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**Editorial**

This issue sees the completion of the second year of the EJournal. Once again a paperback “Annual” has been produced of all four issues of 2008. The 2007 and 2008 Annuals are now available from the print-on-demand website [www.lulu.com/willowpublications](http://www.lulu.com/willowpublications) with printing and pricing (£6.61 and £5.46 in the UK) handled locally to the point of purchase as far as possible (e.g. USA, UK, etc.). This website has a purchase system very like Amazon, and both annuals have been proven to print.

Looking back over the last two years, perhaps the most important observation to make is that the articles that have been published represent a resource for future reference. Issues have added various building blocks which, when taken together, represent something of an alternative paradigm to that which prevails in academic scholarship. Thus, for example, articles have been published that claim back some prophetic books for the eighth century B.C.E. contrary to the trend in scholarship to prefer post-exilic dates; material has been published which gives priority to Israel in the purpose of God rather than the church thereby opposing supercessionist thinking in Christian theology; and papers have been published arguing that the bestowal of the Spirit in the first century came to an end with the ending of the Jewish Commonwealth in AD70. God-willing, this construction of an alternative paradigm will continue in the future in these and other directions.

As is well known, the Christadelphian community is a lay association with no professional clergy. Thus, lacking a Bible College, it has no academic tradition. It has relied on conservative academics to supply information on Bible Background. Hence, the EJournal is always on the lookout for this kind of material for future issues from subscribers. Next year, God-willing, issues will contain articles on topics in Joel, Isaiah, the historico-critical method, the Cessation of the Spirit, the Hope of Israel, chronology in Kings, Daniel, and Obadiah, with a balance of introductory as well as more advanced pieces.

In this issue, the *EJournal* introduces extended discussions of critical and conservative points of view on the Hebrew text using “problematic” texts in Genesis and Daniel. In addition to the more general expositional articles, the *EJournal* will, from time to time, include such philological pieces.

**Stephen and the Divine Council**

**John W. Adey**

**Introduction**

This study looks at aspects of what is called the Divine Council (DC). I refer to the Biblical concept only, seeing it as a depiction of Yahweh and His subordinate heavenly angelic hosts in the exercising of His will. I present a positional ‘sitting and standing’ pattern, both to draw attention to the DC’s theophanic framework and, with OT precedents, to account for Jesus’ DC ‘standing’ and not ‘sitting’ on the right hand of God in Stephen’s vision of heaven in Acts 7:55-56.[[1]](#footnote-2) My approach involves matching texts within and across the Bible’s testaments, especially where relevant quotation of the OT in the NT facilitates inner commentary, or reveals their user’s theological viewpoint. Common terminology and repeated conceptual identities yield a Biblical theophanic perspective which fits Stephen into an angelomorphic category.[[2]](#footnote-3)

**Prelude on Positioning (Sitting and Standing)**

Divine power, operative in the healing of a disabled man, powerfully enabled Peter and John’s preaching, and he is presented *standing* witnessing with the apostles:

And they knew that it was he which **sat** for alms at the Beautiful gate of the temple: Acts 3:10

And beholding the man which was healed **standing** with them, they could say nothing against it. Acts 4:14

Inevitably, this caused a clash in the temple with the Jewish authorities (“…the priests, captain of the temple, and the Sadducees” - Acts 4:1-3) and the apostles being brought before “…rulers, and elders, and scribes, Annas the high priest, Caiaphas, John, and Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest, gathered together at Jerusalem” (Acts 4:5-6).

The contrary counsel of this council is described thus:

When they commanded them to go aside out of the council, they [those judging the apostles] conferred among themselves.Saying, What shall we do to these men? for that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest to all them that dwell in Jerusalem; and we cannot deny it. But that it spread no further among the people, let us straitly threaten them, that they speak henceforth to no man in this name. And they called them, and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus. Acts 4:16-18

The apostles, as Divine agents, reacted to this by inviting the Jewish council to refocus their judgment:

But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, **judge you.** Acts 4:19

The apostles’ subsequent prayer pictures God’s overriding counsel as determining (recent) events, citing Ps 2:2 for its present prophetic fulfillment:

The kings of the earth stood up/took their stand (*yitaccübû* MT/ *paréstësan* NT), and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ…For to do whatsoever your hand and your counsel determined before to be done. Acts 4:26-28

We see this sitting and standing pattern in the following:

The scribesand the Pharisees **sit** in Moses’ **seat** (i.e., they presumed they did). Matt 23:2

…the elders, and the **scribes…**brought him to the Sanhedrin/**the council,** And set up /**caused to stand**false witnesses…For we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which **Moses** delivered us. And all that **sat** in the **council**, looking stedfastly on him [Stephen]… Acts 6:12-15

(We have only to recall God’s ‘sitting’ but not inactive state presented in Ps 2:4, as man is powerless to frustrate His will: “The One sitting in the heavens shall laugh…”.)

When a person’s case was judged before a judgment-seat, that person would not sit. Whilst “people standing” might include their waiting to appear before the judge, the point to note is that ‘stand’ is consistently coupled with ‘sitting’ in conventional council language in the Bible. A link between ‘standing’ and witnessing is analogous to the metaphor of a judgment then ‘standing’ in respect of the facts of a case. In fact, both a physical ‘standing up (against or for)’ someone and this metaphorical ‘establishing-standing’ sense occurs in this legal statement:

One witness shall not **rise up/stand up** [Heb: yäqûm] against a man for any iniquity, or for any sin, in any sin that he sinneth: At the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall the matter/word **be established/stand** [Heb: yäqûm] Deut 19:15[[3]](#footnote-4)

In Deut 19:15, just cited, the Hebrew for both ‘rise up’ and ‘shall be established’ is *yäqûm*, which could have been translated with ‘shall stand’ as some versions have for a priest’s estimation in Lev 27:14. A cognate of *yäqûm*, the imperative *qûmäh*, both forms of the Hebrew root *q-w-m* (*qûm*), is used in Psalm 82 in the context of the Divine Council when God is urged to ‘arise’ or ‘stand up’.

Arise/**stand up** [Heb: qûmäh], O God, **judge** the earth: for you shall inherit all nations. Ps 82:8

The request is for God to change His position from **sitting** (Psa. 2:4) to **standing** [Heb: niccäb] in the council of judgment (Psalm 82).[[4]](#footnote-5) The Psalm’s usage of the imperative *qûmäh* has a parallel or precedent in Moses’ plea:

And it came to pass, when the ark set forward, that Moses said, **Rise up** [Heb:qûmäh], YHWH, and let your enemies be scattered; and let them that hate you flee before you (Num. 10:35).

This matches Jesus, as we shall see, standing and responding to Stephen, at the end of Acts 7.

**Wrestling Jacob**

The theophanic moment in Jacob’s wrestling concerns him seeing God’s/´ël’s ‘face’, and as formerly at Beth-´ël, it involves angelic activity; a mediated angelic manifestation of God’s face makes possible the preservation of Jacob as he recognized (Gen 32:30): “You cannot see My face; for no man shall see Me, and live” (Exod 33:20). Although Jacob wrestled with a ‘man’, he soon came to realize that this was no ordinary ‘man’.[[5]](#footnote-6)

In English versions, ‘God’ translates both the singular Hebrew noun ´ël in ‘Peni´ël’ (‘face of ´ël’) and the plural noun ´élöhîm in “I have seen God face to face….” (Gen. 32:30). Jacob applies ´élöhîm - ‘God’ - to this wrestling ‘man’, conscious that he was a representative of ´ël; hence, his naming of the place ‘Peni´ël’ (Gen. 32:30). Accordingly, Hos 12:4 comments on this event, and identifies Jacob’s wrestling foe, this ‘face’ of God/´élöhîm whom Jacob *saw*, as an angel (Heb: mal´äk).

This interpretation of Gen 32:30 in Hos 12:4 is consistent with the NT conventions of theophany. For example, the inner biblical exegesis of Hosea corresponds intertextually with the ´élöhîm of Ps 8:6 being represented by aggelous ‘angels’ in Heb 2:9; or, similarly, ´élöhîm in Ps 97:7 is matched with ‘angels of God’ aggeloi theou in Heb 1:6;[[6]](#footnote-7) and again, ‘his angels’/mal´äkäyw in Ps 91:11 and 104:4 connects with tous aggelous autou in Matt 4:6, Luke 4:10 and Heb 1:7.[[7]](#footnote-8)

Though Jacob has wrestled with one man, the plural term ´élöhîm connects through the angel-man to ´ël/God, the God of Israel. The ‘God’ term ´élöhîm unites the Divine agent on earth manifesting, or representing the one, singular, unseeable God, the referent of ´ël. There are plenty of other Biblical texts which conform to these theophanic features, and show that the term ´élöhîm, as distinct from ´ël (or ´élôah, and ´ëlîm), marks in its plural form and semantics this extension(alising) of ´ël.[[8]](#footnote-9) Otherwise put, ´élöhîm references (or its *sense and reference* is of) a manifestational God; it marks the presencing (and thereby the accessing) of the ‘absent’ YHWH.

The ‘God’/´élöhîm in the Bush whom Moses engaged with in Exodus 3, Stephen says is “an angel of the Lord” (Acts 7:30, 35). This is the angel, of whom YHWH said later, “my name is in him” (Exod 23:20-21). As the manifestatory medium for God’s utterance, the angel does not say ‘thus says YHWH’ to Moses, or the like, but uses the first person pronoun,

I *am* the God/´élöhê [i.e., ´élöhîm in construct – ‘God of’ – form] of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God (Exod 3:6).

This form of speech is like Jesus’ ‘I am’ utterances in John’s Gospel.[[9]](#footnote-10)

Unmistakably, at the end of his speech, Stephen is directly linked with heaven (Acts 7:55-56). However, no doubt with irony, he is also so linked in Acts 6:15:

They saw his face as it had been the **face of** **an angel**. Acts 6:15

This theophanyin Stephen’s speaking recalls times when God’s bidding was manifest(ed) in the lives of Israel’s founding forebears. However, this recognitional expression about how he ‘appeared’, whether or not just a surface reading by those assembled, enables the pin-pointing of Stephen’s continuity with past theophanic episodes. The relation of ‘face’ + ‘angel’ prompts a connection with Jacob’s Peniel/ Penuel (Hebrew: ‘face of ´ël/God’) wrestling experience in Genesis 32. This remark of Stephen’s opponents places them into the typical position of a wrestling Jacob and Stephen into the angelomorphic position of one manifesting God. How observers ‘saw’ Stephen, or his face, interprets him as a Divine agent occupying an angelomorphic category. In Jesus’ terms this would be equivalent to Stephen being an “´élöhîm -theos to whom God’s word came” (‘theoi’ – ‘gods’ plural in John 10:34-35; cf. Psa. 82:6, which has ´élöhîm).[[10]](#footnote-11)

**Jacob’s Ladder**

Jacob’s vision at Bethel (Genesis 28) sees YHWH ‘standing’ above the ladder in heaven, and this connects with Stephen’s vision of Jesus as described in Acts 7:56. YHWH **stood** [Heb: niccäb the Niphal participle of ycb] above the ladder” whose top reached heaven (Gen 28:12-13), and Stephen sees Jesus **standing** with the heavens open. The same verbal form,niccäb, used of God’s action in Ps 82:1 (“God/´élöhîm **stands** in the congregation of God/´ël; He judges among the gods/´élöhîm”), is similarly contextualized in Isaiah 3. The parallelism in this Isaiah text leaves no doubt as to God’s stance: “YHWH **stands up** [Heb: niccäb] to plead, and **stands** [Heb: `ömëd] to judge the people” (Isa 3:13). In Gen 28:12, a cognate of the Niphal participle niccäb, the Hophal participle muccäb, is used to depict the positioning of the ladder: “it was set up” or “it stood” on the earth. Thus the ladder linking earth with heaven, and the means by which the angels ascend to or descend from the Most High at the top to the earth where Jacob was, is an analogue of God’s stationary position while at the same time He facilitates this bi-directional link.

The motifs of “standing”, “ascending and descending” should cause us to see analogues of Jacob’s ladder elsewhere, for example in respect of Mount Sinai. The verb ycb, which only occurs in Hithpael, seems similar in its semantic functions to ncb. For example, in Exod 19:17-20 the people **stand** (ycb) at the foot of Mount and YHWH descends upon it. While YHWH comes down, Moses goes up. Instead of a ladder there is Mount Sinai. Descending and ascending take place upon the mountain; heaven and earth are linked. To receive the Ten Commandments, Moses goes up Mount Sinai in Exodus 34. God tells him to ascend to the top and **stand** (from Hebrew: ncb) there, or (as per KJV) “**present** yourself to me there” (Exod 34:2). In Exod 34:5 we read: “And YHWH descended in the cloud, and **stood** with him there, and proclaimed in the name of YHWH. ‘Stood’ in v. 5 is Hithpael imperfect from the verb ycb, which, with respect to ‘standing’, functions like ncb; both are verb forms utilized similarly in this context. This functional correspondence between ycb and ncb, in the same or similar contexts about ascending and descending, and relating to standing stances of God and man, enable an intertextual paralleling between Ps 2:2’s “the kings of the earth **stood up** (ycb)”, quoted in Acts 4:26, and Ps 82:1, “God **stands** (ncb) in the congregation of God; he judges among the gods”.

In a similar way, Jacob’s ladder should be inferred in Stephen’s vision:

And said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God. Acts 7:56

This text attracts mention of Jesus’ words: “And he said…Hereafter you shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man” (John 1:51); this places Jesus into the position of the ladder. In typology and experience, at least in part, this connects Stephen’s vision with Jacob’s ladder experience, but Jesus is not now the ladder—he stands in YHWH’s position. As YHWH **stood** above the ladder, so Jesus **stands** beside God, with heaven opened, in support of Stephen. This moment is also conditioned by a Divine council ‘standing’ background, especially where there is a contrast with Jesus ‘sitting’ to Jesus ‘standing’.

**The Divine Council**

Members of the Divine Council, angels, were God’s medium of manifestation to men and women; they ‘were’ God, representatively (without confusion of persons): God’s ‘gods’ (Gk. theioi), as Jesus’ use of Psa. 82:6, the Divine council Psalm, in John 10:34 shows.[[11]](#footnote-12)

In Stephen’s vision, Jesus is **standing** on heavenly holy ground (so to speak), in the holiest of all (to which earthly material *antitypes* of the true pointed that are not able to ‘contain’ God - Acts 7:48). The ‘s**tanding**’ in heaven contrasts with Jesus’ ascended position beside Yahweh of ‘**sitting**’ as per Ps 110:1. So, Jesus, as a manifestor of ´ël (‘Immanu**el**’ Matt 1:23) his Father, is standing, urged by his witness’s case to ***arise*** to stand. Hence, Jesus is ´élöhîm standing. This corresponds with the ‘God’ terms, actions and place of witness or testimony (English versions’ ‘congregation’) in the Divine Council Psalm 82 (Hebraically rendered):

God/´élöhîm stands in the congregation of ´ël; he judges among the gods/´élöhîm (v. 1)

Arise/**Stand up**, O God/´élöhîm, judge the earth: for you shall inherit all nations (v. 8)

‘**Stand up**’ in judgment implies, applying Ps 2:4 to both Yahweh and the Son (acting for the Father), that until then He/he is **sitting**. Jesus sits in Ps 110:1.[[12]](#footnote-13) Regarding Stephen, he is one of the ´élöhîm in this council among whom Jesus pronounces judgment.

Stephen’s witness is based, among other things, on episodes of theophany in the Hebrew Bible:

**[1]** Acts 7: 2 The God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham (speaks to him later of God's future ‘judging’ of Egypt, v. 7. Also, it is Abraham, who, in Genesis 18 ‘stood’ before YHWH - the YHWH angel - as the other two angels descended on Sodom. Abraham, in this impending judgment context, reasoning for righteousness based on his knowledge of God's ways, in v. 25 calls YHWH: “the Judge of all the earth”).

**[2]** Acts 7:33 Then said the Lord [by the angel which **appeared** to him in the Bush (Acts 7:35, 38)] to him, Put off your shoes from your feet: for the place where on you **stand** is holy ground.

**[3]** Acts 7:53 Who have received the law by the **disposition of angels**, and have not kept it.

**[4]** Acts 7:55 But he, being full of the Holy Spirit, looked up stedfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God (cp. verse 2) and Jesus **standing** on the right hand of God.

