (if not in substance) as that of Moses. In fact, Paul argues the opposite; namely, that the law had no mediator (in the sense of reconciler) until Christ. The mediation of Jesus Christ was of a different nature than the ‘mediation’ of Moses and that is why Paul emphasises in Timothy that there is only one mediator (Jesus).

Some scholars believe that Paul employed a rhetorical device known as enthymeme in Gal 3:19c-20a, otherwise known as a contrarium. This is reasoning by contraries: the enthymematic maxim acquires both its logical force and its aesthetic value from a striking juxtaposition of contraries. D. E. Aune states that, “An enthymeme is an argument [...] formed with commonly held opinions rather than categorical propositions that are absolutely certain”. In this case, Paul is accepting a well-known premise (that Moses functioned as a mediator in order to logically disprove it. The point is that Moses did not act as a mediator in the sense of a reconciler of the Law. Moses could not save the people (or himself for that matter), nor could he bring the Law to its logical end. Therefore in the truest sense of the word Moses was not a mediator.

Although Moses had the Law in his hand, he subsequently broke the tablets of the Law (Exod 32:19). Moses obviously felt that the people were not worthy of the sacred Law – but in the very next chapter, Yahweh proclaims the divine name to Moses and demonstrates that it is linked with mercy – it is after this event that Moses is recalled to re-write the Law (Exod 34:1). Yahweh re-issues the Law-Covenant as an act of mercy (i.e., to bring them/teach them about Christ the ultimate expression of divine mercy). Paul bases much of his argument on Deuteronomy (see my original EJournal table) where it states that the Law came from Yahweh’s right hand (Deut 33:2). So, Moses failed in his first act as a mediator (reconciler) - - he was also unable to act as mediator (reconciler) on behalf of the sinners; “Whoever has sinned against Me, I will blot him out of My book” (Exod 32:33). This cannot be said of Christ. So the mediatorship of Moses and Christ are of a completely different nature.

I actually understand Gal.3:19-20 as a Pauline syllogism:

Major premise: the Law was mediated (by Moses/Angels on behalf of God)

Minor premise: a mediator does not act for one (for one party only, i.e., God)

Conclusion: therefore the Law had no mediator (God is one)

The point is that the Promise incorporates all who come by faith into the ‘One seed’ and therefore through Christ into the ‘One God’. This is meant to contrast with the Law and with the ‘mediator’ Moses who could not bring such unity. The Galatians were suffering from division between Jew and Gentile brought on by Law keeping. So, whereas the mediatorship of Moses brought division and disunity, the mediatorship of Christ brought ‘oneness’ because he abolished the Law of cursing.

In the final analysis the mediatorship of the Law and the Promise (Moses/Christ) were completely different – as similar as chalk and cheese. The Law brought cursing, the promise blessing (including the gentiles), the Law brought divisiveness, the Promise unity. The Law required a mediator who could both fulfil it and abolish it – this is something only Christ could do; “For one is God, one also is mediator of God and of men, the man Christ Jesus”. (Young’s Literal Translation

1 Tim 2:5).

No doubt this verse will be discussed further and more fruitful insights will be forthcoming.

**P. Wyns**

**Postscript**

In Gentile times, how do we answer the question, what facilitates people coming to know more about the Bible? I am thinking of turning points in history. We might start with the invention of the printing press and the translation of the Bible into the vernacular. These two turning points are the foundations that paved the way for Bible knowledge to be found by ordinary working people and for them to reject what was being promoted as the gospel by the established church.

These two turning points have grown over the years and we can add other turning points such as the faster means of travel and the growth of disposable income in the pockets of the lower classes facilitating widespread preaching. However, it is only in the last two decades with the advent of the Internet that cost-free promulgation of the gospel nationally and internationally has become possible and been realized.

Of course, the Internet might not be cost-free in the future (if there is such a thing), and there are small costs sometimes even now with e-mail, websites, print-on-demand, using PDFs, forums, etc. But my point is that the Internet is as revolutionary as the invention of the printing press in being a watershed event for people understanding the Bible. Just as the printing press and the translation of the Bible into the vernacular took away the monopoly the church had on the gospel through its clergy, so too now the Internet has taken away the monopoly that church publishing houses (organizations with money) have had over the dissemination of Bible knowledge ‘in print’.

One example of this is the ability to print books on demand. Prior to the Internet, there were considerable costs to getting books printed. Publishing companies controlled the market; you would have to get a book approved by commissioning editors and review readers. This set-up still exists, but it no longer prevents publishing. Within the Christadelphian community there has been an explosion of information online and through print-on-demand publishing. The Internet is a giant printing press that is, at the moment, pretty much cost-free.

There is advantage here but dangers as well. As it was after the invention of the printing press, we should expect less authority and greater plurality. However, there is also the possibility of better understanding of the Bible shared more widely and more quickly—and a better distribution of the responsibility for understanding the Bible in the community.
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