Stephen communicates with Jesus both for himself and for his misguided countrymen, so that their sin would not be laid to their charge, which, unknown to Stephen, will later impact for good upon Saul of Tarsus. In Acts 8:1, the text just says that Saul was ‘consenting’ [Gk. suneudokōn] to Stephen’s death, which could connect with a council – agreement in judgment – background. However, complementing this reading, later, in Acts 22:20, when recounting this moment, Paul inserts ‘standing’: “And when the blood of your martyr [witness] Stephen was shed, I also was **standing** by, and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him.[[13]](#footnote-14) Finally, there is an irony to note in Stephen’s address. The charge levelled against Stephen is that “we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us” (Acts 6:14). The irony is in Moses, the Law-giver whom they revered, being one who also occupied an ´élöhîm-theos category.[[14]](#footnote-15) Moses, speaking God’s word which had come to him, initially at the Bush, was God/a god/´élöhîm to Pharaoh (Exod 7:1). Later Moses’, on Jethro’s advice, creates other judicial ‘G/god’/´élöhîm extensions (Exod 18:13- 24; 21:6; 22:8, 9).[[15]](#footnote-16)

**Conclusion**

Sitting and standing, or sitting versus standing, seem to be positionally significant features of theophanic-associated moments or acts of the Divine Council.

Jesus’ **standing** on Stephen’s behalf, seen by Stephen when the heavens opened, suggests Jesus is standing to judge. Jesus has arisen, and Stephen citing this implies a judgmental censure of the Sanhedrin’s earthly council of false witness.

This is a moment of significant contrast. The Jewish earthly council, before whom Stephen was charged, is the antithesis of the heavenly Divine council opened to Stephen’s view.

Stephen and Jesus ‘stood’ together in the Divine council. Stephen took the opportunity, though pressed upon, to make a plea for his false accusers (“Lord lay not this sin to their charge”) and asked Jesus directly, not in prayer, to receive his spirit, implying that he knew the Just One had justly judged him.

**The “Last Days” and the “Two Ages” of History**

**Andrew Perry**

The expression “last days” appears throughout the Jewish scriptures (evsca,twn tw/n h`merw/n/~ymyyh tyrxa[[16]](#footnote-17)—Gen 49:1; Num 24:14; Deut 4:30; 31:29; Jer 23:20; 30:24; 48:47; 49:39; Ezek 38:16; Hos 3:5) and can be considered to be a technical eschatological term for a first century audience; in Dan 2:28 (Aramaic), and 10:14 it appears as an apocalyptic[[17]](#footnote-18) term. Further, the use of the expression in the Qumran literature and elsewhere reflects a broader literary co-text, and this is evidence that a broad eschatological context would have also been assumed by NT writers, for example, Luke in his incorporation of Isa 2:2 alongside Joel 3:1-5 in Acts 2:17.

Certain Second Temple texts describe the past and present of history and envisage a time to come, which will be qualitatively different for humankind, and which has indefinite extent. In addition, some texts include a clearly defined segmentation of history. This division of history into two ages provides the framework for the concept of the “last days”. These texts associate “troubles” or “woes” [[18]](#footnote-19) with the “last days” and describe the “New Age” in utopian terms. For example,

1) Danieloffers various visions of history and a periodization that proved influential in Second Temple Judaism.[[19]](#footnote-20) The four kingdoms of Daniel 2 lead to a kingdom that will never be destroyed; the seventy weeks of Daniel 9 lead to a period of “everlasting righteousness”. Daniel includes material that attempts to calculate the end of history and when the transition to the new age will happen (Dan 7:25, 9:24, and 12:11-12).

In Ezekiel 38 and Daniel 10, the expression is used to denote a *period* where war(s) are waged against Israel. In Dan 10:14, the angel Gabriel (Dan 8:16) promises to make Daniel understand what would happen to Israel in the last days, and this “vision” is detailed in the *history* of the Ptolemies and Seleucids outlined in Daniel 11.

2) The *1 Enoch* corpus contains several eschatological blocks of material, however, at a certain level of generality, there is a uniform approach to the end of time. There is an awareness of periodization in history in the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (*1 En.* 93:1-10; 91:11-17), which concludes with “many weeks without number forever” (*1 En.* 91:17).[[20]](#footnote-21) It is the contrast with the linear progression[[21]](#footnote-22) of historical events with an indefinite period that forms the substance of Jewish “two-age” thinking.

A “two-age” view of history is expressed in the remark, “they will corrupt until the day of the great conclusion, until the great age is consummated, until everything is concluded (upon) the Watchers and the wicked ones” (*1 En.* 16:1, cf. 72:1), but this idea is presupposed throughout the component parts of the corpus.

The righteous are exhorted to follow the ways that leads to life (e.g. in the *Epistle of Enoch*, *1 En.* 94:4; 96:1-3; 99:3), and so ensure the survival of a remnant from the eschatological trouble (e.g. in the *Dream Visions*, *1 En.* 83:8-9, and in the *Epistle of Enoch*, *1 En*. 106:19; 107:1). This group of “the righteous” emerges in the *Apocalypse of Weeks* during the seventh week of human history (*1 En.* 93:10, cf. the “small lambs” of 90:6).

The new age that awaits the righteous is described in terms such as, for example, peace, truth, kindness and prosperity (*1 En.* 1:8; 11:1-2), or freedom from sin (*1 En.* 5:7-8), a new heaven and a new earth (*1 En.* 45:4-5), or as a restored Eden with the tree of life (*1 En.* 25:5-6).

3) *2 Enoch* expresses a dispensational view of the ages that comprise the “age of creation”, and states that,

…when the whole of creation…shall come to an end, and when each person will go to the Lord’s great judgment, then time periods will perish…they will constitute a single age. And all the righteous, who escape from the Lord’s great judgment, will be collected together with the great age. *2 En.* 65.7-8, cf. 66:6, 50:2

This prospect is made the basis of living a righteous life (*2 En.* 66:1-2).

4) J. J. Collins asserts that the “last days” in the Dead Sea Scrolls “has two aspects. It is a time of testing, and it is a time of at least incipient salvation”.[[22]](#footnote-23) This generalization can be illustrated from a selection of texts:

i) 11Q13 assigns various distinct happenings to the “last days” (~ymiyh tyrxal, II, 4). There is a proclamation of “release” to the captives (II, 3-4), who are made to return by a Melchizedek figure (II, 5-6); there is a time for the “rule of judgment” (II, 9) and “the vengeance of Go[d’s] judgments” (II, 13) upon the peoples. This figure is “anointed of the spir[it]” (II, 18), a messenger who announces good news. The text does not describe a situation where Israel has been restored, but rather the events that bring about her restoration: a return of captives and judgment upon the peoples. The text achieves this through its pesher interpretations of Jewish scriptural texts such as Lev 25:13, Deut 15:2, Ps 82:2, Isa 52:7, 61:1-2, and Dan 9:25. If an identity is assigned to the “last days”, it is a tenth Jubilee “week” in which both release of the captives occurs and vengeance upon the peoples. At the end of this week there is a Day of Atonement (II, 7) after which God will rule. This text *presupposes* the presence of Melchizedek as a precondition for the transition to God’s rule.

ii) 4Q174 offers a pesher interpretation of 2 Sam 7:10 to predict that the temple will be established in the last days (I, 1-5). After this Yahweh will “appear over it forever” (I, 5). It also offers a pesher interpretation of Amos 9:11 to predict that the “branch of David” will be raised up in the last days to save Israel (I, 11-13). This “salvation” appears to be set against a “time of trial” (II, 1) in which the nations conspire against Israel (I, 18), which is the pesher offered for Ps 2:1.

iii) 4Q246 II, 1-9 describe a figure called the “son of God” whose kingdom replaces a state in which peoples wage war against one another.

iv) 4Q177 describes a time in the last days when the faithful community will be tested and refined by those in Israel who are a “congregation” of the wicked (II, 10-16). This is a “period of distress” (IV, 13, twn[ t[). 1QpHab II, 3-6 may offer a further identification of this group as “the traito[rs of the] new [covenant]”, and 4Q169 Frags. 3-4, II, 2 may also refer to the same group as “those looking for easy interpretations” (compare also 4Q385a Frag. 41, 4, and 4Q387a Frag. 2, 6).

v) 4Q398 describes the last days as the time when there will be a “turning to the Law” (Frags. 11-13, line 4) after there has been “blessing [and the] curse” (Frags. 14-17, Col. I, line 6). This implies a period of eschatological woes insofar as blessings and curses run up until[[23]](#footnote-24) the last days and fulfill the terms of the Deuteronomistic “blessings and curse” list (Deuteronomy 28). The text exhorts the faithful to persevere (Frags. 14-17, Col. II, lines 1-8) in the face of the behaviour of those of Belial.

vi) 1Q28a states that Community Rule was “the rule of all the congregation of Israel in the last days (~ymyh tyrxab), when they gather [in community to wa]lk” (1Q28a I, 1). This implies some recognition on the part of the text’s authors that they were living in the last days to the extent that the Community Rule was a guide for the Qumran covenanters.

vii) 4Q504 Frags. 1-2, III, 13-14 states that “evil would [over]take us in the last days”, and this follows a broken clause that refers to the “precepts” of Moses, and which presumably constituted the antecedent condition that the people had disobeyed the Law. The provenance of the “last days” is not clear, but it offers further evidence of the link between eschatological woes and the “last days”.

viii) CD 19:10-15 describes the coming of the “messiah of Aaron and Israel” and the “day of visitation” in which the wicked rulers of the people will be punished. CD 20:14 includes a calculation of the arrival of the “age of wrath”, at 40 years after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness. 1QpHab VII, 6-13 includes an exhortation to wait patiently for the last days, which offers evidence of that the Qumran community recognized a delay in the arrival of the age of wrath.

ix) Various Qumran texts also presuppose a periodization of history (e.g. 4Q180 lines 1-5; CD XVI, 4; XX, 14; 11Q13 II, 7, 18, 21). Thus, 1QS IV, 18-19 presumes a two-age model of history in the remark, “God…has determined an end to the existence of injustice and on the appointed time of the visitation he will obliterate it forever”. This model is developed in conjunction with the dualism of the “two spirits”; the new age will bring an end to the conflict between the two spirits. It is this period of time which can be termed a “new age” rather than any preceding time in which there is conflict.

The texts cited in (i)-(ix) state or assume a two-age view of history. Some offer a nationalistic eschatology centred on the presence of a heavenly individual (11Q13, cf. 4Q174) whose actions lead to the new age; others focus on the faithful community and its testing in the last days (4Q177).

Events that presage the new age such as the coming of eschatological deliverers or the building of the eschatological temple are future, but it is possible that some Qumran texts reflect the view that the eschatological woes had begun (1Q28a, 4Q398). This seems to be the implication in coupling woe material with exhortations to faithfulness (4Q177). On the other hand, some texts (1QpHab) imply that there is a delay in the arrival of the age of wrath.

5) *Jubilees* does not devote much space to eschatology, but it does give an account of various “woes” that would come upon an “evil generation” of the people (*Jub.* 23:14, 16, 22) including war, famine, plague (*Jub.* 23:13-25) and cause them to return to the Lord and his commandments (*Jub.* 23:26, cf. 1:23-29). In consequence the people have their lives extended so that they approach a thousand years and they will enjoy blessings from God and “rejoice forever and ever with joy” (*Jub.* 23:30). The picture here contrasts a period characterized by “joy” with a period characterized by “evil”. There is no cataclysmic transition to the “new age”, no single event, but the text presents the view that a period characterized with “evils” would not be the time of “joy”. This text identifies the transition as a “day of the great judgment” (*Jub.* 23:11), when Israel will “see all of their judgments and all of their curses among their enemies” (*Jub.* 23:30).

6) The two-age view of world history is also found in Jewish apocalypses that in part respond to the destruction of Jerusalem.

i) *4 Ezra* expresses extensive eschatological teaching expressed from a post-70 C.E. perspective. Set against the question of how God will act to relieve Israel’s post-70 C.E. plight, Ezra is given an eschatological answer as a basis for hope. In the first vision, the current age was “hastening swiftly to its end” (*4 Ezra* 4:27) and various “woes” would come upon the earth and the land (*4 Ezra* 5:1-13) prior to the coming of the “good field” (*4 Ezra* 4:29). In the second vision, signs are described which are for “when the seal is placed upon the age which is about to pass away” (*4 Ezra* 6:20). In the third vision, *4 Ezra* explicitly expresses a two age view, “the Most High has made not one world but two” (*4 Ezra* 7.50).

The future age is again contrasted with the present age in terms of various “evils” and “goods” (*4 Ezra* 7.12, 13, 31), and the transition to the new age occurs on the Day of Judgment, “the day of judgment will be the end of this age and the beginning of the immortal age to come” (*4 Ezra* 7.112-14). Those who survive the “woes” will see God’s salvation “in the land” (*4 Ezra* 9:8). In the fifth (Eagle) vision, the people are delivered from the Eagle-power by the messiah (*4 Ezra* 12:32-34). While there are differences in detail to be marked between the various visions, a broad two-age pattern is present and the transition to the new age is predicated upon the Day of Judgment and the advent of a messiah-figure.

ii) *2 Baruch* also expresses a post-70 C.E. perspective. Eschatological woes are described (*2 Baruch* 27:1-15; 70:2-10), after which “the Anointed One will begin to be revealed” (*2 Baruch* 29:3; 70:9; 72:2) for the judgment of the nations (*2 Baruch* 72:1-6), and then there is a restoration of fruitfulness to the earth (*2 Baruch* 29:5-8; 73:1-74:4) and a resurrection of the dead (*2 Baruch* 30). *2 Baruch* like *4 Ezra* predicates a transition to a new age upon the advent of a messiah-figure.

iii) The *Apocalypse of Abraham*, another post-70 C.E. work, categorizes the eschatological woes as a series of plagues in the “last days” conceived of as the twelfth “hour” of twelve assigned to “the impious age” (*Apoc. Ab.* 29:1-2; 30:1-8). These woes come on the heathen before the “age of justice”, which is characterized by truth and justice (*Apoc. Ab.* 29:18). The transition to this new age involves God’s “chosen one” (*Apoc. Ab.* 31:1-2) who will take vengeance on the heathen who have humiliated God’s people.

7) The *Testament of Moses* details war and persecution for Israel by a “king of kings” (*T. Mos*. 8:1) as well as the misrule of godless men from within the nation (*T. Mos*. 7). These conditions will happen when times “will quickly come to an end” (*T. Mos*. 7:1), and scholars have noted that allusions to Maccabean events suggest that the author of this part of the *Testament of Moses* believed that these eschatological woes were currently in process.[[24]](#footnote-25) After these happenings, other woes will occur presaging the new age (*T. Mos.* 10.4-5), woes that echo such “Day of the Lord” texts as Joel 2:10, 4:15, and Isa 13:10. These woes are enacted on the nations by the “Heavenly One” arising from his throne “on behalf of his sons” (*T. Mos.* 10:3-7) after which Israel will be established (*T. Mos.* 10:8-10).

8) *Pss. of Solomon* 17:21-46 delineates the Davidic messiah’s role to be one of restoration: Jerusalem is to be purged of Gentiles and unrighteous rulers (v. 22), Israel is to be regathered (v. 26), land is to be redistributed (v. 28), and nations will be ruled over (v. 29) in righteousness (v. 32). This expression of hope is invoked by the psalmist in response to the destruction of the land and Jerusalem (vv. 11, 14) and the scattering of the people (v. 18). This text petitions for the *advent* of the messiah to effect the transition to the new age.

9) The *Sibylline Oracles III* depicts a pattern where “woes” precede the advent of a saviour. For example, the last oracle (589-808) describes the end-time from the perspective of the writer. There are appeals for repentance (545-570, 624-634, 732-740, 762-767), description of the woes of war (635-651, 796-808), the sending of a “king from the sun” (652-656), an assault on Jerusalem (657-668), the cosmic judgments of God (669-701), the deliverance of Jerusalem (702-709), and the conversion of the nations (710-731); then there will be established a “kingdom for all ages” (766-795). This text identifies a critical advent of a messiah-figure to bring about deliverance, but it also juxtaposes appeals for repentance (624-631) with descriptions of the eschatological woes.

This brief review of eschatological texts, (1)–(9), is not designed to be exhaustive or enter into the complexities of exegesis. Second Temple texts do not present a uniform view of the “last days”; furthermore many texts have a complex redactional history, and this affects their value as evidence of Jewish thought contemporary with Luke. We present this evidence to support the proposition that at a certain level Jewish thought worked with a two-age view of history. The transition to the new age is focused around the actions of an individual (sometimes two individuals). The new age is to be preceded by woes, during which an eschatological community is encouraged to persevere. When the eschatological deliverer[[25]](#footnote-26) comes he will inflict judgments and usher in the new age; the beneficent rule of the deliverer characterizes the new age. D. S. Russell offers a heavily qualified generalization of what he defines as “apocalyptic eschatology”.[[26]](#footnote-27) He avers that Second Temple “apocalyptic texts” assume a two-age view of history, characterize the new age as one that is free of all that is wrong in the old age, and describe a transition to the new age that is cataclysmic. Russell enumerates additional characteristics shared between his selected apocalyptic texts. Allowing for a difference in detail across Russell’s “apocalyptic” texts, this body of literature presents a *violent* transition to the new age. D. C. Allison comments that “many of the ancient Jewish texts that foretell the end of the present world order also announce the coming of a great tribulation, a final time of trouble that is to mark the transition between this age and the messianic age or the age to come”.[[27]](#footnote-28) Collins concludes his analysis of the phrase “the last days” in Qumran texts by saying, “…this period includes the time of testing and eschatological distress. It includes the dawning of the era of salvation, with the coming of the messiahs, and at least in some sources it extends to the final war. It does not, however, include the final salvation that is to follow the eschatological battle”.[[28]](#footnote-29)

**How Types and Antitypes relate to each other and to the True**

**John W Adey**

**Christ is first.** All is patterned off him as He is the True. Rightly, no one applies ‘type’ (Gk: tupos), given us in Scripture, to Jesus, but how often does one find commentators of various persuasions calling him an ‘antitype’? Yet, just as the word ‘type’ is used in the Greek New Testament, and we apply it, so in Heb 9:24 the plural of ‘antitype’ (Gk: antitupa) occurs and is the precedent for our use.

If we applied this term as Scripture does in this case, just as we apply ‘type’ from Scripture, then we would not even consider applying ‘antitype’ to Christ. Just because he is not the type this does not make him, on Scriptural usage, an ‘antitype’! In order of greatness, Jesus is ‘better than’…. He is the origin of, or original for, the representations (in type, antitypes, shadow, examples, etc.), though they may come before him and have their moment before his, in Old Testament time (“then present” Heb 9:9).

These signifiers constitute the identity of Christ; his spirit in the prophets/prophecies (“…beginning with Moses and all the prophets…he expounded unto them the things concerning himself” Luke 24:27). They are what it is to be his ‘I am’ before he was.

|  |
| --- |
| **The True**  **Jesus Christ our Lord**  Not a type or antitype  He is before all things, and by him all things consist/stand  …He has the pre-eminence.  (Col 1:17-18)  The very image of good things (to come)  Of…the heavenly things themselves (Heb. 9:23; 10:1) |
|
|
| The actual reality/the original – “the beginning” (Col 1:18) –  **He is (to be) the one who is represented by type and antitypes\*** |
| Gk: alēthinōn - **the true**  Heb 9:24 …**the true** = heaven itself…the presence of God |
| Heb 9:11 Christ...a greater and more perfect tabernacle |
| Heb 9:34 Christ entering the presence of God in heaven…  Holy of holies – not made with hands |
| Christ and his sacrifice  Rev 5:2 Worthy is the lamb that was slain... |
| Jesus’ *baptismal* death  Rev 1:5 He **washed** us from our sins in his own blood |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Relations of/to the True: representational order & levels[[29]](#footnote-30)**  Heb 8:5 Who serve unto the example/pattern/token [Gk: hupodeigmati] and shadow of heavenly things.  Heb 9:23 …the patterns/examples/tokens [Gk: hupodeigmata] of things in the heavens.  Both are shadows or tokens of the true | |
| **Level 1** | **Level 2** |
| **Type**  **A pattern; prophetic model; based on the True**  **The descriptive stage or idea** | **Antitype(s)**  **Fulfilment of the type; of what it previewed.**  **Implementation of the idea described**  **“The Holy Spirit this *signifying…*”** Heb. 9:8 |
| Vision (or communicated idea) of the reality.  Or, a **representation** of the True | A realization of the type or vision:  **Representing materially or in ritual what was shown** (to Moses) in the **type** of the True. |
| Gk: tupon – KJV ‘pattern’  ***Shown*** to Moses  Heb. 8:5 by God…to make…all things according to thepattern/**type** shewed to thee in the mount. | Gk: antitupa – **KJV ‘figures’**  Heb 9:24 For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the **figures** of the true |
| Tabernacle Heb 9:24  **\***Note: Equation of ‘antitype’ with ‘parable’ Heb 9:8-9 |
| Heb 9:25 High Priest entering the holy place  Holy of holies – made with hands |
| Rev 13:8 (cp. Gen. 3:21)  Lamb slain from the foundation of the world | Passover and other sacrifices |
| Baptism (as a concept and before Christ’s death)  Baptised into Moses (in cloud and in the sea)  1 Cor 10:11 All these things happened to them **typically/tupikōs** | Saved by water (after Christ’s death)  1 Pet 3:21 - the **like figure/antitupon**…  Heb 10:22 - bodies washed in pure  water  1 Cor 6:11 - Now ye are washed…  Rev 7:14 - these…have washed their robes…in the blood of the lamb |

**Jewish Targums**

**Andrew Perry**

Targumic traditions developed in the day-to-day synagogue application of Scripture, (as Hebrew ceased to be the vernacular and was replaced by Aramaic), and they are a witness for identifying *common* theological conceptions among ordinary Jews in Jesus’ day. However, the Targums as we have them are professional translations,[[30]](#footnote-31) which involved rabbinical schools *after* the first century. Accordingly, their value as evidence of first century thought is qualified. However, as G. Vermes notes, the Targums have an advantage as to evidence compared with other rabbinical literature because the Aramaic texts were “probably subjected to a less thorough updating than the *Mishnah*, *Tosefta*, Talmud and halakhic Midrashim”.[[31]](#footnote-32) The main Targums of value for understanding NT times are the Palestinian Pentateuchal Targums, *Neofiti*, *Fragment Targum*, *Pseudo-Jonathan* and *Onqelos*, and the main Targum for the History books and the Prophets, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*.[[32]](#footnote-33)

It has long been held that the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch have “preserved many exegetical traditions which would have circulated in the Jewish community of the first century”.[[33]](#footnote-34) However, an early date for the Palestinian Targums *as a whole* cannot be an assumption in any comparative investigation of the Targums.[[34]](#footnote-35) M. J. McNamara,[[35]](#footnote-36) one of the leading Targumic scholars, argues that the language of *Neofiti* and *Fragment Targum* suggests a 3c. C.E. date, includes earlier tradition, but does not preclude there having been a “proto-Palestinian” Targum in the first century from which *Onqelos* and *Neofiti* derive. S. A. Kaufman, another leading scholar, treats *Pseudo-Jonathan* as a late post-Talmudic composite Targum based on *Onqelos* and Palestinian Targum traditions.[[36]](#footnote-37) Thus, McNamara’s (2004) latest summary of scholarship is that, “it is now generally recognized that *Pseudo-Jonathan* should not properly be classified as representing the Palestinian Targum…it is the work of a scholar and was not intended for synagogue use”.[[37]](#footnote-38)

It is important to recognize the relative dates of the various Targums when using them as a source of information about Jewish ideas in the first century. There is no one “Jewish Targum” but several, and the main writing of each of the Targums dates from different times. *Pseudo-Jonathan* is the least valuable as evidence, while *Onqelos* and *Neofiti* have some value.

Scholars locate *Onqelos* in either Babylon or Palestine.[[38]](#footnote-39) B. Grossfeld adopts the latter view speculating that there was a *Proto-Onqelos* “containing older Palestinian traditions which were preserved throughout the final redaction process in Babylonia”.[[39]](#footnote-40) McNamara notes that several scholars date the language of *Onqelos* to the early 2c.[[40]](#footnote-41) On this basis, we would assign *Onqelos* greater weight as evidence of first century views. Our assumption would be that the Palestinian Targums, including *Onqelos*, represent *alternative* though not necessarily competing traditions, some of which reflect first century views.

The date and place of origin for *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* has been assigned to Palestine and the late first century or early second century. Because of the linguistic affinity between *Onqelos* and *Targum Jonathan*, the two Targums are often given the same provenance.[[41]](#footnote-42) L. Smolar and M. Aberbach, after reviewing scholarship on the question of dating, conclude that *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets “*is a late first century-early second century work which originated and was first developed in the land of Israel before being brought to Babylonia where it was redacted prior to the Arab invasion”.[[42]](#footnote-43) This is a reasonable assumption, and as such, it admits *Targum Jonathan* as evidence of first century Judaism.[[43]](#footnote-44)

The multi-volume nature of *Targum Jonathan* requires us to be aware of the issues concerning the dating and authorship of each of the volumes; accordingly, the conclusion of Smolar and Aberbach is only indicative. Hence, D. J. Harrington and A. J. Saldarini favour a date for the *Former Prophets* (History Books) of 135 C.E., but recognise the need to take into account a period of later redactional composition. R. D. Hayward argues that there are “sufficient grounds for discerning the origins of *Tg*. *Jeremiah* in the land of Israel during, or slightly before, the first century A.D” but allow for later editing. R. P. Gordon and K. J. Cathcart argue for a literary composition after 70 C.E. for the Minor Prophets, *and so on*. B. D. Chilton, who edited the Isaiah volume in the *Aramaic Bible Series*, offers the consensus view that, “it is impossible to know whether a complete Targum was produced at the Tannaitic phase [c. 70-200 C.E.], and reworked at the Amoraic phase [c. 200-400 C.E.], or whether both phases were partial affairs”. Accordingly, the evidence that *Targum Jonathan* can provide for first century Jewish thought ought to be restricted to the provision of analogies with other more precisely dateable first century materials.

In conclusion, we can say that while scholars use the Jewish Targums as evidence of first century thought, their use can only be tentative; they can support clearer lines of evidence for first century thought from documents known to be extant in the first century, but only with the provision of analogies.

**The Composition of Job**

**Andrew Perry**

Scholars assert that the book of Job bristles with problems of textual integrity.[[44]](#footnote-45) A discussion of these issues is beyond the scope of this article; instead our argument is that the textual problems highlighted by scholars can be resolved with a new kind of reading for the book, one that sets the book in a political and military context in dialogue with the 8c. prophets.

Some of the leading compositional issues include,

* The speeches *appear* to be in three cycles with a definite pattern (Eliphaz, Job, Bildad, Job, Zophar, Job, etc.), except that in the “third cycle” the pattern breaks down; Bildad’s speech is much shorter and Zophar does not have a speech. This has led scholars to propose that the text is disturbed and they offer reconstructions that restore the pattern. Some of the things that Job says in the third cycle are taken to represent the views of the friends, and this is where scholars reconstruct Zophar’s and Bildad’s third speeches.[[45]](#footnote-46)

For example, D. J. A. Clines argues, following other scholars, that Job 26:5-14 belongs to Bildad’s third speech and that Job 27:13-28:28 is Zophar’s missing third speech.[[46]](#footnote-47) However, we would argue that the text has not been disturbed and instead follow the treatment of F. I. Andersen[[47]](#footnote-48) in regarding Job as speaking all of Job 26-27. This means that there is no third speech for Zophar and Bildad’s “speech” is just an invited interruption by Job, who says, “If it is not so, who will prove me a liar, and show that there is nothing in what I say?” (Job 24:25).

If Zophar’s speech is absent, and Bildad’s speech is more of an interruption, and the text is not disturbed, then the proposal that there are three cycles of speeches is severely weakened. Instead, it needs to be recognized that there are only *two* cycles of speeches, which are concluded by Eliphaz summarizing the friends’ position in Job 22:

J / E:J:B:J:Z:J / E:J:B:J:Z:J /E

This would make Eliphaz’ speech the structural counterpart to Job’s opening speech with both standing outside the two cycles. Eliphaz’ last speech brings to a close the “first day” of speeches, and the next day begins with Job, saying, “Today also my complaint is bitter” (Job 23:2).[[48]](#footnote-49) D. Wolfers’ conclusion is that “it is impossible to construct from any extant material a Third Cycle which is thematically consistent in the way that the first and second cycles are”.[[49]](#footnote-50)

We see nothing convincing in the reconstructions of scholars for three cycles, and there is value in providing a *final form* reading.[[50]](#footnote-51)

* There is a poem about Wisdom in the middle of the book (Job 28), which is placed into the mouth of Job. Its character has led scholars to observe that it is out of keeping with the tenor of Job’s remarks; it is often interpreted as an interpolation by the author or a later hand. We regard it is a *partial* digression spoken by Job, whom the author states “continues” his parable in Job 29:1.
* Elihu’s speeches are the subject of dispute. Scholars observe that he is not mentioned in the prologue or epilogue, and that Job does not reply to him. Some scholars argue that he is a later addition to the book, e.g. E. H. Dhorme.[[51]](#footnote-52) We follow R. Gordis[[52]](#footnote-53) and others and treat Elihu as integral to the book’s design.
* Another area of dispute is how the narrative envelope and the dialogue relate to each other. Reading the dialogue without the scene setting of the prologue engenders the impression that Job’s situation is much worse; there are social, military and political aspects to his circumstances as well as his physical affliction. The Hebrew of the prologue is different to that of the dialogue. The consensus of scholarship is that the prologue reflects an ancient folklore, which has been adapted to exist with the poem.

Nevertheless, the narrative envelope and the dialogues are linked in such a way that indicates that the book was intended to be read as a unity. We do not need to split the two types of material and assign different authors and a different purpose. They are linked by the way the action flows into the dialogues. Thus the friends come and comfort Job; when they finish speaking, Elihu is introduced; God comes and gives Job an answer, and on the basis of this answer instructs Job to sacrifice for his friends at the close of the book. In addition, there are multiple intertextual links between all the speeches which lend cohesion to the book.[[53]](#footnote-54)

Thus, we treat the book as a literary unit. This takes the book “as is” and places issues of composition to one side.[[54]](#footnote-55) We assume that the prologue/epilogue, the “wisdom poem” of Job 28, the currently assigned speeches of Job and the friends, God’s speeches, and Elihu’s speeches, are all an integral part of the book for the purposes of our analysis. Our view is that the book has an identifiable *author* of both the narrative sections and the poetic dialogues, including those of Elihu.

Nothing in scholarship invalidates such a reading, but to defend its unity would require a different sort of commentary to those currently available. Thus, while it may be true to observe that there is a difference in style and language in the Hebrew of Elihu’s speeches compared to those of the three friends, (there are more Aramaisms), or in the Wisdom Poem of Job 28, or in God’s speeches, such differences do not have to imply different authors of these parts; it could be that an author worked on the book at different times in his life, in different locales, or chose different styles and a different vocabulary for the different voices. If we can present a successful reading of the whole book, then this is an argument for the integral unity of the book.

C. A. Newsom offers a recent discussion of the question of composition, unity, and genre in *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*.[[55]](#footnote-56) She argues that those who assert the unity of the book have trouble offering a convincing explanation of the genre of the book, given the disparity between the prologue/epilogue and the dialogue. Our solution to this challenge is to say that the unity of the prologue/epilogue with the dialogue is achieved by there being a parabolic level of meaning in the prologue, which coheres with the political/military concerns of the dialogue. The genre of Job is therefore unique;[[56]](#footnote-57) but for want of a definition, we would propose that it is a work of the *prophetic imagination*. It is a dramatized lament with associated consolation; it is a disputation about the causes, the progress, and the resolution of the political and military situation of “Job”. It is a work of “providential wisdom”—the wisdom of God’s dealings with his covenant people and the “ideal” righteous Davidic king.[[57]](#footnote-58)

Scholarship is motivated by five factors when it argues for a complex history of composition of Job involving, first, an oral folktale, then an original author of a shortened version of the book and, finally, later editors.[[58]](#footnote-59)

1) Scholars do not see how the MT makes sense; they do not see how certain verses are consistent or coherent with surrounding material, and so they propose amendments to the text, reassign verses to different speakers, or re-order material. Such “errors” are assigned to editors and the vagaries of transmission.

2) Scholars perceive that the poetic structures of some verses are not “right” (according to some poetic theory) and so they suggest that the text has been corrupted or intentionally changed, and they propose corrective amendments to the text. Their amendments hypothesize about editorial activity, and in effect they put forward new versions of the poem of Job to that recorded in the MT.

3) Scholars do not understand the poetic figures. It is often the case that the author of Job puts together words, each of which has a conventional meaning outside Job, but when put together produce an apparently very odd figure; commentators often amend the Hebrew or ignore the pattern of usage outside Job and propose a unique sense for a constituent word in Job; they often rely on comparative philology for these proposals.

4) Fourthly, because of difficulty in comprehending the sense of the MT, scholars argue that text makes better sense if it is adjusted in respect of the separation of words, vocalization, obvious omissions, and scribal errors.[[59]](#footnote-60)

5) Finally, scholars propose amendments to the text that are consistent with their overall reading of the book. Thus deletions and alterations may be proposed that make a speech represent preconceived ideas about what a speaker should be saying if he is to be a consistent character; or such changes may be proposed in order to fit a theory about the development of a theme.

In respect of these amendments, Pope notes that “the Masoretic Hebrew remains our primary source for the Book of Job, even though in many places the text is corrupt or obscure and has to be emended in order to yield any acceptable sense”.[[60]](#footnote-61) But he warns, “…the text has certainly been tampered with before and has suffered greatly in transmission. It would, however, be extremely naïve for anyone to place too much confidence in any of the ingenious and learned textual restorations and emendations contained in the commentaries and the extensive periodical literature on Job”.[[61]](#footnote-62)

The assessment of claims that the text of Job is corrupt depends on how the book is read and a view of its genre. Our argument is that if the book is read in connection with the Prophets and in a political and military setting, then the poetic forms of the existing text can be read as part of a complete design in which the problem of innocent suffering is discussed in relation to the suffering of the ideal Davidic king of the covenant people.

**Book Notices**

I. Young, R. Rezetko and M. Ehrensvärd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*. Volume 1: *An Introduction to Approaches and Problems*. Volume 2: *A Survey of Scholarship, a New Synthesis and a Comprehensive Bibliography*. London: Equinox Publishing, October 2008.

In the last few years a challenge has been mounted to the consensus view that biblical Hebrew (BH) can be divided into two discrete historical periods, Early Biblical Hebrew (EBH) and Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH). The starting point for this challenge was the publication of a volume that I. Young edited, *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology* (2003). The above two volumes, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, continue this argument.

EBH, according to the most widely held view, is the language of the pre-exilic or monarchic period, down to the fall of the kingdom of Judah to the Babylonians in 586 B.C.E. The exile in the sixth century BCE marks a transitional period, the great watershed in the history of BH. After the return from exile in the late sixth century B.C.E., we have the era of LBH. Thus, EBH developed into LBH. Hebrew biblical texts can, therefore, be dated on linguistic grounds because LBH was not written early, nor did EBH continue to be written after the transition to LBH.

I. Young, R. Rezetko and M. Ehrensvärd suggest that following through the logic of this chronological approach to BH actually leads inevitably to the conclusion that *all* the biblical texts were composed in the post-exilic period, which is exactly the opposite of what its proponents have claimed. This may in fact be a conclusion which is congenial to some, but other scholars would not find this agreeable, so Young, Rezetko and Ehrensvärd offer a way out of this conclusion by arguing that the presuppositions of the chronological approach are undermined by the evidence. On the contrary, they argue that the best model for comprehending the evidence is that ‘Early’ BH and ‘Late’ BH, so-called, represent co-existing styles of Hebrew throughout the biblical period. They deal with the objection that Persian loanwords are an irrefutable proof that the chronological approach is correct. More generally, they address the question of the presuppositions involved in the dating—by linguistic or other means—of the books of the Hebrew Bible.

**Discussions**

Two discussions are included in this issue that centre on the integrity of the Hebrew text. Scholars often propose emendments to the text of a word or a phrase, and they often suggest complex compositional histories for books of the OT including hypothesizing about editorial work with later insertions and changes by such editors. Such hypotheses arise from the perceived difficulties of scholars in understanding the text, and as such they challenge anyone to answer the question: Is the Masoretic text the best as it stands or does it require emendation?

**Desire in Genesis**

**Paul Wyns**

**Introduction**

The term desire *theshuqah*[[62]](#footnote-63) is used only three times in the Old Testament. It is employed twice in Genesis (3:16; 4:17) and once in Song of Songs (7:10). The term has generated controversy,[[63]](#footnote-64) particularly with regard to its use in Gen 3:16b, “Your desire shall be for your husband, And he shall rule over you”.[[64]](#footnote-65) This verse has been debated over the centuries; more so recently by feminist interpreters; probably as a reaction against extremely chauvinistic (sometimes verging on misogynistic) interpretations. Because lexical and etymological studies of the term have yielded scant results, I. A. Busenitz concludes that the central consideration in the interpretation of Gen 3:16b **is context**; the meaning of “desire” is best determined in the light of its immediate contextual setting.[[65]](#footnote-66) This is essentially the approach adopted by this article; the term is analyzed within its wider context, but first a text critical emendation is proposed. On the basis of the proposed textual emendation a fresh contextual reading will be offered.

**Text Critical Proposals**

The function and purpose of textual criticism is to reconstruct the original wording of the Biblical text and to establish the history of transmission of the text through the centuries. However, in no single instance is the autograph available and therefore the reconstruction of a critical text is always, to a certain extent, subjective. In order to analyze the Hebrew term translated as “desire” in Gen 3:16b it is appropriate to compare it with Gen 4:7 as it demonstrates parallel verbal usage. However, although scholars readily acknowledge the similarity in grammatical construction between Gen 3:16b and Gen 4:7b, they discount the usefulness of Gen 4:7b in determining the meaning of 3:16b, as it is itself considered to contain interpretive uncertainties.[[66]](#footnote-67) The similarity between the texts is immediately recognizable:

Your desire *shall be* for your husband, And he shall rule over you. Gen 3:16b

And its desire *is* for you, but you should rule over it. Gen 4:7b

Many scholars admit that Gen 4:7 is one of the most difficult in all of the OT to understand. J. Skinner [[67]](#footnote-68) has observed: “Every attempt to extract a meaning from the verse is more or less of a *tour de force*, and it is nearly certain that the obscurity is due to deep-seated textual corruptions”.

The text is grammatically puzzling, for in *theshuqtho* (“his/its desire”) the pronominal suffix is masculine. If the antecedent were “sin [*khata’t*] crouching at the door,” one would expect a feminine pronominal suffix, since “sin” is feminine.

“Sin” in Gen 4:7 is usually understood as a zoomorphism, G. Von Rad comments:

In v. 7b the final *t* of *Ha††ä´t* (“sin”) is best taken as the initial letter of the following verb form and read *Hë†’* *tirbac* (“sin lies in wait”); then one obtains the expected feminine form. The comparison of sin with a beast of prey lying before the door is strange, as is the purely figurative use of “door” (door of the heart?) in such an ancient narrative. One suspects that the meaning of the passage was once quite different.[[68]](#footnote-69)

R. Alter states that the poem is archaic and enigmatic: “The first clause of verse 7 is particularly elliptic in the Hebrew, and thus any construal is no more than an educated guess”.[[69]](#footnote-70) T. Stordalen suggests that the rare word, *theshuqah*, only received a linking function (between Gen 3:16b and Gen 4:7b) *“*late in the redactional process of Genesis*”.*[[70]](#footnote-71)

The Septuagint version further complicates the matter as the translators of the LXX attempted to clarify their understanding of the original Hebrew by translating the relevant word with the Greek*apostrophē* in Gen 3:16b and Gen 4:7b. This word can be rendered in a positive sense of “turning, turning back, refuge, or bend in a direction toward”; it may also be employed in a negative sense of “turning away from”. The LXX rendering of Gen 3:16b is,

Your *apostrophē* *is* toward your husband

The LXX translators interpreted Gen 4:7b as a reference to Abel’s “desire” toward his brother:

…to you *shall be* his *apostrophē*

W. R. G. Loader understands *apostrophē* as “returning” - he detects symmetry between the woman repeatedly *returning* to the man (from which she was taken) in order to get pregnant and the man *returning* (*apostrepsai*) to the earth from which he was taken – both relationships are defined by pain and toil (man/earth, woman/man).[[71]](#footnote-72)

This may well achieve a plausible exegesis for Gen 3:16b but it breaks down when applied to Gen 4:7b. Loader states, “Here, too, LXX translates h` avpostrofh**.** (“return”), where probably with reference to sin returning and to Cain’s needing to rule over it”.[[72]](#footnote-73) This explanation is unsatisfactory and does not account for the difficulties of the Masoretic text. Far more plausible is the suggestion made by R. Bergmeier[[73]](#footnote-74) that the LXX translators were apparently reading the Hebrew, *theshubah* (return)for *theshuqah* (desire) and translating it with the Greek *apostrophē.*

We propose that Gen 4:7 obviously suffers from deep seated textual corruption, particularly surrounding the word “desire” - this article proposes against Bergmeier that instead of *theshuqah* (desire) the original Hebrew was read as *theshu’ah* (salvation, deliverance, e.g. 1 Sam 11:9; 2 Kgs 13:17) or *theshurah* (gift, present, 1 Sam 9:7) *–* in either case the unpointed Hebrew varies in only one letter. We suggest that the Septuagint translators mistakenly reconstructed one of these original words as *theshubah* (return), which they expressed as *apostrophē* in the Greek. As we will show, the proposed alternatives achieve a better contextual reading of Gen 4:7b and Gen 3:16b.

**A Contextual Reading of Genesis 4:7b**

The first principle of good hermeneutics is context. If a text is damaged or corrupted (either purposely or through transmission) then it can only be reconstructed or corrected by careful contextualization. The following contextual points support our proposal:

1) First, Cain was the expected realization of the promise made to Eve in the previous chapter (Gen 3:15-16) – as far as Eve was concerned Cain was the fulfillment of the promised salvation.

Now Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bore Cain, and said, ‘I have acquired a man from the Lord’... Gen 4:1 (NKJV)

The Hebrew for “acquired” (*qanah*) is a word-play on “Cain” (*qayin*); the Canaanites were merchants and smiths. There is no “from” in the Hebrew in “from the Lord”, just the direct object marker. This direct object marker is normally left untranslated and it should not be assumed that the NKJV translators have rendered it as “from”; rather, they have inserted “from” into the text to give it sense. More literally the text is simply,

And the man knew (even or the same) Eve his wife; and she conceived and bore (even or the same) Cain, and said: ‘I have gotten a man (even or the same) YHWH’…

2) Secondly, the sacrifice of Cain was rejected because it came from the cursed ground and therefore represented the “sweat of his face”. Many commentators regard the divine rejection of Cain’s worship as a mystery, or worse, as an arbitrary or capricious act by God. It makes sense to recognise that Cain knew that blood sacrifice was required to cover sin (Gen 3:21) and that the ground (and its produce) was under a curse (Gen 3:17) – God would not accept what had been grown ‘in the sweat of thy face’ (justification by works) as *a sin offering* (although agricultural produce was sometimes offered together with blood sacrifice).

3) Lastly, the giving or making of a sacrifice implies a place of worship – a sanctuary.[[74]](#footnote-75) Thus, the Garden of Eden is a model of the “heavenly sanctuary” (like the tabernacle).[[75]](#footnote-76)

On the basis of these contextual considerations, we propose that Gen 4:7 should read as follows:

If you do what is right, will you not be accepted?[[76]](#footnote-77) But if you do not do what is right, the sin-offering is lying at the door [of the sanctuary]; his **gift** is for you, and you will overcome. Gen 4:7

We have replaced “sin” as “sin-offering”—a translation also offered by Young’s Literal Translation. H. A. Whittaker comments:

With hardly an exception, the word “lieth” is used of flocks and herds peacefully lying down. Also, the extremely common word for “sin” (169 occurrences) is a double-meaning word; it also signifies “sin-offering” (116 times). In Leviticus 4, the same word comes translated “sin” 8 times and “sin-offering” 10 times (In Dan 9:24 A.V. has got the wrong meaning). Again, the word “door” (87 times) needs to be taken in a literal sense; the figurative usage of it has hardly a single parallel in Scripture.[[77]](#footnote-78)

The “sin-offering” (the lamb) was lying (not crouching ready to jump as suggested by some translations) at the door of the Sanctuary. The verse is therefore not metaphoric – it is not a zoomorphism as suggested by most translations and commentators[[78]](#footnote-79) – but rather a literal picture. Abel had brought more than one lamb (firstlings of the flock, Gen 4:4); **he also brought a gift for his brother Cain.** This explains another inconsistency spotted by commentators: Cain does not respond to God. According to M. McEntire; “Yahweh’s statement in v.7 indicates to Cain and the reader that Cain still has the opportunity to do well and find favour...Instead of speaking to Yahweh he speaks unto Abel”.[[79]](#footnote-80)

The translation offered in this article makes sense of this anomaly—Cain does not respond to Yahweh because Yahweh has told him that he can still be accepted if he offers the lamb that his brother Abel has brought as a gift for him—this acts as the prompt for Cain to find his brother Abel in the field—not to thank him for the lamb, or to make “peace” with his brother:

Therefore if you bring your gift to the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar, and go your way. First be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift. Matt 5:24-25

If Cain had accepted the “gift” he would “overcome” or rule over the “serpent” (man had dominion over the beast of the field, Gen 1:28). Cain’s pride and his envy prevented him accepting his brother’s “gift” – he became the first murderer, making propitiation for his sin by “offering” Abel instead.

**Interpretive Approaches to Gen 3:16b**

What are the implications of reading *theshurah* (gift) in Gen 4:7b for a new understanding Gens 3:16b? N. Sarna lists three possible interpretations of the phrase: *“*Your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you*”* (Gen 3:16).[[80]](#footnote-81)

Rashi understood this, together with the next clause, to refer to the satisfaction of female desire being traditionally dependent on the husband’s initiative. Rambam took it to mean that despite the discomforts of pain attendant upon child-bearing, the woman still desires the act that brings about this condition. Third, it may describe a “social reality” in which the woman was wholly dependent for her sustenance upon what her husband could eke out of the soil, in striking contrast to the situation in Eden,” where food was bountiful.

Another view has been argued by S. T. Foh,[[81]](#footnote-82) noting the parallel with Gen 4:7 where, in accordance with the generally accepted interpretation, sin seeks control over Cain but he must master it. Hence, Foh argues that the urge is not a desire for the intimacy of procreation but a desire to be independent of or to dominate her husband, and so the Genesis text states that he will rule over her. P. B. Wilson follows this view and explains that because the word “desire” in Gen 3:16 is the same word found in Gen 4:7, in which God tells Cain that sin was seeking to master the course of his life, in the same way, when God cursed Eve, He was saying to her, “Okay, Eve. You want to be the boss and make the decisions? When you leave this garden you will always want to control and lead the course of your husband’s life. But he will rule over you instead!”.[[82]](#footnote-83) Against this view H. Walton observes that in each of the three texts where *theshuqah* appears there is no common object desired, so it is better to regard it as referring to a basic or inherent instinct.[[83]](#footnote-84)

The above views can be rejected and a fresh perspective offered on the basis of the alternative interpretation of Gen 4:7 established above:

If you do what is right, will you not be accepted? But if you do not do what is right, the sin-offering is lying at the door [of the sanctuary]; his **gift** is for you, and you will overcome. Gen 4:7

The parallelism between Gen 3:16b and 4:7b is more far reaching than mere lexical or grammatical coincidence as both chapters display symmetry in their approach – Genesis 4 is a further outworking of the themes in Genesis 3.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Genesis 3 | Genesis 4 |
| I will greatly multiply your sorrow and your conception; In pain you shall bring forth children **(3:16)** | Now Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bore Cain, and said, ‘I have acquired a man from the Lord’. **(4:1)** |
| And I will put hatred between you ( the serpent) and the seed of the woman... **(3:15)** | Cain rose up against Abel his brother and killed him. **(4:8)** |
| Cursed *is* the ground for your sake **(3:17)** | Cain brought an offering of the fruit of the ground to the Lord. **(4:3)** |
| Your desire *shall be* for your husband, And he shall rule over you. **(3:16)** | And its desire *is* for you, but you should rule over it. **(4:7)** |

It is commonly known that Gen 3:15 has typological significance. As early as the 2nd century C.E., it was given Christological significance and called the *proto-evangelium*. Although this verse has a general reference to the human race, yet the question one asks is: Who is the descendant of Eve who may be said to be victorious over the serpent?[[84]](#footnote-85)

The context is therefore the promised Messiah – the curse was related to the labour pains that the “mother of the living” had to endure in order to come to the birth.[[85]](#footnote-86) The Messiah would rule (Heb: *mashal*) over the serpent. He would deal the serpent a death blow and overcome. The same word is used in Ps 8:6-7; “You have made him to have dominion (*mashal*) over the works of Your hands; You have put all *things* under his feet...even the beasts of the field”.[[86]](#footnote-87) The LXX translates *mashal* in Gen 3:16 with *kurieuō*, which means “to lord it over,”but uses a verb form of *archō* (“to rule over”) in Gen 4:7, possibly to depict a more governmental, autocratic concept.[[87]](#footnote-88)

Scholars have noted that each participant in the drama receives only one punishment **except Eve** who receives two punishments: (1) the pain of childbirth, (2) subjugation to her husband’s rule. Other scholars argue that the second “punishment” is not prescriptive but descriptive – it simply states the obvious consequences of the fall—sin has corrupted the willing submission of the wife and the loving headship of the husband. The relationship is full of dominating, negative attitudes, manipulation and struggle. While the truth of this is a sad reflection of a broken creation, we suggest an alternative that is far more satisfactory:

And I will put enmity between you [=the serpent] and the woman, and between your seed and her Seed; He shall crush your head [serpent’s head], and you shall bruise His heel.” To the woman He said: “I will greatly multiply your sorrow and your conception; in pain you shall bring forth children; your gift *shall be* for your husband, and he shall rule [over the serpent] in you. Gen 3:16

The strength of this reading is that it harmonizes Gen 3:16 and Gen 4:7. Eve was promised the gift of a child that would save her and her husband and give him rule over the serpent. Cain could have used the gift of a lamb left by his brother and thus overcome the serpent. The irony that is implicit in the text is that Eve believed her firstborn to be the fulfilment of that promise. The curse of childbirth was more than physical pain; it was the sorrow of seeing one son murder another – a curse perpetuated throughout history, particularly in the tension between nomadic societies (shepherds) and agricultural societies (who built cities—civilization like Cain).

**The Use of “Desire” in Song of Songs**

The only other place (besides Gen 3:16b, 4:7b) that *theshuqah* is used is in Song of Songs 7:10,

I am my beloved’s and his desireis for me.

R. Davidson comments,

Following her eager wish in verse 9b, the woman responds openly and unashamedly to her lover’s advances. She belongs to him “and his desire is for me” (v.10). The only other place in the Old Testament where this word “desire” is found is in Genesis 3:16 where, as part of her penalty for disobeying God, Eve is told: Your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you. That desire in Genesis is something imposed upon Eve, and indicates her submission: here it expresses the joyful claim that links man and woman, to each other. She thinks of his desire not as domination, but as shared joy. It may be that as in the case with Ecclesiastes...a motif taken from earlier biblical material is being deliberately used with a different meaning.[[88]](#footnote-89)

In Canticles the word seems to be a straightforward expression of longing and desire in what is thought of as being essentially a love poem.[[89]](#footnote-90) If that is the case then we have to assume that textual corruption only occurred in Genesis—the LXX translates Songs 7:10 as *epistrophē* which, when used transitively, means “to make to turn towards (to convert)”; literally—“his turning is towards me” or “his desire *is* toward me” (NKJV). The LXX Brenton translation is: “I am my kinsman’s, and his desire is toward me”.

The LXX compound noun *epistrophē* uses a different preposition to *apostrophē* which was used in Gen 3:16b and Gen 4:7b,[[90]](#footnote-91) but this is not necessarily significant. Again, it is possible that the LXX translators also translated what they mistakenly thought to be the Hebrew *theshubah* (return) with *epistrophē*. However, is this likely? Can we assume the same translational path – that *theshubah* (return) was interpreted instead of *theshurah* (gift) or *theshu’ah* (salvation)? Could the verse possibly read as follows?

I am my beloved’s (kinsman’s LXX) and his gift/salvation is for me. Song 7:10

This would be an unusual turn of phrase in a “love poem” but this is no ordinary love poem as it celebrates covenant love – Yahweh’s deliverance of his people from the Assyrians during the reign of Hezekiah.[[91]](#footnote-92) Canticles is not simply a collection of oriental love poems but an allegorical dramatization of covenant love, employing characters such as Solomon and the Shulamite.[[92]](#footnote-93) Salvation is an expression of Yahweh’s covenant love for his people. Interestingly, the next verse (Song 7:11) has an **enigmatic connection** with Gen 3:16:

Come, my beloved (LXX: kinsman), Let us **go forth to the field**; Let us lodge in the villages. Song 7:11

Similar phraseology is encountered in Mic 4:10,

Be in pain, and labor to bring forth, O daughter of Zion, like a woman in birth pangs. For now you shall **go forth** from the city, you shall dwell **in the field**,[[93]](#footnote-94) and to Babylon you shall go. There you shall be delivered; there the Lord will redeem you from the hand of your enemies.

The immediate context is the deportation of captives transported to Babylon[[94]](#footnote-95) by the Assyrians, who find themselves suddenly liberated (returned)…left standing in the empty field…when the Assyrian army was slaughtered by Yahweh. Note that the metaphor of a woman giving birth is used (cf. Isa 66:7-8) in connection with redemption from the enemy (Gen 3:15-16)—this “bringing” to the birth was Yahweh’s doing—Hezekiah was “resurrected” and a faithful remnant saved. The last section of the phrase—let us lodge in the villages, or more exactly—let us spend the night in the village (*kaphar*). This is surely reminiscent of the kinsman (Boaz) covering (atoning) Ruth with his “skirt” (*kanaph*) when he found her at his feet during the night. Divine love in Ruth 3:4 was so scandalous (as it could have ruined the plan to redeem the land) that Boaz could not reveal his secret liaison (love) for Ruth (although nothing untoward happened) until his case had been presented. Similarly in Hezekiah’s time – Yahweh revealed his love for his people at the last moment – he redeemed them and the land– and Eve “the mother of the living” gave birth to a righteous seed – Hezekiah did not die childless.

**Conclusion**

Our investigation of the word “desire” offers the conclusion that a more intelligible reading can be achieved with **gift/salvation**, which is almost identical to “desire” in the Hebrew.

The proposed readings make sense in context:

If you do what is right, will you not be accepted? But if you do not do what is right, the sin-offering is lying at the door [of the sanctuary]; his **gift** is for you, and you will overcome. Gen 4:7

And I will put enmity between you [=the serpent] and the woman, and between your seed and her Seed; He shall crush your head [serpent’s head], and you shall bruise His heel. To the woman He said: “I will greatly multiply your sorrow and your conception; in pain you shall bring forth children; **your gift/salvation** *shall be* for your husband, and he shall rule [over the serpent] in you. Gen 3:15-16

I am my beloved’s (kinsman’s LXX) and his **gift/salvation** is for me (Song 7:11).

**Desire in Genesis**

**Andrew Perry**

**Introduction**

Textual changes can happen for a variety of reasons. Some Hebrew consonants are very similar in shape, and they could be miscopied giving a different word as a result. Letters might be dropped, added or duplicated, or associated with the word following instead of the word proceeding. Scholars propose textual change for a variety of reasons and one such reason is where the use of a word seems to make no sense. However, each case of textual change needs to be assessed, especially when the reason is a supposed lack of intelligibility expressed by scholars. This is all the more important given the state of the text in Jesus’ day and his attitude to the text as something that could not be broken (John 10:35).

**Genesis 3 and 4**

The use of *theshuqah* in Gen 3:16b and Gen 4:7b is a case in point. Standard versions translate the word as “desire” (e.g. KJV, RSV, and NASB); however the database of usage is small with Song of Solomon 7:10 the only other use of the word. How then is the word to be translated in Genesis and is it the original word? [[95]](#footnote-96)

The last clause in Gen 4:7 is,

And unto thee *shall be* his desire, and thou shalt rule over him. Gen 4:7 (KJV)

The absence of a verb is indicated in the KJV with the italics, “shall be”, but the preposition (la) is clear and indicates direction “towards”.[[96]](#footnote-97) The suffix “his” in “his desire” is masculine and so the statement being made is that Abel’s desire would be towards Cain. It is not “sin” personified crouching at the door whose desire is for Cain as “sin” is feminine.[[97]](#footnote-98) This is further shown by the comparison with Gen 3:16 where two individuals are involved in respect of the “desire” and the “rule”; Gen 4:7b is part of an account about two individuals.

**Song of Solomon 7**

While we have assumed that *theshuqah* is properly translated as “desire” in Genesis, this cannot be taken for granted. We can ask, for example, whether the noun in Gen 4:7 denotes an object or an attitude. An example of object in this context could be a sin-offering lying at the door of the sanctuary, perhaps a lamb. The attitude under discussion is “desire”, but the noun could denote another attitude, perhaps “longing”, “want” or “need”.

The argument for the noun denoting an attitude is based in Song 7:10—there are two individuals involved and attitudes towards each other would seem to be the subject-matter. In Song 7, the man describes the woman in terms that *manifest desire* (vv. 1-9); in v. 10 the woman responds by describing an attitude of the man—*theshuqah* “toward me” (yl[[[98]](#footnote-99)),and translators have rendered the attitude as “desire” on the basis of vv. 1-9. If we ask how we know today that a man desires a woman, then one way of answering this question is to ask whether the man speaks in the same fashion as vv. 1-9: this is the language of desire. The language we use is a key indicator of our inner attitudes.[[99]](#footnote-100) A clear context in Song 7 for “desire” as the meaning of *theshuqah* clarifies the less clear context in Genesis 3 and 4.

**Hapax Legomena**

A thesis that the texts in Genesis were originally *theshurah* (gift) or *theshu’ah* (salvation) does not require a change to the Song text. The hypothesis of a change in Genesis is not one of accidental change due to copyist error in one text, but rather a proposal that two texts have undergone the same intentional change. It is less plausible to suppose two accidental errors than intentional change, but this would require some explanation of motivation and opportunity for the two changes. We need to postulate an editor who sees a typological connection between the two texts and changes the typology from *theshurah* (gift) or *theshu’ah* (salvation). If we postulate intentional change to the three texts, this is less plausible, as it requires an editor to see links between two widely separated texts (Genesis and Song of Solomon) and a need to change all three to make them consistent.

It is easier to postulate both accidental and intentional change for *hapax legomena*. Supplying an explanation of motivation and opportunity for the same change to multiple texts is less easy. If *theshuqah* was a *hapax legomenon* in Song 7, the context is a good paradigm for choosing some attitude or other for a translation; there is no pressure in Song 7 to emend the noun. With a male-female relationship being the focus of Genesis 3, maintaining the choice of “desire” in this case is also not difficult. It is the male-male relationship of Genesis 4 that brings pressure to bear on the choice of meaning.

**Desire and Rule**

In Genesis 3, the woman listens to the Serpent and gives the fruit to the man. The story has a sub-text about relationships that are not functioning in accordance with God’s commands. The man and the woman ought to have had dominion (rule) over the Serpent; the woman ought to have attended to the teaching of the man which he had received from God about the not eating of the tree. The relationship between the man and the woman is therefore the subject of Gen 3:16—there is an emphasis of rule on the part of the man.[[100]](#footnote-101) The woman had desired the fruit of the tree and now her desire would be towards her husband.

The relationship between husband and wife in Genesis 3 is used as a model for Yahweh’s relationship with Israel (e.g. Isaiah 54), as well as Christ and the church (e.g. Ephesians 5). In this relationship the “man” has the rule, and in Genesis terms the “woman” has the “desire” towards God and Christ. This kind of male-female typology is carried in Genesis 4 because both “desire” and “rule” are mentioned with respect to two individuals. While Abel and Cain are both male, in typical terms, a male-female typology surrounding sacrifice is encoded.

Within the Law the administration of sacrifices was performed by men; the sacrifice of Christ was made and offered by the Second Man. The climax of the “Cain and Abel Sacrifices Story” has a male-female typology. If Cain were to offer acceptable sacrifices (Gen 4:7a), then Abel’s “desire” would be to his brother as the “man” offering and making the sacrifice on his behalf, and Cain would be the “man” to rule over Abel. As it happened, it was Abel’s sacrifice that was accepted as the Second Man out of the two men.

**Septuagint and Masoretic Text**

There is nothing grammatically difficult with Gen 4:7b; the difficulties that commentators discuss are with Gen 4:7a.[[101]](#footnote-102) There is the difficult infinitive of “lifting up” rendered in the NASB as, “If you do well, will not *your countenance* be lifted up”? The NASB has inserted “your countenance” to make sense of the clause on the basis of such texts as Jer 3:12 and Job 11:15. And there is the phrase that is rendered in the KJV as “sin lieth at the door”.[[102]](#footnote-103) This clause mixes a feminine noun with a masculine participle. However, there is no grammatical impetus for rejecting *theshuqah* in Gen 4:7b. The scholarly motivation for emendment stems from a lack of understanding of the typology of Gen 4:7b and the grammatical difficulties of Gen 4:7a.

The LXX has two words corresponding to *theshuqah* in the MT, which are *apostrophē* (Gen 3:16; 4:7) and *epistrophē* (Song 7:10). These are related compound nouns and this can be construed as evidence of either the same Hebrew word in the three source texts or related Hebrew words in the three texts. This line of reasoning is important because *theshuqah* is not a cognate word with *theshurah* (gift) or *theshu’ah* (salvation). If we use the LXX as evidence for deciding upon a Hebrew original, and *theshuqah* (desire), *theshurah* (gift) or *theshu’ah* (salvation) are the only proposed candidates, then one of these ought to be selected with *apostrophē* and *epistrophē* picking out different nuances of the relevant Hebrew word in the three texts. With Song 7 giving a clear lead for an attitude word of the “desire” family of words in v. 10, the LXX supports this choice for the two Genesis texts among the three candidates.

The basic sense of the two LXX words, *apostrophē* and *epistrophē*, is that of “turning”, and this can support the suggestion that the LXX translators had *theshubah* (return, e.g. 1 Sam 7:17) in their Hebrew text. However, the database for *theshubah* is small (8x) and the sense of “turning” is the turning of the year (5x, e.g. 2 Sam 11:1), turning back home (1x, 1 Sam 7:17) and the giving of an “answer” (2x, Job 21:34; 34:36). The LXX translators use *epistrophē* for the “turning” (*theshubah*) of the year and *apostrophē* for turning (*theshubah*) back home. This database of usage is not supportive of the proposal that *theshubah* is a “turning of the heart” in an individual, although it cannot be excluded if Gen 3:16b, 4:7b and Song 7:10 are said to be the only three examples.

The use of *apostrophē* in Gen 3:16b and Gen 4:7b but *epistrophē* in Song 7:10 requires some discussion. Elsewhere *apostrophē* is used of the “turning” to or away from God (e.g. Deut 31:18; Jer 5:6; 6:19; 8:5; Ezek 33:11). This sense offers a reason for the LXX choice of *apostrophē* in Genesis: viz., that the translators saw a nuance in the attitude of desire in Eve turning to her husband and Abel turning to Cain. Accordingly, we can say that unless the LXX translators were translating *theshubah*, it is more likely that they were translating *theshuqah*, an attitude word, rather than *theshurah* or *theshu’ah*.

The noun *epistrophē* and related verb is used for the idea of conversion in NT writings (e.g. Acts 7:39; 15:3).[[103]](#footnote-104) Liddell & Scott catalogue the sense of “regard” and the idea of attention being paid to someone for classical Greek, as well as several ideas of “turning”.[[104]](#footnote-105) Again, the use of the word in Song 7:10 allows for *theshubah* as well as an attitude word like *theshuqah* to be the original Hebrew for the LXX translator.

**Jewish Targums**

Jewish Targums[[105]](#footnote-106) are evidence of early Jewish interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Sometimes they render their Hebrew text closely and at other times they are interpretative paraphrases. *Onkelos* renders the Hebrew of Gen 3:16 as “yet to your husband shall be your desire and he shall dominate you”. In Gen 4:7, the clause “and unto you will be his desire, and you will rule over him” is not represented. *Pseudo-Jonathan* has “yet your desire shall be for your husband; he shall rule over you” for Gen 3:16 and “Its desire will be towards you, but you will have dominion over it, whether to be innocent or to sin” for Gen 4:7b. *Neofiti* has “to your husband you will turn and he will have authority over you” for Gen 3:16, and omits the first part of Gen 4:7b keeping only “you shall rule it [sin]”.

These interpretative choices in the Targums suggest that, if anything, their respective Hebrew sources had an attitude word in Gen 3:16 and Gen 4:7; they support the current Masoretic text.

**Conclusion**

In this article we have argued for the integrity of the MT in Gen 3:16b, Gen 4:7b and Song 7:10. We have showed that an attitude word is required by the context of Song 7:10 and that *theshuqah* fits the context. An attitude word is also appropriate in Genesis 3 and 4 given the fact that the contexts there concern the relationship between two individuals. There is therefore no reason to emend *theshuqah* in Gen 3:16b and Gen 4:7b. Finally, we offered a male-female typology surrounding sacrifice which explained the use of *theshuqah* in Genesis 4.

## **Daniel 11**

**T. Gaston**

**Introduction**

The eleventh chapter of Daniel, as J. A. Montgomery correctly judged, “is the greatest stumbling-block to the ‘traditionalist’ interpretation of the bk”.[[106]](#footnote-107) The difficulty presented by the chapter is not so much the accuracy of its predictions but its focus. The consensus of the majority of scholars, critical and conservative, is that larger part of this chapter refers to the Hellenistic age, and more specifically, those events leading up to the Maccabean crisis. This difficulty is not lost on conservative commentators:

This prophecy presents a problem the like of which occurs nowhere else in the Bible. In its detail it is *too* exact, *too* specific – and apparently *too* pointless. Verses 3-39, and possibly to the end of the chapter, read for all the world like a history written in the language of prophecy. For a short and otherwise unimportant period in Bible history, it deals with the inter-relations of the kings of the south (the Ptolemys of Egypt) and the kings of the north (the Seleucids of Syria), with only very slight mention of the consequent sufferings of the attenuated Judean state.[[107]](#footnote-108)

It was, perhaps, considerations of this kind that led the Rev. C. Wright to propose that Daniel 11 in its present form is an interpolation, comparable with the later Targums. He theorizes that the original (Aramaic) was lost when holy books were destroyed during the Maccabean crisis and so the ending was replaced with the only extant copy, a (Hebrew) paraphrase.[[108]](#footnote-109) C. Boutflower embraced Wright’s thesis and thus criticized those scholars who used Daniel 11 as the mould for the interpretation of Daniel’s other visions.[[109]](#footnote-110) Montgomery, however, rejected Wright’s thesis as “pure assumption”.[[110]](#footnote-111) Since then Wright’s thesis has received little consideration. Conservative commentators generally reject the thesis (and other interpolation theories), although it can be found amongst a handful.[[111]](#footnote-112)

The consensus of critical scholars views the eleventh chapter of Daniel as an addition to a later recension of the book (one of many), and scholars are not encumbered by the view that the book was in some way complete in the sixth century B.C.E. One plausible theory, proposed by a number of scholars, is that the main portion of Daniel 11 derives from another text, a historical document that was rewritten into a prophetic format and embedded within the Danielic material.[[112]](#footnote-113) This view draws plausibility from the richness of the historical material contained therein, such that scholars often use Daniel 11 as a primary source for the period. L. L. Grabbe writes:

It is unthinkable that this [i.e. Daniel 11] is based on anything but a sophisticated historical document (or documents) of some sort.[[113]](#footnote-114)

If, for instance, a short historical account of the affairs of the Didachoi were used as the basis of vv. 5-19 then this might explain the focus on marriage alliances and the like, rather than the ill-treatment of the Jewish people. This might also explain sudden appearance of ‘the King of the South’ in v. 5.

Grabbe’s hypothesis allows for “some sort of documents”, and while vv. 5-19 may be based upon a non-Jewish historical source, vv. 30b-35 is certainly a Judeo-centric consideration of the period of the Maccabean crisis. The following section, vv. 36-39, is a general description of an ungodly nemesis—a description that would be linked to the Antichrist in later Christian interpretation. And the final section, vv. 40-45, demonstrates clear parallels with Ezekiel 38-39 and is in some sense a prophetic document.

It might be tempting to dismiss interpolation theories as an apologetic device. However Wright himself believes that interpolations are demonstrable from close analysis of the text.[[114]](#footnote-115) In this analysis he draws attention to many particulars:

* many verses contain phrases which either have no clear referent or, according to Wright, are demonstrably unhistorical
* other phrases are “corrected” in Old Greek versions of Daniel to bring them into line with known history
* significant events and other relevant details are omitted from the passage
* particular characters or events that would have upset or enraged the Jews are ignored, while other details, seemingly irrelevant to a Jewish audience, are included

This detailed “cumulative” argument is worthy of critical examination. Wright’s further proposition of how these interpolations were incorporated into the text may be too simple, yet it is not integral to the thesis as other (more subtle) explanations can and have been proposed.

**General Considerations**

In this section, we will explain the general arguments of Wright (and others) in favour of the view that Daniel 11 is an interpolation.

1) Irrelevance

The principal difficulty with the prophecy, particularly vv. 5-20, is that it has no direct relevance either to Daniel’s situation or the culmination of the prophecy. If, as futurist interpreters have claimed, vv. 40-45 refers to the Antichrist, or some other future aggressor, then the rest of the chapter becomes, at best, tangential. Even if this aggressor is identified with Antiochus Epiphanes, the relevance of vv. 5-20 is questionable; comparison with Daniel 8 indicates that the level of detail in these verses is far greater than that required to set the scene. Rather this section almost has the feel of prophetic showboating.

2) Character

Several scholars have commented that the prophecy of chapter 11 is uncharacteristic of other OT texts. J. G. Baldwin comments “nowhere else is prediction as specific and detailed as here”.[[115]](#footnote-116) While uniqueness is not a firm basis for accusations of fraud, these considerations have led many to conclude that this prophecy is really history-writing.

3) Discontinuity

Several of the features displayed in Daniel 10-12 are absent from Daniel 11.

i) First, in Daniel 10 the prophecy is manifested to Daniel through the medium of the angelic *dramas personae*—the ‘princes’. The power-play between Persia and Greece is acted out by the angel-princes (Dan 10:12-14; 10:20-11:1). The angel-prince motif is repeated in Daniel 12 when Michael the prince “stands up” (Dan 12:1). Yet between Dan 11:2 and Dan 11:45 this motif is entirely missing, the prophecy being conveyed solely by direct speech.

ii) Secondly, there is the *angelus interpreter* – the man clothed in linen (Dan 10:4-6), who comforts Daniel and is sent to cause Daniel to understand (Dan 10:14). This figure recurs in Daniel 12, with two other figures, to foretell the time-periods and to close the vision (Dan 12:5-13). Again these figures are absent from Daniel 11. Though it may be noted that it is the man clothed in linen who utters the prophecy (Dan 10:20-12:4), it is odd that he is allowed such an extended speech without interruption from Daniel, either collapsing (Dan 10:8, 15) or responding (Dan 10:16-17, 19; 12:8).

iii) Thirdly, Daniel’s action (and reactions) are absent from Daniel 11, where elsewhere he describes how he felt and his failure to understand (Dan 10:2, 7, 11, 15, 19; 12:5, 8).

All these features, (i)-(iii), may be explained by the fact that the section in question is all in direct speech. Yet it is this very feature that makes it discontinuous with the surrounding material.

4) The Vision of the Ram and the Goat

The comparison between Daniel 8 and Daniel 10-12 is significant. In both sections we find presented the struggle between Persia and Greece, the notable career of Alexander, the division of his empire, the culmination of the vision in the Maccabean crisis, and the figure of Antiochus Epiphanes. The principal difference between the two sections, in terms of prophesied-events, is the discourse in Daniel 11 regarding the King of the North and the King of the South. Though we should be careful of imposing our own expectations upon the text, we may question the addition of the two-kingdom discourse since, seemingly, it adds little to the purpose of the text. Why describe the fortunes of the King of the South if he does not feature in the crux of the prophecy?

**Specific Considerations**

In this section, we will outline the specific points in Daniel 11 that are highlighted by Wright in developing the “interpolation” theory and offer some possible responses.

1) v. 5 - Capture of Jerusalem (omitted)[[116]](#footnote-117)

Josephus records that, after the division of Alexander’s empire, Jerusalem was captured by means of “deceit and treachery” (c. 320 B.C.E.). Ptolemy I Soter entered the city on the Sabbath day on the pretense of offering a sacrifice and the citizens of Jerusalem allowed him entry unawares. Josephus also records that “he reigned over it in a cruel manner”.[[117]](#footnote-118)

Though this event was probably incidental in the fortunes of the Didachoi, the capture and the subsequent treatment of Jerusalem by Ptolemy I must have been of particular significance to the Jewish people. The fact that this event is omitted, while the marriage-alliance between Berenice (daughter of Ptolemy II) and Antiochus II is included, indicates a particularly partiality in the text.

2) vv. 5-6 – Seleucus I & Antiochus I (omitted)[[118]](#footnote-119)

While v. 5 informs us about the reign and dominion of Ptolemy I (‘King of the South’), the accession and career of Seleucus I Nicator and his son Antiochus I Soter are entirely omitted. This cannot be because nothing of note occurred during their reigns—quite the contrary. Wright proposes that these events were omitted because they were of direct concern to the Jews.

3) v. 6 Impiety of Antiochus II (omitted)[[119]](#footnote-120)

Another significant event omitted by the author is the assumption of the title ‘Antiochus II Theos’ by the King of the North. One might imagine that such impiety would be frankly condemned by a Jewish author, but only his marriage is considered to be significant.

4) v. 6 “she shall be given up and … he who fathered her”[[120]](#footnote-121)

The phrase “she shall be given up” refers to the killing of Berenice. However, “he who fathered her” would refer to Ptolemy II Philadelphus, who was not put to death by the Seleucids. Old Greek versions of Daniel omit reference to the father.

5) v. 7 “a branch from her roots”[[121]](#footnote-122)

This phrase would most naturally refer to a child of Berenice, implying that her child became King of the South. In reality, the one who became king of Egypt was her brother, not her son. Old Greek versions of Daniel amend this phrase to “a plant from his root”. This difficulty may simply result from pedantry on the part of Wright; most commentators allow that a brother is from the same ‘roots’.[[122]](#footnote-123)

6) v. 10 “his sons shall wage war”[[123]](#footnote-124)

This phrase refers to the sons of Seleucus II, namely, Seleucus III (= Ceranus) and Antiochus III. Yet Seleucus III only reigned for three years and did not wage war against Egypt. Old Greek versions of Daniel amend the plural to a singular. At best this is an argument from silence and some commentators allow that the Biblical author was party to better information than modern historians.[[124]](#footnote-125)  E. J. Young notes that while the first part of the verse is in plural, the latter part is singular; only one son ‘overwhelms and passes through’.[[125]](#footnote-126)

7) v. 17 “with upright ones”[[126]](#footnote-127)

On the basis that the phrase ‘upright one’ would most naturally refer to a Jew, this verse implies that the King of the North would invade Egypt aided by a contingent of Jewish warriors, yet this is contrary to known history. On the other hand, “upright ones” may not refer to a group of people but may also be rendered “fair terms”.[[127]](#footnote-128)

8) v. 21 “they shall not give him the glory of the kingdom”[[128]](#footnote-129)

This verse would imply that Antiochus IV Epiphanes was not given the status of king, contrary to history. Old Greek versions of Daniel give “the royal honour will not be granted to him”, perhaps amending the text to imply that it is the honour, rather than the status, that was denied. It may be that this phrase points to the fact that Antiochus was not the legal heir to the throne, but conspired against his brother Demetrius.[[129]](#footnote-130)

9) v. 22 “the prince of the covenant”[[130]](#footnote-131)

Wright asserts that this phrase has no clear referent; it is omitted from Old Greek versions of Daniel. Commentators identify this “prince” as a high priest, usually Onias III,[[131]](#footnote-132) though few are definite on this point.[[132]](#footnote-133)

10) *v. 28 Desecration of the Temple (omitted)*[[133]](#footnote-134)

In v. 28 it is stated that “his heart shall be moved against the holy covenant, so he shall do damage”. This is generally interpreted as Antiochus’ desecration of the Temple on his return from his campaign in Egypt.[[134]](#footnote-135) However, it is odd that this event is so lightly glossed over, especially when it is considered that not only did Antiochus remove the holy articles but massacred the people.

11) vv. 33-35 The Cleansing of the Sanctuary (omitted)[[135]](#footnote-136)

The reaction of the author to the defilement of the sanctuary is, perhaps, quite unexpected. He does not concentrate on the uprising of the Maccabees (usually identified as the “little help” v. 34), but rather speaks of “the wise” teaching the people, whilst some of “the wise” stumble or fall “to refine them”. Particularly unexpected is the omission of any reference to the cleansing of the sanctuary, especially when this very thing is predicted elsewhere in the book (Dan 8:14).

On the basis of these observations, (1)-(11), Wright supports an “interpolation” view of Daniel 11.

**Evaluation**

Wright claims that the historical discrepancies he identifies signify that the full text cannot have been written in the 2c. B. C. E. Rather he proposes that the original prophecy was overwritten by the later author. Those phrases without clear historical reference are seen as vestiges of the original preserved by the interpolator; why else would the author include inaccurate statements? The description of Antiochus (vv. 36-39) is a case in point:

The text … does not contain any clear or distinct description of Antiochus. It does not possess those marked features which might well have been expected from a prophetic history written later than the events described. There are phrases which lead us to regard the prophecy as ‘touched up’ by a later parapharist.[[136]](#footnote-137)

Yet, as we have seen, most of the historical issues raised by Wright are plausibly explained by other commentators; in some cases, it may be our limited knowledge of the period that is at fault. Also, Wright’s thesis does not adequately explain the omission of events of Jewish significance which he highlights. The first section (vv. 5-19) especially seems full of historical allusions, but missing the events upon which one might have expected a Jewish mind to focus. These (seemingly) irrelevant historical details cannot easily be explained either as original prophecy, for they are too accurate, or interpolations, for they are too irrelevant.

One plausible theory, proposed by a number of scholars, is that the main portion of Daniel 11 derives from another text, a historical document that was rewritten into a prophetic format and embedded within the Danielic material.[[137]](#footnote-138) This view draws plausibility from the richness of the historical material contained therein, such that historians use Daniel 11 as a primary source for the period. Grabbe declares,

…it is unthinkable that this [i.e. Daniel 11] is based on anything but a sophisticated historical document (or documents) of some sort.[[138]](#footnote-139)

If, for instance, a short historical account of the affairs of the Didachoi were used as the basis of vv. 5-19, then this might explain the focus on marriage alliances and the like, rather than the ill-treatment of the Jewish people. The interpolation of this historical account into the text may also explain the apparent discontinuity caused by the sudden appearance of the King of the South in v. 5.

This, however, cannot be the whole story for while vv. 5-19 (perhaps vv. 5-30a) may be based upon a non-Jewish historical source, vv. 30b-35 is Judeo-centric in outlook and likely of Jewish origin. The following section (vv. 36-39) also is not historical in character, lacking the specificity of the earlier sections. Many commentators interpret this section as a description of the archetypal “antichrist”, and it has been applied to various individuals including Herod the Great, Constantine, Napoleon and the Pope.[[139]](#footnote-140) It is possible that this description was only secondarily applied to Antiochus IV and predates the composition of the text.

The final section (vv. 40-45) is inaccurate, if intended as a continuation of the events of the reign of Antiochus, and is interpreted by most scholars as a failed prediction of the author, thus pinpointing the date of composition (c.164 B.C.E.). A. S. van der Woude proposes that this prediction was not mere guesswork, but based upon contemporary rumours of a future Egyptian campaign and upon the eschatological framework provided by the OT prophets.[[140]](#footnote-141) Certainly, this section demonstrates parallels with Ezekiel 38-39:[[141]](#footnote-142)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Ezekiel 38-39** | **Daniel 11** |
| northern invader | 38:6, 15; 39:2, | 11:40 |
| allies: Ethiopia and Libya[[142]](#footnote-143) | 38:5 | 11:43 |
| horsemen and chariots | 38:4; 39:20 | 11:40 |
| gathering spoils | 38:13; 39:10 | 11:43 |
| destroyed on the mountains of Israel | 38:21; 39:4; | 11:45 |

If Wright’s central proposition is correct, that the current text of Daniel 11 is an interpolation of the original prophecy, then we may have some clues as to its form. We may tentatively propose that the original prophecy paralleled other OT prophecies of the eschatological battle over Israel; vv. 36-45 would represent a vestige of this prophecy. It is conceivable that in reaction to severe persecution, this prophecy was actualized by many textual additions to portray Antiochus as the eschatological antagonist; a non-Jewish account of the Didachoi was interpolated into the text to bridge the gap between Alexander and Antiochus.

Here, however, we reach the limits of the historico-critical method. While this explanation of the present form for the Daniel 11 is plausible, it is based entirely upon internal evidence. It is incumbent on proponents of such theories to provide some adequate explanation of how such interpolation arose and, if possible, provide manuscript evidence for the textual alteration. We shall see that in this case both these requirements are difficult to fulfill.

**Textual History**

Generally, critical scholars presume that the textual transmission of texts like the book of Daniel was quite free, allowing for interpolations, expansions and additions. The textual history of the book of Enoch seems indicative of this kind of transmission; various forms of the book are witnessed from disparate sources. On the other hand, the comparison between the MT and DSS demonstrates that once a book was accepted as sacred and canonical its textual transmission was closed and it was no longer subject to intentional alteration; this comparison holds true for the book of Daniel. If by the 2c. B.C.E. the book of Daniel was regarded as sacred scripture – and there are some good reasons to suppose this was the case – then it is difficult to explain how such an interpolation as proposed above could have occurred.

Wright answers this difficulty by proposing that the interpolation was not due to intentional alteration but was necessitated by the loss of the original text. Wright asserts that the original text of Daniel 10-12 was written in Aramaic and that later a Targum was written of this text in Hebrew. During the “wholesale destruction of the sacred books” that occurred during the Maccabean period,[[143]](#footnote-144) the original book of Daniel was lost or damaged, and the missing portions were restored from a Hebrew Targum.[[144]](#footnote-145)

Though the extant Targums are generally later and in Aramaic, the concept of periphrastic and interpretative text based upon the scriptures is well evidenced, and were the sacred books destroyed, these interpretative texts would have been the closest record of their original text. In addition, the proposition that Daniel 10-12 are a Hebrew translation from an Aramaic original derives some support the detailed considerations of F. Zimmermann.[[145]](#footnote-146) However, the interpolations identified above are not Targumic in character and there is no way to confirm whether such a text ever existed. Also, the completion of this Daniel-Targum would date after the destruction of the sacred texts, since it “predicts” the events of Maccabean period.

E. E. Ellis updates Wright’s explanation as it facilitates his own hypothesis of the canonization process of the book of Daniel. He proposes that it is “intrinsically improbable” that the book of Daniel should have been composed in its entirety in the 2c. B.C.E. and then, within a century, accepted as canonical without opposition.[[146]](#footnote-147) Thus he proposes that the book of Daniel was already regarded as canonical by the second century and that those elements that may reflect a second-century origin should be explained as the contemporization of the book which took place during the recopying of the Old Testament books after the widespread destruction of sacred books (see above). He proposes that this contemporization not only included updating orthography and terminology, but also “explanatory elaboration”. The Septuagint is cited as an example of such “elaboration” during textual transmission. Ellis argues that the canonical status of the book of Daniel would not have precluded this “elaboration”, stating that such the same sort of elaboration was committed by the writers at Qumran and the New Testament writers.[[147]](#footnote-148)

Ellis’ examples of textual elaboration are problematic. Whilst earlier scholars viewed Old Greek versions of Daniel as elaborative, the growing consensus is that the errors of translation in Old Greek versions of Daniel are “mechanical” rather than apologetic or contrived.[[148]](#footnote-149) The New Testament writers are not an analogous example because they paraphrase the OT to satisfy the requirements of their own writings, not (it must be assumed) with the intention of altering the received text. Again, the Qumran texts are not analogous since, while the Dead Sea Covenanters felt free to compose a plethora of para-Danielic material, they did not take liberties with the book itself; their own copies of the book are largely consistent with MT. Even Wright’s own analogy with the later Jewish Targums betrays his purpose, since the Targums were intentionally kept separate from the textual-transmission of the sacred texts. If the book of Daniel were regarded as canonical, it is difficult to imagine that any pious Jew would consent to the drastic interpolations hypothesized above. Even if the text were damaged it is improbable that it should have been restored using a suspect text; the few comparable examples we have suggest the lacuna would have preserved.[[149]](#footnote-150)

Perhaps the greatest difficulty for the hypothesized interpolations is the absence of any textual variation. We do not possess a single variant manuscript that does not witness to the present form of Daniel 11.[[150]](#footnote-151) Wright and Ellis require a watershed in the textual transmission of the book of Daniel such that all subsequent variants of the book originated from a single (hypothesized) elaborated version. The destruction of the sacred books during the Antiochene persecution would not have been such a watershed. First, it is likely that the dissemination of the book of Daniel had already expanded beyond the borders of the Seleucid Empire; the Alexandrian origin of Old Greek versions of Daniel demonstrates that the book was present in Egypt by the end of the second century. Secondly, it is unlikely that all copies of the book would have been destroyed during the crisis; pious Jews would have sought to preserve their sacred books from destruction.[[151]](#footnote-152) It is certainly significant that no similar watershed has been discerned in the transmission of the other OT books.

Not only are there no extant textual variants to indicate the presence of interpolations, there is also no recorded dispute regarding the form of the text. Memories are long and even if the texts themselves were destroyed, it is probable that people would have remembered the original form of the book. Therefore it is difficult to accept that these individuals would have accepted a corrupted (!) form of a sacred book, especially if its key prediction regarding the death of Antiochus had proved false (Dan 11:40-45). The interpolated text should have been rejected but instead it was universally accepted as Scripture.

We are admittedly dependent on later analogies in our efforts to conceive of the realistic treatment of sacred books by second century Jews; however, these analogies are not so late so as to render our conceptions implausible. Unless we are to concede that second century Jews took a dynamic, rather than a static, view of their scriptures, then it seems impossible that the hypothesized interpolations would have been accepted.

**An Alternative Explanation**

In his Ethel M. Wood lecture, “The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic,W. G. Lambert proposed that Daniel 11 parallels in style the genre of Babylonian Dynastic prophecy.[[152]](#footnote-153)This proposition has been widely accepted amongst commentators.[[153]](#footnote-154)

There are a number of cuneiform texts which record historical events as *vaticinia ex eventu*. These include several examples of annalistic history presented in the future tense and in veiled language. Lambert presents three texts, two whose composition date c. 6-7th century B.C.E.[[154]](#footnote-155) and one which probably dates from the Hellenistic period.[[155]](#footnote-156) Each text uses phraseology reminiscent of Daniel 11. For instance, the phrases “a prince will arise and will exercise kingship for 13 years”, “after him a king will arise and will not judge the judgment of the land”, “after him a king will arise from Uruk”, “a rebel prince will arise”, find parallels in Daniel (Dan 11:2, 3, 7, 20, 21; cf. 9:26).[[156]](#footnote-157) Lambert concludes “it is certainly possible, perhaps even probable, that the author of Daniel adapted the style of a traditional Babylonian genre for his own purposes”.[[157]](#footnote-158)

If Lambert’s conclusion is correct then Daniel 11 was written to conform to a specific genre; it takes the form of a Dynastic Prophecy – from Alexander to Antiochus – including political details characteristic of the genre, though seemingly irrelevant to the modern reader. Thus, the fact that Daniel 11 is uncharacteristic of other OT prophecies is explicable. The apparent discontinuity with the surrounding text (Dan 10:1-19; 12:5-13) is probably best explained by the desire to make a distinction from the Babylonian texts by putting the Dynastic Prophecy in the mouth of an angel.

**Conclusion**

The eleventh chapter of Daniel provides traditionalists with a difficult problem: here in a book purporting to be a sixth century composition we find a chapter that is concerned with the political events of Hellenistic era and the Maccabean crisis, culminating with a predicted invasion of Egypt that never took place. Why should a sixth century Jew concern himself with such political minutiae? And how can an inspired prophet make erroneous predictions? This chapter is the strongest argument in favour of late pseudonymous authorship.

The explanation advocated by Wright, though based upon critical analysis, was proposed in order to remove the foundation of the critical case for a late-date. The inconvenient aspects of Daniel 11 could be dismissed as later interpolations and thereby the majority of the book could be retained for “Daniel”. Though this explanation seems plausible, it lacks positive evidence and is difficult to reconcile with our understanding of the textual transmission of the Scriptures.

Aided by Lambert’s parallels, a form-critical approach indicates that the idiosyncrasies of Daniel 11 should be regarded as intentional. Though Lambert argues in favour of second-century date, the date and provenance of Babylonian Dynastic Prophecy may be taken as strong indicators of an early, and eastern, authorship. The purpose behind adopting this form would be a demonstration of the superiority of the God of Israel over the Babylonian gods, as in the earlier of chapters of the book.

This alternative explanation still leaves many questions unexplained, including: ‘Why the emphasis on the Maccabean period?’ and ‘Are vv. 40-45 really an erroneous prediction?’ Nevertheless perhaps it provides us with a strong foundation upon which to approach these questions.

**An Angelic Piece of Writing?**

**Andrew Perry**

In this article[[158]](#footnote-159) we will look at the context of Daniel 11 rather than the prophetic sequence of events detailed in the body of the chapter. These events principally relate to the times of the Seleucids and Ptolemies, and they are well documented; we will focus just on its context.

Daniel 11 is a unique chapter in the Bible. Most commentaries will suggest that it is an “ex eventu” prophecy (a ‘prophecy’ written after the events). For example, it has been suggested that it is a Jewish commentary or ‘Targum’ on the events it describes—a Jewish Targum that somehow got bound up with the original scroll of the whole book after the events had taken place. My aim in this article is to suggest a hypothesis that accounts for its uniqueness.

The chapter principally documents events between Egypt and Syria that take place from the time of Cambyses (529-522) to Antiochus Epiphanes IV (164). It describes them in great detail, and the amount of detail supplied is greater than we get in other prophecies, and it is detail about a period of Biblical history which doesn’t immediately appear very important to the Bible student. It is the combination of this detail and apparent unimportance that engenders the critical view that the ‘prophecy’ is in fact an historical record.

*I want to suggest that Daniel 11 isn't a prophecy, but neither do I think it to be a Jewish commentary that has got bound up with a Daniel scroll sometime in the past. Instead, I want to suggest that the chapter represents a plan or a schedule set down by an angel for the guidance of other angels in their organization of the affairs of the Syro-Judean land-bridge during the centuries before Christ. In short it is a piece of angelic writing.*

Much prophecy was given to the O.T. prophets by dream and by vision. However, Daniel is almost unique (cf. John the apostle) in that he receives some of his knowledge of the future directly in conversation with the angels. This is a **common feature of Jewish Apocalypses**. The close relationship that he had with the angels has led to a piece of angelic writing being bound with the book.

The work of the angels is illustrated in 1 Kgs 22:19-23, where we have the heavenly court depicted. We learn there that the work of the angels is a co-operative political work directed by the Lord. In Daniel 10, the work of the angels in Near East politics is further described. In this chapter, Daniel understood that the appointed time for the end of things was a long time in the future, and he was greatly distressed as a result. He was mourning for a full three weeks before he received any comfort. Comfort eventually came in the form of a vision of an angel as a linen-clothed ‘man’. What can we find out about this linen clothed man?

He first appears in Daniel 8. The seer sees something like a man between the banks of the Ulai (vv. 15-16), and this ‘man’ calls out to the angel Gabriel to make Daniel understand the Vision of the Ram and the He-goat. As Gabriel approaches Daniel and talks to him, Daniel falls asleep (v. 18). Later on, Daniel again sees the ‘man’ clothed in linen and as he hears his voice (Dan 10:5-9), he again falls asleep. The linen-clothed ‘man’ had sent Gabriel to reveal things to Daniel about the ram and the he-goat in Daniel 8, and Gabriel had touched Daniel out of sleep on that occasion. Here in Daniel 10, Gabriel is sent again (v. 11) and he again touches Daniel out of his sleep and talks to him.[[159]](#footnote-160)

The man in linen appears lastly in Dan 12:6, where he is again described as in the middle of a river (cf. Dan 8:15-16). This man has knowledge of times and seasons, because he is asked ‘How long’? The identity of this angel has been suggested to be Palomoni, ‘the numberer of secrets’[[160]](#footnote-161) mentioned in Daniel 8 (v. 13, KJV mg.), because both he and the ‘saint’ of Daniel 8 is asked ‘How long’? Is the linen-clothed man the same angel as the one called ‘the wonderful numberer’?

Returning our attention to Gabriel, in Daniel 10, he says that he has come to help Daniel understand “what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the vision [is] for [many] days” (v. 14). Before Gabriel had been able to come, the text records that he had been opposed by the ‘prince’ of Persia, before being helped by Michael the Prince. Having broken free from this opposition, which lasted for 21 days, Gabriel came to Daniel to help him. Gabriel then showed Daniel what is recorded in Daniel 11.

The prince of Persia had evidently disagreed with Gabriel over some matter, and this had required the archangel Michael to intervene, he being the angel responsible for Israelite affairs (Dan 12:1). After revealing an answer to Daniel’s prayer Gabriel was ‘going back’ to ‘fight’ the prince of Persia, and it would seem that he anticipated that the prince of Greece would come and join the prince of Persia in opposing him.[[161]](#footnote-162)

In this scene we see that individual angels administer the affairs of the nations. Each nation has a particular angel appointed to its control and, no doubt, angels under them. Gabriel’s provenance of duty appears to be a more personal one than directing the affairs of a nation. Since he appears again to Mary, we might surmise that he was responsible for the revelation of God’s purpose to the mortal saints on earth. He seems to be under the direction of Palomoni. As such, he would be supported by Michael in determining what would happen to Israel, and he would also be involved with other angels in determining the affairs of their respective nations. In this way he could determine what needed to be revealed to the saints on earth.

Before he returns to meet the prince of Persia, Gabriel says to Daniel, “I will shew thee that which is noted in the scripture of truth” (Dan 10:19).[[162]](#footnote-163) Here Gabriel is offering to shew Daniel what is written (literally “inscribed”) in the “writing” of truth, and in Dan 11:2 Gabriel says, “And now I will shew thee the truth”. There then follows a set of notes from the “writing of truth” mentioned by Gabriel. This “scripture of truth” to which Gabriel alludes is not the O.T. but some other piece of writing in his possession. It is this writing that we have transcribed for us in Daniel 11.

The opening verse of Daniel 11 is interesting. It is a first person utterance by Gabriel addressed to the reader:

And I, in the first year of Darius the Mede, my standing [is] for a strengthener, and for a stronghold to him; and, now, truth I declare to thee, Lo, yet three kings are... Dan 11:1-2

The ‘I’ here is Gabriel, and the ‘him’ is Daniel. Gabriel says that he ‘stood for’ something—being a strengthener, and in the first year of Darius he had strengthened Daniel (Dan 9:1, 21-23). This opening is like the openings we find in the Prophets when they detail in which kings’ reigns they prophesied. Having positioned himself in respect of his audience, Gabriel delivers the writing of truth speaking it to Daniel (Dan 11:2). Gabriel tells Daniel that he will “shew” him the writing of truth, and at the end of the meeting Gabriel says to him, “Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book” (Dan 12:4). This suggests that Gabriel has read (part of?) a book with Daniel. (The form of address is continued in Dan 12:1—‘thy people’ and Dan 12:4 —‘and thou, O Daniel’).

We see therefore that Daniel 11 is the direct record of an angelic plan for Israel ‘in the latter days’ (Dan 10:14). We might surmise from this example that angels administer the affairs of the world and use written plans in the performance of their duty. As a schedule delivered by an angel, it has a different character to other prophecies which relate visions, but its hares with the pre-exilic Prophets the characteristic of having unfulfilled elements towards the end of collected oracles. It is a record of the direct speech of Gabriel, and this accounts for its unique character. It is the longest stretch of the direct speech of an angel recorded in the Bible.
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1. In this unique context, prayer petitioning terms are not used when Stephen makes request to Jesus (though some evidently ignore this—H. A. Whittaker, *Studies in the Acts of Apostles* (Cannock: Biblia, 1985), 104: “Now Stephen prayed…to Jesus”). As we shall argue, Jesus ‘in council’ testifies of his testifier (‘martyr’), and thereby judges the Jews. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. [Ed: AP] The term “angelomorphic” is common in scholarship in discussions of how angelic categories apply to persons. For a recent study see S. R. Wiest, “Stephen and the Angel: A Typological Reading of the Story of Stephen in the Acts of the Apostles” (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 2001). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Compare the NT quotation of this text in 2 Cor. 13:1, which matches the Hebrew with its equivalent NT Greek term for ‘arise’/‘establish’/‘stand’ - *stathesetai* - (from *histemi*). Greek LXX mss. normally translate the Hebrew ‘stand (up)’ with this same verb. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Compare “The counsel of YHWH **stands** for ever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations” (Ps 33:11). This is a metaphorical ‘standing’ which can be matched by physical demonstration, moving from ‘sitting’ to ‘standing’ (an analogue of taking a firm stance) in the Divine act of judging. Also, this following eschatological text partakes in the role or fellowship of ‘standing’: “And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince who stands for the children of your people” (Dan. 12:1). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Note: the Hebrew for ‘man’ is ´îš, not ´ädäm, which if it were would be a confusion of categories; angels are not “of”, nor are they “in”, a set of ´ädäm). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Here we are postponing discussion of LXXPs 96:7, LXXDeut 32:43, and 4QDeut 32:43 as proposed sources for Heb 1:6. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. [Ed: AP] A similar relationship of ´élöhîm and mal´äk as well as terms such as aggelos and theos can also be mapped in various DSS texts. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. [Ed: AP] The notion of the extension of a concept is common in logic and semantics; for an introduction see J. Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 454. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Jesus and God present a witness of two who are one in manifestation - John 10:30. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. In Genesis 18 – 19, Abraham’s angelic visitors **stood** [Heb:niccäbîm] by him (Gen 18:2), and while they ate his prepared meal he **stood** [Heb. `ömëd] nearby (Gen 18:8). After two of the angels have gone to Sodom to destroy it, Abraham is recorded as being in a place where he **stood** (Gen 18:22; 19:27) before the remaining angel, representing YHWH, and communed with him over the fate of Sodom; this is another Divine council theophanic episode related to judgment. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Isaac Newton, in his *General Scholium* appended to *Principia* (1713, Second edition, and 1726, Third edition), in arguing for a “relative God” concept in the Bible, picks out instances where Divine agents go proxy for God. This is some of what he spells out (in King’s College Keynes MS 3, f. 45, reproduced, with acknowledgement to S. Snobelen, as it appears in the manuscript): “We may give the name of Gods to other Beings as is frequently done in Scripture. Aaron shall be to thee a mouth [or Prophet <or Logoj>] & thou shalt be to him a GOD. Exod IV. 16. See I have made thee a GOD to Pharaoh & Aaron shall be your Prophet Exod VII. 1. I have said you are GODS, but you shall dye like men Psal. LXXXII.6.” [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. On this see further, J. Adey, “Psalm 110” in CeJBI 2/3 (Jul 2008): 73-95. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. At this moment, recorded in Acts 22:1ff, when speaking his defence in the Hebrew tongue before his countrymen, Paul, ‘**stood**’ on the stairs! An incidental detail? Would this remind him of how he and his fellow Jews crowded in upon Stephen as he S/Paul **stood** by? Eventually, having been brought before the Jewish council (Acts 23:28) and the judge Felix (Acts 24:10), Paul appeals to be heard before Caesar in Rome, and later tells Festus: “I **stand** at Caesar's **judgment** **seat**, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as you very well know” (Acts 25:10). Paul had been advised by Jesus to witness at Rome. In Acts 23:11 Paul records that “the Lord **stood** by him, and said, Be of good cheer, Paul: for as you have **testified** of me in Jerusalem, so must you bear **witness** also at Rome.” And, en route to Caesar’s judgment seat in Rome, shipwreck imminent, Paul was assured by angelic visitation that he would make it to Rome, the crew would be saved, but the ship would be lost: “For there **stood** by me this night the angel of God, whose I am, and whom I serve. Saying, Fear not, Paul; you must be brought before Caesar: and, lo, God has given you all them that sail with you” (Acts 27:23 - 24). [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. The ´élöhîm-theos (*phanerosis*) relation that applied to Moses, a prophet who in time past received and spoke God’s word, is applied to Jesus by way of Ps 45:6 (v. 7 MT) and Heb 1:8. This consistently connects with Jesus’ point in John 10:34-36. Within this same theophanic framework, his own role is determined. He aligns himself (or is in continuity) with human-gods (cf. Ps 82:6) receiving, and being agents for the proclamation of, God’s word. Though, clearly, in him as the Son of God, past proclamatory agents have been surpassed; the Father in the Son has provided this ‘difference’ (e.g., John 1:14; 14:8-9; 2 Cor 5:19). For, this is the fullness of time in God’s scheme for the Jesus-´élöhîm: God has now spoken in a Son (Heb 1:1-2). As Stephen says pointedly in Acts 7:37, Moses prophetically (pre-)describes him: “A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall you hear” (the consequence for Stephen’s audience, or the Jews who neglect to hear this unique prophet that even Moses whom they revered spoke of, is spelled out earlier in Acts 3:22-23, but this is one of those instances, as reported, where Stephen leaves the consequence unsaid; at least at this point he does). [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. In virtue of these Divine ‘extensions’ (angels and human agents who go proxy for the Most High), the plural ´élöhîm used of them, or even of any individual one of them, marks their representational relation (beyond, or through, them) to God/YHWH. Likewise, the use of the plural ´élöhîm where the referent is Yahweh, Himself, suggests we should take this not as a “plural of majesty” (etc.), but a plural whose sense is ‘God-of-manifestation’. This amounts to there being a humanly unquantifiable plurality in YHWH with respect to His being represented, or imaged. The singular ‘God’ terms ´ël and ´élôah cannot convey this theophanic potential.

    Unity is preserved in this plurality (or plural extension) of YHWH: ‘Yahweh our ´élöhîm, Yahweh *is* **one’** (Deut. 6:4). This multiple imaging of one God, bearers of His image (Rom 8:29; 1 Cor 11:7; 15:49; 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4; Col 1:15; 3:10), not being Him, but having His likeness, helps us to understand God/´élöhîm saying “Let **us** [plural]make man in **our** [plural] image [singular/one image].... So ´élöhîm created man in his own image, in the image of God/´élöhîm created he him; male and female created he them” (Gen. 1:26-27). (Compare the cohortative “Let **us**” **(**make)”... + “YHWH ´élöhîm said, Behold, the man is become **as one of us**” – Gen. 1:26-27; 3:22 – with ‘let us’ + ‘one’ (of many) in Gen. 11:1 – 9. There, these terms figure in Babel builder’s talk, and YHWH’s, resulting in His theophanic accompanied ‘coming down’ to confuse them and disrupt their heavenly aspirations.

    Also, man is said to be constituted “lower/lesser than the ´élöhîm” in Ps 8:6. Both Heb 2:9 in quoting this Psalm, and LXX rendering it (whether independently of the NT or not), match Ps 8:6’s ´élöhîm with ‘angels’ (and LXX has aggelous/aggeloi for ´élöhîm elsewhere in the Psalms). Humans, having been made with this same Divine image as angel-´élöhîm, often “entertained angels unawares” (Heb 13:2). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. BDB, 31, defines the phrase as “a prophetic phrase denoting the final period of the history so far as the speaker's perspective reaches; the sense thus varies with the context”. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. We use this term here in a derivative sense, i.e. an expression is “apocalyptic” in virtue of being used in a topic-specific way in an “Apocalypse”. While scholars may disagree on the extent of this genre and argue for “apocalyptic” elements in works that are not Apocalypses, Daniel 7-12 is usually taken to be an “Apocalypse” because it shares features with other Second Temple Apocalypses. An “Apocalypse” may have some or all of the following aspects: periodization of history, predictions surrounding the end of history and the establishment of a new age, eschatological wars and woes, the intervention of a heavenly figure, a day of judgment, and the national restoration of Israel. In addition, the genre involves revelation by an angelic mediator, heavenly journeys, and symbolic visions of Israel and its relation to the nations. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. For an introductory overview of these woes in Jewish apocalyptic writings, see C. Rowland, *Open Heaven* (London: SPCK, 1982), ch. 7; D. C. Allison, *The End of the Ages Has Come* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), ch. 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. J. J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), ch. 2, outlines the influence of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls; see also the discussion of L. T. Stuckenbruck, “The Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed., J. H. Charlesworth; 3 vols; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1:101-130. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. For a discussion of this form of Jewish historiography in relation to the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Animal Apocalypse, see I. Fröhlich, *Time and Times and Half a Time: Historical Consciousness in the Jewish Literature of the Persian and Hellenistic Eras* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1996), 82-90. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. The principle upon which the periodization is organised is not solely linear, but may include chiastic or parallel elements, for a discussion of this issue see M. Henze, “The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Architecture of the End of Time” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins* (ed., G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 207-209. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. *Apocalypticism*, 57. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. Collins appears to be overly fussy in his reading of the text when he says, “the fulfilment of these curses and blessings, then, is not part of the end of days at hand”, *Apocalypticism*, 61. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. For example, see the discussion by D. C. Allison, *The End of the Ages Has Come* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. We use the notion of an “eschatological deliverer” as a catch-all term for expressions used in eschatological texts that refer to an individual who performs critical actions that bring about the new age. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: SCM Press, 1964), 269. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. *End of the Ages*, 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. J. J. Collins, “The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls” in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds., C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 74-90 (62). [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. For further development, see: John Adey, “A Shadow of Good things to come” The Testimony (Jan 1984). [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. The standard English edition is comprised of *The Aramaic Bible Series* (ed., M. J. McNamara; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988—). For an overall introduction to the Targums, see P. S. Alexander, “Jewish Aramaic Translations” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed., M. J. Mulder; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 217-253. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. G. Vermes, “Jewish Literature and New Testament Exegesis: Reflections on Methodology” *JJS* 33 (1982): 361-376 (361). [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. We are excluding the Targums devoted to the *Ketubim* because of their relative late dates; see M. J. McNamara, “Interpretation of Scripture in the Targumim” in *A History of Biblical Interpretation* (eds., A. J. Hauser and D. F. Watson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 167-197 (169). [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. R. Le Déaut, *The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible (Targum)* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982), 24. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. A. D. York in “The Dating of the Targumic Literature” *JSJ* 5 (1974): 49-62 (59), discusses the arguments for the priority of the Palestinian Targums over that of *Onqelos* and concludes, “the prior antiquity of the Palestinian Targum, must be, if not abandoned altogether, modified drastically to say simply that the PT includes some quite ancient traditions”. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
35. M. J. McNamara, “Some Targum Themes” in *Justification and Variegated Nomism* (eds., D. A. Carson, P. T. O’Brien and M. A. Seifried; 2 vols; WUNT 2/140-141; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001-2004), 305-356 (303-306). [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
36. S. A. Kaufman, “Dating the Language of the Palestinian Targums and their Use in the Study of First Century C.E. Texts” in *The Aramaic Bible* (eds., D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 117-141 (124); see also M.J. Maher, “Introduction” to *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*, (ed., M. J. Maher; Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1992), 1-14 (12), who comments that “both the content and the language of *Tg*. *Ps.-J* allow us to accept with confidence the view that this Targum in its final form cannot be dated before the seventh or eighth century”. Compare also G. J. Kuiper, *The Pseudo-Jonathan Targum and its Relationship to Targum Onqelos* (Rome: Institutum Patristicum, 1972), ch. 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
37. “Interpretation of Scripture in the Targumim”, 169. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
38. For a review of the two schools of thought, see E. M. Cook, “A New Perspective on the Language of Onqelos and Jonathan”, in *Targums in their Historical Context* (eds., D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 142-156. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
39. B. Grossfeld, “Introduction”, *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis* (ed., B. Grossfeld; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 1-39 (18), and for a summary of arguments, 30-35. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
40. “Some Targum Themes”, 306. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
41. For a description of the historical background to *Targum Jonathan* and its relationship to *Onqelos*, see Pinkhos Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927), ch. 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
42. L. Smolar and Moses Aberbach, eds., *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New York: Ktav Publishing, 1983), xxviii. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
43. Daniel J. Harrington and Anthony J. Saldarini, “Introduction”, *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets* (eds., Daniel J. Harrington and Anthony J. Saldarini; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 1-15 (3), favour a date for the *Former Prophets* of 135 C.E., but recognise the need to take into account a period of redactional composition. B. D. Chilton, “Introduction”, *The Isaiah Targum* (ed., B. D. Chilton; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), xiii-xxxv (xxiv), argues that, “it is impossible to know whether a complete Targum was produced at the Tannaitic phase, and reworked at the Amoraic phase, or whether both phases were partial affairs”. R. D. Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah* (ed., R. D. Hayward; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 38, argues that there are “sufficient grounds for discerning the origins of *Tg*. *Jeremiah* in the land of Israel during, or slightly before, the first century A.D.”. R. P. Gordon and K. J. Cathcart, “Introduction”, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets* (eds., R. P. Gordon and K. J. Cathcart; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 1-25 (18), argue for a literary composition after 70 C.E. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
44. For example, see the overview of opinion in O. Eissfeldt, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1969), 460-462. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
45. However, it is worth noting that the so-called disturbed third cycle is present in its present form in the Targum fragments discovered at Qumran, indicating that the current composition is as old as the 2c. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
46. D. J. A. Clines, “The Arguments of Job’s Three Friends*”*, in *Art and Meaning: Rhetoric in Biblical Literature* (eds., D. J. A. Clines, D. M. Gunn, and A. Hauser; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982), 199-214 (208). Clines only canvasses one proposal about the disturbance of the text and notes that there are other suggestions. A convenient list of 24 different reconstructions is given in N. H. Snaith, *The Book of Job* (London: SCM Press, 1968), Appendix 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
47. F. I. Andersen, *Job* (Tyndale; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1976), 214-19. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
48. This two-cycle approach to Job is supported by D. Wolfers, *Deep Things out of Darkness* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 225-255 and his “The Speech-Cycles in the Book of Job” *VT* 43 (1993): 385-402. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
49. *Deep Things*, 254-255. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
50. For example, see the introduction to Job in B. S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (London: SCM Press, 1979), 542. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
51. E. Dhorme, *Job* (trans. H. Knight; London: Nelson, 1967), cv. One argument is that the presence of Aramaic words is proportionately greater in Elihu’s speeches suggesting greater influence of that language. Aramaic was rapidly becoming the *lingua franca* throughout the eighth century, and so the different quantity of Aramaisms in Elihu’s speeches could suggest a later addition by the original author; and it is also likely the reason for the Aramaisms is to be found in the distinctive nature of Elihu’s argument. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
52. R. Gordis, *The Book of God and Man: A Study of Job* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 106-109. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
53. The clearest advocate of this position is that of N. C. Habel, *The Book of Job* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985), 25-29. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
54. Scholars disagree on the plausibility of amendments to the text. For a sceptical review see Gordis, *The Book of God*, 17-18. Others who defend the unity of the book and a single “author” include the heavyweight commentary by Dhorme, *Job*, lxxxv, and the popular commentary by Anderson, *Job*, 41-55. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
55. C. A. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), ch. 1. Newsom says that, “the multigeneric nature of the book of Job does not lend itself readily to… [a]focus on unity”, 8. However, our counter-argument is that the elements in the prologue/epilogue direct the reader to a different level of meaning. It is not that the book of Job is multigeneric; rather it is multi-levelled in its meaning. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
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